



ERC Starting Grant 2017

Project Acronym: **N-T-Autonomy**

Project number: **758015**

Project Title: **Non-Territorial Autonomy as Minority Protection in Europe: An Intellectual and Political History of a Travelling Idea, 1850–2000**

Principal Investigator: **Börries Kuzmany**

Host Institution: **Austrian Academy of Sciences**

Non-Territorial Autonomy as Minority Protection in Europe: An Intellectual and Political History of a Travelling Idea, 1850–2000

N-T-AUTONOMY

Abstract

Over the past 150 years, non-territorial autonomy has been one of three models for dealing with linguistic or ethnic minorities within several European states. Compared with the other two, i.e. the recognition of minority rights as individual rights and territorial self-rule, non-territorial autonomy has received little attention. This project proposes to write the first history of non-territorial autonomy as an applied policy tool in minority protection and as an intellectual concept with a chequered history across Europe. Intellectuals, politicians, and legal scholars across the political spectrum from the far left to the far right supported this idea, although they were aware of the risks of strengthening national differences by promoting such a collective approach to minority protection. The project explores how this idea of granting cultural rights to a national group as a corporate body within a state, as a means of integrating diverse nationalities, travelled and transformed throughout the Habsburg Empire from 1850 to the present.

We propose to

- 1) trace the development/circulation of theoretical conceptions and political applications of non-territorial autonomy within the Habsburg Empire, by mapping the networks of scholars as well as politicians who advocated for it;
- 2) explain the continuities in the development of the idea, and its manifestations in policies adopted by interwar Central and Eastern European nation states, where communists, socialists, liberals and fascists alike were able to translate elements of non-territorial autonomy into their ideologies and programs;
- 3) analyse the treatment of non-territorial autonomy, which was advocated by minority lobby groups, in international minority protection in the 20th century despite strong opposition to practices based on it by international organisations.

We rely on a mixture of historiographical methods developed in nationalism studies to analyse the idea's translation in entangled transnational spaces.

1. Introduction / What is non-territorial autonomy?

As national movements and nationalist claims grew ever stronger during the second half of the nineteenth century, the challenges of dealing with national diversity became increasingly urgent. Nationalists strove for national homogeneity through assimilation, redrawing of borders or, most radically, coerced movement of populations. In many cases, however, political actors wanted or had to accommodate the national claims of minorities within a given state by granting them some form of political and/or cultural autonomy. Within the modern state, **three alternative routes** can be distinguished: policies organised around (1) the individual, (2) a distinct territory or (3) a group of people enjoying collective rights. The first option meant that within the liberal state, citizens were not only protected by general civil rights laws, but could also claim certain national rights individually vis-à-vis the state. An example would be the right to address the public administration in his or her officially recognised minority language. The second option provided for a particular administrative district and granted its inhabitants a form of self-rule. A state-wide minority could form a majority in such a territorial subunit and thereby autonomously administer its national affairs; potentially reproducing, however, the majority-minority imbalance on a secondary level.

In the third option, **non-territorial autonomy**, autonomous decision-making in limited and defined matters was granted to an ethnically, linguistically or culturally defined national group. Its members, wherever they resided within the state borders, formed a corporate body, with elected representatives who autonomously determined the cultural affairs of their nation.¹ In this example, members of a countryside scattered national minority could address their minority administration in those domains under its jurisdiction and profit from its institutions, e.g. schools, public cultural institutions, associations, etc. With its emphasis on **national affiliation as the key denominator of autonomous rights**, non-territorial autonomy belongs unquestionably to **groupist approaches** to minority protection.

While individual rights and territorial self-rule have been subject to extensive research, this project proposes to write the first **history of non-territorial autonomy as a political idea and as an applied policy**. Tracing it from its emergence in the late Habsburg Empire, to its spread in interwar Central and Eastern Europe and through its continuities into present day European minority protection, we emphasise the **adaptations and transformations** of the concept. Not only is non-territorial autonomy an important concept on its own terms, it also allows us to sharpen our understanding of the other two strategies in minority protection.

2. Objectives

Those legal scholars and politicians who initially developed the notion of non-territorial autonomy conceived of it as a political **tool to reduce national strife** and to **achieve national equality** in the overarching liberal state. Over the course of time, actors with **divergent worldviews adapted the idea** to their political needs or rejected it according to their ideological convictions. Consequently, they also found different answers to key questions in designing non-territorial autonomy models: Who belongs to the group? What to do with nationally indifferent people? How to deal with the potential ethnicizing of society? Does non-territorial autonomy create a state within the state? Should autonomous decision making be limited to cultural and educational matters or should it comprise social affairs as well? Depending on their ideological convictions, not least their definition of nationality, leftist, liberal, or rightist proponents responded to these questions very differently.

Our **first objective** will be to trace the idea of non-territorial autonomy to its origins in the Habsburg Empire. This project, for the first time, investigates the interrelations, continuities and adaptations of theoretical and practical approaches within and beyond the Empire. Our hypothesis is that theoretical proponents of non-territorial autonomy— whether Austro-Marxists, legal scholars, judges at the Supreme Court or bureaucrats – and politicians of the time were closely interacting with each other. The idea of non-territorial autonomy was circulating in the realm of the inventive Habsburg political laboratory as one possibility to achieve interethnic coexistence. This project ambitiously aims to **link the considerations of theorists with the consequences experienced** in those Austrian provinces that implemented non-territorial autonomy regulations in the early twentieth century.

The **second objective** will be to examine how the idea of non-territorial autonomy was translated to the new political circumstances of the interwar period. Our second hypothesis posits that this concept was flexible enough to be **adapted to warring ideological currents**: communist, socialist, liberal and far right. Minority

¹ This would be the *ideal type* constructed by the Austro-Marxists theoreticians Karl Renner and Otto Bauer. They called this model “national autonomy based on the personality principle”. Other people, historical actors and scholars, refer to this model also as “national-personal autonomy,” “personal autonomy”, “corporate autonomy” or “cultural autonomy”; “non-territorial autonomy”, however, being applied the most often applied term.

activists of the 1920s and 1930s, including Bolsheviks, Jewish Bundists, Baltic German aristocrats or Sudeten German nationalists, explicitly and implicitly referred to practical and theoretical experiences of the Habsburg Empire. Our project thus emphasises these transtemporal and transnational connections in order to explain the different translations of the concept of non-territorial autonomy, and to demonstrate its applications.

Our **third objective** is to analyse the treatment of non-territorial autonomy within **international systems of minority protection through the present day**. While minority lobby groups like the interwar Congress of European Nationalities, or the contemporary Federal Union of European Nationalities, have advocated and continue to show support for the concept, international law making institutions have been far more hesitant about it because they have focused on individual rights. Nevertheless, we claim that when legal recommendations have touched upon the fields of cultural minority protection or on minority education, they also have pointed to non-territorial forms of group rights. They encountered thereby stunningly **similar problems** to those experienced in the Habsburg Empire and during the interwar period, especially pertaining to the mode of registration for members of the group, and the subjective nature of national identity.

