

# POLITICAL MOSAIC

## THE VISIT TO POLAND OF THE REGENT OF HUNGARY

The visit to Poland in February of Admiral Nicholas Horthy de Nagybánya, Regent of Hungary, and M. Kálmán de Kánya, Hungarian Foreign Minister, and the brilliant festivities arranged in their honour in Cracow, Bielowitz and Warsaw were followed with keen interest by the Press all the world over, so it would be superfluous to give our readers a detailed account of them.

What we consider to have been really the most significant aspect of that brilliant reception is the fact that it was a fresh documentation of the friendship existing between the two countries, a friendship, wellnigh unparalleled in the history of the world, which has lasted undisturbed for centuries, the firm foundations of which rest on a similarity of character, temperament, ideals and customs.

"The complete lack of any antagonistic traits of character and of religious friction, a similarity of development in the spheres of culture and civilization, the identical ideas on questions of personal and national honour entertained by both chivalrous nations, are the factors — said President Moscicki at the banquet given in the Royal Banqueting Hall of the Wavel in Cracow — which have contributed to both nations fulfilling their historical mission in a spirit of deep and reciprocal understanding. In the past joint rulers were frequently the guardians of common ideals and in more recent times several of our statesmen were able to count on the support of a spiritually kindred folk."

These words were a masterly description of the spirit of fraternity existing between the two countries, and they open up a vista of bye-gone centuries to our mental vision. We see Louis, the great King of the Angevin dynasty, upon whose head the crowns of Hungary and Poland rested in the eleventh century. From her tomb in Cracow emerges the figure of Jadwiga, his daughter, the Queen of Poland whose marriage brought Lithuania under the sceptre of the Royal Republic. We conjure up a vision of Stephen Báthory, the Hungarian noble who as Prince of Transylvania was called to the throne of Poland and who in the middle of the sixteenth century gloriously defended that country against Russian despotism, which already then was menacing her independence. Here we must also recall Joseph Bem, the brave

Polish general who, in 1849, defended Transylvania against the concerted action of the allied Austrian and Russian armies; nor must we forget Nicholas Wesselényi and Francis Kölcsey, who in Transylvania and Hungary respectively stood up for the Polish nation at a time when Austria, under whose tyranny Hungary was being crushed, was one of the three Powers that refused to allow Poland to rise again from the grave.

But who could enumerate all the great men in the history of both countries at the mention of whose names the heart of every true Pole and every true Hungarian must beat faster? Many there were, very many, who with manly courage, brotherly conduct and even at the cost of their lives forged links binding the two proud nations to each other for ever.

We say "for ever" wittingly, well aware that in the opinion of the cynical no such word exists in political dictionaries. We use it nevertheless, for we are firmly convinced that no possible change of policy is conceivable that would ever set the Hungarian and Polish nations at enmity. They can never become enemies, if only for the simple reason that they are bound to one another, not only by ties of sentiment, but also by those of mutual interests. For, lurking in the background, the same danger threatens both, and their national aspirations do not clash in any field.

In his toast at the Wavel Admiral Horthy pointed out the practical reality of the interests which have always been a link between Hungary and Poland, and showed how, even in extremely difficult times, Hungary had always managed to find ways and means of showing her friendship for and loyalty towards Poland; and he seized the opportunity to throw into relief the "obvious injustice" done to Hungary. If anywhere in the world, in Poland people must understand that Hungary was but fulfilling obligations imposed by her national honour, when she strove to obtain redress. An outward and visible sign that this was understood was afforded by the inscription in Hungarian on the triumphal arch erected in front of the Royal Palace in Warsaw to welcome Admiral Horthy on his arrival from the shoot at Bielovitz. The inscription was: "Long live the Realm of St. Stephen!"

