

tion of Berlin and willy-nilly a train-bearer of the policy of William II.

And now — our readers may well ask what about the parallel between the old events of some century ago and the tragedy and destiny of present-day Hungary? In my opinion the parallel lies in the fact that the Powers of Europe failed utterly when drafting the Paris treaties of peace — and have ever since failed — to realise the importance of Hungary from the point of view of peace and of the maintenance of a more equitable and more lasting order in Central Europe generally and in the Danube Valley in particular. At present Hungary's natural and modest claims are being ignored for the sake of the imperfect and ephemeral idea and alliance known as the Little Entente. Palmerston was too late in 1849; and the Palmerston of today has not yet made his appearance in the arena of international politics to voice the protest of the humanitarian spirit of the British Empire — already a world force — and to protest in the name of the peace of Europe against the tortures being inflicted on the Hungarians.

Today the situation is the same as it was in the days of Louis Kossuth: British public opinion and a large part — perhaps the majority — of the Members of the British Parliament are fully conscious of the absurdity of the provisions of Trianon and realise to the full the still greater absurdity to allow the qualities and traditions and organising power of a people with the great past of the Hungarians to lie fallow in that part of Europe where there is so enormous a lack of higher European conceptions and of a higher constructive political ability — viz. in the Danube Valley. A very large proportion of unofficial Britain is with us today too as it was in the days when Kossuth was acclaimed by the citizens of Southampton, London, Manchester and Birmingham; but *the support of official Britain is still lacking*. Oppression is in the Succession States — particularly in Rumania — and playing fast and loose with Hungarian culture and with the rights of the Hungarian minorities; but the conscience of Europe — the *official* conscience, *that of Great Britain too* — still keeps silence.

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

THE ANGLO-ITALIAN AGREEMENT FROM THE HUNGARIAN POINT OF VIEW

Hungary in particular shares in the pleasure felt throughout Europe over the Anglo-Italian Mediterranean agreement. All the constructive factors in international politics labouring to insure order, consolidation and peace see with satisfaction that Britain and Italy, two powerful nations with civilisation and progress at heart, shook hands completely reconciled, respecting each other's rights, having decided to go together towards common aims, which are also the aims of all those who still have something to lose in the stormy chaos of political, social and economic extremes.

We feel that Hungary, in every respect, belongs to this category. Not merely because, even in her dismembered state, she is one of the constructive, creative elements in the Danube Basin, — an element of equilibrium and defence against anarchy and complete dissolution, but also because the reasonable demands of the Hungarian nation can ever be obtained in a peaceful way except through the fruitful co-operation of the two Great Powers which in European politics stand for the free play of dynamic forces, the mobility demanded by life itself, and a relentless determination to see justice triumphant, and not for the petrification of the *status quo* as created by the peace treaties.

For other States too the maintenance and security of the *status quo* in the Mediterranean zone will mean not only that for a long time a state of quietude will reign in that territory where the interests of the parties concerned were anyhow reasonably satisfied at the time of the great readjustment after the war, but also that Britain and Italy will be able to devote jointly their released energies to problems clamouring for solution in the name of law, justice and peace.

This, in the first place, is true of the Danube

Valley problem, and primarily of the question of dismembered Hungary.

Besides Mr. Eden, all the most important representatives of British public life, beginning with Mr. Baldwin himself, have almost unreservedly adopted the view, which may well be taken as mirroring the conscience of the century, that peace treaties, being human creations, are not infallible, and cannot be regarded as of immutable, unassailable sanctity. The less may be regarded as such the conditions and situations created by them, especially when they petrify serious injustices. This was why in British public opinion the wish arose to divorce the Covenant of the League of Nations from the peace treaties and make Article 19 of the former, which provides the possibility of territorial readjustments, operative in a way that would lead to practical results and change it from a dead letter to a living instrument. The political genius of the British nation as represented by British constitutionalism and the British Parliament and that of Italy embodied in the person of Mussolini, met years ago on this great idea, and in the spring of 1933, when Mr. Macdonald was in Rome, it took shape in the form of the Four Power Pact. Unfortunately a sudden change in international politics frustrated the realization of that mighty conception, which if materialised as originally intended, would have radically altered the lives of the Danubian countries.

