

The Hungarian Quarterly



The Carpathian Basin

April, 1987

THE HUNGARIAN QUARTERLY was first published in the spring of 1934 by the Society of the Hungarian Quarterly. The editors were: Dr. Joseph Balogh, Budapest, Hungary, Owen Rutter, London, England and Francis Deak, New York, USA.

In 1944 the Society of the Hungarian Quarterly was dissolved, and in 1945-46 its members imprisoned or deported into Russia.

Years later the communist government in Budapest started the **NEW HUNGARIAN QUARTERLY**, a propaganda publication, which in no way can be regarded as the legal successor of the original Hungarian Quarterly.

Forty years after the occupation of Hungary by the armies of the Soviet Union, which occupation is still demonstrated by the presence of Soviet troops on Hungarian soil, members of the Hungarian exile in the USA, Canada, Australia and Europe decided to pick up the fallen banner, of "peace, justice and a better future through knowledge and understanding," and republish the Hungarian Quarterly in the USA.

Our aim is the same: to acquaint the English speaking world with the past as well as the present situation of the Carpathian Basin and try to deal with the difficult problems of the future. To clear up the misconceptions and blow away the smoke-screen created by unscrupulous political adventurers in their determination to enforce their nationalistic goals at the detriment of a multi-national population which inhabit the Carpathian Basin for long centuries.

According to the newest statistics the population of the Carpathian Basin includes: 15 million Hungarians, 4.5 million Croatians, 4 million Rumanians, 3.8 million Slovaks, 0.6 million Germans, 0.5 million Serbians, 0.6 million Ruthenians, and 0.6 million others.

Our aim is to point out the festering problems which smolder under the surface ready to explode again and search for a wise and just solution of these problems, a solution which could save the future of 29.6 million people from more destruction, more killing and more suffering.

Table of Contents

Hate: The Curse of Our Century	3
<i>by Albert Wass</i>	
Dr. Alfonz Cavoja	5
Toward a Constructive Ideology and Policy in a New Central Europe	6
<i>by Eugene Padanyi-Gulyas</i>	
From Kossuth's Unknown Federalist Papers	12
<i>by Béla Talbot Kardos</i>	
From Marxist Socialism to National-Socialism Under Ceausescu	21
<i>by Jonel P. Margineanu</i>	
The Croatian Question From the Hungarian Viewpoint	25
<i>by Anthony J. Lebach, M.D.</i>	
Book Review	28
<i>by Andrew Haraszi</i>	
Hungarian Cultural Influence in Europe	29
<i>Compiled by Prof. Leslie Konnyu</i>	

Hate: The Curse of Our Century

by Albert Wass

"Man was created equal, but..." is the latent poison which pollutes the thoughts of the human race today. It sounds innocent. After all, man has the right to express his feelings and choose freely whom he likes and whom he does not. Nevertheless, the thought thus polluted is the yeast that starts the fermentation which leads to prejudice, bias, narrow-mindedness and ends in discrimination, oppression and terror. It is the bacteria that poisons society, ferments hate and causes suffering and death everywhere.

If we examine the causes of this plague under the microscope of sober evaluation, we find that in reality it is nothing more than ignorance, suspicion and a latent fear of the unknown which hides behind the tendency to rate another human being inferior or even dangerous, just because he speaks another language and adheres to customs unfamiliar to us. We are suspicious of what we do not understand. All that is needed is the covert machination of irresponsible persons, politicians, journalists, educators, etc., to blow the smoldering suspicion into a spark and the spark will grow into fire, causing riots, pogroms, massacres, wars, desolation.

This formula, found in action throughout history is illustrated by a simple fable:

The people of a certain valley spoke one language, while the people living above them in the hills spoke another. They looked different, their customs were different, and they did not even try to communicate with each other. The people of the valley raised crops, grew vegetables and planted orchards. The people of the hills raised cattle and sheep. Their slopes were steep and their soil poor. They had to work hard to raise enough food for their families. They looked with envy at the rich fields, lush vegetable gardens, and beautiful orchards down below in the valley. On the other hand, the people of the valley had no place for herds of cattle

or sheep, they were only able to keep a few milk cows, hogs, and chickens; therefore they could eat meat only once a week. They looked up enviously at the big herds of cattle and sheep grazing high above them on the slopes.

Then it came to pass one day that the people of the hills had a great celebration up there, a celebration of thanksgiving. They built a huge bonfire for the burnt offering to their god. It happened to be on a rainy day and the black smoke of the burning meat descended into the valley, making the eyes of the valley people itch and turn red.

"What the hell are those goons doing up there?" they asked each other angrily.

"Perhaps they are burning somebody alive" one of them said, "maybe somebody they captured..." The rumor started. Before the day was over, they decided to send up a small posse of young men to see what was going on. It was still raining and the young men got lost in the woods. As the dark of the evening closed around them, they stumbled into a clearing where a herd of sheep was kept. Dogs started to bark and the herdsmen came out of their huts swinging their axes and spears, thinking some bear or a pack of wolves were bothering the herd. The dogs, encouraged by their masters, attacked the young men of the valley and bit several of them. The posse ran back into the woods and kept running until they reached the valley.

"We were attacked by at least a hundred of them in the dark" they told their people, "those up there are savages!"

Next morning the herdsmen up there found two straw hats in the woods where the intruders were chased by the dogs, and took them into their village.

"These hats are worn only by the people of the valley" they said, "it's proof that they were the ones who tried to steal our sheep!"

"They want to play rough?" yelled one of

them who was known to have a hot temper, "Let's return the visit!"

So the first moonlit night a large group of the hill people descended upon the valley, ransacked the orchards, trampled some of the vegetable gardens and stole a fat goose they were able to catch.

Next morning the people of the valley discovered the damage, recognized the foot prints as made by rawhide sandals worn by the hill people, and after their leader called a meeting they decided to teach the thieves a lesson. Though there were some who wanted to go up first and have a talk with the men up there, they were soon silenced by a few loud-mouths who insisted there was no sense in trying to talk with thieves and murderers who burn their captives alive, and whose language one can not understand anyhow. So all the able bodied men of the valley gathered together with their axes, hoes, clubs, and whatever they decided to use for a weapon; rushed up into the hills, killed a few of the surprised hill-people, beat up several others and returned to their village triumphantly with a few hundred head of cattle and a few hundred head of sheep as booty for the damage done to their gardens. A few days later the hill-people returned the visit at night: set fire to the huts and killed several men, women, and children. From that time on they just kept on hating and killing each other until none of them were left: neither in the valley, nor on the hill. Thus, the smoke of the fire that was driven down into the valley by the rain and irritated the eyes of a few, started a chain of events which finally exterminated both peoples. Could it have been avoided? Certainly. Had they been able to communicate with each other, the valley people would have found out that the smoke that irritated them was caused by burnt offering of a ram the hill people used to sacrifice to their god once a year. The hill people, on the other hand, would have realized that the small band which came up that evening from the valley and got lost in the woods finally to be bitten by the dogs and chased by angry herdsman, wanted nothing more than to find out from whence the smoke was coming and what caused it. The lack of communication created misunderstanding, the misunderstanding grew into suspicion, prejudice, hate, and finally ended in violence; bring-

ing about total destruction.

Had there been any communication without prejudice, an active cooperation could have been established between the valley and the hills, one party selling meat and wool to the other in exchange for corn and vegetables: raising the standard of living for both sides. However, once misunderstanding is allowed to grow into prejudice, prejudice into hate; confrontation is inevitable. Erroneous thinking reaches the boiling point and explodes into violence. Families, neighborhoods, and nations are plagued by this dangerous mental disease and become victims of malicious demagogues who use this fatal human weakness known as hate, to attain their goals, which in each case is nothing else but an intent to divide, subdue, oppress, rule, and exploit the masses.

How can we protect ourselves and the entire human race from this evil? By simply nipping in the bud the first sign of any misunderstanding. If the people of our primitive little story had made the effort to communicate with good will by sign language, peace-offerings, or whatever was necessary to make themselves understood: peaceful solutions could have been reached to benefit both peoples.

The different nationalities inhabiting Central Europe lived side-by-side in peace for long periods of time, in spite of the fact that now and then power-hungry leaders started wars between them. However, during the last century, people were told so many times that their next-door neighbor is a low-down murderous rascal, eager to cut their throat, given the opportunity, that the distrust and anger toward each other rose into dangerous proportions. Those feelings of animosity were fueled constantly by those who wanted for their own advantage, turbulence instead of peace. That trend started with the Habsburg slogan "divide and conquer", and ended in chaos, with the breakdown of sober communications, causing the death of millions of people and bringing untold suffering to those who survived. That state of mental chaos is still being contrived by constantly feeding the peoples of Central Europe with false information concerning their neighbors in order to keep the hate alive. It is done by dictators who fear losing their power over the masses. It is done by irresponsible politicians trying to gain influence

by obscuring the truth and keeping people confused and fearful about their future.

It is indeed time to sober up and realize that the road we were lured into and are being forced to trod, ends in the quagmire of confusion where everything worth living for will be swallowed up by the quicksand of infamy. It is time to sober up and realize that all the phony slogans, twisted interpretations, falsified histories, and all the machinations used by loud-mouthed demagogues to keep the hate alive, serve the sole purpose of turning our attention from the real issues. The truth is that whether you are a Hungarian, an Austrian, a Croatian, a Slovak, a Rumanian, or whatever else: your purpose in life is to build, create, and not to destroy; to live in peace and not in fear; to be happy and joyful instead of dreading the morrow. No matter what language you speak, you were created to be free of oppression, to live a free and productive life;

to do good and not evil; love your fellowman and hate no one.

The face of the Earth is home to all of us. The same hills and the same valleys, the same flatlands and the same mountain ranges are home to all who were born there and learned to love the land that gave them bread. It is high time therefore to forget our differences which were artificially created by evil manipulators, and start building together a country which can be home to all of us: one in which every culture is just as beautiful and important as the other; where justice, freedom, and brotherly love reign, instead of hate, discrimination, and oppression.

It is up to us; all of us. All we have to do is reach out a loving hand toward one another and God will furnish the opportunity to be free and work out a lasting peace with justice: so badly needed for such a long time.

Dr. Alfonz Cavoja

1911-1986

Born in Rózsavölgy — Rozenberok, Hungary, three years before the eruption of World War I, Alfonz Cavoja studied law in Budapest and became one of the great Slovak patriots of his time. He was an ardent and devoted believer of the necessity for an independent Danubian Federation as the only possibility of survival. However, voicing his opinion on this subject in his homeland, Slovakia, brought down upon him the wrath of the Czechoslovak government, dominated by Benes and his followers, who were, from the very beginning on, Russian oriented.

When his best friend, Dr. Tuka, became the prime minister of the short-lived independent Slovak Republic, he accepted the position of Undersecretary of State in his government, with the primary objective to prepare the way for a Hungarian-Slovak federation as first step toward a United Danubian Basin or United Central Europe. However, his efforts in this direction were stopped by the German government. Ribbentrop told him: "Don't get in our way! We have our own plans. Southeastern Europe will be completely reorganized after the war as German Lebensraum."

After the Russian take over, President Tiso and Prime Minister Tuka were executed by the communists, while Dr. Cavoja was able to escape into Australia, where he lived in exile until his death. Nevertheless, he kept on working on his great vision: an independent, strong and prosperous Danubian Federation.

We sincerely hope that his compatriots, the new generation of Slovaks will heed the warnings of Dr. Cavoja and follow in his footsteps as soon as the possibility arises.

Toward a Constructive Ideology and Policy in a New Central Europe

by Eugene Padanyi-Gulyas

(Published in the book *TOWARD A NEW CENTRAL EUROPE, A symposium on the problems of the Danubian Nations*, edited by Dr. Francis S. Wagner, 1970, Danubian Press, Inc., Astor, FL).