Everybody in Poland knows that Dismembered Hungary is not identical with the Realm of St. Stephen, and we believe we are not mistaken when we regard that inscription as something more than a mere act of courtesy. It surely implies the ardent wish of both Poles and Hungarian to see the two countries again neighbours with a common frontier stretching along the ridges of the Carpathians, as for centuries they were. An old political proverb has it that "It is the neighbour of my neighbour who is my friend". Well, the history of the relations between Poland and Hungary give the lie to that saying, for the two nations have always sought each other's friendship, not that of each other's neighbours. And their efforts were crowned with success,

for so long as they were neighbours peace and tranquillity reigned in the regions of the northern Carpathians, while now that the Czechs are in possession of the nearer slopes of those mountains, a permanent state of tension prevails — certainly not through any fault of the Poles, who know how to appreciate a good neighbour — in the Valley of the Danube surrounded by their peaks. The peace and tranquillity of the Danube Valley and of Europe as a whole is served by the effort to restore (always by peaceful means) a common frontier between Poland and Hungary. For in the long run it would even be to the interest of the nation now wedged in between them to get rid of the narrow strip of territory dividing Hungary from Poland, which merely represents a superfluous burden to its present owners, who, because their native land lies so far distant from it, are wholly lacking in the experience required for its proper administration. — y —

#### THE HUNGARIAN GOVERNMENT PROPOSES TO INVEST A BILLION PENGÓ: THE GREATER PART OF THIS SUM TO BE APPROPRIATED FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE PURPOSES

On March 5th, at Győr, Dr. Kálmán Darányi, Hungarian Prime Minister, presented his Government's programme. He established the fact that in Hungary the economic improvement had made serious headway. The equilibrium of the public finances had been restored; the buying power of the currency had been preserved intact; there had been a material improvement in the foreign exchanges situation and a vigorous upward movement of our foreign trade; our exports had increased considerably and there had in consequence been a noteworthy advance in the excess of exports. The national income had increased; there had been an improvement in the situation of agriculture, the earning capacity of agrarian production having been restored to its original level; and as a consequence the buying power of the agrarian population had advanced: the work of settlement had begun; and a beginning had been made with the land policy instituted for the purpose of establishing and increasing the number of independent small agrarian existences. The work of industrialisation had developed vigorously, and there had been an increase of the industrial output leading to an increase in the number of hands employed and to a decrease of unemployment. The accumulation of capital had begun and there had been an increase in particular in the volume of savings deposits. The Premier cited statistical data in support of his statements. The development described — he continued — had made it possible for Hungary to pursue "a more expansive and more vigorous economic, social and national defence policy".

The part of the speech made at Győr which is of most importance from the political point of view was that in which the

Prime Minister said that "as a result of the States surrounding Hungary in particular and all the Powers in general having for years past — at exceptionally heavy expense and by means of exceptional investments — increased the strength of their armies and their equipment, it is quite evident that the disproportion existing in respect of the measure to which Hungary is entitled to participate in the race for armaments — a measure by no means ensuring that country security — has increased very much to the disadvantage of our nation." "The development of our National Defence" — continued the Premier — "serves the security of the nation" for which reason he expected the nation to show an even greater willingness to make sacrifices, that being the most suitable way to perfect the development of our national army.

The Prime Minister then announced that the Government had foreseen the expenditure of roughly one billion pengő for the purpose of realising its programme extending over several years, "the grater part of that sum" — he said — "to be utilised indirectly for national defence purposes, and to include the amounts required for air defence purposes too". The sum needed is to be raised as follows — 600 million by a progressive capital levy on fortunes exceeding 50,000 pengő in amount and 400 millions by an internal loan. The investments programme is to cover a period of 5 years.

### KÁLMÁN KÁNYA FIVE YEARS FOREIGN MINISTER OF HUNGARY

Early in February was the fifth anniversary of the day on which M. Kálmán Kánya de Kánya — a statesman with the rich experience of forty years of diplomatic service — took over the control of the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Prior to the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy M. Kánya was one of the most eminent diplomats of Ballhausplatz. In the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the Great War he occupied the delicate position of head of the press department of the Vienna Foreign Ministry; while during the Great War he represented the Monarchy as Minister to Mexico. After the establishment of an independent Hungarian Foreign Ministry he devoted himself and his abilities exclusively to the service of his native land. In his capacity as permanent Deputy Foreign Minister of Hungary he for years stood for stability in the offices overlooking Disz-tér in Budapest; and it is with his name that the organisation of the young Hungarian diplomatic machinery is connected. Later on he was for years Hungarian Minister in Berlin; and then he took over the political direction of the Foreign Ministry. It is to him that is primarily due the continuous advance in weight and authority achieved by Hungary during the five years he has been in office. His cautious circumspection and

