

SOME ASPECTS REGARDING BORDER DRAWING AND REGULATION RELATIONS BETWEEN ROMANIA AND HUNGARY AFTER TRIANON*

Ion ZAINEA

DOI <https://doi.org/10.56082/annalsarscihist.2020.2.32>

Summary. After the conclusion of the Treaty of Trianon, the work of drawing the new border between Romania and Hungary, made by a commission composed of delegations belonging to the two parties, was extended until the end of 1923. In order to prepare the documents of the new border, the delegation asked the prefectures of Satu Mare, Bihor, Arad and Timiș to notify the inhabitants of the area and to draw up tables with the Romanian names of the localities bordering the border. Other problems were the distribution of assets belonging to the counties whose territory was divided by the new border, the fact that a number of legal entities (foundations, corporations, cooperatives, assemblies, communes, religious communities, etc.) remained with part of their movable and / or immovable property in the territory of the Hungarian State and, last but not least, the conclusion of a trade agreement between the two countries.

Keywords: *the Treaty of Trianon, 1919, new border, Romania, Hungary, county.*

In the summer of 1919, according to the decisions of the Paris Peace Conference, four commissions of experts - English, French, Italian and American - drew Romania's borders with Hungary. Finally, the four proposals were examined and, on the basis of compromise formulas, the final border was established¹, a decision which was brought to Bucharest's attention on 12th October 1919. This corresponded, in essence, to the ethnic principle, which led to its acceptance by the Romanian government. The route of the Romanian-Hungarian border was included in article no. 27 of the Treaty of Trianon, whose article no. 45 provided that Hungary waived, in its favor, in favor of Romania, "all rights and titles over the territories of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy located beyond its borders" and recognized as part of Romania.

The works for drawing the new border, made by a commission composed of delegations belonging to the two interested parties, were extended until the end of 1923. With the address no. 4,768, from 30th January 1924, the Romanian

* This article was published, in full, in Romanian, in the volume: Ion Zainea, *Economie și societate în Bihor (de la Marea Unire la Dictatul de la Viena)*, Universitatea din Oradea Publishing House, Oradea, 2007, pp. 9-15.

¹ *Istoria Românilor*, vol. VIII, (coordinator Ioan Scurtu), Encyclopedic Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003, p. 22.

delegation from the Commission for the delimitation of the Romanian-Hungarian border informed the Prefecture of Bihor County that the border between Romania and Hungary was materialized on the ground, as follows: “The entire border was divided into 10 sections, designated by the letters A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, K and L. The end of each section is indicated by a specially shaped boundary stone (in trachyte). Along each section there are, on the border line, reinforced ferroconcrete bollards of 2 different types. The large ones are called main terminals, and the small ones are called intermediate terminals. All terminals bear, on 2 opposite sides, the initials of the respective countries (R.-Romania, M.-Hungary). Each terminal is then provided with the letter of the section to which it belongs and, in addition, a serial number. The main terminals start, in each section, with the number one and are numbered independently of the intermediate terminals, following the series continuously until the end of the section where the trachyte terminal is located on which the number of the last main terminal is engraved. In addition to the letter of the section, each intermediate terminal bears the number of the main terminal which follows it and, in addition, the serial number which belongs to it as an intermediate terminal. In some swampy parts the main and intermediate terminals have been replaced by impregnated oak pillars, which bear the same indications as the terminals which these pillars replace. In addition, watercourses, canals, etc., i.e. where the border follows an imaginary line, it was materialized by means of stones called landmarks or polygons, which bear as an indication only a continuous serial number for each section, except of the initials indicating the quality of the stone: landmark R. or polygonal P. In the case of landmark stones, the border is halfway between the two landmarks bearing the same serial number, while where the border is a function of polygonal stones, it generally follows the water line on the canal / course / main. The terminals are whitewashed (white) and the inscriptions in black”¹. It was also mentioned that “the point where the three borders of Romania, Hungary and the Serbo-Croatian-Slovenian Kingdom met is designated by a stone of a special format”, while “the triplex confinium point between Romania, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, found at the meeting of the Tur and Hodos waters, was indicated by three landmarks (one on the territory of each state)”.

