

DANUBIAN REVIEW

(DANUBIAN NEWS)

A REVIEW DEVOTED TO RESEARCH INTO PROBLEMS OF THE
DANUBIAN BASIN

Editorial Board :

ELEMÉR SZUDY
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Dr. ERNEST FLACHBARTH
MANAGING EDITOR

Vol. V. No. 11.

April, 1938.

The Slovak Autonomist Movement
OBSERVATOR

The New Rumanian Constitution and the Minorities
ZSOMBOR SZÁSZ

Hungarians in American History
EUGENE PIVÁNYI

Political Mosaic.

How Minorities Live.

Political Economy.

Sports.

Price 50 Fill.

Subscription one year 6 Pengő.

THE SLOVAK AUTONOMIST MOVEMENT

BY

OBSERVATOR

I.

The events of the past few weeks have thrust Czecho-Slovakia's nationality problems into the foreground of international interest. Second to Austria's union with the German Reich, what chiefly concerns the Western Powers today is the fate of the Czecho-Slovak Republic, and in the West the conviction is spreading that, should Czecho-Slovakia fail to solve the Sudeta German question, and her minority problems in general, the disintegration of that new State cannot be long deferred.

In the last issue of this review we published an article of very actual interest on the Sudeta German question from the pen of Dr. Andrew Moravek. From the point of view of international politics that question is undoubtedly Czecho-Slovakia's most burning nationality problem; but it is not her only one. There are others equally grave: the problems of the Magyars, Slovaks, Ruthenians and Poles. More than ever before, in the present circumstances it is incumbent upon this paper to keep its readers informed of all the aspects of the situation. We have decided to open a series of articles with one on the Slovak problem, partly because a number of reports on the lot of the Hungarian minority are to be found in previous issues, but also, and chiefly, because even to a greater extent than the Sudeta German question, that of the Slovaks is shaking the very foundations of the Republic.

The foundations of the Czecho-Slovak State, as we know, rest on the theory of Czecho-Slovak "national" unity, that is to say, on the fiction that the Czechs and Slovaks are merely

two branches of the same tree. We have repeatedly pointed out that Slovak and Czech are not identical tongues: the evolution of the two languages in their literary form has progressed along widely divergent lines. The customs and costumes of the two peoples also show fundamentally different characteristics. In the course of their symbiosis with the Austrians, the Czechs in many respects grew to resemble the Germans, while the Slovaks, whose development until 1918 had taken place within the framework of the Hungarian Kingdom, adopted the forms of Hungarian life and Hungarian society. Their view of life also differs from that of the Czechs: the latter are materialists and rationalists, the Slovaks idealists and of a romantic disposition. But more important than these differences is the fact that the Slovaks feel that they are a separate nation with a different political consciousness. The most typical manifestation of that feeling is to be found in the Slovak Autonomist movement, which dates back already ninety years. Namely, although the struggle for autonomy has been waged with greater *verve* since 1918, in which year the Czechs took possession of Slovakia, the idea itself was first propounded by Slovak nationalists in pre-War Hungary. Let us therefore first cast a glance over the development of the Autonomist movement prior to 1918.

The first political manifestation of the idea took the form of a petition adopted by a popular meeting held on loth May 1848 at Liptószentmiklós (Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš). The men mainly responsible for its adoption were Louis Štur, Joseph Miloslav Hurbán and Michael Hodža, the three leaders of a then youthful Slovak nationalism. This meeting at Liptószentmiklós took place a few weeks after Ferdinand V of Hungary (the first Austrian Emperor of that name) had ratified, on 11th April 1848, the laws which laid the foundations of modern political Hungary and amongst other things established the Government's responsibility to Parliament and liberated the serfs.

The most important of the fundamental principles contained in the Liptószentmiklós petition were as follows: The Hungarian Parliament must be reorganized so as to allow every nationality in the country to be represented, and

the representatives of the nationalities should not merely have the right, but should also be compelled, to address Parliament in their respective mother-tongues. Besides this, the petition demanded the organization of a separate national assembly for each of the different nationalities, which should deal, not only with the affairs of the nationality in question, but also with those of the whole country. These national assemblies were to have determined the ethnic frontiers, and to do so in such a manner as to prevent the Slovaks oppressing the Magyar minority within their ethnic borders and vice versa. The petition demanded the use of the mother-tongue of the inhabitants in the county administration, and in the sphere of education it went so far as to lay claim to a Slovak university. Another demand worthy of note was that Slovakia should have a red and white flag to be recognized as the symbol of the Slovak nation.

The petition of Liptószentmiklós — which demanded autonomy for Slovakia within the framework of the Hungarian State, and was therefore far removed from any conception of union with the Czechs — was acutely at variance with the Liberal ideas providing the motive power of the period, ideas opposed to the autonomy of nationalities; and, of necessity, its drafters found themselves in conflict with a Hungarian Government professing Liberal views. Very shortly we find these men in the service of the absolutistic Vienna Government and making repeated attempts under the leadership of officers of the Imperial Army to invade Hungary with troops recruited in Vienna and Prague, since they were unable to induce the large masses of Slovaks to follow them. At the time most of the Slovaks were fighting against the Austrians in Louis Kossuth's army, which was but natural, since it was Kossuth who had emancipated the Slovak peasants from the bonds of serfdom, and supporting him meant defending the achievements of 1848. It throws much light on the prevailing mood of the Slovaks of that age that almost one-fourth of the Hungarian national defence army was recruited from them, so that more than a proportionate number of Slovaks took part in the Hungarian War of Independence in 1848/49.

When that war came to a disastrous close, Hungary

was incorporated in Austria, and the administration of the country was remodelled on the pattern of Vienna centralism. Vienna, definitely opposed to any form of autonomy, refused to grant even to Slovakia the autonomy demanded by Štur, Hodža and Hurbán, the men who had served Austria. It was only when, following the Patents of October 1860 and February 1861, the Hungarian Parliament had again been convened, that the Slovak nationalists attempted to press their demands anew, and at a meeting held in Turócszentmárton (Turčianský Svätý Martin) on 6th June 1861 carried a resolution to issue a memorandum containing the following principles. Slovakia should form a separate administrative district (*okolia*) the official language of which should be Slovak. In the matter of linguistic rights this memorandum went farther than the resolution of Liptószentmiklós, for the autonomists now demanded those rights for the Slovak language enclave in the Magyar ethnic area. In the sphere of education, on the other hand, they were more modest and would have been satisfied with a Slovak Academy of Law and Slovak Chairs in the Hungarian universities.

John Franciscy, one of the drafters of the Turócszentmárton memorandum, heading a delegation, submitted it to the Presiding Committee of the Hungarian Parliament; then after the dissolution of the Parliament, Moyses, Bishop of Besztercebánya (Báňská Bystrica), laid it before the Emperor Francis Joseph — naturally without result. Here we must lay stress on the point that the leaders of Slovak nationalism at that time too wished to achieve autonomy (which no longer meant legislative powers, but merely administrative self-government) within the framework of the Hungarian State and entirely independent of the national ambitions of the Czechs.

From 1861 to 1918 no more was heard of the idea of Slovak autonomy; it had vanished from the political programme of the Slovaks. After the Compromise of 1867, the followers of the men responsible for the petition of Liptószentmiklós and the memorandum of Turócszentmárton (the so-called Slovak National Party or the Turócszentmárton Group) confined their demands to an insistence on the

linguistic rights of the Slovak nation and later, in the seventies, they ceased to play an active rôle in politics. The Slovak National Party continued to dream vague Panslavistic dreams, but the great majority of the Slovaks were thoroughly content to be loyal subjects of the Hungarian national State. And when at the beginning of the present century Masaryk's Slovak students — the so-called "Hlasists", named after their periodical the "Hlas" — broke away from the passive attitude of their fathers and provided the Slovak National Party with a new programme, no mention was made in it of autonomy. For they knew that no political success was likely to be gained with the slogan of autonomy among a Slovak people the majority of whom, as we have said, were loyal adherents of the Hungarian national State.

II.

It was not until the Great War that the idea of an autonomous Slovakia was broached again. On October 15th, 1915, the following agreement was concluded in Cleveland, Pa., by the Czech National Alliance and the Slovak League of America: —

"We desire a union of the Czech and Slovak nations in a federal alliance of the States, Slovakia to have her own complete national autonomy and Parliament, her own administration of State and complete cultural liberty —, this meaning the full use of the Slovak language —, as well as her own financial and political administration employing Slovak as the official language."

The Cleveland Agreement served as basis also for the Pittsburgh Convention concluded on May 30th, 1918, the signatories to this latter agreement including, besides the organisations referred to above, the Alliance of American Czech Catholics. The Pittsburgh Convention was signed, among others, also by G. Thomas Masaryk (who subsequently became first President of the Czecho-Slovak Republic), Vojta Beneš, brother of the present President of the Republic, and M. Pergler, the first Czecho-Slovak Minister to Japan. In his Memoirs Dr. Masaryk admits that the reason why he signed the Convention was his desire to re-assure the Slovaks of America, who "were dreaming of God knows what sort of

autonomy". From what M. Masaryk says we may therefore conclude that the Czechophile Slovaks of America themselves felt rather anxious concerning the probable future political status of their racial kindred at home, if they were included in the Czecho-Slovak State which it was proposed to establish; and the circumstance that in the following months they both morally and materially supported the movement started for the organisation of a Czecho-Slovak State was due primarily to their presuming that their racial kindred living in the old country would be given complete autonomy.

The text of the famous document in question runs as follows: —

"We approve of the political programme aiming at the union of the Czechs and the Slovaks in an independent State consisting of the Czech provinces and of Slovakia.

"Slovakia shall have her own separate public administration, Parliament and courts of law.

"The Slovak language shall be the official language in the schools and offices and in public life generally.

"The Czecho-Slovak State shall be a republic and its Constitution shall be democratic.

"The organisation and co-operation of the Czechs and Slovaks living in the United States of North America shall be strengthened and adjusted respectively by agreement as required by conditions and by any change that may ensue in the situation.

"The elaboration of the detailed measures relating to the machinery of the Czecho-Slovak State shall rest with the liberated Czechs and Slovaks and their legitimate representatives respectively."

The Pittsburg Convention is not an international treaty in the sense of that term as defined in international law; for treaties of that kind cannot be concluded except by States or formations of the character of States, not by popular organisations. On the other hand, however, it is indubitable that this Convention was one of the documents forming the political pillars upon which the Czecho-Slovak State was erected. For the Czechs to deny its binding character is equivalent to a flouting of the principle of the sanctity of a given word. The Czechs nevertheless do deny the binding force of the Pittsburgh Convention, the arguments adduced by them being wholly or at least in part quite childish. Here these arguments are: —

a) The day on which the Convention was concluded — May 30th, 1918 — was a *Memorial Day*, on which according to the laws of the United States no contracts may be made. This argument is really childishly ridiculous; for the Pittsburgh Convention was not a contract in civil law, but a solemn political document not subject to the rules of civil law.

b) Equally ridiculous is the argument to the effect that the Statutes of the American Slovak League had not yet — on May 30th, 1918 — been ratified by the American authorities, the approval of the latter having been obtained only in the following year. State documents and revolutionary manifestos are not usually issued as provided in the laws of association.

c) More serious in character is the argument that the Slovaks of America, some of whom were already American citizens, had not been entrusted by the Slovaks of the old country to make any statement in their name. However, this is a point to adduce which no right whatsoever can be claimed by the Czechs, who threw themselves on the moral and material support of the Slovaks of America and who are therefore in duty bound under all circumstances to keep their word irrespective of whether the Slovaks of America had received a mandate from the Slovaks of the old country or not. For, even presuming that the Slovaks of America had not received any such mandate, all that follows is that the manifesto in question is a one-sided declaration on the part of the Czechs, whose given word is even then binding on them. Now, though it is true that the Czech National Alliance of America and the Alliance of American Czech Catholics were just as little qualified to speak in the name of the Czechs of Bohemia; but it was certainly in the name of the latter that the Convention was signed by G. Thomas Masaryk. The Czecho-Slovak National Council — immediately upon the establishment of the new State — had declared to be binding all agreements concluded by Masaryk in foreign countries. It follows, therefore, that the Pittsburgh Convention is binding on the Czecho-Slovak State, not only morally but in public law too, and the only people entitled to adduce the present argument are we Hungarians, seeing that it proves that, not being in possession of any mandate given them by the Slovaks of the old country,

the Slovaks of America had no right whatsoever to conclude an agreement relating to the establishment of a Czecho-Slovak State and that in consequence the Pittsburgh Convention cannot be accepted as an act whereby the Slovak people exercised its right of self-determination in favour of the Czecho-Slovak State.

d) The argument adduced by the Czechs to the effect that by virtue of the declaration made at Turócszentmárton on October 30th, 1918, — which decided in favour of a union of the Slovaks and the Czechs —, and also of the circumstance that they voted for the 1920 Czecho-Slovak Constitution, the Slovaks renounced the autonomy guaranteed them under the Pittsburgh Convention, will not hold water either. For the declaration of Turócszentmárton was passed by a group of people assembled at random who had not been entrusted by the Slovak people to make any statement on its behalf. Of the 105 persons attending the meeting 58 were recruited from the small township of Turócszentmárton and the immediate vicinity. 74 were Protestants and only 31 Catholics, though more than 80% of the Slovaks belong to the Catholic Church. The whole of East Slovakia was represented by only *two* "delegates" — those two delegates being also Western or rather Middle Slovaks. Not only did the Slovaks of East Slovakia absent themselves from the Turócszentmárton meeting; they actually adopted a decided attitude against the Czecho-Slovak Republic when, at Kassa (Košice) on December 4th, 1918, they declared the independent Slovak Republic. And the other elements of the population of Slovakia — the Magyars and Germans — also made it quite clear that they did not wish to belong to the new State.

The Slovaks who approved and voted in favour of the Czecho-Slovak 1920 Constitution had not received any mandate from the Slovak people. At the so-called "revolutionary national assembly" which voted the said Constitution the Slovaks were represented, not by men elected by the people, — as were the Czechs —, but by persons appointed by the Prague Government. Consequently those Slovaks who voted for the Czecho-Slovak Constitution represented, not the Slovak people, but the Prague Government. It should

be noted, further, that Monsignor Andrew Hlinka, who was then and is still leader of the Slovak Autonomist movement, was at the time under arrest at Podoly. There can therefore be no question of any legal or legitimate representatives of the Slovak people having renounced the autonomy guaranteed under the Pittsburgh Convention.

In this connection it must be pointed out that some of the persons taking part in the Turócszentmárton meeting referred to above on October 31st, 1918, passed a resolution to the effect that the relations between Czechs and Slovaks should be definitely adjusted by an agreement to be concluded ten years later. This resolution is popularly known as the Turócszentmárton "*secret clause*" — being called so because in the chaotic situation then prevailing it was never put into writing, there not being indeed any minutes recording it. However, the evidence given in the big political trial in which Koza Matejov and Vojtech Tuka were indicted leaves no doubt whatsoever that such a resolution was actually voted and passed. The group then assembled at Turócszentmárton — at that time still unanimously supporting the Czechs — knew nothing of the Pittsburgh Convention, which did not become known to the Slovaks until later, when they were informed of its existence by Monsignor Siška, one of the signatories who had returned from America; but they felt instinctively that the Slovaks were in danger from the Czechs and for that reason thought it necessary to postpone the definitive adjustment of the political status of the Slovaks to a later period. The jealous care with which the authors of the Turócszentmárton declaration stressed the independence of the Slovak nation may be seen from the original text of the declaration itself, point 2. of which demanded the right of self-determination, not for the Czecho-Slovak, but for the Slovak nation and postulated that the Slovaks should be independently represented at the Peace Conference. The original text of the declaration was however arbitrarily modified by M. Milan Hodža, the present Prime Minister, who had arrived from Budapest on October 30th, 1918, and later went to the compositors' room and "corrected" the text — the result being that the present "amended" text speaks of the right of self-determination of

the "Czecho-Slovak nation" and the paragraph relating to the representation of the Slovaks at the Peace Conference has been omitted. Protests against the "amendments" were lodged by Matthew Dula, chairman of the Turócszentmárton meeting, Joseph Škultéty, the eminent Slovak *savant*, and Samuel Zoch, who later became an Evangelical Bishop. All these facts show, therefore, that the history of the origin of the Turócszentmárton declaration does not by any means endorse the argument adduced by the Czechs to the effect that at Turócszentmárton the Slovaks renounced their autonomy: on the contrary, they prove that the declaration was based upon the idea of the independent individuality of the Slovak nation, — as may be seen also quite clearly from the history of the Slovak national movement with which we have dealt above.