foreseeing sagacity — employed by him in his endeavour to further the ideals of his country by the means of "Realpolitik" — have in exceptionally delicate and difficult situations more than once enabled him to render signal service to the peace of Central Europe and of the world at large; while his dynamic foreign policy — rooted in his theory of evolution, not revolution — has at all times been constructive, based as it has been always upon the idea of a universal peace founded on justice which in consequence cannot fail to be lasting. The fact that Kálmán Kánya is today *doyen* of the Foreign Ministers of Europe enjoying general esteem even on the part of his political rivals, is — in this world of kaleidoscopic changes — the best proof of his diplomatic ability.

\*

On the occasion of his jubilee the Hungarian Foreign Minister was interviewed by a correspondent of the "Esti Ujság" (February 17th.). After recalling a few interesting episodes of his diplomatic career, M. Kálmán Kánya made the following political statement of general import:

"Ever since I entered the diplomatic service I have had to devote my energy to a defensive policy. In pre-War days in the interest of Austria; and today in those of Dismembered Hungary. Neither the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy nor Dismembered Hungary can be charged with pursuing an aggressive policy. But the States opposed to us have always pursued an aggressive policy, a circumstance which has driven us to adopt an intensively defensive attitude . . .

"In this respect the situation shows a decided improvement. In the past for a time we pursued a passive peace policy, whereas today we are able to pursue an active peace policy. It is our endeavour to place the security of Hungary — using the term in a different sense from that in which it is so often applied — on firmer foundations. During the last two decades Europe has passed through a critical period; and the situation is not yet by any means cleared up. No one knows whether it will be possible to ensure a European co-operation, or whether — as prior to 1914 — Europe will once more be divided between two groups of Powers? As yet there are no signs of any standstill. But there is no lack of endeavour or of good intentions to that end. The nations do not want war. Perhaps that may allow of our hoping that we may succeed in finding a solution rendering possible — to some extent at least — a co-operation between the States of Europe. Our foreign policy will continue along the same lines with steady consistency, particularly in view of our having already obtained certain results. Today certain States are taking an interest in Hungary which in the past refused to take cognizance of our existence. The absolute reliability of the friendship of Hungary has indubitably contributed very largely to

improving the situation. We have therefore no reason to change our policy, and shall remain what we have always been, — loyal to our friends, appreciative of all good intentions, unswervingly patient in the face of every lack of understanding..."

#### AFTER THE AUSTRO-GERMAN DETENTE...

The agreement arrived at on 12th February between Herr Hitler, *Führer* and Chancellor of the German Reich, and Dr. Schuschnigg, Austrian *Bundeskanzler*, was commented on in the "Pester Lloyd", a daily in close touch on all questions of foreign policy with the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as follows:

"The result achieved on 12th February, so far as we can judge the major implications of the reconstruction of the Austrian Government and the amnesty granted, may, if regarded reasonably and dispassionately, be considered an important step towards peace: it should lead to a lessening of the present well-nigh intolerable tension, and thus have a tranquillizing effect on the whole political situation in the Danube Valley. The nervousness caused in the Capitals of Western Europe by the Vienna report must, if we view the situation calmly and balance the *pros* and *cons* as they affect peace and Europe's real interests, seem exaggerated. One thing, however, is easy to understand: the biting self-criticism displayed. There is no doubt that the Western Powers have been content to play a purely passive rôle in the present developments — and this although the problem was one of their own creating and one in which they have always professed a keen interest. The fact is not to be denied that the two German States, the mighty German Reich and Federal Austria, have come to an agreement by themselves, without the intervention of any agent, great or small. They have arrived at this agreement in a way which does not adversely affect their permanent and major national interests and which — on the same presumption — should also turn out to be a valuable contribution to the cause of European peace. Thus it has been demonstrated that the interference of foreign interests, major or minor, may often merely prove a disturbing factor, and that when statesmen are possessed of firmness and wisdom, valuable results may be achieved even without forcible means or the help of allies and henchmen. We Hungarians can only view the abatement of the tension between the two German States, whose friendship we enjoy, with satisfaction and — with admiration for the results achieved and the powers of statesmanship and human understanding revealed — greet the negotiators with the wish that the path upon which they have entered may lead to the peaceful development of real neighbourly relations between the two German States, each independent of and respecting the other. It is also