On 18th April 1924, the head of the Romanian delegation, gen. C. Dumitrescu, addressed the prefectures of Timis, Arad, Bihor and Satu Mare, the border guards battalions of Timisoara, Arad, Oradea and Sighetul Marmatiei, the 3rd and 4th border regiments, the border guard companies of Arad, Salonta, Oradea, Valea lui Mihai, Carei, Halmeu and Chisinau (Arad County) a statement asking them to take into account all the inhabitants of the communes along the border the following: the owners of the places along the border can work the land

¹ National Archives Bihor County Directorate (A.N.D.J.Bh.), fund *Prefectura judetului Bihor* (i.e. Bihor County Prefecture), folder 68/1923-1924, f. 5.

that belongs to them only up to a distance of one meter from the terminals border. Consequently, “an unworked and cleaned area of any kind of plantations, shrubs, etc. will have to be found at all times along the border line (i.e. the line joining 2 neighboring terminals), being one meter wide (inland) on the territory of each of the two neighboring countries”; with regard to stones or geodetic signs placed outside the border line, the owners are obliged to leave around them a surface of land having a radius of 1.50 m; the landmarks, pillars, stones, etc., which mark the border are and remain the responsibility of the border guards, while the geodetic signs, pyramids, etc. are received and guarded by the respective communal authorities; the communes are obliged to report every year, during April, to the Directorate of the Cadastre on their condition and to indicate in particular the signs that would have been degraded or destroyed by chance; the border guard units are obliged to report to the Border Guard Command about the disappearance of the terminal or pillar, as soon as they have found their absence; those found to have established, moved or destroyed border signs as well as geodetic ones outside the border line will be prosecuted and punished according to the provisions of the Penal Code¹.

In order to draw up the border documents, the Romanian delegation in the Commission for the delimitation of the Romanian-Hungarian and Romanian-Czechoslovak borders requested from the prefectures of Satu Mare, Bihor, Arad and Timiș tables with the Romanian names of the localities bordering the border. From Bihor county were registered in the border documents, registers and maps, with the new Romanian names, the localities: Ant (former Ant), Ateaș (former Atyás), Diosig (Bihardiószeg), Bihor (Bihar), Borș (Bors), Cefa (Cséfa), Ciocaia (Csokaly), Cheniz (Érkenéz), Valea lui Mihai (Érmihályfalva), Șilindru (Érselind), Șimian (Érsemjén), Giriș (Gyéres), Ciumeghiu (Illye), Inand (Inánd), Marțihaz (Marczih) Salonta (Nagyszalonta), Santăul Mare (Nagyszántó), Sânnicolaul Român (Oláhszentmiklós), Parhida (Pelbárthida), Roit (Rojt), Săcuieni (Szekélyhíd), Sântion (Szentjános), Tămașda (Tamáshida), Toboliu (Vizesgyán), Feleghihaz (Biharfélegyháza)².

The law promulgated by Decree no. 20, of 28th April 1923, prohibited the sale of land and buildings to foreigners within a radius of 10 km from the border. The measure is communicated, on 27th September 1924, to the prime praetor from the areas of Valea lui Mihai, Sacuieni, Salard, Centrala and Salonta, who will investigate and ascertain the possible cases of deviation, which they will bring to the attention of the Regional Litigation in Cluj or Arad, so that this can take measures to annul the acts.

By the protocol concluded on 16th April 1924, between the Romanian and the Hungarian delegations, it was ordered that, no later than 10th July 1924, to be

¹ *Ibidem*, f. 6.

² *Ibidem*, f. 13.

concluded the census of values administered by the orphanages located in Bihor, Arad and Satu Mare counties, those whose constituency was divided by the new border. In order to draw up these works, delegates from the three counties were included in the commission set up for the execution of the Convention on the Assets Division between Romania and Hungary, assets belonging to localities and counties whose territory was divided by the border established by the Treaty of Trianon. On behalf of Bihor County, Dr. Victor Fildan, Secretary of the County Council, was delegated to the commission.