An historic course began half a century ago. In retrospect, it can be generally characterized as a disintegration of post-feudal empires. First, Czarism was overthrown in Russia, then the Hohenzollern German empire collapsed and the Hapsburg monarchy fell apart. The latter was engineered by the Western powers in accordance with the wartime objective expressed in the political writings of the Czech Edward Benes.¹ Twenty years later, with Germany's rise to greater power, he had to emigrate a second time. Thirty years later, in 1948 under heavy political pressure of the Soviet Union, Benes became helpless embittered and died a disappointed man. Czechoslovakia's case is not extraordinary, but typical of the fate of small states in Central Europe. The results of political disintegration were fatal.

October 1968 was the date set to celebrate "fifty years of independence" for Czechoslovakia, Great Rumania, and Yugoslavia. Flags, posters, books, pamphlets, commemorative speeches and festivals had been readied for the occasion. Then the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet and four other Warsaw Pact countries demonstrated to the whole world that independence does not and did not exist in the Central European area. Between 1920 and 1938 Edward Benes formed the Little Entente as a satellite system directed against Hungary, Austria and Germany, based on French military power, loans and diplomacy. With Hitler's rise, however, Czechoslovakia broke into two parts, both becoming satellites of Germany together with the other Central European small states. Before his return from his sec-

ond exile Benes concluded a pact with Stalin and Molotov in Moscow, in 1943, and ousted more than three million Germans from Czechoslovakia. This pact led to such reliance on the Soviet Union that his whole country became its satellite and Jan Masaryk, son of Czechoslovakia's first president, committed suicide or, as it is said, was murdered. Hundreds of Czech and Slovak leaders emigrated for a second, or some for a third time.

No matter how great the efforts of small states in Central Europe were to achieve parliamentary democracy, economic development, cultural improvement, the faulty international political system engulfed the leading politicians together with thousands, even millions of families. The suicides, executions, imprisonment, repeated emigration of national leaders during these fifty years are proof that the "independence" of these small states was and is an illusion — with one exception. The only independent country in Central Europe at present is the *neutral and federal Austria* whose neutrality was guaranteed by the great powers together with sixty other states.

After 1918 a few transitional years of democratic parliamentary experimentation followed the disintegration of the empire. Then came military dictatorships and police states first from the extreme right and then from the extreme left, Hitler and Stalin. Some anomalies occurred at a number of elections in the twenties and thirties; but in the forties and after no elections at all were held worth this name. There was no freedom from the military powers and their "spheres of influence" centered first in

Berlin, then in Moscow. The development of new technology, means of transportation and industrialization continues throughout the last decades although they greatly lagged behind the West. But the advantages of industrial development were counterbalanced by loss of religious freedom, Marxist dominated churches, the muzzling of writers and other intellectuals, Marxist-Leninist dictatorial monopolization of the press and all other means of communication, and by a generally low level of subsistence. "Building Marxist Socialism" did not mean building homes for the people. The elementary need for shelter, housing is still one of the sorest spots in the economy of all satellite states and also in the Soviet Union.

The Germany of the Kaiser and Hitler was replaced by a divided Germany and a divided Berlin with its Wall, and the long Iron Curtain behind which the population seethes. Discontent with the "dictatorship of the proletariat" broke out in the uprisings of 1953, 1956 and now in Czechoslovakia. "In our Czechoslovakia of yesterday," writes the Prague *Literarni Listy* of March 28, 1968, "people were driven to trials like cattle to the slaughter house, their heads covered with sacks. Hands and legs tied, they were beaten up till they lost consciousness. Teeth knocked out, skin branded with red-hot iron happened to many. Who will guarantee that such things shall not reoccur?" The Slovak Alexander Dubcek, newly elected First Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, demanded equal rights for the Slovaks with the Czechs. The federalization of Czechoslovakia was decided upon. But then Hungarians, Ukrainians, Germans in Czechoslovakia also demanded equal rights.

Between the two world wars, the League of Nations became submerged in troubled international waters and the first promising idea of international jurisdiction went down with it. Hundreds of national leaders were persecuted and killed by the so-called "liberators of the people." Ironically this was only the start of persecuting and killing tens of thousands of the same people who were supposed to be liberated. Famine, starvation, executions, concentration camps, purges, genocide, class war, "liberation wars," — all kinds of wars followed. Freedom of expression, freedom of gathering, freedom of religion,

or in one world: *freedom* was destroyed or so manipulated that the result was equivalent to its destruction. The relative peace of the world guaranteed by a shaky balance of power was replaced by a "balance of terror" with its nuclear deterrent. It is clear now, Security would achieve better results than theoretical decisions of the that other diplomatic ways must be found. A Conference on European United Nations. This organization, with the "veto paragraph" in its charter and with its membership of questionable good-standing, without an international police force and due to big-power rivalries, has repeatedly proved itself incapable of solving major problems — with a special impotence in Central European affairs. Cold war methods with their inefficient practices will bring no solutions either.

But, while looking for new ways, we have to admit that a century ago the theory of Marxism could be, and actually was attractive to a good many dissatisfied people. What might have been attractive to the leaders of suppressed peoples of Russia 50 years ago, or of China 30 years ago, did not, however, mean progress for the people of Czechoslovakia 20 years ago, although Marxist-Leninism took over. Our question is: how was it possible that political parties proclaiming class struggle could attract millions in countries where the standard of living was high? How could union leaders with princely incomes and trade union members with adequate social security and pension systems organize Marxist parties all over the civilized world, to take part in coalition governments only to overthrow them? How is it still possible that professors and their textbooks favor Marxism as a progressive movement in countries where a high level of industrialization was accomplished without the people being deprived of decent housing; where reforms in agriculture were achieved without reducing its productivity, and illiteracy was cured by an educational system that did not require the killing of ten millions in revolutions — "cultural" or other. How could the Marxist political parties in the past be so successful in spite of terror, "dictatorship of the proletariat," Iron Curtain, Berlin Wall, censorship, "socialist realism" in art and literature against the will of the majority or the real desire expressed by their conscientious writers? The

answer to these questions seems to be essentially that it was possible because of their *international* organization. Calling their movement international meant real progress in a time when other political parties restricted themselves to one nation, not to mention those parties which were even more restricted to the goals and problems of chauvinistic groups within a nation. By organizing their movement internationally, both the Communists and Social Democrats showed foresight in the past decades during and after the dissolution of empires in all continents. Their theoreticians saw the inevitable trend toward international global cooperation many years before Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, whose philosophy emphasized "social infolding," "universal solidarity" and "coordinated planetary systems" toward which the formidable creative power of evolution forces mankind to fare.

It is, however, also a fact that Marxist political parties tried to restrict their international movement to "the worker's class" or "the proletariat," to "the present clumsy and incomplete application of a totalization" — to use Teilhard's words. Today Marxists fulminate against the kind of capitalism which does not exist anymore. Their "international" methods became antiquated.

It is shortsighted to use all the discoveries made available by technical progress for political aggrandizement or economic exploitation of others, by a superpower striving for world domination. An immeasurable amount of material wealth and uncounted millions of innocent lives were sacrificed on the altar of this false god. To ask for more destruction, to call for a global "class struggle" instead of a global struggle against ignorance and poverty seems utterly outdated. An international movement works better when its program is replaced by updated goals and is adjusted to changed demands. A truly internationally organized political movement to achieve the common goals of mankind in an evolutionary progress is right. To try to achieve today's goals with narrow-minded nationalism and chauvinism or with class prejudices of yesterday is doomed to failure.

Construction rather than destruction, integration rather than division, evolution rather than revolution is the idea of our day. These ideas are in the air. The desire for change is very real. But to find the right words expressing the new trend is not easy.

It was four years before Alexander Dubcek, first Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, started his democratic reforms, when the Alliance of Czechoslovak Democratic Associations called for *positive* constructive movements. The program was significant. Its title is less fortunate.² Searching for "nobler and deeper causes," for "new types of international action," Henry Owen refers to a Warsaw philosopher's concept³ which would eventually replace just national slogans: that of "Community" — and which is, indeed, comprehensive and attractive.

Before looking for more words or slogans, however, and assuming that the nations of a reintegrated, "Helvetized" new Central Europe will sooner or later be in the position of defining their own policies, let us review the goals of such a movement. After the Hungarian uprising in 1956 and the recent "democratization" movement in Czechoslovakia, one thing seems clear: the people living in this area are looking for a *realistic Third Way* in foreign policy, economy and in ideology, different from that of their neighbors to the East or West.

Their *foreign policy* should be based on the demand, that the zone between Russia and Germany be *militarily neutral, like Austria or Switzerland* and the neutrality of this zone should be *internationally guaranteed*. This was the idea expressed by the Hungarian freedom fights in 1956 and by the prime minister of their short-lived free government, Imre Nagy, who died a martyr for it.

One cannot, indeed, expect that more martyrs pronounce this demand; consequently we must not wait till the heads of the existing satellite governments declare their independence from the Warsaw Pact. Such a declaration was made on behalf of all the so-called "satellites" by the only free government behind the Iron Curtain and was sealed by the

blood of the Hungarian martyrs. The people in the whole region remember this. On the tenth anniversary of Imre Nagy's execution the "Literarni Listy" — the periodical of the Federation of the Writers in Czechoslovakia — reminded its readers of the merits of this great leader whose ideas on neutrality were premature in his time, but acceptable today.⁴

The wisdom of establishing a neutral zone is obvious. This is the only way for both the American and Russian armies finally to disengage and to pull back to their respective homelands. After this movement — long awaited by taxpayers of both countries — no Warsaw or NATO military pacts can be justified, nor will they be necessary. Eighty to a hundred million people in the "Helvetized" area will take care of their own affairs and will be ready to safeguard the peace of the region which means a very significant guarantee of the peace of whole Europe. This will be also the time for the major nuclear powers to adjust the objectives of their foreign policies to a realistic assessment of their own capabilities.

The *economy* of the "Helvetized" region would probably be neither Communist nor Capitalist. As judged today, the region might have a *mixed economy*. De-etatization of state enterprises and cooperatives are already on the way, but state and federal economic planning would continue. This practice is accepted also in the West.⁵ Mining, heavy industry, railway, postal service and other means of communication would be state or federally owned enterprises with self-management. Many economic organizations for cooperation of states already exist. Besides the COMECON and its committees, there are specialized agencies for cooperation in transportation, electrification, finances, etc. These would be fully developed, but without the membership of any outside major powers, whose presence only would distort the balance and harmony of the Central European community. Terms of trade and contracts would be concluded on an equal basis toward the East and West. The principle of "participation on all levels" — demanded by the Yugoslav, Czech, Slovak and Hungarian workers and students — would prevent unhealthy dictatorship of any of the inflated capital cities and would pave the road toward equality of the member nations to

real democracy without overcentralization.

Thanks to its guaranteed neutrality, the economy of a New Central Europe might be an example of prosperity without giving large sums for massive military budgets that would achieve nothing constructive; an example of continuous full employment without depriving workers of a decent standard of living, good housing, cars and traveling. Considering the world-wide need for *construction* of homes, roads, power plants, dams and factories; for an updated international system of transportation and communication; for rebuilding the dilapidated cities and for building new cities according to the global trend of healthy urbanization — it appears, that *making peace profitable* is within the reach of mankind. The existing giants in their struggle for world domination have failed to give an example of the prosperity described above. The third way of neutral countries may lead us to it.

