

by medieval chroniclers. An attempt was being plotted against the life of the Scotch king — just as against the life of St. Stephen of Hungary. As in the Hungarian legend, Malcolm too hears of the plot against his life and summons the would-be assassin to render his account; the guilty conspirator falls on his knees and frankly confesses everything. Like St. Stephen in our legend, Malcolm too forgives the assassin. It would be

superfluous to base any speculation on the similarity between the St. Stephen legend and the episode in Malcolm's life; but might Malcolm not have heard from Margaret of our saintly king's generosity? and might that not have stirred Malcolm to act similarly under similar circumstances? For we know how deeply the Scottish king was influenced by the gentleness of his consort.

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

THE HUNGARIAN PREMIER ON HUNGARY'S PEACE POLICY

At a meeting of the general management of the Party of National Unity (Government Party) held on 10-th October the Prime Minister, General Gömbös, delivered an interesting address, in which he also spoke about questions of international politics. Amongst other things he spoke of the statement made by M. Velics, Hungary's League of Nations delegate, at the League Assembly held on 9-th October. The tenor of General Gömbös' comments was as follows: Hungary is pursuing and wishes to pursue a policy of peace. She cannot take the initiative in European politics, being too small and weak for that. She must therefore endeavour to adapt herself to the international circumstances with which she is surrounded. The only rôle she can aspire to is that of a humble and zealous worker for what the whole world desires, namely that peace, sincere and genuine, should reign in Europe. Hungary in the first place desires this, for she seeks justice in a peaceful way and is convinced that her cause will triumph by peaceful means. It was a genuine desire to serve the cause of peace that led Hungary to oppose the sanctions planned against Italy and to protest against them in Geneva at the League of Nations' Assembly. For in the application of the sanctions Hungary sees a possibility of armed conflict. The ethical foundation upon which Hungary's foreign policy rests and the spirit of loyalty which has always been and will continue to be the leadstar of Hungarian politics made it impossible for Hungary to vote against Italy. For over a thousand years the Hungarian nation has shaped its own destiny on ethical principles; it does so still today and cannot disregard the moral obligation to honour sacred promises given in the name of friendship. Then again Hungary's economic interests do not allow her to

vote for the sanctions. A little country where the sale of every single bushel of wheat is a matter of vital importance cannot afford to lose Italy's friendship, if only for economic reasons. General Gömbös was firmly convinced that the League of Nations would use its prestige and the great moral and political forces at its command to serve humanity and the cause of international peace.

In connection with the rumours spread concerning his recent visit to Germany General Gömbös declared that there was nothing to forbid the Hungarian Prime Minister meeting the statesmen of friendly countries for the purpose of exchanging views. The attitude of 68 million Germans towards Central Europe could not be a matter of indifference to Hungary. It was the sign of a bad conscience when people suspected the object of every trip abroad to be the creation of a political alliance of a military nature. Neither he, nor the Foreign Minister, had had conversations in Germany or elsewhere about military affairs, for they did not consider them questions of the moment. On the contrary they discussed certain economic and cultural problems the pressing nature of which was admitted by all. Hungary, and every other country too, had still so many war-inflicted wounds that a time of peace and quiet was needed by all the nations, in order to let the sores heal and a return to normal functions set in. Hungary's policy aimed at safeguarding international peace, in other words the peace upon which progress and European prosperity depend. When troubles arose among the nations it was the duty of every state in Europe to do all in its power to isolate the danger, not to increase the possibilities of conflict.

A QUESTION OF COUNT ESTERHÁZY AND THE ANSWER OF THE FOREIGN MINISTER KÁNYA

At the meeting of the Lower House of the Hungarian Parliament held on October 16th. Count Marice Esterházy, former Prime Minister of Hungary, submitted a question to the Foreign Minister, asking him whether he was prepared to inform the House respecting the international situation?

"Those who have followed closely the event of the past few months" — said Count Esterházy —

„and who have watched developments, can have no doubts on the point stressed by the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Samuel Hoare, in his speech at Geneva on September 11th. This point was that (in his opinion) *elasticity* was a *sine qua non* of international security. He referred also to the *changing of international conditions by peaceful means*. And finally he established the fact that *the*

world is not immovable, it being on the contrary necessary to effect changes from time to time. This attitude will, it is to be hoped, make its influence felt in a peaceful liquidation of the conflict between Abyssinia and Italy, and will result in — or at any rate further — the peaceful and evolutionary solution of international problems.

