

DANUBIAN REVIEW

(DANUBIAN NEWS)

VOL. IV., NO. 4.
B U D A P E S T
SEPTEMBER 1936

PUBLISHED BY THE HUNGARIAN FRONTIER
READJUSTMENT LEAGUE

SINGLE COPY 50 FILL.
SUBSCRIPTION:
ONE YEAR 6 PENGÓ

C O N T E N T S

- A Response *Ferenc Herczeg*
- The Danube Basin Problem *Dr. Andrew Moravek*
- James Fitzjames in the Christian Army at the
Siege of Buda *Fr. Endrödi*
- Political Mosaic *Országos Széchényi Könyvtár*
- How Minorities Live
- Political Economy
- Sports

A RESPONSE

by

Ferenc Herczeg

Privy Councillor, Member of the Hungarian Upper House, President of the Hungarian Revision League

Replying to Sir Robert Gower and Mr. Procter, Mr. Edgar P. Young, in a letter to the Times of 5th September, made the following assertion about the Hungarian Revision League of which, at present, I am President:

“Even the Budapest Revision League has confessed that if Hungarian newspapers refrained from reproducing foreign newspaper articles and speeches concerning revision, the enthusiasm of the Hungarian people would die away.”

As President of the Hungarian Revision League I feel it my duty to say that the League never made this statement or any impossible statement of the kind. I pray Mr. Young to tell us on what he bases his allegation, or if he is not in the position to do so, may I, without wishing to be presumptuous, advise him to treat the source of his information about Hungarian matters with more scepticism in future.

Another astonishing statement in Mr. Young's letter is that there are “a considerable number of intelligent and patriotic Magyars who realize that the only practicable policy to pursue is one of abandoning all talk of frontier revision...”

Allow me to assure Mr. Young that “intelligent and patriotic” Hungarians of that description are inventions of the imagination. The many British politicians and tourists who have visited Hungary of late and have met Hungarians of all sorts and conditions, from the aristocracy to the Social Democratic labouring classes, have not seen anything of them. It would be a dangerous illusion were European public opinion to look for a satisfactory solution of the Danube problem from a spirit of meek renunciation on the part of Hungary, such as no normal nation could ever be expected to show. All who wish to take an interest in the Danube question must be prepared to accept the given and immutable fact that the Hungarian nation will never, under any circumstances whatsoever, be able to acquiesce in frontiers that have thrust three and a half million Hungarians under alien yokes and have pushed the political frontiers

of Czecho-Slovakia so far into territories inhabited purely by Hungarians that the capital of Hungary is within the zone of fire of the Czech long-distance batteries. To protest against this is a point of honour with every patriotic Hungarian, and nothing is more natural — although Mr. Young disapproves of it — than that we strive to bring up our children in a spirit of honour and patriotism. And, as it happens, where irredentism is concerned, the Hungarian nation is influenced and encouraged by the lessons of the past. For 150 years Hungary groaned under the Turkish yoke and then, too, there were those who advised our forefathers, as Mr. Young advises us, to pursue a practicable policy and give up vain talk about ridding the country of its oppressors.

The most striking thing about Mr. Young's letter is that he, a British subject, understands why the Little Entente Governments remove “unreliable personnel from the frontier regions and from key positions in the State Services”. Would it not be a more reasonable and honest solution to restore those dangerous frontier zones inhabited by unreliable Hungarians to the country to which for a thousand years they belonged and where the Hungarians would be neither dangerous nor unreliable? Mr. Young seems to approve of the plan of compulsory settlement with its attendant confiscation of property. In his opinion Hungary's policy is a violent one. But it is a wellknown fact that the fundamental principle of Hungarian revisionist policy, which we take every opportunity of emphasizing, is that we wish to gain our ends by peaceful means and with the concurrence of the nations of Europe. Peaceful revision is the safety valve which would relieve the pressure of destructive energies in the Danube Valley. The choice lies between a policy of revision or of war.

Anybody who sees violence in a peaceful desire for compromise and finds it understandable that the autochthonous Hungarian inhabitants of the Czecho-Slovak frontier zone are being driven out and ruined financially, will find it difficult to make us understand what he considers a policy of peace and what he means by democracy.

THE DANUBE BASIN PROBLEM

by

Dr. Andrew Moravék

It is gradually becoming a commonplace in European publicistic that the peace treaties which ended the Great War created an intolerable situation in the Danube Basin. The guarantee of equilibrium in economic, military and political respects alike afforded by the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was abolished by those treaties of peace; the place of the ancient Habsburg Monarchy was taken by small States whose nationalist and exclusive policy, besides involving economic decline, contains in it the germs of eternal conflicts affecting the whole territory of that Monarchy and threatens to bring about a state of disunion and to upset the balance of Europe. The British public was made familiar with the problem of the Danube Basin and with the undivided attitude of the public opinion of Hungary by a series of addresses on the subject delivered a few years ago by Count Stephen Bethlen, who was Prime Minister of Hungary for more than ten years. So, while calling the attention of our readers to those addresses, which have appeared in book form too,¹ we cannot do better on the present occasion than quote by way of introduction to our present article the pregnant description of the situation given by Count Bethlen in a passage briefly characterising to the full past and present. When speaking of the Succession States, Count Stephen Bethlen said: —

"Each of them needs the operating knife of the surgeon, which alone will be able to restore them to vitality and measure that some impartial and educative power shall keep their unbridled ambitions within the proper limits in order to prevent them from doing harm to themselves and — what is worse — to other peoples.

"This power was represented in the past by the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, and it would be impossible to deny — whatever our opinion be in judging its policy now — that all these small races as well as the whole of Europe profited a great deal by the rôle the Monarchy played in this part of the world.

"Its very existence prevented the minor disputes between the various races living in the Danube Basin from becoming more than domestic quarrels and jeopardising the peace of Europe. It assured the position and superior importance of a Great Power to the interests of all those small races whose voice would otherwise have had no weight at all in the concert of the European States. By its military power it safeguarded their security

— much more efficiently than they themselves could have ever done separately — and, finally, it united them into one great economic system which gave a firm basis to the economic life of them all.

"To-day all this belongs to the past. The antagonisms of the small races, far from being limited in importance to tiny domestic disputes, have developed into European problems. The small peoples became independent, but they have to pay heavily for this independence since their voice is of but slight weight among the great nations of Europe and the safeguarding of their security involves extraordinary efforts bearing heavily upon their States Budgets. But their greatest trouble is that in place of an economic unit with a population of 50 millions, within which both the production and the market for the output of each of these nations had been assured for centuries back, now quite a number of tiny national customs territories have been created all of whom lack either raw material necessary for production or a market for the latter, and very often even the very earning opportunities for their population. I make bold to state that — quite apart from the world crisis — all over this territory the conditions and the standard of life of the peoples, as well as their civilisation in general, show a most striking decline if compared with the pre-war situation. It goes without saying that these conditions contribute a great deal to making circumstances even worse: political and racial discontent is increasing as well as the struggle for life which each race has to carry on against all other races, both within the several States and in the neighbouring countries.

"We seem to have arrived at a point where the rivalry of the great nations of Europe is asserting itself with a view to securing political influence over the peoples of the Danube Basin. The former position of the Monarchy as a Great Power successfully withstood this rivalry and — although there were cases when one or the other of the Slav races living within the Austro-Hungarian Empire was trying for support from Russia in its political ambitions, or even may be the Serbs of the southern regions were leering at Serbia, and the Rumanians at Rumania beyond the frontiers — the power inherent in the Monarchy was always sufficient, on the whole, to keep aloof all illegitimate interference with the affairs of the peoples. Today the nations of the Danube Basin are being reduced to the standard of those pre-war Balkan States where the emulation of Russia, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and Italy, each intent intensifying their influence and upon realising their political aims, had in the past so often kindled conflagrations between the peoples or where, on the other hand, some of these small peoples contrived from time to time to secure the interest of one or the other of the Great Powers willing to help them in their selfish aims, which of course, invariably led up to complications of international importance.

"A similar and no less fatal process was started after the war by the so-called Little Entente treaty and by the alliance between this Little Entente and France. Is it not strange that all this should be due to that same Great Power whose populations were advocating the new

¹ *Bethlen, Stephen Count: "The Treaty of Trianon and European Peace"* (London, 1934. Longman, Green & Co.).

organisation of peace based upon the principles of justice?"

The statements made by Count Bethlen could safely be endorsed today by every person engaged in political life who is at all familiar with the Central European questions. As is only natural, the peoples affected by this situation either politically or economically are not content to merely establish the facts, but have set out to find a remedy. This was the origin of all those conceptions originating from the brains of theoreticians of diverse nationality aiming at a reorganisation of the Danube Basin which would attempt to discover the theoretical conditions essential to the construction of a more virile Central Europe.

Apart from deviations in details of a quite insignificant character, these conceptions may be divided into four general types, — the so-called "New Hungary", "Danube Confederation", "Zwischeneuropa" ("Mid-Europe") and "Habsburg Restoration" types. All four types — with each of which we shall deal separately below — rest primarily upon economic considerations and aim at the construction of a vast economic territory. At the same time, however, all four types fully realise the dominant role of the political "rocks of offence" which appear to impede a far-reaching association of nations of the kind. One of the chief "rocks of offence" in this category is the "nationality question". For, as is well known, the Habsburg Monarchy was not a homogeneous national State like England or France. There were some ten different "nationalities" living in it — nationalities large and small; and for that reason it was usually referred to as the classical example of a so-called "nationality State". With the appearance of nationalism as a political creed, in the nineteenth century the "nationality principle" began to make rapid headway in politics, the establishment of the unity of Germany and Italy and of the status as independent States of the small Balkan countries proving that principle to be one of the most important history-making factors of the new age. It was only after the dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy — or rather as a consequence of that dissolution — that people began to realise that the assertion of the nationality principle had its disadvantages too. The catchword employed to ensure the dismemberment of that Monarchy was that its peoples were oppressed and that they were entitled to form independent States. Those who urged the destruction of the "nationality" States and proclaimed that the only criterion for the formation of a State was a uniformity of language and that only those States could be sound which were built on the foundations of a homogeneous population, were by the peace treaties given unrestricted possibilities of enforcing their ideas. But it transpired at once that the nationality principle as sole State-forming factor had proved a fiasco; for the purpose of ensuring their so-called virility the new States claimed territories to which they were not entitled at all on ethnographical grounds and which they annexed by the aid of pseudo-historical, strategical and economic arguments, the annexation of these territories converting them too

— the would-be "national" States — into new nationality States. The former unified Danube Basin thus became occupied by a mosaic of tiny nationality "Statelets" the inner life of which is full of unrest due to racial, cultural and social antagonisms, their economic functioning (owing to the innumerable new customs barriers, to the reciprocal policy of isolation, to the forced increase of armaments beyond their capacity which is due to the tension prevailing at home and in their international relations) being subject to impediments and continuously threatening catastrophe.

The result is that the conceptions relating to the re-construction of the Danube Basin which are serious and well thought out all take into consideration the national principle as being today indubitably a very powerful factor to move the masses, but reject the idea of that principle being the only State-forming force and suggest solutions calculated to establish a harmony between the nationality principle and the other State-forming forces (geographical, economic, historical, cultural, religious forces). For that reason each of the conceptions proclaim a solution of the nationality question on an autonomist-federative basis within a large unit which they deem it necessary to create in harmony with the economic, geographical, historical and cultural postulates. On these two principles all types of conceptions alike agree; in practice, however, each of the conceptions offers a different idea of the re-construction of Central Europe in keeping with its author's principles and sentiments and probably with review in turn — at least cursively — the four main types of the Danube Basin conceptions referred to above.

"New Hungary".

The "New Hungary" theory was explained by Ladislav Ottlik in a series of articles published in the "Magyar Szemle" ("Hungarian Review"). His idea is that we ought to return to the two fundamental conceptions of the older Hungarian civilisation and of "Pax Hungarica". The first is the idea of the primacy of space, which teaches us that the starting point must be the elementary fact of the community of destiny of the peoples belonging to one and the same geo-economic space: the second is the idea of equal liberty for all the peoples which are thus interdependent — to use the words of the old Hungarian legal precept "*una eademque libertas*". Ottlik is of opinion that in the "Pax Hungarica" conception characteristic of pre-War

"It is very desirable that the immense importance of Article XIX should once more be emphasized and every means considered for facilitating its application. It is the first business of the League to provide for peaceful change as an alternative to war. No society can ever be entirely stationary; and yet Article XIX, which was framed for the purpose of making peaceful change possible, has never been allowed to operate."

