

DANUBIAN REVIEW

(DANUBIAN NEWS)

VOL. IV., No 8.
B U D A P E S T
JANUARY 1937

PUBLISHED BY THE HUNGARIAN FRONTIER
READJUSTMENT LEAGUE

SINGLE COPY 50 FILL.
SUBSCRIPTION:
ONE YEAR 6 PENGÓ

C O N T E N T S

“Butter Preferred to Guns“

And so say all of us *Baron Forster*

The Nationality Policy of the Prewar Austria
and Hungary and Czecho-Slovakia

Observer

Kossuth, Lord Palmerston and Post-Trianon
Hungary

Andrew Bajcsy-Zsilinszky

Political Mosaic

How Minorities Live

Political Economy

Sports

"BUTTER PREFERRED TO GUNS" AND SO SAY ALL OF US

by

Baron Paul Forster

Former Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary

Budapest, 27th January.

No Statesman of the world is better qualified, nor more justly entitled to make the above statement than Mr. Anthony Eden. The present Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs could refer to the peaceful policy of all British Governments since the close of the world war. He could mention the fact that the British Empire carried out, even to a dangerous limit that disarmament policy which the Versailles Treaty prescribed and he could most justifiably claim for himself that since his tenure of office he has not ceased to concentrate all his efforts upon the maintenance of Peace.

And surely no one could dare to deny that the people of the world are grateful to the Foreign Secretary for his statement since it embodies all hopes and vital interests of mankind.

But how does it then come that in spite of the efforts of all British governments of the past fifteen years or so that aim of the civilized world has not yet been realised? Surely the fault can not lie with the masses of the people themselves. The horrors of the war are still too vividly in the memory of those who took an active part in it and for these as well, as for the younger generation, the widespread publicity given to the new and formidable weapons of modern warfare, reputedly threatening with annihilation beautiful and flourishing capitals and millions of people, the prospects of a new conflagration cannot be tempting. There is everything to lose for all; and even for the most optimistic war fanatics hardly anything to win.

And yet: when all seems to agree, when it is realised that some very serious efforts can no more be postponed, that the world should be brought out of the present impasse, everybody, but above all the world press ought to give its most earnest attention to the appeal made by Mr. Eden to the Foreign Press Association at its annual dinner on the 12th of January 1937. A year about which Mr. Eden, in his speech in Parliament said: "that if 1937 be a year of acutely difficult international problems and of that there can be no doubt, it is also a year of international opportunities."

It is therefore up to the press which moulds far more than reproduces public opinion to assist Mr. Eden in his efforts.

The Foreign Secretary at the press dinner also expressed the conviction that

"surely the world is not so bankrupt that it can find no way of giving practical force to what, it seems, is the common aim of us all."

A little later he said:

"If progress is to be real, we must wish to see it realized both in the political and in the economic sphere — the one reacts upon the other. Unless there is political confidence there can be no real economic recovery in Europe. Moreover, economic distress is in itself a danger to peace. All friends of peace, therefore must see to wish that distress relieved."

We hope the Foreign Secretary will forgive us for quoting his words, (as they appeared in the Times columns), also in this paper, attempting to give an answer to his query

"how is this — of giving practical force to what is the common aim of all — to be achieved?"

Our answer could naturally be a drop merely in the ocean of controversies even if it were representing the opinion of all Hungarians, while naturally it is only an individual opinion (perhaps supported by good many of us in this part of Europe.)

The answer is simple enough. The mistakes of 1919 and all subsequent years should be radically corrected and that road followed which the present British Foreign Secretary initiated some time ago and to which policy he has several times given unmistakable expression: a policy of evolution instead of that of rigidity. He thus followed in the footsteps of Briand, Stresemann, Mr. Ramsay Mc Donald and Signor Mussilini.

They all made honest efforts to improve the political atmosphere of the world and the "Locarno" pact, for the time being, did intense good. Ultimately however the Pact had to fail because it left important problems unsolved, while the Four Power pact remained an unrealized and vain hope possibly for similar reason.

