

POLITICAL MOSAIC

BILL DEALING WITH PREROGATIVES AND ELECTION OF REGENT PASSED WITH IMPRESSIVE UNANIMITY BY HUNGARIAN PARLIAMENT

An event wellnigh unique in the history of parliaments has taken place in Hungary: The Bill extending the prerogatives of the Regent and regulating the election of future Regents has been passed with the unanimous and enthusiastic assent of all the political parties. Both in the Lower and in the Upper House this important Bill was voted, solemnly and unanimously and without debate, by a Parliament that had for the occasion risen above all party standpoints. An epoch-making Bill of this nature usually provokes bitter debates in every Parliament; this was almost always the case in the past in Hungary too, even when constitutional Bills of far less importance were introduced. In this case the debates preceded the reading of the Bill. The Prime Minister sent the draft to the several political Parties; certain paragraphs were opposed, and it was only after a compromise satisfactory to all concerned was effected that the Bill was read in a plenary session of Parliament.

The national unity thus so impressively demonstrated proves not only that all the Hungarian Parties are able to arrive at an agreement on questions of vital importance, but also how strong the spirit of constitutionalism, of parliamentarism, is in this nation, whose constitutional traditions are — next to Britain's — the oldest in Europe. The Parties carried all their objections; they did not relinquish any of the nation's rights, all of which were duly asserted in the course of the discussions with Government. It was a triumph of historical importance for the Prime Minister and his Party as well as for the Opposition. And, in particular, it was a triumph of that constitutional spirit which on due occasion is able to unite all the political factors in the country and create a united national public opinion.

For the rest, the Bill, which has now become law, has extended the Regent's sphere of authority, giving him the right to return the Bills passed by Parliament twice with a statement of his reasons for doing so. If, however, Parliament still maintains the twice rejected Bill, the Regent must promulgate it as Law within 15 days. In a sealed letter the Regent may recommend

for election as his successor three citizens of full age. The Prime Minister shall attest the seals and hand the letter to a committee consisting of high public dignitaries. In the event of the office of Regent becoming vacant a Council of State will, with certain reservations, exercise the Regent's rights until the new Regent is elected. The Council of State will consist of the Prince Primate, the Prime Minister, the presiding judges of the Curia (Supreme Court of Appeal) and the Administrative Court, the commander-in-chief of the National Defence Army and the Speakers of both Houses of Parliament. The committee must arrange for the National Assembly — consisting of the members of both Houses of Parliament — to meet for the election of the new Regent within eight days. The members of this National Assembly shall first — if the former Regent has exercised his right to nominate a choice of successors — decide by secret ballot whether they accept one of his nominees. If not they will elect a nominee of the National Assembly. At least 50 nominations are necessary for candidature and the final election will choose that one of the three candidates who receives the greatest number of nominations. The new Regent must receive over 50% of all the votes cast. The new Law also ordains that the Regent, whose term of office is for life, may not be called to account and that the right of advowson — which in the Catholic Church is a prerogative of the King as Apostolic King of Hungary — is not affected by the circumstance that the Regent does not exercise it.

— y —

LORDS AND REVISION

On June 30th, the British *House of Lords* discussed the future of the League of Nations, tried to find an explanation for its weakness and examined the possibilities of making it a really effective instrument for the preservation of the peace of the world.

In the course of the debate which followed *Lord Rennell's* motion, light was thrown from every side on the grave dilemma whether the League should be reformed or not, and if so how should it be reformed, how should its constantly weakening authority be restored? The noble Lords who took part in the debate on the reform of the Covenant, may have disagreed on various minor points, but they were all unanimous in admitting that 1) an unsound *status quo* was created by the peace treaties in 1919; 2) there are many nations who are justifiably and profoundly dissatisfied with the present state of affairs; 3) the dissatisfaction and the legitimate grievances of the unfairly treated nations are a constant menace to the peace of the world;

4) it is the task and duty of the League to remedy injustices and to remove grievances.