(The Times, September 21, 1936.)

Greater Hungary which has been defined in outline above there is nothing that could not be extended — with due regard for its fundamental principles — to the whole Danube Basin. We see the concrete ambitions of a practical politician in the conception put forward by Count Stephen Bethlen, who in point of principle adopts an attitude absolutely identical with that adopted by Ottlik, in the following words: —

"What the racial principle really demands is not that every race, be it ever so small, must form a separate State, but that it should enjoy self-government in territories where the bulk of the population belongs to a certain different nation; that self-government should enable them to decide for themselves all questions vital to the preservation of their national character... that within the organisation of a greater State they should be able to assert an influence corresponding to their racial importance.

"On the other hand, in considering the question of which would be the races with whom they would wish to live in community, from the moment that the local autonomy is unassailably safeguarded no great importance need be attached to the other races speaking languages derived from a common root in ages past. What is of importance is that economic interests of paramount advantage link them together; that their community should be a voluntary union based upon natural geographical conditions, upon common historic traditions and a common view of life."

The New Hungary of the Danube Basin re-adjusted on the basis of these fundamental principles — Count Bethlen is concerned only with the Hungarian sector of the Danube question — would present the following aspect: — The Slovaks and Ruthenians would be given full autonomy and the right to decide for themselves — under international supervision — which State they wish to belong to. The "Bácska" and Banate districts — in which there is no racial element, either Magyar or German or Serbian or Croatian or Rumanian, constituting an indisputable majority — would also decide their future in this way. In the case of Transylvania, annexed to Rumania, a province which, though the Rumanian element does constitute a slight majority as against the Magyar and German minorities, for the whole long period of the Turkish occupation of Hungary lived an independent State life of its own and as such was of Hungarian (Magyar) character and acted as the upholder of the idea of Hungarian independence and sovereignty, Stephen Bethlen proposes the restoration of its original independence — the establishment of an independent Transylvania belonging neither to Hungary nor to Rumania.

The "Danube Confederation" Conception.

As contrasted with the "New Hungary" conception, which — as pointed out above — has been elaborated concretely, the "Danube Confederation" theory is far less definite in its outlines, the details varying according to the interests represented by the particular propagator. Its origin dates back as far as the middle of the nineteenth century; it was first suggested by C. Fr. Henningsen, according to whose scheme the confederation was to include Hungary, Serbia, Rumania, Croatia and Poland. On the basis of this conception M. Balescu, a Rumanian emigré, elaborated a less extensive scheme to include

Hungary, Serbia and Rumania (1850). Under this scheme the Confederate Danube States was to be a union including Hungary, Rumania and South Slavia (Yugoslavia), the "nationality" regions of Hungary to be annexed on the majority principle to the other two States to be formed. The common affairs of the Union (Federation) were to be managed by a Parliament of 150 Members (50 from each country) and by a Government consisting of three common Ministers (War, Foreign Affairs, Commerce and Communications). Balescu submitted his scheme to Louis Kossuth, then in exile, who rejected it and declared that he approved of the "nationalities" being given the right of unrestricted social organisation within the boundaries of historical Hungary and would in addition be prepared even to grant the Saxons, Rumanians and "Széklers" territorial autonomy in Transylvania, but insisted upon the unity of Hungary. As a consequence the plan of an agreement was frustrated. In 1862 the Milan "Alleanza" published under the name of Kossuth a so-called "Danube Confederation" scheme which, taking Switzerland as its model, suggested the establishment of a State Federation to include Hungary, Transylvania, Rumania, Croatia and Serbia. The scheme proposed in respect of Transylvania that a general suffrage of the people should be taken to decide whether that province should belong to Hungary or should be taken an independent State? It was however stipulated unconditionally that it should remain in personal union with Hungary. The part of the scheme relating to Transylvania was repudiated by Kossuth. In a "Danube Confederation" of the kind suggested the Hungarians would have certainly occupied a position differing entirely from the position they would occupy today, for instance, in a similar State Federation based on the *status quo*. The Danube Confederation conceived by Kossuth foresaw a Hungary which had shaken off the Austrian yoke and was destined to play the leading role in the Danube Basin, — a Hungary which was to gather round her the small peoples living in that basin which were still groaning under the Turkish yoke (the population of the Serbia of those days, even if we include Montenegro, must have been less than 3 millions) and was far in advance of those peoples in numbers, in historical traditions, in international prestige, in the capacity to organise state life and in cultural progress. In this group of States which was destined to ensure the balance as against the German and Russian predominance, the leading role would indubitably have been in the hands of Hungary.

This is not the case, however, with those "Danube Confederation" schemes which have kept cropping up since the Great War and have since 1920 been constantly increasing in number in the writings of the French publicists who treat Central European questions — evidently inspired from Prague. According to the ideas bruited by Czech and Rumanian publicists and politicians the establishment of a State Federation of the kind is extremely desirable, — though naturally only on the basis of the territorial *status quo* of today. In the now familiar words of Titulescu, what is need-

ed is not a change of frontiers but a pacification, a "rendering invisible" of those frontiers. These publicists and politicians of a Danube Confederation to be absorbed in the Little Entente — an alliance of a purely military character organised primarily as an offensive weapon against Hungary —, that being effected by the two disarmed and dismembered States, Austria and Hungary, which have been deprived of every right of initiative, joining that alliance, their inferiority being thereby perpetuated: while the Danube Confederation would thus be under the control of the new Triple Alliance of the Little Entente States. It is doubtful, however, whether these "peaceful" attempts at a *rapprochement* dangled so temptingly before the eyes of Austrians and Hungarians are really seriously meant despite the alluring perspective offered to the Little Entente; for there are many the other side of the frontiers who fear that in the event of the establishment of a State Federation even of the kind described above the restoration of unrestricted economic trade and intellectual intercourse will lead to a considerable increase in the importance of the Hungarians due to the central position of the latter, and are afraid further that those nationalities of the Succession States which, though on paper figuring as "State-forming factors", are in reality being prevented from living their nationality life, — the Slovaks, Ruthenians, Croatsians, etc. —, which even today betray strong magyarophile tendencies or a desire to achieve independence respectively, — many be enabled to enhance their efforts to emancipate themselves from the Little Entente yoke. These considerations impel us to regard it as more probable that talk of co-operation launched periodically by the Little Entente — or rather by other quarters inspired by and materially supported by the Little Entente — is not evidence of any serious intentions — even on the basis of the *status quo* —, and that it is merely political "stumping", — serving on the one hand to convince international public opinion, which is so poorly informed in such matters, of the sincerity of the "pacifist" longings of the Little Entente, and on the other hand to secure the goodwill of the Austrian and Hungarian public.

In this connection we would note that a few years back — at a time, it is true, when the balance of forces was far more in favour of the Little Entente — publicists were treated (mainly from Czech sources) to "solutions" of the Austrian and Hungarian questions written in a far different tone and far less conciliatory character, — the scheme for the demarcation of a Czech-Yugoslav "corridor" surrounding the whole of Hungary, the suggestion of the partition of the whole of Austria and Hungary, the idea of forcing Austria to join the Little Entente and thus of completely isolating Hungary, etc., etc. That these "schemes" were not merely *ballons d'essai*, is shown by the bloody events that took place in Austria in February, 1934, when Chancellor Dollfuss was only able after a bitter struggle to suppress the insurrection of the Czechophile Republican Guards who were provided with Czech ammunition. According to the official *communiqué* the fight cost the troops engaged in main-

taining public order 421 casualties (102 killed and 319 wounded), the losses of the Social-Democrat Guards having been 137 killed and 339 wounded.

"Zwischeneuropa" (Mid-Europe).

Although in externals resembling the conceptions included in the "Danube Confederation" schemes, there is a complete difference in essentials in the German conceptions that may be grouped under the heading of "Zwischeneuropa". So far as we know, the most exhaustive and the most interesting explanation of these conceptions is that given by Giselher Wirsing,² Editor of the "Tat" and one of the most eminent members of the younger generation of German publicists. The main points in the conception in question may be summed up as follows: — the Greater Germany to be brought into being as a consequence of the "Anschluss" of Austria will on the basis of geopolitico-economic expediency establish a big State Federation to include the peoples of the Danube Basin, here called the "Südostraum" (South East). Neither of these peoples would be leaders or led; as contrasted with the principle of quantity, which may be regarded as exploded, the principle of quality would be enforced; the majority would not oppress the minority: on the other hand, of the peoples all of equal rank and equal rights that people would obtain the leading role which was shown by its capacities and its will-power to be predestined to play that role. This would be the Reich of the future: it would comprise — apart from Greater Germany — the following States of the "Zwischeneuropa" lying between East and West which forms a *frontier region*, — Esthonia, Lettland, Lithuania, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Rumania (Greece, being already a Mediterranean State, and Turkey, an Asiatic Power, would not be bound by any close ties to the new State Federation and would therefore not be included in that Federation). The basis of co-operation within the Federation would be federalism. This German Imperial conception (the "Reichsidee") is very popular with a section of the younger generation of the Germans of Germany and among the German minorities of the Succession States too, in particular in Czecho-Slovakia, where the German minority had a periodical — "Der Weg" — of its own. Until the editors were indicted for treason, — it had many adherents.

The "Habsburg Restoration" Conception.

The German "Reichsidee" is diametrically opposed in principle to the conception behind the "legitimism" which has for its aims the restoration of the House of Habsburg. The programme of this movement makes its appearance indeed — for tactical reasons — in various guises, — sometimes as the domestic concern of Austria, at other times as a "dualism" of Austria and Dismembered Hun-

² In his work entitled "Zwischeneuropa und die deutsche Zukunft" (Jena, Diederichs Verlag). Naumann's "Mitteleuropa" — a book which created a great stir during the Great War — today possesses only a historical importance.

gary, or as a "trialism" of Austria, Hungary and Bohemia under Habsburg rule, or as a State Federation of Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, Croatia, Slovakia and Transylvania, — or again in a more romantic form extending the scheme to Catholic Bavaria: but the pivot of all the suggestions is undoubtedly the restoration of the whole Habsburg Monarchy of former times subject to the stipulation of absolute equality for all the racial units living in that Monarchy. Of all the various conceptions so far broached this is the only one to stress the Catholic character of the peoples it desires to unite.

This conception takes into account only those peoples which belong to the Western cultural community, — the Monarchy which it proposes stretching eastwards only as far as the crest of the Carpathians and to the Lower Danube — i. e. to the frontiers of Historical Hungary —, and south-eastwards as far as the Croatian seaboard. The scheme leaves entirely out of account the peoples living to the east and south of these frontiers — the Balkan peoples proper — as representing a world quite foreign to us the prospects of the organic incorporation of which in the Latin culture of the West are not very encouraging. An interesting corollary to the original conception is the idea broached in certain legitimist quarters that this Catholic Danube Habsburg Monarchy should enter into a close alliance on the north-east with Poland, that country adjoining the Hungarian frontier which is also Catholic in character, and on the south with Italy — also a Catholic country —, co-operating with these countries to form a firm block ensuring the maintenance of peace which would be strong enough to guarantee the free development of the peoples of the Danube Basin and to *ab ovo* to check all endeavours to secure a hegemony coming from without — serving in particular as a breakwater to stem the advance of any pan-German ambitions on the part of Germany and to counteract any threats of pan-Slav interference and oppression on the part of Russia.

The Danube Basin Question — in Practical Politics.

