

## POLITICAL MOSAIC

### MUNKÁCS ALWAYS HAS BEEN, AND ALWAYS WILL BE A HUNGARIAN TOWN

On 15th January, the Magyars, Ruthenians and Germans of the district around Munkács held a mass meeting at which, with impressive unanimity, they declared that they desired to belong to Hungary for ever. They were ready to fight to their last breath to ensure that Munkács should remain what it had always been — a Hungarian town. The meeting was opened by M. Aladár R. Vozáry, M. P. for Munkács, who, among other things, said: — "We have met to protest against the base and treacherous behaviour of the Czechs in attacking the town and to demand redress and reparation before the tribunal of international public opinion. Should the attack be repeated, we shall not halt at the present line of demarcation, but shall drive the aggressors back as far as Verecke. An attack of this sort, executed surreptitiously and with armoured cars, cannon and machine-guns, against a peaceful town, is unprecedented in the history of Europe. The Czechs wished to take advantage of the honourable attitude of the Hungarian Government, which with due respect for international agreements, did not leave in Munkács a larger garrison than is usual in a peaceful town. The treacherous plan failed, and failed because the people of Munkács themselves proved what good Hungarians they were, and repulsed the attacks of far superior forces armed to the teeth..."

M. Vozáry's speech was frequently interrupted by loud cheers and, like a magnificent Greek chorus, cries of "Back to Verecke!" resounded again and again. When he concluded, the meeting was first addressed by M. Stephen Majoros, delegate of the Hungarian National Alliance, and then by Dr. Andrew Fall, director of the Hungarian Frontier Readjustment League, who stated that the attack on Munkács was intended by the Czechs to prove that it was not a Hungarian town. But the people of Munkács had given the lie direct to that insinuation and had shed their blood to

demonstrate that Munkács had always been, and would continue to remain, Hungarian.

"Europe is groaning under the curse of the Trianon peace edict" — said the speaker. — "Twenty years have passed since it was pronounced, but no reconciliation has taken place among the nations. No order is even conceivable in the Danube Valley until the affairs of the peoples living there are settled equitably. In Vienna only the nationality principle was enforced; the right of the nations to self-determination was ignored. Frontiers were drawn in Vienna that threaten our Slovak and Ruthenian brethren with a terrible future. The millions of Magyars in Hungary demand self-determination for their Slovak and Ruthenian brethren, in order that these peoples may be able to throw off the Czech yoke and give free expression to their own wishes by means of a plebiscite."

M. Ladislas Szánthó, one of the leaders of the men who defended the town, described in spirited words how the Magyars, Ruthenians and Germans had co-operated in that work. M. Michael Demkő, a leader of the Ruthenians living near Munkács, addressed the meeting in Ruthenian, and, speaking of the spirit of fraternity existing for a thousand years between the Magyars and the Ruthenians, laid stress on the point that the reason why the Czechs were opposed to a plebiscite was that, given a choice, 90% of the Ruthenian people would have voted for incorporation in Hungary. At the close of M. Demkő's speech the assembly sang the Ruthenian anthem.

Herr Francis Marton, a German teacher from Palánka, spoke to the meeting in German. He said that the Germans of the district had been shocked by the treacherous attack made by the Czechs and that they had immediately felt it their duty to join the Magyars and Ruthenians in their armed resistance to that act of aggression and their defence of the town and of Hungarian soil. "We who live in this German language enclave" — he said — "have always been on friendly terms with the Magyars and it would have been cowardly of us to hold back when the country that gave us our bread was threatened. There is not one man among us of whom our ancestors who rest in Hungarian soil would have to be ashamed for failure to do his duty to his country."

After these speeches M. Vozáry read out the text of a resolution, which was then unanimously adopted by the meeting. In it the people of Munkács demand reprisals and full compensation for the damage done and ask for permission to pursue the enemy beyond the present line of demarcation in the event of a fresh Czech inroad. The resolution begs the Hungarian Government to address an appeal to the Great Powers asking for a definitive revision of the Trianon Treaty and requesting them to order a

plebiscite on the principle of self-determination in the areas wrested from Hungary.

Telegrams conveying the homage of the assembly were sent to the Regent, Admiral Horthy, Herr Hitler, Signor Mussolini, Colonel Beck, Polish Foreign Minister, and the Hungarian Premier, Dr. Imrédy.

— y —

## BULGARIAN PREMIER ANNOUNCES BULGARIA'S REVISIONIST DEMANDS

*Restoration of Bulgarian Territories Attached to Rumania and Greece Demanded in Sofia Parliament.*

On 27th and 28th January there was a great foreign affairs debate in the Bulgarian Parliament. Practically all the leading members of the Opposition, most of them ex-ministers, spoke during the course of the debate. All the speakers demanded the revision of the Neuilly Treaty, especially in connection with the areas assigned to Rumania and Greece. Relations with Yugoslavia and Turkey were discussed in a particularly friendly tone by nearly all the speakers.

