

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

HUNGARY IS TO CARRY THE QUESTION OF MILITARY EQUALITY BEFORE THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Although the Berlin Government's announcement that the strength of the German army was to be increased to 12 army corps and 36 divisions, did not come as a surprise to the European Powers, it caused a wave of great excitement, chiefly in France, Russia, and the Little Entente states. Italy and Great Britain judged the situation more calmly and, thanks to this attitude, the British Secretary of Foreign Affairs, *Sir John Simon*, and the Keeper of the Seal, *Mr. Anthony Eden*, were not obliged to cancel their proposed visit to Berlin. The British statesmen had lengthy and promising conversations with *Herr Hitler* and other leading statesmen during the few days they spent in the German capital.

The attitude of the British Government in sending its representatives to Berlin in spite of recent developments may well be described as historical in its import. The decision to do so was undoubtedly based upon three things. Firstly, the step taken by Germany was no more than the open avowal of a fact known already to the whole world and tacitly tolerated by the Powers; secondly, resort to reprisals in any form whatsoever was not to be thought of; and thirdly, England had no intention, of even in the face of recent events, of abating her efforts to achieve peaceable agreement in Europe. Indeed she was ready to continue them with increased energy.

The British press did its best to judge things as they really were. The *Morning Post* stated the opinion that the German Government had now at least discarded all subterfuge, and matters must be faced with sober commonsense. To tell the truth, the whole of Europe was arming, and *H. Hitler's* important announcement had been preceded by events that made the step taken by Germany understandable. Such events, for instance, were the publication of the *White Book*, the resolution of the French Chamber to introduce a two years' military service, and, above all else, the fact that Soviet Russia had increased the size of her army on a peace footing from 400,000 to 960,000 men. — The *Morning Post* was not the only paper to write in this tenor. Even the most liberal newspapers contained similar statements. They wrote that every one of the nations was arming, and if Germany did so too, it was no novelty. Germany's disarmament 15 years ago was based upon the condition that the rest of the Powers would follow suit. As they had failed to do so, it was they themselves who first infringed the Treaty of Versailles.

Besides the British Government and the press, the House of Commons, too, adopted a quiet and sympathetic attitude. The first member to give his opinion on the question was *Mr. Lansbury*, the leader of the Labour Party. *President Wilson* — he said — when peace was being negotiated, declared that the authors of the treaties must satisfy the nations of the world and create peace and security. Sixteen years after the conclusion of the war the nations of the world were not at all satisfied with their lot. Nations did not arm themselves for amusement, nor did armies march towards peace. The hour had come when England must make new efforts to save the peace of the world and civilization. A new world conference should be convened to debate unsettled international problems. The world must not be allowed to become involved in another war. — *Sir Herbert Samuel*, leader of the Liberal opposition, pointed out that the French standpoint, strong though it might be formally, had been undermined by the shortcomings of the past, chiefly by the fact that in sixteen years' time the Allied Powers had not accomplished disarmament. But Ger-

many must not misunderstand the British point of view. Equality for Germany? Yes! German military supremacy? No! Germany had achieved the liquidation of the impossible situation created by the Treaty of Versailles, but she must rejoin the League of Nations, there to work for peace in co-operation with the rest of the nations.

Sir John Simon, Secretary of Foreign Affairs, spoke to similar effect before he left for Berlin with *Mr. Eden*. It is too early yet, even judging by the semi-official communiqué issued, to form any opinion concerning the results of the Berlin conversations. So much, however, seems clear, namely, that they were conducted with the utmost frankness and sincerity. This is shown by *Sir John Simon's* statement to the representatives of the press:

"It was wise to come to Berlin."