What is then the reason why the Czecho-Slovak régime refuses to entertain the idea of Slovak autonomy? The answer to this question was given by Laurence Srobár — the first Czecho-Slovak plenipotentiary Minister of Slovakia — in a letter addressed by him to the American Slovak League which *inter alia* gives us the following information:

"In accordance with the Convention of Pittsburg Slovensko ought to be given a legislature of its own. Let us consider this soberly. Slovensko has about 3 million inhabitants, of whom 1,600,000 are Slovaks, 250,000 Jews, 500,000 Ruthenians, 155,000 Germans and more than 500,000 Magyars. If the Slovak legislature had 300 members, 22 would be Jews, 50 Ruthenians, 15 Germans, and 53 Magyars, so that 140 non-Slovaks would opposed to 160 Slovaks. But the majority of these latter would consist of the so-called "Slovak Octobrists". The Slovaks would have a majority of 20, but this would not be a majority with which the government could be carried on even for four-and-twenty hours. Let us not forget the large number of the Hungarian intelligent classes; nor that Slovensko is overrun with Magyars, and "Magyarones". Can we suppose that not a single Slovak elector will vote for a Magyar or "Magyarone"? Would this be possible at the present day? Has the Slovak nation awakened in these eight months to the fact that it must vote only for Slovaks?! Do our people know who is a Slovak and who has gone over to the other side? There are counties (Bars, Hont, Nógrád, Abauj, Zemplén, Szepes, Sáros etc.) in which there is not one loyal Slovak whom we could entrust with the leadership of the people.

Imagine a Slovak National Assembly where no Slovak member may miss one sitting! And imagine one with an opposition of 140 members! — not a Slovak opposition, but one composed of alien members. Could this be called a Slovak National Assembly? It would rather resemble a pot-house in which the guests are quarreling over their cups."

The above letter shows quite clearly that the Czecho-Slovak régime thoroughly mistrusted the idea of Slovak autonomy already during the Peace Conference. This fact is proved even more clearly by the evidence given in June, 1929, at the trial of M. Tuka, by Dr. Milan Ivánka, the confidential agent of the Czecho-Slovak Government, who said that the very first session of the autonomous Slovak Diet would have decided in favour of adherence to Hungary, that being the reason why autonomy could not be granted to Slovakia.

We have been compelled to deal exhaustively with the above points because the Czechs have resorted to every form of quibbling and quiddity for the purpose of undermining the principles underlying the Slovak Autonomist movement, although — as may be seen from what has been said above — the first Head of the Czecho-Slovak State undertook an obligation to grant the Slovaks autonomy — an obligation the binding force of which the Czechs deny because they are well aware that the Slovaks — and indeed the whole population of Slovakia — in the event of a realisation of that autonomy would put an end to the system which would fain regard Slovakia as a Czech colony.

And now let us see the development of the Slovak Autonomist movement during the past two decades.

III.

In the December of 1918, the Slovak Autonomist movement became organized as a political party. Andrew Hlinka, parish priest of Rózsahégy, founded a Slovak People's Party, Catholic in character, and welded together to the present day, not only by the personality of Hlinka and the Catholic faith of its members, but above all by the desire for autonomy. The organization of the Party was facilitated by the anti-Catholic behaviour of the Czech troops and

Czech officials, who destroyed or desecrated numerous sacred images and statues of saints and treated the ethical principles and traditions of the Slovak nation with a complete lack of tact. The forward impulse of the Autonomist movement was accelerated when Mgr. Šiška, a Slovak Catholic priest from America and one of the signatories of the Pittsburgh Convention, who was on a visit to his native land, acquainted the Slovaks at home with the contents of that document.

By the summer of 1919 the dissatisfaction of the Slovaks had reached such a pitch that Andrew Hlinka and Francis Jehlička, a former university professor, who had been elected member of the Budapest Parliament in 1906 on the Slovak Nationality Party's list, left for Paris to lay the wishes of the Slovaks before the Peace Conference. Beneš, then Czecho-Slovak Minister of Foreign Affairs, induced the French Government to express a wish that these men should leave Paris, but by that time they had been successful in getting their memorandum handed to certain members of the Peace Conference. In that memorandum they demanded political autonomy, a national assembly, a separate government and administration and full liberty of conscience for the Slovaks, and as proof that these were the wishes of the entire Slovak people, they asked for a plebiscite in Slovakia — a plebiscite to be conducted under the protection of Entente troops and not under a Czech reign of terror.

Francis Jehlička never returned to Czecho-Slovakia; to-day he is still in exile, and is the leader of the Slovak exiles. Hlinka, on his return, was imprisoned on 8th October, 1919, by the Czech Government, first in Mirov, from whence he was later transferred to Podoly, and was also deprived of his seat in Parliament. For eight months he languished in gaol, until, at the Parliamentary election of April, 1920, he won a seat and with it indemnity. On his release he devoted redoubled energy to the organization of his Party, and although for the time being it remained in the Czech People's Party under the leadership of Šrámek and thus in the Government Coalition, it never ceased to demand autonomy in the most spirited manner. Even at that date the propaganda of

the Slovak People's Party was considered so dangerous to the Government that on 10th October, 1920, Czech gendarmes opened fire on a popular meeting arranged by the Party at Námesztó (Namestor), killing two and wounding five persons. In the autumn of 1921 the Party abandoned the Czech People's Party and the Government Coalition and went into Opposition.

As we know, the Czecho-Slovak Constitution framed in 1920 was based on the principle of centralism and it divided Slovakia, like the rest of the Republic, into so-called *Župas* (large counties), at the head of each of which a *Župan* (Sheriff) appointed by the Government was placed. The self-governing councils of these counties were made so incompetent to deal with political affairs that they were forbidden even to discuss politics. The old counties with a past extending back over centuries which had been the strongholds of autonomy, were done away with, a measure which evoked a storm of protest, not only from the Hungarians and Germans of those parts, but also from the Slovak inhabitants. The protest of the population against the dissolution of the ancient County of Szepes, for instance, was signed by all the Slovak villages in the County. To add to the dissatisfaction already rife, martial law, a military dictatorship and a system of preliminary censorship prevailed in Slovakia up to 1923. When they were abolished the *Župa* system was introduced but only in Slovakia, and not in the so-called historical provinces. Slovakia was the experimental „guinea-pig“. Prague refused to hear of Slovak autonomy; on the contrary, under the auspices of Czech centralism the Government abolished Slovakia's authorized Ministry, the work of which had in any case been thankless. Czech officials began to pour into Slovakia in ever increasing numbers, and in economic matters the Government discriminated against this territory in favour of the historical provinces, all of which measures merely served to augment the intensity of the Autonomist movement.

One of the first manifestations of the Slovak People's Party's policy as an Opposition was the Autonomy Bill introduced in Parliament on 27th January. The main principles set forth therein were as follows:

Slovakia's domestic affairs shall be administration, education, religion, commerce, justice, agriculture, public works and public welfare and the financial matters connected with these affairs. In these domestic affairs Slovakia shall have legislative, executive and juridical powers. The organs of self-government shall be the National Assembly and the Provincial Government responsible to it. Domestic affairs shall pertain to the sphere of authority of the Slovak National Assembly. Slovak shall be the official language in Slovakia. The 'common' affairs of the Republic shall be the army, foreign affairs, transport, public law and the election of the President, with the financial matters connected with these affairs. One-third of the Common Ministers shall be residents of Slovakia, as shall be also one-third of all officials employed in the offices dealing with the common affairs of the Republic, and their appointments shall be distributed so that only Slovaks are employed in Slovakia and only Czechs in the other provinces. In the Prague central offices the number of officials with domiciliary rights in Slovakia shall correspond to the percentage of Slovaks in the State. The official language and the language of command in the regiments recruited in Slovakia shall be Slovak. In times of peace Slovak regiments shall be stationed solely in Slovakia and the Czech regiments in other parts of the Republic.

Shortly after this Bill was introduced the Party delegated Andrew Hlinka and Professor Tuka to lay the demands of the Slovak nation before the Conference of Ambassadors at Genoa. Owing to difficulties made about their passports, they were not able to reach Genoa, but they managed to have the memorandum of the Party submitted to the Conference. At a congress of the Party held on 2nd and 3rd August 1922, in Zsolna (Žilina) a memorandum entitled "The appeal to the Civilised World of the Slovak nation doomed to extinction" was issued, demanding the enforcement of the provision of the minority treaty of St. Germain which required the Republic to reconcile the Czecho-Slovak Constitution with the fundamental principles of liberty and justice and to ensure these rights to every citizen of the State. In respect of autonomy all the Party asked was that

a freely-elected Slovak Parliament should freely decide the relation between the Czech and the Slovak nations. A year later, at the end of June, 1923, when at Paris the Eucharistic Congress was in process, Tuka on behalf of the Party approached the Council of Ambassadors with the appeal that they should enforce the treaties guaranteeing the Slovak nation the right of self-determination.

The cry of distress of the Slovaks fell on deaf ears in the international tribunals; but the struggle for autonomy went on at home with unabated zeal. The hatred felt in Czech circles for the Slovak movement was so great that not only were numerous nameless heroes of the movement arrested, but, on 29th September, 1925, Czech legionaries even swooped down on a popular meeting arranged by the Party in Kassa (Košice), killing one Slovak autonomist and wounding many. Since 1921 the Protestant Slovak Party has also taken a part in the struggle. One of its leading men, Louis Bazovsky, who after the occupation of Slovakia was appointed *Župan* of Nőgrád (Novohrad) by the Czech Government, but who soon came to realize the danger threatening the Slovaks from the Czechs, very energetically opposed in his newspaper the predatory economic policy of the Czechs in Slovakia.

Here mention must be made of a letter written at the beginning of 1925 by Hlinka to Ignatius Seypel, then Chancellor of Austria. In this letter it was pointed out that in all the Peace Treaties the name of the Republic was written with a hyphen, — Czecho-Slovakia —, that meaning that Slovakia's equality was recognized; and that in terms of the resolution of Turócszentmárton the system inaugurated there was not binding on Slovakia beyond 31st October, 1928. This letter was not allowed to be published and ever since then any newspaper attempting to write the name of the Republic with a hyphen has always been confiscated by the censor.

At the Parliamentary elections in 1925 the Slovak Autonomist movement achieved a great success, but nevertheless in 1927 the Slovak People's Party decided to take office in a bourgeois Cabinet formed of a coalition of Czechs, Germans and Slovaks under the leadership of Svěhla. The

price was a recognition of Slovakia as a self-governing unit. Thus came into being the Administration Act of 1927, in terms of which Slovakia, like Bohemia, Moravia (including Silesia) and Ruthenia, was declared a province and the system of the *Župa* (greater county) which — as before stated — had been introduced only in Slovakia, was abolished. It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that this meant a step forward on the road to autonomy. The only difference between the old system and the new was that the authority previously exercised by the six greater counties was taken over by the province, the representative corporation of which, however, is not permitted to discuss politics. In fact self-government suffered a reverse by the change, for in terms of the new Act one-third instead of one-fourth of the members of the Provincial Council are now appointed by the Government. Besides, many provisions of the Act serve to increase the power of a bureaucracy mainly in Czech hands.

Coalition with the Government, however, did not prevent the Slovak People's Party from continuing to insist on autonomy. On 1st January, 1928, a notable article entitled „*Vacuum juris*” appeared in the „Slovak” from the pen of the learned Professor Tuka, who was member of the Czech Parliament and Vice-Chairman of the Slovak People's Party. In this article it was set forth that if autonomy were not granted by 31st October, 1928, — the 10th anniversary of the resolution of Turócszentmárton —, a state of *ex lex* would arise in Slovakia. This article was the ultimate cause of Tuka's arrest on 2nd January, 1929, and the reason why he was sentenced to 15 year's penal servitude in the following October. Immediately after this inhumanly cruel sentence had been passed, the Slovak People's Party abandoned the Government Coalition and went into Opposition, in which it has remained to the present day. The Supreme Courts confirmed Tuka's sentence, and it was only in the spring of 1937 that this martyr of the Slovak Autonomist movement was released from prison. He did not, however, regain complete liberty, for he is now confined at Pilsen.

Although the sentence passed in the Tuka trial for a

time paralysed the Slovak Autonomist movement, we find the Slovak Autonomists nevertheless in full activity again by 1931. At the 1931 general meeting of the "Slovenská Matica" Mgr. Hlinka and his followers compelled this important Slovak cultural association to make a change in its management, the latter having — under the pretext of "a reform of Slovak orthography" — encouraged endeavours aiming at smuggling into the Slovak literary language Czech orthography and in general certain Czech forms.

The economic crisis then in full swing which had destroyed the remnants of Slovak industry and mining which had been left in existence by the Czech policy of depredation operating with the catchword "de-industrialisation of Slovakia", contributed also to intensify the Autonomist movement. Louder and louder — more and more energetic — became the demand for a suspension of the economic inequalities (differentiation in respect of taxation, railway tariffs unfavourable to Slovakia, no Slovaks admitted to the big economic institutions of the State, the ignoring of that province in connection with State investments, etc., etc.) which had been employed in the service of the economic policy of Prague as means of inflicting losses on the population of Slovakia. In his address delivered in the Prague "Karolinum" on November 25th, 1932, Mgr Andrew Hlinka was impelled to refer to the far more favourable treatment in economic matters which Slovakia had received at the hands of the Hungarian régime. The Slovaks then began to watch more closely the treatment of the sons of Slovakia in connection with the allotment of posts in the State and other public services; and after the joint meeting of the two parties held at Trenčsénteplic (Trenčianské Teplice), an increasingly intensive part was taken in the struggle for autonomy also by the Slovak National Party, whose leader was the eminent Slovak poet Martin Rázus, now deceased.

When in 1933, after the coming into power of Herr Hitler, the Sudeta Germans were also swept off their feet by the nationalist tendency, this circumstance naturally affected the other non-Czech nationalities of Czecho-Slovakia too and the Slovaks too were swept off their feet. At the celebrations held at Nyitra on August 15th, 1933, in com-

memoration of Pribina, the legendary prince of Slovakia of the tenth century, — celebrations at which a large number of foreign prelates and diplomats were present too — the masses of Slovak Autonomists had their own way and forced the Prime Minister, M. Malypetr, to yield precedence to Mgr. Andrew Hlinka, whom the Czech authorities had been determined at all costs to prevent from speaking at all. This fiasco — which became a world sensation — combined with the "radicalisation" of the Sudeta Germans, prevailed upon the Prague Government to have recourse to the policy of the "mailed fist" in its treatment of the discontented non-Czech nationalities (and therefore of the Slovaks too).

The first manifestation of this policy was the arrest of Louis Bazovszky — who, in the columns of the "Národné Noviny", had spoken of the revision of the treaties of peace as a "categorical imperative" and at a meeting held at Besztercebánya (Báňská Bystrica) had protested in advance against the idea of the fate of the Slovaks being decided in their absence in the event of a revision, adding that the Czechs must repair all the damage done by them to Slovakia — and two of his friends. The trial of this case, which caused the greatest agitation in Slovak circles, was not held until months later, when the proceedings against Bazovsky — who had been set at liberty on account of the serious illness contracted by him during ten months of imprisonment — were suspended, but his two friends were sentenced to one year's imprisonment each.

The next steps taken by the authors of the "mailed fist" policy were the aggravation of the stringency of the Defence of the Republic Act and the passing of an Act relating to the dissolution of political parties and the prohibition of their activity. The Slovak Autonomist Parties were menaced by the constant danger of prohibition; and their leading organ — the "Slovák" — was placed under embargo in 1933 and in 1934, in each case for a period of three months. The Censor resorted more frequently than ever to the method of confiscation and deletion, using that weapon in particular against the Slovak Party papers, which appeared with blank spaces on an average of two or three times a week.

But even these anti-democratic measures failed to break the power of the Slovak Autonomist movement. The conclusion of the Russo-Czech treaty alienated from Prague still more thoroughly the Slovak Autonomists, who are deeply religious and anti-Bolsheviks. The same was the effect also of the Defence of the Republic Act, under which the greater part of Slovakia was declared to be "frontier zone" and a whole series of restrictions of liberty were put into force. When, after his election as President, M. Beneš visited Rózsahegy (Ružomberek), in his address of welcome Mgr. Hlinka stressed the question of autonomy. In a resolution dated March 29th, 1936, the Slovak People's Party once more demanded the recognition of the individuality of the Slovak nation and of the rights of the Slovak language, the establishment of a separate Slovak legislature and ministry, and decided to further intensify the struggle to obtain autonomy. At their mass meeting held at Pöstyén (Piešťany) on September 10th, 1936, the choirs of the Slovak People's Party — to the horror and consternation of the Czechs — were heard to repeat the names of Horthy, Hitler and Hlinka in one breath. The Pöstyén manifesto once more demanded autonomy — on a federative basis, stressing that "this State will never be a pillar of peace and an oasis of stability until all nationalities alike are satisfied with it and until Government gives the Slovaks what the Slovak people demanded already in 1848 through the medium of Štúr, Hurban and Hodža, — i. e. until the Slovaks have their own Diet and courts of law and schools."