The issues regarding the distribution of the goods of Bihor county were debated in several meetings, the result of which was included in 15 minutes, drawn up partly on the territory of Romania, partly in Hungary. In the first meeting, preliminary arrangements were made on the way in which the debates were to take place, the form in which the conclusions of the delegations were drafted and their induction in the minutes were debated. After the delegations of the two states agreed on the preliminary provisions, they proceeded to the execution of the convention, setting out the main points that will be the subject of the debates. The first point was to establish the proportion of division. According to the result of the debates, held in Oradea, on April 1925, the key for the distribution of goods was established, for Bihor county belonging to Romania, 60.3%, and for Bihor county belonging to Hungary, 39.7%. The real estate that, by mutual agreement, formed the object of distribution were the palace / building of the prefecture of Oradea, with all the services and houses of the prefect and subprefect, the building called "Cazarma Crisului" from Oradea, the price buildings from the areas Centrala, Valea lui Mihai, Sacuieni, Marghita, Alesd, Ceica, Beius, Vascau, Tinca, Beliu, Salonta, Cefa, Salard, from the Romanian territory and Berettyóújfalu, Biharkeresztes, Biharnagybajon and Derecske from the Hungarian territory¹. It was not possible to reach an agreement with the Hungarian delegation on the buildings of the County Hospital, the Hospital for the Insane and their built-up areas, as well as on the Hospital in Beius, because the Romanian delegation claimed that these buildings and goods fell under article no. 191 of the Treaty of Trianon and therefore cannot be assigned. The Romanian delegation showed, with documents, that the Beius Hospital was built from donations and funds collected for this purpose from the population of Beius and its surroundings, and was abusively registered in the county's land books, which it illegally appropriated the ownership of this building. In relation to the other goods, although it was agreed that they form elements of distribution, regarding their evaluation, however, no result could be reached, because there was a big difference between the evaluation price of the Romanian delegation and that of the Hungarian delegation. While the Romanian delegation made the evaluations of the buildings and the built lands taking as a basis the provisions of article no. 7

¹ *Ibidem*, folder 125/ 1925, f. 1-4.

and established the average transaction price from 1924-1925, the Hungarian delegation evaluated these buildings on the basis of the price of material, land and construction costs. Consequently, the matter was to be referred to the Arbitration Law Court.

The Romanian delegation drew up, in order to submit to the Arbitration Law Court, an evaluation of the buildings, except the hospitals. The elaboration of the evaluations, made with the help of the county technical bodies and of the engineer Lazar Vasile from Cluj, required several expertises both on the Romanian territory and on the territory of Hungary, not only in the localities where they were located, but also in the neighboring localities, to make the comparisons. The works required time, having to be made paintings, sketches, in most places and photographs of similar buildings, and then procuring contracts for transactions concluded in recent years regarding the sale and purchase of such buildings and real estate, on the basis of which a real assessment can be established. The difficulties encountered in the preparation of these works were sometimes insurmountable, especially since it was not possible to collect accurate data on the territory of Hungary, and on the other hand because in the absence of similar localities and buildings no data could be obtained to make comparisons. The works prepared by the technical bodies, together with the necessary tables, sketches and photographs were reviewed by the General Inspector Costache, delegated by the Ministry of Public Works.

With regard to movable property, the delegations of the two states, after several debates, agreed that in order to establish the price of furniture in the buildings of the County Palace and areas residences, to take into account the decrease in price due to usage, damage and deficiencies caused by war and revolution; the inventory value of the furniture, both of those purchased until 1914, expressed in gold crowns, and of those purchased between 1914-1918 and whose inventory value was expressed in foreign currency crowns, to be multiplied by the coefficient 15, the product thus obtained representing the "up-to-date" price of the furniture in lei-currency. However, this agreement was reached only in terms of the furniture of the prefecture and the prices, without the furniture of the hospitals, which, like the respective buildings, according to the point of view of the Romanian delegation, did not represent an object of distribution. The members of the Hungarian delegation supported their point of view, that both the hospital buildings and their movable assets should be distributed.

The subject of long debates was the county roads and their sidewalks, foundations, railway actions, as well as the division of communal goods. Considering the degraded situation of the roads and their sidewalks on 31st October 1918, in both counties (Romanian Bihor and Hungarian Bihor), and taking into account the cost of restoration, "both parties give up each other to formulate claim". The agreement reached in this form benefited the Romanian

side, as the network of petrified county roads that belonged to it was larger both in terms of extension and number. Regarding the foundations, paragraph 2 of article no. 2 of the Convention was applied, and the railway actions, being transferred in 1911 to the property of the Hungarian state, did not form an object of division. With regard to the division of communal property, the agreement concluded between the local delegations of both states, according to which “each to remain in the property of those that possesses, without formulating any mutual claim”, also brought to the Romanian side a gain which, according to the balance sheet, was 1,747,910 lei.

The Romanian delegation “extradited” several paintings, banners, uniforms and straws to the Hungarian delegation. This gesture urged the Hungarian delegation to insist on the painting called “Festy”, which was not granted, because the Romanian delegation, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article no. 5 of the Convention, considered that this picture is of special interest to the Romanian side and being in our possession does not form a subject of litigation to be submitted to the Arbitration Law Court.