3. Work packages

In order to draw a comprehensive picture of non-territorial autonomy as a minority protection tool in Europe, we will have to marry case studies of applied non-territorial autonomy regulations with an analysis of theoretical writings from its proponents from two centuries. In order to retrace the **origins** of non-territorial autonomy in the Habsburg Empire, to analyse its **translation** to interwar Europe's political spectrum between the radical left and the far right, and to demonstrate the **longevity** of this concept until the present day, this project requires a closely collaborating team. I plan to organise the research in seven intertwined work packages:

- Work package 1: the emergence and earliest practical applications of non-territorial autonomy in the Habsburg Empire;
- Work package 2: the critical evaluation of non-territorial autonomy in the Hungarian part of the empire;
- Work package 4: implicit appropriation of non-territorial autonomy elements in the early Soviet Union;
- Work package 5: the concept's implementation in the socialist Ukrainian People's Republic;
- Work package 6: the translation of these ideas to the liberal political setting of the Baltic States;
- Work package 7: the idea's instrumentalisation by the far-right environment of the Sudeten German Party;
- Work package 8: the sometimes overt, sometimes tacit absorption of non-territorial autonomy elements in international minority protection in the twentieth century.

1. *The Habsburg laboratory of national policy*

The first objective will be to **trace** the history of this idea to its origins in the Habsburg Empire, where, in the aftermath of the Revolution of 1848, religious leaders like Andrei Şaguna and scholars like Józef Eötvös, Adolf Fischhof, or Oszkár Jászi for the first time conceptually outlined basic elements of non-territorial autonomy. In fin-de-siècle Austria, the **Austro-Marxists** Karl Renner, Otto Bauer and Etbin Kristan further developed these ideas, proposing to fundamentally reorganise the Habsburg Empire.² While the state would remain a territorially delimited administrative entity, the Empire's (linguistically defined) nations would assume new functions as non-territorial corporate bodies elected on the basis of national registers. The theoreticians of the time were apprehensive about the possible negative consequences of implementing their concepts. Important studies have shown that **scholars, politicians, and bureaucrats** were especially concerned with the problem of how to determine a person's national belonging and the **ambiguity of national identity**.³

Apart from these conceptual considerations, four Austrian provinces and one town introduced elements of non-territorial autonomy at the beginning of the twentieth century: Moravia in 1905, Bukovina in 1909, Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1910 and **Galicia in 1914**. The municipal council of the Bohemian city of Budějovice/Budweis also opted for non-territorial autonomy provisions in 1914 that went much further than any other province. In other provinces, such as in the Tyrol and the Austrian Littoral, a number of politicians likewise began considering non-territorial autonomy. While detailed studies have tracked the compromises

² Cf. e.g. SPRINGER (= Renner): *Kampf der Oesterreichischen Nationen* (1902); BAUER: *Nationalitätenfrage* (1907).

³ STOURZH: *Gleichberechtigung* (1985); HIMKA: *Galician villagers* (1988); JUDSON: *Guardians* (2006); KING: *Which Equality?* (2010); ZAHRA: *Kidnapped Souls* (2008). ZAHRA: *National Indifference* (2010). More generally, see BRUBAKER: *Ethnicity without Groups* (2004).

adopted in the Bohemian Lands⁴ and on Bukovina⁵, much less attention has been paid to Bosnia⁶ and almost none to Galicia⁷. The PI's preliminary research on the latter suggests that a compromise-friendly atmosphere in public opinion across the Empire, careful interference from Vienna and increasing tensions with neighbouring Russia, forced the Polish establishment to cede some power to the Ukrainians.⁸ As the last agreement implemented in Imperial Austria, the Galician Compromise between Polish and Ukrainian politicians serves our aim of demonstrating the circulation of the idea of non-territorial autonomy in the Habsburg Empire. When political parties, state officials, religious leaders, and journalists negotiated or commented on negotiations, they compared the Galician case with earlier Austrian experiments in non-territorial autonomy. To-date, however, only three short studies have attempted such a comparative perspective, including a recently published survey article of the PI.⁹ The core work package's significant contribution will be to demonstrate the **entanglement of theories and applied policies** in the Habsburg Empire and to prove that non-territorial autonomy was at the very **top of the political agenda**.

The core work package investigates the interrelations, adaptations and circulation of various theoretical and practical approaches within the Habsburg Empire. It aims to prove that non-territorial autonomy was the trend-setting approach for national compromises after the turn of the century.

2. *A critical evaluation in the Kingdom of Hungary*

The second work package investigates the perception and interpretations of non-territorial autonomy concepts in the Hungarian part of the Dual Monarchy. While the first impetus to experiment with this idea can actually be found in Hungary, most Hungarian intellectuals and politicians, including the afore mentioned Eötvös, perceived the Kingdom of Hungary as a unitary state with one political Hungarian nation. However, Hungary was not an isolated part of the empire, and one could easily follow what was going on in Austria. While historians have worked on the small Hungarian Social Democratic Party¹⁰, there are no studies on the mutual personal, intellectual and ideological interactions with respect to nationality questions between Hungarian Social Democrats and Austro-Marxists. Equally absent are studies on the Hungarian reception of the provincial compromises in the Austrian part of the empire.

Even more promising will be a look at liberal and left-wing intellectuals, who opposed the pre-war Hungarian political order and played a key role in the 1918 Hungarian National Council. Most interesting are the socialist aristocrat and short time prime minister Mihály Károlyi and his minister of nationalities, the scholar Oskár Jászi. Earlier studies¹¹ do not refer to possible influences of Austrian experiments with non-territorial autonomy regulations when Jászi later drafted the idea of a Danubian Federation as a successor state of the Habsburg Empire. Another lacuna in contemporary research is to assess in how far experiences from Habsburg times linger on Hungary's minority policies after 1918 and on Hungary's very active involvement in the Congress of European Nationalities.¹²

This cluster looks at the Hungarian part of the Dual Monarchy. We will analyse the reception of Austrian theoretical considerations of and practical experiences with non-territorial autonomy. Moreover, we suppose translations to Hungary's own approach to national minority issues in the interwar period.

3. *Explicit and implicit appropriations in revolutionary Russia and the early Soviet Union*

This work package investigates how and to what extent the concept of non-territorial autonomy was translated to the far left of the political spectrum. While Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries and Jewish Bundists actively encouraged the idea, the **Bolsheviks severely criticised the Austro-Marxist model** as a form of bourgeois nationalism.¹³ However, this project argues that the autonomy given to the non-Russian population in the early

⁴ GLASSL: Mährischer Ausgleich (1967); KLETEČKA: Ausgleichsversuch (1984); KING: Budweisers (2002); FASORA / HANUŠ / MALÍŘ: Moravské vyrovnání (2006); KELLY: Last Best Chance? (2003); ZAHRA: Kidnapped Souls (2008); KING: Who is who? (2010).

⁵ LESLIE: Ausgleich Bukowina (1991); RACHAMIMOV: Diaspora Nationalism (1996); HENSELLEK: *Bukowina* (2011).

⁶ IMAMOVIĆ: Bosnia (2006).

⁷ BUSZKO: Sejmowa reforma (1956); US'KA: Halyc'ke zrivnjannja (2015).

⁸ KUZMANY: Galizischer Ausgleich (2013); KUZMANY: Rise and Limits of Participation (2015).

⁹ RACHAMIMOV: Provincial Compromises (2002); URBANITSCH: Nationalen Ausgleichsversuche (2006); KUZMANY: Habsburg Austria's experiments in non-territorial autonomy (2015).

¹⁰ SCHLETT: A szociáldemokrácia és a magyar társadalom (1982).