The agreements concluded on February 18th, 1937, between the Czecho-Slovak Government and the German "activist" parties now dissolved — agreements which have not yet been carried into effect — were received with a little enthusiasm by the Slovak Autonomists as they were by the other "nationality" Opposition parties. Nothing illustrates better the opinion of these agreements held by the Slovak People's Party than the fact that the Censor confiscated the issue of the "Slovak" dealing with the said agreements. The Party — in particular the younger members — continued more and more vehemently to demand the recognition of the individuality of the Slovak nation; and in the winter of 1937

the students of the Pozsony (Bratislava) "Komensky" University — which is practically in Czech hands — took part in mass street demonstrations in which they demanded that their mother tongue should be given a fitting place in the university. And on the occasion of the visit to Czecho-Slovakia of M. Delbos, French Foreign Minister, the "Slovák" (December 15, 1937) once more declared that the Slovaks would never renounce national individuality or their claim to political autonomy.

During the current year there has been no abatement of the intensity of the fight being made by the Slovak Autonomists, whose efforts are being enhanced by the rapid approach of the tenth anniversary — on May 30th — of the conclusion of the Pittsburgh Convention. The rash statement made by the Minister of Justice, M. Ivan Dérer, in which he spoke of the radical Autonomists as "snotty-nosed brats" ("Rotzbuben"), merely added fuel to the fire. And then came the union of Austria and Germany, a great historical event which raised the autonomist and anti-Czech feelings of the Slovak people to boiling point.

At the session of the Czecho-Slovak Parliament held on March 28th Mgr. Joseph Tiso, Vice-President of the Slovak People's Party, declared that the struggle of the Slovaks to obtain political autonomy was simply a fight to ensure the application in the Czecho-Slovak Republic of the right of self-determination of the Slovak people, reminding the Czechs that those who in the present critical days refuse to respect that right misinterpret the essence of the Czecho-Slovak State and are guilty of a serious offence against its very existence. This statement on the part of M. Tiso was accompanied by declarations of a similar tenor on the part of the Sudeta Germans, Magyars and Poles; while the Czechs branded this attitude on the part of the Slovak people's Party as treason.

The struggle for autonomy is however not confined to the Slovak People's Party, the largest political organisation of the Slovak people: an equal share in that struggle is claimed also by the Magyars and by the Germans and Ruthenians of Slovakia. Even prior to the realisation of the „Anschluss" the non-Czech nationalities of Slovakia united

in the cause of autonomy, the first manifestation of the unity being the Magyar, Ruthenian and German statements appearing in the February 27th issue of the „Slovák” of which the leading chord was the demand of autonomy.

By way of illustrating the situation it should be noted that the population of Slovakia includes, besides some 2.2 million Slovaks, almost 1,000,000 Magyars, 500,000 Ruthenians and 160,000 Germans, while the number of Czech immigrants entering the country after 1918 is even today a mere fraction. The second largest nationality living in this province — the Magyars — have never allowed it to be forgotten that they were absorbed in the Czecho-Slovak State against their will and without their consent. The Magyar deputies sitting in the Czecho-Slovak Parliament in June, 1920, began their legislative activity with a solemn statement to the effect that they had been allotted to Czecho-Slovakia against their will and without their consent. The attitude of reserve latent in this statement has been stressed on several occasions since. However, seeing that for the present they are compelled to live in the Czecho-Slovak State and cannot hold aloof from the internal political struggles of that country, the Magyars have also been impelled to express an opinion of the constitutional machinery of the Czecho-Slovak Republic; and from the very outset they have endorsed the demand for the autonomy of Slovakia. For they have been guided by the consideration that the Slovaks, with whom they lived in exemplary union and agreement for centuries, will understand them better and treat them better than the Czechs who are strangers to them. As a consequence, at the first Minority Congress held in 1928 one of the delegates of the Magyars of Czecho-Slovakia declared that the Magyars of Slovakia were fighting for the territorial autonomy of Slovakia and for the cultural autonomy of the Magyars. And the policy of the Magyars of Slovakia has not deviated a jot from the line thus demarcated. In the statement made on February 27 th, 1938, Count Esterházy — after establishing the fact from the very first moment of their existence the Hungarian parties have fought for the autonomy of Slovakia — expressed his conviction that after achieving their autonomy the Slovaks would not

copy the mistakes made by the Czechs, but would give the Magyars living in the Magyar areas of Slovakia the same rights as those enjoyed by the Slovaks living in the Slovak areas. The significance of the statements made on February 27th is enhanced by the circumstance that it was the first occasion on which the Slovak, Magyar, Ruthenian and German Autonomists had met publicly on the same platform.

The Autonomist declaration of February 27th and March 28th open a new chapter in the history of the struggle for Slovak autonomy. The new international situation brought into being by the „Anschluss" has considerably lessened the diplomatical importance of the Czecho-Slovak Republic and intensified the self-respect of the oppressed non-Czech nationalities. The Slovak people, to which Prague has so far refused to grant the equality to which it is entitled under the Pittsburgh Convention, — having indeed refused to recognise its national individuality —, is today demanding its autonomy more energetically than ever before. Maybe Prague will attempt by the aid of fresh arbitrary measures to weaken temporarily the Slovak autonomist movement, — maybe the present vehemence of that movement will be followed provisionally by a slight abatement of energy —; but here cannot be any doubt that the problem of Slovak autonomy is one of the questions demanding an urgent solution on the satisfactory settlement of which the existence of Czecho-Slovakia depends. The Slovak Autonomists make no secret of the fact that, if Czecho-Slovakia is unable or unwilling to solve the problem, they will attempt to solve it themselves under the auspices of others. On February 22nd, 1934, the „Lidové Noviny" — an organ closely connected with President Beneš — published a statement made by Hlinka to the effect that „*We shall remain Slovaks even at the cost of the Republic.* Our programme is a sovereign Slovak nation and Slovak autonomy with legislative and executive powers".

THE NEW RUMANIAN CONSTITUTION AND THE MINORITIES

BY

ZSOMBOR SZÁSZ

On December 1st, 1918, after the end of the Great War, the Rumanians of Transylvania assembled at Gyulafehérvár for the purpose of declaring the union of that province with the Kingdom of Rumania. Although the revolutionary Hungarian Government then in office offered every facility for the holding of the assembly, the Rumanians did not invite either the Magyars or the Saxons of Transylvania to attend. And the Gyulafehérvár Resolutions were passed by the 53% of Rumanians who formed a very infinitesimal majority of the population of Transylvania.

The Assembly, though it declared the union of Transylvania with Rumania, did so reluctantly. Before the Assembly met, there were protracted discussions between the leaders of the Rumanians (of Transylvania) as to whether Transylvania, a province forming part of a Western Power like Hungary or the Rumanians living in that province themselves would not feel out of place in the orbit of a country with the Balkan manners and politics prevailing in the Rumanian Kingdom? The misgivings and reluctance felt by those leaders was reflected also in the Resolutions, which demanded autonomy for Transylvania and made the annexation to Rumania of that province subject to the condition that "a pure democratic régime should be in evidence in every field of the public life" of the new State to be formed, — a democratic régime displaying all the *criteria* of true democracy, viz. general suffrage and secret ballot, a proportional system, a free press, unrestricted right of assembly and "complete national liberty for all the peoples living together in union". Point 1. of Article III of the said famous Resolu-

tion continues the sentence quoted above as follows: — "each people is entitled to educate itself and to govern itself in its own mother tongue and to possess its own public administration under the control of persons selected from its own ranks; and each people is entitled to be represented in the legislative bodies and in the Government of the country in proportion to its ratio of the population". And Point 2. adds that "equal and unrestricted denominational autonomy is guaranteed" all the various denominations in the State.

Surely no greater provision could have been made for the sound development of the life of a minority.

Yet more effectual provision still was made.

After raising many objections, on December 9th, 1919, Rumania signed the Minority Treaty. There is no reason why I should bother to explain the content of that treaty, which is familiar to every one. The basic principle underlying that treaty is the absolute equality of all citizens alike in every field, "irrespective of birth, nationality, language, race or religion". The provisions of the treaty offer the framework within which — under the provision contained in Article I of the treaty — the rights of the minorities were to be codified and detailed statutes determining the rights of the minorities brought into being.

What followed then is well known too.

Changed conditions in the post-war Rumanian State made the revision of the older Constitution of 1866 necessary. The minorities quite naturally expected a radical reform of the Constitution of the kind to lead to a suitable adjustment of their rights, particularly in view of the fact that the minority question had been previously unknown in the Rumanian State, the Rumanians having constituted 93.47% of the population of Older Rumania.

But the minorities were disappointed. The 1923 Constitution makes short work of the minorities; a brief paragraph in the same determines the general equality of rights of all citizens in the flimsy phrases usual in the liberal constitutions of the nineteenth century. — The value of those phrases, such as it was, being however neutralised by Article 1., which declared that "the Rumanian Kingdom is a united and indivisible national State". Now, in a "united national

State" there is not much room for national minorities of other race.

The Constitution nevertheless gave the minorities something. But that is not all.

Under Hungarian rule the legal position of the non-Magyar nationalities of the country was adjusted by Act XLIV. of 1868 — the so-called "Nationalities Act". When early in 1919 the Rumanian Governing Council took over the government of the autonomous province of Transylvania, this Act — *mutatis mutandis* — was left in force, so that the position of the minorities of Transylvania was in reality supposed to be determined by the same. But the Rumanian Governments ignored the Act, and the Liberal and People's Party Cabinets originating from Old Rumania and supported by majorities recruited from that kingdom forgot all about the codification of the minority rights. When, in the autumn of 1923, the "National Peasant Party" Government consisting for the most part of Transylvanians was formed, M. Maniu promised to carry the codification into effect; but the matter was allowed to lapse.

And the situation of the minorities grew more and more unbearable every day. It is not, however, the object of the present article to enter into details on this point.

We would merely note in brief that the personal persecution and maltreatment in evidence in the early years of the new régime was gradually abolished. Then came the agrarian reform, — the eviction of the minorities from their estates; and next a beginning was made with the policy of cultural depredation — a destructive educational system, the "culture zones", the difficulties attending examinations and the obtaining of higher certificates. The extermination of the Magyars was the object of the censuses and — in the schools — of the system of "name-analysis" and the inquiries into "ethnic origin". And the minorities were excluded from political life, not only by the horrible corruption and terror then rife in the country, but also by the system of parliamentary elections.

Of recent years a wave of intolerant nationalism has

been sweeping over Rumania with ever-increasing intensity. First came the establishment of Codreanu's "Iron Guard", which after the murder of Duca became a party "doing everything for the fatherland" — an intransigent "nationalist" and ruthless "anti-Semitic" formation. The "Rumanian Front" was established by Alexander Vajda, the programme of that party being epitomised in the term "*numerus valachicus*", a programme which proposed to grant work to non-Rumanians either according to numerical ratios or without having recourse to such calculations at all. Today, however, every one in Rumania — every party — is "nationalist". The chambers of advocates in succession have declared that only pure Rumanians may be Members; and the same fate is in store for non-Rumanian doctors and engineers too.

At the end of 1937 the parliamentary session came to an end; and the Tatarescu Government resigned, but — after a certain amount of shilly-shalling — M. Tatarescu was appointed Premier again and issued a writ for new elections. But what happened at the elections was something unprecedented in the history of Rumania. Government failed to obtain a majority, and Tatarescu resigned again. The two strongest parties returned by the elections were the National Peasant Party (with decidedly democratic leanings) and Codreanu's ultra-nationalist party: yet the choice of the King fell, not on either of these two parties, but on the National Christian Party headed by MM. Cuza and Goga — a party which at the elections had received only 9.15% of the total number of votes; as a consequence a Government resting on the support of an infinitesimal minority would have dominated the legislature. This circumstance showed how little headway the two extremist parties had made in the public opinion of the country.

Goga's Government and his Party professed ultra-nationalist views, though not insisting upon the establishment of a "racial State". They started a war of extermination against the Jews, but proclaimed an attitude of understanding towards the national minorities. "The Magyar minority is not menaced by any danger" — declared the Premier in an interview: "Government is not thinking of taking any

measure calculated to curtail its natural rights. The Rumanian State will be able to advance in power and strength without oppressing the nationalities living in symbiosis with the Rumanians”.

We have no comment to make on this seemingly liberal statement; for the Goga Government — leaving behind it a mass of declarations and interviews and anti-Semitic decrees — in the short space of seven weeks exploded and disappeared like a bubble of soap and its place taken by Totalitarian Cabinet consisting of former Ministers and Premiers and headed by Miron Christea, Patriarch of the Orthodox (Greek Oriental) Church.

This Government had only been in power a few days when it made public a new Constitution consisting of 100 paragraphs which was some days later submitted to the approval of the population by plebiscite and voted unanimously by a people 63% of which are illiterates.

Only a few provisions of the new Constitution relate to the minorities; but these few provisions very deeply and profoundly affect the life of those minorities and are a mass of contradictions.

The new Constitution also contains the declaration included in the older Constitution to the effect that “the Rumanian Kingdom is a national State”; Article 5. also corresponds to the similar provision of the original Constitution, as it states that “all Rumanian citizens are equal irrespective of ethnic origin or religious differences”.

A few lines lower down, however, we find a declaration of inequality.

The new Constitution maintains in force the terms of the older Church-laws which stipulate that of the two Rumanian Churches the Orthodox Church is the ruling Church, while the Greek Catholic (Uniate) Church has the precedence of all other Churches, those following after the latter being only churches of inferior rank, — a circumstance reflected also in the fact that, whereas all the prelates of the two Rumanian Churches are Members of the Senate, only one prelate each of the other churches may be a

Senator, no prelate however to be a Senator unless the number of his followers exceeds 200,000. Thus, the Bishop of the Unitarian Church of Transylvania — the only bishop of that Church in the world — is not entitled to sit as Senator, seeing that there are not 200,000 Unitarians in Transylvania.

Under Article 27. all civil and military offices are to be filled "with due consideration for the Rumanian majority and State-building population", which means that — as was the case hitherto also — no minority person is ever likely to obtain such posts. And no one may be made Minister unless he can prove that his family has for not less than three generations been pure Rumanian, that meaning again that all minority persons are excluded for ever from the highest offices in the State.

These are the provisions of the new Constitution which directly affect the minorities and establish far-reaching inequality of rights in denominational and administrative questions in contravention of the equality of rights declared at the outset.

But that is not all: for in Rumania what is of importance is not the law itself, but the manner in which that law is carried into effect.

The present Government system of Rumania is a poorly disguised military dictatorship — a circumstance reflected in the extension to the whole country of a state of siege. When the state of siege was declared, the Commander of the Sixth (Transylvanian) Army Corps issued an ordinance which with a stroke of the pen abolished every form of equality of rights. Not all the provisions of this ordinance are expressly anti-minority; but they are so elastic as to allow all persons belonging to minorities to be involved in the danger of being charged with treason.

The ordinance forbids all outrages on the national feeling of Rumanians, disrespect towards the official language or towards national festivals or disparagement of Rumanian institutions, Rumanian history or the State religion. Opportunities galore for molesting and persecuting the minorities!!

In offices employees may speak to parties only in

Rumanian; drivers of motor-cars or electric trams and market vendors may not use any language but Rumanian; and all notices and advertisements must be exclusively in Rumanian. In newspapers and all other printed matter the place-names and the names of counties used must be the official ones; while the signs and inscriptions on shops and banks must be written in Rumanian — must indeed be "transcribed or rendered in correct Rumanian".

This is what the "equality of rights" spoken of in the Constitution looks like when interpreted in practice by the executive authorities. Conditions were no worse even in the darkest days of persecution under the Liberal Governments. For the moment, it is true, on paper only!! but soon enough it will all become a living reality; and what the Constitution calls "equality of rights" will be interpreted to mean persecution and oppression of the minorities.

OSZK

Országos Széchényi Könyvtár

HUNGARIANS IN AMERICAN HISTORY.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS DELIVERED IN THE "AURORA"
LITERARY SOCIETY OF BÉKÉS-CSABA

BY

EUGENE PIVÁNY

CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

England's organized efforts at colonization in America were begun by Sir Humphrey Gilbert who, on his ill-fated expedition to Newfoundland in 1583, took with him an Hungarian humanist, *Stephanus Parmenius Budaeus*, to record in graceful Latin the history of the enterprise. Both met their death on the return voyage in a violent storm. The memory of Parmenius has been fittingly perpetuated by Richard Hakluyt in his celebrated work: *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation*.

During colonial times quite a number of Hungarian missionaries went to America, where they laboured to convert and civilize the Indians. The most eminent among them was Ferdinand Konság, a Jesuit, who went to America from Buda and became first the head of the St. Ignatius mission in California and later the visiting superintendent of all the Catholic missions. As pioneer and explorer he made several journeys through the then for the greater part uninhabited and unknown California, and in 1746 he drew a map of that country, where in 1759 he died.