In his reply, Premier Kioseivanov said that the Government was resolved to devote its special attention, in an even more marked degree than hitherto, to foreign politics. Bulgaria would try to settle the questions at issue with Rumania and Greece in the near future. The Saloniki Agreement was the first step towards a revision of the Neuilly Treaty.

Today the little States could no longer have any confidence in the League of Nations, for that organization had proved impotent. Bulgaria had come to the decision that she would ask the aid of the Great Powers to help in settling her problems, but the Government was determined to pursue a foreign policy that left no scope for adventures.

The Premier made no secret of his anxiety for the future of the country. Nowadays — he said — when, not without reason, international events filled everybody, but especially the little nations, with fear and dread, it was more than ever important that those minor nations should strengthen the links of friendship binding them one to the other, and that they should form other friendly connections.

During the course of the debate several Members voiced a demand for the restoration of certain territories at present in the possession of their neighbours, Rumania and Greece. When in his speech ex-Premier Cankov mentioned merely the rights of the Bulgarian minority in Rumania, several Members cried: "We demand territory too. We want the Dobruja!"

M. Govedarov, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, said amongst other things that he would gladly welcome a Belgrade-Sofia axis extending as far as Angora.

— y —

## FRENCH DEPUTIES ON THE RUTHENIAN QUESTION

During the recent discussions on foreign affairs in the French Chamber of Deputies very interesting statements were made on the Ruthenian question, — a circumstance that at the same time proves that French policy is devoting considerable attention to the matter.

The first speaker was M. Ernest Pezet, one of the leading authorities on the Central European questions. M. Pezet pointed out (on January 20th., 1939) that the Munich Agreement signified the triumph of the principle of revision. Speaking of the Hungarians, the speaker said it was quite natural that they should have asked for urgent measures; for they had been waiting patiently for very long. The justice of their demands was enhanced by the fact that those demands were supported both by the ethnic principle and by historical rights. In the speaker's opinion there would be nothing illogical in Hungary subsequently demanding from Rumania the restoration of the frontier regions of Transylvania inhabited by Magyars. A principle recognised as valid this side of the Tisza must necessarily be valid beyond the Tisza too.

M. Pezet was followed by M. Philippe Henriot, who is also an authority on conditions in Central Europe, where he has studied those conditions on the spot.

"Prior to the Great War" — said M. Henriot — "Ruthenia was a territory belonging politically to Hungary. Its inhabitants lived in seclusion up in the mountains, their homes being accessible only by roads and paths difficult to traverse. This circumstance ensured them a kind of autonomy.

"After the War their National Council, which was entitled "Ruthenian-Magyar Council", on November 24th, 1919, proclaimed the autonomy of Ruthenia. Subsequently, as the result of certain stratagems and innumerable intrigues, Ruthenia was incorporated in Czecho-Slovakia.

"Our fellow-deputy, M. Guernier, who acted as rapporteur on the Treaty of Trianon in the Chamber of Deputies, in his report made the following statement concerning the Ruthenian question:

"The plenipotentiaries concentrated their energy chiefly on separating Ruthenia from that Hungary with which its whole economic life connected it inseparably.

"It is manifest that the situation in which the Ruthenians have been placed is not final or definitive, and that they will sooner or later return to Hungary or join East Galicia."

"This foresight on the part of our fellow-deputy was proved to have been justified when after the decision taken at Munich

Hungary demanded a plebiscite in Ruthenia to enable the people to decide its own fate.

"The Hungarian proposal was at once seconded by Poland; and indeed since 1920 a book had been published in that country urging the union of Ruthenia and Hungary in order to ensure the realisation of a common Polish-Hungarian frontier."

M. Henriot then said that Hungary did not wish simply to occupy the territory in question, but had demanded that the Ruthenians should enjoy local self-government within the framework of the Hungarian State.

Four days later (on January 24th., 1939) M. Xavier Vallat, the leader of the Hungarian section of the Central European Group of the French Chamber of Deputies, spoke again on the Ruthenian question. He established the fact that, if plebiscites had been held in Ruthenia and Slovakia, the results of the same would have been very unfavourable to Prague. In illustration of the methods still employed by Prague in its dealings with the Ruthenians M. Vallat referred to the case of M. Andrew Bródy:

"When circumstances left them no other choice" — said M. Vallat — "the central Czech Government granted Ruthenia autonomy — which in terms of the Treaty of Saint Germain should have been granted already in 1920 and which in its present form has so far proved of very dubitable value; and Marshal Sirovy himself appointed Andrew Bródy Prime Minister of Ruthenia.

"The choice was a perfectly natural one. Bródy was Editor of the only Ruthenian daily, and was President of the Ruthenian Autonomist Party, while the political tendency represented by him was after all the most important of the three political tendencies in Ruthenia.