But it was not to be, and the whole of Europe sorely felt the results. The political atmosphere has grown tense with uncertainty, the tempo and measure of armaments have increased three-fold since 1933, and the danger of Bolshevism in Europe, especially in view of the events of the Spanish revolution, has become incredibly greater.

There can be no doubt that Britain's first natural

reaction to her agreement with Italy will be a changed attitude towards Soviet Russia and a speedy return to the platform of the Four Power Pact. This would be all the more desirable seeing that her relations with Germany are urgently in need of readjustment. To achieve this, Italy's co-operation is indispensable, for the only possible basis of agreement and the only help towards it lie in the Macdonald Four Power Pact. France's presumable objections will probably change before a recognition of the fact that, for her, a four power pact with Britain and a reconciled Germany is better than a two or three power pact with Russia and the Little Entente, without Britain and with a hostile Germany.

Must the idea of collective security be sacrificed to a solution of this nature? A fictive idea may always, indeed should always be sacrificed to a real historic

value, to a security resting on the inward and sincere reconciliation of the nations.

The agreement concluded with Italy has enhanced Britain's prestige to an enormous extent, but has also increased in like measure her responsibility. It is no exaggeration to say that the future of Europe will be what Britain decides. We hope and believe that out of the Mediterranean *status quo* there will arise in the Danube Valley a dynamic force able to create moral and political conditions with which the League of Nations may at last become what hitherto it has failed to be: the protector of the oppressed and the redresser of wrongs.

And this, not in Hungary's interests alone, but also in the interests of those Danubian States which today most violently protest against any changes in Central Europe.

THE YUGOSLAV-BULGARIAN TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP

The expressions of friendship between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria heard repeatedly during recent years helped considerably to relieve the tension that had so long existed between the two countries. Now a treaty of friendship is about to be concluded between them. It is reported that the Prime Minister of Bulgaria, M. Kioseivanov, is to travel to Belgrade to sign the treaty; the act of signature to be carried out in the Yugoslav Capital to the accompaniment of solemn formalities. The contents of the treaty are those generally in use; and there is no ground for the rumours assert that the new treaty contains secret clauses. For it must not be forgotten that Yugoslavia is bound to the Little Entente and the Balkan Block by various treaties which she cannot easily denounce. Consequently the treaty to be concluded with Bulgaria cannot possibly contain more than what is acceptable to Yugoslavia's allies. The Yugoslav Premier, M. Stoia-dinovitch, himself has declared that he first obtained the approval of his country's allies. The treaty is nevertheless of great importance as a token that Yugoslavia has abandoned what we might call the aggressive attitude displayed towards their defeated neighbours by the other Little Entente and Balkan Block States, desiring by amicable means to ensure that understanding which the defeated States of Central and Eastern

Europe have always tried to attain. This new treaty of friendship denotes an important step towards the development of peace in the Balkans and is calculated to create an atmosphere facilitating the adjustment of the unsolved problems by peaceful means and with due regard for the postulates of justice. Such an atmosphere is wanted badly; for any further maintenance of the injustice now prevailing cannot fail to advance the cause of Bolshevism. The Bolshevik danger is constantly increasing and may in default of a strong feeling of unity prove fatal to the small countries of the Balkan Peninsula. Now such a feeling of unity is inconceivable except as a result of the elimination of all injustices; and a *sine qua non* is the creation of a peaceful atmosphere — and not the incitement of the masses by the infraction of minority rights. It is in this light that people in Bulgaria regard the new treaty of friendship; and it is hoped that the example set by Yugoslavia will be followed also by her allies.

In Bulgaria, by the way, the parish (municipal) elections reform has already come into force; a circumstance that allows of our concluding that the time is approaching when the provisional government of today will be replaced by a government elected on the basis of popular suffrage.