Hungarians also took part in the American War of Independence. In the Continental Army organized by George Washington, Michael de Kowáts, cavalry colonel and one-time cornet of Maria Theresa's Jász-Kun Hussars distinguished himself. On the recommendation of General Washington and General Pulaski Kowáts was appointed Colonel Commandant of Pulaski's legion by Congress. This brave Hungarian Hussar

hastened to the relief of Charlestown (South Carolina) which was besieged by the English, and on 11th May, 1779, fell for American liberty in a cavalry charge under that town.

There were also Hungarians in the great army sent to the aid of the American colonies by Louis XVI of France. The famous Duc de Lauzun was given a foreign legion, called *Volontaires étrangers de Lauzun*, numbering 800 foot-soldiers and 400 horsemen, one squadron of which (140 men not counting the officers) consisted of Hungarian Hussars. We know of at least two Hungarian officers in that legion, Major John Polereczky and Lieutenant Francis Benyovszky. Namely, from the beginning of the XVII. century we find Hungarian Hussars in the Western States of Europe, in Bavaria, Prussia and also in France. In the XVIII. century four Hungarians regiments stood in the service of the French Kings. These regiments consisted chiefly of refugee Hussars organized by officers who had distinguished themselves in Francis Rákóczi II's War of Hungarian Independence and had subsequently fled to France. They were given command of these regiments by the King.

The famous Hungarian traveller, Count Mauritius A. Benyovszky, who at the request of the French Government had also been engaged in colonizing Madagascar, was among those who went over to America in 1782. He carried letters of recommendation from distinguished French gentlemen and he offered Congress to organize three legions in Germany and bring them over to Washington's army. According to the records of the Continental Congress, the idea was regarded with favour. James Madison, later President of the United States, drew up the relevant report, but in view of the fact that the war was practically over, his offer was not taken advantage of.

But it was not only in the first critical period of America's history when the United States was being established, that Hungarians fought for America; they also took part in the American Civil War to preserve the Union. The Hungarians who fought in this war, which lasted from 1861 to 1864, were chiefly emigrants who had fled after the war of independence in 1848—49. Although the total number of these emigrants did not exceed 4000, yet about 800 of

them joined the Union army, two of them becoming major-generals and five brigadier-generals. Besides these there were fifteen Hungarian colonels, two lieutenant-colonels, fourteen majors and fifteen captains, as well as numerous subaltern officers and army surgeons in that army. These are figures which in proportion to their numbers were not approached by any other emigrant nationality in the States. In the first year of the Civil War the balance was in favour of the Southern Army and therefore the feat of arms accomplished by the little troop of cavalry — called Frémont's Body Guard — was considered of great importance. On 25th October at Springfield, Missouri, under the command of Charles Zágonyi, a former officer of Hungarian Hussars, in a charge famed in history a much larger body of the enemy was routed and annihilated. This daring attack, in which a Hungarian lieutenant of Hussars, Theodore Majthényi, also distinguished himself, is recorded in American history as "Zágonyi's Death Ride", and the Commander-in-Chief of the Western army, General Frémont, in writing of it to his wife described it as a "true Balaclava Charge".

The American Government did indeed try to reward the Hungarian political exiles for their excellent services. Thus General Alexander Asbóth was sent to Argentina as ambassador, and Generals Julius Stahel and George Pomucz were appointed consul-generals in Japan and Russia respectively. Besides this, many other Hungarians received high posts in the American civil service.

The heroic struggle waged by the Hungarians in the interest of the United States may be said to have been unparalleled. Thomas Capek, the historian of the Czechs in America, who were about ten times as numerous as the Hungarians, made in his book the facetious remark that the Czechs "gave more musicians than generals to the Union Army" (viz. there was not a single Czech general in the whole American Army). The psychological explanation of the Hungarian's behaviour lies in the fact that, besides coming of an ancient fighting stock, they wished to prove their gratitude to the Government and people of the United States for the interest they had displayed in Hungary in 1848 and the good services rendered then and in the years following to the

Hungarians fighting for their national existence against the superior strength of the Austrian Empire.

Among the American pioneers there were also to be found Hungarians who at the risk of their lives helped to reclaim and civilize the wilds North America. Here only two of them will be mentioned. One was Augustus Haraszty, an Hungarian landowner, who first visited America in 1840. The country pleased him so much that he returned to Hungary, converted all his property into ready money and set out with all his family for America. His life savours more of a romance than of sober reality. First, in the territory of Wisconsin, not far from Madison, on land acquired by the Government only a few years earlier from the Winnebago Indians, he founded a town, which under the name of Sauk City still exists and prospers. In his new country he engaged in all manner of enterprizes and businesses: he established a steamship service on the Missouri and a ferry-boat on the Wisconsin; he opened a store, built houses of bricks made in his own kilns and it was he who planted the first hop-yard in Wisconsin, the State which was later to become famous for its beer. Through all this he never ceased to take an interest in the things of the intellect and he was one of the founders and twice vice-president of the Wisconsin Historical Society. In 1849 he sold his property in that region and after nine months of arduous and dangerous travel by cart arrived in California, then overrun by gold prospectors. There he was first elected sheriff of San Diego, where to this day a street bears his name; later he became a member of the territorial legislative body and the owner of various big enterprizes. In San Francisco, with two other Hungarian emigrants, he established a gold smelting foundry; later on he was appointed to give expert advice on viticulture to the Government of California, and in this capacity he introduced many varieties of vines into that State, amongst others vines from Tokaj in Hungary, the wine of which was afterwards to become famous throughout the United States under the name of California Tokay. His adventure-loving temperament lured him away from California. Again he sold his all and left for Nicaragua in 1869, where he bought a plantation called the San Antonio Hacienda in the neighbourhood of

Corinto. His death was no less remarkable than his life. One morning he mounted his horse to take his usual ride round the plantation, and disappeared for ever. His horse and his jacket were found on the bank of a river flowing through the plantation. In all probability he fell into the stream which was infested with alligators and vanished in their jaws.

Another famous Hungarian pioneer, John Xántus, was originally a lawyer. During the Hungarian War of Independence he served as a lieutenant of the Hungarian National Defence Army; then he was by turn day labourer, professor, natural scientist and the director of a museum in America. At first he had to contend with great difficulties in America, but his talents attracted the attention of the United States Government and he was appointed member of the U. S. Survey expedition sent out to conduct a scientific exploration of Kansas Territory, then mainly inhabited by Indians. Afterwards he was employed by the U. S. Coast Survey to examine the dryland and marine fauna and flora of Southern California. In the course of this work he collected many animals and plants of species mostly unknown till then, some of which he sent home to the Hungarian National Museum, the rest to the Smithsonian Institution. In 1862 he was appointed American consul in Manzanillo, Mexico, from whence he conducted a scientific expedition to the Sierra Madre. Two years later he returned to Hungary. At the end of 1868, as a delegate of the Hungarian Government, he took part in an expedition to Eastern Asia. The fruits of his scientific work have been preserved in various American and English scientific journals. He was elected a member of three American scientific societies.

— y —

POLITICAL MOSAIC

THE LESSONS OF THE "ANSCHLUSS".

When our last issue was being published, we should have considered it inconceivable that the Germans of Austria would in a few days — or rather in a few hours — be united with their racial brethren of the German Empire without any blood being shed and indeed without any exceptional agitation. And when the great change ensued, we regarded it as an elemental happening beyond the capacity of any earthly power to hinder or prevent. We were delighted to find that we had been relieved from the pressure of the *incubus* which had for two decades weighed on us, and that there was no more danger of the Austrian question leading to the outbreak of a world war. We were at one with our Government in regarding the union of the Germans of the countries this side of and beyond the Inn as the private affair of the German people; and we approved the action of the Hungarian Government in conveying its most cordial congratulations to the Head of the German Empire. If we look at this event of international historical importance from the Hungarian — or indeed from the general European — point of view, we cannot but approve of the same for reasons of principle which we shall deal with below.

As compared with the previous denunciations of the Paris Peace Treaties the incorporation in the German Empire of Austria is the first revision of a sweeping character. Though the Turkish frontiers determined by the Treaty of Sevres have long been swept off the map by history, that treaty was never ratified by Turkey, so that it never came legally into force, whereas the Treaties of Versailles, Saint Germain, Trianon and Neuilly had to be ratified willy-nilly by Germany. Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria respectively. As a consequence of the incorporation of Austria, Article 88. of the Treaty of Saint Germain, which — as is generally known — made the suspension of the independence of Austria subject to the approval of the Council of the League of Nations, has become invalid. So no one can take it amiss that the Hungarian nation should ardently long for an equally quiet extinction of the territorial provisions of the Treaty of Trianon, which wrested from Hungary three-quarters of her population and two-thirds of her total area.

We are all familiar with the oft-repeated catchphrase that "revision means war". This is what we are told by those same

people who always insisted that the realisation of an "Anschluß" would also involve us in war. Now, the union of Austria and Germany has been effected without war, — a circumstance that merely serves to endorse our belief and conviction that a revision of the Treaty of Trianon does not by any means necessarily mean war. For, if the Great Powers keep their heads and take the natural consequences of a situation which is already quite untenable, the adjustment of the Danube Valley question can be effected with just as little stir as the Anschluß between Austria and Germany.

The union of Austria and the German Empire was effected on the basis of the right of self-determination of the peoples and of the nationality principle. The unprecedented enthusiasm with which the turn in affairs was received by the inhabitants of Vienna and the whole population of Austria should have convinced every one that the union was desired whole-heartedly by the vast majority of the Austrians. Those who are familiar with the political history of the Austrian people were not for a single moment surprised by what happened; for the idea of an "Anschluss" was not the invention of National Socialist Germany: it had been a living force in the soul of the Austrian people ever since 1918. As pointed out very aptly by Signor Mussolini in his speech delivered on March 16th, the Austrian National Assembly then under the direction of the Social Democrats, in 1918 already declared its desire for a union, at the same time demanding the cession to Germany of the Sudeta German territories too. Although Article 88. of the Treaty of Saint Germain expressly forbade Austria to effect a union, the plebiscites held in the several provinces of the country showed already that, though compelled to yield to the wishes of the victors, the Austrian people refused to abandon its right of self-determination or renounce the nationality principle. The Customs Union Treaty concluded in 1931 between Herr Curtius, German Foreign Minister, and Dr. Schober, Austrian Chancellor, — though as a consequence of the veto of the victorious Powers that treaty could not be put in force —, was fresh evidence of the fact that democratic Austria and the Germany based upon the Weimar Constitution had not given up their hope of a union of the Germans living in the two countries. And now the German Empire so remarkably strengthened in position under the leadership of Herr Hitler has realised the long-cherished dream of the German people. And it strikes one as really symbolical that Austria should have her dream realised by one of her own sons at the head of a popular movement the antecedents of which are to be found in the political history of Austria and of the Bohemia now forming the nucleus of Czecho-Slovakia.

One of the characteristic symptoms of the hypocritical pha-

rianism of the post-War period was the refusal — *in the name of the ideas of liberty and independence* — to allow the wishes of the inhabitants of Austria to be realised. The gaolers of the Austrian people were fêted as the greatest champions of Austrian liberty, although in the West too it was well known that the liberty and independence foisted on Austria rested, not on the will of the masses, but solely and exclusively on the power of the bayonet. Not till the realisation of the Anschluss did the right of self-determination of the Austrian people become a fact, — although the solemn promises of the victorious Powers should have made those Powers put that right into practice as far back as 1918.

The Hungarian nation gladly welcomes this triumph of the right of self-determination; for it too demands that right — the right the flagrant and heinous infraction of which has torn four million of its racial brethren from their native land. The Hungarian nation, however, demands the right of self-determination also for those peoples which — like the Slovaks and Ruthenians — were similarly separated from it against their will and without their wishes being consulted. How can peoples be driven like flocks of sheep from one country to another? — that was what Czar Alexander I. asked at the time of the Vienna Congress; and this rather rough but at any rate striking and unequivocal definition of the meaning of the right of self-determination of the peoples should be remembered by those who in the name of democracy — i. e. of the people's will — have refused to allow millions of Magyars, Germans, Ruthenians, Slovaks and Poles to escape from their present-day prisons into the refreshing air of liberty.

In proof of its self-confidence — and also of its unerring political instinct — National Socialist Germany has determined to hold a plebiscite on April 10th for the purpose of determining whether the inhabitants of Austria approve the great change or not. After the many spontaneous manifestations of its feelings made in recent weeks by the Austrian people there can surely be no doubt as to the result of this plebiscite; nevertheless, we cannot but feel gratified that the German Government has determined to offer the inhabitants of the new province an opportunity — on the basis of absolutely universal suffrage — to express its will. Thereby it is asserting a great principle thrown into prominence by the French Revolution and by the Italian Irredentist movement which towards the end of the nineteenth century — and still more after the Great War — people were rather inclined to forget. Only in a very few places were plebiscites held after the War, — and then chiefly for the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of the world and in the hope that perhaps it might prove a means of filching other territories from the conquered peoples. We must however admit that the technical

execution of these plebiscites — in particular that held in 1935 in the Saar District — was almost perfect; and we have no reason to doubt that the organising ability of the Germans will — if possible — teach the world an even more perfect plebiscite technique.

After the plebiscite to be held on April 10th is over, no one will be any longer in doubt as to whether the population of Austria really desires to be incorporated in Germany or not. We Hungarians are naturally delighted at the headway thus made by the idea of a plebiscite. Already at the Peace Conference we fought might and main for an enforcement of that principle; and it was not our fault that the wishes of the inhabitants of the territories wrested from us were not consulted, that their opinion in respect of the State to which they wish to belong was never asked, and that the situation created in the basin of the Carpathians is in consequence not a final or definitive one. We are still convinced that the majority of the inhabitants of the territories wrested from us desire to return to the fatherland in which they had lived for a thousand years, — just as the Germans of Austria too have returned to the German Empire to which they belonged from 1804 to 1866. And we are ready in advance to accept the decision of such a plebiscite.

After making the above comments on the questions of principle, we must fain express our conviction that Great Britain and France have been politically mistaken in insisting so determinedly on the observance of the treaties, making concessions only after showing an obstinate resistance and always belatedly — in the face of accomplished facts —, instead of hastening the events that were in any case bound to ensue and thereby furthering the definitive pacification of Central Europe. The Great Powers of Western Europe have committed blunder after blunder and are still the victims of an illusion if they believe that the union of Austria and Germany has settled the Danube Valley question. Nothing of the kind!! That question is NOT settled or solved!! Those peoples which in 1918 — against their will and without their wishes being consulted — were incorporated in foreign States have been deeply moved by the events in Austria and are in consequence waiting more eagerly than ever for a change in the present situation and will never rest until they too feel the warmth of the sun of liberty. The Great Powers of Western Europe would be disloyal to their noble traditions if they undertook to support reaction against development, slavery against freedom and artificial botchwork against the natural order of things, and refused to hear the voice of the age. We trust that the twelfth hour is not over yet and that it will still prove possible to find means to convene a new conference of the five Great Powers of Europe — Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy and

Poland — and to give the seething Valley of the Danube a new peace, a new order. Unless that is done within a very short time, the delay must have incalculable consequences.

— y —

REPERCUSSIONS OF GREAT CHANGE IN CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

When these lines are being written Czechoslovakia is the part of Europe on which millions and millions of eyes are riveted. Premier Hodža's broadcast speech of 28th March has not succeeded in dispelling the anxiety as to what the consequences of Czechoslovakia's minority policy are likely to be. For M. Hodža, although admitting that the Czech minority policy "still labours under a certain inequality" (that is to say, he offered a belated admission of the justice of the complaints so frequently referred to in the columns of this paper), continues to imagine that the minority question can be solved on the basis of the Constitution of 1920, in spite of the fact that the nationalities were not allowed to take part in the framing of that document and that owing to its centralistic character it offers no basis for a satisfactory solution. The Premier has promised the codification of minority rights and a minority statute, but all we can say is that hitherto there has been no lack of partial codification, for the Language Act of 1926 alone contains 100 paragraphs. What is the use of all this, if the Constitution itself is bad, and if even this defective Constitution and the ordinary laws of the land are not observed?

The minorities of the Republic, who in the aggregate constitute more than half the population of the country, one and all demand autonomy. In the extremely tense atmosphere of the Prague Parliament, on 29th March, Herr Kundt, speaking on behalf of Henlein's powerful Party, first demanded new general elections, and then continued:

"You know our complaints and grievances. You therefore know what would satisfy us, if you wish to satisfy us. But you must not expect us to be content with a broad solution or to make concessions running counter to our responsibility to our people. Remember that we are responsible not only to them but also to Europe. The serried ranks of the Sudeta Germans are behind us. Let no one imagine that anything short of a fundamental and courageous solution of the minority problem will be able to guarantee the internal and external order of this State."