"For there are three political parties functioning in Ruthenia, — the Ruthenian Autonomist Party, of which Bródy is President, the Great Russian Party and the Ukrainian Party, the weakest of the three, of which M. Volosin is President.

"In Ruthenia an energetic movement has been started to further the idea of re-incorporation in Hungary. This territory was for a thousand years — from the days of Charlemagne until the end of the Great War — an integral part of the dominions of the Holy Crown, its inhabitants having been named "gens fidelissima" by Prince Rákóczy, the great hero of the Hungarian struggle for independence. Therefore, between November 2nd. and November 10th., — i. e. prior to the actual re-occupation by Hungary of the areas allotted to her —, the heads of 200 out of the 320 Greek-Catholic (Uniate) parishes functioning within the territory of Ruthenia called on Bishop

Stojka at Munkács and in the name of their parishioners demanded the incorporation in Hungary of Carpatho-Russia.

"And the inhabitants of the 200 Ruthenian villages submitted a petition to that effect to the Hungarian Government.

"On November 3rd, — in this case, too, prior to the entry of the Hungarian troops —, the leading Ruthenian associations held a mass meeting at Ungvár, at which Minister Fencsik (now Member of the Hungarian Lower House) and Bishop Stojka and many others made speeches. The mass meeting also decided in favour of annexation to Hungary.

"In view of these repeated expressions of the common will of his people Premier Bródy, at the first meeting of the central Prague Government attended by him, demanded that a plebiscite should be held in Ruthenia.

"Marshal Sirovy immediately made Bródy resign and without delay sent a telegram appointing to the office of Premier M. Volosin, who is a Member of the Czech People's Party and — as I must once more remind you — leader of the weakest political party in Ruthenia — the Ukrainian Party with the assistance of which he and his freinds would fain realise a Greater Ukraine.

"Bródy was arrested and is being charged with high treason in connection with Poland."

### UTTER CONFUSION CHARACTERIZES OPERATIONS OF THE VOLOSIN GOVERNMENT

Signs of dissolution are apparent in Sub-Carpathia. There is not an inch of solid ground upon which the Volosin Government can build. The people would like to join Hungary and are hostile towards the Government, which, in order to break the political will of the people, has decided to entroduce a one-party system that would serve its own aims. With this end in view the Volosin Government has completely deprived the Hungarians of the use of their political rights and suppresses all their attempts at political self-expression. At the same time the Ruthenian Government is at loggerheads with its superior, the Prague Government, as may be seen from the Prchala affair, the details of which will be found in another part of this issue. In addition to the political blunders and the indecision characterizing the activity of the Volosin Government, another thing that makes matters worse is the extremely oppressive economic situation with which, under the circumstances at present obtaining in Ruthenia, even a more capable Government with a greater routine in administration would be quite unable to cope. The present Government has lost its head completely, and the sorry plight in which it finds itself will be evident to the reader of the following incontestable facts.

On 22nd January the Volosin Government issued an order dissolving and suppressing all the political parties and organizations in Ruthenia and making the party of Ukrainian National Unity the sole official political organization in Sub-Carpathia. The Hungarian Party was not even allowed to send a representative to the Ruthenian Diet, as in view of the numerical strength of the Hungarians it would certainly have been entitled to do. At the same time the activity of the United Hungarian Party of Czecho-Slovakia was forbidden, the Party premises were closed down, and the officials of the Party dismissed.

According to Volosin's election Ordinance the votes must be either "Yes" or "No", but those who vote "No" must write their names and addresses on the papers, or else their votes will be considered invalid. With this method of "secret" elections Volosin is able, of course, to ensure his own party securing a majority. The "Gazetta Polska" of Warsaw writing of this system on 20th January aptly describes it as "Premier Volosin's conjuring trick". In protest against it, and chiefly because of the grave violation of the rights of the Hungarians, Count John Esterházy, General President of the United Hungarian Party, sent the following telegram to M. Hacha, President of the Czecho-Slovak Republic:

"It is the duty of the United Hungarian Party to represent the interests of the Magyars living in the Czecho-Slovak Republic. It is also a well-known fact that a large number of Magyars remained in the Republic after the Vienna award. Their vital interests demand that their Hungarian character should be ensured in the field of politics through the medium of this Party. Premier Volosin has prohibited the activity of the United Hungarian Party in Sub-Carpathia, has closed and sealed its premises, and forbidden the secretaries and other functionaries of the Party to do any work for it. By these measures the Magyars of Ruthenia have been deprived of their most elementary human rights, as guaranteed to them in the Constitution. The Hungarians have now no means of protection against the official reign of terror (with detention in concentration camps) that has followed the Vienna award. As the President of this Party I beg to inform you, Sir, the President of the Czecho-Slovak Republic, that I refuse to take cognizance of this order of Premier Volosin's and I appeal to you, Mr. President, for urgent redress, confident that justice will triumph."