"My question adressed to the Foreign Minister refers therefore chiefly to the future, — to the Minister who at an earlier period already expressed an opinion similar to that of Sir Samuel Hoare respecting the League of Nations Covenant and other treaties, declaring that it was necessary to carry into effect, not only the provisions serving the security and interests of the big conqueror States, but also those parts of the treaties which serve for the protection of the smaller nations.

"Quite recently, in Geneva, Hungary showed that even without a formal treaty of alliance she is ready to do her duty in international relations. She went to the extreme limit which a small country can allow itself. She has not forgotten the services rendered to her by Italy. Nor, on the other hand, does she forget the fact that in the critical situation in which she found herself last year, it was the League of Nations that — with the effectual co-operation of Great Britain — rendered possible the peaceful enforcement of that friendly assistance.

"The lessons taught by the conflict between Italy and Abyssinia make it of vital importance for Hungary that the Hungarian Government — after calmly considering our economic, political and geographical situation — should refrain from every statement or measure or attitude calculated to render the situation of the country in economic respects and in respect of international law more disadvantageous even than that prevailing today."

Foreign Minister Kálmán Kánya replied immediately to the question.

"Our attitude in Geneva" — he said — "was motivated partly by events in the past and partly also by considerations respecting the future; and finally it was based upon that conception of foreign policy which will I believe be approved by the whole public opinion of the country. For many years past close ties of sentiment have been developing between Hungary and Italy. These ties have repeatedly been strengthened by Italy throwing her whole political and moral weight into the scales on behalf of Hungary's interests. Perhaps many people will say that politics does not consist in sentimental moments; yet it is easy to show that rational motives too inspired us to adopt in the conflict that has arisen between Italy and the League of Nations that attitude which we have taken up — an attitude which all those nations that judge our political endeavours without prejudice could not but approve. I do not believe that there is a single Power — either Great or Little — which refuses to recognise the exceptional value accruing to a nation when it endeavours to reciprocate acts of friendship and thereby acquires the reputation of trustworthiness.

"Our policy in Geneva may be described not only as chivalrous or romantic — as we now and again hear it called — but also as a good policy. A policy which after the passions of the moment have subsided is calculated in the future too to render us extremely useful services.

"I believe I am echoing the thoughts, not only of the vast majority of the Hungarian nation, but also of perhaps a whole group of small nations, when I say that it can hardly be regarded as the work of small nations to show enthusiasm for and

to support the punitive provisions of the Covenant. There can be no doubt that in the event of the application of those provisions the situation in economic respects too of the small nations is bound to become more disadvantageous than that of the big nations. We should rather endeavour to bring these punitive provisions into harmony with those sections of the Covenant which provide for the possibility of effectually settling disputes arising between Members by peaceful means too.

"Ever since her admission to the League Hungary has consistently struggled to secure this harmony and endeavoured to secure the uniform development of all paragraphs of the Covenant alike. Consequently the foreign policy of Hungary merely remained true to itself when in Geneva it emphasised the attitude already spoken of during the discussion of the question of an application of the punitive provisions. The Covenant of the League of Nations has its defects. There are people who believe these defects can be eliminated only by a development of the retaliatory clauses and by an automatic enforcement of the same. Our attitude, on the other hand, is that described above. However, this difference of opinion does not mean at all that Hungary desires to thwart the activity of the League of Nations; still less does it mean that she is opposed to the ideas for which the League stands. All we are doing is to avoid being one-sided; and what we desire is to strive by the aid of all the articles of the Covenant combined to attain the objects for which the League was brought into being. We cannot shut our eyes to the weak points of the League; nevertheless we are far from desiring the weakening of the League and would gladly struggle and fight to strengthen that institution. In this point I believe we are at one with that friendly Great Power whose Foreign Minister in a speech recently delivered in Geneva also entered the lists on behalf of this object."

Francis Rajniss:

"Three cheers for Great Britain!" (loud applause).