to be hoped that the agreement now arrived at may create a permanent framework for these relations. This would be to our interest and also to that of the entire Continent."

— y —

## BRITISH PUBLIC MEN ON THE TREATY OF TRIANON, REVISION AND HUNGARY'S MINORITY DEMANDS

M. Tibor Weber, London correspondent of the "Pester Lloyd", gave a lecture on Hungary at one of the February meetings of the "Near and Middle-East Association". In the course of the debate that followed, Admiral Taylor, M. P. (Conservative) spoke with great appreciation of Hungary's exemplary self-discipline and the moderate trend of her foreign policy. Sir Thomas Moore, another Conservative M. P., declared that the Trianon peace edict had been inspired by a spirit of cruel barbarity and a thirst for revenge and for this reason a revision of the Trianon Treaty was the most urgent condition of peace. Until an equitable revision of that Treaty took place Hungary was in an isolated position, and her further existence was threatened. In his opinion, should Hungary enter into co-operation — however loose — with Austria, it would be easier for her to enforce her demands. It was only after the establishment of such co-operation that Hungary could think of co-operating with the Little Entente in the interest of the economic development of the Danube Valley. According to Sir William Goode, Hungary's political aspirations deserved to be respected more in Britain. Britain should insist on the countries which now trample underfoot the minority treaties fulfilling their treaty obligations. Proceedings of this nature were necessary both through diplomatic channels and through the mediation of the League of Nations. Professor Macartney, the well known writer, also thought it striking that the Powers were bringing pressure to bear on the Rumanian Government on behalf of the Jews and doing nothing to improve the lot of the much larger Hungarian minority. The *pourparlers* begun last summer had been broken off because Rumania refused to give guarantees to the minorities. It was Britain's interest to maintain peace and the *sine qua non* thereof was a respect for the minority treaties ("Pester Lloyd" 16th Feb.).

— y —

## CHAIRMAN OF FOREIGN COMMITTEE OF FRENCH CHAMBER DEMANDS CONCESSIONS FOR HUNGARY

At the February 25th session of the French Chamber, M. Jean Mistler, Chairman of the Foreign Committee, and Senator Anatol de Monzie, expressed opinions which would seem to allow of the conclusion being drawn that certain leading French politicians have revised their views of the Hungarian question.

For M. Mistler expressed a wish that the Chamber should make a study of the concessions to be made to "certain countries which hold that the Peace Treaties were too hard on them". Without going the length of endorsing all Hungary's demands for a restoration of her territorial integrity, M. Mistler asked whether it would not be possible to make partial reparation to Hungary on certain points, as Masaryk himself had thought of doing some years ago.

M. de Monzie said that together with MM. André Maginot, Albert Thomas and Paul Deschanel, he had felt a heavy weight of responsibility at the time the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was cut up. "I still feel ashamed — he said — that at the time I had not the courage to vote against the Versailles Treaty, and I continue to maintain my objections to the Treaties of St. Germain and Trianon, neither of which had the support of my vote. I consider it important to state this here now."

In our next issue we shall return to these statements.