May be we have dealt too exhaustively with the conceptions aiming at a readjustment of the Danube Basin; but we have done so deliberately, for it is only by means of a thorough investigation of the kind and by the analysis of the theoretical constructions that we can hope to reveal the complicated nature of the problem or to show interdependence and disclose ambitions which the official diplomats of certain countries — in particular of the Little Entente — would appear to be doing all in their power to disguise and which those diplomats are certainly not anxious to proclaim or to elaborate.³

The events of importance occurring in the Danube Basin since the conclusion of the treaties of peace — events which may be regarded as veritable milestones — may be summed up under a few outstanding dates, as follows: —

In 1921 occurred the attempt to return to Hungary of King Charles, this being followed by the formation of the Little Entente alliance, an alliance with a military character aimed primarily against Hungary. In 1931 Germany, already considerably strengthened, made an attempt to establish a customs union with Austria (the scheme — behind which France and the Little Entente suspected the presence of a political object, viz. the "Anschluss" —, as is well known, was frustrated by a finding of the Hague Tribunal). In 1932 was broached the Tardieu-scheme, which though on paper proclaiming an apparently purely economic co-operation, in reality aimed at stabilising the *status quo*, — the scheme for an economic confederation of the Danube States which was ultimately rejected by practically all the countries concerned. In 1933 the Little Entente in reply declared its formation into a State Federation, — an event which did not however involve anything new in respect of either internal or international politics, there being no change either politically or economically.⁴ There was promise of great things in the Four-Power Convention signed in Rome on June 7th., 1933, which aimed also at securing the practical effectuation of the clause relating to treaty revision (it is a pity that it remained merely a suggestion). On March 17th., 1934, Italy, Austria and Hungary concluded the Rome Pact which afforded the two latter States guarantees respecting their security and at the same time secured those two countries important economic support. The importance of this political agreement was proved the same year, at the time of the Socialist "putsch" and the murder of Chancellor Dollfuss and later on too in connection with the anti-Hungary campaign ensuing after the attempt on King Alexander of Yugoslavia and M. Barthou in Marseilles, for it on both occasions saved the cause of peace. April, 1935, brought promises of an adjustment of the Danube Basin question; at the Conference of the Great Powers at Stresa the draft of a Danube Pact was submitted for discussion. But the hopes of a settlement were rendered dubious by the Franco-Russian Treaty with a very military tang concluded on May 2nd., 1935, which was supplemented by the Mutual Assistance Treaty between Russia and Czecho-Slovakia concluded in the same month — a treaty which ensured the aerial forces of Russia aviatic bases in the very heart of the basin of the Carpathians. The question of a re-adjustment of the Danube Basin was also relegated to the background for a considerable period by the Abyssinian war, which undermined the agreement of the Western Powers

³ For the question of the distribution of forces in the Danube Basin see the series of articles by Comte de Vienne published in the current volume of the "Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie". For the Austrian question see articles by George Ottlik and others in the March and April issues of that periodical.

⁴ On this points see the very illuminating article by Alexander Körmeny Ékes ("La co-operation économique des états de la Petite Entente") in the February, 1934, and the article by Philippe Develle ("La Petite Entente économique") in the December, 1935, issue of the Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie".

directly concerned in the war, from the Danube Basin. This situation was exploited by the diplomacy of Czecho-Slovakia for the purpose of attempting to oust Italy from the Danube Basin. In February, 1936, the Czecho-Slovak Premier, Hodža, who was at the time Foreign Minister also, visited Paris and Belgrade, proceeding to Vienna in March — in all probability for the purpose of weaning Austria from the Rome Pact and cajoling her into throwing herself into the arms of the Little Entente. The Austro-German "gentleman agreement" concluded on July 11th., 1936, wrested the trump card Czecho-Slovakia had been playing out of that country's hand; under that agreement the independence of Austria was guaranteed by Germany, the country traditionally represented as an aggressor, and not by the Little Entente. In September, 1936, the Hodža--scheme again cropped up, — though without much prospect of success.

What is, then, the situation today in the Danube Basin? There are two groups facing one another, — the Little Entente and the countries belonging to the Rome block. The former has been kept united by the desire to maintain the *status quo*. That is why the countries forming that group have had the backing of the most orthodox factor in European politics — of France, which country has supported the group through thick and thin for the purpose of securing for herself the unconditional assistance of the Little Entente against a Germany continually increasing in strength which was — and is still — adopting a more and more decided attitude. The scheme which France had in mind succeeded allright on paper; but only a blind man could have failed to notice that the influence of Germany was constantly increasing in Rumania and even more so in Yugoslavia, so that the utmost efforts had to be used to force Yugoslavia to take part in the Bucharest meeting of kings which was intended to serve as a demonstration of the unity of the Little Entente. As for Russia — France's and Czecho-Slovakia's latest ally —, Yugoslavia is not only not inclined to enter into an alliance with her, but has actually so far refused to resume diplomatic relations with her: while recently — after the fall of Titulescu — Rumania and Yugoslavia effected a *rapprochement* to the disadvantage of russophile Czecho-Slovakia.

It may seem paradoxical, but is a fact, that the failure of Germany to obtain that footing in the Danube Basin which might have threatened the balance of power was frustrated, not by the co-

operation of the declaredly anti-German French-Russian-Little Entente block, but by the circum-spect foreign policy of the States forming the Rome block. The three States belonging to that block have always opposed the demand for an "Anschluss" and endeavoured to ensure the recognition of Austria's independence and of her sovereignty. That did not of course mean any rigid insistence upon the *status quo*, the intention being on the contrary to give full play to organic development in the Danube Basin. It is this that has lent the Rome block — as opposed to the static character of the policy of the Little Entente, France and Russia — a certain dynamic character which has rendered it to some extent akin in conception and procedure to the German diplomacy which moves in other grooves and to the British diplomacy which pursues a policy aiming at a just and righteous settlement.

This essential difference between the two Danube groups has so far prevented any serious *rapprochement*: it has proved impossible to reconcile the statics and dynamics, while the renewed attempts at co-operation employing economic catch-words have been shipwrecked on this deep-seated difference. This circumstance was pointed out quite recently by Dr. Gustavus Gratz, who is well known to be in favour of the establishment of better relations with the Succession States, in an article⁵ in which he shows that today — in this age of nationalism — it is impossible by economic means to bring about any political *rapprochement*.

The only possible solution of the questions is therefore that to be obtained by political means. The Hungarian opinion on this point has been repeatedly defined. According to that opinion co-operation with the Succession States must be made subject to the following conditions, which are the minimum demands and are of a "real political" character: — first, the conditions of subsistence of the Hungarian (Magyar) minorities numbering 3.5—4 million souls must be really ensured; then, guarantees must be given to ensure political development and to provide that the present intolerable conditions shall be changed by peaceful means — either by enforcing the provisions of Article 19 of the Covenant of the League of Nations or by means of other effectual international agreements.

Hungarian public opinion believes that the "gentleman agreement" concluded between Austria and Germany on July 11th. last was a step in this direction — the only direction, it is convinced, in which we may hope for a Danube Basin living in an atmosphere of peace and justice and for the realisation of general peace in Europe, which depends so much upon conditions in the Danube Basin. The "gentleman agreement" in question eliminated from the life of the Danube Basin a problem which had continuously threatened to lead to an armed conflict, — eliminated it, let us hope, for a long time to come. It has thereby indubitably paved the way for a hearty co-operation

The unveiling of General Bandholtz's statue in Budapest on the 12th August was seized on by the "Universul" that extreme Magyarophobe Rumanian newspaper, as an opportunity to agitate against Hungary. Lacking a better argument, the ceremony was described as a revisionist provocation. We understand the indignation of the "Universul", for the ceremony drew the attention of foreign countries anew to the unprecedented acts of plunder committed by the Rumanian army at the time, not only in Budapest, but all over the country, Hungary's losses estimated at several thousand million gold crowns.

⁵ "Politique et économie en Europe Centrale" ((Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie", June, 1936).

between Germany and the States forming the Rome block. This co-operation is naturally bound to be dynamic in character and must contribute to create an atmosphere of peace and justice in Europe generally. Hungarian public opinion would be delighted to welcome a *rapprochement* — leading to their entering a common path of action — between the Rome block and Poland and Germany which are on friendly terms with that block on the one hand and the policy of Great Britain, which has already on innumerable occasions saved the cause of peace by intervening as mediator aiming at the realisation of a compromise. A continuation of the previous traditions of British foreign policy — supported by a utilisation of its splendid relations with France — would undoubtedly enable

the great nations of Europe by means of mutual understanding and compliance to begin at last the great task which the fulfilment of the unfortunate treaties of peace that brought the Great War to a conclusion have for the last fifteen years been making more and more urgent, — viz. the reconstruction of Europe in general and of the Danube Basin in particular. There can be no doubt that, if the big nations prove able to unite in this work of understanding which postulates an uncommon degree of moral elevation, the smaller nations will also be impelled to yield to the moral pressure and will on their part too make those sentimental and material sacrifices which the Europe to be reborn in consequence is demanding — and which that Europe deserves.

JAMES FITZJAMES IN THE CHRISTIAN ARMY AT THE SIEGE OF BUDA

by

Fr. Endrődi

England always took a lively interest in the desperate struggles of Eastern Europe against the pagan Turks, the most formidable enemy of the Christian Continent in modern times. This lively interest was not only increased by the tragic battle of Mohács, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, but was more and more converted into a desire of active help. As early as the middle of the sixteenth century England, as one of the civilized nations of Europe, realized that the invasion of the Turks was not directed against Hungary alone, whose unfortunate geographical situation had rendered her defenceless against it; England saw that after the complete subjugation of Hungary the Turks would turn against the whole of Europe. For in these wars there were two conflicting forces fighting against one another: Christianity with its fundamental doctrine of love on the one hand, and a Paganism desirous of recapturing its former dominion over the world on the other. It became thus the universal interest of Europe to check the invasion of the Turks.

The year 1526, which was the year of the first great Turkish victory, brought into being almost at once the common front of the Christian world. Various companies of English volunteers, filled with enthusiasm, set out towards the distant East to show their manly valour in the wars raging there.

Unfortunately, our records of these brave men are very scanty and rare, especially with regard to those English soldiers who came to Hungary in the sixteenth century. We know that there

were Englishmen fighting in the army of Nicholas Zrinyi, the Hero of Szigetvár, and that they often distinguished themselves by their gallant conduct.

Two of these soldiers, who rendered a lasting and great service, deserve to be mentioned by name. These are Sir Richard Grenville and John Smith. Sir Richard Grenville, who became a famous naval commander in his later years, was quite a young man when he fought in the Turkish wars in Hungary on Emperor Maximilian's side, between 1560 and 1568.¹

About the turn of the century John Smith visited Hungary, he is known in English history as Captain Smith, Governor of Virginia, in 1608.² After serving his time in Austria he came to Hungary, to the city of Komárom; later he took part in the siege of Székesfehérvár, where his invention, the "fiery dragons", was used with great success by the Hungarian troops. In the spring of 1602 he was in Transylvania; at the siege of the castle of "Regall"³ he cut off the heads of three Turks in a combat, whereupon he received rich gifts from Sigismund Báthory, Prince of Transylvania, in addition to which he was raised to the rank of a Hungarian nobleman; he was allowed to carry the three Turkish heads in his crest, which may still be seen in the family crest of John Smith's descendants.

¹ *Dictionary of National Biography*. XXIII. p. 122.

² *Pallas' Encyclopaedia*, XV. p. 44.

³ The exact place of this castle is unknown. — Cf. "Turul", 1888., pp. 164—68. *Louis Kropf*: Captain Smith.

The beginning of the seventeenth century is the period of religious wars. The Thirty Years' War and the intricate internal affairs of the States involved in it were such a great handicap to the creation of a united public opinion in Europe that it was impossible even to think of the expulsion of the Turks from Europe. England was obviously occupied with the extension of her power abroad and the reconciliation of religious controversies at home. It was only much later, when the entire Christian world of Europe decided upon the most essential common step, the recovery of Buda, that troops of English warriors again appeared in Hungary.⁴ These English troops came to Hungary not only in obedience to the Pope's proclamation of a Holy War (Crusade), but also because the presence of English people in the Turkish wars was already looked upon as a historical tradition in England. This tradition sufficiently explains the fact that all the Englishmen who fought at the siege of Buda were volunteers coming mostly from the best families of the English aristocracy who were always so respectful towards traditions.

Of all these Englishmen James Fitzjames had the most valuable mission. He deserves, therefore, to be dealt with more particularly. No doubt, the impressions and experiences of his youth in Hungary had a lasting effect on the development of his character and on the choice of his career. When his father, King James II. sent him to Hungary he did not think that his fifteen-years old son would take his first campaign so seriously that it would determine his military career for life.

Fitzjames is indeed a most interesting type of soldier and general. Studying his life more closely we are surprised to see that he took part in no fewer than *twenty-nine* campaigns, in fifteen of which he acted as a full-fledged commander-in-chief. He fought at the siege of Buda before he was sixteen, and even at this very early age he is mentioned in the records of eye-witnesses as one of the most praiseworthy and most gallant soldiers. This is what J. Richards, an official delegate wrote about him: "Mr. Fitzjames was in all this Action with Count Taaffe, behaving himself with remarkable gallantry".⁵ As an enthusiastic and true soldier he revisited Hungary after a very short interval. Although he was appointed Duke of Berwick by his father, he only spent the winter months of 1687 in his country and in April his heart brought him back to the scene of the Turkish wars. In the campaign of 1687 and in the victory of Mohács he behaved so gallantly that he was promoted to the rank of colonel and was

made Commander of the Taaffe Cuirassier Regiment.