Third Way in Ideology

The *ideology* of a New Central Europe may also pioneer an interesting third way. Like standing on an ice block with the right foot and on a red-hot plate with the left, one would not feel an average temperature; a neutralized, "Helvetized" zone between Germany and Russia very probably would have its own way of thinking, its own philosophy. Historic and recent experiences of these people are quite unique. An ideology, different of that of their neighbors, would be a natural consequence. Considering the ideological bankruptcy and confusion around the world, it is time to have some fresh ideas.

Since the world wars, nations and their best men: writers, thinkers, statesmen are labouring on the problem of how to find the path of peaceful, normal, healthy life of mankind, leading away from extremities. It seems now, that neither the promises of the "rugged individualism," nor those of Marxist collectivism resulting in an omnipotent state are any longer attractive.

One of the most interesting and honest statements in this respect, while admitting the seeming success of the Russian Revolution, attributes it to the fact, that a number of basic

Christian principles were used for Communist propaganda all through its fifty years of history. These principles: the solidarity and brotherhood of all men, the brotherly love of the poor, the freedom and peace on earth, however, were emphasized though sometimes betrayed by Christendom throughout the centuries; and the crisis of Communism today originated from its own rebellious intellectuals, who discovered that these great principles were betrayed by Communism too. Thus the search for a new way starts again.⁶

Millions in Central Europe have learned at their own expense, that *in concordia parvae res crescunt, in discordia maximaeque dilabuntur* — little things may grow united, great ones diminish in discord. The feeling of their solidarity, of their natural community of destiny, was recently expressed more than once. This is the force behind their struggle for independence from the outside powers and for intensified cooperation among themselves. The chimera of world domination makes them anxious to separate their way from those who are still pursuing this costly dream. Solidarity, masters in their own home, not domination by others, is their dream.

To start with such a joint venture in this region means that, while preserving the national characters of the respective peoples — their language, their culture, their pride of accomplishment throughout history — their energy will be united to build a new home for themselves according to a plan which would accommodate them at the best contemporary standards. This new home has to be large enough, so that its household could be well organized. Agricultural and industrial production modernized; the best use of the labor force and the forces of nature; tariff-free distribution of goods and smooth flow of traffic on the super high- and railways, on improved waterways and in the air; free exchange of ideas through all channels of modern communication; good schools, good instructions for arts and sciences, open for everyone — this is what a “Helvetized,” integrated New Central Europe means. If an industrialist in Prague invents a new product, he could sell it to between seventy and a hundred million customers. A new song recorded by Slovaks, Ruthenians or Rumanians could soon

be popular also in Vienna or Belgrade. A poem, a book, or a newspaper printed in Budapest, in Zagreb, or in Kolozsvár could reach readers or subscribers anywhere in a territory of about one million square kilometers. Free trade, free competition, mutual respect and support of every effort in pursuing the common goal are prerequisites for the progress of the inhabitants of the region.

Such endeavor is unthinkable without effective political changes and international guarantees. To construct the new home according to old-fashioned blueprints by means of narrow-minded policy of mini-states based on jealousy and chauvinism, or on internationally organized movements aimed at destruction, dictatorship or world domination is impossible. Neither can it be designed by the limited vision and controlled imagination of some dusty old principles of “socialist realism.” Therefore a *Constructive Central European Internationale* is needed, with national parties in the individual countries, to carry a joint program among the different peoples. To avoid many difficulties arising from too many small parties campaigning and possibly forming inefficient coalition governments, it was suggested that in a “Helvetized” New Central Europe a two-party system is desirable. It would perhaps be premature to go into such details as to restrict the number of parties in different states of so many different nationalities. But it seems, that one of the two or more national political parties in every member state should be organized between the states, campaigning on similar platforms and directed by principles and guidelines established at periodic congresses of a *Constructive Central European Internationale*. This term is used partly for want of a better; but partly because we believe that construction is a concept best characterizing the epoch to come. At the risk of repetition, we must point to the fact, that after a long period of destruction, disintegration, separation by national or tariff boundaries, by Iron Curtains and by walls in Berlin or elsewhere — the time has come for integration and construction. Construction, in the basic sense of this word, of homes for crowded or homeless families. Construction of an integrated New Central Europe for the people of this troubled region. Construction of a better world

on our planet for all men of good will.

After all, a good example to prove the possibility of close cooperation and effective government of peoples of different languages, nationalities and religious affiliations long overdue. Similar problems are waiting for solution in all Europe, in Asia, in Africa, in many places across the world. Our globe, as a whole, presents the same problem today. We have to start somewhere. Why not in a region, where such a new beginning would be only one more in a long series... maybe better than any of the previous ones. An inspiring example for all.

¹Edward Benes: *Détruisez l'Autriche-Hongrie*, Paris, 1917.

²"Positive Anticommunism" (Studies for a New Central Europe, Vol. I. No. 3, p. 41).

³"Foreign Policy Premises for the Next Administration" by Henry Owen, chairman, Policy Planning Council, Department of State USA ("Foreign Affairs", July, 1968).

⁴Oswald Machatka in the May, 1958 issue of the "Literární Listy", Prague.

⁵Otto Schlecht, chief of the policy division of the West German Economics Ministry: "The ad hoc economy, the economy of the light hand, is dead. We have a new economic system now — a tailored economy. We have learned a lot."

⁶P. Werenfried van Straaten in the "Ostpriesterhilfe" (10-11, 1968). See also the Fourth Dialog of Marxists and Christians (Marianske-Lazne-Marienbad Czechoslovakia, 1968).

News from Transylvania

Medical Supplies Needed

The Transylvanian World Federation reports:

Members of the medical profession in Rumanian occupied Transylvania are sending urgent messages to the free world on behalf of the Hungarian population, especially Hungarian children.

"Since the Government of the Socialist Republic of Rumania refuses to supply the Hungarian inhabited parts of the country with

milk and milk products there is an urgent need for vitamins and medicines. We ask those who are able to help" the plea goes on "to send all aid through private channels, otherwise it will disappear in the hands of government agencies. The Rumanian government is using the lack of medical supplies as a weapon against the minorities..."

Hungarian Books Outlawed

The new Rumanian "Inspector of Education", Mihai Petrescu, ordered the destruction of all books in the Hungarian language, whether these books are for children or grownups, folk tales or scientific material. Education must be uniform in the entire country, the Inspector explained to foreign journalists, therefore only books in Rumanian language can be used, no matter what language the inhabitants happen to speak.

Genocide in Action

The brutal persecution of the native Hungarians in Transylvania reached the proportions of well organized GENOCIDE. Under the leadership of dictator Ceausescu highly sophisticated methods are being invented and implicated for the purpose of eliminating the three-million Hungarians in the shortest possible time and turning Rumania from a multi-national country into a one-nation state. The staff in charge of this project is composed of former members of the dreaded IRON GUARD, a Rumanian NAZI organization.

From Kossuth's Unknown Federalist Papers¹

by Béla Talbot Kardos

Louis Kossuth wrote on February 25, 1850 in Brussa, Turkey, an *Address to the People of the United States of America* which was published in Washington D.C. by the newspapers "Union" on October 21, 1851, and the "National Era" in October 1851; also by the "New York Herald" on October 20, 1851. In this Address Kossuth said:

"Citizens of America! To you I declare with honesty that *my final aim is the idea of Federation which would weld Hungarians and the other smaller neighbouring nations into a Union, to secure the nationality and independence of each and freedom for all; freedom, not power was their desire. The sentiments of sympathy for our sufferings will inspire among the smaller states and races the wish for a fraternal confederation for that which I always urged as the only safe policy and guarantee of freedom for them all.*"

Main Principles of Federalism and Self-Government²

Introduction: Antagonism of Centralization (Etatism) and Federalism (Self-Government)

Most misunderstanding originates from words ill-defined. I shall try to clarify them.

I have always been an enemy of political centralization which absorbs the independence of all communities, counties, provinces. I opposed it at a time when, in Hungary too, many heads were confused by brilliant theories sanctified by European, especially French biases. I have always been an enemy of centralization because I never could coordinate it with freedom.

This my conviction stands today firmer than ever. And I think there are many good

reasons for it if we see what happens in France, even under the form of a Republic.

On the other hand, Habsburg Austria started a godless war against us under the pretext of its centralized system. Subsequent events — and I can say without boasting, I had a large part in them — forced some constitutional reforms on Austria. But the Viennese government threw off these constitutional guarantees, and being a sworn enemy of freedom, returned to forced centralization, thereby paralyzing liberty which the constitutional forms seemed to give to the peoples concerned.

The French nation is a great nation. Under most varying forms of government it experimented with centralization. Yet under all these different banners, it has never been really free, not under the revolutionary Convent, neither under the Consulate, Emperor, Restauration, Louis Philip, nor at present. Not "suffrage universelle," the general right to vote, could unite centralization with freedom. And I predict that the efforts of the Socialists will also end in illusion, if, after getting into power, they will not abolish centralization by a radical change for federalism.

True Liberty Is Impossible Without Federalism

True liberty I am able to imagine only in the form of *federation*.

This has been my unchanging conviction ever since, knowing my mind, I have had my own way of thinking.

If I was asked — many years ago — when anybody, who had declared the events of 1848-49 to be possible, would probably have been called insane — if I was asked what I thought of Hungary's future, I replied that she

has either no future, or if she has, her future is to form with the neighbouring smaller nations a *federation* which shall secure the political liberty and independence of all these smaller nations against the overwhelming weight of any power, and their nationality against absorption.

If I was asked why I am a friend of the county system, I answered: Because I see the idea of *federation* also approachable in the inner organization of my country by planning the county system on a democratic basis.

If I was asked how I think the reconciliation of the nationality disputes, artificially stirred up or naturally awakened, possible, my reply was again: through the idea of *federation*.

This is an old belief of mine — a belief which I did not learn from anybody but derived out of myself, for which I was often derided as a dreamer — the persistence in which is not a concession on account of the present sad condition of my country, but an old conviction of which I have always been an adherent under favorable and adverse circumstances, undauntedly. It was this idea that led me even then, when, in 1841, I proposed the independence of Croatia and stood all alone with that opinion in the whole country.

If, therefore, somebody stands up against me in the name of the federation and calls himself above me, before me, the man of liberty, he has either never understood me or has given no account to himself of his own belief.

Small Nations Cannot Maintain Their Independence Without Federation

Small nations can secure their political existence and independence only through a straight federation among themselves. Otherwise their political existence will ever be threatened by the preponderance of larger powers, and their nationality will be exposed to absorption.

This idea of federation is the surest guaranty of liberty everywhere, and for our country and the neighboring peoples it is the only possibility without which the secure existence of their respective states is inconceivable, to such an extent are they surrounded and threatened not only by overwhelmingly large, but by their very nature, also absolutistic powers.

From this situation follows for us and our neighbors in addition to the claims for securing

our existence the destination to secure Europe and the civilization of Europe.

Europe felt that she needs a wall of defense against this danger and sought it at the cost of the oppression of so many peoples, in the Austrian Empire. So that the existence of the Austrian Empire is for Europe no longer a guaranty but a danger. This is the fact which cannot be denied, admitting no longer any alternative or choice. The confederation referred to above is an indispensable necessity for Europe.

The idea of confederation was thus designated by divine providence, the finger of which is revealed in the events so strikingly, as the only remedy for Europe. An *Europe will have to atone mercilessly, if she does not obey the admonition of providence.*

Principles and Aims of Federalism

The fundamental principles of the organism of this confederation are the following:

1.) Each confederate state is entirely independent from each and from the whole confederation in all its domestic affairs.

2.) The entire confederation *in solidum* secures the independence and national competence of each confederate state.

3.) It is only natural that the relations of Serbia and Moldavia-Wallachia with the Turkish port³ being their domestic affair, they are outside of the sphere of the confederation, and the federal government does not only not mingle with them but even offers to secure its friendly intentions toward the Port by a mutual defensive alliance.