Speaking on behalf of the Slovaks, M. Tiso inter alia said: "The struggle of the Slovaks for political autonomy is after all simply an action to enforce in practice the right of the Slovak nation to self-determination in the Czechoslovak Republic. Those who in these critical and historical times in our effort to safeguard the independence of the State refuse to respect that

right, do not realize what the interests of this State are and are guilty of a serious offence against it."

M. Géza Szüllő, speaking for the Magyars, said:

'All of us who live in this Republic are conscious of the flaw in its construction due to its having been created of two States each with an independent life: Austria and Hungary. In the course of a thousand years the civilization, laws and economic interests of each developed along different lines. These differences still exist, for the two States were not the result of chance, but the creations of geo-physical necessity. For this reason the inhabitants of Slovakia and Ruthenia must find prosperity in other ways than the people of the historical provinces... The basis of the autonomy we demand is laid down in the Pittsburgh Convention, while Ruthenia's autonomy was guaranteed in the Peace Treaties. The Government has not respected either document, and this is the cause of the present unstable situation. Consolidation here cannot be guaranteed by rattling sabres or trusting to the swords of others, but only by the spiritual contentment of the people. The Government must be brought to understand that the only way to attain success is by granting to each nation here, on the principle of complete equality, what is due to it according to the laws of God and man.'

On behalf of the Poles M. Leo Wolf read the following statement:

"The policy hitherto pursued has endeavoured to denationalize the inhabitant of Polish race. When between 1934, and 1936 the Poles energetically demanded their rights, it seemed as though a change were imminent and that their wrongs were to be redressed. As, however, the demands of the Poles of Teschen were not granted even after the statement made by Government on 18th February 1937, they decided to insist upon a radical amelioration of their situation. No fundamental settlement of the Polish demands is possible until they have been granted self-government, for autonomy alone would secure them from further denationalization and ensure a restoration of the conditions prevailing in 1920."

This was the situation on the last day of March. The further developments will be manifest from the following reports:

Nowhere, perhaps, did the Austrian events create so deep an impression as in the neighbouring State of Czecho-Slovakia. Czech public opinion is intensely alarmed by the knowledge that the historical provinces of the Republic are now bounded on three sides by Germany; but hope runs high among the Sudeta Germans that a radical change in their lot will very shortly take place. This feeling of expectation entertained by the largest minority in the State cannot, naturally, fail to make its effect

felt on the rest of the non-Czech peoples of the Republic. Among the Slovaks and Ruthenians, too, signs of great excitement are manifest. The former demand the autonomy promised them in the Pittsburgh Convention of May 30, 1918, which was signed by Dr. Masaryk; the latter demand that guaranteed in the St. Germain Treaty of September 10, 1919. Otherwise, in their opinion, nothing can delay for long the dissolution of the Czecho-Slovak Republic. The Magyars of Slovakia and Ruthenia and the Poles of Silesia also expect shortly an amelioration of their intolerable lot. The next few weeks will decide whether Czecho-Slovakia is able to satisfy the rightful demands of her nationalities — a thing her French and British friends regard in the light of a necessity — and, abandoning the fiction of a "national" State, resign herself to accepting the truth that the majority of her inhabitants are non-Czechs, or whether her lot is to be that of the Habsburg Empire?

The reactions to Austria's union with the German Reich in evidence in Czecho-Slovakia's nationality quarters may be summed up as follows:

The Sudeta Germans.

At a meeting of the Sudeta German Party held in Teschen on 13th March, Herr Henlein, leader of the Party, speaking on behalf of the Sudeta Germans, warmly greeted their "Austrian brethren", after which he issued an appeal urging the minor German factions in Czecho-Slovakia, which had hitherto held aloof from his Party and as "Activists" were supporting the Government, to join the Sudeta German Party. In a speech delivered in the Czech Parliament on 15th March, Herr Frank, acting as deputy for Henlein (who like Hitler prior to 1933, refuses to sit in Parliament), congratulated the German Reich on the occasion of the Anschluss and then went on to point out that instead of growing excited over Germany's concern for the German racial groups, the Czechs would do better to voluntarily create conditions that would give no just cause for complaint. The Sudeta German Party — he said — could not afford to be satisfied either with the idea of a "national" State or with the agreements arrived at on 18th February 1937 between the Government and the German Government Parties. Herr Frank began his speech with his arm raised to the Hitler salute and addressed his hearers as "Comrades" (*Kameraden*), which provoked a storm of indignation and cries of "Shame! Shame!" from the Czechs. According to the press organs of the Sudeta German Party, the effect of Herr Henlein's appeal to the Germans of Czecho-Slovakia was tremendous; an ever increasing number of them have now joined the Party. More important still, the *Bund der Landwirte* (Farmer's Alliance), i. e. the German Party which since 1926 has been represented in the Cabinet by Profes-

sor Spina, has announced its determination to withdraw its delegates from the central office of the Activist Parties and from the local Activist centres

On 22nd March the spokesman of this Party, Herr Gustavus Hacker, announced the withdrawal from the Government of the *Bund der Landwirte*. The reason stated was that the attempt in 1926 to achieve national reconciliation and obtain a guarantee of the vital rights of the Sudeta Germans through co-operation with the Government, had proved as great a failure as was the policy instituted by an Order in Council on 18th February 1937. The German Agrarians had therefore decided *en bloc* to join Henlein's Party, the developments of the past weeks clearly demanding a unification of all racial forces. Next day the representatives of the *Bund der Landwirte*, with the exception of Professor Spina, who has resigned both his post as Minister and his seat in Parliament, took an oath of allegiance to Henlein.

On 22th March, Herr Aloysius Stenzel, with full powers from the German Industrial Party hitherto co-operating with the *Bund der Landwirte*, announced the dissolution of his own Party, stating that in the light of recent events it was clear that for the struggle for the existence and future of the Sudeta Germans to be triumphant co-operation and united leadership were imperative. He appealed to the members of his Party to join Henlein.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the German Christian Socialist Party held on 21st March, a Committee of six was delegated to investigate the possibilities of the situation. This Committee is to report its findings in a fortnight to the Executive Committee, which will then decide whether the Party is to remain in the Government or go into Opposition. The prevailing mood of the Party may be described as leaning towards the latter alternative. Their adoption was followed by the resignation of M. Zajiček, representative as Minister without Portfolio of the Party in the Cabinet, who has given up his place in the Government and his seat in Parliament.

Herr Dr. Kotrba, representing the German Democratic Party in the Provincial Assembly of Bohemia, abandoned the Party because he disapproved of the speech of one of its members, Senator Kostka, as being "too Activist".

A clash also occurred in the Party of German Social Democrats between Herr Czech, its representative in the Cabinet, a Jew, and Herr Jaksch M. P. who some time ago was sent to England to counteract the work being done there by Henlein. Jaksch asked Czech either to resign his seat in the Cabinet or to give up the Chairmanship of the Party. When Czech refused to do either, Jaksch got up and left the meeting.

On 25th March the Committee of the Party resolved to recall Herr Czech from the Cabinet. The Party, though con-

tinuing to support the Government, declines to be represented in the Cabinet.

The German Activist trend inaugurated in 1926 has thus collapsed entirely and Henlein is undoubtedly victor in the Sudeta German areas. With 53 seats in Parliament his Party is now, not merely the biggest German one, but also by far the largest Parliamentary Party in the Republic, and practically the totalitarian representative of the Sudeta Germans. According to the rules of Parliamentary democracy, he should be asked to form a Cabinet, but Czech Parliamentarianism has nothing in common with real, honest democracy.

Slovakia.

Before the recent events in Austria, the Slovak Autonomist Party under the leadership of the Rev. Andrew Hlinka had stated — as reported in our last issue — that there could be no question of joining the Government until the Pittsburgh Convention guaranteeing the autonomy of Slovakia had been incorporated in the Czecho-Slovak Constitution, and that the Party had entered into closer co-operation on the platform of autonomy with the Magyars, Germans and Ruthenians of Czecho-Slovakia. After the new turn of events in Austria, rumours were abroad that the Government intended reopening negotiations with a view to inducing the Autonomist Party to enter the Cabinet, and was hopeful of results. These hopes, however, were soon to be dissipated. Namely, the organ of the Party, the "Slovák", commenting on these current reports said: — "The whole world knows that the largest Party in Slovakia is not represented in the Prague Government. It cannot be, without a betrayal of the Slovak national programme". Later on it said: — "Prague for the present is not willing to dismount from the high horse, and the Government itself is to blame for its failure hitherto to understand the spirit of the times and its inability to cope with its responsibility for the future of the State." (March 18).

At a meeting of the Party Committee held on March 24 with M. Hlinka in the Chair, certain weighty resolutions were adopted. According to the official report issued, it was established that the national minorities of Slovakia had linked up with the Autonomist movement and were desirous of co-operating with Hlinka's Party in its struggle for self-government, convinced that through autonomy they would secure the rights guaranteed the minorities in the Peace Treaties which were theirs by divine right. It was resolved by the Committee that initial steps should be taken to elaborate a concrete plan and establish co-operation. After Easter the Party proposes holding demonstrative mass meetings, together with the rest of the autochthonous inhabitants of Slovakia, in several towns of that province. Since in these stirring times it seemed imperative for the Party to adopt an

official attitude without delay, a smaller Committee with Hlinka as Chairman was delegated to draw up the principles of resolutions binding upon the whole Party. The invitation of the Czecho-Slovak National Council asking the Party to send representatives to the Central Offices of the Party in Prague and the Pozsony (Bratislava) Department, has been declined by the Party Committee. Here let it be said that most of the resolutions adopted were deleted from the "Slovák" by the censor, although the Prague newspapers were allowed to publish them.

These resolutions signify a further consolidation of Slovak, Magyar, Ruthenian and German co-operation and the intensification of the struggle for autonomy, as well as a final rejection of the idea of Czecho-Slovak national unity.

The Government's Attitude.

Under the pressure of the great events M. Milan Hodža prepared to reconstruct his Cabinet, but, in consequence of the dissolution of the German Activist Parties, all that happened was the appointment of M. Ježek, member of the ultra-nationalist (hitherto Opposition) Party of Czech National Unity, as Minister without Portfolio. With this, it is true, the position of the Government in Parliament has been reinforced, but the new composition of the Cabinet signifies retrogression rather than a rapprochement with the nationalities, for the inclusion of the ultranationalist Ježek means a withdrawal from rather than an approach towards the minorities.

On 19th March the Cabinet Council approved a Bill in terms of which 22 per cent of the civil service officials and employees were to be recruited from the German minority. This, according to the Press, is understood to mean that in districts where the proportion of Germans exceeds 22 per cent of the total population an even greater percentage of Germans must be employed in the State offices. In Old Bohemia, for instance, the proportion of German officials would be 33 per cent. Only Germans will be considered as applicants for posts in the District Courts of Eger, since the circuit under their jurisdiction is inhabited almost entirely by Germans. In the various political constituencies the nationality percentage is to provide the standard. In future the legionaries, who are to take priority in civil service appointments, will be relegated solely to the Czech offices.

Apart from the fact that in reality the proportion of Germans in Czecho-Slovakia exceeds the 22 per cent established by the 1930 census, the draft in principle accedes to the long-standing demand of the Germans that they should be proportionately represented in the civil service and that only German officials should be employed in the purely German districts along the frontier. Since, however, as things stand, the Czechs hold a

number of positions in the civil service out of all proportion to their numerical strength and have literally overrun the purely German territories, the preposed solution in practice would satisfy the Germans only if the superfluous officials were recalled, or rather transferred from the German regions, and their places filled with Germans. But this, for obvious reasons, cannot be expected of the Government, and thus the beneficial effects of the new measure will not be felt for at least 25 or 30 years. It is, however, a great question whether the Sudeta Germans will be ready to wait so long.

There is no mention in the draft of the Magyars, Slovaks, Ruthenians and Poles, which seems to indicate that although ready, under pressure of international events and in fear of Germany, to grant concessions to the Germans, the Government is not willing to do the same by the other non-Czech peoples of the Republic. Apparently Prague assumes that on the principle of *divide et impera* it will be possible to set the different nationalities at variance with one another. This assumption, however, will prove a fallacy.

— y —

CZECHO-SLOVAKIA UNWILLING TO TREAT WITH GERMANY ON QUESTION OF THE SUDETA GERMANS OR TO GRANT THEM SELF-GOVERNMENT

On 6th March, that is to say before the Austrian events, the "Sunday Times" published a conversation which Mr. Keane, the diplomatic correspondent of that paper, had had with President Beneš. The gist of that interview as summed up by the "Sunday Times" is as follows:

"Czecho-Slovakia can never discuss the minority problem with Germany officially;

"Recognises nevertheless the moral right of Europe to take an interest in a question so important for peace;

"Regards good relations with Germany as a vital interest;

"Is prepared, therefore, to make her contribution to any general European settlement;

"But excludes as impossible federal autonomy for the 3,000,000 Germans within her borders."

The substance of these statements is that Czecho-Slovakia is not willing to treat with Germany on the question of the Sudeta Germans or to grant them self-government. It is difficult to suppose that in the new situation it will be possible on these principles to lessen the tension existing for more than 5 years already between the German Reich and the Czecho-Slovak Republic, which the events of the past few weeks have only served to accentuate.

— y —

BRITISH OPINIONS ON THE CZECH QUESTION

Mr. Neville Chamberlain:

(Official Report of Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, March 24.)

"Should we forthwith give an assurance to France that, in the event of her being called upon by reason of German aggression on Czecho-Slovakia to implement her obligations under the Franco-Czecho-Slovak Treaty, we would immediately employ our full military force on her behalf? Or, alternatively, should we at once declare our readiness to take military action in resistance to any forcible interference with the independence and integrity of Czecho-Slovakia, and invite any other nations which might so desire to associate themselves with us in such a declaration?"

"From a consideration of these two alternatives it clearly emerges that under either of them the decision as to whether or not this country should find itself involved in war would be automatically removed from the discretion of his Majesty's Government, and the suggested guarantee would apply irrespective of the circumstances by which it was brought into operation, and over which his Majesty's Government might not have been able to exercise any control.

"This position is not one that his Majesty's Government could see their way to accept in relation to an area where their vital interests are not concerned in the same degree as they are in the case of France and Belgium; it is certainly not the position that results from the Covenant. For these reasons his Majesty's Government feel themselves unable to give the prior guarantee suggested.

"Great Britain has repeatedly borne witness to the principles on which she considers the peace of the world depends. We do not believe that any stable order can be established unless by one means or other recognition can be secured for certain general principles. The first is that differences between nations should be resolved by peaceful settlement and not by methods of force. The second, admittedly of no less importance, is that a peaceful settlement to be enduring must be based on justice."

Lord Noel-Buxton:

(*The Times*, March 17.)

"If we joined in hostilities in Czecho-Slovakia we might be fighting to prevent self-determination because the wishes of the people were not accurately known. Even if we succeeded in preventing such an invasion we might only be restoring grievances and ignoring the principle of Article 19 of the Covenant which provided for revision in necessary cases. There was a general and vague impression that Czecho-Slovakia was a model of democracy, but it was a very composite State. The German minority was over one-fifth of the population.

"He asked the noble viscount earnestly to think over the possibility of our own Government discharging a function of immense importance, of providing for a real plebiscite on the lines of that held in the Saar."

(*The Times*, March 22.)

"If we were to involve ourselves in war to preserve Czech sovereignty over these Germans, without first clearly ascertaining their wishes, we might well be fighting against the principle of self-determination. A dangerous situation thus exists, the remedy for which is to ascertain the wishes of the Sudeten Germans. The best means of doing this would be an international plebiscite, on the lines of that held in the Saar Territory in January, 1935."

Lord Astor:

(*The Times*, March 17.)

"What the Prime Minister was trying to do, was that he was trying to remedy some of the mistakes arising out of the Peace Treaties which it had been hoped at one time the machinery of the League might have been able to deal with. So far as public opinion understood that it was prepared to give sympathetic support to what the Prime Minister was trying to do."

"With regard to giving a guarantee, to be backed by military force if necessary, to Czechoslovakia, it was impossible for any Government in this country, whatever its political colour, to embark on war unless there was a substantial volume of public opinion behind it prepared to support the war. He doubted whether there was a sufficient majority in this country to give a guarantee to preserve the status quo in Czechoslovakia. There were 3,000,000 Germans there, and there was evidence that the 7,000,000 Czechs who were in a majority were not giving fair and equal treatment to the Germans."

Major Henry A. Procter M. P.:

(*The Daily Telegraph and Morning Post*, March 17.)

"The League of Nations has received a new blow: Austria ceases to be a member of this international body. She is the first small State in Central Europe which will send no more delegates to Geneva.

"On this momentous occasion we have to recall that this "international institution of the victorious countries", as the vanquished Powers called it, was largely responsible for the recent events in Austria. Had the League tried, under the leadership of the great democratic Powers, to redress the injustices of the Peace Treaties, the terrible abyss between defeated Austria and Hungary and "victorious" Czecho-Slovakia might have been bridged, and Austria would still live as a member of the Danubian federation.