Following his father's call he returned to England, probably at the end of the same year. It was only now that he gave a full display of his wonderful military genius. Instead of recounting his numerous achievements, it will be interesting to pick out just one particular moment of his career. The development of England's affairs forced him to enter the French Army, where he became the only English general in history to lead the French troops to victory against the English troops commanded by a French general (Battle of Almanza, Spain, 1704). Montesquieu, who was a personal friend of his and published his memoirs, gives the most striking description of his character in his preface to that work: "He was brought up to uphold a sinking cause, and to utilise in adversity every latent resource".

This great soldier spent an essential part of his military training in this country. It was an unhappy accident that he had to turn the skill which he had acquired here against his country. But apart from this lamentable fact we had to select him for a more detailed description because he may be considered as an ideal type of those gallant heroes who have often in the course, of history proved that they could fight unselfishly for the high ideals of that Christianity which is the only safe foundation of nations and countries.

— y —

Under the joint aegis of the Pawtucket (Rhode Island) and Budapest Rotary Clubs, American and Hungarian students are to compete for prizes with essays on this subject. The Budapest Rotary Club has offered prizes of 200 pengő to the higher-grade commercial schools for boys for the best essays. The prize-winners are to receive American certificates of merit. Mr. John F. Montgomery, American Minister in Budapest, has consented to act as judge and to distribute the prizes. The counter-competition is to take place in the Pawtucket Grammar School, where American students will compete with essays on the same subject for the Hungarian Minister of Education's certificates of merit. The American essay will be judged by the Hungarian Legation in Washington. The Mayor of Pawtucket has made arrangements that the prize-giving day is to be observed as a "Hungarian Day", and Hungarian festivals will be held on that date.

— y —

⁴ Cf. *Danubian Review*, 1936. No. 12. — *Endrődi*: English Volunteers at the Recovery of Buda.

⁵ *Jacob Richards*: A Journal of the Siege and Taking of Buda 1687. p. 31.

P O L I T I C A L M O S A I C

MR. EDEN, IN GENEVA, SAID THE SAME THING THE HUNGARIAN NATION HAS BEEN SAYING FOR YEARS

Before going to press we received a report of Mr. Eden, British Foreign Secretary's speech in Geneva in which he announced that the British Government was ready to agree to a discussion of Article 19 of the Covenant by the General Assembly of the League of Nations. Mr. Eden said that this Article recognizes that it was impossible in practice to maintain the *status quo* rigidly, and declared that human life was not static but constantly changing, and that it would be a mistake to attempt to settle the affairs of the world according to rigid forms. This last sentence is almost word for word what M. Coloman Kánya, Hungary's Foreign Minister, has so often said in various speeches and statements and what more than one representative of Hungary has urged before different international forums. For this reason Hungarian public opinion unanimously welcomes the conclusions drawn by Britain's Foreign Secretary. They will surely be welcomed also by the British public in general so many members of which have already declared in favour of a revision of the peace treaties, which implies a satisfactory solution of Hungary's just cause.

For many years Hungary has lost no opportunity of declaring that she does not want to attain redress for the injustices done to Hungary — and through it the solution of the Danube problem so important for the whole of Europe — by war but by peaceful means.

True to its historical traditions the Hungarian nation strives to obtain a revision of the Trianon Treaty not by violence, but with the weapons of international law, and Article 19 of the Covenant is the legal basis on which the country stands. Fully aware of the importance of Article 19, the Hungarian nation is of Mr. Eden's opinion that the League Assembly itself cannot order territorial changes to be made, but on the other hand — and this is where our opinion again coincides with Mr. Eden's — the nation is fully convinced that the League Assembly is in a position to encourage the application of Article 19, and that the opinion of the Assembly would certainly exert a great moral pressure which would largely contribute towards a redress of the injustices in question.

Ideal inter-state relations are indeed those that are based on peace and justice. After what has been said by the British Foreign Secretary we have no reason to doubt that words will be followed by deeds, and that under Great Britain's guidance international diplomacy will shortly enter on the path leading, not to fictitious peace of the *status quo*, but the real peace of justice which will close the dark chapter of history begun twenty-two years ago and, instead of a state of permanent crisis and recurring shocks, will bring a more human and peaceful era to the whole world in general and the basin of the Carpathians in particular.

LLOYD GEORGE: "THERE ARE PARTS OF HUNGARY WHICH WERE GIVEN OVER TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA ON UNCHALLENGEABLE STATISTICS"

According to the minutes of the meeting of the House of Commons on 17th July — which we have only just received — Mr. Lloyd George made the following statement, which is of decisive importance in connection with the Hungarian question: —

"One of the difficulties was the principle of self-determination . . .

"... some of the mistakes in regard to Hungary are due to that. We had to adjudicate on the statistics which were submitted to us. There was always a *natural bias* for the nation which fought on our side, and we were more inclined to accept their contentions than the figures of those who fought against us.

"I am sorry that we were not justified in that conclusion in many cases. There are parts of

Hungary which were given over to Czechoslovakia on unchallengeable statistics, which shows what dangerous things statistics are, and the proof of it is that they return at the present moment Hungarian members to the Czechoslovak Parliament."

No comment is necessary. If anybody is competent to give an opinion on the peace treaties, it is Mr. Lloyd George. His words, which were spoken at a public meeting of the British House of Commons, completely justify the politicians who since years have been urging an equitable revision of that Trianon Treaty of which one of its drafters expressed the above opinion.

— y —

"THE STATES OF THE LITTLE ENTENTE WOULD STRENGTHEN THEMSELVES BY REVISION"

Sir Philip Dawson, British M. P. (Conservative Party), recently expressed his views at length to the editor of the "Wiener Wirtschaftswoche", a periodical dealing with economics. His statements were published

in the September 9th issue. Amongst other things Sir Philip Dawson said: —

"One of the things required to insure peace is the political and economic solution of the so-called Danube

problem. In the field of politics, besides guaranteeing Austria's independence, certain re-adjustment demands made by Hungary must be settled in a peaceful manner. The States of the Little Entente would act in their own interests, if they admitted honestly that the territorial provisions of the Trianon Treaty were bitterly unjust to Hungary and that — the sooner, the better — reparation must be made. The purely Hungarian frontier territories must be restored to Hungary by way of a peaceful revision reached through

negotiations conducted without mental reservations on either side. The States of the Little Entente would strengthen themselves by a peaceful revision of this kind, which would largely contribute to their internal consolidation. At the same time, each of the Danube States must adopt an honest minority policy and, within the framework of the State, grant to he minorities the widest rights and liberties in the fields of politics, culture and economy."

— y —

BOLSHEVIST PERIL IN EUROPE AND THE ROLE OF HUNGARY

In a letter which appeared in "The Daily Telegraph", Sir Robert Gower, K.C.V.O., O.B.E., M.P., points out the "acute danger" which he suggests is threatened to Europe by Bolshevism. Sir Robert Gower continues: —

"That alliances should have been made between France and Russia and Czecho-Slovakia and Russia is lamentable. There are strong grounds for belief that the relationship between the two latter — particularly in matters appertaining to the air — is more intimate than has been stated officially.

"The extension of Bolshevism throughout Europe remains the fixed determination of Russia. It regards all other matters as subordinate to it, and an intensive, although extremely subtle, campaign of propaganda is being conducted by Russia for the promotion of its object. It is extraordinary that so many, including prominent people in this country, do not appear to be alive, notwithstanding recent events in Spain and France, to the dire peril that exists.

"As Admiral Sir Barry Domvile says, Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini are the direct outcome of Bolshevism, and there can be no doubt that had it not been for them Bolshevism would be devastating the greater part of Europe to-day.

"One further consideration I would advance. Hungary is the natural "buffer" between Russia and Western Europe. Owing to the operation of the post-war treaties, that nation is now unable to fulfil its functions as such. In my judgment, it is a matter of supreme importance that Hungary shall become strong once more, so that she can take her proper part in stemming the tide that threatens to engulf our civilisation."

SOVIET PROPAGANDA

Subsequently interviewed at the House of Commons, Sir Robert Gower said that the progress made by the Soviet Government in insinuating itself into the counsels of the world was phenomenal. Its work of propaganda had been intense. The present happenings in Spain were the direct result of that propaganda, and in France, once the stronghold of democracy, Communism had made marked progress. "It cannot be too strongly emphasised", said Sir Robert Gower, "that Communism is inherently economically unsound and experimentation with it cannot fail to bring disaster to the country that essays it. Those who suffer most under Communism are the working class, who are reduced to the condition of slaves and serfs. One has only to read the reports of Labour leaders, who going to Russia to investigate, and predisposed to bless, return to curse."

Sir Robert Gower said that what was most perturbing was the political progress the Bolshevik Government of Russia had made in Europe. As was known

it had concluded treaties with France and Czecho-Slovakia. In Central Europe the Soviet Government had achieved what the Czars had failed to accomplish, even at the cost of millions of Russian lives, namely, a foothold. — The military air-fleet bases in those parts of the Slovak territories which had been wrested from Hungary had been designed and built in co-operation with Russia. One could almost call them Russian bases. It was only a few weeks ago that it was reported in the British Press that these bases had been inspected by officers of the Russian High Command. Compared with a few years ago the situation in Central Europe was that for all practical purposes, it had been stated by an authority, the Soviet's advanced military front was in Czechoslovakia. The position between the two countries constituted a very real danger to the rest of Europe and it was difficult to see what the ultimate outcome of it would be. As he had pointed out in his letter to the "Daily Telegraph", the one great ambition of Russia was to extend Bolshevism throughout the whole of Europe and the Russian leaders had not hesitated to aver that to do this Britain must be subjugated. Russia, by reason of her vast territories and extreme prolificness of her population was an increasing world menace and it must not be forgotten that she is the spiritual and material head and moving force of the Third International.

VERY REAL DANGER

Sir Robert reiterated that he was afraid that the British public was not alive to the very real danger which threatened it. Recent events in Spain and France brought the danger very near home.

As he had stated in his letter to the "Daily Telegraph", Sir Robert Gower said that owing to its geographical position Hungary was the natural "buffer" state between Russia and Western Europe. This was realised by both Germany and Italy which could not afford to permit Hungary to remain impotent to fulfil its natural functions. It was indeed in the interests of the whole of Europe that Hungary shall become strong again and its peoples reunited. This could only be achieved by that revision of the Treaty of Trianon as would restore to her those parts of her former territories as are essentially Hungarian. He (Sir Robert) was convinced that such revision must come before long. He hoped it would be the result of agreement rather than in consequence of pressure brought to bear from outside. He was afraid that eventually there would be hostilities between the Bolsheviks and Nazis, and if that did happen Hungary would possibly be the cockpit of the fighting. To avoid this Hungary should be permitted to rearm at once. "I am not an alarmist", said Sir Robert Gower, "but

without doubt the people in this country, who regard the Russian Bolshevik State as a harmless dove, scheming for the welfare of mankind, are living in a fool's paradise. I hope the awakening will not be too bitter. So far as Britain was concerned, we had a democratic system which enabled Social Reform to advance surely, and so that even now the social conditions of all classes were better than in any other

part of the world. British democracy was opposed to both Bolshevism and Nazism. But if a choice between the two had to be made Nazism was a thousand times better than the other. "I hope", concluded Sir Robert, "that we shall never have to make that choice. We most certainly shall not if we proceed with expedition with our present policy of re-armament."

(*"The Courier"*.)

THE PREPARATORY CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL GOODWILL CONGRESS

On the initiative of the Budapest International Club the Preparatory Conference of the International Goodwill Congress held a session in Budapest from 30th August to 5th September. In his opening speech M. George Lukács, former Minister, amongst other things, said:

"Hungary had no part in provoking the world war. The historical documents to be found in the literature of the war have proved beyond dispute that Count Stephen Tisza, Hungary's leading statesman before the war and Prime Minister of Hungary when the war broke out, did everything humanly possible to avert it and achieve a diplomatic settlement of the conflict between Serbia and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy caused by the murder of the Crown Prince. His efforts, however, were of no avail, and Hungary, against her will, was thrust into a war which from start to finish was one of self-defence on our part. And yet Hungary was punished the most severely by the peace treaties concluding the war. She was deprived of three-fourths of her territory and two-thirds of her population — amongst them three and a half million true-born Hungarians; — she lost the most valuable of her economic resources and many, many beautiful creations of a thousand-years-old civilization. Despite this Hungary, although she feels that she was treated in an unjust and arbitrary manner unprecedented in the annals of the world's history, does not, for a single instant, think of war. There was not one Hungarian before the great war who wanted war, and now too the Hungarians, one and all, are desirous of peace. Convinced though we are that the cruel punishment we have borne was meted out unjustly, nothing is farther from us than to think of, far less plan for war. Our aim is to promote mutual understanding among the nations. We look upon the rest of the nations as our brethren, and wait for a spirit of brotherly understanding to redress the wrongs done to us."