YUGOSLAV LITERARY EVENING IN BUDAPEST

In token of the growing friendship between the two countries, Yugoslavia and Hungary, a literary evening was arranged in Budapest on December 19-th by the „Láthatár“, a Hungarian monthly review, under the presidency of Dr. Gusztáv Gratz former Minister for Foreign Affairs. The programme was composed of valuable translations from the best works of modern Serb literature. Two Yugoslav writers, the dramatist M. Theodor Manoilovich and M. Svetislav Petrovich Vice-Chairman of the Yugoslav Pen-Club, came from Belgrade to appear at the evening. Every item of the programme was received with enthusiastic applause by the highly distinguished audience; among those who were present we wish to remember M. Alexander Vukchevich, Yugoslav Minister in Budapest, who appeared at the head of the entire staff of the Yugoslav Legation, the Very Rev. George Zubkovich, the Serb Bishop of Buda, Councillor Dr. Ferenc Marosy, head of the

Press Department in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Councillor Baron Lajos Villani, head of the Cultural Department in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Councillor Dr. Aladár Haász, head of the Arts Department in the Ministry of Public Instruction, M. Jenő Nelky, formerly Hungarian Minister in Vienna, and many others. The Yugoslav literary evening in Budapest proved such a success that the two writers who had come from Belgrade declared that in the near future they would arrange a similar evening in Belgrade to present the representative works of the best Hungarian writers to the Serb public in Serb language. Let us hope that this first attempt at a harmonious cultural co-operation between the two countries will contribute towards the betterment of the situation of the Hungarian minority in Yugoslavia.

THE BUCAREST CZECHO-SLOVAKIAN MINISTER'S ASTONISHING CRITICISM OF RUMANIA

A natural consternation and bitter indignation was aroused in Poland and Rumania by the Bucarest Czecho-Slovakian Minister, M. Jan Šeba's book entitled "*Rusko a malá dohoda v politice svetové*" (Russia and the Little Entente in world politics), which recently appeared and was published by the "Melantrich", the Prague publishing firm of the Czech National Socialist Party, that is to say of President Benes's former party. The introduction to the book, which contains 662 pages, was written by M. Krofta, Czecho-Slovakia's Foreign Minister, and the work received the Masaryk prize. It may therefore be taken that in every respect it represents the official Czecho-Slovakian attitude.

M. Šeba's criticism of Rumania's role in the war is withering. "The role Rumania played in the war — he says — was not a successful one. The army was not adequately prepared for war, either as regards training or munitions. The lessons learned on other fronts during two years' fighting were not taken advantage of. In the two years of neutrality Germany was clever enough to sow dissolution in Rumanian public life, especially in the sphere of political administration. Men trusted by Berlin, for instance, occupied some of the highest posts in the State administration. (For example, the Rumanian Postmaster General was a German agent.) Russia alone was able, to a certain extent, to counteract Germany's activities with a comparatively well organized system of counter espionage in which a prominent role was played by a Russian Czech, the engineer Zival. The position of the Rumanian forces was betrayed to the enemy, and there were traitors even among the highest military functionaries. A bad example was set by General Socek, who abandoned the front. General Zottu, the unfortunate head of the Rumanian General Staff shot himself. According to Russian sources of information, the data recently published by the Rumanian Security Service (State Police — Siguranta) shows how criminally responsible were those vile spies for the misfortunes that overtook the State." (pp. 483—484).

Against Poland's interests M. Šeba makes propaganda for a Russo—Czecho-Slovakian corridor. On the subject of the so-called Curzon line, according to which the Russo-Polish frontier would have passed through Dwinsk, Vilno, Grodno, Nemirow, Brest-Litovsk and Rava-Ruska towards the Carpathians, M. Šeba remarks in italics that had this line been drawn, the Czecho-Slovakian Republic would have had a frontier in immediate touch with Russia, and the question of the marching through of Soviet troops would be much simpler in the event of the Franco-Soviet and the Czecho-Soviet pacts being enforced (p. 483). In M. Šeba's opinion the fact that the Polish frontier was drawn through districts inhabited by White Russians and the occupation by Poland of Eastern Galicia, which is inhabited by Ukrainians, are the reasons why relations between Poland and Russia are not cordial and why they exert a very bad influence on the policy of European peace (p. 487).

Further on in his book M. Šeba says that Czecho-Slovakia cannot lose on the Czecho-Russian pact, for it is evident, at least he thinks it is, that aeroplane-aid, which according to the lessons of the Abyssinian war is the most valuable today, can arrive within a few hours' time. He gives figures to prove this and shows that the western Soviet flying fields are only 10 kilometres distant from Czecho-Slovakia's eastern frontier, which considering that the speed per hour of the planes is 300 kilometres, is no distance at all. He says, however, that the situation is not so easy for the rest of the branches of military service as it would have been had the Curzon line been adhered to; for in that case Czecho-Slovakia and Russia would have had a common frontier over 200 kilometres long.