But instead of redressing the wrongs done to the Magyars, the Volosin Government ordered the agents of the United Hungarian Party who had been circulating papers canvassing votes for the Party to be interned. This was the beginning of a more ruthless persecution of the Magyars and Ruthenians of the Opposition. In the first place, it is forbidden to speak Hungarian and Russian in public places, and the local authorities have issued

orders that even in private the population must speak either Czech or Ukrainian. Atrocities became the order of the day. In Huszt, for instance, when the Sics, i. e. the Ukrainian Guards, assaulted M. Kossei, former M. P., and two of his companions, the gendarmes, instead of arresting the aggressors, marched the three victims off to police headquarters. Many members of the Opposition have been arrested, several people have been maltreated and in Szolyva 52 Magyars and Ruthenians have received orders to leave the country. The people thus expelled have not been allowed to take their moveables across the frontier.

Grave differences have arisen between the Volosin and the Prague Governments. This in itself is remarkable, for it would be hard to find a similar case of a provincial government openly defying the central government of the country to which it is subordinate. The whole affair began with the Slovak official census, according to which there are, in Slovakia, 2,291,000 Slovaks, 51,907 Czechs, 41,691 Moravians, 128,000 Germans, 79,000 Ruthenians, 67,000 Magyars, 29,928 Jews and 27,000 gypsies. Against these census returns (which are quite false from a Hungarian and German point of view) the "Nova Szloboda", the official organ of the Volosin Government, protested, declaring that there were at least 200,000 Ruthenians in Slovakia. Hostile feelings were aggravated by another article in the same paper in which it was stated the Volosin Government insisted on a frontier readjustment (discriminating in favour of Ruthenia) between the latter and Slovakia. M. Sidor, Slovak Minister, immediately announced that Slovakia refused to agree to a readjustment of the frontier, and would not yield one acre of land to Ruthenia. Thereupon the "Nova Szloboda" launched a virulent attack against M. Sidor, for which the paper was confiscated by the military authorities.

On 26th January, M. Sidor made another statement in the Slovak newspapers, again expressly declaring that there could be no question of frontier readjustment, since the 79,000 Ruthenians in Slovakia had their own Parliamentary representation, their own schools, and bishopric in Eperjes, and had therefore no reason not to be happy in Slovakia.

The antagonism between the two Governments is growing more and more bitter. A proof of this is that the Volosin Government has discharged 60 police officials employed partly in Huszt and partly in Szolyva. The discharged officials were sent to Prague to be "at the disposal of the Czech Government." Their posts are being filled with Ukrainian Guardists, members of the so-called Sics.

— y —

PROGRAMME OF UNITED HUNGARIAN (MAGYAR) PARTY  
OF SLOVAKIA

The Executive Committee of the United Hungarian Party of Slovakia on January 19th, held its first meeting since the Vienna award, that meeting being followed by a conference of the leaders of the Party. At the latter Count John Esterházy outlined the Party's programme in the changed circumstances.

In the first part of his speech Count Esterházy expressed his appreciation of, and gratitude to, the Hungarians now restored to the mother country for their loyalty and endurance during the vicissitudes of the past twenty years. They would never forget — he said — how those people, whether they had toiled with their brains or their hands, in towns or villages, had maintained through two decades of oppression, and amidst all the trials of their lot as a minority, their loyalty to the Hungarian language and the Hungarian soil; how they had fostered their national consciousness and guarded against anything that would have been a stain on Hungarian honour. If now they were enjoying the fruits of that conduct, it was a matter of satisfaction to the United Hungarian Party too.

Count Esterházy then went on to speak of their faithful comrades, the Sudeten Germans and their leader, Herr Henlein. They have worked together in a spirit of sincere friendship, and the cordial relations that had developed between the Hungarians and the Sudeten Germans during the past twenty years would have to be further cultivated and fostered. The Hungarian Party must never fall into the fatal mistake of attempting to enforce their rights at the expense of, or by cheating, another racial group.

The Slovaks had reached the first station of their emancipation as conceived by Andrew Hlinka, but they had not fully attained their object yet. The Slovak people might absolutely rely on the constructive co-operation of the Magyars of Slovakia in their work of state-building. The national and political interests of the Slovaks demanded that every racial group should enjoy full rights. This alone would ensure universal contentment. Sound development was possible only if the last vestiges of the old Czecho-Slovak system and spirit were ruthlessly rooted out. The classification of the minorities as second and third-rate citizens would have to cease.