The House of Lords arrived at the conclusion that firm and lasting peace could not be established unless the unjust and unjustifiable treaties were revised and grievances remedied through the machinery of the League of Nations. "The impracticability of a rigid maintenance of the *status quo*" was the cautious phrase by which THE EARL of PLYMOUTH, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, placed the official seal on the plea of so many representative members of the House of Lords in favour of peaceful change through the League.

Inability of the League to Remedy the Faults of the Treaties

THE MARQUES of LOTHIAN gave an illuminating analysis of the causes of the weakness of the League. He said that "there is hardly a citizen of this country who does not accept the League as an ideal, as a practical piece of machinery for the elimination of international discord, and for the solution of international disputes by peaceful means. But, on the other hand, I think more and more people are asking themselves whether the machinery which was constructed at Paris in 1918 can achieve the objects which its expounders had in view."

Why is the League's structure inefficient to settle disputes and to ensure peace? *Lord Lothian* has unhesitatingly given the answer: "My own view is that by far the greatest cause of the breakdown of the League of Nations has been the inability of the League during the years which followed the war to remedy those faults in the Treaty of Versailles which hardly anybody now regards as having been either justified or just."

Lord Lothian's statement implies the recognition of the necessity of revising an unsound *status quo*. Lord Lothian unhesitatingly admitted that "mistakes were inevitably made in 1919 by people who were suffering from four years of war-time propaganda, who had no access to the literature of the origins of the war, and who were in those conditions inevitably bound to do things which were unsound in themselves and which ought to have been corrected within a very few years. And it has been the failure of the League to do that which is, I think, the fundamental reason why it has become weaker in later years."

Lord ASTOR read quotations from contemporary English newspapers indicating that the errors of the treaties had been recognized in time and that as far back as in 1919, eminent British publicists did not conceal their conviction that the treaties imposed on the defeated Powers would lead to recurrent European chaos or war. "A leading article in the "Manchester Guardian" said that the Peace Treaty had set up in Central

Europe a permanent centre of vehement and well-founded discontent."

Lord Astor told the House of Lords how *President Wilson*, when introducing the Covenant or speaking in support of it, admitted that in the war atmosphere there had been mistakes; that the atmosphere was not right for creating a durable, fair or just peace; and that it was his desire that Article 19 of the Covenant should be used for revising the Treaties.

Need to Revise an Intolerable Status Quo

The unsoundness of the *status quo* created by the imposed Treaties explains and justifies the growing dissatisfaction and accounts for the constant menace of war; and it is high time that the League of Nations should be made strong enough to remove grievances that are both justified and dangerous. This has been fully admitted by both *Lord Lothian* and *Lord Astor*.

The difference between the views of the two distinguished Lords was that, according to *Lord Lothian*, without altering the Covenant and *on the basis of the general acceptance of the status quo*, a far more effective instrumentality than now exists should be created for bringing about revision. The creation of adequate machinery for peaceful change should, in the view of the noble Lord, *precede* any immediate action that may be decided on for altering the *status quo*.

Lord Astor took a different view on this particular but capital issue: the alteration of the present intolerable *status quo* which has given rise to dangerous discontent calls for immediate action and must precede the establishment of adequate machinery for revision through the League of Nations. "As I see it, the right objective is first of all to get justice, to get fair play, to get a sound *status quo*. That is the first essential, and after that you should get machinery for dealing with new grievances as they arise. If we get that, we may have a reasonable hope that peace will follow. The wrong way of looking at this question is to say that the first essential is to have an absence of fighting and secondly, to hope that justice will follow. An absence of fighting is not the greatest desideratum. An absence of fighting is not a secure peace. It is not a healthy state of things if there is sullen discontent, a feeling of grievance and injustice, under the surface." — such was *Lord Astor's* remarkable comment.

Lord Lothian, as we see, only differs from *Lord Astor* in the methods of revision, in *timing* the two essential phases of a peaceful procedure; but he is not less in favour of revision through the League than *Lord Astor*. "Article 19 has never actually been invoked; and there is no machinery, as far as I know at present, in existence by which it can be brought into

effect. That is by far the biggest single addition to the machinery of the League which is necessary" — Lord Lothian said.