Thus M. Šeba. It seems he would have liked if the Russian frontier had advanced 200 kilometres further into Europe, and between the lines he is making a little propaganda *post facto* for the Curzon line. For the Czech patriots are determined defenders of the territorial *status quo* only so long as their frontiers are threatened, but have no objection to a readjustment of other frontiers if their idolized Russia would profit by it and Poland, which they hate, suffer. They protest against Ukrainians and White Russians, that is to say races ethnically different from the Russians proper, being attached to Poland, but think it the most natural thing in the world for hundreds of thousands of Hungarians and Poles to be torn away from their mother-countries and incorporated in Czecho-Slovakia. Another glimpse of the Czech Janus face! M. Šeba would also like to clear the Czech Legions of the well-proven charge that it was they who betrayed Koltchak and handed him over to the Bolshevists. Between the lines M. Šeba tries to shift the responsibility unto General Janin, implying that he it was who handed Koltchak over to the Russian Revolutionary Committee.

On the other hand General Zakharof, who knows best what the deeds of the Czech Legions in Siberia were, drawing on information received from Koltchak's suite, states that it was a Czech officer who, citing instructions from the Czech General Sirovy, handed the counter-revolutionary Admiral over to the Reds in Irkutsk, who had made the passage of the Czech troops conditional on the surrendering up of Koltchak. Siriamow, the president of the Irkutsk Revolutionary Committee, himself wrote that Koltchak's head was the price the Czechs paid for the right to a free passage. Likewise Smirnov, president of the Siberian Soviet Committee, writes in his book "The Struggle for the Ural and Siberia" that the Czech regiments had delivered Kolchak and his followers up to the Bolshevists with a promise that they would not interfere in any way with the Soviet as regards its treatment of the prisoners.

We shall have more to say later on about M. Šeba's book.

— y —

AN ENGLISH AUTHOR'S OPINION OF RUMANIA

In his work "Hitlers Drive in the East" (Victor Gollancz Ltd. London 1937) Mr. F. Elwyn Jones gives us a vivid description of political, social and national conditions in Rumania. His statements also cor-

roborate the passages about corruption in Rumania quoted from the "Times" in our last issue.

"Politics — says Mr. Elwyn Jones — are dominated by intrigues, and the King's mistress is the

real power behind the throne. There are terrorist groups which poison and shoot. There are few politicians who cannot be bought, and many who have a price on their heads. There are jails where they hang prisoners by the feet until they lose consciousness."

*

"...In the East End of Bucharest, where the workers live, whole streets are composed of one-roomed wooden shacks, in each of which a family lives. There is a low bed in the corner, a chair, and a rough wooden bench for a table. That is all. No ground-covering of any description; the earth is simply stamped down, and provides a breeding-ground for vermin and infection. Children and adults heap together into the same bed, and live on coarse bread, washed down by hot water. Right in the centre of this district, the Queen Marie of Rumania Street, lies a filthy, stagnant pool where the malaria mosquitoes breed.

But even this is luxury compared to the degraded animal poverty of the gipsy encampment living on the refuse-heap near Bucharest East Station. In parts of Bessarabia the peasants are so poor that they repeatedly use the same salt water in which they have

boiled their vegetables, so as to save buying more salt.

The peasants, who are not politically minded, look to miracles for the bettering of the conditions of their lives. They are superstitious, and easy dupes for charlatans. In 1936 a priest who was "selling seats in heaven" was arrested by the police in Kishinev, Bessarabia. He had a "map of heaven" on his lectern allotted portions out and numbers on them. Simple-minded and trusting peasants, mostly women, used to come to his house and select a position on the map. The places which were "near God" cost double the normal price. Those near the Archangel Gabriel were a little less. Ordinary places cost a sum equal to two English pounds. Many peasants sold their last cow to obtain a place 'on the right hand of God'."

*

"The Rumanian Government also discriminates against the various national minorities within the country. The Magyars of Cluj and the Banat are persecuted. Rumanian apprentices are forced on Hungarians masters, and in 1935 a number of Hungarian officials were dismissed without pension because it was discovered that they spoke Rumanian inadequately."