Other speakers at the opening meeting were Mrs. Katherine van Etten Lyford (Boston), Miss Sherwood-Kelly (Australia), Miss Whitelegg (Britain), M. Henry le Conte (France), Herr T. von Draudt (Germany), Mynheer C. Th. Bollaan (Holland), Mlle Irene Cze-slava Bermanska (Poland), Mrs. Stanley de Villiers (South Africa), and Mme. Guillaume, the organiser of the movement (Hungary).

Among the many interesting speeches heard at the Conference special mention must be made of the following.

Baroness Dr. Melline Asbeck speaking of the possibilities of creating real peace stressed the importance of the revision of Trianon. In her opinion the problem of equality had to be solved by all means,

"Victors" and "vanquished" could not be expected to live in peace and harmony beside one another, and the wrongs done to certain nations could not be left without redress. Nations had a past, and that past was the source of their patriotism. Patriotism admitted of no compromise. The Hungarians, for instance, with a thousand years of historical past could never acquiesce in the provisions of the unjust Trianon Treaty. The peace of Trianon was a treaty that should have been revised "yesterday" rather than "tomorrow". The League of Nations was not suffering from an infantile but from a congenital disease. Its structure was faulty, because it was not built up on the principle of equality. How difficult it was, for instance, for the Hungarians to carry the complaints of the Hungarian minority languishing under foreign yokes before the League. The leaders of international politics recognized now that the question of the Danube Basin was primarily a political and only secondarily an economic problem, and that the present political arrangements in that territory positively must be changed. *And the only way to effect that change was by revision. In the interests, then, of real world peace the most urgent to be accomplished was the revision of the Treaty of Trianon.*

The ecclesiastical head of the Russian emigrants in Hungary, M. Nicolas Esersky, outlined the dangerous policy of Soviet Russia, whose aim was to kindle the flames of world revolution in every country.

Mme. Edith Bors-Farkas spoke of the work done by the International and the Hungarian Youths' Red Cross organisations.

The following resolutions were adopted by the Conference. 1. The International Goodwill Congress will meet in Budapest in 1937. The exact date will be fixed later on. 2. An International Goodwill Committee with headquarters in Budapest will be formed. Complimentary telegrams will be sent by the Conference to the Regent of Hungary and the Hungarian Government. 4. Messages of good-will will be sent to all the Governments of League Member States as well as to all societies and associations with similar aims. 5. All present at the Conference will strive in their own countries and towns to create "Goodwill Circles" which will be in permanent contact with the Central Committee. 6. Films will be made use of as a means of propagating the Goodwill movement. 7. The Youths' Red Cross groups in every country will be asked to co-operate with the Goodwill Circles. The Conference also addressed a request in writing to Dr. H. Szerdahelyi, a lawyer of Budapest re. the construction of a European Economic Association, the aim of which would be to combat unemployment.

CZECH POLICE PRACTISES ARBITRARY METHODS ON BRITISH CITIZENS

In the September 11th. issue of the "Berliner Börsenzeitung" there was an interesting item of news telling us of the treatment meted out by the Czech police in Karlsbad to the British *savant* Pitt-Rivers, Secretary-General of the International Demographical Society, and his secretary, Mrs. Sharp. They were arrested because in the village of Neusattel they had examined German and Czech schoolchildren from a eugenic point of view and had taken photographs of them. Only four hours later were they permitted to ring up the British Legation in Prague, which then energetically demanded their release. They were then

set at liberty; but their passports, their motor-car and their films were seized and were not returned to them until an official of the Prague British Legation arrived and energetically intervened. The two British citizens were nevertheless placed under police surveillance and were watched by detectives in their hotel. It is easy to imagine what opinion these British citizens will now have of the Czech police; and it is equally easy to imagine the treatment meted out to the minorities in that Czecho-Slovakia where the authorities do not hesitate to molest the citizens of the mightiest Empire in the world.

HUNGARY AND THE LITTLE ENTENTE

The declaration of Pozsony (Pressburg, Bratislava), in which the Little Entente gave such an unmistakable expression of its unquenchable hatred of Hungary, has obviously created a great stir in the public opinion of Europe. Even a less unbiassed spectator whose feelings are not too friendly towards Hungary may easily see that this unexpected "raid" was meant to serve the aspects of power and prestige with a view to the intimidation of a disarmed and defenceless enemy.

In section 4. of the communication published regarding the conference of the permanent council of the Little Entente States, we read the following passage:

"Our relations towards Austria have become less friendly owing to the arbitrary violation of the Treaty of St. Germain on the part of that country. Turkey's policy with regard to the problem of the straits is an example to show that there are other methods besides that of accomplished facts, which is a great menace to the friendly relations between States. In the hope that a similar violation of the existing treaties will not occur again, the States of the Little Entente have agreed upon those measures that have to be followed in such cases."

A very strange train of thought, indeed, with a phraseology still more strange. In the case of Austria the Little Entente is satisfied with a simple statement of facts, expressing its opinion in the form of a modest subordinate clause. In the case of Hungary, however mere suppositions are enough to induce the Little Entente to send a hard and strict message to her and to discuss various measures. We must admit that we are quite embarrassed and baffled by this manifestation. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs seem to have completely forgotten about certain precedents. They seem to have forgotten what Hungary said when Austria declared her equality of rights in military affairs; Hungary then declared that, while she agrees with Austria in the question of equality, demanding the same equality of rights in military affairs for herself, she does not wish to follow Austria's example and does not mean to create accomplished facts in the question of armament. This, of course, did not mean that Hungary would not make sure of her right of free play in a diplomatic sense whenever conditions allow it, at a future date.

It was not fair indeed of the Little Entente to forget about this and to act as if they had not heard or known anything. But this is what the Little Entente is actually doing when it is shooting awe-inspiring

rockets up in the air and threatens to take preventive measures. Unfortunately, their memory seems to fail them not only with regard to farther perspectives but also to the less distant ones. For do we not read, a few sentences farther down, a magnificent eulogy on peace and European collaborations; do we not read of the "firm resolution" of the Little Entente States to form their policy so as to serve the interests of universal peace on the one hand and their own security on the other, both economically and politically; and do we not read, lastly, of their readiness to collaborate with any country whose friendly intentions are manifest?

In other words: collaboration with anyone but Hungary? For if I wished to live in peace and friendship with, let us say, a neighbouring country, I should not start by humiliating and intimidating it first and then, after I am thoroughly convinced that it is sufficiently subdued, invite it to a conference and say: now you have a right to accept all the conditions laid down by myself.

For this is what was and is happening in this case. No, Hungary will certainly not play such a game. At such a price Hungary will not make agreements with anyone with regard to the Danube Basin, and she is not prepared to bury her national future in unessential compromises. She does not wish to pay a high price to others to secure their peace of mind. On the contrary, she will rather continue to live her own modest life, which is not solitary after all for, in spite of Trianon, or maybe just because of it, this country still has a number of sincere friends. These friendships are not founded on empty phrases; they are active friendship rooted in the historical traditions of the past and reinforced by an honest and open recognition of the identity of interests. This is a fact we must point out just now because it, too, seems to have been forgotten at the conference of Pressburg. On the whole, we may well call that meeting a conference of poor memories.

Anyhow, we do not take the whole matter too much to heart. After all, the Little Entente had to demonstrate somehow its formal unity, and what more satisfactory way could it find than a joint action against Hungary? For the Soviet-alliance was not a great success. Dr. Beneš's efforts were of no avail; Yugoslavia showed no inclination to change her former attitude towards the Soviet; Rumania, on the other hand, gave a striking expression of her attitude by dropping M. Titulescu, the great champion of the Soviet-alliance, during her last cabinet crisis.

The fact that Rumania's foreign affairs are in the hands of a new man makes it sufficiently evident that Rumania and Czecho-Slovakia have drifted apart in the Soviet-question; and no matter what they may have decided about common tactics and identical calibers of guns and rifles (in about ten years' time), the Soviet army will certainly not march through Moldavia or Bessarabia.

The great political unity has thus lost one of its cardinal points, the political one. But there is something wrong with the other cardinal point, too, namely the economic unity. For a number of years now the economic council of the Little Entente has tried to bring about a close collaboration that would ultimately lead to an economic union, but without any apparent result so far. Now Dr. Hodža, the Czech Premier, with a great effort submitted an extensive scheme of economic collaboration to the conference in Pressburg hoping it would at once solve the whole question. Generally speaking, the scheme proposed a customs-union between the Little Entente States; but, as was reported by the special correspondent of the Manchester Guardian, the whole magnificent scheme was shattered by M. Stoiadinovitch, the Yugoslav Premier, to who expressed his belief that such a precipitate step might estrange many friendly countries; he thought it more advisable to build up a gradual scheme of economic collaboration. At the end of this lively

debate it was decided to discuss the question again at the economic conference of the Little Entente in October. Mr. Hodža's scheme may thus be looked upon as a fiasco; nevertheless, the Little Entente States have issued joint stamps.

As it was thus impossible to bring about the desired unity both in the Russian question and in economic collaboration, there was one uniting force left: the Hungarian question. There the three good friends are at one. They all agree that the spoil which was got by mutual effort must be preserved and protected, and that Hungary must be kept in her present inferior state at any cost.

Yet we take the liberty to doubt whether this will be such an easy matter after all. Surely, there will be others who may wish to say a word or two in this matter; first of all, the chief guardians of the peace treaties; the League of Nations and the Great Powers. The public opinion in Hungary will refer to the definite provisions of the Treaty of Trianon in claiming her complete equality of rights in military matters. If there still exists a moral principle in international politics and in the relations between nations, it will not be so easy to keep Hungary deprived of her most elementary rights of self-determination.

— y —

TITULESCU'S FALL AND AFTER

The new Tatarescu Government formed at the end of August is essentially the same as its predecessor. The only radical change is the omission from the list of the Foreign Minister Titulescu and his assistant Junior Minister Radulescu.

WHAT LED UP TO THE RE-ORGANISATION

According to a *communiqué* issued on July 16th the Government was still unanimously in favour of Titulescu's foreign policy and passed a vote of undivided confidence in him personally. Titulescu then expressed to the King too his dissatisfaction with the agitation work of the Extreme Right, which involved a serious interference in the internal order and in the State organisation of Rumania, and with the role being played by Minister of the Interior Inculetz and Minister of Justice Valer Pop, whom he regarded as the chief patrons of the extreme movements.

The events of the following weeks, however, brought matters to a head. The "Iron Guard", which has played a leading role in the movements of the Extreme Right and which was ultimately responsible also for the murder of Premier Duca, today bears the name of "*Totul pentru Tara*" (Our Country First and Last). Its branches embrace practically the whole of Rumania. The other Extreme Right organisation — the "Lancer" division of the Cuza-Goga Party, the members of which wear blue shirts — is divided into "legions" and "cohorts". These two Extreme Right organisations had made the streets of Bucharest veritable battle-fields. They were responsible for the murder of a former "Iron Guard" leader, Steltescu; and they were responsible also for the attempt made at Galatz on the life of Engineer Stoenescu, Secretary-General of the organisation bearing the title "Cruciada Romanismului", who was shot at

several times and then beaten black and blue with iron sticks and iron bars. Almost at the same time — on August 24th — five Iron Guards appeared in the Sinaia country house of Madgearu a former Minister of Finance, whom they threatened to kill. Madgearu appealed to the King for protection. These events brought matters to a crisis; and the King instructed Tatarescu to make order. Seeing that there was a block in the Cabinet itself which threw the responsibility for what had happened on Inculetz and Pop, — a block which had the support of a large proportion of the "H" group of the Young Liberals behind Tatarescu and also of the adherents of Dinu Bratianu —, it became necessary to make changes in the departments of government involved.