Impracticability of a Rigid Maintenance of the Status Quo

Summing up the debate and replying to what he described as "the brilliant analysis made by various noble Lords of the difficulties which clearly confront Members of the League in their attempt to find the right method of applying the principles of the Covenant", — the *Earl of Plymouth*, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, referred to the criticisms that the League existed only to maintain the *status quo*. He pointed out that Article 19 of the Covenant existed and that it recognised the "impracticability of a rigid maintenance of the *status quo*". The Earl of Plymouth then made a statement which deserves special attention and which should be heard in every country, especially where the possibility of revision through the League of Nations is being rejected on the ground that unanimity would be needed for passing a resolution revising any provision of the peace treaties.

The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said: "His Majesty's Government considered that a clear expression of opinion on the part of a great majority of the Assembly would undoubtedly exert moral pressure on the side of remedying injustices."

Hungary and the Plea of the Lords

In no country will the plea of the British Lords in favour of setting up adequate machinery for remedying grievances be better understood and appreciated than in Hungary. "Unsound status quo"; "mistakes in the peace treaties"; "legitimate grievances"; "sincere desire for creating an effective instrumentality for a revision by peaceful means" — apply to Hungary more than to any other defeated country.

"Can anyone imagine that Hungary will ever be satisfied with the present position?" — *Lord Mansfield* asked the House of Lords in the course of the debate on League reform.

It is hardly necessary to remind students of Central European politics what Hungary's grievances are. The territorial provisions of the Treaties, the severance against their will of nearly 4 million Hungarians, the persecution of these Hungarians by their new rulers, — all these things call for action. The League has so far proved utterly incompetent either to apply Article 19 or to ensure the observance of the Treaties for the protection of the minorities. Hungary therefore warmly welcomes the recommendations of so many distinguished members of the House of Lords who have so eloquently pleaded for such reform of the Covenant as would enable the League to remedy grievances and to ensure peace based on justice.

— y —

APPEAL OF SLOVAK COUNCIL BEFORE THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT

Not long ago Father Francis Jehlička, President of the Slovak Council in Geneva, and its Vice-President, M. Victor Dvortchak, published a striking pamphlet entitled "Should Great Britain go to war for Czechoslovakia?" (Hazell, Watson and Viney Ltd. London and Aylesbury). The pamphlet points out the unnatural geographical structure of the Czechoslovak Republic, attacks the Czecho-Bolshevik Pact, discloses the absurdity of the slogan of Czechoslovak democracy and draws the following conclusions:

"...not the Czechs who deserve England's sympathy, but the many other nationalities under Czech domination: the Slovaks, Sudeta-Germans, Ruthenes, Hungarians, and Poles. These are the peoples that should be commiserated, these are the peoples that are most in need of help.

"Even if they had joined the Czechs of their own free will, they would deserve to be pitied; for to err is human. But here the case is the very contrary: they were thrown into the Czech prisons against their will. Those statesmen who were responsible for drawing the new map of Europe never cared to consult these peoples; no plebiscite or referendum has ever been held in this part of the world.

"These peoples would have been even less eager to join the Czech State, had they known that it would make friends and conclude a military agreement with Soviet Russia. All these peoples are faithful believers in God: they are all true Christians who can hardly bear the thought that together with the Czechs they have also been subjected to the influence of "Bolshevia", and that in the event of war they will be made to shed their blood for the victory of Bolshevism.

"And if we claim justice for these peoples, nobody can say that we are unjust towards the Czechs.

"Such an accusation would only be justified if it could be said that we meant to inflict a loss on the Czechs, taking away from them something that is really their own. Yet nothing really belongs to the Czechs except the land they inhabited before the War — Bohemia. We do not suggest that Bohemia should be mutilated. Let each one have his own share: that is the principle of justice. Therefore let the Czechs have that, and *only* that, which is their own.

