

THE ROAD TO THE DICTATED PEACE

László Botos

Árpád Publishing Company,
Cleveland, Ohio, 1999

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am forever grateful to my wife, Margaret, for her hard work in preparing this book for publication. She spent hundreds of hours at the computer, typing, correcting and rearranging text. I appreciate the support of Dr. Gyula Nádas and the Árpád Academy who have helped finance this project, and who trust that this book will be an instrument in the solution of the problems of the minorities in Europe, particularly those of the Hungarians. I thank Bishop Tibor Dömötör for his financial help, the time he spent reading the manuscript, giving suggestions, and his enthusiasm in promoting the publication of this book. Thanks are also due to Dr. Géza Éles, who contributed financially, and whose advice and research on some difficult points were invaluable. I am very grateful for the generous financial contribution of my sister, Ilona Botos, who also helped considerably with providing research material which was unavailable to me by any other means. Special thanks to the Rochester Hungarian Club, in particular Frank Teremy, who recognized the importance of this book. They made an exception to their normal gift-giving policy and gave a contribution which is much appreciated. I also appreciate the donation from Gabriella Gombai who has encouraged me throughout the years. Many thanks to Dr. Sándor Balogh, who read the book for historical accuracy and gave advice, Dr. József Berzy and Reverend Ferenc Mihály for many articles, books and advice, and Dr. Ferenc Badiny-Jós for his encouragement and support. Finally, I am indebted to Kevin O'Connell Esq., who meticulously proofread the text and gave much appreciated suggestions.

CONTENTS

LIST OF MAPS	4
FOREWORD.....	5
PREFACE.....	7
INTRODUCTION.....	12
1. Racial Elements in the Carpathian Basin.....	19
2. Transylvania	27
3. Foreign „Guests”	32
4. A Short History of the Wallachians	44
5. Wallachian Settlements in Transylvania and Hungary	54
6. The Rumanian People and their language	78
7. The Transylvanian Saxons	84
8. The Destruction of Southern Hungary	89
9. Settlement Names in Austria and Hungary	103
10. Western Hungary – Burgenland	122
11. Felvidék (Slovakia)	164
12. The Hungarian Minority Law	179
13. Eastern Hungary	185
14. Plan to Destroy Hungary	199
15. The Czech Legion	211
16. Events Leading to Trianon	226
17. Eye-Witness account of the Peace Negotiations	247
18. The Lajta Bánság	288
19. Results of the Decision at Trianon	297
20. The Loss of Ruthenia	313
21. The Loss of Felvidék to Slovakia	325
22. The Life of the Minorities in the Successor States	336
23. The Vienna Awards	377
24. The Distribution of the Minorities in the Successor States	415
25. The Necessity of Revision	424
26. A Danubian Federation	443
APPENDIX A. Minorities Living in Villages in the Partium	460
APPENDIX B. Population in Districts of Central Transylvania ..	485
APPENDIX C. Population in the Districts of Székelyföld	505
APPENDIX D. Opinions of Foreign Politicians and Writers	538

MAPS

1. Hungary before and after World War I. (World Book) 11
2. Hungary after the Treaty of Trianon (Badiny).....13
- 2a. Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia13
3. Transylvania (Osterhaven) 26
4. The Carpathian Basin 38
5. Hungarian language territory up to the 13th. Century40
6. Wallachia (Osterhaven)43
- Pictures of Folk costumes 52
7. Migration of the Wallachians (Török)53
8. Rumania after 1920 (Löte)77
9. Hungary divided after 152695
10. Hungarian Settlement Names (Török)104
- Map Facts 141-146
11. The Partium186
12. Hungarian Language Territories in Transylvania (Teleki)191
13. Hungary surrounded by Slavs and Germans200
14. Railroads lost to the Successor States (Palotás) 304
15. The First Vienna Award (Császár) 386
16. The First and Second Vienna Awards (Lakatos) 398
17. Distribution of Hungarians in the Successor States (Török) 418
18. Ethnographic Map of the Carpathian Basin (Török) 419
19. Hungarian Language Territories under Foreign Rule (Török) 420
20. Hungary in the 15th Century, County Map (at end) (from Történelmi Atlasz)

FOREWORD

When one starts to read The Road to the Dictated Peace, one realizes that this is a unique book. Historians and politicians have studied every part of the history of the tragedy of Trianon and all its secrets have been brought to light but, until now, none of the writers has studied the history of the millennia which preceded the Dictated Peace and the eighty years which followed it. Even now, it could cause conflicts to ignite all over Europe. Nobody has offered a solution to correct the historical mistakes which resulted in the creation of artificial states. These states were created in the name of „minority rights” yet many more nationalities were placed under foreign rule.

There is one city in the Carpathian Basin whose citizens, in the past 75 years, became citizens of five different nations consecutively, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Soviet Union and finally the Ukraine, without leaving the territory of their city. Citizens of other territories suffered a similar fate in a different way and they all sacrificed their life-blood because of the mistakes of the Dictated Peace

László Botos has documented, with thousands of facts, that in the Carpathian Basin, in the last 1,100 years, only one nation has been able to form a nation, create peace, provide democratic rights and give self-determination to different nationalities. That was the Hungarian nation. During the thousand-year Hungarian rule, people of every nationality were able to settle in Hungary and keep their language, culture, religion and history. The new settlers were able to multiply, progress and prosper in that country which, in 1222, with the Golden Bull, secured for every citizen the democratic rights, at the same time as the English Magna Carta.

This is the country which was carved up and destroyed at Trianon and the citizens of this land have been persecuted ever since by those dictators of the Successor States who came into power by the sanctions of the Dictated Peace, who actually enslaved their own nations too.

Every politician and diplomat who will play a role in the future of the history of Europe has to read this book by László Botos. Perhaps they will then find a solution to end the sufferings caused by the most unjust dictated peace in the history of Europe. We sincerely hope so!

Árpád Academy

PREFACE

In order for you to understand how I came to write this book, I must tell you a little about my life. I was born in Simontornya in Hungary in 1935. I have some vivid memories of World War II. in my village. Simontornya was on the Russian Front and was occupied alternately by Germans and Russians. I remember the bombing, the fear, the lack of food. I remember the German soldiers who, although they occupied our village, were always polite and treated us kindly. I remember the Russians coming to „liberate” us from the Germans, demanding food and wine and raping women and girls.

My family moved to Budapest and I attended a technical college there. I worked in a cooperative program at a factory in Csepel, an industrial area of Budapest, and every day after work, we had to attend seminars about the Communist philosophy and praise Joseph Stalin whose photograph was posted everywhere. I experienced the oppression of Communism, poverty, scarcity of food and clothing, lack of freedom of speech and movement and a fear of the secret police. I saw a friend and a family member disappear from one day to the next. We knew they had been taken by the Communists and sent to Siberia. Someone must have turned them in to the Secret Police for something that they had said. It was a hard life but we survived.

For me, what made it possible to survive was that I loved sports. As a teenager, I was very good in soccer but after an accident, I was unable to continue to play. Forbidden to play soccer, I took up canoeing and soon reached the ranks of the Junior National Canoeing Team with the hope of representing my country in the Olympics.

So in 1955, even under the oppressive Communist regime, my life was bearable. I had a job and the prospect of becoming an Olympic paddler. If I had become a Communist, life would have been just fabulous. As a sportsman I would have been rewarded with material goods and I would have had the chance to travel abroad. However, I could not forget what I had seen of the Soviets during the war and I found it difficult to praise Stalin and Soviet Russia every day of my life. It finally became too much for all Hungarians and the result was the

Freedom Fight of October, 1956, known to the world as the Hungarian Revolution.

At the beginning, I took part in the demonstrations and later on I took up arms. I saw the Russian tanks rolling into Budapest and witnessed the fighting. When I went to buy bread, I had to step over countless bodies lying in the streets. After the second invasion by the Russians in November, the oppression became much worse. Thousands of people defected to the West. I loved my country and I did not want to leave but in January 1957, together with four other canoe paddlers, I made the decision to flee. We left the city and walked to the southern part of the country, crossing into Yugoslavia by crawling across a field in the snow, covered by sheets. When we reached the other side of the border, we were captured by the Yugoslav authorities and placed in a concentration camp for refugees where we stayed for three months, fighting starvation and sickness. The Italian Red Cross finally offered us asylum because they needed coaches for their Olympic Canoe Team. We remained in Italy for another three months and then the Canadian Red Cross gave us a passage to Canada. The sea voyage to Canada was very rough but we survived.

In Canada, our first thought was to find a Canoe Club and a job. We all got menial jobs because we did not know the language and we were accepted onto the Canadian Olympic Team. We worked hard, learning English to find a better job and training to go to the Olympics. I was an alternate for the 1964 Olympics but did not have the chance to represent Canada.

I was an avid reader and of course, to learn the English language, I read anything I could get my hands on, especially if it was about Hungary. I learned that Hungary had been carved up after the First World War in the Treaty of Trianon. This part of Hungarian history was not taught to us under the Communist regime. All we were told was that Hungarians were descendants of the Magyars, a barbarian horde from Siberia, who had conquered the Carpathian Basin in AD 896. We were not told that Transylvania had once been a part of Hungary or that Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia had been created from other states and a large part of Hungary had been given to them. We were not taught that Hungary had a very ancient history and the oldest language in Europe, or that Hungarians were the original inhabitants of the Carpathian Basin.

After learning all this history, I was shocked to find that there were still some publications which propagated the same kind of history that was taught in Hungary and I became very angry whenever I read derogatory material about the Hungarians, that they were barbarians and gypsies for example. Whenever I found an article that carried false information about Hungary, I made a point of writing to the publication and correcting the mistake. It hurt me to read misinformation about my motherland.

After reading countless books about the Treaty of Trianon, many of which portrayed Hungary in a very bad light, I decided that I had to write a book to correct the misconceptions about Hungary's role in the First World War and expose the injustices she suffered as a result. I cannot claim to be objective because the injustices done to my country have affected me so deeply. However, in writing this book, I hope to help the reader understand the tragedy of the Hungarian nation and empathize with the Hungarians. You may not agree with everything I have to say but I am sure that you will find the story of the tragedy of Hungary very compelling.

The mutilation of Hungary after World War I. was conducted in an arbitrary manner and was based on false claims and false data. If the leaders of the Allied Powers had known the history of Hungary, they would never have carved up that ancient land to make new artificial states which have not withstood the test of time. Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia have both fallen apart in recent years.

The Allied Forces made peace treaties with the defeated nations in various locations around Paris. The treaty which decided the fate of Hungary was the Treaty of Trianon, which was signed on June 4, 1920 and which Hungarians refer to as the Dictated Peace. The Peace Conference was held at the Trianon Palace at Versailles.

Most historians who write about the Treaty of Trianon concentrate on the unjust division of Hungary which transferred large areas of Hungarian territory and large numbers of Hungarian population to the surrounding states. I believe that, in order to understand what happened at Trianon, we need to know the history of Hungary in the preceding centuries. In the first part of my book, I give the reader an overview of the history of settlement in Hungary and the events leading to the infamous treaty. In the second part, I show how the Successor States planned the destruction of Hungary and how the decision to

divide Hungary was made before the conference at Trianon. I offer an eye-witness account of the events leading to the treaty from the writings of Henri Pozzi. I prove that the accusation that Hungary started the war was false and that the Russian Pan-Slavists, along with France, were responsible for the outbreak of the war. Finally, I offer a suggestion for a solution to the minority problems in Central Europe.

I have taken my information from a number of Hungarian writers and historians and from foreign historians, translated into Hungarian. The quotations from some English writers are translated from Hungarian into English, although wherever possible, I used the originals.

I hope that after reading this book, the reader will be convinced of the need for border revisions. It is my hope that my book will influence the opinions of certain people who are in a position to make these revisions.

László Botos, Rochester, NY. July, 1999

INTRODUCTION

June 4, 1920, is the date of the rearrangement of the borders of the Central European countries, which had the greatest influence on the redistribution of power. Rarely in the history of the world had a similar event taken place. On June 4, at the Treaty of Trianon, which followed the withdrawal of the German and Hungarian armies, the most shameful, unjust decision took place. This is officially called a „Peace Treaty”.

At the end of World War I., there were no foreign soldiers in Hungarian territories and the Hungarian army was engaged in fighting deep in the heart of Russia. The German and Hungarian armies were in a victorious position but they voluntarily withdrew and gave up the territories which they had occupied. The loss of World War I. was neither the result of cowardice on the part of the German and Hungarian soldiers nor of the economic exhaustion of these two states. Indeed, the Allied Powers were just as exhausted as the Central Powers. The loss of Hungarian territory was the result of trust in man’s promises.

This trust in man is characteristic of the Hungarian people who place great emphasis on honor. They inherited this honorable characteristic from the Huns. However, when politics are involved, this is a national weakness. It has been the cause of many misfortunes in Hungarian history. Wess Roberts writes about the Huns: „Their guilelessness and naive faith in human goodness frequently caused them to fall prey to the intricacies of more skilled practitioners of diplomacy.”¹

A good example of this naiveté was Count Mihály Károlyi’s trust in Woodrow Wilson’s famous Fourteen Points, one of which was that the wishes of the people would be considered when the new borders were drawn. This was called the Principle of Self-Determination. Mihály Károlyi, the leader of the Hungarian Socialist Government which came into power in 1918, believed that the decision would be based on a plebiscite as was promised. This blind trust caused the dismemberment of Hungary. Hungarian political analysts, in their studies of the Treaty

¹ Roberts, Wess: Leadership Secrets of Attila the Hun, Warner Books, 1985, p. 30.

of Trianon all, without exception, blame the dismemberment of Hungary on the fact that the plebiscite was not exercised. This was the cause of the Hungarian tragedy.

The history of Hungary is the history of the Carpathian Basin. The Carpathian Basin is in the center of Europe. This is the territory where different peoples from East and West met and their cultures mingled or clashed with each other. As a result, this territory is the center of different political aspirations. The cultural development of the peoples here differed from that of the peoples of any other part of Europe. However, in their development, certain influences on each other can be observed. This territory was for more than a thousand years definitely under Hungarian rule racially, spiritually and militarily. Until 1920, the Carpathian Basin, that is Hungary, was in a central position in Europe, not only geographically, but also politically. In the eighteenth century, the Czechs were already beginning to apply the term „Central Europe” to their own territory and the idea of Pan-Slavism² began to take hold.

Surrounded by the Carpathian Mountains and the Alps, Hungary existed as a state whose borders were almost unchanged from AD 896 to 1920. This area is generally referred to as „historic Hungary” to differentiate it from the Hungary which exists today and which is sometimes called „rump Hungary” or „mutilated Hungary”.

The territory of historic Hungary, excluding Croatia and Slavonia, covered 282,870 square kilometers. At the Treaty of Trianon, historic Hungary was divided into seven parts which were given to the surrounding nations. Rumania received Transylvania and the Partium (see map No. 11.), 103,000 square kilometers, with 5.24 million residents. This territory alone is bigger than mutilated Hungary which retained 92,963 square kilometers with 7,615,117 citizens. Yugoslavia received 21,000 square kilometers, with 1.6 million citizens. Czechoslovakia received 3.5 million citizens, the entire Hungarian territory of Felvidék (Slovakia) which reached as far south as the Danube, with many ancient Hungarian castles and cities, 63,000 square kilometers. It also received the Hungarian territory of Kárpátalja (also called Ruthenia, Sub-Carpathia and Carpatho-Ukraine) and the Hungarian territory of Máramaros which bordered Rumania. Austria,

² Pan-Slavism is a movement started in Russia to unite all the Slavs.

which dictated the Hungarian foreign policy, received 4,000 square kilometers, and 292,000 citizens; Poland, 589 square kilometers and 23,662 people; and Italy received the only Hungarian harbor, Fiume, which the Hungarians had just completed, an area of 21 square kilometers, with 46,806 citizens.³

If we look at history books written in the United States, which deal with this subject, we will find some very surprising observations. In the earlier American history books, when the Fourteen Points are discussed, it is clear that Woodrow Wilson intended to include the Doctrine of Self-determination in his Fourteen Points. However, books written much later, do not place as much emphasis on it. Ernest W. Young, writing in 1922, states: „One of the rocks upon which President Wilson settled as a firm foundation for the structure that he intended building for the world was that of self-determination for the smaller nations.”⁴ He goes on to say that, on many occasions, President Wilson „disregarded his own principle of self-determination and ruled otherwise.”

What happened here? Is it possible that the representatives of the Hungarian nation did not understand the situation? No, we cannot make that assumption but we can blame Mihály Károlyi for his blind trust and negligence. What happened after President Wilson's declaration of his famous Fourteen Points? I am convinced that the President, at the beginning, intended to make a just and democratic decision in the settlement of the Central European question but he did not take into account the opinions of the Western European Powers and the American people. When he declared his Fourteen Points, the Americans and the Europeans were in strong disagreement with his principles.

In May 1918, the Philadelphia Convention of the League to Enforce Peace was determined to win the war. „In this convention were two dominant notes: One, that in the struggle then on we were in opposition to the nation conclusively proved to be a criminal at the bar of history and humanity: the other, that in the contest with this guilty and

³ Raffay, Ernő: Magyar Tragédia, Trianon 75 éve, Budapest, 1996, pp.194 -195.

⁴ Young, Ernest W.: The Wilson Administration and the Great War, Boston, 1922, p. 291.

vicious enemy the war must be fought to an overwhelming finish.”⁵ The committee of British workingmen in charge of the Labor and Socialist demonstration held in London, July 14, 1918, published the following declaration: „Let it be known to the democracy of America that, come what may, even if Paris should fall and the channel ports be taken, the people of Great Britain are resolved to support the Allied Nations to the fullest extent of their energy and power.”⁶ This meant that the British workingmen intended to fight the war to a victorious finish.

Ernest W. Young, writing about President Wilson in 1922, says that the President’s wavering raised a question as to what kind of Americanism he represented. „The President’s idea of peace appeared to be different from that of the nations with which we were allied in carrying on the Great War.”⁷ He goes on to say:

„President Wilson’s idea appeared to be to take the Germans in to aid in fixing the terms of peace – a negotiated peace instead of a dictated peace. He entered the danger zone of diplomacy when he opened the doors of conversation with the enemy in the great peace drive directed by Germany.

„His minister to the Netherlands had a distinctly different view when he stated:

‘The duty of the present is to fight on beside France, Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, Servia (sic), Roumania⁸, and, we hope, Russia, ‘to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.’”⁹

The President disregarded the important fact that, in 1918, most of the nations of Western Europe still owned colonies and, if he were to enforce his philosophy of self-determination, all these colonies would have demanded their freedom and autonomy. Because of much opposition, President Wilson gave up his insistence on self-

⁵ Ibid. p. 238.

⁶ Ibid. p. 237.

⁷ Ibid. p. 239.

⁸ This is the old spelling for Rumania. I use the form „Rumania” although the Rumanians themselves prefer „Romania” to give the impression that they have connections with the Romans.

⁹ Ibid. p. 239.

determination and called his Fourteen Points just a provisional sketch. He was also influenced by the Czech statesmen, Thomas Masaryk and Edward Benes. Mihály Károlyi appeared to be unaware of all these disputes and arguments which were carried on around the Fourteen Points. The Allied Powers, who made the decision to carve up the land of Hungary, did so on the basis of false information. They were totally ignorant of the true history of Hungary.

Those who for many centuries were the kings and rulers of Hungary; those who directed the foreign and domestic policy of Hungary; and those who determined and dictated what was taught to the youths of Hungary and how it was taught were in most cases enemies of the Hungarian people. This is why the official history which is taught in Hungary is false. Those who benefit from this written history are those who intend to put a yoke on the Hungarian nation forever. Those who teach history in this way prevent the advancement of the nation. They believe that what they teach is correct and unwittingly serve the enemies of the nation. This is why it is very important for the Hungarians to relearn the deeds of the ancient Hungarian heroes. Knowledge of history gives support and trust in hard circumstances. The heroic deeds of the ancestors provide examples and encourage similar actions. We can draw conclusions, learn from the mistakes of the past and correct the damage. Since Hungarian history was written by the enemies of the Hungarian people, we must scrutinize all the data and correct all statements, assumptions and conclusions which are based upon false historical accounts. Even the royal decrees are suspect, even the decrees of the kings who became saints. There are several reasons for this: first, because they too were men, and therefore could make mistakes like anyone else; second, because to judge how beneficial a law is, it has to pass the test of time and third, because the Holy Roman Empire and the House of Hapsburg were both working toward the destruction of the Hungarian people and they provided the contemporary writers who wrote Hungarian history. They wanted to erase all vestiges of Hungarian ancient history by destroying the Szekler runic script. (The Szeklers, who live in Transylvania, speak the most ancient dialect of Hungarian and are direct descendants of the Huns.) The Christian Church executed the troubadours, the *mágus* (priest-magicians or medicine men) and the *táltos* (shamans) to prevent the relating of the

oral history. This is why the Hungarians have all the rights and reasons to check the material which was written about them.¹⁰

In this study I am researching the reasons for the Treaty of Trianon and I intend to expose the injustices which took place. As a basis to their claims to Hungarian territories, the Successor States (Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Yugoslavia) accused the Hungarians of oppressing them as minorities in Hungary. Let us see who actually were the oppressors. We need to go back to the beginnings of Hungarian history. We need to research that time when the Hungarians abandoned their ancient religion and became Christian. From this time on, the Hungarian people began to be attacked. Before they became Christian, the Magyars were a great power in Europe. There was no nation which would have dared to attack them. What weakened the Magyar nation and what were the factors which increased the self-confidence of their neighbors and led them to attack?

¹⁰ Fehér M. Jenő: Középkori magyar inkvizíció, Buenos Aires, 1956.

Chapter 1

Racial Elements in the Carpathian Basin

The Western powers recognize only the historic rights of a nation. On this basis, the state of Israel was reinstated. In this study, I ask that the World powers apply this recognition equally and fairly because this is the only way we can create peace and order and keep suffering to a minimum. These historic rights are also acknowledged by the Eastern powers. Chu En Lai, the President of China stated: „Every nation whose sovereign land has been occupied by foreign powers has a natural right to reclaim the land.”¹¹

According to some Western historians, the Hungarians are a people of non-European origin who thrust themselves into Europe. Kollmann, a German anthropologist, stated that the European people were formed from five different races. He based this conclusion on research of skulls and skeletons. All five types can be found among the Hungarians. „The races which populate Europe today can be traced back to two ancient variants: two short headed or round headed and two long headed. Between these two we find the fifth type of skull, the medium shape which was formed from a blend of the above two. If we disregard the Germans and the gypsies who migrated into the Carpathian Basin in the last few centuries, then the composition of the Hungarian people is as follows: 1. narrow face, short or round head; 2. wide face, short or round head; 3. wide face and medium head.”¹²

Kollman stated that some of the skulls that he found in the graves of the Árpád dynasty were identical to some of the Bronze Age skulls found at Aggtelek and the skull found at Nagysáp. According to anthropology, there is no permanent racial mixture. This means that if two races intermingle, at the start there is a racial mixture, but with time

¹¹ Csobánczi, Elemér: Nagymagyarország vagy Nemzethálál, Vol. 1., Horvát Magyar Kapcsolatok, p.7; Reference to Dr. Pál Vágó, in his article entitled: A tudománytalan turánizmus

¹² Csobánczi: Op.Cit. p. 9; Kollmann: Europische Menschenrassen, 1882

one or other race becomes dominant. The Hungarian people originated from two ancient short or round-headed variants which had the same ancient forefathers. Throughout the millennia they have branched into five different races.

1. The Caucasian or Turanid race which is also known as the Alföld Hungarian race.
2. The Dinaric or Southern Hungarian race which is the twin variant of the Alföld race.
3. The Eastern Baltic or Baltic Hungarian race which was formed around the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea.
4. The Alpine Hungarian race.
5. The Taurid or Hittite Hungarian race.

According to Etelka Toronyi, a Hungarian researcher, the development of the human skull progressed from long-headed (dolicocephalic) to medium-headed (mezocephalic) to short-headed (brachycephalic). Examples of all three skulls were found in the Carpathian Basin. By the Bronze Age, the short, round-headed skulls made up 36% of the populace of the Carpathian Basin.¹³

The representation of the three skull types among present day Hungarians is as follows: the long-headed or dolicocephalic is 1.03% among males, 0.68% among females; the middle or mezocephalic is 10.20% among males and 7.77% among females; the short-headed or brachycephalic is 39.84% among males and 35.81% among females; and the very short-headed or hyperbrachycephalic is 48.93% among males and 55.74% among females.¹⁴ The short-headed and very short-headed have the largest percentage. The two together compose almost 90% of the populace. The middle size makes up scarcely 10% and the long headed barely 1%. According to these data the long-headed race is barely represented. It appears as if the hyperbrachycephalic race has several origins. The brachycephalic and hyperbrachycephalic reach or surpass 50% in all the Hungarian territories. In the south west part of the country and in the Great Plain they are close to 100%. The size of the skull indicates the intelligence of the individual. The Mediterranean dolicocephalic skull index often goes below 70. The average Hungarian skull index is generally 86.88 and the German is 83.65. (Bártucz, p.370)

¹³ Toronyi, Etelka: *A Kárpáti Medence, a kultúrák bölcsője és a magyarok őshazája*, Buenos Aires, 1974

¹⁴ Bartucz, Lajos: *A Magyar Ember*, Budapest, 1938, p.297

In 1892, at the Moscow Anthropological Congress, Bogdanof, a Russian anthropologist, called the attention of the scientists to the long-headed skull type which he named the „Rjäsán” type which was found in the kurgans of Central Russia, where most of the skulls found were classified as mezocephalic and dolicocephalic. They were markedly different from the short-headed populace which had a lighter complexion. The skull index hardly reached the 79.5 level. (Bártucz, p. 377) Deniker, a French anthropologist, identified these skulls with those of the Ugor type of people. Tschepurkovsky also calls them the Rjäsán type and Bunok calls them the Ural type. (Bártucz, p. 378) Yet the Finno-Ugric theorists still state that the short-headed Hungarians are the descendants of this long-headed Ugor race. According to Bunak: „The origin of this race cannot go back more than four centuries.” (Bártucz, p. 379)

Now based on the above-mentioned facts, the question arises: For what reason do the Finno-Ugric theorists try to originate the Magyars from this long-headed race? Many scientists identify the race which was discovered by Bogdanof with the Ugors. The difference between the long-headed and short-headed is most obvious among the long-headed Ostyaks.

The Alpine race has been called many different names. This proves that this race is spread widely among all the peoples of Europe. The Alpine race differs only slightly from the other races of Europe. This is why its place of origin has not yet been finally determined. The members of this race are characteristically stout, stocky, with a wide face, wide short neck, wide long trunk and short legs, arms and fingers. Their average height is 150-163 cm. and the average skull index is 85-86. They have small eyes, set wide apart, and a short, flat, turned-up nose. This race is widespread in Western Europe. Ripley believes that the Hungarians originated from this ancient European Alpine race and that the Finno-Ugric element among the Homecoming Magyars counted for no more than one eighth. The average skull index of the Hungarians is almost equal to that of the Alpine race. (Bártucz, p. 387) One difference between the Hungarians and the Alpine race is in the height. The Alpine man is 163 cm. and the Hungarian is 167.02 cm. 40% of the Hungarians have light hair and skin. This means that almost one half of the short-headed Hungarians have a fair complexion. At the same time, the Alpine race has black hair and dark complexion. Therefore the

Hungarians cannot originate from the Alpine race. There can be no more than 15% of the Alpine race among the Hungarians. This Alpine race appears more often on those territories where the strong foreign settlements are obvious, such as in cities. Among the village people there are very few examples of this race. This race only appears more often where the Slavs and the Southern German Schwabs are living. This is why, in these territories where this race appears in larger numbers, we can be sure that the people are immigrants. The study of the skeletons and skulls of the Árpád dynasty supports these conclusions. 55% of the skulls were short-headed and among the present day Hungarians 89% are short-headed.

In 1898, Deniker stated that, in the territories of the Adriatic Sea, Bosnia, Dalmatia and Croatia lived a European race of people, tall in stature, round-headed who were in the majority in this area. They were called the Dinaric race. This race is differentiated from the Alpine race by its height and slimness. This short-headed race was formed in the Carpathian Basin and composes the majority of the Hungarians of today. Some of the Homecoming Magyars were of the Dinaric race.

Csobánczi sees a connection between the Hungarians and the Croats. Quoting Eugene Pittard: „At first sight, and carrying a stage further what we know to be the case with BOSNIANS and SLOVENES, the CROATS – to whom we may add the DALMATIANS – ought to belong to the DINARIC race, or at all events a large proportion among them. These slavonized folk would thus be widely separated anthropologically from the NORTHERN SLAVS.” . . . „The CROATS of Croatia, Slavonia and Istria, and the DALMATIANS in general, are round-headed. Their cephalic index must certainly exceed 85.”¹⁵

The Dinaric or South Hungarian race is an important part of the Hungarian people. This type is found in large numbers in the Great Hungarian Plain and in Transdanubia. In these territories it makes up 30-35% of the populace. This race produced the majority of the Jazygians, the Cumanians and the Hajdu people and people of the Dinaric race can still be found in large numbers in the territory of Csallóköz and can also be found among the Palóc people and the

¹⁵ Csobánczi: Op.Cit. p. 11; Pittard, Eugene: Race and History, 1926, New York, p. 257-259

Transylvanian Hungarians. The physical description of the Dinaric race is that they were tall, with a short-head, flattened in the back, narrow face, well-developed nose, sometimes with an aquiline nose, well-developed muscles, strong chin, eyes well-placed, dark complexion, brown or black eyes and dark brown hair. (Csobánczi, p. 12)

According to the writings of Anonymus¹⁶, Álmos, the leader of the Magyars, was of Dinaric or Southern Hungarian origin. „Álmos was elegant, tall and slim, with a brown complexion, black hair and big eyes. His hands were massive with long fingers and he himself was merciful, good-hearted, wise and a good soldier. He was generous to all those who fought with him in the land of Scythia.” (Csobánczi, p. 11.)

Saint László's head and the skeleton of Béla, Prince of the Macsó *bánát*, prove that the kings of the Árpád dynasty belonged to the Dinaric race. The anthropological characteristics of the Dinaric or Southern Hungarian type can be found in the Carpathian Basin throughout the millennia from the most ancient times. This is proven by the findings from the Chiselled Stone Age. This race could not have originated in the Balkans. (Csobánczi, p. 11) In the Bronze Age a similar type of people migrated from Mesopotamia through the Caucasus into Central and Southern Europe. The people of the Carpathian Basin were in constant contact with the Mesopotamian peoples. According to the observations of John Dayton and Etelka Toronyi, these people migrated to Mesopotamia and back to the Carpathian Basin when circumstances forced them to do so.¹⁷

A second short-headed race represented among the Hungarians is the Turanid race, which entered the Carpathian Basin with the Huns and the Magyars. Bartucz originally called this race „Caucasus Tartaroid” but recently changed its name to the „Alföld” race or „Homo Pannonicus” because the largest number of these people can be found in the Great Hungarian Plain (Nagy Alföld) and in Transdanubia. The Alföld race was formed from different regional types and these regional types showed a great resemblance to the original Turanid race. „The ‘Hungarian type’ or ‘Alföld race’ is a complimentary expression because there is no other type like this in the world.” (Bartucz, p. 419)

¹⁶ Anonymus was a 12th century historian who did not dare to identify himself for fear of persecution by the Church.

¹⁷ Botos, László: The Homeland Reclaimed, Rochester, NY. 1995

The Alföld race is the group of people that anthropologists formerly called a 'Turkic' type people. Bartucz writes that they are on average 165-166 cm. tall, with a large skull, the face slightly Tartaroid but not flat. The nose is more developed than that of the Asian Turanid race. The eyes are bigger. The color of the eyes is lighter, yellowish-brown. The face is reddish-brown. The skin and the eyes have a lively characteristic, a friendly facial expression. The arms and legs are short. The lines in the face are soft but determined. Every foreign anthropologist emphasizes that their appearance is appealing. Both sexes are declared to be good-looking. According to Bartucz, the Alpine race is angular and has primitive characteristics. The Dinaric race is crude, forceful and aggressive while the Alföld race is very strong, assertive and charming. (Bartucz, p. 421) This Alföld race makes up 25% of the present-day Hungarian populace.

Throughout Hungarian history, because more people of this race died in those territories where the Alföld race lived (presently Serbia), we can assume that at the time of Árpád, in A.D.896, the percentage of this race among the Hungarians was much higher than it is today.

In the Carpathian Basin, during the Bronze Age, there was a period of racial mixing. The Mediterranean long-headed race, for some reason, almost disappeared from the Carpathian Basin and the Hungarian Alpine race mixed with the Dinaric and Eastern Baltic races to take its place. It appears that this took place during the first and second periods of the Bronze Age. This people developed new customs and culture in this territory. This can be seen in the trepanation of the skulls which were excavated from the Szöreg cemetery. (Bartucz, p. 443)

The fifth racial element among the Hungarians is the Taurid race which is only about 4-5% of the population. Among the Homecoming Magyars, there were some of the Taurid race. Their physical appearance was tall, 166-167 cm., stocky, with a tendency to become fat in old age, short arms and legs and wide hands and shoulders. They were short-headed, with a cranial capacity of 85. They can be found in Transylvania and in southern Hungary. They are largely represented in the Caucasus, Asia Minor and Persia. They have also been called the Caucasoid race and even Hittite and Armenian but Bartucz says that these names are misleading. (Bartucz, p. 409-413)

From the linguistic point of view, Adorján Magyar, Lajos Marjalaki-Kiss and most recently, Grover Krantz, have stated that the

Hungarian language is the most ancient in Europe and native to the Carpathian Basin. Grover Krantz states: „The antiquity of Magyar in Hungary may be equally surprising; I find it to be a Mezolithic speech that predates the Neolithic entry.”¹⁸ He also states: „If this is true, it means that Hungarian (Magyar) is actually the oldest in-place language in all of Europe.” (Krantz, p. 72)

¹⁸ Krantz, Grover: Geographical Development of European Languages, Peter Lang, 1988. p. 10-11

Chapter 2

Transylvania

The topography of Transylvania was formed 12 -14,000 years ago by a cataclysm. The majority of the European Ice Age population died in this disaster. In some protected territories, a few groups of people managed to survive. Transylvania was such a territory, and also the territory of the Erzgebirge where the Hungarians of the Torockó region presently live. After the end of the Ice Age, this ancient populace progressed very rapidly. Here, for the first time in Europe, the cultivation of the land was begun, ceramics were made and even glazed ceramics which required a temperature of 1700 degrees centigrade. Because metals can be found in large quantities in this territory, they soon learned how to smelt metals.¹⁹

The ancestors of the Torockó Hungarians lived in the Transylvanian Erzgebirge. In the territories of the mountains called the Gyulai Havasok, the Rézhegység, and the Meszeshegység lived the ancestors of the Hungarians of the Kalotaszeg region. The skeletal remains of a similar type people are proof of this. Between 10,000 and 5,000 BC, this ancient populace who lived on the virgin land are now called the people of the Körös (Kris, Starcevo) culture. For some reason they migrated out of the Carpathian Basin to Mesopotamia. From there they migrated again back through the Caucasus, through the Carpathian mountains and into the Carpathian Basin. Their remains can be found at the Maros, Küküllő and Szamos rivers. These people mingled with the people who had remained in this territory and together they formed the Szekler culture of today. Because Transylvania was rich in metals, these people maintained their connections with the Mesopotamian, Anatolian, Aegean and Egyptian peoples. One proof of these connections is an artifact of antimony and gold which was found in the grave of Kheneri the Pharaoh of Egypt. Elemér Csobánczi quotes A. R. Burn who says

¹⁹ Dayton, John: Minerals, metals, Glazing and Man, London 1978, pp. 50, 75, 80

that the two metals, gold and antimony, can only be alloyed by the use of a catalyst, a third metal called „tellurium”. Geologists have found only three places in the world where the three metals can be found together in natural form, in Australia, North America and in Zalatna, Transylvania. We can conclude that the Egyptians received these metals from Transylvania. (Csobánczi, Op Cit. p. 26) A further proof of the Transylvanian-Mesopotamian connection which Csobánczi mentions, can be found in the Révai Nagy Lexicon, Vol. II, Budapest 1911, p.3, under the subtitle „arany leletek”: „Many gold rings were found in Hungary which could not have been used as jewelry. Twenty-two of them were found among the Máramaros treasures. When these rings were weighed, they appeared to belong to some kind of a measurement system. They weighed in units of 9 grams, some weighing six times that number, some 18 times and some 36 times. That system of weights showed that the ancient populace of the Carpathian Basin used the Babylonian system of weights.”²⁰ In addition to this Zsófia Torma found, in the valley of the Maros, ceramic remains on which there were found Mesopotamian pictographic signs.

In 1961, N. Vlása, a Rumanian archeologist, excavated a settlement at Tartaria, Rumania (formerly Tatarlaka, Hungary). Among the excavated artifacts were three amulets upon which writing is clearly visible. This writing closely resembles the prehistoric writing of Jamdet Nasr in Mesopotamia. It has been deciphered and the Soviet researcher, Dr. Titov dates it to 5000 BC and states that the amulets were made of local clay and are 2000 years older than the remains excavated at Al Ubaid. (See The Homeland Reclaimed, p. 145) According to Ripley, an American scientist, the Hungarians were an autochthonous European people and Kollman states in his book Europische Menschenrassen, in 1882 that the skulls which were found in the graves of the kings of the Árpád dynasty were examined and the measurements of some of them were similar to some of the skulls found in the Aggtelek cave, the Nagysáp skull and the skulls of the Bronze Age. The present Hungarian nation was formed from two groups:

1. the autochthonous people of the Carpathian Basin and
2. A group of people who were identical to the people of the Carpathian Basin, racially, linguistically and in their customs and war tactics, who

²⁰ Csobánczi: Op.Cit. p. 26.

were known as the White Huns, who came from India and Persia, through the territory they called Dentumagaria (north of the Black Sea) back to the Carpathian Basin with Árpád the Priest-king.

Let us return to the ancient history of Transylvania. Numerous Bronze Age objects, smelting-furnaces and urn cemeteries all prove that Transylvania was a relatively densely populated territory in ancient times. It is very interesting that documents show several hundred man-made fish ponds among the ancient remains. Hiador Sztripszky, in his book proves the existence of these fish ponds.²¹

In ancient times many thousands of fish ponds existed in Transylvania between Kolozsvár (Cluj) and Torda (Turda) in the Virágos valley and in the Rakadó valley near Brassó (Braseu). Transylvania is full of small valleys which are dammed. These dammed areas have slowly filled up with soil with the passing of time and the water has been drained off. The valleys became flat land. The bottom of these one time fish ponds, now flat land, yielded hundreds of Bronze Age net weights and other Bronze Age fishing tools. There is no doubt that these areas were at one time fisheries and the water was used for the animals, for irrigation of the land and for working the mills. In addition, the people needed these fish ponds because this territory lacked water and often the springs could not be used for drinking water because they were salty. These ponds were in existence at the time of the Romans. The Latin name for the fish pond was *piscina*. They were still used at the time of the Homecoming Magyars. These fish ponds were drained at the time of the infiltration of the Wallachians because, as pastoralists, they needed the territory for grazing. The Rumanians call the fish pond „halasteu”. It is obvious that they took this word from the Hungarian „halastó” and not the Latin „piscina”. It is interesting to note that, in the Middle Ages, in the Hungarian law book, written in Latin, the word „piscina” is used but the Wallachian law book in Bucharest, writes „halasteu”. This seems to be strong evidence against the Daco-Roman theory.

Zoltán Szilády informs us that, in the territory of Transylvania, on the slopes of the mountains, the remains of the ancient terrace agriculture can be noticed everywhere.²² Presently this system of

²¹ Ibid. p. 28; Sztripszky, Hiador: Az erdélyi halastavak ismeretéhez – Régi és mai halastavak, Kolozsvár, 1908

²² Ibid. p. 29; Szilády, Zoltán: A mi Erdélyünk, Budafok, 1922

agriculture can be seen to be continued only in the areas inhabited by Hungarians and Saxons. The Rumanians do not continue to use the land in this way. They have continued to use it as grazing land but the remains of the ancient terrace agriculture can still be found in the areas in which they live. Szilády states that at the time he was writing, (1922) there were very few Rumanian blacksmiths. Among their people, the gypsies were the blacksmiths. The Rumanians used tools and utensils made of wood in that land where iron had been used for 3,000 years.

Jenő Cholnoky has written an interesting book about the geography of Hungary.²³ Of particular interest are the cities of Transylvania. The Romans called Kolozsvár „Napoca”, the Rumanians call it „Cluj”. The Romans called Torda „Potaissa”, the Rumanians call it „Turda”. The Roman name for Gyulafehérvár was „Apulium”, the Rumanians call it „Alba-Iulia”. But they should at least remember the name of the capital of Dacia, which the Dacians called „Sarmisegethusa”. The Romans called it „Ulpia Traiana”. When the people of Árpád arrived and found only castle ruins in this place, they called it „Várhely” (castle-place). The Rumanians translated Várhely to a Slavic word „Gredistye”. (Cholnoky, p. 92) This is another proof that there were no traditions handed down to them by the Romans. Because the Rumanians originated from the Balkan territory called „Rumelia”, they received the name „Rumuni” and were never called ROMANIAN.

Csobánczi says that it is an unforgivable sin that the Transylvanian aristocracy did not stop the Wallachian infiltration into Transylvania and it is also unforgivable on the part of the Hapsburgs that they supported the Wallachian settlements in Transylvania. They did that so that they would be able to weaken the Hungarians and overcome them as they had planned to do for centuries. The military maps which were published in Vienna, whenever possible, used the new Rumanian names for Hungarian cities and geographical locations. In this way they spread the belief that in Transylvania, everything was of Rumanian or Wallachian origin. Many historical distortions originated from these maps.

The Rumanians can thank the French for their support in the annexation of Transylvania to Rumania. At the beginning of World War II., the Rumanians took part on the side of the French and the Allied

²³ Ibid. p. 29; Cholnoky, Jenő: A föld és élete. Magyarország földrajza.

Forces but, when the Germans occupied France and it looked as if Germany would win the war, they immediately went over to Germany's side. However, when the Germans lost their strength, the Rumanians went back on the side of the Allies. In this way, they opened the way for the Soviets to come through the Carpathian passes. This shows that after the dismemberment of Hungary, that powerful nation, which through the millennia was able to keep out the danger from the East and at the same time prevent the Germans from spreading toward the East, lost its territory and its strength.

The result of the loss of Hungarian power is that American troops had to remain in Europe for decades to hold back the Soviets. What will happen when the American taxpayers get tired of keeping the peace in Europe? The more farsighted politicians like Foreign Minister Briand of France, and Prime Minister Francisco Nitti of Italy stated that the dismemberment of Hungary was a huge mistake. (See Appendix D.) This is why the question of Transylvania and Hungary is not just a Hungarian problem but is an international problem, not only for political reasons but also for cultural reasons.

Chapter 3

Foreign „Guests”

The Homecoming Magyars²⁴ lived in freedom and independence which was unheard of in Europe in the tenth century. They had no serfs or inferiors. The feudal states of Europe had to stamp out this unheard of freedom before it spread to their countries and their people began to demand this freedom for themselves. Hungary at that time was the greatest military power in Europe. The German Emperor, Otto I made countless attempts to subdue the Magyars. History records that the battle of Lechfeld, AD 955, which was a victory for the Germans, was a final victory over the Magyars. However, the Magyars remained strong for seventy-five years following this battle and they were able to prevent Otto I. and the Germans from entering Hungary. Historians represent Hungary as a weakened, defeated nation whose only escape was to become Christian. Otto I., unable to subdue Hungary by military means, used Christianity to reach his goal. He arranged an alliance between the Germans and the Magyars at the Assembly of Quedlinburg in AD 973. In a letter to Pope Benedict VII., in AD 974, Bishop Pilgrim wrote: „According to the alliance between the Germans and the Hungarians, we started to spread Christianity as the peace prevailed.”²⁵ An interesting fact about the Quedlinburg agreement is that every German document that survives mentions only the spreading of Christianity. This was the beginning of Hungary’s loss of independence. Otto decided to give a German wife, Adelhaid, to Géza, the Kagan or leader of the Magyars. In this way, he would open up the Hungarian borders to German immigrants. This was the only way for the Germans to break the power

²⁴ I use the expression „Homecoming Magyars” because the Magyars returned to their homeland in the Carpathian Basin in A.D. 896. They did not conquer the peoples of the Carpathian Basin but rejoined their own people. See my book, „The Homeland Reclaimed”.

²⁵ Grandpierre, K. Endre: Magyarok Istenének Elrablása, Budapest, 1993; quotes Endlicher: Monumenta Árpádiana, p.131.

of the Magyars. The Quedlinburg agreement stated that the Magyars were to withdraw their guards from the marchlands and open up their borders to missionaries and anybody who wished to enter the country. They were to allow churches to be built, parishes to be established and, in Hungarian territory, there were to be no restrictions placed in the way of the spreading and practicing of Christianity. Kagan Géza was to marry Adelheid and had to promise to give positions, land and titles to her ten thousand German bodyguards who occupied the royal residence.

Kagan Géza's son, Vajk, converted to Christianity and was crowned the first King of Hungary in AD 1000, taking the Christian name István, (Stephen). He was later canonized and became known as Szent István (Saint Stephen). The Magyar people had one language, comprising of different dialects. King István warned his son that: „a country which has one language and is united in its customs is weak and perishable.”²⁶

King István became the country's greatest landowner. He believed that the value of a country was not in its size but in the numbers of people who lived on the land. Therefore, in order to strengthen the Kingdom of Hungary, he opened the borders to outsiders. Thus Germans, Italians, Czechs, Serbs, Russians, Poles and many other nationalities settled in Hungary. The Church would not allow the Cumanians and the Pechenegs, the brother-nations of the Hungarians, who lived to the east of Hungary, who spoke a related language and had similar customs, to enter Hungary because they were not Christians. King István granted the Hungarian territory between the River Enns and the River Lajta to the Germans. He applied the Frankish system to the distribution and the defense of the settlers. The Royal wealth was overseen by the „*curtis*” in the castles. The castles were defended by the soldiers and the people living around the castles. The bailiff was the lord of the settlers around the castle and almost all the bailiffs were foreigners. King István allowed the foreign „guests” a tax-free status but at the same time, the Hungarians had to pay taxes, build churches and support the priests.

From the twelfth to the fourteenth century, a large number of German immigrants settled in the territory east of the Elbe, where Slavs were living, in Silesia, Holstein and Prussia. During the reign of the

²⁶ Halmi, Dezső: „Trianon Gyökerei”; Ősi Gyökér, Jan -Feb., 1978, p. 30

Hungarian King Géza II. (1141-1162), these Germans crossed into Hungarian territory into the territory of Kiralyhágó, and the counties of Szepes, Bereg, Ugocsa and Bihar. The king gave whole counties to the foreign knights who brought their own artisans with them to replace the Hungarian artisans. Most of the artisans from this time on were foreigners. After the Tartar (Mongol) invasion, King Béla IV. (1235-1270) also encouraged the settlement of foreigners into Hungary. At this time, a group of Cumanians was able to settle into Hungary and they became the most trustworthy Hungarians. Historians do not mention how much Hungarian blood was shed in order for Hungary to remain the defense bastion of the West.

At the Battle of Mohács (1526), large numbers of Hungarians were killed, fighting the Turks, in their defense of Western civilization. The fighting was all in vain because they lost their independence. They could have allowed the Turks to cross Hungary without opposition because the envoys of Suleiman II. announced many times that they were just asking permission to travel through Hungary to fight the Hapsburgs. If the Hungarians had accepted the request of Suleiman II., the 400 year occupation of Hungary by the Hapsburgs would never have happened. From the Hungarian point of view, would it not have been more advantageous to come to an agreement with the Turks? In the five centuries after István I., it was not the Turks who were killing the Hungarian populace, but the Germans and the Austrians who always wanted to subdue the Hungarians. They finally succeeded after the Battle of Mohács in 1526 when Emperor Ferdinand I. became the first Hapsburg to become King of Hungary. The Hapsburg rule of Hungary lasted almost 400 years. After the insurrections of Imre Thököly (1678-1686) and Ferenc Rákoczy II. (1703-1711), and after the suppression of the freedom fight of 1848, the Hapsburgs retaliated by killing the Hungarian populace and resettling Germans in their place. In that way the numbers of foreigners settled in Hungary increased dramatically.

Beginning in the thirteenth century, a slow infiltration of Wallachians crossed the Carpathian Mountains from the Balkans as a shepherd people and settled on the slopes of the Havas mountains in Hungary. Here the Hungarian tax collectors could not reach them for centuries, so they multiplied and prospered. After the liberation of Buda from the Turks, in 1686, the Hapsburgs did not allow the Hungarians to resettle in the territories freed from the Turks. Instead they settled

people from all the European nationalities, primarily Serbs, Slavs and Germans.

Before World War I, there was nationalistic propaganda from the Southern Slavs the Czechs and the Rumanians to weaken the Hungarians. This was propagated throughout the West, and was even supported by the Hapsburgs, with false maps, indicating the settlements of these people in Hungary.

In 1920, the Austrians claimed the territory as far east as Hegyeshalom, the territory today called Burgenland. With this claim they broke a 900 year-old agreement with Hungary. When King István I. took a wife, the younger sister of the Holy Roman Emperor, who was registered in the documents as Giesel, which means „pledge or security”, her name was added to the list of Hungarian queens as Gizella. The question is: for what was she a pledge or security? When we research the Árpád codices, we learn that Géza, the father of István, gave the Holy Roman Emperor the Basin of Vienna. This was given with the condition that, in the future, neither the Germans nor the Austrians would have any territorial demands over Hungary. Gizella was the security for this agreement. In Trianon, Austria broke that 900 year agreement with Hungary when she came forward to claim the territory of Burgenland for Austria, turning against her own ally. This territory was 4020 square kilometers and there were 261,618 Hungarian citizens living there, who became Austrian citizens. At that time, another false map surfaced demonstrating where the national settlements were located. Based on this map, the Czechs and the Slovaks demanded the territory to the river Danube, the Rumanians claimed the territory as far Gyulafehérvár, the Southern Slavs the territory towards Szeged and the Austrians wanted to reach Hegyeshalom.²⁷

The reduction of the Hungarian territory began even before the time of the Homecoming Magyars. The greatest loss of territory was in the east. All that territory where the Rumanians are presently living was inhabited by a people related to the Magyars. According to the archeological findings from the Stone Age, the Copper and the Bronze Ages, we can conclude that there was a Hungarian related people (Turaniens) living in that huge territory, from the Carpathian Basin to the territory of the Don River. The Torockó people were living in the

²⁷ Ibid. p. 30

Transylvanian Érchegység (Erzgebirge), the Kalotaszeg people in the Rézhegység, the Szeklers from Erdőd in County Háromszék, the Csángó people in Moldavia, and the Cumanians and the Pechenegs in Bessarabia and Havasalföld (Wallachia). Until the thirteenth century, these people were settled in this territory and no other peoples settled among them. Elemér Csobánczi writes that in the thirteenth century the Russians lived only in the territories around Novgorod.²⁸

One cannot determine the nature of a people solely by examining their language but we must take into account anthropology, archeology, ethnography and folk art. Csobánczi says that if we examine the Rumanian people for example, then we will learn that to a greater extent they are a Rumanized Hungarian people. (Csobánczi, p.3.) However, this writer believes that they are rather a Rumanized Cumanian people.

After Budapest, Bucharest is the city with the largest Hungarian population, 320,000 Hungarians. In the Ukraine, which is the territory between the rivers Don and Dnieper, the populace is made up of ancient Scythian or Hun people, and the Russ people from whom the Russians received their name. This is why the Russian songs and music are similar to Hungarian – they come from the same territory of the Ukraine.

Among the tribes of the Magyars were the Tarján, Jenő, Gyarmat, Nyék tribes and the Megyers, who gave their name to the nation,. Around AD 760, these tribes settled between the Don and the Dnieper. In the eastern part of this territory, between the Don and Donets rivers, lived the Kéri, Keszi, and Kürt tribes of ancient Scythian or Hun origin. In this territory was the western border of the Kazar Empire. These three tribes later on joined the aforementioned tribes of Megyer, Tarján, Jenő, Gyarmat and Nyék.

In the 1926 Archeological Congress in Madras, the Indian-Hun connection was discussed and the historians came to the conclusion that the White Huns, or Ephtalita Huns, who at the time of Atilla²⁹ lived on the border of the Persian Empire, ruled over the 40 principalities of

²⁸ Csobánczi, Elemér: Nagymagyarország vagy nemzethalál, Vol. 3. Keletmagyarország pusztulása és elrablása, p.3.

²⁹ Western historians spell this name „Attila” but I will follow the recommendation of Professor Ferenc Badiny-Jós, who writes „Atilla”. Atilla was named after the ancient name for the River Volga, the River Etel. Etel or Atil means „the water of life”. With the suffix -la, it becomes „giver of the water of life” – Atil-la.

India. The four Magyar tribes, Megyer, Tarján, Jenő and Gyarmat were the White Huns who returned from India to the Carpathian Basin. This fact is recognized in the history of Pakistan and India. In AD 710, the White Huns of India lost a decisive battle against the conquering Arabs. As a result of this loss, three Hun tribes, Megyer, Tarján and Jenő were forced to separate from the other tribes and move toward the West. During their migration, they met the Nyék tribe of Parthian origin. Between AD 734 and 740, a big revolution broke out in the territory of the Caucasus. As a result, the White Huns crossed the Caucasus mountains and in AD 760, they settled in the Don and Dnieper territories. This is that territory which the Byzantine historians call DENTUMOGER. The people who lived here were called Turk. Csobánczi provides certain proven data that the White Huns were the direct descendants of the ancient Scythian people just as were the Cumanians, Kazars, Bulgarians, Avars, Palóc, Uz, Alans and Pechenegs. All their languages were the same as that of the White Huns, that is the Magyar language. These languages only differed from each other as much as do the dialects of the present-day Palóc, Szeklers, Göcsej and the Csángó people of Moldavia. (Csobánczi, p. 5.)

Anthropological research shows that the racial characteristics of the Magyars are identical to the racial characteristics of the ancient European people. The proponents of theories such as the Finno-Ugric, Indo-European, and Eastern-Baltic theories are convinced that most people are ignorant of their history, therefore they propagate these false theories. Zenaide A. Ragozin, historian, states that the Hungarian people are of Turanian origin, blessed with the highest level of intellectual ability among the nations of Europe.³⁰ The proof of Magyar settlement in the Carpathian Basin, which the Magyars regarded as their own sovereign possession, is that the ancient forefathers of the Magyars were the autochthonous populace of that land, 9,000 years ago and they gave the geographical names to features in that territory. The Magyars of Árpád, the priest-king, when they returned to the ancient territory, at the request of the Szeklers and the Palóc people and reorganized the territory, spoke the same language as the people living there, that is, Magyar (Hungarian). In brief, Árpád did not conquer countries or

³⁰ Csobánczi: Op. Cit. p. 6; quotes Ragozin, Zenaide A.: The Story of the Nations, The Story of Chaldea, Putnam and Sons, London, 1896

enslave peoples but settled his people among the populace of that territory and assimilated into them. The Carpathian Basin was the motherland³¹ of the Turanian-Scythian-Hun people.

Normally, in a particular territory, the development of a people and its language progresses without much change. In the past, in the Carpathian Basin, there was uniformity in the language, racial characteristics, customs, folk art, and the worship of God, the Sun-God, Baal or Bél.

There were efforts during the last century to break up the geographical unit of the Carpathian Basin, together with the people's unity, by dividing the territory and introducing foreign settlers. New nations were formed with artificial borders, like Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, which could not survive the test of time because they were man-made. They fell apart not because of any outside interference but because of their own interior conflicts. However, the suppression and genocide of the original Hungarian populace still continues, such as the Szeklers in Transylvania (Rumania), Magyars of South Baranya (Yugoslavia), the Palóc Magyars of Felvidék (Slovakia), the Csángó Magyars in Moldavia (Rumania), and the Magyars of Kárpátalja (Ukraine). I will talk of this in more detail in a later chapter.

In the tenth century, the territory between the Carpathian Mountains and the River Don was inhabited by Hungarian speaking people. The contemporary Byzantine historians called that territory „Dentumagyaria”. Kiev was established by the people who lived in that territory. Its original name was Keõ or Kõ. The Hungarian ancestors on this territory moved west to the Rivers Bug, Dniester, Prut and Szeret, a territory which they called „Etelköz”. This territory is now in Rumania. The southern border of the Hungarian territory was at one time the lower Danube which the Hungarians call Havasalföld, now in Rumania. During the era of the Árpád Dynasty, other peoples related to the Magyars settled there, such as the Pechenegs and the Cumanians. Later on the Gyula tribe wandered into Transylvania from this territory where they mingled with the Keszi tribe and took over the leadership.

³¹ The Hungarians call their homeland their „motherland” unlike the western nations who use „fatherland”.

In the thirteenth century the course of history changed the fate of Hungary forever. King Béla IV. (1235-1270), with a strong hand, tried to hold back the Tartars (Mongols) but he was unable to prevent the destruction and the loss of Hungarian people which resulted from the Tartar invasions. In 1240, the son of Genghis Khan, Okdaj, set out to conquer Europe. His commander-in-chief, Batu Khan, asked Béla IV. to unite with the Tartars against Europe because the Tartars respected the military strength of the Hungarians. They also believed themselves to be related to the Hungarians, since the Hungarians were a Turanian people. Béla IV. rejected this offer. The Tartar army, led by Szabutaj and Batu Khan, after it defeated, one by one, the peoples living in the southern Russian territories, reached the Carpathian Mountains in 1241, and here it separated into three parts. The smaller army to the north at Liegnitz defeated the much larger united army of Germans, Poles and Moravians. After this defeat the Moravian (Czech) king escaped, abandoned his country and the Moravians (Czechs) without any resistance allowed the Tartars to proceed toward Hungary. After the victory at Liegnitz, the Tartar army, in three columns, a total of 150,000 soldiers, marched against Hungary. The main army defeated the defending force of Bailiff Dénes at the Verecke Pass. At Vác, they defeated the regiments of Bishop Ugrin of Esztergom and here they waited for Orda and his regiments from Liegnitz. The third army attacked Transylvania under the leadership of Bogutaj Khan and defeated the regiment of the *vajda* (ruler) of Transylvania. On April 11, 1241, on the shores of the River Sajó, in the Mohi desert, the Hungarian army met the Tartar army for the first time. Prince Kálmán, the younger brother of King Béla IV., together with Bishop Ugrin, managed to repel the attack of Batu Khan. Batu Khan attacked again and the Hungarians repelled this second attack. Then Sejbán Khan arrived on the scene with a well-prepared plan and encircled the Hungarian camp which was protected by a ring of carts. He annihilated the entire army of 50,000-60,000 men and their leaders. The only one to escape was Prince Kálmán who died of his injuries.

The Hungarian king's first intention was to visit his younger brother and then to go to Croatia and to the Dalmatian seashore and organize a new army. But Friedrich Babenberg, Prince of Austria, dissuaded him from his plan and persuaded him to go with him on the more „secure” route to Hainburg and Bécsujhely. As the king reached

the Austrian territory, Prince Friedrich confiscated all his wealth and threatened him that if he did not repay the tribute which he, Friedrich, had paid to Endre II. and to Béla in 1235, and if he did not give him the three western Hungarian counties of Moson, Sopron and Vas, he would give him up to the Tartars. Béla IV. paid him 2,000 silver marks and agreed to give him the three Hungarian counties, a region which is now called Burgenland. Prince Friedrich broke into Hungary as far as Győr and occupied the castle, destroying the people just as the Tartars had to the east. Finally, he forced Béla to pledge to keep his agreement to give him the three Hungarian counties. Soon after that, the people around the castle of Győr succeeded in taking back the castle from Friedrich Babenberg. The castles which Friedrich received with the three counties were rebuilt and fortified so that the Magyars would not be able to take them back as they had the castle at Győr. Historians record this reinforcement as an act by which Babenberg became the Defender of the West against the Tartars. Some years later Béla IV. won back this territory in a battle in which Friedrich Babenberg died. (In 1920, the politicians of Austria, in the document of „Die Sendung Oesterreich im Donauraume” claimed the right to replevy this area called Burgenland. According to Csobánczi, this was an act of gangsterism.)

Hungary became so depopulated after the Tartar invasions that on a journey of several days it was rare to meet one person. People lived on the mountain peaks, in swamps and on moors, just surviving. Everywhere there were corpses and skeletons and burned down buildings. At this time, the first Wallachians (Vlachs) appeared in Havasalföld (later called Wallachia), the Lower Danube territory, and later in Etelköz, which became called Moldavia and Bessarabia and is now part of Rumania.

The Hungarian historical notes in 1222 mention for the first time that a Balkan shepherd people were wandering in the country's southern region. Béla IV. allowed these shepherds to settle because the country needed to repopulate these territories. The first Wallachians settled in the meadows of the Olt River, then in Etelköz and quickly multiplied. At first, they came in with the consent of the king. Later, they came in secret from the Balkans and settled in large numbers. In 1296, according to the Hungarian statistics, there were about 15,000 Wallachians in the Carpathian Basin.

Chapter 4

A Short History of the Wallachians

In his study of the history of Hungary Elemér Csobánczi writes that in ancient history there is no trace of a name such as Wallachian. (p. 15.) Much of the information in this chapter is taken from this study. The Wallachians received the name „Rumanian” at the Berlin Conference in 1878 on the suggestion of Count Gyula Andrásy. The name they received was „Rumanian” and not „Romanian” as they write it today. The name „Romanian” is misleading because it gives the impression that they have some connection with Rome. The linguists Miklosich and Hunfalvi state that the Rumanian language originated in the Balkans in the tenth century AD. The theory that the Rumanian language originated in Dacia in Transylvania in the second and third centuries AD is erroneous because the Rumanian language itself is proof to the contrary. The Rumanian language is a romanized Slav language. Cihac, a Rumanian linguist, studied the origins of the Rumanian vocabulary. The result of his research is as follows: The Rumanian vocabulary is **45.7% Slav**, 31.5% Latin, 8.4% Turkish, 7.8% Greek, 6% Hungarian and 6% Albanian. (Csobánczi p. 15) The Slav words must have entered the vocabulary when the Slavs were connected with the Wallachians. **This was possible only in the seventh century AD because at that time the Slavs reached the Balkans.** The Romans, between AD 271 and AD 1000, do not mention that they found a Latin speaking people in Transylvania. There is no doubt that the language was formed in the Balkan Peninsula. The shepherd people of Epirus who originated in Italy, the Turks, Greeks and Hungarians all left their influence on the language.

In the first half of the thirteenth century, in the counties of Brassó, Hunyad, Alsófehér and Fogaras, there were very few Wallachians, and these Wallachians did not have a permanent home. They wandered here and there in the mountains. At the end of the century, only 9 permanent Wallachian settlements are known to have

existed in Hungary. In the middle of the fourteenth century, there were 24 villages. The Wallachians moved to the more secure territory of Transylvania, Moldavia, Bessarabia and Havasalföld (Wallachia) when the Turks were spreading into the Balkans. In these territories, the people did not have to worry about the raiding Turks who rounded up the people for slaves. At that time the Hungarian sword was still respected.

The Hungarian state was not antagonistic toward the incoming Wallachians. In some cases, they even received help from the state. In the fifteenth century they even received a tax-free status so that they might settle into their homes. The Greek Orthodox Church did not even require them to pay the tithe to the Church. In the Middle Ages, after the Tartar invasion, when Hungary had become extremely depopulated, the Hungarians still outnumbered the Wallachians. The Wallachians were attracted to the civilized lifestyle of the Hungarians. Families of foreign origin often received the rights of the aristocracy, which secured for them connections with Hungarian families of similar rank.

The literary Wallachian language was introduced in the sixteenth century when the Saxons of Transylvania brought the Reformation to the Wallachians and the Transylvanian princes continued their work. The most important factor in the formation of the nation was the use of the vernacular in the Orthodox Christian Church. In the eighteenth century, the Catholics did not want to fall behind, so the Jesuits took over the use of the language and intentionally latinized it. The early Wallachians used the Cyrillic alphabet. Because of the difficulty in adopting the Latin alphabet, two methods of spelling developed, the phonetic and the etymological. Today the phonetic method of spelling is used. The development of the language was rapid and soon the printing houses at Buda published the first books in the Wallachian language.

The Hungarian intellectuals, in their enlightened concept of the state, believed that the Wallachian idea of nationality was just cultural nationalism which was a harmless movement. The present day Hungarians now know that they were mistaken.

István Báthory, Prince of Transylvania, (1571-1581) who later became the greatest king of Poland, brought large numbers of Wallachians from the territories occupied by the Turks and settled them into Transylvania. During his reign, industry and commerce flourished and books were published in the Wallachian language. That was the

beginning of the era of enlightenment in Wallachian history but this peaceful coexistence was disturbed by the politics of the Hapsburgs with intrigues, false promises and instigation of anti-Hungarian feeling.

The Austrian chancellor appointed György Basta as Marshal of Transylvania in 1601 and he ruled in a most merciless way. He levied unbearably high taxes and instead of paying his mercenaries, he instigated them to robbery. If anyone raised an objection to this treatment, he was immediately executed.

In 1657, war broke out between the Swedish and the Polish kings. Each party asked György Rákoczi II., Prince of Transylvania, to be his ally. Rákoczi chose to ally himself to the King of Sweden. Leopold I., the Hapsburg Emperor and Hungarian king, supported the Poles. The Turkish Sultan supported the Crimean Tartars. Rákoczi went to the aid of the Swedes with a large army of Szeklers but, because he was outnumbered and saw the hopelessness of his effort, he turned back. The retreating Szeklers were surrounded by the Tartars and the majority of the soldiers were killed. In this way Transylvania was left without an army and, for four years, the Turks, on the side of the Tartars, devastated the country. In 1661, the Turks almost totally destroyed the whole of Transylvania. All the cities were burned and 100,000 Szeklers were taken into slavery in Constantinople.

In the second half of the seventeenth century, all the villages in seven Transylvanian counties were depopulated and the Wallachian shepherd people came down from the mountains and flooded these territories. The Wallachians numbered 200,000 in AD 1700, and thirty years later reached 425,000. In the south of Bihar county, out of 40 ancient Hungarian villages, 33 became completely Wallachian. Four villages completely disappeared and only three villages survived and remained Hungarian. The Hapsburgs were also responsible for depopulating and resettling Hungarian territories.

In 1791, in the publication: „Supplex Libellus Vallachorum” the Wallachians advocated a new theory, that the Wallachians were the ancient populace of Transylvania and that they were the descendants of the colonization army of the Roman Emperor Trajan. The Rumanians teach that the Wallachians surrendered to the Magyar leader Töhötöm in AD 896 and, ever since, there has been an agreement between the Wallachian and Hungarian people. (Csobánczi, p.17)

Based on this theory, in 1791, the Wallachians submitted a petition to Emperor Leopold II. in which they asked that the Wallachian people be recognized along with the Hungarians, Szeklers and Saxons as a fourth ethnic element in Transylvania with equal rights. The Emperor did not grant this request but a segment of the Hungarian ruling class accepted this Wallachian cultural nationalism and even supported it. So Pest became the center of the Wallachian nationalism. (Csobánczi, p. 17.) The first Wallachian school was established at Balázsfalva, in a territory which was owned by Prince Apafi. In a short time, three hundred Wallachian schools were established in Transylvania and in the reign of Emperor Leopold II., this number increased to five hundred, in spite of the fact that he did not support them. The first Wallachian intellectual leaders were educated at Balázsfalva. In 1831, the Faculty of Philosophy was established at Balázsfalva and it was soon enlarged to a Theological Faculty.

Simon Barnitui, a Rumanian professor at Balázsfalva, describes the Wallachian nationalism in the following way: „The Wallachians inherited the Roman soul, the Roman blood and the Roman language from the Romans. Therefore they must revolt against that unheard of injustice which the descendants of the Romans (Wallachians) have had to bear for centuries. . . . Whoever denies this is a traitor, and so are those who espouse a different theory.” (Csobánczi, p. 18)

However, not every intellectual Hungarian was blind. Benedek Jancsó writes: „The study of language and linguistics was important to the school at Balázsfalva not just because they intended to raise their people to a higher cultural level but because, with this knowledge and these lies, they could convince the Wallachian people of the Daco-Roman theory.” (Csobánczi, p. 18)

In Transylvania, in the eighteenth century, the advocacy of the tenets of the Russian Orthodox church played the biggest role in the development of national pride and Wallachian nationalism.

If we study the territory of the Wallachian people, we will see that, from the River Don to the Carpathian Mountains and the southern part of the Ukraine, which is presently Rumanian territory, the original settlement names were Hungarian.

The historical events also prove the Hungarian sovereignty over this territory. I shall mention a few facts from Hungarian history which may not be known in the West. Havasalföld (Wallachia), Moldavia and

Bessarabia under King Mátyás Hunyadi (1458-1490) was Hungarian territory. In 1467, Benedek Veres instigated László Suky, *vajda* or ruler of Transylvania, to declare Transylvania to be an independent state. King Mátyás, with 12,000 men, defeated the revolutionaries at Kolozsvár (now Cluj in Rumania), and defeated the revolutionary, István Bogdánovics, at the city of Baja near the Szeret river. In 1479, the Turks again tried to take back that territory which Sultan Murad had returned to Hungary but Pál Kinizsi, Hunyadi's commander, with a division of soldiers, defeated the Turkish army in a mountain pass. 8,000 Hungarians and 30,000 Turks died in the battle. After the death of Mátyás Hunyadi, Hungary started to decline. In 1520, Suleiman, the Turkish Sultan finally took Transylvania from the Hungarians. A short time after that, the Wallachian shepherd people and others settled into Transylvania. In spite of this the Hungarian language remained pure and the people retained their racial characteristics. In the eighteenth century, in Moldavia and Bessarabia, in the cities and villages, the people still spoke Hungarian. The names of the cities, villages and geographical sites were all Hungarian. The name of the capital city of Moldavia was Jászvásár, a Hungarian name. The present Rumanian name is Jassy. Karácsonykő became Pietra, Ürményes became Urminásul-Valen and Baja became Bacau. The capital of the ancient Hungarian territory of Szörénység was Szörénytornya. It is now called Turnu Severin. János Hunyadi, the great Hungarian hero, who beat back the Turks, and his son, Mátyás Hunyadi, the greatest Hungarian Renaissance king, are now claimed by the Rumanians to be Rumanian and not Hungarian. In the nineteenth century, the Turkish Sultan sent Greek governors from the Fanar section of Constantinople to Moldavia and Wallachia and these rich Greek princes, together with the Turks, continuously robbed and extorted money from the people. Therefore the people took this Greek name „Fanar” to mean „swindler”. These princes, whom they called „hospodar” bought their titles with money and then they extorted this money from the people whom they were sent to govern. (Csobánczi, p. 20-21)

On January 6, 1764, at night, the Hapsburg army encircled the peacefully sleeping Hungarian village of Mádéfalva, and with cannons they destroyed everything and burned the village. Lieutenant General Baron Siskovics was responsible for this destruction. This was an act of retaliation against the people of Csík county because, when Empress

Maria Theresa ordered the recruitment of men for soldiers for the Seven Years War (1756-1763), the men of Csík County refused to go into the army and fled into the mountains. The village was destroyed in the hope that the men would return to their families which they had left behind. Instead of returning to this devastated village, the men migrated to Moldavia to avoid going into the Hapsburg army. Baron Siskovics sarcastically explained his action by saying that by this means the Szeklers would remain healthy, because they needed blood-letting every century. (Csobánczi, p. 34.) This massacre was carried out with the knowledge of Maria Theresa, who had become Empress by reason of the Pragmatic Sanction. At her coronation, the Hungarian aristocracy supported her and swore loyalty to her with the shout „We give our life and blood to the empress.” This is the way she repaid their loyalty.

In this devastated territory the Hapsburgs resettled foreigners in large numbers. In 1784, Emperor Joseph II., Maria Theresa's son, became King of Hungary but refused to be crowned officially so that he did not have to swear to uphold the Hungarian Constitution. He ordered a census of the people. The Wallachian priests explained to the Wallachian people that this census would free them from the statute labor or lord's service and would enable them to become soldiers and free men, with no bonds to the Hungarian aristocrats. At that time, a criminal, named Hora, stepped forward and became a Wallachian leader. He showed the people a paper, which he claimed was his pardon from Joseph II., inscribed in golden letters. He said that the emperor wanted to kill out the Hungarians from Transylvania and had authorized him to be leader of this action. So the entire Wallachian people joined him and burned all the Hungarian villages in the counties of Zaránd, Hunyad, Fehér, Torda, Kolozs, and Szeben and massacred almost all the people. Field-Marshal Preuss sent out a few hundred mercenaries to stop the insurrection, with the command that they were to attack only if the rebels attacked them. This appeared to the Wallachians to be an encouragement to proceed. The Emperor was finally obliged to use more force to quell the uprising. He sent Field Marshal Fabry who surrounded the rebels with his army, captured Hora and his second-in-command and broke their backs on the wheel. As a result of this revolt, 62 Hungarian villages, 132 aristocratic homes, and more than four thousand Hungarians disappeared. Hora became the greatest national hero of the Wallachians. (Csobánczi, p.35-36) The Hungarians and the

Szeklers fled by the thousands to Moldavia and Wallachia in hope of finding a safe place. In a short time they assimilated into the Wallachians. At this time the Wallachians received support from Russia in religion and in politics. The Russians came and started to spread the idea of Great Wallachia among the Wallachians. In 1770, the Hapsburgs organized an association, called „Fratii De Cruce”, whose goal was to help the Wallachians develop national feeling. At this time knowingly or unknowingly the Hungarian and Szekler nation was saved because the Hungarian populace multiplied and there was a revival of Hungarian nationalism. In 1848, the Hungarian Revolution broke out which the superior forces of the Austrians and the Russians combined were successful in subduing. During the 1848 revolution, the Wallachians again attacked the Hungarian and Szekler people in their villages under the leadership of Abraham Jancu and Axentie Severin. After World War II., they did the same thing with the support of the Russian army. However they have not been able to subdue the nationalistic spirit of the Hungarians. (Csobánczi, p. 36)

In spite of the oppressive measures taken by the Rumanians to force them to assimilate and to prevent them from learning their mother-tongue, most of the Hungarian families have preserved their language and their customs. Hungarians living in Transylvania still count themselves as Hungarians rather than Rumanians and are proud of their Hungarian ancestors.

Napoleon III., in 1856, would have liked to unify the two Hungarian possessions, Moldavia and Wallachia but Turkey, England and Austria opposed him and he was unable to do that. At that time, in these two territories, which were freed from the Turks, the Wallachian people, who had grown in numbers, would have liked to settle this matter by a plebiscite which would have followed Napoleon's suggestion. The endeavor split into two parts. The one was to unite France, Prussia and Russia. The other was to follow the intention of the English, Turks and Austrians which was to try to maintain the status quo. Finally, under pressure from France, at the conference in Paris in 1859, the unified Principality of Wallachia came into being. Alexandru Cuza was elected to be the Prince, with two ministries, one in Jassy and the other in Bucharest. In 1861, the Turkish Sultan accepted the final unification and the autonomous Principality of Wallachia was established. The Wallachian army suddenly rejected Cuza and on

January 23, 1866, forced him to resign. In his place, Karl Hohenzollern, a relative of Napoleon III., was elected as Prince of Wallachia. The Sultan was forced to recognize him. The newly elected prince favored the Prussians while the Wallachians favored the French, so an anti-German movement broke out. Prince Karl contemplated resigning when, on July 19, 1870, the French declared war against Prussia. According to the French foreign minister, Leboeuf, the French were ready for war. On August 4, Prussia occupied Alsace and on August 6, Lorraine became Prussian territory. On August 16, the Prussian army defeated the French Commander Bazaine, and decimated his troops. The Prussians surrounded another French division in which Napoleon III. was imprisoned with 90,000 men. This victory by Prussia saved the throne of Karl Hohenzollern of Wallachia.

In 1877, during the Russian-Turkish war, Karl Hohenzollern allowed the Russian army to move across Wallachia and with their help, he announced the independence of Wallachia. This independent state was recognized by the Berlin Conference in 1878 and given the name Rumania.

Rumania was grateful to the Russian army and helped it in the struggle against the Turks. Prince Karl was crowned King Carol I. of Rumania in 1881. At this time, the dream of unifying and freeing the Rumanian people from all the surrounding territories to create Great Rumania was widely spread among the Rumanian people. The ancient Hungarian populace in Wallachia, no longer under the rule of the Turks, were now ruled by the Rumanians. Most of the Hungarian elementary and high schools had to close because the Rumanians would not allow teachers or priests to come from Hungary. The Hungarians and Szeklers turned to the Vatican for help but Rome sent Italian priests who spoke only Latin to the people which caused the Hungarian language to fall slowly into disuse.

Today in Rumania (Moldavia, Bessarabia (Etelkőz) and Havasalföld (Wallachia), ten million Hungarians speak the Rumanian language. (Csobánczi, p. 21-23)

Chapter 5

Wallachian Settlements in Transylvania and Hungary

The answer to the question of when and under what circumstances the Rumanians came to Transylvania is simple. The Wallachian settlements in Transylvania took place over several centuries from the thirteenth to the eighteenth century. This is why we cannot talk of a Wallachian migration, just of **intermittent** settlement of groups of Wallachians. This was not the planned conquest by a nation, but a movement of groups of people who were seeking a better life or fleeing from oppressive enemies. Only the first group came with the permission of the Hungarian king, Endre II.(1205-1235), who employed them as border-guards, like the Pechenegs and the Saxons. This was in 1222 in the County of Fogaras. These incoming Wallachian shepherds did not develop a feeling of nationalism until the eighteenth century. Hungarian documents from 1247, mention the presence of Vlachs (Wallachians) in the county of Hunyad, in the village of Hátszeg. In 1283, in the county of Bihar, documents mention a Wallachian family. In 1288, documents mention the presence of Wallachians near the castle of Salgó, and in the vicinity of Brassó. In 1292 and 1293, four landowners in the county of Fehér and three in the county of Hunyad received permission to bring in Wallachians to work on their land.

According to the archives of the Árpád Dynasty, we know of about one thousand localities in the territory of Transylvania in 1301. Among these there were only nine villages in which some Wallachians were living. 80% of the Transylvanian Hungarian names of these one thousand villages which were recorded until 1301 have gradually been changed to Rumanian names but these Rumanian names are a distortion of the Hungarian names to sound Rumanian. 20% of the Hungarian names have become Slavicized or Germanized and only three village names are actually Rumanian.

The Wallachians appeared for the first time in the territory of southern Transylvania after the Bulgarians and Wallachians had lost a war against Constantinople in 1208. The Hungarian document of 1222

mentions only the forerunners of the Wallachians. We know that in 1234, they appeared in southern Transylvania in larger numbers. The Wallachians settled on the outskirts of nine villages and not in the villages because their numbers at that time were so small. Their small number is indicated by the Hungarian proposal of 1293, which stated that all the Wallachian people should to be settled in the valley of the Székás Creek.³²

The Rumanian argument that there is very little information about the Wallachians in the Middle Ages because there are very few documents from that time is questionable. As time went on and there were more documents, they were mentioned only on the border-lines, in the hidden valleys of creeks, and on the pastures on the snowy mountain slopes. There is no record of Wallachians living in the central part of the former territory of Dacia (Transylvania).

We know of 34 Wallachian settlements at the beginning of the thirteenth century in Transylvania. This number is small compared to the total number of 736 known settlements. Before 1350, there were 36 settlement names of Wallachian origin.³³ This number is surprisingly low because, at that time in County Bihar, there was a total number of 410 settlements; in the county of Arad, 90; in Brasso, 20; in Beszterce, 26 and in Székelyföld, 190. In the rest of the Transylvanian counties we see approximately the same proportion. By 1404, the Wallachian settlements had increased to 95. Of the approximately one and a half thousand villages which were settled in the 500 years following the Magyar Homecoming, whose names today are Rumanian, only 76 were originally Rumanian. 1355 were originally Hungarian and they have now become Romanized. For many years, linguists have believed that the Wallachians, as they were coming from the south, came slowly across the western border of Transylvania and when they reached northern Transylvania, they went east to Moldavia. But Makkai was the first to show that this is incorrect, from the timing of the establishment of the settlements. He showed that they came from Moldavia, through the

³² Török, Sándor, Településtörténeti tanulmányok és határproblémák a Kárpátmedencében, Astor Park, Florida, 1973, p. 215; Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenburgen I. 193

³³ Ibid. p. 215; Knieza, István: Magyarország népei 11. században.

counties of Máramaros, Szilágy and Kolozs.³⁴ The first Wallachian data from the county of Máramaros, was in 1326. There was mention of Wallachians in northern Transylvania in 1331 and in the county of Kolozs in 1332. There are data that 13 Wallachian settlements were established around the castle of Valko in the county of Szilágy which were first recorded in 1341. We have data from 1365, in the county of Máramaros, that a *vajda* called Valk asked for permission to settle Wallachians in this county. In the county of Szatmár, the first Wallachian village was formed in 1379. In 1387, in the county of Szilágy, there were 10 Hungarian villages but in the mountainous territory of this county, in the south east, there were 12 Wallachian villages established in that year.

Documents mention the Wallachians on the western and eastern borderlines of Transylvania, together with the Pechenegs. The Wallachians were settled in the unpopulated mountainous territories between Transylvania and the Hungarian Plain as border guards. These shepherd people of the Balkans were used to the hard life in the mountains and did not mind this location. Szöllősy mentions that they must have arrived after the Saxons were settled in this territory because many Rumanian settlement names are Rumanized forms of Saxon names.³⁵ Many Wallachians were brought in from Moldavia by Hungarian farmers, in order to populate the unpopulated territories. For the first time, in 1375, Wallachians were allowed to settle inside a Hungarian village. Sándor Török writes that it was also characteristic of the age that, when farmers received permission to bring in Wallachians, these people were settled beside the village in a „twin” village. This village bore the name of the original Hungarian village but was written with a Wallachian suffix. In the county of Kolozs there are three such „twin” villages.

The Wallachian villages which, according to the documents, were settled in Transylvania, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, are no longer in existence. The reason for their disappearance is that the Wallachians left their winter quarters in the spring and went up into the high mountain territories with their flocks and in the autumn, they did not always return to the same spot. Some of them were still living in

³⁴ Ibid. p. 216; Deér-Gardy: *Magyarok és Románok*, Budapest, 1943

³⁵ Szöllősy, Sándor: *Ez az igazság. Erdély a román nép és protektorai*, London, 1968, p.72

tents in 1373. In the fifteenth century they managed to establish permanent settlements, so their village names remained.³⁶

The fifteenth century was the time when large numbers of Wallachians were brought into Transylvania. In the previous two centuries, the settlements of Wallachians were mainly made up of nomadic Wallachians but in the fifteenth century, they became an asset to the country because they became permanent settlers. This allowed them to increase the number of their settlements. At this time they were settled on the property of their lords, beside the already existing Hungarian villages such as Jófő, Déva, Sólyomkő, Kővár and Gyula. These new settlements were established in the southern, western and northern mountainous territories. In the fifteenth century, a total of 389 Wallachian villages were established; in the county of Hunyad, 134, and 67 high on the mountain tops. In the north and north-west there were 109 new villages, which were mentioned in the documents. From the remaining 79 villages, in only 27 were found a few Wallachians.

In the fifteenth century, there was a very strong Wallachian influence in the south-west territory of Transylvania, in the county of Hunyad. In the Bánát, the Wallachians also made their appearance but the majority of the populace here was still Slav and Hungarian. In that part of Transylvania where the Saxons lived and in the territory populated by the Szeklers, there were no Wallachians in the fifteenth century.

In the sixteenth century, the number of Wallachian settlements increased. In the county of Bihar, they increased by 216 and in Arad by 165. They were settled mainly on the lands of Belényes, Magyarcsík and Világos. At the same time, in Transylvania, they increased by only 63. There is a document which states that in Belényes and the neighboring area there were 10 Hungarian settlements which grew in three centuries by natural growth to 27 settlements. This shows that the increase in Wallachian settlers is due to the immigration policy. (Török, p. 218)

Up to now we have been talking about the Wallachians coming into the country and settling mainly in the forests, mountains, valleys of creeks and sparsely populated territories. Later, they were brought in by

³⁶ Török: Op.Cit. p.217; Jakó, Zsigmond

landowners to settle on their lands and the borders of villages. This plan was disturbed by the bloody involvement in war.

Emperor Rudolf Hapsburg (1576-1608) thinned out the Szekler and Hungarian populace of Transylvania who were fighting for their independence from the Hapsburgs. The people who lived near major highways suffered the most. In 1603, it is documented that the Hungarian populace between Karánsebes and Szászvár was entirely annihilated. The Wallachian *vajda*, Radu, asked if he might settle on this depopulated area with his family. His request was granted. In 1664, there was another Wallachian ingress, which began the Rumanization of the Saxon lands. This is the time when the Wallachians settled the Hungarian villages of the Mezőség territory. (Török, p. 218)

The long struggle with the Turks caused the numbers of the Hungarian populace to decline. The Hungarian populace was much diminished after these long wars but because of the 'liberation' by the Hapsburgs in 1686, it was almost completely annihilated. A large part of the country became desolate and, in the empty places, the Hapsburgs settled all kinds of European adventurers, mainly Germans. The Hapsburg goal was to weaken the Protestant German power and strengthen the power of the Hapsburgs in Hungary. The Germans at that time were starting to overcome the bloodshed of the Thirty Years' War and become stronger. By settling Germans in Hungary, the Hapsburgs succeeded in weakening Germany again. The Hapsburgs knew that foreign settlements into Hungary would change the social composition and the vitality of the Hungarian people. In order to further their intentions of destroying the Hungarian people, they ordered that, twice a year, all the criminals and those suffering from syphilis and other venereal diseases, including prostitutes, be brought by boat on the Danube from the territories of Germany and Austria. Emperor Leopold decorated Karaffa with the title of Field-Marshal and the title of Knight of the Golden Fleece because he did such outstanding work in carrying out his cruel orders. In 1697, the Emperor passed a law which declared that anyone who killed a Hungarian 'rebel' would be rewarded with the gift of half the estate of the 'rebel'. As a result, many foreigners became 'Hungarian' aristocrats in the government of Hungary. Leopold accepted General Kolonics' plan to administer the territories taken from the Turks. He proposed to apply the same rules as were in effect in Austrian territories. He intended to annex Hungary to Austria officially

and he asked the Hungarian aristocracy's approval of his plan. When they did not accept, Leopold retaliated by passing a law which decreed that, in order to reclaim their estates on the territories which he had taken back from the Turks, the Hungarians had to prove on paper that the land was their property. If they did not have the papers to show their ownership, the land was confiscated. Those who had ownership papers had to pay a heavy 'contribution' to get their land back. If they did not have the money, the land was confiscated and given to foreigners.³⁷

The settlement of people from the neighboring territories into the „promised land” of Hungary had started before the Hapsburg settlements described in the previous paragraph. When the Hungarians who lived in Western Hungary (Burgenland) either died or left their land because of hardship, their lands were taken over by Germans and Croats. In the north, Felvidék (Slovakia), Slovaks and Ruthenians took over the land and in the northeast, the Wallachians.

The southern part of Hungary which is called the Bánát was freed from the Turkish yoke in 1718. This territory was totally depopulated by the Turks and the Hapsburgs. According to the Byzantine writers, in the Middle Ages, this was the most heavily populated and the richest territory of Hungary. After 1718, there were only 700 people left in the area.

From the land of the Turks, the famous, rich '*fanars*',³⁸ started out toward Hungary. With them came the Wallachians. They established principalities in the eastern part of the Bánát and they also came into the center of Transylvania and the edge of the Hungarian Plain.³⁹

In summary, the Tartar invasions of Hungary in the early thirteenth century gave the Wallachians their first opportunity to enter Transylvania. As we have seen, the first group of Wallachians appeared just before the Tartar invasion in Cumania which later became Wallachia. This happened at the time that the Cumanians fled from the Tartars and left their territory, settling in Hungary and Bulgaria. An opportunity presented itself to the Wallachians, when the Tartars moved

³⁷ Botos, László: The Homeland Reclaimed, p. 235-236

³⁸ The „*fanars*” were rich princes from the Fanar district of Constantinople.

³⁹ Török: Op.Cit. p. 219; Egyetemi tankönyv, Budapest, 1962, Magyarország Története 1526-1790, p. 397

out of this territory in 1241, to create a homogeneous Wallachian settlement. The small numbers of Cumanians who remained in Cumania, the Magyars who settled there from Transylvania and the migrating groups of Bulgarians did not give any objections to the Wallachians claiming this territory for their own and calling it Wallachia. In the beginning, the biggest obstacle to the Wallachians' establishment of their own state was the nomadic nature of their people who did not stay in one place for any length of time.⁴⁰

The nomadic life of the shepherds is the reason that the Wallachian-speaking peoples could not unite. The Wallachian people can be found in Greece, Bukovina, Eastern Hungary and in the Crimean Peninsula. The Wallachians could achieve only a partial political independence because, after the retreat of the Tartars, in 1242, the Hungarian king Béla IV. (1235-1270) annexed their territory to Hungary and gave it to the Maltese Knights to govern as a feudal territory. The name of this territory was Ungro-Vlachia, and its *vajda* called himself Ungro-Vlach in the letters he sent to Greek or Bulgarian courts. The movement of Wallachians into Hungarian territories took place by individual family decisions. Many years passed before the Wallachians united and introduced their political demands. Their main goal was to create a politically independent state but this did not come to reality until the second half of the nineteenth century. We cannot talk about a separatist movement before this time. The Wallachians' goal in the eighteenth century was to have their people recognized as the fourth ethnic group in Transylvania, along with the Szeklers, Hungarians and Saxons. Before the French Revolution of 1789, the Wallachians could not obtain the same social status as the other groups. The Hungarian aristocracy and the Szeklers, because of their duty to defend the country, had the right to make political decisions in Transylvania but **the Hungarian serfs had no right to involve themselves in the politics of the country. This is why the Hungarian government could not give these rights to the Wallachian people who were also serfs.** The Wallachian aristocrats were included in the Hungarian aristocracy and had the same rights and therefore they were a political factor in the

⁴⁰ Török: Op.Cit. p. 219; Gunda, Béla: Erdélyi pásztorvándorlások Budapest 1941 and Dr. Karl, János: Földrajzi tényezők szerepe Erdély népeinek megtelepedésében, Budapest, 1944

decision making. **The Wallachian serfs were in the same position as the Hungarian serfs. In the Hapsburg Empire, no serf had the right to make political decisions.**

In order for the Wallachians to achieve the acknowledgement as a fourth ethnic group in the country, **the feudal system would have had to be abolished but this was impossible under the Hapsburg oppression.**

Here I have to mention that, after the Turks were expelled from the country, Transylvania lost its independence and became a Hapsburg possession. In order for the abolition of serfdom to occur, the development of a bourgeois mentality and self-enrichment was needed but the opposite was occurring because of the Hapsburg oppression. The serfs even lost the standard of living that they had originally possessed. The Wallachian demands were the result of the Hapsburg politics. The intention of the Hapsburgs was to unite the Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches to balance the strength of the Protestant Hungarians. Thus they came to a compromise: The Greek Orthodox Church recognized the Roman Catholic Church as an established religion and the Roman Catholic Church no longer opposed the Greek Orthodox ceremonies and the priests' right to marry. In 1735, the Greek Orthodox Bishop, Innocent Klein, began to preach the Daco-Roman theory and stated that, since the Wallachians were descendants of the Dacians and the Romans, and they were the ancient populace of Transylvania, they should have the same rights as the other ethnic groups. This Daco-Roman theory, advocated by Bishop Klein, spread so much in 50 years, that it became the cause of the Transylvanian Wallachian peasant insurrection, led by Horia Closca in 1784. A half century later, in 1848, when Transylvania was again returned to Hungary and the serfs received their emancipation as a result of the Hungarian Revolution against the Hapsburgs, all the peasants enjoyed the same freedom as the Szeklers, the Hungarians and the Saxons. When the abolition of the feudal system came about, the majority of the Szeklers were peasants. Since all the peasants in Hungary were freed, they all became equal and the Szeklers lost their special position. In addition, because they had supported the Hungarians against the Hapsburgs in the 1848 Hungarian Revolution, they lost all their privileges and they were persecuted in their own territory where the Wallachians had more rights than they did. (Török, p. 221)

However, the eighteenth century was especially favorable for the Wallachians to obtain an enormous part of Hungarian territory. The Hapsburg Empress Maria Theresa, between 1769 and 1780, gave several hundred thousand cadastral holds⁴¹ in the territory of Besztercebánya, Nagybánya and Hátszeg to the Wallachians so that they would guard the Hungarian border but the Wallachians, instead of guarding this territory, occupied it or allowed it to be occupied by the Turks. This land donation became the foundation of the Rumanian National Treasure and started the movement which claimed more Hungarian land for the Rumanians.

The Wallachians obtained more land as a result of the 1848-49 Hungarian Freedom Fight. After the Freedom Fight, the victorious Hapsburgs gave 1,615,774 cadastral holds of land to the serfs. However, because the Hungarian serfs and peasants were fighting against the Hapsburgs, almost all of this land was given to the Wallachian serfs and very little to the Hungarian serfs. (Szöllősy, Op. Cit. p.75)

In the Bach era after the Freedom Fight, they received more land when the Hapsburgs confiscated the land of the Hungarian aristocrats who had opposed them and gave it to the minorities, Germans, Serbs and Wallachians.

When the Hungarian people fought their life and death struggle against the Hapsburgs who had tried to subdue them for centuries, the Wallachians took up arms against the Hungarians. Why? Because for a full century they had wanted to be free of serfdom in the feudal system in Transylvania. They attacked the Hungarians in spite of the fact that the Wallachians received more than they could have expected. They did not actually want to break away from Hungary and unite with the other Wallachians. In fact, the Wallachians living outside of Hungary did not even come to their aid. They merely wanted to be recognized as the fourth ethnic group in Transylvania.

Lajos Kossuth proposed that, instead of half a million Hungarian aristocrats having the political power, the nine million people in Transylvania should become a political entity. This would have given political rights to all the non-Hungarian people. This could not come about because the Wallachians revolted against Hungary at this time. In

⁴¹ A „cadastral hold” is a measure of land, equal to 1.42 acres.

Transylvania, the Wallachian threat became dangerous for the Hungarians when Wallachia and Moldavia united in 1861.

At this time, Hungary was a part of the Hapsburg Empire, one of the great powers of Europe and therefore, in theory, it did not have to fear a small Balkan state (Wallachia). Transylvania still kept its Hungarian character. Every city in Transylvania was Hungarian, except for the few Saxon cities. The Hungarian peasants lived in the central plain of the Carpathian Basin. The lines of transportation, road and rail, were in the hands of the Hungarians. In the eastern third of Transylvania, the Szeklers lived in a large Szekler-Hungarian unit. (Török, p.222)

Later, at the end of the 19th century, the Rumanians obtained more Hungarian land by buying it through their banks. The main activity of the Rumanian Orthodox priests was to walk around the territories where the Rumanians and Hungarians lived in the same community and whenever they noticed that Hungarian farmers had financial problems, they immediately obtained money from the Rumanian banks and gave low interest loans to the Rumanian peasants to help them to buy up the Hungarian lands. At the same time, it was almost impossible for Hungarian farmers to obtain these low-interest loans. „The liberal Hungarian government not only tolerated but even supported the Rumanian bank transactions so that they could establish more banks in Transylvania which was a part of the Hungarian Kingdom. The bank of Nagyszeben, which was established in 1872, over a period of 40 years was able to open 152 branches and accumulate 260,000,000 golden crowns. Each year they bought up 20,000 cadastral holds for the Rumanian peasants.” (Szöllősy, p. 76)

The Hungarians were helpless in this situation because the anti-Hungarian politics were made in Vienna. The Hungarian Jewish bank capitalists exploited the Hungarian people with usury, whereas the Rumanian banks helped the Rumanian peasants by giving them low-interest loans.

The Rumanians always accuse the Hungarians of suppressing them. This originates from the fact that the Hungarians recognized three political nations in Transylvania, the Szeklers, Saxons and Hungarians. „In 1691, the Hapsburg Emperor Leopold published a document called Diploma in which he accepted Transylvania's tradition of autonomy within the state of Hungary, but insisted that it was still a part of the

Empire. The Hungarian constitution is based on the acceptance of three political nations and four major religions, Catholicism, Calvinism, Lutheranism and Unitarianism with no regard for the Eastern Orthodox Church. In this way, it is clear that the Rumanian nation suffers under a double oppression, social and national.”⁴²

This „oppression”, if we can call it oppression, cannot be blamed on the Hungarians but on Emperor Leopold. Hungary’s legislative branch enacted their laws, based on the concept of three nations and four religions. Leopold reinforced this concept. The reason that the Rumanians were not considered a nation in Transylvania at the time that this concept came into effect was that they were not descendants of an ancient populace like the Szeklers, or of Daco-Roman descent, and they were not settled into Transylvania in a large group at one time like the Saxons but they came in small groups at intermittent intervals. If they had been present in considerable numbers in Transylvania at the time of the Magyar Homecoming, like the Szeklers, the Magyars would have accepted them as another national group. If they had come in later, as the Saxons did, in one large group, they would have been accepted as the Saxons were. This proves that their theory of the Daco-Roman continuity is unfounded. (Szöllősy, p.77-79)

The Hungarians deny the accusation that they oppressed the Rumanians. It is well known that the Hungarians belong to the Turanian group of people. In their state organization, the Turanian peoples never practised oppression of conquered peoples. They simply demanded obedience and loyalty and if some men showed bravery in war, all kinds of opportunities opened up for them. They could climb to the highest rank. The conquered people could retain their nationality, language, customs and religion. To prove this fact, Sándor Szöllősy says that we have only to look at the people on the Siberian Steppes. The small, and at that time insignificant, Slav people, instead of blending into the much more numerous Turanian peoples, were able to multiply and force their Slav language onto their conquerers, the Turanians. Look at the Ukrainians. They were Kazars who were a Turanian people. Now they are Slavs. This policy of non-oppression continued among the Magyars after their christianization with one small change. Devotion to Christianity became the benchmark for promotion in rank instead of

⁴² Szöllősy: Op.Cit. p. 77. *Erdélyi Története*, Rumanian Government Publication. p. 222

heroism. King István's advice to his son to open the borders to strangers and treat them as guests, became an unwritten law in Hungary. This is probably why the small, minority peoples were able to grow into nations in the land of Hungary. If there was minority oppression in Hungary, this did not come from the Hungarian king. Already in the fourteenth century, King Endre III. wanted to settle the minorities into solid groups in the land of Hungary. This is why, by the end of the fifteenth century, the national minorities had self-government. If the Hungarians had intended to make them blend into the Hungarian people, they would have scattered them as the Rumanians do now.

The intense Rumanian nationalism started out at about the same time as the Hungarian nationalism, after the French Revolution. The Rumanian separatism developed under the influence of the Serbs. This movement was supported by the Hapsburgs' anti-Hungarian policies.

Szöllősy states that the life of the Danubian peoples was poisoned by the government of Vienna which created a passionate hatred of the Hungarians among the minorities, although they all depended on each other, politically and economically and will continue to do so in the future. All the cultural benefits which the minorities received from the Hungarians do not indicate oppression. „The minorities received land, freedom, defense, culture and the opportunity to develop in peace.” (Szöllősy. p. 82) They cannot deny that the Hungarian state provided them with schools in their own language for centuries. In fact, Ödön Málnási tells us that Hungary was the first country in Europe to mandate attendance at the elementary school level.⁴³

In Hungary, the establishment of the Wallachian language as the national language of the Wallachians is due to the princes of Transylvania. Jozsef Mosolygó, a Greek Orthodox archdeacon, writes in his study: A keleti egyház Magyarországon: „In 1643, on the advice of Geleui, Prince György Rákoczi took upon himself the task of propagating the acceptance of the Roman origins of the Wallachians. He made a law that, in the Wallachian churches, the priests were not allowed to preach in any language except Wallachian. However, this law could not be enforced until the most important religious books were translated into the Wallachian language. Therefore in 1648, the catechism was translated into Wallachian by István Fogarassy (a

⁴³ Málnássy, Ödön: Magyar nemzet őszinte története, Munich, 1959

Hungarian) according to the Heidelberg catechism and published in the Wallachian language. In the same year Fogarassy translated the New Testament into Wallachian and three years later the Psalms of David. This is how the propagation of the Wallachian Romanization started which ended much differently than György Rákóczi expected.” (Szöllősy, p.83)

Szöllősy, quoting from the letters of Dr. Pál Vágó, says: „Both the Catholics and the Protestants in Transylvania expressed opposition to the acceptance of the Wallachian language as the official language of the Church. Even the Greek Orthodox Bishop of Bucharest opposed it because he was worried that there would be a unification of the churches. His worry was not unfounded because the Greek Orthodox Church united with the Roman Catholic Church, with Cardinal Kolonics and the Jesuits in Rome, in 1689. At that time the Wallachian language became the liturgical language of the Wallachians. Later, the Rumanians accepted the benefit of this unification.” (Szöllősy, p. 83-84)

The Rumanian historian, Obedinariu, wrote to Nilles about the unification of the churches: „The Romanian union was a superb idea. Without it the Romanians would not have progressed. Without this union, today we would be no more cultured than the Bulgarians.” (Szöllősy, p. 84)

When the Rumanians mention Hungarian cultural oppression against them, we can refute it by quoting Dr. Gergely Moldovan, a Rumanian university professor, who states that the Rumanians had more than 3,000 Rumanian schools in Hungary. From 1857 to World War I, this number grew by more than 1500. In this number are included 15 colleges and 15 divinity schools. (Szöllősy, p. 84-85, from the letters of Dr. Pál Vágó)

Since the present-day Rumanians never mention the humanitarian actions of the Hungarians, we have to note the opinions which the Rumanians held in the past. They used to give credit to the Hungarians for the way they treated them but now they are silent because they are afraid to give the Hungarians the slightest grounds for their irredentist demands.

On August 22, 1911, the Bucharest newspaper „*Universul*” wrote: „The Rumanian peasant’s life in Hungary is incomparably better than the Rumanian peasant’s life in Rumania. In Hungary, every peasant is able to read and write and they live in healthy circumstances.” On

January 1, 1918, the Rumanian newspaper „*Nemaul Romanesce*” wrote: „We can establish one fact. That is that the Rumanians in Hungary live at a higher economic standard than those in Rumania. Our peasants are much poorer, pay higher taxes and are much more uneducated than the Rumanian peasants in Hungary.” The December, 1912, Bucharest newspaper „*Adaverul*” wrote: „The Romanians who live in Hungary are an enormous factor economically and culturally. They are continually progressing. The social and economic life of the peasants there cannot be compared to the life of the peasants in Romania.” In 1906, a placard at the Congress of Bucharest stated that between 1850 and 1900, 109 Hungarian villages became Rumanian. (Szöllösy, p. 86)

After the above quotations, can we accept the anti-Hungarian accusations that the Hungarians oppressed the minorities, economically, culturally and religiously?