Count Esterházy stressed the point that his criticism was not directed against the Slovak people itself and that his only object was to eliminate the institutional wrongs and just causes of complaint that were a hindrance to peaceful co-operation. It would be absurd — he said — if now when the Slovak people had obtained executive power it should use that power as a means of placing other racial groups at a disadvantage, groups that had

always sympathized with the aims of the Slovaks and which now expressly stated their willingness to continue to co-operate. Slovak public opinion should regard the speaker as a friend, ready always to enter the lists for the rightful demands of their Slovak brethren across the frontier. And no amount of fault-finding or ingratitude would ever make him desist from his labours.

Hitherto — he continued — the Party programme had rested on three pillars: nationalism, Christian ideas, and social justice. The programme would now be extended to embrace the idea of racialism and to implant that idea in the Magyar ethnic group. They had become fewer in number, but it did not follow that they had grown weaker, provided they accepted all the implications of that idea, which meant that all Christian Magyars in Slovakia were members of the Hungarian national group there if they clung to Hungarian traditions and were ready to struggle disinterestedly for the aspirations of the Hungarian people.

Count Esterházy closed his speech with the following words: "The measures of Providence as regards our lot are not what we hoped they would be, but the dejection caused by this must be only temporary. A new, greater, and nobler vocation awaits us, and we must accept it. In the changed circumstances our devotion to our former Hungarian fatherland will suffer no decline, while at the same time we will scrupulously do our duty as citizens of this country. With heads uplifted we take our stand before the whole world under the immaculate, snow-white standard of the Virgin and proclaim to all: Here we stand as Hungarian sentinels; law, right and justice are our weapons and God is our shield; to Him we commit the future of the Hungarian people, looking to Him for the triumph of the Hungarian cause."

Count Esterházy's speech was warmly applauded by the meeting, and the Party unanimously accepted the programme outlined therein. Expression was also given to the unanimous opinion of the leaders of the Party that the provisions of the Vienna award relating to the rights of the Magyars in Slovakia, and their guarantees, could not be made dependent on reciprocity, or on any circumstance over which they had no control.

— y —

## RUTHENIA UNDER MILITARY OCCUPATION BY CZECHS

On January 16th., M. Hacha, President of the Czecho-Slovak Republic, appointed as Carpatho-Russian Minister General Leo Prchala, who had previously functioned as military commander in Slovakia — although Prchala is not a Ruthenian but a Czech. The news of this arbitrary measure prevailed upon M. Volosin, Prime Minister of Ruthenia, to protest against a Czech general being appointed by Prague to function as Minister in Ruthenia. In his protest the Ruthenian Premier stressed the circumstance

that he had nominated two persons for appointment to the ministerial office in question, but that these nominations had been rejected by Prague. He emphasised further that Ruthenia could never under any circumstances acquiesce in the appointment of General Prchala. He would leave no stone unturned — said M. Volosin — to prevent Prchala entering upon his official functions.

On January 17th., there were great demonstrations all over Ruthenia, the population unanimously protesting against the appointment of General Prchala, while at the same time warning Prague that it would prevent Prchala from entering the territory of Carpatho-Russia. On this occasion the demonstrators everywhere shouted: — "Down with the Czechs! We do not want Czechs!"

On hearing of the demonstrations the Czech Government made a statement to the Press according to which the appointment of General Prchala to the office of Ruthenian Minister had to be made in order to ensure the restoration of order in Ruthenia, seeing that the Ruthenian Government had lost control of the situation.

On January 19th., Minister Fedor Revaj and M. Brascsajko, delegate of Carpatho-Russia, called on M. Beran, Czech Prime Minister, who was then at Huszt, for the purpose of protesting once more against the appointment and of reiterating the arguments which had already been communicated by wire to the Prague Government — above all stressing the point that only Carpatho-Russian politicians could be appointed Ruthenian Ministers, and not Czech soldiers. The discussion however led to no result, the Prague Government not being prepared to reconsider its original decision.

Seeing the intransigence of the Prague Government, the Ukrainian Minister Revaj sent the following telegram to the German Foreign Minister, Baron Ribbentrop:

"Prague has refused to take cognizance of our protests against the appointment of Prchala to the office of Minister. Despite our protest Hacha, President of the Republic, has administered the oath to General Prchala. The tension at Huszt is great. The population is embittered. Yesterday there was a great demonstration at Huszt in which the people and the members of our party took part spontaneously and of their own accord. The Czech officials and excise officers threaten to strike. The Czech military authorities have forbidden every form of communication; and the oppression of the inhabitants may lead to great difficulties. The Huszt Czech National Council, though condemning the action of Prague, is unable to achieve any results by intervention. Should Prchala assume his duties at Huszt, the situation may become disastrous. I feel it my duty to inform Your Excellency

of all these matters. In Prague even our official notifications are confiscated."

