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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. In this example, members of a countrywide 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 maybe 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. 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.

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).
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 Károly 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
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¹⁰ SCHLETT: A szociáldemokrácia és a magyár társadalom (1982).
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.\textsuperscript{14} Contrary to the established literature,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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.

\textbf{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textbf{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

\textsuperscript{14} NAM: Kul’turno-nacional’na avtonomija (1999); NAM: Nacional’nye men’šinstva (2009).


\textsuperscript{17} ŠARAPOV: Nacional’nye sekci (1967); DONNINGHAUS: Minderheiten in Bedrängnis (2009); SHNEER: Yiddish (2004); KUZMANY: Neuerfindung (2005).

\textsuperscript{18} MAKARENKO: Nacional’no-personal’na avtonomija (2013); LIBER: Ukrainian Nationalism (1987).


\textsuperscript{21} KUZMANY: Galizischer Ausgleich (2013).

bodies. A year later, Lithuania passed a non-territorial autonomy law for Jews based on the traditional, but de-confessionalised, Jewish councils. 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. 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.

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.

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. 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.

27 Cornwall: The Devil’s Wall (2011).
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 **facily**. 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.

---

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


\textsuperscript{31} KAPLAN-FEUEREISEN: Im Dienste der jüdischen Nation (2008).

\textsuperscript{32} KUNZ: Present Status (1954); THORNBERRY: Phenix (1980); BERNMANN: Passion (2011).


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

\textsuperscript{35} OSIPOV: Non-territorial autonomy (2011); BAUBOCK: 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, translation 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 Hrušev’s’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), Černívci (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 Süddeut 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


BAUER, OTTO: Die Nationalitätenfrage und die Sozialdemokratie (Vienna 1907).


BRANDES, DETLEF: Die Sudetendeutschen im Krisenjahr 1938 (München 2010).


BURKE, PETER: Czultural Hybridity (Cambridge 2009).


CATTARUZZA, MARINA: Sozialisten an der Adria. Plurinationale Arbeiterbewegung in der Habsburgermonarchie (Berlin 2011).


GLASSL, HORST: Der Mährische Ausgleich (München 1967).


HERKNITT, 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.


HOBSBAWM, ERIC/ RANGER, TERENCE: The Invention of Tradition (Cambridge 1983).


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).


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).


Laun, Rudolf: Das Nationalitätenrecht als internationales Problem, in: Österreichische Zeitschrift für öffentliches Recht, 4 u. 5 (1917), 397-418.


Makarenko, Tamara: Nacional’no-person’al’na avtonomija jak skladova etnopolityky periodu ukrajins’kych vyzvol’nych zmahan’ 1917–1921 r., in: Kul’turolohičniy visnyk Nižin’oji Naddniprianščyny (Zaporizhja 2013), 159-166.


Nam, Irina V.: Kul’turolohičniy visnyk Nižin’oji Naddniprianščyny (Zaporizhja 2013), 159-166.


Rabinovich, Simon: Jewish Rights, National Rites. Nationalism and Autonomy in Late Imperial and Revolutionary Russia (Stanford 2014).


Šarapov, J.A.: Nacional’no sekcii RKP(b) (Kazan’ 1967).


STALIN, JOSIF: Marxismus und nationale Frage, in: Werke, Bd. 2 (Berlin 1950 [1913]), 266-333.


VIDDLINGER, JEFFREY: The Moscow State Yiddish Theatre. Jewish Culture on the Soviet Stage (Bloomington IN 2000).


WALDSTEIN-WARTENBERG, BERTHOLD: Der letzte Ausgleichsversuch in Böhmen vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg, in: Der Donauraum, 4, Nr. 2 (1959), 65-81.


WHITLEY, BENARD/ KITE, M.: The psychology of prejudice and discrimination (Belmont, CA 2010).