4.) The objects of the confederation are:

a.) Common defense against exterior enemies.

b.) Common customs.

c.) Common diplomacy.

5.) The affairs of the confederation are to be governed by a federal council into which each confederate state delegates at least one and, in proportion to its population and territory, at most, four members.

6.) The members of the federal council are to be elected by the legislative bodies of the states concerned and may be recalled by them.

7.) The proportion of the contribution to the common defense and the common expenses, ac-

ording to the population and the size of the territory, is to be fixed in the fundamental covenant of the confederation.

8.) The government of each state is bound to execute the decision of the federal government in its own sphere of authority, and the execution is to be guaranteed by the confederate states *in solidum*.

9.) In the ministry of each state one portfolio will be entrusted with the federal affairs; the federal councilors of the states being in constant official contact with the minister, the latter will represent the federal affairs at the national legislatures of the states concerned.

10.) Envoys to foreign powers are to be appointed and instructed by the federal council, the government of each state being free to have their own affairs represented either by the federal envoy or by a special delegate.

11.) The declaration of war and the conclusion of peace belong to the rights of the federal government.

12.) The seat of the federal government will be a place to be selected in the interior of Hungary, but not in the same place where the seat of Hungary's own government is located. The seat of the federal government is under the direct authority of the federal government, but is to be governed according to Hungarian laws and does not loose its right to representation in the Hungarian legislature.

13.) The federal council elects its president for one year from among its own members; it also decides itself as to the language of the deliberations and the minutes.

14.) The federal covenant would be subject to revision in every twenty-fifth year, on which occasion each state would be free to withdraw from the confederation or to bind itself to stay.

The above would be the principal feature of the constitution, subject of course, to modification in their form.

Inner Structure of a Member State and Division of Power

After these premises I shall draw up the contours of my construction in a short sketch:

1.) A good political division into counties (cantons)⁴ which shall be of equal size as far as possible and properly answer the natural requirements of successful administration.

2.) In this division attention must be paid mainly and above all to the nationalities, so that *people of the same tongue shall be contained in a county (canton) as far as possible*. This division solves the question of the reconciliation of the nationalities, or nothing can solve it, and the various peoples are condemned, mangling one another, to get all under the yoke.

From Kossuth's **Principles of a Political Constitution with Regard to the Solution of the Nationality Problem⁵**

Preface

The Disappointing Example of French Centralized Etatism

The example of the French Republic furnished striking proof of a thesis, which I have maintained all of my life. viz. that in order to guarantee both the rights of the individual and the freedom of the people, it is not sufficient to just pronounce the sovereignty of the people, if the power of government is too extensive, and in case any assembly whatsoever, though elected by universal suffrage, is constituted as the sole organ of that sovereignty, the said assembly be-

ing vested with unrestricted legislative powers, and forming at the same time the only legal barrier against the encroachments by the government on the rights of the individual and on political freedom.

We have seen a President of the French Republic⁶ elected by general suffrage, rebel with impunity against the honor, the dignity and the liberty of his country.

We have seen a legislative assembly, likewise elected by universal suffrage, even do away with that same universal suffrage, the source of its own mandate.

We have seen how, through the criminal

coagency of these two unrestricted powers not only were all rights, all liberties violated, all guaranties broken, all democratic institutions falsified and perverted, the Republic turned into a falsehood, but also how thereby the nominal existence of that very republic was called in question, so much so that before these all-powered organs of the people's sovereignty republican sentiments and attachments to the Republic had assumed the character of crimes, and that the poor French Republic had been reduced to a point where, as Th. Moore said deploring the fate of his country:

"It is treason to love her, and death to defend her."

Poor France! Here you are in need, not being able to guard yourself against the loss of everything you have gained by so many revolutions, except by resorting to a new revolution!

It is very sad, indeed! But it is quite natural! I have foreseen it, I have publicly foretold it the very day when reading the constitution of the French Republic I became aware that France, in spite of all those trials, has not yet learned to rid herself of that fatal propensity to *centralize power*, a propensity so flattering to the vanity of glory, but at the same time so injurious to liberty!

Do you expect that a government having at its disposal a numerous standing army which is subject to a rigorous discipline, such as is indispensable for the existence of such an army, disposing of an annual revenue of one and a half milliards, controlling all offices and employments, even those of mayors of communes; having the power to disband the National Guard to establish martial law in the country, etc. and all this subject only to the condition of not being disapproved by the majority of an assembly who in their turn are covetous of governing and of sharing the advantages, which the government doles out; do you expect that such a government should not have ambitious desires? Do you expect an all-powerful assembly not to take advantage of its absolute power?

But this would directly run counter to human nature — in order to succeed nothing less would be required than a nation of Washingtons! Washingtons, however, are very rare!

However, it may very well be that this

unhappy propensity to centralization, sprung from the inexhaustible source of traditional sentiments, originates in the character of the French people, thus being sort of fated; in this case, it is to be regretted rather than found fault with, for the hearts of nations, like those of the individuals, may easily break, but change only with great difficulty; thus France will still have to undergo many trials until she contrives to change that fatal trait in her character.

State Sovereignty Should Not Suppress the Inalienable Rights of the Individual, the Family, the Town and Community, the Autonomy of the Church, the Rights to Nationality and Freedom

I am a Hungarian, knowing the character of my people, whose propensity lies in the opposite direction, whose traditional sentiments, though immutable, rebel against any kind of centralization, I who am not striving the vanity of a conqueror's glory for my country, I, striving only after true liberty and the happiness of complete democracy for my country, I loath the centralization of power, I detest the claim to omnipotence both in government and in legislation; I shall never aid the introduction in my country of similar institutions which I consider absolutely incompatible with the inalienable rights of man — by the centralized state. Political freedom cannot be combined with a centralization, diametrically opposed — according to its natural direction — to liberty.

I wish that these rights, this liberty be secure from the encroachments of authority. There follows a rough draft of the principles of political organization, as I should submit it for approbation to the people of my country.

Fundamental principle: *Sovereignty of the people constituted in a democratic republic.*

But the people as a whole this totality of all the citizens of a country, revealing themselves through universal suffrage and the functions of the mandatories elected through that suffrage — will only in matters common to the state as a whole be the sole organ of this sovereignty.

The individual with regard to his personal rights — the family in family matters — the commune in communal matters — and the county in county matters — are likewise the organs of the said sovereignty!

Even the most absolute despot had never dreamt of taking families in the management of their domestic business under his tutelage, merely on the strength of the possibility that they might mismanage their affairs.

Thus the same liberty, the same right must be reserved for the individual, the commune, the province or county.

Men must be free in the exercise of their *individual rights*, free in their domestic affairs, free in the business of the commune, free in that of the county.

The rights of the individual cannot be subjected to the will of the family, of the commune, of the province, of the state; on the contrary, the commune must afford them support and protection against the tyranny of the family, the province against that of the commune, the state that of the province, and the inviolable principles of the constitution against that of the state; they must also find support and protection in the communes and provinces being entitled to refuse to act as executives of the state's tyranny; finally, the actual responsibility of the public officials must guarantee to every individual, to every family, to every commune, to every province the right of lodging complaints against and claiming damages from any officials whatsoever before the duly constituted tribunals.

The liberty I have just claimed for the individual, I claim likewise for the communes, for the provinces.

I cannot content myself with that homeopathic dose of liberty which consists of being entitled to go periodically to the polls with millions of my fellow citizens — I also want to enjoy individual liberty and a continuous influence on communal and provincial affairs.

Bill of Inalienable Rights

Therefore: The individual rights of man (to be enumerated in the constitution) do not fall within the province of state legislation.

Among these rights are: freedom of thought (of the press), freedom of worship (of religion) and freedom of association.

I hold that it is an inviolable right of the individual to freely associate with others with the view to the development, protection and safe-

guarding of both their moral and material interests.

People of the same creed, of the same religious associate — the churches are such free and independent associations that govern themselves at their discretion, according to the principles of their respective cults, of their respective religions. They have nothing to do with the state, and the state has nothing to do with them. (That is liberty).

The Right to Nationality is inalienable, — has nothing to do with the State. Nationalities may freely, like religions, form associations, autonomous bodies irrespective of denominations or political frontiers. They will draw up statutes for their associations, and will govern them in accordance with these statutes. The association will have nothing to do with the State and the State will have nothing to do with it. (Here again we have liberty, here we have social nationality guaranteed by the freedom of association.)

Communities and Towns. Rights of Minorities.

Let us pass on to the commune.

The commune is free and independent in the administration of communal affairs. The organization of this administration is based on the inviolable principle of universal suffrage, by all those that compose the commune.

The constitution states the required condition of an aggregation of several families to qualify for being considered a commune; it recognizes the inviolability and immutability of universal suffrage, and of the right of every official being recalled by those who elected him; but beyond that, neither the county, nor the government, nor the legislature have the right to interfere with the administration of communal affairs. Consequently every commune stipulates itself *in which language it will be administered*. They draw up their reports, write their correspondence, their petitions addressed to the counties, to the government, to the legislature in the language they have chosen for the communal administration, and they will receive the reply of the county, or the government through the intermediary of the county in the same language. (So much for nationality politics in the commune.)

But the constitution guarantees to the minority the right of lodging a complaint, or of addressing a demand to the commune, and of pleading its cause before the tribunals in its own language, or, what is more, the right of forming into a separate commune, provided it meets the requirements established by the constitution for the formation of a commune. (So much for the protection of the minority against oppression by the majority.)

Among the conditions indispensable for the constitution of a commune is the establishment of at least one primary school maintained and administered by the commune. The language used in this school will be one chosen for the administration of the commune. (So much for the development of the nationality in the commune.)

But the constitution guarantees to the minorities the freedom of educational activities both in the commune and in the associations (as the church, national associations, associations of farmers, manufacturers, trades people, etc.) Everyone has the right to open and maintain schools under the sole protection of the public, and everybody is entitled to avail himself or herself of any schooling that might be had. (So much still for the guaranty of the rights of the individual, and those of minorities.)

As to the primary schools of communes, neither the county, nor the government, nor the legislature have the right of interfering with them; the legislature, however, in view of the common interests of the State may prescribe a *minimum* of public instruction, e.g. every citizen being obliged to defend the country against any aggressor, it is necessary that elementary military instruction (drill and the fundamental maneuvers) should already be given in the communal schools. The communal official in charge of directing the school is responsible to the government, which latter is vested with the right of inspection, which it may, however, exercise only through the county.

So much for the sovereignty of the inhabitants of communes in communal matters.

But the commune and its officials as elected by the inhabitants of the commune are also the performers of the decrees issued by the county, of the orders issued by the government, and of the laws issued by the legislature of the county in all matters reserved to the county, the

government, and the legislative respectively. (A true democracy: the people make the laws and the people carry them into effect.)

For the performance of the above duties the respective officials of the commune are responsible to the county and to the government. (So much for the efficiency of the government.)

But the government cannot get into direct touch with the communes; it may send them orders only through the intermediary of the respective county. The rights of the county will be outlined below. (So much for the barrier to protect the communes against oppression by the government.)

The Counties (Cantons)

Let us pass on to the discussion of the counties.

The government establishes the boundaries of the counties, into which the country will be divided.

In so far as geographical conditions permit, the boundaries will be so established with regard to the diverse nationalities that, as far as possible, inhabitants speaking the same language live together in the same county.

The principles, which I have just established for the administration of communal affairs, will in a similar manner apply to the administration of the affairs of the counties.

The counties are composed of the representatives of the communities, who may be recalled at any time and are elected periodically by the inhabitants of the communities on the principle of universal suffrage.