¹¹ LITVÁN: Twentieth-Century Prophet (2006).

¹² FEILER: Allianz mit Vorbedingungen (2013).

¹³ BOWRING: Burial and resurrection (2005).

Soviet Union in fact strongly resembled broader elements of non-territorial autonomy and can be best explained as an **implicit appropriation** of earlier leftist models.

This sub-project first addresses peripheral revolutionary regions like the autonomous Siberian Territory and the Menshevik Far East Republic that officially enacted non-territorial autonomy legislation.¹⁴ Contrary to the established literature,¹⁵ the ground-breaking hypothesis of this sub-project is that the **early Soviet Union experimented with territorial and non-territorial autonomy solutions**. A recent study suggests that the way the **People's Commissariat** for Nationalities Affairs was structured, where 13 Moscow-based sub-commissariats dealt with the national affairs of their respective minorities, can be interpreted as a form of non-territorial autonomy.¹⁶ This work package also revisits the various **national sections** within the Communist Party as a version of non-territorial autonomy provided for scattered ethnic groups. While we have important research literature on these national sections, including an article by the PI,¹⁷ to-date scholars have not analysed these cases in relation to the wider category of non-territorial autonomy.

Revolutionary Russia will serve as an example of an implicit appropriation. Whereas Mensheviks embraced the idea of non-territorial autonomy openly, the Bolsheviks harshly refuted it. This sub-project claims that the early Soviet Union nevertheless introduced elements of non-territorial autonomy for pragmatic reasons.

4. *A socialist realisation: The Ukrainian People's Republic and its links to Galicia and Bukovina*

The fourth sub-project traces the origins of the 1918 Ukrainian law on national-personal autonomy, which was the first fully implemented modern non-territorial autonomy provision. Earlier research has shown that the short-lived **left-leaning Ukrainian People's Republic** provided for autonomous non-territorial bodies mostly for Russians, Poles and Jews.¹⁸ Ultimately, only the latter successfully established autonomous institutions, drawing on earlier conceptions of the Jewish Workers Bund, the Jewish Socialist Workers Party and Simon Dubnov's Jewish People's Party.¹⁹ Important recent studies suggest that notions of non-territorial autonomy circulated to Jewish parties from the Austro-Marxist school, but to understand their actual influence on general Ukrainian politics requires further research.²⁰

The main hypothesis of this sub-project assumes **Austro-Marxist influences** on the Ukrainian People's Republic as well as **adaptations from the earlier compromises** in Bukovina and Galicia.²¹ Ukrainians were one of the negotiating parties in both of these Habsburg provinces, and their political experiences easily passed over to the other side of the border. A closer look at Ukraine's key political figure and acting president, Mychajlo Hruševs'kyj, might prove most promising for our analysis. We know that he taught at the University of L'viv between 1894 and 1905, and that he was one of the founding members of Galicia's Ukrainian National-Democratic Party that later negotiated the 1914 Galician Compromise.²² However, there is no research on **how Hruševs'kyj or other political leaders like Volodymyr Vynnyčenko and Moshe Zilberfarb developed their vision** of non-territorial autonomy for independent Ukraine. This project's findings will have a significant impact on our understanding of the Ukrainian People's Republic, not only from a historical perspective but also with regards to present-day Ukraine, where this short period of Ukrainian independence plays a crucial role in current political discussions.

This sub-project looks at a leftist translation of non-territorial autonomy concepts in the short lived Ukrainian People's Republic in 1918 to 1920. The responsible Ukrainian politicians were familiar not only with Austro-Marxist writings but also with the earlier Habsburg compromises in Bukovina and Galicia.

5. *A liberal approach: The Baltic States and their transnational minority activists*

This sub-project concentrates on the **liberal interpretation** of non-territorial autonomy and the necessary adaptations of the model to the needs of the newly independent Baltic States in the interwar period. In 1919, Latvia introduced far-reaching educational autonomy for its minorities including autonomous corporate

¹⁴ NAM: Kul'turno-nacional'naja avtonomija (1999); NAM: Nacional'nye men'sinstva (2009).

¹⁵ SLEZKINE: USSR (1994); MARTIN: Affirmative Action Empire (2001); HIRSCH: Empire of Nations (2005).

¹⁶ BARBIERI: National Minorities (2011).

¹⁷ ŠARAPOV: Nacional'nye sekcii (1967); DÖNNINGHAUS: Minderheiten in Bedrängnis (2009); SHNEER: Yiddish (2004); KUZMANY: Neuerfindung (2005).

¹⁸ MAKARENKO: Nacional'no-personal'na avtonomija (2013); LIBER: Ukrainian Nationalism (1987).

¹⁹ ABRAMSON: Prayer for the Government (1999). HILBRENNER: Diaspora-Nationalismus (2009); RABINOVICH: Jewish Rights, National Rights (2014).

²⁰ GECHTMAN: Conceptualizing National-Cultural Autonomy (2005). ŻYNDUL: Państwo w państwie? (2000).

²¹ KUZMANY: Galizischer Ausgleich (2013).

²² PRYMAK: Hrushevsky (1987). HYRYČ: Hruševs'kyj. Tvory (2002-2012).

bodies. A year later, Lithuania passed a non-territorial autonomy law for Jews based on the traditional, but de-confessionalised, Jewish councils.²³ Finally, the cultural autonomy law implemented in Estonia in 1925 was interwar Europe's most minority-friendly legislation. It was in effect modelled after the needs of the German minority, though it was also meant for Estonia's Jews, Russians and Swedes.²⁴ The Estonian state overall adopted a more liberal understanding of national affiliation than many minority politicians did. Some of the latter preferred a definition that would follow presumably objective ethnic criteria, while the government insisted that **national identity was a matter of individual choice**.

What remains unknown, however, is *how* minority and majority political actors in the Baltic States developed their non-territorial autonomy models. For the first time, this sub-project explores their familiarity with Austro-Marxist concepts, their adaptations by the Bund or the autonomy ideas developed by Simon Dubnov. German activists in particular were deeply involved in **transnational discussions** on how to deal with issues related to the administration of minority populations. Under their aegis, the Congress of European Nationalities hailed cultural autonomy and adopted resolutions recommending other countries to follow the Estonian example.²⁵

The liberal approach of the Baltic States in the interwar period will be at the heart of this work package. Its main hypothesis is that a transnational community of minority activists was a necessary precondition of the translation and promotion of the idea of non-territorial autonomy in the interwar period.

6. An instrumentalisation by the radical right: The idea of an ethno-corporative federation

This work package investigates extreme right-wing interpretations of non-territorial autonomy during the interwar period. A look at the heavily nationalised Bohemian Lands might be especially fruitful. Of particular relevance are the ethno-federalist models that the **far right Sudeten German Party** developed. Studies have shown that in the 1938 memorandum/ultimatum to the government, the party leader Konrad Henlein demanded a complete restructuring of the republic, whereby the polity would derive its sovereign power from peoples constituted as corporate bodies. Each nation, in accordance with an essentializing definition of ethnic membership, was to constitute itself as a legal entity with a proper representative organ and an autonomous executive board.²⁶

This sub-project investigates how German minority activists in Czechoslovakia, who were familiar with the pre-war Moravian Compromise, the Austro-Marxists' writings, as well as with the principle recommendations of the Congress of European Nationalities, later **adapted** concepts of non-territorial autonomy **to the demands of a racist ideology**.²⁷ The Sudeten German Party's conception of an ethnic federation in a sense affirms Austro-Marxist concerns over **forced ethnic attributions** and the ethnicization of the state. Of particular interest will also be Henlein's relationship with the Congress of European Nationalities, whose once liberal orientation later transformed into an instrument of German nationalist and revisionist foreign politics in the 1930s. Jewish activists largely quit the Congress after 1933 and many Sudeten Germans filled their ranks.