— y —

### DR. KROFTA'S CATCHWORDS

The "Sunday Times" of 6th February contains an article entitled "A New Central Europe Basis of Stability", by Dr. Krofta, Czecho-Slovak Minister of Foreign Affairs. In it Dr. Krofta is forced to admit the mischievous consequences of the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, which was due, in the first place, to Czech propaganda. Thus amongst other things he says:

"The disappearance of the immense Central European block ungeared the whole economic life of its components, which, united before this event, were now forcibly separated. Each of them suffered in varying degree..." He then admits the great losses sustained by Czecho-Slovakia in consequence of this disruption, continuing with these words: — "...several branches of her extremely developed industry were deprived of their markets in the Succession States of the old Monarchy and were thus forced to considerably reduce their output." Dr. Krofta sees the serious obstacle to co-operation which "...the lack of confidence between the States directly or indirectly interested" signifies, yet he is of opinion that "...Closer economic relations between the Central European States must be effected in full agreement with... Germany and Italy". (Later on he includes Russia among the States with interests in the Danube Valley.)

He is fully aware that the political side of the question is of very great importance, but fails to offer any suggestion for a solution of the political problems. For the "pacific co-operation of the Smaller States" advocated by Dr. Krofta is merely a catchword, not a concrete suggestion of any practical value in respect of the solution of the Danube Valley problem.

\*

Major Henry A. Procter, M. P. (Cons) commented on the article of Dr. Krofta in the same paper (on February 13) as follows:

"Dr. Krofta's article, which appeared last week, is of vital interest. I agree that the time has come to raise the problem of a pacific rapprochement among the Danubian States; but I cannot share his views concerning the international situation in that part of Central Europe. Dr. Krofta mentions only three Great Powers as being interested in the Danubian Basin: namely, Germany, Russia, and Italy. But why omit France?

"Historically, attempts at domination began with the inauguration of the post-war policy of France; she destroyed the Dual Monarchy, created the Little Entente, and later induced Czecho-Slovakia to make a pact with Russia. Italian and German interference in the Danube Valley is due solely to that policy. "A new Central Europe" will be possible only when France relinquishes her present course and effectually persuades her allies to settle their economic, political, and territorial differences with the two mutilated central States, Austria and Hungary."

And Mr. Rhys I. Davies, M. P. (Labour) expressed the following opinion:

"Dr. Krofta, Minister of Foreign Affairs in Czecho-Slovakia, has examined in your journal the question of a new Central Europe. It was interesting to note from the Minister of one of the countries mostly concerned that post-war Central Europe is lacking the "basis of stability." Unfortunately, he put forward no constructive ideas; he contented himself by saying that there are serious obstacles in the way, the most serious of which is lack of confidence among the Danubian peoples themselves.

"It was fairly obvious in 1919, when the Treaty was drafted, that not only lack of confidence, but hatred and enmity must follow the mutilation of Austria and Hungary, which, during the ten previous centuries, had together created a very substantial economic unit.

"It is not very helpful, therefore, to speak about collaboration between Austria, Hungary, and Czecho-Slovakia, unless the Austrians and Hungarians who live as minorities under Czecho-Slovakian rule are given what they conceive to be their rights; unless the Slovaks and Ruthenians are given the autonomy promised them in solemn agreements during the World War.

"It must have been foreseen that the great Powers, always tempted to extend their influence, would grasp the opportunity offered by the absence of consolidation in the Danubian countries to try to establish an exclusive domination there,

and it would seem futile now to search for an appeasement without a peaceful modification of the conditions brought about by that Peace Treaty.

"The failure of the different plans (Briand, Tardieu, Flandin) is the best proof that, without a policy of justice, it will always be possible to write about these problems and present plans, but impossible to create a peaceful Central Europe, which is the basis of a closer economic collaboration."

#### ACCORDING TO LORD ROTHERMERE THE FATE OF CZECHO-SLOVAKIA IS SEALED

In February the Viscount Rothermere, the generous and noble champion of the justice of Hungary's cause, gave a Correspondent of the "Pesti Hirlap" a statement which was published in the March 2nd. issue of that journal:

"What is now beginning in Central Europe is at the same time the overture to the fulfilment of the legitimate demands of Hungary. Every one familiar with the question of revision is well aware that the re-acquisition of the Hungarian territories can only be effected in a certain order of succession, — as also that the first Hungarian territory to be recovered will be the Hungarian Highlands!! Czecho-Slovakia's fate was sealed at its birth; and now this fate is approaching fulfilment and that process of purification is beginning which will at the same time adjust the question of the Hungarian territories in conformity with the principles of justice. Tell the readers of the "Pesti Hirlap" that the hour of Hungary's resurrection is coming nearer and nearer; and tell those Hungarians living here in South America and feel that they are in exile that the time is not far distant when they will be able to return to their beloved native land!!"