The county-assembly decides in its first session by a vote of majority, which will be the language to be used in the administration of the county for the duration it is in office. It will thereafter carry on its correspondence with the government in the language so chosen. (So much for the national policy in the county.)

Kossuth's paper ends with an apology for the errors he may have unwittingly committed in 1848-49: "I openly confess with full sincerity of the brotherly feelings in my heart if the wishes of the other nationalities escaped my attention, it was because they were not brought to my knowledge. But our co-citizens of other languages may be convinced that the Hungarian

nation has long since buried the previous mutual grievances. It offers its hand in

brotherhood and is willing to give freely what one brother may offer to the other."

Plan for a Danubian Confederation

(First published in the Italian review "Alleanza" May 1, 1862)

Since the undoubtedly peculiar conditions of countries situated between the Carpathians and the Danube, the Black Sea and the Adriatic render the formation of a unified state very difficult, it is desirable that the old historic states in this region should enter into a federation with one another, which might be called "*Danubian Confederation*." In addition to the affairs of mutual interest, which would be attended to by the federal authorities, the legislation, jurisdiction and administration of each state would be entirely independent. By extensive decentralization and by allowing ample freedom to each community and province, all inhabitants of the federation could develop without hindrance, and each people could occupy the place due to it in the great family of humanity.

The basis of the new order in the Danubian countries would be the free consent of the peoples concerned either by a constitutive assembly or by universal vote. For instance, the inhabitants of Transylvania would decide by general vote whether their country shall be one with Hungary, or whether it shall be politically united and administered separately from Hungary or, finally, whether it shall be only in alliance with Hungary and the other federated states, as an autonomous state, on the basis of complete equality. Concord between the Hungarians and Rumanians, which is my most fervent desire, would secure well-being and freedom to both. I sincerely hope that we shall attain that great object.

Should the oriental question be solved by the independence of the Christian peoples, it would be desirable that Serbia and the other Southern Slav countries also join the Danubian Confederation which would then extend from the Carpathians to the Balkans and consist of Hungary, Transylvania, Rumania, Croatia and the provinces eventually to be appended to Serbia, etc.⁷

For the solutions to such delicate questions as could not be agreed upon by the peoples the

mediation or verdict of friendly powers could be requested.

Principles of a Federal Covenant

The covenant of the confederation would be drawn up by a legislative assembly, on the basis of certain principles, some of which I am going to indicate.

1.) Affairs of mutual interest would be the defense of the territory of the confederation, foreign policy, foreign representation, the commercial system including commercial legislation, customs, the principal lines of communication, weights and measures.

2.) All questions concerning the military and naval forces, fortresses and naval ports would be regulated by the authorities of the confederation.

3.) The individual states of the confederation would have no separate representatives at foreign courts, the diplomatic service will be one and common for all states.

4.) Customs affairs will be common, and the revenue of the customs will be divided among the individual states in accordance with the decision reached in this matter by the legislative assembly. Commercial legislation will be common. One currency, one system of weights and measures throughout the whole confederation.

5.) The legislative assembly will likewise decide whether the federal assembly (parliament), which exercises the legislative power, shall consist of one chamber or of two, as in the United States of America. In the latter case, the members of the House of Representatives will be elected in proportion to the number of inhabitants of the individual states. In the Senate, large and small states will be represented by the same number of members, which principle constitutes an excellent guaranty for the smaller states.

6.) The exclusive power will be exercised by a federal council to be elected by the chamber (if there is to be only one) or by both chambers (if

there are to be two). The council will direct the foreign policy, too, under the control of the legislature.

7.) The legislative assembly will decide which is to be the official language of the confederation. In the exercise of the executive power every member can use his own mother tongue.

8.) The towns: Budapest, Bucarest, Zagreb and Belgrade, will be the seats of the authorities of the confederation by rotation.

9.) The head of state, in which the authorities of the confederation will reside according to the above order, will be at the same time the president *ad interim* of the federal council and of the confederation.

10.) Each individual state makes for itself such a constitution as agrees best with its interests, provided, of course, that the principles of that constitution be not in conflict with the principles sanctioned by the confederation.

The Rights of Nationalities and Religious Bodies:

Nationalities like religious denominations, may organize in free associations, irrespective of political frontiers and administrative boundaries.

11.) The relations of the various nationalities and religious denominations would be regulated on the following basis:

a.) Each community decides its official language itself. That language will be used in its oral deliberations, its reports and communications to the chief of the country, its petitions to the government and the diet. Each community decides also as to the language of its instruction in schools.

b.) Each country decides by a majority vote which language shall be used in the administration. The oral deliberations and protocols, as well as the correspondence with the government will be this language.

c.) In the discussions of the parliament, each representative may use at pleasure any of the languages current in the country.

d.) The laws will be promulgated in all languages current in the counties and communities.

e.) In the interest of their nationality the inhabitants of the country can freely unite into large national associations (consortii), organize

themselves at will and hold smaller or larger meetings and periodical conferences for the settlement of their religious affairs. They may also elect a national chief, whom they may call Woyvode, Hospodar, or some similar name.

f.) They can entrust the nationality associations with taking measures in regard to their churches and schools, freely electing their prelates, calling them patriarchs, metropolitans as the case may be.

g.) They can enact statutes in regard to their organization and their nationality and religious interests.

h.) The state demands from them only one thing, viz. that their decisions and acts be made public.

Mutual Understanding Between Hungarians, Slavs and Rumanians

I trust that all Danubian countries will accept the above propositions, for they are in accordance with their desires and interests, and secure their future. Thus we should succeed in creating inner harmony between them the first consequence of which would be the fall of the tyrants and the crumbling away of the senile and decayed states which keep them now in bondage and hinder them in their noble endeavours. In the name of Heaven, I entreat the Hungarians, Slavic and Rumanian brethren to throw a veil on the past and to stretch out their hands to each other, rising like one man for their common liberty and fighting all for one and one for all *according to the old example given by the Swiss*. In the name of Heaven, I entreat them to accept the plan, which is not a concession, but a mutual and free confederation. Each nation of the lower Danube, even if it should succeed in gathering around itself its racial relations now belonging elsewhere — could form, in the best case, only a second-rate state, the independence of which would incessantly be in jeopardy, and which state would necessarily be subjected to foreign influences. But if the Hungarians, Southern Slavs and Rumanians accept the above plan, they will form a first-rate, wealthy and powerful state, which will weigh heavily in the balance of Europe.

Unity, concord, fraternity among the Hungarians, Slavs and Rumanians! This is, indeed,

my most fervent desire, my most sincere advice!
Here is a smiling future for all of them!

¹The following texts are from a manuscript: *The Federalist Papers of Louis Kossuth* which gives the original explanation and historical background of Kossuth's partly unpublished papers on the Confederation of the Danubian nations. The manuscript of Béla Talbot Kardos was awarded a Gold Medal Award from the Cultural Meeting of Hungarians in America, Cleveland, November, 1962. In the following pages we publish some excerpts of Kossuth's more extensive and detailed plans.

²"Main Principles of Federalism and Self Government" was written by Louis Kossuth in Kutahia, Asia Minor, June 14, 1850 in the first year after the collapse of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848-49. The original manuscript is in the archives of the Hungarian National Museum, Budapest, No. 342, Kossuth's Papers. It was first published in a little-known Hungarian review printed in Transylvania: "Magyar Kisebbség" (Hungarian Minority) Lugoj-Lugos. 1932, by Dr. Imre Deák, p. 376-392, part of which was translated into English in 1944. It was never published in book form but a few copies of the translation-proof sheets — edited by Stephen Gál remained. Other parts have been translated by Béla T. Kardos.

³Kossuth wrote this plan while a guest of the Sultan on Turkish soil. Point 3 is antiquated.

⁴Under "counties" Kossuth understands not only administrative subdivisions of a state but *suo jure* existing self-governing units resembling Swiss cantons. The word "county" may be replaced by "Canton".

⁵Written in Kutahia, Turkey in 1851 during his exile in Asia Minor. This sketch was published in French translation in the book of Irányi-Chassin: "Histoire politique de la Révolution de Hongrie, 1847-1849" (Paris, 1859, Appendix).

⁶Here Kossuth means Louis Napoleon who misused his name and power in order to become Emperor of France.

⁷When Kossuth conceived this plan, the Turkish empire still included the Northern part of the Balkan Peninsula.

Editor's note: Items 8 and 9 on p. 118 seem to be impractical as they exclude the establishment of a permanent federal government and its offices. Instead of a changing seat of government, in a convenient central location a federal Capitol should be built — Kossuth's plan of 1862 did not include the provinces of Austria, therefore Vienna, Prague etc. are not listed in this paragraph.

News from Transylvania

Churches Closed Down

The 200,000 Hungarian "CSANGO" population in Moldova, a several centuries old Hungarian settlement was left without priests. The Hungarian priests were removed in order to be replaced by Rumanian priests, who cannot speak the language. However, the replacement did not arrive yet and the churches are closed down. In one of the villages, where the Hungarian Roman Catholic priest refused to go and kept on serving his people, one Sunday the church was surrounded by the police force, the congregation ordered to disperse and every song book and prayer book in the Hungarian language confiscated. When the priest tried to protest, he was beaten in front of the church, arrested and taken away.

When a group of travellers from the neighbouring Hungary attempted to visit this ancient Hungarian settlement, they were turned away by the police. The Rumanian government

does not want any strangers to witness the methods used in this "assimilation project".

All the Old Historic Monuments Must Be Destroyed

Since all the old monuments in Transylvania are of Hungarian origin, some dating back seven, eight and even nine centuries, dictator Ceausescu ordered all monuments destroyed and replaced with Rumanian monuments in support of the newly invented "Daco-Roman theory". So far 1,996 old historical monuments were destroyed throughout Transylvania. Not even the cemeteries are being spared. Gravestones with Hungarian names are also victims of this ruthless purge, just to prove to the world that Transylvania was never inhabited by Hungarians.

From Marxist Socialism to National-Socialism Under Ceausescu

by Jonel P. Margineanu

(Mr. Margineanu was born in 1898 in a small village of central Transylvania, to a Rumanian peasant family. He received his education in Kolozsvár in a Rumanian language high school, under a Hungarian government. He finished college with a law degree under a Rumanian government in the same city. After practicing law for more than twenty years he was invited to join the faculty for the Babes-Bolyai University and was soon forced into retirement for "uncooperative attitude toward the government". Mr. Margineanu left the country in 1976, and settled in France. He is an ardent advocate of the "Independent Transylvania" movement and member of the Danubian Research Center.)

Though I am proud to be a Rumanian, I am even prouder today to be a Transylvanian Vlach, which is my nation's original name, meaning "shepherd". My forefathers were shepherding people for more than a thousand years, moving their herds slowly northward from near Albania into our present homeland, in search of peace and better pastures. There is no doubt about our Latin origin and our migration, since we have left our footprints all over the Balkan peninsula in the names of mountains and streams, while our language bears witness to close connections with Albanians, Greeks, Serbs, Bulgarians and finally the Magyars. (See: Andre Du Nay, "The Early History of the Rumanian Language", Jupiter Press, Chicago, Ill, U.S.A., 1977.)

We do not have to hide behind false faces or invent a politically motivated history in order to become equal to other European nations. We do not have to claim to be "first settlers" in our land while all geographical names around us prove the opposite. We are native inhabitants of Transylvania (Erdély-Ardeal-Siebenbürgen)

together with others, having the same God given rights to this land as anybody else who belongs here. This does, and must, suffice for any one of us; Magyars, Germans, Vlachs. Together we are the proud heirs of a Western cultural inheritance which goes back many centuries into European history. It is a Transylvanian culture, special and unique in this world. It is the blend of different cultures coexisting here for many centuries forming a perfect foundation to a very special Transylvanian brotherhood; which, I am sorry to admit, because of overwhelming outside influences, never was able to materialize.