This sub-project examines the ideological transformation of the idea of non-territorial autonomy into a political tool for the radical right Sudeten German Party, whose ideologists were still socialised in Habsburg Bohemia. Only in the 1930s, they developed a concept of a racial ethno-federalist reorganisation of Czechoslovakia.

7. The wider perspective: Non-territorial autonomy in international national minority protection throughout the twentieth century

The last work package traces non-territorial autonomy approaches in international systems developed to protect minority interests during the twentieth century. Specific attention will be paid to **transnational minority lobby groups** supporting this concept and their interactions with **international law making institutions** that have tended to be sceptical. One of the main reasons for their diverging evaluation of non-territorial autonomy owes to the question whether **collective rights or individual rights** should be favoured.²⁸

²³ LIEKIS: 'A State within a State?' (2003), 81-157; GARLEFF: *Kulturelle Selbstverwaltung* (1990), p. 91f.

²⁴ HASSELBLATT: *Minderheitenpolitik* (1996); ALENIS: *Birth of Cultural Autonomy* (2007); LAURITS: *Saksa kultuur-omavalitsus* (2008), see also LAURITS: *Deutschbaltische Minderheit* (2010). SMITH / HIDDEN: *Ethnic Diversity* (2012).

²⁵ BAMBERGER-STEMMANN: *Europäische Nationalitätenkongress* (2000).

²⁶ OSTERKAMP: *Verfassungsgerichtsbarkeit* (2009); VIERLING: *Kommunikation* (2014); BRANDES: *Sudetendeutsche im Krisenjahr* (2010).

²⁷ CORNWALL: *The Devil's Wall* (2011).

²⁸ CASTELLANOS: *Minority Protection* (2016).

The **Congress of European Nationalities** founded in 1925 outspokenly espoused notions of non-territorial autonomy. However, as a lobby group it lacked executive authority over interwar minority legislation.²⁹ The **League of Nations**, on the other hand, which was a law making institution in the domain of minority rights protection, opposed non-territorial autonomy out of a concern that such measures might undermine the ruling principle of the nation-state. Thus, the League defended only *individuals* whose national rights had been violated.³⁰ Nevertheless, the concept was part of the debate over the exemplary Polish Minority Treaty, signed under the auspices of the League in 1919, particularly where it concerned the plight of Jews.³¹

As the interwar period's approaches to minority protection were discredited, post-World War II international law making institutions **broke with the idea of collective minority rights and have emphasised individual human rights** ever since. However, after a dip of more than three decades, national minority rights have **reappeared** in world-wide discussions, in particular in post-1989 Europe.³² Still, none of the key legal documents in **present-day European minority protection policy** explicitly mentions or recommends non-territorial autonomy; rather they constitute national rights under the framework of equal rights. At the same time, they **point to non-territorial forms** of minority self-administration in the field of culture, education and identity.³³

On the other hand, **non-governmental organisations** have been less hesitant to promote collective rights for national groups. For example, the Federal Union of European Nationalities, founded in 1949 in the spirit of the Congress of European Nationalities, is a transnational umbrella organisation for regionalist and nationalities movements **advocating territorial and non-territorial forms of autonomy for ethnic groups**. Ever since it gained consultative status at the Council of Europe in 1989, it has lobbied for minority protection measures within established international organisations.³⁴ It is important to note, however, that those who address non-territorial autonomy models remain **aware of the problems** arising from conferring collective rights on ethnic groups as a social body, and clearly contend that personal status and ethnic affiliation must be a matter of individual choice and must not lead to segregation. Hence, there is not only a degree of continuity in the idea of non-territorial autonomy, but also in the reservations towards it.³⁵

This work package traces continuities and breaks of non-territorial autonomy in international minority protection in the twentieth century. Specific attention is paid to transnational minority lobby groups supporting this concept and their interaction with international law making institutions that usually are rather sceptical.

The guiding hypothesis binding together all seven sub-projects is that non-territorial autonomy was a **flexible idea** translatable to antagonistic ideological conditions and adaptable to different political settings over the course of time. We claim that its transformations did not occur in a void. Theoretical proponents of this idea and political actors enacting non-territorial autonomy regulations were **linked with each other through entangled transnational spaces**. They knew each other in person, were familiar with each other's writings or shared ideological convictions. These **adaptations and adoptions** occurred at times in an **open way**, and other times more **tacitly**. However, our team intends to prove that the main ingredients remained unchanged: *national representatives* exercised a degree of *autonomous decision-making* for a *nationally defined group* irrespective of their place of residence in a given country, in order to *integrate national differences* into the overarching state.

²⁹ On the Congress in general see BAMBERGER-STEMMANN: Nationalitätenkongreß (2000).

³⁰ DYROFF: Völkerbundesbeschwerde (2013); SCHEUERMANN: Minderheitenschutz (2000); GÜTERMANN: Minderheitenschutzverfahren (1979).

³¹ KAPLAN-FEUEREISEN: Im Dienste der jüdischen Nation (2008).

³² KUNZ: Present Status (1954); THORNBERRY: Phenix (1980); BERMAN: Passion (2011).

³³ KYMLICKA: National cultural autonomy (2007). Cf. the OSCE's *Copenhagen Document* in 1990; the Council of Europe's *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* in 1995. The OSCE's *Lund recommendation* in 1999 even refers to the notion of '**non-territorial arrangement**' as an alternative to territorial self-governance.

³⁴ I thank David Smith for providing me with his conference paper SMITH: Rise, Fall and Revival (2015); KÜHL: Federal Union (2000).

³⁵ OSIPOV: Non-territorial autonomy (2011); BAUBÖCK: Political autonomy or cultural minority rights? (2005); NIMNI: National-Cultural Autonomy (2005); COAKLEY: Nationalism (2012).

4. Methodology and sources

This project seeks to analyse the movement of the idea of non-territorial autonomy as a minority protection tool – namely, how it **circulated synchronically** in geographically different but entangled spaces in Europe; and how it **meandered diachronically** from the late Habsburg Empire through the twentieth century. This study emphasises two analytical aspects of the movement of ideas. First, we focus on the hybrid outcomes and analyse the **adaptations and differences** to the purported ideal type. Second, we focus on the **transmitters** of the concept, whether people (scholars, politicians, bureaucrats, etc.) or texts (journals, books, footnotes, etc.). Hence, trans-lation in a wide sense is key to our analysis. Very literally, writings on non-territorial autonomy were translated in many different languages. More important are the considerations put forward through the **concept of translation** (Neumann/Nünning 2012, Italiano/Rössner 2012, Bachmann-Medick 2014) that was developed in the social sciences and cultural studies. It emphasises the mutuality of interaction, the processes “in-between”, and the novelty of the result, which fits our **transnational** and **entangled history** approach (Conrad/Randeria 2002, Iriye/Saunier 2009, Werner/Zimmerman 2002, Burke 2009). We will consider a multitude of national spaces, as well as the transnational arena of interwar nationality rights activism. Through the mutual exchange of ideas and experiences, these national and transnational actors created an entangled sphere of communication.