#### "NO AMOUNT OF WAR COULD PRESERVE THE STATUS QUO IN CENTRAL EUROPE"

Mr. I. L. Garvin wrote in the "Observer" of March 6 as follows:

"Then is it to be war for Czecho-Slovakia? This notion, if anything, is more deluded than the other. It would be a war of foredoomed futility in the vain attempt to preserve a state of things which never ought to have been created by the purblind and botching statecraft of Versailles in 1919. The result is not a national unit, such as soap-box warriors suggest, but a medley ruled by a minority? Shall we fight to maintain the racial ascendancy of the Czechs over a majority of other races — Germans, Slovaks, Magyars, Ruthenians, and Poles? To define such a proposition is to exclude it. The Bohemian Germans in 1919 were promised equality "on Swiss principles". The promise has not been kept. It has got to be fulfilled.

"Czecho-Slovakia — the very name is an artifice — seeing the importance of its German population, will either exist on terms of friendship and co-operation with its mighty neighbour, the Reich, or will not exist. No amount of war for the jerrymandered status quo of 1919 in Central Europe could preserve that status quo. To these test-questions the answer of the British people is "No"; and if the Oppositions stand for the contrary they will be crushed at the polls. 'Because we are not geese', as Palmerston said."

### RUMANIAN IMPERIALISTIC CLAIMS ON CZECHO-SLOVAKIA AND YUGOSLAVIA

A pamphlet by Pimen R. Constantinescu entitled "Rumania and Italy" left the press recently as a publication of the "Curierul", a periodical appearing in Nagyszeben (Sibiu). This pamphlet throws an illuminating light on the ambitions of Rumanian imperialism. Not only is M. Constantinescu dissatisfied with Rumania's post-War acquisition of parts of Hungary, an annexation the injustice of which beggars description; not only does he aspire to further encroachments on purely Hungarian territory; he also lays claim to areas belonging to the other two States of the Little Entente. *Inter alia* he says that the Banate "was divided by the most ridiculous of frontiers", especially around Versec and Fehértemplom, that is to say, he demands the cession to Rumania of territory at Yugoslavia's expense, quite forgetting that Hungary would also have something to say in the matter of the Banate, since it belonged to her prior to 1918, and since the aggregate number of Hungarians and Germans living there exceeds that of either the Rumanians or the Serbs. Then M. Constantinescu objects to the transection of the railway line leading through Szatmár (Satu Mare) and Máramarossziget (Sigethul) and the territory between it and the Visó Valley having allotted one-third of the area of County Máramaros to Czecho-Slovakia, although — as he says — it is inhabited by Slovaks and not by Czechs. He also regrets that the river Tisza does not form the frontier between Czechoslovakia and Rumania. From all this it would appear that Rumanian imperialism lays claim to the part of County Máramaros attached to Czecho-Slovakia, even to the districts belonging to the province of Ruthenia. True as is the Rumanian writer's statement that the area in question is not inhabited by Czechs but by Slovaks, Rumania's claim to it is equally unreasonable, for there are only three Rumanian villages in the whole region and the Ruthenian and Hungarian inhabitants of County Máramaros wish to belong to Hungary and not to Rumania.

There is a certain piquancy, in the following observations of M. Constantinescu: Czecho-Slovakia is the humble creation of

the Peace Treaties... Yugoslavia will never fight against Germany... Prague, which is paying its addresses to Rumania, is on the point of thrusting her into the rapacious arms of Communist Russia... etc. etc.