And nevertheless, on January 21st., General Prchala appeared in the Governor's Office at Huszt for the purpose of paying his respects to Premier Volosin. The latter, in the presence of Minister Revaj, had an hour's discussion with General Prchala. Ukrainian official quarters issued a communiqué respecting the discussion in which they asserted that Prchala had been convinced that his appointment had been effected with the approval of the Members of the Volosin Government. He had realised, however, that he had been mistaken and that the inhabitants of Ruthenia opposed his appointment. And in consequence he had refused to accept office as Minister and had returned to Prague. At the same time the Volosin Government had sent the Prague Government a message through General Prchala informing that Government that it was prepared to enter into negotiations respecting the appointment of a third Minister, though the new minister must be a person of Ukrainian nationality, whose appointment would then be approved. Otherwise the Ukrainians would appeal to the German Government and ask that Government to act as arbitrator.

The above statement made by Ukrainian official quarters was answered on January 30th., by a Prague statement — also originating from competent quarters — refuting the allegations of the same. According to the statement made by the Czechs the only reason why General Prchala had returned to Prague was to inform the Czech Government of the situation in Ruthenia. He had not however resigned his office as Ruthenian Minister. He had on the contrary left Prague that day (January 30th.) for Huszt for the purpose of beginning his work as third Minister of Carpatho-Russia.

The reply given to this statement made of official Czech quarters by Volosin and his colleague was a counter-declaration published the same day — January 30th., — in their Press. In this declaration the Volosin Government asserted that there was no truth whatsoever in the report that General Prchala was returning to Huszt, seeing that the serious difference of opinion arising as between Huszt and the central Prague Government as a consequence of Prchala's appointment had not been settled. General Prchala would remain for the moment in Prague, where he was negotiating with the central Government respecting his mission in Carpatho-Russia and the tasks awaiting him there. The central Government still insisted upon General Prchala's assuming office as Minister, regarding that as a guarantee of the assertion in Huszt too of the will of Prague. On January 29th. Revaj, Carpatho-Russian Minister, had spent an hour and a half discussing with the Czech Prime Minister Beran the question of

Prchala's appointment; but the discussion had not led to any result. On January 30th. Minister Revaj had once more had an audience with Prime Minister Beran.

The complications caused by the appointment of General Prchala strikingly illustrate the differences of opinion existing between the Ukrainian Government of Volosin and the Prague Government. This case shows clearly that Prague is subjecting to a military dictatorship the so-called "autonomous province of Carpatho-Russia", the government of which has been entrusted to Ukrainian terrorists. However, now that they are comfortably settled in the posts for which they yearned, the latter are defying their Prague patrons and demand absolute liberty of action for the purpose of being able to arbitrarily impose their rule on a people — the Ruthenians — which is loud in its protests against "Ukrainianism."

### ANTI-MINORITY PROVISIONS OF NEW RUMANIAN NATIONALITY ACT

In its January 19th., 1939, issue the Rumanian Official Gazette (Monitorul Oficial) published the text of the new Rumanian Nationality Act which is to come into force on February 1st, 1939, a law which contains provisions involving exceptionally grave consequences to persons belonging to the Magyar minority living in Rumania. These provisions deprive all citizens of minority status — and in particular Magyars — who have so far for purely formal reasons not obtained the rights of citizenship (have not been naturalised) of the possibility to become Rumanian citizens by de post facto inclusion in the list of those citizens.

Now this politically disabling provision threatens the very existence of a very large section of Rumanian citizens. It is most unjust towards those who are materially entitled to obtain Rumanian citizenship but who were originally omitted from the list of citizens on the ground that they had not reported themselves. Those pensionaries who have no certificates of nationality have not received their pensions for three months; while the officials, craftsmen, tradesmen and employees belonging to non-Rumanian nationalities are in danger of losing their posts owing to their not possessing nationality (citizenship) certificates. The latter, seeing that they failed to report themselves for enrolment in the list of citizens by the last date appointed for the purpose (September 30th., 1933), under the new Act cannot be given Rumanian citizenship except by the process of naturalisation. As to the proportion of persons belonging to minorities involved, that is shown by the report presented to the Pension Fund by the Mayor of Nagyvárad, according to which of the 86,000 inhabitants of the town at the present moment only 53,925 have been entered in the list of citizens, 19,268 of the person involved being heads of

families. We see, therefore, that in Nagyvárad alone roughly 32.000 persons have been omitted from the list of citizens through no fault of theirs. According to an approximative estimate there are nearly 400.000 persons who failed to report themselves for enrolment during the term originally fixed for that purpose, roughly 90% of these persons being Magyars. Their omission from the citizenship roll is particularly unjustifiable in view of the circumstance that both the treaty of peace and § 56 of the original Nationality Act unequivocally stipulated that every person who on December 1st., 1918, possessed rights of citizenship (*pertinenza*) in territory previously forming part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy transferred to Rumania should obtain ipso facto Rumanian nationality and should therefore be regarded as Rumanian citizens without being compelled to comply with any formality whatsoever.