Now I am going to talk about the lack of patriotism among the Hungarian feudal aristocracy. Several factors contributed to the Rumanians' acquisition of lands in Hungary. We must take into account the acts of the Hungarian feudal lords and high clergy during the course of Hungarian history. In the time of the Tartars and the Turks, foreign peoples settled in Hungary and under the Hapsburgs, Germans, Slavs, Moravians, Slovenians and Wallachians were brought into the country. Those who became Hungarian aristocrats accepted Hungary as their country but felt no real patriotism. There were a few very honest and valuable exceptions but most of the feudal princes, counts, barons, primates and bishops invested their enormous incomes on property in Vienna rather than in Hungary. They did not notice the poverty of the Hungarian people. They did not care about the future of the nation. For them it made no difference who worked the land; they were interested only in profit. It did not seem to matter that Hungarian lands were gradually slipping into the hands of non-Hungarians.

Szöllösy says: „The Hungarian kings, in order to protect the value of their land and increase their income, settled foreign serfs on their own territories. They gave the serfs territorial autonomy on the royal lands, thus ensuring their loyalty. This was the basis of the minorities' development of a national identity and later on their wish to break away from Hungary. This intention was facilitated by the fact that they were settled in lands near the borders of Hungary, close to their own people on the other side of the border.” (Szöllösy, p.87)

I would like to mention one of the many anti-Hungarian acts of the „Hungarian” aristocracy. The biggest Transylvanian insurrection took place in 1437. The reason for this was that the Transylvanian Roman Catholic bishop demanded that the taxes be paid not in kind but with money. Those who could not pay with money were subjected to an inquisition and were excommunicated. Under the leadership of János Kardos the insurrectionists secured the cities of Nagyenyed and Kolozsvár but the combined aristocratic army, reinforced by German mercenaries, defeated them. The leaders were impaled and all the peasants in the territory of Mezőség were executed. Wallachians were settled in their place.⁴⁴

I would like to make the comparison between the situation in feudal Hungary in 1437 and that of the situation in Hungary after World War I, when Hungary returned to the ancient feudal system after the short-lived Communist commune. The Compromise of 1867 between Austria and Hungary, which created the Dual-Monarchy, was the prime opportunity to initiate a land-reform, to give back the land to the peasants, but this was not done. Neither was it done after World War I. At the same time, in Rumania, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, the land which was taken from the Church and the lands which were taken from Hungary in the Treaty of Trianon were divided between the Serb, Czech, Moravian and Rumanian peasants. These nationalistic states applied their agrarian reform to raise up their own people and obtain more land for them. At the same time the Hungarian aristocrats' demands went only as far as financial restitution for the lands which they had lost in the Treaty of Trianon. This they demanded that they receive in taxes from the remaining Hungarian people.⁴⁵

From the above-mentioned data, we can see that the non-Hungarian feudal aristocracy was one of the causes for the growth of the minorities in Hungary. We still have to mention the Rumanian policy of assimilation. We have to state that the increase in Rumanian territory and the Rumanization of the minorities in Rumania always followed a definite plan. First, the Orthodox priests worked on this policy in the villages to increase the members of their parishes; later the King and Queen and then the governments which came into power. The leaders of

⁴⁴ Szöllösy: Op. Cit. p. 88; Málnási Ödön: Op. Cit. p. 43.

⁴⁵ Málnási, Ödön: Op. Cit. P. 152-153

the Rumanian Orthodox Church recognized very early on the destructive effects of Pan-Germanism⁴⁶ and Pan-Slavism among the peoples of the Danube Valley. Therefore they focussed their attention on this and turned it to their advantage. (Szöllösy, p. 91). The priests led the people to believe that the Hungarians were to blame for all the hardships they endured and they secretly became supporters of Pan-Slavism. With the support of the minorities in Transylvania, the Rumanians reached their goal - the break-up of the Monarchy and the mutilation of Hungary.

The Orthodox Church always counted as Rumanian children of mixed marriages where one partner was Rumanian, and counted the family as a Rumanian family. In this way countless Hungarians were included in the Rumanian census. This distortion was supported by the Catholic Church too because they held the view that it was better if the person was married to an Orthodox Catholic Rumanian than to a Protestant Hungarian. Besides this we can mention that the Hungarian people had a facility for learning languages and an over-zealous politeness. It became a Hungarian custom that if a single Rumanian came to a group of Hungarians, out of politeness, they all spoke Rumanian. Their patriotism may have been weak because it was underemphasized by the Catholic Church, whereas the primary goal of the Orthodox priests was to encourage the Rumanian people to be nationalistic. (Szöllösy, p. 93)

While the Wallachians were in a minority in Transylvania, they saw that the Saxon people had their own autonomy. Therefore they advocated that autonomy was the only just solution for the problem of the minorities. However, when they achieved their goal with intrigue and bribery and the help of the victors of World War I., the Rumanians immediately adopted the ideals of the French national state and instituted them in their government program. They immediately abandoned the idea of self-determination of the minorities and governed the country as if only the Rumanian people lived there and no other nationality. Already in 1923, they declared: „The Rumanian kingdom is unified, and indivisible. It is a national state and every Rumanian enjoys, without any distinction, racial and linguistic freedom, freedom of conscience and upbringing, freedom of the press and freedom of

⁴⁶ Pan-Germanism is a movement to unite all people of German origin wherever they may live.

assembly which the law secures.”⁴⁷ All these rights applied only to those who were Rumanian by birth.

According to the declaration of Prime Minister George Bratianu of Rumania: „We regard every minority as Rumanian.” (Szöllősy, p. 94) This policy of assimilating the minorities has resulted in the majority of the population becoming Rumanized. Since 1920, the nationalistic, chauvinistic Rumanians have conducted a policy of suppressing the minorities, whereas in Hungary, under a more humane regime, the minorities have enjoyed their freedom for centuries. The Rumanian state should not have regarded the French idea of a national state as their own governmental program. The Hungarian state could have done that centuries ago but, for a millennium, the Hungarians developed a national spirit and culture, with the minority groups as loyal Hungarians. These groups were united under the Holy Crown. Belonging to the Hungarian nation was an individual decision. Only this old concept of Hungarian government could secure for every citizen the freedom which every man needs. This freedom continued until the subversive agitators, the Hapsburgs, Pan-Slavists and Pan-Germanists appeared in Hungary. Socialist Rumania has a minority program which has suppressed the minorities to a greater extent than the pre-war chauvinism ever did.

On May 2, 1848, at the Balázsfalvy Assembly, the Rumanians stated: „The Rumanian people do not wish to suppress other peoples.” . . . „They acknowledge the mutual respect and sincerely intend to maintain it.” . . . „The Rumanian nation does not intend to rule over other nations.” . . . „They wish to give equal rights to all nationalities.” (Szöllősy, p. 95-96) We know, from 1923 on, how sincerely they meant „equal rights to all nationalities”. Socialist Rumania closed down the Bolyai University at Kolozsvár, the high school at Nagyvárad and Marosvásárhely, the teacher’s college at Nagyvárad and did not allow the Hungarian schools at Bonyhád, Hosszúfalu, Erdőd, Farkaslak, Gyergyóújfalu, Gyergyószentmiklos, Brassó, Kibéd, Mártonos and Vajdahunyad to open. Many Hungarian high schools were transformed into Rumanian trade-schools. All parochial schools became state-owned even the famous College of Nagyenyed.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Szöllősy: Op. Cit. p. 94; Asztalos, Miklós: A korszerű nemzet eszme

⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 96. Amerikai Magyar Népszava. Jan.9. 1948

The leaders of the Communist Hungarian government, who were of foreign origin and Soviet citizens, never raised their voices against the oppression of the nearly two million Hungarians living in Rumania.

Szőllősy gives examples of Rumanian atrocities against Hungarians. „Rumanian agents shot to death a Roman Catholic priest who was celebrating Mass in Balázsfalva because he did not accept the Greek Orthodox religion.”⁴⁹ In Rumania, many Hungarians were imprisoned or transported to unknown locations and many were killed. This was accepted in Rumania as a method of getting rid of the Hungarians.

According to a reliable source, the Rumanians gathered 16,000 Hungarian families and took them by train to unknown locations.⁵⁰ Artur K. Tompa, a seventy-year-old Hungarian priest, was nailed to the door of his church at Kend Ilona. Oltanea, the leader of the Rumanian Maniu organization, gathered 400 wealthy Hungarian peasants and had their heads chopped off by axe on a tree trunk.⁵¹

I could give many more horrible examples but I will refrain from doing so. However I must give one final example. Seeing all these brutal anti-Hungarian acts, the Soviet army, which was no friend to the Hungarians, finally had to step in and stop these atrocities. At Csíkszereda, the Soviet Major Szocsin was shot to death by the Rumanians as he tried to stop these brutalities.⁵² The Maniu organization made an arrangement to transport 4000 Hungarian intellectuals, the entire body of the Seminary at Kolozsvár, to the Soviet Union. They all froze to death in the forests of the Ural Mountains.⁵³

As war reparations, the Rumanians were supposed to send slave labor to Soviet Russia. Instead of Rumanians, they sent Hungarians and Germans, with the knowledge that they would never return. They sent approximately 15,000 Hungarian and Szekler prisoners of war to build the Danube canal. The hard labor, the hot and cold temperatures, the lack of drinking water, dysentery, typhus, living in the open and in mud

⁴⁹ Ibid. p. 97; *Iránytű*, April 22, 1949

⁵⁰ Ibid. p. 98. *Hungaria*, Sept. 14, 1951

⁵¹ Ibid. p. 98. *Kronika*, July, 1951

⁵² Ibid. p. 98. *Hungaria*, Sept. 14, 1951

⁵³ Ibid. p. 98. *Kronika*, July, 1951

huts and no medical attention, all contributed to their decimation. There were no burials or headstones, only ditches and lime for the dead.⁵⁴

It looks as if even the Soviet soldiers found the Rumanian brutality too much to take, just as Hugh Seton-Watson, the English historian, did in the following quotation: „The Rumanian Communists wish to erase nationalism in the country but, at the same time, just like their Czech counterparts, they are much more chauvinistic than the nationalists before World War I. The Rumanian policeman or tax-collector has hardly given up the custom of watching the Hungarians with suspicion. The official propaganda of the government advocates the cessation of the persecution of the minorities but the persecution continues. The ideology of the Communist regime and the political oppression give birth to nationalism. The Hungarian peasants may not be persecuted because they are Hungarians but they are persecuted because they are ‘kulaks’ (wealthy peasants) or because they are Catholics or simply because they are „reactionary”.⁵⁵

Sima Horea, a Rumanian Socialist, gives his opinion of the policy of the Rumanians: . . .

„It is not the interest of the Rumanian people which directs the politics of Rumania but the momentary compliance with the foreign interests. The direction of their politics came not from Bucharest but from London, Paris or Moscow. The Rumanian foreign policy came into the hands of a rotten clique with a foreign mentality who took upon themselves the task of guiding the nation. Between the two World Wars, our governments jumped here and there in their political views. They followed the interests of the English and French when these groups were dominant but, when it looked as if the Germans were winning, they forgot their former allegiances and dived head first into the German camp. They offered all the country’s treasures and all its manpower to help the Germans but in the end they did not give anything. The most important thing for them was to show their servitude to the new rulers of Europe but when the Russian soldiers reached the River Moldova, the Rumanians repeated their gesture of servitude. They threw themselves as prey to the

⁵⁴ Ibid. p. 99. *Hungaria*, Sept. 14, 1951

⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 101. *Hungaria*, Sept. 7, 1951

new lords, without any conditions.” . . . „The Bolschevik Moloch was not satisfied with the treasures of the country and the bloody sacrifices but threw away the traitors like a squeezed lemon.”⁵⁶

After this Sima Horea emphasized that in the future the Rumanians have to place the government of the country in the hands of people who serve the interest of the Rumanian people.

I have already mentioned Pan-Germanism but I did not explain it. Pan-Germanism or the Völkisch theory advocates the mutual origin, language, culture, fate, and a mutual homeland which is Germany. Anywhere the Germans settle, they always regard Germany as their fatherland. „To be German is not to forget, abroad or at home, that they are one blood and one tribe, and this remains true even if they are politically separated.”⁵⁷ This means that wherever a German settles, that land is the possession of Germany. This theory awakened in the intruders and „hospes” (guests) in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy their national consciousness and their drive to separate. This caused the many centuries-old peaceful coexistence in Hungarian territory to disintegrate. This theory was the precedent for the theories of Pan-Slavism and Pan-Romanism.

Szöllösy states: „Pan-Slavism is an endeavor similar to Pan-Germanism, in that it intends to unify all Slav people into one empire.” (p.110)

According to the Russian Czar, Peter the Great, the Russian people’s future destiny was to rule over the whole of Europe. Five hundred Bulgarian students were enrolled in Russian universities to learn about Pan-Slavism. The effect of this was felt during the Hungarian Freedom Fight of 1848 against Austria, when the minorities, instigated by the Hapsburgs, demanded to separate from Hungary. This separatist movement progressed quickly without much opposition and in 1920, at the Treaty of Trianon, gained the support of the leaders who, with their extremely limited knowledge of history, accepted the falsified ethnographic statistical data, historical and geographical data of the Czechs, Serbs and Rumanians. They accepted the Daco-Roman Theory

⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 102; Horea, Sima, *Nyugati Magyarország*, May-June 1953

⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 109; Asztalos, Miklós: *A korszerű nemzet eszme*; from Constantin Noepel, a Jesuit priest

of the origin of the Rumanians and the propaganda of the Czech historian, Palaczky, that the Hungarians of Finno-Ugric origins had stood in the way of the unification of the northern and Southern Slavs for more than a thousand years. Frantisek Palacky stated that they were constantly causing unrest in the Carpathian Basin. The Freemasons used the disintegrating effect of the Pan-Slavic movement to their benefit. Already in 1890, a map appeared in the Christmas issue of the English review „*The Truth*”. The publisher of this review was Henry Labouchers, a high-ranking Freemason. This review was displayed in the library of the museum of the London suburb of Collingdale. On this map could be seen the countries of the future Europe. It names Germany, Poland, Switzerland, Austria, Spain and Russia as republics. Germany, Poland, Austria, and Spain were at that time all monarchies. Only Hungary was missing from the map because at that time they had already divided the country.⁵⁸ According to this map, Rumania would have the more valuable part of Hungary: Transylvania and the Körös River territories. Ödön Málnási writes: „When Woodrow Wilson came to Europe he knew nothing of the history of Europe but when he left, he complained that everybody lied to him.”⁵⁹ Lloyd George also was of the same opinion when he said: „Wilson’s knowledge of the power structure of the European countries was not even on the level of the common man. That is why he deferred to the more knowledgeable Masaryk and sealed the fate of all of Europe, including the Monarchy and Hungary.”⁶⁰

When the French foreign minister, Pichon, in the name of France, made a dishonorable agreement with Edward Benes to create a Czech government, Benes had no power to agree. He was just an emigrant lawyer.⁶¹ At the time of the Peace Conference, there was a well-organized Czech-Serb-Rumanian clique which gathered at the London home of Seton Watson. They planned how they were going to present their speeches against the Hungarian delegation so that they would be united in their attack. As a result of these meetings, these politicians and experts, Benes, Bratianiu, Veznic, Tardieu, and Seton

⁵⁸ Ibid. p. 112. László, Endre: A Zsidókról, 1947

⁵⁹ Ibid. p. 114; Málnási, Ödön: Ország Veszejtés, p.29)

⁶⁰ Ibid. p. 114; Málnási, Op. Cit. p. 7

⁶¹ Ibid. p. 115, Málnási, Op. Cit. p. 12-13

Watson disregarded Wilson's Fourteen Points. The French Foreign Office at the Quai D'Orsay could not free itself from the influence of this group. The Hungarian delegation was excluded from the discussions at the Peace Conference. They were not allowed to speak and the decisions were made without them.⁶² Those who took part in the Conference received considerable rewards. The French General Berthelot, on October 24, 1922, received the lands of a Hungarian aristocrat. Seton Watson received the professorship which Masaryk used to have at the University of London.⁶³ This is a shame not only for the people who received the gifts but from the government which allowed this to happen. At the negotiations at the Peace Conference after World War I. and World War II., Paris became the world capital of bribery. French politics were guided by the politicians and writers who could be easily bribed. The press was paid by Prague, Moscow, Bucharest and Belgrade. (Szöllősy, p. 117.)

The French fear of the Germans also contributed to Rumania's annexation of Transylvania. Instead of trying to find a solution and come to an agreement with the Germans who were on the same cultural level, the French asked a power outside of Europe, Russia, for help. They had previously done this after the defeat at Sedan in 1870. They did not notice that, under the pretext of helping them, Russia always moved closer to the center of Europe. This anti-German feeling on the part of the French led Clemenceau and Tardieu to the decisions they made at Trianon. It also played a part in the punishment of Hungary after World War II. Szöllősy says that the French wanted the Hungarians to be punished because they fought to the last man on the side of the Germans against the Allied Forces. (p. 119)

The press encouraged this anti-German attitude among the French people. They did not mention the fact that Hungary had no other choice than to defend herself from the Russian, Rumanian and Slav invasions.

The bribed press writes of the new situation which was created at Trianon. „The liberated people (Slovaks, Serbs and Rumanians) rule all the minorities, and although the latter have demands, they have no rights in any case. Thus nobody can deny the obvious progress which

⁶² Ibid. p. 115, Málnási, p. 25

⁶³ Ibid: p. 117; Málnási, p. 30

has come out of this liberation. Although there are some problems, there is no reason for further insurrections, and we can state without hypocrisy that the new borders of Europe are undeniably better than the old in regard to the minority rights.”⁶⁴

The French politicians and intelligencia like Leon Noel, Charles Roux, Bernard Lauvergne, and the editor of the newspaper *Le Monde*, Beuve-Mery, all agreed on the treatment of the minorities. Beuve-Mery questioned whether this was a final enough solution for the half million Hungarians which the Rumanians had remaining in their territory. The young French politician, Descotes simply advised a Czechization of the Hungarians remaining in Czechoslovakia.⁶⁵ Here we can see a high level of hypocrisy. France, in the past, objected that the Hungarians insisted that their language, which was the official language of the state, was to be studied in the schools of the minorities, along with the language of the minority. These liberal views come from the same country which created the slogan: Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.

⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 119; Baráth, Tibor: A Dunataj államszerkezete francia szemléletben

⁶⁵ Ibid. p. 121; Barath, Op. Cit.

Chapter 6

The Rumanian People and their Language

In this chapter, I will present two conflicting views about the origin of the Rumanian language. (After 1878, the name „Rumanian” gradually replaced the name „Wallachian”.) The one view is that of the linguists, the other that of political literature which always supports the viewpoint of the Rumanian government. In the nineteenth century, in the Age of Romanticism, the myth of the Daco-Roman origin of the Rumanians was created. According to this theory, the Wallachians were the ancient populace of Transylvania, the descendants of the Dacians and the Romans, therefore the Rumanians have the sole right to Transylvania.

The latter part of the last century was the Age of Classicism which questioned all history based on legend and patriotism and only regarded as history, that which was based on the results of research. At this time, a series of scientific research studies about the origins of the Rumanians appeared, written by such linguists as R. Roessler, C. Gooss, Pál Hunfalvy, L. Réthy and others.⁶⁶ The essence of these studies is that the Roman Emperor Aurelianus, between A.D. 257 and 271, withdrew his legions from Transylvania and resettled them south of the Danube. We have a continuous flow of information about the Wallachians from A.D. 579 to the fourteenth century in the Byzantine Chronicles. The ecclesiastical language of the Wallachians indicates a strong connection with Macedonia. The Wallachian language shows a strong Slav influence and shows a relationship with the Albanian language. A second group of linguists was involved in researching the Rumanian (Wallachian) language: M. Gaster, G. Moldovan, Sextil Puscariu, C. Weigand, G. Murnu and others. This group took into consideration the information from the Byzantine Chronicles, studied the geographical

⁶⁶ Török, Sándor: Településtörténeti tanulmányok és határproblémák a Kárpátmedencében, 1973, Astor Park, FL p. 204

locations where the language was spoken, and attempted to reconstruct the origins of the Rumanian language. (Török, p. 205)

After reading the researches of these scientists, Sándor Török concludes that there is no trace of Dacian influence in the Rumanian language. There is also no trace of influence from any of the other peoples who lived in Transylvania after the withdrawal of the Romans, the Huns, Goths, Gepidae, Avars, Pechenegs and Kuns. If these languages did not have any influence on the Rumanian language, we can be sure that this is proof that at that time there were no Wallachian settlers in Transylvania.

Sándor Török makes an interesting observation: „In its structure, the Rumanian language resembles the Albanian language but in its grammar it resembles Bulgarian.” (Török, p. 205) The Rumanian and Italian words for numerals resemble each other up to the number ten but above ten the Rumanian numerals resemble the Albanian numerals. Török concludes that the ancestors of the Rumanians lived in close community with the Italians until they learned to count to ten and then they must have moved closer to the Albanians in the Balkans where they learned the numbers above ten. (p. 206) This would indicate that the Rumanians adopted the names for the numerals from the Italians and the Albanians.

Historical data support this theory. In AD 976, In the territory of Kastro and Prespa, in Greece, in an attack by the Bulgars against the Byzantine Emperor, Basileios, one of the Bulgar leaders, David, was killed near the Albanian territory, by „Blachs” who were living there. (Blach > Vlach > Wallachian) This was the first time that this name was recorded in history.⁶⁷ According to Gyóni, Kekaumenos states in his „Strategikon” that these „Vlachs” spent the winter on the Pindus Mountain and on the Thessalian Plain in Greece and spent the summer in the Grammos Mountains of Bulgaria, the Nerecska Plain, the Bisztra Mountain and Sardagon.⁶⁸

In 1020, Emperor Basileus II. ordered that the Wallachians living in the territory of Bulgaria be placed under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Ochrida. Ochrida was on the border of Macedonia and Albania. The ecclesiastical language of the Wallachians until 1715 was

⁶⁷ Ibid. p. 207; Kedrenos II. 435. ED. Bonn.

⁶⁸ Ibid. p. 207; Gyóni: *A legrégibb vélemény a román nép eredetéről* . 38. Budapest. 1944.

Bulgar-Slav. This is an indisputable proof against the Daco-Roman continuity.

Between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries, the official name of Thessaly was Megali Vlachia (Great Wallachia). In 1097, Emperor Alexis Komnenos resettled the Wallachians from the Chalkidiki Peninsula into Peloponnesos.

Between A.D. 1130 and 1260, the territory of the Rhodope Mountains was called „Vlachia” (Wallachia). This is written in a document in the archives of the Árpád Dynasty.⁶⁹ In 1186, the Byzantine Emperor, Angelos Izsák heavily taxed the Bulgarians and the Wallachians. Therefore Calopeter and Ossen, two Wallachian leaders who were brothers, revolted against the Emperor and when the Emperor defeated them, the Wallachians fled to the northern shore of the Danube and settled among the Cumanians.

In 1208, the combined Bulgarian-Wallachian army lost a battle to the Byzantine Emperor and the Wallachians, who lived southwest of Philippopolis became his serfs.⁷⁰

The Wallachians organized by their church appeared in great numbers in Havasalföld in 1234. Between 1247 and 1257, there was a war between the Wallachians and the Greeks, in the territory of the Rhodope mountains, which the Greeks won. According the writings of the cleric Ansbert, in the territory of northeastern Serbia, Greeks, Serbs, Bulgarians and Wallachians attacked the Christian army. The local names of the territory of Sofia showed the Wallachian presence in this area: Vakarel, Paserel, Cerecel, Chorul, Karnul, Murgas etc.⁷¹

From the above-mentioned historical data, the researchers came to the conclusion that the Rumanian language was formed in the Balkan Peninsula, in the territory of Thrace and Macedonia, at the beginning of the Middle Ages. The earliest written records appeared in A.D. 579 but these were not accepted by the Rumanians who still advocate that Transylvania was their original ancient home.

⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 208; Wenzel: Árpádkori Okmánytár VI. 267, 277, 282-284; Thenier: Monumenta Hungariae I. 157

⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 208; Jireček: Geschichte der Bulgaren, Über die Abstammung der Rumänen.62.

⁷¹ Ibid. p. 209; Theiner: Monumenta Hungariae, I.

The Rumanian scholars, because of the strong international pressure, had to alter their theory of the Daco-Roman continuity somewhat. However, from this politically tendentious theory, they kept the part which supports their claim to Transylvania. In his book: Originea Rominilor, published in 1925, Philippid, a Rumanian historian, promotes the theory that the Wallachians originated in the Balkans and places their arrival into Transylvania in the 7th century, without any proof. He tries to uphold this theory so that he can show that the Wallachians were in Transylvania at the time of the Magyar Homecoming in A.D. 896, and therefore claim that this was their land prior to the Magyar arrival.

G.L. Bratianu, another Rumanian historian, without any supporting data, tries to explain that a new group of Wallachian settlers joined the original Daco-Roman settlers in Transylvania. When L. Tamás refuted this theory,⁷² Bratianu altered his theory and stated that the people who lived on both sides of the Danube continually changed their place of settlement from one side to the other, and from the beginning of the thirteenth century the Wallachians migrated back to Transylvania. He suggested that the presence of non-Roman characters in the Wallachian language was due to the influence of nomadic shepherd peoples on the language.

M. Friedwagner refutes Bratianu's theory stating that a nomad people cannot change the characteristics of a Roman language. He dates the arrival of the Wallachians in Transylvania into the 12th and 13th centuries. Sándor Török agrees that there are no data until the thirteenth century, that a people speaking the Rumanian language lived in this territory, even temporarily. E. Gamillscheg, a Rumanian linguist, states that **the Rumanian language was formed in the Balkans in the territory of Albania**. This would indicate that they are not of Daco-Roman origin. However, to give support to the Daco-Roman theory, he suggests that one branch of the Rumanian people, the Móc people, lived in the Transylvanian Erzgebirge 1800 years ago.⁷³

The Daco-Roman theory is based on the supposition that the present Rumanian language is built on the phonetic structure of the language of the Móc people which is Latin based (although the phonetic

⁷² Ibid. p. 210; Tamás. L.: Romaiak, románok, oláhok, Dácia-Trajanában, Budapest, 1935

⁷³ Ibid. P. 211; Gamillscheg, E.: Cahiers Sextil Puscariu, 3.

structure of the Rumanian language is clearly Slavic. Gamillscheg builds his theory that the Rumanian language is of Latin origin based on a single word – „rarunchiu” (kidney). This supposedly originates from the Latin word „ren” but it is unlike any of the other Latin based languages. The French word for kidney is „rein” which sounds more like Latin than „rarunchiu”. The Italians use „reni” which means loins and the Spanish „rinon”. In Spanish kidney stones are „cálculo renal”. Sándor Török asks if it is possible to make the determination that the Rumanians were the original inhabitants of this territory based on just one word when we can see that all other reasoning goes against this.

Török gives us the length of Roman rule in countries outside of Italy. (p. 211.)

Romanized population remained

Bosnia – 576 years	temporarily
Macedonia – 576 years	did not remain
Hellas and Albania – 495 years	temporarily
Gallia – 465 years	remained
Egypt – 425 years	did not remain
Pannonia – 390 years	did not remain
Serbia and Bulgaria – 381 years	temporarily
Britannia – 364 years	did not remain
Armenia – 305 years	did not remain
Dacia – 150 years	did not remain

We can see that Dacia was the territory where there was the smallest chance for Latinization to take root.

Capidan, a Rumanian linguist, also came to the conclusion that the theory of the Daco-Roman continuity is incorrect. He supported his reasoning in the following way:

„I. The Rumanian language has four branches:

1. Daco-Roman, (the former Dacia)
2. Arumun (in Macedonia)
3. Meglenoroman (southern Bulgaria)
4. Istro-Roman (northern shore of the Adriatic Sea)

These four branches were very similar and developed simultaneously. The southern branch could not have originated in the north, so the northern branch must have originated in the south.

II. Among these four branches, the Albanian language had the greatest influence on the Daco-Roman language, particularly the Southern Albanian language. Since the Albanians never lived in the northern half of the Balkan Peninsula, the ancient homeland of the Rumanians or Wallachians must be in the territory of the Ochrida Lake.

III. The Slav language characteristics can be found in all four branches, even in the Arumun branch. The speakers of this language, for centuries, had no chance to mingle with Slavs because they were living among Greeks, in Greece. This Slav influence on the Arumun branch could only have taken place in Macedonia, where the Bulgar-Slavs were living, close to Albania.

IV. The Transylvanian Rumanians until most recent times belonged under the jurisdiction of the far distant Greek Orthodox Bishop of Ochrida, although there were Greek Orthodox bishoprics in the Rumanian *vajdaságs* like Bulgaria and Serbia, which were much closer to them.. These facts indicate that the ancestors of the Transylvanian Rumanians migrated to Transylvania from the territory of the Ochrida Lake in Albania and Macedonia.” (Török, p. 212).

G. Stadtmüller, O. Mitterstrauss and S. Dragomir state that the dispute is settled because there is overwhelming historical and linguistic evidence to disprove the Daco-Roman theory. Dragomir reasons that there are very few geographical names which are originally Rumanian and these are all from the thirteenth century.

Since there is so much literature written about the research of the Rumanian ancient homeland, I can only mention a small section of it. Publishers publish any „research” material which is presented to them, without ascertaining its validity. They unfortunately propagated Bratianu’s theory of the changing settlements on the banks of the Danube. It is regrettable that the encyclopedia do not take the trouble to check on the research which is given to them, so false or incorrect information is published as accepted history.

Chapter 7

The Transylvanian Saxons

Pope Pius II. (1458) wrote in his book: De statu Europae sub Frederico tertio that the Saxons came to Transylvania from Saxony. The Transylvanian Saxons sang from a hymnal which was published in 1532, the following text: „Vom Rhein und Sachsen ich gemein bin aufgewachsen in grossem Schein.” (I grew up under the sun in the territory of the Rhine and Saxony.) In spite of this declaration of their land of origin, the Saxons adopted a theory, published in 1538, which stated that the Saxons were the descendants of the Dacians and the Goths. This theory of the origins of the Saxons was accepted until 1696. After this a more scientific theory took hold. (Török, p. 192)

The linguists in the 18th and 19th centuries stated that the ancestors of the Transylvanian Saxons came from the territory of Germany. The linguist, G.F. Marianburg, in 1843, stated that Luxembourg was their place of origin. The Hungarian researchers stated that the Magyars, in the Middle Ages, called „Germans” those Germans and Austrians who came from Bavaria. They called the Alemans „Schwabs”, and the Germans from the north and center of Germany „Saxons”. It was clear to the Magyars that the Saxons of Transylvania came from northern or central Germany.

According to the document of the Hungarian King, Endre II. (1224), the Saxons came into Hungary as guests of King Géza II. (1141-1161). The territory where he settled them stretched from Szászváros to Homoróddaróc. (Török, p. 193)

In this time period, the German interest, the „Drang nach Osten” (push toward the east) agreed with King Géza’s policy of encouraging more people to settle in Hungary.

G.E. Müller, between 1906 and 1938 published studies called: Desertumslehr. He stated that the Saxons settled on virgin land in Hungary. This statement is refuted by the research of settlements by István Kniezse, who showed that the geographical names written in

German all originated from Hungarian geographical names. The Hungarian names entered the German language with German pronunciation but have no meaning in German. G. Kisch proved that the majority of the German names in the territory of the Transylvanian Saxons are of Hungarian origin. This is the proof that Saxons settled in territories originally inhabited by Hungarians. In the time of King Géza II. (1141-1162), the Szeklers, the original populace, had to move out of their territory, into which the Saxons were settled, and seek new homes further to the east, to Háromszék in the Eastern Carpathians. The king was able to move these people because the Szeklers were in his service as a military group and he placed them wherever he needed them. The new settlers were more than willing to come to a territory where the land had already been worked. (Török, p. 194)

The king donated Hungarian land to the Saxons. For this land the Saxon families did not have to pay taxes as the Hungarian serfs did and they were not obliged to serve in wartime. The Saxon community, the „universitas”, paid the tax and provided army contingents. These privileges were renewed in 1224 by King Endre II. This was an enormous advantage for the Saxons over the Hungarians and Transylvanians. This helped them to keep up their language and their national characteristics and customs. G. Müller wrote that the Saxons were: „die älteste, organisierte Minderheit der Gegenwart”. (The oldest, organized minority of our time) (Török, p.194)

We have no exact date for the settlement of the Saxons in Transylvania. The settlement of Saxons who were brought in by King Géza II. is the oldest settlement, dated somewhere between 1147 and 1161. The first three Saxon settlements were placed between the settlements of the Orba, Sebes and Kézd Szeklers. The German names here are all taken over from Hungarian names, for example: Leschkirch comes from the Hungarian word „les” meaning „watch”.

The most ancient Saxon settlements are called „*Hétszék*” (seven seats) in spite of the fact that they have eight administrative centers or seats. The eighth seat was formed when the seventh seat grew too large and started to occupy the territory of the Szeklers of Kézd, in the city of Segesvár. In this area can be found many names of Hungarian origin, for example: King László was canonized in 1192 and the village of Lasseln was established. Saint László was the patron saint of this village and became the patron saint of the Saxon settlers after they had forced the

Szeklers from this village. This took place in 1260. This is the date that the Saxons of Lasseln received their autonomy. (Török, p. 195)

The fourth seat was formed in the time of King István III. (1163-1172). After the Tartar invasion, the Saxon immigration into Hungary increased and the Saxons settled in the territory of the Szeklers of Kézsd in the villages of Medgyes (Mediasch) and Selyk (Schelk). The Saxons arrived in Beszterce (Bistritz) and Brassó (Kronstadt) in the middle of the thirteenth century. The most ancient village names of the territory of Beszterce are Budak (Bodagd) (1228), Nagyfalú (Nogfolu) (1243), and Malomárka (Molunark) (1243). These names and the River Sajó indicate that, before the Saxon settlements, this was obviously an area populated by Hungarians. In 1211 King Endre II granted the territories of Bárcaság (Burzenland) and Brassó (Kronstadt), to the Teutonic Knights. The castle of Brassó was one hundred years old. In exchange they agreed to protect this territory from invaders and to christianize the territory of Wallachia but in 1225 the Knights granted this possession to the Pope and they obtained political independence from Hungary. Between 1211 and 1223, the Knights settled many Saxons into this area but King Endre, after their disloyal action in 1225, chased out the Teutonic Knights from the territory. However, the Saxons were allowed to remain. In four out of the 13 Saxon villages of Bárcaság, the Teutonic Knights built stone castles. In Földvár, Feketehalom and Keresztvár, stood Hungarian earth castles of an earlier date. The rest of the Saxon villages were established in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The village of Botfalú became a Saxon possession in the seventeenth century when the Szeklers died out. At the end of the fifteenth century, the Saxons managed to unify all the Saxon or partly Saxon territory. The seven villages of the Csángó Hungarians in the vicinity of Brassó, came under the Saxon administration in Brassó.

Throughout the three centuries before the Saxons received their autonomy, there had been a continuous immigration of Saxons with the result that this Hungarian territory became Germanized. In Alvinc (Winz) and Teke, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, the populace was mainly Hungarian but the priests were German. Transylvania's German name was Siebenburgen (Seven Castles). It received this name from the seven Saxon settlements surrounding castles. Johannes Schiltberger (1394-1427) wrote: „Sybenbürgen das ist ein dütsch land und die hoptstat des lands heist Hermenstatt.”

(Siebenbürgen is a German land and its capital is Hermannstadt) (Török, p. 199.)

The Transylvanian Saxons reached their zenith in the fourteenth century. At that time their influence spread into non-Saxon territory, around the city of Brassó. In 1490, 260,000 Hungarians lived in Transylvania and 70,000 Saxons. In the Hungarian census of 1910, there were 924,609 Hungarians and 233,573 Saxons.

Looking at these numbers, we can see that the Germans who were 1000 kilometers away from German territory, were able to keep up their heritage and multiply in a foreign territory, at the same rate as the Hungarians. The Hungarian laws favored them and there was no oppression against them as a minority.

For 750 years, the Saxons were able to keep their German characteristics, customs and language but, in spite of that, in 1940, when the occasion came to show their loyalty to the Hungarians, they voted to belong to Rumania. What was the motivation for this decision? Maybe they thought that, if they went with the Rumanians who had a lower standard of culture, they could become dominant. The subsequent years have shown this to be the wrong decision. How many Saxons now live in Transylvania? Very few, only about 60,000. What is the rate of population growth? Very slow. Are they permitted to speak their language? No. Do they still have their schools? No. What has become of the formerly strong Lutheran Church? It no longer exists. What kind of political autonomy do they have now? They have none. Whom did the Rumanians sell for good money to the Germans, like cows? The Saxons, for \$1000 per head.

At the time of the Magyar Homecoming, Transylvania was a very sparsely populated territory because the wars between the Romans and Dacians caused a great depopulation. In the Carpathian mountains there was a similar situation. The Goths, when they revolted against their overlords, the Huns, also killed a large number of people. The Chronicles of Charlemagne boasted that they had annihilated the Avar populace in that territory. Since then, the findings in the Avar cemeteries have proved that this was an exaggeration, but it is true that the population diminished and the ancient autochthonous people remained. At that time, the Slavs were living in small numbers on the perimeters of Transylvania.

The Magyars settled in the entire Carpathian Basin, but populated the central part more densely. Later they organized the defense of the borders, divided the territory into counties, created bishoprics and built castles and churches. As I wrote earlier, the Saxons were „guests” of the Hungarian king and they received land where the king allowed them to settle. The Hungarians did not object to their speaking their own language and keeping their customs. Sándor Török writes: „The kings did not invite the Saxons into the country with the purpose of giving them territory which they would then give to the Holy Roman Emperor.” (page 201) Unfortunately this is just what happened. The „guests” took over the Hungarian territory and even gave some of it away.

Chapter 8

The destruction of Southern Hungary

We shall now examine the history of Southern Hungary. Much of the information in this chapter is taken from Elemér Czobánczi.⁷⁴ Originally Hungary was a national state. The autochthonous people of the Körös culture provided the majority of the people of the Carpathian Basin. These people have always remained in that territory. The different conquering powers came and left but the majority of the people remained. For short periods of time, Indo-European nations came and settled but only the Turanian peoples such as the Pannonians, Huns, Avars, Szeklers, Cumanians, Csángós, Jazygians, Magyars, Pechenegs, Torockó, Palóc and Kalotaszeg people were able to remain for longer periods. I just mention here the best known of these peoples. How did the strong Hungarian national state become an international state? In the examination of Hungarian history we come to the conclusion that some foreigners such as the Wallachians and the Serbs slowly infiltrated into the country but in most cases when this influx increased it was because they were fleeing from the Turks and the Hungarian kings allowed them asylum. The higher standard of living of the Hungarian people attracted the Serbs and enriched them. The enlightenment of the Serb people of the Balkans began on the Hungarian border lines and not in the Slav settlements.

We can approximately date the origin of the Serb-Slav people to the time of the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius, AD 610-642, when the Slavs had progressed to a tribal system. This is the time that they became freed from slavery and became an independent people who started to migrate. The Serb people has no ancient history. (Czobánczi, p. 7.) Before this date they had no organized state. They had no king and no capital city. They only had territories in which they lived in scattered

⁷⁴ Czobánczi, Elemér: Nagymagyarország vagy nemzethalál, Vol. 2. Délmagyarország pusztulása és elrablása, Marrickvill, Australia, 1966

groups. The name, „Serb”, originated from the Latin „servus” which means servant and Slav is derived from „sclavus” which means „slave”. The Slavs lived in the mountainous territories of the Valda and around the Volga River. They arrived in this territory from Siberia. The Slavs who continuously migrated toward the south reached the Sarmatian plain where they came under the rule of the Scythian, Sarmatian, Jazigian, Alan, Hun, Avar, Varkun, Kazar, Bulgar, Magyar, Pecheneg, Cumanian and Uz peoples, who were all Turanian peoples of the Magyar race.

In AD 630, the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius settled the ancestors of the Serbs into the Balkans as a buffer against the Avars. Csobánczi writes that the Slavs who were settled in the Balkans absorbed many of the autochthonous peoples into their numbers and in this way, the Serbian people was formed. Under the rule of Byzantium, the Balkan Slavs developed the tribal system and elected tribal leaders or *zsupa*. In the ninth century they became Christians and at that time they elected a chief *zsupa* who ruled in the city of Ráska, (now called Novi Pazar in Serbia) and from that name, Ráska, developed the Hungarian word „rác” which is the Hungarian name for „Serb”. (Csobánczi, p. 7-8)

In the ninth and tenth centuries, the Serb people came under the rule of the Bulgarians and in 1018, they were taken back under Byzantine rule. In 1040, Dobró Voisláv, the chief *zsupa* of the Serbs, freed the Serbs from Byzantine rule. After his death, his son, Mihály, received a crown from Pope Gregory VII., who was the adversary of Byzantium. In 1080, at the death of King Mihály, the kingdom fell apart and again the *zsupas* took over the leadership of the Serbs. Some of the *zsupas* accepted the rule of Byzantium but others recognized Hungary as their sovereign. The former title of „king” went into oblivion. (Csobánczi, p. 8)

The Hungarian-Serb connections began with King Béla II., of Hungary (Béla the Blind), (1131-1141) who married Ilona, the daughter of Uros, the chief *zsupa* of the Serbs who were under Byzantine rule. Csudomil, the son of Uros and uncle of King Géza II. (1141-1162) asked his nephew to help him free the Serbs from Byzantine rule. At that time, on the throne of Byzantium was the last highly intelligent and, in peace time, very cunning Emperor Manuel Comnen, whose mother was Piroska, the daughter of King László of Hungary. The Emperor claimed a right to the Hungarian throne. His goal was to conquer Hungary so the Hungarian involvement was very useful to his goal. When the

Hungarians sent help to the Serb leader, Csudomil, Emperor Manuel defeated the combined army and made the Serbs accept him as their feudal lord. While King Géza II. was fighting in Russian territory, Manuel, with a swift attack, captured the Hungarian castle of Zimonyvár, in southern Hungary, and destroyed and devastated Transdanubia. Géza II. came back at once but Manuel did not wait for him and moved out of the country. Géza II. took his revenge by breaking into Byzantium and devastating the border territory. Manuel was forced to beg his relative for peace. After the death of Géza II., in 1162, in the reign of his son, the twelve year-old King István III. (1162-1172), Manuel attacked again and captured Nándorfehérvár (now Belgrade), Zimony and Szerémség. In the following year, King István III. recaptured them all.

Emperor Manuel instigated the German Emperor, the Venetians and the Russian princes to organize a joint campaign against Hungary, while he also attacked with a separate large army. After two years of alternating successes, István III. was forced to give up Dalmatia in 1163. After the death of Manuel, King Béla III. (1172-1196), took back these Hungarian territories from Byzantium. The Serbs were fighting sometimes on the Hungarian side and sometimes on the Byzantine side. King Imre, (1196-1204), freed the Serbs from Byzantium and crowned himself King of the Serbs. King Béla IV. (1235-1270), in the territories south of the Danube, established a new *bánság* (territory), with the name Macsó, next to with the already existing Só and Ozora *bánságs* as a defense line against Byzantium and the Bulgarians.

King István V. (1270-1272) attacked the Bulgarians who were wandering on the borderlines of Hungary, occupied the territory of Bodony and made it a Hungarian *bánság*. In the reign of Béla IV., the chief *zsupa*, Uros (1243-1277), wanted to obtain for himself the *bánság* of Macsó but Béla IV., in 1268, destroyed the Serb army and captured Uros. While he was a prisoner-of-war, Uros became a Hungarian sympathizer and he arranged for his eldest son, Dragutin, to marry Katalin, the daughter of the Hungarian King István V. King István V. appointed Dragutin to be the governor of the territories of Macsó and Szerém.

After the death of Endre III. in 1301, the Árpád Dynasty died out and after a long dispute Charles Robert, the son of Charles of Anjou, the King of Sicily, became King of Hungary, (1308-1342) because he was

the husband of Maria, the daughter of Béla IV. In 1319, Milutin, Dragutin's younger brother, took away the *bánság* of Macsó from Hungarian rule but Charles Robert recaptured it and deported the entire family of Dragutin from the ancient Hungarian land. After the death of Charles Robert in 1342, his son, Lajos the Great, inherited the Hungarian throne. At that time the country of Hungary reached its zenith. The territory stretched to three seas, the Black Sea, the Adriatic and the Baltic. Hungary's rule over the Balkans was firm. Inside each *bánság*, there was peace and abundance. There was not even a trace of Serbian power. Serbia, which was located in the territory of Ráska (Novi Pazar), was outside the Hungarian border and the *bánságs* which were located between Bosnia and Byzantium were Hungarian feudal states until this territory became occupied by the Turks in 1364.

Around AD 1000, 50,000 families had migrated from Central Asia, from the territory of the Uighur Empire. There were among them Uighurs, Ugors, White Huns and Arabs. They received their name from their leader, Selyuk and became known as Selyuk Turks. Over the course of three centuries, this group of people became a formidable force, conquering Drinapolis and endangering Bulgaria. Szizsman, the Prince of Bulgaria made to an alliance with the Selyuk Turks and with an army of 80,000 the Turkish-Bulgarian army attacked Hungary. Lajos the Great defeated them and reinforced the *bánság* of Bodony, appointing Dénes Apor as *bán* (governor). From 1363, for three hundred years, Hungary became a battleground. Famine, misery and the plague swept through the country. The Turks became stronger and stronger and Sultan Bajazid even attacked the *bánság* of Macsó. This was the time when the Serb people, fleeing from the Turks, began a slow infiltration into the ancient Hungarian territory.

In 1392, Zsigmond of Luxemburg, the King of Hungary, who later became Holy Roman Emperor, was forced to chase the raiding Turkish armies from the border of Hungary. The Turks attacked again in 1395 and therefore Zsigmond gathered an army of 60,000, in which there were French, German and Hungarian regiments. He lost a battle at Nikapolis against Sultan Bajazid who had an army of 200,000. In 1419, he took back from the Turks the territory of Serbia. In 1421, Sultan Murad and King Zsigmond made a 5-year peace treaty but this did not help. The Turks continued their raids which caused the Serbs to flee to the north into Hungarian territory.

Lazarevics, the *chief vajda* of Serbia, fled to Hungary with his grandson, György Brankovics and a large number of Serb leaders. The lifelong dream of the old Lazarevics was to arrange for his grandson to become a leader, therefore he made an agreement with King Zsigmond and the Hungarian leaders by which Brankovics was declared to be a member of the higher Hungarian nobility and a member of the Hungarian Council of State. In Serbia he would become a vassal of Hungary and would inherit the title of Prince, which would be hereditary. In order to obtain these honors he accepted the responsibility of helping Hungary to fight the Turks. Then Brankovics made an oath that with his entire army he would support Hungary in any war. In 1428, Zsigmond tried to recapture a Hungarian castle from the Turks but he could not do that because Sultan Murad was too strong. At that time, Brankovics broke his vow, going over to the Turkish side and giving his daughter in marriage to Sultan Murad. He also accepted the payment of a yearly tribute to the Turks. In 1438, Murad attacked again but failed to take the castle of Szeben, so he just devastated Transylvania and left a message for Brankovics that he was to give the strong castle of Szendrő to him and the Turks and that he was to go immediately to Drinapolis. Brankovics was afraid and, leaving the castle under the protection of his older son, he went at once to Buda with his younger son to ask for help. Albert Hapsburg, the Hungarian king, was recruiting an army but before he could gather enough soldiers, the Sultan captured the Castle of Szendrő, and imprisoned the young György Brankovics and blinded him. King Albert could not wait any longer so he attacked the Turks with 24,000 men. Dysentery broke out in the camp and the weakened Hungarian army ran from the Turks. The King died on his way back to Buda. Finally a newly recruited Hungarian army defeated the Turks.

In 1442, a new Hungarian hero came on the scene - János Hunyadi. He originated from a family of the lower nobility. His father, Vajk Hunyadi, was a soldier of the King. His mother, Erzsébet Mozsina, was also a member of the lower nobility. Because of his heroic deeds, King Albert made János Hunyadi *bán* of the County of Szörény. His first task was to recapture the Castle of Szendrő from the Turks which he did successfully. He married Erzsébet Szilágyi and received the title of Chief Advisor to the King. He became the head bailiff of the County of Temes. In 1444, with an army of 15,000, he defeated the Turkish Sultan Murad, who had 70,000 men. He recaptured

Nándorfehérvár (Belgrade) from the Turks and chased the Turks to Bulgaria. After this defeat, the Sultan gave back Havasalföld to Hungary. János Hunyadi became captain of Nándorfehérvár and *vajda* of Transylvania. In a short time he became the country's richest aristocrat. He possessed 4 million cadastral holds (about 6 million acres). He used the enormous income which came from the land to prepare for war against the Turks. In 1446, the Hungarian aristocracy named him Regent for the young King László V. Two hundred years later, Ferenc Rákóczi II. Used his own personal fortune to fight the Hapsburgs.

In 1453, the Turks occupied Byzantium and Hungary's situation became more serious. In the fifteenth century, under the rule of Mátyás Hunyadi, Hungary again became as great as she was under Lajos the Great but after the death of King Mátyás, in 1490, the Serbs entered the country in large numbers. The Serbs had settled initially in the city of Keve in 1404 but the majority of the refugees could not be kept on the border of Hungary. They sought refuge in Hungary, where they would be protected from the Turks who were trying to conquer the world. The fall of Hungary would have also meant the fall of the Serbs and the victory of Hungary meant their survival.

After the death of Mátyás Hunyadi, the country began a rapid decline. It was more than possible that he was poisoned. After a feast which took place when he conquered Vienna, he died unexpectedly. In 1526, with the loss of the Battle of Mohács and with the Turkish campaigns of 1529, 1541 and 1582, the decline of Hungary continued. During these campaigns the Turks took 100,000 Hungarians into slavery. The Turkish success was aided by consecutive seizures of border-castles such as Temes, Szerém, Pozsega and Valkó. Without the protection of these castles the populace of these territories was at the mercy of the Turks. This was the reason for the slow extinction of the Hungarian people on their own land. After their victory at Mohács, in 1526, the Turks were able to launch their campaigns from these Hungarian castles. The rich southern Hungarian territories became depopulated. At this time Hungary was divided into three parts. One was the territory under Turkish rule, the second was the territory of the border-castles and the third was Transylvania which, after Mohács, became the last Hungarian stronghold.

During the time of the Turkish occupation of the central part of Hungary, a line of border castles was built from the River Dráva to the Upper Tisza River to prevent the Turks from progressing further to the West. In this territory the war against the Turks continued for centuries and the best of the Hungarian fighters died in defense of their country. The lower nobility and the peasants who had lost their land under the Turkish occupation were among those who fought and died. During these years (1526-1686), the ethnic composition of the Hungarian people went through a major change because the ethnic minorities, living in the mountain territories, far from the war zone, and exempt from enlistment in the army, were able to multiply and because they did not live in villages and cities, the Hungarian laws could not be enforced in their scattered settlements. In addition, the Hapsburgs resettled foreigners in the Hungarian territories. In Transylvania, the situation was similar. The populace of Transylvania was devastated by the Tartars, the Turks and by the Germans (Hapsburgs) and later on by the Wallachians. The Szeklers and the Hungarians suffered the greatest losses of men, in the 16th and 17th centuries under Zsigmond Báthory, Mihály Vajda, and György Basta. During this time period, the Transylvanian Saxons were more easily able to survive because they lived in fortified cities.

It was not the goal of the Hapsburgs to improve the situation in the territories which were freed from the Turks. They were rather looking for another way to subdue the Hungarians. At this time the people were forced to hide in the forests and the marshes to escape the mercenaries of the Emperor or to chose the lesser of two evils and escape to the side of the Turks. The strong feeling of dissatisfaction among the refugees, who called themselves the „bujdosók”, caused a rebellion (1678-1686), led by Count Imre Thököly of Szepes County and another by Ferenc Rákóczi II, Prince of Transylvania (1676-1735), the son of Ilona Zrinyi and the stepson of Imre Thököly, which lasted from 1703 to 1711. The huge infiltration of Serbs into the country caused more problems for Hungary than the settlement of Germans in the country. On April 6 1690, Emperor Leopold requested the peoples of the Balkans to give military aid to the army of the Empire and in return he would give them exemption from taxation and the right to elect their own *vajdas* (leaders). If they succeeded in their struggle against the Turks, he would grant them any of their desires. But, in spite of his

promises, the war in the Balkans was unsuccessful in holding back the Turks. The Serb patriarch of Ipek, Arzén III, who was on the side of Emperor Leopold, was forced to flee from the revenging Turks, with 37,000 - 47,000 Serb families, to the territory which the Hapsburgs named the *bánság* of Temes, which is between the Danube, the Tisza and the Maros rivers.⁷⁵

On August 21, 1690, Emperor Leopold gave a document to the Serbs, which gave them the protection of the Emperor's army, allowed them to practise the Greek Orthodox religion and use the calendar of the Greek Orthodox Church. He also allowed them to use their language, relieved them from paying the tithe and exempted them from military service. On December 11, 1690, he informed the Hungarian authorities that as soon as the territory of the Serbs was freed from the Turks, these Serb refugees would return to their own land. We can see that these privileges were given only to the Serbs who came in with Patriarch Arzén, and that they were expected to return to their own land. However, conditions in Hungary were safer for these half-nomad Serbs and they enjoyed the higher cultural level of the people in these southern Hungarian territories, so they decided to remain even after their country was finally freed from the Turks.

During the freedom fight of Ferenc Rákóczi II., (1703-1711) these Serb settlers, as a partisan army, on the side of the Hapsburgs, devastated the Hungarian Plain and Transdanubia. The privileges which they received from Emperor Leopold placed them above the laws.

The ancient Hungarian counties of Bács, Bodrog, Csongrád, Csanád, Arad, Torontál and Krassó-Szörény, which the Hapsburgs called the Temes *bánság*, had been freed from the Turks by the Peace Treaty of Passarovic in 1718, but King Charles III. without regard to the Constitution, instead of giving this territory back to Hungary, filled it with Serbs. This territory was placed under martial law, under Austrian administration, and was divided into military sectors. (Csobánczi, p.22)

Between 1737 and 1739, the Serbian Patriarch, Arzen IV., arrived in this territory with large numbers of Serbs. Soon after this, more Serbs, fleeing from the Turks, flooded this area. In 1790, the Serbs came forward with the demand that they officially be given a territory

⁷⁵ Ibid. p. 22; The New Universal Encyclopedia, edited by Sir John Hammerton, The Educational Book Co. London, Vol. 9, p. 7451.

from the Hungarian land as their own. Leopold II. (1790-1792), agreed to grant their demand. This was the first very serious omen for the Hungarians that these settlers would pose a threat to the existence of Hungary.

The Hungarian National Assembly in 1790 clearly emphasized the Hungarian people's opinion about this subject in the following declaration: „A people which is looking for a place in which to settle, who comes into any country or territory without weapons, can expect to receive fewer rights than the inhabitants of that country or, at most, as many rights as those inhabitants. Such immigrants could never be accepted into the country or territory with the expectation that they will establish a separate state within that country because that would result in the territory in which they settled eventually breaking away from the motherland. That would be the establishment of a new state.”

Any nation in the world which has stability and unity cannot allow this to happen because that would result in placing the life of that nation in extreme danger. (Csobánczi, p. 23.)

„The Hungarian law of 1791, Article 21, denied the Serbs the right to form an independent state in the land of Hungary which would have offended the rights of the Hungarian State. This law declared that the former law was invalid but retained for Serbs the same rights as the Hungarian citizens. They received the right to own animals, possess land, and accept any kind of administrative position. The concept of the Hungarian political law was based on a national view yet **it was first in the world to recognize the equal rights of all citizens within the state no matter their ethnic origin.**” (Czobánczi, p. 23)

Along the important trade route of the River Danube, the Serbs settled as far as the city of Győr and became rich by imposing high taxes, renting out pasture land and operating ferries from one side of the Danube to the other. On this ancient Hungarian land, the Slavs attained a much higher standard of living than the Slavs who lived outside the country.

The liberation of Buda in 1686, after 146 years of Turkish occupation, was another turning point in the life of the Hungarians. This date should mark the happiest event of the century but it doesn't. What happened after the liberation of Buda? In large numbers, foreigners settled onto the ancient Hungarian land. The Hapsburgs would not allow the Hungarians to resettle onto the land abandoned by the Turks in

southern Hungary because they thought that the Germans already settled there would lose their homes and land. The Hapsburgs openly demonstrated their anti-Hungarian feelings in their administration of laws. The settlement of foreigners on the Hungarian land was a planned genocide.

The Hungarian aristocrats, who were to a great extent foreigners – Germans, Austrians, Czechs and Slovaks – had broken away from the Hungarian life. The Hungarian born-aristocrats spoke the German language and were under the influence of Vienna. Some were more Austrian than Hungarian.

Maria Theresa's hidden anti-Hungarian feeling surfaced in 1774, when she announced her desire to have the Hungarian youngsters learn the German language. Her son, Joseph II., in 1784, made this desire into law, making German the official language of Hungary. This law provoked a strong reaction from the Hungarian people. Hungarian poets like Bálint Balassi (1554-1594), Miklós Zrínyi (1620-1664) and Sebestyén Tinodi (1505-1556), gave the people a renewed national feeling. Therefore the Hungarian language was reinstated as the official language. (Csobánczi, p. 20)

Without consulting the Hungarian aristocracy, Maria Theresa gave the counties of Szerém, Pozsega and Valko to Croatia. This territory was originally the home of the Magyar tribe which was led by Botond.

Emperor Leopold II., who was also King of Hungary (1790-1792), always used the Serb people to maintain the balance between Austria and Hungary. He was able to do this by constantly stirring up the anti-Hungarian feelings among the Serbs. This attitude was adopted by the Greek Orthodox priests who were Russian sympathizers because they hoped to break the Turkish power with the help of Russia and unify all the Serb people into one Slav empire.

Neither the enlightened Hungarian writers nor the clergy took into account the ever-increasing danger from the Serbs. On the contrary, with Hungarian money, they established elementary schools, high schools and seminaries for the Serbs. In 1797, in Károlyváros, in 1810, in Ujvidék and a few years later in Pest and Vienna, the Serb youths were able to attend the universities. In 1826, in Pest, a society formed to research the Serb language and national customs. At this time the myth of the antiquity of the Serbs was developed. With the help of the myths,

folk poetry and prose writing, the national feelings of the Serbs were aroused but, in a short time, the Serbs realized that all their efforts were without foundation because this was just a dream and nothing more. Safarzsik, one of the creators of the Serb myth, sent this letter to Palaczky, a Czech historian in 1870: „Everything is not lost. . . This is just a dream, only an idea . . .so if we all die, just as our forefathers did, without having accomplished anything, then we die for our dreams . . . but our fear is without foundation because the Slav people will be awakened. . . the new generation will bring a renewed power everywhere, and everything which was dead will begin to move. An end to sleep! Life must follow! But how this will happen, who can foretell?” (Csobánczi, p. 25)

In 1844, the Serbs worked out a plan to unify all the Serbs and the clergy did everything they could to reach that goal. Vuk Karadzsk (1787-1864) was the first Serb advocator of the Serb intellectual upheaval. He created the Serb grammar which he had translated into German. In 1847, Kopitár had the New Testament published in the Serb language. Karadzsk and Kopitár chose the Serb dialect of Hercegovina to be the literary language of the Serbs.

Rajics, the Patriarch of the Orthodox Church, wrote the history of the different Slav peoples which he published in the Old Slavic language. He declared that all those territories, in which the Serbs lived under the leadership of the Patriarch of Ipek, to be Serb territories. With this work, he fabricated a totally false historic and geographic document which became a source of information for later historians .

The idea of Serbian nationalism started out in two places at the same time, Pest and Vienna. One group wanted to maintain the existing Serb-Hungarian connection. The other emphasized the anti-Hungarian attitude. The latter sent a proclamation to the rebelling Croat, Slovene, Dalmatian and Slovak peoples to incite the anti-Hungarian feelings. When the Hungarian Revolution broke out against the Austrian oppression in 1848, the Serbs sent 10,000 to 12,000 armed soldiers against the Hungarians. Many of the leaders of these soldiers were Austrian officers and a large number of Austrian soldiers joined them in fighting the Hungarians. This anti-Hungarian Slavic revolt was so strong that the Hungarian army could not defeat them until 1849. Until this could be accomplished, they burned Hungarian villages and robbed the Hungarian people who had given them a home.

The first Serb freedom movement took place in 1804 against the Turks. György Kara led the revolt which the Turks subdued. 38 of the revolutionaries were impaled and 114 were hanged. The second uprising against the Turks came a few years later, led by a pig merchant named Milos who was defeated and became a vassal of the Sultan with the title of prince. In 1817, Milos ordered the execution of György Kara.

On July 8, 1876, Franz-Joseph I., Emperor of Austria and Czar Alexander of Russia, in Reichstadt, signed a treaty to jointly secure the independence of Serbia from the Turks. On June 13, 1878, at the Berlin Conference, arranged by Bismarck, the Chancellor of Germany, the fate of Europe was decided. The Turkish-Russian War and the dissolution of the Turkish Empire were discussed. At this conference, Serbia was granted full independence. King Imre I. of Hungary (1196-1204) had freed the Serbs from Byzantium and had crowned himself King of Serbia. This title had belonged to the Hungarian kings from that time on. Until the Turkish occupation of Hungary, the Serbs had lived under Hungarian protection as vassals of the king.

Peter Karagyorgyevic (1903 to 1921) and the Serb intelligentsia blindly followed the activities of the underground movement and became very instrumental in furthering the ideal of the establishment of Great Serbia. In 1908 the Narodna Obrana movement was founded which organized a group, which became known as „the Black Hand”, with the slogan „Ujedinjenje Ili Smrt” or „Unity or Death”. Serbia, at that time, came under the influence of Russian and French politics.

On June 29, 1914, the Black Hand (Narodna Obrana) ordered the assassination of Archduke Franz-Ferdinand, the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne, and his wife. The reason for their death was that the Serbs were worried that when Franz-Ferdinand inherited the throne, the dual-monarchy would become a triple-monarchy. According to Franz-Ferdinand’s plan for the triple-monarchy, the countries of Krajna, Croatia, Slovenia, Dalmatia, Bosnia, Hercegovina and Hungary would all have the same rights as Austria. If this were to come true, the Serbs would have to abandon their fantasy of a Great Slav State. Franz Ferdinand hated the Hungarians. He took part in a conspiracy to kill the

pro-Hungarian Rudolf, the original heir to the throne and he took his place. He planned to rely on the Serbs to build his empire's power, yet it was his favored Serbs who killed him and his wife, and not the Hungarians who perhaps would have had reason to do so. (Csobánczi, p. 33-34)

Chapter 9

Settlement Names in Austria and Hungary

With the analysis of the historical settlement and geographical names, I intend to study the time before King István I., the so-called „pagan era”, when the settlement names in the territory of present day Austria and the present-day Czech Republic were those of the tribal leaders. The information I present is taken from the work of Sándor Török: Településtörténeti tanulmányok és határproblémák a Kárpátmedencében.

The names Unger and Uhersky refer to the guards of the Hungarian borderlands and the guards of these territories which are today in Austria and the Czech Republic. These names could only have come into being when these territories were in the possession of the Huns, Avars and Magyars. The discovery of these names deep into Austrian or Czech territory indicates that the Hungarians were the defenders of these territories. Countless such names can be found in Hungarian territory. Innumerable geographical names can be found which go back to the time of the original Hungarian populace who gave the geographical names to these territories.

Sándor Török collected 1050 Hungarian settlement names from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy's national survey of 1893, from 46 map segments and from the Austrian and Hungarian gazetteer. The analysis of these names demonstrated that most of the tribal settlement names which remained were connected with the Megyer and Nyék tribes. But how was it possible that on certain territories many names of similar origin remained? Sándor Török answers this by stating that originally the name of the whole large territory was the name of the tribe, for example MEGYER. When that people began to move from one valley to the next, in naming the newly settled territory, they added a descriptive word to their name; for example: Vadasmegyer meaning

„Megyer of the hunt”, Kismegyer „Little Megyer”, Nagymegyer „Large Megyer”.⁷⁶

The Keszi and Kürtgyarmat tribes settled in an area shaped like a scythe which extended into Moravia and the Viennese Basin and even into East Styria. Other settlements named after a Magyar tribal leader, such as „Tattendorf”, named after the tribal leader, Tétény, and „Urscha”, named after the tribal leader, Örs, indicate the presence of Magyars in this territory. Before going into an explanation of these settlements, I have to mention that I support the theory that the people of the Körös Culture (6000 B.C.) populated the Carpathian Basin and had a great influence on this territory.⁷⁷ The Carpathian Basin was the ancient homeland of the Magyars. The Hungarian speaking ancient populace, whom the Romans called Pannons, lived there long before the Roman invasions and the Huns took this territory back from the Romans. The borders of the Hun Empire stretched from the Ural mountains to the River Enns. After the defeat of the Huns by the Goths, in A.D. 453, the Avar-Hun-Magyar speaking people reclaimed this territory and reestablished the borders on the River Enns and the Ural mountains.

The Avars were defeated by Charlemagne after eight years of war and their power was diminished. The Homecoming Magyars of A.D. 896 reestablished the former Western border at the River Enns. From these facts we can see that the territory of Austria for many centuries was part of the territory which belonged to the Hungarian speaking peoples. Sándor Török, in his book about the history of the settlements in the Carpathian Basin, gives more detailed information to support this brief synopsis of the history of the area.

In A.D. 898, a Magyar attack against the West started out from the southern part of Hungary, not from Transdanubia (Pannonia) which would have been closer. In A.D. 900 an attack against Bavaria started out from the confluence of the River Enns and the River Danube. Sándor Török says that this seems to prove that the Magyar reclamation⁷⁸ of Transdanubia took place at the same time as their reclamation of Lower Austria and Styria.

⁷⁶ Török, p.1-17

⁷⁷ Botos, László: The Homeland Reclaimed

⁷⁸ The word „reclamation” is used instead of „conquest” because this land was originally inhabited by a Hungarian speaking people and the Magyars returned to the Carpathian

The campaigns of 909, 911, 913 and 943 indicate that the Magyar borderline was not strictly at the River Enns but actually extended through the marchland to the River Inn. We can base this conclusion on the fact that the Magyars had to have the marchland⁷⁹ which their troops could cross easily and where they could obtain the military equipment for their campaigns toward the Rhine and the Baltic Sea. To the west of this marchland, the Bavarians built fortresses to defend their territory on the other side of the River Inn. We can state that the territory south of the Danube to the Enns was a Hungarian possession and the territory between the Enns and the Inn was Hungarian marchland where there were also Bavarian settlements. (Török, p.19-20) In this territory the Magyars built observation posts on the River Inn and settlements for the border guards and their families.

We have no written documents about the Hungarian presence on this territory which is now Austria and the Czech Republic, therefore to prove this I shall quote from a detailed analysis of the settlement names which Sándor Török presents in his book. The German names with prefixes „Unger-“, „Öd-“, „Wart-“ „Wache-“ all refer to the observation posts of the Magyars in the marchlands. W. Steinhauser, a German historian, says that the large number of settlements in the marchlands with the name „Ungerdorf“ indicates that these were originally settlements inhabited by Hungarians.⁸⁰ Other German historians, such as Fritz Posch, Max Vancsa and Mark Pittner, when researching the history of settlement names, have come to the same conclusion. An historical Atlas, used in the Austrian schools, contains a map of Europe in the tenth century on which the area of Lower Austria is labelled Hungarian for the period between 907 and 955.⁸¹ This territory was taken over by Austria in A.D. 976 and the territory between the Fischer and Lajta was declared to be German around 1020. At the same time, Mark Pittner declares this territory to be Hungarian in 1042. If there were still Hungarian residents in the town of Ungerdorf in the eleventh and twelfth

Basin in A.D. 896 to „reclaim“ a territory which was originally theirs, not to „conquer“ another nation.

⁷⁹ march or marchland: an uninhabited frontier or borderland.

⁸⁰ Török, p. 21; Steinhauser, W.: Zur Herkunft und Bedeutung der N.Ö. Orts und Flurnamen

⁸¹ Török, p. 21; Putzger, Lendl, Wagner: Historischer Weltatlas, Vienna, 1965, p.47

centuries, then it stands to reason that there must have been a Hungarian populace there in the tenth century. (Török, p. 22)

In his book, Die Bedeutung der Ortsnamen in Niederdonau, 1941, Heinrich Weigl writes that the prefix „Öd-“ or „Oed-“ indicated settlements and whole villages which had been abandoned and remained without populace for a long time. When they were resettled, the new name was preceded by this prefix eg. Ödengürtel. However, he does not mention why these villages were depopulated in the first place. These names can be found on the territories which between A.D. 900 and 1040 were the western marchlands for the Magyars. This shows that there was a systematic destruction of these settlements by the Germans.

The territories of Southwest Austria, Upper Austria, Salzburg and Wachau were the territories of the marchlands where the settlements beginning with the prefix „Öd-“ were located. There were 196 settlements altogether, 18 around Salzburg, 92 in Upper Austria, 66 in Lower Austria, 14 in Styria, 5 in Tyrol, and 1 in Vorarlberg.

Because the settlement names beginning with „Öd-“ can be found on the borderline and in the marchlands and, the many settlements east of them, which begin with „Wart-“, „Wache-“ and „Schützen-“, were closer to Hungary, we can surely state that these were Hungarian settlements whose purpose was to guard and watch over the marchlands. In East Styria we find the names: Warthen and Wartberg and in Austria, Warschen, Waschen, Waxen and Urscha. In Hungary, the same types of settlements are called Ör, Lövö, Varsány, Tarkány, and Örs.

The names with the affix „Lee-“ such as Leebarn, Langenleebarn and Breitenlee can be found in Lower Austria. Weigl found 55 of them north of the Danube. He suspected that they were mound burials from the Hallstatt era or mounds marking the borderline. Sándor Török disputes this and suggests that these are a Turkish mode of horse-burials, not at all characteristic of the Celtic (Hallstatt) burial customs. In addition, he mentions that they are located in the territory where the Hungarians were living for 150 years. Weigl also mentions that „Langenlewer“ is derived from „Leuower“ which was the German form of the Hungarian „Lövér“ meaning „marksman“.

In Lower and Upper Austria and in Styria, Weigl found 39 names beginning with „Hain-“ such as Haindorf, Hain bei Melk. He suggests that the name „Hain“ is the equivalent of „Hun“. Dr. Gyula László supports this suggestion in his book: A kettős honfoglalás where

he proves that the Magyars entered the Carpathian Basin before the Homecoming of A.D. 896. He says that they first came in AD 560 with the Avars and again in AD 670. The name „Hain” indicates the Hun, Avar, Magyar continuity. The Huns, Avars and Magyars were related and contemporary historians used these names interchangeably.

Sándor Török says that, just as the Hungarian „Lövér” became „Lewer” in German, so the names of the tribes changed from Hungarian to German – Megyer became Mayer, Keszik became Kessel, Sopron-Nyék became Neckenmarkt and Kűszény became Gűssing. In Upper Austria we can find the distortion of the name of the Nyék tribe in Neckreith, and in Lower Austria, the distortion of the name of the Keszi tribe in Gűsing (Kűszény). The Kér tribe became Kehr whose meaning is „guard”. Nine examples of this name can be found in the former Hungarian territories.

North of Neukirchen, the following names can be found in a line, 1-2 kilometers apart: Oed, Hohenwart, Waxeneck, Oed, Oed, Ungerberg, Ungerbach, Oed, Oed, Ödendorf, Dornau. Nearby can be found a mountain named Auf der Kehr and a stream called Kehrbach. According to Weigl, Kehrbach was the name of a man-made channel from the Middle Ages, and he found four of them. The fact that the mountain was named Auf der Kehr indicates that this was a border guard's territory, since the guard had to patrol the land, hence the name Kehr. All these names reference guards, lookouts or watchmen.

We can see that present-day Austrian place-names which can be identified with Magyar tribal names are located in the former Hungarian border territories. We are certain that Neckreith and Neckenmark originated from the name of the Nyék tribe. In the same way we can derive the name Totendorf from the Magyar Tétény. Again in Austria there is one more name of a Hungarian tribal leader, Örsöd. This can be found three times as Urscha and three times as Urschendorf. Urscha can also be derived from Ursu and Urschendorf from the village name Örsfalva. All these six places are located in the former Hungarian territories.

In Moravia, instead of Unger, we find Uhersky or Uhritz. There seven such names. In the same territory can be found a settlement called Bisenz, which is Besenyő in Hungarian (Pecheneg). The name Sallasch is a distortion of the Hungarian Szállás. The city of Brünn comes from the Hungarian Berény. The Pechenegs moved into Hungary in the time

of Kagan Taksony (947-970)⁸² We can see that the Hungarians were settled deep in Moravia and the territory of present Austria.

The Szeklers are the only Hungarian ethnic group which continued to exist as an ethnic unit in the Christianized Hungarian Kingdom. It is important to note that the Szeklers and their customs were mentioned in the Hungarian Chronicles well before the Magyar Homecoming. They were known in the time of the Huns. Sándor Török says that the Hungarian Chronicles do not mention much about the Avars but rather speak of their forefathers, the Huns, even in the territory of present Austria, and he states that the Szeklers are the descendants of the Huns. The Szeklers performed the same role that the Kabars played as border guards. György Györffy states that the Szeklers developed from the Avars and Kabars living in the territory of present Austria. (Török, p. 52)

According to the research in Sándor Török's book, the Szekler tribal names can be found together with the Kabar names in the northern and eastern Kabar observation posts. We see for example in Austria such Szekler settlement names which can not be found today in Transylvania: Székelyfalu, Székelyhid, Felsőszékely.

Szekler settlement names in the County of Bihar in Transylvania can all be found in the marchlands near Délfalu and Nagyenyed. The Szeklers who lived around Pozsony (now Bratislava, Slovakia)) were moved into Transylvania to defend the Gyergyó Pass. The reason for this Szekler transfer was probably to prevent the Moldavians, who had just obtained their independence (1359-1365), from migrating into Transylvania. The linguistic similarities between the dialects of the region of Pozsony, which is close to Austria and Kassa, which is close to Transylvania, witness this transfer of Szeklers. (Török, p. 42)

The presence of Szeklers in Transylvania in the eleventh century, in the counties of Marosszék and Hunyad is mentioned by István Kniezsa in his book Magyarország népei 11. században.

György Györffy's statement that the Magyars of the tenth century spent the winters in the valleys of the rivers and the summers with the herds of horses and cattle in the grazing lands of the Carpathians gives us a new perspective.⁸³ The geographical names in

⁸² Török, p. 26; Györffy, György: Honfoglalás, p. 222

⁸³ Török, p. 43; Györffy, György: A honfoglaló magyarok települési rendjéről, Budapest, 1970

the Carpathian Basin which are written in a Slavic language or in Hungarian all signify the winter and summer quarters of the tenth century Magyars. On the banks of the River Olt, geographical names can be found which represent the summer quarters of the voivode or viceroy of King István. Gyulafehérvár (presently Alba Iulia in Rumania) and Küküllővár (presently Cetatea de Balta in Rumania) were his winter quarters. It is Sándor Török's conclusion that in the summer quarters there must have been a continuous settlement otherwise the people would not have remembered the name of the tribal leader, „Gyula”. The permanent settlements were surrounded by a circle of land which later on became populated. The settlement of Háromszék on the River Olt was established in 1045. The Szeklers at the River Sebes were living in the county of Hunyad. This is especially interesting because the Rumanians claim that Hunyad is their own ancient homeland.

When we examine the tribal settlement names from the time before Christianity, we observe that these names are definitely from the tenth century or the time of the Árpád dynasty. We can find the names of all the tribal leaders except Géza.

I shall now present the names of the Magyar tribes and their origins.

1. NYÉK. This is supposedly the only Finno-Ugric tribal name and it means hedge. It has no meaning in Hungarian.
2. MEGYER. The Magyar tribal union of ten tribes received its name from this tribe. Many local place names can be found with varieties of this name - Mogyer, Mogyar. In the county of Pozsony, the settlement called Nagy-Magyar is another example. There were Magyar settlements around the city of Pozsony already in the tribal era.
3. KÜRTGYARMAT. Constantine Porphyrogenitus calls one tribe Kürtgyarmat but we never find the name Kürtgyarmat as a settlement name. We find Kürt and Gyarmat but never the two together. The settlements named Kürt in Hungary show a 72% frequency of occurrence and Gyarmat a 61% frequency. We can conclude that the two tribes had one leader. According to Sándor Török, Huba and Lehel were the leaders of the combined tribe - Kürtgyarmat. Lehel became known as „Kürtös” – „the bugler”. Gyula László expressed doubt that the leader of an army division of ten thousand men would be the bugler for his division. He suggests that Lehel received this name as the leader of the Kürt tribe, rather than as the bugle player. We can find many such

place names and researchers believe that Kürt received its name from the Hungarian word for trumpet - „kürt”. Sándor Török disagrees with this theory. The Kürtös creek in the county of Nográd cannot possibly have taken its name from the trumpet or from the military trumpeters but rather from the tribe of Kürtgyarmat which lived in this area.

4. TARJÁN. This tribe's name means „viceroy” in Turkish.

5. JENŐ. In Turkish, this tribe's name means „advisor”.

6. KÉR. This is the most frequently found tribal name. It appears in written documents as early as A.D. 1002. Its Turkish meaning is „giant”.

7. KESZI. This tribe's name means „fragment” in Turkish. The original form of this name was KESZŐ. It appears most often in this form in written documents. (Török, p 45-46.)

We know the family tree of the Árpád dynasty from the writings of Emperor Constantine. Prince Tormás, the grandson of Árpád related it to Constantine. The most recent research has shown that the Hungarian people and the Árpád dynasty had close connections with the Sumerians. The names of Árpád's ancestors can be analyzed only with the aid of the Sumerian language.

Anonymus, in his chronicle Gesta Hungarorum, circa A.D. 1200, which was based on earlier sources, relates the legend of the Dream of Emese and the origin of the name „Álmos”.⁸⁴

The following is a free translation:

„In the year of Our Lord 819, as was mentioned above, Ügek, who was a descendant of the people of King Magog, and was the most noble prince of the Scythians, in Dentumagyaria took in marriage Emese, the daughter of the Prince Eunedubeliani. A son was born to them whose name was Almus. He was named Almus after a divine event. His mother was impregnated by a divine vision which appeared to her in a dream in the form of an eagle.”

⁸⁴ Novotny, Elemér: Szumir nyelv, magyar nyelv, Buenos Aires, 1978, p. 47

„Anno dominice incarnationis DCCCXVIII „Ügek” sicut supra diximus - longo post tempore de genere „Magog” regis - erat quidam nobilissimus dux Scitiae. Qui duxit sebe uxorem „in Dentumoger” filiam Eune du beli anni ducis - nomine „Emesu”. De qua genuit filium, qui agnominatus est: „Almus”. - Sed ab eventu divino est nominatus: Almus, quia matris eius - pregnantis per sompnum apparuit divina visio, in forma asturis que quasi veniens eam gravidavit.”

Let us compare the Hungarian legend to Sumerian history:

A) The name Emese is identical to that of the Sumerian high-priestess EMES. That means that the mother of Álmos was a high-priestess among the Magyars.

B) The Magyar high-priestess Emese, just as the Sumerian high-priestess EMES, was the daughter of a ruler. The father of Emese was Eunedubeliani, whose name in Sumerian, according to Professor Badiny, was ENE-DU-BI-ELI-AN-NI.⁸⁵

C) The Sumerian national god EN-LIL or GAL-MAH, in the form of an eagle, impregnated the high-priestess, EMES. The TURUL bird (eagle) impregnated the Magyar high-priestess, Emese. Therefore the people and the priests had to accept her son, Álmos, as their legitimate ruler of divine origin.

D) The divine origin of the ruler was most important among the Sumerians. According to their religious beliefs, the king always descended from Heaven. Therefore, the divine origin of the king was expressed in his name. The Sumerian form of the name „Álmos” was GAL-MAH-US which means „the son of the most exalted”. US means „son”. GAL-MAH means „most exalted”.⁸⁶

Dr. Novotny says that the formation of the name Álmos went through the following stages: GAL-MAH-US; GAL-MU-US; HAL-MU-US; AL-MU-US; ALMUS; ALMOS.

Álmos is a given name used in Hungary today. HAL-MU-US became HALMOS, a commonly used Hungarian family name. We can see that the name of the first prince of Hungary, Álmos, was a Sumerian name. Some of his ancestors also had Sumerian names. Another explanation of the name of Álmos is that the Turul bird visited his mother in a dream. (Magyar - Álom) Álmos then, means „Child of dream”.

E). ÜGEK - (nobilissimus dux), the father of Álmos, descended from the Scythian clan of Magog. The Sumerian name was UG-EGE which means „the leader or prince of the clan”, (IGI , EGE, EKE, EK)

⁸⁵ Botos, László: The Homeland Reclaimed, p, 170; Badiny-Jós, Ferenc: The Sumerian Wonder, Buenos Aires, 1974, pp. 165-167

⁸⁶ Ibid. p. 171; Novotny Elemér, Op.Cit.p. 48

F). MAGOG in Sumerian was MAH-UG. MAH was also MAG, meaning exalted or sublime. UG or UKU means „son or descendant”. Therefore MAGOG means „the son of the exalted.”

G). Árpád was the son of Álmos. In Sumerian it was UR-POD-E which, with the changes due to vowel harmony, became AR-PAD-E. UR or URU means „shepherd, pastor or priest-king”. In the names of the Sumerian kings, UR, UTU, UTUL often appear with the meaning of „defender or pastor”. PAD or PADA or PADE means „named or chosen”. The name of the Sumerian king A-AN-NI-PAD-DA who was the king of Ur around 2800 B.C. means „chosen lord or ruler”. Dr. Novotny notes that in the dialect of the region of Palóc, in Hungary, Árpád is pronounced „Orpod” or „Orpad” which is closer to the Sumerian UR-PAD or UR-PUD.

In naming a king, the Sumerians placed great importance on including in his name his divine origin. The Finno-Ugric historians however propose that the name of Árpád comes from „árpa” meaning „a grain of barley”. How could this name be given to the leader of a nation, whose father, Álmos, was of divine descent?. They also state that the people of Árpád was a nomadic people. If this were true, they would not have been farmers producing barley and if they had this word in their vocabulary, it would not have been an important word suitable for the name of a leader.⁸⁷

This long explanation was necessary to show that Árpád and his Magyars were not of Finno-Ugric origin, but were related to the Turanian or Sumerian people

Anonymus calls the tribal leader, Ond, „the son of Tas”. Many of the settlement names „Ond” can be found in the territory of the Tisza River, from the northern Carpathians to the southern territories, especially in those places where Ond’s summer settlements were established, where a river cuts through a valley. The Slavs changed this name to „Ondova” or „Ondera”.

Kabar Tribal names:

Among the Turkish-Tartar tribes the use of the number 7 was almost mandatory. Maybe that is the reason that the Hungarian chronicles talk of seven tribes although the Magyar tribal union grew to ten tribes when the three Kabar tribes joined them after the dissolution

⁸⁷ Ibid. p 171

of the Kazar Empire. Constantine Porphyrogenitus names only one KABAR tribe but he starts his list of tribal names with them. (Török, p. 47) The name Kabar in Turkish means „rebellious”. Three Kabar tribes rebelled against the Kazar Empire and joined the Magyars. Probably because of the meaning of the word, this name was not used in the Magyar tribal union, but the name Kazar was found eight times in the form of „Kozar”. Anonymus, the Hungarian chronicle writer from the 12th century, mentions only the KALIZ tribe among the Kabar tribes. This has no meaning in Hungarian. VARSÁNY, another Kabar tribe, according to Györffy, is the name of a mountain chain in the Caucasus.⁸⁸ This name can be found 26 times in Hungary. It can also be found in Austria and Moravia in the territory where the Magyar guards were posted in the marchlands and on the western border of Hungary. In Moravia, Varsány became Wazsan, in Austria Waxen, Waschen, Warschen-Werschen. The fact that the names Waxen or Waschen in most cases are the names of mountains leads us to suppose that these were observation posts of the Magyars and these names remained as mountain names after the settlements disappeared. The names of settlements often underwent a change but the geographical names survived.

TÁRKÁNY was the name of another tribe whose meaning was „gathered regiment”. In Turkish **tirgin** means regiment. (Turkish - **tiril**; Hungarian - **terel**)⁸⁹ This name can be found thirteen times in Hungary and twice in Austria where it is written Takern. The Austrian researchers declare this name to be of unknown origin. Sándor Török offers this linguistic progression: TÁRKAN : TARKEN : TARKERN : TAKERN. These two places were obviously named after the Hungarian settlers. It is also possible that these two villages received their name from the mountain which is located between them TAKERNBERG. If this conclusion is correct this mountain was a Kabar observation post just as was the mountain called Varsány.

The Hungarian King, Samuel Aba (1041-1044), was from the KALIZ tribe which, according to the Hungarian Chronicles, was the only tribe of Choresmian origin. Yet for linguistic and religious reasons many historians disregard this determination. This tribe originated from

⁸⁸ Török, p. 47; Györffy, Op. Cit. p.193.

⁸⁹ Török, p. 49; Pais, Dezső: Az ogur hozzátartozói. A Magyar Nyelv, 1970, Sept.

the territory south east of the Aral Sea, the Chorezm. Their language was not Turkish. The linguists state that it was an Indo-Iranian language. György Györffy stated that the Hungarian name for Vienna, „Bécs”, meant „basin” in the language of the Kaliz tribe and this word was „pécs” in Indo-Iranian. However, Professor Badiny states that the Chorezmians were a Scythian (Turanian) people, related to the Sumerians and they were one of the ethnic groups which made up the Parthian Empire. The majority of the Kaliz tribe were Mohammedans. They were money lenders and salt merchants. In the eleventh century, the Moors who came into Hungary were also money lenders and they were Mohammedans but there was no relationship between the Kaliz and the Moors. Historians found difficulty in distinguishing between the two peoples because the Moors and the Kaliz were both Mohammedans and both were called in Hungarian „böszörmény”. The Arab MUSLIM = MUSULMAN in Persian = MUSULMAN in Caucasian Tartar = BUSURMON in Kirgiz and from this was derived the Hungarian BÖSZÖRMÉNY. There are no Moorish place-names in Hungary. The name BÖSZÖRMÉNY is rare. The name KALIZ appears twenty times. This name first appeared in documents in 1111. (Török, p. 50)

I mentioned earlier that linguists classify the language of the Kaliz as an Indo-Iranian language. Professor Badiny disagrees. He believes that they were related to the Parthians and Chorezmians and that their language was a Turanian language. Who were the Parthians and what language did they speak?

The following quotation is translated from Professor Badiny’s book.

„The history of the Parthians is not yet well known. Historians represent them as a people of unknown origin in spite of the fact that there are enough data to identify their origin. Their empire extended from the Euphrates River to India and for five hundred years Rome was unable to defeat them.”⁹⁰

Professor Badiny made a study of the Parthians in which he quotes Professors Basham, Pijoan, Frye and Ghirshman.

„Professor Basham writes that the Parthians came from the north in about 250 B.C. and occupied Bactria but he does not

⁹⁰ Badiny-Jós, Ferenc: Kaldéától Istergamig, Buenos Aires, 1971, p. 141-153.

mention that the Parthians were part of a huge ethnic unit.⁹¹ In a very short time they were able to establish an empire which extended from the River Euphrates in the West to the Indus River in the east. The southern border was the Persian Gulf and the northern border was a line from the Caucasus Mountains to the Caspian Sea and the Oxus River (the Amu Darya). This empire lasted for five hundred years in spite of constant attacks by the Romans. During that period of time, there was no civil war within the Empire. The Parthians were united in their struggle against the Romans. Another interesting fact is that they introduced entirely new customs and decorative motifs to the people of this territory. José Pijoan describes the arts of the Parthians. He states that the Parthian art cannot be categorized as Hellenistic, as is generally claimed, but was the 'forerunner of the Byzantine style of art'.⁹² This conclusion was drawn from artifacts found in recent excavations in the Choresm which were created by the Sassanidae, one of the many peoples who lived in the Parthian Empire. In addition to the Parthian art objects, there can be found ornaments of many different styles which indicates that the Parthians were a people of an advanced and enlightened culture. Moreover, the theater was already a well-developed art form. We can definitely say that these people were not nomads as is generally believed.

„According to Richard N. Frye, the Parthian custom for the succession of kings was 'unusual and obviously Asian.'⁹³ The crown was inherited by the oldest male of the ruling tribe, who also had to be the fittest, physically and mentally, and not necessarily the son of the deceased ruler. If we combine the observations of Basham, Pijoan and Frye we can conclude that the Parthians came from the north, their art was unique and their custom of royal succession indicates that they were Turanian or Ural-Altaic. Historians say that the term 'Turanian' or 'Ural-Altaic' is just as comprehensive as the term 'Indo-European', so

⁹¹ Badiny, Jós Ferenc: Kaldéától Istergamig, Buenos Aires, 1971; Basham, A.L.: The Wonder that was India, New York, 1959

⁹² Badiny-Jós: Op. Cit. p. 145; quotes Pijoan, José: Istoria General del Arte, Madrid, 1950

⁹³ Badiny-Jós: Op. Cit. p. 145; quotes Frye, R. N. La Herencia de Persia, Madrid, 1965

we are actually no closer to identifying the origins of the Parthians. However, one source, Sebeos, tells us that, in 210 B.C., Arsak, the eldest son of the King of the Ephtalites (White Huns) became king of the Parthians.⁹⁴

„Roman Ghirshman writes in detail about the Parthians but does not identify their origin. ‘This people who originated from one center, in spite of encountering, in this large territory, autochthonous people and differences in climate and terrain, succeeded in developing an elaborate civilization.’”⁹⁵

If we examine more closely the three peoples who made up the Parthian ethnic unit, the Sarmatians, the Sacae and the Kush, we will come to a surprising conclusion: All three are of ‘unknown origin’. At least this is what the Indo-European historians and linguists teach us. How is it possible that a powerful nation which ruled for 500 years and developed such a high level of civilization and culture could be of ‘unknown origin’?

„Elemér Csobánczi suggests that the problem began with the ancient Greek historians who gave to the ancient people of the Caspian Sea territory names in the Greek language which they had fabricated. Thus the ancient Caspian people were named ‘Scutas’ or ‘Scyhae’ (Scythians).⁹⁶ . . . Numerous Greek, Latin, Armenian and Chinese records state that the principle tribe of the Scythians were the Kush (Cush). Calmet, the famous biblical commentator, noted that another frequently mentioned Scythian tribe was the Saga tribe.⁹⁷ This name ‘Saga’ was a Greek name for the Kush tribe. Both names refer to the same people. Calmet says that the same thing happened to the Massageta tribe. The name ‘Massageta’ was of Armenian origin but was distorted by the Greeks. The Armenian meaning of ‘Massageta’ was ‘Great Chus’. According to Armenian writings, ‘Massageta’ was originally written ‘Maschus’ or

⁹⁴ Nagy, Olga: Eredetünk kutatási nézetkülönbségei, Hunnia, No 58, p.13., Sept. 1994

⁹⁵ Badiny-Jós: Op. Cit. p. 146; quotes Ghirshman, Roman: Iran, Partos y Sassanidas, Madrid, 1962

⁹⁶ Csobánczi, Elemér: Ősturánok, Garfield NJ, 1963, p. 62-64

⁹⁷ Ibid. p. 63; Calmet: Commentaires en Genese, Ch. 10

‘Massachut’. They combined two words ‘Mas’ and ‘Chus’ or ‘Chut’. The Armenians used ‘Massachut’. The Greeks pronounced it ‘Massageta’. From the ‘Chus’ came the name Chazar or Kazar. The Arabs called the Caspian Sea ‘Chusar’ which came from the name ‘Chus’ or ‘Kush’. ‘Mare Caspium Arabicus Chusar’.⁹⁸ The ancient historians most often mention these three tribes: Daha, Saca and Massageta.⁹⁹

„The Scythia , Massageta, Saca, Daha and Cush (Kush) names all refer to the same people. Herodotus, Strabo and Eustinius all describe a bloody war between Cyrus, the King of Persia, and Tomyris, the Queen of the Scythians. All three mention different peoples’ names. Herododotus mentions Tomyris as Queen of the Massageta. Strabo calls her the Queen of the Saca and Eustinius calls her the Queen of the Scythia. Among the ancient Scythian peoples, the Parthians have an important historical name. The Parthians were a branch of the ancient Chus tribe, which departed from the main tribe and thus they received their name. The Armenian historians sometimes call them ‘Chus’ (Kush) and sometimes ‘Parthus’. Finally the name ‘Parthus’ (Parthian) remained.”¹⁰⁰

After 500 years of glorious struggle against the Romans, this huge empire, comprising of many ethnic groups, disintegrated. The people were not annihilated as historians advocate but the Parthian Empire ceased to be known under that name. The people migrated and reorganized in the Kazar Empire. After the fall of the Kazar Empire, they returned to the Carpathian Basin as Magyars, organized by Álmos and finally led by Árpád. (In my book The Homeland Reclaimed you can read that, in the Bronze Age, due to over-population and drought, some of the Proto-Magyars migrated from the Carpathian Basin and they settled territories which at that time were not populated or were just sparsely populated. In later eras, when they were in distress, they

⁹⁸ Ibid. P. 63; Calmet: Dissertatio de regionobis decem tribum Israel L. IV.

⁹⁹ Ibid. Curtius: Historiarum, L. VI. „Sogdiana Dahae, Massagetae, Sacae, sui juris sunt.”

¹⁰⁰ Csobánczi: Op cit. p. 64 and Badiny-Jós: Op. Cit., p. 152.

returned to their ancient land under different names. This theory is supported by the research of Etelka Toronyi and John Dayton.¹⁰¹

When Árpád's people appeared in the Carpathian Basin, five contemporary non-Hungarian documents called them Parthian, because their ancient origins were well-known at that time. Considering these facts, I question whether the Choresmian language was really an Indo-Iranian language. It could not have been because the Choresmian culture indicates the Turanian connections. The Choresmian art was the forerunner of the Byzantine style.

Professor Badiny says that the Parthians originated from that Turanian people which the ancient historians called Sarmata, Massageta, Chus, Hun, Scythia and Saca. We now know that these people belonged to the same ethnic unit but were known by different names.¹⁰² They probably spoke the same language but with different dialects. All of the people in this ethnic unit called themselves one name – Choresmian. Choresm is the territory which is located in Inner Asia, in the present Turkmenistan and the Karakum Desert, between the Syr Darya and Amu Darya rivers. Tolsztov, the Russian archeologist made some very successful excavations in this territory. He uncovered twenty Sumerian ideograms. This is important because it proves the Sumerian-Choresmian-Magyar connections. Let us not forget that Strabo identified the Choresmian people with the Parthians. „Ex massagetarum et sacarum gente sunt Artasii et Chorasmini.” (De Situ Orbis. 2.)¹⁰³ He said that the Parthians were descended from the Massageta and therefore the Parthians and the Choresmians came from the same roots. Both people can claim to have Sumerian origins.

If we analyze the name „Choresm” (Khorezm) and we disregard the vowels, then we get:

	K	H	R	Z	M
In Babylonian:	KU	-	MA	-	R - IZ - MA
In Sumerian:	KU	-	MAH - GAR	-	RI - ES - MA

The meaning of the Sumerian text is: „The Land of the Great Powerful Clan”. The people called themselves KU- MAH - GAR.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ Toronyi, Etelka: *A Kárpáti Medence, a kultúrák bölcsője és a magyarok őshazája*. Buenos Aires, 1974; Dayton, John: *Minerals, Metals, Glazing and Man*. London, 1978

¹⁰² Badiny-Jós: Op. Cit. p. 161.

¹⁰³ Ibid. p. 162.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. p. 162-163

When we determine the Parthian language we have to assume that the Sarmatians, Daha, Saca, Sogdiana, Massageta, Chus, Huns, Scythians and Jazygians, all spoke the same language but with dialectical differences. Frye states that the first Sarmatian invaders into Europe were the Jazygians who settled in Hungary.¹⁰⁵ The Jazygians who settled in Hungary did not leave behind a distinct Jazygian language. This is proof that their language was similar to the language of the KU-MAH-GAR or Megyer tribe, from which the Magyar language evolved which became the official language after Árpád united the autochthonous Scythian-Hun-Avar peoples. Popes Urban V. and Gregory XI., in their Papal Bulls, called these homecoming Magyars „Scytha”. The German Chronicles, as I mentioned earlier, called them „Parthus” and once called them „Ungarus”.¹⁰⁶ Others who called the Magyars „Turks” meant Parthians because in Hebrew „Turk” means „Parthian”.¹⁰⁷ The people of the former Parthian Empire, in different times and under different names, arrived and settled in their ancient homeland, the Carpathian Basin. I refer to it as their ancient homeland because, according to the Greek historians, the Scythian ancient homeland was north of the Balkans, in the territory of the Boreaus mountains. According to the research of Adorján Magyar, ethnographer and linguist, the Greek legend of Hyperboreus mentions that the Scythians lived north of the territory of the Isztrosz (Danube) beyond the mountains of the Balkan Peninsula. They had a happy life without sin and had a high level of culture. They did not eat meat but lived on milk, honey and fruit. They knew no war or sickness and lived for several centuries. When they died, they had a painless death in their sleep. They worshipped the Sun-God and, the Greeks acknowledged that they adopted the worship of the Sun-Gods, Apollo and Artemis from the Scythians.¹⁰⁸

The many returning migrations of the Sarmatians began with the Jazygians in A.D. 126 and continued with the Huns in A.D. 375. After the fall of the Hun Empire, the Avar Empire was established in the same

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. p. 169; Frye: Op. Cit. p. 200

¹⁰⁶ Ibid. p. 169; Ebert: *Überlieferungen*, Dresden, 1826.8.I. Bd. I. ST. 81-82

¹⁰⁷ Ibid. p. 169; Laoniel Chalcocondylae, Hist. Lib. X. Parisiis, 1650. 1.Fol. p. 480

¹⁰⁸ Badiny-Jós, Ferenc: *A Magyar Ősvallásról*, Ősi Gyökér, April-June 1997, p. 64-65

territory. On 37 occasions, from the sixth century A.D. to the thirteenth century, historical sources called the Avar-Huns „Huns”.¹⁰⁹

The leading tribe of the Magyars, who were called „Turks”, who settled in the Carpathian Basin, were of Subarean origins. In the sixth century A.D., Menander identifies them with the ancient Sacae people: „Turci, qui antiquitus Sacae vocabantur”. The well-informed Byzantine historian Theophanes, in the eighth century A.D. identified this same people with the Massageta people: „In Oriente ad Tanaim (Don) Turci tegunt qui Massagetae antiquitus dicti sunt.” It is understandable then that the contemporary historians identified the Magyars with the Parthians, Huns and Avars. Therefore the KU-MAH-GAR-RI-ES-MA, that Great Powerful Clan, included all the Turanian peoples in the Parthian Empire, including the Kaliz or Chorezmian people. These peoples made continuous migrations, returning to the ancient homeland.¹¹⁰

If we continue to research the history of settlements we will learn that the territory of the settlement of Ond, one of the leaders of the seven Magyar tribes, stretched from the Carpathian Mountains to Bácska (in the territory of Yugoslavia) and the full length of the River Tisza from north to south, as György Györffy stated in his paper, A honfoglaló magyarok települési rendjéről.

If this territory had been populated by Serbs and Croats at that time, is it feasible that the newly-arrived lord would have taken it over for his people who would have been in the minority and would have exposed them to harrassment from the people who lived there? The answer is obviously in the negative. This territory had to be unpopulated or sparsely populated.

¹⁰⁹ Badiny-Jós, Ferenc: Káldeától Ister-Gamig, p. 171

¹¹⁰ Ibid. p.171.

Chapter 10

Western Hungary – Burgenland

Nowadays the Hungarians constantly talk of the Slav and Rumanian theft at Trianon but I am going to write about the dishonorable claim of the comrade-in-arms of the Hungarians in the First World War – Austria. What happened here? I am going to use information from Dr. Rezső Dabas¹¹¹ to explain the Hungarian presence in Burgenland and show how the Austrians received this territory at the Treaty of Trianon. (Map No. 2)

Austria is a country but there is no Austrian language. The people of Austria come from peoples of different origins such as the Illyrians, Huns, Avars, Magyars and the Germanic tribes who settled among them. Originally, the non-Germanic people were in the majority but they adopted a variant of the German language.

According to the 1910 Hungarian census the population of Western Hungary (Burgenland) was 437,000. There were 299,400 Germans, 79,200 Hungarians, 44,500 Croatians, and 13,900 Wends. In addition to Western Hungary, the Austrians claimed the city of Pozsony. The population of the city of Pozsony was 78,223. Of these 32,790 were German, 31,705 Hungarian, 11,673 Slovak and 2,055 others. Thus the Slovaks were almost three times smaller as a group than the Hungarians, yet they received the City of Pozsony and made it their capital, Bratislava.

The Austrians called the four Hungarian counties of Pozsony, Moson, Sopron and Vas „Vierburgenland” (land of four castles).. In Western Hungary (Burgenland) today, the language of the majority is German. This can be explained by the fact that there was a constant effort to assimilate the Hungarians. The many Germanized Hungarian names attest to this e.g. Lazlo, Kery, Sarkan, Zabo, Wargha, Khisch, Schiwan, Nagi, Unger, Ungar, and many more yet not even the

¹¹¹ Dabas, Rezső: Burgenland álarc nélkül, Montreal, 1984

Hungarian newspapers mention this fact because it is taboo.¹¹² The media emphasizes the „Hungarian chauvinism” whenever possible, yet how easy it is to prove this view to be incorrect. If we look at the Hungarian statistics, just from 1700 to the present, on those territories which were taken from Hungary in 1920, we would learn that it was not the Hungarians who assimilated the Germans – although they were in a position to do that – but the reverse.

On April 24, 1921, in the elections in Tyrol, Austria voted to join the Anschluss, with an overwhelming majority, 132,296 - 1722. In the same year, on May 21, Salzburg held elections on the same matter and 100,762 voted for the Anschluss and only 797 against it. The Entente powers did not allow the rest of the Austrian territories to vote on this subject because they were sure of the outcome. On November 1, 1943, the Allied forces declared that the results of these Austrian elections were null and void. After a short Russian occupation, Austria was declared to be a neutral state. Why was Hungary punished as a war criminal and Austria excused?¹¹³

Before World War II., Austria imported grain from Hungary but after the war she used the Marshall Aid to develop Burgenland (Western Hungary) as an agricultural territory and, because of this, by 1960, Austria was able to sustain herself. This territory became a very important part of Austria.