I was a teenage boy when the Hungarian gendarme called by father a "stinking Vlach", and a few years later I saw the newly arrived Rumanian gendarme beat up our neighbor and call him a "Hungarian Dog". It took time until I found out that neither the Hungarian nor the Rumanian gendarme "belonged" to us. They were both foreigners. One from Hungary, the other from Rumania. They were not Transylvanians.

There were times in my life when I felt that a Transylvanian brotherhood could be worked out, making our mutual homeland into a peaceful and wonderful place to live for all of us, no matter what language we spoke. First, it was during that late 1920's and early '30's, and again during the 1950's, when it seemed that perhaps old hurts and grievances could be forgotten and Hungarians, Germans, Rumanians could share the responsibilities of a brighter future, enjoying equal rights and carrying equal burdens.

Before World War II it was the plague seeping across the borders from Germany that obstructed the natural development of mutual

understanding and trust between us, and contaminated the air with the miasma of hatred, turning our youth into ravaging wolves.

For the second time, my hope lay anchored in the new constitution of our socialist republic, which clearly stated:

In Art. 17: "The citizens of the Socialist Republic of Rumania, irrespective of their nationality, race, sex or religion, shall have equal rights in all fields of economic, political, social and cultural life. The State shall guarantee the equal rights of the citizens. No restriction of these rights, and no difference in their exercise on the grounds of nationality, race, sex or religion shall be permitted."

In Art. 22: "In the Socialist Republic of Rumania, the coinhabiting nationalities shall be assured the free use of their mother-tongue as well as books, newspapers, periodicals, theatres and education at all levels in their own languages. In territorial administrative units, also inhabited by population of non-Rumanian nationalities all bodies and institutions shall use, in speech and in writing, the language of the nationality concerned and shall appoint officials from its ranks."

However, in 1958 I found with dismay that these were only words used to camouflage the very opposite of everything I believed in and believed the constitution to stand for. One day a man by the name of Nicolae Ceausescu (at that time quite unknown to us Transylvanians) entered our bilingual university in Cluj-Kolozsvár with his leather jacketed storm troopers called the SECURITATE, and took the first brutal step toward the termination of the Hungarian section of that university. As a result, one of my Hungarian friends, the well-known poet, László Szabédi, committed suicide for fear of further physical and mental tortures. From that day on until today, Ceausescu and his "enforcers" have caused the death of many fine and dedicated Hungarian educators, and students, who bravely fought for their rights as set forth in the constitution. How great the number of those who were tortured and beaten to death, I do not know. It will be the job of future researchers to prepare the statistics of

our awful shame as Rumanians and socialists as well.

Between 1959 and 1962, more than 2,000 Hungarian schools in Transylvania were merged with their Rumanian counterparts. The use of the Hungarian language in certain classes was retained only if a sufficient number of students were available who did not understand Rumanian. Such a requirement does not occur in a country where children grow up in a bilingual environment.

Then, in 1965, the Ninth Communist Party Congress adopted a new constitution, which declared:

"Rumania is a uniform national state, its territory now occupied by one nation which was formed by concrete historical events, and which resulted in the Rumanian Socialist Nation."

With this the practice of government policy shifted legally over from socialism to NATIONAL-SOCIALISM with a new Hitler at the head of his storm troopers - DICTATOR CEAUSESCU!

Methods and practices are the same as used in the Third Reich: Rumanians, descendants of the glorious Roman Empire and the brave Dacians, inhabiting the land for more than 2,000 years (What a shameful and ridiculous falsification of history!) are the only accepted and legitimate nation, the HERRENRASSE, the only culture bearers in this part of Europe, and the descendants of all intruders into this GREAT RUMANIAN "LEBENSRAUM" - Hungarians, Germans, Bulgarians, Jews, Russians, Serbians, Gypsies, Slovaks, numbering more than 5 million - must assimilate or be eliminated by force.

In order to eradicate every trace of Transylvania's cultural past, it was decreed that each document, book - even private letters, older than 25 years - is "national property". This decree was used in former Hungarian cultural centers, like Oradea-Nagyvárad, Cluj-Kolozsvár. Aiud-Enyed, Alba Julia-Gyulafehérvár, Targu Mures-Marosvásárhely, Odorhei-Udvarhely, etc., etc., to confiscate Hungarian museums, archives, libraries, including all church archives, and move them to a "central location", where most of the ancient historic material was systematically destroyed, while the rest was put away in damp cellars

where they will rot away on their own. At the same time all historic markers, statues, coats of arms; even old Hungarian names engraved on tombstones, were removed or simply replaced by markers or names which could impress upon the foreign visitor an artificially created, non-existent, purely Rumanian past. Complete cemeteries were destroyed in order to erase the Hungarian past of certain towns. Tombs were bulldozed, bones hauled away by trucks and new cemeteries established at the same locations for future use of the recently imported Rumanian settlers, brought there from the "old country" (REGAT) to fill better paying industrial and administrative jobs, previously held by the native Hungarian population.

I am writing these facts with deep embarrassment as a Rumanian, and a believer in the socialist doctrine. I do not associate myself with these evil and barbaric deeds, and must emphasize again that I am a Transylvanian-Vlach, a "Rumun", and not a Rumanian from across the mountains.

I feel sympathy and brotherly allegiance to my Transylvanian compatriots, like Mr. Jenő Szikszai and Mr. Lajos Kuthy, two splendid Hungarian educators in the city of Brasov-Brassó, who refused to sign a declaration praising the nationality policies of dictator Ceausescu, and denying any further need for Hungarian schools, and because of their brave refusal were tortured and killed — creating the illusion of suicide.

I feel great respect for Mr. Károly Király, a leading Hungarian socialist who had the courage to protest openly against these inhumane anti-socialistic breaches of governmental power, knowing that he would be severely punished for his deed. His whereabouts are unknown today, perhaps he is not even alive.

As my good compatriot, Paul Goma, dissident Rumanian writer now living here in France, testified in 1978 in Frankfurt, Germany, at the international press conference dealing with human rights: "There is a clearly defined plan in progress today, executing anti-Hungarian measures beyond imagination by the use of arrests, interrogations, intimidations, terror and torture."

At the same time the Ceausescu government has published again and again new

statistics on the country's population, based on arbitrary census figures. I personally know of Hungarian families in the community where I come from, whose names are: Fekete, Szőke, Puskás and Demeter, who are listed now as: Negrutiu, Seche, Puskasiu and Dimitru by the authorities. Even with all the falsifications and intimidations, the Ceausescu government admits the presence of 1,800,000 Hungarians. This figure does not include those deported into the swamps of the Danube delta, those living in Bucuresti, the Rumanian capital (about 200,000) and those in Moldova (another 200,000). I am certain that a fairly and honestly implemented census would bring up the total of Hungarians living within the borders of today's Rumania way above the 3,000,000 mark.

However, it is not up to me to list all the legitimate grievances of my fellow countrymen of Hungarian nationality. Their plight is made public and it must be the task of the United Nations and other international organizations to deal accordingly with this abominable oppression, practiced by a newly emerged national-socialist dictatorship.

Though my age lessens the possibility of seeing it with my own eyes, nevertheless I desire to look into the future, no matter how distant it may be. A future in which Transylvanian Rumuns as well as Transylvanian Magyars will be able to forget the past with all its ugliness and begin to build together something enduring, something worthy to be built; a Transylvania in which human dignity comes first, with everything this often misused expression truly entails.

I am sure that there are possibilities to work out solutions which could ensure such a future. But it must include the full mutual respect toward one another, as nations and as peoples, and complete trust based on this respect.

I am not stating that there are not other possible solutions, for possibilities are always unlimited. But to me, as a person, a socialist in my brain cells and a Rumun in my heart, the simplest and best solution seems to be the idea of an independent Republic of Transylvania, with as many autonomous administrative districts as needed, for each nationality group. This would create a rich and blessed country in which Rumuns, Magyars, and Germans would

not compete AGAINST each other, but would be able to work TOGETHER in harmony.

I fully realize that the idea suggested here cannot be popular today with anyone of the concerned parties. My fellow Rumanians will regard it as treason, while the Magyars, rightfully embittered today, would not trust any solution suggested by a Rumun. They can see no other possibility for their survival than a return under the protecting shield of Hungary.

I must admit, there is solid argument underscoring this demand. Within the framework of a relatively tolerant Hungarian Kingdom, many nationalities, including us, Vlach or Rumuns, were allowed to enter the country and settle in organized groups without ever being asked to give up our own national identity. On the contrary, we were aided and supported by Hungarians in maintaining our own religion, our own language, and in developing our own culture.

While on the other hand, under the brutal rule of today's national-socialist regime of Ceausescu, the Transylvanian Magyars are con-

demned in their own land to extinction. Regarded objectively, the intolerable political, economical and cultural situation within the National Socialist Republic of Rumanian definitely turns the scale in favour of the Hungarian demands.

Nevertheless, as Hitler fell, so will Ceausescu, also. In today's world shiftless deceit of political propaganda, no matter how cunning, cannot fool public opinion for a long period of time. The eradication of 3,000,000 Magyars cannot go unnoticed, and sooner or later world opinion will react against Rumania. Then, perhaps, enlightened and knowledgeable leaders of the ruling powers, sincerely trying to make just and fair decisions, will realize the given similarities between Transylvania and Switzerland and will act accordingly.

(This article was published in the book "Transylvania and the Hungarian-Rumanian Problem" in 1979. Three months after the publication, Professor Margineanu disappeared mysteriously from Paris.)

The International P.E.N. Club Declares:

"Literature, national though it be in origin, knows no frontiers, and should remain common currency between nations in spite of political or international upheavals.

"Members of the P.E.N. should at all times use what influence they have in favor of good understanding and mutual respect between nations; they pledge themselves to do their utmost to dispel race, class, and national hatreds and to champion the ideal of one humanity living in peace in one world.'

"The P.E.N. stands for the principle of unhampered transmission of thought within each nation and between all nations, and members pledge themselves to oppose any form of suppres-

sion of freedom of expression in the country and community to which they belong. The P.E.N. declared for a free press and opposes arbitrary censorship in time of peace. It believes that the necessary advance of the world towards a more highly organized political and economic order renders a free criticism of governments, administrations, and institutions imperative. And since freedom implies voluntary restraint, members pledge themselves to oppose such evils of a free press as mendacious publication, deliberate falsehood and disortion of facts for political and personal ends..."

(From the International P.E.N. Club, center for writers in exile, Newsletter, winter 1987.)

The Croatian Question From the Hungarian Viewpoint

by Anthony J. Lebach, M.D.

According to an old saying, it takes more ingenuity to have people accept sincerity and truth than to have them accept falsehood. In view of this I have mastered a certain amount of boldness to present what follows. As Prime Minister Churchill said in his opening statement of his first speech in Parliament, "If I were a Boer, I hope I too would have taken up arms". In this spirit, I too hope that I can present the Croatian-Hungarian question in an objective manner. For this sincere effort on my part I ask for a just and objective appraisal from those in opposition to this question.