§ 62 of the new Rumanian Nationality Act that is now coming into force instead of providing facilities for persons omitted from the citizenship roll to have themselves enrolled *de post facto* — stipulates that "those who have not complied with the conditions postulated in the Act of February 24th., 1924, shall be regarded as having renounced Rumanian citizenship as defined in the provisions of the treaties of peace and in the measures of general import." Thus, the Act contains a categorical stipulation and deprives those who have not yet obtained Rumanian citizenship of the possibility of doing so.

The only way open to these persons is to obtain citizenship by naturalisation. One of the conditions indispensable to the obtaining of Rumanian citizenship by naturalisation is ten years' uninterrupted residence in Rumania (Point 4. of § 10.) However, applicants will find that it is for nothing that they have lived their whole life in the territory now belonging to Rumania, for the period of ten years is reckoned only from the day on which applications are filed. It is true that under § 11 of the Act in cases where such procedure appears justifiable applicants may be exempted from the obligation of a ten year's period of probation; but there will be only very few cases in which applicants belonging to minorities will be allowed to avail themselves of this privilege. One of the conditions prescribed in such cases is that the applicant shall be married to a Rumanian woman. But it must be remembered that in practice it has long become the rule that only marriages with women who are ethnically pure Rumanians shall be considered as marriages coming under this provision.

It is quite evident, therefore, that the non-Rumanian minorities here too suffer from an inequality of treatment. This fact is reflected even more strikingly in the Ordinance of the Minister of Justice issued on June 5th., 1938, which required the inhabitants who are ethnically of Rumanian origin to submit applications for the recognition of their citizenship. In order to prevent

the non-Rumanian minorities from being given an opportunity to report themselves de post facto, the Ordinance of the Minister of Justice postulated that all applicants should procure from the mayors of their townships and from the ecclesiastical authorities certificates of their ethnic origin, of the faith professed by them and of their not having opted for the nationality of any other State. This Ordinance of the Minister of Justice deprived persons belonging to minorities — i. e. persons not ethnically Rumanians — of the possibility of being entered de post facto in the citizenship roll and thereby offered proof positive of the inequality of treatment meted out to persons belonging to minorities.

### THE MINORITY SITUATION MISREPRESENTED BY THE "UNIVERSUL" AND THE "VREME"

Two newspaper articles from Bucharest attack the Hungarian point of view, which has been recognized as just by international public opinion. The one appeared in the "Universul", a Rumanian newspaper notoriously given to stirring up strife, the other, in the "Vreme" of Belgrad. The latter, which of course was written in Serb, had been sent from Bucharest and bore all the hall-marks of Rumanian anti-Hungarian propaganda.

In the first-mentioned article, which appeared in the "Universul" of 28th January, the Trianon Treaty is described as "the justest act in history." This statement gives the lie to all the leaders of international politics who have recognized and frankly admitted that it was a great mistake, for which the slogan of the nationality principle, was responsible, but which subjected masses of people belonging to civilized nations to a degree of oppression hitherto unparalleled in the history of minorities. The "Universul" denies the statement made by "Le Temps" which admits that Hungary was cruelly dismembered by the Treaty of Trianon. That Paris does not require information from the "Universul" was proved by nothing better than by the opinions voiced when questions on matters of foreign policy were put in the French Chamber some days before the above-mentioned article appeared in the Bucharest newspaper. In his statements made on that occasion (January 20), M. Pezet established the fact that Hungary deserved to be rewarded for the patience with which she had waited for the enforcement of her rights and legitimate demands. M. Pezet also said that French foreign policy should have advised the Governments of the Little Entente in time. We know that these opinions are shared by the men who shape England's foreign policy, and it was but lately that M. Chamberlain declared that the League of Nations ought to have applied those paragraphs of the Covenant which in fact prescribe readjustments in accordance with the ethnic principle. But the spirit of which the "Universul" is the mouthpiece ignores advice and refuses

to listen to warnings. Articles of this nature merely serve to hinder a peaceful evolution towards the "Right". Perhaps they are intended to do so. But the case of Czecho-Slovakia shows that justice triumphant is able to break, unarmed, through lines of fortifications and set the oppressed free.

The article in the Belgrade "Vreme" is an echo of Bucharest's opinions, and it reveals the same tendency to frustrate peaceful effort. The Bucharest author of this leading article would have his readers believe that all the minority problems confronting Europe were definitively settled at the Munich Conference. He says that the questions of the minorities in Rumania were discussed then and the complete and perfect tranquility reigning within the Rumanian frontiers established in consequence.

Strange to say, nobody else has any knowledge of a general settlement extending to the whole of Europe having been arrived at in Munich. So far as the rest of us know, the decision pronounced in the case of Czecho-Slovakia by the leaders of the Great Powers assembled in Munich paved the way towards new arrangements on the ethnic principle and made the enforcement of legitimate rights theoretically possible.

