Finding the sources of data used for making ethnic maps
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Abstract. The mapping of the ethnic groups in Hungary reached its peak between the second half of the nineteenth century and the second world war. These maps were not only produced in Hungary, but also in other countries, particularly in the countries adjacent to Hungary and in Germany. Some maps were made in the United States of America, Great Britain and France. Many of these maps were made just before the signing of The Treaty of Trianon. Quite often maps made in different countries had large variances. Some of these can be explained by the various mapping methods used, while others are due to the use of different sources for data serving as the basis of the ethnic mapping. Unfortunately some maps do not show the source anywhere, so the only way of determining the source is by comparing it with other maps.
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Introduction

The mapping of the ethnic groups in Hungary reached its peak between the second half of the nineteenth century and the second world war. These maps were not only produced in Hungary, but in other countries as well, particularly in the countries adjacent to Hungary and in Germany. Some maps were also made in the United States of America, Great Britain (United Kingdom) and France. Even though the legend varies on nearly every map, there were certain guidelines which were followed. The red areas were usually showed the ethnicity of the country in which the map was made, if it existed in the area shown on the map. Quite often it was decided on the basis of the interests of the country making the map. For example the countries that had an interest in gaining territories from Hungary made maps on which the Hungarian population was less obvious and the population of their nation state was more prominent, especially in the areas they
wanted to integrate into their states. In many cases only those areas were shown that a particular state wanted to claim. Many such maps were made of Transylvania. On these maps the Romanian population was shown either in red or in a colour that was very dark and dominant, while the Hungarians were shown in a very pale colour, for example light yellow. This legend can be very often discovered on maps made in the United States, Great Britain(United Kingdom) and France. On the other hand, the maps made in Hungary in the early 20th century tried to show as many Hungarians as possible living within Hungary to try and keep as much territory as possible. On these maps the Germans were quite often shown in orange, which is also a very dominant colour. This was a change from the nineteenth century, when the areas of German population were shown in yellow. The turning point of the change in the legend was primarily just before the peace talks in Trianon in 1920. There are also some maps with unique legends. An example is the map of Czechoslovakia by Paul Langhans published in 1920 on which the Czechs and the Slovaks are shown in white. This is a very rare legend. It also appears for example on the ethnic maps of the Habsburg empire made by Karl Czöring in 1855 and 1856. On these maps the Hungarians are shown in white. In these cases only large areas with that particular ethnic group were obvious, but areas where they lived only in a small area can hardly be noticed on these maps. At first sight the areas in white appear to be uninhabited, especially if the viewer has no knowledge of the areas, and has not looked the legend. This method therefore was hardly ever used.

Comparing maps made in the Entente States and maps made in Hungary

Many maps were made both in Hungary and the Entente States for the peace negotiations to be held in the palace of Trianon near Versailles, France in 1920. The Hungarian peace delegation hoped for the new borders along ethnic lines as enunciated by Woodrow Wilson in his twelve points. After the peace treaty was signed, ethnic maps were still produced in Hungary to show the fact that the peace treaty did not take into account the principle of self governance of ethnic groups. One can clearly see a conflict between the production of maps to gain as much territory as possible and those to keep as much territory as possible. The following example presents this conflict in the examples of the maps below.
1.1. Comparing a map from the atlas of Romania published in Paris and the map published by Károly Kogutowitz in Budapest

Map 1: Ethnic map of Romania from page 55 of the atlas published in Paris

In 1919 a historical, political and ethnic atlas of Romania was published in Paris. In this atlas shows an ethnic map of the areas with Romanian population, which includes Transylvania, which was part of Hungary at that time. The areas with Hungarian populations were indicated as being much smaller than on other maps dating from those times. If it is compared with the map made by Károly Kogutowitz in 1927, it can be seen that on the map made in Paris, the areas with Hungarian populations in Seklerland are much smaller than on the map made by Kogutowitz.
There are also areas shown with a Romanian population north of Debrecen as well as near Nyíregyháza, which do not appear on the map made by Kogutowitz, nor on any other map made in Hungary or Germany. The areas shown on the map are only those that Romania wanted to gain at the time. There are no state borders indicated on the map. It has no reference to who the mapmaker was, nor to the source of data used on the map, but when it is compared to any map whose source of data is known, it can be seen that this map of Hungary contains many discrepancies, which were probably made to serve the interest of Romania to enable it to obtain as large an area as possible.
1.2. Guidelines along which the ethnic maps in Hungary were made

The ethnic maps made in Hungary immediately before the signing of the peace treaty of Trianon were intended to show how many Hungarians would end up being outside the borders of Hungary once the treaty was signed. The Hungarian delegation wanted to present the fact that they thought the treaty was unacceptable. The maps made in Hungary after the signing of the peace treaty illustrated the fact that the borders were not drawn along ethnic lines, thereby breaking the principle of the self-determination of ethnic groups. On the map made by Károly Kogutowitzc in 1927 one can clearly see how many Hungarians lived outside the new borders of Hungary after the signing of the peace treaty. Both new and old borders of Hungary are shown on this map. Another interesting aspect of this map is that there are two illustrations, the one being a schematic illustration of the east-Prussian exclave of Germany, the other showing Seklerland as a Hungarian bulk away from the borders of Hungary, as signed in the peace treaty of Trianon.
According to the treaty of Versailles, a referendum had to be held in east-
Prussia to determine to which country East Prussia was to belong. The ma-
jority voted for Germany. Hungary demanded a similar referendum in the
areas to be handed over to the neighbouring states. This demand was re-
jected. The loss to Germany as well as to Hungary is presented on the edge
of the map in numbers, as well as on a pie chart. According to the data on
the map Germany lost 12% of territory and 10% of its population, while
Hungary lost 71.5% of its territory and 65% of its population.