"Czech statesmanship has so mutilated Hungary that she has lost all her natural frontiers. More than 3,000,000 Hungarians have been separated from Hungary and handed over to their neighbours. Whenever the Hungarians complain against this state of affairs and demand the readjustment of the frontiers (revision), the Czechs vehemently protest against

revision and think it a just thing that Hungary should not even have her ethnographic frontiers. It is therefore all the more justifiable to demand that the Czechs should be confined within their ethnographic boundaries.

"The possibility of a peaceful revision is given in Article XIX of the League Covenant. But the Czechs will not even hear of revision, contending that revision means war. Moreover, they are considering the possibilities of a preventive war, as we have seen.

"The public opinion of Great Britain must be made to understand that our Slovak soldiers will not fight for the Czechs and the Soviet Russians. Nor will the Sudeta-Germans, the Hungarians, the Poles, or the Ruthenes fight for them.

"English fathers and mothers, do not allow your sons to sacrifice their lives for a bad cause like the Czecho-Bolshevik cause."

Mr. Sorensen's Question in Parliament

The pamphlet has been discussed in the British House of Commons. On 5th July Mr. Sorensen (Leyton, W. Lab.) put questions to Mr. Eden, Foreign Secretary. This was reported in "The Times" of 6th July as follows:

Mr. Sorensen asked if Mr. Eden was aware that a party styling itself the Slovak Council had been sending propaganda to this country regarding Czechoslovakia and whether he could give any information as to the status of this body.

Mr. Eden said he was not aware of this.

On 21st July Mr. Sorensen repeated his questions. According to the newspapers he asked the Foreign Secretary whether he had received representations from the Czech authorities in connection with the "misleading Hungarian propaganda" against Czecho-Slovakia going on in Great Britain, and whether the Foreign Secretary was able to make a statement concerning the situation of the minorities in Czecho-Slovakia. Mr. Eden's reply to the first question was in the negative. Regarding the second he reminded Mr. Sorensen that the situation of the minorities in Czecho-Slovakia was regulated by the minority treaty signed by Czecho-Slovakia in 1919. Mr. Sorensen then said that many members of the House of Commons had received a propaganda pamphlet, apparently from a Hungarian source, the object of which was the disintegration of Czecho-Slovakia. He asked the Foreign Secretary whether he was willing to take steps in the matter and acquaint the "Hungarian authorities responsible for this propaganda" that their behaviour — so said Sorensen — was extremely ill-willed and not to the credit of the Hungarian nation. Mr. Eden said he had no knowledge of this matter, but

had full confidence in the members who had received the pamphlet. Thereupon Mr. Sorensen asked whether the Foreign Secretary would be willing to take steps to have the propaganda pamphlet in question inquired into. Mr. Eden made no reply to this question.

In an interview granted to the London correspondent of the "Pesti Hírlap" which appeared in the issue of July 24, Mr. Sorensen stated that at the time of his question he was thinking of the appeal of the Slovak Council and that it was after reading it that he had decided to call the attention of the Foreign Secretary and the House of Commons to that sort of propaganda. He had attributed the work to Hungarian propaganda, because he had at first been informed that it was printed in Hungary and that even if official Hungary was not behind the Slovak Council the latter was maintained with the support of certain Hungarian circles. The Hungarian journalist thereupon told Mr. Sorensen that Hungary had nothing to do with the Slovak Council or the pamphlet. Mr. Sorensen's reply was that in his opinion the admittedly objective Hungarian information work would suffer in England were it to come to light that this pamphlet had originated in Hungary. He also said, however, that nobody in England, least of all himself, had any objection to a Hungarian propaganda that in a proper form revealed the wrongs undoubtedly done to Hungary in the Peace Treaties. He referred to Sir Robert Gower's last work on minority problems and declared that there was not a single person in the House or in the country who did not approve of work of that sort. In his opinion everything must be done to protect minorities and eliminate injustices. He was well aware that the forces dominating in the Succession States were oppressing the Hungarians as well as the rest of the minorities and that this was not to be tolerated. If he could do anything to help the Hungarian minorities he would certainly do his best. England was the home of liberty and would always protest against oppression, come from what side it might. Wellfounded complaints could always count on a fair hearing in Great Britain. But in his opinion Hungary could not have anything in common with the attack launched against Czecho-Slovakia in the work issued by the Slovak Council. The British nation loathed the idea of war and there had never been any possibility anywhere of Great Britain going to war for any country in Central Europe.