As a result of the negotiations between the Romanian and Hungarian delegations, agreements could be concluded regarding the key distribution, county roads and their sidewalks, foundations and railway actions, furniture of the prefecture, sub-prefecture and areas, funds, except allodial fund and notaries’ salaries. The final Balance Sheet was drawn up on them, taking as a basis, when drawing up the real estate balance sheet, the evaluation of the Romanian experts and the point of view of the Romanian delegation regarding the buildings that are the object of distribution (i.e. without hospitals) which was agreed and applied only to the furniture that the Romanian delegation considered to be distributed (i.e. without the hospital furniture), and to the funds the result of the management accounts at the end of 1918, taking into account the deficits of the fund allodial, which the Hungarian delegation did not accept. The positive elements were taken in the Balance Sheet, according to the common understanding, again only regarding those that according to the point of view of the Romanian delegation were the object of distribution (i.e. without the passive elements of the hospital). Based on this Balance Sheet, Romania would pay to Hungary, according to a first evaluation, the amount of 4,421,496 lei, converted into dollars, with the average exchange rate of 204 lei one dollar, respectively 21,674 dollars, and according to the second evaluation 7,041,672 lei converted in dollars, with the same average of the exchange rate, i.e. 34,518 dollars¹.

No agreement could be reached on the following issues: valuation of real estate which, by mutual agreement, were admitted as allocations, due to the large difference between the valuations of the two parties, real estate of hospitals which, according to the Romanian delegation, did not form elements of distribution, the

¹ *Ibidem*, f. 4.

furniture of the hospitals, the liabilities of the County Hospital, the deficit of the allodial fund and the salary of the notaries, the "Festy" painting and the Hospital from Beius. As a result, they were referred to the Arbitration Law Court.

By drawing the new border between Romania and Hungary, a number of legal entities (foundations, corporations, joint stock companies, cooperatives, assemblies, communes, religious communities, etc.) remained with a part of their movable and / or immovable property on the territory of the Hungarian state. The identification of such situations was done through announcements, newspapers and official posters from the county prefecture, and the assets were to be recovered. The action, which began in November 1921, was completed in the summer of the following year. 29 legal entities from Bihor County declared themselves interested in an enterprise / institution from Hungary, or having located a part of the fortune outside the borders of Romania. Of these, 12 were credit companies (Suplac, Santandrei, Beliu, Diosig, Tamaseu, Hodis, Spinus, Cetariu, Parhida, Salard, Tamasda and Salonta), 5 valorization and consumption companies (Suplac, Hodis, Tamaseu, Sisterea and Fegernic), 5 banking institutions (Preservation Bank from Diosig, Banca Eriului and Banca Populara from Sacuieni and Credit Institute from Gyula) and Salonta commune. The latter claimed the area of 3,212 jugers remaining within the commune of Zsada (Hungary). The assets of companies and banks consist of cash (total 1,087,321 lei) and shares (totaling 108,691 lei) in various institutions in Budapest (Országos Központi Hitelszövetkezet, Pénzügyi Központ, "Hangya" vegyes Értékesítő Szövetkezet)¹.

Other legal entities owned movable and immovable property that was to be shared with institutions remaining in Hungary. Thus, the Batar Sugar Factory remained in the possession of 1,734 jugers, the property of the Sarkand Sugar Factory (Hungary), the Priestly Institute of the Reformed Evangelical Church District in Salonta was in the possession of the claims of residents of the communes of Okány, Sarkand and K Hungary, worth 6,570 lei, and the Joint Stock Company "Bihari Helyérdekű vasutak" from Budapest had a railway canton, 12 jugers and 1,543 fathoms in Coliu commune, a railway canton, 7 jugers and 635 fathoms in Cadea commune and 1 juger and 1 244 fathoms in Targusor commune, all located in Salard area. Clara Lovassy, repatriated to Hungary after 1918, claimed the area of 1,514 jugers within the commune of Batar (Tinca area), while Emeric Horvath from Remetea (Beius area) owned 1.5 jugers and 1,577 fathoms in the commune of Bakonyszeg (Hungary), inherited land from parents. Kismarja commune (Hungary) declares that it has in Romania 277 jugers and 1,493 fathoms, land that was sold to the inhabitants 10-12 years ago, but which had not been labeled in their name. The Salonta Credit Federation declares itself interested in the Budapest Regional Credit Federation with the amount of 185,624

¹ *Ibidem*, folder 76/ 1921-1922, f. 16.