1.3. A map made in a state not taking part in the
Hungarian peace negotiations: Germany

The ethnic map of Hungary made by Paul Langhans was published in 1912
in the journal „Deutsche Erde”. On this map there are far fewer differences
between the map published by Langhans, and the map published by Kogu-
towitz, than there are between the map published by Kogutowitz and the
map published in Paris. On the map published by Langhans, there are not
as many Hungarians shown in the area around Nagyvárad (today Oradea)
as on the map made by Kogutowitz. No Romanian diaspora north of De-
brecen and near Nyíregyháza are shown on the map made by either Paul Langhans or Kogutowitz. Langhans distinguishes three categories: relative majority, absolute majority, and 90%-100% majority.

Map 3: Ethnic map of Hungary published by Paul Langhans in 1920

This, along with the fact that his goal was primarily to emphasize the German population of the area, could be the cause of the differences. This cannot be said in regard to the map published in Paris.

Finding sources of data based on another map

Another map reflecting a similar picture as the one made by Kogutowicz is a map published by Ignaz Hatsek in Petermanns geographische Mitteilungen in 1885. This map is based on the census of 1880. Even though the map made by Kogutowicz in 1927 has no reference regarding the data, based on content it is very likely to have been based on the census of 1910. Kogutowicz published a previous map in 1919 which he intended for the peace negotiations to be held in Trianon. On this map he stated that he used data
from the 1910 census. Even though the mapping method is different, the content regarding ethnic groups on the two maps is identical. The differences on the maps published by Hatsek and Kogutowitz are due purely to the fact that they used census data that was gathered at different dates.

Differences on the maps in the same atlas

3.1 Two maps in the same atlas with different content

Map 4: Ethnic map of Romania from page 53 of the atlas published in Paris

In the atlas published in Paris in 1919, another ethnic map located on page 53 has yet another picture. On this the Romanian diaspora north of Debrecen cannot be seen. Nyíregyháza is not on the map, since it is covered by the legend. There is on the other hand a Romanian diaspora half way between Nagyvárad (today Oradea) and Debrecen. The Hungarian population is not shown near Nagyvárad. East of Szeged there are two spots of Romanian di-
aspora, and another southwest of Nagyvárad. These do not appear on the Hungarian nor the German maps. Furthermore the Romanian population spreads much further west along the Maros river towards Szeged than on any other map. The toponomy on the map is also interesting. It has very few placenames. Some placenames that later became part of Romania have the Romanian name, while others have the Hungarian name. On the bottom of the map the following text appears. „Ethnological map by Elisée Reclus”. This does not mean that the map on page 55 is made by the same mapmaker, nor does it mean that this map can help us find the source of data used on it. The atlas does not indicate to us anything about source of data on the map on page 53 either, but the fact that we know who made the map makes research in this direction much easier. One thing that is obvious, is that neither the map on page 55, nor the map on page 53 reflects the results of the census of 1910 or the census of 1880.

3.2 A map with data closer to the maps based in the census of Austria-Hungary in the Atlas published in Paris

Another map on page 54 in the same Paris atlas (on page 54) has data that is much closer to the map published by Kogutowitz. The Hungarians near Nagyvárad are shown. The few differences that there are could have came from errors during the drawing of the map. There is one Romanian diaspora shown near Szentes that does not appear on the map made by Kogutowitz. The Hungarian population near Belényes spread out on a much smaller area on the map on page 54 than on the map made by Kogutowitz. Even though this map is apparently based on the census data of 1910, differences can still be found. The only other information we have about the map is that it was made by the geographical institute de Agostini of Novara.

3.3 The only ethnic map in the atlas published in Paris with a date

The only ethnic map in the atlas that has the year of publication on it is the map „Ethnological map by Kiepert (1876)”. This does not mean that we know the sources of the data used, but at least we know when it was published. This map, even though it dates from earlier times, has much less differences from the maps based on the 1910 and 1880 census. These can again have come from the fact that it has to based on earlier data, since the map was made before this data was released.
Map 5: Ethnic map of Romania from page 53 of the atlas published in Paris

Conclusion

All four ethnic maps in this atlas have large differences when we compare them with each other. Since these maps seem to have been made independently of each other and were probably not intended for this atlas, the only thing that is for certain is that they were not based on the official census of either 1880 or of 1910 of Austria-Hungary. This eliminates many maps as possible sources of data as well, since most maps in those days were based on the official census made by the authorities of Austria-Hungary.
**Map 6:** The only ethnic map in the atlas published in Paris that has a date
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