Minister Kánya (continuing):

"It would certainly be very serious self-deception not to be willing to see that the conflict that has arisen between Italy and the League of Nations contains the seeds of great dangers. Pessimism is beginning to possess all peoples alike; but it is reassuring to see that in this situation — despite the great difficulties in force — practically all States alike are endeavouring to secure the maintenance of universal and of European peace. In this question the decision rests with two leading Members of the League of Nations, France and Great Britain, or rather with the attitude adopted by these two States. In respect of this attitude the French Premier recently made a very interesting and noteworthy statement. He (M. Laval) said that he and his British colleague, Mr. Eden, had always gone hand in hand alike in the Council and before the General Assembly and had always spoken on the basis of a mutual agreement. And he added that both he and Eden desired to continue the work which they had previously too been doing for the maintenance of European peace. He declared further that it was not only his (Laval's) but also Eden's wish and intention to discover the way to a peaceful settlement, naturally within the limits prescribed in the Covenant of the League of Nations. I believe that under such circumstances there is perhaps some justification for the hope, still in evidence in many places — despite the legion of croakers — that notwithstanding the

many difficulties and the grave differences still in existence it will be possible to save Europe from further horrors."

In his reply to the Minister Count Maurice Eszterházy stated that from the Minister's answer he

saw that the Government desired in the future too to secure Hungary's vital interests in the spirit of the provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations and was sincerely anxious to co-operate in the work of maintaining peace.

SIR SAMUEL HOARE AND REVISION

In the reply given by Sir Samuel Hoare, British Foreign Secretary to the French Government's note, we find the following sentence:

"Elasticity is a part of security, and every member of the League must recognize, as the Covenant itself recognizes, that the world is not static."

This was not the first time the same idea had been voiced by Great Britain's present Foreign Secretary. On July 11th., in his speech in the House of Lords, he expressed it in the following words:

"I believe that the strength of the League in Great Britain, just as the strength of the British Parliament, depends upon the amount of public opinion behind it in this country, and on the adaptability of a great institution to a continually changing world. Secondly, I consider the League not from the angle of the past but from the angle of the future. I think much less of what it has done

and what it has failed to do in the last 15 years if it is given a fair chance."

And on September 12th., in his address to the Assembly of the League of Nations, the British Foreign Secretary said:

"The possibility is open, through the machinery of the League, for the modification by consent and by peaceful means of international conditions whose continuance might be a danger to peace."

Elasticity instead of static immobility, the adaptability of the League of Nations to a constantly changing world, and a modification by agreement of the international conditions menacing peace mean, in other words, the same thing as what the revision movement, based on Article 19 of the League of Nations Covenant, insists on and demands. We Hungarian revisionists think we are not mistaken when we recognise a close relationship between Sir Samuel Hoare's trend of thought and our own.

— y —

"THE WORLD IS NOT STATIC"

The "Washington Post" which is closely connected with the State Department published a very remarkable article under the above title in connection with Sir Samuel Hoare's note of 29-th September to the French Government. Because of its theoretical significance we publish it here in full.

"In retrospect it is easy to see that a serious blunder in the drafting of the League of Nations Covenant was the separation of the two articles now found therein as numbers 10 and 19.

Article 10, which had much to do with keeping the United States from League membership, is the one under which „the members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League." Article 19 provides that:

The Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by members of the League of treaties which have become inapplicable and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world.

In the early drafts of the Covenant these two provisions were actually, as they are still logically, complementary parts of a single well-proportioned article. Those early drafts, in fact, made collective action against an aggressor clearly contingent upon coincident procedure to revise treaty settlements which encourage aggression. The desirable balance between the principle of treaty guarantee and treaty revision was clearly emphasized by the italicized phrase in a rejected British draft which read:

The states members of the League undertake, subject to the provisions of Article 22 (now Article 19), to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all states members of the League.

The paramount significance of the British note on League policy, which Sir Samuel Hoare has now delivered to the French Ambassador in London, is that it seeks to reestablish that proportion which was lost when what are now Articles 10 and 19 were separated in the League Covenant. The current British note seeks to emphasize treaty revision as the essential counterpart of treaty guarantee. It points out that no permanent peace can be achieved merely by acclaiming the sanctity of settlements which are as disadvantageous to some nations as they are agreeable to others. In the words of Sir Samuel Hoare: „Elasticity is a part of security and every member of the League must recognize, as the Covenant (Article 19) itself recognizes, that the world is not static."