Yet the concepts of translation, and transnational and entangled history, are perspectives and not tailor-made methods. Thus, they rather serve as **organising frames** to a wide variety of theories and methodologies developed for intellectual history, history of political thought, comparative history, legal history and political rhetoric. Running like a thread through the entire project are issues raised in the **theorization of nationalism**. Of particular importance is the scrutiny of non-territorial autonomy’s inherent groupist approach (Brubaker 2004). We will therefore investigate the strategies intellectual proponents used to create exclusive national identities. Here, we are able to rely on methodology developed for the study of invented traditions, and for research on the use of stereotypes and national images. (Hobsbawm 1983, Whitley 2010, Beller 2007).

This project requires a **wide range of printed and archival sources** in ten languages and from twelve countries. Taking a hermeneutical approach, our team will concentrate on the immanent content of the sources; in addition, we will also analyse the discourses across many of the texts.

Printed sources on non-territorial autonomy regulations and its theoretical elaborations will be extremely important for all six work packages. These will include: (1) newspapers in many different languages, (2) jurisprudential journals/series like the *Österreichische Zeitschrift für öffentliches Recht*, and the *Annuaire de l’Institut de Droit International*, (3) informal theoretical mouthpieces like the Austro-Marxist *Der Kampf*, and the Congress of European Nationalities’ *Nation und Staat*. The League of Nation’s (4) *Official Journal*, (5) party programmes, (6) minutes of party conventions, parliamentary and provincial diet sessions, and the (7) conference proceedings of the Congress of European Nationalities can also serve as valuable sources. (8) Last but not least we will make extensive use of the League of Nations and UN *Treaty Series*, European Court of Human Rights *HUDOC database*, and other legal texts collections.

The **archival sources** to be studied are not only located in many different archives, but also include many different kinds of documents, ranging from administrative debates, reports and decrees, to draft laws, personal papers, diaries and correspondences of important figures from the period like e.g. Karl Renner, Ewald Ammende, Mychajlo Hrushevs’kyj, Paul Schiemann, and Konrad Henlein. For the *core work package* and the case study on the Galician Compromise in particular, archival research in L’viv (CDIAL) and Vienna (ÖStA) will be necessary. In order to find cross-references between the compromises in other Habsburg provinces, we plan additional trips to Brno (MZA), Černivci (DAČO) and Sarajevo (ABiH). For *work package 2*, documents from the Section II of the National Archives of Hungary (MOL) need to be studied. For *work package 3* on the tacit circulation of the concept to the early Soviet Union, we will consult the files of the GARF and RGASPI archives in Moscow. On the origins of the Ukrainian People’s Republic’s non-territorial autonomy law (*work package 4*), we will visit Kyiv’s CDAVO and L’viv’s CDIAL archives. For the background to the various cultural autonomy regulations in the Baltics (*work package 5*), it will be necessary to consult documents from Estonia’s, Latvia’s and/or Lithuania’s National Archives (ERA, Latvijas arhīvi, LCVA). For *work package 6* on the development of Henlein’s racial conception of non-territorial autonomy, we will explore holdings in Munich’s Sudeten German Archives, as well as files stored in Prague based archives. For the cross-sectional Jewish reception of the idea of non-territorial autonomy in Ukraine, the Baltics and the early Soviet Union (*work packages 1–5*), a trip to New York’s YIVO Archives and to Jerusalem’s CAHJP is needed. For *work package 7* on the place of non-territorial autonomy in international law, we plan an extended research trip to Geneva (Archives of the League of Nations) and Flensburg’s FUEN.

5. Human resources

The Austrian Academy of Sciences will host this five-year long ERC project, which is divided into seven sub-projects for six scholars: the **PI**, **two post-doctoral** researchers and **three PhD students** who will be based in Vienna.

I will devote **90 % of my working** time to this project and will focus on the first and fourth work package as well as on the coherence and consistency of the entire project, not least because I have reading knowledge in most of the languages needed for this research as a whole. The PhD students will be employed for four years each (65%) and should be multilingual specialists in the respective field of the sub-projects 2, 5 and 6. Work packages 3 requires a background in Soviet history and 7 requires a background in legal and contemporary history. Owing to their analytical scope, it is necessary to employ post-doctoral researchers (65%) for these sub-projects.

Our project will benefit from the external expertise of three senior scholars in our advisory board, which will meet annually, and informal co-operation with other scholars in the field. In conjunction with two of these affiliated scholars, one at the EUI and the other at the University of Munich, our project will organise **two larger conferences** that will widen the notion of non-territorial autonomy to (1) the global perspective (e.g. native Americans, New Zealand's Maori, Israel/Palestine, etc.), and (2) to premodern history (e.g. Transylvania's Unity of Nations, Ottoman Millet system, etc.).

6. Ground-breaking approach, challenges and impact of the project

Scope and challenges: This project constitutes the first full-length study of a central issue in the history of minority protection. It analyses non-territorial autonomy not only as an evolving multigenerational **concept** but also, and more crucially, as a set of **implemented policies** in the twentieth century. It marries **theoretical writings** from the period with **case studies** from Central and Eastern Europe, as well as from pan-European institutions of minority protection. It seeks to demonstrate that non-territorial autonomy was a **political tool** that could be translated into Bolshevik, socialist, liberal and far right political contexts. Thereby, this project brings together the history of the Habsburg Empire and interwar Central and Eastern Europe, European legal history, nationalism studies, and contemporary history and applies them from a transnational perspective. Considering **seven different countries** in addition to the transnational arena of minority protection and legislation, only an international and multilingual team working with at least **ten languages** will be able to realise this challenging programme. The PI's language capacities and familiarity with Eastern European sources will certainly facilitate the merging of the results of the sub-projects into the larger hypothesis of interaction and transformation.

Impact: While the conferral of rights to national minority communities by means of the rights of individual members or through the allocation of territorial autonomy have been widely researched, the **third route** of national minority protection through non-territorial autonomy has received very little attention in the study of nationalism. We will show that elements of non-territorial autonomy have been far **more often considered** and applied between 1850 and today than previously acknowledged. While this is **not a normative project** that intends to promote non-territorial autonomy as a political tool, our historical research resonates with the lively present-day discussions on how to deal with national conflicts. Following the concept's evolutionary arc over time and space, and by critically evaluating its radically different applications, this project will have a strong impact on our understanding of how states have tried to **deal with national diversity**.