One thing is sure. The situation has been essentially cleared up; for Germany has put her cards on the table, and now, when the game is being played with open cards, there is a possibility that the world may be delivered from the obsession of a mad competition in armaments. This, of course, cannot be achieved in one single conference, however fruitful it may have been. The only way to a realization of that aim lies in the convening of a conference of all the responsible statesmen from the four great European Powers. The Berlin conversations have certainly, and in no small measure, opened up the possibilities of mutual understanding. Therefore it is quite likely that the reintroduction of conscription in Germany and the announcement of the fact may — other circumstances being favourable denote the serious beginnings of a European policy of peace.

Now as concerns Hungary, the situation is clear. The military provisions of the Treaty of Trianon, were an annihilating blow to Hungarian national defence, putting, as they did, our borders entirely at the mercy of the military imperialism of the Little Entente States, who are armed to the teeth. This intolerable state of matters has now lasted for over 16 years. Italy has long since realized the impossibility of the situation, and it was but lately that *S. Mussolini* gave emphatic expression to Italy's views on the subject. The *Duce's* disarmament policy rests upon three fundamental principles: equality in armaments, security, and willingness to negotiate. *S. Mussolini* has declared that should the western Powers come to terms with Germany over Army and Navy questions, Italy will enter the arena on behalf of the rest of the defeated states, viz, Hungary, Austria, and Bulgaria. But Italy will do so even should no compromise with Germany be forthcoming, for Rome has no wish to see the states of Europe judged by two different standards.

Hungary's standpoint was stated firmly and clearly by the Premier, General *Gömbös*, in one of his recent speeches which contained the following passages:

"Whoever really wants to solve the European problem must first put an end to the injustices and humiliations which the so-called defeated nations are being made to suffer. Germany first demanded equality, then invoking her own sovereignty proclaimed her equality. We cannot follow Germany along this path; for Hungary — and this is what we consider the most important of all is a member of the League of Nations, and, as such, will turn to the League with the same request. And, relying on our noble Italian friends and on all those who

have proved themselves friendly towards us, we hope to attain our aims."

For our own part we have no comments to make on the Prime Minister's unequivocal statements. It is to be hoped that the League of Nations will now, as it has done several times recently, rise to the heights of its

vocation, and, in spite of the intrigues against Hungary which are sure to be forthcoming, grant to Hungary and to the rest of the defeated states what by all the laws of human and Divine justice should by rights be theirs. In view of what has happened, and what is about to happen, we have no reason to doubt that so it will be.

—v—

FRESH YUGOSLAV PROPOSAL FOR PARTITION OF AUSTRIA

In our February number we published an article dealing with the plans of the Czechs and Yugoslavs for the partition of Austria. We would now call the attention of our readers to a pamphlet by a Slovene teacher named Emil Lilek just published at Cilli, in which this latest spokesman of Yugoslav imperialism demands the immediate annexation to Yugoslavia of Carinthia, independently of whether the "Anschluss"

comes into being or not. In another pamphlet issued a few years ago the same writer put forward a scheme for the partition of Austria between Czecho-Slovakia and Yugoslavia, — a scheme under which the Czechs claimed Lower and Upper Austria and the northern section of "Burgenland", while the Yugoslavs claimed a part of Styria and the other section of "Burgenland".

AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN CULTURAL AGREEMENT

On March 4th., in the Austrian Federal Chancellery, the Austro-Hungarian cultural agreement was signed, — by *Chancellor Schuschnigg* and *Foreign Minister Berger-Waldenegg* on behalf of Austria and by *Dr. Hóman, Minister of Education*, and *Baron Apor, Hungarian Minister in Vienna*, on behalf of Hungary. In the Agreement (Convention) based upon the principle of reciprocity the Hungarian Government declares that it will continue to maintain the Collegium Hungaricum in Vienna, as also the Hungarian Historical Institute there bearing the name of the late Count Klebelsberg, former Hungarian Minister of Education. On its part the Austrian Government is to create a chair of Hungarian literature or history in the Vienna University to be filled by a visiting professor. The chair will be filled by the Austrian Government inviting one of the scholars nominated for the purpose by the Hungarian Government. In addition, both States — as far as possible in the same measure — will carry into effect an exchange of university and