THE NEW GOVERNMENT

The new Cabinet was essentially the same as its predecessor. Jon *Inculetz*, former Minister of the Interior, remained Member of the Cabinet with the title of Deputy Prime Minister, being thus able to continue to exercise an influence on the policy of the Cabinet. *Pop* too remained Member of the Cabinet, being placed at the head of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. The re-appointment of Pop — who has for years been notorious for his extreme right predilections — is a moment by no means reassuring from the point of view of the minorities. The new Minister of the Interior, *Juca*, who had previously been Junior Minister, is a nonentity; it is therefore evident that the department of the interior will continue to be directed by Inculetz, whose dismissal took the form of promotion. The new Minister of Justice, *Djavara*, has represented Rumania at several international conferences; he is a university professor and belongs to the older Bratianu school. The fact that the Ministry of Education is in the hands of *Jamandi* means that Government wishes to prevent theological students participating in the future in acts of ter-

rorism. The Foreign Minister, *Antonescu*, was Rumanian Minister in Paris prior to the Great War and is well known for his partiality for France. The Ministry of Finance has been allotted to *Cancicov*, former Junior Minister (Under-Secretary of State) in the Ministry of Agriculture.

WHY TITULESCU WAS „PUT ASHORE“

Rumania's "hereditary Foreign Minister", who had occupied the position for almost ten years without a break, did not learn of his fall until that fall was already an accomplished fact. In his telegram to Titulescu, the Premier *Tatarescu* emphasised that he had been driven to re-organise his Cabinet by the exigencies of the internal situation. It must not be forgotten that Titulescu was not a Member of the Liberal Party now in power and spent practically all his time abroad. Whenever he did happen to go home, he usually had some difference of opinion with *Tatarescu*. He frequently criticised *Tatarescu*'s internal policy and repeatedly hauled his Premier over the coals. Titulescu was no particular favourite of the King either, particularly as the differences of opinion between him and *Tatarescu* often made it appear as if Titulescu will be willing to join it; it has been suggested that he should be offered the office of honorary president of the Party; and the Secretary-General of the Party, *Lupu*, has actually left Rumania to visit the former Foreign Minister.

The report of this visit has caused a considerable stir in the Liberal Party, because any co-operation between Titulescu and the Peasant Party would mean

a renewal of the struggle against the King, particularly as the omission of Titulescu from the new Cabinet is said to have been due to the personal intervention of the monarch.

The extreme conservative press approves of Titulescu's dismissal, because it believes that it was his choleric and obstinate temper that impeded the work of Government. According to the radical press, on the other hand, the treatment meted out to Titulescu was unprecedentedly brutal. At the same time the trend in internal policy is expected to move gradually more and more to the right. The "*Indreptarea*", the organ of Marshal *Avarescu*, has desired Titulescu to communicate to the French press the causes of his dismissal, now that the activity of the censorship prevents him expressing his opinion openly in the Rumanian press. The Peasant Party papers speak of Titulescu's fall as an attack, not upon a person, but upon a whole system. The "*Miscarea*", *George Bratianu*'s organ, writes that the retirement of Titulescu was long overdue, having become necessary when he fell a victim to the "pactomania" of Geneva and adopted an anti-Italian attitude. The dismissal of Titulescu involves a weakening of the Sovietophile tendency of the Franco-Rumanian alliance. In Rumania the latter tendency has very many opponents, the anti-Soviet feeling being very strong.

It is left to the future to show how far the new *Tatarescu* Government will be able to realise its programme and to reveal the role in store for Titulescu.

KING EDWARD VIII. IN BULGARIA

Returning from his voyage in the Mediterranean Sea, King Edward travelled through Bulgaria to visit his Royal cousin, King Boris III. In Turkey his train suffered a delay of 70 minutes so it was feared the King would not be able to realize his plan; but the Bulgarian railways made up for this delay on the route of 250 kilometers. King Edward left his train a few stations before Sofia and was accompanied by King Boris to the Royal residence at *Vrana*; from here he travelled to Sofia, where he inspected the town. This was the first time in history that Bulgaria had been visited by a British monarch, and it offered a favourable opportunity to the Bulgarian people to de-

monstrate their wellknown hospitality and express their gratitude and deep respect for Great Britain, whose great sons have often helped the young Bulgarian State to become a strong and powerful country. The endless thousands who flocked to the stations to greet the King on his journey through their country, the spontaneous expression of their love, and the innumerable columns written about King Edward in the Bulgarian Press were, all meant to demonstrate not only the sincere love of the Bulgarian people for the British Empire and its great Representative, but also their firm confidence and belief in Great Britain's sense of justice.

— y —

CIVIL LORD OF THE BRITISH ADMIRALTY IN HUNGARY

Early in September Hungary had a distinguished guest in the person of *Mr. Kenneth Lindsay*, Civil Lord of the British Admiralty, who spent nearly a week in Budapest. Although he had come *incognito*, he was unable to remain unnoticed. He was visited in succession by members of the diplomatic corps and of

the political world; he was thus able to meet the most important leaders of the political life of Hungary. During his stay in Budapest *Mr. Lindsay* was received in audience by *Admiral Nicholas Horthy*, Regent of Hungary.

HOW MINORITIES LIVE

CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

NO SOLUTION OF SUDETA GERMAN QUESTION POSSIBLE WITHOUT AUTONOMY

The Party Assembly of the Sudeta Germans convened to meet at Falkenau on August 29th and 30th was prohibited by the Czecho-Slovak authorities on the plea that the Assembly would have met in such enormous numbers that it would have been bound to endanger public order. In answer to the prohibition almost all the inhabitants of Falkenau marched out on the day on which the Assembly was to have met to an outlying forest, the result being that on the Sunday in question the town was practically depopulated. At the party meetings held since then at Römstadt and Karlsbad Conrad Henlein once more most energetically demanded autonomy for the Sudeta Germans. In his speech at the latter place during the meeting held there on September 6th Henlein made the following statements:

"Our native land, which has been saturated with the blood and the sweat of our fathers, belongs for ever to us Sudeta Germans. Our native land is Germany and we must use our utmost strength to ensure that our native land shall always remain German. It is impossible to exterminate three and a half million Sudeta Germans... We must never cease proclaiming that for us there can be no solution of the Sudeta German question until our demand to be granted the right of self-government in our own affairs has been definitively complied with."

"THE TURN OF CZECHO-SLOVAKIA IS COMING"

The following interesting news was published in the Sept. 7 issue of the Daily Mail on the Sudeta-German question.

That synthetic State contains three and a half million Germans. Nazi racial principles claim them for Germany. Under false representations by the Czech delegates at the Peace Conference they were transferred from Austria to the new hybrid nation of Czecho-Slovakia created by various peace treaties. A million Hungarians were annexed in the same way.

These racial minorities have never been assimilated. Harsh treatment by the Czech Government makes them increasingly conscious of their captivity in a strangle land. But for Czecho-Slovakia's associations with France and Russia it is doubtful whether they would have remained unliberated so long. Continuance in their present condition is manifestly impossible.

If the British Cabinet were disposed to make a practical contribution to the peace of Central Europe it would offer a discreet word of advice to the Czech Government. The speedy grant of local autonomy to its German and Hungarian populations is the only means of averting the critical situation which will otherwise soon confront Czecho-Slovakia.

THE SLOVAKS CONTINUE TO INSIST ON THE PITTSBURG CONVENTION

In connection with the arrival in Kistapolcsány (Topolčianky) of President Beneš, the September 2nd issue of the "Slovak" once more demanded the realisation of the autonomy promised to Slovakia. "We welcome the first citizen of the Republic"; — so wrote the organ of Monsignor Hlinka's Slovak Autonomist Party — "President Edward Beneš, as we welcomed his predecessor in office fifteen years ago, "in the name of the Conventions of Cleveland, Moscow and Pittsburg".

In these three conventions, namely, the Czechs of Russia and America respectively during the Great War undertook obligations to grant the Slovaks the most far-reaching legislative, administrative and judicial autonomy. The Pittsburg Convention was signed by President Masaryk himself, who later on, however, repudiated the binding character of the convention. In a speech delivered at the Rózsáhegy (Ruzomberok) station in September, 1921, Monsignor Hlinka reminded Masaryk, then on tour in Slovakia, of the terms of the conventions; but the Czechs have not yet granted the autonomy they promised to the Slovaks. The "Slovak" now addresses to Masaryk's successor the very words addressed by Hlinka to Masaryk when the latter was President.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE RUTHENIAN AUTONOMY

The struggle to obtain the Ruthenian autonomy so long promised is still being carried on. The Central Little Russian National Council demands that the Government shall put into force the principles laid down in the Minority Treaty of Saint Germain. It demands that the power shall be handed over at once to the Governor of Ruthenia, and that the Ruthenian language shall be introduced for use in the schools and courts of law and in the public administration generally. The Council demands that elections shall be held at once in order that the "soym" may be able to begin its activity on January 20th next. The most important of the demands formulated by the Council is that relating to the demarcation of the western boundary of Ruthenia in order to annex to Ruthenia the hundreds inhabited by Ruthenians now belonging to East Slovakia. This initiative work is welcomed also by the "*Kárpátaljai Magyar Hirlap*" ("Hungarian Journal of Ruthenia"), the organ of the Hungarian parties in Ruthenia.

THE RUTHENIANS OF EASTERN SLOVAKIA DEMAND A PLEBISCITE TO DETERMINE RUTHENIA'S FRONTIERS

According to Article 10 of the Minority Treaty concluded between Czecho-Slovakia and the Allied and Associated Powers, the country of the Ruthenians,

which lies South of the Carpathians, is entitled to the most extensive autonomy. The Czecho-Slovakian Government, which hitherto has not realized one single letter of this obligation, from the very outset drew the frontier of Ruthenia in such a manner that, according to the 1930 census, 91,000 Ruthenians do not belong to the autonomic territory but to Slovakia. In reality the number is considerably larger. At a meeting held in Eperjes (Prešov) the Ruthenians of Eastern Slovakia protested against this. A permanent committee of 30 was formed to remind the Czecho-Slovakian Government and the political parties, as well as the whole of the Ruthenian nation, that, in terms of the Treaty of St. Germain, all the Ruthenian territory under the Eastern Carpathians is entitled to autonomy. The meeting demanded a plebiscite in the regions of Eastern Slovakia inhabited by Ruthenians, in order to give the people a chance to determine whether they wished to join the Ruthenian territory entitled to autonomy. It also demanded the introduction of Ruthenian as the language of tuition in the schools and the appointment of Ruthenian teachers and school-inspectors, and that if parts of Eastern Slovakia inhabited by Ruthenians were not attached to Sub-Carpathia, then the Governor of that Province should be given the right of veto in matters concerning the Ruthenian population there.

LANGUAGE GRIEVANCES OF HUNGARIANS

The Hungarian Deputies and Senators of the Prague Parliament recently made representations to the Czecho-Slovak Government in the matter of the language grievances and demands of the Hungarian minority.

After explaining the relevant provisions of the Minority Treaty of Saint Germain and of the Czecho-Slovak Constitution, the political leaders of the Hungarian minority above all emphasise the fact that „before calling the attention of the Council of the League of Nations to their grievances, they are appealing as they have always done hitherto to the Czecho-Slovak Government for the redress of their grievances. Should the Government so desire, they are prepared to offer detailed evidence of their statements and a full expression of their wishes”.

The lengthy Memorandum offers the following description of the situation:

The Ordinance regulating the carrying into effect of the Language Act provides that in all judicial circuits in which the Hungarians (Magyars) constitute more than two-thirds of the population all public offices, courts of law, sheriff's offices etc. shall communicate with parties alike orally and in writing exclusively in Hungarian.

The circuit magistrates and the courts of law to which they are subject nevertheless reply to all applications in Hungarian exclusively in the State language, issued indictments exclusively in the State language, issue land register and firm register documents exclusively in the State language (Czech); the text of all extracts from land registers is also written exclusively in Czech; the judges (magistrates), sheriffs and officials functioning in the courts are persons unacquainted with the language of the minority; there are no sworn interpreters in the courts of law; and notices of sales by auction are posted in the villages exclusively in the State language (Czech). The situation is the same also in those local courts and superior tribunals in which — owing to the fact

that the Hungarian minority constitutes more than 20% of the population — the use of Hungarian is allowed too.

The courts of law to which the local (hundred) courts are subordinated generally speaking do not issue any findings in Hungarian, even where the applications are in Hungarian. The judges and clerks functioning in the various councils are persons unfamiliar with Hungarian who are unable to understand a word when the proceedings are carried on in that language.

The Government keeps continually changing the areas (circuits) of the local (hundred) courts, thereby arbitrarily eliminating the minority character of the various hundreds.