7. Selected bibliography

- ABRAMSON, HENRY: *A Prayer for the Government: Ukrainians and Jews in Revolutionary Times, 1917-1920* (Cambridge MA 1999).
- ALENUS, KARI: *Birth of Cultural Autonomy in Estonia: How, Why, and For Whom?*, in: *Journal of Baltic Studies*, (2007), 445-462.
- BACHMANN-MEDICK, DORIS (ed.): *The Trans/National Study of Culture: A Translational Perspective* (Berlin, et al. 2014).
- BAMBERGER-STEMMANN, SABINE: *Der Europäische Nationalitätenkongreß 1925 bis 1938. Nationale Minderheiten zwischen Lobbyistentum und Großmachtinteressen* (Marburg 2000).
- BARBIERI, SARA: *National Minorities in Post-revolutionary and Soviet Russia, 1917-1932. Theoretical Framework and Institutional Arrangements* (Diss. Univ. San Marino 2011).
- BAUBÖCK, RAINER: *Political autonomy or cultural minority rights? A conceptual critique of Renner's model*, in: Nimni, E. (ed.): *National Cultural Autonomy and its Contemporary Critics* (London 2005), 97-111.
- BAUER, OTTO: *Die Nationalitätenfrage und die Sozialdemokratie* (Vienna 1907).
- BAVAJ, RICCARDO: *Intellectual History*, in: *Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte* (2010), 1-19.
- BELLER, MANFRED / LEERSSEN, JOEP: *Imagology. The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters. A Critical Survey* (Amsterdam, et al. 2007).
- BERMAN, NATHANIEL: *Passion and Ambivalence. Colonialism, Nationalism and International Law* (Leiden 2011).
- BERG, EIKI: *The Peculiarities of Jewish Settlement in Estonia*, in: *GeoJournal* (1994), 465-470.
- BERNATZIK, EDMUND: *Über nationale Matriken. Inaugurationsrede gehalten von E. Bernatzik* (Wien 1910).
- BLOCH, MARC: *Pour une histoire comparée des sociétés européennes*, in: *Revue de synthèse historique* 46 (1928), 15-50.
- BOWRING, BILL: *Burial and resurrection. Karl Renner's controversial influence on the 'national question' in Russia*, in: Nimni, E. (ed.): *National-Cultural Autonomy and its Contemporary Critics* (London, et al. 2005), 191-206.
- BRANDES, DETLEF: *Die Sudetendeutschen im Krisenjahr 1938* (München 2010).
- BRIX, EMIL: *Der Böhmisches Ausgleich in Budweis*, in: *Österreichische Osthefte*, 24/2 (1982), 225-248.
- BRUBAKER, ROGERS: *Ethnicity without Groups* (Cambridge MA 2004).
- BURKE, PETER: *Cultural Hybridity* (Cambridge 2009).
- BUSZKO, JÓZEF: *Sejmowa reforma wyborcza w Galicji 1905-1914* (Warszawa 1956).
- CASTELLANOS, LEÓN: *Minority Protection and the Foundations of Human Rights* (Diss. GIG Geneva 2016).
- CATTARUZZA, MARINA: *Sozialisten an der Adria. Plurinationale Arbeiterbewegung in der Habsburgermonarchie* (Berlin 2011).
- COAKLEY, JOHN: *Nationalism, ethnicity and the state: making and breaking nations* (London 2012).
- CONDOR, SUSAN/ TILEAGĂ, CRISTIAN / BILLIG, MICHAEL: *Political Rhetoric*, in: Huddy, L. et al. (ed.): *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (Oxford 2013), 262-300.
- CONRAD, SEBASTIAN/ RANDEIRA, SHALINI (ed.): *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus. Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften* (Frankfurt 2002).
- DONATH, HANS/ SCHIEMANN, PAUL (ed.): *Leitartikel, Reden und Aufsätze in Auswahl* (Frankfurt 1980-1992).
- DÖNNINGHAUS, VICTOR: *Minderheiten in Bedrängnis. Sowjetische Politik gegenüber Deutschen, Polen und anderen Diaspora-Nationalitäten 1917* (München 2009).
- DYROFF, STEFAN: *Der Platz der Völkerbundbeschwerde in den politischen Strategien nationaler Minderheiten. Positionen aus dem Kreis des ‚Europäischen Nationalitätenkongresses‘*, in: Beer, M. et al. (ed.): *Politische Strategien nationaler Minderheiten in der Zwischenkriegszeit* (München 2013), p. 27-56.
- ESBACH, CARSTEN: *Nation und Nationalität im Werk von Karl Renner und Otto Bauer*, in: Kiss, E. et al. (ed.): *Nation und Nationenbildung in Österreich-Ungarn 1848-1938. Prinzipien und Methoden* (Wien 2006), 73-85.
- ESPAGNE, MICHEL/ WERNER, MICHAEL: *Deutsch-Französischer Kulturtransfer im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. Zu einem neuen interdisziplinären Forschungsprogramm des C.N.R.S.*, in: *Francia*, 13 (1985), 502-510.
- FASORA, LUKÁS / HANUŠ, J. / MALÍŘ, J. (ed.): *Moravské vyrovnání z roku 1905 / Der Mährische Ausgleich von 1905* (Brno 2006).
- GARLEFF, MICHAEL: *Die kulturelle Selbstverwaltung der nationalen Minderheiten in den baltischen Staaten*, in: Meissner, Boris (ed.): *Die baltischen Nationen. Estland Lettland Litauen* (Köln 1990), 87-107.
- GEBEL, RALF: *„Heim ins Reich“. Konrad Henlein und der Reichsgau Sudetenland 1938-1945* (München 1999).
- GECHTMAN, RONI: *Conceptualizing National-Cultural Autonomy. From the Austro-Marxists to the Jewish Labor Bund*, in: *Simon Dubnow Jahrbuch*, Bd. 4 (Leipzig 2005), 17-49.
- GLASSL, HORST: *Der Mährische Ausgleich* (München 1967).