college professors and will offer facilities for a certain restricted number of visiting professors to give lectures, and later will provide for lectures to be given in German in certain seminars, reciprocally ensuring also as many places as possible for professors and research students to work in scientific institutes. Both States will alike grant certain benefits in respect of the payment of fees to a restricted number of students (not more than 12 in either case in one and the same school-year); adjusting and systematising the cultural intercourse between the two countries in roughly the same manner as provided in the Polish and Italian agreements. — On the day of the signing of the Convention *Chancellor Schuschnigg* — in the presence of *Dr. Hóman*, Hungarian Minister of Education, — opened the Exhibition of Hungarian Popular Art arranged by the Austrian Cultural Association in the rooms of the Hagenbund which displays the products of Hungarian art.

DISSOLUTION OF THE HOUSE OF DEPUTIES IN HUNGARY?

On March 5th. the Regent of Hungary dissolved the House of Deputies convened in 1931 and convened the new Parliament to meet on April 27th. The dissolution of the House of Deputies is to be attributed to the tension in evidence in the inland political situation for some nine months past, which last spring followed the calm ensuing after the formation of the Gömbös Government (in October, 1932). The resignation, first of *Nicholas Kállay*, Minister of Agriculture, followed by that of *Béla Imrédy* ensuing upon his appointment as Governor of the National Bank of Hungary, and that of *Francis Keresztes-Fischer*, Minister of the Interior, necessitated the reconstruction of the Cabinet — or rather the construction of a new Cabinet, which was joined by *Nicholas Kozma*, Managing President of the Hungarian Telegraphic Agency, as Minister of the Interior, and by *Géza Bornemissza*, General Manager of the "Hungaria" Electrification Co. Ltd., as Minister of Commerce. In a speech broadcast on March 8th., *Julius Gömbös*, Prime Minister, gave as the reason for the dissolution the "unrest and nervousness" which had "seized certain factors of public life", when "it was made known that in its reform endeavours the Government did not intend to content itself with merely proclaiming the reforms". According to the Premier, what was needed was "a situation not permitting of misunderstanding or mis-interpretation". "On the one hand it has to be made

quite clear to the sober and objective public opinion of the country that these reforms did not aim at a revolution, but on the contrary at preventing revolutions, while on the other hand the reform policy had to be hermetically closed against the atmosphere of demagogy, agitations and extremes." In the opinion of the Premier the dissolution of the House was rendered inevitable also "by the inadequate time at our disposal for a realisation of the reforms", seeing that it was quite evident to him that "the reforms had to be discussed and put into execution without a break and at one and the same period, while the parliament that had been dissolved would not have had time therefore, since its term would have lasted only barely a year and a half. While going to press, the election campaign is at high tide all over the country. One of the chief points of interest in the election struggle is the fact that Count Stephen Bethlen, who for more than ten years was Prime Minister of the country, after the dissolution resigned membership of the Government (the so-called National Unity) Party, which was founded by him, and accepted nomination at Nagykanizsa as non-party candidate. Some of his personal adherents have also left the Government Party, while a few of his former fellow-ministers are standing for election on the basis of the program formulated by the Government.