This British note, in other words, is directed as much to Italy and Germany as to France. It tells Mussolini that if he will hold his hand from aggression in Ethiopia, the British will work under the League aegis for some orderly rearrangement giving sympathetic consideration to Italian expansionist aspirations. Similarly the note tells the Germans—particularly by stressing the difference between „a positive act of unprovoked aggression" and "a negative act of failure to fulfill terms of a treaty" — that Great Britain regards the League as something much more than an instrumentality to uphold the Treaty of Versailles.

The British note will therefore fail to give the French that assurance of automatic support against Germany which Paris desires before lining up solidly with Britain against Italy. But it does provide the more constructive assurance that Great Britain will work for a fundamental solution, rather than a time-serving evasion, of the larger struggle between satisfied and dispossessed nations which really underlies the Ethiopian dispute.

Few would predict that this lead toward a rational

solution of the basic problem will of itself dispel the present electric atmosphere. But it is decidedly and appealingly in line with the original conception of the League of Nations. It is, in fact, a practical extension of the remarks made by President Wilson to the Peace Conference on January 25, 1919, when he said:

Settlements may be temporary, but the actions of the nations in the interests of peace and justice must be permanent. We can set up permanent processes. We may not be able to set up permanent decisions."

HIGH HUNGARIAN DISTINCTION CONFERRED ON BRITISH MP'S.

The Regent of Hungary has conferred upon Sir Robert Gower, British M. P. the Commander's Cross and Star of the Hungarian Order of Merit, and upon Colonel Charles Thomas Russel Moore and Dr. Frederick Llewellyn Jones, British M. P. the Commander's Cross of the Hungarian Order of Merit.

*

Dr. Llewellyn Jones who, as already reported in another column, received the decoration on the occasion of the Tercentenary of the Budapest Peter Pázmány University of Sciences on September 30th, delivered a lecture on "Little Wales and the Great World" in the International Club.

Dr. Llewellyn Jones began his lecture by paying homage to Great Britain's most able diplomat, the Prince of Wales, who had recently spent a few days in Budapest.

He then went on to say that shortly before, when he was visiting the fine museum in Székesfehérvár, some Celtic remains that might have been found in Wales caught his eye. He was pleased to find that the Hungarians knew about Wales, if only from John Arany's beautiful ballad "The Welsh Bards". That ballad, a gem of Hungarian poetry written by John Arany at a time when Hungary was struggling to achieve her independence, is not founded on historical facts; but that is no reason why it should not be considered one of the most beautiful ballads in the whole world of literature. The poet apparently wanted to conjure up an episode in the reign of Edward I — one that mirrored the relations then existing between England and Wales. History tells us that Edward was

anxious to pacify the people of Wales and establish friendly relations between that country and England. To further this end he sent the Queen to the castle of Carnarvon in Wales, in order that her first child might be born on Welsh soil. A son, the first Prince of Wales, was born there in 1248. Since that time there has never been any conflict between the national patriotism of the Welsh and their loyalty to the British Empire. Their attitude might well serve as an example of reconciliation to be followed by certain of the minor nations in Central and Eastern Europe.

Continuing, Dr. Llewellyn Jones said that, even if the League of Nations was not a perfect institution, it still provided the possibility of settling differences in a friendly way. The question of a revision of the peace treaties was a problem of that nature. The victors had dictated the treaties in a spirit of vindictiveness, instead of seizing the opportunity to create a real basis of friendly co-operation among the nations. Dr. Llewellyn Jones was convinced that it was not too late yet for the representatives of the nations to meet in friendly conference and find a way of curing the evils created by the peace treaties. Then Hungary's just demands would be satisfied.

After loud and prolonged applause Mr. Stuart Childs spoke about the Ireland of today. Amongst other interesting things he said that one of the most widely read books of the Irish Home Rule movement, which has now completely subsided, was "The Resurrection of Hungary" by the Irish statesman, Arthur Griffith.