- GREEN, NANCY: The Comparative Method and Poststructural Structuralism. *New Perspectives for Migration Studies*, in: *Journal of American Ethnic History*, (1994), 3-22.
- GRODZISKI, STANISŁAW: Der Landtag von Galizien und Lodomerien, in: Rumpler, H. et al. (ed.): *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918. Band VII/2: Verfassung und Parlamentarismus. Die regionalen Repräsentativkörperschaften* (Wien 2000), 2131-2170.
- GÜTERMANN, CHRISTOPH: *Das Minderheitenschutzverfahren des Völkerbundes* (Berlin 1979).
- HACKMANN, JÖRG: Werner Hasselblatt on Cultural Autonomy: A Forgotten Manuscript, in: Housden, M. et al. (ed.): *Forgotten Pages in Baltic History: Diversity and Inclusion* (Amsterdam, et al. 2011), 147-160.
- HANISCH, ERNST: *Der große Illusionist. Otto Bauer (1881–1938)* (Wien, et al. 2011).
- HASSELBLATT, CORNELIUS: *Minderheitenpolitik in Estland. Rechtsentwicklung und Rechtswirklichkeit 1918-1995* (Hamburg 1996).
- HAUPT, HEINZ-GERHARD/ KOCKA, JÜRGEN: Historischer Vergleich: Methoden, Aufgaben, Probleme. Eine Einleitung, in: Haupt, H.-G., et al. (ed.): *Geschichte und Vergleich. Ansätze und Ergebnisse international vergleichender Geschichtsschreibung* (Frankfurt, et al. 1996), 9-45.
- HENSELLEK, THOMAS: *Die letzten Jahre der kaiserlichen Bukowina: Studien zur Landespolitik im Herzogtum Bukowina von 1909 bis 1914* (Hamburg 2011) (= Dipl. Univ. Wien 2002).
- HERRNRITT, RUDOLF VON: Die Ausgestaltung des österreichischen Nationalitätenrechts durch den Ausgleich in Mähren und in der Bukowina, in: *Österreichische Zeitschrift f. öffentliches Recht*, 5-6 (1914), 583-615.
- HIDEN, JOHN: *Defender of Minorities. Paul Schiemann, 1876–1944* (London 2003).
- HILBRENNER, ANKE: *Diaspora-Nationalismus. Zur Geschichtskonstruktion Simon Dubnows* (Göttingen 2007).
- HIRSCH, FRANCINE: *Empire of Nations. Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union* (Ithaca 2005).
- HOBBSAWM, ERIC/ RANGER, TERENCE: *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge 1983).
- HOUSDEN, MARTYN: *On Their Own Behalf. Ewald Ammende, Europe's National Minorities and the Campaign for Cultural Autonomy 1920–1936* (Amsterdam 2014).
- HYRYČ, IHOR (ed.): *Mychajlo Hruševs'kyj. Tvory u 50 tomy* (L'viv 2002-2012).
- IMAMOVIĆ, MUSTAFA: *Bosnia and Herzegovina. Evolution of its political and legal institutions* (Sarajevo 2006).
- IRIYE, AKIRA/ SAUNIER, PIERRE-YVES (ed.): *Dictionary of Transnational History* (New York 2009).
- ITALIANO, FEDERICO / RÖSSNER, MICHAEL (ed.): *Translatio/n: Narration, Media and the Staging of Differences* (Bielefeld 2012).
- JILEK, GRIT: *Nation ohne Territorium. Über die Organisierung der jüdischen Diaspora bei Simon Dubnow* (Baden-Baden 2013).
- JOBST, KERSTIN: *Zwischen Nationalismus und Internationalismus die polnische und ukrainische Sozialdemokratie in Galizien von 1890 bis 1914* (Hamburg 1996).
- JUDSON, PIETER M.: *Guardians of the Nation. Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge, et al. 2006).
- JUDSON PIETER M. / ZAHRA, TARA: Introduction, in: *Austrian History Yearbook* 43 (2012), p. 21-27.
- KAELBLE, HARTMUT: *Der historische Vergleich. Eine Einführung zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt, et al. 1999).
- KAPLAN-FEUEREISEN, OMRY: Im Dienste der jüdischen Nation. Jacob Robinson und das Völkerrecht, in: *Osteuropa*, 58/ 8-10 (2008), 279-294.
- KELLY, MILLS T.: Last Best Chance or Last Gasp? The Compromise of 1905 and Czech Politics in Moravia, in: *Austrian History Yearbook*, 34 (2003), 279-301.
- KING, JEREMY: Which Equality? Separate but Equal in Imperial Austria. Draft article (2010).
- KING, JEREMY: Who is who? Separate but Equal in Imperial Austria. Draft introduction (2010).
- KING, JEREMY: *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans. A Local History of Bohemian Politics. 1848-1948* (Princeton NJ 2002).
- KLETEČKA, THOMAS: *Der Ausgleichsversuch des Ministeriums Hohenwart-Schäffle mit Böhmen im Jahre 1871* (Diss. Univ. Vienna 1984).
- KÜHL, JÖRGEN: *The Federal Union of European Nationalities. An outline history 1949-1999* (Aabenraa 2000).
- KUNZ, JOSEF L.: The Present Status of the International Law for the Protection of Minorities, in: *American Journal of International Law* 48/1 (1954), 282-286.
- KUZMANY, BÖRRIES: Der Galizische Ausgleich als Beispiel moderner Nationalitätenpolitik?, in: Haid, E. et al. (ed.): *Galizien. Peripherie der Moderne – Moderne der Peripherie* (Marburg 2013), 123-141.
- KUZMANY, BÖRRIES: Die Neuerfindung des Judentums. Der Aufbau einer sowjet-jüdischen Nation im Spiegel jiddischer Parteiorgane (1917-1922), in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 2 (2005), 247-279.

- KUZMANY, BÖRRIES: Habsburg Austria: Experiments in non-territorial autonomy, in: *Ethnopolitics* 15/1 (2016), 43-65.
- KUZMANY, BÖRRIES: The Rise and Limits of Participation. The Political Representation of Galicia's Urban Jewry from the Josephine Era to the 1914 Electoral Reform, in: *East Central Europe* 42/3 (2015), 216-248.
- KYMLICKA, WILL: National cultural autonomy and international minority rights norms, in: *Ethnopolitics*, 6/3 (2007), 379-393.
- LAUN, RUDOLF: Das Nationalitätenrecht als internationales Problem, in: *Österreichische Zeitschrift für öffentliches Recht*, 4 u. 5 (1917), 397-418.
- LAURITS, KAIDO: Die deutschbaltische Minderheit in der Republik Estland von 1918 bis 1940, in: *Nordost-Archiv. Zeitschrift für Regionalgeschichte*, 19 (2010), 71-115.
- LAURITS, KAIDO: *Saksa kultuuroomavalitsus Eesti Vabariigis 1925–1940* (Tallinn 2008).
- LESLIE, JOHN: Der Ausgleich in der Bukowina von 1910: Zur österreichischen Nationalitätenpolitik vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg, in: Brix, E. et al. (ed.): *Geschichte zwischen Freiheit und Ordnung. Gerald Stourzh zum 60. Geburtstag* (Graz 1991), 113-144.
- LIBER, GEORGE: Ukrainian Nationalism and the 1918 law on national personal autonomy, in: *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, 15/1 (1987), 22-42.
- LIEKIS, ŠARŪNAS: „A State within a State?“ Jewish Autonomy in Lithuania 1918-1925 (Vilnius 2003).
- MAKARENKO, TAMARA: Nacional'no-personal'na avtonomija jak skladova etnopolityky periodu ukrajins'kych vyzvol'nych zmahan' 1917–1921 rr., in: *Kul'turolohičnyj visnyk Nižn'oji Naddniprožčyny* (Zaporizžja 2013), 159-166.
- MALLOY, TOVE / OSIPOV, A. / VIZI, B. (ed.): *Managing Diversity through Non-Territorial Autonomy – Assessing Advantages, Deficiencies, and Risks* (Oxford 2015).
- MARTIN, TERRY: *The Affirmative Action Empire. Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union. 1923-1939* (Ithaca, et al. 2001).
- MIDDELL, MATTHIAS: Kulturtransfer und Historische Komparatistik – Thesen zu ihrem Verhältnis, in: *Comparativ*, 10/1 (2000), 7-41.
- MOMMSEN, HANS: *Arbeiterbewegung und Nationale Frage. Ausgewählte Aufsätze* (Göttingen 1979).
- NAM, IRINA V.: Kul'turno-nacional'naja avtonomija v istorii Rossii. Dokumental'naja antologija. Tom 2: Dal'nij Vostok, 1921-1922 (Tomsk 1999).
- NAM, IRINA V.: Nacional'nye men'sinstva Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka na istoričeskom perelome (1917-1922 gg) (Tomsk 2009).
- NESEMANN, FRANK: Minderheitendiplomatie – Leo Motzkin zwischen Imperien und Nationen, in: Diner, D. (ed.): *Synchrone Welten: Zeitenräume jüdischer Geschichte* (Göttingen 2005), 147-171. [English version in: *Central and Eastern European Review*, Vol 1, 2007.]
- NEUGEBAUER, MAX: Die Nationalitätenpolitik Karl Renners, in: *Der Donauraum*, 4/ 2 (1959), 219-225.
- NEUMANN, BIRGIT / NÜNNING, A. (ed.): *Travelling Concepts for the Study of Culture* (Berlin, et al. 2012).
- NIMNI, EPHRAIM: *National-Cultural Autonomy and its Contemporary Critics* (New York 2005).
- OSIPOV, ALEXANDER: Non-territorial Autonomy and International Law, in: *International Community Law Review* 13/4 (2011), 393-411
- OSTERKAMP, JANA: Verfassungsgerichtsbarkeit in der Tschechoslowakei (1920-1939). Verfassungsidee – Demokratieverständnis – Nationalitätenproblem (Frankfurt Main 2009).
- PICKHAN, GERTRUD: „Gegen den Strom“. Der Allgemeine Jüdische Arbeiterbund „Bund“ in Polen 1918-1939 (Stuttgart 2001).
- PRYMAK THOMAS M.: *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture* (Toronto 1987).
- RABINOVICH, SIMON: *Jewish Rights, National Rites. Nationalism and Autonomy in Late Imperial and Revolutionary Russia* (Stanford 2014).
- RACHAMIMOV, ALON: Diaspora Nationalism's Pyrrhic Victory. The Controversy Regarding the Electoral Reform of 1909 in Bukovina, in: Micgiel, J. (ed.): *State and Nation-Building in East Central Europe. Contemporary Perspectives* (New York 1996), 1-16.
- RACHAMIMOV, ALON: Provincial Compromises and State Patriotism in *fin-de-siècle* Austria-Hungary, in: Zuckermann, M. (ed.): *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte. XXX. Ethnizität, Moderne und Enttraditionalisierung* (Göttingen 2002), 116-128.
- REIFOWITZ, IAN: Otto Bauer and Karl Renner on Nationalism, Ethnicity & Jews, in: *Journal of Jewish Identities*, 2/2 July (2009), 1-19.
- ŠARAPOV, JA.: *Nacional'nye sekcii RKP(b)* (Kazan' 1967).
- SCHEUERMANN, MARTIN: Minderheitenschutz contra Konfliktverhütung? Die Minderheitenpolitik des Völkerbundes in den zwanziger Jahren (Marburg 2000).