Mr. Sorensen deserves all praise for his frank statements. We entirely agree with what he says about Hungarian propaganda, Sir Robert Gower's book and Britain's Central European policy. But may we be allowed to remark that the appeal of the Slovak Council did not appear in Hungary, but in England. It is an organization not of Hungarians but of Slovaks driven out of their native land who in the elementary outburst of a well-justified

bitterness perhaps offend English ears accustomed to a more moderate tone, but for whom allowance must be made if we consider the lamentable conditions under which the Slovaks of Czecho-Slovakia live.

"Who is Traducing Czecho-Slovakia?"

In conclusion mention must be made of an article that appeared on 23rd June in the "Central European Observer", which is published under the aegis of the Foreign Ministry in Prague by the Orbis firm. The article: "Who is Traducing Czechoslovakia?" contains no objective arguments, but is merely a virulent attack, full of personal insults, on Jehlička's and Dvortchak's pamphlet. That organ of Czech propaganda did more harm than good to Czecho-Slovakia by replying to the Slovak Council's appeal with a personal attack on its authors instead of with arguments. The real enemies of Czecho-Slovakia are not to be sought for among those who struggle for the rights of their nation, whether — like Hlinka — at home, or — like Jehlička and Dvortchak — in compulsory exile, but amongst those who refuse to grant Slovakia the rights guaranteed to the Slovaks by the Czechs in the Pittsburg Convention of May 30, 1918, which was signed on behalf of the latter by Dr. Masaryk himself.

— y —

"THE FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN AMERICANS AND HUNGARIANS IS BECOMING STRONGER EVERY YEAR"

"The friendship between Americans and Hungarians is growing stronger every year: the reciprocal affection of the two peoples too. The Americans have come to love the Hungarians through the person of Louis Kossuth. Every American citizen visiting Hungary adds to the number of true friends of Hungary in America; for the more Hungarian air an American breathes in this country, the greater the affection he feels for Hungary and Budapest."

These were the words spoken by Mr. Howard K. Travers, in his official capacity as deputy chargé-d'affaires of the American Legation, when he laid a wreath on the statue of George Washington in Budapest. Mr. Travers further explained that Louis Kossuth had graven his name in the soul of the American people.

The speech was made by the American diplomat during the ceremony commemorating the Fourth of July — the day on which the American Declaration of Independence was issued — before the Budapest statue of George Washington erected by the generosity of American Hungarians which was the first outward symbol of the Americophile sympathies of the Hungarian

people. During the ceremony — which is held every year on July 4th. with enthusiasm and due pomp — Baron Paul Forster, Minister Plenipotentiary (retired), was the official speaker: he begged the American Hungarians not to forget their origin but at the same time to be faithful citizens of their adopted country, the great Republic of America.

It was this same sympathy for America that was reflected in the enthusiastic cordiality with which the widow of General Bandholtz was feted in Budapest. Mrs. Bandholtz visited Budapest as the guest of Hungarian society for the purpose of placing a wreath on the statue of her late husband in the presence of a large and enthusiastic gathering. As is well known, last year the Hungarians erected a statue to the memory of the late General Bandholtz, the American soldier who during the Rumanian occupation of Budapest saved the lives of many Hungarians and protected many valuable Hungarian treasures against the depredations of the Rumanians. It was owing to his energetic action, for instance, that the Rumanian soldiers were unable to carry off the unique treasures of the Hungarian National Museum.

THE PREMIER OF HUNGARY AND THE QUESTION OF MILITARY EQUALITY

In a statement made to a correspondent of the Swedish journal "Nya Dagligt Allehanda" Premier Darányi deals with the present problems of Hungary. This statement includes *inter alia* the following passages: —

"In the general race in armaments Hungary is today practically the only State in Europe which in consequence of the intolerable relevant provisions of the treaties of peace is not yet on a footing of equality; in other words, Hungary is still forbidden to organise and develop that legitimate self-defence which is the natural right of every State..."

