

ficance must be attached to the idea — a veritable egg of Columbus — propounded by Sir Austen Chamberlain at the last debate on foreign affairs in the British Parliament. Sir Austen Chamberlain suggested that only such states as had previously submitted themselves to the revision paragraphs of Article 19 should be accorded the protection of the League and of other countries in the event of their being attacked. This really tremendous

idea and others of a like nature voiced at the recent debate on foreign affairs in the House of Commons are hopeful signs of changing times. They are hopeful indications that Britain has begun to realize the fact that to effect a new arrangement of Europe's affairs, a new spirit and new means are needed, because the methods in use for the last twenty years can lead to nothing but a new catastrophe.

## NATIONALITY CONDITIONS IN RUMANIA

by

*Dr. Andrew R. Szeben*

An article of mine with the above title which appeared in the *Danubian Review* of February this year was criticized at length in issue No. 4 of the „*Revue de Transylvanie*” by Dr. S. Manuila, Director of the Rumanian Census Institute, who was invited to do so by the editor of that Rumanian periodical. I should have been very pleased had Dr. Manuila, — who is undoubtedly one of the most eminent Rumanian statisticians, and who is in a position to conduct investigations and find out all about ethnographic conditions, helped me with his comments to unravel the intricacies of the nationality question in Rumania and its several provinces; or where, for lack of adequate sources, I was not able, except with great difficulty and in round-about ways, to ascertain the nationality statistics of a province at a certain date, he had dispelled uncertainty with statistical data and his own knowledge of the subject.

I am sorry to say that Dr. Manuila did not fill up any gaps in my statistics. All he did was to comment in a very annoyed tone on a few casual remarks of mine. I regret this all the more because I had no intention of giving personal offence, either to Dr. Manuila or anybody else, and I am convinced that the tenor of my article was nowhere so personal or aggressive as his reply to it.

Of the entire six and a half quarto pages to which my article ran Dr. Manuila mentions only one passage — that in which I deplored the fact that the nationality figures of the 1930 Rumanian census (the first regular census in Rumania, which for the first time since 1910 or 1912 should give a clear picture of the population statistics of the different provinces) have not been published yet, six years after it was taken. I also said that the Rumanian Statistical Office was well enough staffed and technically well enough equipped to make the delay incomprehensible.

Strangely enough in his criticism Dr. Manuila takes objection primarily to the statement that the 1930 census was preceded by a long period of preparation. Is there anything offensive in that remark? I merely said that a census was taken in

Transylvania in 1920, but that its figures were inaccurate and that another embracing the whole country was taken in 1927, which, however was so full of errors that it could not be made public, adding that, probably in order to avoid a similar failure again, thorough preparations were made for the 1930 census. Here I was alluding to the courses of instruction for the enumerators, the series of propaganda lectures and the wide-spread poster campaign, the aim of which was to draw the attention of the population to the importance of the census. All very laudable efforts, and it puzzles me to discover why Dr. Manuila should allege that it was „tendentious” to mention them.

The Director of the Rumanian Census Institute is also offended because I called the official report on the census returns a „tiny Indicator”, when it was a work of 850 pages. In its title the book describes itself as an „indicator” and by tiny I simply meant that, 850 pages and all, it was small enough in bulk to have room in the pocket of a man's jacket.

Dr. Manuila declares that what I said about the Census Institute having a personnel of 260 employees since 1930 is not true, that the Institute never worked with a larger staff than 120 or 130 persons. I am exceedingly sorry, but I have no means of judging from this distance which Rumanian office tells the truth, and when. The last paragraph, page 12, of the official gazette for 1931 published by the Rumanian Census Institute, of which Dr. Manuila must have known, seeing that he wrote an introduction to it,<sup>1</sup> contains the following sentence „*Le personnel central de la Direction du Recensement, à l'heure actuelle, est composé de 260 personnes*”.

Dr. Manuila asserts that the calculating machines received from the Rockefeller Foundation are used for compiling demographic statistics and rarely for working out census figures. Approved!