"If we remember the important position of Dr. Beneš in Geneva, it is impossible to deny the great moral and political responsibility of Czecho-Slovakia for the irretrievable collapse of the Danubian conception — a collapse which may endanger Czecho-Slovakia herself.

"If the League does not want to lose the last part of its prestige, why does it not apply Article XIX of the Covenant in order to draw nearer the countries separated by the Peace Treaty while they are still free and independent?

"Inaction now may prove fatal for the League. There are several Articles of the Covenant which make it possible to enter into the examination of this question, and I am sure that all people who stand for international law and justice will only be too happy to redress the wrong done to Hungary in 1919."

Mr. Rhys Davies M. P.:

"The events of the past few weeks — said *Mr. Rhys Davies* to the correspondent of the "Pesti Hirlap" (see "Pesti Hirlap" March 29) — have demonstrated to every member of the House of Commons that it is not enough merely to be aware of the increasingly tense situation in the Danube Valley or to sympathize with the idea of a solution of the problem: *practical steps must be taken to avert the danger of war.* The unjust treatment of minorities is the chief cause of dissatisfaction in Central Europe, and *something must be done towards an equitable readjustment.* The concessions lately made by the Czech Government to the German minority are merely proof of the unfair treatment to which they have hitherto been subjected. We who have been in those parts of Europe were hardly believed at home when we told people of the way the minorities were being treated. When the question of the German minority is being settled the affairs of the rest of the minorities must certainly be arranged too.

The Speech of Mr. A. T. Lennox-Boyd: Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour.

(*The Times*, March 19.)

"Speaking at Biggleswade, he said that he could countenance nothing more ridiculous than a guarantee that the frontiers of Czechoslovakia should not be violated when half the people in that country could not be relied upon to be loyal to the Government of the day; and from what he knew of Mr. Chamberlain, he did not think he would make a move to give a guarantee of that kind.

"Germany, he said, could absorb Czechoslovakia and Great Britain would remain secure; but Germany could not invade France without threatening us. We should therefore reaffirm our undertaking to France to defend her if she should be invaded. He could think of Governments he liked better than M. Blum's.

Nevertheless we should give him support at this moment. He did not think we should tie ourselves in advance by giving undertakings to go to the aid of European countries if they were invaded unless their security was a vital concern to us."

Mr. J. L. Garvin:

(The Observer, March 20.)

"What is Czechoslovakia? It is a nonesuch, a State like no other on earth. It contains about 15,000,000 of various peoples. The Czechs proper — a brave and stubborn breed, no doubt — are a minority of rather less than 7,000,000 ruling and rather lording over a mixed majority of other peoples — Germans, Slovaks, Magyars, Ruthenians, Poles. Is this democracy? Let Labour and Liberalism say. What we are really asked to guarantee is the racial ascendancy of the Czech minority over the rest. France and Russia have renewed that bad pledge. It should be absolutely impossible for a British Cabinet to adopt it. There is a German minority of 3,000,000 who have never accepted Czech ascendancy under the Versailles system, and never will. In 1919 they were promised political equality "on Swiss principles". That promise has never been executed. It will have to be, and in full. Otherwise no force of arms under these conditions could maintain the composite State.

"Any British pledge in these circumstances to guarantee Czechoslovakia as it is would encourage the Czech element to refuse adequate concessions. Our endorsement of the Soviet pacts on this subject would be another nail in the coffin of peace. To guarantee an indefensible and untenable status quo in Czechoslovakia is about the last thing on earth whereon the British Empire should stake itself."

— — —
(The Observer, March 27.)

"Then, can they put Czechoslovakia among the supreme issues? Not for a moment, as the Prime Minister makes clear. Paris and Moscow, to reinforce own ill-judged and ill-starred Pacts with Prague urged this country to guarantee the composite State and the jarring Czech ascendancy over a majority of other races speaking different languages. The Oppositions and the Churchillians — but the latter already are a vanishing quantity like the Cheshire cat — supported this egregious proposition. We repeat that it is unthinkable.

"We cannot give all the reasons. They would fill a treatise accompanied by a packet of maps. The bombing of Britain would be certain; the preservation of Czechoslovakia impossible. Military aid from Britain or anyone else could not reach the Czechs; nor maintain their dominance if it did. Germans and Magyars — like the Poles of Teschen — would rejoin their mother races. Slovaks and Ruthenians would not fight for their

masters. No war could maintain as it is the mosaic of Czechoslovakia. Any war would pull it to pieces divided between the Reich, Poland, and Hungary."

"The merciless mutilation of Hungary proper by the Versailles system was and is the most cruel case of all. Mr. Churchill talks of strategy in this business. What about conscience? What about his "moral basis" when he invites democracy to mobilise twenty years after for the impotent as well as unblessed purpose of trying to stereotype Versailles?"

R. W. Seton-Watson:

(The Times, March 24.)

"The plain fact — regrettable, perhaps, but indisputable — is that there are only two alternatives; either to leave the existing historic frontiers of Bohemia untouched or to incorporate the whole western half of the Republic with Germany, leaving Slovakia and Ruthenia to revert to Hungary."

(As is well known, Professor Seton Watson (Scotus Viator) is the most ardent friend of Czechoslovakia in Great Britain. It is a sign of changed times when he is forced to reckon with the disintegration of the Republic. To his line of thought the objections may be put forward 1. that those who took no heed of the incomparably more continuous historical frontiers of Hungary are the last who have any right to defend the historical frontiers of Bohemia, and 2. that a solution of the Sudeta German question does not of necessity mean the incorporation with Germany of the regions inhabited by Czechs.)

The Rev. Basil Viney:

Minister of Finchley Unitarian Church.

(News Chronicle, March 18.)

"Was not the boundary of Czechoslovakia drawn with unfair discrimination against Germany and Hungary? Would it not be best to suggest a rectification on the boundary before pledging ourselves to stand with France in this matter?"

Mr. Archibald Ramsay:

(The Daily Telegraph and Morning Post, March 26.)

"The record of the Czechoslovak Government is one of broken promises to all its minorities, which actually constitute together a majority of the population (thus contravening the fundamental rule of democracy).

"At the Versailles Peace Conference the right of self-determination was held to justify the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in face of the demand of the Sudeten-deutsch peoples to be granted inclusion in the new Republic of Austria.

"The Czech delegation led by M. Beneš was able to have this demand for self-determination set aside after the Allies had been given a categoric assurance that Czechoslovakia would be governed democratically, with full regard for the rights of the minorities.

"How many people in this country know that, during the ensuing decade, the German-speaking minority appealed 20 times to Geneva — as was their right — against very real Czech oppression, only to have every appeal suppressed before it came to the Council for consideration, as part of France's price for Little Entente support against Germany?

"The Czech Government has during the past four years utterly destroyed the Czechoslovak Constitution in the frontier areas which the minorities occupy by the passage of an Act which placed the military and entirely Czech gendarmerie in "occupation", gave them the right to arrest and hold under indefinite "preventive detention" all and sundry accused of "crimes against the safety of the State" without proof given, and conferred upon these Czechs powers of demanding the dismissal of all and sundry, with appeal only to a special court composed of officials and defence only by lawyers chosen and removable from a special panel approved by the Government.

"What then is the moral ground for the demand that His Majesty's Government shall engage this country to fight for Czechoslovakia? A Government which could not conciliate its minorities when there was no threat of "German aggression" can surely not expect unconditional aid when a reconstituted Germany champions the cause of its own cousins, just as France championed the cause of Alsace and Lorraine?"

L. W. Myers.

(The Manchester Guardian, March 19.)

"Why is Czecho-Slovakia now supposed to be in danger? Because a rich industrial area inhabited by over 3,000,000 Germans was included within her frontiers at the peace, and because it is certain that Hitler will not rest content until that area is once more within the German Reich. Is the possession of this territory by Czecho-Slovakia a vital concern of ours, a concern for which we must pledge the lives of our people and perhaps the existence of our Empire? Is it a just cause, or one for which an appeal to British honour can rightly be made?"

"The need is for honest realism. We are committed to the maintenance of a treaty that is proved to be unworkable and productive of disaster. Germany is strong and determined to overthrow that treaty single-handed or in alliance with other Powers that can serve their interests by joining with her. Treaty revision is the only way to peace and the only basis on which to

found a system of international law which all nations will support. At least let it be clear that the people of this country will not be dragged into war to maintain a settlement that was obviously unworkable and wrong."

"The Daily Mail", March 14.:

"Czecho-Slovakia is the artificial product of the Peace Treaties of 1919. Her population is made up of 7,000,000 Czechs and 2,000,000 Slovaks, 3,500,000 Germans, 1,000,000 Hungarians, and an assortment of others.

"She is not, and never can be, a truly homogeneous nation. From the moment this State was created it was bound to be the object of fierce dispute and a source of grave irritation to Europe. Shall British lives and British money be committed in such a cause?

"Revision of the peace treaties has been consistently refused, and apart from the power politics of Herr Hitler no move has ever been made to correct the injustices perpetrated after the war. Everyone knows, for instance, that the 1,000,000 Hungarians in Czecho-Slovakia have been grossly treated, but nothing has been done to right the wrongs of Hungary or to safeguard the interest of her minorities on alien soil.

"It is the blind, obstinate spirit of the League of Nations which has always stood in the way of revision by discussion and consent — and it is the League which has brought these new and forceful methods upon its own head, and upon that of Europe."

IMPORTANT CZECH NEWSPAPER ON "PERFIDIOUS ALBION"

On the subject of the attitude of the British Government towards Czecho-Slovakia we read in the March 22 issue of the "Lidové Noviny", a newspaper closely connected with President Beneš: —

"Troubled Europe has turned to Great Britain with the question: what is to be done? So far no answer to this question has been forthcoming; at least not the answer expected. As a result, when Great Britain is mentioned some people fall into despair, others into a rage. It would appear that the expression "perfidious Albion" still retains its meaning on the Continent. The sight afforded by the British Parliament, and especially by the British Prime Minister, during the past few days was indeed strange. In his massive chair, behind which his Ministers and the leaders of the Opposition sat, old Chamberlain vacillated between uncertain statements and silence. His behaviour was at once undignified and heroic."

— y —

SIR ROBERT GOWER AND SEVERAL OF HIS COLLEAGUES
DEMAND RESTORATION TO HUNGARY OF
ESSENTIALLY HUNGARIAN TERRITORIES.

Sir Robert Gower, Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Thomas Moore, Mr. Mabane, Sir Nicholas Grattan-Doyle, Colonel Baldwin-Webb, Mr. Rostron Duckworth have submitted the following motion to the House of Commons:

"...this House is of opinion that, in the interests of the pacific settlement of Europe as well as to perform an act of justice to the Hungarian nation, the Treaty of Trianon should be revised so that the Kingdom of Hungary shall have restored to it those parts of its former territory that are essentially Hungarian, and urges His Majesty's Government to bring the matter before the Assembly of the League of Nations at the earliest opportunity." (Order Book of the House of Commons 1938 from Friday 11th March inclusive, p. 15.)

IT IS OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE FOR GREAT BRITAIN'S
DANUBE VALLEY POLICY THAT ENGLAND SHOULD TAKE
THE LEAD IN SECURING A REVISION OF THE TREATY
OF TRIANON

On 1st April the Hungarians in London gave a lunch in honour of M. Constantine Masirevich, the retiring Hungarian Minister. Among those present were Lady Snowden, Lady Boynton, Lord Strabolgi, Sir Robert Gower, Sir Philip Dawson, Sir John Haslam, Sir Patrick Hannon, Admiral Taylor, Sir Cyril Entwhistle and twenty other M. P.s. On behalf of the Hungarians in London Dr. *Béla Póka-Pivny* took leave of M. Masirevich, and in the course of his farewell speech he drew the attention of the guests to the Hungarian problem. The coloured people of mandated territories — he said — are in a far better position than the minorities. (And every third Hungarian is a minority since 1919.) They can appear and speak before the Permanent Mandates Commission. *The minorities have no such right.* They can complain: their case is examined in secret. How? You ask it? Out of 840 cases only 5 reaches the Council of the League. Five!"

Then *Sir Robert Gower* expressed his appreciation of the work done by the Hungarian Minister, adding that there was not one single M. P. in the British Parliament who did not realize that peace in Central Europe could not be ensured except by a revision of the Peace Treaties. Sir Robert Gower declared that *Hungary's rôle in the Danube Valley would now more be important than ever.* He demanded a redress of the grave injustices done to Hungary, but said that this demand was not inspired by any unfriendly feeling towards the Succession States. It was his firm conviction that in the interests of Europa as a whole, but particularly of the Little Entente States

themselves, the injustices to Hungary must be redressed, peaceably and equitably, and reconciliation and co-operation must be restored in the Danube Valley. Sir Robert Gower concluded his speech by saying that in its bearings on the question of peaceful revision Mr. Chamberlain's recent statement was of decisive importance. *It was of primary importance for Great Britain's Danube Valley policy that England should take the lead in securing peaceful revision of the Treaty of Trianon and not entrust that task to any other Power.*

Next *M. Masirevich* expressed his thanks to these present for the honour done to him and amongs other things said:

"Ladies and Gentlemen, do not believe that my emotion is so deep that I accept all the flattering praises without trying to share them honestly and in a fair way with you, members of the Hungarian colony and members of that admirable legislative body, of the British Parliament, who were also kind enough to attend this family lunch.

"The task of a Minister is always easier if the citizens residing abroad have brought with them love of the country of their old civilization and the determination to fight for the right cause of their mother country, and I thank most warmly the Hungarians living in England for their very diplomatic work of promoting mutual understanding.

"And what should I say, touched as I am today, about the Members of Parliament, grouped around Sir Robert Gower, so disinterestedly working for Hungarian justice. Their only satisfaction is the fact that recent Central European events show clearly the importance of just settlements, and have drawn public attention once more to the historic mission of Hungary in that part of the World.

"I share Sir Robert Gower's view that Hungary reached a new milestone on the road of her National redressment. So much greater are my thanks, therefore, for all the understanding that British members and other factors of British public life have shown to the cause of Hungary."

"Expressing my firm belief that our people at home in Hungary will be happy to know of the harmonious meeting of the Hungarian Colony and of our British friends today, I ask the benediction of Almighty God upon you, on your families, and on your noble efforts on the interest of justice."

In conclusion *Major Henry Procter M. P.* said that he had been in Hungary not long ago and gave a beautiful description of what he had seen there. He spoke of the ardent patriotism of the Hungarians, which must touch the heart of every Englishman who had been to Hungary, and of the Hungarian's love of liberty and Hungary's valuable contributions to the world. A nation — he said — *which had done so much for noble ideas, which had*

given so much of value to culture, art and music as Hungary, must not be allowed to languish under the weight of an unjust peace treaty. The Hungarians' love of liberty must be appreciated, particularly now when few of the nations of Europe look upon the British Constitution as their ideal.

— y —

"NO CHANGE NEED BE MADE IN RESPECT OF THE DECIDED DIRECTION FOLLOWED BY THE FOREIGN POLICY OF HUNGARY."

At a meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Lower and Upper Houses of the Hungarian Parliament held on March 23rd. M. Kálmán Kánya, Hungarian Foreign Minister, delivered his exposé, which has exercised an exceptionally powerful effect all over the country.

In the introductory part of his speech M. Kánya stressed that the question of the Austrian "Anschluss" had been continuously in the limelight of European public opinion ever since the end of the Great War, and that people had become more and more convinced that a union of the Germans of Germany and Austria must in any case sooner or later ensue.

For the whole world was familiar with the difficulties with which the new Austrian State compelled to adjust itself to the requirements of an independent political existence had continually to contend. These difficulties had been due primarily to the shortsightedness of the treaty-makers, who — when the readjustment of Europe was effected on the basis of the "nationality" principle, in connection with which so many injustices had been inflicted on Hungary — had prevented the territories left to Austria from carrying into effect the wish formally expressed by Austria at the very outset and joining the German Empire. The Treaties of Saint Germain and Versailles and, later on, when Austria took up foreign loans, the Allied Powers too, forced Austria to be independent, but forgot to provide the means indispensable to the maintenance of her independence. This ban on a union of the two German countries — a ban incompatible with President Wilson's Points and with the "nationality principle" — naturally provoked feelings of profound bitterness in the other camp, in the German Empire; and it was evident from the outset that after she had adequately strengthened her position Germany would make every effort to shake off this artificial impediment. It has always been a grave political blunder to attempt to force intolerable and humiliating conditions of peace on a great people on the basis of a momentary advantage of position.