THE RUMANIANS OF TRANSYLVANIA AND BESSARABIA COMPLAIN OF THE BUCAREST ADMINISTRATION

M. Ghița Pop, ex-deputy minister and one of the members of the Rumanian National Peasant Party, addressed questions to the Government in Parliament on 19th December about exploited Transylvania. In this interpellation he complained that the Rumanians of the Old Kingdom (the Regate) had undertaken, literally speaking, a predatory invasion of Transylvania and were ousting the Rumanians of that province from civil service and country offices. M. Pop's speech drew forth a great storm of protests in both houses of Parliament, and two M. P.'s (Urziceanu and Nichofor Robu) threw themselves on Ghița Pop and began to beat him about. He was rescued with difficulty and left Parliament with a bandaged head.

An almost similar fate overtook M. Pan Halippa, National Peasant Party Senator and ex-minister, in the Senate. M. Halippa, who had played a leading role in the attachment of Bessarabia to Rumania, declared in his speech that Bessarabia had been better off under the rule of the Russian Czars than it was now. He spoke of the destitution in the Bessarabian villages. According to the "Adverul" of 20th December 1936 (No. 16. 231) one thing he said was: —

"It is not necessary to go deep into the history

of the province lying between the Prut and the Dnyester to understand the present lamentable conditions. For the Russians Bessarabia was a stolen province administrated by an alien government. And yet it was during that period that Bessarabia got the railways it still possesses and could use the Dnyester, the Prut and the Danube for navigation. All the Rumanian Administration did was to build a short 20 kilometres long road which cut across the elbow at Tighina. On the other hand all navigation on the Dnyester and the Prut was stopped."

Transylvania's and Bessarabia's troubles, in this instance, were not disclosed by minority speakers, but by true-born Rumanians who see for themselves what the blessings of the peace treaties are. If the system of a *numerus clausus* is being applied to the Rumanians of Transylvania, then we may safely say that what is being applied to the Hungarians there is a system of *numerus nullus*. M. Octavian Goga was quite right in saying that whether he was aware of it or not, M. Pop had produced evidence that Transylvania was suffering ever since it came under Rumanian rule and that it was on this suffering that the Hungarians based their demand for frontier revision.

THE WORLD MISLED BY A BOGUS SUPPRESSION OF TWO RUMANIAN NEWSPAPERS ITALOPHOBS

Our last issue contained a literary translation of the articles published in the "Glas Romanesc" and the "Turda", in which articles a stream of vile abuse was poured out on the Italian nation and Mussolini because of his speech at Milan on 1st November, and the Hungarians of Transylvania were threatened with a St. Bartholomew's night. The articles in question were published with the approval of the Rumanian censor-

ship, for in Rumania today no press publication may appear until it has been released by the censor. The articles were mentioned in Parliament by the Hungarian deputies, and criminal charges were brought against their authors by the Presidency of the General Hungarian Party.

After weeks had elapsed — reports from Rome state — the Rumanian Foreign Minister informed

Italy's Minister in Bucarest that the two newspapers had been suppressed for an indefinite period. But in a very short time it came to light that either a mistake had crept into the source from which the Rome report was taken, or deliberate lies had been told in Bucarest. According to the semi-official Rumanian press agency, the "Rador", the two papers in question were not suppressed for an indefinite period, but only for a fortnight. As both of them are weekly papers *their suppression for a fortnight is nothing but a farce to mislead the world.* This in itself is proof positive that no manner of criminal proceedings have been instituted either against the censor or the authors of the incriminating articles.

To what results the campaign of agitation in those two papers has already led may be seen in the gory events that took place near Torda (Turda), when a mob of Rumanians, stirred up by an anti-revision meeting, sacked Hungarian villages and murdered several persons. And — to crown all — it was not the agitators and culprits who were sentenced, but the Hungarian reporters who, with the greatest impartiality, had described the events.

The authorities of the city of Torda have forbidden the Hungarian theatrical company to continue its performances under the pretext that the music hall of the local Reformed Church, where the performances had been held, was not fireproof; the true cause, however, was the brutal campaign conducted by the local paper „Turda” against the Hungarian population.