— y —

## WHY DOES YUGOSLAVIA NOT RATIFY THE CONCORDAT?

The passing of the Concordat Bill last summer aroused a storm of widespread indignation in Orthodox ecclesiastical circles, and also among Serbs in general, which induced M. Stoyadinovitch to postpone introducing the Bill in the Senate. Influenced by the increasing virulence of the attacks on it by its opposers, M. Stoyadinovitch, on 9th October, stated that he would not have the Bill debated by the Senate at all. To this statement Dr. Koroshetz in his exposé of 29th December added that the Government had no intention of concluding a Concordat at all, being of the opinion that the establishment of honest and friendly relations with the Orthodox Church was a matter of greater importance.

But this statement was not sufficient to satisfy the Orthodox Church, so — according to the organ of the Patriarchate, the "Glasnik" (Feb. 8) — the Premier, in a memorandum (No. 2790) dated January 20, announced that the Bill had been taken off the Order of the Day. As, however, even this did not content the Holy Synod, on 1st February M. Stoyadinovitch issued a confidential memorandum (No. 1865), in which he promised that the ratification of the Concordat would not be discussed in Parliament again and that in their negotiations with the Vatican and in the question of the constitution of the Roman Catholic Church the Government would certainly adhere to the principle that all recognized denominations were entitled to equal rights.

After these preliminaries the Holy Synod met in Belgrade on 22nd January. According to the official report of its proceedings, on 6th November the Prime Minister, having been requested by the Synod to make full amends for the events of 19th July (when the police dispersed a religious procession), expressed deep regret on behalf of the whole Government and declared that those civil servants whose guilt in the matter had been established would be punished. Besides this, in a letter dated 1st February, the Premier announced to the Synod that certain officials had been discharged. Thereupon, on 3rd February, the Premier announced to the Synod that certain

officials had been discharged. And, on 3rd February, the Synod demanded the punishment of all responsible persons, no matter what positions they held. The Synod also insisted that Government should cease to prosecute those against whom proceedings had been taken, pay compensation to those who had suffered innocently, ensure the freedom of Divine Service and protect the Church from interference.

In his reply of 3rd February, M. Stoyadinovitch assented to all these demands. On 8th February the Synod accepted the Premier's reply, with the remark that in terms of the constitution of the Church the ecclesiastical courts were the proper authorities to deal with churchmen, while as regards the responsibility of State officials, the Church was content to leave the Administration to do its duty. Regarding financial reparation, the Synod again stated that it expected the Government to find ways and means of discharging that obligation. On 8th February the Episcopal Convention resolved to discontinue the measures taken against the members of the Skupshtina who had voted for the Concordat, as soon as the Administration stopped proceedings against those who had opposed it. Since Government had already proclaimed an amnesty before this resolution was passed, the Synod instructed the bishops of the various dioceses to discontinue the sanctions imposed.

With this the Concordat has been definitively removed from the order of the Day, — a circumstance which in substance signifies a victory for the Pravoslav Church and a defeat for the Government.

\*

According to the "Osservatore Romano" the Holy See on 15th February lodged a protest with the Yugoslav Government because the Concordat was not to be submitted to the Senate for ratification.

— y —

## NO PARTIES IN THE BULGARIAN PARLIAMENT

The Bulgarian parliamentary elections will be held in the first half of March. The Government has extended suffrage to women and also introduced certain modifications in the terms of passive suffrage. At the same time the candidates are enjoined to sign a declaration to the effect that they will not belong to any party and will — as legislators — not serve the interests of any particular party or class. In other words, there

will be no parties in the new Bulgarian Parliament. The Government feels sure that it will obtain a majority in the elections, as it did in the municipal elections of last year. — y —

### THE ANGLO-HUNGARIAN SOCIETY BIDS RETIRING HUNGARIAN MINISTER FAREWELL AT EVENING RECEPTION IN LONDON

M. Constantine Masirevich, Hungarian Minister in London, recently arranged a brilliant reception and concert for Members of the Anglo-Hungarian Society. The new Hungarian String Quartette and Maria Nermi, a Hungarian singer, supplied the programme of the concert.