The Hungarian Foreign Minister said that one reason why the "Anschluss" had been realised was the fact that the Powers

which had guaranteed the independence of Austria were no longer in a position to take armed measures for the protection of Austria's sovereignty; the other reason, he added, being that as a consequence of the material shifting ensuing in the political situation in Europe Italy had naturally ceased to be particularly interested in Austria's independence. After establishing the fact that the idea of an "Anschluss" had at all times been a vital force in the life of both German countries, M. Kánya explained the attitude adopted by Great Britain, France and Soviet Russia in the question of the "Anschluss", and then stressed that the Hungarian Government had always been of the opinion that interference in the Austro-German controversy was none of its business, in the first place because the problem in question was one the solution of which lay outside the political sphere of action of the country, and in the second place because we have always been convinced that any interference on our part would have been taken amiss by both Parties. Hungary had always consistently observed that attitude, to which the Foreign Minister had given decided expression already in 1933, in his speech during the debate on the Estimates. Hungary had left no stone unturned to maintain the most cordial relations both with Austria and with Germany — an endeavour which had been crowned with complete success notwithstanding the formidable difficulties in evidence for so long a period.

"However, we were disappointed in our hope that Dr. Schusnigg and the Berlin Government would succeed in eliminating the differences of opinion existing between them by means of a joint agreement. The "Anschluss" is therefore an accomplished fact; and as a consequence the only change from the viewpoint of Hungary is that Austria's place has been taken by the German Empire, a country our relations with which are also those of a close and cordial friendship, so that there could not for a single moment be any doubt as to the attitude to be adopted by Hungary. As a logical consequence, therefore, on the occasion of the union between Austria and Germany Hungary conveyed to the German Government the expression of her congratulations and at the same time expressed the hope that the friendly relations already existing between the two countries would continue unchanged in the future too. Chancellor Hitler sent the Regent of Hungary a message of cordial thanks for this action on the part of the Hungarian Government, the German Government also conveying its thanks to the Hungarian Government. Recent events have shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that in making it one of its prime objects to foster the friendship of Germany the Hungarian Government acted wisely; nor will there be any change in this policy in the future either on the part of that Government.

"Seeing that there is no important difference of opinion

between Hungary and the German Empire in any of the fundamental questions of international politics, there being indeed a complete community of interests in respect of some of those problems, Hungary will continue to pursue the policy towards the German Empire which she has hitherto pursued, even under the changed conditions, and indeed no change need be made in respect of the decided direction followed by the foreign policy of Hungary even in the light of recent events."

Dealing with the question of the Austro-German union the Foreign Minister said it was regrettable that in connection therewith all kinds of sensational rumours and reports — due probably to the prevailing excitement — had spread abroad; and he earnestly warned the (often involuntary) propagators of these reports that persons spreading the rumours were rendering the cause of Hungary a disservice both at home and abroad, adding that on the other hand every one who decidedly repudiated the reports calculated to create general unrest which are usually the inventions of interested quarters was serving the vital interests of the Hungarian people. These sensational rumours and reports were absolutely unfounded; and in any case the German Government had made it quite clear that it regarded the frontier of Hungary now adjoining that of the German Empire as just as inviolable as the frontiers of Italy, Switzerland and Yugoslavia.

Later on the Foreign Minister dealt with the relations between Hungary and other Powers.

In this connection he stressed that the relations with Italy were as friendly as ever and that, though the Rome Three-Power Bloc had, as a consequence of Austria being no longer an independent State, ceased to exist as such, the spirit of the Rome Protocols would continue unchanged to rule in the relations between Hungary and Italy.

Speaking of Poland the Foreign Minister told the Committee of the spontaneous enthusiasm far exceeding expectations with which the Polish people had received the Regent of Hungary everywhere on the occasion of his recent visit to Poland. The profound and deep-seated sympathy felt by the Polish people for Hungary was undoubtedly an important political factor in the life of the Danube Basin. Poland was interested in that Basin; a circumstance peculiarly gratifying from the Hungarian point of view which encouraged us to hope that the peaceful co-operation between Hungary and Poland would in the future continue to develop favourably.

In conclusion the Hungarian Foreign Minister spoke also of the Little Entente, stressing that Hungary was as ready as ever to endeavour to make her relations with the Little Entente States more cordial or at any rate normal. The negotiations begun for the purpose between Hungary and the Little Entente States which had been broken off last September had recently

been resumed in Bucharest; and it would certainly not be Hungary's fault if they did not lead to a satisfactory issue.

The events occurring recently as between the Great Powers encouraged the Foreign Minister to hope that the open or hidden dangers in evidence for years in international relations had reached their culmination last year and that we were already on a fair way towards improvement — even though there might here and there be set-backs or even upheavals.

Leading Politicians Espouse Cause of Hungarians in Czecho-Slovakia and Rumania.

The Foreign Minister was followed by Dr. *Béla Kenéz*, former Minister of Commerce and at present Rector of the Budapest University, who dealt with the situation of the Hungarians living in the Succession States. In connection with the circumstance that the Czech Government had guaranteed the German minority a number of posts in the public services proportionate to their ratio of the population, Dr. Kenéz said the time had come to emphatically demand that this right should be accorded to the Hungarian minority too.

Dr. *Joseph Illés*, Professor in the University of Budapest, pointed out that Czecho-Slovakia had undertaken an obligation under an international treaty to grant Ruthenia autonomy but had so far not shown any readiness to fulfil that obligation.

Dr. *Tibor Eckhardt*, leader of the Small Holders (Opposition) Party, spoke of the necessity of making the provisions relating to the Germans of Czecho-Slovakia apply also to the Hungarian (Magyar) minority, dealing at the same time with the intolerable situation of the Hungarians living in Rumania.

Count *Stephen Bethlen*, former Prime Minister of Hungary, begged Government to follow with the closest attention — in the interests of the Hungarians living in Czecho-Slovakia — the movement of the Sudeta Germans aiming at securing self-government.

PREMIER DARANYI ON ADMIRAL HORTHY'S VISIT TO POLAND AND PRECARIOUS SITUATION OF HUNGARIAN MINORITIES.

In his important speech at Győr on 5th March, of which brief mention was made in our last issue (for the Section dealing with Hungary's financial and economic position, see this month's Political Economy columns), M. Darányi made several important statements about foreign politics, some of which are still actual.

Speaking of the visit of the Regent, Admiral Horthy, to Poland, the Premier said:

“His Highness the Regent's recent visit to Poland, where — as you all know — his reception by Polish official circles and by the Polish people was of the most impressive and

cordial nature, has, if possible, strengthened the bonds of the traditional and sincere friendship which for centuries has bound the two nations together. In the past, as well as in the present, Poland has always taken an interest in the problems of the Danube Valley, and this circumstance contributes to bring the two nations closer."

Referring to the unsettled question of the Hungarian minorities in the Succession States M. Darányi said:

"In my speech in Szeged in the April of last year among other things I pointed out *that we are ready to establish correct relations with those States from which certain differences divide us* and that we should like to settle our differences by reciprocal concessions, provided that the States concerned are willing to further that object by showing a similar goodwill, and that *Hungary's natural demands receive proper recognition on the other side.*"

"Nearly a year has passed since I made that statement, and yet so far, discounting the expression of some wishes of a general nature, no progress has been made, although our willingness to come to an agreement has remained throughout *We are still willing, provided no one attempts to take advantage of our political patience.* On this occasion I consider it necessary to stress anew the point that *the conditio sine qua non* of the establishment of correct relations with our neighbours is that *legal weapons of defence be guaranteed the Hungarian minorities. Until the lot of the minorities has been satisfactorily settled, no normal relations between Hungary and the Little Entente States are possible.*"

*
*
*

After his speech in Győr, M. Darányi on 9th March reconstructed his Cabinet. This reconstruction does not signify any change in the Government's policy, and was necessary only because the carrying out of the new programme of great investments made the inclusion of new men imperative. To ensure co-operation among all the economic Ministries M. Béla Imrédy, the distinguished Governor of the National Bank of Hungary has been appointed Minister without Portfolio. Instead of M. Tihamér Fabinyi, who has accepted the post of General Manager of one of the biggest banks in Hungary, M. Louis Reményi-Schneller has been appointed Minister of Finance. The Department of Agriculture, which M. Darányi had previously reserved for himself, has been entrusted to M. Francis Marshall, Secretary of State in that Ministry. Secretary of State Edmund Mikecz, has been appointed Minister of Justice, an office rendered vacant by the resignation of Dr. Andrew Lázár, who has been seriously ill.

— y —

A "PLEBISCITE" ON NEW RUMANIAN CONSTITUTION

On 21st February, by *décret lege* the text of the new Constitution was promulgated in the Rumanian Official Gazette. Article 100 thereof provides that by Royal consent the new Constitution is to be laid before the tribunal of the people. Simultaneously there appeared the Royal Decree fixing the date of the plebiscite for 14th February, that is to say only three days later.

The "Curentul" (Feb. 25), a newspaper supporting the Government, published the text of the Royal Decree, which also prescribed that in every case of opposition to the new Constitution protocols were to be drawn up, which, after proving their identity, the opposers would have to sign. This provision is sufficient explanation of the result of the plebiscite.

Voting, which was obligatory, took place according to the list of electors. Altogether 4.288.808 votes were recorded, and of these 99.87 per cent were in favour of the new Constitution. In connection with this the "Patria", the organ of the National Peasant Party, pointed out that in the past the number of votes cast had always been less than 3 million, and gave as an explanation of the striking increase the fact that, while on the one hand voters were not required to produce their papers and persons neglecting to vote were liable to severe punishment, on the other hand all citizens of 24 years of age could vote, even if their names were not on the lists of electors.

In conclusion let it be said that in terms of Articles 129—130 of the Constitution of 28th March, 1923, a modification of that Constitution required a meeting of Parliament convened for the purpose with the presence of two-thirds of its members and a majority of two-thirds of the votes cast. The new Constitution is thus a breach of the old one. It may be of interest to note that the first Rumanian Constitution promulgated after the union of Wallachia and Moldavia by Prince Cuza on 2nd May, 1864, was also forced upon the people and subsequently sanctioned by a "plebiscite".

— y —

ACCORDING TO M. MAČEK, ONLY FEDERATION CAN SAVE YUGOSLAVIA FROM DISINTEGRATION

During the Foreign Affairs debate in the Skupshtina, M. Barichevitch brought up the subject of M. Maček's recent statement in the "Revue de Paris". To the correspondent of that paper M. Maček had said: — "We desire a federation of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, with a separate Government for the Croats. I

cannot, however, make any promises for the future. Should redress be refused us, the separatist movement will lead to a disintegration of the State and consequently to a grave European crisis." In reply to the reporter's remark that an independent Croatia was but a dream, M. Maček said he did not believe that. In his youth he had been a convinced panslav, but today when he saw how the Czechs were oppressing the Slovaks and the Serbs the Croatian nation, he no longer believed in a union of all Slavs. The organ of the Croatian Peasant Party, the "Hrvatski Dnevnik", though not denying that M. Maček did make this statement, says that Barichevitch made use of facts to suit his own ends ("Vreme", March 11, "Hrvatski Dnevnik" and "Obzor", March 12).

* * *

The organ of the Government Party, the "Samouprava", has published an article containing a report of the activity displayed in America by the "Ustasa", the followers of Pavelić. According to an article appearing on 1st February in the "Slobodna Miso" of Toronto they are broadcasting from six wireless stations and systematically arranging numerous meetings, for which purpose they have pressed a considerable number of Croat priests and congregations into their service. At the last meeting of the leaders of the Ustasa movement it was resolved to send out a delegation to the various capitals of Europe with a view to furthering the interests of the Croat national movement ("Obzor", March 3).

— y —

HOW MINORITIES LIVE

CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

M. GÉZA SZÜLLŐ ON SOLIDARITY OF MINORITIES AND M. HODŽA'S ATTEMPTS TO MISLEAD FOREIGN OPINION

In the Czechoslovak Parliament, on 8th March, M. Géza Szüllő, Chairman of the Parliamentary Club of the United Hungarian Party, delivered a speech in reply to the Foreign Minister's *exposé*, in which *inter alia* he said:

"The Premier's speech was really addressed to foreign countries. Therefore, to avoid giving rise to doubts, but at the same time in order to puzzle those who were inquiring into the causes of the difficulties of the present situation, he stressed two circumstances likely to be misleading. The one was that Czechoslovakia is what it is and is peopled by so many nationalities because, in Hodža's own words," it is a historical fact that Czechoslovakia is one of the countries in which nationals of various origin live mixed and for this reason the Peace Conference could do nothing after the war but stabilize a situation centuries old." This is a gross misstatement. For true as it is that Czechoslovakia consists of two territories joined together, the historical provinces detached from the Austrian Empire and Slovakia, which for a thousand years was an integral part of Hungary, it is equally true that it was not because no other course was open that the Peace Conference drew these ethnographically mixed frontiers, but because it was a fundamental mistake of the Peace Conference that it played the rôle of a judge meting out punishment rather than that of an arbiter between negotiating parties.

"The other statement of the nature of propaganda was that the Czechoslovak Government had fulfilled all the obligations towards the minorities which it had undertaken — and even more. Therein lay the Government's moral strength, and no nation had therefore any ground for interfering in the affairs of its racial kin in Czechoslovakia. Fully aware of the responsibility I incur, I declare that this statement of M. Hodža's does not tally with the facts. The minority question has not been solved, it has merely been side-tracked.

"What happened a few days ago is a classical example of how the question of minority rights finds solution here. It was trumpeted abroad that in recognition of the great services

rendered by the "activist" (renegade, *Ed.*) members of Parliament the minority rights of the Hungarians were to be recognized and the Magyar names of villages inhabited for a thousand years by Magyars were to be restored at the railway stations and post offices — naturally alongside of the official names of those places. But there was a restriction — namely this act of grace was to extend, not to places in which the number of Magyar inhabitants constituted the 20% of the population prescribed by the Language Act, but only to towns and villages where the percentage of Magyar inhabitants was 50% and which belonged to judiciary circuits with a 50% Magyar population. I have often had an opportunity of stating my conviction that it is bad tactics to underrate the intelligence of one's opponents. The Premier has not taken this axiom into consideration... All along the line and in everything, from the buying up of hotels and printing offices, the Government, with the help of the subtleties of the agrarian laws, is bent on one object — to act contrary to the spirit of the laws framed for the protection of the minorities. Deliberate colonization, deliberate denationalization, a deliberate educational policy, deliberate economic repression and a deliberate misleading of public opinion — all these are political instruments, but they are never the means towards an honest compromise, a thing the desirability of which we also recognize, but of which the first condition must be *clara pacta, boni amici*.

"The present situation is a critical one. For decades we have been insisting that the Achilles heel of the Czechoslovak Government is its determination to create a national State out of a typically nationality one."

M. Szüllő next criticized the Little Entente system. Here his chief objection was the lack of fair play. He then continued as follows:

"I assert that we Hungarians feel that in this Republic the Government has never made any gesture likely to create understanding. We are always spoken of as "second-rate" citizens. There are others who share this lot with us, and it is therefore quite comprehensible that a feeling of solidarity among those treated as "second-rate" citizens should have forged ties of spiritual unity which must be reckoned with. I therefore again declare that our Party, taking the historical consequences of a community of interests, shares the lot of and sympathizes with the German minority and also with the Slovaks who are striving for Slovak autonomy. So far as it lies within our power, this Party and all Hungarians are ready to do their utmost to assist the Slovaks in their fight for autonomy. Fully aware of the responsibility we incur, I also state that in the interests of the Hungarians of Czechoslovakia and in order to obtain redress of minority grievances we are ready to enter into serious negotiations with the Government.

"This is a trying hour for Government. Therefore I again draw its attention to the fact that in moral force lies its strongest support. And to acquire moral force it must see that justice triumphs. If the Government follows this principle, M. Hodža's announcement that "for a thousand years we have feared no one" — a boast rather than a historical truth — will prove true. But M. Hodža is a Slovak, and, looking upon his statement in this light I must accept it as a historical truth, but only because for a thousand years the Slovaks lived together with the Hungarians."

Two days later Count Esterházy, Acting-Chairman of the United Hungarian Party, made a speech on the *exposé* in which he emphatically pointed out that besides the German question there was also a Hungarian one. "When in this Parliament or in the Republic the minority question is spoken of either by the Premier or by the Agrarian and Socialist members" — he said — "it is always the German problem that is mentioned. This is an interesting phenomenon, and I cannot explain it otherwise than by the assumption that the German question is of such paramount importance to the Prague Government because mighty Germany is there. Did the Government wish to find a just solution of the minority problem, the German question would not always be thrust into the foreground, when there exists a Hungarian problem too. Even if Hungary is not such a great military power as the Third Reich, the Government should admit that the Hungarian problem is also one of primary importance, and one of its most pressing duties should be to solve it; for this would promote that reconciliation in the Danube Valley which is so frequently urged by the Premier."

— y —

AGED CHAIRMAN OF HUNGARIAN PARTY IN RUTHENIA UNDER ARREST.