The idea of obtaining this territory did not come up for the first time at Trianon. Already on March 14, 1905, in the Austrian Reichsrat, it was proposed by Dr. Josef Scheicher that Austria place a claim on this territory. On October 2, 1907, at a meeting of the Lower Austrian Assembly, this was again proposed by Freiherr von Herenfels. (Thoroczkay, p.20)

At the end of the First World War, when the Successor States came forward with their exaggerated demands for the annexation of huge territories from Hungary, then Hungary's partner, Austria, also came forward with territorial claims, just like the surrounding states who were enemies of the Austria-Hungary. On February 12, 1920, after the speech of Count Albert Apponyi at the Peace Conference, General Smuts

¹¹² Heckenast, Dezső: „Nyugatmagyarország - Burgenland”; *Kronika*, Jan. 1980. p. 11

¹¹³ Thoroczky, Éva: *Levelesláda*, p. 18-19; P.Rainer, E. Ulreich, F.Zimmermann: *Pressburger Land und Leute*, Wien, 1976, p. 52.

proposed the application of the plebiscite but it was Chancellor Renner of Austria who opposed it and took away that opportunity. Already on January 13, 1920, Chancellor Renner had accepted a Czech-Austrian-Serb alliance which Rumania later joined.¹¹⁴

Studies of Hungarian history emphasize that, in 955, at the Magyar defeat at the Battle of Lechfeld, the ancestors of the Hungarians had to retreat to the line of the Vienna Forest. Now we know that this is only a speculation. This account is based on information written by the Germans to glorify their victory, which the Hungarian historians adopted and was quoted from one source to the next.

However, Endre Grandpierre, in his study, A magyarok istenének elrablása (Budapest, 1993), with authentic research, proved that the Magyar power was not broken and that it was not necessary for them to retreat to the Vienna Forest. After this „final defeat” of the Magyars, they made two successful campaigns of several thousand kilometers, under the leadership of Botond, Orkond and Szabolcs. The city of Melk, which is located 80 kilometers west of the Vienna Forest, was not taken from the Magyars by force as the Germans record but, as Dr. Sándor Nagy states, was given to them freely by the Magyars:

„If he (King István) were able to persuade his people to adopt Western Christianity, his country would become a member of the great Western Church. The resulting friendly atmosphere would end the struggle between the two nations. To this end the Magyars even sacrificed territories on their own accord. They gave up the territory between the River Lajta and the River Enns to the Germans. In the little Austrian city of Melk, on the road to the ancient abbey, there is a little tablet on a stone pillar which states:

‘Melk, in the Middle Ages, was called Molk. It was the borderline stronghold of the Magyars from 906 to 984. Prince Heinrich Hohenstaufen, who later became Emperor, took it from them.’

„The truth is that the Germans did not take this place from the Magyars by armed force, but the Magyar forefathers, in the hope of peace and friendship, moved out of it on their own accord. Heinrich Hohenstaufen was King István’s brother-in-law, Princess Gisella’s brother, who became Emperor as Heinrich II. This territory between the

¹¹⁴ Málnási, Ödön: Országveszejtés. Munich, p, 25

Rivers Lajta and Fischa, Princess Gisella had brought as a dowry in 973.”¹¹⁵

When the Magyars gave up this territory, the leaders of the German Empire stated, in an agreement, that in the future they would never have any territorial demands against the Magyars. At the time of Trianon, this agreement was broken by Austria.

I wrote earlier that Burgenland received its name from the castles – Hungarian „Várvidék” (Land of the Castles). There is another explanation of the name Burgenland. Otto Röttig, in 1919, established a newspaper called *Vierburgenland* which means „land of four castles”. These castles were in the four above-mentioned Hungarian counties, Pozsony, Moson, Sopron and Vas. Because Pozsony was given to Czechoslovakia, the name of the territory „Vierburgenland” was changed to „Dreiburgenland” (land of three castles). The simpler name of „Burgenland” was used for the first time by Professor Alfred Waldheim, of the University of Vienna, in a newspaper called *Ostdeutsch Rundschau*. The name „Burgenland” was adopted by the Austrian Chancellor Karl Renner. We have to determine to which country the here-mentioned castles belong. Numerous Hungarian castles in good condition can be found close to each other in Austrian territory, for example the Esterházy Castle, Bathány Castle, Nádasdy Castle, Erdödy Castle, Draskovich Castle, and Almásy Castle. Why were the Hungarian castles built on Austrian territories? A few years ago, when the editor of the National Geographic Magazine visited this territory, he received the official prospectus of the castles. According to this prospectus, the castles were built by the Austrians along the Hungarian border as a defense against the dangerous Hungarian invasions. The younger sister of Count Pál Esterházy was the tour guide who explained the history of the castle. The editor of the National Geographic noted in his article that it was unbelievable that the Hungarian aristocratic families built castles on Austrian territory to protect against Hungarian invasions. In his article he also mentioned that he did not notice any difference between Burgenland and Hungary in topography and settlement geography, whereas there is a sharp contrast between Burgenland and Steiermark (Styria). (Kronika, January, 1980)

¹¹⁵ Nagy, Sándor: The Forgotten Cradle of the Hungarian Culture, Toronto, 1973, p. 247-248 (translated by László and Margaret Botos)

The Austrians teach the history of Burgenland from their one-sided point of view and they omit the 1500 years existence of the Huns, Avars and Magyars on this territory, and try to emphasize the existence of the Germans and Slavs on this territory instead of the afore-mentioned peoples. The Hungarian Academy of Science has not yet published any material to correct this warped view of history. Sandor Török tried to fill this void, with his Település Történet (History of Settlement.) He refuted the Austrian claim and proved the existence of Hun, Avar and Magyar settlements in this territory, which Rezső Dabas, in his book, Burgenland álarc nélkül, (Montreal, 1984) supports.

I present the same point of view as I declared in The Homeland Reclaimed, and that is that the Carpathian Basin must be looked at as a whole and not in smaller pieces. The Hungarians have lived there for more than 1100 years and have left their mark on this territory. The history of the Carpathian Basin is the history of the Hungarian nation. Quoting W.G. East, Rezső Dabas says: „The Morava-Vardar route from the Aegean was opened up in the third millennium BC and the south Danubian region was brought into closest cultural association with Macedonia, Thessaly and the Aegean, with the result that Hungary and these southern lands mutually influenced each other.”¹¹⁶ The German and Slav historians purposely forget or often slander the Hungarian historical and cultural achievements and often attribute these to their own nations. At the same time, they call the Moravian principality, which never had exact borders, Great Moravia. They consider the Avar empire, which lasted approximately 250 years, and which extended from the River Enns to the Ural mountains, to be an insignificant power. (Dabas, p. 18)

Burgenland never had a constitution under the Romans, the Avars, or under the Hungarians because it was not uniform geographically, ethnically or economically. It was always under the influence of the cities of Kőszeg, Szombathely and Körmend, and not Austrian cities or the Alpine Noricum. The Huns, Avars and Magyars influenced the cultural and political life of this territory. The Austrians do not mention the more than one thousand year presence of the Hungarians on this territory. Dabas says that the Hungarians have the

¹¹⁶ Dabas, Rezső, Burgenland álarc nélkül, p. 17; East, W.G. A History and Geography of Europe, p. 374

right and moreover the duty to notify the world of the theft of Burgenland by the Austrians and to lay the foundation for a possible revision. (p. 20)

Since 1920, the Hungarians have become the largest minority population in Europe. **It is incorrect to call the Hungarians a „minority” because the Hungarians present a unified block and there is no doubt that they are in the majority in the Carpathian Basin. It was not the Hungarian people who settled into foreign territories, but the neighboring peoples who entered the Carpathian Basin, seeking refuge from their oppressors and asking for Hungarian protection.** It is not enough to acknowledge the fact that today the Hungarians are in the minority in the Successor States but we must examine the reasons that they received this minority status. Frank Graham Jr. says : „Burgenland, part of the old Hapsburg Empire, with a German majority, always belonged to the Hungarian Kingdom.”¹¹⁷

Because Austria was part of the Holy Roman (German) Empire, and Burgenland was a colony of Rome, the Austrians like to emphasize that this territory rightfully belongs to Austria. But they have no basis for this claim because, in this territory, besides a few Roman roads, there are no other remains of the Roman occupation, and the German-speaking people cut off all Roman connections. Among the Hungarians, however – even though it was by force – the Latin language was the official language until the middle of the last century. Until 1945, at the university level, the study of the Latin language was compulsory. (Dabas, p. 22)

The Austrians also claim Burgenland as a legacy of Charlemagne who was supposed to have annihilated the Avars. Macartney writes: „The Avars, the last invaders to enter the Basin in force, had ruled the whole of the unprecedented span of over two centuries.”¹¹⁸

The Austrians blame the disappearance of the Avar people from this territory on the Plague. (Tourist information on a roadside tablet in Nemesvölgy, Edelstal today). The research of István Dienes and Gyula László refutes this Austrian explanation. They have proved that the Avars survived and were living in Transdanubia at the time of the

¹¹⁷ Ibid. p. 21; Graham, Frank Jr.: Austria, p. 77

¹¹⁸ Macartney: Hungary: A Short History, Edinburgh, 1962, p. 4

Magyar Homecoming. Therefore, if the Avars disappeared from the territory of Burgenland and west of this territory, it was not as a result of the Plague but they died at the hands of the Germans. The German historians, who supported the „Drang nach Osten”, tried to make the world believe that the German-speaking people in Hungary were the remains of Charlemagne’s empire (Regnum Francum). In this way, Austria tries to claim the Hungarian territory. Therefore it is the duty of the Hungarians to refute these arguments because if they do not do so, these lies will become accepted fact. Dabas quotes from the Brockhaus Encyclopedia, 1967, : „1. Charlemagne did not establish Ostmark. 2. The Awarische Mark, in the East, reached to the River Lajta. Therefore the present Burgenland is not included.” Dabas writes: „The map of the Carolingian Empire, in the Petit Larousse Encyclopedia, supports the statement from the Brockhaus Encyclopedia. The borderline of the territory which Charlemagne conquered is identical to the border of Carinthia which later became the border of Historic Hungary.” (Dabas, p. 38-39)

After the fall of the Western Avar Empire, many historians stated that Transdanubia, before the Magyar Homecoming, was a territory conquered by the Franks, yet we know now that Charlemagne only occupied the territory called the Noricum along the Danube, between the River Enns and the Vienna Forest. This territory was called the Awarische Mark after the remaining Avar leaders. M.Vancsa, an Austrian historian, is of the same opinion.¹¹⁹

Robert Folz writes: „Charlemagne annexed only the territory between the Enns and the Vienna Forest, the future Austria which became a march whose counts were responsible for the surveillance of Pannonia.”¹²⁰ After the death of Charlemagne in 814, the Frankish Empire began its decline and this was why the Franks were unable to extend their power over Pannonia.

W. G. East, a British geographer, is of the same opinion: „Of the lands which comprised imperial Germany and Austria in 1914, only a small part lay within the empire of Charles the Great, whilst the rest were then occupied by the Slav and Avar people.”¹²¹

¹¹⁹ Dabas, p. 40; Vancsa, M. *Geschichte N.u. Österreich.*, I., 161-162

¹²⁰ Ibid. p. 39; Folz, Robert: *Charlemagne and his Empire* p. 86

¹²¹ Ibid. p. 40; East, W.G., p. 80

The fact that Pribina and his son, Kocel, were able to establish an insignificant weak rule, proves that the Franks were not present and the Slavs cannot declare that it was a royal reign because the landowners just owned the land and had no aristocratic title. The Germans or Austrians would like to prove that they have an historic right to Burgenland. They mention some Carolingian geographic local names as a basis for their claim. Dabas says that this is just a fantasy and he believes that we can accept the information from the Cambridge Medieval History, which says: „The Franks advanced as far as the Raab without making a permanent conquest.”¹²²

Pannonia was never a Carolingian crown land. There was no Frankish public administration and no feudal lord or military garrison. Only the Church developed enormous power in this territory which was governed by the Church hierarchy. The Carolingian Empire found that it took enormous power to organize the Awarische Mark so they were unable to extend their power over Transdanubia. The Franks were hardly able to organize the public administration of the Empire because they were illiterate „In regard to central institutions, there has been as much exaggeration as in regard to ‘local government’! There was for example, NO civil service, NO clerical staff, NO secretariat, NO chancery.”¹²³

Another reason that the Franks were not interested in taking Pannonia under their administration was that, in the war between Charlemagne and the Avars, the territory became devastated and became very poor. The conquest of Pannonia did not promise for the Franks an immediate profit for the state treasury. The Frankish rule consisted of breaking the military power of the Avars, in robbing the rich Avar populace and taking the Avar people under the rule of the decadent Frankish Christian people. History likes to glorify the Christian development of the „cultured” Frankish State. At that time, the Franks were not in a position to help the Pannonian or Avar people to increase their piety in their Christian faith. In order to do that, they would have had to be themselves on this level of culture and piety. There is no proof that they were at this level. Their settlements were disorganized and

¹²² Ibid. p. 41; Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. II., 1913; Seeliger Gerhard, Professor at the University of Leipzig, Ch. 19, p. 609

¹²³ Ibid. p.43-44; Barraclough, Geoffrey: The Crucible of Europe, p. 60

scattered and only one or two settlements were bigger than the so-called „hamlets” of Pannonia.

Dabas says that it makes the historian wonder how it was possible for the Magyars, who were called nomads, to create three thousand villages and many cities in the course of one century.

It is still taught that the Magyars were chased by the Pechenegs and so they took over the Carpathian Basin. That is a major misconception. The ancestors of the Magyars knowingly moved toward the Carpathian Basin so that, at the right time, they could return to the land of Atilla, as rightful heirs. We can say „rightful” because this knowledge existed among the Scythian, Hun, Avar, Szekler, Magyar peoples, as related peoples.

In the century before the Magyar Homecoming, the Magyars, on several occasions, went in small groups to the Carpathian Basin to become acquainted with the territory and the people. In 839, they accompanied the Bulgars; in 862, they came to the aid of the Moravians against Pribina. The Magyars of Etelköz continuously received news from the Carpathian Basin, brought by messengers.¹²⁴ Álmos organized and prepared the Homecoming which was accomplished by Árpád. Researchers from Hungary and abroad prove that the Carpathian Basin was occupied several times by peoples who belonged to the Hungarian race and who spoke the Hungarian language, or was reconquered when it was occupied temporarily by others, the Scythians, 500 BC to 400 BC; Sarmatians, 400 BC to AD 500; Jazygians, AD 359; Huns in the first part of the 5th. Century AD; the Avars in the sixth century and the Magyars in AD 896. The oral history of these people emphasized that they were heirs to this land.

The territory in the county of Vas, the so-called „Őrség” (garrison territory), at the time of the Rákóczi Freedom Fight (1703-1711), was well-known as the territory of the Szekler people. Its name indicates its importance to the people and the state and its antiquity because it received its name before the use of writing became widespread and this name was passed on from generation to generation. At the time it received its name, there were no written documents to indicate the purpose of this territory and to which state it belonged. The

¹²⁴ A magyarok története; Tarih-i Üngürüs; Madzsar Tárihi, Magvető Könyvkiadó, Budapest, 1982

„word of mouth” knowledge of the name of this territory was just as valuable as a written document. László Sebestyén states that the Magyar Homecoming in AD 896 was the rightful reclaiming of the Hun-Magyar territory.¹²⁵ Zoltán Gombócz supports this statement when he talks about a „secundus introitus” of the Magyars who were related to the Huns. (Dabas p. 46)

There is a huge volume of literature available which states that the Scythian-Sarmatian presence in the Carpathian Basin existed about a thousand years before the Huns. For example, Stuart Piggott writes: „Westward they moved into the Carpathian, forming local groups of Scythian culture in Transylvania and on the Hungarian Plain. There is evidence for Scythian trade and even raiding into northeastern and western Europe.” „But the Scythians have come down in history not merely as a barbarian tribe of the Eurasiatic Steppe-land, but as craftsmen, working in distinctive and moving style of fantastic animal art.”¹²⁶

When Atilla formed his empire, with its center in the Carpathian Basin, he took the Scythian land as his inheritance. The Avars claimed it in AD 550, 568 and 670. The Magyars took this same land as their inheritance from the Avar-Huns. Therefore, we can declare invalid the theories of the Slav and Daco-Roman inheritance. Dabas took this information from Talbot Rice who said: „The Scytho-Sarmatian influence was particularly marked in Central Europe. Scythian influence first made its mark in Hungary around about the year 500 BC.”¹²⁷

According to the archeological findings, the Hun peoples remained in the Carpathian Basin, from the River Enns to the Carpathian Mountains, until the Avars arrived. According to Lajos Marjalaki-Kiss, the Scythian-Sarmatian Hungarian speaking people were the remains of the autochthonous people of the Körös culture.¹²⁸

¹²⁵ Ibid. p. 46; Sebestyén László, Vitairat Kézai Simon Védelmében, Budapest 1975, p. 89

¹²⁶ Ibid. p. 47; Piggott, Stuart, Ancient Europe (from the beginnings of agriculture to classical antiquity), Edinburgh, 1965

¹²⁷ Ibid. pp. 47-49 Talbot Rice, Tamara: The Scythians, NY, 1957 p. 188-189

¹²⁸ László, Gyula: A kettős honfoglalás, Budapest, 1978, p. 85; Marjalaki-Kiss, Lajos: Néhány Árpád-kori Helynyelvünkről, Miskolc, 1928)

The Chronicles and later historians interchangeably use the names Huns, Avars and Magyars, and classify them all as Scythians. According to the sixteenth century map of Ortelivs, the Huns and the Magyars lived in the land of the Scythians and he states that they spoke the Scythian language. Two centuries later, the British historian Edward Gibbon (1737-1794) also used the name „Scythians” as a collective name for the Huns, Avars and Magyars: „Hungary has been occupied by three SCYTHIAN colonies: 1) The HUNS of Attila, 2) the ABARES (Avars) in the sixth century and 3) the MAGYARS, A.D. 889 (sic!) the immediate and genuine ancestors of the modern Hungarians.”¹²⁹

After the reoccupation of Transdanubia, from AD. 900, Burgenland was continuously an integral part of Hungary. After the victory of the Magyars over the Bavarians at Pozsony in AD. 907, Árpád staked out the border of Hungary at the River Enns which had historically been the border of Hungary in the time of the Huns and Avars. At the same time Styria came under Hungarian rule. This meant that the River Enns was the political border of Hungary and the River Inn was the actual territorial border. According to the Hungarian folk tales, the territory beyond the Enns, the present Upper Austria, was called the „Operencia” (ober Enns, meaning beyond the Enns). The Enns was the border which separated the Western powers from the East. For two centuries, this river protected the Avar Empire and for seven centuries protected the land of the Magyars, (Magyarország) Hungary.

When the people of Árpád reclaimed the territory of the so-called Awarische Mark, they occupied a part of Moravia at the same time. We find settlement names to prove this in the aforementioned work of Sándor Török, *Település Történet*, p. 131. Pan-Slav or Pan-German historical writings, accuse the Homecoming Magyars of conquering the German and Slav peoples who lived in this territory .

The ancestors of the Magyars, Scythians, Huns, Avars and Sarmatians, could not have taken territories from the Slav and German peoples because, at that time, there were no such peoples living in these territories. The Slavs, a servant people, used to cut roads through the forests for these equestrian peoples. As we have already mentioned, their name indicates their status. St. Boniface, the missionary who

¹²⁹ Dabas, p. 50; Gibbon, Edward: *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, II. 244

christianized the Germans, called the Slavs „born stinking slaves” and „people deserving scorn”.¹³⁰

The Hungarian history taught by the Marxists, although it does not represent the Hungarian interest, mentions that „the country of Transdanubia and the Northwestern territories, except for one part, was an unpopulated territory” at the time of the Magyar homecoming.¹³¹ This territory was an almost impenetrable forest and this is why they had to cut the trees to make roads. Even now, 1100 years later, nearly half of the County of Vas, is covered with forests. Macartney also stated that this territory was unpopulated in the time of Árpád: „There were only one or two places larger than hamlets in Pannonia or in the Alföld; Transylvania too consisted at that time mostly of unpenetrated forests.”¹³²

The Austrian Historischer Weltatlas mentions that in the fourteenth century, the territory from Dévény to Orsova, in the Carpathian Basin, the northeast territory and Transylvania were unpopulated territories.¹³³ Many studies prove that, in the time of Árpád, two thirds of the Carpathian Basin were unsuited for agricultural purposes.

The records about the Homecoming indicate that the larger part of this territory was unpopulated because the small number of Magyar people were quickly and easily able to settle in this huge territory. There was no large population of Slavs, Vlachs or Germans in this territory. The Magyars marched through the populated territories without any resistance because the people living there, the descendants of the Scythians, Huns and Avars, along with the Szekler people, welcomed them as descendants of Atilla.

In the ninth century, the danger to the autochthonous people of the Carpathian Basin came not from the East but from the West. The inhabitants were aware of the danger so Árpád’s intention was to replace his borderline at the historical borderline of the River Enns. He regarded

¹³⁰ Ibid. p. 51; Herr, F: Das Heilige Röm. Reich, p. 52

¹³¹ Ibid. p. 52; Szabó, István: A falurendszer kialakulása Magyarországon, Budapest, 1971, p. 148

¹³² Ibid. p. 52; Macartney, C.A.: Hungary, 1962, p. 5

¹³³ Ibid. p. 52; Putzger: Hist. Weltatlas, p.55

this borderline territory as his inheritance which the Magyars ruled for about 150 years after he reclaimed it.

After the „defeat” of the Magyars at Lechfeld in 955, they did not have to give up this territory to the Germans. The Bavarians did not begin to move into this „garrison territory” until 976. The Peace Treaty which Kagan Géza made in 973 seems to have been made under pressure from the Germans and this is why the Magyars had to give up the territory beyond the Enns. In the last quarter of the tenth century, the Ostarrichi-Ostmark (Austrian) power started slowly to spread toward the east as the Hungarians retreated.

In 987, the Magyars pulled back behind the Vienna forest and so, in 1002, the Germans moved into the abandoned territory around Vienna. This territory had been an integral part of Hungary for almost a century. „Nach der Niederlage des bayrischen Heerbannes bei Pressburg, geriet Wien auf hundert Jahre unter magyarischen Herrschaft.” (After the defeat of the Bavarian army at Pozsony, Vienna came under Hungarian rule for a century.)¹³⁴

The Hungarian supremacy in this territory in the ninth and tenth centuries is obvious. The first record of this territory dates to AD. 881, and the next to AD. 1030, when King István reconquered Vienna.

This territory was undeveloped which is shown in the fact that in 976, when the Hungarians gave up the Castle of Molk, for a full century, Molk became the capital of Ostarrichi (Austria) and only in 1100, was it moved to Tullin. From there, in 1118, it was moved to Leopoldberg, and finally, in 1137, to Vienna.

Vienna was ruled by the Marquis of Babenberg and the Bishop of Bavaria. At this time, King István had two archdioceses, one at Esztergom, established in 1001, and the other at Kalocsa, established in 1006. He also had eight dioceses. Vienna received her first bishop in 1469. When we compare the religious and secular development of the Hungarians and Austrians in the year 1200, we will find that the Hungarians by far surpassed the Austrians. Esztergom had a population of 1800, Vienna, 1200. Esztergom had six parishes, Vienna had four.¹³⁵ The Hungarian supremacy in this territory was broken by the Tartar invasion, which killed out most of the Hungarian populace, but in the

¹³⁴ Ibid. p. 55; Lehrbuch für Geschichte, Hauptschule 2. Klasse, 1965, p.208

¹³⁵ Ibid. p. 56; Three thousand years of urban growth, 1974

time of Mátyás Hunyadi (1458-1490), in culture, art and intellectual growth, Hungary by far surpassed Austria. The Encyclopedia Britannica (1972) expresses this opinion: „The position of the Babenbergs was, at that time, still a modest one.” The Marquis of Babenberg were not rulers but feudal lords. They gained the title of Prince when Ostarichi and Styria united in 1192. This is the way Austria was formed, but it was still a feudal territory of the Western Roman Empire. At this time, Hungary was already a well-developed nation with a 300 year-old tradition. The southwestern Hungarian border was the coastline of Dalmatia. The kingdom of Austria was actually established when King László IV. (Kun László, 1272-1290) aided Rudolf Hapsburg, the first king of Austria, in 1278, against the Bohemian Prince Ottokar. We will never find the name Ostmark as a historical name for Austria, because it is political jargon made up by the Pan-Germans. This is the collective name for all the territories (Länder) of Austria. „Each of these Länder retained a strong sense of individualism until the present day.”¹³⁶ Hungary, on the other hand, right from the time of Árpád was a unified state. In the tenth and the thirteenth centuries, Austria or Ostarichi was a German feudal state. At that time Styria and Carinthia were not included in the territory of Austria. „Austria was not formally known as such until the end of the twelfth century.”¹³⁷ „In 1154, the Ostmark was separated from Bavaria and became a duchy, and around 1192 the Ostmark and Styria were united into one marchland, called Österreich (Austria).”¹³⁸ The maps show Austria in its present form only in the 19th. century. At that time Hungary had been, for 600 years, one of Europe’s strongest nations. Burghardt says: „Hungary and Poland were probably the most powerful single states in Europe and effectively shielded Europe against all invaders against the East and Southeast.”(Burghardt, p. 99)

The inhabitants of Styria, Carinthia and the Tyrol although included in the Austrian state did not consider themselves Austrian. „They were the loyal subjects of the Austrian Emperor and played a leading part in the services of the Monarchy, but they did not feel that they were ‘Austrian’ by nationality.” „The variety in speech among the

¹³⁶ Ibid. p. 58; Mutton, A.: Central Europe, London, 1961, p. 137

¹³⁷ Ibid. p. 58; Encyclopedia Britannica, 1972

¹³⁸ Burghardt, Andrew F.: Borderland, Madison WI., 1962, p. 83

Austrians reflects a mixed ethnic background. . . These differences date back to the ancient times when Ilyrians, Celts, Romans, Teutons, Huns and others lived and warred on the territory which was to become Austria. The present ethnic mixture is largely derived from the results of conflicts between the Franks and Avars.”¹³⁹

The Magyars of Árpád undertook threatening campaigns against the West, more exactly against the German states, for the purpose of stopping the progress of German aggression against Hungary, which had already taken place against the Huns and the Avars. The campaigns were also undertaken to repossess the Avar treasures stolen by Charlemagne. The attacks were their best defense.

The Pechenegs, who settled in the country in the time of King Solomon (1063-1074) were given the positions of guards in the territory of Lake Fertő. The other western guards were the Szeklers, which is recorded in the *Képes Kronika*. (Magyar Chronicle, 1358). „First a screen of Szekels was set in front of the Magyar settlement in the west of the country and then the Szekels were moved forward into the valleys behind the main eastern passes, the Magyars following behind them.”¹⁴⁰

We have to mention that the duty of the guards was not only to defend the borders of the country but also to signal from the mountain tops to the rest of the country when there was approaching danger, by using smoke signals in the day-time and fires at night. The remains of this signalling system can be found in the county of Vas, in the „Őrség”, the so-called „garrison territory”. Ungerberg, Csatárhegy and another Ungerberg, which were watchposts, follow the valley of the Pinka River toward the heart of the country. (Dabas, p. 65)

At the mutilation of Hungary at Trianon, of the territories of Göcsej, Őrség and Felsőőrőség, only the first two remained with Hungary. Felsőőrőség went to Austria. We have to mention this injustice because the small number of Hungarians in this territory had lived on this territory as guards before the small Bavarian margraves were established. King Béla IV. placed the grey crane in the shield of Felsőőrőség as a symbol of watchfulness. The populace of this territory had cut out the forests in order to settle in this territory. This is proof

¹³⁹ Dabas, p.59; Carsten, F. L.: Fascist Movements in Austria – from Schönerer to Hitler, p. 9 and Area handbook for Austria, p. 64

¹⁴⁰ Ibid. p.64; Macartney, C.A.: Hungary, 1962, p.23

that they took possession of virgin land and were the first settlers in this territory. The territory of Felsőörség is considered to be one of the most ancient Hungarian territories. It has straight public roads, edged with black locusts, mulberry trees, other fruit trees and pines. The railroad lines have stone distance markers which still show the distance from Szombathely which is still in Hungary. The valley of the Pinka River is marshy, so the transportation is difficult. Therefore the Magyars used it as a defense line from the West. The county of Vas was a strategically important defense line territory because between the territories of Alsó and Felsőőr there is a dense forest. This territory was able to hold back the western intruders for a thousand years. In the time of the Turkish occupation, the populace on this territory lost the Hungarian language but the style of architecture was still Hungarian and was similar to that of the Hungarian market towns. (Dabas, p.67)

Felszeg, today Füzög, has the only Reformed Church, which shows one time Hungarian rule on this territory because the Protestants were persecuted in Austria and could not build churches. The ancient Hungarian settlement places were divided into segments (szeg, szög – corner, part), (szer – place). In the name of Felszeg (Upper part), we find the ancient Hungarian form, and we can find in Austria the names – Pinkaszer, Cigányszer, Alszeg, Felszeg, and Középszer. The most ancient Hungarian names can be found in Burgenland which is in Austria. It can be seen that these settlements were Hungarian even without the Hungarian names because the basic designs of the houses in Alsóőr and Felsőőr are Hungarian and the street plans resemble those of the Hungarian tribal camps. The Austrians have tried to erase the traces of the past but it is not possible to erase them all. (Dabas, p.68)

In 1921, in Felsőőr, the establishment of the Lajta *bánság* was announced and Felsőőr became its capital. In the main square of Felsőőr, there is a tablet on which the history of the Hungarian possession of the Lajta *bánság* is written in German. (Dabas p. 70) I shall write more on this subject in Chapter 18.

The Hungarian character of the territory can be noticed not only on the Pinka River territory but also along the Köpcsény, Mészvölgy, Lajta, Lapincs and Rába rivers and in the plain beside Lake Fertő.

The center of the territory, east of Upper Pinka, is Rohonc. The southeast part of Rohonc was an original Hungarian settlement, which only received its present name – Ungmark – when the Germans settled in

this territory in later times. It was the possession of the Hungarian Count Batthyány, who settled bootmakers (Hung. „csizmadia”) on this territory. From this came the German name for bootmaker „Tschismenmacher”. The railroad joined Pinkafő, Felsőőr, Rohonc and Szombathely. These cities provided the leather to the bootmakers of Rohonc. (Dabas, p. 71)

Rohonc and Szalonak are better-known for their production of bronze in the Bronze Age. Kálmán Miske, a Hungarian archeologist, already in the early 1900's informed us of the result of the excavations at Velem St. Vid in Hungary. He offered indisputable proofs that Bronze Age mining contributed to the spread of bronze artifacts in Western Europe.¹⁴¹ Antimony was mined in the Rohonc Mountain in Burgenland near Velem St. Vid. The antimony mines are still in use today. The Hungarian name for the mining area was Szalonak. The present name is Schlaining. The majority of the artifacts found in the three excavations at Velem St. Vid is presently on display at the museum at Szombathely. There must have been a large population at Velem St. Vid in the Bronze Age for Kálmán Miske says: „This site has also yielded tuyeres, crucibles, and some fifty stone moulds, mostly for socketed axes, and must have been a very important production centre.”¹⁴² Dayton says: „Evidence is in fact accumulating for trade over a large area of Western Europe during the Third Millennium.”¹⁴³ Most of the Bronze Age artifacts, hand-wrought or cast in a mould, which can be found in the museums of Western Europe, originated from Velem St. Vid. Miske mentions that, already in the Bronze Age, bronze was made from an alloy of copper and tin but the Velem St. Vid process was an exception because it used antimony instead of tin. It is an indisputable fact that antimony bronze was developed at Velem St. Vid. John Dayton supports this conclusion and again reinforces the fact that antimony is not mined in the Near East.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴¹ Dayton, John: *Minerals, Metals, Glazing and Man*, London, 1978 p.66; Miske, Kálmán: *Die Bedeutung Velem St. Veist als Praehistorischen Guss-Stätte mit Berücksichtigung der Antimon-Bronzfrage*. Archiv für Anthropologie, Neue Folge, Braunschweig, Vol. 2., part 2.. 1904, pp. 124-128

¹⁴² Dayton, John: Op. Cit. p. 66

¹⁴³ Ibid. p. 72

¹⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 142; See Botos: *The Homeland Reclaimed*, p 131-132

How are these facts connected to the Hungarians of today? The Homecoming Magyars of Árpád found an autochthonous Hungarian-speaking people in the Carpathian Basin, who had lived there for millennia and the descendants of the Huns, Jazygians, Sarmatians and Avars who spoke the same language. Different conquering peoples came through their land but the autochthonous people remained and they gave names to their surroundings – mountains, rivers, etc. The conquerors learned the language of these people who were in the majority and adopted the geographical names. Árpád's people also adopted this language which was similar to the language of one of the tribes of the Homecoming peoples, the Megyer tribe. They gave the name to the language, Magyar. Árpád organized the seven tribes and the autochthonous people of the Carpathian Basin into one nation called the Magyar nation. If this ancient people had been Slavs or Vlachs, then because of their numbers they would have slavonized the incoming peoples or would have caused them to become Vlachs. The Bulgar people settled among the Slavs and their language became Slavic although their name remained.

After the fall of the Avar Empire, early in the ninth century, the Carpathian Basin had temporarily fallen into non-Hungarian hands. The Magyars reclaimed this land in 896. This territory was such a perfect geographical unit that the formation of Hungary as a nation was the greatest good fortune for Europe. Protected by the Carpathian Mountains and the Alps, Hungary was able to provide the most effective defense against invasions from the East, and the West was able to prosper. The Austrian and Czech propaganda in 1920 tried to make the European nations forget these facts and the Austrians presented Burgenland as a territory which could never have belonged to Hungary.

If we take the trouble to look at maps of the European countries in the 11th., 13th., 15th., and 19th. centuries, which appear in atlases published in Britain, the western Hungarian borders are marked at the Rivers Lajta and Lapincs and the Rosalia Mountain. According to these maps, Burgenland was never an independent unit. It was always included as an integral part of Hungary and part of Pannonia.

The map made in 1561, in Vienna, of the *Ducatus Stiriae Marchiae*, even gives an explanation of the Hungarian political border between the River Lapincs and the Rozalia Mountain, from Ungerpach in Lower Austria to the southwest to Styria. On this map can be seen the

coat of arms of Árpád, with the double cross (patriarchal cross). (Dabas, p.72) Burghardt writes: „Symbolizing this separation was the western boundary of Burgenland. For much of its length this line had remained fixed since the time of King Stephen.” „Although in the dismemberment of Hungary, the international frontier was moved eastward, the historic border is still EXTANT. Since 1921 it has served as the provincial boundary between Burgenland and the other provinces of Austria.” (Burghardt, p. 211) Burghardt also says: „To the Hungarians, these boundaries were sacred, to their neighbors, they were clear and unmistakable.” (Burghardt, p. 72)

In 1672, the map of Lower Austria, published by G.M. Vischer, shows the Morva River to be Hungary's western border. South of Dévény, the Lajta River is the border and the territory from here to the east is called PARS REGNI HUNGARIAE and the Hungarian coat of arms with the Holy Crown on it can be seen on the map. There are many more proofs that Burgenland was Hungarian territory for a thousand years and only at the Treaty of Trianon did it come into the hands of Austria.

The maps of the 16th. and 17th. centuries also prove where the three counties of Vas, Sopron and Moson belonged. If they had not belonged to Hungary, then these maps would not have noted „Comit. Castri Ferrei, (Vas) Soproni, (Sopron), Musunen (Moson)”¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁵ Dabas, p. 73-74, Footnote No. 197. Zündt map of 1567 and 10 maps from 1514-1696

MAP FACTS FROM THE TIME OF ST. ISTVÁN¹⁴⁶

Date	Border location	Detailed description	Source
X-XI. c.	Vienna Woods	Western border is Vienna Woods, southern is the eastern bank of Mura River.	Cambridge Medieval Hist. Vol. III., Map: Germany in the 10th and 11th. cent.
Circa. AD.1000	Historic Hungary	Western border - Lajta and Lapincs rivers; North, East and South, the Carpathians. Szerémség (later Slavonia) was part of Hungary.	Lopez, Robert: <u>The Birth of Europe</u> . Europe about 1000 AD.and the German Empire from the tenth to thirteenth c. Maps p. 113, 214
1042, 1058	Pitten Mark, eastern Styria	Until 1042, Pitten Mark belonged to Hungary. On the same map the Hartberg, Fölöstöm, Fehring and Reged border strip of Styria belonged to Hungary.	Putzger: Hist. Weltatlas, p. 47

¹⁴⁶ Ibid. pp. 76-79

Date	Border location	Detailed description	Source
1031-1043 or 1068	Fischa River, Neumark	Territory between the rivers Lajta and Fischa, and the territory north of the Danube — Morvamező (Neumark) belonged to Hungary.	Cambridge Medieval Hist. Vol. III. p. 281
1043, 1053 1058	River Lajta, Schwarza and Pitten together, from Pitten, 182 km., of which 70 km. was Hungarian.	In 1043, King Aba Sámuel promised territory west of the Lajta to Kahlenberg, to Emperor Heinrich III., and King Endre I. gave it to him, in the Treaty of Tribur (1053). The historic Hungarian southern border became final in 1058 and the northern border in 1068.	Révai Nagy Lexikon, Vol. XII. (Budapest, 1915) Török, Sándor: <u>Település Történet</u> , p. 20

Date	Border location	Detailed description	Source
XI.c.	Lajta-Lapincs rivers, 55 km. along Hungarian border	„Lajta and Lapincs, today the border between Northern Austria and Styria, was from the 11th. century the border between Austria and Hungary.” „In the second half of the 11th. cent. the Lajta became the final border.”	Öster. Lexikon Bundes-verlag für Unterricht, I. 171.
1001-1246	Lajta-Lapincs , Morva river was Hungarian border for 83 km.	The border of the Archdiocese of Esztergom was the border of the Lajta and Lapincs. Transdanubia and Muraköz belonged to the Estergom Archdiocese, whereas the territory between the Dráva and Száva rivers belonged to the Kalocsa Archdiocese (1006)	Dienst, H.: <u>Die Schlacht an der Leitha</u> , p. 1. „Oster. Kultur” Kunsthist. Museum, Vienna, 1972. Map: „Die Metropole von Salzburg”.

Date	Border location	Detailed description	Source
1246	Morva-Lajta-Lapincs	The historic borders as described on former maps.	As above: Map: Das babenbergische Öster.
1400	as above	The Holy Roman Empire includes the Principality of Austria. There is no unified Austria, just „Hzm. Öster., Hzm Steiermark” etc.	Knaurs Deutsch. Geschicht.: Map.: „Das Heilige Röm. Reich Deutscher Nation um 1400”
1526	as above	Border as on the former map. Hungary described as „Kingdom of Hungary”. Whereas Austria is described as part of Germany as the Principality of Austria.	Atlas Östliches Mitteleuropa (Berlin 1959) Edited by four German university professors who could not be accused of being partial to Hungary.
1561	as above	„Laufnicz Fl. Limites Hungariae et Stiriae.” (The River Lapincs is the border of Hungary and Styria)	Latzius, W.: Map: Ducatus Stiriae Marchiae (1561)

Date	Border location	Detailed description	Source
1570	as above	The ancient western border of Historic Hungary	Ortelivs: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum. Antwerpen, 1570
1648	as above	Borders and description as they were on the map of 1526	Atlas Östliches Mitteleuropa
1771	as above	as above	as above
1815	as above	The description of „Imperial Austria” included Hungary. Beneath it stands „Kingdom of Hungary”. At the same time, the Austrian territory was included in the map of the „Deutcher Bund”.	As above - The Map of Europe.
1815 - 1866	as above	Description as on the map of 1771.	As above

Date	Border location	Detailed description	Source
1866	as above	Description „Österreichische Monarchie” includes the whole of Hungary. The Austrian possessions are labelled separately like „Steiermark” or „Kärnten”.	Knaurs: Deutsche Geschichte, (Munich, 1960)
1871-1919	as above	as above	as above, Map: „Das Deutsche Reich, 1871-1919

I could mention many hundreds of Hun, Avar and Magyar settlement names in Burgenland, but for lack of space I cannot do so. From the historical and national point of view, somebody should record this huge number of toponyms on this territory before they disappear. Sándor Török has already begun this important task. The Hungarians have a great need to record these names in the territories of the Lajta, Inn, Styria and Morvamezõ. Foreign researchers may be surprised that the names of mountains and bodies of water in the River Lajta territories were already Hungarian when Árpád arrived in the Carpathian Basin. Steinhauser, the German researcher, is of the same opinion, when he states that the name of the valley of the little brook, Edlaubach, which empties into the River Répce, was Egervölgy (Egurwelgh) in 1263. He states: „The percentage of Hungarian population at the beginning was significantly higher than it is now.” Steinhauser also emphasises that the Hungarian settlers could be found in the river valleys such as Gyöngyös, Répce, Csáva, Füles, Aranypatak and Ikva.¹⁴⁷ Beside these settlement names, he mentions the scattered Hungarian population: „Ausserdem muss es aber auch sonst im Lande einzelne Madjaren oder madjarisierte Deutsch u. Slaven gegeben haben, wie es sich in einem dem ungarischen Staat angegliederten Gebiet von selbst versteht.” (Steinhauser : 5 - 22 - 37) (Apart from these there must have been in the country isolated Hungarians or Magyarized Germans and Slavs, which is understandable in a Hungarian state.)

Steinhauser stated: „We cannot prove by any means that, in the 16th. century the Croats settled here could have found people who spoke a Slavic language in this territory. The villages which were populated in the 16th. century by Croats already had existing Hungarian or German names which became slavonized. The names which the Croats gave to the localities can be shown to be distortions of the Hungarian names.” (p. 5, 29) The Germans formed their geographical names from numerous Hungarian names. For example the Hungarian name „Ezturmen” in 1157 became „Eztermeg” in 1257 and later became the German creek name „Ztrem-en”.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. p. 85; Steinhauser, Walter: Die Bedeutung der Ortsnamen in Niederdonau Part II. – NordBurgenland, St. Pölten, 1941

¹⁴⁸ Dabas, p. 86; Moór, Ede: 243, 289, 301.

Steinhauser also states that in the territory west of Pozsony, the names „Königswart” and „Königsberg” could only have referred to the Hungarian king, István. Here I give examples of Hungarian names which can be found on Austrian maps today. In Moson County: Csárda, Erdei-hof, Öregpuszta, Püspök-Hof; in Sopron County: Szomjas, Fenyős, Puszta; Vas County: Bordó, Falusi-tal, Szigeth.

The Hungarian taxation system was established by Prince Faisz in the tenth century and the Árpád Dynasty developed it further, states Sándor Török. (p.73) Burghardt states that Austria and Hungary remained two separate states after the Hapsburgs took over the throne of Hungary: „Even after 1526, when the Habsburg emperor became also the king of western Hungary, the separation of the two countries was maintained, and until 1850 a tariff was collected on all goods crossing this border.” (Burghardt, p.78.) Many historic studies emphasize that in that time, Hungary lost her territorial unity and ceased to exist as a country. The truth is that Hungary lost her independence and the ability to manage her foreign policy. I will mention a few tax-collection places from the Middle Ages which, by their location, prove that Burgenland was a part of Hungary – Köpcsény, in the county of Moson, which was a Royal Crown possession in 1363; Szárazvár in the county of Sopron, which was mentioned as a tax collection place in 1320 and Nezsider, a Royal Hungarian tax collection place. (Dabas, p. 93)

In the territory of the Rozária Mountain, Lajtaszentmiklós extended into Lower Austria, as far as the Lajta River and somewhere here, in front of the gates of Bécsújhely was the Hungarian borderline. Here in the heavy traffic on the bridge was the most ancient tax collection place of Hungary and the one which was the furthest in the west. King Endre II., mentioned it in a document in 1223. This place later became the so-called „thirtieth” Hungarian tax-collection office and preserved its function in the village name of Vámósderecske (Vám - duty) in the county of Sopron. (Dabas, p.93)

A document from 1428, mentions the village of Keresztúr as a tax-collection place on the highway from Fehérvár to Gráz, which is on the Hungarian borderline in the territory of Rába-Lapincs, in Vas county.

In spite of these many facts which I have mentioned and many others not mentioned here, the Austrians based their claim to Burgenland as an inherited possession because the village of Kismárton was Austrian. They demanded this territory back at the Peace Conference at

Trianon as a territory which had originally been taken from them by the Hungarians. (Dabas, p. 94)

The Carpathian Basin was regarded by the East as a passage to the West and similarly the Westerners regarded it as a passage to the East. First the Germans tried to possess it with force, then the Hapsburgs tried to take it with cunning and falsifications. It is a proven fact that the Hungarian ethnic border was at Ostarrichi, Styria and Moravia. The Hungarian and Slav names in the foundation document of the Abbey at Újvár (Küssen) prove that this was the border.¹⁴⁹

The populace of the marchlands, until the 12th. century was Hungarian, Avar, Szekler and Pecheneg. From the middle of the 12th. Century, the marchlands were flooded with Germans. Burghardt states: „The border strips of territory, including especially the westernmost portions now comprising Burgenland, were kept unpopulated for over a century. This was the *gyepü*, a glacis or empty zone along the frontier; only small fighting forces were allowed to live within this glacis. . . . As long as threats from the west seemed serious, this border area was kept a wasteland, but by the twelfth century Hungary felt secure against Austria and promoted the settlement of the *gyepü*.” (Burghardt, p. 67)

In 1157 Géza II. gave a land grant in this territory to the Germans from Styria and by so doing caused a change in the balance of the population in the area. In a short time there were more Germans than Hungarians. When the Szeklers were resettled from here to Transylvania, the number of Hungarians decreased even further. Burghardt says: „Gradually the Pechenegs and some of the Magyar groups were absorbed into the German speaking majority.” (Burghardt, p. 111) (At Trianon, the Austrians tried to camouflage their policy of assimilation and blamed the Hungarians for trying to do the same thing to them.) Burghardt says: „The ease and thoroughness with which the Tartars (1241) devastated this area suggests again the probability of open spaces.” (Burghardt, p.288) From this border territory of Ostarrichi, the Hungarians fled in large numbers because they could no longer prevent the ever increasing numbers of Germans entering their territory, destroying the agriculture and killing the people. According to Ede Moór, they fled into the Turkish occupied territories.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁹ Ibid. p. 97-98; Moór, E. p. 243

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. p. 99; Moór, p.323

The plague of 1409-1410 also contributed to the loss of Hungarians, especially in the territory of Rápce. In 1532, when the Turks were unable to occupy the castle of Kőszeg, and were forced to retreat, in his anger and disappointment, the Sultan ordered all this territory to be burned and all the people to be killed in the territory of Rápce and Felsőőr. In 1532, when the Croats were chased out by the Turks from the shoreline of the Adriatic Sea, they found sparsely populated land in the territory of Rápce and Felsőőr and settled in this area. From this time on, not only the Germans but also the Croats absorbed the remaining Hungarians into their numbers and „in those areas where Croatian villages formed clusters, the language had maintained itself strongly and probably absorbed German and Magyar elements.” (Burghardt, p.158) After the liberation of Buda from the Turks, in 1686, because of the Hapsburg settlement politics, which settled the Slav, Wallachian and German peoples in large numbers in this territory, the numbers of Hungarians decreased considerably. In 1722-1723, a law was passed, giving the new settlers a waiver from paying taxes for a six-year period. The craftsmen received a fifteen-year waiver. At the same time the Hungarians were heavily taxed. (Dabas, p. 100)

The Austrian anti-Hungarian politics are reflected in the statistical drop in Hungarian population in Burgenland. According to the 1910 census, when Burgenland was an integral part of Hungary, the total population was 291,618. By 1923, the number had dropped to 275,851, a decrease of 5.4%. The Hungarian population in the territory given to Austria was estimated to be 65,000 before Trianon. The census of 1920, showed that there were 24,867 Hungarians on this territory, which was 8%. This does not include the numbers of Hungarians who fled from this territory during the previous three years and emigrated to America. Three years later, in the Austrian census of 1923, there were 14,931 Hungarians in this territory, which is 5.2%. In the census of 1934, there were 10,430 Hungarians, 3.5%. The distorted statistical data after the second World War reflect the anti-Hungarian politics of the Austrians even more. The Österreichisches Lexikon of 1966, writing of the population in 1961, mentions that the Hungarians were only 2% of the population, whereas the Encyclopedia Britannica, in 1973, stated that they were 4%. The Fodor Tourist Guide to Austria in 1972 (p.195), is probably the most accurate in stating the percentages of the nationalities

because the numbers were not gathered according to the language spoken, but by the ethnic origin of the people. It states that there were 14% Croatians and 6% Hungarians. (Dabas, p. 100) The official statistics from Austria state that there were 10% Croatians and almost 2% Hungarians but these statistics were based on the language spoken. Many Croatians and Hungarians by that time no longer spoke their mother tongue.

If we take the 1920 Austrian census as the basis of our calculation, that is 25,000 Hungarians, and if we estimate a 0.5% population growth over 50 years, this number should have grown to a minimum of 31,250.¹⁵¹ Since 1920, the Austrian rule over Burgenland caused the Hungarian population to drop to lower than one sixth of the population. The Austrian statistics do not mention the original Hungarian numbers, nor the growth rate. Dabas believes that such conduct, which has in 70 years suppressed the numbers of an ancient populace to one sixth of their original number, does not match the European liberalism which they emphasize. This is none other than genocide. When a people who has fallen into a minority status cannot keep their national character because all the possibilities of retaining their heritage and language have been revoked; when their existence is simply denied or their percentage of the population is falsely presented as being so low that it is negligible, this is in effect a kind of genocide. Genocide can be committed in „the Serbian manner” or it can be accomplished by taking away all the possibilities for a group to retain its culture and to survive.

Religious and racial tolerance is a basic quality of the Hungarians. D. Sinor states: „In practice the government was not harder on alien nationalities than on Hungarians. Indeed, in many respects, the former actually found themselves more favorably placed than the Hungarians.”¹⁵² From time to time, if there were decisions which were unfavorable to the minorities, that was as a result of the European influence of that time period. Some historians bring out that the Hungarians were too tolerant with their minorities and that was the cause of Trianon. Burghardt states: „**Hungary, in contrast to Austria, may**

¹⁵¹ Ibid. p. 101; Austria, population, 1971, 7.4 million with an annual growth rate of 0.5%; U.S. State Department 1972

¹⁵² Ibid. p. 107; Sinor, D.: *History of Hungary*, p. 277

have suffered from too much tolerance and perhaps what was wrong with her policy of forced assimilation was that it came too late.” (Burghardt, p. 160) Pozsony and its territory became Slovak as a result of this Hungarian over-tolerance. While 24 Hungarian villages in the Viennese Basin were completely Germanized in the course of one century, at the same time, 56 Croatian villages, beyond the River Lajta, under Hungarian administration, in the three centuries before Trianon, were able to remain Croatian. **This was possible because of the Hungarian over-tolerance.** This means that for three centuries the Croats were able to keep their language and their national character. Burghardt states: „ **In fact, it can be said that, contrary to general opinion, Hungary was more tolerant of her minorities than Austria, and that the reason for the presence of the Croatian minority within Burgenland today, just as for the presence of a Protestant minority is simply that this area was within Hungary.**” (Burghardt, p. 159)

At the beginning of the fifteenth century, the Jews were chased out of Carinthia and Styria and the Protestants were being persecuted. The Austrians never mention that it was due to the tolerant attitude of the Hungarians that the Jews were able to settle in Burgenland. When they do talk about the Jews in Burgenland, they present it as a humanitarian action of their own. Burghardt names the largest Jewish settlements in Burgenland protected by the Hungarians. „After 1671, the Jewish communities in Eisenstadt, Mattersburg, Deutschkreutz, Lackenbach, Kobersdorf, Frauenkirchen and Kittsee were under the direct protection of Prince Esterházy, who exercised his noble prerogative to protect them from various taxes and payments.” (Burghardt, p. 317)

To present the Hungarians' national and religious tolerance, Dabas mentions that, in mutilated Hungary, 710,000 Jews were living and in the whole of Austria, 70,000. In the Hapsburg Austrian Empire, they never had such religious freedom as in Hungary, where already, in 1568, at the Torda National Assembly, the freedom of religion was declared. At the same time in Austria, the Protestants were being persecuted. These facts can be proven by numbers. In Burgenland, in the eighteenth century, the percentage of Protestants was 14.37% and in Austria, only 6.2%. Even in the eighteenth century Lutheran Germans

were chased out of Austria to settle in Burgenland in the territory of the River Lapincs.¹⁵³

The Hungarian argument to refute the accusation of Magyarization of the Germans is that the minorities were able to remain for centuries in Hungary and were able to retain their national character, their language and religion and did not voluntarily migrate out of this territory to a more liberal country. That their numbers actually increased rather than decreased is the greatest argument other than the Hungarian tolerance and humanitarianism. In spite of the policies of King István I., King Béla IV., and King Lajos the Great of settling foreigners into Hungary, Hungary remained a national state, because the foreigners regarded themselves as Hungarian. However, from the seventeenth century, because of the influx of small nationalities fleeing from the Turks, who were encouraged by the Hapsburgs to retain their feelings of nationality, Hungary became a multi-national state. Since the Treaty of Trianon, in 1920, because of the enforced settlement, into the territories taken from Hungary, of settlers from the Successor States and especially in Burgenland, the Hungarians have found themselves in a minority status. This trend continued after 1945.

It is very regrettable, but a good lesson for the Hungarians to learn, that those people who were welcomed into Hungary made a big propaganda campaign against Hungary, claiming that they were suppressed. These people, who had been able to remain in their own settlements, keep their language, customs and religion conducted this campaign with the purpose of winning foreign support for their demand to annex Hungarian territory to the states from which they originated. The Hapsburgs were those who worked for centuries so that they could conquer and subdue and take over the territory of Hungary, but this campaign of smearing the Hungarians has still not ended because their encyclopedia even now talk of Hungarian oppression. This is why they would not allow the plebiscite, because they knew from the example of Sopron, Burgenland would have remained Hungarian. Even Professor Walheim, of German origin, born in Sopron was forced to note that: „The people of Burgenland regard the Austrians as foreigners in Burgenland.”¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³ Ibid. p. 109; Moór, Ede, p. 306

¹⁵⁴ Ibid. p. 110; Walheim, A. *Deutsch-Öster. Tageszeitung*, 1921, August 27

The view of the most objective historians is that the goal of the Successor States was to ruin the good name of the Hungarians. Burghardt says: „It seems to have become a part of the official point of view to stress the „horrors” of the semi-legendary Hungarian past.” (Burghardt, p. 307)

In their presentation of the bad image of the Hungarians, the Austrians went so far as to instigate the Croatian populace who had lived under Hungarian rule in Burgenland for four hundred years, to develop an anti-Hungarian propaganda and distort the historic facts. The Austrians boast that the Croats now hold public offices in Austria as if, under Hungarian rule, this was never possible before. But the uninformed reader will not know that the Austrians lowered the number of the Croatian population in Burgenland to one fifth of the population which lived there in the time that Burgenland belonged to Hungary. „In schools and in churches where now German is preached, under the ‘suppressive’ Hungarians the sermons were in Croatian.”¹⁵⁵ This was natural in Hungary because the Doctrine of the Holy Crown states that every nationality should enjoy equal freedom. (Una eademque libertas) The Hungarian Constitution not only made this a law but also put it into practise and guaranteed the use of the minorities’ language. Macartney said: „The free use of any language in private life was guaranteed.”¹⁵⁶ The politicians forget to mention that there is an important factor which would nullify or lessen the anti-Hungarian propaganda and that is that the official language in Hungary, until 1844, was the Latin language. This meant that the nationalities did not have to learn the Hungarian language to settle their business. They had to learn the Latin language. Therefore they did not have to worry about becoming Magyarized. This law was definitely a disadvantage for the Hungarians. This was the main factor that the nationalities did not assimilate into the Hungarians. The anti-Hungarian accusation that the Magyars who lived in Felvidék (Slovakia) and the Szeklers who lived in Transylvania (Rumania) and the Csángók are all Magyarized Slavs and Rumanians is absolutely false.

In defense of the Hungarian people, we can examine the situation in nineteenth century Europe. There was scarcely any European nation which did not practise oppression. I would like to

¹⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 112; *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, Munich, 1980, Oct. 18-19

¹⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 112; Macartney: *Hungary*, 1962 p. 112

mention here the British, French, Belgian, and Spanish colonial policies and the uprisings of the minorities of Corsica. Colonial rule and oppression was accepted by the Europeans. Why then was there this self-righteous indignation among the Europeans against Hungary when she supposedly „suppressed” her minorities? Was it because they wanted to cover up their own crimes and their lack of knowledge about Hungarian history? They were influenced by a bold, chauvinist political goal. The French forgot to look at themselves when they condemned the Hungarians with false accusations. Burghardt says: „The first modern nationalists of Europe, the French, as early as 1794, began a campaign to force the Bretons, Alsatians, Flemings, etc., of France, to speak French.” (Burghardt, p. 305) „There was no discrimination in Hungary against non-Hungarians.”¹⁵⁷ Dabas says that if there had been Hungarian oppression in the land of Burgenland then, in the County of Vas, the Germans would not have been able to keep their language for six or seven hundred years (p. 113). If there had been Hungarian oppression in Burgenland, as they advocate, then why is it that, in spite of this Hungarian oppression, the Germans came to settle there in large numbers? Why did they not emigrate from there to a better environment to find a freer, better life?

When the Hapsburg oppression was unbearable in Transylvania, thousands of Hungarians and Szeklers left their motherland and migrated outside of the Carpathian mountains in the hope of finding a better life.

In the Middle Ages, the Walloon settlers and the French, who were chased out by their own feudal lords, came and found refuge in Hungary during the Turkish occupation. The Hungarian Kingdom accepted all refugees without any discrimination. The Lutherans and Jews, who were chased out of Vienna and Styria, found refuge in Hungary. Would these refugees have come if they knew they would be oppressed as severely as where they had come from?

We have proof of the free use of the German language in Hungary. „In den Dörfern, mit Ausnahme derer, die kroatisch oder ungarisch waren, sprach man ausschleisslich Deutsch, der Pfarrer predigte von der Kanzel in der deutschen Sprache u. bei der Faschingsunterhaltungen wurde auf deutsch gestritten u. gerauft.” („In the villages, with the exception of those which were purely Croatian or

¹⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 113; Sinor, D. P. Op. Cit. 277-278

Hungarian, German was spoken exclusively. The priest spoke in German from the pulpit and during the festival of the Carnival (Mardi Gras), the people shouted or quarrelled in German.”¹⁵⁸ German was accepted as an official language beside Hungarian in Hungary. For example, in the Register of Deaths at Pinkafő in Burgenland, in 1900, the entries were written in German and Hungarian. More documents in German can be found in the Archives of the Burgenland Administration at Kismarton. (Dabas, p. 114)

The Hungarians cannot be held responsible for those few people who actually became Magyarized. That Magyarization was the result of the freedom that they felt in Hungary and their feeling of friendship with the Hungarians. „No attempt was made to force a new language upon the non-Magyars. . .”(Burghardt, p. 111) Macartney writes that the Rumanians, Slovaks and Germans were most successful in assimilating the Hungarians into their communities. Burghardt states that the mistake of the Hungarians was that they were too late in imposing the Hungarian language in the schools, not that they were too strict in imposing their language. „Again it appears that the mistakes of the Magyars may have been their tardiness rather than their rigor.” (Burghardt, p. 161)

We can state that the mistake of the Hungarians was that they realized the danger too late. Before the time of Trianon, in 1891, in the County of Vas, only 12.5% of the non-Hungarians spoke the Hungarian language.¹⁵⁹ Today the Hungarians who live in the so-called „democratic” Successor States have to learn the language of the country to which they belong and they are not allowed to use their mother tongue in public. Where are the so often mentioned basic human rights?

Burghardt, who knows well the shameful act of Trianon, mentions the Austrian assimilation of Hungarians: „The Croats as well as the Magyars seem certain to be assimilated within a few decades.” (Burghardt, 273)

If the Austrian intention was so clear, then why did the Great Powers, who guaranteed the freedom and basic human rights of the Hungarians in Austria, not intervene to stop this assimilation?

Together with the territory of Western Hungary (Burgenland), Austria received populace of 18% who were not Germans. In the

¹⁵⁸ Ibid. p. 114; Berczeller, Burgenlandschicksal, 215

¹⁵⁹ Ibid. p.115; Pallas Nagy Lexikon Vol. XVI. under *Vas County*

County of Sopron, the Hungarian and Croatian populace were considered as one unit. There was no reason for the annexation to Austria. Dabas says it was a crime to give it to them.

In 1910, the German and Wend population of the villages in the Lapincs Valley and the left bank of the River Rába totalled 3163. The Hungarians on the right bank of the River Rába totalled 2030. The right bank of the River Rába had remained Hungarian from the beginning of the age of the Árpáds,. The left bank became Germanized. Macartney declared the ethnic border of Historic Hungary in the west, to be unchanged from that time. „Broadly, the ethnic frontiers in the west, north and east remained stationary on almost the exact lines on which they had been established at the end of the *impopulatio*.”¹⁶⁰ The Germans had lived within the historic border of Hungary for 700 years and their population had been allowed to grow to twenty-five times their original number, in that period of time. Since 1920, the Hungarians living in the territory given to Austria were forced to assimilate and, within fifty years, their population was reduced to one fifth of their original number. (Dabas, p.120) Yet the Hungarians are accused of forcefully assimilating other nationalities.

In 1977, in a lecture at the Historical Institute in Vienna, Seton-Watson attacked the Hungarians in the following way: „Die ungarischen Regierungen der Epoche des Dualismus bemühten sich sehr energisch die Rumänen und Slowaken und andere Völker zu Magyaren zu machen, aber diese Anstrengungen schlugen fehl: Sie haben nur dem antimagyarischen Nationalismus verstärkt. . . . Inzwischen bemühten sich die britischen Behörden kaum aus Asiaten oder Afrikanen Engländer zu machen.” („The Hungarian regimes during the period of the Dual Monarchy made energetic efforts to Magyarize the Rumanians, Slovaks and other peoples but these forceful methods failed. They only strengthened the anti-Hungarian nationalism. . . .At the same time, the British colonialists hardly tried to make Englishmen out of Asians or Africans.”)¹⁶¹

¹⁶⁰ Ibid. p.120; Macartney, C.A.: Hungary, 1962, p.187

¹⁶¹ Ibid. p.121; Seton Watson, Hugh: Multinational Staaten u. Nationalismen Öster. Osthefte; Vienna, 1978, II. p. 361, Lecture: Öster. Ost-u. Südosteuropa Institut. Nov. 22, 1977. English text unavailable.

How can Seton-Watson compare the people colonized by the British with the nationalities in Hungary? He tries to present the British colonization as good action when he writes this. At the same time he forgets to mention that the British were colonizers and were not the original ancient populace on that territory as were the Hungarians in Hungary. Rezső Dabas writes: „In India there were not three million original English inhabitants, like the three million Transylvanian Magyars and Szeklers in Hungary who, in spite of being the ancient populace, were given to those Rumanians who had slowly infiltrated into this territory. Seton Watson draws false parallels between the Hungarians and the British, with perfidious reasoning. He tries to clear the image of the world's greatest colonizers.” (Dabas, p.121) The nationalities living in Hungary were „guests”. They had fled from the Turks and their own feudal lords, and they came of their own free will into the well-organized kingdom of Hungary. Under the influence of the French Revolution, as in all the European countries, Hungarian nationalism also blossomed. Therefore the Hungarians had the right to rule that the Hungarian language be the official language of the entire Hungarian Kingdom. This attempt was justified because the official languages of Hungary for many centuries were Latin or German, under Hapsburg oppression.

Dabas points out that it has always been the policy of the American Government to expect the immigrants of all nations to give up their nationality and assimilate by adopting the English language. „Americans established a public primary school system and legislated that all instruction was to be in English.”¹⁶² The Successor States which declared themselves to be democracies do not allow immigrants to have public schools in their own languages, nor do the United States or Canada. „At the same time, the western politicians admonished Hungary for imposing a few hours of Hungarian language instruction in the elementary and secondary schools.”¹⁶³ However, the Hungarians have always allowed the minorities to have their own schools, even when they adopted Hungarian as the official administrative language of the country.

Jeromos Szalay and other historians like Macartney claim that the Hungarian Minority Law of 1868 was Europe's most humane

¹⁶² Ibid. p. 368; Larousse Geography, p. 463

¹⁶³ Ibid. p.124; Liptay, L. Hungary the Innocent Victim, p. 15

minority law. Why was it not successful when it received this favorable opinion? The answer is simple. Jeromos Szalay says: „The nationalities sabotaged it because they wanted territories.”¹⁶⁴ According to the Law of 1868, the churches could establish their own parochial schools and freely choose the language of instruction. In actuality, the parochial schools were 95.4% of the schools in Hungary. Because the churches received religious autonomy, in practically all the schools, the children were able to learn in their own mother-tongue. „The churches had the right to prescribe the language of instruction in the schools controlled by them.”¹⁶⁵ This system was accused of being chauvinistic and oppressive. Between 1879 and 1883, when the new law was introduced by which all instruction had to be in Hungarian, the parochial schools were exempt from this law and could continue to use the language of their choice. From 1879, the Hungarian language was introduced as a subject in elementary school for a few hours. In 1883, the Hungarian language was introduced as a subject in the secondary schools. (Dabas, p. 124) „In fact, the only measures, were that in 1879, the teaching of the Magyar language, as a subject, during a number of hours to be prescribed by the Minister of Cults and Education was made compulsory in primary schools and that in 1883, Magyar language and literature were made compulsory subjects in the two top forms of secondary schools.” (Macartney, p. 184)

In 1907, 76% of the schools were parochial schools, therefore the „Magyarization” was no more than a false accusation against the Hungarians.

According to Burghardt, instruction in Hungary was bilingual. How much the Hungarian language was used depended on the teacher. German reading books were used regularly. „The amount of Magyar used in the teaching of the other subjects varied with the teacher. In some villages, it appears that everything else was in Magyar; in others evidently both Magyar and German readers were used. So that instruction was actually bilingual.” (Burghardt, 152) In Ruthenia, the language of instruction was Ruthenian. In 1906, in Historic Hungary, 492 elementary schools and 13 secondary schools were German. Today there is not one Hungarian elementary school in Burgenland. The

¹⁶⁴ Ibid. P. 124; Szalay Jeromos: Op. Cit. p. 312

¹⁶⁵ Ibid. p. 124; Macartney, p. 170

Hungarians were accused of not allowing the nationalities the opportunity to attend secondary school and universities. This is refuted by Burghardt: „Contrary to general Western opinion, there does not seem to have been any ethnic criterion for being able to advance to the upper schools.” (Burghardt, 153-154)

In 1938, Hitler sent an administrator, called Kepler, to organize the Germanization of the educational system in Burgenland. As a result, in many cases, two villages were merged and the Hungarian educational system was erased. There was no longer the possibility of using the Hungarian language in public life. The government which followed Hitler continued the Germanization policy in Burgenland.¹⁶⁶

Paragraph 7 of the Austrian Constitution still mentions the rights of the minorities in Burgenland but this does not apply to the original Hungarian populace. They are treated as if they are non-existent. This law mentions only the Slav minorities. The Hungarians are not even mentioned, in spite of the fact that throughout four centuries, the Hungarians and Austrians were ruled by a common ruler, the Hapsburgs, and they were also part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. This action of the Austrians shows their centuries-old antagonism and lack of sincerity. (Dabas, 126) I agree with Dabas' opinion that the Slavs were mentioned because the Austrians were afraid of the murderous Serbian leaders.

It is true that, after the Second World War, on paper, the Austrian administration allowed some elementary schools to use the Hungarian language as the language of instruction. This was, however, too late because there were so few Hungarians, no teachers and no opportunity to continue the instruction in the secondary schools. The time for this should have been after World War I.

The percentage of minorities in Burgenland in 1976 was 15%. In mutilated Hungary, the number of minorities was approximately 100,000, i.e. under 1%. According to the information of 1976, these minorities had 78 non-Hungarian nursery-schools and 22 minority elementary schools. In 289 elementary schools, the language of the minorities was taught. There were also seven high-schools where the language of the minorities was taught. The minority students could

¹⁶⁶ Ibid. P. 125; Karsten, F.L.: *Fascist Movements in Austria*, p. 328

continue their education at the university level in any of the Successor States at the expense of the Hungarian state. (Dabas, 127)

In spite of all of this, the Successor States still claim the Magyarization which does not exist and never existed. The best known German Encyclopedia, the Brockhaus Lexikon writes about: „Magyarische Nationalitäten Politik” (Dabas, p.110) This propaganda is spread so that the territory which was stolen from Hungary will never have the chance of being restored to Hungary. At the same time they are preparing for the annexation of even more territory from Hungary.

The Austrians explain to the world that their educational system, which suppresses the nationalities, is necessary because this policy of Germanization in the schools provides the minorities with the means of becoming equal to the Austrian citizens and allows them to obtain equal working opportunities. This is the way they manipulate the people. Dabas says that he believes that the difference in the educational policy of the two states, Hungary and Austria, speaks for itself. (p.127)

Until 1938, at Felsőőr, in Burgenland, the Hungarian language was used in the public administration but there was pressure to Germanize it. After this time, in the elementary schools, the children were not allowed to use their mother-tongue. Burghardt remarks about this policy of Germanization: „Thus Oberwart (Felsőőr) has become German and Magyars are being rapidly Germanized. . . Because of its importance, Oberwart has been subjected to intense pressure to Germanize.” (Burghardt, 248, 250) In the county of Baranya, in Hungary, where there is a mixed populace, the street signs are all in two languages. Why doesn't Austria, who declares herself to be democratic, follow the Hungarian example? If Austria were to use the Hungarian educational policy in regard to her minorities, the tension would be eased.

The situation is the same in the so-called „Socialist” countries. They all deny the five million Hungarians living within their borders the basic human rights of using their mother-tongue, education in their own language and the practice of their customs. Even now, after Trianon, only the Hungarians guarantee the basic human rights to their minorities. This is one sided and, if the surrounding countries do not do the same, this could lead to further annexation of Hungarian territories.

The Hungarians of Felsőőr and Felsőpulya, in the journal *Határmenti Hírek*, expressed their last call for help, when they asked the

Austrians, at least here, in this territory where the Hungarians still live in a community of 3,800 people, to allow them to have a Hungarian school. The Austrian Government, which counts itself to be very European, still applies cultural oppression. This situation is doubly hard for the descendents of the indigenous Hungarian populace because the Hungarian Communist Government did nothing and the present Socialist Government does very little to help these Hungarians of Burgenland. They gave them up and forgot them because they want to become a member of the European Union. This lack of concern on the part of the Hungarian Government emboldened the Austrian Government to the point that they do not even allow the existence of an organization to safeguard the interests of Hungarians in Austria. This is why every kind of linguistic and cultural concession requested by the Hungarians is denied by the state or the local administration.

After World War II., all instruction in Hungarian gradually ceased and an even greater oppression of Hungarians began. At the same time, the Hungarians in Burgenland opposed the Communist regime in Hungary, although they knew that the Communist government system would not be temporary, and under Communism, there was no possibility of even mentioning the plight of the Hungarians living in the separated territories. This realization meant that they had to choose the lesser of two evils, and they chose to become Austrian. Another reason that the Hungarians of Burgenland became estranged from the Hungarians in Hungary was that, after 1945, the reign of terror of Mátyás Rákosi (originally Roth) completely closed the Western border and it was impossible to maintain any cultural connections. The Hungarians living in the Successor States could not rely on any support from the Hungarian Communist regime, which disallowed any expression of nationalism, therefore in their hopelessness, they lived the best they could. In most cases, this resulted in assimilation.

The life of the Croatians in Burgenland is somewhat better than that of the Hungarians but they will also be assimilated in the near future. This better life is due to their larger numbers and to the fact that there are Slavs living in the surrounding areas. These Croatians, fleeing from the Turks, settled into Burgenland, with the permission of the Hungarians, six to seven hundred years after the Hungarians settled this area. The assimilation politics of the Austrians serve the same goal as those of the genocidal Rumanians, Slovaks or Serbs. In Burgenland, the

Austrians allowed only the German language to be spoken. Later, in Germany, Hitler adopted this same policy. Austria should follow the example of Switzerland and Canada and allow the mother-tongue to be used in schools, in administration and should post street signs in both languages. The courts should be bi-lingual and the TV and radio also. If Switzerland and Canada can provide bilingualism in their country then Austria should be encouraged to adopt this system.

Chapter 11

Northern Hungary
(Felvidék, Slovakia)

After the Avar Empire dissolved, the Carpathian Basin had several temporary rulers. The Pan-Slavic historians created princes out of the Slav feudal lords, who temporarily took possession of territories in the Carpathian Basin. For example, they called the territory of the feudal lord called Samo, who ruled for twenty-one years, a „Slav empire”, or they called the territory of Svatopluk, Zwentibold, an „empire” which existed for about twenty five years. There are no contemporary sources of information which mention the Slavs as having an empire. Only the Pan-Slavic historians talk about the „Slav Empire”. There are no sources which give both bad and good information about them as they do about the Huns. Colin McEvedy states: „Politically, all the Slavs were very backward. Their myriad chieftains lacked all sense of unity and they were therefore easily dominated by other races.”¹⁶⁷ W.G. East says: „The economy of the Slavs was of a rudimentary type. Agriculture and trade had little place in their economy.”¹⁶⁸

According to Hugh Seton-Watson: „The Slavs, according to their nature were sly. They lived in the depths of the forests and the moors, avoiding strongholds: instead of waging war openly, they applied continuous robbing, harassing actions.”¹⁶⁹ Jenő M. Fehér says: „The Slavs’ role in the people’s migration was a very insignificant one. Their cultural level was low; their social organization was primitive and their ability to create a state was non-existent.”¹⁷⁰ The Croats were fugitives who fled from the Turks and when they arrived in Hungary, Hungary had already been in existence as a state for seven hundred years.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid. p. 102; McEvedy, C.: The Penguin Atlas of Medieval History. p.22

¹⁶⁸ Ibid. p. 102; East, W.G.: p. 81

¹⁶⁹ Ibid. p.102; Seton-Watson, Hugh: Eastern Europe between the Wars. p. 12

¹⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 102; Fehér M. Jenő, Korai Avar kagánok.p. 187

According to Kniezsa, the Slav people's greatest political organization was that of the clan. They lived at the edge of the forests and the Steppes and this itself prevented them from forming a higher political organization.¹⁷¹

Ferenczy mentions that the Slavs became more significant at the time of the Avar rule and they can thank the Avars for teaching them how to form a state.¹⁷² It is false information that the Magyars suppressed them and erased them. Sándor Nagy says that the theory that the Slavs were assimilated in large numbers by the Magyars is erroneous. They did not live in large numbers in the Carpathian Basin in the ninth century. Their numbers were insignificant at that time compared to the autochthonous ancient populace of Pannonia who were not Slavs.¹⁷³ The situation is the reverse here. The numbers of the Hungarians decreased after centuries of long continuous wars against the Tartars, the Turks and the Hapsburgs and the Slavs were later able to absorb them into their numbers. Therefore there was no Hungarian oppression against them.

The Wends were maybe the only group of Slavs which lived in a larger organized group in the territory of Western Hungary. They were the ones who pushed the Hungarians out of the territory of Őrség, in Vas county and Hetés, in Zala county. These Wend people became good Hungarian supporters because at the time of Trianon, they opposed the break from Hungary.

The Pan-Slavists advocate that the political border of the territory of Moravia was at the Rába River in Pannonia but Macartney questions this. He states: „We have no evidence that Pannonia was ever a part of Moravia.”¹⁷⁴ Edward Gibbon was of the same opinion: „That ample and fertile land was loosely occupied by the Moravians.”¹⁷⁵ These statements emphasize that, at the time of Árpád, not the Slovaks, but the Moravian Slavs lived in scattered settlements, without organization, in the western territories of the Carpathian Mountains.

¹⁷¹ Ibid. p. 103; Laszló, Gyula, p. 103, quoted from Kniezsa

¹⁷² Ibid. p. 103; Ferenczy, I.: A magyar föld népeinek története honfoglalásig, p. 119-120

¹⁷³ Ibid. p. 103; Nagy, Sándor: A magyar nép kialakulásának története, p. 96

¹⁷⁴ Ibid. p.105; Macartney, C.A.: The Magyars in the Ninth Century, p.149

¹⁷⁵ Ibid. p.105; Gibbon: Volume V. p. 570

The existence of the Moravian Empire is still without proof. Even now, nobody knows the name or the location of the supposed capital. Now probably the Slavs could bring up the counter-accusation that the Hungarians do not know where the capital of Atilla was located. However, according to Dabas, the Empire of Atilla was four centuries earlier than the supposed Moravian Empire and recently, his capital has been found in the Pilis Mountains near Esztergom. The Moravian Empire was nothing more than a union of tribes. The Slav distortions are so reckless that they state that the Hungarians learned agriculture from them, when it is a well-known fact in the scientific world that „they lived miserably, from hand to mouth.”¹⁷⁶

When the Magyars arrived in the Carpathian Basin in the ninth century, they found very few Slavs. At that time, there was a Moravian-Slav state around the city of Nyitra, which had existed for sixty years. Prince Mojmir I. (A.D. 830-846) chased out Pribina, who found refuge with the Franks where he became a *comes*, the governor of a castle from 847 to 862.

The Czech historians claim that, when Árpád entered the Carpathian Basin in AD 896, there were Slavs living in a state of Moravia whose Prince was called Svatopluk. Árpád supposedly bought this territory from Svatopluk for a white horse, a saddle ornamented with gold and a golden bit. However it is documented that Prince Svatopluk died in A.D. 894, so how was it possible for Árpád to buy the Carpathian Basin from him in AD 896? We know that, when Árpád and the Homecoming Magyars entered the Carpathian Basin in A.D. 896, there was no state of Moravia in existence in the Carpathian Basin. The original sources write Svatopluk's name as Zwentibold. This name was originally of German origin but it was Slavicized to Svatopluk or Sventopolk. The western chronicles write: „Zwentibold and Rastez had a camp north of the territory of the Margrave of Moravia and they attacked the German territories in Pannonia.”¹⁷⁷ After the dissolution of the Avar Empire, Zwentibold managed to create a temporary Slav rule in the area. In A.D. 860, Zwentibold and his uncle, Rastez, made an alliance with the slaves of the salt-mines and they started to harass the

¹⁷⁶ Ibid. p.106; Davis, R.H.C.: History of Medieval Europe, p. 400

¹⁷⁷ Botos, Op. Cit. P. 9; Fekete, Zsigmond: Hól volt, hól nem volt, Pribina országa, Buenos Aires, 1978, p.78

German states in Upper Pannonia. King Ludwig II. sent his son, Ludwig, to settle one of these conflicts and he, himself, attacked Zwentibold. When he was captured, Zwentibold negotiated with Ludwig and betrayed his uncle, Rastiz. Ludwig II. then called an assembly of the Franks, Bavarians, Saxons and Slavs who unanimously decreed that Zwentibold should be blinded and lose all his powers. This happened in A.D. 870 and, after that, Zwentibold disappeared from the history books. He died in A.D. 894.

The Czechs or Bohemians broke away from the Moravians and became serfs of the Franks. There was another attempt to reestablish the Moravian rule when they attacked Hungary but at the Battle of Bánhid, in A.D. 907, they were defeated and were never heard of again. „Nestor, (A.D. 1074-1114) a monk of Kiev, in his Chronicles, calls the populace of the Moravian state ‘Slavs’. Cosmas (1039-1125), a Czech writer, in his historic works, did not even mention the Slovaks among the Slav nations. The Register of Pozsony only talks of Slavs but not Slovaks but often mentions such names as Tót, Vend, Hungari-Slavoni, Slaven, and Wenden. The name ‘Slovak’ as the name of the present Slovak people, was first used by Antal Bernolák (1762-1813).”¹⁷⁸ The Slovak people was formed after the Magyar Homecoming in the northern part of Hungary (Felvidék) by the intermarriage of scattered Slav, Avar, German, Hun, Kun, Pecheneg and Hungarian people. The kings of the Árpád dynasty settled these people in the positions of border guards of the marchlands. The kings built castles on the marchlands, the ruins of which can still be seen. In the twelfth century the Árpád dynasty kings settled many Germans, Bavarians, Flemish, Saxons and Schwabs in these northern territories of Nyitra, Túróc, Trencsén, Liptó, and the territory of Szepesség. In the sixteenth century Wallachian shepherds migrated into the grazing lands of the Carpathians.

The first large-scale ethnic mixing took place after the Tartar invasion. The peoples living in these territories began to think about forming a nation in the sixteenth century. Among the Slovaks this feeling only surfaced in the eighteenth century. Initially, it was the Slovak priests and teachers who started the idea and later the lawyers took over the leadership of the movement. It was a dispute about the

¹⁷⁸ Kostya, Sándor: *A Felvidék*. Budapest, 1990 p. 9-10

Slovak language which initiated the idea of forming a nation. At that time there was no distinct Slovak language.

Three „scientific” Slav theories developed concerning the Slovaks. None of them agreed..

1. According to the accepted Slovak theory, the Slovak tribe was the first to break away from the northern Slav tribes and migrate to the south to Moravia, reaching the territories of the Rivers Enns and Lajta.
2. The Czechs deny that the Slovaks were an independent nation. According to the Czechs, the Czechs and the Slavs together crossed the Oder and Vistula rivers. According to this theory, the Slovak language was just a dialect of the Czech language. In the Czech view, the Slovaks are Czechs or Hungarians, converted into Slovaks. According to the Czech historian, Frantisek Palacky, the Slovak separation from the Slavs was caused by the Homecoming Magyars. He says that this was the greatest Hungarian sin because they placed an obstacle in the way of the unification of the Northern and Southern Slavs, preventing the formation of a great Slav Empire.
3. The Slovak people only accepts a part of these „scientific” Slav theories. According to the Skultéty theory, the Slovaks had already separated from the other Slav tribes in the ancient Slav homeland. Skultéty believes that in the first century A.D., they arrived as an independent tribe in the Danube territory. The border of the Slovak territory is the Danube from Lower Austria to Dévény, Komárom and Esztergom. This border goes to the foot of the Mátra and Bükk Mountains to Miskolc and east to the Rivers Tisza and Bodrog as far as the Polish border. **Since the Slovaks have been known only since the ninth century, Kostya asks where they were hiding for eight centuries before that time.** According to the theory of Safarik and Stur, Slav historians, the Slovaks believe themselves to be heirs to the Great Moravian Empire. „The Slovak people were the rulers of both shores of the Danube, from the territory where the Danube flows out of Austrian territory as far as the Black Sea, from the Tatra Mountain to Saloniki.” (Kostya, p.12.,) The trouble is that neither Constantine Porphyrogenitus nor any of the Chronicles mention anything about this. This theory was propagated not only in Slovakia but among the Slovak emigrants also.

The historians and politicians of the past, who altered history and recorded it in a manner favorable to the Austrians, and the members of the ruling class, for their loyalty toward those in power in Hungary received rewards of money and position. This behavior was also rampant in the making of the laws. The trend was to identify the state with the nation and citizenship with national status. The government acknowledged that many national minorities were living in the territory of the state but it did not acknowledge the national independence of these minorities. This caused unrest among the minorities. The Hungarians have felt the anti-Hungarian attitude of the minorities since the time of Trianon. After World War II., the Soviets adopted this anti-Hungarian attitude. This is what the Hungarians experienced in Rumania, the recently dissolved Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, and the newly established Slovakia.

A state can survive only if it is based on a secure national awareness. If the national awareness is missing, it is usually because the youth has been taught a false version of their history. In Hungary, the propagation of untrue, derogatory historical „data” has caused apathy among the Hungarian people. At the same time, the Successor States have adopted the glorious Hungarian past and the Hungarian folk arts and have presented them to their nation as their own. They have attributed to the Hungarians the negative characteristics of their own people. For almost 200 years the adherents of the Pan-Slav ideology have constantly attacked the 1000 year-old presence of Hungarians in the Carpathian Basin. These unfair international attacks against the Hungarian nation are very offensive and very damaging. They are much more damaging and cause much sadness when they come from the pen of Hungarian historians. In the announcement of the Dictated Peace of Trianon, the loss of the Hungarian territory was not the greatest sorrow for the Hungarians but rather the demoralizing loss of national pride. There were Hungarian historians who did not mention in their writings the good qualities of the Hungarian people or simply diminished them. In the past there were Hungarian governments, supported by the Hapsburgs, who, for decades, subsidized historians teaching false historical theories, whose version of Hungarian history became adopted as the official history of Hungary which was taught in all the schools. Those historians whose independent research provided different theories were not allowed to teach at the universities or could not find a publisher

for their works. The government supported „experts” competed against each other to destroy the Hungarian past. Those historians and scientists who refused to sell their soul fled the country and published their books abroad. The true history of Felvidék has not yet been written by an official Hungarian historian but numerous writings have been published in the Czech, Slovak, and German languages and, on the advice of Benes, in French. These writings all emphasized that Felvidék was a Slovak territory. The reason that Hungarian historians have not yet written the history of Felvidék is that it was not in the national interest to write about this subject in the Age of Absolutism (1867) or after World War II., in the age of the so-called Socialist People’s Democracy. In the Socialist Era, in Hungary, it was not even allowed to mention that Felvidék was at one time a Hungarian territory. The majority of the Hungarian historians were brought up in the spirit of the Austrian-German politics and many of them were originally of German origin.

According to the Hungarian beliefs, which oppose both the Czech and the Slovak views, the Slovak people was formed in Felvidék, (northern Hungary, now Slovakia) after the Magyar Homecoming. The majority of Hungarians do not doubt that the history they learned in school is true but the most recent archeological excavations have shed light on the antiquity of the Hungarian people. I am going to explain the Homecoming of the Árpád people into the Carpathian Basin. The so-called Finno-Ugric theory spread the belief that the Magyar Homecoming was caused by an attack from the Pechenegs which forced the Magyars to leave the territory in which they were living and caused them to migrate into the Carpathian Basin. This absurd theory has been proven to be untrue. We know now that Árpád and his people did not just stumble into the Carpathian Basin while fleeing from the Pechenegs but rather there was a well prepared military movement. Prince Álmos, the father of Árpád, prepared this Homecoming.

„The seven Magyar leaders came to the conclusion that only a unified leadership could achieve the enormous task of resettling into the Carpathian Basin. Therefore they made a blood union and elected Álmos to be their leader. They declared that the new leaders should be elected only from the descendants of Álmos. Anonymus described this blood-union, calling the new leader: ‘ducem et praeceptoram’. Álmos and his son, Árpád, were spiritual and political leaders at the same time.

„Álmos was the Magyar leader or Priest-King who prepared the Magyars' return to their ancient homeland. He ordered them to manufacture all the tools and implements that they would need on a long journey and grow enough food for the journey. Only by being prepared could they undertake a successful migration. If they had not made adequate preparations, this undertaking would have been a disaster. . . . The migration of 400,000 people and an unbelievable number of animals required a great deal of planning. The preparation for this migration was described by Dunlop, Marquart and Macartney.” (Botos, p. 107)

Researchers in archeology and anthropology have proven that the Avar people did not die out in the Carpathian Basin. They survived and were still there when the Magyar Homecoming took place. The richest archeological findings were excavated in the county of Szabolcs in Felvidék. These were strictly Avar remains, hand-made folk art and pottery. At the same time the geographical and settlement names in Felvidék are almost all Hungarian. We have some very convincing data to prove the Hungarian possession of Felvidék. „In the county of Zemplén, in 1958, now in Slovakia, archeologists discovered the grave of a Magyar prince from the time of the Magyars of Árpád. The head of the skeleton was cut off and placed at the right shoulder. The skeletal measurements were identical to the measurements of the body of Álmos. At the time of his burial, perfect silver replicas of the golden weapon of Álmos were placed in his grave. This was done so that the weapons which Álmos used, which were believed to have magical properties, could be used by Árpád, as the new priest-king. The only prince of the Magyars, at that time, was Álmos. Árpád and, later, King István I. (Saint István), inherited the original sword of Álmos, which is presently in a museum in Prague in the Czech Republic. The decoration on the sword found in the grave was identical to that on the sword of St. István. The decorations on the saddle-bag, the sacrificial goblet, the horse's harness and the other objects from the grave, such as bracelets, necklaces and ankle bracelets made of gold and silver, ornaments for braiding, the quiver with seven arrows, leather clothing with silver decorations, were all identical to those of the Magyars of that period and all indicative of the high rank of the person buried in the grave. The appearance of the identical sword in this grave proves that this is the grave of Álmos. . . .

„In the vicinity of Szomotor, in the present land of Slovakia, where the grave of Álmos was found, the Magyars buried him and paid him their last respects. In Hungarian ‘szomorú tor’ means a sad feast or burial feast. ‘Szomorú’ in modern Hungarian means ‘sad’; ‘tor’ means a feast. Both words are still used today but the phrase ‘szomorútor’ has been replaced by ‘halotti tor’ which means ‘feast of the dead or burial feast’. ‘Szomorútor’ was mispronounced ‘szomotor’ by the Slavs. The earliest written Hungarian version of the word ‘szomorutor’ was found in 1803, in the writings of Szirmay, who writes: ‘Szomotor olim zomorutor pagus Hungaricus’.¹⁷⁹ It is evident that this was Magyar territory because the Magyars would not have buried their leader in foreign territory. This territory later became inhabited by Slavs and was given to Czechoslovakia in 1920 at the Treaty of Trianon.” (Botos, p. 108-109)

The leaders of the Czechs, Slovaks and Serbs in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, were faithful subjects of the Hapsburgs. When they began to demand their freedom, they did not intend to break away from the Monarchy. Their only desire was autonomy under Austrian rule. In this desire they were divided into two movements. One was Pan-slavism, with the aid of the Russians, the other was the Austro-Slav movement. After the Compromise between the Austrians and Hungarians in 1867, the plan of the Austro-Slavs was to create the Austrian-Czech Compromise but this was not effected because there was opposition from Vienna. Edward Benes created the idea of a Czech-Slovak state. After the fall of the Russian Czar in 1917, this idea unified the two movements, the Pan-Slavs and the Austro-Slavs. Their goal was to unite the Northern and Southern Slavs by dividing up the territory of Hungary.

Unfortunately, the Western politicians, at the time of World War I, did not really know that the minority problems in the Carpathian Basin were ignited by the Pan-Slav movement. In the early part of the nineteenth century, the leaders of the Slovak and the Serb peoples in the Carpathian Basin, together with the leaders of the Czechs, regarded Czarist Russia as a supporter of the unification of the Slav peoples. This cause was advanced by the Russian-Turkish War (1877-78) and the Russian foreign policy. It looked as if the Slavs who were freed from

¹⁷⁹ Botos: Op.Cit. p. 108-109; Zakar, Andras: Fordulópontok Történelmünkben, 1987, p. 67

Turkish rule would really receive independence with the aid of Russia. The Western leaders did not take into consideration something which was well known by other nations, that is that the Russians' real goal was to expand as far as the Mediterranean Sea. They did not consider either that Russia was not a democratic state but was under a despotic, merciless rule where the slightest opposition met with deportation to Siberia. This despotic attitude was well-camouflaged with their politics of friendship toward the Slavs which animated the Czech, Slovak and Serb peoples with enthusiasm for Russia. (Kostya, p. 15)

The Slavs took advantage of the opportunity which the absolutism of Metternich provided for them. They developed anti-Hungarian, pro-Slav propaganda which was supported by the Germans. It became the fashion to disavow the Hungarian culture and language. Leipzig became one of the centers of the Pan-Slav literature. Sándor Rudnay, Archbishop of Esztergom, in 1830 stated in one of his sermons: „I am a Slav.” This fanned the fire of Pan-Slavism. We have to notice that the movement to retain the use of the nationality languages was a camouflage to cover the spread of Pan-Slavism.

At the National Assembly of 1790-91, the Hungarians had demanded that the Hungarian language be adopted as the official language of the state instead of Latin or German. In the same year, the Croatian and Slavonian county nobility submitted a petition, under the title of *Declaráció*, against the adoption of the Hungarian language and they demanded the continuation of the Latin language as an administrative language. The Croatian and Slavonian aristocrats had already objected in 1681 that the Serbs who lived within the Empire were receiving special favors while the Croats were not given the same advantages. One hundred and ten years later, they objected to the adoption of the Hungarian language as the administrative language in Hungary and wanted to keep the Latin language as administrative language. In their demand, they emphasized that the administrative language in the Empire was Latin and that the Hungarian aristocracy acted against the Constitution when they intended to introduce the Hungarian language as the official language. The *Declaráció*, already at that time, was supporting the idea of the Great Slav State. The reason for their objection to the Hungarian language as the administrative language was that they were afraid that, in time, the languages of the

provinces would disappear. This proves that they were allowed to use their own language at that time. (Kostya, p. 18)

In 1790, for the first time, the Slovaks asked Metternich to establish a Slovak university. The request was not fulfilled because of the intervention of the Palatine Joseph yet, if it had been granted, the Slovak nationality problem would have taken a different direction. The Austrian government refused this request.

In 1844, when the Hungarian government at the National Assembly, officially announced the use of the Hungarian language as the administrative language of Hungary, the Croatian representatives spoke Latin in objection to this decision. During the decades of the struggle to adopt the Hungarian language as the administrative language, many objections surfaced which were published in the form of collections. The tone of these papers was not conciliatory, but rather antagonistic and they openly expressed anti-Hungarian hatred. It is interesting that most of them were published in Leipzig in the German language yet the centers of the activity were Prague and Zagreb. In these writings the influence of the Universities of Halle, Jena and Göttingen can be observed. In other words the Germans were supporting this goal of Pan-Slavism. Why? In the interest of a final weakening of the Hungarians so that they could fulfil their centuries-old goal of conquering Hungary. (Kostya, p. 20)

In 1848, the Slovak politicians, Stur, Hodzsa and Hurban submitted a nine-point memorandum to the Austrian government which was a very strong demand rather than a request. Most of these nine points could have been granted with a little negotiation because the last two points were exactly the same as those included in the twelve points of the 1848 Hungarian Freedom Fight. At the same time, in these nine points, there were such demands which were, at that time, impossible to grant. Some such demands were the determination of the borders of the ethnic territories and the use of the Slovak language in the National Assembly and in the National Guard. At that time it was impossible to grant these demands because a Slovak insurrection, organized by Hurban and supported by the Austrians, was put down by the Hungarians and many individual Slovak regiments. The leaders of the 1848 Hungarian Freedom Fight and the leaders of the Slovak insurrection could not come to an agreement.

The Austrian government gave a few concessions to the supporters of the Austro-Slavs. The Austro-Slav propagandists, Kollár and Kusmány received professorships at the University of Vienna. Kollár received permission to publish the newspaper *Slovenské Noviny* with the financial support of the Austrian state. After the death of Kollár in 1852, there was no-one to continue the Austro-Slav politics and, as a result, the Czech party came to the fore. In 1850, the Viennese Bach administration had come into power in Hungary. Historic Hungary was divided into five parts: Kronland Ungarn, Voivodina, Transylvania including the Partium, Croatia-Slavonia, and the Border Territories. The strictly Hungarian territories were again divided into five districts: Pest, Pozsony (now Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia), Sopron, Kassa (now Kosice, in Slovakia) and Nagyvárad (now Oradea in Rumania). We can see that these were all regarded as pure Hungarian territories. There was nothing to be done against despotism. (Kostya, p. 22-23)

After the Russian intervention, the 1848 Hungarian Freedom Fight failed and the Austrian despotism made it impossible to settle the minority problems. It was too big of a problem for Emperor Franz Joseph to solve at the same time as he was fighting to regain the former power of the Hapsburg Empire, restrain the demands of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters and maintain the German hegemony in Italy. At the same time the administration of Alexander Bach was the most flamboyant in Europe which exhausted the Empire financially. Hungary was overcome by the Centralists of Austria and the agents of the Czech federalists. The Czech political leaders were Russian Pan-Slavist supporters. These Czechs were the most faithful supporters of the Bach administration who were known as the „Bach hussars”. In the October Constitution, the Emperor was forced in theory to give up absolutism and reestablish for the individual states within the Empire their historic rights to a feudal National Assembly. At the same time, he named an advisory group, representing the Empire, in whose hands the power rested. He gave them the task of settling public matters. This action caused the start of a very active age of Hungarian resistance. Up to that point, the nationalities within Hungary were fighting to maintain the status quo. After decades of being at a standstill, instigated by the Russians and Czechs, the minorities in Hungary started to become active. This era made the Slovaks forget the good relationship that they had had for centuries with the Hungarians and changed it for the worse.

At the time of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise, in 1867, the Hungarian politicians regarded Pan-Slavism to be an insignificant movement. At the same time the leaders of the minorities took it very seriously. The Slovaks demanded much more at Túrócszentmárton than the Serbs did at Karloca. They not only demanded territorial autonomy and equality of rights but also demanded that the Slovak language be the only official language in Felvidék.

These Pan-Slav nationalistic demands became a factor in the formation of the public opinion. The Hungarian aristocracy ignored the Pan-Slav idea as posing a danger to the Hungarian nation. The upper ten thousand did not serve the interest of the Hungarian nation but were the supporters of the Austrian Centralist rule over Hungary. While the official government body looked disinterestedly at the nationality demands, in Moscow and St. Petersburg, in May of 1867, the Russians arranged a Pan-Slav Congress, where 300 Czechs, Serbs and Croats gathered. They were mainly teachers, professors, priests, bishops and politicians, all persons who had immediate connections with the people. This Pan-Slav assembly prepared the way for the First World War. (Kostya. p. 26)

After 1867 Hungary gave up the 1848 spirit of social-democratic peaceful reconciliation. Because of the establishment of the Dual Monarchy, the influence of the Austrian centralists and the German politics ruled Hungary. Around the time of the Compromise there was an expression of the demands of the Slovak leaders. The Túrócszentmárton Slovak Cultural Society, the *Matica Slovenska*, developed a Slovak grammar and created reading books for the parochial schools. It published the poems of Holly and Sládkovics. At that time it was hoped that the Hungarian and Slovak intelligentsia, would become closer to each other but, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the passivity of the nineteenth century changed into a powerful national movement. In the Hungarian elections of 1905, during the administration of István Tisza, the Slovak National Party suffered serious losses but a year later they received seven seats in Parliament. The new representatives united with the Serbs and Rumanians in the Nationality Club and they expressed solidarity with the idea of Pan-Slavism. The Slovak National Party used for the first time the title of the „Slovenská Národná Ludova Strana”. The hierarchy of the Catholic Church attacked its leader, Father Andrej Hlinka and the Bishop of

Szepes suspended him from his position. Hlinka, the pastor of Rózsahegy, gave an anti-Hungarian speech on November 20, 1906, and he was arrested for instigation against the Hungarians. He was sentenced to a year in prison. This arrest caused dissatisfaction in the whole country and because of this, he was set free.

Conflict erupted between the two Slovak political groups. The group led by Hodzsa was expecting that Prague would solve the nationality problems. The Old-Slav group expected the same thing from Vienna. Milan Hodzsa organized a language- nationality movement. The Czechs and one part of the Slovaks supported Archduke Franz Ferdinand's idea of a Tripartite Federation. From the Hungarian side, Gábor Ugron and Lajos Láng worked out a plan to create an Austro-Hungarian-Czech monarchy. On July 13, 1907, in Prague, another Pan-Slav Congress took place.

Father Andrej Hlinka, who was a Hungarian citizen, went on a tour to preach in Felvidék. His journey was supported by the church. The crowd which was waiting for the arrival of Hlinka, in Cernova, in November, 1907, aggressively challenged the Hungarian police who used their weapons and killed nine people. The later investigation, without doubt, showed that the incident was caused by the rebellious attitude of the crowd. The crowd was instigated by the Czech propaganda. This incident increased the hostility between the Slovaks and the Hungarians. Hlinka was arrested and imprisoned in Szeged. His letter to Hodzsa before he went to prison was published in the November 30, 1907 Slovak-American newspaper. With this act, the Pan-Slav propaganda against Hungary became world-wide. The Munich review, *März*, sharply attacked the Hungarian nationality politics. In August, 1908, another Pan-Slav Congress took place in Prague, where new leaders appeared. Professor Karel Kramar spread leaflets about the basics of Neo-Slavism. In the Congress, 80 Slovak, 35 Serb-Croats and 160 Polish teachers gathered together and Edward Benes came to the fore, with his study: *Le Probleme Autrichien et la Question Tcheque*. In this study, Benes recommended that Austria become a federal state, with autonomy for some of the minorities. Seton-Watson, with his book: The Racial Problems in Hungary, became the main source of anti-Hungarian propaganda. Several Slovak politicians, such as Hurban, Vajansky and Srobar, provided data for the book.

In the Hungarian House of Representatives, Milan Hodzsa denounced the Cernova incident of 1907. Count Gyula Andrássy placed the blame on those who instigated the crowd and those who attacked the Hungarian militia. In 1912, the clique of Túrócszentmárton again asked the *Matica Slovenska* permission to appear but their request remained unanswered. Because of the supposed and real offence, Srobar and Hlinka took over the leadership of the movement. The demonstrations, which lasted until the outbreak of the First World War, made for a closer cooperation between the realists of Masaryk and the socialists of Srobar. On May 14, 1914, the Czech politicians decided to destroy the Monarchy. (Kostya, p 29).

Chapter 12

The Hungarian Minority Laws.

After the Serbs laid down their arms in 1849, there was hope that an agreement would be reached in the question of the Hungarian minorities. The Hungarian Parliament accepted the proposal of Berthalan Szemere for a law dealing with the minorities. This was the first proposal of its kind. On July 21, 1849, the Hungarian National Assembly discussed these laws and approved them. The Hungarian National Assembly stated the following:

„The following measures will secure the free development of every minority within the territory of Hungary:

1. The official language of the government, the administration, the legislature and the military will remain Hungarian. Regarding other languages used in the country, the law is as follows:
2. In the village assemblies, the people are allowed to use their mother-tongue. The majority of the people will agree upon the language to be used in the minutes of the meetings.
3. In the County assemblies, the judges may speak either Hungarian or their own mother-tongue. In those counties where more than half of the populace speaks a language other than Hungarian, the minutes may be written in the language of their choice. In correspondence with the Government and other administrative branches, Hungarian will be used.
4. On the witness stand, at the first hearing of a case, because at this time the procedure is verbal, law No. 3 can be applied.
5. The language of the National Guard will be the same as the language used by the village administration.
6. The instruction in the elementary school will always be conducted in the language of the village or the church.
7. The register of births will always use the language used by the church.
8. An individual seeking redress before the law may use his mother-tongue.