We publish below uncommented the literal text of an article which has appeared in the "Turda" — a Rumanian weekly published at Torda — with the approval of the Rumanian Censor:

"So long as the Budapest revisionist jackals only howled at the moon, the Rumanians contented themselves with spitting their contempt. Now, however, the mangy orchestra has been joined by one whom we had previously regarded as a brother. While the jackals howl, Mussolini grinds the organ to increase their appetite. Mussolini has become a revisionist — though only for the time being, for otherwise Italy would have set the revisionist ball rolling. It is on Mussolini's face that Budapest will strike the match that is to set Europe in flames; and Mussolini will be able to energetically kiss that other part of Hungary which she will so kindly present to him. The howling jackals of the plains who are baying with their mugs turned towards us should note that we shall never again be vassals or serfs and will never again people their convict prisons. Worms will suck the marrow from their bones; and spirits will make soap of the putrid fat of the fools of the puszta. Heaven forbid that the Hungarians should live to see the day when the Rumanians consent to a revision!! for the latter will use their boots to knock down the frontiers and will sweep off the face of the earth the dirt deposited on the map of Europe by a fly which is there tinting the air. We shall occupy the royal palace of Budapest and shall remain there for ever. The mangy dwellers of the plains should note that the Rumanians will never allow themselves to be intimidated either by Mussolini's barrel organ or by anything else. The Hungarians will be given land; but not that they should rule it, but that they should bite the dust. Let it be known to the starving hordes of the puszta that the Rumanians of Transylvania will cross the Tisza but that the crossing will be delayed one night — a St. Bartholomew's Night — serving for the destruction of all the Hungarians in Transylvania. That is our message to them."

SIR ROBERT GOWER IN HUNGARY

Sir Robert Gower, Chairman of the Central European Group of the British Parliament, arrived in Budapest on January 23rd, after a rather adventurous journey by air. For owing to the thick fog-bank hanging over Budapest the British' plane was unable to land at the Mátyásföld-Budapest aerodrome and was obliged to turn back and to make a forced landing near a Hungarian village in Czecho-Slovakia. Sir Robert then hired a motor-car and travelled by road to Budapest, where he was met by his friends, who had been anxiously waiting for his arrival.

On Sunday, January 24th, Sir Robert went to Debrecen, the great metropolis of the Hungarian Lowlands known popularly as the "Calvinistic Rome". He had been invited by the Stephen Tisza University of Debrecen to visit their academic city and to inspect the up-to-date clinical hospitals, the big library and the Déry Museum; in the latter Sir Robert was evidently very much moved by the impression made on him by Munkácsy's "Ecce Homo!" At the lunch in his honour, at which he was welcomed by the Rector of the University, Dr. Béla Tankó, Sir Robert declared that the sympathy and esteem for Hungary and the Hungarian nation in his country was greater than ever. For the majority of the Members of the House of Commons felt the greatest sympathy with the Hungarian cause. He was familiar with the traditions of Debrecen, whose ancient College — the forerunner of the present University — had maintained

such close connections (particularly since the sixteenth century) with British culture.

On his return to Budapest Sir Robert paid visits to the Hungarian Frontier Re-adjustment League and to Dr. Otto Légrády, Editor-in-chief of the "Pesti Hírlap". He was subsequently received by Premier Darányi in Parliament. After his conversation with Dr. Darányi, Sir Robert went to the Diplomatic Gallery of the Lower House, where the Member then speaking — Mr. Julius Petrovác — interrupted his speech to address a few words of welcome to the distinguished visitor. At the mention of Sir Robert, name the whole House rose and cheered and applauded. Mr. Petrovác expressed the hope that the work being done by Sir Robert would contribute to the realisation of the legitimate claim of the Hungarian people in respect of a re-adjustment of the provisions of peace. Dr. Tihamér Fabinyi, Minister of Finance, and Count Takách-Tolvay, President of the Hungarian Association of Ex-Servicemen, then explained the debate that was going on in the House and informed Sir Robert concerning the business now before Parliament.

After a visit of three days in Hungary rendered interesting by opportunities of meeting many old friends, Sir Robert returned to England. To those of his friends who defied the cold air of the early morning and accompanied him to the station Sir Robert said that he was fully satisfied with what he had seen and heard.