In Ungvár (Užhorod), the capital of Ruthenia, on 14th March, the minions of the political department of the police paid a surprise domiciliary visit at night to the homes of M. Stephen Kerekes, Chairman in Ruthenia of the United Hungarian Party, and M. Charles Kőszörű, its Secretary-General, and carried away these two universally respected men to the Public Prosecutor's Office. These two arrests, every explanation of which was refused by the Police, have given rise to much excitement among the Hungarians of Czecho-Slovakia, particularly as M. Kerekes is an old man of 78. Thanks to the intervention of M. Andrew Korláth, a Deputy belonging to the United Hungarian Party, M. Kerekes was released after three days, but proceedings have been instituted against him under the Defence of the Republic Act.

— y —

ADHERENTS OF HUNGARIAN PARTY MOLESTED.

In a question recently put by Count John Esterhazy, Acting-Chairman of the United Hungarian Party, and several of his colleagues, it was stated that "the weapons with which, curtailing the rights and liberties of the citizens, it was sought to suppress all Opposition opinion, were intimidation on the part of the authorities, excessive severity on the part of the censor, and denunciations". In support of this statement Count Esterházy said that in Bodrogszerdahely M. Gajdos, President of the local group of the United Hungarian Party, had been intimidated with the threat that he and his family would suffer greatly if he continued to support the Party. In Bozsi the members of the Party had been told that their permits to cross the frontier would be withdrawn. In Ladmóc criminal proceedings had been instituted without any cause against the adherents of the Party, and similar measures had been taken in several places in the Királyhalmec (Královsky Chlumec) district.

— y —

RUMANIA

MINORITY LANGUAGES: FURTHER RESTRICTIONS

On the strength of the fact that — as stated in our last issue — the whole country has been placed under martial law, certain military authorities have issued stringent orders imposing restrictions on the exercise of civil and political rights and the free use of minority languages such as render those rights practically a farce. In the most recent instance the Prefect of County Bihar added explanatory notes to the order issued by the Sixth Army Corps. These notes state that on no account are public officials to use any language but Rumanian in their official capacity. The public criers in villages must make all announcements in Rumanian only; the sign to stop and start in *'buses* and *'trams* must be given in Rumanian only; newsvendors in the streets and public places must use Rumanian only in advertising their wares, and all advertisements must be drafted in that language ("Napló", March 4). — The order dealing with shop-signs issued by the Minister of Commerce among other things categorically bans the use of foreign languages in book-keeping ("Reggeli Lapok", March 8).

— y —

TWO HUNGARIAN NEWSPAPERS SUPPRESSED

By order of the Ministry of the Interior two weeklies, "Különvélemény" and "Hétfői Ujság", of Kolozsvár (Cluj), have been suppressed ("Brassói Lapok", March 17).

— y —

ACTIVITIES OF HUNGARIAN CULTURAL AND CHORAL SOCIETIES IN COUNTY SZATMAR SUSPENDED

The committees of these societies have applied to the Prefect for a restoration of their rights. The Prefect has answered that he would allow them to resume their activities after the new Constitution had been promulgated ("Keleti Ujság", February 28).

The application sent in by the Committee of Patrons of the Hungarian Theatre that the municipal theatre should be leased to a Hungarian company for six weeks has been rejected by the Mayor, who said that for the present he did not consider a Hungarian theatrical company desirable in Szatmár ("Ujság", March 13).

FOUNDLINGS TO BE ENTRUSTED TO KEEPING OF RUMANIAN FAMILIES ONLY

In terms of an order just issued by the Rumanian Minister of Public Hygiene, waifs and orphans supported or aided by the State may not be put in the charge of any but Rumanian families, whatever their religion or nationality may be. In future such children must attend State schools ("Estilap", March 11).

THREE OFFICIALS SUMMONED BEFORE MILITARY TRIBUNALS FOR USING MINORITY LANGUAGE IN OFFICIAL DEALINGS

Three Russian officials of the Revenue Office at Kisenev were summoned before the military tribunals for having spoken Russian in their official capacity, thus acting contrary to an order recently issued by the Military Command. (For details of this order see our January issue. *Ed.*) This act was described by the prosecuting officer as "showing disrespect towards the Rumanian nation". According to the indictment, twenty years after the union of Bessarabia with Rumania public officials could not be permitted to speak a foreign language in their official capacity ("Keleti Ujság", March 9).

POSITION OF JEWISH JOURNALISTS STILL INSECURE

The Syndicate of Rumanian Journalists has suspended the membership of Jewish journalists until the question of their citizenship has been settled ("Universul", February 27).

YUGOSLAVIA

THE SENATE ELECTIONS

February 6th was the day of the senate elections in the whole of Yugoslavia. The number of seats to be filled was 23; 17 of these were won by the Government Party (the JRZ), while M. Maček's party obtained the remaining six seats. The coalition of the opposition and M. Demeter Ljetič's "Zbor" movement were unable to secure seats. Among the new senators of the Maček Party — whose victories were won in the Dalmatian and Save constituencies — special mention is due to M. Augustin *Kossutić* (son-in-law of the late M. Stephen Radič), Dr. George *Krnjević* (a Croatian refugee residing at Geneva), Dr. Ivan *Perner* (one of those who were seriously wounded at the time of that memorable and fatal attempt in the Skupstina on July 20, 1928), and M. James *Yellašić*, secretary of the Croatian Peasant Party. In view of the provisions contained in the Senate Elections Bill (discussed in our February issue) it will be easy to see why the opposition did not stand for election in more than three Banates: namely, in the Save, Danube and Dalmatian Banates. The Government describes this result as a triumph of its own policy at home and abroad, though it is clear from the provisions of the law that the Government was bound to win, since the electorate is composed of the members of the National Assembly on the one hand and Government — appointed electors on the other. — The newly elected senators of the Maček Party are reported to have decided not to take part in the work of the Senate. — y —

HUNGARIAN FARMERS CANNOT VISIT BUDAPEST
CATTLE SHOW

The Banate Agricultural Society had planned an excursion to Budapest in March (22—27) to visit the Hungarian Cattle Show. A special train was to have conveyed the excursionists from Nagybecskerek (Petrovgrad) to Budapest, and it had been proposed to make excursions to Bugac Puszta near Kecskemét, to Mezőhegyes and to several large estates in the vicinity of Budapest. More than 300 applicants registered. A similar excursion was planned by the Bácska Agricultural Society, but both plans have been frustrated by the veto of the Yugoslav authorities. — y —

COMMEMORATION FESTIVAL IN HONOUR OF GREATEST
HUNGARIAN POET OF GREAT WAR FORBIDDEN

The Committee of the Szabadka (Subotica) Hungarian Reading Circle wished to arrange a fête on 17th March in memory of Géza Gyóni, the brilliant Hungarian poet who died as a prisoner in Siberia. The authorities, however, have interfered and frustrated the arrangements. — y —

HUNGARIANS AGAIN PASSED OVER IN CONNECTION WITH SENATOR APPOINTMENTS

In the name of the King, the Regency Council again appointed four senators at the beginning of March, and, as was the case on former occasions, the Hungarian national minority was again passed over ("Reggeli Ujság", March 10). — y —

LEADER OF HUNGARIAN MINORITY DEPRIVED OF SEAT ON MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

The Ban's Office of the Danube Banate has deprived M. Andrew Márton of his seat, on the Municipal Corporation of Becskereke. No reason has been given. — y —

RUMANIAN COMPLAINTS THAT RUMANO-YUGOSLAV EDUCATIONAL AGREEMENT IS NOT BEING RESPECTED

The official organ of the Rumanian National Peasant Party, the "Patria", has published an article by Vasile T. Maxovici, a teacher in the part of the Banate belonging to Yugoslavia, in complaining of the lamentable state of Rumanian schools in that region, in spite of the Rumano-Yugoslav educational agreement of 1935. — The children have no Rumanian schoolbooks and there are no Rumanian schoolboards. Neither is the number of Rumanian teachers sufficient. The Rumanian schools are in fact mixed Rumanian and Serb, and teaching in Rumanian takes place only in the elementary classes, while in the secondary classes the language of instruction is Serb. There is not a Rumanian school in every Rumanian township; Versec and Fehértemplom, for instance, have none. For months in succession the Rumanian teachers do not receive their salaries, and when they do, it is with illegal cuts ("Patria", February 27). — y —

CROAT TEACHERS OF HERCEGOVINA SEVERELY CRITICIZE SCHOOLBOOKS ISSUED BY STATE.

At a meeting of the teachers of the Stolac district the schoolbooks issued by Government were severely criticized, it being said that they did not come up to the intellectual standard of the children and were unsuitable in the given circumstances both from the pedagogic and from the linguistic point of view. No mention was made in them of Bosnia-Hercegovina. In the III standard reader there were eight chapters on Serb history and only one unimportant legendary story from the history of the Croats. The drawings and pictures were beneath criticism, and besides this the books contained numerous grammatical and orthographical mistakes. The children often failed to understand the text ("Obzor", March 12). — y —

POLITICAL ECONOMY

THE EFFECT OF THE ANSCHLUSS ON ECONOMY IN HUNGARY, YUGOSLAVIA AND RUMANIA

On the list of Hungary's exports for 1929 Germany's share was only 11.5% and Austria's 30.3%. In 1937 Germany figured with 24% and Austria with 16%. Germany's share of Hungary's imports in 1929 was 19.9% and Austria's 13%, but in 1937 the figures were 26.2% and 17.9% respectively. Thus Hungary's economic links with Germany show a steady growth in strength yearly.

The importance of these links has but increased since the *Anschluss*, for Germany plus Austria will absorb a round 40% of Hungary's surplus products, while Greater Germany will now supply 38.1% of Hungary's imports. In terms of the agreement concluded on 6th July 1937 between Hungary and Germany, the latter took over 40% of Hungary's surplus wheat last year. The ratio between Hungary's exports to and imports from Austria was fixed at 1.5 : 1 by the Rome Protocol, but of late Austria has not been able to buy the quota fixed. The last account with Germany shows a favourable balance for Hungary of 12.500.000 marks.

Hitherto Hungary's barter purchases from Austria consisted mainly of timber, paper and metals; from Germany she received manufactured and semi-manufactured goods and to a lesser extent raw materials. As Germany will probably absorb more of Austria's timber and metals, principally iron ore, than heretofore and the Austrian *schilling* will have to be reckoned in marks, the negotiations contemplated between Germany and Hungary will be destined to provide a new agreement applicable to the changed circumstances.

From Hungary's point of view the importance of trade with her biggest buyer and seller has greatly increased. Hungarian economic circles are of an optimistic frame of mind as regards the future and expect that if Germany's barter exports should show an increase of manufactured goods, this will be balanced by the increased importance of Hungarian agriculture and the Hungarian milling industry.

Until now Yugoslavia's main exports to Austria and Germany were cereals and live stock. Yugoslav economists expect the result of the *Anschluss* to manifest itself in a brisker trade with these countries. Greater Germany has already granted a pre-

ference to Yugoslavia inasmuch as she has undertaken to buy flour over and above the present fixed quota. In any case Germany's share of Yugoslavia's exports last year was 21.7% and Austria's 12.5%.

Czecho-Slovakia's balance of exports to and imports from Austria was always very favourable. Her chief export was coal, and according to the statement made on 6th April by M. Kalfus, Czecho-Slovak Minister of Finance, there will be no decline in the export of this commodity to Greater Germany.

Austria's and Germany's imports from Rumania consisted mainly of cereals, cattle and petroleum, in exchange for which Rumania chiefly bought manufactured goods. No important change is likely to ensue.

— y —

CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

MORE UNEMPLOYED IN SLOVAKIA AND RUTHENIA

It appears from the data published by the Czechoslovak Statistical Bureau that the total number of unemployed at the end of February, in the whole of Czechoslovakia, was 510.655. The data referring to Slovakia and Ruthenia show the least favourable situation; for, while in Bohemia and Moravia there was a slight improvement of conditions, unemployment in Slovakia and Ruthenia has increased by nearly 3% within a month.

— y —

10.8 MILLIONS MORE EXCESS OF EXPORTS IN FEBRUARY

Following are the figures for February published by the Hungarian Statistical Bureau: the value of *imports* amounted to 32.4 million pengő, while that of our *exports* amounted to 43.2 millions; the balance of our foreign trade thus shows an excess of exports of the value of 10.8 (18.5) million pengő.

In *January and February* 1938 the total value of Hungary's imports amounted to 60 million pengő, against which there stands a total value of 86.6 millions on the export side; the trade balance for the first two months of the current year thus shows an excess of exports of 36.3 million pengő, as against 26.6 millions in the first two months last year.

— y —

RUMANIA

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE STATES: NEW LANDED PROPERTY RIGHTS STILL UNCONSOLIDATED

It has been stated by M. Jonescu Sisesti, Rumanian Minister of Agriculture, that the most urgent task is to bring the work of agrarian reform to a definite close. He considered it

would be a great mistake for anyone to suggest further expropriation at present, seeing that the new land property rights were not yet properly consolidated ("Viitorul", February 26).

— y —

YUGOSLAVIA

MEASURES RELATING TO REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS MADE MORE STRINGENT IN VOIVODINA AND SAVE BANATE

A greater danger, and more detrimental to the minorities, — especially the Hungarian minority — than the Co-operative Society Act, with which we acquainted our readers in the September issue of this paper, is the Ordinance issued on 24th February by M. Milan Shimonovitch, Minister of Justice, jointly with the Ministers of Agriculture, the Interior and War. This Ordinance, which came into operation as a law on the date of its issue, imposes restrictions on the sale of real estate in the districts under the jurisdiction of the Courts of Appeal in Ujvidék (Novisad) and Zagreb, i. e. in the Voivodina, a region wrested from Hungary, and the Croat Save Banate, territories comprising the most important Hungarian and German settlement areas and part of those of the Rumanian minority. In terms of this Ordinance the conveyance of property rights following a transaction in real estate between natural persons may not be effected without the permission of a committee created to deal with the matter, and only providing the change of owners does not run contrary to interests represented by *the Defence of the State, State Administration, and autonomous — Banate, municipal and communal — administration or public traffic*. The provisions of the Ordinance also extend to land leased for a period of 5 years or longer and to real estate bought at public auctions the conveyance of which to its new owner is conditional upon the obtaining of the special permission of the committee. The new Ordinance, which is an amplification and aggravation of the ordinance that came into operation as a law under the Financial Act of 1927/28, in terms of which the purchase and sale of real estate by aliens in a zone 50 kilometres in breadth along the borders of the annexed territories is — also for reasons of defence — conditional on the Minister's permission, will make the sale and purchase of land by minority subjects, especially by the Hungarians, absolutely subject to the caprice and despotism of the authorities and the new committees. The decree has given rise to wide-spread indignation among the national minorities reflected in the fact that in the districts afflicted by it the sale of real estate has practically ceased.

— y —

S P O R T S

HUNGARY AMONG THE TEN BEST SPORTING NATIONS OF THE WORLD.

At the meeting of the International Athletic Union in Paris in March, a list was drawn up of all the member nations according to their importance in sports. The ten best sporting nations were grouped together in the first class, while another seventeen were included in the second class, the others being placed in the third class.

The class comprising the ten best sporting nations of the world consists of the following countries: Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Sweden, and the United States.

FOOTBALL

The thirteenth meeting of the representative teams of Germany and Hungary took place at Nürnberg on March 20. The Hungarian team consisted mainly of young players and was obliged to play the match without the excellent abilities of the best Hungarian forward, Dr. Sárosi. It came, therefore, as a surprize that the match resulted in a draw, 1 : 1 (0 : 0) against the first-class German team. The Hungarian team concentrated its attention upon the defence and was successful in warding off the attacks of the German team. The referee was the Belgian M. Langenus.

Of the thirteen matches hitherto played between the German and Hungarian teams, six have been won by the Hungarians, three by the Germans, while four have resulted in a draw.

On March 25 the Hungarian representative team played a first-round match in Budapest against the representative team of Greece in the presence of 14.000 spectators. The Hungarian team beat the Greeks by 11 : 1 (7 : 0).

Two famous British teams, the Wolverhampton Wanderers and the Arsenal, are reported to be visiting Budapest in the course of their tour on the Continent. The Wolverhampton Wanderers are to play in Budapest on May 15, while the date of the Arsenal match has been fixed for May 29.

— y —

LAWN TENNIS

Hungary's first Davis Cup contest will be held in Budapest on May 27 and 29, between the Hungarian and German teams. Prior to that the Central Europe Cup matches will be played in Budapest on May 13 and 15 between the Italian and Hungarian teams.

The Danubian Review is published monthly. — Editorial Offices and Management: Zrinyi-utca 1, Budapest V. — All articles, — with the exception of those signed "y" — have been translated by Dr. ARTHUR B. YOLLAND, Professor of English literature in the University of Budapest. — Responsible for the publication: Dr. ANREW FALL. — Editor for Economics: NICHOLAS UDVARDY. — Issued and printed by Sárkány Ltd. — Responsible for the printing: Dr. A. and J. Wessely.