9. The Greek Orthodox Church should call an annual General Council and it may freely decide religious and educational matters as other religions do. It is the right of the Council to chose their own bishops and decide whether Serbs and Rumanians remain united or separate from each other in religious matters.
10. The Greek Orthodox churches and schools should enjoy the same rights as the state provides for the churches and schools of other religions.
11. The members of the Greek Orthodox Church should administer their own churches and schools.
12. The University of Budapest will provide a Faculty of Theology where the members of the Greek Orthodox Church may have the opportunity to study theology.
13. In order to achieve a position of high honor, a person's merit and ability should be considered, without regard to his ethnicity or religion.
14. The government has the power to apply these laws and at the same time has the responsibility to uphold them.
15. The government has the power to apply these laws and is entrusted with applying them fairly, especially in regard to the Serbs and Rumanians. They should listen to their reasonable requests and address all their well-founded grievances or present them to the National Assembly for discussion and resolution by law.
16. The government has received the power, in the name of the nation, to give amnesty to those who lay down their arms within a certain period and who swear on the independence of Hungary.

The government intended to make this into law at the Parliament at Debrecen. However, it could not be enacted immediately because on August 12, 1849, the Hungarian Freedom Fight was unsuccessful and the Freedom Fighters laid down their arms before the Russians. As a result, the first independent democratic Hungarian government was dissolved. The Hapsburgs placed Hungary under the despotic rule of the Bach administration.¹⁸⁰

In 1868, another attempt was made to introduce a Minority Law. Alajos Wlad, János Missic and others represented the view that a

¹⁸⁰ Kostya: p.30-32; Horváth, Mihály: Magyarország függetlenségi harcának története 1848-1849, Geneva, 1865

Hungarian policy could have been formed to achieve peace between the Hungarians and all the minorities. These politicians enlightened the public about the situation in Hungary before the 1848 Hungarian revolution and explained what caused the Hapsburg despotism and its consequences. The Hungarian Minority Law was proposed by Endre Medán, a representative of the Rumanian minority. He asked the House of Representatives on October 28, 1868, to accept for the basis of negotiations, the Serb representative's proposal for law which was made on February 11, 1868. If we compare this Serbian proposal to the proposal of the Hungarian Nationality Council, then we will see that the proposal of the Nationality Council provided for no more and no less than the individual freedom of citizens and use of the mother-tongue of the individual. This proposal would have allowed the minorities to have the same political rights as the Hungarian citizens. On the other hand, as a basis for negotiation, the Serbian proposal demanded that some minorities in the country be accepted as a nation within Hungary. (Kostya, p.41)

At the negotiations to settle the problems of public rights, more proposals were heard from the Hungarian side and from the side of the minorities. These were proposals for agreement and peaceful coexistence but the proposals, during the five months of negotiations, were never enacted. It seemed as if there was an unbridgeable chasm between the above-mentioned two viewpoints, the Hungarian and the Serbian but if they had negotiated these two proposals, they probably could have come to some agreement. Shortly before the proposals of the Minority group were heard, on June 23, 1868, Eötvös, the Hungarian Minister of Education, submitted his proposals for public education which, in that year, became law. (XXXVIII tc:) Paragraph 57 stated that the village schools might teach religious education in the language of the villagers, independently of the Hungarian State. Paragraph 58 clearly acknowledged the necessity of the use of the mother-tongue. Every student was to be educated in his mother-tongue, in the language of the village. In the villages of mixed population, teachers had to be hired who spoke the languages of the village. (Kostya, p. 42)

On November 24, 1868, The Hungarian National Assembly discussed the minority law proposals. At this assembly, the first to speak was Ferenc Deák who, with his idea of a political nation, decided the fate of the law. Deák based his speech on Constitutional Law.

„Time is short.” – said Deák, – „I am not going to make a long speech. I simply wish to state that, in this question, my belief is that, in Hungary, only one political nation exists and this is the unified Hungarian nation which cannot be divided. Every citizen, regardless of his ethnicity, has equal rights. I also believe that this equality before the law and the use of the different languages in the country can be given to the minorities only in so far as it does not threaten the unity of the nation. I have said nothing new. Until now these rights have always been provided by the Constitution. All the citizens in Hungary represent the political nation, the Hungarian nation, in which every citizen has equal rights. I announce that the official language of the government can only be Hungarian. The laws should be written in Hungarian and should be faithfully translated into the languages of the minorities.” (Kostya, p. 54)

Deák, right after he announced his minority politics, invested all his attention in appeasing the minorities and explaining his policies to them. When he made his speech, he had no idea that the expression „political nation” would be the cause of an anti-Hungarian movement on the part of the minorities in the Dual-Monarchy. The Hungarian people did not intend to rule over the minorities because they had never done so in the past. If they had wanted to, there was plenty of time, almost a thousand years, to Magyarize all the minorities or eradicate them. Deák merely intended to create an agreement between the minorities. The dispute over the Minority Law lasted over five days. During this time there were some very heated and malicious speeches in Parliament. At that time, the Parliament should have accepted the proposal of Misić, the Serb representative of Délvidék, who asked that the assembly be dissolved because it was not the right time to discuss this question and the mood of the representatives was not favorable to this discussion. If they had accepted his proposal, this would not have become a passive-aggressive situation. Perceived offences and real offences were heatedly discussed and these unsatisfying disputes caused many to become supporters of Pan-Slavism. (Kostya, p.55-70)

Finally the Deák-Eötvös law was passed, on December, 5, 1868. (1868. XLIV tc.) The law was based on three basic principles:

1. The doctrine of the political nation which in this case is Hungary.

2. Within this frame the administration secured for every citizen equality before the law, religious freedom, freedom to chose the language of instruction, the right of assembly, and general cultural, political equality.
3. The third principle originated from the first one. This law recognized only one political nation, Hungary, and declared that Hungarian should be the official language of the National Assembly. The later paragraphs of the law explain the rights provided by the second principle. The protection of individual rights and the freedom of opinion are automatically provided by the law.¹⁸¹

From this we can see how divergeant were the mental processes of the Hungarians and the minorities. From the use of the vernacular in the churches came the idea of national politics. The endeavor to protect the individual developed into the liberal idea of nationalism which spread worldwide when the minorities everywhere tried to obtain their self-rule. Is it possible for a nationality group to form a state in the heart of a nation? Is there any country which would allow this? The United States has many ethnic groups but none of them is allowed political autonomy and English is the official language of the nation.

When the Deák-Eötvös bill became law, a new age began in Hungary which we call the Passive Era. This was a gradual development. The minorities did not like the central state power. When this law was discussed in Parliament, Wilmos Toth Paulini, the president of the Túrócszentmárton Slovak Cultural Organization, the *Slovenska Matica*, and Miletics, the Serb politician were present. In 1863, when the Hungarians gave the Slovaks permission to establish their Cultural Organization, the *Matica* was not chauvinistic or anti-Hungarian. At the time of the Compromise in 1867, there was the hope that, in those counties where there was a mixed populace, the Slovak and the Hungarian intelligentsia would draw closer to each other. Certain opportunists among the minorities, who had become assimilated and thought of themselves as Hungarian, presented a nationalistic Hungarian attitude and prevented this cooperation. They did more damage than those Slovaks who declared themselves to be Slovak, who were looking for peace with the Hungarians. In 1868, Mihály Zsilinsky, in his column in the review, *Század*, wrote, in an unscholarly manner, articles about

¹⁸¹ Kostya, p. 43; Vartikova, Marta: *Historicky Casopias II.* 1976, p.195

Slovak history which were full of falsifications. Pál Madocsányi, Mór Zmeskál and Florián Rudnyánsky spoke in Parliament against the Slovak populace of Liptó and Árva counties. This propaganda poisoned the minorities in the eighties and brought about a reaction to it from the Serbs and Slovaks which reawakened the latent Pan-Slav movement. In answer to the Pan-Slav activities, the Hungarian government closed three Slovak high-schools and the *Matica* of Túrócszentmárton. With this, they closed out the possibility of the rapprochement of these two nationalities. (Kostya, p. 49)

The Serbs were the first to announce their program opposing the law, on January 16, 1869. The nationalistic Serb program, in the spirit of liberalism and democracy, became popular among the minorities. This program, which was introduced at Nagybecskerek, became the national program of the Serbs who lived in Hungary, from the time of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise until the First World War. From this time on, the Serbs became very antagonistic towards the Hungarians. (Kostya, p. 47)

Chapter 13

Eastern Hungary (Transylvania, Rumania)

At Trianon, the Eastern borderline was set along the only Hungarian railroad which ran from north to south, and this railroad line was assigned to the Rumanian side of the border. Because this railroad was built by Hungarians in Hungarian territory, this meant that the Trianon border cut deeply into the Hungarian language territory.

Before we talk of this problem in detail, we have to explain the rule of the majority, which was applied many times after World War I. to determine the new borders. The rule of the majority was that the nation whose population was in the majority received the territory on which they lived. This was often unjust because significant minorities, who lived in large groups, were given to nations who had fought on the side of the victors. This study does not look for this kind of a solution. In a territory of mixed populace, this might sometimes have to be applied but in general it is not a good solution. If we draw a line from Danzig to Trieste, we shall see that East of this line we cannot find a homogeneous nation at the time of World War I. because the historical events had completely mixed up the populace.

A. THE PARTIUM

According to Sándor Török, the populace of the Partium was 62.2% Hungarian. Therefore we can declare that territory to be Hungarian territory because the percentage of the second ethnic group, the Rumanians, was only 32.8%. (Török, p. 274)

The Partium was formed in the 16th and 17th centuries after the establishment of the Principality of Transylvania, in the counties east of the Tisza river – Bihar, Kraszna, Közép-Szolnok, and Máramaros, the territory of the Körös River, and the Karán-Sebes territory. It included the cities of Arad, Zilah, Lugos, and Zaránd. After constant urging in

1792, 1832, 1836, 1848 and finally in 1877, territories which belonged to Transylvania – the counties of Arad, Szilágy, Szolnók-Doboka and Hunyad were added to the Partium.

In the 19th century every big European nation contained many ethnic minorities. I have to repeat that the new Successor States which were created at Trianon were not formed from a territory which they could originally call their own but they were formed from parts of other sovereign nations. The Treaties of Versailles and Trianon after World War I. created such a drastic change in Central Europe, that Austria and Hungary became one nation national states, where the majority in Austria was 92.1% Austrian, and in Hungary, 86.8% Hungarian. In the newly established state of Czechoslovakia, the percentage of Czechs was 49%. The percentage of Poles in Poland was 68.9%, Rumanians in Rumania 65%, Russians in Russia, 51%, and Serbs in Serbia, 37%. In the mixed territory of the Partium, where the total population was 716,000, the Hungarians were 62% and the Rumanians 32%, so there was no question that the Hungarians were in the majority. The intelligentsia of the Partium lived in the cities. The village people were occupied with agriculture, forestry and small cottage industries. The office workers and the intelligentsia needed to have a perfect knowledge of the administrative language. To be successful, they needed a good education, knowledge of the laws of the state and familiarity with politics. If the peasants and shepherds were lacking in these areas, this was not an obstacle in their everyday life.

Drawing from the information in Sándor Török's book, I would like to determine the ethnic borders of those territories where the minorities live in Eastern Hungary. It is not enough to identify their homogeneous linguistic territories but we also have to identify the majority of the people in those territories where the population is mixed.

In Transylvania, there were three historic nations in the seven counties which make up the Partium. The Hungarian populace was the first, then the Szeklers and the Saxons. This reflects their numbers.

The numbers of Hungarians in the 1910 Census in the following territories:(Török, p. 273)

I. Eastern Hungary (Partium and Bánát)	747,252
II. Székelyföld	502,030
III. Transylvania (remaining part)	<u>416,187</u>
Total given to Rumania	1,665,469

From this:

I.a. The Partium, where the Hungarians were in the majority and Bánát where the Germans and Hungarians were in the majority	648,125
I.b. Territory in Partium and Bánát where the Rumanians were in the majority	99,127
II.a. Territory of Székelyföld where the Hungarians were in the majority	498,326
II.b. Edge of Székelyföld where non-Hungarians were in the majority	3,704
III.a. Transylvanian non-Szekler counties next to Székelyföld	42,193
III.b. Transylvanian non-Szekler counties between Partium and Székelyföld	230,033
III.c. Transylvanian territories where Rumanians and Saxons were in majority	<u>143,961</u>
TOTAL of Hungarians in territories where Hungarians were in majority	1,418,677
TOTAL of Rumanians in territories where Rumanians were in majority	246,792

In the following tables I will present the distribution of the population in the cities of the Partium, according to the information from the 1910 census.

City	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Szatmárnémeti	32,563	594	820	174
Nagybánya	9,992	175	2,677	33
Felsőbánya	4,149	19	230	24
Máramarossziget	17,389	1,181	1,764	498
Nagykároly	15,636	63	198	27
Szilágysomlyó	6,030	20	759	76
Zilah	7,389	18	449	29
Nagyvárad	<u>56,527</u>	<u>1,098</u>	<u>2,870</u>	<u>539</u>
Total: 164,010	149,675	3,168	9,767	1,400
	91.3%	1.9%	5.9%	0.9%

Let us add to the population of the cities, the population of the county seat and the country towns which follow:

City	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Halmi	3,371	51	19	14
Túrterebes	3,774	5	10	3
Szinérváralja	1,942	2	118	0
Avasújváros	2,542	57	2,451	6
Erdőd	3,434	35	133	0
Tasnád	4,763	26	236	5
Szilágycseh	3,221	6	202	17
Zsibó	2,481	20	532	14
Kraszna	3,790	4	90	0
Érmihályfalva	6,231	5	13	6
Székelyhíd	5,235	19	15	10
Bihardiószeg	6,206	2	59	2
Margitta	5,329	30	264	53
Szalárd	2,349	3	45	7
Bihar	3,021	3	1	2
Élesd	2,175	36	112	14
Total:	59,864	304	4,300	153
Grand Total:	209,539		3,472	14,067
	1,553			
cities and towns	91.7%	1.5%	6.1%	0.7%

If the population of the territory of the Partium was 91.7% Hungarian, then this territory should have been regarded as Hungarian territory.

In the southern part of the county of Bihar and the northern part of the county of Arad, the territory of Nagyszalonta and Tenke, of the total population of 49,534, the Hungarian population was 41,736, which is 84.2%. The Rumanians numbered 7,026, which is 14.2%. The number of city dwellers were:

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Nagyszalonta	15,206	41	650	46
Tenke	3,388	6	448	15
Total:	18,594	47	1,098	61
	94.0%	0.2%	5.5%	0.3%

The territory around the city of Arad also came under Rumanian rule after Trianon, together with two Hungarian regions, the Budapest – Békéscsaba – Arad railroad and the Orosháza –Magyarpécska – Arad railroad. The language or ethnic border was beyond these two lines. This is a part of the Great Hungarian Plain on which the Hungarian populace died out as a result of the devastation at the hands of the Turks and the Hapsburgs. On this territory, the villages were distant from each other and the majority of the people lived in isolated farmsteads. In the region called Bánát, in the territory of Arad, some large hamlets were given to another nation at Trianon and were connected to villages where another language was spoken. Because the Hapsburgs resettled the area with foreigners, the population distribution changed. This is shown in the numbers of minorities in the total population. But even so, the Hungarians were still in the majority – the percentage of Hungarians was 69.3% and the Rumanians 18.8%. The Hungarians counted 45,161 of the population of the city of Arad, 74.1 %. The Germans were 4,025, 6.6%. The Rumanians were 9,466, 15.5% and the others, 2,317, 3.8%. The northwest corner of the Rumanian Bánát is a Hungarian language territory, where the populace in the villages of Porgány and Pusztakeresztúr was 90% Hungarian. (Török, p. 278)

The distribution of minorities living in villages in the Partium, a Hungarian language territory can be found in Appendix A.

B. TRANSYLVANIA

These territories must be divided into three groups:

1. Central Transylvanian territories where the majority speaks Hungarian.
2. The pure Hungarian territory of Székelyföld and the territory of Eastern Transylvania, where the majority speaks Hungarian.
3. Hungarian linguistic islands in the Rumanian and Saxon language territories. It must be noted that all the areas labelled „uninhabited areas” were Hungarian territory for more than a thousand years.

1. Central Transylvania

In the Middle Ages Transylvania was divided administratively into seven Hungarian counties, the Szekler land, the Saxon land, and three other territories of mixed populace. The three northern counties, Belső Szolnok, Doboka and Kolozs were formed in the ninth century on the territory belonging to the tribal leader, Kende. The three southern counties, Fehér, Hunyad and part of Küküllő were the territories belonging to the tribal leader, Gyula. The four northern counties, Kolozs, Torda, Szolnok and Doboka were developed in a north-south line. Here we find four cities, Kolozsvár, Torda, Dész and Szamosújvár: „In the territories surrounding these four cities, the majority of the village populace is Hungarian. On the road to Hungary, as far as Királyhágó, from Kolozsvár toward Nagyvárad, we can find Kalotaszeg, and the cities of Gyula and Bánffyhunad. The Hungarian language territory of Kalotaszeg creates a bridge toward the Hungarian language territory beyond the Tisza. The natural southern border of this territory is the ridge of the mountain range of the Gyulahavasok on the side of which we find a Rumanian settlement. In the county of Alsófehér, the cities of Nagyenyed and Marosújvár are also counted as part of the Hungarian language territory of Inner Transylvania. This Hungarian territory continues from Torda and Nagyenyed toward the east, in a line of Hungarian villages like Felvinc, Marosludas, Radnót and Dicsőszentmárton. After this the territory is connected to the Székely land.” (Török, p. 293)

Three quarters of the population of the cities of Central Transylvania was Hungarian.

Population of the cities of Central Transylvania:

City	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	Other
Bánffyhunad	4,699	28	451	16
Kolozsvár	49,634	1,457	6,581	809
Kolozs	2,271	3	1,808	56
Szamosújvár	4,513	170	1,832	155
Dész	7,898	438	2,770	104
Torda	9,674	100	3,389	292

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Nagyenyed	6,449	162	1,838	59
Dicsőszentmárton	3,210	118	957	132
Total:	88,348	2,476	19,726	1,623
	78.8%	2.2%	17.6%	1.4%

We shall follow the same method that we used when we explained the territories of Eastern Hungary. We will add the populace of the county seats and the country towns to that of the cities.

County seats and country towns:

City	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Gyula	1,144	5	1,773	50
Szék	3,163	16	494	44
Bethlen	1,791	60	1,205	9
Kékes	509	5	567	1
Torockó	1,343	2	136	31
Felvinc	1,775	8	196	109
Marosludas	3,116	61	1,385	70
Marosújvár	2,862	78	1,845	191
Radnót	1,498	8	595	8
Total:	17,201	248	8,196	513
Grand Total:	105,549	2,724	27,922	2,136
	76.3%	2.0%	20.2%	1.5%

The distribution of the population in Hungarian language territory in Central Transylvania can be found in Appendix B.

2. Székelyföld (Szekler territory in Transylvania)

What today is called Székelyföld (Szekler land) can only be called so in an ethnic concept, because it is larger than the historic territory of the Szeklers. It includes the territory in which the language of the majority is Hungarian, which is located between the territories where Rumanian is spoken and where the Saxons are settled.

The city populace of the Szekler land lived in six Szekler cities of which two were partly German and Hungarian (Brassó and Szászrégen). The Rumanian minority is only worth mentioning in these two cities. This can be seen on the tables.

Cities	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Marosvásárhely	22,011	467	924	326
Szászrégen	2,947	2,994	1,311	58
Székelyudvarhely	9,622	194	86	26
Gyergyószentmiklós	8,549	115	155	86
Csíksereda	3,431	45	21	20
Kézdivásárhely	5,810	37	23	22
Sebszentgyörgy	8,273	151	93	37
Brassó	16,631	10,523	11,295	550
Total:	77,274	14,526	13,908	1,125
	72.4%		13.6%	13.0%
	1.0%			

If we add population of the county seats to that of the cities which existed in 1910, then we shall see that the percentage of Hungarians visibly increases.

County seats:	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Erdőszentgyörgy	2,719	20	351	21
Nyárádszereda	1,510	5	8	1
Parajd	2,858	17	8	5
Székelykeresztúr	3,766	71	25	24
Lövéte	3,389	30	13	2
Gyergyótölgyes	2,572	237	1,032	37
Szépviz	2,974	8	92	4
Tusnád	2,281	2	0	2
Kovászna	4,154	48	1,105	144
Barót	2,501	22	2	6
Total:	28,184	460	2,636	246
Grand Total:	105,548	14,986	16,544	1,371
	76.3%	10.8%	11.9%	1.0%

This table shows that the Hungarian administrative workers and citizens were in the majority even in the cities of Brassó and Szászrégen

where there were large numbers of Rumanians. What justified the decision at Trianon to give these cities to the Rumanians?

If we examine the statistics, they clearly show that the Rumanian infiltration into the periphery of the country into the mountainous areas caused the village population to increase but the population of the cities remained primarily Hungarian. The ingress was possible only because of the non-hostile attitude of the Hungarians toward the minorities. If the Rumanians were the descendants of the Romans, as they claim, they would most likely have settled in the cities because the Romans were city-people.

Distribution of population by district in Székelyföld can be found in Appendix C.

Summary of Hungarian Language territory in Rumania

I. THE PARTIUM

A.	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	
other				
Ugocsa County	13,190	810	9,694	863
Máramaros County	23,373	5,226	8,597	6,644
Szatmár County	153,492	5,787	64,420	1,026
Szolnok-Doboka	1,416	20	431	5
Szilágy County	84,082	439	65,648	3,266
Bihar County	169,673	2,862	86,119	9,012
Total:	445,226	15,134	234,909	19,816
	62.2%	2.1%	32.8%	2.9%
B.				
Nagyszalonta				
Bihar County	27,341	103	4,380	245
Arad County	14,395	279	2,646	145
Total:	41,736	382	7,026	390
	84.2%	0.8%	14.2%	0.8%
C.				
Arad				
Arad County	66,768	6,439	18,769	3,484
Csanád County	3,636	30	705	376
Temes County	2,847	2,015	383	342
Total:	73,251	8,484	19,857	4,202

3.9% **69.3%** **8.0%** **18.8%**

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
D.				
Bánát				
Torontál County	1,631	68	59	54
Total:	90.0%	3.8%	3.3%	2.9%

II. CENTRAL TRANSYLVANIA

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Kolozs County	99,903	2,095	93,985	2,758
Szolnok-Doboka Co.	40,268	1,533	45,317	1,449
Beszterce-Naszód Co.	274	127	29	0
Torda-Aranyos Co.	41,198	474	43,247	2,376
Alsófehér County	19,608	298	21,125	1,086
Kisküküllő County	28,782	644	28,501	2,625
Total:	230,033	5,171	232,204	10,294
	48.2%	1.1%	48.6%	2.1%

III. SZÉKELYFÖLD (Szekler land)

Kolozs County	1,421	1,935	653	135
Maros-Torda Co	132,763	8,233	58,285	4,583
Udvarhely County	118,138	332	464	165
Nagyküküllő Co	6,474	47	2,173	238
Brassó County	34,298	19,321	27,856	1,076
Háromszék County	122,533	576	10,377	938
Csík County	124,892	966	6,335	717
Total:	540,519	31,410	106,143	7,852
	78.8%	4.6%	15.5%	1.1%

Combined totals

A. -D.

Eastern Hungary	561,844	24,068	261,851	25,462
-----------------	----------------	---------------	----------------	---------------

The Road to the Dictated Peace 197

Total:	64.4%	2.8%	29.9%
2.9%			

II. - III.	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Transylvania	770,552	36,581	338,347	18,146
Total:	66.2%	3.1%	29.1%	

1.6%

I- III. Total population on the Hungarian language territories in Rumania

I.

Total:	1,332,396	60,659	600,189	43,608
	65.4%	3.0%	29.5%	

2.1%

I shall now present the distribution of the population, by district, on those territories which Rumania received at the Treaty of Trianon, where the Hungarians were living in the majority.

Hungarian language territories in present Rumania

I. The former territory of Eastern Hungary

A. Szatmár-Nagyvárad territories

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Total:	445,226	15,134	234,909	19,816
	62.2%	2.1%	32.8%	2.9%

B. Nagyszalonta territory

Total:	41,736	382	7,026	390
	84.2%	0.8%	14.2%	0.8%

C. Arad territory

Total:	73,251	8,484	19,857	4,202
	69.3%	8.0%	18.8%	

3.9%

D. Bánát County in two villages

Total:	1,631	68	59	54
	90.0%	3.8%	3.3%	

2.9%

I. Eastern Hungary				
Total:	561,844	24,068	261,851	25,462
	64.4%		2.8%	29.9%
	2.9%			
II. Historic Transylvania				
III. A. Central Transylvania				
	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
	230,033	5,171	232,204	10,294
	Total: 48.2%	1.1%	48.6%	
	2.1%			
B. Székelyföld	540,519	31,410	106,143	7,852
Total:	78.8%	4.6%	15.5%	
	1.1%			
II. Transylvania				
Total	770,552	36,581	338,347	18,146
Total:	66.2%	3.1%	29.1%	
	1.6%			
I. + II. Total	1,332,396	60,659	600,198	43,608
Total:	65.4%	3.0%	29.5%	
	2.1%			

(Statistics from the 1910 Census in Hungary can be found in Magyar Zentral Komission: Neue Folge Osterreichische Statistik. Vienna 1912)

It is clear from the statistics of the 1910 census that, in Eastern Hungary, the Hungarians were in the majority in most cities and counties. In those areas where they were not in the majority, they were close to 50%. The Hungarians have been in the majority in the Carpathian Basin for a thousand years. The Carpathian Basin was one unit, including Eastern Hungary. The infiltration of the minorities into the Hungarian territory was gradual but their population count increased because of the Hungarian policy of welcoming foreigners. At the same time, the Hungarian population decreased because of the wars with the Turks and the Hapsburgs. Looking at the numbers in the villages and cities, it is obvious that the Hungarians were no longer a huge majority

200 László Botos

but they were still a majority. Why then were these villages and cities given to Rumania?

Chapter 14

The Plan to Destroy Hungary

In the tenth century, the Carpathian Mountain chain was the eastern border of Europe but when Poland was established, the border of Europe was pushed farther to the East and in the sixteenth century, the Carpathian Basin became Central Europe. The Carpathian Basin became a cultural border because the western European culture met the eastern and southeastern European culture in this territory. One of the criteria by which we judge the standard of a culture is the number of people who are literate. On the southern and eastern borders of the Carpathian Basin there is a considerably lower standard of culture. From north of the River Száva, illiteracy is 10% but south of this river it is above 50%. (Kostya, p. 78) At the same time, in the Carpathian Basin, the level of literacy is the same as that of Western Europe. In this territory the three large language families of Europe come together, the Germanic, Slavic and Romance language families. In spite of this, none of them was able to dominate in this territory. Kostya says that in the Carpathian Basin, a fourth language, Hungarian, has been dominant since the tenth century. However, if we accept the results of archeology and anthropology, and if we look into the Chronicles, we will know that a Hungarian speaking people lived in the Carpathian Basin for centuries prior to this time, under different names, as Sarmatians, Huns, Jazygians, Szeklers, Pechenegs and Avars. Presently, there are many peoples in the Carpathian Basin who have mingled with each other and adopted each other's culture. In northern Europe, the Protestant religion is in the majority; in southwestern Europe, Roman Catholicism; in the East, the Greek Orthodox Church and in the south, Islam. The northern border of the Mohammedan religion is the River Száva. North of this, Roman Catholicism is dominant. From here, Catholicism spread into the territory of Poland. (Kostya, p. 80)

I show this map to the reader so that we can see how the Hapsburg Austrian Empire surrounded the Hungarian people with Polish, Czech, Moravian, Austro-German and southern Slavic peoples. The Hungarian territory is closed from the West by the Germans, and from the northeast and the south by the ring of Slavs. Hungary is the only country which is in the way of the Slav unification. This is one of the reasons that the Slavs hate the Hungarians so much.

The advocates of the Pan-Slav movement are the chauvinist Czech and Slovak propagandists who are scattered throughout the Carpathian Basin and the entire Danube Valley. The Pan-Slav danger is not only a Hungarian problem but affects the whole of Central Europe. Every non-Slav people has to be on the alert against the Russian imperialism. This Russian danger was graphically proven by the Soviet imperialism, which annexed and occupied the countries of Central Europe. If the Hungarian Revolution had not occurred in 1956, then the Soviets or Russians might have continued to enslave hundreds of millions of people. The Russian-driven Pan-Slav danger did not disappear with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and will not disappear, especially if this movement has such ill-informed supporters as the USA who only regards the momentary economic advantage of an alliance.

The Northern and Southern Slavs are bonded by the common philosophy of Pan-Slavism. The people of Europe are fortunate that there is a mutual hatred between the Slovaks and the Czechs – yet the Allied Powers joined them together into Czechoslovakia at the Treaty of Trianon in 1920. Following the dissolution of Czechoslovakia in 1992, it has become obvious that the makers of the Peace Treaty at Trianon were mistaken in believing in the importance of the brotherhood of the Slavs. Russia is the long-time enemy of the Poles, and the Croatians look down on the uncultured Serbs. Until recently, the Czechs were ruling the Slovaks, the Serbs ruled the more cultured Croatians and the Russians tried to rule all the Slavs.

Karl Marx said: „Pan-Slavism is not only a goal for the unification of the Slav people but it is also a goal to destroy a thousand years of history in Europe. In the interest of this, we have to erase Turkey and half of Germany from the maps of Europe. When Pan-Slavism has reached this goal then the Slavs will begin to subjugate

Europe. Europe has only two choices, to accept Pan-Slavism or to conquer Russia and eradicate the center of Pan-Slavism.”¹⁸²

The most dedicated advocates of Pan-Slavism were the Czechs. They deceived the Slovaks and instigated the hatred against the Hungarians. These Czech propagandists, already from the time of the 18th century, wove a web throughout the entire Danube valley. The Czech agents used different methods but they were united in their anti-Hungarian feelings and the instigation of hatred of the Hungarians.

We have to call to the attention of the world the historical falsification which was propagated in the university libraries, public libraries and encyclopedia. The Decision made at Trianon was based on the falsified history which the Czechs and the Slovaks provided to the western nations. The Czechs had an enormous influence on the development of the Treaty of Trianon but we have to rely strictly on unofficial reports of the secret agreements, testimony of eyewitnesses and correspondence to appreciate the extent of their involvement. According to Thomas Masaryk, the President of the Czech Republic: „Without Benes, we would have no Czech Republic.” (Kostya, p. 85) Kostya links Masaryk’s name to that of Benes, saying that without Benes and Masaryk, there would be no Czechoslovakia. The Slovak people never wanted to make an alliance with the Czechs, except for a few Pan-Slavist agitators who were dreaming of a Great Slav Empire, led by Russia. Among them were a few who were dreaming of an independent Slovakia, which they received, through the goodness of Hitler, in 1939 and which existed for five years. Many Slovaks desired autonomy or a Slovak-Hungarian confederation. The formation of Czechoslovakia was the result of the Western Powers’ political ignorance. Karel Kramar, the most acclaimed Czech politician of that time, was imprisoned by the Austrians because he was a Pan-Slavist and a Russian sympathizer. When he was released from prison, by the mercy of the Emperor, he became the greatest adversary of Edward Benes. He stated about Benes: „Benes applies such means in politics which every honorable man would reject.” (Kostya, p. 85)

Masaryk and Benes used the anti-German politics of the Great Powers to their own advantage. Since the Monarchy was in alliance with Germany, they were able to further their anti-Monarchy politics.

¹⁸² Kostya, p. 82; Karl Marx’s Political Works, Vol. 6, Budapest, 1960, p. 196

Initially, they only advocated a Central European Peoples' alliance, under Czech leadership. In this way they intended to change the political situation of Central Europe. Obviously the Czechs would have to be in control of this alliance because they believed that they were the most cultured. Their goal was to eradicate Hungary and create a Czech-Slovak-Croatian-Serb federation in which they would have included Rumania. In this way they felt that they would be strong enough to oppose Germany. The Czech politicians spread the idea that the division of Hungary would secure the stability of Central Europe.

The Hungarian-Czech relationship became hostile on the Slovak question because Masaryk wanted to annex the Hungarian Felvidék. The Hungarian state defended its integrity. Vienna was willing to come to an agreement with the Austrian-Czech consolidation which the Hungarian government opposed.

Benes published his anti-Hungarian plan in his political work: Détruisez l'Autriche-Hongrie. (Destroy Austria-Hungary) This was widely publicized by the Czech anti-Hungarian propagandists. „The German, Austrian and Hungarian brutality originate from the same root. . . The Hungarians are the most loyal and the longest established allies of the Germans. . . The Hungarians are the Germans' spiritual relatives. . . The Hungarians are the pillars of the gang who oppresses the Central European people. . . The Hungarians are the obstacle to the unification of the Serbs and the Croats. . . The Hungarians exploited Bosnia and Hercegovina. . . The Hungarians regard as their own the route to the Aegean Sea, the so-called route of Saloniki. . .”¹⁸³ Masaryk stated that the Hungarians were responsible for the outbreak of World War I.¹⁸⁴ On the Hungarian side, no-one took a stand to refute these lies. The biggest mistake on the part of the Hungarians was that, while Benes was writing his leaflets in a rented room, the Hungarian journalists, poets and university students were in Paris amusing themselves. None of them took note of the danger when the writings of Benes were published. In Trianon, when the Hungarian delegation tried to refute his statements, it was too late. Masaryk and Benes knew the Hapsburg despotism very well but, in spite of this, they did not mention the 1848 Hungarian Revolution ignited by Kossuth. They also kept silent about the fact that,

¹⁸³ Kostya, p. 86; Benes: Détruisez l'Autriche-Hongrie

¹⁸⁴ Ibid. p. 86; Masaryk G. Tamás: Svetové Revolucia, Prague, 1920

under the Hapsburg despotism, for centuries, the Czechs were the most loyal subjects of the Austrians. They were the ones who publicised the theory of Frantisek Palacky, the Czech historian, that the Hungarians were an obstacle to the unification of the northern and Southern Slavs. The Czechs supported the idea of creating a corridor through Hungarian territory to join Czechoslovakia to Yugoslavia, which was only possible with the disintegration of Hungary. By creating this corridor, they could prevent the German „Drang nach Osten” (movement toward the East). They stated that they had to do this in the interest of a lasting peace in Europe. They intended to settle the Central European problems without Hungary which is located in the heart of Central Europe.

Benes, in his cunning, two-faced manner, intended to gain the support of the Western politicians for his goal. When he realized that there was a problem with the creation of Czechoslovakia, he changed his propaganda and adopted the slogans of Democracy, Humanitarianism and World Peace. At this time he did not boast of the greatness of the Czech Republic but rather spoke of a small, brave people that had fought for centuries against the German Goliath. This propaganda was published continuously in the *Times* newspaper. Kostya says that this „small, brave people”, of their own will, accepted the German culture, civilization and even their language. In the last century, only the people in the rural areas spoke the Czech language. The language of the cities was German. The University of Prague was established in 1348 but only in 1882 became bi-lingual. Until then it used the German language. In 1882, Masaryk was invited to teach there. He was uncertain about accepting the position because he did not speak the Czech language fluently. (Kostya, p. 87-88) „The Czech nation is the hero of Democracy and humanitarianism.”, Benes stated in his writings. Kostya says, sarcastically, that the Hungarian people know best of anyone „how democratic and humanitarian these brave people were.. . . God created the Czechs to become the pillar of democracy against the barbarian Germans, Hungarians, Avars and Tartars. They became the guardians of peace.” (p. 88) Masaryk stated that in order for the Czech people to fulfill this calling they had to be freed from the oppression of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Benes called for the eradication of Hungary. „Therefore, *Détruisez l’Autriche-Hongrie!* Austria-Hungary has to be destroyed. We have to unify the Czechs with the Slovaks and the

Yugoslavs. Think finally of the interest of Europe, which is your interest.”¹⁸⁵

The 64 year-old Masaryk and the 30 year-old Benes met at the beginning of World War I. To begin with, their opinions differed. At that time, Masaryk was the editor of the newspaper, *Cas* (Time) and Benes was writing for the newspaper, *Právo Lidu* (The People's Rights) and also for the newspaper *Volna Myslenka* (Free Thought). Masaryk was a rationalist and Benes a radical. They both admired the Western Democracy and hated absolutism. Because of their origin, they hated feudalism and the aristocracy. Masaryk, a university professor, noticed Benes, who was a high school teacher, who came from peasant stock. They soon developed a close friendship and Masaryk introduced Benes to his foreign connections. He brought to his attention the works of Seton Watson which were pro-Czech. Masaryk regarded Benes as his successor. Benes became the organizer of the pro-Czech propaganda. Masaryk sent Benes to Paris where he benefitted from Masaryk's connections. Masaryk emigrated to London but they kept in close contact. Benes soon noticed the Allied Powers' lack of knowledge and he built his foreign policy on this failing. In a short time, he achieved unbelievable success abroad but at home, it was much more difficult for him to reach the same level of success. At this time, the Czech citizens and the aristocracy were not as nationalistic as Masaryk and Benes. Benes had to alter the Czech citizens' century-old Austrian connections. His political rival was Karel Kramar, who hoped that the Czech nation would flourish with the help of Czarist Russia. At that time, Benes was not well-known in Czechoslovakia. He lived under very poor circumstances in Paris and was able to continue his work of propaganda only with the support of his friends. (Kostya, p.89)

One of his friends was Milan Stefanik, who later became the third founding father of Czechoslovakia. Together, Masaryk and Benes asked Stefanik to take over the Ministry of Defense. They sent him to Italy, where he began to organize the Czech Foreign Legion among the Czech and Slovak prisoners-of-war. However, he was unable to fulfill his goal of creating an autonomous Slovak state because, somewhere near Pozsony, his plane crashed and he died. The crash was declared to

¹⁸⁵ Ibid. p 88. Benes: Détruisez l'Autriche-Hongrie

be an accident but later, Father Andrej Hlinka stated it was an assassination, ordered by Benes.

Stefanik knew of the Pittsburgh agreement between Masaryk and the Slovak-Americans, to establish an independent Slovakia. The enemies of Benes accused him of misappropriating the money that the Slovak-Americans had collected for the independence of Slovakia. They accused him of leaving the continent of Europe a poor man and returning a rich man and asked where he had obtained his money. On the advice of Masaryk, he was forced to make a second accounting of the money. The Czech people did not know what these two leaders were doing, under the camouflage of Democracy. In 1918, they became members of the first Czechoslovak government and until 1935, Benes was the Foreign Minister so he had plenty of time to stabilize Czechoslovakia and strengthen the state with the support of the Entente. He was neither an orator nor a party-leader. He created and stabilized Czechoslovakia from behind his desk. From here, he organized his army of propagandists. Even his rivals acknowledged him as the greatest Foreign Minister. He was very diligent, talented and unscrupulous. His chauvinism took him from his peasant family to the Czech parliament. (Kostya, p. 91)

Masaryk went to Holland in 1914 to organize the support of the West for the proposed state of Czechoslovakia, which Seton-Watson supported in the *Morning Post* and the *Times* and in his book: The Racial Problem in Hungary. Then he returned to Prague where Benes was working to broaden the activities of the anti-Hungarian propaganda organization. Together, they succeeded in establishing propaganda centers in Austria, Germany and Switzerland. In 1914 Masaryk went to Rome, where he sent leaflets, on which was printed the Slav anthem, to the Czech and Slovak soldiers who were serving in the army of the Monarchy. Russian aeroplanes dropped these leaflets on the Russian front and, before long, everyone was singing the Slav anthem. As a result, the Czech and Slovak soldiers defected to the other side. These propaganda activities came to the knowledge of the Austrian police and, with plenty of evidence, Kramar, Sokol and others were imprisoned.

Benes succeeded in escaping to Geneva. He became the leader of the anti-Hungarian propaganda center in Paris and Masaryk became the leader in London. Masaryk also received a professorship in Slavic Studies at King's College. They extended their propaganda organization

to Washington, St. Petersburg and Rome. According to the propaganda of Benes, the Czechs were praised to the skies while the Hungarians were barbarians and intruders into Europe.

Initially, it was difficult to convince the West of this view because, at that time, the English and American historians wrote admiringly of Lajos Kossuth. Kossuth was the symbol of democracy in Europe. Masaryk and his clique had to destroy this prestige. They started to advocate that the Hungarians were no longer the same as they were in Kossuth's time because they had become vassals of the Austrian despotism and they were no longer democrats. They had become the oppressors of their minorities. They did not mention that Kossuth was the first in history to promise autonomy for the Slovaks. It took a big effort to change the pro-Austro-Hungarian opinion which was internationally accepted by the Western states. I shall quote a few opinions which reflect this international pro-Austro-Hungarian attitude.

Frantisek Palacky, a Czech historian, wrote in 1848: „Really, if the Austrian Empire had not existed for such a long time, it would have become necessary, in the interest of Europe to create it.” (Kostya, p.93) Otto von Bismarck, in his work Gedanken und Erinnerungen, poses a question which he answers: „What could we state about that territory which from Tyrol to Bukovina the Austrian state occupies? The forming of new states on this territory would cause a continuous revolution. In Eastern Europe it is impossible to create small states. Here, only countries with a long historical background could exist.” In 1917, before the American Congress, Woodrow Wilson stated: „It is our duty to announce that it is not our intention to weaken the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy or to alter it. We have no say in how this country intends to live politically or economically. We have no intention of dictating anything to them. All we desire is that the affairs of the people remain in the hands of the people.” Lloyd-George, the British Prime-Minister, on January 5, 1918, said: „The destruction of Austria-Hungary is not a British goal.” (Kostya, p.94)¹⁸⁶

How were Masaryk and his propagandists able to change the international opinion about Austria-Hungary in such a short time? President Wilson, nine months after his first announcement, informed

¹⁸⁶ These quotations are translated back into English from Hungarian writers because the originals were not available.

the Austrian Emperor, Charles I., who was also King Charles IV. of Hungary, that he had changed his opinion and that it was not enough to give the minorities their autonomy. The price of peace was the nationalities' right of self-determination. (Kostya, p.94-95) Kostya gives the answer to the success of Masaryk in six points:

1. Masaryk sincerely admitted that he placed a great emphasis for his success on his connections and also admitted that he was not very discriminating.
2. Because of his connections, he was well-informed about every situation and knew the private secrets of influential people. He knew whose words held weight. He knew their weaknesses and used them to achieve his goal. He knew the details of the Rumanian, Italian and Serb agreements and used them to further his interests.
3. Masaryk adopted Bismarck's idea of how to determine human ability. Bismarck stated that a man's ability is in proportion to his vanity. The more conceited a man, the less able he is. Because Wilson was a very conceited man, Masaryk constantly flattered him and by so doing, he gained his trust.
4. The most important factor in his success was that he succeeded in winning the confidence of the most influential people.
5. Masaryk was a very well-informed man of great intelligence. He ranked his tactics in order. He suggested to Wilson a very daring action which Wilson thought could not be accomplished. A few days later, there was a newspaper article supporting Masaryk's suggestion, which made Wilson think that Masaryk was a far-seeing politician who could be trusted.
6. Masaryk and his group applied historical intrigue with great success, slanting the facts, advocating half-truths, exaggerating small and unimportant facts. They kept silent about important facts. (p. 95-96)

It is the duty of researchers or historians to expose the moral background and value system of these two great politicians, Masaryk and Benes. This has never before been researched. All we know is that both were inspired by the Jacobin movement in France of the Revolution of 1789, and that **they were both violent radicals, nationalistic chauvinists and atheists.** (Kostya, p. 96)

Many politicians knew that there was going to be trouble if the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy were to be dissolved and the new

federation of states suggested by Masaryk were to be established but they did not dare to voice their opinions. Wilson opposed Masaryk's proposal with two major points. One was that the Czechs were not ready to form an independent state. The second was that the six and a half million people was not strong enough to live together and keep the balance of peace with the three and a half million Germans. Masaryk dispelled Wilson's first worry with his story of the „heroic deeds” of the Czech Legion in Siberia which he grossly exaggerated. After hearing this story, Wilson came to the conclusion that a nation which was capable of such heroic deeds was ripe enough to become independent. Masaryk dispelled the second worry with his fiction of the Csecho-Slovak people. Since there were, at that time, not enough supporters to carry out this idea, on July 30, 1918, he made an agreement with the Slovak-Americans in Pittsburgh, that he would create Czechoslovakia, but this did not have any real value. He showed this document to Wilson as a document of the alliance between the Czech and Slovak people. In this document, in the name of the Czech people, Masaryk promised full autonomy to the Slovaks. He signed the document although he had no authorization to do so. When he presented this document to President Wilson, the President acknowledged the existence of a temporary state of Czechoslovakia. In 1921, Masaryk stated: „There is no Slovak nation. This is just a figment of the Hungarians' imagination.”¹⁸⁷ About the agreement which he signed in Pittsburgh, he said in 1925: „This agreement was signed for a small group of Slovak people who were dreaming of Heaven knows what kind of independent Slovakia.” (Kostya, p. 97)

When the leader of the French delegation at Trianon, André Tardieu, questioned the fate of the numerous minorities who would come under Czechoslovak rule, Benes calmed his anxiety, on May 20, 1919, by saying it would become a sort of Switzerland where the minorities would live in full autonomy. At the Peace Treaty of Saint Germain, on September 10, 1919, the Czechoslovak government acknowledged its far-reaching goal to maintain the rights of all citizens of non-Czechoslovak nationality. (Kostya, p. 97-98)

The Entente powers and Britain had a good opinion of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Britain regarded as political insanity

¹⁸⁷ Kostya, p. 97; Borsody, *Magyar-Slovák kiegyezés*, p. 82

Benes' proposals to dissolve the Monarchy because she knew that the Monarchy balanced the power of Germany. Therefore the British intended to sign separate treaties with the two countries of the Monarchy, Austria and Hungary. In December 1917, Lloyd-George, the British Prime Minister, authorized General Christian J. Smuts from South Africa to start negotiations with the Monarchy's ambassador, Albert Paully Mensdorff, and offer the British proposals. If the Austrian government accepted the British proposals then with the support of the British government, they would forward the proposals to the Entente powers for acceptance. The British proposed a dominion of the British type on the territory of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Their government proposed giving Galicia to Poland, so that Poland would become a neighbor of the Monarchy, which would have been advantageous for Hungary because for a thousand years Hungary and Poland had lived in friendship. Yugoslavia would be established from the states of Serbia, Hercegovina and Montenegro. Rumania would receive Bukovina. Mensdorff was of the opinion that Britain was not firm about wanting Transylvania to go to Rumania.

When Benes learned about this British proposal, he did all he could to convince the Entente powers that Austria-Hungary should not be federalized. Masaryk and Benes saw the end of the dream of the Czechs. At the same time, they supported the federation of Poland and Russia but they did not give up the idea of independence for the Southern Slavs.

Chapter 15

The Czech Legion

The stated goal of the Peace Conference was to create a true, lasting peace, where the people of all the Central European nations, together with their minorities, could find a solution for their problems. At the end of World War I, the well-intentioned, idealistic world leaders were hoping that the victors and the defeated would achieve a Christian forgiveness and be able to live together in a Christian world. These leaders believed that the Roman era of *Vae Victis* (Woe to the vanquished) had ended and that modern man would not apply this outdated slogan. The defeated nations were hoping that President Wilson's well-advertised democratic arrangement of borders according to a plebiscite would take place. Therefore, from as far away as Russia, they withdrew their troops, because they trusted that this would happen. The gullibility of the victors was immeasurable when, in their ignorance, they accepted the lies of a few chauvinist, political propagandists and they abandoned the ideal of self-determination. They promised to create a new Switzerland „une sorte de Suisse”. Benes demanded, in the name of humanity, the freeing of the Slav people living in the Monarchy. He misled the Western politicians and their people through the media, in order to put the Czech people in a position to suppress other peoples. It was not a Switzerland that he wanted but a nationalistic Slav state. It became the same as the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, because in the new Czechoslovak state lived as many national minorities as lived in the Monarchy, only the Czechs were dominant. Benes and Masaryk hid the real goal of the Czechs behind their public goal of democracy. They demanded self-determination for the Czechs and the Slovaks. At the same time, they vehemently opposed this same right for other peoples. The following is an example of Benes' two-faced behavior: He demanded the German territory of the Sudetenland for Czechoslovakia based on historic rights but at the same time vehemently opposed the historic right of Hungary to Felvidék. (Kostya, p. 104)

Benes advocated the view that, if Czechoslovakia came into existence, it would provide a strong enough bastion to prevent the Germans' push to the East and the Russians' push to the West. How did the Czechs fulfill this promise of a strong bastion between East and West? In 1945, they were the first to embrace happily their Soviet brothers and give them passage into the heart of Europe. They were not suited for that role which Hungary had played for more than 1000 years. We can state this based on their actions. Dr József Berzy states: „No power outside of Europe, which is willing to make a political alliance with the Bolsheviks, and no nation which supports Communism and Pan-Slavism, can be a sincere ally of the big family of European nations.”¹⁸⁸

Writing about Czechoslovakia and Communism, Berzy states: „Czechoslovakia was the first to make a strong alliance with Communism whose goals were to destroy the Western European Culture, dethrone the monarchs, erase the borders of the countries, erase the idea of belonging to a nation, disarm the armies of every state, eliminate the aristocracy and the intelligentsia, abolish the constitution of every state and erase every religion.” (Berzy, p. 157) World War II paved the way for Communism to advance into Eastern Europe. This is when the destruction of morals and religion began. At the same time, in the West, the freemasons made it appear that the West was opposing the Communist ideals but, in reality, they were supporting each other, because the different orders all came from the same root. The leaders of these two groups, in denying God, in their hatred of Christians and with their materialistic view are identical. Plinio Correa de Oliveira describes the official policy of the Communists which dictated the persecution of the Christians in the Soviet Zone.

„It is the duty of the Communist state to eradicate all possibilities of the practice of religion. Therefore, in those countries which come under Communist rule:

- I. Sooner or later all churches will have to be closed. All clerics will be eradicated. Practice of religion will be forbidden and all missionary activities will be stopped.

¹⁸⁸ Berzy, Jozsef: Európa Felszabadítása. Passaic, NJ, 1966. p. 129

2. If, for any reason, this cannot be accomplished immediately, then the state administration will be patient and allow the temporary practice of religion.
3. The state will apply different methods of espionage to discover who practises religion. Communists must be planted among the priests and the leaders of the churches. From within the church we will form the church policy to advance Communism.
4. The Communist Party Dictatorship has to be strengthened by every possible means and, at the same time, the people must be taught to be disbelievers.”¹⁸⁹

Now if we take into account that the Communists’ destructive, anti-Christian activities were made possible by the Peace Treaties of Paris, then we have to come to the conclusion that the situations after Trianon and after 1945 were anti-European. Who were those who dictated the Peace Treaties? Instead of writing their names, let us write about their characters and from this we can conclude who they were. „Atheists, sectarians, Pan-Slavists, fanatics, Zionist race-protectors, drawing-room communists, Marxist socialists and Bolsheviks who are preparing a new world order. Behind all these, are the freemasons whose secretive methods unify and connect them all. Their deeds they shamelessly call a Peace Treaty.” (Berzy, p.176-177)

President Wilson, on his return from the Peace Treaty negotiations declared: „If we did not administer well the power invested in us by the people, then we would be the greatest criminals on earth.” (Berzy, p. 178) Kennan writes: „This Peace Treaty was written by the hand of the Devil and in it is the tragedy of the future.”¹⁹⁰

The Czechs made a strong alliance with these Communist Pan-Slavist, anti-European people, the Soviets. They voluntarily gave Kárpátalja, which they received at the Treaty of Trianon, to the Soviets. With this gift, this territory became property of the Soviets and the Pan-Slavist movement became located in the heart of Europe. As we can see, the Czechs were unable to fulfill the task which was given to them at the Treaty of Trianon, to be the bastion between the East and West, and Europe became unable to defend herself from the East. In this territory

¹⁸⁹ Ibid. p. 174; Plinio Correa de Oliveira: Az Egyház szabadsága a kommunista államban

¹⁹⁰ Ibid. p. 178; Kennan: La Diplomatie Americaine, p. 91

in the Carpathians, we need a nation on which Europe can rely to fulfill the duty of a buffer nation.

The Czech Legion was formed from the Czech deserters from the army of the Central Powers in Galicia. Masaryk organized them into an army in Siberia and gave them the name of Czech Legion. The „glorious” deeds of this legion in Siberia has to be brought to light because they are unknown to the Western world, yet the legion played a major role in the establishment of Czechoslovakia. Lieutenant General Constantin Sakharow writes about the Czech Legion in his memoirs.¹⁹¹

Sakharow writes that Admiral Koltcsak, the Commander-in-Chief of the Russian Menshevik army, (White Army), in spite of the endless Russian Steppes, the merciless cold and unimaginable difficulties, attempted to save Russia and went to war against the Bolshevik army (Red Army). This Russian nationalist was defeated not only by the Red Army and the merciless cold, but also by the Czech Legion, who betrayed him. Masaryk describes the deeds of the Legion in his work Anabasis, calculating that the lies he wrote would never be discovered because the distance was too great. It was not in the interest of the Bolsheviks to publicize these lies, because the Czechs helped their Revolution to be successful. The Czechs, when they deserted the army of the Central Powers, became an ally of Czarist Russia as long as the Czar was in power and financed them. But as the Red Army became stronger, they abandoned the Czar because they were not brave enough to face the danger of the Red Army. At the beginning, they did not dare to help the Bolsheviks openly because they did not know how the Entente nations would regard this action. Later, after they had advanced far into Siberia, they decided to withdraw from Russia, which they did fully armed. They robbed the entire country of Russia on their way back to the West. Their greatest „heroic deed” was to betray Admiral Koltcsak and help to give him over to the Reds. It cannot be described how cruelly these Czech soldiers treated the Hungarian prisoners-of-war. The „heroic deeds” which they supposedly performed in Siberia were taken into account when the Allies decided to establish Czechoslovakia and annex Felvidék to Czechoslovakia. We can read in the introduction to Sakharow’s book: „When the world revises the borders of

¹⁹¹ Sakharow, Konstantin: A Cseh légión Szibériában, in 1930 (reprinted in Garfield, NJ in 1988)

Czechoslovakia, this book, as a historic document, will be a decisive factor in the service of historical truth.” Sakharow was strongly opposed to Pan-Slavism. He saw clearly that the fall of Russia was caused by the unreasonable spreading of Pan-Slavism over different nations and peoples, which rightfully caused antagonism among the non-Slav peoples who saw the greatest danger in the imperialist Pan-Slavism.

Sakharow did not want to enslave or unify the Slav nations, as was the goal of Pan-Slavism, but rather to encourage the spiritual, cultural and material development of the Russian people in their own country, according to their special Russian character, a gift which numerous Russians have already given to the world. He says that Hungary has every reason to sympathise with Russian nationalism which also opposes Pan-Slavism. „We, Russians, do not belong to the victorious nations but rather the defeated nations, and we pledge solidarity with those nations who had to sign those outrageous treaties. The whole world groans under the yoke of slavery made at the Dictated Peace.” (Sakharow, p.10) Sakharow says that the Russian people suffered even more than those unfortunate people who had to sign the treaties. The name of their country was even taken away from them. 150 million people were taken into slavery. The people were starving yet the soil was good. Everything could grow. The children of this land were raised in the wrong direction, raised as atheists because prayer was forbidden. Inside the country, the web of espionage kept the people in subjection and under the threat of death. The Communist power was kept in place by international criminals. Their leader was Stalin. Under him were Kalinin, Béla Kun and others. Sakharow’s book brings to light the horror of betrayal. Sakharow says that he talks of traitors who called their victims brothers and friends before they betrayed them. He says that his goal is to make people aware of the evil deeds of the Czechs so that mankind will never forget them. Man forgets easily, especially those who suppress and actually change the facts. He says that the Russian exiles have just now come to the conclusion that fate punished the Hungarian people much harder and many more times than it did some other nations.

Sakharow says that the Russians and Hungarians suffered the most at the hands of some Slav peoples. When the Russian National Army (the Mensheviks) was almost victorious, the betrayal took place in Versailles. The outbreak of the the First World War was blamed on the

Germans and the Hungarians by those who were constantly preparing for revenge and war. The defeated nations were disarmed and were made to pay all the expenses of the War. Now we know for sure that, if Russia and Germany had been allies, the World War would not have taken place. These two great powers would have set an example of cooperation for all the nations of Europe but it was exactly this that the politicians of Versailles feared the most. This is why they provided Russia with Communism. They imported into Russia Communists of different races and nationalities so that they could alienate the two nations, Russia and Germany from each other. They cut Europe into two parts, under the camouflage of advocating self-determination, and created new countries. Czechoslovakia was formed from the land of the Czechs to which was added the German territory of Sudetenland and the Hungarian territories of Felvidék and Kárpátalja. With the arbitrary establishment of the new Successor states, created at Trianon and St. Germain, the seeds of a new World War were planted, for which the victors of the First World War were preparing. The World War could have ended earlier and would have caused less bloodshed and used less money, if the USA had become involved in the War in 1915 but then the USA would not have been able to make a profit by supplying the arms to those involved in the War. (Sakharow, p. 16)

The World War ended, not by a decisive victory of the Entente Nations over the Central Powers, but by the inside collapse of the Central Powers, caused by pacifist propaganda. Russia collapsed in a similar way. The late entry of the United States into the War obviously contributed to the end of the War. The Americans entered the War when they were sure of victory and sure that they could make a profit from the War. This is why, at the end of the War, they categorized the nations, not as victors and defeated, but as winners and losers. Russia and the Central Powers were categorized as losers. Sakharow says: „The time will come when Russia will free herself of Communism and then will settle her account not with Germany but with those who made the Dictated Peace.” (Sakharow, p.17)

This victory over Communism was almost successful in 1919 and would have taken place if an act of treason had not occurred. This came from the Czechs in the territory of Siberia which was the center of the Russian National Army (the Mensheviks). Sakharow says that the dagger, which gave the death blow to Russian freedom, was hidden in

the hands of the Czech Legions, who still called the land of Russia their mother and the Russians their brothers. He says that, as Admiral Koltcsak's closest colleague, as Commander of the Army, he saw the horrible crimes which the Czechs committed in Siberia. They betrayed the National Army and their leaders. They made friends with the Bolsheviks and, like cowardly hordes, they fled toward the East. They committed rape and robbery among the Russian populace. They killed countless people. They took immeasurable wealth and treasures home with them. The Russian people ask the Czech and Slovak people how they could do that. They ask them how they are going to be able to pay back all these treasures. Sakharow says that to bring these shameful deeds of the Czechs to the public knowledge is not only the duty of the Russians but it is the duty of every honest person who calls for justice. It is in the interest of the whole world to bring the Czechs to justice for these actions. If this does not happen then Europe tolerates a sinful nation of killers, rapists and liars and even celebrates them as heroes. (Sakharow, p. 19)

There is no question that Czarist Russia lived under the delusion that Pan-Slavism would unite all the Slav nations. A renewed nationalism would have dispelled this idea. In the fifty years before World War I., Pan-Slavism exerted a strong influence on the Russian people. It originated in the first half of the 19th. century and first appeared in literary writings and linguistic studies in an effort to discover a common Slav language and literature among the Slavic peoples. When the Bulgars and the Serbs suffered oppression under the Turks, this cultural movement became a political movement. As a result, the Russian-Turkish war took place in 1877-1878 and the Bulgars and Serbs gained their independence. At this time, the intelligentsia joined this political movement which became known as Pan-Slavism. With their fanatical work, they became a major factor in this movement.

The expansion of Pan-Slavism was the result of the dissolution of the Holy Alliance which had existed between Germany, the Hapsburgs and Russia. This new coolness between these three countries was already evident at the Berlin Conference, in 1878. There was another factor which contributed to this coolness, the agreement between France and Czar Alexander III. of Russia which balanced the German orientation to the West. With their political intrigues, the French used Pan-Slavism to obtain their own goal. These two factors completely

separated Germany and Russia. At the same time, in St. Petersburg and all over Europe, Pan-Slavism grew like a mushroom. The advocates of Pan-Slavism used this philosophy to their own advantage. All the Slav nations bowed down to Great Russia. They swore loyalty and in exchange they received continuous support.

In March of 1919, the Czechs stated that they were loyal to the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and pledged to remain loyal to the Emperor and moreover, they asked Charles Hapsburg, Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary to become King of Czechoslovakia. Before this they had also asked the Romanov House of Russia to accept the Czech crown.

As the Bolshevik Revolution broke out in St. Petersburg, in 1917, the Czechs soon noticed that the wind was blowing from a different direction. They changed their colors and all of a sudden they became vehement Republicans. The Czech National Council suggested that the Czechs borrow 20 million francs from France. With this money, Lieutenant General Nikolaus Duhonin organized three Czech army divisions. In October, the Communist Revolution was successful. The National Army was dissolved. Masaryk writes of the situation in his book entitled: Világ forradalom (World Revolution). This work is dangerous because it presents Masaryk as a very knowledgeable person and his work as creditable, yet this book is full of falsifications and misrepresentations.

Between May, 1917 and April 1918, the Czech prisoners of war of the Entente nations were given their freedom and joined the Czech Legions. They were told to work with all their might for the creation of Czechoslovakia. At this time, the Czech leaders were in a dilemma because they had advocated that Communism, which had taken hold in Hungary in 1919, was a danger to Europe. This caused the Western nations to become anti-Hungarian. This was one of the factors which later contributed to the dismemberment of Hungary. The dilemma was that the Czechs in Siberia were supporting the Communists. This was the reason they decided to move out of Siberia. The Czechs occupied all the Siberian railroads. The government of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy demanded that the prisoners of war be disarmed and that they be sent to concentration camps and deported back to their own countries as deserters.

How did the story of the Czech heroism begin? The Czech propaganda which presents the heroic deeds of the Czech Legion is none

other than a fabricated fantasy because in the Siberian cities which were occupied by the Czechs, e.g. Omsk, Irkutsk, Cseljabinszk, there was no defensive force of any kind. They marched into these cities as liberators and they were warmly welcomed by the populace. An eye-witness writes that they made it appear that they were liberating these cities from Bolshevism. (Sakharow, p. 33)

Before the Russian National Army was disbanded, members of the Russian intelligentsia, which had not yet been annihilated, sent their sons by the thousand into its service. Individual heroism was a daily event. When a city was freed by the Army, through the heroism of individual Russians, the Czech Legions moved in ahead of them and set themselves up as liberators of the city. Therefore the Russian people's gratitude, before they realized the truth, went toward the Czechs. The Russian Army initially ignored the fact that the Czechs were taking this glory away from them. Later, when the situation became serious, the Russian people saw the cowardly, disgraceful behavior of the Czechs toward the Bolsheviks. They saw how the Czechs took out the treasures in wagons from the cities, and how they ran from the Reds at the city of Kazan, leaving the people there to suffer the retaliation of the Bolsheviks. Sakharow says that the entire Czech Legion resembled a large band of robbers without any army regulations and all they did was rob and rape. At that time, their leaders were Pavlu, Girska, Patejdel, Medek, and Blogosch, with Thomas Masaryk in command. When the English General Knox arrived, he was very surprised to see the disorganization and atrocious behavior in the Czech army which had such a good name. He tried to convince them to continue the war against the Reds but they refused. In the Czech army which numbered 50,000, Colonel Schwer was the only person to feel shame at the behavior of his comrades whom he tried to regulate. His efforts were in vain, so in his shame, he committed suicide.

The Czechs used 20,000 railway wagons to take the stolen goods out of Russia. That means that, in theory, each Czech soldier could have received almost half a wagon of treasure. The Russian National Army would have liked to defeat these Czech soldiers but they were not strong enough to fight at the same time against the Bolsheviks and the 50,000 well-armed Czechs.

The temporary Russian government put the defense in the hands of Admiral Koltcsak. He was a very intelligent man. He honored the

German organization and diligence but he was first of all a Russian patriot. This respect for the Germans was enough for the French to brand him and his colleagues as German sympathizers. That was one of the reasons that the Czechs did not like him either. Zacharow writes that if Koltcsak and his army had not fallen victim to the Czech betrayal, then the history of Russia would have been different. (Sakharow, p.54)

Admiral Koltcsak was appointed as Head of the Russian State, on November 18, 1918, opposed only by the Czechs. Gaida became the new Commander of the Czech Legion and pledged his loyalty to Koltcsak. Koltcsak accepted his pledge and trusted him, supporting him in every matter. He appointed him to the rank of General in 1919.

When the first Czech delegation arrived at Vladivostok, Stefanik, the Czechoslovakian Defense Minister, also noticed the Czech legion's disorganization and, like Schwer, he tried to regulate them. He tried to dissolve the Czech National Council and he placed the Czech legion under the leadership of the French General Janin.

The barbaric treatment of the prisoners of war, by the Czech legion, was called to the attention of the International Red Cross. (I do not want to go into details about this but if the reader is interested, he can find a detailed account on page 109 of Sakharow's book.) Here is just one example:

„Three sacks were thrown out of a Russian train, commandeered by the Czechs, as it was crossing a bridge over the River Onon, at full speed. When these sacks were fished out of the river, they were found to contain the corpses of three Russian women whom the Czechs had raped and killed on the train. It is impossible to determine the number of similar actions the Czechs committed in Siberia.” (Sakharow, p. 112) Since I cannot write of the scale of the Czech robberies or the amount of treasures they took from their „brothers”, the Russians, from which they established the richest bank in Czechoslovakia which is still in business, I shall mention one or two of the most outstanding.

Admiral Koltcsak was captured by the Czechs, as he was trying to save the Russian National Treasures on the railroad, whose value was approximately 20 million *rubles*. The treasure which was taken at Vladivostok filled 28 railroad cars, the value of which, in 1918, was 38,692,815 *rubles*. When the Czechs left Irkutsk, they took all the treasures, money and banknote stereotype plates. On their way, they made a flood of counterfeit banknotes, of 5,000 *rubles*, 1000 *rubles* and

200 *rubles* and created a panic in the stock market. They captured General Skiptrov and his armored train with 8 million *rubles*, which they took as war booty.

The most hurtful of the actions of the Czechs was that Masaryk in his book Anabasis, an epic of lies, glorified the exploits of the Czechs as being as great as those of Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar. Those who created Czechoslovakia believed his lies and created this state on the basis of the „heroic actions” of the Czechs. Benes regarded Masaryk as a person with the gift of foretelling the future. He always knew when and how to change sides. This ability benefitted Czechoslovakia. In 1918, they abandoned Communism and they oriented themselves to the French.¹⁹²

Masaryk stated: „After I was informed about the political situation and I learned something about the circumstances, on March 18, I sent a telegram to Miljukov and Rodzianko, in which I expressed my satisfaction at the collapse (of the Russian Empire).”¹⁹³

Masaryk explained in detail the events of 1915-1916 when he was in London but he forgot to mention a memorandum which he gave to Sir Edward Gray in 1915: „Independent Bohemia” accompanied by a map. (Map of United States of Bohemia) In this memorandum, he wrote the following: „For the Czechs and the Balkan Slavs, friendship with Russia is of the utmost importance. The Czech politicians are of the opinion that Constantinople and the straits should belong to Russia. They are planning to make Czechoslovakia a monarchy. The idea of a Czech Republic is supported by only a few radical politicians. The question of the Royal House could be solved in two different ways. The Allies would give us a prince and Serbia and Czechoslovakia would make a personal union. The Russian Dynasty would be very popular.”¹⁹⁴ In 1915, Masaryk was a Russian sympathiser and a monarchist and he placed all his hopes in his Russian „brothers” and in the Russian Dynasty. In 1917, after the Revolution, he announced: „I have seen through Czarism and cursed it and its impotence.”¹⁹⁵ Masaryk

¹⁹² Ibid. p. 135; Benes, E.: Der Aufstand der Nationen p. 343-345

¹⁹³ Ibid. p. 136; Masaryk, T.G. Die Weltrevolution, p. 133

¹⁹⁴ Ibid. p. 136; Hassinger, H. Die Tschechoslovakei, p. 330-331

¹⁹⁵ Ibid. p. 137; Masaryk: Op. Cit. p. 314

acknowledged that the Czechs supplied themselves and the army from the Russian stockpiles.¹⁹⁶

In *Anabasis*, Masaryk describes the „glorious deeds” of the Czech soldiers as they liberated some Siberian cities. He states that this news caused pleasure in the United States: „Like everywhere, here also the Jews came to my aid, especially here in America. . Already, in 1907, the Jews welcomed me to New York. At this time, I had many meetings with the representatives of the Orthodox and the Zionist Jews of New York. The news of the events of the war in Siberia were sent by cable to the Jews in America, where it was received with greater enthusiasm than in Europe. The Czech legion was already very popular in America in August, 1918, although much later in Europe.”

Masaryk said: „I was even more dismayed by news from the officers of our allies, who came back from Russia and Siberia, who revealed the corruption of the morals of the Czech Legion. This news of the Czech behavior only partly became publicized but even so was very damaging. But in spite of all this, public opinion and public officials continued to support the Czechs.”¹⁹⁷

Masaryk adds as an explanation that the Czech legion should not only be judged as soldiers but also as being influential in improving the economy in Siberia. He says that they formed trade unions in Siberia and mercantile banks in Czechoslovakia. Sakharow, however, strongly denies this and states that this is just a fantasy of Masaryk’s because the legion dismantled the factories and took the machines with them on trains. The Czech banks were established with around 90 million rubles, which were stolen from Russia and from treasures from the trains which Koltcsak tried to save from the Reds. The Czechs were able to obtain the sympathy of different governments because they spent unimaginable amounts of money on propaganda which they spread in the West and which is still being distributed. With such an effective propaganda campaign, they obtained their independence and they expanded their rule over different nations. According to the estimate of H. Hassinger, 6.4 million Czechs rule over 6.8 million people of other nationalities and among these 1,747,000 are Hungarians.¹⁹⁸ The Czechs demanded every

¹⁹⁶ Ibid. p. 137; Masaryk: Op. Cit. p. 172

¹⁹⁷ Ibid. p. 138.; Masaryk: Op. Cit. p. 85 and 249

¹⁹⁸ Hassinger, H.: Die Tschechoslovakei

Austrian and Hungarian prisoner of war in Siberia to accept Czechoslovak citizenship within the new Czechoslovak „historic” borders. These Austrians and Hungarians could not in good conscience accept this but it was forced upon them with tortures, with the acknowledgement of the Czech government.

An employee of the Red Cross stated that most of the Austrian and Hungarian prisoners did not want to hear of the new borders or of Czech citizenship, but they had to appear weekly before the Czech recruiting committee and all those who did not want to become members of the Czech legion were ordered to be tortured. This treatment was observed by many so it cannot be denied. The Czechs made a name for themselves in Siberia because of their cruelty which cannot be forgotten. (Sakharow, p. 142)

Sakharow states: „We Russians, who lost our homes because of the Czech betrayal, and who have lived abroad for many years, have found out that the Czech people and the Slovak people have no relationship and they are as different as the Russians and the Poles. The Slovaks are mainly simple, modest people. They remain faithful to each other while the Hussite Czechs hate them and often offend them deeply because of their religious beliefs. The Slovak people are an independent race whose history and language are not identical to that of the Czechs. A Czechoslovak people is non-existent and is just a fiction.” (Sakharow, p. 143-144)

The worst part of the legend of the Czech Legion was that it actually succeeded in influencing the Allied Powers. The Czechs received the right, as a party to the War, to be present at the dictation of the Peace Treaty.

The Peace Conference was ruled by blind hatred. The Czech desire to gain new territories knew no bounds. They believed that the losers of the War would never be able to revive and therefore they did not have to worry about irredentism. In their eagerness, they were not satisfied just to receive the Hungarian Felvidék, but demanded Kárpátalja (Ruthenia) as well.

In the German-Russian Peace Treaty at Brest-Litovsk, it was agreed that Russia would never gain access to the Carpathian Basin. Unfortunately, twenty-five years later, this actually took place because the politicians disregarded the right of more than 1000 years of Historic Hungary. In 1919, the Allied Forces stipulated that the Ruthenian

people should receive their autonomy, which the Czechs accepted by signing the Treaty of Saint Germain. The drawing of the borders at Trianon was influenced by strategic considerations and the question of public transportation, so large pieces of Hungarian territory were given away. To receive this territory, the Successor States had to win over the Great Powers to their side. Therefore they used the different propaganda organizations located in all the countries of the West and they sent memoranda to the politicians which were never made public. Why were they not made public? Because these are the proofs of their manipulation. The Germans obtained these documents in the 1930's and published them in French and German. These writings show shocking distortions. Later, Benes acknowledged that some memoranda provided falsification but attributed this to errors on the publisher's part. He said that these erroneous data did not influence the decisions made at Trianon. The American delegate to the Peace Treaty negotiations, Professor Archibald Cary Coolidge, who was the most knowledgeable expert in the politics and history of Central Europe, presented his report to Woodrow Wilson on January 19, 1919, in which he proposed to retain Hungary's economic unity and opposed the annexation of Transylvania to Rumania, which the conference did not accept.¹⁹⁹ He stated that if the extent of foreign occupation indicated the future boundaries of Hungary, more than three and three quarter million Hungarian citizens would be subjected to alien rule and „to compel what has been since a thousand years a unified country to accept such an arrangement as permanent would be only to condemn it to a future of hatred and strife with every probability of violent outbreak before many years have elapsed.”²⁰⁰

At the First Vienna Award in 1938, the borders which had existed before the time of Napoleon were reinstated, the kingdom of Holland was established and Switzerland's everlasting neutrality was accepted.

¹⁹⁹ Kostya Sándor: Op. Cit. p. 133-134.; Gunst, Peter: p.322

²⁰⁰ Taraszovics, Sándor: „American Peace Plans and the Shaping of Hungary's Post-World War I. Borders”, Essay in War and Society in East Central Europe, Vol. VI. Essays on World War I. A Case Study of Trianon. P. 240. Cited from Francis Deák Hungary at the Paris Peace Conference. The Diplomatic History of the Treaty of Trianon, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. 17-18

In 1920, the artificial Successor States were created and an alliance between them, the Little Entente. Czechoslovakia was formed not by the decision of the people, but rather by the decision of the enemies of the Monarchy, who were of one opinion. This was possible because the knowledge of the Allied Powers about this territory was very limited. Benes sometimes talked of the necessity of Czechoslovakia and when sometimes that was not convincing, he switched to the security of Europe. He demanded the Hungarian territories of Kassa, Csallóköz, Pozsony, so that he could defend Europe against the Drang nach Osten. He stated that the Ronyva Creek was a navigable river, which the West believed. The negotiators accepted such lies as that there was a Slovak border. Where and when was there such a state? When Czechoslovakia obtained the right to take that territory, they were unable to decide where the borderline ran. They merely called it Slovensko. When the French General Vyx asked the Hungarian government to clear the territory of Slovensko, they could simply not do that because they had never heard of such a territory.

Benes fabricated another good sounding slogan which affected the judge who drew the border lines. He accused Hungary of being the spring-board to Russian communism which endangers the security of Europe.

Chapter 16

Events Leading to Trianon

On November 3, 1918, when the cease-fire was signed by General Weber of the Monarchy and General Diaz, representing the Allied Forces, this meant the end of the war for the Hungarians. While Mihály Károlyi and his delegation were in Belgrade meeting with General Franchet d'Esperey, and discussing further negotiations, the Serb army marched into the Hungarian territory of Szerémség and on November 8, the Czech army occupied many cities of northern Hungary, Felvidék, although the Serbs and the Czechs had already signed the cease-fire. The conditions which the Belgrade Convention presented to Hungary were so severe that Károlyi did not sign the ceasefire agreement until November 13 and then only under duress.²⁰¹ At the negotiations with the Rumanians, Oszkár Jászy from the Hungarian side tried everything to reach a just agreement with the Rumanians for drawing the border lines but his efforts were unsuccessful because the Rumanians were just stalling for time to convince the Rumanians living in Transylvania to join the Kingdom of Rumania. At that time these Transylvanian Rumanians were not eager to join the Rumanians outside the country. Another reason for not agreeing with Jászy was to win the acknowledgement of the Entente to Rumania's right to enter Transylvania to keep the peace there. They used another stalling tactic by making an agreement with the Kolozsvár Rumanian army commandant that together with the Rumanian National Guard, they would instigate constant small clashes between Rumanians and Hungarians in the cities. In this way the Rumanians could come into those territories which were not yet occupied by the Rumanian army, in order to keep the peace. Finally, on December 17, the Rumanians received permission from the Entente to move north of the Demarcation Line. The Károlyi Government asked the Entente to explain why the

²⁰¹ Raffay, Ernő: *Magyar Tragédia: Trianon 75 éve*, Budapest, 1996, p. 55

Rumanians had the right to break the cease-fire agreement, cross the Demarcation Line and occupy Hungarian territory. Instead of answering, General Philippe Berthelot, the commander of the French Army, on December 23, stated that he gave the order for the Rumanians to cross the Demarcation Line. (Raffay, p. 64)

In the Rumanian and Hungarian disputes, the Rumanians made the excuse that they did not break the cease-fire agreement, because the Hungarians had made that agreement not with them but with the Entente. However when the Rumanians occupied Transylvania, they declared themselves to be the army of the Entente. When Károlyi, on November 8, 1918, came to the agreement with the Entente for a cease fire, the Rumanians did not accept it although they were part of the Entente. The purpose of the Rumanians for occupying the territory beyond the Demarcation Line was to present the Entente with a *fait accompli* which they would accept. At that time there was a big disagreement between the Transylvanian Rumanians and the Rumanians of the Kingdom of Rumania. The Hungarians tried to use this to their own benefit. The goal of the Rumanians was to prevent them from doing so. Therefore their goal was to occupy Transylvania as soon as possible.

On December, 1, 1918, at the Rumanian National Assembly at Gyulafehérvár, the leaders of the Transylvanian Rumanians declared that they wanted to join the Rumanian kingdom forever. On December 13, this decision was seconded by the Consiliul Dirigent. This was a breach of international law because the International Peace Treaty Conference had not yet assembled so they could not have accepted it. There were approximately 100,000 Transylvanian Rumanians who took part in the Rumanian National Assembly. The rest of the populace of this territory, Serbs, Saxons and Hungarians were not allowed to take part in this assembly. This makes it illegal. Later, it came to public knowledge that this National Assembly was arranged by the Royal Rumanian Government through the Transylvanian Rumanian leaders. It is obvious that the Rumanians intended to influence the decisions of the Peace Treaty. (Raffay, p. 71)

The Rumanian Government did not acknowledge the Army Convention which took place on November 13, 1918, nor did they acknowledge the Demarcation Line of Apáthy-Berthelot which went north and south from Kolozsvár. At the beginning of 1919, a dispute

broke out between the diplomats who wanted the territory and those who were trying to maintain the integrity of Hungary.

The Hungarian Prime Minister, Dénes Berinkey, declared that the only solution to the dispute was the plebiscite which was denied. Instead of this, it was suggested that those territories which the Hungarians occupied when they entered the Carpathian Basin, be taken away from Hungary and „given back” to the „rightful owners”, i.e. the peoples of the Successor States, the Czechoslovaks, Serbs and Rumanians. So it became clear that the anti-Hungarian politics of the Successor States had reached their goal among the Entente politicians who were unfamiliar with the geography and history of Central Europe.

Julin Maniu, the President of the Transylvanian Rumanian Government Council, tried to prove that the Hungarian government acknowledged the annexation of Transylvania to Rumania. In seven points, he set down his proofs which now I will not study in detail because they are too long but they can be found on p.72 of Raffay's book. I shall just mention Berinkey's answer: „All this (the seven points) according to my understanding, proves exactly the opposite of what Mr. Maniu was hoping to prove because the facts he presented declare that the Hungarian Government had always given every freedom to the minorities living within its borders. Now the Government wishes to give all the minorities the right to self-determination or national autonomy.” Berinkey continues: „One of the Hungarian ministers went to the city of Arad with the purpose of discussing the autonomy of the Rumanians who were living in Hungary. When it became obvious that the Rumanian Nationality Council's only goal was to annex Hungarian territory to Rumania, the Hungarian government stopped all negotiations with the Rumanian Government. The Ukrainian and German minorities however were given autonomy.” (Minority Laws, 1918: X. 1919: VI.) (Raffay, p. 73)

According to Berinkey's reports of October 12, November 9 and December 1, 1918, Hungary did not, of her own will, give up Transylvania to Rumania. The Hungarian Government did not acknowledge the National Assembly of Gyulafehérvár because only Rumanians attended it and no Serbs, Saxons or Hungarians. Another reason that we cannot acknowledge the decision of the Rumanian National Assembly is that in 26 counties the Rumanian populace was

only 43%. These reasons are enough proof for the rejection of the Gyulafehérvár decision.

Raffay says that the Rumanians wanted to obtain the Hungarian acknowledgement that they gave up Transylvania, so that when they went to the Peace Conference, they could show that the Hungarians gave up this territory. (p. 74)

The Rumanians intended to obtain Transylvania with armed force. After the Rumanian armistice agreement on November 3, 1918, which took place in Padua, the French army envoy went to Rumania on November 6, and the Rumanian king immediately made Prime Minister Alexandru Morghilon resign because he was a German sympathizer. He named Colonel Eremia Grigorescu as his successor. Grigorescu mobilized the Rumanian army immediately and recruited all men between the age of 18 and 38. This mobilization took place at the end of the war. France wanted Rumania as an active military partner at the Peace Negotiations on the Entente side. There was an obstacle to Rumania becoming the comrade-in-arms of France in that, six months before the end of the war, Rumania had signed a peace treaty with the Central Powers in Bucharest and had become an ally of Germany. With this act she nullified the secret agreement with the Entente powers which she had signed at Bucharest in 1916. This meant that Rumania lost her right to obtain the territories which were promised to her in that secret agreement. So to demonstrate that she was a military ally of the Entente, Rumania mobilized her army and attacked the retreating German Commander, General Mackensen from behind. The German army had already surrendered the day after Alexandru Morghilon resigned and the Hungarian army had laid down their arms a week before that. The French foreign ministry only succeeded at the last minute in persuading the Entente to accept Rumania as an equal partner. Raffay says that it is obvious that Rumania, with armed force, intended to achieve the goal that she was unable to achieve in 1916, the annexation of Transylvania and to extend her border to the one promised her at the secret treaty. If Rumania had reached that goal, the present Hungarian territory to the east of the Tisza would be Rumanian territory now. (Raffay, p. 75)

The eagerness of the Successor States to take land from Hungary caused disagreements between the Serbs, Rumanians and the Czechs. When the Rumanians occupied Hungary, the Czechs were afraid that they would take so much booty from Hungary that there would not be

much left for them. The Serb-Rumanian antagonism almost resulted in a war between the two because they both had claims on the Bánság.

The plan of the Czech-Yugoslav territorial corridor was suggested in January 1919. This corridor was planned to be located in the western part of Transdanubia. It would be 200 kilometers long and 80 kilometers wide. This would belong to Czechoslovakia, Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia. This corridor would have cut through four Hungarian counties, Moson, Sopron, Vas and Zala. There were 1,171,000 people living on this territory, 662,000 Hungarians, 220,000 Slavs and 289,000 others. The purpose of the corridor according to the Czechs, was to separate the Germans from East and Central Europe. They emphasized this for the benefit of the French. They also mentioned that they wanted to join the Northern and Southern Slavs. Their real purpose was that Czechoslovakia would have a seaport and they intended to make Pozsony a great Danube harbor. This would isolate Hungary even more. They advocated that Pozsony was the ancient capital of Slovakia, omitting the fact that Pozsony was for four centuries the coronation city of Hungary.

At Trianon, the verbal disputes became very angry because the Serbs did not acknowledge the secret agreement that the Rumanians had made because it had been made in secret. They demanded the territory of the Bánság and Temesvár for themselves on an ethnic basis and because some of the great Serb leaders were born on these territories. These great Serbian leaders were accepted by the Hungarians as refugees from the Turks. This did not mean anything. The Hungarians had no right to claim this territory yet many great Hungarian leaders, poets and writers were born here and buried here. The Serbs acknowledged that the Germans were in the majority on these territories but they said they had to disregard that because the defeated had no rights. These were the reasons they gave for their „just” claim to these territories. (Raffay, p. 87)

In the Rumanian-Serb dispute, the Serbs stated that if Rumania received the Bánság, then Belgrade could no longer be the capital of Yugoslavia, because it would be too close to Rumania and could not be defended adequately. (Raffay, p. 102)

The fact that Budapest, the capital of Hungary, was very close to the Slovak border was not even considered in the negotiations. After World War II., „because of the goodness of Stalin”, Csallóköz was given

to Czechoslovakia, so that the Czechs could own both sides of the Danube. This puts the city of Esztergom within shooting distance of the Czechs. If the decisions of Hitler, who was declared to be a mass-murderer are overturned (the Vienna Award), then the decision of the greater mass-murderer, Stalin, should also be overturned.

The inhumane actions of the Rumanians, in the city of Zilah, are described by Gyula Kemecei, János Mészáros, György Kiss and Lajos Kiss: „On February 16, 1919, the Rumanian army treated the Hungarian populace in the most merciless way. In the afternoon of that day, the soldiers, together with the mob, allowed extensive robbery and looting in the city. All those Hungarians, who were unable to provide the requested food, money and housing for the soldiers, were beaten with sticks and the butts of guns and were chased out of their homes. Their houses were robbed and everything taken from them. The Hungarian officials were taken to Zsibó and imprisoned. The Hungarian populace of Zsibó were forbidden to give them food and clothing.” (Raffay, p. 106) This is the way the Rumanians worked as the ally of the Entente.

How did Mihály Károlyi, the President of the Hungarian Republic, react during this time? In one of his letters he wrote:

„I trust in the victory of Wilson’s pacifist teachings. I do not believe that the great President of America would allow, instead of peace, punishing expeditions against innocent peoples. I do not believe that, in place of the imperialism which is now at an end, he would allow a new imperialism to take over and again threaten World Peace. I am sure that a democratic agreement will take place and not a victorious peace achieved by an armistice. To reach this goal, America and Wilson have strong supporters in the truly democratic politicians of the western democracies, France, Italy and Britain. It cannot be that half of Europe has to experience an imperialistic, humiliating and disheartening peace. I trust that soon that time will come when the small nations around us will come to the conclusion that imperialism is not in their own interests. Now we (Hungarians) are surrounded by all kinds of enemies but I am not disheartened and I believe that we will be able to settle the disputes, one by one, and the uncertainty will dissolve and in its place consideration and understanding will take root. We will not put grenades in the hands of the soldiers but hammers,

shovels and ploughs. With these means we will forge together a new Hungary.” (Raffay p.115-116)

Mihály Károlyi finally came to the conclusion that Wilson’s principles were only a lure for the Central Powers to lay down their arms. It was not possible to stop the enemies coming into Hungary from every direction with democratic slogans. So he decided himself that Hungary needed self-defense but it was too late. Károlyi gave a command to Colonel Stromfeld to recruit a hundred thousand soldiers as soon as possible.

We know from the Stromfeld documents that he authorized Lieutenant Colonel Jenő Tombor to do this recruitment. It was obvious that they intended to organize a nationwide military defense which would be made up of 18 divisions and 3 Szekler armies, which could successfully repel the Czech and Rumanian invaders.

The Károlyi Government’s documents dealing with the national defense were signed by Colonel Kratochwill. They show that they seriously intended to arm themselves and defend themselves from the invaders. The speech of Károlyi to the army :

„I hope and I believe that the sensational injustices committed against us will be resolved justly at the conference at Versailles. I cannot believe that Wilson would allow the imperialist influence to take hold. If that were to happen, Hungary would be a victim of this imperialist movement. I am convinced that the democratic and socialist public of America and the Entente will object to the mutilation of Hungary which would cause her to be unable to survive. We Hungarians are never going to accept that. Let the whole world hear that they cannot run over a nation. The spirit of survival cannot be killed out of a nation which wants to survive. They cannot destroy a country whose only goal is to give to every citizen the same rights. Let the world hear and understand that if the Peace Conference at Paris goes against the Wilson Principles, against the right of the people to self-determination, which would be a vote against peace, then we, in our last hour of need will, with arms in hands, free our country.” (Raffay, p. 119-120)

When the leader of the Hungarian Government was beginning to understand the situation, the Czechs and Rumanians came forward with huge territorial demands. The Czechs demanded the larger part of Transdanubia, the cities of Győr and Komárom and the railroad which ran south of the Bükk mountains. Some of them even wanted to claim

Budapest as well. The Czechs at that time submitted documentation to the Great Powers which stated that only one million Hungarians lived in Hungary in the eighteenth century. The rest of the population was Slovak, which was the majority. That such extraordinary lies could be presented at the Conference shows how misinformed were the members of the Conference. The Conference rejected the suggestion of a Czech corridor and, under American pressure, the proposed borders of the Czechs were moved further to the north.

General Gondrecourt remarks about the unjust borderline,:

„I have come to the conclusion that the Peace Conference has been misled. We had to be blind to believe that such a mutilation could be forced upon Hungary without driving the country into despair, for we did not have any data about this country. As I am writing this, I have not yet expressed my deepest thoughts because I regard myself to be a newcomer in this matter. But it is my conviction that it has been excessively proven that neither Rumania nor Serbia has deserved that the great powers satisfy their oversized ambition of taking territory from Hungary. We have thrown the dice to put ourselves in a new adventure called Communism which might possibly start another war.” (Raffay p.131)

He also writes: „Because the Hungarians cannot organize themselves otherwise to defend themselves with a chance of success, they are using Bolshevism for their benefit. It is true it is hard for a nation to survive, when they have been left no coal, no mines, no forests and no industry. We really went too far.” (Raffay p.131)

Gondrecourt says that the Hungarian people are Bolshevist only out of fear or out of nationalism. But if the Hungarian Bolshevist mob comes to power then it will be impossible for the West to stop them.

He states . . . „Presently there is senseless waste in the economy. These bandits are now occupied with ruining a country which could have splendidly paid back the cost of the war.” (Raffay, p. 132)

Talking about the role of the French, he says: „We French are playing there in Hungary a thankless role. They so greatly accepted us French a few months ago. The French are highly honored in this country and we could have benefited from this situation, but no more.” (Raffay, p.132) General Gondrecourt measured up the situation well and he was able to be unbiased. He was the only one to recognize the interest of France in this territory.

The Hungarian Soviet Republic did not declare that the territory of Hungary could not be divided but it opposed the occupation by the imperialistic Successor States. The Hungarian Government did not accept General Smuts' border proposals.

On April 20, 1919, the Rumanian army, under the pretext of fighting against Bolshevism, started their attacks against the Hungarian Communists and took over the city of Nagyvárad. At that time, some Hungarians were even pleased at their intervention because they were hoping that they would help Hungary to become free of Communism. It did not take long for them to become disillusioned. On August 4, 1919, they took Budapest. At this time, the Szekler division disbanded. General Prezon of Rumania, had made an offer to the Commander of the Szekler division, stating that, „ because of the superior strength of your enemy, we give you a suggestion. Your life will be secure. Your money and your possessions will not be touched and you can peacefully return to your home. Measuring up the hopeless general situation, I cannot take responsibility for later on shedding more blood under such circumstances. You choose which path you want to take!” (p.134)

The condition was to lay down their arms. When that happened, each of the soldiers of the Szekler army had to sign the following declaration: „The undersigned prisoner of war from the Szekler army states: when I am freed, I give my word of honor to make it my duty to follow the following conditions:

1. I shall continue to live in the village of and shall be able to leave the village only with the permission of the Rumanian commander.
2. After I arrive in the village, I shall immediately report to the closest Rumanian Army Headquarters and after that, I shall report as often as they request.
3. I shall not wear the uniform of the Austro-Hungarian Army, except if it is completely altered. I shall never wear the cap.
4. I shall not carry or hide any kind of weapon.
5. I shall never oppose the Rumanian state or its army in action or in words.
6. If I do not obey the first or second points as I promised, I shall be imprisoned for five years. If I do not obey the third point, I shall be imprisoned for one year. If I do not obey the fourth point, I shall be

imprisoned for ten years and fined ten thousand *lei*. If I do not obey the fifth point, I shall be sentenced to death by firing squad.”

On August 2, 1919, according to the Peace Conference, the Rumanians were not allowed to occupy Budapest, but because they were there on August 4, the Conference allowed them to stay. This is how the small country of Rumania presented the Entente Powers with a *fait accompli*. The Peace Conference, in one and a half weeks, sent four memoranda to Bucharest to remind the Rumanians to be more humane and more reasonable and to put an end to the looting. It was in vain. The Rumanians did not obey. On August 14, Bratianu sent this memorandum to the Entente in reply to the requests of the Entente: „In the wake of the success of the Army, Rumania has not altered her territorial demands but Rumania believes that the actions of the army, which they were forced to undertake, to suppress the Hungarian offence, and which they were forced to undertake for the sake of civilization and the Entente, gave them the right to claim their dues.” (Raffay, p.135)

The Rumanian looting continued in the country. The Entente was unable to do anything about it. Clemenceau intended to send a memorandum to Rumania and Lord Balfour proposed a demonstration by the Black Sea fleet against Rumania. Finally, on September 5, the memorandum to Rumania was ready. It asked three questions of Rumania:

1. Is Rumania willing to withdraw her forces from Hungary?
2. Is Rumania willing to return the goods taken from Hungary?
3. Is Rumania willing to work with the Entente to form the domestic policy of Hungary? (Raffay, p. 137)

The Entente Powers sent Sir George Clerk to examine the situation in Rumania but the trip was fruitless because, at that time, the Rumanian Prime Minister Bratianu resigned. He was not willing to negotiate the problems of the minorities, as he was required to by the Entente. Bratianu regarded the treatment of the several million Rumanian minorities as Rumanian business. Clerk then went to Budapest and he obtained a promise from the leaders of the Rumanian Army in Budapest that they would leave Hungary when the new Hungarian Government was formed on the multi-party system. The Rumanians employed delaying politics to gain enough time to take the stolen goods out of the country. Bratianu wrote to King Carol of Rumania on September 12 that he resigned because the Entente did not

fulfill the secret treaty, which was signed in 1916. Clemenceau was so upset with the behavior of Bratianu and the Rumanians that he was trying to find a legal means to change the decision to give Transylvania to Rumania. The Entente finally, on November 25 1919, gave an ultimatum to the Rumanians to:

1. Leave Hungarian territory to the final borderline.
2. Sign the Peace Treaty with the Austrians, together with an agreement to uphold the rights of the minorities.
3. Give the Entente the right to check all the goods, which Rumania took from Hungary.

On December 9, the Rumanian General Coanda signed the agreement that approved the rights of the minorities. The Rumanians did not sign the Austrian Peace Treaty. On the same day, the Entente gave an order for the Rumanians to leave Hungary. The Rumanians did not obey this order. The Entente could have come to the conclusion that they could hardly control the imperialistic demands of their allies.

In December 1919, the Yugoslavs were demanding the Hungarian coal mines around Pécs. They were already there and did not intend to leave. The Rumanians dismantled and took out all the Hungarian factories that they were able to reach. They took factories that produced arms, ammunition, screws, printers and agricultural machinery. They took mills, electrical companies, pumping companies and railroad wagon companies. They took all the cars that they could find. The Manfred Weiss machine company, the Wolfner leather company and the Bárdi automobile company suffered enormous damage. The Bárdi Company, only a few years earlier, was installed by the German Opel Company with the newest technical advances. From the agricultural industry, they took all the animals they could find, even chickens. They took meat, milk, animal fodder and seed for the next year's planting. They took the newly established ironworks at Diósgyőr. This was just a fraction of what the Rumanians took from Hungary. (Raffay, p. 138)

The Hungarians made an inventory of all the things that the Rumanians took out of Hungary because they thought that they would be able to subtract the value of these goods from the payment, which Hungary would have to pay to Rumania after the War, but this was not counted.

Pál Prónay organized the Hungarian army after the Commune was defeated. The Government of Károly Huszár was established and the Horthy administration followed that. Károly Huszár, the Hungarian President, in his letter to Clemenceau, wrote:

„The highest advisory board of the Entente could very effectively contribute to calming the Hungarian disposition. If they would be willing to send envoys to Transylvania, especially to Kolozsvár, Nagyvárad and to Marosvásárhely and to northern Hungary, to Pozsony, Rózsashegy and Kassa, and finally to southern Hungary, to Szabadka and Zombor and their territories, to study the situation, they could come to their own conclusions about the injustices which are conducted against the Hungarians by the Successor States, and they might do something about it to make these sufferings end.” Clemenceau did not even answer this request. (Raffay, p. 142)

On July 1, 1920, Bratianu spoke to the Rumanian Parliament: **„We cannot rest until we completely destroy the Hungarian people, economically and militarily because, as long as there is a spark of life in the Hungarian nation, we ourselves cannot feel secure.”** (Raffay, p. 142)

Ferenc Heinrich, Hungarian Minister of Finance stated: „The eye of Hungary is turning toward Paris. . . We Hungarians will never give up Felvidék (northern Hungary), the Carpathian Mountains or the valleys of Transylvania. . . We must kill Bolshevism at the root and we have to use that weapon against them which they first took from us - the right to religion and honor.” (Raffay, p. 142)

Károly Huszár spoke to Count Albert Apponyi before he went to Paris to the Peace Treaty negotiations. He said:

„A Hungarian statesman never travelled a more difficult road than that which you are about to travel. You have been for your whole life the greatest son of the nation. You were the impassioned apostle of the national feeling and national thought. You were also the impassioned apostle of the national character and the national development. Fate did not grant you the opportunity for your ideals and your desires to come true. Fate did not allow this thousand year old nation to come to full bloom. What is waiting for us (at Trianon) will decide not only the fate of Hungary but how lasting will be the peace in Europe. A just peace will mean for European civilization peace and

security. An unjust peace will be another suicidal attempt at peace in Europe.

„We send the best son of the Hungarian nation, and the pride of the nation to tackle this problem. May God's blessing and the prayers of all the Hungarians accompany you and whatever fate deals us, we will act as our heroes did during the last thousand years in good times and bad.

„Like a nation which does not lose heart in misfortune, and is not overconfident in success, we know that you will do all that you can. We know that there is not much hope that our desires will come true but we are trusting and we hope that the peace will be such that the nation will be reborn and renewed and given strength to survive in the coming centuries.

May God Bless you and be with you all. Through your work, may God give the nation a better future.” (Raffay, p.145)

The Hungarian delegation arrived at the Chateau Madrid in Neuilly on January 7, 1920, where they were placed under a strict military guard, as if they were common criminals. The Hungarian delegates sent eight studies to the Conference, with all kinds of information and maps. These data proved that Hungary was blameless in the outbreak of the war, described Hungary's role in the history of Europe and explained why the history of Hungary is not well known among the Western European nations. These studies showed that, for centuries, Hungary was not allowed to have a foreign policy, not even foreign trade, under the Hapsburg rule. Under public law, Hungary and Austria were separate states in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The unity of Austria was a result of the dynastic politics whereas Hungary had already existed as a unified state for a thousand years.

The independence of Hungary was broken by the Turkish conquest. During that time Hungary fought and bled for the whole of Europe and diminished in numbers and so Hungary became the state of the refugees and the immigrants and became a multi-national state. The Compromise of 1867 gave Hungary her independence on paper. But the fact that Hungary was bonded to Austria in diplomacy and that they had a combined army choked the Hungarian development. In the eighteenth century, with laws, which came from the Emperor, Germans, Rumanians and Serbs were settled into Hungary.

The Hungarian delegation mentioned in the studies sent to the Congress that, if Hungary were carved up, then instead of one multi-national state, they would create three multi-national states. If they took into account the interests of these three states the conflicting interests would be multiplied. The historic Hungarian borders were unpopulated mountain ranges. The borders of the new artificial states would cut through economic centers and such borders would not seem to be secure in the future. If Hungary were carved up, it would make it impossible to protect Hungary against flood and the pollution of the waterways. There would be a risk of the Successor States poisoning the drinking water for Hungary.

The Entente powers disregarded every Hungarian argument. The Conference, on the last day, January 16, allowed Count Albert Apponyi to speak to the members, but they limited the length of his speech. The decision had already been made and there was no possibility for change. There were only two possibilities, to accept the decision or refuse it. Just as Apponyi said, „The only choice left for the country is to commit suicide so that they will not kill her” because the territory which would remain for Hungary would be unable to survive. (Raffay, p.151)

Apponyi said that the conditions of the Peace Treaty opposed the principles that the Allied Forces had advocated. They opposed the interests of Europe. They opposed the requirements of civilization. They opposed the economic reconstruction, and general human interest. He said that the newly formed states would become heterogeneous states just as Hungary was but they would not have the economic unity of Hungary, which in time would require the reannexation of these territories to Hungary. Another reason that the mutilation should not occur was that the Successor States, who were culturally inferior, by every means would apply oppression on the Hungarian people who would come under their rule. This would cause the cultural standards on these territories to decline. This would also cause a constant unrest between the peoples. (Raffay, p. 155-156) He also emphasized that if the Conference favored the Hungarian proposals, then Hungary would provide a very wide cultural autonomy and, depending on to the geographical possibilities, would give territorial autonomy to these peoples. Transylvania would remain an autonomous country under the Hungarian Crown. He proposed the plebiscite on those territories that

were located between the present Historic Hungarian borders and the borders suggested by the Conference, with the exception of Croatia, which had always been an autonomous state. Every person over the age of 21, regardless of sex, and who was living on this territory on November 1, 1918, should be allowed to vote. (Raffay, p. 159)

Lloyd George felt that Count Albert Apponyi was not strong enough in his demand for a plebiscite: „It was unfortunate that he (Apponyi) did not not emphasize the plebiscite on those borderline territories where the Hungarians without question were in the majority and the Borderline Committee annexed these territories to other states for economical and geographical reasons. If he had directed his critics to these territories, there would have been enough material to put him into a strong position which would be indisputable.” (Raffay, p. 194)

On May 6, the Allied Forces gave the text of the final decision to the Hungarian delegation and the accompanying letter written by President Millerand of France in the name of the Entente. Here is a part of the Millerand letter:

„Mr. President:

The Allied and Associated Powers have conscientiously studied those documents which the Hungarian Delegation forwarded to the Congress on the subject of the conditions of Peace. In our examination we were led by the desire to make decisions that serve the truth and those higher interests, which we guard. If the result of this study leads us to disagree with the Hungarian Peace Delegation's counter-proposals, the only explanation we can offer is that the Allied Powers find it impossible to accept the proposals of the Hungarian delegation. . . .

„But when the Border Committee starts its work and comes to the conclusion that the decisions of the Peace Treaty somewhere are unjust, and it is in the general interest to correct these injustices, then you (Hungarians) may submit a report to the League of Nations.