The distinguished company present included, among others, Lord Londonderry, Sir Robert Vansittart, Mrs. Malcolm Bowes Lyon, Queen Elizabeth's aunt, Lord and Lady Mottistone, Lord Runciman, former President of the Board of Trade, and Lady Runciman, Lord Inverforth, Lord Dickinson, the Countess of Rosebery, Lady Snowden, Lady Sydenham, Mrs. Charles Rothschild, Sir Otto Niemeyer, Director of the Bank of England, Lord Strabolgi, Colonel Sir Thomas Moore, Vice-Admiral Taylor, Capt. Cazalet, Mr. Geoffrey Mander, M. P., Colonel Mason, M. P., Mr. W. Mabane, M. P., Mr. John L. Garvin, Editor-in-chief of the "Observer", Miss Elinor Glyn, the famous novelist, Sir Hugh Allen, Director of the Royal College of Music, etc., etc.

Early in the evening Lord Londonderry, President of the Anglo-Hungarian Society, rose to express the general regret and his sincere esteem and to bid God-speed to the retiring Hungarian Minister, M. Masirevich, who after thirty-three years of signal service was retiring, adding the wish that he might for years to come enjoy the peace and quiet of his well-earned rest. Lord Londonderry said that he regarded it as a great privilege to be President of the Anglo-Hungarian Society. His duties in connection with the post had been rendered particularly light by the zealous support and hearty co-operation he had always received from the Hungarian Minister, — a co-operation which had contributed so effectually to strengthen the traditional friendship existing between the British and Hungarian peoples. He believed that there was no need to artificially cement the ties of friendship between the two nations — no need to improve or expand the relations already existing, — for the whole world was aware of the true and profound esteem and friendship felt for Hungary in Britain and reciprocated by the Hungarian people.

Lord Londonderry's words were greeted with hearty applause.

In reply M. Masirevich, whose voice betrayed his emotion, expressed his gratitude to Lord Londonderry, Lord Mottistone, Sir Thomas Hohler, Sir William Goode and all Members of the Society alike for their understanding support and assistance,

which was primarily responsible for the successful revival of the Anglo-Hungarian Society. The necessity of that revival had been impressed on him as a prime duty by the Hungarian Government two years previously, when he had been entrusted with the representation of Hungary at the Court of St. James'. He was very sorry to leave England, but would avoid melancholy, which is fear of life. Whenever he felt inclined to fall into melancholy, he would remember the title of Lord Mottistone's book, "Fear is Death".

The new Hungarian String Quartette performed pieces by Mendelssohn, Schubert, Hugo Wolf and Dohnányi, their interpretation being a perfect example of artistic abstraction. Maria Nermi sang arias by Saint Saens and Bizet and a few Hungarian songs. Her powerful voice made her singing brilliantly effective.

### ALBANO-HUNGARIAN ROYAL BETROTHAL

The news of the betrothal of King Zog of Albania to the Hungarian Countess Geraldine Apponyi was received with great joy by all social classes in Hungary. The whole Hungarian people feels proud to know that a Hungarian Countess is to become Queen of Albania. This feeling of pride and joy is increased by the numerous historical ties existing between the two countries. We all know of the great national hero of Albania, Skander Beg — George Castriotes —, who fought against the Turks for the liberty of his people side by side with the great Hungarian general, John Hunyadi. By carrying on a victorious campaign against the Turks about the middle of the fifteenth century, these two great national heroes for some time checked the Turkish invasion in its overwhelming march towards the heart of Europe.

Countess Geraldine Apponyi belongs to one of the most ancient and distinguished aristocratic families in Hungary. Her family is a lineal descendant of the Péch-family, one of those that took part in the conquest of Hungary. This family has given many excellent sons to Hungary. The family included, until recently, the great statesman of international repute, Count Albert Apponyi, and Count Alexander Apponyi, who presented the nation with one of its most valuable public libraries. The future Queen of Albania unites in herself most favourably the traditions of Hungarian aristocracy with the best traits of the Anglo-Saxon spirit. Her mother, Gladys Virginia Stewart, is an American by birth, while the Countess herself received an education half Hungarian and half American, having spent most of her school time in America.

— y —