The announcement made by the Director of

<sup>1</sup> *La population actuelle de la Roumanie. Publié par la Direction du Recensement Général de la population. Bucaresti, 1931. Le Moniteur Officiel et les Imprimeries de l'Etat.*

the Roumanian Census Institute to the effect that nobody in Rumania was feverishly (*avec fièvre*) anxious to see the census results is surprising. We are not feverishly anxious to have them either, but in six years' time something might have been published — fever or not. Another striking sentence in Dr. Manuila's article states that they do not intend to publish the nationality statistics of each village separately, but in aggregate. Well, this will really justify everybody in taking these round numbers with a grain of salt. To obtain a clear notion of the nationality aspects of any district we certainly require the statistics of every village separately, especially in a country like Rumania, containing large territories inhabited by a mixed population. The statistics of the several villages can be controlled, and they alone are of any value to research work. How, for instance, does Dr. Manuila propose to draw a detailed nationality map of Rumania — a thing which would have been necessary long ago — if village statistics are not to be made public? Or are geographers to be deprived utterly of the possibility of using different methods of throwing light from all sides on nationality conditions? Is the nationality map of Rumania to be drawn by the Census Institute itself, and are its statistics to be inaccessible to everybody else?

There is one thing which we do not understand. Now, as before the war, the Rumanians could not be loud enough in asserting that the

figures of the old Hungarian censuses were unreliable. Such an extensive propaganda campaign was launched to make people believe this that many at home and abroad were misled by it. Yet the Hungarian Statistical Office was never afraid to publish the nationality data of each village separately and in every kind of combination. Dr. Manuila, as a statistician, must know that such publication affords to everybody the only serious possibility of control which makes falsification — at least undiscovered falsification — well-nigh impossible.

After this I wonder whether there is anyone who accuses the Hungarian statistics of being unreliable, when the Rumanians could not or would not publish their "better and more reliable" statistics for eighteen years. Even Rumanian scientists are obliged, for lack of better and more particularized data, to use the 25 years old Hungarian statistical sources when they wish to establish the nationality conditions of any district accurately and in detail.

In conclusion may I be allowed to remark that the offensive tone in which the „Revue de Transylvanie" introduces and adds a few closing words to Dr. Manuila's article and in which V. Dima, in the same periodical, criticizes an article of mine on the increase of the population in Transylvania is an unfailing sign of a lack of serious preparedness. When we get a criticism based on earnest argument, we shall take up the latter theme too.

## HUNGARIAN FOLK-SONGS

by

*Rudolph Boros*

**H**ungarian music, like the Hungarians themselves, was formerly considered something exotic by the peoples of the West. The word exotic is applied to a diversity of things that come from remote regions, to things strange and widely different from the well-known domestic ones, and therefore interesting, often even excitingly interesting. Probably this is the attitude of many towards Spanish or Russian music, for instance — and not without foundation —, but compared with the music of the South and the North, it is justified in a higher degree in connection with that of the East, which bears even more apparent traces of Asiatic origins and influences.

Here we must clear up one or two points. What the West on the whole knows as Hungarian music; what Westerners grew so fond of in the last century; what in its "exotic" charm so often enchants the English and the French, is primarily the so-called "Cigány" (gypsy) music. The term has been much disputed ever since the middle of the past century. It was natural for the Hungarians to feel that the music played by their favourite gypsies, which to all appearances so completely expressed the fulness of their emotions and was so firmly rooted in the hearts of the people, gentry and peasants alike, was peculiarly their own, the offspring of their own hearts.

Great then was their surprise when the most outstanding figure in the Hungarian world of music, Francis Liszt of European fame, came forward with the startling statement that the music played by the gypsies was not a manifestation of the creative art of the Hungarian genius, but was simply the product of gypsy talent. This startling opinion of Liszt's was founded on his observations of Russian, Rumanian, and Spanish gypsies during his tours in those countries. He found a great similarity in their music — the embellishments of the theme, the characteristic, capricious rubatos, and above all the intervals of one and a half tones derived from the Indian scale etc. etc.

With musical science on the level it was on more than three quarters of a century ago, all the heated discussion and wrangling did not lead to a satisfactory solution of the problem. Today we know that gypsy music is an *ad libitum* and very greatly transformed — from certain points of view corrupted — rendering of original Hungarian tunes. By the time — practically only in the first quarter of this century — pure, original folk-songs which the better classes had either never heard, or thought beneath their notice, were brought to light again, were discovered in the literal sense of the word; the educated classes had long since turned away from them. Another reason why those classes were averse to them lay in the circum-