„In this case the Allied and Associated Powers will accept that the revisions of the original borders be undertaken in those places where the committee has found that they are unjust. The Allied and Associated Powers trust that this procedure will provide enough possibilities to correct all the injustices where basic objections are brought.” (Raffay, p. 162)

On January 11, 1935, Millerand, in the *Est* newspaper denied writing this letter. He forgot that there is a written document to prove that he did so! Pozzi quotes from a letter from Millerand to Lloyd George: „**We all definitely acknowledge that there is a possibility of revisions of the Treaty.**”²⁰² When Millerand showed his letter to Clemenceau, Clemenceau said: „We have committed so many merciless acts that now we can at least correct one.” (Pozzi, p. 293) **Because of the promise of possible revisions in the Millerand letter, Hungary signed the Treaty on June 4, 1920.** Three weeks later, Millerand, in a circular letter, informed the Border Committee that the duty he had assumed in the name of the Entente was invalid. This letter was dated June 22, 1920. (Pozzi, p. 293)

The Border Committee was disturbed because they had not known of the original letter so they did not know what duty he was referring to. On June 22, 1920, in spite of the circular letter, the Border Committee gave Muraköz to Hungary, because the majority of its population was Hungarian. This decision was accepted by the League of Nations. But because the Serbs had already occupied this territory and would not move out, the Entente Advisory Board allowed them to stay there. Ever since, the Entente has behaved as if the Millerand letter never existed, yet this letter was written in their name. (Pozzi, p. 293)

The Hungarian National Assembly replied to this letter on May 10. This is an excerpt from that letter:

„ . . . When we were demanding the plebiscite, we (Hungarians) were considering the rights of the peoples concerned. We chose that path because we intended to close out every possibility of disagreement. We accepted the plebiscite as a basic principle because it is an unquestionable principle, unparalleled in its effect. We also declared that we would accept in advance the will of the peoples concerned.”

. . . „With this declaration we gave our final answer to the continued accusations that the Hungarian people oppressed their minorities. We will give these people, whom we supposedly oppressed, the choice of where they wish to belong.” (Raffay, p.164)

²⁰² Pozzi, Henri: *Szazadunk bünösei*, 1936, translated by Dr. Frigyes Marjay, Budapest, p.292; Letter to Lloyd George

The Allied Powers did not apply to the Hungarians this principle which they were advocating at the beginning of the war. The French politician Charles Danielou recognized this in an article in *The Daily Mail* on June 21, 1927.

„Those who intended to apply the principle of self-determination made the biggest mistake when they excluded three million Hungarians. The ratio of the three million in the new states to the eight million who remained in Hungary is too great. Who would believe that these eight million Hungarians would accept a situation where they would be separated forever from the three million Hungarians in the new states? It is especially ironic that the Czech border was pushed 40 kilometers further toward Budapest so that the city would be within firing range of the Czechs. At the same time, Bácska was annexed to Yugoslavia so that Belgrade would be far from the firing range of the Hungarians.” (Raffay, p.179)

Some anti-Hungarian propaganda advocates that there were some assemblies where the people were allowed to decide where they wanted to belong but we have to state that these so-called „assemblies” were not representative of the whole population and they were not authorized to make decisions in the name of a particular people.

Finally the Hungarian delegation had to accept the decision of Trianon. The Hungarian Government needed to borrow money to rebuild the country. Their application for a loan was accepted on condition that they sign a document stating that there was no coercion when they signed the Treaty of Trianon and that they had ratified it willingly. They needed the money so they signed the document.

The American Congress did not ratify the Treaty of Trianon but made a separate peace treaty with Hungary on August 29, 1921. Even in France the dissatisfaction continued for weeks in the French Parliament, yet they were the ones who created the Treaty of Trianon. The French Parliament ratified the Treaty only on the condition that the French Government would make further examination of the unjust decisions.

How could Hungary have obtained a more favorable decision for the benefit of the Hungarians? The economical and geographical concerns dictate that the unity of the Carpathian Basin be maintained, so why was territory given to the Successor States „for economical and geographical reasons”. We have to acknowledge that in the territories

annexed from Hungary the Hungarians were not in the majority but neither were the people of the Successor States to whom these territories were given. In Felvidék, Northern Hungary (Slovakia), 1.7 million Slovaks were living and 1.87 million other nationalities; in Eastern Hungary, Transylvania (Rumania), 2.8 million Rumanians and 2.46 million other nationalities. In the Serb-Croat-Slovene state, there were 1 million Serbs, 1.7 million Croats and 1.36 million other nationalities. 232,000 Germans and 126,000 other nationalities came under the rule of Austria. Neither the Slovaks nor the Croats were asked if they wanted to live under Czech or Serb rule. We can see that the advocacy of self-determination was only a pretext under which the dismemberment of Hungary could be accomplished.

The following are a few of the articles from the Treaty of Trianon:

ARTICLE 44

The Serb-Croat Slovene State recognizes and confirms in relation to Hungary its obligation to accept the embodiment in a Treaty with the Allied and Associated Powers such provisions as may be deemed necessary by these Powers to protect the interests of the inhabitants of that State who differ from the majority of the population in race language or religion, as well as to protect freedom of transit and equitable treatment of the commerce of other nations.

ARTICLE 47.

Roumania recognises and confirms in relation to Hungary her obligation to accept the embodiment in a Treaty with the Principal Allied and Associated Powers such provisions as may be deemed necessary by these Powers to protect the interests of the inhabitants of that State who differ from the majority of the population in race, language or religion, as well as to protect freedom of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of other nations.

ARTICLE 55.

Hungary undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Hungary without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion. All inhabitants of

Hungary shall be entitled to the free exercise, whether public or private, of any creed, religion or belief whose practices are not inconsistent with public order or public morals.

ARTICLE 58.

All Hungarian nationals shall be equal before the law and shall enjoy the same civil and political rights without distinction as to race, language or religion.

Difference of religion, creed or confession shall not prejudice any Hungarian national in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil or political rights, as for instance admission to public employments, functions and honours, or the exercise of professions and industries.

No restriction shall be imposed on the free use by any Hungarian national of any language in private intercourse, in commerce, in religion, in the press or in publications of any kind, or at public meetings.

Notwithstanding any establishment by the Hungarian Government of an official language, adequate facilities shall be given to Hungarian nationals of non-Magyar speech for the use of their language, either orally or in writing before the Courts.

Hungarian nationals who belong to racial, religious or linguistic minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as the other Hungarian nationals. In particular they shall have an equal right to establish, manage and control at their own expense charitable, religious and social institutions, schools and other educational establishments, with the right to use their own language and to exercise their religion freely therein.

ARTICLE 59.

Hungary will provide in the public educational systems in towns and districts in which a considerable proportion of Hungarian nationals of other than Magyar speech are resident adequate facilities for ensuring that in the primary schools the instruction shall be given to the children of such Hungarian nationals through the medium of their own language. This provision shall not prevent the Hungarian Government from making the teaching of the Magyar language obligatory in the said schools.

In towns and districts where there is a considerable proportion of Hungarian nationals belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities, these minorities shall be assured an equitable share in the enjoyment and application of sums which may be provided out of public funds under the State, municipal or other budgets, for educational, religious or charitable purposes.

It is interesting to note that the articles 55, 58 and 59 prescribe in detail the obligations of Hungary to her minorities. Why was it necessary to do this when it had been Hungary's policy for a thousand years to give the minorities all the rights that are stipulated in these articles? In fact, it was precisely because Hungary had given her minorities all these rights that these minorities had grown to such proportions that they were in a position in 1920 to demand their independence. However, as we have seen, it was only under false accusations of oppression that they were able to obtain the territories from Hungary, which they demanded. Why were the Successor States not instructed to treat their minorities as humanely as Hungary? Why were they not placed under the supervision of the League of Nations, as Hungary was, to monitor their treatment of their minorities? And why even after the Helsinki agreement of 1975, have they still continued to oppress their minorities and conduct a policy of cultural and actual genocide without any actual opposition from the western states?

In 1922, the Hungarians succeeded in breaking through the wall, which the Little Entente had created around Hungary, when the country was accepted into the League of Nations. The Hungarian Government had to turn to the Reparations Committee because they could not satisfy the demands of the committee. They wanted to obtain a short-term loan of 40-50 million golden crowns. The Little Entente and France opposed this request. Hungary had to consider that her territory would be occupied by those countries that she could not pay, just as the territory of the Ruhr Valley was occupied by the French and the Belgians. In this case the disagreement between Britain and France helped Hungary. Hungary asked the Reparations Committee for the loan which they had promised them and suggested that the League of Nations monitor their use of the money. They also asked that the reparations that they had to pay and the total that Hungary needed to restart her economy be separated. After a long dispute, Britain, with financial pressure on the

states of the Little Entente, forced them to take the question of the loan to Hungary to the League of Nations for negotiation. Finally, in July, 1923, the Little Entente accepted that Hungary could pay the war reparations separately from the loan. At the same time, they were demanding for themselves the right to oversee Hungary's military preparedness. Hungary accepted that for two and a half years the League of Nations could check over Hungary's economy. The Reparations Committee declared that Hungary had to pay the Successor States for reparations in the sum of 179 million golden crowns. In addition they had to provide Yugoslavia with coal for three years. At the same time Hungary had to give up her claims to reparations from the Rumanians for the damage and the robbery that they had committed during their occupation. So Hungary suffered even more losses. The loan, which Hungary received, was not enough to rebuild the country so Hungary was unable to pay the fines. Hungary had to organize secretly to develop the country's military defense. In order to develop a revision policy Hungary needed military power. Now the reader can see what terrible obstacles the country had to overcome. (Raffay, p. 215-216)

Chapter 17

Eye-witness account of the Peace Negotiations

One of the accusations against Hungary at Trianon was that she was the cause of the start of the First World War. She was called a war criminal and had to be severely punished. At the time of the Trianon Decision, what went on behind the scenes in the salons and the hotel rooms, under the influence of alcohol and women, was totally unknown to the public. The secret agreements and political decisions were made possible because the media was bribed. The misled, influenced, bribed, unknowledgeable politicians who were won over to Pan Slavism, were able to make whatever unjust decisions they wanted. The misled or uninformed public even supported their decisions. This was true not only of the French people but the people of other European nations as well. If the people had known all the facts which came to light after fall of the Czarist Empire, when the archives of the Czar became public, the Treaty of Trianon would never have been signed.

Henri Pozzi (1879-1946) worked for Clemenceau for twenty-five years and for two years he worked at the Rumanian Embassy in Paris. Every memorandum and communication passed through his hands. For ten years all the materials of the *Agence des Balkans* (a news agency) were at his disposal. He was a French politician and diplomat who was privy to the most secret decisions. He studied the role of Russia in the preparation for World War I. His work is authentic because he and representatives of his government were present during the negotiations for the Treaty of Trianon. He soon came to realize the mistakes and fraud and he dared to declare that the Pan-Slav (Serbian) secret organization, „Unity or Death”, was actively supported by Baron Hartwig, the Russian ambassador to Belgrade, who gave his approval to the assassination at Sarajevo. He was the champion of truth, even at the time when the Serbs put a price on his head. We cannot declare him to be a German, Austrian or Hungarian sympathizer because in every

sentence he writes it is obvious that he was a French patriot and completely unbiased.

The Pan-Slav expansionist plan of Czarist Russia was unknown to the French people and the French Government. On August 8, 1892, the first Russian-French military agreement was signed. This was an important step for the Russians because, with this agreement, the Russians were able to oppose the German influence and secretly spread their Pan-Slav propaganda, whose goal was to influence the territories of the Carpathian Basin, the Aegean Sea and the Adriatic Sea. France also had great expectations from this alliance but in the course of twenty years until 1914, France stopped Russia from attacking Austria three times, in 1905, 1908 and 1912-13. France was able to stop this Russian aggression because her policy was based on peace. In 1913, Sazonov, the Foreign Minister of Czarist Russia, sent a telegram to France: „The Russian Government, in advance, rejects every attempt at peace between Vienna and Belgrade.”²⁰³ In the Balkan wars, when Austria occupied the territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908, 1909 and 1912-13, the Russian Pan-Slavists were not yet ready to attack Austria. They were preparing themselves and waiting for the right moment. But in 1914, Gavrilo Princip’s action was the sign for the Pan-Slavists to attack. (He was the one who shot Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo.) When the Russians hurried to the aid of the Serbs against Austria, the French, and maybe the whole world, looked upon this as a chivalrous action of Russia to aid the Serbs against the aggressive Austrians.

The 1892 Russian-French agreement stipulated that, in case of war, the Russians, with their full army would oppose the Germans. This agreement was renewed every year for ten years. It stipulated that Russia would also oppose Austria and would aid the French against Italy, if Italy were to go onto the side of the Germans. The Russians broke this agreement when they attacked Austria with full force, instead of Germany. President Raymond Poincaré of France pressured the Russians to attack the Germans instead of the Austrians but it was in vain because they planned to conquer the Danube Valley. Sazonov answered Poincaré: „As soon as we crush the Austrian Army in Galicia, then we will turn with full force against Germany.”²⁰⁴

²⁰³ Pozzi, Henri: *Századunk bűnösei*, p.9

²⁰⁴ Ibid. p. 15; Poincaré: *L’Invasion*, p. 301; Paléologue: Telegram No. 617, Sept. 16; General Laguiche, Military attaché, Telegram No. 611, Sept. 15

The Russian Government used bold lies to cover up their anti-Monarchy politics, their negotiations with Rumania and their support for the secret Pan-Slav movement. When France tried to create a separate Peace Treaty with the Monarchy in December 1914, Sazonov said, „Not at any price, never. Austria and Hungary have to be carved up and must cease to exist.” (Pozzi, p.16) Pozzi writes: „Grandduke Nicholas of Russia made a declaration to the people of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, in which he encouraged the people of the Monarchy to shake off the Hapsburg yoke and establish their own nationality goals. In the same spirit, the Russian Government advised Rumania to occupy Transylvania and it offered the help of the Russian Army to Rumania in its occupation of Bukovina.” (p. 17) As we can see, these plans had to be well thought-out because they carried great weight in important decisions which preceded the decision of the Trianon Peace Treaty. Poincaré, in a telegram to Maurice Paleologue, stated, „We cannot allow Russia to decide on her own without the acknowledgement of England and France.”²⁰⁵ According to Pozzi, Russia cunningly pulled the French into the war.

Pozzi says that the actions of Czarist Russia, at the beginning of January, 1917, caused the French to freeze. **The Russians informed France that Germany, which was superior in every way, had made an offer to Russia so favorable that the Russians could not refuse it. If Russia went to the German side, it would have been the end of France. Clemenceau kept all this secret from the French to avoid panic. It is still not known by the public. Only those government officials involved knew of it. When he informed the French of the German proposal to Russia, Sazonov at the same time informed them that Russia was willing to remain on the side of the Allied Forces on certain conditions. If the Allied Forces won the war, Russia would propose the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France and also the left side of the Rhine River, Koblenz, Mainz, and the Pfalz territory. In exchange, even if the British and Italians were to oppose it, France would commit herself to assuring that Russia would receive Ruthenia, Galicia, Constantinople, the Bosporus, Armenia, Asia Minor and the Holy Land. By agreeing to this,**

²⁰⁵ Ibid. p. 17; Poincaré: *L’Invasion*, p. 309, Paleologue Telegram No. 625, Sept. 17, 1917

France made Russia the greatest power in Europe and betrayed the rest of the Allied Forces.

Philippe Berthelot, the French Foreign Minister accepted the Russian proposal. At the same time, Paleologue, the French Consul to Russia, objected, giving this answer to the Russians: „France is not involved in a conquering war, but a war of liberation, which should take place in the name of right and justice. Our British and Italian allies will never accept the expansion of Russian power to the Mediterranean Sea and the Suez Canal.” (Pozzi, p. 20) **The Russian Czar and Sazonov signed the Treaty which reads: „Alsace-Lorraine will go to France without any conditions. Its border will be the old 1790 border and not that border created by the Vienna Decision. Taking the old duchy of Lotharingia as a base, the French Government may draw the borderline as it pleases, so that all the iron-working territory, the coalmining territory and the Saarland will belong to France. Those territories which are presently under German rule on the left bank of the Rhine, will not be annexed to France and we will create there a neutral state.” (Pozzi, p. 20)**

The Russians and the Serbs were partners in crime for ten years. Baron Hartwig, the Russian ambassador to Belgrade, was so involved with Pan-Slavism, that he almost played an active role in the assassination attempt in Sarajevo. Henri Pozzi writes that he cannot understand why Russia demanded France’s full armed involvement in the war. Czarist Russia fully supported Serbia and did not notify France of this action so she broke her agreement. The French Government constantly notified Russia that they would not support the Russian aggression against Austria.²⁰⁶

The Russians had to keep secret their plan to dissolve the Monarchy because they knew that France would not help them achieve this goal. The alliance between Russia and France would only be activated if Germany attacked Russia. The Russian politicians hid their secret well and found only one way to pull the French into the war on the Russian side, and that was a secret mobilization without the knowledge of the French. They knew that when they mobilized the Germans would also mobilize. According to French historians, the Russians only mobilized after July 30, after the mobilization of the

²⁰⁶ Ibid. p. 24; Poincaré: Les Balkans en Feu, p. 22. Declaration to Izwolsky, Jan. 1912

Monarchy. However, as early as July 24, the Russians had secretly mobilized the Baltic and Black Sea fleets. This meant that they provoked the Germans to mobilize. As soon as the Germans mobilized, the French did too. (Pozzi, p. 25)

Some historians have tried to explain that the Russian mobilization took place because of a possible Austrian attack but this explanation is quite illogical. How could a fleet have opposed an Austrian attack on the Carpathian Basin? It is obvious that the mobilization of the Baltic fleet was an open threat to Germany. The known Russian mobilization was on the 28th, but the actual, secret mobilization was on the 24th. This was hidden from the French people and the historians.²⁰⁷

As we can see, the Russian mobilization was four days before the Austrian declaration of war and five days before the Austrian mobilization. (Pozzi, p. 26) Germany knew of the Russian mobilization on July 25. Even now, the Russian mobilization is not public knowledge because, by keeping this secret, the Russians intended to put the blame on the Germans. It is clear that the Russian mobilization on July 24, the assassination of Franz Ferdinand and his wife in Sarajevo by Gavrilo Princip, the Serb bandit, and the Serb mobilization against the Monarchy on the encouragement of Russia are to blame for the start of the war. (Pozzi, p. 27) Pragmatic historians are well aware that the Russian Pan-Slavists are responsible for the outbreak of the war.

In 1916, the Serbs accused Austria and Germany of using every opportunity to start the war. Benes, in his proclamation: „Detruisez Autriche et la Hongrie” published in Paris in 1916, blames Hungarian Prime Minister István Tisza for causing Austria to enter the war and states that the Serbs only entered the war to help their allies the Czechs. Furthermore, he says that Tisza knew of the Sarajevo plan to assassinate Franz Ferdinand and helped it to materialize. These lies were spread by Veznic, the Serb ambassador to Paris, for the first time in *Le Temps*. (Pozzi, p. 29) Unfortunately, the school books and the historians, although we now know the truth, have still not corrected the lies. The Rumanian ambassador to Paris, Lahovary, proved that it was not Germany but the secretary of the French foreign minister, Berthelot, who rejected the Austrian suggestion to accept peace.

²⁰⁷ Ibid. p. 26; Poincare: *L'Union Sacree*, p. 293, 391

The British proposal to call an international conference was accepted by the Germans but was not adopted because the Russians objected.

Since 1909, Germany had been aware of the Pan-Slav plan to expand to the West and the Germans were deeply concerned for themselves and also for their alliance with Austria. Germany knew that soon Austria would be forced by the spread of Pan-Slavism to enter into a life and death war against the Pan-Slavists. Therefore Germany's only solution was to join Austria. At the same time, France was allied with Russia. Pozzi says that there is no question that the assassination at Sarajevo was a good opportunity for the Germans once and for all to settle their account with their arch-enemy, Russia. This is why Germany suggested to Austria that she avenge the assassination of Franz Ferdinand by the Serbs. (Pozzi, p. 31) The Serbs found the Austrian demands to be unacceptable but a year earlier, the Serbian Government had demanded that Bulgaria dissolve the revolutionary organization of Ivan Mihálov. Germany at that time had no aggressive plans. They were hoping that the Serb-Austrian dispute would be solved. We can conclude this from the fact that if they had wanted to attack, the Germans would not have given the Serbs and the Russians time to prepare themselves.

Because Pan-Slavism openly advocated the eradication of Austria, Germany had to go to the aid of her only ally against the obvious superior force of the Russians.

The superficial observer would make the conclusion that Germany started the war because she attacked first. She did not wait for the Russian attack. But after studying the data, we now know for sure that the secret Russian mobilization of July 24, started the whole action. But because Germany attacked first, the responsibility for starting the war was put on Germany.

According to Pozzi, the French mobilized before Germany. France mobilized on August 1, 1914, at 3:45 pm. The Germans gave the order to mobilize at 5:00 pm. (p.33) In Central Europe and the Balkans, the Slavs and the Germans for centuries had been facing each other with hostility. According to Pozzi's explanation, France had known since August 1, 1914, that it was not Germany, but her allies, Russia and Serbia who were responsible for the war but the misled French people even now believe that the Germans were responsible.

(This is still the belief in the Western world.) Russia, who was the ally of France, was obviously responsible for the outbreak of war but the French media was afraid to mention it because it was so great a crime. With this silence, France omitted to publicize the real reason that she entered the war. This is why the French omitted that fact from the so-called French Yellow Book although they knew of the secret Russian mobilization. They did not expect that Sazonov himself would reveal the truth.²⁰⁸

After the Russian mobilization, Germany had no other choice than to do what she did. The responsibility is not Germany's but Russia's. Pozzi says that because France was unaware of her ally's plan, her responsibility was somewhat less. The Russians kept their goals secret from their ally but kept Serbia informed.

The explanation for the fact that Sazonov kept the mobilization secret from the French and at the same time let the Germans know about it, was that the Russians could then provoke the Germans to attack. In that way, the Germans would be blamed for starting the war. Because they kept it secret, the French could not stop the Russian aggression as they had done in 1909, when on Feb. 27, because of the French and British opposition, Russia was prevented from starting a war against Austria. It is obvious that, if the Germans learned of the Russian mobilization, they would also mobilize and it would be too late for any objection on the part of the British and French. To prove these facts, the reader can find the text of the telegrams in Pozzi's book, pages 51-63.

„There would not have been a war if Germany had not wanted it. Only the Germans desired war.” shouted Professor Ernest Lavisse on November 15, 1915. (Pozzi, p.65) This mistaken view was announced and soon became public knowledge.

At the time of the Dictated Peace Treaty of Trianon, the decisions were made according to this view. Germany and the Monarchy were found to be responsible for the war. The French historian Raymond Reonly writes that Germany, since 1870, had been building her army and preparing for war.²⁰⁹ Pozzi says there is no doubt that this is true, but nobody has studied the reasons that Germany had to do that. He suggests that Germany was lagging behind the other

²⁰⁸ Pozzi, Op. Cit. p. 53; II. D. S. Sazonov: Sechs schwere Jahre

²⁰⁹ Ibid. p. 66. Reonly, Raymond: A Nagy Háború Története

nations in war preparedness and wanted to catch up to them. In spite of every effort, she was never able to reach the preparedness of the other nations because at the time of the outbreak of war, the distribution of arms was as follows: The Entente had 191.5 infantry divisions and 46.5 cavalry divisions, 10,482 light cannons, 684 heavy cannons, 5,476 machine-guns, 336 airplanes and 5 dirigibles. The Central Powers had 138 infantry divisions, 22 cavalry divisions, 8,640 light cannons, 743 heavy cannons, 3,900 machine-guns, 274 airplanes and 9 dirigibles.²¹⁰ The facts mentioned here prove that the Entente was well-prepared when the German attack began in spite of the fact that it is generally written that the Entente was not prepared. What caused the Germans to prepare for war? They were convinced that they had become diplomatically isolated and politically encircled. This situation was caused by Edward VII., Delcassé, Sazonov and Poincaré. On the suggestion of Russia, these people created an anti-German and anti-Austrian coalition. The following countries were also in the coalition: Russia, Rumania, Serbia, Montenegro and the Slav nationalities inside the Monarchy.

Serbia's victories in 1912 and 1913 posed a great threat to Austria. If Austria were to fall to the Russian supported Serbs, that would endanger the future of Germany. Germany was arming herself, not against France or to obtain world rule as it is often advocated, but rather to be ready to repel the approaching danger. The Germans and Austrians were preparing for war, so that they could defend themselves from the attacks of Pan-Slavism. In January, 1913, it became obvious that it would be impossible to avoid the Slav attacks. In the time before the First World War, the measures taken by France's ally, Russia, influenced the French foreign policy in the same way that Austria's actions influenced those of Germany. Pozzi says that the misfortune here is that, in this critical time, Austria did not have an outstanding head of state and it was a mistake on the part of the Germans to let the Austrians dictate their foreign policy which led them in the wrong direction. In the same way the French let themselves be led by the Russians. Public opinion at that time was unconcerned and they did not find it important to check the validity of the propaganda in the media. Those who knew the truth were afraid to come forward and announce it. Finally it is time make it known to the public and correct all the

²¹⁰ Ibid. p. 76; Reonly, p.7-8

injustices. Many facts, which were not allowed to come out until now, are finally available. We have to make sure that people learn the truth about those who caused the death of millions.

In 1913, the Belgrade, Bucharest, St. Petersburg agreement was signed which understandably caused great alarm in Austria. The dilemma was to go to war or allow the establishment of a great Slav State right next to her borders. In the European political circles, the view was spread that the Monarchy's measures regarding peace were „dangerous”. At the same time, there was no mention of the Pan-Slav anti-Austrian activities and demands.

The Slavs developed a very active anti-Austrian propaganda in the media and the person who organized this effort was Izwolszky, the Russian ambassador to France, who succeeded in turning the French against Austria.

„My intention is to influence daily the most important newspapers: *Le Temps*, *Le Journal de Debats*, *Le Matin*, *L'Echo de Paris*.” Izwolszky wrote this to Sazanov, on December 5, 1912. (Pozzi, p.99; Izwolszky to Sazonov: Paris December 5, 1912, Russian Diplomatic Documents, State Publisher, Moscow and St. Petersburg, 1922)

The press attacked the measures the Austrians took to defend themselves yet these measures were forced on Austria by the Pan-Slav actions. Austria had to apply these measures to maintain the order inside the state. At the same time, the Russian support of the Serbs was presented in the media as the defense of a just cause.

On February 26, 1913, Izwolszky reported that the money which he received was used to pay *Le Temps*, *L'Éclair*, *L'Echo de Paris* for their services. (Pozzi, p.100; Raffalovics to Izwolszky, February 26, 1913, Russian Diplomatic Documents)

Pozzi writes that in July, 1914, the above mentioned newspapers deceived the public and the French Parliament when they stated that the war could not be avoided. (Pozzi, p.100)

On January 1, 1914, Take Ionescu, said to Poincaré: „The Austrian generals are complaining that Berlin will not allow them to go into war against Russia, yet they know for sure that in a few weeks they would be able to progress as far as St. Petersburg.”²¹¹

²¹¹ Ibid. p. 100; Poincaré: *Európa fegyverben*, p. 56

Take Ionescu received 5000 francs a month from Sazonov for the service he provided to the Pan-Slavists. The Balkan aggressive attitude became stronger and because of this, Austria placed seven army corps in the territories of Bosnia, Croatia and Dalmatia in order to prevent a rebellion. These seven army corps faced eleven Russian army corps and three hundred thousand armed soldiers. The Russians were placed on alert. We have to mention that an Austrian squadron consisted of sixty soldiers, whereas the general number worldwide was 130 soldiers. Therefore we can see that they were ill-prepared for war. This shows that they were providing soldiers only to maintain order inside the territory and that they were not intending to go to war.²¹²

Pozzi writes that the French intention at this time was to make peace between the Serbs and the Austrians because they knew that Germany would support Austria and the Russians would support the Serbs. This would lead to a widespread war.

On January 11, 1913, the German ambassador to Rumania, Waldhausen, sent a telegram to his government: „The Russian spies and numbers of secret supporters in Rumania, in the last few months, have grown enormously. All these agents emphasize their intentions to turn the country against Austria. What do they want to accomplish?”²¹³

A second telegram states: „The Rumanian-Russian propaganda has almost reached the point, as my Rumanian friends are telling me, where Rumania will break away from the Central Powers. This Russian propaganda has reached every strata of society.”²¹⁴

From the Vienna and Berlin secret archives and materials it has become known how much some French politicians were supporting these Serb and Russian agents.

. . . „The Rumanians do not really like the Russians yet, but they forgive the Russians for taking the territory of Bessarabia from Rumania. Now every Rumanian looks toward Transylvania with longing.”²¹⁵

The attitude of the French ambassador to Austria, Dumaine, who sympathized with Pan-Slavism, cooled off the just forming friendship

²¹² Pozzi, Op. Cit. p.102; Telegram No. 3 from George Lewis, January 2, 1913

²¹³ Ibid. p.104; Jan. 11, 1913, telegram from Waldhausen from Bucharest

²¹⁴ Ibid. p.104; Telegram No 33. March 1, 1913, Z. 22. 3rd. Document package, Athens

²¹⁵ Ibid. p.105; Telegram No.66, September 16, 1913, from the castle of Szinaja

between the Germans and the French. The French public remained misinformed and this helped the flow of events toward war. Pozzi says: „Izwolsky, Sazonov, Raffalovics, Hartwig, Chebeko and Witte all fought for the same Pan-Slav interest as Veznic, Bratianu, Take Ionescu, Pasic, Avarescu and Jovanics who were serving the Pan-Slav interest in Paris.” (Pozzi, p. 106) The alliance of these two groups was the cause of the First World War.

The French government did not inform the public of the Russian demands, the Russian preparedness for war and the ultimatum which they gave to France that if France did not accept the Russian proposal, then Russia would become the ally of Germany. Because they were afraid of the unfavorable reaction from the public, the French politicians remained silent, accepted the lies and put the blame for the start of the war on Austria and Germany. On July 20, the French press all at once went to the defense of the „innocent” Serbia and avoided mentioning the reason for the assassination in Sarajevo. (Pozzi, p. 108) André Tardieu, former Foreign Correspondent for *Le Temps*, who became President of France, knew of the Russian mobilization but he was silent about it and Russia realized that the time had come to fulfill her long desired dream of expanding to the West, by breaking into the Carpathian Basin and preparing it for the spread of Pan-Slavism, which she had attempted twice in the previous sixty years, in 1855 and 1878. To fulfill this goal, both Serbia and Russia needed the French money and arms. This is why France should take the blame for an imperialistic war, which was based on unjust lies and caused an enormous amount of bloodshed and destruction. When they realized that they had been deceived, instead of correcting the injustices, they continued on their path, acting as if they were fighting a just war and perpetuated the lies about the Austrians, the Hungarians and the Germans. Will they ever admit that they were wrong and that the Trianon Peace Treaty was unjust? Will they ever advocate a correction of the injustices committed at Trianon?

We have to mention the role of the bribed press. The press forms the public opinion and is of decisive importance in the formation of the nation’s political view. At the beginning, the French were worried because of the great risk caused by the Russian Czar’s reckless manoeuvre. The Russians badly needed the French alliance, so they decided to influence the French public to their side, in case the French government, which was uneasy at the beginning, might not want to

undertake a joint action with them, and might prevent them from fulfilling their goal, as they did in 1909, 1912 and 1913. Izwolsky, the Russian ambassador to France, through the French media, influenced the French ministers. According to Pozzi, Izwolsky worked toward this goal for five years. After overcoming many difficulties, he succeeded. „Tardieu eagerly offered his pen in support of our goal.”²¹⁶

Now we know the full list of the names of those who were bribed to commit treason. Because of the „good will” of the Bolsheviks, the secret archives were opened and nobody was spared. This was done during the Commune of 1918. These are the names: Gaston Calmette, of *Le Figaro*; Auguste Gauvin of the *Radical*; Henri Letellier of the *Journal des Debats*; later Charles Humbert of *Le Journal*; *La République Française*; *Le Matin*; *L’Echo de Paris*; *L’Éclair* and André Tardieu, of *Le Temps*. (Pozzi, p. 135)

Poincaré informed Davidov, representative of the Russian Minister of Finance, that there were some French ministers who helped Izwolski to distribute the Russian *rubles* to those who wrote well in the service of Russia.²¹⁷

These articles of Pan-Slav propaganda influenced the most well-read French people. This is why Izwolski wrote to Sazonov, „Thank God that I don’t have to struggle in the future against the opinion of certain Frenchmen that France will be entering the war to support foreign interests.”²¹⁸ This situation was enlightened the most by the words of Raffalovics: „I am thankful that the Parisian press can be bribed abominably. From 1909 to the fall of the Czar, in the papers which the reading public trusted, not a single political, economical, financial or military article appeared which revealed or would have foiled the plan of Russia.” (Pozzi, p.137) At the same time, the bribed press, since 1912, had praised to the heavens the interests of Russia and Belgrade. They were able to influence the public because these papers had correspondents in the cities of various countries of Europe. These writers presented their propaganda material as if it were coming from these correspondents but in most cases, these articles came from the offices of the Pan-Slavists. Pozzi says, „I have seen it many times, with

²¹⁶ Pozzi, Op. Cit. p. 134; Izwolsky wrote to Sazonov, May 10, 1912

²¹⁷ Ibid. p.136; Poincaré, Európa fegyverben, p. 98

²¹⁸ Ibid. p. 137; Izwolski’s letter to Sazonov, Dec. 5, 1912

my own eyes, that André Tardieu, Eugene Lautier or Edgar Roels . . . edited the articles following instructions.” (Pozzi, p. 137) Under the influence of money, they silenced the truth and this influence still exists.

In 1934, the Parisian press supported the idea that Germany, Hungary and Italy were the war criminals of World War I. In November, 1934, the press quoted „*Le Temps* special correspondent in Budapest . . .” At the same time it became known that *Le Temps* did not have a correspondent in Budapest. Even so, articles appeared in *Le Temps* under the title of „Hungarian Letters”, which was a favorite column, yet not a single letter actually came from Hungary. They were written by Georges Marot, the Editor-in-Chief of the *Europe Central* in Prague which was the semi-official newspaper of Benes. According to Pozzi, Marot was of Russian origin; his original name was Damanski. He was raised in Geneva, became a French citizen and was on the staff of *Le Temps*. (Pozzi, p. 140)

We know from the Soviet information, how much the Pan-Slavists paid to bribe the French press. In 1904, the press received 935,785 *francs*; in 1905, 2,014,161 *francs*; between 1905 and 1911, 7,894,360 *francs*; in 1912, 882,140 *francs*; in 1913, 1,102,500 *francs*; of this the sum of 374,000 *francs* was personally handed over in an envelope by Izwolsky. In 1914, they received 1,025,000 *francs*; in 1915, 931,000 *francs*; in 1916, 1,153,225 *francs*; of this 100,000 went to the *Agence des Balkans*. Between 1909 and 1912, Serbia gave France 275,000 *francs* from the money that she received from Russia. Of this money, *Le Journal des Débats* and *Le Temps* together received 150,000 *francs*. In 1913, the bribe of 700,000 *francs* was received of which 230,000 *francs* was given to *Le Temps* and *l'Agence des Balkans*. In 1914, of the 760,000 *francs* which were received, 437,000 were given to *Le Temps* and *l'Agence des Balkans*; 45,000 *francs* were given to *Le Figaro*; 15,000 to *Le Radical*; 50,000 *francs* to Charles Humbert, the director of *Le Journal* and 60,000 *francs* to *Le Journal des Débats*. (Pozzi, p. 140-141; Stefanovics tables.) Stefanovics, the Serbian agent in Paris, believed that the above-mentioned numbers, during the time of the Peace Conference, increased tenfold. In order to the opportunity to annex Fiume, the Serbians gave *Le Temps* 3 million *francs*. In August of 1932, the Yugoslav press office in Paris, at 20 Boulevard de Courcelles, received 6 million *dinars*. The Belgrade Government had at their disposal 25 million *francs* (60 million *dinars*) for the Foreign

Ministry and the Ministry of the Interior which they could spend on propaganda for the Serb claims. (Pozzi, p.142) Czechoslovakia used almost twice as much money for their purpose as Yugoslavia. Here we do not count that basic money which the three Little Entente countries collected together in Geneva, in 1934, and which was administered by Benes. „Twenty years earlier, the Russian ‘envelopes’ were handed over personally.”²¹⁹

Since 1934, the only thing that has changed is that the money has come not from Russia and Yugoslavia but from the Soviets and the Little Entente. The Pan-Slav movement continued in the Successor States so the Hungarian revisionists made their requests in vain. Today, Pan-Slavism is not as openly advocated as it was earlier in the century but we can see this Slav unity in the Russian support of Milosevic in Serbia.

The pro-Slavists created the *Agence des Balkans* publishing company, which was one of the branches of *Le Temps*. The two worked together. If they wanted the public to accept something which they were suggesting and the article was too long, they divided the material between the two publications. Now we can see who was really the war criminal. (Pozzi, p. 145) They were knowingly falsifying material for payment and they destroyed a country which had defended Europe for a millennium. Pozzi writes: „We should feel nausea and contempt if we look at the editions of *Le Temps*, *Le Journal*, *l'Éclair*, *le Matin*, *Le Journal des Debats*, *L'Echo de Paris*, and *Le Figaro* in the year before the beginning of the war. The press tendentiously formed the public opinion with lies. The French people knew only as much of the events as the Serb and Russian agents allowed them to know.” (Pozzi, p. 146)

On March 11, 1914, at a lecture by André Tardieu in Bucharest, the French ambassador, the Rumanian president, Rumanian foreign minister and the commander of the Rumanian army were present. The title of his lecture was „Transylvania: Rumania's Alsace-Lorraine”. The title and the lecture itself were a provocation to Austria. The goal of Tardieu's lecture was to convince the Rumanian chauvinist and imperialistic circles to support the Russian and Serbian Pan-Slavists. Izwolsky and Veznic informed Tardieu about Sazonov and the Belgrade Black Hand plan. Pozzi says that Tardieu knew that the war against the

²¹⁹ Ibid. p.142; Izwolsky to Sazanov: *The Black Book*, December 5, 1912

Monarchy was definite and it was only a question of months or weeks before it broke out. (Pozzi, p. 148)

Tardieu, who was the spokesman for the Quai D'Orsay, was a big influence on Rumania because, through him, the Rumanians felt a support behind them against Austria-Hungary. These anti-Austria-Hungary politics were started by the Russians. The speech of Tardieu had a big effect on Russia and on Serbia. **Tardieu's real guilt came out when, in *Le Temps* he announced that Germany had mobilized on July 30. This prompted the French mobilization. The actual truth was that the Germans had only written about the danger of the threat of war.**²²⁰

The Russian propaganda tactics were taken over by the leaders of the Little Entente, who used them against Austria and also to annex Hungarian territories. The Serb preparation for war was well-hidden from the people of the world. The Serb political demands forced Austria to step up with a strict demand against Serbia but as soon as that happened, the Russian government could not stand by idly. „**Austria (not Hungary) informed Russia that she would stop the formation of the Great Slav State beside her borders.**”²²¹

On May 13, 1913, at the request of Sazonov, Spalaikovic sent a telegram to inform Pasic that Serbia would shortly have a chance to conquer the huge territory of Austria.²²²

On May 14, Pasic showed a copy of this telegram to Veznic, the Serbian ambassador to Paris. He showed it to Tardieu; Tardieu showed it to Gaston Calmette. On July 13, 1913, Delcassé informed the Quai d'Orsay that this telegram was the anti- Monarchy politics of Hartwig, the Russian ambassador to Belgrade. Delcassé also notified the Quai d'Orsay that Vinozéllos, the Greek ambassador, had reassured Demidoff, the Russian ambassador to Athens, that Russia would receive the support of Greece in the case of a Serbian-Austrian conflict. (Pozzi, p.172)

²²⁰ Pozzi, Op. Cit. p. 149; „Zustand Drohender Kriegsgefahr”, *Le Temps*, July 31, 1914

²²¹ Ibid. p. 171; telegram from George Lewis, French ambassador to St. Petersburg, February 9 and 10, 1913 (Yellow Book , Telegram No. 104-105

²²² Ibid. p.172; Spalaikovic telegram to Pasic, 97/6, Volume 26, No. 4 Dossier in the archives of the Serbian Ministry

Serbia, Rumania and Greece renewed their secret agreement of 1912 which stated that Greece and Rumania, in the case of a Serbian-Austrian war, would go to the aid of Serbia. (Pozzi, p. 173)

In July and August, 1913, at the Peace Conference at Bucharest, Spalaikovic, the leader of the Serb delegation, declared: „Bulgaria had to become the ally of Rumania and Serbia so that she could help these two powers to attain their nationalistic goals against the Monarchy.”²²³

When Austria learned of these developments, she had no other choice but to inform Germany and Italy of her decision on August 8. The Italian ambassador, San Giuliano, on August 9, sent a telegram to Gioletti in the Italian Parliament that Austria would make a military attack on Serbia. Italy had been an ally of Russia since 1909.

Gioletti sent a telegram to San Giuliano instructing him to tell Austria that if she attacked Serbia, the Austrian-Italian agreement would no longer be valid. (Pozzi, p. 174) Germany objected to Austria's intention to attack Serbia. Germany acknowledged the danger of Serbia to Austria but considering the involvement of war, suggested that Austria change her mind. This is why Austria changed her mind and did not attack.

On September 21, 1913, Spalaikovic, the Serb ambassador to St. Petersburg, sent a telegram: „The Minister of War notified me that he had taken the necessary steps in Paris in the interest of the loan which Russia should receive. The money would have to be used up to reorganize and rebuild the army and armaments. The Russian government feels uneasy because the French loan of 200 million, which has to be used for our armory and the building of railroads is late.”²²⁴

On October 12, 1913, Spalaikovic sent another telegram: „Sazonov has no doubt about the strength of our army. He is convinced that we will realize our goal in the near future. He has reassured me that we can count on the effective support of Russia and he advised that we try with every means to develop the closest connections with Paris.”²²⁵

²²³ Ibid. p.173; Telegram no. 294 from Blondel, the French ambassador to Bucharest

²²⁴ Pozzi, Op. Cit. p. 175-176; Serb Ministry Archives, 1913. No.247. Dossier No.16; Package No. 5.; Volume No. M/7; Milanovics signature

²²⁵ Ibid. p. 176; *Agence des Balkans*

Spalaikovic informed Belgrade that Sazonov was satisfied with the effort of the *Agence des Balkans* to influence the French public in Paris.²²⁶

The historians in the past had no chance to study the secret archives, documents and telegrams of the war because they were all locked up but they have since become available. We hope that it will soon become public knowledge as to who were the true war criminals.

Already, twenty years after the First World War, there were official data which could have been made public, but the Pan-Slav supporters even at that time were protecting the real war criminals just as they did the later criminals, Titulescu, Benes, Masaryk etc. Pozzi informs us of an indisputable proof about who started the war.

This is a letter from Stefanovic to the director of *Le Temps*, Edgar Roels:

„Belgrade, November 29, 1913

Dear Sir:

The shipment of the guns is very urgent. Please make arrangements to have them shipped as soon as possible. Let me know the earliest date that the company can fill the order. The cost of the guns cannot be more than 80 *francs* per gun, including the commission. (After the annexation of Bosnia, Serbia intended to attack Austria.) Only the 1910, 7mm. Mauser guns can be considered. The Mauser Company is in a cartel with the Austrian Steyer Company. We do not trust the Mauser guns because they are actually manufactured by the Steyer Company. If the political stress increases, we will not be able to receive the order. This is what happened in 1908. The order will be paid from the French loan. We are not allowed to inform the Mauser Company under any circumstances of the real situation.” (Pozzi, p. 179)

Dragomir Stefanovic showed this letter to Pozzi in November, 1917. Pozzi says that Stefanovic was a rare, honest Serb politician, who was tremendously annoyed by the Pan-Slavists' imperialistic goal and who strongly condemned their criminal behavior. (Pozzi, p. 179-180)

At the beginning of the war, Rumania was very cautious about which side to join in the conflict. Of all the Successor States, we know

²²⁶ Ibid. p. 176; Serb Ministry Archives. 1913. No. 247; Dossier No.16; Package No. 5. Volume M/7.

the least about Rumania's intentions at this time. Russia intended Serbia to persuade Rumania to join the war on her side. The Russian-Serb alliance was relying on Rumania's involvement so that they could encircle Austria. They were disappointed that Rumania made a peace treaty with the Central Powers.

The first Russian-Rumanian political connection began in 1912, from the efforts of Take Ionescu who received 1,000 *rubles* monthly from the Russians for his services. The receipts for this money were found in the Russian Embassy in Bucharest.²²⁷ Russia, already in 1913, had tried to effect an alliance between Rumania and Serbia against Austria. The newspaper columns of the Bratianu brothers slowly influenced the Rumanians to accept the Russian politics. The Queen of Rumania and her political leaders, under the protection of Russia, conducted increasingly aggressive politics. This became known by the Quai D'Orsay by the summer of 1913. So we can safely say that the French politicians knew everything about the Rumanian war preparedness against Austria but they did not do anything to stop these actions. The French also knew that Edgar Röels, the director of the *Agence des Balkans* received large sums of money to soothe his conscience. Take Ionescu told Pozzi that, in the case of an Austria-Russian war, Rumania would attack Austria to fulfill her territorial aspirations. (Pozzi, p. 187)

Around the middle of June, 1914, five days before the assassination in Sarajevo, it became clear that Rumania would join with the Russian instigated anti-Hungarian Entente. This was already planned in 1913 but materialized when the Russian Czar Nicholas II., accompanied by Sazonov, visited the Rumanian Royal Family. This alliance took place in the absence of the Rumanian King Carol, who was of German origin. His nephew Prince Ferdinand and Ferdinand's wife, Princess Marie represented Rumania. Sazonov asked Bratianu what conditions the Rumanians would ask for declaring war against Austria-Hungary. Bratianu stated that they would demand the whole of Transylvania, the Hungarian territory of the Bánát and half of the Austrian Bukovina. They also demanded that Russia guarantee the territorial integrity of Rumania and pay the cost of the war

²²⁷ Ibid. p. 182; Marghiloman: Note Politice 1897 - 1924 Vol. I. Bucharest, 1927

preparations.²²⁸ On June 24, Take Ionescu, in a secret telegram, informed Tardieu and Edgar Röels of the success of the negotiations with Rumania: „Complete agreement between Sazonov and Bratianu. At yesterday's meeting, the agreement was effected in the best mutual interest. Rumania's rightful claim to Transylvania, the Bánát and Bukovina was acknowledged. We cannot give detailed information right now. A letter is following with an envoy.” (Pozzi, p. 189) Pozzi says that the historians try to prove that Rumania joined France because of linguistic relationship and a matter of sympathy. Now we can see the real reason that Rumania entered into the war.

On May 8, 1918, when Rumania changed sides and went on the side of the Monarchy, she did that because she thought that the Allied Powers were going to lose the war. A few days later, when it became clear who would win the war, she abandoned her allies. „At the very first, it was decided with King Ferdinand that the peace which Rumania signed on May 8, 1918, in Bucharest, with the Central Powers, would only be kept as long as their interest dictated it.” (Pozzi, p. 190)

Clemenceau declared this Rumanian action to be dishonorable and he was extremely angry. On July 31, 1914, Bratianu informed Sazonov that Rumania would accept the Russian proposals. The next day, the telegram was sent to the French newspapers and a copy of this telegram can still be found in the archives of the Quai D'Orsay. Pozzi says that the final text of the plan for the Russian-Rumanian alliance is to be found for the first time in his book: *A századunk bűnösei*, p. 192. No other historians have mentioned it, not even Poincaré. The following is the final text:

„By signing this agreement, Rumania agrees that, with her full army, she will take part in the war which Russia has declared against Austria-Hungary . . . – . . . Russia, at the same time, agrees that she will not make peace with Austria-Hungary until the Dual Monarchy gives those territories to Rumania where Rumanians are living.”²²⁹

On August 8, Izwolski, the Russian ambassador to Paris, informed St. Petersburg in a telegram that France had accepted the

²²⁸ Pozzi, Op. Cit. p. 189; Sazonov: *Sechs Schwere Jahre*, Berlin, 1927, Memorandum to the Czar, June 24, 1914, Russian Diplomatic Archives

²²⁹ Ibid. p. 192; Archives of the Empire, St. Petersburg, August 7, 1914, *Black Book*, Sazonov: *Sechs Schwere Jahre*

Russian-Rumanian agreement. Poincaré mentioned this in his memoirs but his notes about it do not represent the truth yet we know that Izwolski, in person, informed him of the telegram of Sazonov on August 7, at 9:00 pm. (Pozzi, p. 192)

On August 17, 1916, France, Britain, Italy and Russia, made a secret agreement to give all those territories to Rumania which the paragraph No. 4 mentions.²³⁰ Many historians and politicians want to silence the fact that Rumania went into the war as an ally of Russia. They would rather mention that Rumania went into the war on her own. **If they would accept the truth, that the anti-Austrian alliance between Russia and Rumania existed well before the war, then it would become public knowledge that Russia worked with a well-prepared plan which caused the war. This would mean that the responsibility for the outbreak of war would be Russia's.** If these preconditions had been public knowledge, if Rumania's demands to her allies as conditions for entering a so-called „just war” were publicly known, then everybody would have learned that the „reannexation” of Hungarian territories to Rumania was nothing more than a forceful conquest. But they had to silence this. At the time of the German victories at the beginning of the war, the Germans moved toward Paris and at that time, the Rumanians did not fulfill their agreement. On May 8, 1918, when Rumania signed a Peace Treaty with Germany, the French politicians began to recognize Rumania's true character. Only the Russian victory at Lemberg and the telegram of Edgar Roels placed Rumania back on the side of the Entente. Telegram of Edgar Roels: „If Rumania wishes to receive what we promised her, then she has to decide once and for all. The peace will come in two months and Bratianu has to understand the promise which we gave him would be kept only if Rumania takes part on the side of the Entente. Here they are wondering why Rumania has been vacillating for such a long time in keeping her promises.”²³¹

After two years of procrastination, when Rumania entered the war, this did not help the Entente much because the Rumanians were

²³⁰ Ibid. p. 193; Rumania before the Peace Conference: Documents de la Conférence Official; Rumanian publication Paris 1919. Annexe A.

²³¹ Ibid. p. 196; Telegram to Take Ionescu, from Bordeaux, September 15, 1914, the archives of the Agence des Balkans, S.R. 11/37

cowards in the open fighting and only liked to attack from the rear. This is why the following saying became famous: „The war for the Rumanians means running away.” (Pozzi, p. 198) There was another national characteristic – to take advantage of the possibilities of prosperity, to sell at a high price whatever came into their hands. Clemenceau said, in October, 1918: „Among the hyenas of the war, the Rumanians are the lowest. They were the allies of France and yet they behaved for two years as if they were on the German side. They gathered millions by selling grain and petroleum to the enemy. I will never agree to renew our agreements which we signed with them if they would go to war on the side of France.”²³² Pozzi says: „The whole world knows what a ridiculous and lamentable role they played.” „After fighting the war with someone else, they were brave enough to come forward at the Conference and demand their dues.” (Pozzi p. 201) Clemenceau said: „There is no end to the insolence of these Rumanians. They left us in a cowardly manner and then they expect us to deal with them. This is too much.”²³³ However they managed with great cunning to annex huge territories from Hungary.

I have to disagree with Pozzi's statement that the Monarchy had no outstanding politicians at that time, who could have found a solution to these problems. On October 29, 1918, the Monarchy's Foreign Minister, Count Gyula Andrassy called Attila Orbók and informed him of his plan to save the Monarchy. He told Orbók that he should go abroad and notify the West of the Monarchy's point of view. „We acknowledge the supremacy of England over Germany and we will force the Germans to accept this supremacy as we make a separate peace with England. We expect England to prevent the mutilation of Hungary.” Gyula Andrassy also told Orbók to speak in the name of Hungary and to make it known that Hungary would support the English and finally give up her friendship with Germany. He also told him to make arrangements with Prince Windischgraetz for his journey. Orbók asked the Prince what would happen if the Károlyi government came into power while he was abroad. The Prince said that, because the situation in Hungary was changing from hour to hour, Orbók was to support that government which is negotiating with the Entente. Windischgraetz arranged for him

²³² Pozzi, Op. Cit. p. 199; Poincaré, R.: *Győzelem és fegyverszünet*, p. 69

²³³ Ibid. p. 201; Poincaré: *Győzelem és Fegyverszünet*, p.338

to get a passport to Switzerland. On October 31, the representatives of the Hungarian Government informed Andrassy that the Hungarian Communist Revolution was successful and that they were demanding Andrassy's resignation. So Andrassy's solution of the problem of saving the Monarchy could never materialize.²³⁴

The greatest misfortune in Hungary's one thousand years, was that the most untalented, conceited, proud, very rich Count Mihály Károlyi, who was a gambler and easily influenced, became the leader of the Independent Democratic Party in Hungary, and in 1918, became the head of state. His colleagues were those who used him to obtain for themselves the positions of ministers. They soon discovered his weaknesses and Pál Kéri-Krammer, the reporter for the *Est* newspaper, with nauseous articles glorifying Károlyi, encouraged him to trust them. These opportunists took him into their web and Oszkár Jászi, naively saw the country's protection, not in a strong Hungarian Army, but in a rapid transformation. This transformation consisted of the Hungarian government, of that time, blaming itself in front of the world, with the publication of newer laws, (giving freedom to the minorities, appointing new socialist ministers, disarming the Hungarian army). The fact that these were new laws caused the people of the world to come to the conclusion that before this time there was no freedom for the minorities and that Hungary was aggressive. They believed that Hungary was populated with suppressed nationalities and workers who were ruled by the rich aristocracy. The State administration was conducted on the advice of Kunfi, Kéri-Krammer, Simonyi-Steiner-Henrik, Pogány, Jászi, according to the philosophy of the Social Democrats. This was a state where 90% of the people were peasants. This infamous group, and the Jewish group among the Social Democrats, intended to take into their possession the whole economic life of the country. In order to accomplish that they conducted a persecution of the intelligentsia and the rich peasants.²³⁵

Count Gyula Andrassy's plan to save the Monarchy could not come into effect because the Károlyi government came into power. When the Károlyi Social Democrat Jewish group came into power by ousting Andrassy from his position, the Austrian-Hungarian diplomacy

²³⁴ Orbók, Attila: Ki árulta el a hazát?, Budapest, 1919 p. 16-17

²³⁵ Ibid. p.11

could no longer be effective. Instead of Andrásy, the Károlyi government sent abroad a corps of diplomats whose leader was a pacifist-anarchist by the name of Rózsa Bédy-Schwimmer. With her worldly, extravagant lifestyle, she spread the view that those who blamed Hungary for the troubles of the oppressed nations must be right because just by looking at her they could see that she represented the oppressive aristocrats. In the three months as an ambassador for the Károlyi government, she contributed to the destruction of the Hungarian image abroad. At the time of the propaganda mission of Károlyi, the French, English and American Press wrote many sarcastic articles about Károlyi's „friendship” with the Entente. They never supported his attempt in any way. Instead of that the articles constantly attacked him and his efforts.

In 1918, Mihály Károlyi went to Switzerland in the company of Dénes József Diener to negotiate the peace agreement with the Entente. Károlyi wrote a letter to the French Bolshevik leader, Guilbeaux, in which he asked him to work with him, for the benefit of the Communist World Revolution. Diener influenced Károlyi to write this letter. In January, 1919, the Swiss authorities, because of the activities of Guilbeaux, searched his house and found Károlyi's letter. This letter was given to the Quai D'Orsay. When this came to public knowledge, Bratianu, referring to the letter, asked and received a new Demarcation Line. In this way much of Hungary's territory was taken away. The Swiss had Guilbeaux deported out of Switzerland. The French sentenced him to death. They could not do anything about Károlyi but, by their decision, we can see how they punished not him but his country.

It was a caprice of fate that Gyula Andrásy, who had great knowledge, intelligence and experience, and who was farsighted in political matters, at the last moment could not help his nation, because a Hungarian traitor caused him to lose his position.

In Trianon, it was possible to become rich from the bribes of money and land. This opportunity attracted the parasites and dishonest adventurers to Paris. In Paris, intelligence, honor, humanity and justice were slapped in the face. Ignorance, pride, and greed ruled. In Trianon, the thousand year old borders were changed and the fate of millions of people was decided. Cities, universities, harbours, ancient cemeteries, historical places, the burial place of kings all fell into foreign hands. Many of the castles which had stood in defense of the West for

centuries, were given to artificial states which had never before existed. People who found refuge in Hungary, who had lived in freedom and free of taxation in Hungary, were given away to other countries because Clemenceau did not know the facts and made abrupt decisions which were not properly considered.²³⁶ There were two major points which interested Clemenceau, the reinstatement of the 1792 borders of Alsace-Lorraine to France and the dissolution of the Catholic Anti-Democratic Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Apart from these he was interested in the right of general election which was prepared by his colleague, Mandel.²³⁷ He gave a free hand to the looters from the Successor States to steal what they wanted from Hungary.

Another contributing factor to the Decision at Trianon was that the British were interested only in the Rumanian oil wells. The Italians were tied down with the question of the Adriatic. The tragedy of Wilson was that he did not know the history of Europe and he placed his trust in the decisions of Colonel House. Robert Lansing could not help in this matter yet he would have been the one who could have helped the most because he was well-informed. Orlando and Balfour were also intelligent, well-informed persons but they were not in a position of influence. Clemenceau appointed Tardieu as President of the Committee to draft the Peace Proposals. Tardieu had a free hand to do as he pleased. Trianon was like a free market. Lansing was deeply disillusioned with the Trianon discussions. „Here, everybody talks in secret and in whispers about questions of major importance. In the open meetings, they make official decisions which have already been settled in secret. The agreement and the deals take place behind closed doors.”²³⁸ Lansing could not say all he wanted to say because he was sworn to secrecy. On February 5, 1919, he resigned from the Negotiations and said to his friend, Hunter Miller, „I want to find some fresh air, I have experienced the effect of the poisonous gases.” He said this after listening to Benes’ two hour speech which was made up of a chain of lies. Lansing spoke harsh words about those who killed the possibility of future peace and dishonored the name of France. The

²³⁶ Pozzi, *Op. Cit.* p. 209; Poincaré, *Victoire et Armistice*, p. 68; „Hongrie”; Delagrave édit. Paris, 1916

²³⁷ *Ibid.* p. 209; Poincaré, *Op. Cit.* Pp. 356, 358, 414, 425, 430, 452, 458 and 461

²³⁸ *Ibid.* p. 210; Lansing: *Negotiations de Paix*, London, 1921

Second World War was the proof of Lansing's final words : „This Peace Treaty will be the cause of a new war. This is as certain as day follows night.”²³⁹

President Wilson listened to the advice of Colonel House and accepted whatever House proposed. Wickham Steed, in his memoirs writes that Colonel House negotiated everything with him and he took all his information from Masaryk, Benes, Osusky and Kramar.²⁴⁰

Almost everybody was present at the secret negotiations which took place behind closed doors: the Rumanians, Serbs, Czechs, bankers and industrial magnates. Only the Hungarians were excluded. The Czechs worked together with the Serbs, using the methods of Sazonov and Izwolsky. They bribed the press. At that time the Hungarian delegation was held under house arrest and was waiting for the democratic possibility of „free speech”. The public did not know anything about what went on. They did not know about the bribery of the press.

This was the time period that history calls the Era of Right and Truth and the new Europe was built upon this. Probably the well-written articles about the falsifications of history received the largest bribes. Pozzi writes that the nobodies before the war became great, rich, influential men. The Rumanians, soon after signing the Armistice, appeared in Paris because they were afraid of the decision. They knew that Clemenceau was angry with them because of their cowardice and because they had made a pact with Germany. (Pozzi, p. 214) When Antonescu mentioned that he wanted a Rumanian alliance with France, Clemenceau shouted „No. No. What's done is done.”²⁴¹ Even so, Rumania was able to succeed in reaching her goals.

Pozzi says that first the Rumanian women appeared in the dining-rooms of the hotels at Trianon and Versailles. „Take Ionescu and Bratianu brought a ring of beautiful women to the defense of the true cause. These women were the members of the Bucharest elite. They all fought for the cause of expanding the power of Rumania. These ravishing patriotic women constantly pressed their affections on the experts, politicians and diplomats of the Conference to further the

²³⁹ Ibid. p. 211; Lansing, Op Cit.

²⁴⁰ Pozzi, Op. Cit. p. 212

²⁴¹ Ibid. p. 214. Poincaré: *Victoire et Armistice*, p. 457

Rumanian cause.” (Pozzi, p. 215) Prince Cantacuseno smilingly told Pozzi, „Really, this outstanding idea could only have come from TAKE. Poor Antonescu almost stopped breathing when Clemenceau congratulated him on the beautiful women.” (Pozzi, p. 215)

The American wives of the Serb diplomats and their women friends also dangerously disturbed the composure of the decision makers of the conference. The whole of Paris admired the wife of the Serb ambassador, Veznic. In the evenings, this ravishing woman obtained serious and passionate friends for the Serb cause. Her salon was visited constantly by statesmen, diplomats and rich men. (Pozzi, p. 215) It looks as if Queen Marie of Rumania contributed to Rumania’s territorial gains, because her lady-in-waiting, Mabel Potter Daggett, writes:

„A gentleman kissed her hand and the measure of state is on the way. Comes a day when it is consummated at last. Someone thinks he did it, a senator, a prime minister, a king, a crown-consul, or perhaps it is a whole parliament of men. That’s the way she lets them feel. Brilliant minds! She applauds. Their names get written in government reports. History will take care of hers. Though on the stage of Rumanian political affairs the lady has not appeared at all, yet listen!! From the wings there is sometimes the swish of a red kilted-skirt, the echo of a woman’s soft laughter.”²⁴²

Such common human frailty has caused more damage to the truth than anything else.

At that time it was unfortunate that „when Tardieu began the dissolution of the Monarchy and upset the balance of Europe, all of Clemenceau’s attention was directed toward his bid to become President of France.”²⁴³ Among the French statesmen, Laucheur and Dutasta concentrated on gathering wealth, Klotz on card games and horse races and Pichon tried to please Clemenceau. The Italians were watching Lloyd George, Balfour and Wilson to see if they supported Clemenceau and Tardieu who wanted to break the promise they had made to Rome on April 26, 1915. The intention of the Serbs, Veznic and Trumbic, was to prevent the formation of an independent state for the Croats and

²⁴² Potter Daggett, Mabel: Marie of Romania, p.290-291

²⁴³ Pozzi, Op. Cit. p. 219; Poincaré, Op. Cit. pp. 356, 338, 414, 425, 461

Slovenes.²⁴⁴ According to their view, a Catholic independent southern Slav state would have meant the end of the Pan-Slav movement. The Rumanians feared that they would not receive the territory they were promised because they had gone over to the German side in 1918. Benes and Masaryk were constantly visiting Wilson with newer demands for the Czechs. Tardieu was responsible for creating the peace treaty but, through him, France was also responsible. We have to declare that not a single report from experts was considered when the decision was being made on May 8, 1919. Important decisions such as the dividing of the Bánát, the creation of Yugoslavia from Croatia and Slovenia and the Serb-Italian question (the Adriatic shoreline) were simply omitted from their reports, says Pozzi, only because the disputes about these could have given obstacles to the purpose of Tardieu.(p. 219-220)

The decisive committee report was so long that it would take weeks or longer to study it. However, the delegates were given only a few hours to read it. Lansing was very angry. Because of that Tardieu and Lansing had a strong argument.²⁴⁵ How is it possible that the trial of a common criminal can take months yet here where the fate of millions was in the balance a decision had to be made within hours? How could new artificial states with artificial borders be created in such a short time and how could they be sure that they would survive? This was an illogical decision and **therefore the Hungarians are entitled to revisions.**

In the chief committees and the lesser committees, the same people spoke over and over again, delivering texts learned by heart. There was hardly any discussion. Those in authority posed some questions, just for appearances, but finally they always accepted the lecturers who were supported by Tardieu. Only one serious dispute occurred and that was between Rumania and Serbia, on the question of the territory of the Bánát. They could not agree, so Clemenceau announced that he would order a plebiscite on this territory. The following day, all the three politicians, Bratianu, Veznic and Trumbic came to an agreement because they were afraid of the plebiscite. They knew that two thirds of the populace of the Bánát were Hungarians or Germans who had become Hungarian and that would have meant a

²⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 219; Poincaré, Op. Cit. p. 355

²⁴⁵ Ibid. p. 220; Nicholson, Harold, British delegate: Peacemaking, 1919,

definite Hungarian success. With this decision, Clemenceau offended the Hungarians deeply. (Pozzi, p.220-221)

According to Lansing, the disputes were just a formality. „Everything was just a deception.”²⁴⁶ The minutes of the meetings will not tell us anything because all the important points were omitted. The truth can only be found out from the notes of a few objective representatives.

Some time in the future, the shorthand notes which were made at the secret negotiations, behind closed doors, by the British, Belgians, Americans, Italians and Japanese will be available for all to read. When these documents are revealed, the world will wonder how it was possible to discard the truth in such a way. Then the world will know that those who openly declared that they would make their revisions peacefully or if necessary with war were not the war criminals. The war criminals were those who, in the First World War, formulated the Peace Treaty, says Pozzi. (p. 222)

Another important example of the carelessness of the western politicians at Trianon, was that many of them did not take part in the negotiations but came to enjoy themselves and to pursue their own business interests. (Pozzi, p. 222)

„On February 5, 1919, at the suggestion of Benes, the Czechs announced the desire to annex the city of Kassa, which was populated almost completely by Hungarians, giving as their reason that it was a Czech city. Lord Balfour, who was informed in time by his Hungarian friends, made a speech on behalf of the Hungarians and his convincing arguments had a great effect on the representatives, even on Clemenceau who decided to send an unbiased committee to Kassa to check over the claims of Benes. Benes, as a skillful player, immediately supported this decision. According to a strategy proposed by Colonel House, two Americans were appointed to this committee, Robert Kamev and Edward Karmezin. In Kassa, which was occupied by Czechs, this committee was received by Secac, the county manager and Hanzalik of the Czech police.

„The two Americans were originally Czechs. One of them had become an American citizen two years earlier, the

²⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 221; Lansing, *Negotiations de Paix*, London, 1921

other only eight months earlier. Obviously, nobody in Trianon was aware of this. **Both of these officials had been childhood friends of Benes.**

„Hanzalik revealed what happened to the delegation at Kassa. With a lengthy testimony, as the audience laughed out loud, he described how he went with the committee of experts at Kassa, into the first tavern and for a whole week they enjoyed themselves at the expense of the Conference.

„This report, which supports the statements of Benes that Kassa was a Czech city, was composed by Hanzalik in one of the rooms of the Hotel Schalk. Because of this statement which is kept in the archives of the Peace Treaty as a serious proof, the fate of more than one hundred thousand Hungarians was decided and, without any further examination, the city of Kassa was annexed to Czechoslovakia.” (Pozzi, p. 266-267)

The British and the Italians were the most serious in conducting their responsibilities. They almost succeeded in blocking the goals of the Czechs, the Croats and the Serbs. When General Smuts, Lord Balfour, Sonnino and Nitti, remained away from the negotiations, the Czechs, Serbs and Rumanians regarded their absence as a blessing from God. (Pozzi, p, 223) Those politicians who found the lecturers' demands too excessive asked for more explanations to some points. The leaders of the conference decided that the answers to those questions could come the following day. The President asked those who posed the questions to the lecturers, and who were demanding more explanations, as they did after the speech of Benes, to wait until the speaker had finished his speech, to pose their questions, but right after the lectures, the Assembly was dismissed and the questions remained unanswered. In Trianon, the emphasis was not on serving justice but on serving the individual interests. (Pozzi, p.223)

Two years later, this became clear when Hungary was demanding a plebiscite in Felvidék. It was flatly rejected because Tardieu knew that the plebiscite would be favorable to the Hungarians. Tardieu, in his memoirs, stated: „We had to chose a plebiscite or the establishment of Czechoslovakia.”²⁴⁷

²⁴⁷ Pozzi, Op. Cit. p. 224; Tardieu: *La Paix*, 1921

„The Conference finally decided the borders of Hungary” Benes said on December 2, 1919, „and there is no place for any kind of a border revision for Hungary”.²⁴⁸ On January 15, 1920, the Allies announced the final text of the peace conditions. The Hungarians had to sign the document without any alterations. If they had objected, they were threatened with military occupation, the withdrawal of help for the sick and war-injured and the denial of food for the children.

„There is no mercy for Hungary,” announced Tardieu, the friend of Sazonov and Izwolski, on the day that he accepted the position of the President of the Committee to draft the Peace Proposals. Tardieu had been a friend of the Serbs and Rumanians for many years and, as editor of *Le Temps*, he wrote anti-Austrian articles.²⁴⁹

Pozzi states that the one-sided information made it possible, behind the green doors of the Conference room, for the hidden interest groups to make historical swindles. (p. 225) He goes on to say that the defeated nations were convinced that the treaties which they were forced to sign were not formulated with good intentions but they were forced dictations. Therefore they were legally and morally false. (p. 226)

Trumbic, whom Wickham Steed and Seton Watson appointed to be one of the persons to form Yugoslavia, himself proved the existence of the democratic Hungarian policy of human tolerance. Trumbic said to Pozzi: „First of all I demanded that the Serb government guarantee that the Yugoslav Administrative autonomy should be inviolable and so, in the future, in Great Serbia, the Yugoslavs should retain the rights and privileges which they enjoyed under Hungarian rule.” . . . (Pozzi, p. 231)

Under what pretext was the Bánság annexed to Yugoslavia when the population of that territory was two thirds Hungarian? The Hungarian enemy, Trumbic himself, proved that there was no Hungarian oppression. I can see no other reason than the fulfillment of the Pan-Slav ideal which was aided by the lack of knowledge on the part of the politicians, the corruption of the participants at the Peace conference, the power of money and beautiful women.

The Corfu Agreement which the Serb government effected on July 27, 1917, supposedly states that the south Slav minorities desired

²⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 225; *Le Temps*, December 2, 1919

²⁴⁹ Ibid. p. 225-226; Documents Diplomatiques Russes, Edition d’Etat, Moscow, St. Petersburg, 1921

to join with Serbia. Pozzi says: „This is a barefaced lie and one of the greatest frauds of the age.” (Pozzi, p. 232)

Pozzi brings to the attention of the official politicians and historians that: „it was not the leaders of the Monarchy’s so-called ‘suppressed south Slav minorities’ who negotiated this unification but it was three individuals, Wickham Steed, the foreign correspondent for *The Times*, Seton Watson, the leader of the Slav propaganda in London and Doctor Trumbic, the former mayor of the Dalmatian city of Zára.” (Pozzi, p. 228) This agreement was signed on July 27, 1917, in the name of the Yugoslavs by Trumbic, and in the name of the Serbs by Pasic. On July 4, 1932, Pozzi spoke with Trumbic in Zagreb and asked him to tell him in detail about his role in the Corfu Agreement. This interview came to the knowledge of the Pan Slav authorities and therefore the Serbs arrested Trumbic, accusing him of working against the state. The 70 year old Trumbic was imprisoned at Mitrovic for four months. He was fed every other day, the soles of his feet were beaten regularly with a stick, his male organs were tortured and he left the prison half dead after four months. (Pozzi, p. 228) Trumbic was not a well-known person. Neither the Croatians nor the Slovenes knew him. Therefore he was not a trusted representative of the people.

The three individuals who made the Corfu Agreement did not represent the people and offended the people’s right to self determination when they appointed themselves to make the agreement. With this act, five million Austro-Hungarian, Slovene and Croat Catholics were placed into servitude. In our time (1999) we can now see the result - the genocide in Serbia conducted by Milosevic. The Corfu Agreement was the reason that the Allied Powers at Trianon, believing that this was the will of the people, took this territory from Hungary and gave it to the Serbs.²⁵⁰ The Croatians had been demanding the plebiscite since July, 1917. (Pozzi, p. 233) Trumbic explained his action at Corfu: „I would like to ask my homeland to forgive me. I could not have known, I could not have foreseen the results of my mistake.” (Pozzi, p.233)

Those who created the Corfu Agreement did it with the intention of preventing the Italians from possessing the Adriatic shoreline. They announced publicly that this agreement was made for the sake of the

²⁵⁰ Ibid. p.232; Poincaré: *Victoire et Armistice*, p. 365

minorities rather than the interest of the government. This announcement was timed to come out right at the Peace Conference. This time Britain and France did not regard the demands of Italy so their plan materialized. Seton Watson and Wickham Steed convinced the Italian representative, Luigi Torre, to sign the agreement which they had prepared, telling him that it would be to the benefit of Italy. The goal of the Slav propagandists was to stop the formation of an independent Yugoslavia. Therefore Benes organized a congress for the „suppressed” nationalities in the Monarchy. Here the Slavs applied every possible propaganda material to reach their goal. They advocated the „suppressed” Slav people’s desire for freedom and right to self-determination throughout the whole world and that was helped in London, Paris, Washington and Rome by their correspondents. Their goal succeeded because the Yugoslavs had no money but the Serbs, in Belgrade, had plenty of money. The money came from Lord Northcliffe. They applied again the former method of bribery. The Peace Conference accepted the suggestions of the Pan-Slavists. (Pozzi, p. 236-237)

Seton Watson wrote about the Corfu Agreement in the *London Review of Reviews* five years later, in 1923. He stated that the „suppressed minorities” were represented by a few dozen Croatians, Slovenes, Illyrians, and Serb emigrants and these were joined by a few Czech soldiers who were Italian prisoners of war. He told Pozzi that the Frenchman, Magat, the Director of the Corfu Press, said, „This was the height of absurdity, but it was a great success!” (Pozzi, p. 237)

Seton Watson and Stefan Osusky managed to persuade the leaders of the Slav representatives who were still under foreign oppression to accept the Corfu and London agreements. Then, on April 8, 1918, by public acclamation they made them accept the Rome Declaration. In this Declaration, the assembly announced that all the Yugoslavs wanted to join Great Serbia. At the same time, they declared to be traitors and suppressors those who wanted to declare an independent State of Croatia, Slovenia and the Adriatic possessions. The Entente powers blindly trusted the Rome Declaration and voted that Czechoslovakia and Great Serbia come into existence.²⁵¹ This was why the Wilsonian principle of the real self-determination of the people did

²⁵¹ Pozzi, *Op. Cit.* p. 238; Poincaré, *Op. Cit.* p. 406-407

not materialize. This is how the South Slav (Yugoslav) peoples unified under the free hand of Serbia.

The Czechs were the ones who toppled the Monarchy with their decisions which the Entente implemented.

Masaryk did not play such a large role at the Conference as Tardieu, Take Ionescu, Benes and Bratianu but, indirectly, he was the one who affected the Peace Treaty the most. He had great prestige. Pozzi writes that Benes was merciless, ambitious, and reflected a strong determination. He can be compared with Sazonov who worked excellently for the cause of Russian Pan-Slavism.(p.243)

Wilson himself announced, before he went to the Peace Conference, that the right to self-determination did not apply to the minorities of the Monarchy. This announcement came as a tremendous surprise to the delegates at the Conference. Wilson, in October 1918, wrote to Emperor Charles I. that the minorities of the Monarchy, in the last months of the war, had officially expressed their desires through their authorized representatives in Corfu, Rome and Pittsburgh. Therefore the Conference had no other duty than to accept these desires.(Pozzi, p. 244) Clemenceau was not interested in „the secondary questions”. He was never interested in the Central European questions. He only wanted the dissolution of the Hapsburg Empire.²⁵²

Lloyd George opposed the dissolution of the Monarchy: „The dismemberment of Austria and Hungary is not the goal of this war.” (Pozzi, p. 276) However, Masaryk and Tardieu convinced him to drop his opposition. They promised to give Britain concessions in the Persian Gulf and Mesopotamia and they promised to give special attention to Britain when the German colonies were divided up. When Lloyd George realized his mistake, in accepting the dissolution of the Monarchy, it was too late.(Pozzi, p. 245;) On March 24, 1917, Emperor Charles I., with the intervention of Prince Sixtus, promised France and England that he would return the territory of Alsace-Lorraine to France and that he would move his troops out of Belgium and pay back the damages. According to this plan, Serbia would have received its sovereignty and would have received access to the Adriatic Sea. She would also have received large scale economic favors. In his letter of May 9, 1917, Charles emphasized that the Italians had promised to give

²⁵² Ibid. p. 244; Poincaré, Op. Cit. p. 429

up their Adriatic territories inhabited by Slavs and they only wanted to claim the territory of Tyrol which was populated by Italians. King Victor Emmanuel of Italy and Prime Minister Gioiotti, working together, informed the Monarchy's ambassador to Switzerland of Italy's conditions of peace. The French Prime Minister, Ribot, committed a crime against France when he refused these proposals of Italy and the Monarchy. His acceptance would have meant that the war would have been ended a year earlier and 500,000 French lives could have been saved. (Pozzi, p. 245-246)

Wilson's statement announcing that the plebiscite would not be applied to the minorities in the Monarchy was the cause of the Second World War and caused all the injustices and sufferings which resulted from this decision. General Smuts, the South African representative, vehemently opposed Wilson's change of mind. He questioned why Transylvania, Felvidék, Ruthenia, Croatia and Slovenia could not exercise the plebiscite, while Silesia, Posen, the Saar province and Schleswig-Holstein were allowed to do so. The representatives of Japan, Poland and the British dominions supported General Smuts in his request for a plebiscite in the above-mentioned territories. Later, the Italian representative, Nitti, joined this group and demanded the renegotiation of these territories. He objected that the Serbs, Czechs and Rumanians received huge territories and huge numbers of population without a plebiscite.²⁵³ Wilson's knowledge of Europe was shockingly lacking. He was just a toy in the hands of the others which they knew how to use. In 1924, Masaryk stated:

„On July 30, 1918, in Pittsburgh, I supported that 'agreement' which the representatives of the Slovak Americans and the Czech emigrants made in Cleveland on May 17, 1915. This agreement served the demands of a small group of Slavs. God knows what kind of a childish thing they were dreaming of, some kind of Slovakia which would have autonomy, its own administration, independent parliament and jurisdiction, their own schools, etc. . . Without any hesitation, I supported these Slovak demands in the name of the Czech people.

²⁵³ Ibid. p. 247; Viorel Tilea: L'Activité Diplomatique de la Roumanie de Novembre 1919 a 1920

„This agreement was like an individual agreement made by only a few emigrants. Except for two of them, they were American citizens. There was no reason that I should not sign this worthless paper, especially since this ‘agreement’ was made on a holiday. This under American law makes it invalid.”²⁵⁴

Masaryk silenced the truth. In Cleveland and in Pittsburgh the Slovak-Americans were demanding an independent Slovakia within Czechoslovakia. This was accepted when they signed the agreement. Here is the proof: „The Slovak-American League today made a declaration according to which they are willing to work together with the Czech state, which includes Moravia, Silesia and Slovakia, on condition that the constitution of this state will assure the Slovak autonomy.”²⁵⁵

This was that „worthless paper” which Masaryk referred to, which changed the map of Europe. Wilson, based on this agreement, believed in the brotherly unification of the Slovak and Czech people to create Czechoslovakia. (Pozzi, p. 249) After Wilson had accepted this agreement, the Trianon Conference also accepted it. How well that brotherly unification worked we can read in the Slovak People’s Party Declaration to the Public of the World in May 1923 and also in 1934: „There is no man of honor in Slovakia who does not suffer the economic oppression, the political persecution or the calvary of imprisonment. In Slovakia, the terror and the silence of the prison is ruling. Every leading Slovak statesman is in prison or has to live in exile, just like the Croatian leaders..” (Pozzi, p.249-250;)

How was it possible that the agreements at Corfu and at Cleveland were officially accepted? The participants at Corfu were Wickham Steed, Seton Watson, Tardieu and Trumbic. In Cleveland, just the emigrant Slovak-Americans voted. What happened to the Hungarians’ right to vote? They were 30% of the populace of Felvidék, which became Slovakia. How could an emigrant league vote in the name of the people of the motherland?

On October 16, 1918, Emperor Charles I. promised autonomy to all the minorities and with this action he solved the problems of the suppressed minorities. In this way, he thwarted the plans of the Slavs to dissolve the Monarchy on the grounds of minority suppression. The

²⁵⁴ Ibid. p.248; T.G. Masaryk: *The Making of a State*, London, 1924, p. 229

²⁵⁵ Pozzi, Op. Cit. p. 248-249; *Le Temps*, February 4, 1910. *La Guerre Social*, 1915, II. 3

Slavs then became scared and made even more efforts to prevent this promised autonomy from actually materializing. They ignored his announcement and simply blamed the Monarchy for the outbreak of war. (Pozzi, p. 250) Masaryk travelled to Washington and told President Wilson that the Pittsburgh Agreement, which he had accepted, could not be nullified. Wilson told the Emperor that the Pittsburgh Agreement was final and that there was no way to maintain the Monarchy. He also declared that no plebiscites were to be allowed. In this way Wilson retracted his principle of the right of self-determination. The Hungarian soldiers and their leaders, trusting in the Conference to allow a plebiscite to take place, laid down their arms. Following their surrender, the revolution broke out.

Jusserand, the French ambassador to America, wrote a memorandum in the name of Clemenceau. „The fate of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy is no longer a subject of discussion because this power no longer exists. Therefore, neither the different armistices which were made before this memorandum, nor the President's fourteen points can serve as a basis for the negotiations at the Peace Conference.” (Pozzi, p. 252)

Pozzi says that the American President and the French knew well that the Central Powers laid down their arms, not because they were defeated but because they trusted in the Fourteen Points of President Wilson to formulate an acceptable peace. (Pozzi, p. 253) They trusted in the armistice which was made by General Diaz, on November 3, in Padua and in the November 6 armistice made by General Franchet d'Espéry in Belgrade. Two days later, on November 8, Marshal Foch requested the highest council of the Entente to nullify the Paduan armistice. At the same time General Franchet d'Espéry authorized the Serbs to occupy the Bánát. When the Germans moved out of Transylvania, the Rumanians boldly occupied that territory. The Entente Powers broke their agreements. The Czechs and the Serbs in Central Europe and in the Balkans accomplished the Pan-Slav secret goals which were the reason that the Russians started the First World War. At the same time, the power of Hungary, which for a thousand years had held back the East and the West, ceased to exist.

The agents of Pan-Slavism continued their arbitrary demands, setting one nation against another. They instigated, bribed and finally reached their goal, causing the war to break out. At the end of the war,

men who trusted in goodness and in God, believed that the bees nest, the family of the Russian Czar, was killed out in the Communist Revolution and they were hoping that Pan-Slavism would also die out.

The Peace Treaties made in Paris and its surroundings after the Second World War, made such concessions to the Soviets that it was obvious that Pan-Slavism had not died out, but under the mask of Communism and internationalism had salvaged itself and was still existing in the Balkans and Central Europe, not so openly but more covertly. The idea of Pan-Slavism is still spreading even if some politicians camouflage it with the name of democracy. All those nations and politicians who were working in the interests of the Czechs, Rumanians and Serbs at the time of the Peace Treaties following the First and Second World Wars, supported this covert philosophy in these territories.

How could all this happen? Tardieu simply went over to the side of Pan-Slavism and Wilson trusting in honor, believed and was simply deceived. Pozzi mentions that when the fate of Austria-Hungary was negotiated at the Little Trianon Palace, everything had already been decided four years earlier, not by the Allied Powers, but by individuals who were working in the shadows. (Pozzi, p. 256)

Pozzi mentions a few of these people who were working behind the scenes: Masaryk, Wickham Steed, Seton Watson, Ernest Denis, Vivogradov, Eisenmann and Kovalevsky. Some of them stated that they were Freemasons. Their work was easier because they were on good terms with the Western politicians and the Press. There was another group which joined them: Benes, Trumbic, Kramar and Osusky. These groups worked secretly behind the scenes. These were the people who created the new Europe and not Clemenceau, Lloyd George or Orlando. The latter just accepted their proposals. (Pozzi, p. 256-257)

The people of the world did not know that these Czech, Serb, English and French agitators and propagandists, who constantly talked of the freedom of the suppressed minorities, were really serving the interests of the Russians, those who suppressed and robbed their own people. Masaryk was more honorable than Benes but his conscience was not disturbed when he wrote anti-Hungarian propaganda or if such an article came from one of his friends, like Eisenmann. One of Eisenmann's articles contained a lie which gave the greatest service to the Czechs. „Alongside Germany, Hungary carries the heavy

responsibility for the start of the war in Europe. The imperialism of Tisza only differs in size from Pan-German imperialism.”²⁵⁶

Masaryk took advantage of the lack of knowledge of the French about Central Europe. The original Czech intention was to be the supporter of Russia and to create a Czech feudal state, under a Russian king. In this way, Russia would have reached the heart of Europe. This was the Pan-Slav goal. But the Bolshevik Revolution, in 1917, upset this goal because it was unimaginable that the West would stand for a Communist Russia in the heart of Europe. Luck was again on the side of the Czechs because the French promised them that they would give them everything which they had been promised by Czarist Russia.

The Czechs were a bit worried about the result of the Peace Conference because they knew that Lloyd George opposed the dissolution of the Monarchy. This is why Masaryk, shortly before the Conference, came forward with much more modest demands. He was only demanding that territory be divided along ethnographic borderlines. At that time he was not demanding Pozsony, Léva, Ipolyság, Kassa, Felvidék or Ruthenia. It was Benes who came forward with these reckless demands.

On November 3, 1918, Seton Watson forwarded a memorandum in the name of the Czechs to the Foreign Office, in which he demanded the entire territory of Felvidék for the Czechs. But Masaryk was still afraid and he did not believe that this would be possible. Benes grasped at the opportunity and on November 4, in *The Times* and on November 5, in *Le Matin*, he proved the righteousness of Seton Watson's demands. In these articles, he presented the Czechs as the Defenders of the West against Bolshevism and so he convinced the Entente Powers to give this territory to the Czechs.

Pozzi mentions that, twenty days after these articles, the „Bastion against Communism” – the Czechs, would not allow the Hungarian armaments to be transported through the territory of Czechoslovakia to Poland to be used to defend Poland against the Communists. Furthermore, the Czechs informed the Russians that the Slovak borders were open for the Russians to march toward Europe after they had defeated the Poles.

²⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 274; Osusky: *Magyars et Pangermanistes*, Foreword

The Czech representatives demanded Pozsony under the pretext that it was a city that had been populated by Czechs for centuries but, at the same time, in Masaryk's newspaper, *The New Europe*, Seton Watson stated that it was without a doubt that Pozsony was Hungarian and German and the Slav populace in Felvidék was only 1,900,000. **Masaryk, on December 6, 1918, demanded the annexation of Felvidék to Czechoslovakia, saying that the Slav populace there was 1,900,000, the same as Seton Watson had stated in *The New Europe*. But on February 18, 1919, when he realized he could demand almost anything he wanted, when he negotiated with André Tardieu and Colonel House, the advisor of Wilson, then he changed his former statement and he stated that the Slav population of Felvidék was 2,900,000. It was well known that at least one million of this number were Hungarian.** Sonnino, Lord Balfour and Masaryk agreed with the ethnographic borders but Benes did not accept them. He demanded the strategical borders suggested by Osusky and Seton Watson which he said were of vital importance to Czechoslovakia. But Hungary's vital interest was not considered. (Pozzi, p. 297)

Benes based this Czech claim on the secret French-Russian agreement of 1917. However the Russian Pan-Slavist ideal was lost because of the Bolshevik revolution. This Pan-Slav ideal was taken over by Benes for the Czech Pan-Slav interest. Benes took over the role of Sazonov. This was possible because Clemenceau was misinformed on the real situation in Central Europe and he supported the demands of Benes.²⁵⁷

Lloyd George's conclusion was the following: „Some of the proofs which our allies provided were lies and distortions. We made decisions on false claims.”²⁵⁸

Tardieu, who was known to be a Slav supporter and influenced by them, presented all the material at the Trianon Peace Conference. (Pozzi, p. 283-284) This is how Czechoslovakia was born with a Russian-Slav mentality. It became obvious that Hungary would demand her rightful territories which could lead to war. Therefore Czechoslovakia put herself into the position of the defender of Central Europe and the guard of the Trianon decisions.

²⁵⁷ Ibid. p.283; Poincaré: *Victoire et Armistice*, p. 68 and 399

²⁵⁸ Ibid. p. 83; Lloyd George, Speech at Queens Hall

We know that Benes had great success at the Peace Conference. The only thing that he was not able to accomplish was to establish a corridor between Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, because England, Italy and Poland together opposed it. Even so, he still tried to convince the Serbs that, together with Czechoslovakia, they should attack Hungary and create the corridor with force. In Paris, he had already made arrangements that the Council of Ambassadors at the Peace Conference would not oppose this. He arranged the neutrality of Rumania in this matter by offering them those Hungarian territories which Rumania did not receive at Trianon but the Conference opposed this. On the advice of Pasic, the new Serb President did not accept the proposal of Benes because he was afraid that if the Entente found this aggression too much, they might lose what they had already received. It is obvious who were the war criminals and how much they took into consideration the ethnographic borders in the just solution of the border arrangements. (Pozzi, p. 285-286)

Admiral Miklós Horthy became Regent of Hungary on March 1, 1920 and his intention was to rebuild the damage which the Communist Revolution had created. He could not accept the Dictated Peace either because the public opinion would have swept him away. This would have caused another insurrection which even the Entente would not have liked to see happen. Under the pretext of restoring order, the Rumanians, Czechs and Serbs would have flooded the country again.

On June 24, 1920, the Soviet Bolshevik Army was threatening Warsaw. Prague did not go to the aid of the Poles as „the Bastion of Europe”. Rather they made an economic boycott against the Hungarians who wanted to help the Poles. The Czechs were sure that the Soviets would defeat the army of the Polish Marshal Pilsudsky. The Soviets could have moved into the heart of Europe. The French, in their fear, asked the Hungarians to help Poland fight the Communists. Fouchet, representing the French, informed the Hungarian Government that, if the Hungarians would help the Poles, the French would promise revisions to the Treaty of Trianon and Hungary would get back Ruthenia and Felvidék.²⁵⁹ The French fear was well-founded because the Czechs offered a free passage to the Soviets through their territory several times.

²⁵⁹ Pozzi, Op. Cit. p.294; L. Villat: Magyarország szerepe az 1920-as lengyel bolsevista háborúban, Paris, 1930, pub. *La Revue Mondiale*

Pilsudsky ruined the Czech calculations because he defeated the Soviet Communist Army. (Pozzi, p. 295)

The enemies of the Hungarians tried to silence these promises to Hungary. In 1921, when the Czechs published the text of the French-Hungarian negotiations, these promises were not mentioned.

At that time, Benes in his fear, asked for support from the Serb President Nincsic who cautiously advised him to wait until the end of the Polish-Russian War, to see what would happen. On August 29, Benes sent a circular letter to the Entente demanding the nullification of the French proposals and the resignation of Paleologue. He said that Paleologue was anti-Slav. (In 1915, Maurice Paleologue had informed the French Government that the plans of Sazonov and Masaryk to destroy Austria and Hungary would be a danger to France and to the balance of power in Europe.) (Pozzi, p. 297)

Because the French Government did not want to accept the demands of Benes, he announced that he would leave the alliance. As a result of this announcement, the French gave in to his demands. By that time, the danger from the Soviet Communists had been erased but the French did not want to break up the established alliance of the Little Entente. Benes was again successful. Paleologue, who knew the truth and intended to do something about it, was removed by the Quai D'Orsay and was replaced by General Philippe Berthelot. The verbal promises of the French representative, Fouchet, were not kept.

Pozzi writes that the French lost the opportunity to get close to an honorable nation, looking for a way out of the war and later revolution, because their cold, uninformed foreign policy made it impossible for that nation to get close to them. As a result of this foreign policy, the Hungarians, who had to fight the enormous Slav pressure, were forced to go to the side of the Germans. The French could have given a helping hand to the Hungarians without weakening their alliance with the Little Entente because not even the Hungarians would have expected the French to fulfill all the Hungarian demands. The duty of the French would have been to correct the obvious injustices against Hungary. All those who, since 1920, have followed each other in the Quai d'Orsay, have made an inexcusable mistake when they declared solidarity with the beneficiaries of the Trianon Decision. Pozzi says that the French have to solve the problems of Central Europe and the Balkans. (Pozzi, p.303-304)

Chapter 18

The Lajta Bánság

Some Hungarians were expecting that the French soldiers of the Entente, who arrived in Szeged in May, 1919, would provide help to free the Hungarian nation from the rule of the Communists, Jews and Masons. The Commune wanted to give this group, which was causing social, economical and moral chaos in the country, the power to rule Hungary. Pál Prónay organized a dependable armed force made up of officers who had been ordered to lay down their arms at the end of the war. Joining them were Hungarian patriots, recruited from the entire territory of Historic Hungary. Every minority group was represented in its ranks and this armed force became the National Army. The Hungarian farmers from the territory of Orgovány, when they joined this army, took off their boots and left them behind for their families to use, considering the possibility that they might not return. This „ragged army”, which was about two thousand in number, was gathered without the help of the Hungarian Royal government and even with their opposition. They used traditional war tactics which, in the previous century, the Hungarian Freedom Fighters had used against the Hapsburg oppressors, without being aware that they were using the same tactics.

With Count Gyula Károlyi, Prónay formed a counter-revolutionary government in which Miklós Horthy was a member. Horthy later became premier and then Regent of Hungary. The French did not want a counter-revolutionary national government in power because it was too nationalistic. They would rather have seen a liberal government. So the counter-revolutionary government of Gyula Károlyi was dissolved but the army organized by Prónay remained. After Trianon, it was not possible to establish a real Hungarian National Government which would really have served the interests of the Hungarian people.

Pál Prónay's most important action was the formation of the Hungarian National Army which supported the stability of the Horthy

Government. This Hungarian National Army could have provided a just, peaceful settlement and border revision but the Communist leader, Béla Kun and his comrades committed atrocities against the Hungarians, resulting in a reaction which History now calls „the White Terror”. During this time, many Jews lost their lives and this, through the media, caused anti-Hungarian feelings world wide. This also contributed to the fact that the long awaited border revision did not take place. When this retaliation ended, a real national Hungarian government could have been formed, which could have obtained the border revisions. However, under pressure from the Entente powers and the suggestion of the media, certain freemason politicians were allowed to come to power who agreed with the viewpoint of the foreigners. Within the country the Government presented itself as nationalistic, but its actions proved otherwise. It was not strong and it made compromises. Instead of Count Albert Apponyi, Miklós Horthy was elected as Regent. He was easily influenced by Count István Bethlen, Count Pál Teleki, Count Miklós Bánffy, and Gyula Gömbös. The main interest of these ministers of Transylvanian origin in the Rumanian-Hungarian negotiations, was not to regain the land of Transylvania for Hungary or at least find a just settlement of the ethnic borders but rather to claim recompense for their estates which were confiscated by the Rumanians.

Under the leadership of Colonel Otto Bauer, German anti-Bolshevists, anti-Semites and Nationalists came into Hungary in large numbers after the Berlin coup was unsuccessful. This group wanted to try to restore the German Empire. They made the statement that „they would honor the ancient borders of Historic Hungary and that they would not aspire to the Hungarian territory where the German were living if Austria were annexed to Germany.”²⁶⁰ This statement leaves no doubt that the Bauer group was working for the benefit of the Anschluss.

It became obvious to Prónay that a Great Unified German State was just as dangerous for Hungary as Pan-Slavism. According to Prónay, the fact that the Germans prevented the separation of Burgenland from Austria, in 1922, indicates that Colonel Ludendorff planned to include Central Europe in the Anschluss. In the summer of 1920, the Hungarians had a chance to break through the ring of the Little Entente, when Millerand sent his foreign minister to the city of Gödöllő, in

²⁶⁰ Prónay, Pál: A háborúban a halál kaszál. Budapest, 1963, p. 201

Hungary, where he negotiated with the Hungarian Government. He proposed that, if the Hungarian Government would provide armed forces to support the Poles in their struggle against the Russians then, in exchange, the French would return Kárpátalja (Ruthenia) to Hungary from Czechoslovakia. That would have been an excellent opportunity for Hungary to break the Treaty of Trianon and she would have again become the neighbor of the friendly Poland. The French first offered this proposal to the Czechs who refused it. This means that right at the beginning, when Czechoslovakia was created by the French, she did not fulfill her promise to the French to become the „Bastion of the West”. According to the proposal of the French to the Hungarians, Hungary would provide 100,000 soldiers to help Poland. But Bethlen and the Hungarian Government did not accept that proposal because, as they explained, „we cannot offend the Germans”. According to Prónay, this mobilization to help Poland would not have been directed against the Germans but against the Bolsheviks. (p. 217) The loss of this opportunity was a big mistake on the part of the Hungarians. Such opportunities are rare. Prónay, already before the French negotiations, had tried to convince Horthy to make an alliance with the Poles against the Communists because the time was right for that. But he could not convince Horthy, Gömbös and Wolff because they said that they had previously made an agreement with the Germans and that they could not break the agreement. (Prónay, p. 218)

In spite of the signing of the Treaty of Trianon on June 4, 1920, the flame of Hungarian irredentism was still burning. The irredentist movement, led by Prónay, strongly opposed the activities of the Transylvanian Masons, István Bethlen and Pál Teleki. Therefore, in secret, Prónay started to organize against the Czech imperialist aggression. He planned several attacks to take place during the night of December 25. From Köpcsény they would attack the bridge at Pozsony; from the city of Szőny, the bridge at Komárom; from Szob which was north of Balassagyarmat, the main attack was on the city of Léva. Prónay says that they counted on the help of the Hungarian populace in these territories and they estimated that they could easily chase out the occupying Czechs. Everything was prepared. The Hungarians were expecting help promised by the Sudeten Germans, led by Otto Bauer, who was notified of the impending attacks. Such attacks from different directions against Czechoslovakia promised obvious success because, at

that time, there was no organization or unity among the Czechs. The Little Entente had not yet been established. Prónay says that they also hoped that the Austrians would intervene and would throw out the Czechs who had settled into Austrian territories. The combined attack was to take place on December 25, 1920 at 10 pm. (p. 225)

The Government of Pál Teleki learned of the preparations for this combined attack and Teleki sent an envoy to Prónay saying that the Government would accept no responsibility for this attack and that he should cease all mobilization and if he did not obey, he would send a telegram to the Czechs. „You cannot mobilize before Horthy does. You know well that he will organize a better-prepared armed attack and he will accomplish the same result.” (Prónay p. 226) Prónay was called on the telephone and instructed to go to meet the Regent. When he arrived Horthy said to him, „What do you want to accomplish, you miserable people? Do you want to ruin the country? Cease this mobilization at once! The Czech Ambassador already wants to leave Budapest. With this action you would ruin the plan which I have already worked out with Berzeviczy to chase out the Czechs and break them next spring. I will clear the Czechs from Felvidék.” (Prónay, 226-227) Under this constraint, Prónay aborted the planned attack. He writes that the soldiers became very bitter. But the most disheartened were the Hungarians who lived in the territory which was now Czechoslovakia. At that time the Etelköz Association, who were Freemasons, made an attack against Prónay and they demanded to remove him from the command of the Army. They were disturbed that there was a Hungarian who would fight successfully for the interest of the Hungarian people.

If he had not stood aside out of modesty, and if he had not given the power which was in his hands to Horthy, Teleki and Bethlen, then the fate of the Hungarians would have turned to the better. They could have regained some of the 1000 year-old borders and could have fulfilled the social reforms which were already in law but because of the administration of the Dual Monarchy were not implemented. Just as Pilsudsky freed Poland from the invading Russians, or as Kemal Ataturk resisted the enemies attacking the Turks from every direction, finally keeping his country's territorial integrity, in the same way Prónay could have fulfilled the duty to which he was called, especially if he had received some kind of support from the Hungarian Government instead

of camouflaged attacks which were intended to blacken his name and take away from him the leadership of the Army.

During the evacuation of the Hungarian Administration, Free Army troops were organized without the acknowledgement of the Hungarian Government, with the purpose of encouraging people to oppose the annexation of Western Hungary to Austria. Prónay was relieved of his position as Commander of the Free Army and his battalion was sent to Burgenland in August, 1921, without him. It was only through the unity and the power of this battalion that Horthy had been able to form his Government. The older Army officers, led by Ronsenberger, approached the Hungarian Government and asked it to restore Prónay as the Commander of the Army, or they would refuse to serve in Burgenland when the Hungarian administration was ordered to evacuate the country. When Horthy realized that the battalion could not do the job without Prónay, he reinstated him as the Commander of the Free Army in September, 1921.

On September 6, 1921, Prónay arrived at Sopron, where he came into contact with the local leaders at Felsőőr (Oberwart), and Pinkafő (Pinkafeld), who were also opposed to the annexation of this territory to Austria. These local leaders were also of the opinion that Burgenland should have independence and autonomy. This was the only way to stop the annexation. On the suggestion of Béla Bárdoss, they called this territory the *Lajta bánóság*. Temporarily, until they could elect a governor, they gave the title of *bán* (governor) to Prónay. The proclamation of the newly formed autonomous *Lajta bánóság* was issued in three languages, Hungarian, German and Croatian. Postal stamps and an official seal were issued. On these stamps can be seen the castles of the territory and on one of them is the portrait of Prónay. Prónay tried to fill the offices of the administration of this new *bánóság* with local people which would demonstrate the people's self-determination. But they could not find anyone locally to fill these positions, because the people were afraid of the retaliation of the Austrians, so they selected the administrative officials from the leaders of the Free Army. Every detail was negotiated. The *bánóság* of Lajta which was established by Pál Prónay, is not the same territory as is now called Burgenland. The *Lajta bánóság* was formed from the counties of Moson, Sopron and Vas and the territory to the east as far as the river Rába.

The Declaration of Independence of the Lajta *bánság* was officially delivered on October 4, 1921. This occurred on the day after the evacuation of the Hungarian administration had proceeded according to the law. The Declaration was read in Felsőőr (Oberwart), Németújvár, Felsőpulya and Nezsider. The representatives of every village, came to these places, with the village seal and the signatures of the village guarantors. They all accepted the Declaration and swore allegiance to Prónay. In the afternoon, telegrams arrived from all over the territory of Burgenland, notifying Prónay that the people of the territory unanimously accepted the independence of the *Bánság*. Dr. Ferenc Lévy, notified Austria, the Hungarian Government and the Entente by telegram that, through the people's self determination, this territory had become independent. This was proven by the advisory board of the *Bánság* which had evidence that 400 villages freely accepted the Declaration. The *Bánság's* official position was to live side by side with Hungary and when the opportunity arose, to rejoin Hungary officially. (Prónay, p. 278) This fast, unexpected movement surprised the Austrian government and at first they could not even react. Not even the Entente objected at the beginning, because this decision for independence was based on the principle of self-determination which they also advocated. Therefore everything moved forward in the interest of the Hungarians, until the Hungarian Prime Minister, István Bethlen, interfered. He sent a message to Prónay stating that he did not accept the Lajta *bánság's* Declaration of Independence. Hungarians who were not government officials had no right to act on behalf of the Hungarians. He ordered the revisionists to move out of Western Hungary (Burgenland). Bethlen wrote to Prónay, stating what would happen if he proceeded with this Declaration:

„Hungary would be totally isolated from abroad: they would stop the railway traffic everywhere in every direction around our border. The country would not receive coal, petroleum, salt, wood or any kind of goods, without which this mutilated country would be unable to live or exist. They would stop payment to Hungary of all monies due to Hungary. We could not export our animals or our flour. The passenger traffic and the mail service would disappear. The telegram, the telegraph and the telephone would be denied. In a word we would be cut off from the world. . . .The Bolsheviks hidden here

and the Jews who are opposing the Christian views would use the opportunity to bring back a Communist revolution and reinstate the Commune. I know the situation well, and I declare with full knowledge of my responsibility, that in eight to ten days, the Red Commune would come back to Budapest,. They would hang out the red flag again in Budapest.” (Prónay, p. 290-291)

The Hungarian Government could have used this opportunity to their advantage. The four hundred villages which united in declaring independence seemed to be more official than the assemblies at Túrócszentmárton and Gyulaférvár, when the Slovaks and Rumanians decided to separate from Hungary and the agreement made at Corfu to give some southern territories to Yugoslavia. But the Bethlen Government rejected the Declaration and declared it to be treason because the Entente had promised negotiations in Venice and they were going to decide in favor of the Hungarians. The negotiations took place but the decision was not in favor of Hungary. That was treason or naiveté on a great scale on the part of the Government. On the advice of Gyula Gömbös, the Hungarian government ordered a blockade and made a police cordon on the road from Budapest to the Lajta *bánság* so that the Hungarian populace could not go to that region to help the revisionists. The Hungarian Government declared, „We have to capture the revisionists in Budapest, who are trying to go toward the West, and we have to imprison them or force them back to where they belong.” (Prónay, p. 280) Horthy wrote to Prónay: „. . . soon after the receipt of the telegram, I will order the revisionist troops to move out of Western Hungary.” (Prónay, p. 285) The negotiations held in Venice between October 11 and 13, 1921, which the Entente had promised Bethlen, gave the city of Sopron, the capital of Burgenland, permission to have a plebiscite and as a result it remained with Hungary. The liberal Hungarian Government called this a favorable situation which they could not disturb with the formation of the *Lajta Bánság*.