THE NEW BRITISH AND AMERICA HONORARY DOCTORS OF THE BUDAPEST UNIVERSITY

The Budapest Peter Pázmány University of Sciences recently celebrated its tricentenary jubilee. On this occasion the University conferred the degree of Hon. Dr. on several outstanding men of science in Britain and America. Among the 32 Honorary Doctors we find the following Englishmen: Sir Frederick Hopkins Gowland (Cambridge) and Sir Charles Sgenington (Oxford). Americans were Mr. Edwin Borchard and Mr. Harrison Ross Granville (Yale), Mr. Ottmer Manley Hudson (Harvard) and Mr. James Thompson Shotwell (Columbia). The ceremony took place on 28-th September in the aula of the University. On the day before at the jubilee celebrations, held in the presence of the Regent, Admiral Horthy, Mr. A. C. Seward representing the Royal Society of London congratulated the University on its three hundred years spent in the service of science and the search of truth. Those — he said amongst other things — who see the fine city of Budapest lavishly endowed with beauty by Nature, and who remember the thousand years of glorious Hungarian history, know

that Hungary has inscribed her name perpetually in the annals of European history.

*

Dr. Albert Seward, Professor in Cambridge University, Master of Downing College, and Secretary of the Foreign Department of the Royal Society, was also present at the celebrations. During a conversation with the correspondent of the "Pester Lloyd" on October 2-nd the eminent savant spoke with the greatest admiration of the work which has been going on for centuries in Budapest University and of the cultural work in general carried on for a thousand years by the Hungarians in an outpost of western civilization. In his opinion the intellectual strata of British society are definitely on the side of revision, if only because originally the peace treaties were intended merely as a temporary solution providing only for a period of a few years, and also because the profound changes that have taken place in Europe since the close of the war make a general revision of

the treaties seem imperative. Sir Samuel Hoare's recent speech — he continued — suggests the conclusion that the revisionist current observable in British public opinion will before long find its way into the Foreign Office. The cause of Hungarian justice would benefit greatly if, in order to strengthen the links between the two nations, invitations to visit Hungary were sent to as many members of the educated classes in Britain as possible, and if, on the other hand, the

Hungarians would send as many young men — students, writers and journalists — as possible to Britain; then finally if meetings were arranged as often as possible between the leading scholars and public men of the two nations. From this point of view the memorable jubilee of the Budapest University has left an indelible impression in the minds of all who were present, and has been of the greatest service possible to Hungary's cause.

COUNT MAURICE ESTERHÁZY'S STATEMENT AFTER THE LONDON INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION CONGRESS

Count Maurice Esterházy, former Hungarian Prime Minister took part in the Congress of the Interparliamentary Union held in London, and on his return gave an interview to the representative of the "Esti Kurir", a Budapest evening newspaper. As we think his statements are likely to interest our British readers we give them in full underneath. Count Maurice Esterházy said:

"I have just been in England for the twentieth time, and can say that I never met with so great an interest and sympathy for Hungary there as now. Besides the increasing dimensions of tourist travel and the Prince of Wales' visit, I think another reason for this is that the situation in Central Europe closely affects Britain. One of the British delegates to the London Congress of the Interparliamentary Union produced statistics to show that Britain's trade with the Succession States had shrunk to a fraction of what it was in pre-war days, and that even so the Succession States frequently remain in Britain's debt. Economic consolidation in Central Europe has therefore become important from a British point of view. It is gratifying that this fact has been recognised, for the world-wide importance of the Anglo-Saxon race, with its several hundred millions of people, is indisputably, both as a moral and as an economic factor.

One hundred and forty members of some thirty parliaments took part in the Congress. Dozens of ministers in office and ex-ministers were present. We listened to Mr. Chamberlain, Chancellor of the Exchequer, who told us that a return to the gold standard was desirable, but not timely; to M. Paul-Boncour, France's ex-Premier, who spoke of the difficulties attending the enforcement of the claims adjudged to private individuals against States by international arbitration, and how to eliminate them; to M. Hodzsa, Czecho-Slovak Minister of Agriculture, who urged the marketing in Europe of Central Europe's superfluous agrarian stocks, and in a masterly study exposed the present low purchasing power of the agricultural population. We heard of the approaching Canadian and Danish elections, with their currency problem slogans. In a word, the same vicious circle of difficulties and problems that form the axle of our own internal policy today was discussed in the centuries-old building of the British Parliament, in the Metropolis of world trade. Following the usual procedure of international congresses, at the last sitting we accepted the proposals submitted by the sub-committees and drew the attention of the Governments concerned to possibilities calculated to ease the economic crisis. In my opinion the positive value of that week lay in the opportunities of exchanging ideas and views afforded by social intercourse, by official and private invitations. The most impressive official reception was the Lord Mayor's soirée, with 1200 guests, amongst them Mr. Macdonald, ex-Prime

Minister, and the members of the diplomatic corps. We were received by the Lord Mayor amidst old traditional ceremonies in a fourteenth century drawing-room. It took him over an hour to shake hands with the more important of his guests.