Another policy which filled the world with hope and was supported by most statesmen was the effort to make the League of Nations the forum for the settlement of international difficulties. Even the most faithful and most stubborn supporters of the League have realized by now, that that institution has ingloriously failed in its attempt to solve serious problems. It is of little use to dwell over the mistakes of the past and, to facilitate finding the remedy, it is hardly advisable to enter into academic discussions as to whether the lack of power to enforce the League's findings is responsible for the failure or if the organic fault of the actual covenant, which made the League more an instrument for the rigid maintenance of the *status quo* than an organ for sane evolution. Perhaps, nay probably, it was not always the lack of good will on either side which was responsible for the failures of the past but it was rather a misfortune, as if an epidemic had stricken the world, blindfolding some and preventing them from seeing the simplest truth and plain facts.

Nothing is settled which is not rightly settled, once said Lincoln and nothing can be settled in Europe, or in fact in the world, so long, as we endeavour to cure the evil by superficial medicines which might be useful to make the visible signs of the disease fade away for the moment, but do not tackle the evil at its roots and eradicate it once for all.

There are cases of course where the disease is stronger than we are and in these cases it breaks forth in spite of all superficial quacksalvery. *Mutatis mutandis*: Germany one sidedly denounced those stipulations of the Versailles Treaty which it considered an infringement of its sovereignty. The result was to create a lot of bad blood on all sides, and even in Germany itself, on account of the feeling that prevailed there, that in spite of all profession to the contrary it is still discriminated against at its own disadvantage.

Yes, by all means let the League be reformed but not by strengthening the measures of sanctions against those who were the less fortunate in 1919, but by returning to the principles which were the basis of the covenant, and were intended to constitute a remedy for dangerous and untenable international situations.

Any effective reform must, however necessarily fail if the working out of it be entrusted to the League itself, the organ which amply proved its incapacity for good work, and particularly if there be left out of the reform those important States which have not joined the League, or have left it for, what they considered to be good and legitimate reasons. Nor would it be right to assume that the unwillingness of outsiders to co-operate is based on sheer, or unfair selfishness. We should on the contrary give them credit for that which we ask for ourselves — a belief in their honesty and integrity.

After all it must not be forgotten that 1919 left on the devastated battle grounds of Europe two entirely different groups of nations: the exuberant and saturated victors and the other group of disappointed ones. Such however, it can be

claimed, is the fortune of wars. That may be so, but real peace requires fairness for all, equality of sovereign rights and as the importance of economics overshadows political considerations, equal chances to all.

It is said, both as regards economics and politics, that there must necessarily be a return of confidence before any real progress can be made. This is true, but why should one group of powers be distrusted when all they ask for is equal treatment and equal chances in the fight for existence. It is clearly wrong to mistrust those who simply, in plain and unmistakable words demand equality at a time when others continue in the spirit of 1919. It has always been for victors to tender a friendly hand to the defeated.

Monsieur Blum has made yet another pacifist speech on the 24th inst — but this again was so characteristically surrounded by safety valves that it is hardly probable that Herr Hitler will be able to go further than he has done before offering all possible guarantees to France on the question of the Franco-German border and that of peaceful co-operation between the two countries.

Germany has, besides, already guaranteed the integrity of Belgium. And Belgium seems to be satisfied with these guarantees and, if we are not mistaken, wishes to carry on an independent foreign policy of her own. To all appearances Belgium is not yet convinced that the recent French foreign policy can increase her own security but she seems to fear that she may become entangled in a French adventure.

This consideration leads to that of another slogan which, it is to be hoped, is but a dream of the past, that of collective security.

As it was advocated by its supporters it had the appearance of being of an innocent nature but in fact it was nothing less than a means of maintaining the *status quo* as against evolution. The idea was rendered the more pernicious by reason of the Franco-Russian alliance which is greatly responsible for what is considered to be a danger in England, that of the splitting of Europe into two camps that of Fascist and Antifascist.

Collective security is an utopian dream or a mask for the selfish, which it must necessarily be so long as it is based upon the *status quo*. No sane politician can expect any collective security pact to be of lasting value as long as it is based upon two sets of powers: saturated ones on the one hand and dissatisfied ones on the other.