"The chief endeavour of all conscientious statesmen is to leave no stone unturned to avert a fresh World War; for such a war would undoubtedly be a catastrophe to European civilisation", — the Prime Minister continued. — "The Hungarian Government is of the opinion that Europe cannot expect a brighter or better future except as a consequence of a true, constructive peace. Such a peace would render possible an adjustment of the conflicts of interests as between the several States by reciprocal agreement and compromise without any prejudice to the prerogatives or the dignity of either of the States concerned."

THERE IS EVERY POSSIBILITY OF A FAVOURABLE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN HUNGARY AND YUGOSLAVIA

M. Kálmán Kánya, Hungarian Foreign Minister, received a correspondent of the Belgrade "Vreme", to whom he made a statement which appeared in the July 10th. issue of that journal:

"I would ask you kindly to note down accurately our present conversation, to prevent any misunderstandings arising subsequently. As you know, you are the first publicist, not only from Yugoslavia, but from the countries of the Little Entente generally, with whom I have had a conversation; so I would ask you to listen carefully.

"In her foreign policy Hungary is quite decided: her only object internationally is close co-operation with her friends, to whom she will always remain loyal. The ties of friendship binding us to Italy and Austria as signatories of the Rome Protocols, not only exist unchanged; recently they have become stronger than ever. The same is true of our friendship with the German Empire, which is based on the reciprocal interests of the two States.

"Like our general foreign policy, that relating to the Danube Basin is also inspired by the same peaceful principles. We sincerely desire normal relations between our country and our neighbours. We are fully conscious, however, that there are still certain obstacles in the way of a *rapprochement*, and that it is only after the removal of those obstacles that we shall be able to approach those States from which we are separated by differences of varying significance. We still need time: but I am convinced that with a certain amount of goodwill and reciprocal concessions it will eventually prove possible to achieve the desired results.

"In this connection it will suffice for me to refer to the favourable development of the relations between your country and ours mentioned by Premier Stoyadinovitch recently in his speech on the Estimates. As for me, I am convinced that there is every possibility of this situation leading to happy results. Particularly in view of the fact that among the Hungarians there are signs already of a certain sympathy for Yugoslavia; and among the Yugoslavs for Hungary.

"During the last two years there has been a gradual improvement in the situation of the Magyar minority living in Yugoslavia; a new atmosphere is asserting itself in the treatment of the Magyar minority living in the Vojvodina. Great importance attached from the outset to the fact that the new régime began at once by mitigating the severity previously exercised. I trust that this will continue."

In answer to the question as to what was the attitude of Hungary in the matter of equality, — whether it was proposed to realise that equality by negotiations or by simply denouncing the military clauses of the treaty of peace? Minister Kánya replied as follows:

"It goes without saying that Hungary would much prefer the question to be adjusted by way of friendly negotiations. For the present, however, the negotiations to that end have been suspended. I prefer not to enter into details: however, both the Little Entente and Hungary have formulated separate demands of their own. What is demanded of Hungary is the conclusion of non-aggression conventions. For my part, however, I cannot see that such pacts would offer Hungary any practical benefits at all. I am prepared to negotiate: but I am not prepared to pay any price whatsoever for that equality of which so much is being said and in respect of which the League of Nations has in its possession written treaties; least of all am I prepared to pay for that equality — by new pacts. Hungary is an independent State and must pursue an independent policy, — just like your own country."