As was natural, the agenda of the Congress was supplemented by the Italo-Abyssinian conflict. It was while the Congress was in session that we got news of the first battles. Here I must point out that faith in the League of Nations is very strong in England, both in Church circles and among secular organisations. I had the pleasure of talking to many English people, Churchmen, business men and bankers. All of them declared — as the British Prime Minister has publicly stated — that there is no national hatred against Italy in Britain. The conflict is not between Italy and Britain, but between Italy and the League of Nations. I noticed the same sensitiveness in connection with the League Covenant and the Kellogg Pact as that with which British public opinion reacted to the violation of Belgium's neutrality in 1914. This explains Britain's attitude towards sanctions in the Italo-Abyssinian conflict; on the other hand, however, it follows logically from the British standpoint in the question of collective security that Britain, in the long run, will scarcely go further than France, in the matter of sanctions. It is also perfectly understandable that in the past months Britain has taken no independent steps, but only through the League and for the maintenance of the League. She did not protest when at the beginning of the year Italy and France came to an understanding over Africa, although Italy's expansive ambitions were not unknown to her then. As I see the situation, by the time I left no important French standpoint had crystallised so definitely as the British point of view, but I think the explanation lies in the fact that in two cases — those of Japan and Germany — the League omitted to apply sanctions. It is true that in the case of Germany there was no question of military action.

It is also certain that one part of Abyssinia has not been long under the sovereignty of the Negus, and it is a fact that objections to Abyssinia's election as member of the League of Nations were raised at the time. All this, coupled with the factors of a common frontier, the Mediterranean Littoral, the importance of the Stresa front and mutual interests in the Brenner Pass, explain the welcome development of friendly relations between the present French Government and Italy and the attitude hitherto adopted in Paris.

There is every reason to suppose that Britain will continue to consider that the Italo-Abyssinian conflict is primarily not her own private business, but that of the League, and so — presuming that the present French Government remains in office — we may hope that, although the definition of economic sanctions is loose and well-calculated to lead to con-

flicts at present unpredictable, a European conflagration may yet be avoided.

Many people express the hope that a rapid Italian military advance will make the peaceful settlement of the conflict possible soon without detriment to Italy's prestige. — always supposing, of course, that some unforeseen international incident happening without intention on the part of the Governments or even without their knowledge does not create a *fait accompli* constituting an insult to the British nation. Let us not forget that Britain's present Foreign Secretary is made of firmer and tougher stuff than his predecessor. He gave proof of this in his handling of India. Nor let us forget that for the past 150 years Britain, even if she did lose battles, always managed to win the last one.

And when it comes to peace negotiations that is all that counts. Waterloo would have had another significance coming after Valmy. What struck me as peculiar in both countries — it is true that England is on the eve of general elections — was that the most extreme sanctionists were the very pacifists who had hitherto grudged the sums spent on national defence, but who now, all of a sudden, are ready in connection with the African question to defend peace at the expense of war. Those, on the other hand, who went through all the horrors of the world war protest, especially in France, are against this policy. Mr. Amery, former Colonial Secretary, writing in the

"Times" of October 4-th, declared that the League of Nations was a splendid institution as far as discussion, intercourse and conciliation went, but hardly an effective instrument where the enforcement of compulsory measures was in question. In many respects he was right; for today the League of Nations of which the U. S. A. Germany and Japan have ceased to be members, is no longer what it was meant to be. Shortly ago the Soviet delegate pronounced peace to be indivisible, which implies the danger of war being indivisible too. In a word, instead of collective security we should be reduced to the superchaos of the era of the Flood. To sum up: Although I am filled with anxiety as to what the future may hold, I hope we shall not be swept on to a declivity where the curbing power of commonsense is too weak to avert catastrophe, and that this Europe crippled by the last war will keep away from the brink of a dangerous ravine.