BULGARIA AND THE REVOLUTION IN GREECE

The events that have just occurred in Greece caused grave anxiety in the whole of Europe, though more particularly in the Balkan States. Bulgaria regarded the events as a threat to her frontiers, — and that not only from the side of Greece. The Bulgarian frontier on the Thracian side was defended by only a very few detachments of frontier guards; and the effects of the deadly feud in Greece might easily have penetrated into Bulgarian territory. And this would very probably have complicated matters. However, to every rational person it was evident that Bulgaria was not going to plunge into adventures; and the speech made in the Royal Theatre by Premier Zlatev, as also the statement given to representatives of the foreign press by Foreign Minister Batolov, emphasised unmistakably Bulgaria's determination to preserve peace. Yet the peace of the Balkans was actually in danger. For at the very outset of the insurrection Turkey concentrated formidable military forces on the Bulgarian frontier. This move would in itself not have been of any importance, had the Turks — as they themselves would have us believe — done so merely because their treaty with Greece requires them to watch the territorial integrity of that country. However, if we take into account that the Turkish press has for over a year been conducting a bitter and causeless campaign of calumny against Bulgaria, while during the last year or more big forts have been built in Turkish Thracia, we will understand that the measures taken by Turkey caused grave misgivings in Bulgaria. This procedure on the part of Turkey was anything but a demonstration of the strength of the Balkan

Alliance, for the defence of the Balkan frontiers is not the duty of Turkey only. The reason must be sought elsewhere. There is, for instance, the question of the passes and of the European Turkish hinterland of the passes. This is a question affecting, not only Bulgaria, but also Greece, the ally of Turkey. So we have every ground for supposing that the disarmed condition of Bulgaria and the doubtful value of a Greek army wasted by internal struggles suggested to the Turks that the present was a favourable opportunity to satisfy their territorial claims. This explains the appeal of Bulgaria to the League of Nations. The watchful eyes of the European Powers, combined with the telegrams of a peaceful character exchanged between the Bulgarian and Turkish Governments on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of Izmet İnönü's appointment as Prime Minister, luckily justify us in believing that the tension in the situation has slackened and that with the advent of settled conditions in Greece the warlike atmosphere will be removed for some time to come. The lesson to be gathered from recent events is that the Balkan Alliance gained nothing by Turkey's behaviour. On the contrary, the fact that the concentration of the Turkish troops was effected without the previous consent of the other Members of the Alliance, shows that the existence of this Balkan Alliance does preclude the possibility of individual action on the part of individual Members, even if such action is calculated to lead to war. Consequently the consolidation of the peace of the Balkans must be effected, not by a Balkan Alliance, but in some other way.

HOW MINORITIES LIVE

TWO STANDARDS FOR MINORITY PETITIONS

Under the title "*In Geneva Two Standards Are Employed When Dealing With Minority Complaints*" Dr. Ewald Ammende, Secretary General of the Permanent Congress of European Minorities, wrote an article in the March 13th. issue of the *Ujvidék* (Novisad) "*Deutsches Volksblatt*" in which he complained that, whereas the League of Nations without delay referred to the Hague Arbitral Tribunal the petition filed by the Greek Minority against Albania, the petitions filed — for instance — by the German Minorities of Pozen and Pommerellen are systematically rejected. (The same course has been taken also with most of the petitions submitted on behalf of the Magyar minorities. *Ed.*) The article stresses the fact that the Greek petitioners were represented by the same Greek diplomat, Politis, who had previously spoken before the League in favour of the Mellon-Franco principle of absorption; he had thus turned his back on his previous attitude and appeared in the arena as a champion of minority rights, merely because it was a question of the rights of a Greek minority.

CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

CZECHS AND SLOVAKS

We have repeatedly spoken in these columns of the political suit brought by the Czech authorities against Louis Bazovsky, the well-known Slovak politician who was the first Czecho-Slovak župan (sheriff) of Nógrád County, under the Protection of the Republic Act, and of the trial having been postponed owing to the illness of the accused. One of the ramifications of this political suit, which at the time created such a stir, is the trial begun on March 8th. before the District Court of Besztercebánya against Milos Vančo, former Secretary of the Turócszentmárton (Turčiansky Svety Martin) Chamber of Advocates and one of the leaders of the autonomist Slovak National Party, for having multiplied copies of the indictment against Bazovsky and having sent these copies to politicians, advocates and editorial offices. So proceedings are being taken against Vančo on the charge of having made public confidential official papers, and for that reason he has been deprived of his office as Secretary of the Chamber of Advocates. The Court