In the minority circuits (hundreds) the State registers are kept exclusively in the State language (Czech), extracts being supplied to parties only in that language. All certificates of poverty, frontier licences, certificates of *pertinenza* and of citizenship and passports are issued — contrary to the provisions of the law — exclusively in the State language. Parish notices are also drafted only in the State language.

The official organs and ordinance gazettes of the ministries and of the public offices of Slovakia and Ruthenia are issued exclusively in the State language (Czech). The Law Journal is indeed issued in Hungarian too; but it often happens that by the time the translation of the same appears the law or ordinance in question has already become invalid.

The provisions of the Languages Act are ignored also by the industrial corporations, the chambers of commerce and industry, the various other chambers and similar bodies, the sick relief funds and the several endowments.

There is not a sufficient number of Hungarian (Magyar) schools; and the Languages Act is not observed even in the existing schools.

The Hungarian secondary schools are everywhere under the direction of non-Magyar directors (headmasters), although there are plenty of teachers (masters) available who are of Hungarian (Magyar) nationality and possess the required qualifications. The Hungarian children are taught the names of places only in the State language and have no idea of the Hungarian name of their respective village (parish) or of the Hungarian name it formerly bore.

In the years immediately following the establishment of the Republic the plenipotentiary Slovak Ministry issued an ordinance making it obligatory to draft shop-signs etc. in the State language, — a measure which did away once for all with Hungarian shop-signs etc. The same is the case with the advertisements of picture theatres (cinemas) and with the texts of film inscriptions.

CULTURAL AUTONOMY AND A DIOCESE FOR THE HUNGARIANS!

Throughout the whole of Czecho-Slovakia — indeed beyond its borders — a great sensation was caused by an article written by Anthony Granatier, Secretary-General of the Slovak League in the “Novy Svet”. In it that militant representative of Czecho-Slovakian aspirations, amongst other things, said:

“Hitherto Prague has always looked upon the Hungarians as individuals and not as a national unit. The truth is that Czecho-Slovakia is not a national but a nationality state in which the Hungarians, too, have their own demands. Therefore the Hungarians

must be granted, in the first place, cultural autonomy and then a Hungarian diocese".

Granatier then went on to say that Hungarian institutions should get their proper share of the public revenues. He also demanded the establishment of a Hungarian chair at the Pozsony (Bratislava) University and of Hungarian board and agricultural schools, and insisted that the use of Hungarian as an official language should be made compulsory everywhere where the conditions stipulated in the Language Act were forthcoming.

This article, which proves better than anything else that the Hungarians are justified in their demands, and that the leaders of the "Czechoslovakizing" organisations themselves realize the futility of their endeavours. In view of the general deterioration in the position of the Republic both as regards her foreign and nationality politics, they deem it wise, after eighteen years of oppression and repression, to turn a friendly face towards the Hungarians.

UNFAIR TREATMENT OF THE HUNGARIAN THEATRES

At the beginning of the present theatrical season 3,500,000 Czech crowns accruing from taxes on wireless were distributed to the theatres. Of that sum the Czech and Slovak theatres got 2,381,000 crowns, the German theatres 1,089,000, while the Hungarian theatres received only 30,000, so that less than 1% of the whole sum distributed was given to the Hungarian theatres. ("Prágai Magyar Hirlap", 10th September.)

RUMANIA

RUMANIA'S EDUCATIONAL POLICY TOWARDS THE HUNGARIANS

The openly confessed aim of Rumania's educational policy is to increase the number of Rumanian elementary state schools and at the same time to do away with the denominational schools in which the language of instruction is Hungarian. Now, at the beginning of the new school-year, M. Angelescu, Minister of Education, closed the following denominational schools: the Roman Catholic school at Nyikómalomfalva, the Unitarian school at Székelyszentmihály and the 136 years old Roman Catholic elementary school at Tasnád. Rumanian educational policy has found that the most effective means for Rumanizing the minorities is the creation of new state schools. M. Angelescu forces the building of state schools, especially in purely Hungarian Siculia. Rumanian state schools paid for by Hungarian villages and built by public labour have been established in places where there were good Hungarian denominational schools — and not a single Rumanian inhabitant. The next step was to people them. Trickery or violence was employed to keep scholars away from the denominational schools and shepherd them into the Rumanian ones. This new school-year sees the beginning of a fresh campaign by the educational authorities. A Decree issued recently by the Minister of Education makes the county of Maros-Torda a "cultural zone" and ordains that a state school and a Rumanian infant school must be erected in every Hungarian village in the county, even in the very smallest of them. In

each of the counties of Csik, Udvarhely, and Háromszék from 60 to 80 new posts in state schools are waiting to be filled by teachers who speak nothing but Rumanian. And minority parents who wish to send their children to a denominational school must first prove their "racial descent".

Rumanian policy is careful to prevent Hungarian students from acquiring diplomas. Hungarian secondary school pupils are mercilessly flunked at the secondary school final examinations (baccalaureate). The following table shows the results of those examinations at different places. The figures refer to Hungarian pupils.

Town	Candidates	Passed	Failed
Sepsiszentgyörgy (Mikó College)	10	5	5
Székelyudvarhely (R. Cath. Gymnasium)	17	5	5
Brassó (R. Cath. Gymn.)	6	1	5
Székelykeresztur (Gymnasium)	10	4	6
Csikszereida (R. Cath. Gymn.)	12	4	8
Szatmár (Ref. Church Gymn.)	10	—	10
Gyulafehérvár (R. Cath. Lyceum)	15	6	9
Temesvár (Piarist Gymn.)	12	4	8
Arad (R. Cath. Gymn.)	5	4	1
Kolozsvár	117	30	87
Total	214	64	150

According to this table of the 214 Hungarian students only 64, or 30%, passed while 150, or 70% failed.

THE PROPERTY OF THE PREMONSTRATENSIAN ORDER SEQUESTERED

The real estate belonging to the Premonstratensian Order in Nagyvárad, which consisted of the monastery, a secondary school building and the church, was conveyed by the Land Registry Office to the State, merely on the strength of a petition lodged by Professor Onisifor Ghibu of the Rumanian University in Kolozsvár. The reason given was that the Order was not a fictitious person. The Land Registry Office simply accepted Ghibu's statement that the Hungarian State had only allowed the Order the use of the property in question. The deed of conveyance was served on the Provost of Jászó in Czecho-Slovakia. Here let it be said that in 1927 the Rumanian State recognized the Premonstratensian Order as a fictitious person, so that the right of the Order to the property in question is indisputable ("Magyar Lapok" September 1.).

A SERIES OF HUNGARIAN MEETINGS PROHIBITED

In the county of Háromszék the authorities refused to countenance the meetings of the Hungarian Party. Even meetings of a religious character are

banned despite the fact that according to the laws of the land, permission to hold them need not be asked ("Brassói Lapok", August 21). — The seventy-years-old Museum Society of Transylvania, which is the oldest and most important Hungarian social and scientific society there, was not allowed to hold the meeting and congress of physicians planned for August 23 to 25th in Temesvár ("Keleti Újság" August 22, No. 192). — The Hungarians of Transylvania wanted to arrange an exhibition under the title of "Sicilian Week" in the Reformed Church College at Marosvásárhely. The permission issued was withdrawn all of a sudden, and when it was given again, it was too late to arrange the exhibition because school was about to begin. ("Ellenzék" No. 192, August 21, 1936).

— y —

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF LAWYERS REJECTS MINORITY PROPOSAL OF RUMANIAN LAWYERS

At the recent congress of the International Union of Lawyers held in Vienna the members were painfully surprised by a proposal presented by the Rumanian delegation to the effect that in every country only such lawyers should be allowed to practice in the courts of law who use the State language of the respective country. The proposal — as every one saw immediately — was intended primarily to prejudice the rights of Hungarians living in the Little Entente States. A protest having been made by the Hungarian delegation, the President of the Congress, M. Appleton, refused to allow the proposal to be even put to the vote.

— y —

YUGOSLAVIA

M. STOJADINOVITCH'S FIFTEEN MONTHS, — NOT A SINGLE AUDIENCE TO HUNGARIAN LEADERS

An article published in the official organ of the Yugoslav Government, the "Samouprava", on August 20th, deals with the conditions of the Voivodina and lays particular stress on the Government's friendly policy towards the Hungarian and German minorities. To demonstrate the truth of this statement, the article informs us that the Hungarians in Yugoslavia are now allowed to hold fêtes and performances of their own, while the colonization festivities of the German villages are even attended by the representatives of the authorities. It must certainly be admitted that the Stojadinovitch Cabinet really shows a little more understanding towards the minorities than its predecessors; the official pressure on the part of the authorities has actually become less of late, and there is a distinct improvement to be observed in the handling of such affairs as cultural and popular performances, passports, etc (the granting of passports being facilitated also by the recent conclusion of various international tourist agreements). While, on the one hand, it is good to record these signs of a more conciliatory treatment of the minorities, which is no doubt

dictated by certain political considerations, it is to be regretted, on the other hand, that this understanding does no show itself in a wider field comprising at least the partial redress of minority grievances and the solution of their most vital political, economic, and cultural problems. As an illustration of the present situation it is interesting to know that for fifteen months, since the Stojadinovitch Cabinet has been in office, the Premier did not give a single audience to the leaders of the Hungarian minority to hear their complaints and desires. This explains the fact why instead of a lang wanted improvement of the situation we are always hering of a continuous repetition of official abuses against the minorities; numerous examples of this will be found in our earlier issues and in the present number.

— y —

HUNGARY NOT ALLOWED TO SEND REPRESENTATIVES TO HUNGARIAN FESTIVITIES IN YUGOSLAVIA

Some of the villages of the Bácska (a part of former South Hungary) have just celebrated the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of their foundation. The festivities of the descendants of the original German colonists were attended by the representatives of the German Legation in Belgrade: delegates from the home villages in Germany, as well as a delegation of the German Union in Hungary, were also permitted to appear at the celebrations. The celebrations of the Hungarian villages, however, were not allowed to be attended either by representatives of the Hungarian Legation in Belgrade or by the delegations of the parent-villages in Hungary. The latter, as undesirable aliens, were simply not allowed to enter the country. This piece of news throws a very strange light on the sincerity of Belgrade's intentions just now when so much is being said about the establishment of friendly relations between Hungary and Yugoslavia.

— y —

IS THIS SELFGOVERNMENT!?

The Ban's Office of the Danube Banate dissolved by order the elected parish council of Óbecse (Stari-beče), the majority of the inhabitants are Hungarians, and has appointed a committee after the pattern of the Rumanian interim committees to manage the affairs of the place. There is not one single Hungarian national on the committee.

— y —

FOREIGNERS MAY NOT PERFORM RELIGIOUS FUNCTIONS IN YUGOSLAVIA

The "Katolicki List", the official organ of the Roman Catholic Archbishopric of Zagreb, published the Ordinance issued by the Ministry of Justice in terms of which under § 3 of the Administration Act foreigners are to be debarred from performing church functions in Yugoslavia territory from May 1, 1937. The church authorities must see to it that their places are filled by subjects of the Yugoslavian State from that date on. *This provision does not apply to priests of Yugoslavian (?) nationality who are subjects of a foreign state, or to Russian refugees.*

The Ordinance strikes a particularly hard blow on the Reformed Church, two-thirds of the adherents of which are Hungarians. The Reformed Church has no independent theological college in Yugoslavia, and as the Calvinist youths who wish to join the ministry are forbidden by the Serb authorities to study at the faculties of theology in Hungary, the only possibility of filling the vacant pulpits is by calling in foreign clergymen.

— y —

HUNGARIAN OLYMPIC CHAMPIONSHIPS AND THE YUGOSLAV FILM CONTROL

The motion pictures taken from the Olympic games in Berlin were also introduced, among other places, in Újvidék (Novisad), which is the capital of the Danube Banate. The films which had already gone through the general film control in Yugoslavia were now subjected by the police to a new control, with the result that the parts showing the Hungarian champions and their celebration were ordered to be cut out. That part of the music in which the Hungarian

National Anthem could be heard was softened to such a degree that it could not be recognized at all.

— y —

MAČEK GAINING GROUND IN THE VOIVODINA

In Szabadka (Subotica), on 15th August, the Bounievaz people of the district celebrated the 250th anniversary of the settlement in Hungary of their forbears, who had fled before the Turks. The celebrations were distinctly Maček Party in tone. Deputizing for M. Maček, M. Pernar, former State Secretary, delivered a speech. The flags used were the Croatian colours and loud cheers were given for Maček. All this gave rise to great indignation in Serb official circles. They can see for themselves now that their political repression and economic exploitation of the Voivodina has resulted in estranging the Bounievaz people from Belgrade. Punishment was not slow to follow, for all the Municipality officials and employees not yet confirmed in their posts who attended the celebrations have been dismissed.