A large part of the population of Burgenland demonstrated that they did not want to be a part of Austria but, because Hungary gave up her demand for the return of this territory, the Burgenlandians declared themselves independent. At the same time, they did not want to cause any trouble for the motherland, Hungary, because Hungary had evacuated the government officials from this territory and the

revisionists had chased out the Austrian officials and occupying forces, so they made themselves independent and took the responsibility onto themselves. The *Lajta Bánság* came into existence with the acknowledgment of the people living there, without any difficulty. Prónay says that the revisionists were sure that they would be able to maintain the independence and they planned to chase out the Czechs from Felvidék in a short time. In this way, Hungary would have no responsibility for these actions. (Prónay, p 299). All Prónay's arguments to Horthy were in vain. Horthy told Prónay that if the revisionists did not leave Burgenland, then he, himself, would lead the Hungarian Army against them. As a result of this threat, Prónay's troops moved out of Burgenland and the many leftist, freemason attacks and the attacks of the Etelköz Association against Prónay caused his permanent removal from the command of the Free Army.

During the administration of István Bethlen, in the era of Regent Horthy, the freemasons, supported by the world media and the Western Powers, came into power in Hungary. At that time, the standard of living in Hungary rose considerably and at the same time, the numbers of foreign businessmen increased. They gradually took the country's economic life into their hands, pushed out the Hungarian people from the well-paid and influential positions in the media, radio, banks and industry, which resulted in the dissatisfaction of the Hungarian people. There were many opportunists seeking titles and political roles, and in order to obtain these, they adopted Hungarian names. Outwardly they appeared to be patriotic but inwardly they were sly liberals. The Government and administration, under the influence of the freemasons, actually helped these people to reach favored positions. This policy of the Hungarian government was maintained by the press and the media. The Hungarian irredentist movement was unsuccessful, not because the Hungarian demands were unjust or unfounded, but simply because the Western Powers acknowledged only those Hungarian governments, right from the time of Trianon, as I said earlier, which followed their own views. They discussed the Hungarian revisionist demands and gave the appearance of being serious, in order to blind the Hungarians. The moment that pro-Hungarian demands were uttered, anti-Hungarian speeches or articles appeared abroad and in Hungary.

Today we can often hear, even among Hungarian emigrants, that the Hungarian populace of Burgenland has become Germanized. They

say we cannot expect any change and cannot ask for border revisions. However, if we examine closely the feelings of the Hungarians of Burgenland, we will get a completely different picture. They do not consider themselves to be Austrians. In Austria, the concept of provincialism still exists. The people even now declare themselves to be Tyrolean or Styrian rather than Austrian.

At the time when Hungarians had a class system and the ancient Hungarian County System was in effect, the emphasis was on the administration of the county rather than its political significance. In Hungary, the concept of State was a unifying force. In Austria, France, Italy and Germany, the individual provinces competed for dominance. The Magyar blood union which unified the Magyars into a confederacy, took place about 500 years before the above-mentioned European states were established. Louis XI. (1461-1484) unified France. Bismarck (1815-1896) unified the German States. Italy was unified by Garibaldi (1807-1882). The concept of a Magyar state, which was born in AD 896, still retains its magnetism. In the Hungarian populace of Burgenland, even after almost eighty years of foreign occupation, the Hungarian national feeling which has existed for the last thousand years, is still alive. The populace of Burgenland does not regard itself as Burgenlandian because that word is an artificial name made up after Trianon. They regard themselves as people of the Őrség, the guardian territory or the people of the Lajta *bánság*.

Chapter 19

Results of the Decision at Trianon

The territory of Hungary was reduced from 282,000 square kilometers to 93,000 square kilometers. Rumania received the largest part, 103,000 square kilometers, which is 36.2% of Historic Hungary. This territory alone is bigger than mutilated Hungary which retained 92,963 square kilometers. With this gain, Rumania, from 137,903 square kilometers, grew to 294,967 square kilometers. Czechoslovakia received the second largest territory and gained 63,000 square kilometers, which was 22.2% of Historic Hungary. Yugoslavia gained 21,000 square kilometers, 7.4% of Historic Hungary. Austria received 4,000 square kilometers, 1.5%. The loss of population parallels the loss of these territories. 5.24 million people were given to Rumania, of which 1.7 million were Hungarian. This is 30.2%. Czechoslovakia received 3.5 million, of which 1,072,000 were Hungarian, which is 30.2%. Yugoslavia received 1.6 million people, of which 465,000 were Hungarian, which is 28.7%. Austria gained 292,000 people, of which 26,000 were Hungarian, 8.8%. When we look at these figures, we can see that the Entente Powers did not consider the ethnic borders but rather the territorial gains of the Successor States.

The population of Hungary, (excluding Croatia), before Trianon was 18 million. The percentage of Hungarians was 54.5%. 16.1% were Rumanian, 10.7% Slovak, 10.4% German, 2.5% Serb, 2.5% Ruthenian, 1.1% Croatian, 1.2% mixed population. The population of Greater Rumania is 16 - 17 million. 65% are Rumanian. The Hungarians are above 10%, the Germans, 5.5%. The Jews are around 5%. The Bulgarians are around 5%, the Russians and Ukrainians, 3% and the gypsies and other nationalities 1-2%. The population of Czechoslovakia is 13.5 million. 12-13% are Slovak, 46-48% Czech. The Czechs and Slovaks together are 60%. The Germans are around 27-30%. Hungarians are 6.5%. The rest are Ruthenian and Polish. Greater Serbia has a population of 12.5 million. The Serbs are 40-42%, the Slovenes, 9%; Hungarians 7-8 % as are the Germans; the Muslims are 5% and the

rest is mixed populace. It can be seen that the nations in which the national population is in the majority do not have a much higher percentage of population than the minorities and in the case of Czechoslovakia, the Czechs are in the minority. This proves that the emphasis on national unity was not the most important factor. When the national minorities began to voice their demands, the goal was not to provide self-determination but rather to give Hungarian territories where minorities were living, to the matching nation. The only exception was the territory which the Czechs received because there were no Czechs living in that territory, only Hungarians, Germans, Ruthenians and Slovaks. How did the goal of national unity apply in the case of Czechoslovakia?²⁶¹

Some of the politicians presented the Trianon Decision as a positive decision because finally Hungary was able to break away from Austria. It is true that the nation achieved freedom but, at the same time, she lost all her national resources which are essential for her existence. The economical and cultural loss is immeasurable. Hungary's lost resources helped to stabilize the new states. Hungary retained only 45.7% of the wheat-growing territory, 62.9% of the territory where rye was grown, 47.3% of the territory where barley was grown, 32.2% of the territory where oats were grown, 35% of the territory where corn was grown and 39.1% of the territory where potatoes were grown. In 1913, Hungary exported 10.5 million tons of grain. 50.7% of the industrial workers were given to the new states. Their productive value which generated 44.4% profit was also given away. The steel, textile, cement, glass, milling, timber and paper industries suffered the most. The salt and coal mines and stone quarries were all given to the Successor States together with the natural gas wells. They took away the railroads, the highways and the telephone lines. 57.8% of the Hungarian railroads and 60.3% of the Hungarian highways were given to the Successor States. Those who made the decision at Trianon took away from the Hungarians the control of the flooding of the rivers.(Raffay, p. 187)

It is almost impossible to measure the cultural loss. I will mention a few items so that the reader will get some idea. Of the 2,958 nursery schools, only 1,206 remain. Of the 17,000 elementary schools, 6,402 remain. Of the 32 pedagogical institutes for women, 22 were

²⁶¹ Raffay, Ernő: *Magyar tragédia, Trianon 75 éve*, Budapest 1996, p. 185-186

given to the Successor States. Out of 221 high schools, 121 were given away. Two universities, at Kolozsvár and Pozsony, had to relocate to Hungary. All these and many more cannot be shrugged off as merely a litany of sorrows because the lives of millions of people were affected. They had to change their language, their customs, their culture, their allegiance, their whole lives. (Raffay, p. 190)

Professor Raffay writes that Hungary was sure that at least Austria would return the territory of Western Hungary, which the Treaty of Trianon had promised her, but this did not happen. Austria accepted the territory and demanded that the Hungarians leave the country, announcing that, if it was necessary, the armies of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia would help them leave. A Hungarian youth group of about one hundred would not allow the Austrian soldiers to take over. The Entente Powers officially announced that the Hungarians had to abandon that territory by October 3, 1921, otherwise they would place international sanctions against Hungary. After the Hungarians had left the territory, the news came that the Entente had allowed the City of Sopron to exercise the right of the plebiscite. As a result of the plebiscite, the city remained Hungarian. The Dictated Peace allowed Pécs to remain with Hungary but the Serbs, who were occupying Pécs, did not want to give it up. Finally, on July 26, 1921, they moved out. The peaceful settlement was disturbed by several attempts by King Charles IV., to retain the throne, which were opposed by the Entente and the Regent, Admiral Horthy. Finally, in 1921, by the Law No. XLVII., the Hapsburgs were dethroned. (Raffay, p. 191)

Now, in 1999, it appears that the Hapsburgs are trying to reinstate their influence in Hungary. The wedding of George Hapsburg took place in Hungary and he has bought property in Hungary.

The third segment of the Dictated Peace Treaty deals with the political and territorial questions. The Treaty dictated that Hungary would acknowledge the independence of the Serb, Croat and Slovene states which were to become Yugoslavia. In exchange, the new states would accept the duty of protecting the rights of the Hungarians living on their territory. There was no such official agreement with Czechoslovakia. That also demonstrates the "sincerity of their democracy".

The Austrians did not see the value in making such an agreement either, saying that so few Hungarians lived on that territory

that their number was negligible. It makes no difference whether a few Hungarians or many Hungarians live in the territory which Hungary had to abandon. Hungary cannot accept this abandonment as final. The French Foreign Minister Delcassé says: "A nation is not humiliated by the fact that she was defeated or because she signed a peace treaty with a knife at her throat but she will become dishonored if she does not oppose it and even contributes to her own ruination. It is not defeat which causes the ruin but renouncement."²⁶²

The minority agreements which became law and the international guarantees did not work as was hoped because the Entente lacked self-confidence and because it was too difficult a problem for the Successor States to create a unified culture, given the different cultural levels in these territories. As a result, they became impatient and began the radical political program of cultural genocide which I have already described.

On May 1, 1919, the Committee of New States was formed which stated that the new states would be accepted only if they would acknowledge the rights of the minorities who lived on their territories. On December 9, 1919, in Paris, the Preamble between the Allied Powers and Rumania, declared that it was necessary to make an agreement with Rumania because Rumania had received large territories and "of her own will wished to provide the freedom and truth for every citizen". (p.11-12) The Treaty of Trianon, in Articles 54 - 60 stipulates in detail how Hungary should treat the minorities in her country but the only provisions for the treatment for minorities in the Successor States are stated in general terms. Article 78 states: "Separate conventions between Hungary and each of the States to which territory of the former Kingdom of Hungary is transferred, and each of the States arising from the dismemberment of the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, will provide for the interests of the inhabitants, especially in connection with their civil rights, their commerce and the exercise of their professions."

Bratianu, the President of Rumania, resigned in the fall of 1919, because he did not want to accept the responsibility of providing minority rights. The first Rumanian constitution, in 1923, did not accept the minority agreement and did not make it law. The reason they gave was that it would compromise the sovereignty of the Rumanian State and

²⁶² Raffay, p. 195; Daruvár, Yves: *A feldarabolt Magyarország*, Lucerne, 1976, p. 201

would place Rumania under international supervision. (p. 15) Why did the Allied Powers accept such open defiance against the principles of democracy and the denial of the basic human rights? Why did they allow them to act in such a way and get away with it? Why did they allow the Rumanians to keep Transylvania when they did not sign their part of the agreement? All three Successor States opposed giving basic human rights to their minorities. When it was to their advantage they eventually signed the agreement, but never actually put it into practice. Their goal was to weaken Hungary and kill or assimilate the Hungarians who were living under their rule. They wanted to force mutilated Hungary to pay reparations for their war losses. Hungary was put under international observation. Her army was regularly inspected and her sovereignty was offended. Therefore the Dictated Peace invited rebellion. This is why it prepared the way for World War II. The League of Nations created the possibility that in the future the Successor States would be able to prove that, unlike their one time “oppressor” Hungary, they would be able to provide the minority rights. Raffay states that if they cannot provide this proof, then **this gives the Hungarians the right to ask for the revision of the Treaty of Trianon.**²⁶³

We have learned about the Hungarian tragedy and the injustices done to Hungary, and about the fact that, in the past, the Hungarian nation gave her minorities a level of freedom that none of the minorities enjoyed in Europe except perhaps in Switzerland. The minorities in Hungary never had the feeling in the past that they were suppressed by the Hungarians. This feeling was expressed by only a few members of the intelligentsia who instigated others and it grew to become a movement for secession from Hungary. The propaganda campaign abroad was overwhelmingly tendentious. It tried to prove that, in the Hungarian territories of mixed populace, life was unbearable. The reason that it was possible for the propagandists to state that and have it accepted was that the western politicians were not familiar with Hungarian history and did not know about the County-System. There is no question that there were problems to be solved but these problems were no more prevalent than anywhere else in Europe. We know of occasions of unrest among the Csangó Hungarians, Bulgarians, Turks,

²⁶³ Raffay: Op. Cit. p.15

Serbs, Rumanians and Albanians and there were serious problems between the Hungarians and Croats. Hungary's autonomous province, called Croatia, did not allow any Hungarian public schools. Therefore the Hungarians were obliged to use the unofficial "Julian schools" which taught the Hungarian language.

Besides this, there were other examples in Europe where a minority was not allowed to practise their language – the Bretons and Basques in France, the Armenians, Greeks, Kurds and Arabs in Turkey. All these were forgotten because among them there was not a trio such as Masaryk, Benes and Stefanik who kept their complaints in the media's attention. Dr. Zoltán Palotás states that there is another factor which is worthy of our attention. He says that one of the basic rules of history-writing is that the historian should always record the events of an era, taking into account the circumstances surrounding these events. For example, if today we write that in Historic Hungary there was minority oppression, we are looking at it from the standards of today. At that time it was not regarded as oppression.²⁶⁴

The formation of the new national states was greatly helped by Emperor Charles I., in his manifesto of October 16, 1918. In this manifesto, he acknowledged the Austrian nationality's right of self-determination to form an autonomous state within the frame of the Monarchy. Shortly after this manifesto, the Italian offensive began, which brought unexpected success to the Italians because the armies of the Monarchy, including the Hungarian army, were already on their way home from the war. At the same time, the French-Serb army broke through the Balkan-Macedonian front. This unexpected military success together with the manifesto, which was written with good intentions, caused more emphatic demands on the part of the minorities. Long before the actual division of Hungary took place, the Rumanian Royal Army, which was supported by the Entente, the Czech Legions and the Serb military all crossed the proposed demarcation lines and occupied Hungarian territories in the East, the North and the South. Their presence in Hungary contributed to the mutilation of Hungary. All the Successor States, claiming the right of victors, had started the expansion of their newly-created states. It is clear by now that the Trianon borders were determined one year before the Peace Treaty took place. Every

²⁶⁴ Palotás, Zoltán: A Trianoni határok, Budapest, 1990

argument of the Hungarians opposing the decision, every reason that they gave for their opposition, the proofs that they presented and their sovereign historical rights were all disregarded. The Great Powers ignored Wilson's proposal for self-determination in the Carpathian Basin.

In Karinthia, Silesia, East Prussia and Schleswig-Holstein, where the people demanded self-determination with arms in their hands, so that they could be re-annexed to their original state, they found that their demands were met.

In the annexed Hungarian territories, self-determination was denied because of the propaganda of Masaryk and Benes, because the Hungarians lost the war, because two revolutions had taken place in Hungary, the revolution against the Communists in 1919 and the counter-revolution, and because the state was weakened by the destruction committed by the above-mentioned occupying forces. Hungary was too weak to demand her rights at the Treaty of Trianon.

The Successor States, with the right of the victors, did everything they could to strengthen their power. They started the deportation of Hungarians immediately, even before the Treaty was signed. They continued this policy after the signing of the Treaty because they noticed that the League of Nations was too weak to do anything about it.

In Historic Hungary, the Hungarian State Railroad (MÁV – Magyar Állam Vasútak) crossed through the territories populated mainly by Hungarians and through the industrial areas, connecting the Hungarian cities. At the Trianon negotiations, the Entente powers recognized that it was “necessary” to give the network of roads and railways to the Successor States. This was the decisive factor rather than the ethnic considerations in drawing the new borders. They did not consider what would happen to the thousand year-old state of Hungary if she were to lose this network.

On the eastern edge of the Great Hungarian Plain, the Vásárvonal (Market Line) was formed to serve the needs of the people who lived on the plains and in the mountains. This was a band of territory where markets were established so that the people from the mountains could come to buy the grain which the Great Plain provided, and the industrial products that they needed. The people of the Great Plain obtained timber, coal and salt which was brought down from the

mountains on the rivers. The railroad lines were built to serve this domestic trade which was necessary to supply the needs of both the plains people and the mountain people. It is not accidental that the Trianon borders, in most cases, were parallel with the railroads, which as we now know were in the Market Line. These railroads are now in Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. This fact was an immeasurable advantage for the new states and a considerable disadvantage for Hungary for three major reasons.

1. It caused disruption of transportation. Large territories inside Hungary became inaccessible.
2. With the disappearance of The Market Line, these territories lost their significance.
3. Much time and considerable capital was necessary to build new roads and railroads in Hungary. At that time, Hungary had very few means to do this. (Palotás, p. 37-56)

In Felvidék (Slovakia), in 1920, the Slovaks and Hungarians were sharply separated, living in separate groups. Even today, there is a large Hungarian population in the southern part of Slovakia. There were only two areas of mixed populace in 1920, the cities of Nyitra and Kassa and their surroundings. If the border had been drawn according to the ethnic lines, and not according to the “necessity” of the railroads to Czechoslovakia, then Hungary could have kept Pozsony (Bratislava), Nagyszombat (Trnava) and the northern segment of Kisalföld (the plain in northwestern Hungary), together with the cities of Nyitra (Nitra) and Aranyosmarót (Zlaté Moravce) and the surrounding territories. Not only in Czechoslovakia but in all the Successor States, the railroads were considered and the borders placed so that they would be within the borders of the new states. Czechoslovakia received Pozsony without any difficulty, writes Dr. Zoltán Palotás, in spite of the fact that in the 1910 Census, the Slovak population in Pozsony was only one seventh of the total population of Pozsony. The Slovaks did not even call the city “Pozsony” but used a Slovak version of the German name, Pressburg, which was “Prespurk”. They demanded for themselves Pozsonyligetfalu, which at first the Entente did not want to give to them because they were planning to give it to Austria. The Czechs regarded the possession of this village to be very important and to obtain it, Masaryk offered to give up their claim to the Hungarian Csallóköz, which could then be given to Austria. Then Benes intervened and convinced them to allow

Czechoslovakia to receive Pozsonyligetfalu and to keep Csallóköz. The Entente allowed this on the condition that in the Peace Treaty was included Paragraph 51, forbidding Czechoslovakia to place a military base at the bridge-head in Pozsony. Did the Czechs ever consider honoring this agreement? In 1946, in the Paris Peace Conference, the Czechs demanded five Hungarian villages from south of Pozsony so that they could expand the territory around Pozsony. They received three villages; two remained with Hungary. It is interesting to note that Czechoslovakia did not demand Austrian villages to expand the territory around Pozsony, although these villages were located closer to Pozsony than the Hungarian villages were. Dr. Palotás asks if the expansion of the territory around Pozsony was really the reason that the Czechs demanded that those villages become Czech. He answers this question by stating that it cannot be the reason. The 1947 border revision proves that. As a result of this border revision, the new Czechoslovak border cuts 40 – 60 kilometers deep into a unified Hungarian language territory and it is 22 kilometers in length. With this revision, the Czechs received both sides of the Danube, giving them a great strategic advantage. This strategic advantage was proven by the building of the Duna-Nagymarosi Dam. (Palotas, 49-50) With the possession of this dam, in the future, the Slovaks will be a threat to Hungary. Whenever they wish to, they can endanger the lives of the Hungarians living downriver from them, not to mention the ecological damage they can cause by diminishing the subterranean waters which could cause the alkalization of the Hungarian agricultural land and the loss of the healing waters. With the possession of this territory, their border has come so close to the Hungarian capital, Budapest, that this in itself poses a threat.

I wish to point out that Czechoslovakia received these villages and the Hungarian territory of Csallóköz on the suggestion of Stalin. The Vienna decisions which returned some territories to Hungary before the War were nullified because these decisions were made by Hitler and Mussolini. Stalin was just as bad as Hitler, if not worse, so why cannot the decision at the Paris Peace Conference be nullified also, which gave Hungarian territory to Czechoslovakia? It was Stalin's plan to expand the Russian influence into the heart of Europe, to make the Danube a major waterway for the Pan-slavists. The Slovaks, after the fall of the Soviets, fulfilled that plan by building the Nagymarosi Dam and altering the course of the Danube. The Hungarians wish to reverse the decision

and have the Danube reinstored to its original course.

Károly Hokky gives an example of the uncaring attitude of the Czechs toward the results of their ill-planned deforestation policy in Ruthenia. The resulting soil erosion caused catastrophic floods. In 1933, the River Tisza flooded, destroying 25 villages. **Especially heavy damages were caused in Hungary.**²⁶⁵

Dr. Ernő Raffay discusses the unjust treatment of Hungary at Trianon, when the Allied Powers allowed the Successor States to occupy the biggest part of Hungary's territory and the occupying forces applied Martial Law on the Hungarian populace. The Hungarians were beaten them with sticks, driven away from their homes, put to forced labor, robbed of their possessions, all in the name of Democracy. The information which follows is from Dr. Raffay's book – Magyar Tragédia, 75 éve (Budapest, 1996)

The occupying forces considered that the occupied territories and everything which they found there to be their property. In the territory of the Carpathian Basin, the states surrounding Hungary gathered the largest possible army to oppose the Hungarian army of 35,000, which was hardly enough to keep order within the country. Yugoslavia was able to maintain an army of 185,000; Rumania, 278,000; Czechoslovakia, 162,000 and at the same time these armies were armed with the most advanced French weapons of the time. (p. 7-8) Hungary was not allowed to have airplanes or to manufacture them. At the same time, Rumania obtained 773 airplanes, the Czechs received 546. Ernő Raffay believes that these numbers show who was the aggressor between the two world wars. The Successor States not only secured for themselves the goods stolen from Hungary, with the help of this armed force, but they also created the Little Entente from Rumania, Serbia, and Czechoslovakia who coordinated their actions and politics against Hungary, in order to isolate that country. Even with the knowledge that they had an overpowering force, they still could not rest because they always knew that Hungary would never give up her rightful demands.

We can declare, as a success for the Hungarian foreign policy, that Hungary regained some of her territory without war, between 1938 and 1940. This success was aided by the advocacy of the truth and the

²⁶⁵ Hokky, Károly: Ruthenia, Spearhead toward the West, p. 67; translated by Alexander Gallus, Gainesville, Florida, 1966

creation of a new political situation. From the point of view of the Hungarians, there was a flaw in the success which was that the Hungarian politicians were too cautious. They did not take the opportunity to benefit from the good situations which presented themselves. They always waited for the acknowledgement of the Allied Powers. Such was the situation in 1920, when they gave up Western Hungary, Burgenland, for the the uncertain negotiations at Venice. They did not confront the Entente with their presence in Burgenland as a *fait accompli* as the Successor States had done when they occupied the Hungarian territories. Again, the Hungarian Government did not take the opportunity to help Poland with 100,000 soldiers, as Millerand requested, and they lost the chance of regaining Ruthenia. The Hungarian people would have accepted the risks involved in aiding Poland in order to break the Trianon border and create a mutual border with the friendly Poland.

After 1920, the Successor States started to homogenize the population in the territories that they annexed from Hungary because they knew that this was the only way that they could keep these annexed territories permanently. This was a huge undertaking for the Successor States because there were cultural, educational and economic differences between the peoples in their territories. Raffay writes that in Czechoslovakia, the economic difference between the Czech industry and that of Ruthenia was almost unbridgeable. (p. 9) In Rumania, the territory of Bánság, was economically far ahead of Bessarabia. The situation in Yugoslavia was the same. The territory of Bácska, which was taken from Hungary, and Croatia far surpassed the level of southern Serbia and Kosovo. In culture and civilization, the Czechs were on a much higher level than the Ruthenians. The Transylvanian Hungarians, Szeklers, Germans and Rumanians were on a much higher level than the Rumanians in the kingdom of Rumania. In religion, there was again a large difference. The major religion in the Rumanian kingdom was the Orthodox Catholic Church. In the territories annexed from the Hungarians, the people were Roman and Greek Catholics, Evangelical Protestants and Unitarians. Therefore from the beginning of the 1920's, the Orthodox Catholic Church was favored by the government and received national support. To organize the legal tender was a big problem because the *ruble* was the legal tender in Bessarabia, in Rumania the *leu* and in Hungarian territory, the *korona*, so they had to

be unified to the *leu*, which was done to the benefit of the *leu*. In Yugoslavia the situation with the religions was the same. Here there were several world religions, like Islam, and Roman and Orthodox Catholicism. To create a homogenous state in these countries, there were many obstacles. Therefore the populace had to go through a lot of harassment and had to face many new laws. This is the reason for the ongoing genocide in Serbia. (p.10)

According to the report of the Office of Hungarian Refugees, in the summer of 1924, 197,035 Hungarians fled from Transylvania to Hungary; from Slovakia, 106,841 and from Yugoslavia, 44,903. Altogether, 348,779 Hungarian refugees, with only the clothes on their back, arrived in mutilated Hungary, which was devastated by the Communists. (p. 15) The nation was unable to give them shelter so they lived in railway wagons with their families for years, with the knowledge that they had to leave their whole lives behind in Kassa, Pozsony, Újvidék, Kolozsvár and Nagyszombat without any recompense. The Hungarian peace delegation, in note XII. Appendix 10, entitled *A magyar békedelegacio román és cseh visszaélések*, quoted the words of the Rumanian politician, Iuliu Maniu, about the Rumanian and Czech atrocities: "To Rumanize Transylvania is the first and most urgent goal of the Rumanians, which does not regard democratic or self governing rights as obstacles." (p. 16) In Czechoslovakia, Benes was so chauvinistic that he did not even acknowledge the Slovaks to be an autonomous nation, but just a tribe of the Czechs. The whole society in the Successor States was full of chauvinist, imperialist politicians, like Benes, Maniu, Pasic, Bratianu and others, so there is no possibility that the minorities would be given their human rights. At the beginning of the formation of Czechoslovakia, the Slovaks started to Slovanize the southern part of the territory, close to Hungary by settling Slovaks in this territory. At the same time, they applied very strict taxation. In Transylvania, in the 1920's the populace paid many millions more in taxes than the Rumanians in the former kingdom of Rumania. The taxes rose 28.4% in the former kingdom of Rumania and in Transylvania, 72%. In some Szekler territories they rose 76%, 86.5% and 110%. With this policy, the goal of the Rumanian government was to make the Hungarian and Szekler people poor, disheartened and force them to leave the country. In 1910, the percentage of Hungarian craftsmen was 18.7%, but ten years after the Rumanians took over, there were hardly

any Hungarian craftsmen in Transylvania because the sales tax had quadrupled. The total taxes for the year multiplied by five. From the beginning of the thirties, only the national citizens of the Successor States were able to obtain bank loans. The trade signs in the Hungarian language cost eight times more than those in the Rumanian language. These laws were definitely a discrimination policy against the Hungarians. We have to mention that, in Czechoslovakia, the state workers had to swear allegiance to the new State and to the new Government. Because at that time, the men supported their family, if a Hungarian worker swore allegiance to the Czech State, then his whole family became Czech. This method opposes the Hague Agreement, which says that the occupiers are forbidden to force the populace to swear allegiance to them.²⁶⁶

In Yugoslavia, the elementary schools were nationalized and so almost all Hungarian elementary schools disappeared. In Czechoslovakia, by order of the Minister of Culture, shortly before the end of the school year, in 1921, in Pozsony, instruction in the Hungarian language was to cease and from May 15, the Czech language was to be used for the rest of the year under the title of *remedial course*. Very few Hungarians signed up for the course because they simply did not understand the Czech teachers. Because of the indignation of the people, the government promised to reinstate instruction in Hungarian and German. We need to know that the language of the populace in Pozsony at that time was not Slovak, but German and Hungarian. Count Albert Apponyi writes that the Hungarian professors and the highly educated individuals were forced to accept the lowest possible physical work in order to support their families. The Hungarian churches wanted to employ some of them but this was not allowed. So the Hungarian students and their professors became second class citizens. More than 2000 teachers had to leave the city of Kolozsvár. In Yugoslavia, the Serb language became the language of instruction. Hungarian was allowed in only the first four elementary grades. In 1924, the territory of Rumania was divided into cultural zones. This meant that, in all those counties where Hungarians and Szeklers lived in large numbers, the introduction of Rumanian as the language of instruction was enforced. The Rumanian teachers who accepted a job in this territory received

²⁶⁶ Raffay, Ernő: Op. Cit. p. 20; The Hague agreement, para. 45, XXIII. Appendix 10.

50% more wages than anywhere else and the equivalent of three months wages for moving costs. They received privileges for advancement and ten hectares of land. This was done to create a favorable situation for the Romanians to come and settle among the Hungarians and break up the Hungarian unity. Ernő Raffay quotes Sándor Biró (p. 24) "In 1934, out of six Protestant high schools, only eighty five students took the graduation examination and, out of this number, only thirteen passed the exam. This meant that the professors purposely failed almost every student. In the city of Marosvásárhely, out of 19 students, not one passed. Out of 23 students from the Protestant high school in the city of Kolozsvár, only four passed. In the Zilah Protestant high school every student failed. In 1935, from the Kolozsvár high school, 90% of the students failed. They did not have to close all the Hungarian schools, they found a way to stop the Hungarian advancement.

After learning these facts, can you wonder why the Hungarian people are thinking back to Trianon and all which is connected to it? Pop Ghita, a Rumanian politician, wrote in a newspaper article in 1929: "Under Hungarian rule, in the Rumanian and Saxon middle schools, the Hungarian language was taught as a subject, while the rest of the subjects were taught in the language of the populace, except for the history of Hungarian literature which was taught in Hungarian in the last two years." (p.24-25) Pop Ghita states: "I was also educated in Hungary before Trianon, in a Rumanian high school and I took my graduation examinations in Rumanian except for the Hungarian language and literature. Is it possible that we Rumanians give fewer rights to the minorities now than we had under the Hungarian rule.?" (Raffay, p. 25)

The press had the same fate as education. The Rumanian Constitution in 1923, stated: "There is no censorship. All kinds of articles may be published. There is no measure to prevent anyone from writing whatever they want." (p. 26) Since 1932, censorship has existed nationwide. Therefore we can see that they broke their own Constitutional law. In Rumania, the freedom to gather was revoked. In 1933, the Rumanian army was authorized to dissolve any kind of assembly. In some places, people even had to ask permission to come together for a Christening. On Hungarian holidays, the Hungarian populace was taken to do forced labor. All three Successor States had a similar system to extinguish the language of the minorities. In the 1920's, there were signs on the streets reminding pedestrians to speak

only Rumanian. In 1923, if a Hungarian word was uttered in an official place, the person was punished by a beating with a stick. Raffay writes that, in spite of an agreement for minority laws, the first constitution of Rumania states that the official language in Rumania is Rumanian. In 1936, the Parliament of the Rumanian National Liberal Party, established a new law for public administration. It states that anyone who speaks in a minority language will be fined. In 1938, the Army administration forbade the use of the local Hungarian geographical names in Rumania. The ultra chauvinist acts have no end. Hungarian art and historical artifacts were removed and destroyed, to erase any proof that Hungarians ever lived in this territory. In the city of Zilah, the statue of Wesselényi made by János Fadrusz was destroyed. In Szatmárnémeti, the statues of Saint István and Saint László were toppled from the church. Saint István was the first in the world to officially welcome foreigners into his country and who gave them tax exemptions and land donations so that they could progress. The statues of Petöfi and Kossuth were also destroyed.

Raffay says that now we live in the time of recompense, the Hungarians have to demand recompense for the damage which they have suffered from the Successor States since Trianon. (p. 28) József György Óberding, the expert of research in damages, states that, in 1930, the Hungarian loss as a result of the land reform, was 41,666,837,490 *leu*, which is 40,000,000 English pounds. The later confiscations, between 1937 and 1939, which took place as a result of the agricultural laws, were valued at another 15 milliard *leu*. All the different Hungarian classes together, in Rumania, suffered a loss of 56,000,000 English pounds. This figure equals that sum which the Hungarian nation had to pay in 1945 as war reparations. This applies only to Rumania, and does not include the other annexed territories. This does not include material damage. (p. 29) Therefore the demands of the Hungarian people for new revisions are just. The Hungarian people who came under foreign rule do not want to assimilate and do not want to leave their motherland either.

Chapter 20

The Loss of Ruthenia

Senator Charles Hokky, a former member of the Czechoslovak Senate, stated that he wrote his book, Ruthenia, Spearhead toward the West, because he read statements which are totally contrary to the situation which he had experienced. No democratically thinking person could accept these statements. He says that the name "Czechoslovakia" is in itself misleading because the two nations were not equal. In fact, in Czechoslovakia, the Slovaks suffered just as much as the Germans, Hungarians, Ruthenians, Rumanians and the Polish.

Ruthenia (Kárpátalja) belonged to Hungary for more than a thousand years. The Carpathian Mountains surround the central Danube area like a fortification, providing all-round protection. If we take Ruthenia out of this community, then we open the gate to the imperialistic designs of the East and the West.

Hokky points out that this is why Ruthenia is in a key position, not only for Hungary but also for Central Europe and the whole of Europe, in the same way as Panama is for America. This territory of Ruthenia needs to belong to a federation because she cannot support herself. Ruthenia fits perfectly in the Carpathian Basin.

The territory of Ruthenia is 12,639 square kilometers. According to the 1910 census, the population was 397,062. 56.13% was Ruthenian, 29.22% Hungarian, 1.3% Slovak, 4-5% Rumanian, and the same percentage of Germans and there were only 234 Czechs. These numbers were disregarded at Trianon and the territory was given to Czechoslovakia. (Hokky, p. 2)

According to the observations of Lloyd-George, every census count submitted by the Czechs was falsified. Hokky states that his research proves the same thing: "The Czech census agents came from distant areas: nobody knew them. They marked the data with pencil which they could change as they wanted. They forced several persons to register themselves as other than they were, for example: Hungarian

state officials were first registered as Czechs.” (Hokky, p.2)

Because of the fraudulent census, in 1921, the Czech population of Ruthenia had grown to the inflated count of 9,513. Ruthenia’s only exports worth mentioning were timber and salt. Because all the rivers flowed toward the center of the Carpathian Basin, the transportation of these materials to Hungary was very inexpensive. At Trianon, Hungary lost both of these resources. In spite of this, Tardieu declared that these were “vital needs of Czechoslovakia so they cannot be the subject of any argument.” (Hokky, p.3)

Some Western politicians recognized the importance of this territory. W. Gordon East stated:

“Ruthenia, as the Hungarians call it; Carpatho-Ukraine, as the Russians know it, is geographically and strategically more important than would appear from a glance at an atlas map. . . It offers a natural passage between the Galician plateau and the Hungarian Basin. Through its passes came the Magyars who reclaimed Hungary at the end of the ninth century, the Czar’s armies which overthrew the so-called revolution in Hungary in 1849, and attacked the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1915, and the Red Army in 1945. Historically part of the Hungarian Kingdom, it passed to Czechoslovakia after World War I, and was returned to Hungary by Czechoslovakia. . . but to their ethnographic interest must clearly be added a strategic interest . . . as well as a railway, with which the Ukraine S.S.R. now has a common frontier.”²⁶⁷

After the Second World War, Czechoslovakia gave Ruthenia to the USSR and it is presently part of the Republic of the Ukraine.

Leland Stowe, an American publicist, recognized the importance of Ruthenia when he wrote: “The key to the Kremlin’s momentous communications offensive in Carpathian Ruthenia . . . a Russian bridgehead, assuring the military domination of all Central Europe. . .”²⁶⁸

These observations, and many more which Hokky mentions in his book, represent the Hungarian point of view and bring to the

²⁶⁷ Hokky, Op. Cit. p. 3-4; East, W.Gordon: The New Frontiers of the Soviet Union, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 29, N. 4. p. 599, July 1951

²⁶⁸ Ibid. p. 5; Stowe, Leland: The Conquest by Terror, p.33,

attention of the world the strategic importance of Ruthenia. Hungary lost a territory and a people very loyal to the Hungarians, who had always lived in peace within Hungary, who were not asked with a plebiscite where they would like to belong, and even now would like to return to Hungary. In addition, with the decision to give them to Czechoslovakia, the Pan-Slav nationalist border, formerly Soviet, now Ukrainian, has invaded the heart of Europe. The Trianon Decision disregarded all of this (and the other Peace Treaties in Paris did too) but we can still do something positive to correct the mistakes. To retain the present status quo is not in the interest of Europe.

The Ruthenians came to Hungary in large numbers in the reigns of King Lajos the Great (1340-1380) and King Zsigmond, who became German Emperor and Hungarian King (1388-1438). There were 30,000 - 40,000 of them under the leadership of Prince Theodor Koryatovic. They received the territory around Munkács. In October 1846, at the time of the Galician peasant uprising and continuously following it, Ruthenians came and found refuge here. The Ruthenians lived peacefully with the Hungarians until 1919. First, Counts Bobrinsky and Gerovskiy, who were brothers, agitated the people against the Monarchy on religious grounds, but soon after World War I., Pan-Slavism became a political goal. The population of these Ruthenian settlements was falsified and exaggerated. Masaryk, in 1915, wrote a memorandum, asking for the establishment of Czechoslovakia, in which he did not demand the cities of Pozsony, Léva, Rimaszombat and Kassa but, in a second memorandum, he claimed all these cities plus Ungvár and the entire territory of Ruthenia. Benes revealed his plans in his work, *Où vont les Slaves?* Paris, 1948 (Where are the Slavs going?) "The motive of my activity was the battle against the German and the Hungaro-Turk menace, which was completely in the line of the Slavic traditions." Working in the Pan-Slav interest, he revealed that he planned to annex Ruthenia to Czechoslovakia, in order to give it to Russia later. Hungary, along with Germany and Turkey, was in the way of the Pan-Slav expansion. (Hokky, p. 12)

Lajos Kossuth had described this world danger (Pan-Slavism) already in 1849. There is more information about this in the study of Endre Sebestyén. (Sebestyén, Endre: Kossuth, p.199-201)

The data of the 1910 census were altered. Benes talked of only 300,000 Hungarians living in Ruthenia. There were actually 464,270

Hungarians living there. The numbers of Germans in the Sudetenland were also altered. There were 3.5 million Germans living there, but he announced only one million. Benes' request was modest at the beginning but he demanded more and more as he noticed the ignorance of the foreign politicians about the history of this territory.

On December 6, 1918, the Czechs claimed an area of pre-war Hungary inhabited by 202,511 Hungarians, 11.2% of Slovakia, and also Ruthenia. Two weeks later they demanded 841,198 Hungarians and a month later, on January 3, 1919, they claimed 899,953 Hungarians. They were finally granted at the Treaty of Trianon, 1,066,577 Hungarians, a total of 32.2% of the total population of the northern part of pre-war Hungary. Benes recommended also that the territory between Sátorajáújhely and Körösmező be annexed to the Czechs.²⁶⁹ Benes emphasized that the goal of Czechoslovakia was to establish a hold over the strategic territory of Ruthenia.

On November 8, 1918, there was a national movement in Ruthenia which demanded self-determination for Ruthenia and secession from Hungary.²⁷⁰ In December, 1918, the Hungarians guaranteed autonomy to Ruthenia. **“The Soym (parliament of Ruthenia) assembled in Munkács and declared union with Hungary.”** (Hokky, p. 14) On January 3, 1919, the Czech troops under the leadership of General Paris, occupied Ungvár. “The Rumanians advanced to Munkács. Thereupon a strong Ukrainian detachment arrived from East Galicia on January 17, 1919 to protect their brothers from the Czechs and Rumanians. Four days later, the Ukrainians moved out but in Huszt, they established a Third Council which declared the union with Ukraine.” (Hokky p. 14) In March, President Wilson delegated an American officer, Godwyn, to Ruthenia to find out where the Ruthenians wanted to belong. He stayed there for two days and he reported to Wilson that the Ruthenians wanted to remain with Hungary, since their autonomy had already been guaranteed.²⁷¹ On May 8, a Central Council met in Uzhorod and accepted the Czech proposals. On May 9, a second

²⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 13.; Sir R. Donald: The Tragedy of Trianon, p. 294-295

²⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 14; Macartney, C.A.: Hungary and her Successors, p. 213

²⁷¹ Hokky, Op. Cit. p. 14-15; Scrimali, Anton: L'Enquete etc. Au Lieu du 8 - 10 Mars, 1919: also C.A. Macartney, Op. Cit. p.218

Council met in Uzhorod and declared its loyalty to Hungary.²⁷² On May 18, Benes submitted the plan for autonomy which clearly followed the Hungarian article of Law dated Dec. 21, 1918.²⁷³ **On September 19, 1919, the autonomy of Ruthenia was included in the Peace Treaty of Saint Germain but the Czechs did not accept it and Ruthenia was subsequently given to Czechoslovakia.**

The Hungarians, who had been in control in the Carpathian Basin for over a thousand years, were prevented by the Armistice from regaining control in the area. Hungary had been weakened by the war, then the revolutionary government and lastly the Communist Dictatorship under Béla Kun, who was sent from Russia to Hungary, and who was working in the interest of Pan-Slavism.

The Hungarians based their claim to Ruthenia on two major historic facts. One was that, on May 9, 1919, at the second Central Council, Ruthenia freely announced that she wished to remain with Hungary. Secondly, the Ruthenians had always been loyal to Hungary. In the time of the Freedom Fight led by Ferenc Rákoczi II., 1703-1711, for eight years, they were the most loyal supporters of the Freedom Fight because they had requested Rákoczi to begin this insurrection against the Hapsburgs in the interest of the Ruthenian and the Hungarian people. The Ruthenian people received the title of “gens fidelissima” (the most faithful people).

Benes was astonished when all his exaggerated demands were fulfilled. “I am alarmed when I see that they give me everything that I ask for. It is too much.”²⁷⁴ The Czechs received Ruthenia in September, 1919, but in 1920, Masaryk promised it to the Soviets.²⁷⁵ This shows how little the Czechs thought about the wishes of the people, while talking of true democracy and humanism.

When the Soviets annexed Ruthenia, they deported the Ruthenian populace aged 18 to 50 years old. As time passed they allowed the oldest 5 age groups to return. The rest were absorbed into the millions of Soviets. The Soviets did not even designate Ruthenia as

²⁷² Hokky, p.15; Macartney, p. 218

²⁷³ Ibid. p. 15; Hunter Miller: Diary in Microfilm Duplication

²⁷⁴ Ibid. p. 17; Martin, William: Les hommes d'État pendant la Guerre, p. 316

²⁷⁵ Ibid. p. 17; Narodny, Listy: National Lists, the newspaper of Kramar, Issue July, 11, 1924

a separate province. They simply regarded it as a district under the name Zakarpatska Oblast. Ruthenia ceased to exist. (Hokky: p. 21-22)

American historians noted after World War II., concerning the annexation of Ruthenia to the Soviet Union: “The restored Czechoslovakia has regained these lands, i.e. the so-called Sudetenland, but has relinquished to Soviet Russia the region known as Sub-Carpathian Russia. Linguistically, this belongs to Ukrainian stock. Religiously, it was Eastern Orthodox with allegiance to Rome, i.e. Uniate. The cession of this region to Soviet Russia has the tremendously important consequence of bringing the political and military power of the Soviets into a part of Europe where it has never been before. For the Hungarians, it means the realization, politically and militarily, of a fear they have had since the days of Tsarist intervention in the Hungarian revolt (under Kossuth in 1849) namely inundation in a Slavic sea.”²⁷⁶ With this annexation, Ruthenia became the center of Soviet imperialism in Eastern Europe.

On August 26, 1950, the Figaro wrote: “Once Austro-Hungary was able to defend Europe. In our days – how paradoxical – American soldiers have to be dispatched to the banks of the small Enns river in order to break the waves of the Pan-Slav expansionism.” (Hokky, p. 23) Look at the situation today in Bosnia and in Kosovo. Will it be necessary to maintain peacekeepers in this area forever?

Along with Ruthenia, the Soviets annexed thirteen pure Hungarian villages which belonged to the Czechs. According to the 1930 census, there were only 145 Ruthenian residents among the population of 28,000 in these villages. The only reason that these villages were annexed along with Ruthenia, was to obtain the railroad and the railway station at Csap. (Hokky, p. 23; based on information submitted by Dr. Károly Bartha) The Soviets took these 13 communities without first consulting an international committee and without offering the people a plebiscite. This annexation was not included in the decision of the Peace Conference.

In Ruthenia, according to Law No. 17 of 1926, the Czech language had become the official language even though a few years before this, there were no Czechs living there and in the 1910 Census, only 234 Czechs were counted. On what basis did the Great Powers give

²⁷⁶ Hokky, Op. Cit. p. 22; Cave, Floyd A.: The Origins and Consequences, p. 622

this land to Czechoslovakia? There was no plebiscite. The Czechoslovaks entirely disregarded the provisions of the Peace Treaty and they denied basic human rights to all the minorities living there. Compare this situation with that of the minorities in Hungary in 1886 when the Hungarian Article of Law XXII., secured minority rights. At that time, it was the most liberal law of its kind in the world. According to Senator Hokky, this Law stated that: "Anyone who lived in the same place for a period of four years, if he paid only one penny of tax on one single occasion and if there were no moral objection against his person, could not be denied domicile: and, on this basis, citizenship. On the contrary: if he lived in the same community for a period of two years, and he fulfilled the above-mentioned two requirements and applied for admission as a member of the community, the domicile and citizenship could not be denied." He continued: "Act No. 136 of 1886 exempted from taxes everyone in public service: officials, soldiers, teachers, further parish clerks, clericals and everyone in the service of the community." Hokky says that it is worth mentioning the tolerance of the Hungarian nation for the minorities, which is obvious in the fact that "Hungary was the only country of the world which had the value of the currency printed in seven languages on the banknotes." (Hokky, p.35-36) What other state went this far to accommodate the minorities?

Under Hungarian rule, a certificate or proof of residence was needed only when a person lived alone and became a burden on the community; for example, if he had to be taken to the hospital, where his nationality had to be determined so that the hospital costs could be paid by that group. In Czechoslovakia, on the contrary, it was very difficult to obtain citizenship. In Slovakia and Ruthenia, more than 90,000 people, particularly Hungarians, lost their citizenship and with this they lost all the possibilities for getting ahead in life. They were not allowed to take any kind of examination without showing proof of citizenship. Therefore they could not qualify for any jobs. Those who did not obtain their citizenship became prey to the ultra-chauvinists. There were several forms of discrimination. For example, on July 2, 1933, when the River Tisza was flooding, the Hungarian populace of the village of Tiszaújlak did not get any help from the government to rebuild their houses because they were not citizens, in spite of the fact that they had lived there for the longest time. Only those who were Czech citizens received help. **When the Czechs conducted their agrarian reform,**

they took away the citizenship of many people. If he wanted to regain his citizenship, a person had to give up his land and his property to the state. At this point he was a citizen without any possessions and he had to perform manual labor to live as a Czech citizen. In this way many Hungarians were assimilated into the Slovak and Czech peoples. In his book (pages 35-42), Senator Hokky mentions many different cases of Hungarians whose wealth was confiscated. In some cases, they even had to give up their identity in order to eat.

Most of those Hungarians who lost their citizenship, their property and their retirement and became manual laborers were teachers, doctors and lawyers. They had lived in this territory for 30 - 40 years, paid their taxes, were politically inactive, and never got into trouble with the law, so we do not know what was the reason for this kind of treatment. The only possibility is that the Czechs planned to reduce the numbers of Hungarians living in this territory. **A young Hungarian man without citizenship had to go into military service, and even when he had completed his tour of duty, he still could not receive citizenship. This is why Senator Hokky says: “Duty without rights is slavery”.**(Hokky, p. 41) In Ruthenia, the percentage of Czechs is only 0.18% and for a thousand years there were no Czechs in this territory. In 1907, the Supreme Court of the Civil Service in Hungary renewed the Hungarian Law of 1886, which exempted the civil service employees from paying local and state taxes. The Czech government ignored these laws and instead continued its policy of denaturalizing teachers and civil servants.²⁷⁷

Masaryk said: “Our Republic must ensure full liberty of conscience to every citizen so that discussion may be free and every conviction be expressed.”²⁷⁸ In spite of this statement, the Czechoslovak police confiscated the newspapers of the minorities from the newspaper stands and threatened the vendors because they were selling minority newspapers. Those who placed advertisements in the newspapers were also threatened. Senator Hokky writes that he intended to write an article to explain that there is no Czechoslovak people because the Czechs and the Slovaks are two different peoples with two different languages. There is more than a dialectical difference between them.

²⁷⁷ Ibid. p 42; Donald, Sir R: The Tragedy of Trianon, p. 55

²⁷⁸ Ibid. p. 44; Masaryk, T. G.: The Making of a State, p. 492

When the chief of police of Ungvár learned of his plan, even though many supported his view, he threatened Hokky that if he wrote about this subject, he would permanently prohibit the issue of his paper. (p.45)

Masaryk and Benes always advocated liberty of the press but, at the same time there was a Press Department in the Ministry of Justice whose duty was the censorship of newspapers and periodicals. This oppressive situation has existed since the Peace Conference. This is why Robert Lansing, at that time, noted: "It may be years before these oppressed people are able to throw off the yoke, but as sure as day follows night, the time will come when they will make the effort."²⁷⁹

Hokky writes that as early as 1620, the Mayflower Compact provided the freedom of religion, speech and the press for the new immigrants to America. The Czechs, three centuries later, acknowledged on paper the basic human rights, with the purpose of misleading the world public opinion. They have never provided the basic human rights. The Czech oppression affected every branch of society, even the elections. In the elections, Hokky and other Hungarians experienced injustice and deceit. Twice as many votes were needed to elect a Hungarian representative to the Parliament as were needed to elect a Czech representative yet, in spite of this, in the 1935 elections, there were fewer Czechs from Ruthenia elected to the parliament than Hungarian. In addition, there were 90,000 people without citizenship who were not allowed to vote. Hokky says that if we count their wives and one adult child, there would have been many more people. If this number of people had been taken into account at Trianon, this area would not have been given to Czechoslovakia. (Hokky, p. 54)

Already in 1919, the Czechs had dismissed the Ruthenian administration and replaced them with administrators from Prague. Professor C.A. Macartney, wrote that "this new set of Czech officials turned Ruthenia into an occupied colony." He wrote that the Czechs were not only the ruling class but foreigners in this territory. "In many respects, the position of the Czechs in 'liberated' Ruthenia reminded Macartney of that of the British in India."²⁸⁰ (Hokky, p. 61)

Mr. Michael Yuhas Sr., President of the Ruthenian Council of Defense in the USA during the war, states that the Czechs occupied the

²⁷⁹ Ibid. p. 46; Lansing, Robert: The Peace Negotiations, p. 275

²⁸⁰ Hokky, Op. Cit. p. 61; Macartney, C.A.: Hungary and her Successors, p. 266

offices, owned the factories, and they owned the banks. Their chauvinism was most intolerant. The Ruthenians were demoted to the lowest positions. Hungarians were not represented in the administration at all.²⁸¹ The Czechs ruled the people on this territory ruthlessly. Members of the minorities, especially Hungarians, were beaten to death, and women and children were tortured to exact from them “confessions” of crimes that they never committed. The Czechs needed this kind of “documentation” to reduce the numbers of the Hungarian population. (Hokky, p.62)

Further examples of the Czech ruthlessness can be found in : Wilson’s Principles in Czechoslovak Practice by M. Yuhas and The Tragedy of Trianon by Sir Robert Donald.

In 1933, 15 years after the Czechs took possession of Ruthenia, the population count was as follows: Ruthenians, 450,925; Hungarians, 115,805; Jews, 95,008; Czechs, 20,719; Slovaks, 13,792; Germans, 13,804; Rumanians, 12,777; Gypsies, 1,442; Polish, 610; others, 193. In spite of the fact that the Czechs were only 2.9% of the population, the Czech language was declared to be the official language.²⁸²

While Ruthenia was a part of Hungary, it had a unique dairy system, maintained by the Hungarian government. There was cooperation with the Hungarian farmers and the livelihood of the inhabitants of Ruthenia was ensured by the Hungarian government. When there were plans to give Ruthenia to Czechoslovakia in 1919, leaders of the Ruthenian party sent a memorandum to the Peace Conference in Paris, stating that Ruthenia could survive only by remaining with Hungary. Ten years later the truth of this statement was apparent because although there was no evidence of drought, Ruthenia, occupied by the Czechs, suffered a raging famine. Delegates, sent to study the famine, reported that they had never seen such conditions before, not even in India or China. At the mass meetings organized by the Czech government to counteract a movement seeking revision of the borders, one of the peasants declared: “Brethren, I think it is better for us to go where the River Tisza goes (meaning Hungary) because at least there was bread for us.” This indicated the desire of the Ruthenians to

²⁸¹ Ibid. p.61; Yuhas, Michael, Sr.: Wilson’s Principles in Czechoslovak Practice, p. 20-21

²⁸² Ibid. p. 64; Zpravy St. Uz Statistichehe

return to Hungary.²⁸³

The Czechs did not even try to help the Ruthenians out of the economic catastrophe caused by the new borders, but ruthlessly further exploited the territory which they regarded as a new “colony”. Hokky writes on p. 68: “When the old Austro-Hungarian currency was converted into the newly created Czech currency, the key of conversion in Bohemia was two to one, while in Slovakia, four to one and in Ruthenia, ten to one. This shows clearly that the Czech government used different measures for the Czechs and the non-Czechs, discriminating not only politically but economically against the other nationality groups and especially against the Ruthenians. Mr. Yuhas states in his book, Wilson’s Principles p.50: ‘The Czech State made in Ruthenia a profit of 315 millions by the withdrawal of the old Austro-Hungarian banknote. As a result of this, sixty agricultural cooperative societies went bankrupt in Ruthenia.’”

The Czech land reform in Ruthenia was widely advertised in Europe as a benefit to the people but instead of benefitting the Ruthenian peasants, the Czechs exploited them. The land was taken away from the Ruthenian landowners, who received no compensation, and, instead of being redistributed among the Ruthenian peasants, was given to Czech families brought from Bohemia, subsidized by the government. Because of these economical and political pressures, more than 168,000 people emigrated from the country, between 1922 and 1926.

Professor Macartney, writing about Ruthenia, stated: “It seems in view of economic connections, that the course most advantageous to the Ruthenians as well as to the Magyars, would be to return the entire district to Hungary.”²⁸⁴

For more than a thousand years, Ruthenia was the bastion of the Carpathian Basin. It was a long-time goal of the Russian Czars to obtain this natural fortress in the Carpathians. Many Russian army divisions were wiped out here in World War I. This is the territory which Benes gave to Stalin after World War II. With this act he took away from Hungary the role of bastion of the West. (Hokky, p.70)

“Mr. Stokes, correspondent of the St. Louis Post Dispatch had seen in Washington the secret agreement of Stalin and Benes, and

²⁸³ Ibid. p. 66-67; Yuhas, p. 24

²⁸⁴ Hokky, Op. Cit. p. 70; Macartney, C.A.: Hungary and her Successors, p. 247

explained the same in detail. According to him, in this agreement, Ruthenia was referred to as ‘spearhead toward the West’”. (Hokky, p. 22)

Chapter 21

The Loss of Felvidék to Slovakia

Numerous studies were published, especially abroad, about what took place at the negotiations for the Peace Treaty of Trianon. These studies hardly mention how the Czech propaganda influenced the decision of the Entente. They do not mention either the effect that the Hungarian Bolshevik revolution of 1918 had on the Treaty of Trianon or the intrigues of the leaders of the minorities in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The leaders of the Socialist Peoples Democracies and the leaders of the Czech and Slovak emigrants after World War II. do not mention these intrigues against the Monarchy either. Moreover, they become very indignant if these intrigues are mentioned. These Czech politicians and emigrants, in their writings, called the army deserters and those who broke their vow to defend the country “patriots” and the actions of the rebels, who stabbed the Hungarian soldiers in the back, they call “heroic deeds”. They call the intrigues of the Czech politicians “successful diplomacy”. The deeds mentioned here were committed by government officials, university professors and military personnel, who pledged their allegiance to the Emperor and swore that they would defend their country. These people prepared and signed the different secret treaties.

One of these treaties is dated August 18, 1915 – “Entente – Aide-Memoire”. According to this secret treaty, Serbia would receive Bosnia, Hercegovina, Dalmatia, Slavonia, Croatia and Fiume. In the Bucharest Treaty of August 17, 1916, the Entente planned to give to Rumania Transylvania, Bukovina and the Bánát and the present Hungarian territory up to the city of Debrecen. The government of the future Czechoslovakia would be acknowledged and would receive the territory of Felvidék (northern Hungary) and Kárpátalja (Ruthenia).²⁸⁵

Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife, who were visiting the

²⁸⁵ Kostya, Sándor: *A Felvidék*, p. 99-100

city of Sarajevo, were assassinated by the Serbs on June 28, 1914. Leopold Berchtold, the Foreign Minister of the Monarchy, announced to the Hungarian Prime Minister, Count István Tisza, that Austria regarded this action as an invitation by Serbia to involve the Monarchy in a war.

On July 1, 1914, Tisza wrote a memorandum to the Emperor, which was published in the Red Book of the Austrian revolutionary government. István Tisza wrote: "Count Berchtold, with whom I discussed the matter, was well aware that I thought his plan to go into war was a mistake and that I did not want to have anything to do with it. Till now we do not have enough evidence that Serbia is to be blamed for the Sarajevo assassination. If Belgrade provides a satisfactory explanation, then we cannot make Serbia responsible. We certainly cannot make war against her. If we did that, the whole world would regard us as warmongers and we would go into war under the most unfavorable circumstances."²⁸⁶

On July 2, Tisza re-emphasized his position to the German ambassador. On July 7, at the Assembly of the Royal Council, Count Berchtold announced that Emperor Wilhelm II., supported his proposal to go to war. Berchtold sent a letter to the Emperor and in answer to this letter, the Emperor consented to the mobilization of the army. Tisza knew nothing of this letter of Berchtold to the Emperor and vehemently attacked the Austrian proposals. He stated: "I am never going to agree that we should attack Serbia before we have diplomatic negotiations with her, not even if this has already been decided in Berlin."²⁸⁷

On July 7, Berchtold explained why it was necessary for the Monarchy to declare war on Serbia. István Tisza proposed that the Monarchy send a concrete proposal to Serbia and if Serbia rejected it, then send them an ultimatum. Count István Tisza, taking the public opinion into account, submitted a letter to the Emperor, opposing the war.

"July 8, 1914

Your Excellency!

Because of the good news from Berlin, together with the

²⁸⁶ Pozzi, Henri: A háború visszatér, p.199

²⁸⁷ Ibid. p. 199-200

events in Serbia and the rightful indignation they caused, the ministers who were at the conference of public ministers, which took place yesterday, proposed that we declare war on Serbia, so that we would finally deal with this ancient enemy of the Monarchy.

I was not in a position to agree completely with this plan. If we think carefully about it, we shall see that an attack on Serbia would cause the involvement of Russia, which would cause a world war and, in spite of the optimism which I observed in Berlin, I am very doubtful that Rumania will remain neutral. The public opinion in Rumania would vehemently demand that they declare war against the Monarchy and the present Rumanian government of King Carol would find it difficult to oppose it. In this war, therefore, we could expect that the Russian and Rumanian armies would fight on the side of the enemy which would make the outcome of the war unfavorable to us.

I am very reluctant to give my consent to start a war under such circumstances. Right now, in Berlin, we have just reached the long-desired goal that there should be no obstacle to our Balkan politics. We have just obtained the possibility of influencing the Balkan development in our interest and by so doing we can create a more favorable situation for the Monarchy. This gives us hope that if, later on, the decisive battles of the war are forced upon us, then in that case we will be better prepared to face the challenge .

“ . . . Tomorrow, it will be my duty to convince the Hungarian Cabinet to take a stand. Until then, I announce to you, in my own name that, in spite of my service to Your Excellency, or rather, because of it, I am unable to share the responsibility of becoming involved in a war of aggression.

Count István Tisza”²⁸⁸

On July 9, the Hungarian government supported the stand of István Tisza and gave him the authority to do all he could in Vienna to

²⁸⁸ Raffay, Ernő: *A magyar tragédia, Trianon 75 éve*, p. 220

prevent the war. A huge propaganda campaign began against Tisza, especially in France because, on July 14, in Vienna, at the Second Assembly of the Royal Council, he accepted the proposal of Count Berchtold to give a strict ultimatum to the Serbs which they would not be able to accept.

According to the information in the Red Book, in the ultimatum which the Monarchy sent to Serbia, on July 19, Tisza added the stipulation that, in case of Austria's victory in the war, Hungary would not take territory from Serbia. This is the proof that Benes tricked his allies and supporters, when he blamed Tisza for the outbreak of war. Soon after came the Serb rejection.

The propaganda campaign of Masaryk and Benes stated that István Tisza and Hungary were responsible for the outbreak of World War I. Unfortunately, Count István Tisza, because of his loyalty to the Royal House, did not publicize the letter that he had written to the Emperor. Tisza was murdered during the Bolshevik revolution accused of being a warmonger. After his death, it became clear why he supported Berchtold on July 14.

Now we know that at that time the Russian mobilization had taken place. The Russian troops had surrounded the borders of the Monarchy. Czar Nicholas II., in a circular telegram, informed the governments: "Russia rejects in advance every intervention which comes to the knowledge of St. Petersburg, which attempts to prevent the war." Hungary as a partner in the Dual-Monarchy, was drawn into the war.²⁸⁹

In March, 1915, in Paris, Masaryk established a review: *La Nation Tcheque* which, already in its first issue, published a map of the Czechoslovak territory which he proposed to establish, which did not include the territory of Csallóköz. Later, he gave the editorial rights of this review to Edward Benes. Masaryk went to London, where he wrote a memorandum with the title: *Independent Bohemia*, which dealt with the necessity of creating a federal Czech state. He became acquainted with Sir George Russell Clark, the head of the British Department of Foreign Affairs, whom he informed about his goal. At the request of Masaryk, Clark made arrangements for him to give this proposal, for the establishment of a Czech state, to Sir Edward Gray, the English Foreign

²⁸⁹ Pozzi, Op. Cit. p. 200

Minister.

The well-organized Czech propaganda groups obtained influence over the English and French governments and their newspapers. In spite of the success of the propagandists abroad, Masaryk was not completely successful in convincing the Slovaks of Felvidék that a Czechoslovak Republic should be established. This was because the Slovaks depended on the Hungarians for their year's supply of flour for bread, which came from the Hungarian Plain. At the end of the wheat harvest, lines of Slovak carts waited for the wheat to arrive at the railway stations in the Felvidék cities of Igló, Rózsahegy, Zsolna, Liptószentmiklós, Árvavára and Alsókubin. Hundreds of travelling Slovak craftsmen received wheat in exchange for their work, in the Hungarian villages through which they travelled. In a similar way, many hundreds of Slovak lumberjacks and rafters on the Vág River received their supplies of food from the Hungarians. Therefore the Slovak people were not enthusiastic about the creation of Czechoslovakia. The Slovak intelligentsia did not support Masaryk. They did not wish to make an alliance with the Czechs. At that time, if the Hungarians had given the minorities total cultural and administrative autonomy, they could have prevented the division of Hungary.

On November 21, 1916, Emperor Franz Joseph, who was also King of Hungary, died. His nephew, Charles Hapsburg of Lotharingia inherited the throne. He was Emperor Charles I. of Austria and King Charles IV. of Hungary. He was crowned in Hungary on December 30, 1916. His first goal was to create peace. Prince Sixtus of Parma negotiated a peace for Austria and Hungary. At the same time, the Emperor advocated that he was trying to expedite the peace among the minorities. Therefore, he pardoned Karel Kramar, who had been sentenced to death.²⁹⁰

Raymond Poincaré, the French President, on March 8, 1917, promised that he would forward the peace proposals of Prince Sixtus to the English and Russian Royal Houses. The efforts of Sixtus were to no avail because the Italian government objected.

In May, 1917, Count István Tisza resigned and several short-lived governments followed. Móric Esterházy and later, Sándor Wekerle formed governments. On October 16, 1918, the Emperor declared the

²⁹⁰ Kostya, Sándor: *A Felvidék*, p. 103-104

federalization of the Monarchy, with autonomy for all the minorities. On October 17, he accepted Prime Minister Sándor Wekerle's proposal of a personal union between Hungary and Austria but this could not take place because of the political developments within Hungary. The power fell into the hands of the Hungarian National Council. The leader of this Council was Mihály Károlyi and he was supported by the leftist radical group. The King made a mistake when he appointed Mihály Károlyi as Prime Minister. Károlyi and his leftist group influenced the political developments in Hungary because they did not oppose the Communist revolution but actually supported the Commune. Soon after Mihály Károlyi was sworn in as Prime Minister, he asked the King to release him from his vow to serve the country and the King did so. This gave him the freedom to establish a new radical Communist order. The King also released the army from their vow to serve him. The army came under the leadership of the radical Communists. With these actions, Hungary was on the way to Bolshevik destruction and in a few months the centuries-old Constitution was abandoned. The Soviet Communist ideology took its place – which was to destroy anything connected with religion, tradition and honor.

On October 9, 1918, the Czech representatives walked out of the Viennese Reichsrat. On October 14, Benes informed the Allies that the temporary government of Czechoslovakia was officially formed. On October 15, the French government accepted the temporary Czechoslovak government. On October 18, President Wilson rejected the peace proposal of the Monarchy which was the plan to create a federation of the Czech, Slovak and Yugoslav states. Instead of this proposal he accepted the government of Czechoslovakia. On October 28, the Czech National Council and the leaders of the four Czech parties, declared the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic. On October 30, at the meeting of the Slovak Nationality Council at Túrócszentmárton, 90 Protestant and 15 Roman Catholic Slovak delegates declared Felvidék (Slovensko) to be annexed from Hungary. This Declaration of Independence of Slovakia, was accepted in 1920 as “the will of the people”, as a basis for giving Felvidék to Czechoslovakia. How could this be recognized as the will of the people when only Slovak delegates were given the vote and Hungarians were excluded?

On November 6, the Czech legions crossed the Moravian-

Hungarian border at Hodonin. On November 8, the representative of the Allied Forces, ordered Mihály Károlyi to Belgrade to negotiate an armistice.

The opinion of the governments of the Allied Powers, about the Communist policy of destroying everything connected to religion and tradition, is reflected in the statement of French General Franchet d'Espéry to Mihály Károlyi: “Vous êtes déjà tombés si bas?” “You have already fallen so low?” (Kostya, p. 105)

According to the terms of the Belgrade armistice, the Serbs would occupy the Bánát, Bácska, Muraköz, Vas, Zala, the southern part of Somogy county, the greater part of Baranya county, including the cities of Pécs and Baja. At this conference, the annexation of Felvidék was not mentioned. The border of Historic Hungary remained as the northern and north-eastern border demarcation line. The Czech army was the first from the Successor States to occupy the Hungarian territory of Felvidék. (Kostya, p. 105-106) The government of Count Mihály Károlyi turned a blind eye to all this movement. Moreover, Károlyi forbade the Hungarian regiments to try to take back the territory.

The English historian, Owen Rutter, wrote that Hungary would never have come under Communist rule if the Allied Powers had held back the Successor States from occupying the territories before they were officially assigned to them.²⁹¹ This immeasurable aggression was possible only because the Czech politicians and the Czech emigrants in Paris obtained the permission of the Great Powers to do whatever they wanted to, to occupy the Hungarian territories in Felvidék where the Slovaks were living, which were the subject of the Peace Treaty. However the terms of the Treaty had not yet been finalized and this plan was not yet publicised. The politicians of the Entente Powers were ignorant and easily influenced and were full of anti-Hungarian feelings. On October 14, 1918 the temporary Czechoslovak National Council declared the Hapsburgs to be dethroned and declared that Czechoslovakia was officially a Republic. Thomas Masaryk was appointed to be the first President, Karel Kramar, Prime Minister, Edward Benes, Foreign Minister, Alois Rasin, Minister of the Treasury and Milan Stefanik, Defense Minister. On October 18, President Wilson acknowledged the government of Czechoslovakia. The Czech

²⁹¹ Ibid. p. 106; Rutter, Owen: *The Regent of Hungary*, London, 1939

Government sent a note to Mihály Károlyi, stating that the movement of the Czech army into Felvidék (Slovakia) was internationally sanctioned and historically justified. At the same time, the Czech legions occupied Trencsén and Nagyszombat. On November 16, 1918, the Hungarian National Council declared the Hungarian People's Republic (the Commune).²⁹²

The well-intentioned Hungarian politicians were hoping that the West would help Hungary fight against the presence of the Russian Communists in Hungary but no help was forthcoming. Those who "dictated the Peace" became even more anti-Hungarian because they thought that Hungary had allowed the Communists to take over their country. At the same time, Czechoslovakia advocated the western style of democracy which was more acceptable in the eyes of the western states. The "Bolshevist Brigade", which came from Russia to Hungary, led by Tibor Samuéli and Béla Kun, who were Hungarian Jews brought back from Russia, tortured and killed Hungarians only for being educated and for being members of the intellectual élite or because they were wealthy farmers who declared themselves to be Hungarians.

With the statement of Béla Linder, Hungary's Defense Minister, in October, 1918: "Never again do I want to see another soldier", as he announced the disarmament of the Hungarian army, the Hungarian soldiers became demoralized and they lost their fighting spirit, while the surrounding nations were still fully armed and ready to attack them.²⁹³ Few historians have explained the reason for the disarmament which left the country defenseless, when it was known that the surrounding nations were still building their armies. Attila Orbók, a journalist, wrote in 1919, that the pacifist Hungarians, with this action, were hoping that the Successor States would also begin disarmament.²⁹⁴ On the contrary, the Rumanians and Czechs began their occupation of Hungarian territories.

The naiveté of the Hungarians was recognized by the advisors of the Allied Powers. General Bandholtz, who represented the United States in the Allied Forces, was the one who stopped the Rumanians from robbing the palace of the Hungarian King and the National Museum. In his memoirs, as an eye-witness, he writes about the events

²⁹² Ibid. p. 106-107; Horthy, Miklos Emlékirataim, Toronto, 1974, p. 108-109

²⁹³ Várdy, Steven Béla: History of the Hungarian Nation, 1969, p.208

²⁹⁴ Orbók, Attila: Ki árulta el a hazát?, Budapest, 1919

which took place in Hungary.²⁹⁵ General Bandholtz writes that, in 1918, the Allied Powers, in a note, acknowledged the new Czechoslovak state and authorized the Czechoslovak army to occupy Felvidék (now Slovakia) as a peacekeeping force until the Great Powers made a Peace Treaty. The Czech army misused this administrative duty and committed open robbery of manufacturers, individuals and all the state museums. The Czechs never thought that they would receive Kassa, Pozsony, Komárom and the territory of Csallóköz. Therefore they took whatever was movable in these territories. On January 9, 1919, Bregcha, the Czech administrator of Ruthenia, and the French General Hennoque signed an agreement to allow the military occupation of Ruthenia by the Czechs. (Hungary had given autonomy to Ruthenia on December 1, 1918) According to the four points of this agreement, *Podkarpatska Rus Statutu*, the Ruthenian *Sojz*, National Assembly, should be called 90 days after the Czech election and they would decide where they would like to belong. Unfortunately, this National Assembly never took place. On March 21, 1919, the Hungarian Council of Workers announced the Proletarian Dictatorship and Hungary became the Hungarian Republic (Communist). Károlyi lost the little power he had originally possessed. He stated that he had based his foreign policy on the Wilsonian Fourteen Points but it was too late. The Entente Powers did not believe him. Károlyi was attacked abroad and inside his own government because the clique of the Proletarian Dictatorship did not want the Wilsonian program. They were leaning toward Leninism. Károlyi stubbornly clung to the Fourteen Points because he hoped that, at the Peace Conference, the delegates would appreciate his views. We know from the report of the observers of the Allied Forces that the Hungarian internal politics were directed by the above-mentioned agitators who had returned from Russia, who at the same time, stood in opposition to the Entente powers. (Kostya, p. 108-109)

In May, 1919, the Czechs occupied Miskolc. The Hungarian Republic proposed a peace treaty with the Czechs and with the Rumanians. They acknowledged that Rumania could move its borders to the Tisza River. However, both countries rejected these proposals because they were expecting to be in a more advantageous position at

²⁹⁵ Kostya, Sándor: Op. Cit. p. 107; General Bandholz: *An Undiplomatic Diary*, New York, 1933

the Treaty of Trianon. The Hungarian Republic organized the Hungarian Red Army which made a successful counter-offensive against the Czechs and on June 10, the Hungarian Red Army reached the borderline of Historic Hungary but did not attempt to follow the enemy beyond the border. On July 8, 1919, on the ultimatum of Clemenceau, the Hungarian Red Army gave up Felvidék and retreated.

It is often not the knowledge of history but the individual feelings which influence the decision of a man. Georges Clemenceau, the President of France, was influenced by his anti-Hungarian feelings engendered by the propaganda, rather than by his knowledge of Hungarian history. We do not know for what reason but, on April 2, 1918, Czernin, the Foreign Minister of the Monarchy, in one of his speeches stated that Clemenceau's efforts to make peace would be in vain because France did not want to give up Alsace-Lorraine. Clemenceau became angry because supposedly this statement was untrue. He called Czernin a liar. From this point on, Clemenceau vehemently turned against the Monarchy.

On May 5, 1917, when America entered the War, every hope of the Central Powers winning the war was lost. During the latter part of the War the public opinion in the Central Powers was divided on whether to continue the War or not because Russia had collapsed and the Slav danger no longer existed. At the same time the majority of people in Central Europe wanted to continue the War because they knew that the Entente Powers intended to dissolve the Monarchy. These agreements signed secretly by the Rumanians, Serbs and Czechs were publicised worldwide by the Czech propagandists. At the negotiations at the Quai d'Orsay, Benes and Clemenceau agreed to involve the Czech legions in the War. With this action they gave the right to the Czech government to take part in the War on the side of the Entente and to take part in the negotiations as an equal partner. From this time on, France became the biggest supporter of the Czech claims. Benes constantly fed Clemenceau's German, Austrian and Hungarian hatred. He told Clemenceau that the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was the vanguard of the German Imperialism; that the Hungarians were the means for the Germans to push toward the East; that the Hungarians were the spiritual relatives of the Germans; that the Hungarians were worse than the Germans because the Germans learned their brutality from the Hungarians. (Kostya, p.111) Clemenceau believed everything that

Benes told him. The Western nations, who did not know Hungarian history, caused Hungary to suffer more than any of the defeated nations at the Peace Conference.

According to the 1910 Hungarian census, 1,034,343 Hungarians lived in Felvidék, 30% of the total population of Felvidék. The number of Slovaks in Felvidék was 1,686,713, that is 58%. The remaining 12% were Ruthenian, German, Polish and others. 42% of the population were minorities. At the Conference, Benes altered the statistics and announced that there were 65% Slovaks, 23.5% Hungarians and 12% others. The 1910 Census was available for the Conference but it was disregarded and Benes' numbers were adopted. In a speech lasting three hours, Benes was allowed to talk about the Czech claims. He stated: "We do not have to talk in detail about the matter of Slovakia (Felvidék), because it is a known fact that it will be a part of Czechoslovakia." At the same time, Count Apponyi, the leader of the Hungarian delegation, was detained for three days in a room at the Chateau Madrid. He was allowed to speak only at the end of the negotiations. What kind of justice was this? (Kostya, p. 112-113)

Chapter 22

The Life of the Minorities in the Successor States

On October 14, 1918, Edward Benes announced the establishment of Czechoslovakia and joined the Allied Forces. 270 representatives were invited to the first Czechoslovakian National Assembly but none of them was German or Hungarian. Thomas Masaryk was elected to be President of the Republic. The first act of the new state already belied the "Swiss type of democracy" promised by Masaryk. The foreign policy was two-faced and the domestic policy was based on terrorizing and subduing the minorities. The goal of the new state organization was to slavonize everything. The election laws stated that 19,000 votes were necessary to elect one Slav representative. At the same time a German or Hungarian representative needed 27,000 votes. Compared to the small number of Hungarians this was an enormous number necessary for a representative.²⁹⁶ The state instituted Martial Law, censure of the press, travel restrictions and on the spot arrests. Meetings of the minority groups were forbidden. This is what the Czechs called "democracy". They handled the Slovaks as if Slovakia were a Czech colony. The Slovak people retaliated with a worker's strike which the Czechs stopped with machine-guns. They put the blame for the organization of the strike on the Hungarians. The Hungarians who took part in the strike were imprisoned and many of them were thrown over the Hungarian border. Because the majority of the Hungarians were Catholic, they gathered in the churches for protection. Therefore Wilmos Batthyányi, Bishop of Nyitra, István Novák, Bishop of Eperjes, Sándor Párvi, Bishop of Szepes, Farkas Rudnay, Bishop of Besztercebánya, and Antal Papp, Bishop of Munkács were exiled to Hungary.

²⁹⁶ Ibid. p.136; Kettős Járom alatt a Csehslovákiai Magyarok Nemzeti Bizottmányának jelentése, 1951

To influence the opinion of people abroad, the statistics of the population were altered. In the Census of 1910, 1,069,978 Hungarians lived in Felvidék which was given to Czechoslovakia. The Czech census in 1921, counted 744,620 and in 1924, 106,840 Hungarians were exiled from the country. In 1930 only 719,569 were counted. In 1941, when Felvidék (Slovakia) was reannexed to Hungary, 896,677 Hungarians were returned to Hungary but only a part of Felvidék was returned. The number of elementary schools in Felvidék on September 1, 1918, was 3,641. Of these there were 3,298 Hungarian speaking schools. The Slovak and German schools numbered 343. In the 1937-38 school year, the number of Hungarian schools in Slovakia was 754, in Kárpátalja, 121. In Slovakia, of the original sixty Hungarian high schools, only eight were left. At the University of Czechoslovakia, there was not a single Hungarian professor and there were no classes taught in Hungarian.

At the "Peace Conference", the demands of the Successor States were given priority. The politicians considered their demands for transportation and railroads and granted them large pieces of Hungarian territory. At that time, approximately 350,000 Hungarians fled from these territories to the territory of mutilated Hungary and approximately 2.5 million remained in the territories which were given to the Successor States. Hungary lost its natural resources and became poor. This was one of the reasons for the demand for a revision of the borders which caused more anti-Hungarian acts in the Successor States. Under the supervision of the League of Nations, the Czechs and Slovaks should have kept the agreement which they signed, protecting the rights of the minorities but they disregarded it from the very beginning. Czechoslovakia handled the minority questions arbitrarily, completely disregarding the League of Nations.

How can we talk of a Hungarian minority in the Carpathian Basin? This large territory, with the Carpathian Mountains as natural borders and very few passes, has been the home of Hungarians for more than 1100 years, from the time of Árpád and the Magyar Homecoming. According to the results of archeological and anthropological research, it has been proven that the Avars were Hungarian and spoke the Hungarian language.²⁹⁷ Ever since this territory has been settled by Hungarian

²⁹⁷ Laszló, Gyula: *Kettős honfoglalás*, Budapest, 1978

speaking people, there has been a strong organized khanate and later kingdom. Even now, the Hungarian people are in the majority in the Carpathian Basin. In all the centuries that the Hungarians have lived in the Carpathian Basin, many neighboring peoples have received asylum on the border territories of Hungary, especially at the time of the Turkish invasions. This fact is proven by the history of settlement on the border territories. In the Carpathian Basin, for centuries, the Hungarian Kingdom was the only power able to oppose the Turkish aggression. This is why, at that time, the people of the not yet established nations fled to Hungary for protection and they lived there under better circumstances than they had formerly experienced.

It is absurd to call the Hungarians, who gave culture and defense to the small surrounding peoples, a minority people in their own home, which was at one time the bastion of the West. The Serbs, Rumanians and Slovaks, who were given protection in Hungary, can be rightfully called minorities. Separately, they are minorities in the Carpathian Basin compared to the total number of Hungarians. Because the Great Powers divided this territory and caused the autochthonous populace, the Hungarians, to become minorities in the new states, the Treaty of Trianon was a great injustice.

The Entente Powers intended to weaken the influence of Germany. At the beginning, they only intended to give Czechoslovakia a secondary role, which caused Benes to doubt that he would be able to reach his goal of gaining more territory and weakening Hungary. However, because Hungary, for a long time, had appeared to be a part of the Austrian Monarchy, and had lost its full independence a long time before that, and because the history of Hungary was unknown to the Western politicians, Benes had the advantage of being able to write or say whatever he wished. If any politicians intended to check the truth of what Benes said, then the information which came into their hands was that which was written by the enemies of the Hungarians, who for many centuries had intended to enslave the Hungarians (the Hapsburgs). They wrote Hungarian history with the purpose of proving that their conquest of Hungary was justified because Hungary did not deserve to rule herself. (See The Homeland Reclaimed, Chapter I.).

Some of the diplomats of the League of Nations observed that the peoples of the Carpathian Basin depend on each other but every time any person advocated any territorial concessions for Hungary, Benes

declared this to be an irredentist action. He convinced André Tardieu, Clemenceau, and Nicolae Titulescu to support his plan. He declared the Hungarian revisionist movement to be chauvinist but, at the same time, he and the Czechs were ultra-chauvinist. The Entente Powers did not notice this. Why not? Benes openly predicted that, in 30 to 40 years the population of Czechoslovakia would be 20 million, that of Rumania 25 million, and of Yugoslavia 20 million, whereas the population of Hungary would barely reach 10 - 12 million. The leaders of the League of Nations did not see that the goal of the Little Entente was to reduce the size of Hungary. (Kostya, p. 143)

The Rumanians were advocating Great Rumania and intended to push their borders to the city of Debrecen. They openly advocated this plan and even published a map of Great Rumania. None of the Entente Powers remarked on their chauvinism. In Geneva, Count Albert Apponyi tried to convince members of the conference that it was not the signatures of the participants to the agreement that would create a lasting peace but the logical drawing of the borderlines. His argument was not accepted by the Czechs. They thought that the longer they kept the status quo, the sooner the Hungarian resistance would cease. They rejected every peace proposal and revision of the borders.

Instead of revision, they demanded that Hungary become a democracy. At the same time, they introduced the greatest dictatorship against the nationalities in their country. In Felvidék, Slovakia, the Czechs began the economic oppression of the Hungarians. Without recompense, they confiscated the land of any Hungarian who had 200 or more *cadastral holds*. This land together with the estate was given to Czechs and Slovaks with the goal of making Felvidék Czech. They applied economic and administrative terror to break Hungary. The League of Nations did not see or did not want to see what their goal was. The Western Powers did not realize that they had made a mistake and there was still no sign that they wanted to rectify the situation.

On August 29, 1921, the United States signed a separate Peace Treaty with Hungary in which they declared that they did not accept the new borders. Lloyd George announced in 1927: **“They (the British) never considered the possibility that the terms of the Treaty of Trianon could not be altered.”**²⁹⁸

²⁹⁸ Kostya: Op. Cit. p.144; Kovács, Imre: Magyarország megszállása, Toronto, 1979, p. 376

As it was expected, the Hungarians in Felvidék remained loyal to the motherland, Hungary. The Hungarian representatives submitted a declaration to the Czechoslovak parliament in which they emphasized that they were never asked their opinion in the Peace agreement and that they would never give up the right to be in charge of their fate.

Those who were allowed to attend high schools or universities had to learn the Czech language but at home and in their Hungarian clubs they spoke Hungarian. The Slovaks were divided in their opinion of the union of Czechs and Slovaks. Some of them longed for the time before the establishment of Czechoslovakia but there were those who were so influenced by Pan-Slavism that they became more chauvinistic than the Czechs. The Czechs ruled over Slovensko (Slovakia) and despised the Slovaks. (Kostya, p. 144-145)

The Highest Court in the land took away from the Hungarians their Czech citizenship which meant that 26,646 Hungarians found themselves with the status of displaced persons, with no rights and no protection from the law, in the territory where their ancestors had lived for 1000 years. They protested to the League of Nations but their protests were not heard and nothing was done about their situation.

On January 10, 1920, Czechoslovakia joined the League of Nations. On May 6, 1920, on the advice of Benes and Titulescu, the Entente Powers rejected Hungary's request for a revision of the borders and declared the Dictated Peace to be final. On June 4, 1920, the Hungarian delegates were forced to sign the calamitous Peace Treaty at the Palace of Trianon.

On June 15, the International Unions, which were under the rule of the Social Democrats, declared a political and economic boycott against Hungary. On June 20, Czechoslovakia declared a boycott against Hungary. On August 14, in Belgrade, on the suggestion of Benes, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia signed a pact to defend themselves against Hungary. On January 10, 1921, when the Entente Powers notified Hungary in a note that Western Hungary, now Burgenland, would be given to Austria, Czechoslovakia offered aid to Austria against Hungary in case Hungary mobilized her forces. On March 26, 1921, Benes invited Rumania to become a member of the Czech-Yugoslavian Pact and this became the Little Entente. On April 17, 1921, an organization was formed under the name of the Czechoslovakian League, which developed anti-Hungarian propaganda

and settled Czechs on Hungarian ethnic territory. At this time, thousands of Czechs flooded into Felvidék, Slovakia. On October 25, Czechoslovakia mobilized because King Charles IV. intended to return to Hungary. Martial Law was declared in Slovakia and Ruthenia. On June 5, 1922, in Prague, the Czechs signed the Czechoslovak-Soviet Russian Pan-Slav brotherhood agreement. In February, 1924, Lord Dickenson, the President of the League of Nations, visited Slovakia and Ruthenia with Lord Ramsay. In their report, they asked for immediate aid to improve the life of the minorities in these territories. Benes, at the same time, in his new book, Probleme Nove Evropy a Zahranicny Politika Ceskoslovenska (The Problems of the New Europe and Czechoslovakian Foreign Policy), declared dissatisfaction with the new borders. On February 3, 1926, according to the new language laws, the official language in Ruthenia was to be the Czech language. On June 26, 1926, a new law declared that those citizens, who had lived for four years before 1910 on the territory which was now part of Czechoslovakia, could apply for Czechoslovak citizenship. On March 5, 1928, Seton-Watson, after his journey to Slovakia, continuously advocated, in the Times, the settlement of the minority problems because the status quo was a threat to peace in the Danube Valley. On September 25, 1929, President Masaryk stated to the editor of the Times that there was a possible solution to the territorial dispute. Here Masaryk himself came to the conclusion that there was need for a peaceful border revision. According to the census of December 2, 1930, 7,446,632 Czechs were living in Czechoslovakia and the total number of other nationalities was 7,282,904. Included in these others were 3,318,445 Germans, 2,309,972 Slovaks, 719,569 Hungarians, 568,941 Ruthenians, 204,779 Jews, 100,322 Poles, 14,170 Rumanians and 46,706 others. (Kostya, p. 149)

The minorities submitted several petitions to the League of Nations, asking for an examination of their complaints about the Czech oppression. According to the Czechoslovakian statistics, the Hungarian population of the cities of Pozsony, Kassa and Ungvár dropped to under 20% which was obviously a blatant falsification. On March 5, 1932, Tardieu, the French President, declared his plan for a Danubian Federation which is as follows: The five Danubian states should create a favorable tariff agreement and gradually approach each other to create a Danubian Federation. On February 16, 1933, in Geneva, on the advice

of Benes, they established, within the Little Entente, an organization called the Diplomatic Federation, which had an anti-Hungarian tendency.

On August 15, 1933, during a holiday celebration in Nyitra, the Czechoslovak representative, Andrej Hlinka, read a declaration in which he demanded that the Pittsburgh agreement, signed by Masaryk, be honored because up to then it had been ignored. On December 7, Benes refused the Slovak demands. On March 26, 1936, the Czechoslovak National Assembly accepted a Bill describing the defense of the state. They declared a 25 kilometer wide strip of land around their borders to be a frontier zone and they started to build cement bunkers along this zone. In this territory, "citizens who could not be trusted" (meaning Hungarians) were not allowed to possess land. They could not find employment and could not occupy positions of national importance.

On April 4, 1938, Andrej Hlinka went as far as he could to obtain autonomy for Slovakia. On May 17, Hungarians in Pozsony demonstrated for equal rights and the right of self-determination. On May 21, Czechoslovakia mobilized and 300,000 soldiers were placed on the borders. In Paris and London this movement was regarded as hasty. On September 16, the Hungarian government objected to the Czechoslovakian mobilization. On the following day, the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia again demanded equal rights and self-determination. **On September 19, Chamberlain, Daladier and Bonnet in London, accepted Hitler's demands to change the Czechoslovak borders.** On September 22, President Hodzsa resigned and Benes succeeded him. General Jan Syrový, on September 23, ordered a new Czech mobilization and declared a state of war.

On September 29, Hitler, Mussolini, Chamberlain and Daladier met in Munich to negotiate. They came to an agreement (the Four Powers Pact) that Czechoslovakia should move out of the German territory of Sudetenland between October 1 and October 10. The problem of the Hungarian minority was to be settled in three months. On October 5, Benes resigned as President of Czechoslovakia and the Germans reoccupied the territory of the Sudetenland.

Chamberlain announced that he could guarantee the Czech borders only after the Hungarian problem was settled. In Pozsony, the Hungarian National Council was established which, advocating self-determination, demanded that a plebiscite take place and the Hungarian

ethnic territories be returned to Hungary. On October 9, the Hungarian government representatives, Pál Teleki and Kálmán Kánya, began negotiations at Komárom with Tiso, the President of Slovakia, for the return of Hungarian territories to Hungary. On October 11, as a result of these negotiations, the Hungarian army occupied the territory of Ipolyság and the territory beyond the Ronyva Creek and Sátoraljaújhely. On October 26, **Czechoslovakia proposed that Germany and Italy be the judges in this matter.** On October 30, Germany and Italy accepted the role of judge. On November 2, the foreign ministers Ciano and Ribbentrop, in the Belvedere Palace in Vienna, came to an agreement and Hungary regained 11,912 square kilometers, with a population of 1,060,000. This agreement in Vienna is known as the First Vienna Award.

Between November 6 and November 10, the Hungarian army reoccupied this territory. On January 6, 1939, the Czech army attacked Munkács and was defeated by the Hungarian army. On March 7, the Czechs demanded that the Slovaks swear allegiance to them. The Slovak Cabinet rejected the Czech demands. On March 15, 1939, Slovakia declared its independence. **On March 17, Tiso, in the name of the Slovak government, asked Hitler to be the defender of Slovakia. Hitler accepted and occupied a part of Slovakia. On March 23, Hitler guaranteed Slovakia independence for the following 25 years.** (Kostya, p. 154)

When the Hungarian Government wanted to open negotiations with Czechoslovakia to talk about their territorial problems and their minority problems, the Czechs rejected the Hungarian proposals. They stated that this question was the business of the Slovakian National Party, since Slovakia was independent.

At the end of World War I., the League of Nations ordered the armies of the Central Powers to be reduced to such small numbers that they hardly had enough manpower to keep order within their countries. Germany was allowed 100,000 soldiers. Austria and Hungary were allowed 35,000 each. None of them was allowed any weapons of attack nor were they allowed to manufacture these weapons. At the same time, the armies of the surrounding nations were armed with the most modern armaments and their total number was one and a half million soldiers which, in case of war could be raised to five million. The Little Entente, when it was established, had a total of 540,000 soldiers and 3,000

airplanes.²⁹⁹

This enormous force was put in place so that Hungary could not take back its historic heritage which was taken away by falsified data. The League of Nations strictly supervised the Hungarians and checked the numbers of their arms and personnel but did not place any controls on the victors.

The Czechs regarded as their first priority the dismissal of Hungarians, who were members of the intelligentsia. They replaced them with anti-Hungarian Czech or Slovak nationalists. This method is identical to that of the Soviet Communists. We can see the lack of character of the Czechs and Slovaks in their dishonorable behavior. They supported Germany, later the Russian Czar and then the Soviets. They switched their allegiance to the French and called themselves the advocates of democracy. They also held themselves out to be staunch republicans. It did not matter to them where they placed their allegiance, as long as they were able to keep their stolen territories.

Benes, in his aforementioned book, wrote on behalf of Hungary: "Only one road is open to Hungary's existence. That is to join the Czechoslovak-Polish Confederation. Otherwise Hungary can expect a more severe Trianon." (Kostya: p. 177) According to Benes the minority question could be solved in the following way. He stated that there should be an easier populace exchange between countries and emigration should be made easier. This means that if the Hungarians living in the Successor States feel that they cannot live under oppression, they are free to leave their ancient land. Those who do not wish to emigrate from the land of their ancestors can expect an enforced assimilation policy. Benes wrote that, in the future, the protection of the minorities should come from the protection of democratic human rights rather than from the protection of nationality rights. This is the exact opposite of what he had advocated at the Trianon Negotiations, where he claimed that the Czechs and the Slovaks were oppressed by the Hungarians. He claimed the territory of Felvidék on "nationality rights".

The European minorities between the two World Wars constantly opposed the segment of the Treaty of Saint Germain, of September 10, 1919, which specifies only the protection of language and religion. At the same time, the accepted international law states that the

²⁹⁹ Ibid. p. 157; Padány, Viktor: Op. Cit. p. 289

protection of nationality rights ensures minority rights. Benes stated that World War II. was started by ultra-nationalism. He said that this is why in the “new” Europe, humanism has to be emphasized in place of nationalism. But he “forgot” that between the two world wars, it was not minority nationalism which was the cause for the war but rather super-chauvinism and the imperialist goals. (Kostya, p. 177)

In December 1943, in Moscow. Benes met Clement Gottwald, the Secretary of the Czech Communist Party, and they came to an agreement about the fate of the minorities in the former Czechoslovakia. They decided to reform Czechoslovakia into a national state where the Czechs would be in the majority and would be the rulers. They would remove the German and Hungarian minorities from the state. It is interesting to note that this solution came not from Benes but from Tiso, the fascist president of the Slovaks. Already in April 1943, Tiso had asked Hitler’s approval for the deportation of Jews and Hungarians from Slovakia, and for a count of the gypsies.

This Slovak request appeared on the front page of the April 1943 issue of the Bratislava review called *Gardista*. On December 27, 1944, the Slovak Nationality Council stated: “The land of the Slovaks, which was settled by our ancestors, must return to the possession of their descendants. Not a single Hungarian landowner shall remain on this land; not a single traitor. We shall take the lands of the Hungarians with no compensation to them.”³⁰⁰

On February 27, 1945, the Slovak Nationality Council, in the law of 1945, No. 4. declared that all German and Hungarian property in Slovakia should be confiscated. This law explained the reason for the confiscation: “The Hungarian and German minorities were always the bastion of reaction and fascism.”

Samuel Czambel explained the above-mentioned law: “With this law, justice was done because the Slovak land came back into the possession of the Slovak people from the hands of the oppressors.”³⁰¹ Czambel talks of Slovak land yet it was Hungarian land for more than a thousand years. He does not explain the “oppression”. He does not mention either the separation of Fascist Slovakia from Czechoslovakia. Kostya writes that the Slovak Nationality Council, in February 1945,

³⁰⁰ Ibid. p. 178-179; Czambel, S.: *Ceskoslovensky Casopis Historicky*, 1976, p. 32

³⁰¹ Ibid. p. 179; Ibid. p. 39

adopted the Nationality plan from the National Socialist Slovak Government.

The Slovak Communist Party's Resolution against the Hungarian Slovaks stated: "Those Hungarians who took part in or celebrated the reoccupation of the southern part of Slovakia by the Hungarians or who committed some crime against the Slovak people will be tried in court. They must be punished as the enemies of the Slovaks, the Slavs and Democracy." This is why the Slovak Communist Party solemnly announced: "The southern territories of Slovakia, which in the past or in the past six years have been forcefully Magyarized, must be planfully and continuously re-Slovakized."³⁰²

Such preliminary statements preceded the announcement of the well-known Kassa Government Program which for three years had taken from the Hungarians all their rights, submitted them to inhumane humiliations and had chased them out of their motherland.

On April 5, 1945, the Kassa Government Program made 98% of the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia displaced persons by taking their citizenship away from them. The 2% who opposed the Vienna Award and who were loyal to the Czechoslovak Republic did not lose their citizenship. Every Hungarian who was in state employment lost his job. The Hungarian language schools were closed. The Hungarian Cultural organizations and Sport Clubs could no longer operate. These decisions resulted in the greatest abuse of the Hungarians. Zoltán Fábry, a Hungarian writer from Slovakia writes that signs appeared everywhere which said: "If you want to see a barbarian, look at a Hungarian."³⁰³

Presidential "Constitutional decree" No. 33-1945 states: "At the time of the foreign occupation, those citizens, who obtained German or Hungarian citizenship, lost their Czechoslovakian citizenship immediately. The rest of the Hungarians and Germans of Czechoslovakian citizenship, will also lose their Czechoslovakian citizenship, when this present law comes into effect on September 10, 1945."³⁰⁴

How was the Czechoslovak President, Klement Gottwald, able to make such a law in 1945, when this territory still belonged to Hungary

³⁰² Kostya, Sándor: Op. Cit. p. 180; Historicky Casopis Bratislava, 1976, p. 199

³⁰³ Ibid. p. 181; Ölvedi, János: Magyarok Csehslovákiában, Rome, 1978

³⁰⁴ Raffay, Ernő: Magyar Tragédia, Trianon 75 éve, p.31

until the final ratification of the Treaty of Paris, in February, 1947? Ernő Raffay answers this question when he states: “It happened exactly the same way as happened between 1918 and 1920. Before the Peace Treaty was signed, the Czechoslovakians slowly followed the Soviet Army toward Prague and occupied that territory. They wanted their possession to be an established fact.” (Raffay, p. 32) The Slovak National Advisory Board, on June 5, 1945, passed a law which allowed them to confiscate all the possessions of Hungarian individuals. “In the territory of Slovakia, the possessions of all persons which the State regards as untrustworthy, are seizable by the State and can be locked up.” (Raffay, p. 32)

Para. No. 4. of this law clearly declares who those persons are whom the State regards as untrustworthy: “Germans and Hungarians who cannot prove that they very actively took part against the Germans or Hungarians during the war or contributed significantly to the restoration of the Czechoslovak Republic and freedom of the Slovak and the Czech people.” (Raffay, p. 32)

Para. No. 6 states: “To determine whether a person is Hungarian or German, the language spoken in the family is considered, registration in a Hungarian or German political party or what the person declares during the census.” As we can see the ownership of possessions was taken away based on ethnic discrimination. By the law of August 23, 1945, the Slovak National Council further advanced the Hungarian and German genocide. “For the benefit of the land reform, immediately, without any recompense, land can be confiscated in the territory of Slovakia, whose owner is:

- a) German without consideration that he is a Czechoslovak citizen,
- b) Hungarian without consideration that he is a Czechoslovak citizen,
- c) traitors of the Slovaks or Czechs,
- d) owners of corporations or associations, or persons who on March 1, 1945 were Hungarian or German citizens. . .” (Raffay, p 33)

But all this was not enough because Benes, on October 25, 1945 passed another law: “If until now some Germans or Hungarians have avoided making recompense to the Republic of Czechoslovakia, all their possessions can be confiscated, including the deeds to property, bonds, investments and patents which belonged to these Germans or Hungarians until this land was repossessed by Czechoslovakia.” This meant that absolutely everything could be confiscated from the Germans and

Hungarians without recompense to the owners. **The Czechoslovak jurisdiction did not take into consideration the rights of the individual property owner. This is Communist ideology. At the same time they applied the Fascist idea of collective guilt against the Germans and Hungarians. (Raffay, p. 33)**

The state of Czechoslovakia was built on such ideologies and therefore they were the first to form the so-called “People’s Republic”. They placed everything in the state under state ownership but even when they did this, they used discrimination. The Czech, Ukrainian and Slovak owners received some recompense but the decree emphasized that the Germans and the Hungarians were not to be recompensed. **It is a well known fact that life was unbearable under Soviet Communism. Add to this anti-minority laws of the Successor States and one will get an idea of the extent of the suffering of the Hungarians and Germans who fell under the foreign rule. Yet the Hungarians had lived on this territory since A.D. 896 and had never left this territory. They were not settlers in Czechoslovakia. This was their land.**

The Czechoslovak government sent a memorandum to the Potsdam Conference (July 17 - August 2, 1945) asking for the deportation of the Hungarians from Slovakia. The Conference did not accept this request. They ordered only the deportation of the Germans from the Sudetenland and Hungary to Germany. The Soviets supported the Czechoslovakian request at Potsdam.³⁰⁵ The rejection of the Czech request at Potsdam increased the anti-Hungarian feelings in Czechoslovakia. The Hlinka “gardists” were marching in the Hungarian territories and insulting the Hungarian populace in the streets, causing bloody fights.