A sober calculation of how we stand as to geographic, economic and political forces will point out the path we must take. The only policy we can pursue in one that, while it does everything to preserve existing links of friendship and sympathy, is careful to avoid taking steps or decisions which might bring us into conflict with an international public opinion shaped by factors over which we have no control."

— y —

REVIVAL OF PAN-SLAVISM

"Prior to the Great War our nation had living cultural connections with those principal nations which today constitute the Soviet Union. These connections arose from a community of language and from blood relationship. We shall never forget what Russian literature in particular meant to us prior to the War; and we cannot but remember the interest we showed in the development of Russian philosophy. In this connection all I have to do is to simply point out the manner in which these connections are mirrored in the great philosophical and literary work of our President Masaryk."

These words were addressed on October 6th. by

Dr. Beneš, Foreign Minister of Czecho-Slovakia, to the Soviet writers and journalists then enjoying the hospitality of Prague. *Mutatis mutandis* practically the same words must have been used by Kramář, the founder of the modern pan-Slav movement known as "neo-Slavism", in the speech in which he toasted the Russian "slavjanophile" visitors to one of the Sokol celebrations held in Prague prior to the Great War. Since that War Dr. Beneš has consistently — for political reasons — turned his back upon political pan-Slavism; but those words of his which are quoted above are eloquent proof that pan-Slavism is not dead.

INTERNAL POLITICAL SITUATION IN RUMANIA

The National Peasant Party and Alexander Vajda's "Frontul Romanesc" are engaged in a concentric attack on Tatarescu's Government. The work of attack is being joined in also by Marshall Avarescu's party and by Gheorghe Bratianu's Liberal Dissidents too. These attacks are the prologue preparing the way for the mass meeting of the National Peasant Party convened to assemble in Bucharest on November 14th., it being proposed to organise a march of 200,000 persons through the streets of Bucharest on that occasion. The Government Party proposes to arrange a demonstration of 300,000 persons for the same day; and the opening of parliament has been postponed till that date. Of the attacks on Government appearing in the anti-Government press special mention is due to the *communiqué* dealing with the meeting of the National Peasant Party held on September 27th., the same declaring that the two years' government by the Tatarescu Cabinet has prejudiced the highest interests of the State, resulting in a catastrophe alike in economic, monetary and financial respects and in an atmosphere of corruption and immorality culminating in the foreign exchange fraud ("Patria", Oct. 1). In

one of his speeches Julius Maniu declared that the aggravation of the domestic political situation was due, not to a struggle between parties, but to the clash of two opposing systems. In a speech delivered at Marosújvár Maniu drew a parallel between the respective political methods of himself and of Tatarescu. He said that Tatarescu proposed to change the constitution so as to enable the king to act arbitrarily, though the Government should be responsible. At a political meeting Avarescu and Gheorghe Bratianu protested vehemently against the censorship and the state of siege. In their opinion the system of government was immoral, seeing that the power had fallen into the hands of traitors and robbers. In a speech delivered at Constanza Tatarescu bitterly attacked Maniu, declaring that the only opposition movement of a constitutional character was that of the Extreme Right (Cuza—Goga parties), and branding the endeavours of Maniu to defend the Constitution as an attempt at extortion.

Titulescu's russophile attitude is provoking protests ever increasing in vehemence. At meetings of the "Frontul Romanesc" held at Dés and Szamosújvár

Vajda spoke rather sharply in condemnation of the Russo-Rumanian military alliance; his criticism being extremely depreciatory and his conclusion being that according to the evidence of history the passing of Russian armies through the territory of Rumania had never done Rumania any good. "Should the Russians enter Rumanian territory", — he asked — "how do we expect them to go out?" Gheorghe Bratianu submitted a question in parliament protesting against the russophile policy and pointing to the serious danger to Rumania latent in that policy. And he spoke to the same purport also at a meeting of his party held at Campolung.