The article strives to prove that peace and contentment reign within the present borders of Rumania, and that the masses of the minorities have no complaints, no wishes, and no demands. The author ventures to make some very bold statements. He says, for instance, that the large estates were divided among the peasantry by a Liberal Parliament without respect of nationality. This is a very risky thing to say, for internal conditions in Rumania are very well known to the Great Powers and to the whole of Europe. Large estates were divided among the peasants, but we all know that the land in Hungarian hands, even that belonging to the small farmers, was ruthlessly and mercilessly confiscated and handed over to Rumanian peasants, in order to further nationalist aims. Poor people whose only property was an acre or two had their land expropriated, Rumanian churches, Rumanian schools and Rumanian institutions being built on these plots of land.

The principal argument employed by the writer of the "Vreme" article is that the minorities have joined the Rumanian Party — the only party permitted by the present régime. Does this mean that the minorities are content? If the Edict issued by a military dictatorship does not allow more than one party and orders every citizen to join it, what are the poor minorities, who are at the tender mercies of the authorities, to do? Were the formation of other parties permitted, the Hungarians would belong to the Hungarian Party, and the Germans to the German one, as they did so long as that was possible. The article finds fault with the minority treaties and complains that they were forced on the Succession States. They were, in any case, very weak and

inadequate guarantees of minority rights. But if the nationalities in Rumania are really content, what fault can the author have to find with these weak guarantees? — y —

## BRITISH M. P.'s IN HUNGARY

In the middle of January, Major Henry Procter, M. P. again visited Hungary to study the situation in Central Europe after Munich. While he was here, he met a number of our leading politicians, who gave him detailed information about the Hungarian standpoint. As it was just on the eve of his arrival that Czech regular troops made an unsuccessful attack on Munkács, Major Procter decided to visit that town, and on his return he said:

"I had an opportunity of speaking with all sorts and conditions of people in Munkács, with the Mayor and the soldiers, with scientists, missionary sisters, merchants and peasants, all of whom were eye-witnesses of the events. I myself went over the scene of the battle three times. I investigated the affair from every angle, and can say with a clear conscience that undoubtedly the Czechs were the aggressors. I cannot quite understand what they actually wanted, but anyhow, from a military point of view, the manoeuvre was clumsily executed."

The Editor-in-chief of the "Pesti Hírlap", Dr. Otto Légrády, gave a dinner in honour of Major Procter to which his Budapest friends and several politicians were also invited. M. George Lukács, Privy Councillor, proposed the health of Major Procter, who replied in a long speech. Below we publish certain interesting passages therefrom.

"The first time I came to Hungary," — said Major Procter, — "a tourist's curiosity brought me. Afterwards, however, when I become acquainted with the work of the Revision League and Dr. Otto Légrády's activities, my heart was filled with a growing attachment and respect for the Hungarian people and Hungarian institutions. I heartily congratulate both on the good work they did in difficult circumstances.

"When I say this in general I must in particular express my great admiration of Hungarian diplomacy for the self-discipline manifested at the time of the Munich and Vienna negotiations wherewith a major service was rendered, not only to Hungary, but also to the whole of mankind. This was greatly appreciated by Great Britain . . .

"I look around on the political horizon and see two things. The one is the conscientiousness of Mr. Chamberlain, the strongest Prime Minister of the past fifty years. The other is the perseverance of the Hungarian nation . . . This perseverance would not have been possible without the Revision League and the work of

Dr. Otto Legrády, nor would the struggle for revision have ever been crowned with success without their efforts.

"Hungary's policy of peaceful revision will surely continue... The need for that policy is manifest if we consider what happened at Munkács. Yesterday and the day before I had an opportunity of examining the Czech triangle that reaches down under that town. This is an absolutely absurd frontier, which was drawn without any idea of local conditions."

The "Szepesi Szövetség (Zipser Alliance), the representative organization of the Germans who had been forced to flee from former Upper Hungary, appeared before Major Procter. The leaders of this Alliance stated their unswerving determination to insist upon a plebiscite being held without delay, not only in County Szepes, the part of former Upper Hungary (now Slovakia) inhabited by Germans, but also in the whole of Slovakia. The representatives of the Germans of Upper Hungary expressed the hope that Major Procter would support their cause in the British Parliament.

Another British M. P. to pay a few days' visit to Hungary was Mr. Arthur Henderson. During his stay in Budapest he made contacts with several prominent Hungarian politicians, with whom he had lengthy conversations about the Central European problems of the moment. This was not Mr. Henderson's first visit to Hungary, and he has many friends and acquaintances here. While in Budapest he made a statement to the Press in which he pointed out the importance of Hungary's role in economic and political co-operation with her neighbours. Mr. Henderson also emphasized the necessity of maintaining peace. "But" — he added — "a hatred of war is not enough for this purpose; peace must be founded on political and economic justice."

— y —