FRANCE NERVOUS ABOUT VISITS OF HEADS OF POLISH AND RUMANIAN STATES

The repeated exchange of visits between the heads of the Polish and Rumanian States, the object of which was to establish a common defence against Russia, has created an awkward situation in the relations between Rumania and France, Rumania and Czecho-Slovakia and Poland and France, who, along with Czecho-Slovakia, is, as we know, a military ally of Russia. This is a great deviation from the Rumanian foreign policy pursued by M. Titulescu, who a year ago convened in Bucharest a meeting of the Heads of the Little Entente States with a view to reconstructing the Little Entente into a military alliance that would have stamped Rumania and Yugoslavia too with the characteristics of the Czecho-Russian alliance. The military parade arranged at Cotroceni near Bucharest was to have been a demonstrative sealing of the pact, but M. Titulescu's plans collapsed (as did the tribunes for the spectators of the military parade at Cotroceni) like a house of cards, and all that came of the contemplated military alliance to serve Russia's interests was the fall of M. Titulescu.

The great nervousness noticeable in the French press shows how awkward the situation is.

In the "Echo" *Pertinax* accuses Polish foreign policy of being hand in glove with Pangermanism and hostile towards Soviet

Russia, a return, in fact, to General Pilsudsky's plans — intervention in the Ukraine and incidentally the dismemberment of Czecho-Slovakia. *He also accuses King Carol of Rumania of being an accomplice of Pangerman Germany*, because in a message to the press the latter ventured to announce the independence of Rumania's foreign policy. *Pertinax* considers Poland's and Rumania's behaviour intolerable, if they wish to remain in alliance with France and while they receive their arms from that country.

According to the "Oeuvre" the military agreement arrived at between Poland and Rumania breaks up the Little Entente and prevents the execution of the Franco-Soviet pact. The Rumano-Polish military agreement is not merely defensive but also offensive in character and internal order in both countries is mutually guaranteed. The object thereof is to break up the Little Entente and isolate Czecho-Slovakia, and as against the Franco-Soviet pact the object is to concentrate round the Berlin-Rome axis in order to shut Soviet Russia completely out of Europe.

In the "Débats" Albert *Moussset* declares that Rumania cannot undertake fresh commitments towards that Poland which refused to ratify the Treaty of Trianon, thus demonstrating that in principle she reserved her decision in the Danube question.

The "Oeuvre" and the "Echo" on the other hand publish a *Sud-Est* report from Bucharest according to which the disclosures in the international press concerning the transformation of the Rumano-Polish alliance of defence into one of offence have created a great sensation in Rumania. The Rumanian censor has carefully suppressed these foreign reports. The National Peasant Party will firmly oppose any action which would divorce Rumania from the Little Entente and France.

M. Angelescu, Rumanian Minister of Public Education, has made a statement to the "Temps" about the Rumano-Polish relations and has pointed out that Poland and Rumania think only of mutual *defensive* support. Rumania adheres to this policy because this was France's advice and because it is in keeping with her traditions.

M. *Litvinov* would also like to trouble the waters of the Rumano-Polish relations. For this purpose he has met M. Titulescu, who wished to receive a promise that Russia would recognize the present situation in Bessarabia. Hitherto the Russians have refused to accept the relevant provisions of the Peace Treaties and have not yet relinquished their claims on Bessarabia. The "Informatia" press agency states that M. Litvinov, Russian Commissary of Foreign Affairs, intends to make a very important and favourable statement about Bessarabia. It is

obvious that the real object of this report is to remind Rumanian public opinion that the new links between Bucharest and Warsaw do not provide a solution of the disturbing Bessarabian problem.

— y —

THE SECOND HODŽA CABINET

The resignation of M. Kalfus, Minister of Finance, which was handed in on 16th July, resulted in the whole Cabinet resigning. The President of the Republic again entrusted M. Hodža with the task of forming a Cabinet and after a four days' crisis the second Hodža Cabinet was formed. It differs from the first only in so far that M. Kalfus's work is being done for the time being by M. Franke, Minister of Education. The crisis was brought to a head by differences of opinion concerning the price of cereals that had arisen between the Czecho-Slovak Grain Society on the one hand and the various coalition parties on the other. To this was added the jealousy felt by the other Government parties because of the increasing influence of the Czech Agrarian Party. The new Cabinet has fixed the price of rye at 136 crowns per quintal and, that of wheat at 182.50 crowns.

— y —