The persecution of Hungarians in Slovakia did not end with the “re-Slovakization”. It continued with relocation. The Slovaks wanted to get rid of the ancient Hungarian populace and, because the Trianon Peace Treaty did not allow deportation, they found a different solution to attain their chauvinist goal. They moved the Hungarians out of their own territory and scattered them all across Czechoslovakia and the depopulated Sudetenland. Vladimir Clementis, Deputy Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, on October 31, 1946, announced: “The Hungarians

³⁰⁵ Kostya, Sándor: *A Felvidék*, p. 182; Ölvedy: p.15

have to be forcefully deported to the former Sudetenland.”³⁰⁶ Stalin did the same kind of deportation with the Tartars of the Crimean Peninsula. Vladimir Clementis was a good student of Hitler or Stalin. In spite of all this, the West still favors the Czechs and Slovaks. On November 13, 1946, the official newspaper of the Slovak Nationality Council, the *Narodna Obroda*, wrote: “We have the right to assimilate the Hungarians and create, at any price, a national state. We have to keep in mind our final goal, which is to scatter the Hungarians.” (Kostya: p. 184)

In the Kassa government program undertaken by Czechoslovakia, more than 68,000 Hungarians were uprooted from their homes in Slovakia and scattered throughout the territory of the Czech state. These people left behind 160,000 cadastral holds of land and 15,000 houses. The Slovaks left Hungary of their own will and went to Slovakia, leaving 15,000 cadastral holds and 4,400 houses. Hungary never received recompense for all this, not even an apology for the many humiliations and personal injuries.

Károly Vígh writes: “Ninety percent of the Hungarians of Pozsony (the capital of Slovakia) were chased out of their homes.”

“On May 5, 1945, in the city of Pozsony, the Slav soldiers gave the Hungarian populace half an hour to pack their belongings. They gathered them into groups of fifty and one hundred and chased them over the Danube bridge at Ligetfalu.” Raffay mentions that Pozsony did not return to Hungary in 1938, so there was no “Hungarian occupation” yet they treated the Hungarians in this way. After this the Slovaks began the “re-Slovakization”. In this way, they intended to reduce the numbers of Hungarians so that the Slovak state could be established. (Raffay, p. 34)

According to the June 17, 1946 law, the more than 400,000 Hungarians who remained in Slovakia could choose to declare themselves to be Czechoslovaks, in which case they could regain their citizenship, or Hungarian and suffer continued persecution. A. Garantier stated: , : “The forcefully Magyarized populace will not be resettled to Hungary. This group of people, who are actually the victims of the old Hungarian chauvinist politics, should have the opportunity to return to their original nationality.”³⁰⁷ I would like to point out that this decision

³⁰⁶ Kostya, Sándor: Op.Cit. p. 184; *Pravda*, Bratislava, 1946, November, No. 1

³⁰⁷ Ibid. p. 183; Garantier, A.: *A Felszabadított dél*, Nyitra, 1946

was made by the Czechoslovak government which, for years, had advocated that they would create another Switzerland after Czechoslovakia had been established. The Hungarians could not resist this pressure forever because they had to consider the future of their families. They could not bear the constant harassment, the hopelessness, with nobody to hear their grievances and nobody to write about their conditions in the newspapers. What could they do? 410,820 of them accepted the “re-Slovakization”. This means that 410,820 Hungarians were forced to give up their origins, culture and language just so that they could live without harassment. What a terrible sacrifice this was.

On November 17, 1946, the Czechoslovak army and police encircled Hungarian villages. Károly Vígh states that those who were singled out for deportation from Slovakia were put into cattle wagons and transported to the Czech state. Those who resisted were tied up and thrown into the wagons. Kálmán Janics in his book called A hontalanság éve, (translated into English and Slovak), describes the same situation: “They proceeded according to a plan. The army units encircled one or two villages and, from a prepared list of names, they called the families, told them to pack all their belongings because they had to leave their homes and animals. No objections were allowed. Every member of the family without regard to age or sex, had to leave.” This lasted for 99 days, ending on February 25, 1947. 44,129 Hungarians were taken to the Czech state. Their possessions were taken over by the Slovaks. (Raffay, p. 35)

On February 27, 1947, representing the Hungarians, János Gyöngyössi, and representing the Czechoslovaks, Vlado Clementis, the Czechoslovakian Foreign Minister, signed the Populace Exchange Agreement. As a result of this agreement, 60,252 Slovaks were resettled from Hungary into Slovakia and 76,613 Hungarians were taken from Slovakia to Hungary. But this populace exchange was not 100% successful in making a pure Slovak state because many Hungarians remained in Slovakia. In order to break up this unity, the Slovak Settlement Office declared that the Hungarians remaining in Slovakia had to be redistributed.

Kostya places the fate of the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia at that time into four categories:

1. Expatriation

2. Populace exchange
3. Re-Slovakization (because the Slovaks stated that the Hungarians Magyarized the ancient Slovak people)
4. Deportation

As a result of this program, approximately 30,000 of the Hungarian intelligentsia were persecuted as war-criminals and had to leave the country.

The Slovak office for the resettlement of Hungarians denied the request of 84,141 Hungarians to become Slovak. As a result, they became outcasts. They were kicked, robbed and became prey to the chauvinist greed. The 1950 Czech census reflects this terrible situation. Only 367,733 were registered as Hungarians. Why was the western media silent about this? Was there nobody interested in the events in Central Europe? If these problems are not resolved, this will lead to another world war. Already two world wars have broken out in this territory. After World War I., there was not a just decision. If we do not settle this question now, the seeds of the third World War will be planted. Is this the intention of the World Powers? The Hungarian people request that every nation be treated equally. Only in this way, can the Great Powers obtain the trust of the people of the world. The politicians should work not to maintain the status quo but to bring the truth to light.

The Czech Government stated: "Our government, in case it is not successful in coming to an agreement with Hungary, will find a solution which will solve, now and forever, the problem of the Hungarian minority. If necessary, strictly in interior matters, the southern borders of Slovakia have to be populated by Slovaks."³⁰⁸

The relocation of Hungarians began on November 19, 1946 and lasted until February 25, 1947. The newspaper, *Slovensky Vychod*, November 24, 1946, wrote: "We ourselves will make order in the country if Hungary and Czechoslovakia do not come to an agreement because Hungary is sabotaging the populace exchange." (Kostya, p. 185) The deportation was accomplished by the Slovak army and the police. It did not even cease during the coldest part of the winter. The Slovak army encircled Hungarian villages, notified the families to get ready to move and pack the most necessary things. They were told that

³⁰⁸ Ibid. p.184; Pravda, November 1946, No.3.

everything else would be confiscated. There was no chance to appeal the decision.

Juraj Zvara, a Slovak journalist, described the events of the deportation: "This action involved 9,610 families, 41,640 people. These people were gathered from 393 villages in 17 counties." Zvara mentions that among these people were 5,128 peasant families. "The numbers of those who died as a result of this deportation, and from suffering in unheated railway wagons in the winter, could be about a thousand. Slovak settlers from Northern Slovakia and Czech agrarian workers were given the homes and estates that the Hungarians had left behind."³⁰⁹ The same kind of deportation has recently taken place in Kosovo, where thousands of ethnic Albanians have been taken from their homes by the Serbs and forced to flee, many of them dying along the way.

Zoltán Fábry, a Hungarian-Slovak writer, sent around a memorandum to the Slovak intelligentsia and political leaders, under the title: *A Vádlott megszólal* (the Accused speaks out). In this 80 page document, he demanded humanity, understanding and justice and asked them to cease the abuse which was occurring as a result of the chauvinist rage. This memorandum did not receive a single reply. The cold disinterest was most hurtful. Many of those who received this memorandum from Fábry now live in the United States as Czech and Slovak emigrants.

On August 14, 1946, at the Paris Peace Conference, the Hungarian foreign minister brought up the question of the Czech treatment of the Hungarian minority. A day later, Masaryk accused the leaders of the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia of collaborating with Frank, the executioner at *Lidice*. This is why Masaryk demanded the deportation of the Hungarians from Czechoslovakia. A.J. Vishinsky, the Soviet delegate supported Masaryk. He announced that the Hungarian deportation could not be avoided but he did not mention the role of the Slovak Fascism. On September 20, the United States delegate and on September 23, the delegate from the United Kingdom opposed any further Hungarian deportation. However, in the Peace Treaty made on February 10, 1947, there is no mention of a law which would secure the rights of the more than 3 million Hungarians in Czechoslovakia,

³⁰⁹ Ibid. p. 184-185; Zvara, Juraj: *Madarska Mensina Na Slovensko pro Roku 1945*, Bratislava, 1969

Yugoslavia or Rumania. Kostya's opinion is that it was a compromise. The Czechoslovak government ignored the Treaty and on November 19, in the Presidential Order No. 88, under the title of "Recruitment of Workers", Czechoslovakia started to deport Hungarians to the Czech territory. Zoltán Fábry, in his afore-mentioned memorandum, not only made demands but also asked questions: "Why did the victors step upon us? Why especially on the Hungarian-Slovak minority, whose writers and intelligentsia bravely and with honor demonstrated their humanity between the two world wars? Why did they single out the Hungarian-Slovaks whose only leader was János Esterházy who, in the Pozsony Slovak parliament was the only one who dared to oppose the National Socialists?" (Kostya, p. 186)

Count János Esterházy, after the Vienna Award of November 1, 1938, when Slovakia became independent under the leadership of Josef Tiso, remained in Slovakia so that he could be the leader of the 67,000 Hungarians left there as a minority. It was to his merit that these Hungarians did not come under the influence of the National Socialists. On May 15, 1942, the Slovak Assembly passed Law No. 68 of the Constitution, which proposed the deportation of 90,000 Jews to Germany. Among the 80 senators, Esterházy was the only one who voted against the deportation. He stated "It is a shameful thing that a government, whose President and Prime Minister declare themselves to be good Christians, can deport its Jewish populace to the concentration camps of Hitler in Germany."³¹⁰ At that time 65,000 Jews were handed over to the Germans. The Slovak administration sentenced Esterházy to death. He was taken to a Soviet *gulag*. He was freed in 1949 and he died in 1957 in the prison of Mirov at age 56.

Esterházy's political program was that Slovakia should have no ruling class and no minority class. His whole life was dedicated to making the life of the minorities easier. On October 6, 1938, when the independence of Slovakia was declared in Zsolna, he immediately demanded the autonomy of the other nationalities and the people's right to a plebiscite. At the beginning he was a supporter of the People's Party of Andrej Hlinka but he came to the conclusion that this road led to joining with Germany so he abandoned the party. He remained in

³¹⁰ Balassa, Zoltán, *A Felvidéki Magyarság Mártírja*, Transsylvania, Vol XXXIX (1998) No. 3-4, p. 58

Slovakia after the first Vienna Award trying to ease the co-existence of the Slovaks and the Hungarians. The Slovaks, in the upheaval of their independence, did not respond to his call yet this view of his is even now very timely because the two territories, Felvidék (Slovakia) and Hungary depend on each other for geographic and economic reasons.

Sándor Kostya writes that the Hungarians received the answer to Fábry's questions only twenty years later. Juraj Zvara wrote in the periodical, *Prehled*, 1964, Issue No. 5., that it was wrong for the Czechs to take away the rights of the Hungarians, but he emphasized that, although unjust, the Czech actions were necessary. "They kept the iron hot in Hungary. The Czechs were afraid of a Hungarian attack against the Czech Republic under the pretext of solving the Hungarian minority question in Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovak bourgeoisie would have used such an attack to spread the anti-Hungarian chauvinist feeling. . . . This forced the Czechoslovak Communist Party, already in the Kassa Government Program, to take precautionary measures so that the Munich or Vienna Decision could never recur. This is why the negotiations for a mutual exchange of populace continued between Czechoslovakia and Hungary in 1945 and 1946. We (Czechs) went to the Conference in Paris to request a populace exchange, and maybe the deportation of the Hungarian populace from Czechoslovakia, in order to end the nationality disputes which would disturb the consolidation after the War. This is why the Paris Peace Conference acknowledged Czechoslovakia as the National State of the Czechs and the Slovaks."³¹¹

According to the statement of Juraj Zvara, Czechoslovakia had to worry that Hungary would take back her territory with armed force.

Zvara spoke about the time period of 1945, when Hungary was economically totally exhausted, when the ashes of the war had hardly settled, when there was no Hungarian army and the country was under Soviet occupation, when Hungary was at the beginning of its greatest oppression. From 1945 on, in the schools, it was forbidden to mention the territories that were taken away from Hungary – Transylvania (Rumania), Felvidék (Slovakia), Délvidék (Yugoslavia), Western Hungary, (Austria) Fiume (Italy), Kárpátalja (Czechoslovakia) and part of the county of Árva (Poland). Is it not obvious that this was a purposeful omission to blame Hungary for the Czech actions and make

³¹¹ Ibid. p. 187-188; Zvara, Op. Cit. p. 168

the Hungarians forget the truth? Zvara justified the Czech actions. He blamed Benes and the Communist Party for these actions but presented them as the only possible solution. At the same time, he omitted to mention that, already in 1943, Benes and Gottwald had come to an agreement to solve the German and Hungarian minority question in a radical way. He also omitted to mention that the Kassa program was not just the program of Benes but was first of all the program of the Czechoslovak Communist Party.

If any constitutional state offends the rights of the minorities in that state, the citizens can turn to an international forum and invoke the International Law which protects the rights of the minorities. This law provides for them political, cultural, linguistic and economic freedom. The problem is that the Socialist Republics do not recognize the international guarantee. They consider the minority problems as their interior policy. The Socialist Republics do not include the minority rights as part of their constitutional law but consider them as decisions of the Communist or Socialist Party. These Party decisions are driven by a hidden chauvinism. (Kostya, p. 189)

Dániel Okali, President of the Czechoslovakian Deportation Committee between 1946 and 1948, has stated that the Kassa program is still in effect although not as strict. (According to Kostya in 1990) During the "Prague Spring" of 1968, which was crushed by the Russian T-34 tanks, the Hungarian minority, led by Miklós Duray, attempted to throw off the Czech oppression but they were unsuccessful.

In 1978, in Czechoslovakia, Miklós Duray formed the Hungarian Minority Rights Committee. He did that with the purpose of giving the Hungarians the opportunity to defend themselves in an organized manner against the oppression of the Czechs and so that they could fight for the rights that the Czechoslovak Constitution provided for them. This brave organized stand, from the first moment, stunned the Czechoslovak and Slovak governments but in 1982, Duray was arrested and tried, accused of being a bourgeois nationalist. His popularity attracted many foreign and Hungarian intelligentsia to the trial so the chauvinist Slovaks were forced to suspend their judgment.

In November, 1983, the Czechoslovak government proposed a new school law. This law would have closed all the Hungarian schools in Czechoslovakia. Duray's Minority Rights Committee appealed to President Gustav Husák and as a result, the proposal did not become

law. However, the Committee was informed that if the schools could not be closed by passing a law, then the government would seek to close them by Order of the Ministerial Council. Shortly after that, Duray was arrested again and was kept in solitary confinement; even his wife could not see him until weeks later. This time the accusation was that he attempted to ruin the good name and the honor of the Czechoslovak Republic in the eyes of the West.

The New York Hungarian Human Rights Foundation organized demonstrations in New York and Ottawa and the Hungarian solidarity efforts forced the Czechs to free Duray.

The goal of the Czechoslovak government was obvious. The government of Czechoslovakia, which was established for the second time in 1943, was unable to eradicate all the Hungarians from the country therefore, in the Kassa program, they hastened the slow genocide of the Hungarians. After tens of thousands of Hungarians were liquidated, together with their leaders, they thought that they had broken the Hungarian opposition and that they would force the remaining Hungarians to assimilate. But the tyranny brought new Hungarian leaders to the fore, who are now revealing the activities of the Slovak Socialist Nationalism.

There were, however, some promising results in the Hungarian struggle. In Czechoslovakia, there were a few brave, objective persons, those who supported Duray. It is alarming that not one emigrant Slovak or Czech supported Duray. The silence of the Czech and Slovak emigrants indicates that their views are identical to those of the Czech and Slovak mock-socialist leaders. If this were not so, they would have supported the Czech intelligentsia who were on Duray's side. (Kostya, p. 189-192)

The genocide of Hungarians continued, not only in the above mentioned manner, but also by the Slovakization of all the Hungarian geographical names, cities, villages, counties, forests, valleys, mountains, rivers and creeks. The use of the Hungarian names in the media was forbidden. If they used the names of Pozsony and Kassa, they were fined 20,000 golden crowns, according to Kostya. The several centuries old Hungarian street names were changed. In Komárom, only the name Jokai remained, but in the Slovak transliteration as Jokaiho. **In contrast, in present day Hungary, in those territories where Slovaks settled voluntarily, the names of the localities are now written in**

both names, Hungarian and Slovak.

The last part of the Potsdam agreement demanded that Hungary deport back to Germany, the Germans remaining in Hungary. This was not at the request of the Hungarian government nor the Hungarian people, not even at the request of Germany. The other defeated nations, such as Bulgaria and Finland, were not forced to do a similar relocation. The Potsdam agreement served two purposes, to make place for the Hungarians who were deported from Czechoslovakia and to ruin the German opinion of the Hungarians because the Germans thought that the deportation was at the request of Hungary. This would leave Hungary without a friend. (Kostya, p. 193)

Kostya writes that the Slovaks listened to the Czech propaganda before the Treaty of Trianon and turned against those Hungarians who, since 1790, had tried to solve the minority problems peacefully and who, in 1848, were the first in the world to pass Minority Rights Laws which secured the Slovak people's rights in Felvidék. The Slovaks opposed the Danubian Federation proposed by Kossuth, because they believed that the ten million Hungarians would be the dominating factor in this federation.

After a few decades of living together with the Czechs, the Slovaks came to a realization that the embrace of the Czech brothers was too tight. This is why they eventually broke away from the Czechs.

Slovakia never actually achieved her independence until January, 1993 because, on March 14, 1939, Slovakia became not a true independent state but a protectorate of Germany. In spite of all the Slovak tyranny, the Hungarian minorities still exist in Slovakia and, in many cases, still exhibit their national feelings. In December, 1945, Benes came to an agreement with Stalin and Molotov that, at the end of the war, he would give Kárpátalja (Ruthenia) to the Soviets. In exchange the Czechoslovaks could liquidate the Hungarians in Slovakia and Kárpátalja. Kálmán Janics demonstrated that in 1945, the Czechoslovakian Decrees No. 33 and 108, which dealt with the fate of the Hungarians in Slovakia, word for word was the same as the constitutional law which the Slovak Fascist state, in 1942, enacted against the Jews. It would take away their citizenship and confiscate their property. The right to vote was reserved to the Slavs. Therefore in 1946 and in 1948, in the Czechoslovak elections, Hungarians were not able to vote. The situation which somewhat bettered the Hungarians'

life in Czechoslovakia occurred on October 13, 1948, when they were allowed to receive Czechoslovak citizenship. But after the crushing of the “Prague Spring” in 1968, the persecution of the Hungarians began all over again. (Kostya, p. 194)

We have to talk briefly of the situation of the Hungarians living in Slovakia at present. On October 27, 1968, the new constitution secured a few basic human rights for the minorities but, at the same time, the Slovak Socialist Republic knowingly neglected the ten thousand square kilometers in southern Slovakia, where the Hungarians live, with the purpose of forcing the Hungarians to migrate voluntarily because there were no jobs or houses and they were unable to make a living. Those who were forced to leave their homes slowly assimilated into the Czech and Slovak communities. From 1950 to 1978, the Czechoslovak State closed 223 Hungarian schools, most of which were in the Slovakia. At the same time, the numbers of Hungarian students attending Slovak schools increased 20%. The school politics of the Slovaks were very discriminatory. Law No. 5., para. 1c. allowed the minorities to have private schools but in Czechoslovakia, private schools were forbidden. Under such circumstances, the right to provide Hungarian schools was given to the state. Because the school politics of Czechoslovakia intended to eliminate the Hungarian schools, the state disregarded the wish of the parents to have their children educated in the Hungarian language and the state pressured the parents to enroll their children in public schools. Those Hungarian children who did have the chance to attend Hungarian schools received fewer opportunities as they grew up. These disadvantages increased as they proceeded toward a higher education. In the southern part of Slovakia, the Hungarians were at an economic disadvantage because they could not receive a higher education. Since 1977, the number of Hungarian students allowed to attend training colleges for teachers has diminished so there are fewer Hungarian teachers.

In the 1998 Slovak elections, the Hungarian Coalition Party received 304,839 votes which is 9.12% and they received 15 seats in the Parliament.

Most politicians state that it is too late for the revision of the Hungarian borders because the Hungarians who live outside the borders have already scattered or assimilated into their new countries. From the point of view of an outsider, it does look this way because in Pozsony

(Bratislava), the Hungarian language cannot be heard on the street. But the 1998 elections show the opposite. In spite of the decades of Slovakization, the deportation of Hungarians, and the denial of their citizenship, the Hungarian Coalition Party won in all the territories where Hungarians lived. In the 1991 census, 608,000 people declared themselves to be Hungarian speaking. The results of the 1998 election signify that almost all Hungarians in Slovakia support the Hungarian Coalition Party. **Therefore there is a need for the revision of the borders or at least for total autonomy for the Slovak Hungarians.**

The treatment of the minorities in Rumania was not much different. On September 12, 1944, the Soviet-Rumanian Weapons Agreement was signed. This agreement nullified the Vienna Award of 1940. This meant that Rumania received Transylvania, in exchange for their successful volte-face and so the Petru Gorza Communist Government came into power in Rumania. He applied his double-faced politics toward the Hungarians living in Rumania. At the beginning he appeared to be accommodating, which misled the Transylvanian Magyar People's Alliance. Therefore, the Assembly of this Alliance, which was half-inclined to accept the union of northern Transylvania with Rumania. Those who saw through Petru Gorza's policy, such as Bishop Áron Márton, proposed a new border-line which would allow more than a million Hungarians to return to the motherland. "We do not want an unjust solution. We do not want southern Transylvanian counties where the Rumanian nationality is in the majority. The Hungarians who live in southern Transylvania and the Rumanians who live in northern Transylvania could voluntarily make a populace exchange." So he was proposing a peaceful border settlement. (Raffay, p. 40)

István Lakatos, another Hungarian, also spoke out for a peaceful border settlement. "I declare to you, I do not want to commit any kind of injustice toward the Rumanian people but I find it unjust that the ten million Hungarians who lived in the territory of Hungary in 1918, received only 93,000 square kilometers of their own territory and the 2,900,000 Rumanians received 104,000 square kilometers from Hungary. On mixed territories, the Rumanians and Hungarians can justly divide the territories if they both make sacrifices. They should divide the territories according to their numbers. In 1910, the populace of Transylvania was 48% Rumanian and only 36% Hungarian. In the name of justice, this is what they should receive, not the entire territory of

Transylvania with nearly two million Hungarians. The two million Hungarians are not sheep which the French can donate to Rumania just because, in 1916, Rumania was on their side during the war.” (Raffay, p. 40)

The Rumanians incarcerated and killed many Hungarian teachers, clergymen, doctors, actors and writers. For his just proposals, Áron Márton received ten years of solitary confinement and forced labor for the rest of his life; István Lakatos received ten years of solitary confinement and 25 years forced labor; Pál Szász, ten years of solitary confinement. I will not mention all the other names for lack of space. (Raffay, p. 41)

Raffay writes, quoting István Kocsis, that Bishop Győző Macalik of Transylvania was in the Jilava prison, in Rumania, where he was tortured to death in 1952. In the same place, in the same year, the Bishop of Szatmár and Várad, János Scheffer, was also tortured to death. In 1953, Szilárd Bogdánffy, Bishop of Szatmár and Várad, was tortured to death at Nagyenyed. In 1954, Alajos Boga, Bishop of Transylvania, at the prison of Máramarossziget, was tortured to death. In 1956, Bishop Béla Gaiditsy was tortured to death in the prison of Nagyenyed. The Hungarians had to suffer this torture and genocide just because they were Hungarians. When will the Hungarians receive recompense for all this suffering?

Lajos Kazár says that “the systematic thinning out of the ethnic Hungarians and Germans in Rumania began in the autumn of 1944. . . Roumanian Maniu-guardists . . . returning to northern Transylvania, which in 1940 had been reunited with Hungary, massacred many thousands of Hungarian civilians.”³¹² After the War, Transylvania was returned to Rumania.

Following the Revolution in Hungary in 1956, the anti-Hungarian activities in Rumania were increased. In 1958, when the Soviets left Rumania, the Rumanians more freely introduced anti-Hungarian laws which worked to create a national Rumanian state. They permitted the Jews to emigrate, sold the Rumanians of German origin to Germany. Only the Hungarians remained as their prey. The world media never raised their voice to support these remaining Hungarians.

³¹² Kazár, Lajos: *Transylvania, the Facts*, Canberra, 1989, p.14

According to Lajos Kazár, the following measures, officially denied, have been carried out in Rumania:

1. "Almost complete elimination of Hungarian and other ethnic educational institutions.
2. Suppression of Hungarian and other ethnic minority languages.
3. Falsification of historical data and population statistics.
4. Confiscation of cultural archives, even of church registers.
5. Obstruction of contacts with relatives abroad.
6. Dissolution of Hungarian and other ethnic communities under the guise of industrial resettlement.

Now, such measures surely amount to the crime of CULTURAL GENOCIDE as laid down in the UN Document E/447, 1948, of the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on Genocide." . . . "Western governments are generally silent on Roumanian violations of human rights, even if complaints have been presented by Amnesty International, and even if the complaints amount to the charge of cultural genocide."³¹³

After 1957, the Rumanian prisons filled up with Hungarian youths who in some way had shown solidarity with the spirit of freedom of the 1956 Revolution. In the eyes of the Rumanians, this kind of solidarity was regarded as irredentism. Ceausescu was regarded by the West as a hero who dared to oppose Stalin.

In the Rumanian schoolbooks, the Hungarians are described as barbarians, and the Rumanians as an ancient populace. When the Rumanian oppression of the Hungarians was at its peak, a brave Hungarian bishop, László Tőkés, at Temesvár, Transylvania, was influential in the fall of the dishonorable dictatorship of Ceausescu in 1989. The Rumanian people who were suffering together with the Hungarians, were hoping to create a new regime in Rumania. They realized that the chauvinistic, nationalistic politics were not a good solution and they hoped to come to an agreement with the Hungarians and the Szeklers to create a more humane society with no oppression. But it did not take long for the Rumanian Government to return to their usual chauvinistic politics. It makes no difference that they call the new regime "democratic". The long-engrained chauvinistic state politics are deeply rooted in the minds of the Rumanian people. We can even hear some murmurs that they will again occupy Budapest. In 1990, the

³¹³ Ibid. p. 14-15

Rumanian Fourth Army was strengthened along the Hungarian border.

In Yugoslavia, the hostility toward the Hungarians was mainly on the side of the Serbs and continued until the time of World War II. István Varga, from the village of Topolya, in the county of Bácska, which used to be Hungarian territory, served with Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia in the Spanish Civil War. Tito convinced him to organize a Hungarian regiment from the territory of Bácska, to serve in the Yugoslav Army. Groups of Hungarian partisans joined Varga's division and in the county of Bácska they developed a big propaganda campaign among the Hungarians, stating: "We Hungarians of the Vajdaság show Comrade Tito and the new Yugoslavia that we do not agree with those fascist Hungarians (those who fought on the German side). We shall show them that we are ready to fight with weapons in hand for the new Yugoslavia. Those who do not sign up are fascists and enemies of the people and will be punished. We shall exterminate them."³¹⁴ This division received the name "Petöfi Brigade". As a result of this propaganda, most of the Hungarian families sent one "volunteer". Their leader was István Varga. The formation of the Petöfi Brigade made it seem that the Hungarians of the Vajdaság opposed the reannexation of their territory to Hungary because they took up arms on Tito's side. These unfortunate soldiers were in a terrible situation because they had to fight against their motherland, Hungary.

World War II. was coming to an end. Tito could not allow this Hungarian division to survive the war. In case of a battle, this division was not allowed to surrender to the Germans so they were forced to fight because their families were living in Bácska in the Vajdaság. Tito's clique would have taken revenge on their families if they noticed that they were not fighting with all their strength. In April, 1945, Tito sent the lightly armed and not well-trained division, without the support of any heavy artillery to attack the strong German army which had tanks and heavy artillery. This battle lasted more than a week and, in spite of all the effort, 90% of the Petöfi Brigade were killed including István Varga. These Hungarians remained loyal to the good reputation of the Hungarian soldiers. They accepted the impossible task of saving their families at home but their march into death did not bring the hoped-for peace for their families.

³¹⁴ Szigethy, György: *Szemtánuja voltam*, Cleveland, Ohio, 1956, p. 31

The Serbs annihilated all the Germans who were living in this territory. The numbers of Hungarians who were killed, directly and indirectly, were approximately 60,000. Szigeti calls “killed indirectly” all those Hungarians who were killed in a period of extermination which followed the war. Many died by slow suffering from the cruelty of the prisons. Many starved to death and many died in “hospital treatment” where none of them survived.

From the beginning of September, 1994, for a period of several months, Ilona G. Stelmár, wrote articles in the newspaper called *Keresztény magyar vetés*, about the Yugoslavian atrocities against the Hungarians of Bácska county, after the end of World War II.

The strong animosity between the Serbs and Hungarians began in 1941 and became stronger as time went on. I have to relate the details of the slaughter of the Hungarians in Bácska because until now it has been covered up. The Communist dictatorship in Hungary and Yugoslavia, which came into power in 1945, did not allow the atrocities against the Hungarians to be brought to the knowledge of the public. Since then, other nations have been recompensed for their losses, some of them more than once, but the Hungarians have received nothing. In 1941, when a part of Délvidék was returned to Hungary, the incoming Hungarian soldiers were attacked by Yugoslavian partisans from the rooftops and the trees and ambushed as they were marching.

To put a stop to these ambushes the local Hungarian army commander at Ada captured 17 partisans and killed them. In retaliation, the Serbs gathered 200 Hungarians and, after submitting them to the most cruel tortures, they killed them. In the village of Mohol, 760 Hungarians were tortured for weeks on end. They carved out a belt of skin from their backs. Finally they shot them, naked, on the shore of the River Tisza and threw them into the river. The parish priest, Lajos Varga, had all his finger-nails and toe-nails torn off just because he made a pro-Hungarian speech when the Hungarian army came back. They slit his stomach so that his guts spilled out and then they hanged him. The partisan women tore off the robes of Dr. Jozsef Takács, the parish-priest of Péterréve, and they tore off his penis. Daily, they burned his body with rods of hot steel. Finally, after he had suffered enormously, on November 19, they stood him against the wall of his church and shot him. In 1941, in Csurgó, the Serbs captured two Hungarian policemen, whom they impaled.

At the time that Újvidék was returned to Hungary, the daughter of the Serbian pastor came to greet the commander of the Hungarian Army, with a bouquet of flowers in her hand. She shot him with a pistol hidden in the bouquet. The indignant Hungarian soldiers captured her and her father and a few accomplices whom they killed. Before they shot them, the village's Hungarian priest came forward, stood in front of them and asked them to kill him too, in order to maintain peace in the village. They would not do so. Two and one half years later, when the Serb aggression began, they first shot that same Hungarian priest. Out of the population of 3,300 Hungarians of the village of Csurgó, only a few survived.

The Hungarian Brigadier-General Feketealmi-Czeydner was tried by the Hungarian Martial Law for killing 869 Serb partisans. At the same time, the Yugoslav accusation against Feketealmi claimed that he killed only 756 partisans. This indicates that the Hungarian leaders issued no general order to kill partisans but when the killings occurred certain individuals were responsible for retaliation against partisans who conducted ambushes against them. On the other hand, the Serb retaliations were directed against innocent people. In the village of Zablya, a father had eight sons. The sons had to march at attention to the execution of their father. After the father was killed, the eldest son was executed and his brothers had to march at attention to his execution. This procedure was followed with each of the brothers but the youngest son who was thirteen years old refused to march at attention to each of the executions. When it was his turn to be killed, he spat at his captors who knocked out all his teeth, tied his testicles behind him with wire and hammered them. In this village, 2000 Hungarians were killed with similar brutality.

In the continued mass executions in Délvidék, about 10,000 Hungarians died. The only crime these people committed was that they were born Hungarian. It was not even allowed to mention these poor victims. Even decades later, the eye-witnesses did not dare to talk about what they had seen because they knew that revealing these secrets was punishable by death. This taboo is still in existence. The children were not even allowed to learn what had happened in their family.

In 1941, the Serbs gathered the workers of the Hungarian Railroad together. They tied nine of them together and laid their bodies on tracks. At first they allowed the locomotive to cut off their legs and

then they put their necks on the rail.

In 1849, in the village of Szenttamási, at the time of the Hungarian Freedom Fight, the Hungarian soldiers found the decapitated heads of thirty-seven children in the local Catholic church. The Hungarian soldiers were so upset that they shot 2000 Serbs. In 1945, in memory of this retaliation, the Serbs executed 3000 innocent Hungarians in Szenttamási. They made them dig a 20 meter long, seven meter wide, deep trench, lined them up in groups of 200 beside the trench and shot them. The following 200 had to bury those who were shot before them. In this small village, five mass graves of this kind were found. Among the victims was a young mother, seven months pregnant. The fetus had been cut out from her womb and in its place they put a dead cat. A forty-five year-old woman, with serious wounds, managed to climb out of this mass grave but without any assistance, she bled to death.

In Óbecse, 600 Hungarians were killed. The parish priest, Ferenc Péternyi, suffered a terrible death. A young partisan girl completely broke the body of the 65 year-old priest, undressed him and put him on the floor and with nailed boots walked on his body and his testicles. Finally, he was thrown out of the window and it was reported that he had committed suicide. In Óbecse, the Serbs cut off the male organs of the Hungarian men and stuffed them in their mouths before their execution. In every village and city such atrocities took place. In the village of Mozsor, 69 men were killed with selected forms of barbaric executions – cutting open the abdomen, pulling out the nails, squeezing of the testicles till they broke.

In 1941, in the city of Zombor, the Hungarians found 11 Serbs whom they brought before the court to be tried for anti-Hungarian actions. As a result, these 11 men were shot and killed. Two and a half to three years later, the Serb retaliation was terrible. At a horse race-track, they killed 2,500 Hungarians. Before they killed them, they made them run along carpets of embers. Many were thrown into the mass graves, still alive. Often the next day, their screams for help could still be heard. The Serbs buried people in a vertical position so that only their heads were above ground. Then they ran over the heads with tanks. The bus terminal of the city of Zombor was constructed on one of the sites of the mass burials. In the city of Zombor alone, 5,650 Hungarians were killed.

These merciless atrocities against the Bácska Hungarians were

committed by Tito's partisans. In the village of Pacséro, where 16 Serbs died, 200 Hungarians were killed by the Serbs. In the village of Bajmok, where the Hungarians executed 35 Serbs for ambushing, the Serbs killed 78 innocent Hungarians in retaliation. They skinned the judge of the village and he was still alive when they threw him into the grave. 7000 Hungarians are buried in a mass grave in the territory of Szabadka.

When this territory was returned to Hungary, no Serbs died in the village of Apati, yet the partisans killed 300 Hungarians. 500 Hungarians were executed in the village square in Kula, without any reason. Here, when the villagers were preparing food for the many starving children, the partisans came and urinated into the food. The Serbs often tied two Hungarians together, threw them onto a haystack and set fire to them. They tied people to logs and cut them in two with the electric saw. The blacksmiths were forced to nail hot horse-shoes onto the bare feet of Hungarian prisoners. These crimes which the Serbs committed against the Hungarians would take up too many pages to enumerate. In the villages of Topolya, Temerin, Péterrév, Bajmok and Gákovó approximately 10,000 to 15,000 Hungarians were killed.

Márton Szűcs, the parish priest of Bácsszöllős, and József Kovács, who was also a priest, wrote about these atrocities in their book: Halottak hallgatása, which they requested be published after their death because they were afraid of retaliation. In this book, they estimated the number of Hungarians who were killed to be 40,000. This book emphasizes that the Hungarians who were killed by the Serbs were all innocent people. The authors say that those officials who committed war crimes against the Serbs should not have been lynched in such a brutal way, but should have been brought to court and given a legal trial, as the Hungarians gave to the Serbs. In 1941, when Bácska was returned to Hungary, the Croats and Serbs did not suffer any harsh punishment. They were not deported out of the country, could remain in their homes and many of them in Sárvár in Transdanubia survived the war. If the Hungarians had deported them to Yugoslavia, most of them would have perished in the conflict in this territory. When they finally returned to their land, they declared that they had been interned in Hungary, yet it was a known fact that they could have left the country at any time. At the time of the First World War, the administration of the Serbian king brought in Serbs from the counties of Lika and Krbava to

the county of Bácska, to the cities of Mártonos and Kanizsa with the purpose of increasing the Serb population and altering the ethnic percentages. These newly-settled Serbs, as they noticed the weakening of the Serbian Royalty, changed their loyalties, abandoning the king and supporting the partisans. These people wanted to prove their loyalty to Tito by committing all these atrocities against the Hungarians and the Germans. The Serbs dared to do this because they felt that they had the support of the Soviet Union.

Brigadier-General Ferenc Szombathelyi and two of his generals and others were executed by the Serbs in the fall of 1946. It cannot be proved but it is generally believed that Szombathelyi was impaled. It was a known fact that he was innocent of every accusation since he had issued a command to cease all retaliations against the partisans. The Hungarian government gave him to Yugoslavia with the condition that his punishment should be no more than that which the Hungarian government had imposed on him, that was ten years imprisonment. The numbers of those executed in Yugoslavia, recorded by the priests, was 34,991 but, including those unrecorded, the number would reach 40,000. Many writers have noted that the Serbs and Croats hate foreigners.

In 1990, when Yugoslavia was dissolved, the Serbs attacked the Croats and the Slovenians because they were trying to achieve their independence. As a result many thousands of Hungarians living in that territory lost their homes. The young Hungarian men were recruited into the Serb army so that in the heat of battle the Hungarians would die and the policy of ethnic cleansing would be achieved legally. The Serbs almost erased Sarajevo from the map. Many Bosnian villages were erased. Tens of thousands of Bosnian women were raped.

During this Serb-Croatian conflict, many of the ancient Hungarian villages in northern Serbia were erased. The half a million Hungarians of the Vajdaság (Voivodina), were greatly reduced. In Serbia, the Hungarian population of South Bácska is 46%, yet 85% of the army recruits from Bácska to the Serbian army are Hungarian. These soldiers were placed in positions where the Serbs were expecting the NATO attacks in October 1998. They were expecting that the NATO retaliation against the brutal genocide conducted by the Serbs would further their policy of ethnic genocide because it would not be the Serbs but the Hungarian youths who would die. (Kanadai Magyarok, October 10, 1998) When the Croats recaptured certain of their territories, the

Serbs by the tens of thousands, fled to the territory of Bácska which used to belong to Hungary. In this way their numbers will change the percentage of Hungarians in Bácska. The homogenization which started at the time of Trianon continues with the ethnic genocide of Hungarians and Albanians..

According to the opinion of Raffay, at Trianon the principles of Democracy were ignored when the Allies did not apply the principle of Self-Determination to the Hungarians, although they had applied it to the Rumanians, Serbs and Slovaks. They should have taken into consideration the desires of all the peoples, not only some of them. This is the explanation for the fact that in the 1920's, the Hungarian people did not like the word "Democracy". Some historians distorted this feeling of the Hungarians and started to declare that the Hungarian people were on the far right, politically. At the same time, these historians announced that Czechoslovakia and the other Successor States were the champions of Democracy. Yet if we look into the laws and the history of the Successor States, then we can easily be convinced that regardless what system of government is in power in these states, the basis of their politics is to suppress the minorities, in order to homogenize their territory and to deny the demand of these minorities for autonomy.

The anti-Hungarian attitude is still prevalent. There is hardly ever a decision made in the Western world which would support the Hungarian interest. Since 1920, the Hungarians have never been able to regain permanently even one part of their territory or secure the basic human rights for those Hungarians who found themselves under foreign rulers. They have been unable to stop the genocide of Hungarians by the Slovaks, Serbs and Rumanians and the assimilation by the Austrians. The Hungarian emigrants do what they can to make known to the world the genocide which is taking place in the Successor States but the media does not support them. Even Pope John Paul II. is unwilling to send Hungarian speaking priests to Transylvania for the Csángó Magyars. With this denial, he helps the Rumanian forced assimilation. This papal indifference is also shown by the fact that the Pope does not speak out against the abortion in Hungary. Why is there such disinterestedness? The Western Capitalist system is not interested in the future of the small oppressed nations but rather has an interest in the giant conglomerates. The western nations are interested in production of industrial goods, the

idea of democracy and the elimination of borders so that their products can freely enter all countries and the idea of democracy can take hold without regard to the religion, language or culture of the people. The capitalists prefer there to be no national consciousness. They believe that the Trianon borders must remain because otherwise they would have to give in to the nationalistic demands of other nations.

The American foreign policy supports the same tendency because her policy is based on the philosophy of the Melting Pot. Most of the people who immigrated into the United States came with the purpose of settling and they gave up their past and assimilated. To do that it was necessary to learn the English language. The American people place a great emphasis on human rights, the freedom of speech and the press and the freedom of religion.

From 1980 on, many Latin Americans have settled in the U.S. and they have tried to maintain their culture. The Americans have encouraged this by allowing them bilingual education. In the past two decades, people have been encouraged to take pride in their roots, cultural groups have flourished, and the multi-cultural aspects of the American society have become appreciated. In spite of the fact that the Americans supported the Helsinki Agreement which ensured human rights to all minorities, the Americans have ignored the cultural oppression in the Central European countries and have made no efforts to enforce the Helsinki Agreement and prevent the cultural genocide of millions of people in these countries. The American politicians fear that if they support the nationalists or the collective rights of the European peoples, as I mentioned earlier, this would have a negative effect on the United States. Only Woodrow Wilson saw that the only solution in the European territories was self-determination but he was influenced against this idea and gave up this plan. The Allied Powers gave up the idea of giving minority rights to nationalistic groups in Europe and, in the frame of the Successor States, the law only allowed basic human rights to individuals. This decision favored the assimilation policies. The United States even today does not acknowledge the collective rights of the minorities in Europe. The politicians disregard the wishes of the minorities to have total autonomy, self-determination or even cultural autonomy.

My belief is that the politicians in Washington do not see clearly that the support of individual basic rights does not necessarily provide

for the support of the rights of the whole ethnic group. The chauvinist bureaucratic laws easily suppress the rights of the individual. A single individual voice is too weak a protest for anyone to solve the problem. By “basic human rights” the world means “no discrimination” but ethnic groups demand more than lack of discrimination. They want freedom to use their language and instruction in their own language, which helps to maintain their ethnic character. The United States favors maintaining the status quo. They believe that this helps to maintain order. At the same time, they believe that if they support collective rights, the situation will become unstable. This is why, in almost every case, the United States supports the government which is in power. The United States could easily help the oppressed peoples and could become their champion, if they would accept the view that these minorities have a democratic right to obtain their freedom and independence. This should be a part of the American foreign policy. Thus they would also help their own nation because their double-dealing politics result in the people’s hatred of America. Every nation sooner or later will need supporters. Once it loses the trust of the people then, when it is in need, it will receive not support but attack. With these politics they could easily have solved the Central European and Serbian crisis which appears to be insoluble. The peoples’ self-determination is the only lasting solution to this complicated question, which could resolve the situation in these territories and which would stop the chauvinist atrocities of Milosevic and Metziar.

There will be no peace and harmony while the officials of the United States make such remarks as “we cannot interfere into another country’s domestic policy” when they are asked to act to protect the basic human rights of the oppressed Hungarians living in the Successor States. This may be an international law but it is a law which should be changed. We can see that the United States which guaranteed the basic human rights at the end of World War II., does not support the basic human rights for individuals or the collective rights of the oppressed peoples. The representatives of the Successor States at Trianon used the argument that they were “oppressed” by the Hungarians in order to gain territories that they had coveted for years. They promised to protect the rights of the new minorities in their territories yet, since 1920, the Hungarian minority has been oppressed and persecuted in all of the Successor States and nothing has been done to stop the oppression. The

United States, with sanctions, could easily have prevented the anti-Hungarian assimilation and genocidal politics of the Successor States which has continued since 1920. They should have supported the actions of the Hungarian Government on behalf of the suppressed Hungarians, instead of opposing them.

Hungary was not in a position to oppose the anti-Hungarian propaganda of the Successor States because during World War I., and after World War II., Hungary was not a completely independent state. I am thinking here of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the German occupation in War II, and the Soviet occupation after World War II. After the Second World War, that lie was spread which still exists, that the Second Vienna Award, when Hungary regained some territory, was effected because of the good will of Hitler. This Decision was nullified because it was ordered by Hitler and the land was taken back. The truth is that President Tiso of Slovakia proposed that Germany and Italy be the judge in this matter. Such lies are the reason that the Hungarian irredentist movement failed. Moreover, at the end of the War, other villages in Csallóköz were given to Czechoslovakia. At the end of the War, Hungary came under Soviet occupation. The intention of the Communist Powers was to eradicate the patriotic feelings in Hungary.

In 1992, when Czechoslovakia was disintegrating, there was a new opportunity for a just territorial solution but, in Hungary, the cosmopolitan government of József Antall and the government of Gyula Horn which followed it, missed the opportunity to request that those Hungarian cities in Slovakia, which in 1910, had a majority of Hungarian population, be reannexed to Hungary after Czechoslovakia ceased to exist. After the break up of Yugoslavia, they also failed to request the return of the territories in Yugoslavia, where the Hungarians were living. These Hungarian governments did not even request that the Hungarians in this territory be allowed to have their autonomy. Whose mistake was this? Maybe it was the lack of knowledge of the Hungarian people because they were unable to elect real Hungarian leaders. No, the answer is clear, the media, the press and the West still support only such politicians who support their philosophy. If a politician appears who is patriotic, he is accused of being anti-Semitic, nationalist, neo-Nazi, fascist and so is not allowed to rise into power. This is why a real Hungarian leadership was not allowed to come into existence. Perhaps, in the future, this will change and the Hungarians living in the Successor

States will be able to stand up for their rights. These collective rights were given to the minorities in Italy, Spain, Belgium and Finland. Now it is time for the Hungarians living in the Successor States to obtain their rights.

China is one of the world's most powerful nations, severely criticized by the western states, particularly the United States because her politics limit the freedom of speech. At the same time the United States turns a blind eye to the abuses of freedom of speech and the press in her own country.

America seeks a policy of cooperation with China. The Sino-American relations would improve if America were to follow the example of China and adopt a policy of supporting the collective rights of the minorities in Europe. The American press gives extensive coverage to the negative acts of the Chinese such as the great injustice which was committed at Tiananmen Square, but they do not publicize the fact that China provides a wide reaching, minority policy. The Chinese minority program came into existence in 1941. This was followed by laws in 1949 and 1952 by the People's Republic of China which secured territorial autonomy for the national minorities. These laws were accepted into the 1954 Constitution which states: "The People's Republic of China is a multi-national state which was formed by all the minorities. Therefore it is a unified multi-national state, as was Hungary before 1920. All nationalities living in the country have the same rights. The nation guarantees the minority rights to further the interests of the minorities and develop equality, mutual understanding and mutual aid in connections between the minorities. It is strictly forbidden to discriminate against or suppress any minority in any way. Taking into account the demands of the minorities and their national characteristics, the state gives them economic aid and furthers their cultural development, giving territorial autonomy to those who live in large numbers in one area. They can create autonomous constitutions in their territories and can exercise their right to self-government. All the autonomous territories of the minorities of the People's Republic of China are inalienable from the Republic."

Three types of autonomous territories are currently found in China.

1. Autonomous province
2. Autonomous prefecture

3. Autonomous county

The administrators of these territories are elected from the local populace. The duties of their self-governing institutions are to promote education, scientific research, general culture, the protection of health, the administration of sports and the preservation of cultural inheritance. The state provides financial and technical support for the minorities' economic, social and cultural development and helps them to develop their own experts.

The here-mentioned basic rights of the minorities were secured in the constitution of 1984. According to this constitution, there were 5 autonomous provinces in China, Inner Mongolia, Ningxia-Hui, Uighur, Guangxi-Zhuang and Tibet. China has 31 autonomous prefectures and 124 autonomous counties.

The minorities living in scattered territories can create national villages, where they can use their own language for public administration. In the territories where minorities are living, multi-lingual local names and road signs can be found depending on the minorities. These signs are not merely in the language of the majority of the Chinese but also in the language of the minorities living in the territory. Besides the Chinese language, another six languages are printed on the Chinese banknotes. At the end of the nineteenth century, Hungary was the only country in the world which did this. They had the banknotes printed in seven languages.

For the majority of Chinese, family planning limits the number of children they are allowed but this law does not apply to the minorities. In China there is a National Research Institute to study the minority problems, which has its own publication.

These Chinese laws should be introduced in Europe and America. The politicians of Hungary should refer to these minority collective rights and on the basis of these they should demand the collective human rights for the Hungarian minority in the Successor States, instead of focussing on the individual basic human rights.

If Slovakia, Serbia, Rumania, Austria and the Czech state do not acknowledge the collective rights of the ancient Hungarian populace then we have to find another way to enforce these rights.

The national states have very little understanding of the minority problems. They do not regard it as politically important to solve these problems. But it is very important for the Central and European states.

To solve these difficult problems neither nationalism nor nihilism is suitable. The long lasting solution is to create equal rights for the majority and the minority.

In 1989, the Eastern European revolutions ignited the national feelings which led to the creation of new states like the Ukraine, Moldavia, Gruzia, Slovakia. In these states there was no bloodshed. Slavonia, Croatia and Bosnia were created after a bloody struggle. Old states like Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, were reinstated.

In the satellite states of Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Poland, which gained their freedom after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the nationalistic philosophy not only took away the independence of the minorities but also developed the oppression of the minorities who lived in their territories. This was the case especially in Serbia where there is an official policy of ethnic genocide against the Croats and the Bosnians and the same fate awaits the Albanians in Kosovo and the Hungarians in Délvidék (Voivodina). Bishop László Tőkés stood up bravely against Ceausescu, and was influential in ending his iron rule in 1989, creating a slight thaw in Rumania but the oppression and genocide of Hungarians still continues in that country only in a more covert manner. The same trend is visible in Slovakia and Ruthenia.

The Western politicians cannot understand why it is so difficult to find a peaceful solution to the Eastern European situation. Dr. József Pungur from Edmonton, explains the situation. He says that the states which were formed in the Middle Ages, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland etc., lived for centuries as kingdoms. At the end of the Middle Ages, the Germans obtained the power in the Western part of Europe. Hungary, and later the Dual Monarchy, obtained power over the Central part. Russia ruled the Eastern territory. The Ottoman Turkish Empire ruled over the Balkans. This order remained until the end of the nineteenth century. The Romantic movement awakened the national feelings in the smaller nations, who were living under these great powers. This caused the development of the national cultures and started the wars to obtain political independence. In the Balkan war, the Turks were forced to give up territories and new states were formed or older ones such as Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, Albania, Rumania, received their independence. This fact inspired the minorities who were living under the Monarchy to obtain their full independence. Some nations even went further, not only demanding independence but also advocating expansion. This

resulted in the assassination of Franz Ferdinand and his wife, which started the First World War.

The Great Powers found the solution to the problem of satisfying the nationalistic demands of these nations, in the dismemberment of Hungary at the Treaty of Versailles and Trianon. They relied on false data, and gave two thirds of Hungary to the new and artificially created neighboring states. But the problem was not solved because the Hungarians, who were the autochthonous people of the Carpathian Basin and who were in the majority in the Carpathian Basin, were given to these newly created states, and became a minority in their own homeland. They found themselves under the rule of nations who, because of their chauvinist nationalism, were unable to rule over a minority or live with them without suppressing them. This is why the minority peoples who lived under foreign rule, kept their desire for independence and this view was supported by the National Socialism of Hitler's era. That was the result of the Vienna Decisions. In Yalta, it was decided that the Trianon borders should be reinstated. Therefore, again, the plebiscite was not applied. Stalin solved the problem of nationalism by introducing and spreading internationalism which he propagated in a brutal manner. But this did not kill out the desire, just made it latent. It was waiting for the right moment to reappear. We have to mention that in spite of the constant reminder of internationalism, the Russian nationalism was very strong. The Soviet example was followed by Ceausescu in Rumania, the Serbs and now the Slovaks with their merciless anti-Hungarian laws.

At the time of the dissolution of the Soviet Union, in 1990, there were two forms of nationalism and both of them gained strength after the fall of Communism. One is the aggressive nationalism, whose goal is to create a nation where there is one language and one culture. They would oppress all minorities in the country. This is the situation which exists at present in Serbia. The other one is the defensive nationalism, like that of the Albanian freedom-fighters in Kosovo, which opposes the aggressive nationalism.. What can we do to solve this problem? The suppressed nations who live in this territory, the Bosnians, Albanians, Hungarians, Croatians and Germans, are unable to live under such a form of government because the government's goal is to eradicate them. Those nations whom the status quo favors, Rumanians, Slovaks, and Serbs, have lost the trust of the people because

378 László Botos

they have proven that they are unsuitable to rule over the minorities.

Chapter 23

The Vienna Awards

Hungary never gave up hope that her territorial claims would be finally heard and her borders be restored. She was not planning to take back territory with military action although the opportunity presented itself in 1937. Macartney tells us that when Hungarian Prime Minister, Kálmán Darányi, visited Berlin in November, 1937, with Foreign Minister Kánya, “Hitler again intimated to his guests that Hungary could have Slovakia-Ruthenia when he acted against Czechoslovakia.”³¹⁵ In response to this suggestion, Anthony Endrey tells us: “They made it clear to Hitler, however, during a state visit by the Regent to Kiel in August, 1938, that Hungary would not take part in any armed action against Czechoslovakia. At the Munich conference (the Four Powers Pact) held on September 29, 1938, when Britain, France, Germany and Italy dealt with the Czechoslovak problem, the Hungarian claims were referred to arbitration.”³¹⁶ The Four Powers, however, took the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia and gave it back to Germany. The World Press called this decision “the shame of Munich”. Török Sándor says that Hitler never forgave Horthy for instructing him in international political ethics and Hitler's continued hostile attitude toward Hungary stems from this rejection.³¹⁷

The foreign ministers of Germany and Italy proceeded to arbitrate between Czechoslovakia and Hungary at Komárom. The official position of the Hungarians at these negotiations was that the southern territories which were liberated from Czechoslovakia should be returned to Hungary and also three larger and some smaller territories of

³¹⁵ Macartney, C.A.: Hungary, A Short History, Edinburgh, 1962, p. 227

³¹⁶ Endrey, Anthony: Hungarian History, Part Three, Melbourne, 1981, p. 102-103

³¹⁷ Török, Sándor: Település történet a Kárpátmedencében, p. 258. A. Ullein-Reviczky: Guerre Allemande, Paix Russe. La Hongrie entre deux feux . . . Neuchatel, 1947, Horthy Miklos: Emlékirataim

mixed populace, surrounded by a majority of Hungarians. The north-western part would remain Slovakia. The Ruthenian territory should have a plebiscite to decide where it should belong and also the territory which was called East Slovakia, because the populace was part Ruthenian, part Slovak, part Hungarian and part German.

The Slovak position in these negotiations was to oppose the Hungarian demands and claim all the territories with mixed populace, even those territories where the Hungarians were in the majority. They opposed the plebiscite. They demanded Ruthenia and asked that it keep its autonomy under Czechoslovak administration. The Hungarian people followed the progress of the Komárom negotiations with scepticism because they did not desire the Slovak people to begin their autonomy within the Hungarian Kingdom. For 1020 years, the Slovaks had been faithful, loyal citizens in the Kingdom of Hungary. In addition, the Hungarian representatives at Komárom did not demand that the border of Hungary be restored to the borderline of Historic Hungary. The delegates could have demanded the return of the corridor of land where the populace was 92.4% Hungarian on 70% of the territory and the Slovak populace was just 3.4%. On 30% of this territory lived a mixed populace where it was 50% Hungarian and only 32.8% was Slovak.

The participants in the Four Powers Pact at Munich accepted the census of Greater Hungary of 1910 because the Czech census of 1930 did not mention the Slovak people, but called all the people Czechoslovak. The German and Hungarian Jews were simply declared to be Jews. At the same time the Czech or Slovak Jews were declared to be Czechoslovak and not Jews. There was such a big difference between the Hungarian Census of 1910 and the Czech census of 1930 that the Czech census automatically lost its validity. In spite of the natural 10% Hungarian population increase in Slovakia, the census showed a 20% decrease in Hungarians. Ten years later, it showed a 30% decrease.

Because there was an agreement to establish ethnographic borders, Hungary had to give up linguistic islands of Hungarians in Slovak or Ruthenian territories, living in cities like Pozsony and Kassa, where the Hungarians outnumbered the Slovaks. There were 224,115 Hungarians who came under Slovak rule. Sándor Török mentions that this number equals the number of French who lived in Alsace-Lorraine, in 1900, for whose "liberation" the Entente Cordiale military alliance was created. At the same time, the number of Slovaks on the territory

which the Hungarians wanted returned to Hungary, was 100,000 fewer. Because 21% of Hungarians who lived in Slovakia lived in isolated groups, the Hungarian delegates asked for such mixed territories where the total populace was 18,000 but the number of Hungarians was only 7000. They demanded a plebiscite in Ruthenia and East Slovakia. If there had been a plebiscite in East Slovakia and only 11% voted to stay with Hungary, then this territory would have been returned to Hungary. There was no doubt that the Hungarians who lived there, the Saxons who lived in Szepes and the Ruthenians were pro-Hungarian. The combined number was 44% of the populace. This is why the Slovaks opposed the plebiscite. (Török: p.260)

It was important to Hungary to regain possession of Ruthenia too, so that she could create a break in the closed ring of Little Entente nations and create a friendly border with Poland. It was important for both Poland and Hungary to create a balance of power with Germany. The following tables will show the Czech territory which was Hungarian territory until 1918 and which Hungary regained from the Czechs in the first Vienna decision in 1938. (Török, p. 263-264)

Distribution of population:

I. in the territories returned to Hungary:

Hungarian	German	Slovak	Ruthenian	Other	Total
751,951	17,354	84,905	8,941	6,148	869,299
86.5%	2.0%	9.8%	1.0%	0.7%	100%

II. In Slovakia:

252,666	184,189	1592,237	97,980	44,070	2,171,242
11.7%	8.5%	73.3%	4.5%	2.0%	100%

III. In Ruthenia:

60,905	55,094	3,394	323,835	12,512	455,740
13.1%	12.1%	0.7%	71.1%	2.7%	100%

Total of liberated citizens: 3,496,281 76.3%

At the negotiations at Komárom both parties made some

concessions. The Hungarians gave up their demand for a plebiscite in Eastern Slovakia. This meant that they gave up some Hungarian territory on which there was a mixed populace. At the same time, they gave up their demand for other territories where the Slovaks were in a slight majority. The Slovaks gave up their demand for some smaller territories of mixed populace on the southern side. However, they did not give up three territories of mixed populace which contained large cities, Pozsony, Kassa, Nyitra and Nagyszombat. They did not accept a plebiscite in the territory of Ruthenia.

The distribution of the population in 1910, on the three important territories of mixed populace are presented in the following tables:

Pozsony district

	Hungarian	German	Slovak	other	total
City of Pozsony	31,705	32,790	11,673	2,055	78,223
Villages betw. Pozsony and Hung. Lang. Ter.	6,102	3,487	2,712	49	12,350
	37,807	36,277	14,385	2,104	90,583
	41.7%	40.0%	15.9%	2.4%	100%

City of Pozsony w.out foreign citizens	31,705	27,132	11,673	514	71,024
Villages without foreign citizens	6,102	3,388	2,712	49	12,251
	37,807	30,520	14,385	563	83,275
	45.4%	36.6%	17.3%	0.7%	100%

Nyitra district

Nothern part, Hungarian majority	41,302	2,098	16,772	398	60,626
Southern part, Slovak majority	8,759	531	29,779	319	39,332
	50,061	2,629	46,551	717	99,958
	50.1%	2.6%	46.6%	0.7%	100%

	Hungarian	German	Slovak	other	Total
Kassa district					
City of Kassa	33,350	3,189	6,547	1,125	44,211
Villages to the south	10,654	111	3,180	121	14,066
Villages to the west	1,926	149	7,526	298	9,899
Villages to the east	3,671	105	8,762	451	12,989
	49,601	3,554	26,015	1,995	81,165
	61.1%	4.4%	32.1%	2.4%	100%
Kassa and immediate surroundings					
	49,601	3,554	26,015	1,995	81,165
Mecenzéf district	1,769	2,518	885	225	5,397
Nagyszalánc-Töketerebes distr.	7,238	90	7,134	332	14,794
Kassa and wider surroundings					
	58,608	6,162	34,034	2,552	101,356
	57.8%	6.1%	33.6%	2.5%	100%
City of Kassa w.out foreign citizens					
	33,350	1,193	6,547	395	41,485
Villages without foreign citizens	25,258	2,835	27,350	312	55,755
	58,608	4,028	33,897	707	97,240
	60.3%	4.1%	34.9%	0.7%	100%

I have to emphasize that the 1910 Hungarian census was more accurate than the Austrian census in Austria. The Hungarian census counted the total number of Hungarians and foreign citizens together. It indicated the number of minorities according to their mother-tongue. According to the census, the number of foreigners living in Hungary was 278,130. If this number had not been counted separately, the percentage of Hungarians would have been 55.3% instead of 54.5%. According to Béla Kenéz, in 1900, 86% of these foreigners were Austrian citizens whose mother-tongue was Polish, German or Czech.³¹⁸ In the 1910

³¹⁸ Török, Sándor: Op. Cit. p. 263; Kenéz, Béla: Magyarország népességi statisztikája, Budapest, 1906

Hungarian census the number of people in the category “other” had increased. In the Austrian census the numbers of Germans increased. From the 1910 census, we cannot distinguish how the foreigners were divided in the small communities but it was possible to count their numbers in the larger cities. In the category “other”, the origin of the “others” was noted in a footnote. In Pozsony, which is now the capital of Slovakia, in the category “others” which numbered 1,541, there were 1242 Moravians, 115 Poles, 69 English, 65 Italians and 50 Bulgarians. These were all foreign citizens. If we subtract the total of these numbers from the total number of foreigners in Pozsony, 7,199, then we are left with 5,658 which means that, in Pozsony, this was the number of Austrians.

Although the Hungarian census was more accurate than the Austrian census, it was conducted by officials of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and therefore was not entirely favorable to the Hungarians. The Hungarian numbers were played down and the minorities were favored by the Austrians.

In their census, most European nations ask about the national origin of the citizens. The Austrians asked what was the conversational language of the citizens. This kind of questioning obviously favored the Austrians. In Vienna, the conversational language of every family was German, not Polish, Czech or Hungarian. The Hungarian census of 1910, registered the mother-tongue of the people, therefore it did not count those people as Hungarian who were pro-Hungarian but whose mother-tongue was not Hungarian.

In regard to the reliability of the census, I wish to mention the Census of 1890, which was very unfavorable to the Hungarians and did not accurately reflect their numbers. The Roman Catholic Church taught the young Catholics that only the Catholics would go to Heaven. Those who were not Catholic were automatically excluded and were sinful people. This turned the Catholics against the Protestants, Jews and the Greek Orthodox Catholics. Because the ecclesiastical language of the non-Catholics was the vernacular and because their churches did not exact a tithe from their parishioners, many Hungarians began to associate themselves with the Serbs, Germans or Rumanians. The Roman Catholic Church was given the duty of conducting the census in the time of King László (Saint László) in the eleventh century. Since many Hungarians were affiliated with the Protestant, Jewish or Greek

Orthodox faiths, they were declared in the census as “others” and not counted as Hungarians at all. This is one of the reasons that the Hungarians in their own land were assimilated into the minorities.³¹⁹

In Komárom, the Hungarian and Slovak delegates could not come to an agreement on the territories of Pozsony, Nyitra and Kassa where the populace was 50% Hungarian and 32.5% Slovak. **Therefore the Slovaks asked the Germans and Italians to decide the matter.** The Czechs flatly denied the request of the representatives of the Ruthenian people for a plebiscite. **They were certain that the people would have voted that this territory be returned to Hungary because the population of the city of Ungvár was 80.3% Hungarian and just 3.8% Ruthenian. The population of the city of Munkács was 73.5% Hungarian and only 8.1% Ruthenian. The Czechs supported the claim of the Slovaks.** The Hungarian delegates at the negotiations at Komárom accepted the request of the Slovaks to hand over the decision to the Germans and Italians but they asked that the Poles also be a part of the decision-making. This Hungarian proposal was not accepted because the Slovaks stipulated that, if the Poles were to be a part of the decision then the Rumanians should also be included. Therefore the government of Hungary was forced to accept the decision of the axis powers if they did not want to go to war.

In Munich, Hitler accepted the Slovak proposal that the Germans take part in the decision about the division of the territories. The Slovaks asked the Germans to be one of the judges in this matter because this was favorable for Slovakia. The German plan was to give every city to Slovakia, where the number of the German-speaking populace reached 1000, disregarding the fact that the majority of the citizens were Hungarian. We can see what was Hitler’s plan for the future. He already knew that he would not keep his agreements with the Czechoslovaks and he knew that he would occupy Moravia and that he would place Slovakia under German rule. To fulfil this plan, he needed the German populace who lived in the northern part of Hungary. These Germans would have provided Hitler with support from within the country.

The dispute continued in Vienna in the Belvedere Palace. The diary of the widow of Ciano, the former foreign minister of Italy,

³¹⁹ Joseph Báli, József: *A gúzsba kötött világ*, p. 164

mentions that Ribbentrop supported the Slovak proposals, as long as they made one change – to allow the city of Ungvár to return to Hungary. The Italians supported the Hungarian request and agreed to half of the proposals. The Germans wanted to give Pozsony to Slovakia. They agreed that Kassa would be returned to Hungary if Pozsony was given to Slovakia and they divided Nyitra and the surrounding territories between Hungary and Slovakia. I would like to remind the reader that, after World War II. the anti-Hungarian propaganda and Stalin himself often used the explanation that Hungary received these territories through the good will of Hitler. (Török, p. 265-266)

On the following table, we can see the cities which were the subject of the negotiations at Komárom and the final decision at Vienna. The first column will show the 16 Hungarian cities which were given to Czechoslovakia at Trianon, where the Hungarians were in the majority. Those cities which the Germans proposed to give back to Hungary are indicated in bold characters. The second column shows 16 cities which the Slovaks claimed. In this second column, there are 6 cities which were mentioned in Column I. The third column will show 16 cities where the Germans lived in larger numbers. The number of Germans includes the Austrian citizens if their language was German. According to this table we see that Hungary would have lost eight of the 16 largest Hungarian cities including Pozsony and Kassa. The Slovaks would have kept all the 16 cities, and cities where Germans were over one thousand. They would have received altogether 24 cities. This is why the Slovaks suggested having the Germans make the decision. There is a cross beside the two cities which were actually returned to Hungary after the Italian intervention in the negotiations. (Török, p. 267)

Hungarian population	Slovak population	German population
1. Kassa + 33,350 75.4%	Pozsony 11,673 14.9%	Pozsony 32,790 41.9%
2. Pozsony 31,705 40.6	Selmec 8,341 55.0	Késmárk 3,242 51.3
3. Komárom 19,924 89.2	Rózsahegy 8,340 68.1	Kassa 3,189 7.2
4. Érsekújvár 14,838 91.5	Nagyszombat 8,032 53.0	Munkács 3,078 17.8
5. Ungvár 13,590 80.3	Kassa 6,547 14.8	Nagyszombat 2,280 15.0
6. Munkács + 12,686 73.5	Eperjes 6,494 39.8	Gölnicbánya 2,096 54.6
7. Beregszász 12,432 96.1	Igló 5,103 48.5	Igló 1,786 17.0
8. Losonc 10,634 82.2	Zsolna 4,954 53.9	Dobsina 1,688 33.6

Hungarian population			Slovak population			German population		
9.Nyitra	9,754	59.4	Nyitra	4,929	30.0	Nyitra	1,636	10.0
10.Léva	8,752	90.5	Beszterce bánya	4,388	40.7	Bártfa	1,617	24.6
11.Eperjes	7,976	48.8	Újbánya	4,256	88.4	Bazin	1,558	32.4
12.Selmec	6,340	41.8	Szakolca	4,155	82.8	Huszt	1,535	14.9
13.Rimaszombat	6,199	89.7	Modor	4,124	82.3	Körmöc	1,514	33.5
14.Nagyszőlős	5,943	76.1	Trencsén	3,676	47.0	Zsolna	1,463	15.9
15.Rozsnyó	5,886	89.7	Zólyom	3,579	40.7	Eperjes	1,404	8.6
16.Besztercebánya	5,261	48.8	Korpona	3,460	86.1	Löcse	1,377	18.3

Upon superficial examination, one might state that the purpose of the Hungarians was to reannex as many of their lost territories as possible. The Slovaks' goal was to prevent this from happening and to retain the territories. Looking at this question objectively, the best situation would have been to free as many people as possible from the minority status. In other words, the fewest possible people would remain in minority status.

As we can see from Sándor Török's history of settlement, a perfect solution was not possible because of areas of mixed population of Germans, Hungarians, Slavs and Slovaks. At the Komárom negotiations, the Hungarian proposal was that the percentage of people remaining in a minority status would have been 77.4%. Those who would have been freed would have been 22.6%.

According to the Slovak proposals, 75.0% would have remained as minorities and 25% would have been freed. According to the German proposals, 75.4% would have remained in minority status and 24.6% would have been freed. According to the Vienna Award, 76.3% remained in minority status and 23.7% were freed.

In the First Vienna Award, Hungary received from her lost territory, part of Slovakia (Felvidék) and part of Ruthenia – 12,700 square kilometers of land and 1,030,000 persons including 830,000

Hungarians, 140,000 Slovaks, 20,000 Germans, 40,000 Ruthenians and others.³²⁰

Historians wrongly call the result of these negotiations, when Felvidék (Slovakia) was returned to Hungary, “the Division of Czechoslovakia”. This expression is incorrect, writes Sándor Török, because Czekoslovakia was never a unified state, it was a newly-created state. When East and West Germany were unified, East Germany was eliminated and Germany again became one nation. When Felvidék (Slovakia) returned to Hungary, Slovakia no longer existed and Hungary again became one nation. In the negotiations at Komárom there were discussions about the territory and political borders of Slovakia. The Slovak name appeared as part of Czechoslovakia but the exact borders of Slovakia were not known.

At the end of these negotiations, the official borders of Slovakia were established. We can state that the southern border of Slovakia was also the northern ethnic border of Hungary. When the Czechs were forced to give up Hungarian territory, the Hungarian, Slovak and Ruthenian minorities were liberated. Under the ancient Hungarian County System, language borders were not a consideration. Now, for the first time these ethnic groups were attempting to establish ethnic borders.

When the land of Hungary was carved up, the cartography or map-making skills of the period were inadequate which also served the advancement of the minorities. Why? On the older maps there was no possibility of indicating the density of the population. In Western Europe, there is a sharp line dividing the minorities within the nations. Where the populace was mixed, the minorities were indicated by colors. On the Austrian maps every territory in which Germans lived was always indicated as a German homogeneous territory even if the Germans were in the minority, for example, southern Transylvania, Királyföld, Pozsony and Bánát. On these maps, the territories where the Hungarians lived in the majority were indicated as Hungarian territory. On the remaining territory on the map it was not considered whether the territory was populated or unpopulated. It was designated as belonging to whatever people lived there. Therefore a territory marked on the map as a Rumanian or Slav or German territory was drawn larger than its

³²⁰ Chászár, Edward, Decision in Vienna, Danubian Press, Astor, Fla

actual size.. Because of using this technique when creating the maps, the territories or the mountain chain which were close to the above mentioned Hungarian territories were marked as Rumanian in spite of the fact that this area was unpopulated. These unpopulated territories had belonged to Hungary for a thousand years and should have remained with Hungary. In such a representation we can see the Austrian Hapsburg anti-Hungarian politics to weaken the effort for Hungarian independence and strengthen the anti-Hungarian feelings of the minorities in Hungary.

Count Pal Teleki was the first to notice the inaccuracy of the ethnographic maps. He worked out a map where the nationalities were represented according their numbers. Such a map was very suitable for the military maps on which the scale was 1:200,000. But to show Historic Hungary on the map according to this ratio, 47 pages would be required, with each page measuring 38 cm. by 55 cm. If they wanted to put it onto one page it would have to be 4.20 m. wide and 3.33 m. long. So we can see that it was not possible to give a detailed map of Transylvania which was part of Hungary.

In 1920, Teleki's maps were published in reduced size on a scale of 1:1,000,000. This meant that the territory of Historic Hungary had to be presented in much smaller proportions. On these maps 100 people were represented by a colored block, 1 mm. square. The disadvantage of this map technique was that a city of 100,000 people would have to be represented by a block of 10 square cm. which was much larger than the city's actual territory. Therefore the block was placed far from the city, which meant that it was not possible to see the exact population represented in this territory. On the territories where the populace was mixed, the mosaic technique was used and even there a distortion appeared because some of the minorities were represented in territories where they were not living. For example the Hungarian city of Brassó appeared as a Rumanian language territory. At the same time Nagyszeben, where the Germans were in the majority, was represented as city of Hungarian language and Budapest was represented as a territory of "others" or Slavs. If we looked at the colored circles on the map where these cities were located, then we would be quite misled. It was not possible to determine the exact location or number of population of the nationalities on the mixed territories until 1940, when Pál Teleki published two maps of Transylvania, where Transylvania was

represented on a scale of 1:500,000 and the minorities were represented on a scale of 1:750,000. Because of the larger scale, these maps minimized the mistakes of the former maps but were not perfect. If we add all the similar colored circles, according to the administrative units, and we round them off to the nearest thousand, then we will obtain approximately accurate numbers of the populace living there. Using this method we can obtain the most accurate numbers of the minorities in the territories of mixed populace. Unfortunately, after the Second World War, when the Soviet Union broke into these territories, the question of providing a just solution to the minority problems was postponed indefinitely. (Török, p. 272)

In 1939, the Soviet Union found that the time had arrived to repossess the territories which the Czar had lost during World War I. In the first year of the Second World War, as an ally of Germany, the Soviet Union repossessed more than half of the eastern territory of Poland which had been occupied by the Germans. In 1940, she took unpopulated territory from Finland and then gave an ultimatum to Rumania to give up Northern Bukovina. The Soviets demanded Bessarabia and Bukovina based partly on historical and partly on ethnographic claims but both claims were very questionable because these territories, after the dissolution of Cumania, had come under the rule of the following nations: the Principality of Rumania, the feudal states of Hungary and Poland, and also Turkey, Russia and Austria. The peoples living there were Wallachian, Ukrainian, Russian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, German and Tartar. The language of the majority was Wallachian. The populace of the northern part of Bukovina was Ukrainian, that of the southern part was Wallachian. Smaller numbers of Germans and Hungarians lived in both parts.

Before sending the ultimatum to Rumania, the Soviet Union, acknowledging the Hungarian claims to Transylvania, made a proposal to the Hungarian Government, through the Soviet Embassy at Budapest, that a combined Soviet-Hungarian attack be launched against Rumania. The goal of the Soviets was simple and clear. The questionable Soviet claims to Bessarabia and Bukovina were packaged in with the Hungarians' thousand year old right to repossess Transylvania. The Soviets had learned from their attack on Finland that they would not be strong enough to attack Rumania on their own. This was the reason for the proposal for a joint attack by the Hungarians, the Bulgarians and the

Soviets. The Soviets had also considered the possibility that the Germans would oppose their claim to Bessarabia and Bukovina so, by involving Hungary and Bulgaria, they hoped to avert a German action to prevent their taking over these two territories. If Transylvania were returned to Hungary and Dobrudja to Bulgaria, with Soviet intervention, this would have allowed the Soviets to extend their influence to the Danubian states and introduce their Soviet politics into Central Europe. This is the reason that the Hungarian government did not accept the Soviet proposal.³²¹ This Soviet proposal would have provided the only way to stop the spread of the overwhelming German influence in Central Europe. This could have led to the possibility of the establishment of Hungary as a neutral state. However the government of Count Pál Teleki did not wish to take part in a Soviet Communist act of aggression.

On the suggestion of the Germans, the Rumanian Government accepted the Soviet ultimatum and gave up Northern Bukovina. Then Bulgaria announced its demand to repossess Dobrudja. Following this, the youths of Budapest demanded that Transylvania be returned to Hungary. The Hungarian Government thought that the international situation was favorable for them to fulfill their long-time desire to repossess the territory that had been taken from them. The French had been defeated by the Germans, and Soviet Russia, which 22 years earlier had instigated Rumania to attack Hungary, now was instigating a Hungarian attack on Rumania. Rumania had to consider not only Hungary but also Bulgaria. The balance of power appeared favorable to Hungary. The Little Entente had ceased to exist in 1938. The Czechs were under German occupation. In Yugoslavia, the non-Serb populace would have sabotaged every action of the Serbian army, therefore they did not have to consider an anti-Hungarian attack from that quarter. With the First Vienna Decision, and the re-annexation of Ruthenia to Hungary, the Hungarian population had grown by almost two million. At the same time, Rumania lost three million people, and of the remaining Rumanian population, three million people were not Rumanian. They were Hungarian, German, Bulgarian and Turk. The percentage of the Rumanian population which was not Rumanian was 37% which had an effect on the remaining 63% of the Rumanian population.

³²¹ Török, Sándor: *Op. Cit.* p. 323; Hóry, András: *Még egy barázdát sem*, Munich, 1967

The Hungarian government knew that they had the upper hand, yet they did not involve themselves in a war but instead demanded negotiations. Here it is worth mentioning that the Hungarian Prime Minister, Pál Teleki, the family of the Regent, Miklós Horthy, his most trusted advisor, Count István Bethlen and also the Defense Minister and Foreign Minister were all of Transylvanian descent. The foreign politicians did not acknowledge that the Hungarian politicians, instead of taking advantage of the circumstances favorable to them for the repossession of Transylvania, opted to take the honorable position of making a just decision which would be a permanent solution to the minority problems. This idealism of the Hungarian politicians eventually caused Hungary to lose the chance of repossessing Transylvania.

The Rumanian oil was most important to Hitler, therefore he suggested to the Hungarians that they should wait and at the end of the War they would receive all the territories that they were demanding. Here we have to note that Pál Teleki, the Hungarian Prime Minister, did not refuse the Soviet proposals because he was hoping that in the uncertain future he might be able to repossess these territories as a gift from Hitler. András Hóry, the Hungarian representative at the Rumanian-Hungarian negotiations for border revisions in 1940 at Turnu-Severin (Szörénytornya), was advised by the Hungarian government not to rely on the Axis powers.³²² At the same time it was clear from the Rumanian attitude that they were counting on Hitler's support. The following was the Hungarian proposal for the solution of the Transylvanian problem at the negotiations of Turnu-Severin:

1. In spite of the 1000 years of historical Hungarian rights, they did not wish to repossess all the territory because they did not wish to have a large number of Rumanians within the Hungarian borders.
2. They would only accept a solution which would return to them the entire Székelyföld (Szekler land).
3. **The size of the territory in Transylvania which would be reannexed to Hungary would depend on the population of this territory. This number would include the number of Hungarian-Rumanians on this territory in 1940, which was 2 million plus the 280,000 Hungarians which the Rumanians had**

³²² Ibid. Op. Cit. p. 325; Hóry: Op. Cit

chased out from Rumania into Hungary and the 100,000 Hungarians who were forced by the anti-Hungarian politics to flee to America, an approximate total of 2,400,000 people. This proposal would involve a mutual exchange of populace in order to achieve a just and lasting solution.

4. In 1919, Hungary would have accepted an autonomous Transylvania, but in 1940, they were unable to do this because several hundred thousand Hungarians were chased out of Transylvania and those Hungarians who remained in Transylvania were economically ruined. (Török, p. 325) (At the time of this writing, in 1999, there is a strong movement for an autonomous Transylvania, supported by the Hungarian and Rumanian youths and the Rumanian intelligentsia because they hate to see the wealth of Transylvania taken out and sent to the former Rumanian kingdom.)

When Hitler was informed about the Hungarian proposals for the solution of the Transylvanian question, he first of all objected to the proposed date for these transactions and then he opposed the reannexation of the Transylvanian Saxons and the Schwabs of the Bánát to Hungary because he counted on them to ensure the continuation of the economic support of Rumania and the supply of Rumanian oil to Germany. Because of Hitler's opposition, the Hungarians had to give up their claim to the Bánát, where 100,000 Hungarians were living, although the Schwabs in this territory were willing for the annexation to take place. Therefore, not only the Hungarians but all the other peoples living on this territory were given to Rumania.

The Hungarians negotiated with Rumania taking into account the four points mentioned above and accepted the border line which was drawn at the cease-fire on November 13, 1918. This border-line followed the Maros river but this time it included the Székelyföld (Szekler land). This was not the final border but provided a basis for negotiations. They were secretly willing to concede the Transylvanian Erzgebirge to the Rumanians. This was similar in size to the territory of the Székelyföld. The Hungarians did not urge the repossession of Ruthenia and they were willing to give up territories in the north-eastern part of Transylvania. Hóry could not announce this proposal at the Turnu-Severin Negotiations because the Hungarians could not accept the proposal of Pop, the Rumanian representative, for a population exchange of two million Hungarian citizens living in Rumania for 10,000

Rumanians living in Hungary. The Hungarians wanted the territory of Transylvania along with the populace. Rumania used the Turnu-Severin Negotiations to gain time, while the Rumanian army was on the way to Transylvania. Then Rumania allowed Bulgaria to repossess the territory of South Dobrudja. From this advantageous position the Rumanians could offer some proposals to Hungary. I do not intend to deal with political events in this chapter but rather I would like to look at the two rivals and see how much their proposals would have helped to create a true national state in the Carpathian Basin.

The proposal of the Hungarians, which was the basis of the negotiations, was to draw the border along the Maros River and the southern border of the Szekler land. From an ethnographic point of view it would appear as if the Hungarians were demanding too much for a just solution. However, this was a tactical demand to see how much they could let go. In the territory south of the Maros-Nagyküküllő-Székelyföld line, the number of Rumanian population was relatively low, 1,021,000, which is only 56% of the total population, and in the northern territory, which the Hungarians regarded as a negotiation piece, the Rumanian population numbered 88.5%. This is about the same number as the Szekler population living on the Székelyföld which Rumania received at Trianon. If the Hungarians had begun the negotiations by offering the northern territory to Rumania, then perhaps the Rumanians would have continued the negotiations.

The creators of the Dictated Peace Treaty of Trianon lost their influence over the Danube Valley. The new agenda at Vienna was to recreate the borders. The Hungarian dilemma was whether or not to give up those territories where Hungarians and other non-Rumanian people were living. At that time, in Budapest, there was no consideration of dividing up Rumania. This was obvious in the government's refusal of the earlier mentioned Soviet proposal to attack Rumania. The Hungarian proposal for the redrawing of the borders would have reannexed to Hungary (from Rumania) the Hungarian territories and the territories of mixed populace and would have left for Rumania all the non-Hungarian and non-Rumanian territories. That meant 770,000 people would be given up by Hungary to become Rumanian citizens. This is a considerable number. The ancestors of these non-Hungarian, non-Rumanian citizens migrated into the ancient Hungarian territories and made it clear that their wish was to settle in Hungary rather than in

Wallachia, otherwise they would have chosen to settle there. Therefore Rumania never had and even now does not have the right to demand that the non-Rumanian populace come under their jurisdiction. It is not right that the Hungarian government gave up the territory of the Bánát to Rumania at the negotiations at Turnu-Severin.

The Rumanian proposal at these negotiations only emphasized the exchange of population and some correction of the borders without clarifying exactly which territories were involved. At that time, the Rumanian government in Bucharest had to know that the Hungarian government came to these negotiations with the intention of reclaiming the two million Hungarian citizens (1,665,469 Hungarians and others) who had been separated from Hungary at Trianon. They also had to know that in mutilated Hungary there was no space and no jobs for two million people. Therefore they knew that they would have to give up a considerable sized territory from what they had received at the Treaty of Trianon. This territory was Transylvania, which was the land closest to Hungary, where two million people were living.

If we suppose that the Rumanians intended to exchange a smaller number of the population, then the territory in which Hungarians were living in Eastern Hungary (the Partium) and the territory connecting it to north and inner Transylvania would be the territory returned to Hungary rather than Transylvania. In 1920, the number of Hungarian citizens on all the territory given to Rumania was 1,665,469. In the Partium alone the population was 873,000. In the Hungarian language territory connected to the Partium (not counting the Székelyföld and its surroundings) the population was 425,000. In the Rumanian language territories of the Partium and the counties of north-western Transylvania, the total population was 314,000. If we add these three numbers we will get 1,612,000. If we add a segment from Maros, Torda and Kisküküllő territories with a population of 53,000, then we will get 1,665,000. This number, in the 1910 census, consisted of 915,000 Hungarians, 700,000 Rumanians and 50,000 others who were all Hungarian citizens. In the Rumanian proposal at Turnu-Severin, 750,000 Hungarians would have remained in Rumanian territories. This meant that in 1940, 2 million people would be transferred from their homes with all the suffering and bureaucracy involved. How would this have been advantageous for Rumania and how would Hungary have fared? With this proposal Rumania would only have had to give up a

territory on which the Hungarians living under Hungarian rule would have been able to live. With this they would be able to rule all the non-Hungarian language territories in Transylvania, with 770,000 non-Rumanian inhabitants. At the same time, they did not consider exchanging the 90,000 ethnic Hungarians who lived in the former kingdom of Rumania. This plan would have prevented the extension of Hungarian territory to the Carpathian Mountain range. If Hungary had regained the Székelyföld, the Hungarian border would be closer to the Rumanian oil fields and Bucharest. From the strategic point of view this plan was advantageous to Rumania. The populace exchange would mean that at least 700,000 Hungarians and Szeklers would leave their clean, well-equipped homes in the cities of southern Transylvania, allowing some Rumanians to move out of their inadequate housing and take over these much nicer homes. According to this plan, one quarter of the Transylvanian Rumanians would have attained a much higher standard of living, at no cost to the Rumanian government, which the government would never have been able to provide for them.

If Hungary had accepted the Rumanian proposal as a basis for the negotiations, and the possibilities which would have followed, then she would have gained a considerable territory. She probably could have regained some of the bigger cities such as Szatmár, Nagyvárad, Arad, Kolozsvár and some smaller cities such as Máramarossziget, Nagybánya, Felsőbánya, Nagykároly, Nagyszalonta, Szilágysomlyó, Zilah, Bánffyhunad, Szamosújvár, Dés, Torda, Nagyenyed, the Szamos, Kraszna and the Sebes-Körös territories which included the counties of Ugocsa, Szatmár, Szilágy, Szolnok-Doboka, and Kolozs and the larger part of the counties of Bihar, Csanád, Torda-Aranyos, and a smaller part of the counties of Máramaros, Alsó-Fehér and Arad. On these territories, the Hungarian government would have had to build new homes for approximately one million people because the Hungarians could not move into the inadequate quarters of the Rumanians. They would have had to build high schools and universities because the Rumanians had very few schools. There are data remaining from 1903 about the difference in the cultural level of the two peoples. In 1903, 81% of the populace of Historic Hungary, above 20 years of age were able to read and write and only 29% of the Rumanians. The 29% of the Transylvanian Rumanians who could read and write surpasses the number of 20 year old Rumanians in Rumania who could read and write

which was only 11% . In Hungary, 71.9% of the army recruits, including the minorities were literate. In Russia, only 38.9% were literate, in Germany 99.6%.³²³

In addition to this, Hungary would have had to build at least one thousand new Protestant and Catholic churches because the Byzantine style churches were not suitable. Under the above-mentioned tasks, writes Török, the enlarged Hungary would have collapsed and at the same time, Rumania, reduced in size, would have been enormously strengthened. This is why there were large mass celebrations in the streets of the Rumanian cities during the negotiations. It was clear to them that Rumania stood to gain much from the agreement. When the Hungarian government rejected the Rumanian proposals as a basis for negotiation, maybe the Hungarian delegates did not even see clearly the advantages for the Hungarians. There is no question that this would have led to a desperate dispute. For example, the Rumanians did not accept the Hungarian speaking Jews as Hungarians. The Rumanians did not recognize all the people on the registers of the Hungarian churches as Hungarian speaking and reduced their number by half a million. Many more complicated questions could be mentioned but for lack of space we have to let them rest.

Because the negotiators could not agree on the basics at Turnu-Severin, István Csáki, the Hungarian Foreign Minister, invited Maniolescu, the Rumanian Foreign Minister, to Budapest for face-to-face negotiations. The Rumanians rejected the time and place and there was no further opportunity to settle the problems by negotiations. The Germans were afraid of a Rumanian-Hungarian war breaking out in the shadow of the Great War. There was no doubt in the mind of the Germans, who would come out victorious. They were worried that the victorious Hungarian army would not be able to be stopped until they reached the borders of Historic Hungary. The Schwabish and Saxon territories would not remain in Rumanian hands as the Germans wanted. In case of a Hungarian-Rumanian war, both countries would have suspended their exports to Germany which the Germans badly needed for their war preparations, especially the oil. Ribbentrop, the German Foreign Minister requested that Csáki and Pál Teleki come to Vienna and roughly informed them that, if it was necessary, Germany would

³²³ Ibid. p. 329. Dr. Béla Kenéz: *Magyarország népességi statisztikája*, Budapest, 1906

stop the armed conflict between the two countries. He ordered that Hungary ask for German and Italian arbitrators to decide this question. When Csáki emphasized that he would like to negotiate with the Rumanian Foreign Minister, in the presence of foreign ministers of the Axis powers, Ribbentrop rejected his request and angrily brought into the discussion that the Hungarians had supposedly committed offenses against the German minorities in Hungary. On the advice of Csáki and Admiral Horthy, the Hungarian government accepted the arbitration by the Germans and Italians because by then there was no other possible solution. This was accepted by the Rumanians also with one stipulation, that the new borders would be guaranteed by Germany. In this way the Second Vienna Award was enacted on August 30, 1940. (For detailed information see András Hóry's afore-mentioned work.) The decision was actually made not in Vienna but in Berlin and the Italians had no voice in the decision. The new borders were drawn by Hitler and made into law in Vienna.

What did the Second Vienna Award mean for Hungary and Rumania and for the Germans? This will be shown in the following statistics. According to the 1910 census, on August 30, 1940 the following populations were reannexed to Hungary:

Hungarian	German	Rumanian	others	Total
1,123,216	89,254	919,690	53,386	2,185,546
51.4%	4.1%	42.1%	2.4%	100%
Populations remaining in Rumania				
542,253	475,643	1,910,361	148,905	3,077,162
17.6%	15.5%	62.1%	4.8%	100%

The Vienna Award divided the Hungarian language territories into three sections. The northwestern part was returned to Hungary, the western and southeastern part of the central section remained as Rumania and the larger part of the Székelyföld and the eastern part of Transylvania was returned to Hungary. The only way the northwestern part and the eastern parts could be connected was by crossing the Rumanian language territory, the northern part of Transylvania which, except for the southern corner, was returned to Hungary. In addition, the Máramaros territory with German, Jewish and Ruthenian population was

returned to Hungary along with a segment of the Hungarian language territory of Nagyszalonta. The Arad Hungarian language territory, the Bánát mixed language territory, the German language territory of southern Transylvania and the southern Rumanian language territory remained with Rumania. Half of the Carpathian mountain passes remained in Rumanian hands.

Distribution of population on territories reannexed to Hungary at the Second Vienna Award

Territories	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
1. Hung. lang. territory	1,063,677	31,463	408,735	31,924
2. Nagyszalonta	15,206	41	650	46
3. Máramaros mix language territ.	2,096	10,442	8,145	9,174
4. North. Transylvan. Ruman.lang. terr.	38,474	47,150	473,007	11,555
5. South. Transylv. Ruman. lang. terr	2,367	43	15,130	680
6. The Rumanian Carpathian passes	1,396	115	14,023	7
TOTAL:	1,123,216	89,254	919,690	53,386

Distribution of population on territories received by Rumania

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
1A. Hungarian lang. terr.	151,460	20,186	144,945	6,986
1B. Kalotaszeg south. Ruman. part	641	76	19,576	42
2. Nagyszalonta Hung. lang. terr.	26,530	341	6,376	344
3. Arad Hung. lang. terr.	73,251	8,484	19,857	4,202
4A. Bánát Hung. Mixed terr.	52,384	50,115	32,384	11,746
4B. Bánát Germ. lang. terr.	38,725	169,445	120,631	48,791

Territories	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
5.South Transyl. Saxon land	30,681	141,888	120,654	12,638
6.Fogaras lang. Territory	3,392	1,920	105,064	1,373
7.NorthTransyl. Ruman.lang. terr.	7,075	179	33,242	1,740
8.South Transyl. Ruman. lang. terr.	157,529	82,969	1,297,372	61,005
9. Rumanian Carpathian passes	585	40	10,260	38
TOTAL:	542,253	475,643	1,910,361	148,906

Nationalities combined**Territories reannexed to Hungary**

1.Hung.lang. terr. (1+2)	1,078,883	31,504	409,385	31,970
2. Mixed lang. territories (3)	2,096	10,442	8,145	9,174
3.Rumanian lang territories (4,5,6)	42,237	47,308	502,160	12,242

Territories received by Rumania

1. Hung.lang terr. (1A, 1B, 2, 3)	251,882	29,087	190,754	11,574
2. Mixed lang. terr. (4A, 4B)	91,109	219,560	153,017	60,537
3.German lang. territories (5)	30,681	141,888	120,624	12,638
4.Rumanian lang.terr.(6, 7, 8, 9)	168,581	85,108	1,445,938	64,156

The above-mentioned data show that secret motives were employed when the borders were decided and that they were not drawn along ethnographic lines. Therefore they were not satisfactory to either side. 36% of Hungarians remained under Rumanian rule and they were located close to the old and the new borders. The mixed population on the Bánát territory remained with Rumania, in spite of the fact that the Rumanians were only 26.5% of the population. The decision was disadvantageous for the Hungarians because the central part of the

Hungarian language territory was given to Rumania and the the western and eastern Hungarian language territories were not connected except by crossing through the northern Rumanian language territories. This could not be done by train because the railroad passed through the Hungarian language territory which was given to Rumania. Two years earlier, at the First Vienna Award, Czechoslovakia received the city of Nyitra, so that the Czechs could have the railroad connections.

The Second Vienna Award was theoretically advantageous for Hungary because she was rewarded considerable territories even if she did not receive the Hungarian cities of Arad, Temesvár, Torda and Brassó. Hungary received approximately two-fifths of Transylvania, an area of 43,104 square kilometers, with a population of 2,577,260. About 1.5 million of these were Hungarians, the rest were Rumanians and Saxons. This took place without an armed conflict. Anthony Endrey says: "Although Hungarians were again overjoyed at the return of so many of their people, over 600,000 Hungarians and many historic Hungarian cities and towns remained under Rumanian rule. The decision therefore pleased neither party and . . . Hungary refused to abandon her claim to the rest of Transylvania. . ."³²⁴

The Second Vienna Award was disadvantageous for Rumania in that she had to give up territory and she lost 91% of the northern Rumanian language territories. **It was advantageous for Rumania in that the Germans guaranteed the security of the country. It was also advantageous in that the numbers of population that the Rumanians received were considerably higher than the numbers of Rumanians who lived in Transylvania. In addition Rumanians were able to move into the German and Hungarian cities and raise their standard of living. Who gained from this decision? Obviously, those who made the decision.** The Hungarian Government was obliged to the Germans who fulfilled 75% of the Hungarian requests in spite of the fact that the Hungarian Government sympathized with the British and the Americans. As a result, the German Government claimed to have jurisdiction over the Germans living in Hungary and made their influence felt in the country. From this time on, Germans living in Hungary had the right to join the "Wehrmacht" or the German Secret Service.

³²⁴ Endrey, Anthony: Op. Cit. p. 105

The Germans gave Rumania the areas of light industry and heavy industry in Transylvania because, in this way, this would be advantageous for Germany. This is why they gave the natural gas wells east of Kolozsvár and the central part of the Hungarian language territory to Rumania, the southwestern edge of the Székelyföld and also the city of Brassó. In this way, the railroad would serve the Germans and connect the natural gas sources.³²⁵

Hitler gave all the Transylvanian and Bánát German and partly German populace to Rumania except for the 27,000 Saxons on the territory of Beszterce. With this action, he intended to secure Rumanian support for Germany and gain Hungary's friendship. We can state that Hitler regarded Rumania as a territory where the German influence could be greater but at the end of the War, the Allied Forces favored Rumania and punished Hungary.

In the 1930's the Western Powers had left the arrangement of Central Europe to Hitler and Mussolini. The weakened and mutilated Hungary tried to find help wherever she could. One cannot blame her for accepting the helping hand of Mussolini who helped Hungary to break out of her isolation. Britain did not accept the Hungarian plea for help. The Vienna Awards did not satisfy the Hungarian interest completely but they were very significant because they demonstrated that the right to self-determination applied to Hungary as well as to the Successor States. After the Second World War, the Communists would not allow any mention of the Treaty of Trianon in Hungary and this is why no demands for revision could be made. The Soviets gave three purely Hungarian villages to Czechoslovakia, with the reasoning that, in the case of a Hungarian attack, the defense of Pozsony would be possible. That explanation is absurd because it is well known that, in the Socialist countries, there was not even a possibility of territorial dispute. The Soviets probably gave them that territory because Czechoslovakia had not been involved in the war against them, without even considering that Czechoslovakia could not have been involved because, in 1939, the country did not even exist. (The state of Czechoslovakia was dissolved in March, 1939 and was not reinstated until after the War.) With the act of giving Czechoslovakia three villages in 1947, the Soviets changed the Trianon borders which in 1920 were declared to be permanent.

³²⁵ Ibid. p. 334; Ullein-Reviczky: *Guerre Allemande, Paix Russe*, Neuchatel 1947

Therefore there is a possibility for border revision.

What did Hungary do to prevent the East from pushing into Europe? Before the United States had made arrangements for the Soviet Union to become a member of the League of Nations, already Miklos Horthy, the Regent of Hungary, on July 21, 1931, had announced at the Hungarian National Assembly that he would try, in the form of a letter to 23 nations, to bring a peaceful unified European action against the Soviet Union. He stated: "Only the peaceful cooperation of the nations of the world can lead us out of the the present world economic crisis."

These are the countries to which he sent the letter: England, Italy, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Belgium, Japan, France, Poland, Spain, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Germany and the United States.

This following is the text of Horthy's letter:

"... When the world catastrophe reaches its peak, it is the duty of every man, according to his ability, to act to save mankind. In Geneva, Lausanne and other places, the leading statesmen are working to solve the problem of the world economic crisis." . . . "Even if we can solve all these problems, as long as we still tolerate the dangerous, festering wound of Soviet Russia on the body of mankind, the culture and peace of mankind and its prosperity cannot be achieved.

"This is why I dare to take the initiative to try to solve the Soviet question. Hungary has felt on her own body the horrors of the Soviet-type Communism. Furthermore, I am convinced that as long as Communism has the chance to spread without any obstruction, this will result in the destruction of mankind. This question cannot be negotiated in Geneva because open negotiations would automatically prevent any attempt to organize against Russia, yet this has to take priority over every other question which is negotiated in Geneva. For example, how can we discuss the disarmament of the European nations when the danger is still there that the Soviets will run down Europe?

"Soviet Russia, for 15 years, has carried on an open war to annihilate the whole world, with the slogan: 'Western Capitalism must be erased'. Western Capitalists, instead of uniting and declaring war on the Soviets, are actually helping

their enemy to build up its peaceful economy and war preparations. . . At home, the Soviets apply terror tactics with terror brigades and abroad they pay agents and instigators to stir up unrest in the West. At the same time, they cannot even give their own workers dry bread to eat. Mr. Maurice Paleologue, who is the most acknowledged expert in Russian affairs, says: ‘The Bolshevik tyranny has caused an unquenchable hatred in the heart of the Russian peasant and these peasants with anti-Soviet feelings make up at least 90% of the population of Russia. In spite of their numbers and their hatred, these 160 million unfortunate people, without any help from abroad, are unable to shake off the tyrannical rule of the 3 million Communists because an unarmed crowd can have no success against tanks, cannons and machine guns. These people have an even lesser chance because the Soviets punish with death the smallest opposition against them. . . People can say what they want about Capitalism but there is no question that this is the most effective way in the culture of mankind to reach a higher standard of living and to build a future for our children.’ . . .

“. . . The Communist promise to distribute the national wealth more fairly, to make poverty disappear and bring prosperity has failed. What they did was to prevent individuals from becoming rich and accumulating wealth but, in the former system, numberless poor people were able to make a living. Today, this one-time flourishing country has become a cemetery and a land of poverty. The slogan of the Communists is the word ‘equality’. Where is equality? In poverty and slavery. This power which wants to erase the culture of mankind, which ignores the ten commandments, and which regards the thought of freedom as a sin has to be erased. The whole world is unaware of the danger. The situation is getting worse day by day. Here and there the flames of revolution erupt. We have to grasp the opportunity before it is too late.

“I intend to do that, even without any hope, for no other reason but to sooth my conscience. Somebody has to start. We must begin the opposition to choke this power from Hell, in the interest of curing the wounds of the world and so that the process of healing can start, so that we can again enjoy peace,

happiness and prosperity. I ask your excellencies and your highnesses, after negotiating with your governments, to inform me of your decision as soon as possible. I will obviously treat your answers with discretion and nobody will learn about them. I am favoring a fast radical solution. . .”³²⁶

Why did I quote Horthy’s letter? Certain propaganda circles have circulated the accusation against Hungary that Hungary was the most loyal supporter of Hitler and therefore, as a war-criminal, she received the well-deserved punishment at the Yalta Conference, in February 1945. I believe that this letter refutes this accusation and proves that Hungary was not the most committed supporter of the Fascists and Nazi Germany but rather the adversary of Communism which since then most of the world nations have rejected. Therefore, Hungary should receive not punishment, but acknowledgement. Yet at the time of the announcement of the Yalta Conference, with the “good-will” of the Soviet Union, Hungary lost more of its territory. Csallóköz was given to Slovakia. This happened not because Hungary was loyal to Germany. That was an accusation advocated by Stalin and adopted by the West. This happened because Stalin retaliated against Horthy’s anti-Soviet attitude. Slovakia received new Hungarian territories as a gift for further expanding Pan-Slavism to the West. Slovakia, since the beginning of her existence, even as Czechoslovakia, has demonstrated her antagonistic attitude toward the nationality groups living within her borders. The Slovaks practise a total oppression of these people and make administrative decisions against them such as preventing them from speaking their mother-tongue and closing their schools. They have built huge constructions, such as the Nagymarosi Dam, which endanger the lives of the millions of people. This Dam causes the subterranean water and the wells on the Hungarian agrarian land to dry up and also the healing waters.