Some of the opposition meetings held in the provinces led to bloodshed. Quite recently, at Măranarossziget, the gendarmes were compelled to use their arms to check the destructive depredations of the crowd. The fate of Government will be decided at

the audiences to be given by the king during the second half of October, the leaders of the Opposition having also been summoned to the same, which are being looked forward to with eager excitement by the whole public life of the country. The anti-minority policy of Government was severely criticised by Dr. Joseph Willer, deputy belonging to the Magyar Party, in the speech to his constituents delivered at Nagyvárad on October 13th. He stressed that the lot of the Hungarian inhabitants had not been so grave even during the first two years after the change of régime is 1920 as it was today, and emphasised the fact that no previous government had so completely flouted the minority rights as that headed by Tatarescu, which desired to utilise the anti-minority atmosphere it was creating for the purpose of distracting attention from the difficulties prevailing in the internal political situation.

VELTCHEV'S SCHEME OF ASSASSINATION

On October 3rd., the anniversary of the accession to the throne of Czar Boris and of the declaration of the independence of Bulgaria, the celebrations usual in other years were replaced by a state of siege. Government was compelled to resort to this measure because steps had to be taken to prevent an attempt on a large scale planned with the object of assassinating the Czar, the members of the Government and a whole host of prominent politicians and military officers. The political group bearing the name of "Zveno", which on May 19th., 1924, availed itself of the assistance of friends in the military league to exploit the cabinet crisis of the time for the purpose of seizing the reins of power by a "putsch", very soon alienated the sympathies of the people by radical reforms which merely aggravated the serious economic conditions then in force; and the people, which was sick of the eternal party squabbles, gladly welcomed the Government formed by Kimon Georgieff. The situation was aggravated by the fact that this political group showed decided republican tendencies. Damian Veltchev, the *spiritus rector* of the Georgieff Government, was anxious to be made President of the Republic at all costs. Thereupon the Bulgarian officers withdrew their support from the Government, which was consequently compelled to yield the power to a new Cabinet. However, the by no means numerous group of republicans refused to abandon their endeavours. Damian Veltchev fled from the country and established himself in Belgrade, where he continued his work. Having convinced himself that his endeavours had not many supporters in the country, he planned a murderous attempt. He designed a notorious assassin of the name of Uzunoff to murder the Czar. At the end of September last he clandestinely

visited Sofia for the purpose of studying local conditions. The attempt was to be made in the Cathedral and in the big square in front of the Cathedral, where the celebrations of the anniversary on October 3rd. were to be held in the presence of the Czar and all the Ministers. However, the authorities were informed in good time of the proposed attempt, the ultimate object of which was a *coup d'état*. Veltchev and the other conspirators were arrested; and they are now awaiting their trial. Only Uzunoff succeeded in evading the vigilance of the authorities. In view of the fact that the origin of the conspiracy could be traced to Belgrade, the Yugoslav Press, instead of hastening to the assistance of the Bulgarian Government in its work investigating the case, made a political affair out of the crime. After the disclosure of the conspiracy the Bulgarian Government issued a statement which was not by any means intended to be an insinuation against the Yugoslav people, as the Yugoslav Press suggested; but Bulgaria cannot be expected when investigating the truth to avoid mentioning a fact relating to something (isolated as that something may be) that did actually happen in Yugoslav territory. On his way back from Geneva the Bulgarian Foreign Minister Kiosseivanov stopped a day in Belgrade, the real object of this visit being to assure the Yugoslav Government that the scheme of assassination cannot in the least dissuade the Bulgarian Government from continuing the friendly relation between their country and Yugoslavia and to inform Yugoslav public opinion how unfounded was the agitation aroused in connection with the unsuccessful attempt. We are reminded of an old proverb — *celui qui crie n'a pas raison*.

HOW MINORITIES LIVE

CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

WHEN APPOINTING MEMBERS OF DISTRICT COUNCILS GOVERNMENT IGNORES THE RIGHTS OF MINORITIES

In terms of the administration law in force now, one-third of the members of the provincial and district

councils are not elected by the population, but are appointed by Government. We have already reported that the last time the members of the provincial councils were appointed the national minorities were completely ignored; the two Hungarian parties were not given any seats. The same thing has occurred again in connection with the appointment of members of the district councils. Although Henlein's Sudeta German Party is not only the largest German party, but also the largest party in the whole Republic, it was simply ignored by the Ministry of the Interior