crowns and 56 filers. In addition to actions at the Hitelszövetkezet (170,000 crowns) and Berezsadolom (250,000 crowns) in Budapest, the commune of Tamasda claimed 261 jugers of land in the latter. From the same locality, Boor Geza claimed 3 jugers of pasture in the commune of Közegyan (Hungary), the widow Ercsey Ernőne 261 jugers of land in the locality of Vasegyar, Petruta Ioan and Rosu Maria $\frac{1}{2}$ juger of land in the commune of Mehloved, Csiko Iuliana and Szilaghi Jozsef a house and 2 jugers of land, Kuzasi Gyula a house and 1 juger grape vine, Vaczy Jozsef and Pallog Erszebet a house, all in the same locality Kozegyan. Solyom Janos was left with a house and $\frac{1}{2}$ juger land in Geszo (Hungary), Mozes Sandor a house, Kuso Istvan a house and $\frac{1}{4}$ juger grape vine, Fazekas Ianos and Grosz Natalia a house and 2 jugers of land in Sarkand, and Piko Gergely a house and 2 jugers of land in Sarkandkeresztur¹.

Many of the existing cooperatives in Bihor County had, before the war, amounts deposited at the Budapest Central. According to the data gathered by the Prefecture, at the end of 1921, the value of deposits, in cash or shares, totaled 2,468,853 lei, belonging to the following cooperatives:

a) "Hangya" consumer cooperatives: Auseu (550 lei), Luncsoara (500 lei), Telechiu (146,610 lei), Cefa (1,100 lei), Inand (250 lei), Suplac (250 lei), Albis (10,040 lei), Hodis (1,400 lei), Sisterea (15,119 lei), Fegernic (250 lei), Arpad (800 lei), Tarcaia (300 lei), Simian (unknown amount);

b) credit unions: Gepiu (800 lei), Biharea (1,250,131 lei), Cheresig (8,000 lei), Osorhei (104,320 lei), Sacadat (1,000 lei), Santandrei (26,000 lei), Tarian (150 lei), Tileagd (5,000 lei), Suplac (15,118 lei), Abram (5,941 lei), Petreu (15,756 lei), Chet (30,164 lei), Poclusa (16,000 lei), Tamaseu (1,689 lei), Hodis (19,000 lei), Spinus (2,237 lei), Cetariu (93,402 lei), Parhida (900 lei), Salard (104,673 lei), Ghiorac (28,793 lei), Tamasda (87,254 lei), Arpad (60,511 lei), Ant (1,682 lei), Diosig (32,853 lei), Saniob (85,000 lei), Sanmiclaus (1,400 lei), Ciocaia (1,000 lei), Ginta (72,500 lei), Gurbediu (1,685 lei), Miersig (400 lei), Salacea (62,875 lei), Valea lui Mihai (164,000 lei)².

Similar actions were carried out during the years 1921-1922, in order to identify the alienated means of transport, carried out by the Ministry of Communications, the General Directorate of the Romanian Railways - C.F.R., or of the properties belonging to the Habsburg family. In accordance with the agreements reached at Portereze, between the successor states of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy, it was decided to return to each other the wagons belonging to individuals and rental companies belonging to the successor states and which wagons had been incorporated in the park of the former monarchy. The restitution was made only for wagons that were not included in the lists of wagons

¹ *Ibidem*, f. 15.

² *Ibidem*, f. 47.

claimed by the allied states as prey to war, confiscation and armistice. As for the properties, the Habsburg family, more precisely Archduke Joseph, owned in Bihor county a property in the commune of Tamasda, with an area of 548 jugers¹.

On 16th April 1924, the Trade Agreement was concluded between Romania and Hungary to facilitate small border traffic. According to the agreement, residents of the border area could obtain three-day permits to cross the border. Only the communes located within a radius of 10 km on either side of the border benefited from the advantages of the agreement. Cities were excluded, even if they were in this area. From Bihor county, the communes of Ant, Arpasel, Boiu, Ciumeghiu, Ghiorac, Homorog, Madaras, Martihaz, Tamasda, Tulca (Salonta square), Biharia, Bors, Cauaceu, Episcopia Bihor, Nojorid, Chisirid, Paleu Saldabagiu, Santandrei, Santion, Santaul Mare, Santaul Mic, Seleus, Giris, Palota, Uileacul de Munte (Seleus area), Sacuieni, Ciocaia, Cadea Mica, Coli, Cadea Mare, Diosig and Ianca (Sacuieni area), Parhida, Niuved, Tamaseu, Hodis, Rosiori and Vaida (Salard area), Ateas, Cefa, Inand, Berechiu, Sannicolau Roman, Roit, Cheresig and Toboliu (Cefa area) were included in the provisions of the commercial agreement².

¹ *Ibidem*, f. 53.

² *Ibidem*, folder 60/1928, f. 2.