If it is once recognised, as it seems to be to day, that Versailles was a grave error and that general Smuts, J. M. Keynes and the many others were right who strongly criticised the Peace Treaties and pointed out the dangers inherent in them, it is clear that it is high time for radical measures to be adopted with a view of mending the situation. No palliatives or half measures can avail, nor can the use of slogans like the one of collective security. If some power is required to guarantee the maintenance of a situation which is unfairly discriminating against others it hinders the economic resurrection of those powers which lost everything by reason of the treaties.

Another problem which hinders the appeasement of the world is the obvious danger of separating Europe into two adverse camps the one Fascist and other Antifascists.

Mr. Eden's thesis that the internal policy of every country is a concern of their own must be accepted. But at the same time no country can be allowed to meddle with other countries affairs, or be allowed to make subversive propaganda, or incite to acts of sabotage and the like.

No one can believe that Fascists or Nazis have committed such acts abroad which in the case of communist propaganda is undeniable. A Canadian visitor to this country has given us the appalling news that since President Roosevelt recognized the Moscow government Soviet money has been lavishly used for communist propaganda in Canada and that there are now scores of bolshevik press organs in that particular British Dominion. It would not be surprising if similar happenings are threatening other parts of the world as well.

Liberty of speech can also be abused and can degenerate into license — but the same measure should be used against every political system which does not correspond to the true standards of democracy. It is inconceivable that the Valencia

government should be supported and recognized as a democratic one after it has abolished religion, has persecuted priests, has destroyed churches, in a country, where we have every reason to believe that the masses of the peoples are sincere christians and faithful to their religion.

In Hungary we believe in democracy and in liberalism which we not only preach but also practice and that towards all our citizens irrespective of nationality or creed. What we ask for is our full and rightful sovereignty, for equal treatment and for equal chance.

No „Locarno“, no Four Power pact and above all no collective security can bring the blessings of Peace to this world without justice and fair play, at the same time being given regard to and unless the selfishness of small groups of people be replaced by a just and sincere desire for co-operation in order to secure the good of all and the common interests of mankind.

Let us undo the mistakes of 1919 and 1920 and rearrange the world by honestly applying those principles which were the aim of the world war —: those of liberty and equality and the right of self determination for the Hungarian people as well as for other nations.

— y —

THE NATIONALITY POLICY OF THE PRE-WAR AUSTRIA AND HUNGARY AND CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

by

Observer

An important part of the radio speech delivered on 22nd January by the Czecho-Slovak Premier, M. Milano Hodza was about the minorities.

In his opinion there was no State in Europe that might set an example to Czecho-Slovakia as regards liberal, democratic minority policy. In Switzerland and Belgium the problem is not one of minorities. A fair and liberal minority policy is of vital importance to Czech nationalism in particular, for political independence had always been the latter's chief aim. It was just the nationalists by principle who knew very well that even the slightest departure from the sentiments of national liberty was apt to be the source of very serious crises in the state. It was not in the smallest degree to the interests of Czech nationalism and Czecho-Slovak nationalism as a whole that the State should be kept in permanent unrest through the evolution of a centre of political crises. The regulation of administrative routine was certainly not analogous with what in the history of Czech politics lived on as an odious memory of "*Punktationen*" (contracts) and attempts at compromise. These "*Punktationen*" and attempts at compromise

had their origin in the Hapsburg Empire, because the Constitution of the old Empire did not meet the reasonable requirements either of its citizens or of State policy.

No one had ever accused, or would ever be able to accuse, the Czecho-Slovakian Constitution of not allowing sufficient scope to the fullest national aspirations, or of not being an adequate guarantee of the independent development of the different ethnic groups in the State. It was the duty of the Government to see that the Constitution was not a mere scrap of paper, but a living proof of the political and moral maturity of the Czecho-Slovak people.

*

The warning addressed to the Czech Nationalists by M. Milan Hodža — to the effect that it is not in the interests of the Czecho-Slovak State to have to continuously face crises due to its nationality policy — must be endorsed by us too, though we believe that it was very belated.

But the statements of the Czecho-Slovakian Premier's concerning the nationality policy of pre-war Austria and Hungary challenge contradiction.