On the matter of Croatian-Hungarian relations, those nations lived in a partnership for centuries beginning in the days of our kings Saint Laszlo and Kalman. Both nations jointly fought in defense of Christianity against the forces of Islam. Later that peaceful coexistence was undermined in Croatia by the nationalism espoused by the French Revolution. It took the form of the Illyrian movement, whose goal was to create a large Slav state cut out of southern Hungary. The Habsburgs also had their hand in that movement. According to Louis Gaj who started the movement, the Illyrian movement was to take place within the Habsburg Empire but under the leadership of the Croats. At the same time the Serbians secretly were planning the same take-over but under Serbian rule. During the Reform Movement in Hungary, led by Louis Kossuth and Count Stefan Szechenyi, the Habsburgs exploited that vague plan by mobilizing Croatian sentiment against the Hungarians. As a result of supporting Habsburg absolutism, Croatian anti-Hungarian politics intensified. Under those circumstances improved Croatian-Hungarian relations could not develop; instead a continuous political crisis existed.

The Hungarian viewpoint was that the Croats should have autonomy under the aegis of the Holy Crown of Hungary, consistent with the historical traditions of generations of Hungary and Croatia. That position was arbitrarily rejected by the Croats. The generations of Croats following the Turkish wars would accept only the authority of the power structure of the Habsburgs of Vienna. That new generation who wielded public opinion against the Hungarians had little gratitude for those Hungarians who in the 18th Century magnanimously transferred the southern Hungarian provinces of Szerem, Verce, and Pozsega to Croatia in exchange for the seaport of Fiume. The Hungarians could have refused to transfer those provinces. Croatia had been considerably reduced in size as a result of the Turkish Wars, having lost its largest territory, Bosnia.

While the Hungarians were struggling to revive the use of their language in Hungary, the Hungarian authorities recommended that in Croatia, Croatian be the official language. Instead, responding to outside influence, the Croats pressured for the use of the Latin language. As a result of tragic misunderstanding, the Croats were fighting against an imagined Hungarian oppression. All of that culminated in the Croats fighting on the side of the Habsburgs against the Hungarians in the Hungarian War of Independence of 1848.

Irregardless of the Croatian's anti-Hungarian attitude, after the compromise of 1867 when Austria finally gave up on its Pan-German dreams, Francis Deak, the Hungarian prime minister transferred the three previously mentioned provinces to Croatia. The majority of the population of those provinces were Serbians who infiltrated during the Turkish wars to replace the Hungarians who had been killed in

those areas. After 1867 Croatia had total self-government; their representatives in the Hungarian Parliament were allowed to use the Croatian language. The Croatian flag was flown on the Parliament building in Hungary. The use or teaching of the Hungarian language was not a requirement in Croatia. In contrast in Slavonia, the people in Hungarian villages could only with greatest effort obtain the right from the Julian Society to teach the Hungarian language in their schools. In poverty stricken Croatia, Hungary built public buildings, railroads, etc., yet Croats protested when they saw emblems of the Hungarian state. Those emblems on signs or letterheads indicated, in their opinion, Hungarianization.

That attitude was exploited by the Serbians who were agitating for the creation of a Yugoslavia with Serbian orthodox leadership supported by Russia. The Croats were extremely hurt when the Budapest government cooperated with the Serbians, yet they forced the Hungarians into that situation. Thus it was possible for a time for the Serbians to mislead both the Croats and the Hungarians. At that time Svetozar Pribicevic was the secret advisor of the Hungarian prime minister, Count Stefan Tisza. Compounding that was the fact the Habsburgs were using their allied-nationalities against the Hungarians, who were the strongest nation in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Although the allied nationalities of the empire aided the Habsburgs against the Hungarians, Vienna did not keep any of its promises to the nationalities.

When Austrian Pan-German ambitions came to an end after losing the wars against Prussia in 1859 and 1866, they finally came to terms with Hungary. Even after the Deak compromise of 1867, in reality Hungary still carried the label of an Austrian colony. In 1868, Hungary passed the nationality laws, which were very enlightened when compared to those of other European countries. The minorities in Hungary received all the rights and responsibilities which the Hungarian nation enjoyed. Those laws had their source in historical Hungarian traditions. In official communications everyone could speak or write in his own language. That was without example anywhere else in Europe. Furthermore, the new liberal

Hungarian laws inadvertently provided a very powerful anti-Hungarian weapon to the minorities in giving them total religious autonomy. In parochial schools, which were supported by the Hungarian government, the Serbians were able to spread anti-Hungarian propaganda. It was not the intention of the Hungarian government to have the nationalities use those rights for the purpose of slicing off portions of territories from the host country, Hungary. In the developing literature of the Serbians, hatred against Hungary was the dominant factor. The same thing occurred in Croatia. That anti-Hungarian propaganda spread because of the naivete of the Hungarian politicians. The end result of all that was that the great experiment and sense of direction was brought to naught by the self-inflicted hatred of the Croats against Hungary. It was under those circumstances that the most tragic years of Hungarian history unfolded. In time of greatest need, during and immediately after World War I, tragically, Hungary did not have a Kemal Ataturk, but instead a Lukacsics; a Bela Kun; a Tibor Szamuelli, a Keri; a Mihaly Karolyi; a Bela Linder (the War Minister who disbanded the army saying he did not want to see a soldier). Those so-called revolutionaries under the leadership of Mihaly Karolyi eliminated any resistance which threatened their power. Unfortunately that group, even more than the nationalities or our enemies, perpetrated the destruction of historic Hungary. That group of fancy dupes actually ruled Hungary on behalf of an alien power-structure, which made jokes of their cruelty and crimes, and scandalously rejected everything which was right and respected by the population.

At the peace conference, after the German Treaty, the partition of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was placed on the agenda by the allies. Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points had served as a welcome step to end the war for the war weary central powers, who were pleased to think their future would be predicated on the basis of the right of self-determination. In reality it only undermined the strength of the central powers. However the gravediggers of Europe with Edward Benes at the helm, determined with organized machination, otherwise. Wilson,

the sick and vain man; according to Clemenceau's memoirs, finalized Europe's destiny by not keeping his promise. As a result, thirty years later the world witnessed the serious consequences for humanity. Lansing, the American representative to the Peace Conference could not put into practice his convictions. After one of the meetings he stated that those peace treaties would be the cause of the next war. In response Clemenceau stated haughtily that the peace treaties were just another continuation of the war; and continue it did to the detriment of the victorious allies. Thus Yugoslavia was born. Trumbic, the Croatian representative at the treaties, realized at the time the mistakes he made. Unfortunately, where political interests dominate, justice does not always prevail. If the Hungarians made mistakes, they harmed only themselves. The Croatians not only harmed Hungary but got what they deserved — Yugoslavia. In that new state they must exert extreme effort just to survive as a nationality. Their leader, Stefan Radic announced that it was a misfortune that their politics chained them to the Svetozar Pribicevic, who at one time had won the confidence of Count Tisza, and who exploited that confidence on behalf of the Serbians. At one of the sessions of the new Yugoslav Parliament he said they were far worse off than they were under the Hungarians. Under the Hungarians they belonged to the European community; since the change they were victimized by Byzantine duplicity. Stefan Radic, along with his brother was assassinated in the Yugoslav Parliament by a Serbian representative, Punisa Rasic. Jovic, a Serb from former southern Hungary, shouted as he fled from the scene: "Let us dismantle the prison of the people of Croatia and the Vojvodina — Yugoslavia".

Croatian Cardinal Stepinac, who started his career as a volunteer partisan in the Dobroviljac Organization and worked for Yugoslav union, observing the new situation joined the separatists groups.

The Croatian people did not become masters of their own destiny when they became a separate nation during World War II. Ante

Pavelic took over the power in Croatia after the collapse of Yugoslavia, declaring Croatian independence, but the country was occupied by the military forces of Italy and Germany. During the war the Croatians fought mostly against the Serbians in a reciprocally brutal manner.

For the Hungarians in present day Yugoslavia, survival as an ethnic group is in danger. Hungarian schools are continuously being closed in Croatia as well as in other parts where Hungarians live. Children of mixed marriages have no opportunity to learn the Hungarian language. It is estimated that Tito's partisans under the leadership of Moshe Pijade murdered 100,000 Hungarians, a fact which is attested in Katyn-like graves in virtually every Hungarian village and town. The male Hungarian population between the ages of 17 and 40 were ordered to dig their graves into which they fell as they were shot, just as in Katyn. Is this not genocide?

The Hungarians have rights on paper only. In practice, Hungarian newspapers print only translated Serbian or Croatian articles, or promote Yugoslav interest to the detriment of the Hungarians living there. Hungarian writers are only communist mouthpieces.

The Croatians hope that should Yugoslavia collapse, they will gain control of historic southern Hungary (Vojvodina). For the Hungarians it would mean a change as "from the frying pan into the fire", since the Croatians would not be more tolerant toward the Hungarians than are the Serbians.

At the present time, Yugoslavia is a fragile political structure. They have labor strikes daily, regardless of the fact that it is prohibited by law. Recently the miners called a general strike and they won all of their demands only because the government is trying desperately to maintain internal stability. It is highly probable that the government will be taken over by the military, which will give the Soviet Union the opportunity to invade Yugoslavia in order to "maintain law and order". It appears that this will be the first move on the part of Gorbachev in his overall plan to encircle and absorb the soft portions of the Middle East through Iran.

Book Review

(*Eleven Hundred Years of Common Polish-Hungarian History, an outline, by Andrew Haraszti, B.A., B.ED., M.A. Published by the Polish-Hungarian World Federation, Chicago.*)

All through history there was a bond of mutual sympathy between the Polish and the Hungarian people. Though most of the time separated geographically, the two nations fought for the same ideas. Great Polish patriots were involved in the Hungarian liberty wars and Hungary gave leaders to Poland like the Transylvanian Prince, Stephen Báthory. The Polish people took in Hungarian refugees in time of trouble, and Polish refugees found homes in Hungary when their country was invaded by foreign powers.

Prof. Haraszti deals with this subject in an outstanding manner. His bibliography is impressive. The book has only one fault: it is much too small. Eleven-hundred years of history would have deserved more details.

We bring here the INTRODUCTION to the book, by Andrew Haraszti:

I. Introduction.

In an attempt to discuss Polish-Hungarian relations through the long period of eleven centuries, let me clarify first of all, that Polish-Hungarian associations, which were usually excellent at these times, were representing not only memories, sentimental or tragic events. They represent evidences from the past, experiences for the present and hopes for the future, — and not only for the present and future of Poland and Hungary. When we are talking about Poland and Hungary, — we must keep in mind the present and the future of East-Central Europe as a whole.

Freedom in East-Central Europe could be and will be possible only on the base of the friendship and cooperation of the two most important regions of this European area: Poland and the Carpathian Basin. If Poland and Hungary are not free, other smaller nations of East-Central Europe will remain victims of alien imperialistic forces.

“... a free East Central Europe is indispensable for any sound balance of power on the Continent... The temporary disappearance of that whole region created a dangerous tension between suppressed nationalisms and apparently well-established imperialisms which usually were in dangerous rivalry with one another.” (Oscar Halecki: *Borderlands of Western Civilization*, Preface, The Ronald Press Co., New York. 1952).

Consequently, the introduction of Polish-Hungarian relations and mutual friendship should be much more than simply a “nice story” for Polish and Hungarian patriots. It should be a stimulative testimony for other East-Central European intellectuals, advice and useful experience for all European peoples. If History is really the great teacher of Life, then the combined history of Poland and Hungary should provide good lessons not only for Poles and Hungarians, but for other Europeans and for American intellectuals.

Let us begin our approach to answer this question: which are those common geopolitical and cultural characteristics, which stimulated the mutual interests of Poland and Hungary? Well, here they are:

(1) They are both very old nations in Europe, establishing their national states at about the same time, more than one thousand years ago. (2) They both adopted Western (Roman) Christianity in association with the founding of their national states. (3) At a very early stage of their nationhood, they both recognized their common fate; they were threatened by Pangermanism from their western-, and Russian-oriented Panslavism from their eastern side.