— y —

P O L I T I C A L E C O N O M Y

A U S T R I A

THE HARVEST

The quality as well as the quantity of the Austrian rye crop remains below last year's. Similar conditions prevail in the harvest of wheat, although the decrease is not so considerable as in the case of rye. The quality of the wheat is rather good, though apophysis has been experienced in individual cases. In spite of unfavourable weather conditions the harvest of barley may be called satisfactory, but it has not fulfilled expectations. Oat has been improved by the warm weather in the second half of August, so that it is expected to yield a fairly good harvest with very satisfactory quality. Early potatoes are very satisfying while late potatoes have suffered from the drought. The harvest of coarse fodder promises to be so good that it will lead to a considerable reduction in the purchase of victuals. Maize is expected to turn out well.

— y —

C Z E C H O - S L O V A K I A

DIFFICULTIES OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK CORN MONOPOLY

Czechoslovak corn monopoly begins the new harvest year with a surplus amount of 68.000 waggons of wheat (10 hw. each) left from the past season. The importance of this encumbrance on the Czechoslovak market may be guessed from the fact that this reserve corresponds to half of the yearly consumption. Recent records published by the Statistical Office show that

weather conditions have caused considerable damages so that the total produce in wheat will not be more than 14.7 million double hw. This is 2.2 million hw. less than last year's yield and remains below the average of the past. Thus the available quantity of wheat, adding the surplus from year to the new harvest, will amount to a total of 215.000 waggons. To this we must add 10.000 waggons from Yugoslavia in accordance with existing agreements. This will bring the total amount to 225.000 waggons against the actual consumption of 135.000 waggons, so that there will still be left, at the end of the harvest year, a surplus of 90.000 waggons.

— y —

LIVE STOCK MONOPOLY

The idea of establishing a live stock monopoly has been broached repeatedly at intervals in Czecho-Slovakia, — that depending upon the chances in the political situation. The prices of live stock and of meat are continually rising, and in the question of an increase of animal imports the Ministry of Agriculture has adopted an attitude of refusal at any cost; while nothing — or very little — has so far been done to prevent the raising of prices. According to a report published in the "Brázda" the question of a live stock monopoly has for the moment been shelved. The live stock syndicate has been given a further lease of life; and — so that paper tells us — its lease of life will be prolonged in the future too irrespectively of whether it serves the interests of the general public or of the cattle-breeders — as it certainly does not.

— y —

HUNGARY**ANGLO-HUNGARIAN BANK REPORT ON ECONOMIC IMPROVEMENT**

The economic report published by the Anglo-Hungarian Bank at the beginning of September points out that there is a *steady progress* to be observed in the economic situation of Hungary. This improvement may be seen from the increase of production and business transactions, as well as the *growth of consumption*. In view of the favourable development of this year's crops, this improvement will largely depend on *how the crop will be placed on the market*. The main question is, of course, the sale of *wheat* which is sufficiently ensured by means of different international export agreements.

The industrial production in the first of half of this year shows an increase of 20% against that of the first half of last year, while the number of workers has increased by 10%.

It is to be hoped, the Report states, that the improvement in the purchasing power of agriculture, the gradually rising number of foreign visitors and, last but not least, favourable crops will influence the economic life of this country in general and produce a *wholesome effect* on the development of *trade*.

— y —

TEN TIMES AS MUCH WHEAT EXPORTED AS LAST YEAR

The Hungarian Foreign Trade Bureau has just published the chief statistics relating to the agrarian exports in August. These figures practically without exception point to a material advance in the agrarian exports of Hungary. The quantity of wheat exported in August, for instance, was 818,702 metric quintals — the quota of that quantity despatched to Italy being 284,506, that taken over by Switzerland being 293,265, that sold to Austria 159,140, that taken over by Greece being 76,741 metric quintals, the remainder — 5051 metric quintals having been purchased by Great Britain. Therewith the total quantity of wheat exported during the economic year rose to 1,534,886 — ten times the quantity exported in the corresponding period of the previous year. The quantity of rye exported by Hungary was 72,897 metric quintals — 63,097 quintals being despatched to Austria, 5000 to Holland and 4500 to Italy. The total quantity of rye exported during the economic year thus rose to 83,028 metric quintals — as against 12,550 metric quintals in the corresponding period of the previous year. The quantity of barley exported was 3292 metric quintals — the quota of beer-barley being 2542 quintals: 1350 quintals being marketed in Italy and 1192 quintals in Great Britain. Therewith the total quantity of this agrarian produce exported in the economic year rose to 9447 metric quintals. During the month in question (August) Hungary exported 40,206 metric quintals of flour — 25,529 quintals to Austria, 5767 quintals to Italy, 1857 quintals to Egypt, 1400 quintals to Holland and 153 quintals to Czecho-Slovakia. Therewith the total quantity exported during the economic year rose to 105,999 metric quintals — that being twice the amount exported in the corresponding period of the previous year.

— y —

RUMANIA**NEW ECONOMIC AGREEMENT BETWEEN ROUMANIA AND HUNGARY**

The Hungaro-Roumanian negotiations at Sinaia ended with the conclusion of a new economic and clearing agreement between the two countries. Several facilities were accorded on both sides to give a fresh stimulus to their goods traffic, which has considerably fallen back in the last few months.

The rule hitherto followed in the clearing transactions of the two countries was that 25% from the amount of sale to Hungary had to be paid in Pengö to an account at the Roumanian National Bank (petrol was the only exception to this rule); this rule has now been altered in so far as the amount deducted for this payment was limited to 20% of the amount of sale. This means that instead of 75%, as before, 80% of Roumania's export to Hungary will be compensated by the export of goods from Hungary into Roumania. The 20% deduction on Pengö payment will fall off in the case of fire-wood import as well as in that part of saw-wood import which is effected in the frame of special constructions.

The agreement seeks to promote the fulfilment of Hungary's goods claims in Roumania. Whereas it was hitherto impossible to balance export claims dating from before April 1-st by means of imports after that term, Roumania has now consented to that solution.

Roumania has conceded certain super contingents on the import of Hungarian ready made goods in the course of this quarter. The frame of those super contingents amounts to about 20 million Lei. On the other hand, Hungary has accorded certain privileges to Roumania in the import of fire-wood. It was agreed that the payment of imported fire-wood may also be effected, to a certain amount, in fiscal Lei with a small extra charge; this again means that the Roumanian fire-wood will be bought at a lower price so that it will occupy a more favourable place in competition on the Hungarian market. In addition to this the dispatch of business transactions has been facilitated, technically, by the acceptance of agreements concluded between the Hungarian Wood Traffic Ltd. and the Roumanian export organization.

YUGOSLAVIA**YUGOSLAVIA'S FRUIT EXPORT SERIOUSLY COMPETING AGAINST CZECHO-SLOVAKIA'S**

At a recent meeting of the Fruit-growers' Association, the President of the Association gave a gloomy picture of the lamentable situation of fruit-growers in Czecho-Slovakia. The fruit-growers are not able to find a market for their produce (which is of a fairly good quality), so that they are obliged to feed their cattle with the best quality of pears which were intended for export. Germany, which has hitherto offered the best market for Czecho-Slovakia's fruit export, is continually lessening her fruit import from that country. Yugoslavia's fruit export to Germany, on the other hand, is rapidly growing at the expense of Czecho-Slovakia's. The meeting carried the resolution to call to the Government for urgent help to the distressed fruit-growers.

— y —

YUGOSLAVIA'S AUGUST FOREIGN TRADE BALANCE

During recent months Yugoslavia's foreign trade balance has improved very considerably. Earlier in the year the foreign trade balance had every month closed with a large deficit (excess of imports); whereas in August the deficit was entirely eliminated. For the value of exports recorded for that month was 97.9 million dinars in excess of the value of imports; the result being that the total excess of imports for the first eight months of the year declined to only 54 million dinars — as against an excess of exports of the value of 67.9 million dinars in the corresponding period of the previous year. There can be no doubt that the deficit in evidence in the current year is one of the consequences of the very considerable decrease in the volume of the trade between Yugoslavia and Italy ensuing as a result of the "sanctions" measures against the latter country.

The re-adjustment on the original basis of the commercial relations between Yugoslavia and Italy is the object of the agreement which — according to a report in the September 25th. issue of the "Politika" — has after protracted negotiations been concluded between those two countries. The provisional agreement is to be in force only for 6 months; but it may be tacitly prolonged until the conclusion of a definitive commercial treaty. The said agreement provides for adequate quotas of horned cattle exports from Yugoslavia, as also of the branch of Yugoslavia's export trade (that in wood) which was particularly badly hit by the "sanctions" measures; it also fixed satisfactory quotas of other Yugoslav exports. The agreement at the same time adjusts the clearing system and the system of reciprocal payments, arranging for the settlement of a considerable proportion of the surpluses due to Yugoslavia and for the resumption of regular trade relations.

— y —

S P O R T S

The most outstanding feature in Hungarian sports recently was the "Balaton Sports Week" in the first half of September. This sporting festival is held on the Lake Balaton every year with ever-increasing success, and has a programme composed of the most varied sporting events. The time at which it is held is most favourable to sporting on account of the mildness of the Autumn Season in Hungary. The programme is composed of such items as "across the Balaton" (a distance of 12.5 kilometers), horse-racing, boat races and sailing boat races, lawn tennis and table tennis championships, fencing tournaments, and a motor car race from Bodensee to the Lake Balaton. These sporting events occupied a whole week and offered many highly enjoyable races. Those who feasted in the programme of the "Balaton Sports Week", and those who merely took part as spectators were enthusiastic in its praises; its agreeableness was enhanced by the constant sunshine.

TENNIS

The tennis championships between Hungary and Egypt were held in middle of September and ended with a result of 6:0 for Hungary.

SWIMMING

When the Hungarian Francis Csik became world champion in 100 metre swimming at the Olympic games in Berlin leaving behind him the wonderful Japanese swimmers, there were many who looked upon his achievement as a mere accident and ascribed to a momentary indisposition of the Japanese rather than to his own merit. The Hungarian-Japanese swimming contest held in Budapest at the end of August proved how false this belief was and how well Francis Csik deserved the title of champion. This time the Hungarian champion gallantly offered his Japanese opponents an opportunity for revenge and furnished, at the same time, an excellent proof of his inimitable

skill by defeating the Japanese a second time. The details of the great contest are as follows:

100 metres fast swimming: 1., Francis Csik (Hungary), 57.8 sec.; 2., Yusa (Japan), 58.2 sec.; 3., Sugiura (Japan), 59.2 sec.; 4., Abay-Nemes (Hungary), 59.4 sec.

400 metres fast swimming: 1., Makino (Japan), 4.52.6 sec.; 2., Lengyel (Hungary), 4.58.2 sec.

1500 metres fast swimming: 1., Gróf (Hungary), 20.12.2 sec.; 2., Nagami (Japan), 20.58.2 sec.

100 metres back-swimming: 1., Yoshida (Japan), 1.11.2 sec.; 2., Gombos (Hungary), 1.12.2 sec.

200 metres breast-swimming: 1., Hamuro (Japan), 2.47.2 sec.; 2., Fábian (Hungary), 2.54.8 sec.;

100 metres breast-swimming: 1., Engel (Hungary), 1.14.6 sec.; 2., Hamuro (Japan) 1.15.00 sec.

4×200 metres estafette fast swimming: 1., Japan 9.06.6 sec.; 2., Hungary 9.10.8 sec. (European record).

The water polo match between Hungary and Japan ended on the first day with a result of 11:0 for Hungary, and on the second day it brought another Hungarian victory (12:0).

"FAIR PLAY"

The "Belgrade Sporting Club" invited the "Hungaria", one of the Hungarian football teams to Belgrade on August 16th. The match was won by the Hungarian team, but two Serb players were very rude to two of the Hungarian players and injured them very severely; in fact, one of the best players of the Hungarian team, Turay, who has often been selected for the special team, received such a bad blow that he had his jaw broken. This unprecedented behaviour towards visiting team was severely criticized by the Serb paper "Politika"; "their rudeness", it says, "and their un-sportsmanlike behaviour is a disgrace to the football sports of Yugoslavia".

— y —