- SCHMALE, WOLFGANG: Historische Komparatistik und Kulturtransfer. Europageschichtliche Perspektiven für die Landesgeschichte; eine Einführung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der sächsischen Landesgeschichte (Bochum 1998).
- SEIBT, FERDINAND (ed.): Die Chance der Verständigung. Absichten und Ansätze zu übernationaler Zusammenarbeit in den böhmischen Ländern 1848-1918 (München 1987).
- SHNEER, DAVID: Yiddish and the creation of Soviet-Jewish culture. 1918-1930 (Cambridge 2004).
- SLEZKINE, YURI: The USSR as a Communal Apartment, or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism, in: *Slavic Review*, 53/2 (1994), 414-452.
- SMITH, DAVID/ HIDDEN, JOHN: Ethnic Diversity and the Nation State. National cultural autonomy revisited (London, et al. 2012).
- SMITH, DAVID: Rise, Fall and Revival: One Hundred Years of Transnational Ethnic Coalition-Building in Europe. Paper presented at the conference 'Trans-ethnic coalition-building within and across States', Uppsala 2015.
- SPRINGER, RUDOLF (= Renner, Karl): Der Kampf der Oesterreichischen Nationen um den Staat (Leipzig, et al. 1902).
- STALIN, JOSIF: Marxismus und nationale Frage, in: *Werke*, Bd. 2 (Berlin 1950 [1913]), 266-333.
- STARZYŃSKI, STANISLAUS RITTER VON: Eine neue Konstruktion der Minoritätenvertretung, in: *Österreichische Zeitschrift für öffentliches Recht*, 3 (1918), 419-433.
- STOCHEL-NABIELSKA, TERESA: Das polnische Parteienspektrum in Galizien vor 1914. Eine Bestandsaufnahme der Bemühungen um die Demokratisierung des Landes (Diss. Univ. Vienna 2008).
- STOURZH, GERALD: Die Gleichberechtigung der Nationalitäten in der Verfassung und Verwaltung Österreichs 1848 – 1918 (Wien 1985).
- STOURZH, GERALD: The Ethnicizing of Politics and 'National Indifference' in Late Imperial Austria, in: Stourzh, G. (ed.): *Der Umfang der österreichischen Geschichte* (Wien et al. 2011), 283-323.
- THER, PHILIPP / SUNDHAUSSEN, H. (ed.): Regionale Bewegungen und Regionalismen in europäischen Zwischenräumen seit der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts (Marburg 2003).
- THORBERRY, PATRICK: 'Is There a Phoenix in the Ashes? – International Law and Minority Rights', in: *Texas International Law Journal* (1980) 421-458.
- TRENCSENYI, BALÁZS/ JANOWSKI, M./ BAÁR, M./ FALINA, M./ KOPEČEK, M.: A history of modern political thought in East Central Europe. Vol. 1. Negotiating modernity in the long nineteenth century (Oxford 2016).
- URBANITSCH, PETER: Die nationalen Ausgleichsversuche in den Ländern Cisleithaniens in den Jahren vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg – Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede, in: Fasora, L. et al. (ed.): *Moravské vyrovnání z roku 1905 / Der Mährische Ausgleich von 1905* (Brno 2006), 43-58.
- US'KA, ULJANA: Halyc'ke zrivnannja 1914 r. jak pol's'ko-urkajins'kyj polityčnyj kompromis, in: Lytvyn, M. (ed.) *Ukrajina-Pol'sča. Istoryčna spadšyna i suspil'na svidomist'*, vol. 28 (L'viv 2015), 57–68.
- VEIDLINGER, JEFFREY: The Moscow State Yiddish Theatre. Jewish Culture on the Soviet Stage (Bloomington IN 2000).
- VIERLING, BIRGIT: Kommunikation als Mittel politischer Mobilisierung. Die Sudetendeutsche Partei auf ihrem Weg zur Einheitsbewegung in der Ersten Tschechoslowakischen Republik (1933-1938) (Marburg 2014).
- WALDSTEIN-WARTENBERG, BERTHOLD: Der letzte Ausgleichsversuch in Böhmen vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg, in: *Der Donauraum*, 4, Nr. 2 (1959), 65-81.
- WERNER, MICHAEL/ ZIMMERMANN, B.: Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung. Der Ansatz der Histoire croisée und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen, in: *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28/4 (2002), 607-636.
- WHITLEY, BERNARD/ KITE, M.: The psychology of prejudice and discrimination (Belmont, CA 2010).
- WINGFIELD, NANCY M. (ed.): *Creating the Other. Ethnic Conflict and Nationalism in Habsburg Central Europe* (New York 2003).
- ZAHRA, TARA: National Indifference as a Category of Analysis, in: *Slavic Review* 69/1 (2010), 93-119.
- ZAHRA, TARA: *Kidnapped Souls. National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands. 1900-1948* (Ithaca NY, et al. 2008).
- ZIMMERMAN, JOSHUA D.: Poles, Jews, and the Politics of Nationality. The Bund and the Polish Socialist Party in Late Tsarist Russia, 1892–1914 (Madison 2004).
- ŻYNDUL, JOLANTA: Państwo w państwie? Autonomia narodowo-kulturalna w Europie Środkowowschodniej w XX wieku (Warszawa 2000).