Recognizing their common geopolitical situation, they became good neighbours, showing each other friendship and affection, which was simply unparalleled in European history. Their identical situation forced them to build dynastical relationships in the Mediaeval Age, and to build political, military, social, cultural and economic relations in the modern age. These relations effected real

blessings for both nations; made them stronger, defended them and secured them through the course of more than ten centuries.

Those, who are able to speculate about friendly relations only on the base of race and language, may wonder about the traditions of Polish and Hungarian friendship. The facts, however, are here. The IXth century revealed the tribes of Polani, Slazani, Opolani, Mazowsani, Willani, Luziczani, — so the cradle of the Polish nation was unquestionably a Slavic cradle.

Very dissimilarly to this, in about the time of the appearance of these tribes in the Vistula and Oder-basins, Mongol- and Turkish looking tribal organizations arrived from Mother-Asia. They did speak various dialects of the Magyar language, with large amounts of Finnish and Turkish vocabulary. The language of these nomad horsemen was not Slavic. Their language was not even similar to any members of the Indo-European language-family. Their race could be mentioned as "Turanian", and their language as a "Finno-Ugric branch of the Ural-Altai family" of languages. The Magyars came (896) to reconquer the previous Great Empire of Attila the Hun, and to re-establish the Carpathian empire of the proud Avar Khaganate.

...And the Polish- and Hungarian nations, which originated from so different racial, linguistic and cultural roots, — became friends for more than ten centuries.

Hungarian Cultural Influence in Europe

(During the Habsburgs, 1867-1918)

Compiled by

Prof. Leslie Konnyu, Cultural Historian

The turn of the century brought many musical geniuses to Hungary. Four of them rose to European (international) fame and influenced greatly, Europe's musical life. The first was EUGNE (JENO) HUBAY who was born in 1858 in Buda(pest). He studied violin in Berlin and Paris. In 1882 he became a professor of violin in the Musical Conservatory in Bruxelles, Belgium. In 1886, Hubay returned to Budapest as professor of violin at the Hungarian State



Hubay Jenő (Eugene Hubay)

Conservatory. He elevated his department to a Master-Violinist School, favored by many talented European violin students. He also published a Violin Learning Manual used by violinists all over Europe. Hubay was not only a virtuoso violin artist but also an excellent composer. His operas are: Violinist of Cremona (1894), Bad Guy of the Village (1896), Love of Lavotta (1906), Anna Karenina (1923), The Mask (1929). His Symphonies are: Dante (1921), Petofi (1923) and Scene in the Village Inn. The creator of the Hungarian Violinist Style died in 1927 in Budapest.

ERNEST (ERNO) von DOHNANYI was born in 1877 in Pozsony, Hungary (now Bratislava), Czechoslovakia. He studied piano at Budapest Conservatory and started his concert tours around Europe in 1899. In 1905 he became professor of piano at the Berlin Conservatory. In 1916 he left his position for the Budapest Conservatory. In 1928 he became president of the Budapest Philharmonics and took his orchestra for a long international tour.

In 1928 he was named Chief-Director of the Budapest Conservatory. At the end of World War II he emigrated to Austria, then to Argentina and finally, in 1949, he settled at the State University of Florida, (USA). Besides teaching at the university, he gave concerts (he was one of the best classical pianists of the century) until his death in 1960. His compositions are: E-Minor Piano Competition (1897), D-Minor Symphony (1902), E Flat-Minor Quintet (1914), Ruralia Hungarica (1916), Variations for Hungarian Themes (1916), Mass for Szeged Cathedral (1930), Stabat Mater (1958). Operas: The Veil of Pierette (1910), Tante Simone (1912). Dohnanyi died in New York in 1960.



Dohnányi Ernő (Ernest Dohnányi)

One of the best known Hungarian composers, ZOLTAN KODALY was born in 1881 in Kecskemet, Hungary. First he studied philosophy and received his doctorate in Hungarian philosophy. At the same time he also studied music. After graduating from Budapest Conservatory, he started a concert tour in Western Europe. In 1907 he became professor of composition at Budapest Conservatory. He found time to teach music-teaching methodology and choral methods. Kodaly also gave major concerts in England, Soviet Union and the United States. In 1960, Oxford University and in 1964 Berlin University gave him honorary doctorates. The International Folklore Teachers' Association elected him as its president. He was also Honorary president of the International Music Educators' Association. With his folkloristic compositions he created a musical style. With his choral works he emphasized the importance of the choir. With his new music teaching method he completely changed the method of music teaching all over

the world. The Kodaly-method is very popular in the United States. Kodaly's main works are: Hungarian Folksongs (1906), Magyar Folklore Series (1951-1966), Psalmus Hungaricus (1923), Janos Hary (1926), Dances of Marosszek (1927), Summer Evening (1929), Dances of Galantha (1933), Te Deum of Buda Castle (1936), Panna Czinka (1946-48), Hungarian Mass (1966). He died in Budapest, in 1967 a famous man.



Kodály Zoltán (Zoltán Kodály)



Bartók Béla (Béla Bartók)

BELA BARTOK was born in 1881 in Nagyszentmiklos, Hungary (now Rumania). He started his music training in Pozsony (now Bratislava, Czechoslovakia) and finished his studies in Budapest. After his graduation, in 1903, he started a concert-tour in Western Europe. In 1905 he started collecting Hungarian folksongs, mainly in Transylvania. In 1909 he collected Slovak and in 1910 Rumanian folksongs. In 1913 he studied Arabic folksongs in North Africa, and in 1936 he collected folksongs in Turkey. His dance play: Prince Carved from Wood was finished in 1916 and his opera: Bluebeard's Castle in 1919. His Dance-

suite was completed in 1923, *Cantata Profana* in 1930. Because the danger of the German War came closer to his country, in 1940 he left Hungary and settled in the United States. In New York he composed: *Concerto* (1943), *Violin Sonata* (1944) and *Deep Viola Competition* (1945, finished by Tibor Serly). One of the greatest composers of the century, Bela Bartok died in 1945, in New York.

At the turn of the Century not just in music, but also in fine arts, Hungary made great leaps into European fame. PAUL (PAL) SZINYEIMERSE was born in 1845 in Szinyeujfalu, Hungary (now Czechoslovakia). He started his arts training in Budapest, followed by Alex Wagner and Prof. Piloty's teaching in Munich, Germany. After his graduation from the Art Academy, he exhibited his paintings all over Europe and won many prizes in Vienna, Paris and Budapest. His main works are: *Horse Chestnut* (1869), *Swing and Clothesline* (1869), *Lovers and Picnic* (1872), *Lady Dressed in Purple* (1874) and *Snow Melting*. He befriended the Swiss painter Bocklin and was working with him to intensify the colors of his paintings. Later in his career he became a member of the Hungarian Parliament and painted many elegant portraits. Paul Szinyei-Merse died in 1920 at his estate in Jernye, now in Czechoslovakia. Posthumously his paintings had a great success in Japan.

In 25 years from an autodidact painter (professionally a druggist), THEODORE (TIVADAR) K. CSONTVARY advanced to great fame. He was born in 1853 in Kisszeben, Hungary (now Rumania). He started his formal art training at the age of 41 in Budapest. Then for graduate study he went to Munich and Karlsruhe, Germany. After graduation he traveled to Dalmatia, Italy, Upper-Hungary, Serbia, Western Europe, Kairo, Jerusalem, Lebanon and Greece. He developed an individual postimpressionistic, surrealist style which was recognized, copied and adored after his death in Budapest, in 1919. His paintings were exhibited all over Europe. At the Bruxelles World Fair, in 1938, he posthumously won the Grand Prix of the "50 years' Modern Art" Exhibition. This is what we call a resurrection of an artist.

JOSEPH (JOZSEF) RIPPL-RONAI, a



Joseph Rippl-Rónai: Portrait of Bonnard, 1897

secessionist artist, was born in 1861 in Kaposvar, Hungary. He studied art from prof. Herterich at Munich, Germany and from Michael Munkacsy in Paris, France. From 1892 to 1902 he resided in Neuilly with Scottish artist Knowles. Beside Knowles he also befriended Whistler, Gauguin, Maillol, Vuillard and Denis. Rippl-Rónai illustrated Rodenbach's book: *Les Virages*. In 1892 he had a successful exhibition at the Austro-Hungarian Embassy in Paris. Rippl-Rónai's portrait of Maillol (1899) was bought by the Parisian Musee d'Art Moderne. After returning to Hungary, he settled at his hometown, Kaposvar. There he painted and exhibited till his death in 1927. Because of his art and because he lived for a decade in France, Joseph Rippl-Rónai is one of the best known Hungarian artist in France.

CHARLES (KAROLY) FERENCZY was born in 1862. First he learned agriculture and law, but in 1884 he switched to paintings. He studied art in Rome and Munich, then went to Paris where Robert Fleury, Bouguereau and Bastien Lepage were his masters. After he returned to Hungary, he settled in Szentendre. In 1896 he went to the new Hungarian Art Colony in Nagybanya (now Rumania). In open air style he painted many biblical paintings: *Sermon the Mount* (1896), *Three Wise Men* (1898), *Joseph Sold by his Brothers* (1900). For a long time he experimented with the problem of light: *Summer Morning*, *March Evening*, *Lady Painter* (1902), *October* (1903), *Forenoon with Sunshine* (1905), *Summer Day* (1906). While in Nagybanya he was named as professor of Budapest Fine Arts College. Dividing his time between Nagybanya and Budapest, teaching

and painting, he passed away in 1917. Ferenczy was the leading spirit of the Hungarian impressionism and his achievements inspired many European artists.



Sir Philip László: Beer Hall in Munich

The world famous Hungarian portraitist SIR PHILIP (FULOP) LASZLO was born in 1867 in Buda(Pest), Hungary. He had training in the Budapest Artists' Master School of the classical painters: Bartholomew Szekely and Charles Lotz. After graduation, Laszlo studied in Western Europe and settled in London, England. There he became the best portraitist of the high society: King and Queen of England, Pope Leo XIII, Cardinal Rampallo, Duke Hohenlohe, President Roosevelt, Spanish King and Queen, Bulgarian Czar, Regent Horthy of Hungary, etc. In 1914 he became an English citizen and professor of Royal Art School of London. And on top of it, the King conferred knighthood upon him. Laszlo's self-portrait is in the possession of the Uffizi Gallery, Florence, Italy. His official English catalogue was published in London in 1922. Sir Philip de Laszlo passed away in his beloved London in 1937.



Paul Szinyei-Merse: Clothesline, 1869

During the nearly 50 years of peaceful constitutional monarchy (1867-1914) came the best time of the Hungarian Kingdom as population increased, economy was booming, building of roads, railroads, schools, factories showed the betterment of life for the population. Many Hungarian cultural institutions were founded and served as models for Eastern-European and Balkan countries. We mention only a few: The Royal College of Arts (1871), The National College of Applied Arts, Fine Arts Museum, Museum of Applied Arts, Naval Academy, National Veterinarian College, Eotvos College (College for training of Secondary School Professors, 1894), Millennial Expositions (1896), Artists' Colonies at Nagybanya (1896) and at Szolnok (1899). But the most important cultural achievement was the enlarging and remodeling of Hungary's beautiful capital city, Budapest.

SOURCES: Gethon-Zador: Art Encyclopedia, I-IV. Budapest: Akademia, 1965. Kenyees, Agnes: at all: Magyar Biographic Encyclopedia. Bp: Akademia, 1967. Kosary, D: Hungary's History in Pictures. Bp: Gondolat, 1977. Legrady, Otto: Justice for Hungary. Budapest: Pesti Hirlap, 1928.



*Theodore K. Csontváry:
Athenian Drive Out at New Moon*