Most recently, the Mochovce Nuclear Plant, which was planned by the Soviets and which was found to be unsafe, has now been finished by the French and German technology but according to the Austrian nuclear experts, it is still not secure enough. It does not meet the Western Safety Standards. The Austrian experts believe that the foundation of this nuclear plant is not strong enough to withstand the

³²⁶ Horthy, Miklós: *Titkos iratai*, Hungarian Archives, Budapest, 1963, p. 121

radioactivity. The Austrians, under the leadership of their Chancellor, Viktor Klima, tried to initiate a campaign to prevent the Slovaks from putting this plant into operation. Klima stated that, if they activated it, he would recall the Austrian Consul from Bratislava. The Slovaks built this nuclear plant in the former territory of Northern Hungary where many thousands of Hungarians are still living, taking into consideration that if any catastrophe were to happen, it would not be their people that would suffer but the Hungarian populace. Vladimir Meciár, the President of Slovakia, did not even have the courtesy to send an answer to the Austrian Government before giving the order to activate the nuclear plant.³²⁷

Toward the end of World War II., the Hungarians, occupied by the Germans, could find very few opportunities to disobey the orders of the German Gestapo to deport the Jews. Samuel Stern, the President of the Jewish Council established on March 19, 1944, reports that the Hungarians prevented the deportation of large numbers of Jews. He tells us that, in Budapest, in July and August, 1944, the Regent, Miklós Horthy, József Cavallier, the secretary of the Holy Cross Society, Bishop Vilmos Apor of Győr, the Jesuit monk, Ferenc Jánosi, Cardinal Jusztinián Serédi and Lieutenant Colonel László Ferenczi, together with the Jewish Council were able to prevent the deportation of 200,000 Jews from Budapest: “. . . the Governor was duly informed of the proceedings. According to the plan, the Government was to forbid the deportation referring to the protest by foreign countries.”³²⁸ “ It was Ferenczy who saved the situation: he dared. He saw Eichmann, declared that the Hungarian Government did not consent to the deportation and that the Army and the country police troops brought to the capital would, if necessary, resist with arms any violation on the part of the Germans.”³²⁹ After preventing the deportation, the Government made an agreement with the Germans that the Jews would be interned in camps in the provinces. “The Government included in the agreement concluded with the Germans the stipulation that the provincial camps were to be run consistent with European standards to be verified by the

³²⁷ *Amerikai Magyarság*, June 13, 1998

³²⁸ Stern, Samuel: Race with Time, *Hungarian-Jewish Studies III.*; p. 38

³²⁹ *Ibid*, p. 38-39

Hungarian Red Cross.”³³⁰ The Governor guaranteed that there would be no deportation from these camps. “The Governor agreed with my arguments and declared that despite the understanding arrived at with the Germans, there would be no deportation.”³³¹

Ferenc Szálasi, the Prime Minister of Hungary, from October, 1944 to April, 1945 was disliked by the Germans because he did not favor the Nazis and he encouraged the Hungarians to have pride in their nation. Szálasi followed Horthy’s call to fight Communism. He had to choose between two evils, adopt Communism or fight it. Fighting Communism meant fighting on the side of the Germans. He chose the lesser danger for Hungary and fought on the side of the Germans. He fought, not in the interest of the Germans, of which he has been accused, but to prevent Communism taking hold in Hungary. With this task, he did an immeasurable favor for Western Europe which was never understood. If he had not held back the two Russian armies for seven weeks at the siege of Budapest (December 25, 1944-February 13, 1945), then the English and American armies would not have been able to free Western Europe and the Bolshevik Soviets, which regarded Capitalism as their biggest enemy, would have run down Europe. The Communist goal was to annihilate the Capitalists.

If this had happened, the West would have learned what Communism was. I am not sure that they would have given the Soviets that support which they have ever since provided to them. I know it is not popular to mention these facts but pragmatic history writing demands that I write the truth even if there is momentary opposition from the present existing public opinion.

In the last months of the Second World War, when the Germans and the Hungarians, led by Szálasi, made their last efforts to win the war, trusting in the new “wonder weapons”, they sensed the danger of failure. They experienced shortages of food and all the necessities of life. They sensed the chaos in the last minute desperate orders.

When Winckelmann, Commander of the Secret Service, ordered the deportation of the Jews of Budapest to Germany, Ferenc Szálasi opposed it. His statement opposing the deportation appeared in all the Budapest newspapers in the first week of November, 1944. “I am not

³³⁰ Ibid. p. 40

³³¹ Ibid p. 40

anti-Semitic and I never was. I am a-Semitic. The Jew is a man just as we are. We cannot solve this problem with brute force. The only just solution is that which the Zionists advocate. Anyhow, now it is not the right time to solve the Jewish question, but after the war is over we have to solve it by all means. Not with mass graves, but with a solution which is acceptable to Europe. Recently, some German groups have called for the deportation of the Jews. I am emphatically opposed to this idea because I know what fate would await them under the present circumstances. Taking into consideration that the Hungarian Jews do not regard this war to be their own war – and we do – we are forced to separate them from us in a secure place. I have heard that deplorable atrocities have taken place in certain areas. My Government and I will do everything so that in the future these atrocities will not recur.”

Jenő Lévy, an expert from Hungary about world Jewry, explained, at the University of Jerusalem, how the Jews from the Budapest ghetto were saved from deportation to Germany. Frederick Werber and Thurston Clarke in their book: Lost Hero, which was dedicated to Frederick Werber’s grandfather, Rabbi A.I. Jacobson, stated: “Eichmann intended to accomplish, in December, the deportation of 175,000 Hungarian Jews to Germany, most of whom were from Budapest, but this was prevented by the order of Szálasi in that same month. Following Szálasi’s order, he put a stop to the enforced march to Germany and stated that he would lend to Germany only the strong, healthy Jewish men, but even that did not take place. Veessenmayer reported to Berlin that Szálasi’s order meant that the deportation of Jews to Germany had stopped completely.” According to Frederick Werber, in the time of Szálasi, October 15, 1944 to April 4, 1945, less than 50,000 out of the 600,000 Hungarian Jews, were deported to Germany and in this period the Jewish loss did not reach 2000.³³² The deportations of the Jews from Hungarian cities and the prevention of the deportation of 200,000 Jews from Budapest, all took place at a most critical time, when Hungary was already under German occupation. Actions were directed by panic and by the knowledge that it was the last chance to make decisions. Even at that time, there were Government officials who provided help whenever they could. The thousand year-

³³² Major, Tibor: Nemzet szolgálatában a vértanúságig, *Szittyakiúrt*, 1996, March-April; sources: Szálasi, Ferenc: Út és Cél; A kortanú; A válság férfija; Fiala, Ferenc: Zavaros Évek; Málnási, Ödön: A magyar nemzet őszinte története

old Hungarian tradition of tolerance and humanity was obvious. Did those nations, who are now supporting the Jews, behave in a similar way in a similar situation? Let us see.

The Jews opposed the German program of National Socialism and therefore they became a threat to the German interest. As a result of this, the Germans ordered the Jews to be concentrated in labor camps so that they could remove from them the possibility of opposition. At the same time they could put them to use as cheap labor. At that time, the view spread throughout Europe that the best solution of the Jewish problem in Europe was to settle the Jews into Palestine. Adolf Eichmann established camps where the Jews were trained in agricultural work. These camps were supported by the Zionists. The Zionists created the organization called *Hagana*, supported by the German SS (Gestapo), whose goal was the secret settlement of Jews in Palestine. The British opposed this movement.

On November 25, 1940, 3,800 German Jews, arrived in the port of Haifa, on a boat called the *Patria*. The British colonial officials refused them entry, quoting the law of 1939, from the White Book, which stipulated that only 15,000 Jews were allowed to emigrate to Palestine in one year. The boat was ordered to detour to the island of Mauritius. The Jews on the boat broke out in a scream, "Palestine or death!", and did not want to leave Haifa. Finally the British fleet fired on the boat and 2,875 Jews burned to death. This was not mentioned in Nuremberg as an action of war criminals. In May, 1944, Adolf Eichmann proposed to the Zionist World Organization, through the Hungarian Zionist leader, Joel Brand, that another settlement of German Jews be sent to Palestine. He asked the West for ten thousand trucks in exchange for the Jewish emigration. The Zionist World Organization accepted this proposal but Churchill refused their request. The British as the Colonist rulers of Palestine, continually placed obstacles to the settlement of Jews in Palestine. From this we can see that Hitler originally planned to force the Jews to emigrate to Palestine. He did not originally plan to exterminate them.³³³

Rumania, who was on the side of the victors at the end of World War II., embarked on a program of evacuating and killing the Jews in Rumania, many of whom declared themselves to be Hungarian. Lajos

³³³ Hernádi, Tibor: *A Második Világháború Igaz Története*, 1996, Baja, p. 193-194

Kazár quotes from Hannah Arendt's book: Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the Banality of Evil: "In the middle of August (1941), by which time the Roumanians had killed close to 300,000 of their Jews, mostly without any German help, the (German) Foreign Office concluded an agreement with (virtual dictator) Antonescu 'for the evacuation of the Jews from Roumania, to be carried out by German units'."³³⁴

Roland Mischke wrote an article in the German newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeine* on September 21, 1985 under the title "In the Shadow of Conspiracy". In this article he declares that the Horthy regime was Fascist which is a lie because in 1944, in Hungary, there were eleven political parties. There were 260 representatives in the Parliament and only 43 were on the far right. Until the German occupation on March 19, 1944, there were 5 liberals and 5 social democrats among them. At that time, 44% of the newspaper reporters were Jewish, 39% of the engineers were Jews, 46% of doctors were Jewish, 48% of those who worked in commercial institutions were Jews and 54% of the country's commerce was in Jewish hands, 51% of lawyers were Jews. There were no pogroms in Hungary as there were in Russia, Poland, Rumania, and there were no Jewish ghettos before or after 1938 in Hungary as Roland Mischke states. The first such ghetto was established in Hungary on November 29, 1944, eight months after the German occupation.

Under Hitler's pressure, in 1938 and 1939, "Jewish laws" were enacted which restricted the number of Jews allowed in certain professions. When these laws were enacted in Parliament, as a reaction a movement took hold in the whole society against these laws. In this movement, 56 of the most distinguished artists and writers took part, and during the War, 101 Hungarian generals took part in demonstrations against these laws. Hungary was the only country under Hitler's influence, where the Jews were able to live without any restriction until March 1944. This is why during that time, 16,000 Jews sought refuge in Horthy's Hungary from countries which were under Hitler's influence. Goebels called Hungary "the island of European Jews". The Jewish

³³⁴ Kazár, Lajos: Transylvania, the Facts. (p.14) He quotes from Genocide and Ethnocide of the Jews and Hungarians in Roumania, which is based on Hannah Arendt's book: Eichmann in Jerusalem, a report on the Banality of Evil, in which reference is made to Raul Hilberg's book: The destruction of the European Jews

deportation from Hungary started on March 19, 1944, as Eichmann took into his own hands the deportation of Jews but, as already mentioned earlier, Horthy managed to slow down and stop the actions of Eichman which the German Consul in Hungary, on October 10, 1944, reported to Hitler and expressed his disagreement.³³⁵

Dr. John Lukács writes in his foreword to the autobiography of General Géza Lakatos that, after Adolf Eichmann was captured in Argentina and taken to Jerusalem to be tried, he testified: “Horthy’s action was unique in the part of Europe occupied by Hitler. A country – allied with Germany – which employed its regular army to save Jews! I never heard of such a thing before. First I thought the information must be erroneous or I must be dreaming. But later Lakatos expelled me from Hungary altogether.”³³⁶ János Fercsey writes that in 1994, the movie “Schindler’s List” was released, which relates the story of a German businessman who saved the lives of 1,100 Jews. When are they going to make a movie about Ferenc Koszorus, a Hungarian brigadier-general, who saved the lives of 250,000 Hungarian Jews and many thousands of foreign Jews who had sought refuge in Hungary at that time?³³⁷

Between 1938 and 1945, Hungarian historians were not allowed to mention these matters for fear of provoking the Third Reich. After 1945, the Soviets forbade any research of this period, therefore we do not have any clear data about this era. Even the Decision at Vienna fell within this time period and to speak about it was taboo.

At the Peace Treaty signed in Paris after World War II., Hungary was again punished as a war criminal, yet Pál Teleki, the Hungarian Prime Minister, had been the only one to oppose this war and when an outside pressure – Germany – forced him to enter the war, he committed suicide. Winston Churchill stated: “At the Peace Conference, we will leave an empty seat at the negotiation table for Count Pál Teleki. This empty seat will bring to the attention of the world that the Prime Minister of the Hungarian people sacrificed himself for the truth.”³³⁸ Unfortunately, this promise was forgotten.

³³⁵ Article from *Ösi Gyökér*, October-December 1998, p. 155-156

³³⁶ Lakatos, Géza: *As I saw it, Tragedy of Hungary*. Foreword, p. iii. Quoting from *Magyar Nemzet*, Oct. 14, 1994, p. 12

³³⁷ Publication of the Universal Publishing Co.

³³⁸ Encyclopaedia Hungarica, 1996, Teleki, Pál, p. 580

The above-mentioned facts may have caused the reader to wonder why all these unjust decisions could have taken place. Did the Hungarian people really deserve the death sentence at Trianon? Many people may believe that the Hungarian people are wicked. The encyclopedia, city and university libraries are full of literature which is derogatory to the character of the Hungarians and their past. According to the politicians and the historians of the Successor States the Second Vienna Decision was Hitler's gift to Hungary. The Hungarian people are a freedom loving people and are ready to die for their freedom. When they finally reclaimed their ancient land in the Carpathian Basin in A.D. 896, as a Scythian-Hun-Avar-Subarean inheritance, in a short time they established a powerful, rich, cultured kingdom. The adversities they suffered, their position at the crossroads of East and West, their defense of the West against the Tartar and Turkish invasions all weakened them and they became vassals of the Hapsburgs. This is when the anti-Hungarian propaganda began from the pulpit and in the schools. The struggle against the Hapsburgs lasted for four-hundred years. The Austrians were looking for explanations to camouflage their intention to subdue the Hungarians. This is why they adopted the theory of the Finno-Ugric origins of the Hungarians first proposed by Aeneas Silvius Picolinimi, Pope Pius II. (1448-1464). According to this theory, the Magyars were descended from the primitive Ostyak and Vogul tribes of Siberia, and also related to the Finns. From this time on the Magyars were called a Finno-Ugric people. In his efforts to advocate the Finno-Ugric theory, Joseph Budenz, a German who was appointed Chairman of Linguistic Science of the Hungarian Academy of Science, although he did not speak the Hungarian language at first, was aided by the Germans, Hundorfer, Schedel, Munk and Ferber. Hundorfer changed his name to the Hungarian Hunfalvy, Schedel to Toldi, Munk to Munkácsi and Ferber to Szinnyi.

In the sixteenth century, Adam Kollart was the first writer serving the Hapsburg interest, to produce anti-Hungarian texts. He flooded the universities with anti-Hungarian writings. At the Hungarian nation's strong objections, the Hapsburgs removed Adam Kollart from his position but, in private, he continued to spread anti-Hungarian propaganda. He stated that, at the time of Árpád, Hungary (Magyarország) did not exist as a country because there were no Magyars living there, only Slavs. This information is propagated even

today. “The Hapsburgs forbade the publication of Hungarian writings dealing with the subject of self-pride, patriotism, pride in the historical greatness of Hungary or dealing with internal or foreign policy. At the same time, they supported and propagated publications which spread the concept of national self-depreciation, emphasizing that the present-day Hungarians originated from a primitive people, ‘from the lowest branch of mankind’s family tree’, portraying the Magyars as ‘pagan, barbarian hordes whose diet consists of raw meat’.”³³⁹

When the Hapsburgs realized that, in spite of all their might, they were finally unable to suppress the Hungarians’ desire for freedom, they began to support the Vlach (Wallachian) and Serbian shepherds who had entered the country over the course of time. Adopting the principle of “Divide and Conquer”, they instigated these people to revolt against the Hungarians and so weaken them. The Austrians blamed the majority rule of the Hungarians for the hard life of the shepherds. They promised them a better life but because it never materialized, they blamed the Hungarians. This is the way the anti-Hungarian feeling was fostered throughout the centuries. Finally, after the French Revolution of 1789, with the slogan of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, the idea of national independence grew in the minds of the minorities. In the Age of Romanticism, in the eighteenth century, the Wallachians created their theory of Daco-Roman continuity. The Czechs and the Slovaks created their theory of the Great Moravian Empire. The Hungarian people believed that the peoples who had migrated into Hungary would eventually become Hungarians but because of the above mentioned reasons this never took place.

There was another factor which fanned the movement of anti-Hungarian feelings. The politicians of the Successor States knew that they had taken over the land of a more cultured people and that they had unjustly placed these people into the position of a minority. They were now ruling over this people with whom they had lived in peace and harmony for centuries, with whom they had shared good times and bad, with whom they had fought shoulder to shoulder against the invaders or against the imperialist Hapsburg aggressions. This is why there are immeasurable anti-Hungarian feelings among the Serbs, Slovaks, Rumanians and the populace of Western Hungary. Ruthenians, Serbs,

³³⁹ Botos, The Homeland Reclaimed, p. 4

Slovaks and Wallachians! Look into the Hungarian history and you will see how many heroes you gave to Hungary. This could only have happened because your ancestors felt free and united in the Hungarian struggle for independence. Think about the Rákoczi and Thököly Freedom Fights and the Hungarian defense against the Turks. The Hungarian people just waits for the right time and for the right leader to bring a just revision of the borders.

Chapter 24

The Distribution of the Minorities in the Successor States

Now that the European nations are attempting to create a United Europe, it might be worth looking at the breakdown of the minorities in the successor states and studying the question of the borderlines and how they were drawn.

The basic principles of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, which were stated in 1867, were outdated in the 20th century. At that time, if they had based their principles on federal ideas, then the Monarchy would have remained and could have become the seed of the United Europe. The leaders of the Monarchy did not recognize the changing times. The neighboring states, the Serbs, Russians, Italians, Slovaks, Czechs and Rumanians began to organize a campaign to divide the Monarchy among themselves. The victory of the Central Powers over Russia in 1918, temporarily prevented the Russians from taking over the northern part of the Monarchy, (Brest-Litovsk) but they were not strong enough to prevent the Allied Powers from redrawing of the borders of the Central European countries in 1920.

Woodrow Wilson's famous Fourteen Points, which advocated self-determination, were disregarded in the Peace negotiations at Versailles and the new borderlines were drawn which had no connection to the ethnic borders. They served only the interests of economy and power. Many Germans, Hungarians, Croatians, Slovaks, Slovenes and Ruthenians became minorities and were considered to be enemies in their new states.

At that time, there was a predominant belief that Archduke Franz Ferdinand's plan for a federation would have helped the Monarchy survive, but he was not a follower of the "real-politik". He did not wish to base his political plan on the political views of the Hungarian state. His goal was rather to weaken the Hungarian influence in the Monarchy because he thought that Hungary was the enemy of the Monarchy. He wanted to establish German as the administrative

language in all parts of the Monarchy. He intended to reduce Hungary's power in the Monarchy and increase the power of the Slavs by giving national autonomy to all the Slav peoples. He wished to add to the Monarchy a third partner, the Southern Slavs in Bosnia, Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia. However the Southern Slavs (Yugoslavs) objected to the use of the German language and could see this plan of the Monarchy as an obstacle to the spread of Pan-Slavism. This is why the Serbs killed Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo.³⁴⁰

The Monarchy's historical borders were not established on ethnic borderlines. This can be understood because the borders of the nationalities were not very distinct but blended together. It was almost impossible to solve this problem, especially in several places in Croatia and Bosnia. When the original borders of Hungary and the Monarchy were established, the minorities were not demanding autonomy.

During peacetime in the Monarchy, there was more emphasis on retaining traditions than on the risky proposal of modification of the borders. It is always a war which effects this kind of change. The goal of World War I, which was prepared by Russia and the successor states, was to cause the Monarchy to disintegrate and, in place of two national states, Austria and Hungary, to create many national states. Sándor Török quotes statistics from the census of 1910. These data will enlighten the situation and show the injustice of the Treaty of Trianon.

Numbers of the populace taken away from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy

Czechoslovakia received:	13,502,140	of which	46.4%	were Czech
Poland	8,097,179		58.6%	were Polish
Rumania	6,055,909		51.1%	were Rumanian
Serbia	7,576,530		25.3%	were Serbian
Italy	1,516,097		51.2%	were Italian
Total population taken:	36,747,855			

Those who were united with their own nationality: 16,813,551, **45.8%**

Forced into minority status: 19, 934,304, **54.2%**

Let us compare these data with those of the minorities in Hungary.

³⁴⁰ Török, Sándor: Település történet a Kárpátmedencében, p. 225-226

According to the census of 1910, **54.5%** of the population of Hungary was Hungarian. The minorities in Historic Hungary numbered **45.5%**. After Trianon, in the successor states, the number of minorities grew to **54.2%**.

Here I present some information which speaks for itself. The 52 million people of the three nations, German, Hungarian and Croat, in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, numbered 49.4%. This number is 3.6% larger than the state-creating peoples who received territories at the Treaty of Trianon. These were the Czechs, Poles, Rumanians, Serbs and Italians. Now if we add the German-speaking Saxons in Historic Hungary, 10.4%, to the **54.5%** Hungarians, the total number is **64.9%**. **This would be valid because the Saxons were not the enemies of the Austro -Hungarian Monarchy.**

Now we shall see how it is possible to divide the territory of Historic Hungary along ethnic border-lines. We shall see that this is a very difficult task. To demonstrate how difficult it is, we shall look at some maps from the study by Sándor Török.

Map No. 17 shows the new territory within Historic Hungary where the Hungarians live in the majority and outside its new borders the same ethnic group also lives in the majority. The number of ethnic Hungarians living in Hungarian territory never reaches 100% because there are several factors which influence the numbers. There are Hungarian citizens of foreign origin who are counted in their own ethnic group. There are islands of people speaking a foreign language who also dilute the numbers of Hungarians. The Hungarian people who originally populated the Carpathian Basin were in the majority and formed a sovereign state. All the people who came to settle in the Hungarian territory kept their own national language which caused the ratio of Hungarians to diminish while increasing the total population of Historic Hungary. The territory in which the Hungarians are in the majority, Sándor Török calls the homogeneous territory. He mentions that there were two "language islands" formed after the Turkish and Hapsburg devastation and at the time that the Hapsburgs settled foreigners into the country. One of these is the mountain chain from Buda to the Pilis Mountains, the Vértes mountain and the Bakony mountain which stretches from the south to the west. The language on this territory is German. (Török, p. 229)

The second “language island” mentioned by Török comprises of the counties of Csanád and Békés and here the Slav language is spoken. According to the census of 1910, the total count of citizens of foreign origin in areas of Hungarian majority in Historic Hungary was 109,341 which is 5.7% of the population of the country. This is a low percentage for Europe. 90,000 of these citizens of foreign origin are living in the area he calls homogeneous Hungary which further dilutes the Hungarian population. On Map No. 17, S. Török shows the areas where there is a mixture of ethnic groups. In these territories, the Hungarians numbered one third, the Rumanians, one fourth, the Germans, one fifth, and the other nationalities combined, one fifth.

Map No. 18 shows the homogeneous Hungarian territory in the Carpathian Basin, together with the territories of mixed population where the majority is Hungarian. This is an ethnographic map of the Carpathian Basin. At the same time it shows the percentage of people who are in the majority and the percentage of the minorities combined. The accompanying table shows the distribution of the population in these territories. Such a map could have been the basis for the just allocation of the borders. The language borders on this map in the north, northeast, south and southwest could have been applied without any change. There could have been some change on the western side. The only problem is in the east where the Rumanians had settled deep into the Hungarian territory.

Map No. 19 shows the parts of the homogeneous Hungarian territory which came under foreign rule after the Treaty of Trianon, where the Hungarians became a minority within these new borders. The accompanying table shows a graphic picture of the distribution of the minorities and shows the numbers of the torn away Hungarian populace. The tables which accompany the maps allow us to compare the ethnographic borders and the borders dictated by the Treaty of Trianon. (See Török’s book for the tables)

At the Treaty of Trianon, those who decided to set the new borders were not limited by the structure of the feudal system as were those who drew the borders of the Monarchy. In 1920, it was the right time to make changes. The Great Powers made an immeasurable mistake in that they did not apply the principle of self-determination. They allowed themselves to be misled by all kinds of misinformation and therefore they made an unjust decision. Because of their lack of

knowledge of the history and geography of Central Europe, they accepted untrue historical explanations and falsified geographical data. They believed the false propaganda and therefore they laid the base for the second World War. Who was responsible for this? Ignorance of the law is no excuse. The sacrifice of the many millions of people during World War II. cannot be nullified but we can still correct the mistakes of the past and achieve some measure of justice so that the same thing will not recur and Europe can live in peace once and for all.

In the 1935 Yugoslav elections, two western newspaper reporters had to leave Serbia and many were arrested, just because they wrote about the actual events and the truth about the elections and they expressed the desire of Croatia for independence. They stated that the Croats did not want to be unified in the same state as the Serbs.³⁴¹ Pozzi predicted in 1932 that the artificially created states would be the cause of future unrest or war. These two peoples, the Serbs and the Croats are enemies just as are the Czechs and the Slovaks. The unjust drawing of the border-lines caused unrest in the past and the present, resulting in mass murders and genocide, for example when the Ukrainians killed a large part of the Polish minority in the second World War or the ethnic cleansing by the Serbs in Bosnia and Kosovo in this decade.

As a result of the unjust border-lines, after the end of World War II., the Serbs killed several thousand Hungarians and a hundred thousand Hungarians were deported from their mother land, Felvidék (Slovakia). I have to mention that, in the former Czechoslovakia, and the former Yugoslavia, just the Czechs and the Serbs were regarded as the ruling class. The Czechs regarded the Slovaks, and the Serbs regarded the Croats as second-class citizens but in the time before the Decision of Trianon, their propaganda was broadcast to the world that they were brother nations and once they were “liberated” from the “oppressive” Hungarians, they would create a second Switzerland in Europe. (Török, p. 225-228)

How many Rumanians lived on the territory which Rumania received at the Treaty of Trianon, where one and a half million Hungarians were living? Was the number of Hungarians, living on this

³⁴¹ Pozzi, Henri: *Századunk Bunösei*, p. 301; *The Times*, May 2 and 8, 1935; *The Daily Herald*, May 6; *The Manchester Guardian*, May 4 and 8

territory, larger than the number of Rumanians? The statistics of the 1910 census prove that it was. Was it larger than the number of Rumanians on the territory which was returned to Hungary in the Vienna Awards? Again the answer is in the affirmative. If so, would it not be good to accept the ethnographic border as the political border to separate them from the Rumanians?

Chapter 25

The Necessity of Revision

On March 25, 1919, Lloyd George wrote: “There will never be peace in southeast Europe because the Hungarian irredentists are appearing in the territories of Serbia, Czechoslovakia and Rumania. I wish that when the Peace terms are stated, we will stick to that plan that different nationalities should be connected to their own mother nations. This humane view has to come before every economical, strategical and financial consideration.” (Pozzi, p.188) Pozzi says that, if the Peace Treaty had been drawn according to Lloyd George’s wishes, it would have been a just and conciliatory peace. “This would have been the peace of which the losers of the war were dreaming for the interest of their children.” (Pozzi, p.189) Monzie wrote in 1923, “The historical psychologists will never understand how those who were advocating racial and nationality rights could have taken from the Hungarians cities and villages whose populace was strictly Hungarian.” (Pozzi, p.189)

In 1926, Aristide Briand, a French statesman, came to the following conclusion: “It is enough to glance at a map of Central Europe to come to the conclusion that these borders are not just and cannot be permanent” (Pozzi, p.193) The French Senate denied the ratification of the Treaty of Trianon. They declared that they would ratify it only on condition that the Government reexamine the mistakes and injustices which were brought to their attention. This examination which was the condition for the Senate signing the treaty was never undertaken. Legally the Treaty of Trianon was not ratified by the French.³⁴²

Since 1920, the British Government had been aware of the problems of the peoples of the Danube and since the Locarno Pact of 1925, the British Press had fought strongly for the revisions of the Hungarian borders. The British public unanimously acknowledged that the problems in the Danubian states started with the mutilation of

³⁴² Ibid. p. 298; *Hivatalos napló*, 1921, July 11, p. 1697-1703

Hungary. Lloyd George announced to the Rumanian Minister Vajda Voivoda, on June 30, 1920, "The Hungarian demands to a great extent are rightful. We have to look for a way to come to an agreement."³⁴³

Nitti, the Italian Prime Minister foresaw that peace in the Danube valley could be established by the correction of the injustices committed against Hungary.³⁴⁴ **Nitti advised that the border question be renegotiated.** It is not true it was only the fascist Mussolini who brought up the question of territorial revision. The revision of the borders of Hungary was in the interest of Europe.

Pozzi writes that there are some who blamed the Hungarians for the unrest because they demanded revisions. They said that if the Hungarians would cease their demands there would be peace. Pozzi says: "They forget that this is only the peace of the cemetery and the galley slaves." (Pozzi, p.304)

Benes, in a speech to the Hungarian government once announced: "If you do not give up your revisionist politics, I will chase you from Europe to Hell."³⁴⁵ If Hungary had accepted the decisions of Trianon, then the Czechs and the Pan-Slavs would by now have expanded their rule to the Mediterranean Sea. As a result of such propaganda, the French Foreign Minister, Barthou, declared: "The peace gave back to Rumania her former borders." (Pozzi, p. 307) His statement is a lie.

The Entente took the territory of Dobrudja in 1913 from Bulgaria and gave it to Rumania. Rumania received Bessarabia from Russia in 1918 and Bukovina, Transylvania and the Bánát in 1920 from the Monarchy. These territories had never belonged to the Rumanians. They received Dobrudja without any effort and the western borders were a gift. They received their "conquered territories" by the goodness of the Entente. None of the territories which Rumania, Serbia and Czechoslovakia received had formerly been theirs. Czechoslovakia

³⁴³ Ibid. p. 300; Viorel Tilea, the secretary of Vajda Voivoda: Romania diplomácia tevékenysége, November 1919- March 1920. Bucharest, 1922

³⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 301; Nitti, the Prime Minister and Italian delegate to the Peace Treaty: L'Europe senza Pace, 1921; La Decadenza dell'Europe, 1922; La Tragedia dell'Europe, 1922; La Pace, 1924; A szerződés megvitatása Magyarországgal, 1920, May 3

³⁴⁵ Kostya, Sándor: A Felvidék, p.156; Padanyi, Viktor: A Nagy Tragédia, 1977, p.286

received the status of state in the Treaty of Trianon. The Czechs settled in Moravia a thousand years ago. According to Elisée Reclus, Hungary already a thousand years ago was a perfect geographical and political unit, a unified state. (Pozzi, p. 307-308)

The Croatians had lived in Hungary voluntarily for eight hundred years, when they were given to Yugoslavia in 1920. In matters of culture and religion, they were closer to the Hungarians than to the Serbs. The Slovaks and the Ruthenians had lived for a thousand years in freedom with the Hungarians, yet they were given to the Czechs. Transylvania and the Bánát were Hungarian territories for a thousand years. The language of the Huns, Avars and the ancient populace who had never left this territory was Hungarian. The ruling classes passed through but the original inhabitants remained.

France did not acknowledge that these people had voluntarily shared their fate with the Hungarians for a thousand years. The Hungarian rights were not acknowledged yet we know that France was formed in a similar way from a center called Ile de France. Slowly, throughout the centuries, many territories voluntarily joined the Ile de France. Many more were conquered. The Successor States demanded the "return" of their territories, accusing the Hungarians of oppressing the Serbs, Croats, and Slovaks. That accusation, which became the basis for the mutilation of Hungary, can be applied to almost every state. Just as the Successor States demanded the "return" of Hungarian territories, the Germans demanded the return of Belgium and the northeast French territories, stating that they were originally German territories. If, according to the French, this German demand was unjust, then how did they justify the mutilation of Hungary? (Pozzi, p. 309)

Pozzi says that Hungary never conquered Czech, Serb or Rumanian territory and never suppressed those peoples. The territories which were annexed from Hungary were all rightfully Hungarian and the populace did not want to be separated from Hungary, to belong to the Successor States. That was why the plebiscite was not allowed. The Hungarians who found themselves under foreign rule, were treated like fourth class citizens. Most recently they have been rendered unlearned and ignorant because it has become almost impossible for them to attend high school or university. The rulers move them out of the Hungarian neighborhoods. The Rumanian land reform law in theory applied to every Rumanian but in practise it is only applied to the national

minorities. With this law, the Rumanians gave themselves the right to confiscate the land and the belongings of the minorities.

The French should have the right to a just intervention because they sacrificed 800,000 people in the war, only because, in 1917, they rejected Austria's offer of a separate peace. The Allied Forces, with great difficulty, managed to make the Rumanians pass laws protecting the rights of the minorities, which the League of Nations guaranteed. One such law stated: "Rumania binds herself to the rights of the minorities which are added to the Constitution of Rumania and there will be no laws or orders which would oppose the rights of the minorities."

Paragraph 12 of this law specifies, "Whenever there is a difference of opinion in a point of law or judgment of facts, the disputed question can be taken to the permanent international forum. The decision of this court is legally binding and cannot be appealed." (Pozzi, p. 319)

The Rumanians did not want to accept this law because they saw an obstacle to their policy of Rumanization. Bratianu, in his feigned indignation, said: "No self-respecting Rumanian would sign this document which so deeply offends the national honor. By signing this document, we would acknowledge that we are half-civilized. We will not receive Transylvania if we do not sign this document? Let's see! Let anybody dare to try to take it from us!" . . . But on December 9, 1919, a few minutes before the ultimatum expired, Bratianu signed it.³⁴⁶ Since this document was signed, Rumania has never kept any of her agreements.

On the Hungarian side, all efforts and proofs were in vain; the League of Nations did not do anything. This means that Hungary was sold out at Trianon. The breaking of the agreement is equal to a lie and the Entente which declared itself to be the champion of truth and peace was a liar. The treaties do not protect the small nations or the defeated nations, only the victors. Therefore in this hopeless situation, many of the Hungarians who were given to the Successor States migrated out of their ancient land to give place to the foreign people who immigrated into the country. Thus the population ratio was changed dramatically. Many thousands of Szeklers and Hungarians were forced to leave their motherland and those who remain, without leaders – because they were

³⁴⁶ Pozzi: Op. Cit. p.320; Marghiloman: Notes Politiques, Vol.V.

denied higher education – live like second class citizens. Because of their fear, they keep their national origins secret. In the newly formed states of Central Europe, the minorities had no rights.

Once more we return to Hungary's rightful demand for revision because the accusations for which Hungary was so severely mutilated have since been shown to be lies of Benes. Benes placed the responsibility of the outbreak of the First World War onto Count István Tisza in his leaflet called *Détruisez l'Autriche et la Hongrie*. In this leaflet, he states that, on July 8, 1914, at the Assembly of the Royal Council, Tisza was the one who demanded the start of the war. Earlier, I mentioned Tisza's letter to the Emperor, which was written soon after the distribution of this leaflet. Take Ionescu supported Benes in his accusation. Marghiloman, another Rumanian Minister, with written documents, had proved that Ionescu was a paid Russian agent, yet he dared to state that Tisza started the war. The Serbs also supported that reckless accusation. They tried to make the world believe that the Sarajevo assassination was prepared by Tisza because he intended to prevent the Czechs becoming dominant over the Hungarians when Ferdinand became emperor. According to the Serbs, Tisza caused the assassination by giving mixed orders so that the assassins could get close to the Archduke in order to kill him. But fortunately, the Serbs did not coordinate the announcement of their propaganda. At the same time as this accusation was announced in Paris, Colonel Dragutin Dimitrievics, the leader of the Serb news agency, in his prison cell at Salonici, made this declaration:

“I wanted it. I did it. I am boasting and I am proud because I wanted the destruction of Austria.”³⁴⁷

This acknowledgement that Dimitrievics was the one who prepared the assassination did not become public knowledge. Even now, the information to the public comes from the declaration of Benes. The Hungarian efforts to change the decision at Trianon were unsuccessful because everything was decided before the Conference. Charles Danielou writes: “Their intention was not to punish the one side but rather to satisfy the demands of the other.” (Pozzi, p.186) Henri Pozzi says that in Trianon they did nothing more than secure those decisions which the Czechs, Rumanians and Serbs had made between themselves.

³⁴⁷ Pozzi, Henri: *A háború visszatér*, p. 184-85

(Pozzi, p.186)

Already in 1917, The Czech Revolutionary organizations had divided Hungary between each other. These plans were helped by the French and the English advisors, and Lord Northcliffe with his financial support when they made the decisions, in London, Amsterdam and Paris. The propaganda committee met regularly in London at the house of the Marquis of Crewe from 1918 until the decision at Trianon. These were the people who influenced the decision at Trianon. The new borders were drawn from the proposals of this group. All the statistical data were provided to this committee by Benes. The president of this group was Lord Northcliffe. The members of the committee were the Count of Denbigh; Robert Donald, the editor of the *Daily Chronicle*; Sir Roderick Jones, the director of *Reuter News Agency*; Sir Sidney Low; Sir Charles Nicholson, Member of Parliament; Sir James O'Grady; Wickham Steed, foreign correspondent of *The Times*; Seton Watson, editor and historian, and H.G. Wells, the writer. (Pozzi, p.186)

Fifteen years later, the British acknowledged that they were misled. Therefore, more than two hundred Members of Parliament demanded the revision of the Hungarian borders.

Charles Danielou, who reported to the French Parliament from the Trianon Peace Conference, stated in 1921:

“The Little Entente came forward every day with new proposals. Every day they cut deeper and deeper into the flesh of the thousand year old Hungarian body. That border which Masaryk was demanding at the beginning in the name of the Czechs, was a totally ethnographic border. The pure Hungarian cities such as Pozsony, Léva, Ipolyság, Rimaszombat and Kassa, would have remained within the borders of Hungary. So the entire east Slovakia and Ruthenia would have remained with Hungary.” (Pozzi, p. 191)

The Great Powers, on the proposal of Benes, thrust aside the ethnographic borders and instead they adopted the strategic borders. This is why the Hungarian irredentist movement was born, to which Lloyd George referred.

It is a thousand years since the interests and history of Slovensko (Slovakia) and Ruthenia were blended with that of Hungary. Transylvania and the Bánság were Hungarian territories with Hungarian populace for a thousand years. The people have lived for centuries in a

unified civilization with a mutual economy, under the same laws and under the same rulers. In this territory which was taken from Hungary these people lived in a social, political and moral unity. (Pozzi, p.195)

Pozzi asks if the nationality principle can be applied to one, then why can it not be applied to another? Why is this principle not given to the Szeklers who live in close unity and to the Hungarians in the Bánság? Why is it wrong for the Hungarians to hope for the repossession of their land? He says that the French did the same thing from 1871 to 1914. They said the same thing 'No, No, Never!' They continued to demand the return of Alsace-Lorraine.

Hungary has a special right to a revision because the documents which came out after the war prove that Hungary cannot be blamed for the outbreak of war. On the contrary, she did all she could to prevent the outbreak of war. (Pozzi, p. 198)

According to Paul Boncour, the French Foreign Minister, France was the only nation who would have been able to change the untenable Trianon borders in a peaceful way. (Pozzi, p.194)

But do the people know about the documents which came out after the war to prove who was the real cause of the war? Pozzi says that they do not because the Great Powers do not want that to become public knowledge. They want to cover up their mistakes and the Successor States want to keep their stolen territories. The documents which came out cleared the name of István Tisza as the person responsible for the outbreak of war, so Hungary cannot be blamed.

We have to talk of the ring of the Little Entente which surrounds mutilated Hungary. The only way to escape from this unfriendly ring was through Austria. Benes intended to close that route when he tried to convince Austria to enter an alliance with the Czechs and the Poles which would have excluded Hungary. Hungary would not have been able to escape from this trap.

Tardieu called this alliance the Danube States Economic Alliance. The proposal for this alliance at Geneva did not materialize and finally Mussolini came to the aid of Hungary.

The Trianon border lines, at first glance, look as if they were drawn without any logic, writes Zoltán Palotás, but if we look closely, it is really very logical and, I may add, purposeful, not to the advantage of Hungary but to the advantage of the Successor States. A peace treaty can only last if it provides a just solution for both sides. If the treaty

favors one over the other, it is not a Peace Treaty but a Dictated Peace and knowing this, the one who is favored can later endanger the existence of the other. In the opinion of Dr. Palotás, the Hungarian revisionists made a mistake when they disregarded the changes which time has made and they appealed to the conference with arguments which represented the Hungarian point of view: the Szent István concept of the state, the integrated Hungarian state and the perfect geographic unity of the Carpathian Basin. In the circle of the Western politicians, these three arguments were regarded as the remnants of feudalism and imperialism. It was only much later that they realized that they should have emphasized that a just decision be made along ethnic lines. But by that time, they were unable to break through the influence of Masaryk and Benes. They very rarely brought up the argument that the new borders followed the railroads and the market line. This is a very important argument from the point of view of economics because, in most cases, when the new borders were drawn, they crossed through the middle of territory where the Hungarian populace was in the majority. There were many politicians who knew of or sensed the unjust decisions at Trianon and therefore the League of Nations, in its founding document in Paragraphs X. and XIX., stipulated the possibility of a Hungarian revision but this has been ignored:

Para. XIX:

“The General Assembly, from time to time, can call the members of the Entente to change those agreements which cannot be applied and call them to examine again such international situations which, if not changed, could endanger world peace.”³⁴⁸

In my opinion, Hungary was in disfavor with the Western nations because they saw her as a feudal state in the Age of Democracy, ignoring the fact that she provided for the rights of her minorities.

We can distinguish three different types of borders among the borders drawn at Trianon. Most of them are political borders. Only one fourth of them are natural borders and three fifth of the borders cut through the middle of Hungarian territory. In 43% of the borders the transportation questions were considered.

³⁴⁸ Palotás, Zoltán: A Trianoni határok, Budapest, 1990, p. 54

Border Segment	Length in km.	Length of the borders					
		Natural border km.	Artificial border km.	Languag. border km.	Non-lang border km.	Transpntn border km.	Non-trns border km.
Czecho-slovakia (1920)	823	298	525	18	805	561	262
Czecho-slovakia without Ruthenia	608	268	340	18	590	346	262
Ruthenia	215	30	185	—	215	215	—
Yugslav	631	215	416	450	181	100	531
Rumania	432	—	432	90	342	310	122
Austria	356	30	326	356	—	—	356
TOTAL	2242	543	1699	914	1328	971	1271

Zoltán Palotás asks whether the Hungarian government could have proposed a compromise to the Slovaks which would have satisfied both parties and would have kept the two nations together as they had been for centuries. It is a difficult question, he says, but every attempt to encourage friendship between the Slovaks and Hungarians was rejected by the Slovaks and the other Successor States because they knew they had the advantage of the support of the Entente. At the same time, the Entente did not recognize those Hungarian governments which represented Hungarian interest, such as that led by Gyula Károlyi. The Successor States closed out the possibility of negotiations and accepted the Dictated Peace. Therefore the Hungarian governments formed after that had to be very careful how they presented their request for a revision of the borders. This caution was obvious when the Hungarian government went to the League of Nations to ask for financial aid toward economic reconstruction. Before they would give them the money, the League of Nations forced the Hungarian government to declare that they signed the “Peace Treaty” of Trianon voluntarily, without any coercion.

Reading the history of Hungary before Trianon, which deals with nationality problems, the reader will very seldom find any suggestions for a solution to the minority problems. Why is that so? We have to analyse the situation from the Hungarian point of view in order to find the answer. The Hungarian nation was a great power in the Carpathian Basin, able to oppose the Tartar invasions and, for centuries, oppose the power of the world-conquering Turks and the Hapsburgs. Hungary was the only place of refuge for the people of the small nations in Central Europe. When the peoples who had been given asylum and who had settled in the Hungarian territory, came forward at Trianon with demands to annex Hungarian territories, this was, in the eyes of the Hungarians, a great injustice and it almost paralyzed any realistic thoughts. It threw the Hungarian politicians into a deep apathy.

After 1848, Austria, together with Czarist Russia, overcame the Kossuth-led Hungarian Freedom Fight and in 1867 the Austro-Hungarian Compromise took place which resulted in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The interior and the foreign policy were in the hands of the Austrians and, as they done centuries before, they again brought in foreigners, this time bankers, landowners, and industrialists. They did this purposely because they did not trust the Hungarians. They

did not trust these people who for four hundred years had tried to break away from the Hapsburgs. Therefore the Hungarian ruling class was untrustworthy in their eyes. In order to keep them under their control, they allowed Germans, Jews, Slavs and Rumanians to settle in the country. The universities, the public education, the Church and the county leadership went into the hands of the Germans, Jews and Slavs. The industry, trade and the press were in the hands of the Jews. All these foreigners became “good, true Hungarians” and the Hungarian people remained “untrustworthy” and became second-class citizens in their own country. The situation became even more difficult when Protestantism, which was the only Hungarian stronghold, lost its role and the Hungarians remained without any support.

At the same time, a new class of people was formed, the capitalist, industrialist class, which in Hungary was made up mostly of Jews. This is the time, world-wide when the bourgeoisie took over the leading role. At this time, the class of serfs disappeared, but on paper only. In reality, the peasant, who had no land, was at the disposal of his lord. The peasant, as a result of his hunger, was forced to take some drastic action, asked for more bread and the received the bayonets of the police instead. The foreigners, however received many privileges.

In the Hungarian army, the situation was not favorable to the Hungarians either. If a Hungarian wanted to advance to the rank of officer, he first had to deny his Hungarian identity and accept the Austrian interest. The Hungarian, in every part of his life became a second-class citizen in his own country. Then came the accusation against the Hungarians that they were suppressing the minorities in their country. So to the Hungarians, who were denied every position, every opportunity, remained only the duty of going to war when the recruiters came, and to pay taxes, yet in the eyes of the Western politicians the Hungarians became ethnic oppressors. The Austrians advocated this oppression so that they could influence the opinion of the western politicians against the Hungarians and in so doing they could suppress the Hungarians. All this is just anti-Hungarian propaganda, unjust statements because, in spite of the centuries of “Hungarian oppression” the minorities in Hungary were able to become educated and multiply and at the same time the Hungarian people diminished in numbers.

It was in the interest of the foreign Hapsburg rulers and those who served this power, to divert the attention from the enormous

economic and social problems by raising the nationality feelings of the minorities and the anti-Hungarian feelings among them. In this way, it was easier for them to control the Hungarians.

The foreign Hapsburg emperor, who was at the same time Hungarian king, did not make it a priority to put a stop to the anti-Hungarian politics inside and outside the Monarchy. This is why we cannot find, even today, a historian who would show the true face of the Hungarian nation, except for Ödön Málnási, C.A. Macartney, Andrew Burghardt, Rezső Dabas and a very few others. Those history books which are available are those which were written by historians of those countries which gained from the Trianon Decision.

Dezső Szabó writes that if all the people in the Carpathian Basin, living in the Monarchy, could have forced the Monarchy to give them all their independence from the Hapsburgs, this could have been the cornerstone of Hungarian politics.³⁴⁹ Instead of this, the Hungarian people, as a suppressed people, but a people in the majority in the Carpathian Basin, were serving the interest of the Hapsburgs. As such, they helped the unrestricted power of the Hapsburgs to prevent the minorities from becoming independent. With these politics, there was no other possibility than to ally themselves with the German and Austrian imperialism.

At that time, after 1848, if the Hungarian nation could have taken her own administration into her own hands, her interior and foreign policy, she would have been able to do something to avoid the events at Trianon. But the many people of foreign nationality who became Hungarians, the foreign government, the Hapsburgs and those who supported this government, in the loudest manner advocated that the Hungarians' only chance was to march with Germany. At the same time, they were instigating the anti-Hungarian feelings inside the Monarchy and they blamed every hardship on the Hungarians.

The propaganda of these "foreign Hungarians" did not allow any concessions to the minorities at the time when it was the biggest necessity for them. With these concessions, they would not have broken the old historical connections but could have forged new ones. However, these foreign Hungarians showed the greatest allegiance to their alliance with Austria.

³⁴⁹ Szabó, Dezső: *Az egész látóhatár*, Lyndhurst, NJ, 1975

Could Hungary have expected a just peace settlement after this propaganda which gave the Hungarians a bad name abroad and within the country? Why was Hungary punished much more than Germany, against whom the Western Powers went to war? How is it possible that they made border revisions there and they applied the plebiscite in certain mixed territories? And why was the Entente satisfied with the fact that they made minority protection laws in the Successor States but did not provide for the Western Powers to move in and correct the situation, if these states did not protect the minority rights? On the part of the Hungarians, it was also a mistake that the politicians did not emphasize enough that Hungary was mutilated to the point that she could not survive without a subsidy from the League of Nations.

If we read through the decisions of Trianon, then we wonder how it was possible that the Great Powers could have been misled to such a great extent. How was it that they did not know any Hungarian history? How could the French and the English trust the Little Entente and how can they trust that they will take the responsibility to protect Europe in the future?

At the time of the negotiations at Trianon, the principle of Self Determination was a well accepted term which was regarded as important when the Rumanians, Serbs and Slovaks were considering border changes. The Allies even regarded this for the benefit of these people although it was later proven that only their own people took part in the voting. For example, in Túrócszentmárton, a Hungarian territory, only the Slovak people were allowed to vote. On Dec. 1, 1918, at Gyulafehérvár, only the Transylvanian Rumanians were allowed to vote yet there were many Transylvanian Rumanians who would have preferred autonomy for Transylvania and who did not want to belong to Rumania. Such was Pop-Cicio, a Rumanian politician, who was demanding autonomy for Transylvania and opposed annexation to Rumania. He was afraid that the Rumanians outside of Transylvania (in the Kingdom of Rumania), who were on a lower social standard, would come into Transylvania and take over the rule of the Rumanians in Transylvania.

As long as the minorities live in the territories of the Successor States, we cannot expect to see democracy there, because these states are afraid that sooner or later, Hungary will demand border revisions. This is why all the Successor States build up their armies to be many times

greater than the Hungarian army. The building of this superior force indicates a hidden aggressivity. We can see that in the way that they are now openly demanding more territory from the already mutilated Hungary. This is why, until the injustices of Trianon are set right, there will always be the seed of war in Central Europe. This stress is not caused by the Hungarians, but by the Successor States' continuous anti-Hungarian policies. None of the states keeps the agreements it signed in regard to the Hungarians living within its borders, not even according them the basic human rights. This is why the Hungarian people have no other choice than to fight for revision.

In 1975, the final clauses of the Helsinki agreement allowed the peaceful revision of borders. Therefore it is legal to talk about the subject of revision.

The Hungarian governments, even in their revisionist demands were very moderate. They only demanded the ethnographic borders based on the 1910 census. They demanded a plebiscite which would be supervised by an international committee. Hungary is not demanding the return of those territories where, in 1910, the other nationalities were in the majority. The Hungarians demand all those territories where the Hungarians live in isolation because of the foreign peoples' settlement into Hungary and they demand that the Hungarian persecution cease.

This is the essence of the Hungarian revision, according to Pozzi. It was the same thing that the French were demanding for 44 years for the territory of Alsace-Lorraine. (Pozzi, p. 204)

When the Hungarian government signed the Dictated Peace with a knife at their throat, they did that as a result of the letter they received from President Millerand of France. This is the reply of the Hungarian government to Millerand:

“The Hungarian government is convinced that, in the spirit of understanding and development, the disputed questions in the Peace Treaty will be resolved and, in the same manner, all those injustices which are not even mentioned in the letter will be discontinued or perhaps the Great Powers do not regard these as injustices. In this hope, and the knowledge of the difficult situation the country is in, the Hungarian government is forced to sign the Peace Treaty.”³⁵⁰

We can see that the Hungarian government, knowing the

³⁵⁰ Raffay, Ernő: *Magyar Tragédia, Trianon 75 éve*, p. 45

country's alarming situation, and at the same time, trusting that the injustices would be discontinued, signed the Treaty. The fact that Hungary was not allowed to be present at the negotiations for the Treaty, and could not defend herself from the accusations, and the fact that decisions were made without her, are all reasons that Hungary is not legally bound to the Treaty, states Raffay. Thus the struggle for revisions is legal.

Pozzi says it is not a question of whether France is a friend of the Little Entente or a friend of the Hungarians. He says, "We are talking about satisfying the demands of justice. Let us acknowledge the mistakes and correct them. We accepted the promises in the Millerand Letter, and in our own interest, honor binds us to keep them. One huge question still remains for France to solve. The revisions which are inevitable will happen with the help of the French, or they will happen by force without us and in spite of us." (Pozzi, p.194)

Pozzi says that the nations which guaranteed the Trianon Decision did not even have to go as far as nullifying the Decision, they only needed to conduct the border revisions that were promised in the Millerand Letter.

Professor Badiny writes: "On the proposal of Count Potocki of Montalk, the Congress of the New European Order of Barcelona declared the Treaty of Trianon to be null and void and they made an official declaration entitled the Declaration of Barcelona."³⁵¹

Masaryk, the President of the Czech Republic, often expressed his regret about Benes's forceful Trianon victory and stated to Polson Newmann, the editor in chief of the English journal *The XX. Century*, on August 30, 1930,: **"I am very willing to take into consideration a revision of the present borders for the benefit of Hungary."**³⁵²

Today we cannot avoid the revision of Trianon because, of those nations which were created at Trianon, Czechoslovakia no longer exists. The Treaty was not made with Slovakia. Yugoslavia of 1920 no longer exists either because Croatia has separated from it unable to withstand the Serb oppression. Benes gave Ruthenia to the Soviets so that Pan-Slavism could enter into the heart of Europe. The Soviet Union has also dissolved. The Ukraine never owned Ruthenia. Rumania because of her

³⁵¹ Article in *Ősi Gyökér*, Jan. 1973, p.12

³⁵² Pozzi, Henri: *Századunk bűnösei*, p. 298

politics of assimilation, taking away the rights of the minorities, has proved that she cannot rule Transylvania. This is why the Szeklers and the Transylvanian Hungarians now demand the autonomy of Transylvania which would have a good economical connection with Hungary.

On the eve of the Second World War, the first phase of the Atlantic Charter, the Great Powers ceremoniously announced that they recognized the mistakes of the past and that in the future they would rectify them.³⁵³

We should apply the wisdom of the proverb: “Better late than never” and reconsider the present borders.

Dr. Joseph Pungur offers a solution. The politicians of the United States, Europe and all those officials who have the power to make border revisions in Europe, have to support the request of the minorities for self-determination. They have to prevent further bloodshed. They have to make the oppressors understand that the borders were final before Trianon and that the people want to restore the pre-Trianon borders. We have to make them understand that the small nations in Central Europe can only survive with peaceful coexistence. They depend on each other. If this peaceful coexistence does not take place then they will become the victims of the Great Powers of the East and the West. Therefore, according to Dr. Pungur, we have to advocate the solution that the people who presently live as minorities, have to be brought into one strong unit, in the territory where they lived before the Decision of Trianon. For example, the Rumanians should be united in Moldavia, the Hungarians of Transylvania, Slovakia, Southern Hungary and Ruthenia, should return to Hungary and the Albanians of Kosovo be reunited with those in Albania. He proposes a populace exchange of smaller groups, done in a civilized manner, for example, the Rumanians living in Hungary to be exchanged with the Hungarians living beyond the Carpathian Mountains. The here-mentioned examples could be used as models for other problematic territories. If we are not able to solve the Central European question, then this will continue into the next millennium because it will not be solved by itself.³⁵⁴ This solution of Dr. Pungur does not appear to me to be a viable one.

³⁵³ Hapsburg, Otto: “Önrendelkezési jog”, *Kanadai Magyarság*, August 29, 1998

³⁵⁴ Pungur, József: “A Keleteurópai nacionalizmus és a nyugat felelősége”, *Hunnia*, June 25, 1998 p. 6-7

I would prefer to see a federation of Transylvania, Slovakia, Croatia and Hungary. Giving the states autonomy would be the last resource because, as András Rozgonyi writes, the acceptance of autonomy within their present states would not solve the minority problems.³⁵⁵ They would remain forever foreigners and would lose their Hungarian identity. To give autonomy to these peoples is only possible by the acknowledgement of the majority. The Successor States would never allow a plebiscite to decide this. Therefore this problem cannot be solved by the interior policy of these states whereas a just and final border revision could be implemented by an international court.

As I mentioned earlier, the Carpathian Basin is the only geographical unit in Central Europe which is completely self-supporting. The land provides everything in abundance. The territory is protected by natural borders which are easily defended. In the past, the peoples who lived in this territory enjoyed peace and prosperity when they were not threatened by the Germans, Tartars, Turks or Austrians. Because of man's greed and false accusations, the Decision of Trianon divided this unity.

It is only as one complete unit that this territory is able to provide security and prosperity for the inhabitants. A section of this territory is unable to provide all the needs of the people and therefore, separate from each other, different sections are not viable and are unable to serve as a defense bastion between East and West as Hungary did in the past.

The Successor States, in their greedy frenzy to acquire Hungarian territory, did not think about the future. They could only think about gaining as much territory as they could.

Slowly, with the passing of time, those people who gained the Hungarian territories at Trianon have begun to realize that the Decision at Trianon was unjust. There is still hope that the Trianon borders can be changed. This change will not be brought about by the Great Powers but by the sober realization of the people living in these territories.

I would like to mention an article which appeared in the Prague newspaper, "*Ludove Noviny*", June 15, 1990, written by Petr Liska. He writes: "At that time (1920), Slovakia had no borders. . . If the Slovaks favored the principle of nationalism over the principle of territory and at

³⁵⁵ Rozgonyi, András : További érvek a határrevízió érdekében, Australia

the same time they denied the Túrócszentmárton Declaration³⁵⁶ of October 30, 1918, then they could not deny the same principle to the 700,000 Hungarians in their territory.” The newspaper, “*Ludove Noviny*”, stated that Szerdahely, Komárom, Párkány, Galánta, Losonc, Rimaszombat, Rozsnyó and even Kassa did not belong to the territory of the Slovak state. This means that the most fertile land of the Slovak Republic was inhabited by Hungarians. Petr Liska says: “The Slovaks cannot refer to the passage in the Treaty of Trianon, referring to the borders of Czechoslovakia, because they would not even exist without the Túrócszentmárton Declaration.” (Kostya: p. 1.) He goes on to say: “For the same reason that, in the past, I have supported the Slovak struggle for independence, in the future, I shall support the Hungarian rights to Felvidék, where the Hungarians will live temporarily in the framework of the independent Slovak state.”

The present-day historians and politicians advocate that the Treaty of Trianon cannot be revised so they deny the Hungarian request to reconsider the borders, but I wish to point out that the Treaty has been broken several times in the past decade, when the Czechs and Slovaks dissolved Czechoslovakia, when the Serbs dissolved Yugoslavia and when Ruthenia was given to the Ukraine and also in 1945, after World War II, when the Soviets gave Czechoslovakia the Hungarian territory of Csallóköz.

Since the Trianon borders have already been changed to further benefit the Successor States, then Hungary must continue to hope for border revisions to correct the injustices of Trianon.

This possibility for change appears to be realistic in the light of the events taking place in Rumania at this time (1999) where the Transylvanian Rumanian intelligentsia are demanding autonomy from Rumania because Moldavia, the former Kingdom of Rumania, is exploiting the Transylvanian Rumanians. Croatia separated from Yugoslavia for the same reason.

Another promising sign against Trianon is another article which appeared in Prague daily newspaper, *Ludové Noviny*, on June 8, 1999. According to the writer, Bohimil Dolezal, the Hungarian Kingdom, at the time of the signing of the Trianon Peace Treaty, was an outdated,

³⁵⁶ The Túrócszentmárton Declaration provided for the formation of Czechoslovakia by unifying the Czechs and the Slovaks into one state.

medieval state, which had no basis for existence after the modern Central European nationalism came into being.

“The method with which they made this country disappear was more than regrettable. . . .In spite of the formal participation of the Hungarian negotiators, it was a merciless Dictated Peace whose goal was not to settle the problems peacefully and intelligently but rather to settle an account with the losers. The widespread territories inhabited by Hungarians were annexed to the neighboring countries. One third of the Hungarian people found themselves outside of their borders. The high cost of war damage compensation, which Hungary was forced to pay, and the cost of repairing the destruction in Hungary caused by the war and the Communist Revolution, tied down the Hungarian economy. The country was left alone to solve her problems and that gave the Horthy regime the opportunity to survive and cure Hungary’s wounds, but the solution that Horthy found pushed Hungary into a new war. The Treaty of Trianon and the Munich and Potsdam agreements are three shameful documents which were signed with the acknowledgement of the western countries or at least with their assistance. These three agreements sanctioned the obvious offenses against Hungary. These decisions complicated the connections between the small nations in Central Europe and their relationship with the advanced Western European countries.”

Dolezar is a well-known critic of the post-World War II. Decrees of Benes.

It is well known that the strongest advocates of Trianon were the Czechs, Thomas Masaryk and Edward Benes. However, taking into consideration the here-mentioned Czech and Rumanian opinions, we can see that the wheel of history is slowly turning. Perhaps it is just these people who will be the most effective supporters of the Hungarian revisionist movement. This support comes from the people’s new born awareness of the truth. The Great Powers still disregard these demands but the time will come when they will realize the mistakes they committed at Trianon.

Chapter 26

A Danubian Federation

I shall now present an overview of the Hungarian County-System which has provided a system in which the peoples of the Carpathian Basin have been able to live together for almost a thousand years. I take my information from an article by Dr. Gyula Varsányi: Regionalism in Practice. – The Ethnoprotective role of the semi-autonomous County System of Historic Hungary, which appeared in the January-March, 1985 issue of the *Revue de Droit International* in Geneva.³⁵⁷

The formation of the ancient Hungarian County-System began with the many Hungarian castles, which were administered by governors, in the reign of King Kálman, the Book Lover, of the Árpád dynasty, (1095-1116). These governorships were filled by the descendants of the former tribal leaders and the leaders of other nationalities living in the country. The intention of the governors was to keep themselves independent of the king's jurisdiction. The County-System of today was developed in the fourteenth century. The counties were called "comitates". István Verbőczy, in his book, Tripartitum, in 1517, wrote down the laws of the County-System. This book of laws was accepted as the Constitution of Hungary until 1945. The Doctrine of the Holy Crown was added to the laws of the County-System. The Doctrine of the Holy Crown was more or less a federal organization which bound the central power of the king to the autonomic regional power of the counties. In this political system, the different nationalities (minorities) were free to use their own language and customs and neither the central power (the king) nor the local power (the county governor) could prevent this freedom. The administration of each county was totally independent. The county administration was entrusted to the aristocrats and the public body of the free citizens and it was through the

³⁵⁷ Summarized by Doctor István Mailáth in *Kronika*, September, 1985

will of the king that the aristocrats received their titles and land. He did not discriminate between the Hungarians and non-Hungarians. The only expectation the king had of the aristocrats was that they perform acts of heroism or Christian piety. The aristocrats were not separated by language or nationality. They were all aristocrats which placed them in a separate class. A serf, with a heroic action, could be raised to the status of aristocrat.

István Kocsis explains how the Doctrine of the Holy Crown helped maintain the Hungarian self-defense. The populace who lived under the auspices of the Holy Crown regarded the Doctrine of the Holy Crown to be the best security (guarantee) for the continuance of the Constitutional State of the Hungarian people. The Doctrine of the Holy Crown was able to create national unity in the most difficult situations in the nation's history. In October, 1390, King Zsigmond rewarded Count Peter for having taken up arms against him when he, Zsigmond, as Hungarian king, did something which was illegal according to the Doctrine of the Holy Crown. Count Peter was defending the right of the Doctrine of the Holy Crown. This episode demonstrates that the Doctrine of the Holy Crown held more weight than the power of the king. Even the king was subject to its laws. The Doctrine of the Holy Crown was the highest law of the land. It encompassed all the legislative branches. The division of power was decided by the Doctrine of the Holy Crown. The members of its organization were the representatives of the three political nations, Hungarians, Szeklers and Saxons and were those who created the laws. It was this way until 1848.

After 1867, the people were able to vote to make the laws. In the constitutional law, all men were equal, none was privileged. The sovereignty of the Hungarian state was guaranteed by the fact that, not only the king and the three political nations, but also territories and cities were governed by the Doctrine of the Holy Crown. The right of the Holy Crown to possess territories was given to the king at the time of his coronation, but these were not his personal possessions and were only temporary. Nobody, under any circumstances could have the absolute power in the state. According to the basic rule of the Doctrine of the Holy Crown, the absolute power was in the hands of the combined political nations. The feudal system was overturned in 1848 as the peoples' rights were being advocated and, in 1867, they were given to every citizen. We have to mention that the Doctrine of the Holy Crown

did not separate but rather unified the different religious groups. Therefore, this doctrine encouraged the nation's unification without regard to racial or religious differences.

The two exceptional Hungarian individuals, Cardinal Péter Pázmány, the Catholic orator and Gábor Bethlen, the Protestant Prince of Transylvania, in spite of their religious differences, were united in fighting for the same goal, on the basis of the Doctrine of the Holy Crown. Cardinal Pázmány was a person of importance because he spoke out against the king in order to protect the Doctrine of the Holy Crown. Prince Gábor Bethlen also fought to protect the rights of the Doctrine of the Holy Crown by going to war against the Hungarian king. This was the mystery which, for almost a millennium, unified all the peoples who lived in Hungary. The Doctrine of the Holy Crown protected the rights of the people against absolutism. Only the Hungarian National Assembly could make changes or new laws. In the National Assembly every representative from all three political nations had the right to vote.³⁵⁸

In 1919, during the administration of the Károlyi government, Béla Kun and his clique who had been sent to Hungary from Russia, destroyed this power of unification, this Doctrine of the Holy Crown, which had unified the Hungarians and other nationalities who lived in Historic Hungary for a thousand years. In 1945, under the leadership of Mátyás Rákosi, the Hungarian Constitution was abandoned and the Soviet form of Communism was adopted.

The County-System and the Doctrine of the Holy Crown provided representation for all segments of the community. It gave equal opportunity to all. The oppression which the Slovaks alleged in their arguments at the negotiations at Trianon could therefore not have existed. The proof of this is the percentage of Slovaks represented in the county government. In Felvidék, which is now Slovakia, and the surrounding territory, in the counties where Slovaks lived, there was a large number of Slovak representatives in the county administration. For example, in the county of Trencsén they were 40%; in Túróc County, 43%; in Zolyom County, 36%; in Liptó County, 37.5%; in Bars County, 26%; in Nógrád County, 23%; in Gömör County, 24%; in Szepes

³⁵⁸ Kocsis, István: "A trianoni pszichózisok"; *Trianon Kalendárium*, 1997, p.37; Szent Korona mysterium, Budapest, 1997

County, 29%. These county representatives were on good terms with their Hungarian and German speaking colleagues.

It was under Hungarian protection that the Slovak people and nation developed to the point it had reached at the time of the Treaty of Trianon in 1920. Gyula Varsányi says that this unbelievable progression is unique in Europe.

The Serbs, Croats, Germans and Rumanians all settled into the Carpathian Basin in the time of the Turks, in some cases by invitation of the Hungarian kings. As we have seen, right at the start, the Slovaks accepted the rule of the Hungarians and lived in harmony with them under the Hungarian political system. In the Hungarian County-System, they were able to retain their national characteristics. They were members of the National Assembly of the Hungarian Kingdom which dealt with the country's problems. They were also able to fill positions in the church such as bishops and archbishops. The fact that in one thousand years they did not assimilate into the Hungarian nation, where the Hungarians were in the majority, is the biggest proof that the Hungarians did not intend to Magyarize them. Exactly the opposite happened when the Hungarians were in the minority in their states. They forced the Hungarians to assimilate.

Dr. Varsányi, sees in the County-System the reason the foreigners did not assimilate into the Hungarian population. The Hungarian County-System secured for every citizen regional autonomy and national characteristics. Varsányi discusses the origins of the nationalist and ultra-nationalist views which disrupted a well-trying system of peaceful co-existence which had worked very well for a thousand years. He blames the liberal ideas of the French and the English for affecting this system. He suggests to the politicians that, in own interests and in the interests of Europe, they look for those solutions which over the course of centuries have worked well and, if necessary, that they modernize these old systems and disregard the ideas and solutions which the blind chauvinistic politicians advocate, with the hidden goal of spreading Pan-Slavism.

The Hungarian County-System, the *comitates*, was based on constitutional law, contrary to the German constitution which was linked to the formation of the feudal society where, as time passed, the entire government system became the private possession of the ruler. The Hungarian public opinion did not allow the individual interest to come

out in public life. So the Hungarian counties never became the private possession of a particular governor. The lord-lieutenant of the county, the *comes*, never became a feudal lord, as did his western counterpart. He was always appointed by the king and could be removed by the king. He was the chief administrator of the county. His power was controlled by the national laws. When the western states were still groups of princedoms and had not yet become nations, the Hungarian state was a unified, lawful society with constitutional law, with a county system whose administration encompassed every branch of society.

The administration of the county developed into a higher authority. This County-System has great significance in world history because it came into being as a natural development of the Hungarian nation. Hungary was the first country in the world to introduce the principle of self determination and apply it in each county, yet this still did not compromise the unity of the nation. The administration of justice aided in the development of the autonomy of each county, says Varsányi. The king, at the very beginning of the County-System, every five years, administered justice from county to county and on his way, as the declaration of King Kálmán, the Book Lover, states, he was accompanied by two county judges. Later, the tribunal of the palatine (the highest administrative dignitary) was elected in each county by the public of the county. If the palatine, for some reason, could not travel to the county, there was the tribunal who could act in his place and administer justice. At first, this was an exceptional occasion but later, from the 13th century on, the tribunal administered justice on a regular basis.³⁵⁹

The Western leaders and the public do not know that Russia, for centuries, desired to spread as far as the Mediterranean Sea and the Adriatic. To further this goal, they started the Russian-Turkish War. In 1914, by the instigation of the Serbs against the Monarchy, the Russians appeared to be reaching their goal. Only the Monarchy was in their way. Therefore Russia, with false promises, instigated the minorities who were living in freedom in the Monarchy. After the fall of the Czar, this goal was continued by the Czechs, Slovaks and the Serbian Slavs. Their first goal was the extermination of the Hungarians. Czarist Russia did not accomplish this goal, but her smaller allies almost accomplished it.

³⁵⁹ Révai Nagy Lexikon, under “vármegye”

If all the Slav peoples actually do unite, then Western Europe will face a very difficult future. This is why the interest of the West is not with the Serbs, Czechs and Slovaks and in the strengthening of the perfidious, incalculable Rumanian state. It is in the interest of the West to effect a just revision, where the administration of this territory will be given back to the Hungarians in a reinstated Hungarian state, under the county system, which will be able to become a barrier between the East and the West.

The division of Hungary in 1920, when new artificial states were formed, which did not prove to be permanent, was a result of the accusations of the minorities, who complained of oppression by the Hungarians. Having just examined the County-System, we can see that there was no truth in these accusations. The new artificial states could not fulfill the role which was assigned to them, that is to be a buffer between East and West.

Hungary cannot accept the mutilation and the way the Hungarian people were treated and are still being treated in the Successor States. Therefore we have to work so that the peoples of the Danube region will find a common denominator. They should establish a federation based on the laws of the ancient County-System.

Lajos Kossuth, after the failure of the 1848 Hungarian Freedom Fight, also as an emigrant, suggested the plan of a Federation of the Danubian peoples. He placed the emphasis on peaceful co-existence rather than on an outdated plan of imperialism.

Kossuth thought a Danubian Federation was necessary for the following reasons. He said: "There are great powers around us. Therefore let us make an alliance so that we can support each other and we can all protect our independence. If the smaller nations are not protected from being occupied by the Great Powers, then in Europe there will not be freedom or peace, just continued conspiracies and a tendency toward expansion and war to obtain territory. I am strongly convinced that a federation of the smaller nations of the Danube Valley is the logical result of the demands of history."³⁶⁰

We can see that Kossuth did not emphasize the superiority of any one nation. Kossuth's idea of federation was a peoples' alliance in this

³⁶⁰ Kostya, Sándor: A Felvidék, p. 176; Kossuth, Lajos: Összes munkái I. – XII. Budapest, 1957

territory, the Danube Valley.

Count László Teleki, the Ambassador to Paris, in his letters of March 7 and May 10, 1849, brought to the attention of Lajos Kossuth the idea of a federation in the Carpathian Basin.³⁶¹ Kossuth's plan did not close out the idea of the unity of Historic Hungary. He made a detailed study of how the federation would work and especially studied the minority problems.³⁶² In later years, Kossuth's idea was accepted in theory by the Hungarian public but it could not materialize because Kossuth was never able to return to Hungary. He died in exile. The plan which he sent to Hungary in 1851, with Mack and Noslopy, who prepared the insurrections in Hungary, reached only a very small number of Hungarian leaders because, between 1852 and 1854, the Hungarian political leaders were captured, condemned and executed by the Hapsburgs. Therefore the Hungarian society was not informed. This limited activity of the Pro-Hungarian movement further affected the minority question.

The idea of the Compromise, proposed by the Austrians, was supported by Károly Eötvös, Zsigmond Kemény and the conservative György Apponyi, and the idea of federation was abandoned. At this time, two persons were very aware of the Hungarian politics, Kossuth in exile in Turin, and Count László Teleki. At the beginning of the 1850's, Kossuth clearly saw that the minority problems of the Danube territory could be solved only with a federation. This would have been the only way to prevent the mutilation which took place at Trianon. The effects of the failure of the Hungarian democratic Freedom Fight of 1848 was felt by the minorities too. The minorities received rewards whereas the Hungarians were punished. Everywhere, the Austrian administration took over the rule. Kellesperg in Zagreb, Wohlgemuth in Transylvania, Mayerhofer in Voivodina, in November 1849, punished those who demanded any kind of rights with Martial Law. For more than a decade, in this era without a constitution, there was no chance to settle the minority problems. On October 20, 1860, the Austrian *Diploma* only made promises to the minorities but did nothing. On February 26, 1861, the *Pátens* did not even make promises. The majority of the minorities wished to maintain the status quo so that they would not have to belong

³⁶¹ Ibid. p.32. Sulyok, Dezső: *Magyar Tragédia*, p.170

³⁶² Ibid. p.32; Borsody, István: *Budapest Athaeneum*, p. 202

to the Hungarian National Assembly and the Hungarian Government which made the Compromise with Austria. The Pan-Slavists showed their anti-Hungarian feeling even in this time of Hapsburg despotism. This anti-Hungarian Slav attitude alienated the Hungarian administration from the Slavs.

The need to settle the minority problems in the Carpathian Basin surfaced at three different times, in 1850, 1854 and 1859. In 1854, in London, when the Hungarians and Serbs met to settle their differences, Lajos Kossuth represented the Hungarians and Prince Mihály Obrenovic the Serbs. Kossuth noted the following in his writings: "In the question of the minorities, we are ready to go as far as we can to maintain the Hungarian political unity. I informed the Prince of this intention and he completely agreed with our concessions and finds them quite sufficient. He gave his word to do all that he could so that this agreement would materialize. He has already assured me that there will be no difficulties."³⁶³

Kossuth's idea of a Danube Federation showed amazing logic and the Serbian Prince Obrenovic and General György Klapka were in full agreement with this suggestion. This idea, which Kossuth published on September 15, 1860, in his Turin Memorandum, was introduced to the Hungarian government by General György Klapka. In January, 1861, Kossuth reintroduced it in the Plan for a Danube Federation in Jászy (now Jassy).

We know for sure from the writings of the Serb, Jovan Ristic, who was an expert about the life of Obrenovic, that Obrenovic did all that he could, according to the London agreement, to spread the idea of federalism and create a federal state to solve the question of the minority politics. On two occasions, the Prince negotiated with the Hungarians on this matter, in 1861 and in 1868. In 1868, Ristic, as the representative of the Prince, sought out Gyula Andrassy, Prime Minister of Hungary but, unfortunately, Andrassy declared that it was impossible to implement the idea of a federation. This unexpected act of diplomacy on the part of the Serbs, if it had been accepted, perhaps could have favorably influenced the 1868 Hungarian Minority Laws. (LXIV tc) This mission toward a federation, advocated by the Serbs, could not be completed because of the death of Prince Mihály Obrenovic. This

³⁶³ Ibid. p. 36; Iratok. (Kossuth Lajos összes munkai), Budapest, 1880

movement is worth explaining for two different reasons. The first is that this movement toward federation is not mentioned in Hungarian history books. The second is that we can see some connections between the London agreement of Kossuth and Obrenovic and the negotiations which Obrenovic was conducting with the Balkan states.

What was the situation here? After the unsuccessful negotiations in Budapest, the Serbian Prime Minister, Garasanin, with the sanction of Prince Obrenovic, signed an agreement with the Bulgarian National Propaganda Committee in Bucharest. This was an agreement for Serb-Bulgarian cooperation. In March, Ristic made an agreement with Prince Nikita of Montenegro to create a Southern Slav Federation. Obrenovic delegated the power to Garasanin to instruct Strassmayer, the Bishop of Zagreb, to invite the Croatians join the South-eastern European Federation. The Serb government and the Bulgarian Emigrants' Propaganda Committee in Bucharest came to an agreement that they would develop a basic Serb-Bulgarian constitution. Obrenovic told Garasanin to negotiate with the government of Greece to join the South-Eastern European Federation which would protect of the interest of the Greeks. This was the political situation on June 10, 1868, when Prince Obrenovic was killed. The assassination does not appear to be at the hands of one of his political rivals but was most likely ordered by the authorities in Vienna. I believe that could have been the last occasion when the Hungarians and Serbs could have come to an agreement, because Prince Obrenovic took very seriously the agreement with Kossuth which took place in London. He gave up on this agreement only when the negotiations with the Hungarian government failed. The Hungarian government, to solve their minority problems, adopted a policy of giving political concessions.

Stephen Borsody wrote in support of a Danubian Federation in 1950. "An irreconcilable conflict existed between the territorial demands, supported by the victorious Allies, and the Wilsonian principle of self-determination. Only a federal reconstruction of the Danube region could resolve the conflict – and the experts knew it. . . . An Allied federalist liberation policy, emphasizing the democratic solidarity of the Danubian people, could perhaps have united victors and vanquished. . . In concrete political terms, a federalist liberation policy would have meant a program of preserving the unity of the Habsburg

empire without the Habsburgs”³⁶⁴

Before the signing of the Dictated Peace on June 4, 1920, Count Albert Apponyi announced that Hungary would accept the decision based on a plebiscite and he insisted that a plebiscite take place. If this had happened, then the continuous rebellions in Central Europe and the present massacres in Yugoslavia could have been prevented. It would also have meant that the separation of three and a half million Hungarians from their motherland could have been avoided. Pure Hungarian cities, such as Kassa, Nagyvárad, Arad, Temesvár, Nagyszombat and Pozsony, which was the capital of Hungary for more than 300 years, were all given away. The biggest tragedy for Hungary, as the years have passed, was the change in demographics on the territory that was lost. Therefore we have to consider that this indeed was a great territorial loss for Hungary. The Hungarians have to accept that it is already too late to reclaim the original borders of Historic Hungary. That means that, in the future, every logical solution has to set new ethnic borders based on demographic information. The original Hungarian cities where the majority of the population was Hungarian should be returned to Hungary. This is the only way that another revolution can be avoided. This is the way we can create a lasting settlement which satisfies all parties. We have to give the people the right to have a plebiscite. Schleswig-Holstein, Sopron and the Saarland are good examples of places where a lasting peace followed a plebiscite.

We have to state that, since 1920, none of the states has come forward and suggested returning to Hungary those territories which they obviously received unjustly. Austria has not even returned Western Hungary, yet Hungarians were fighting alongside Austrians in the same regiments and Austria was directing the foreign policy about which Hungary had no say. István Tisza was the only one to oppose World War I., yet Hungary was blamed for the outbreak of the War. The Successor States strongly opposed Hungary’s irredentist demands between the two World Wars. Maybe the most terrible part of the unjust decision at Trianon is that the conscience of the leaders of the Successor States won’t let them rest and, knowing that they received the land

³⁶⁴ Borsody, Stephen: The Break-up of Austria-Hungary: Fifty Years After, reprinted under the title “The Empire : An Unrealized Federal Union,” in The Austrian Empire: Abortive Federation? Edited by Harold J. Gordon, Jr. And Nancy M. Gordon (Lexington, 1974), pp. 151, 153)

unjustly, they treat Hungarians with distrust and hate. This is why out of all the minorities in these states, the Hungarians suffer under the most horrible oppression. The Communist rule made their life even harder because they had not the slightest chance to voice their dissatisfaction. Therefore the assimilation of Hungarians into the ruling nationality was hastened. If any reports come out about their life, the Western Press does not publish them because it was the Western powers who signed the Treaty putting the Hungarians into modern-age slavery.

These Hungarians living in the Successor States have gradually lost hope because they can not expect any help from abroad, nor from Hungary. They cannot even get help from their church because that too is persecuted. Therefore these Hungarian minorities live under double or triple national and political persecution. These artificial states are waiting for the moment when these constantly suffering minorities will get tired of resisting them and they will give up and assimilate. Their goal is to create a national state, where there are no minorities.

When the time comes to revise the borders in Central Europe, the politicians will have to be realistic and will have to make sure that the minority groups in the Successor States can retain their national character, keep their traditions and folk arts and receive autonomy. These minorities could also decide to be connected to a regional group and unite in a federation or a confederation. This can only be accomplished if the Successor States give up their dictatorial policies and cease the suppression of the minorities.

According to the historian, Georges Roux, the problem in this territory is that politically all the peoples are unable to live together although they need each other economically. The geographical location demands that the people of the Danube Valley find a common denominator.

The big mistake of the Trianon decision was that the Great Powers dissolved a state which was geographically and historically compact and whose borders were not created by man. The Carpathian Basin was a territory where there was a natural centripetal water system. This unity must be restored. Such thoughts are often expressed in the newspapers. We cannot regard the present situation as a final settlement of the borders, especially since the Soviet Union, which no longer exists, tried to keep this status quo. Now that the Soviet Union has dissolved, it will not be able to prevent a redrawing of the borders.

There is another reason to restore the unity of the Carpathian Basin. In Slovakia, on the shoreline of one of the tributaries of the River Bodrog, the Slovaks built a tannery without a water purification plant. The pollution, especially at the beginning, was so great that sometimes the flooding River Bodrog became brown. The tannic acid and other chemical materials killed all the fish and the smell was discernable far from the factory. The River Bodrog has been called the country's second largest sewer after the River Sajó.³⁶⁵ Because of the artificial borders created at Trianon, the sources of most of the rivers which flow into the center of the Carpathian Basin, into the territory of Hungary, are located in those states created at Trianon. Since these states are antagonistic toward Hungary, they do not care that they are polluting the streams which flow into Hungarian territory, which provide the drinking water for cities like Budapest, Szeged, Szolnok and Kecskemét. It is necessary to create a Danubian Federation as soon as possible so that the unity of the Carpathian Basin can be reestablished and the chemical poisoning of the Hungarians can be prevented.

Because it is in the center of the Danube Valley, there can never be sincere cooperation, politically or economically without Hungary. This unification is possible because the Hungarian people and nation desire this for themselves and for the peoples of the Danube Valley. This would be a much more realistic goal than for the Danubian peoples to join United Europe. In a Danubian Federation they could become stronger economically and would not be a burden on the Western nations. Jacques Bainville, already in 1920, stated that, in this region, the nation which is the most suited to unite all the peoples in this territory has to be the leader and it is not necessary that it have the largest population. He said that it looked as if this role would be fulfilled by Hungary. I can add to this that the Hungarian nation has already, for more than 1000 years, had the experience of holding the nationalities together and knows how to live with them in harmony.

What has happened in Czechoslovakia since 1920? The state has fallen apart twice. Those politicians who are sincerely looking for the solution to the minority question take the trouble to look into the minority laws of Slovakia. I have to say no more because they will come to the realization that the minorities have absolutely no rights. Neither

³⁶⁵ Lázár, István: *Kiállt Patak vára*, Budapest, 1980, p. 247

the Czech nor the Slovak people are ready to live together and rule other nationalities. The same thing applies in Rumania and also to the Serbs in Yugoslavia. Not even the Austrians allow the minorities to use their own language. There, it is not even allowed to mention that Burgenland (Western Hungary) was annexed to Austria in 1920. The people who now live in the Successor States were freely allowed to use their language and practise their traditions in Hungary before Trianon.

There was a time period when the Hungarian government, on paper, did not give in to the minorities' demands but let us not forget that the Hungarian people, through many centuries, were just as suppressed under the Hapsburgs as were the minorities. The country's official languages were Latin and German for 1000 years. The ideals of the French Revolution electrified the Hungarian national consciousness just as they did those of the other nationalities in Hungary. It is no surprise then that, under such conditions, the Hungarians also clung to their power which was their right as the sovereign state and they did not want to give up this right to the nationalities whom they had defended for a millennium from the Tartars, the Turks and the Hapsburg imperialists.

Lajos Kossuth, already in 1849, and the different Hungarian governments which followed this date, were the first in Europe to give autonomy to the minorities. The French, even today, deny autonomy to the Basque people and the British only recently granted home-rule to the Scots and the Welsh.

According to Professor József Kindles,³⁶⁶ the European peoples were classified into national majority and national minority categories. He states that this is why the people do not have equal opportunity in these democracies. The national majority receives more rights than the national minority. Yet human rights are universal and should not be tied to numbers. Every man should receive these human rights. The policy which gives more rights to the majority is in opposition to the European Human Rights Convention Basic Law, para. 14. This why the European Ethnic Groups Federal Union (with German letter abbreviation : FUEV) in 1922, proposed a new agreement which they sent to the different European forums. The principle of the new agreement is the democratic constitutional state and the positive protection of collective

³⁶⁶ Kindles, József, article in *Transsylvania* January, 1999, p. 6

human rights. According to FUEV this is the only way it is possible to maintain a lasting peace in Europe. Such positive examples for this are South Tyrol, Karinthia, East Belgium and the Danish-German borderline territory. If this is not applied the result will be just like the Serb ethnic cleansing, genocide. The FUEV agreement in 1994, was divided into two major and three minor parts.

1. The right to fight for one's existence.
2. Equal rights before the law and the right of equal opportunity.

These two rights can be ensured by protection laws, the right to use the language and the right to obtain autonomy. The President of the FUEV, Christof Pan, declared: "In most cases autonomy provides the best solution to the majority of the problematic situations among ethnic groups. Yet the number of autonomous groups in Europe is very small and we know very little about them. There is always fear on the part of the state because autonomy is the first step to total independence. Yet granting autonomy at the right time, is the best way to prevent a total break."

The FUEV Plan declares that autonomy is a major factor in the obtaining the rights of the ethnic groups. It supports three forms of autonomy:

- A) territorial autonomy, where the ethnic populace lives in the majority.
- B) cultural autonomy, where the ethnic populace is not in the majority.
- C) local autonomy, where the minority lives in scattered groups and is in the majority in the village or district.

The minimum level of these three forms of autonomy is that which is necessary for the existence of these groups and the maintainance of their customs. The maximum level of autonomy is that which does not offend the integrity of the state. In spite of this, Professor Pan says that looking at the depth and size of this problem, in spite of the intensive international negotiations, very few autonomies have been created. There are two reasons for this. One is that when negotiations take place to solve these complicated situations, the people whose fate is being discussed are not involved in the negotiations. Only the majority takes part in the negotiations. They represent their own ethnic group.

The big powers did not want to hear about the autonomy of Transylvania. A revision of the borders or autonomy for Transylvania would certainly be the best solution for this territory to achieve a just

and lasting peace. For centuries, Transylvania was a principality with its own prince, its own administration and the right to make laws. It had a high level of culture and wealth but the people knew that it was a part of Hungary.

I agree that autonomy is a step forward toward the freedom of the oppressed minorities but it is not a final solution to their problem. They will remain a minority and, if the Successor States continue their policy, they will eventually assimilate.

I favor the idea of a Danubian Federation. I would like to propose that the peoples of the Holy Crown live together under the rule of the Holy Crown where in the past no one nation ruled the others and where in the future no one nation would rule over the others. This has worked for about a thousand years. If we compare this to the last 80 years since Trianon, we will see the advantage of the organization of the country under the Holy Crown and the disadvantages of living in the Successor States.

Viktor Padányi points out that the Entente powers, when they applied the Wilsonian principle of self-determination never defined what criteria they would use. They finally decided that the use of the same language or a similar language was to be the criterion for the establishment of a new state.³⁶⁷ Why did they favor peoples who spoke a similar language when it was a known fact that the Slovaks and the Czechs, although they both spoke a Slavic language, harbored great animosity toward each other and they had never lived together in one community? The Czechs believe that they are superior among the Slavs just as the Germans believe in their own superiority. They despise the simple, religious Slovaks. At the same time the Slovaks lived for 800 years in political unity with a people with a similar religion: the non-Slav Hungarians. During that time there was never any insurrection. The other two nations, the Croats and the Serbs, also spoke a Slavic language and their origin was similar but they are just as hostile to each other as are the Russians and the Poles. This hostility goes back many centuries. The Croats are on a higher cultural standard than the Serbs and are culturally closer to the Hungarians and other Europeans than to the Serbs and the other Balkan peoples. They are Roman Catholics like the

³⁶⁷ Padányi, Viktor: *A Nagy Tragédia, Part I*, San Francisco CA, 1977, pp.193, 195, 198, summarized by József Berzy in: *Európa Felszabadítása*, Argentina, 1966, p. 236.

Hungarians and they offered their country to Saint László, in the eleventh century. Until 1920, they lived in an autonomous state within Hungary. Their geographical locality also indicates that Hungary and Croatia depend on each other. The same thing applies to the Slovaks and the Hungarians. Why did the Entente not consider the here-mentioned points and give national identity more priority?

We can feel the result of that incorrect decision today – the poverty and suffering of many thousands, and the genocide which is presently conducted in Serbia. Now, in 1999, NATO is becoming involved to stop the Serb genocide on this territory. The involvement of NATO is necessary now because the Wilsonian principle of self-determination was denied at Trianon and the geographical, economic, strategic, cultural and religious factors were ignored. The Entente powers sold out this territory to the Balkan or the Russian Pan-Slavists. On these territories, we have to take into consideration the geographical and cultural factors and make sure that the unity is not affected by a linguistic determination.

Here we are talking of peoples which are a mixture of ethnic groups but their mutual interest and defense and their similar world view and similar culture binds them together. Such a unity should not be disturbed by linguistic considerations. If these people are divided by linguistic criteria, (as they were at Trianon) there is sure to be conflict.

In such a territory a federal union provides for the most effective defense for the members of the federation. In order for this to take effect the countries have to recognize that they are interdependent. They have to choose to accept a mutual fate. The people who live in this territory all face the same danger. In their misfortune they can rely on their mutual friends. All these factors have to be taken into consideration to protect the mutual interest which is nothing more than national consciousness. We can explain national consciousness as being the patriotic feeling of the populace of a country who fight together for their own interest and not because they are forced to do so. Such a unity in the Carpathian Basin, which existed for 800 or 1000 years should not be disturbed by a linguistic similarity.

The solution of the minority problems in the Carpathian Basin is to create a Federation with Slovakia, Transylvania, Croatia, Hungary and maybe Poland and Austria. These would all be independent states and an independent committee would decide upon the borders of these

countries which would have definite borders within the federation. The mutual constitution of this federation of states would be decided by a federal assembly. The administration of the Carpathian Basin Federation would follow the rules of the ancient Hungarian County-System and the Doctrine of the Holy Crown which was the most lasting and most democratic system in Europe.

Winston Churchill called the complete break-up of the Empire a “cardinal tragedy” and British Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden, stated in 1950: “The collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was a calamity for the peace of Europe. If the countries that formed it could one day find some arrangement that would allow them to work together again in a happy association, how welcome this would be.”³⁶⁸

³⁶⁸ Churchill, Winston: The Gathering Storm, Boston, 1948, p. 10 and New York Times, October 3, 1950 quoted by Stephen Kertész in “Consequences of World War I: Effects on East Central Europe” Essay in War and Society in East Central Europe Vol. VI. p. 40

APPENDIX A.

DISTRIBUTION OF MINORITIES LIVING IN VILLAGES IN THE PARTIUM.

District of Ugocsa beyond the River Tisza

Village	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Bocskó	5	0	452	13
Nagygérce	48	14	911	37
Hömlöc	20	11	6	277
Batarcs	116	304	1,183	9
Tamásvár- alja	576	0	56	13
Ugocsa- komlós	22	103	817	2
Turc	246	286	3,146	14
Nagytarna	881	20	555	475
Kisgérce	65	0	1,673	1
Túrterebes	3,774	5	10	3
Dabolc	496	2	0	0
Halmi	3,371	51	19	14
Kisbábony	553	2	10	0
Kökényes	1,339	3	0	3
Csedreg	719	9	0	0
Fertősalmás	827	0	0	0
Avaspatak	72	0	856	2
Total	13,190	810	9,694	863

County of Máramaros, district of Técső:

Técső	0	0	0	0
Ferencvölgye	324	5	15	4
Pálosremete	19	348	105	811
Total	343	353	120	815

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	Other
Sziget Dist.				
Szaplonca	131	1,168	2,152	24
Szarvaszó	221	87	843	1
Hosszú- mező	2,230	70	47	241
Kabolapatak	601	53	1,631	2
Tiszaveres- mart	266	112	133	268
Tiszakará- csonfalva	58	1,131	26	1,102
Alsóróna	0	404	1,624	14
Felsőróna	379	198	9	2,551
Rónaszék	1,471	9	9	5
Total	5,357	3,432	6,474	3,201
Tisza valley district				
Lonka	131	194	2	2,058
Máramaros- sziget	17,542	1,257	2,001	570
Total	17,673	1,451	2,003	2,628
Szatmár County:				
Szatmárnémeti district:				
Nagypalád	1,513	12	0	0
Adorján	531	0	3	0
Amac	419	0	523	0
Batiz	1,711	1	0	0
Batizvasvári	624	0	116	0
Berend	512	0	12	0
Dobrácsapáti	339	0	22	0
Egri	1,050	0	0	0
Kak	406	0	0	0
Kakszent- Márton	513	3	34	1

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Kiskolcs	654	0	29	4
Kispeleske	421	0	0	0
Kissár	179	7	0	0
Lázári	1,322	0	0	0
Mikola	1,885	10	1	0
Nagykolcs	431	3	372	2
Nagy- peleske	1,014	3	1	0
Ombod	900	0	23	0
Pettyén	485	0	24	1
Pusztadaróc	500	0	0	0
Sándor- homok	608	0	0	2
Sárköz	2,363	2	117	20
Sárközújlak	1,649	0	2	3
Szamos- kóród	351	0	150	3
Szamos- krassó	991	0	435	27
Szamos- lippó	105	0	803	0
Szárazberek	992	0	0	0
Szatmár- pálfalva	280	0	47	0
Szatmár- udvari	1,565	4	280	0
Szatmár- zsadány	234	18	1,315	1
Total	24,547	63	4,309	62
Szatmár- németi city	33,094	629	986	183

Csengeri District:

Atya	675	0	0	1
Óvári	1,462	0	26	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Csenger- bagos	971	0	583	0
Pete	337	0	11	0
Szamosdara	846	0	0	36
Szamosdob	652	1	910	0
Vetés	1,713	2	54	2
Total	6,656	3	1,584	39
Nagykároly district:				
Bere	525	0	0	0
Börvely	2,342	36	74	3
Csanáros	1,727	19	2	0
Csomaköz	2,170	0	5	0
Domahida	1,038	0	155	4
Érdengeleg	716	13	699	1
Érendréd	1,434	0	331	0
Érkört- vélyes	2,198	5	21	7
Esztró	46	0	295	0
Gencs	1,482	0	15	24
Gilvác	647	0	9	7
Iriny	735	0	39	0
Kálmánd	1,058	4	0	10
Kaplony	1,933	0	4	0
Kismajtény	695	0	978	1
Kraszna- szentmiklós	483	0	525	0
Mezőfény	1,748	22	0	0
Mezőpetri	1,455	0	0	0
Mezőterem	1,953	12	362	12
Nagymajtény	1,809	62	23	0
Reszege	24	0	459	0
Portelek	237	28	501	13
Szaniszló	3,485	60	1,273	4
Vezend	68	0	923	0
Total	30,008	261	6,693	86
Nagykároly	15,772	63	216	27

Avas district:

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Avasfelső- Falu	490	184	2,541	38
Avas- lekence	21	20	547	0
Avasújfalú	167	112	1,380	25
Avasújváros	1,942	2	118	0
Bikszád	50	142	1,506	4
Bujánháza	8	38	666	50
Kányaháza	183	55	1,691	19
Komorzán	51	70	1,861	1
Kőszeg- remete	782	1	40	0
Lajosvölgy	29	11	328	115
Mózesfalú	21	27	730	20
Ráksa	21	6	1,573	4
Rózsapallag	132	1	617	0
Tartolc	17	150	1,676	6
Terep	134	61	708	10
Túrvékonya	113	44	757	50
Vámfalú	1,038	4	1,147	1
Total	5,199	928	17,886	352

Erdőd District:

Rákos- terebes	63	20	584	5
Nántú	352	93	483	2
Dobra	1,504	0	26	0
Kraszna- béltek	2,158	30	57	0
Alsóboldád	10	10	365	0
Kraszna- sándorfalu	49	524	19	0
Nagy- szokond	127	481	69	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Szakasz	122	525	181	69
Oláhgyûrûs	62	16	769	2
Erdöd	3,434	35	133	0
Oroszfalva	38	0	408	1
Résztelek	52	0	1,068	1
Ivacskó	57	26	447	0
Alsó- homoröd	120	749	57	0
Szinfalu	125	772	226	0
Hirip	950	0	311	0
Nagy- madarász	432	7	1,412	0
Géres	1,042	1	21	0
Gyöngy	169	1	560	0
Királydaróc	1,698	2	930	3
Piskárkos	27	0	1,004	22
Kraszna- terebes	770	169	586	7
Total	13,361	3,461	9,716	112

Szinérválja District:

Józsefháza	1,040	0	380	0
Aranyos- meggyes	925	1	2,310	0
Szatmár- görbed	264	0	427	0
Apa	797	0	1,732	3
Szinérvár- alja	2,542	57	2,451	6
Iloba	198	8	891	1
Nagysikárló	122	0	1,224	0
Patóháza	421	0	726	0
Kissebes- patak	34	0	548	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Apahegy	283	0	258	0
Szamos-berence	56	0	936	0
Total	6,682	66	1,583	11

Nagybánya District:

Misztótfalu	605	1	478	11
Misz-mogyorós	69	16	424	0
Miszbánya	164	0	159	0
Láposbánya	475	21	847	12
Feketefalu	9	6	571	0
Felső-fernezely	29	10	1,382	0
Alsó-fernezely	648	6	1,487	26
Kisbánya	4	0	829	0
Kapnik-bánya	1,864	49	1,604	0
Giródtótfalu	167	0	759	48
Total	4,034	109	8,540	97
Nagybánya city	9,992	175	2,677	33
Felsőbánya city	4,149	19	230	24

Szilágy county:**Tasnád district:**

Ákos	1,352	10	356	0
Alsószopor	287	0	1,167	1
Csekenye	12	0	188	0
Csög	105	0	629	0
Érgirolt	126	0	390	0
Érhatvan	173	6	614	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Érkávás	185	0	677	43
Érkisfalu	27	2	513	16
Érkisszöllős	239	0	98	5
Érkőrös	418	0	198	0
Érmindszent	413	9	363	4
Érszakácsi	1,308	1	453	0
Érszent- király	661	0	523	24
Érszodoró	245	1	310	0
Érszöllős	956	0	23	0
Felsőszopor	182	0	928	0
Girókuta	49	0	695	0
Kegyé	140	1	790	65
Keszi	245	0	24	0
Kisderzsida	30	0	712	77
Kraszna- cégény	229	0	100	10
Kraszna- háza	82	0	80	0
Kraszna- mihályfalva	696	0	61	0
Magyar- csaholy	1,078	0	84	0
Oláhcsaholy	26	0	1,392	3
Pele	532	0	168	0
Peleszarvad	42	0	336	5
Szilágypér	1,943	4	247	0
Szolnok- háza	351	4	107	0
Szödemeter	191	0	567	0
Tasnád	4,763	26	236	5
Tasnád- bajom	253	22	1,010	119
Tasnád- balázsháza	62	0	261	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Tasnádorbó	178	13	289	2
Tasnád- szántó	1,168	7	1,279	5
Tasnád- szarvad	514	6	894	102
Tasnád- szilvás	23	0	345	10
Újnémet	105	9	912	18
Usztató	54	0	351	30
Total	19,471	121	18,719	578

Szilágysomlyó district:

Alsókaznacs	20	0	563	0
Bürgezd	542	0	10	0
Detrehem	9	0	576	22
Doh	21	0	540	0
Elyüs	11	0	451	18
Felső- kaznacs	29	0	444	0
Halmosd	50	0	1,149	418
Hármas- patak	24	3	1	940
Ipp	1,057	1	370	98
Kárásztelek	1,814	0	17	1
Kémer	2,581	3	148	50
Kerestelek	74	0	704	126
Kraszna- hidvég	110	0	809	11
Lecsmér	383	0	91	0
Maladé	36	0	532	9
Márkaszék	35	13	961	33
Nagy- derzsida	145	0	1,234	6
Porc	18	0	375	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Selymes- ilosva	717	1	102	0
Somály	122	0	686	0
Somlyó- csehi	80	1	892	28
Somlyó- győrtelek	107	1	1,206	8
Somlyó- mező	16	0	364	4
Somlyó- szécs	27	0	757	0
Somlyó- újlak	625	0	55	0
Szilágy- badacsony	29	0	806	10
Szilágy- bagos	1,168	1	115	58
Szilágy- borzás	457	0	74	0
Szilágy- cseres	17	0	432	5
Szilágy- domoszló	14	0	289	0
Szilágy- lompért	530	0	232	15
Szilágy- nagyfalu	2,302	0	205	0
Szilágy- perecsen	1,447	0	1,050	34
Szilágy- zovány	1,107	0	28	0
Zálnok	225	0	784	37
Total	15,946	24	17,052	1,932

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Szilágy- somlyó city	6,030	20	759	76

Kraszna District:

Kraszna	3,790	4	90	0
Magyar- kecel	484	1	446	31
Petenye	180	0	178	0
Kraszna- horvát	282	0	437	0
Ráton	389	1	146	11
Varsolc	857	0	250	0
Kraszna- hosszúaszó	9	0	317	0
Alsóvalkó	251	37	611	1
Felsővalkó	11	0	600	41
Gyümölcs- énes	53	0	1,220	175
Valkóvár- alja	8	0	441	6
Krasznajáz	13	0	816	33
Kraszna- récse	268	0	796	0
Total	6,595	43	6.348	298

Zilah District:

Egrespatak	432	0	702	6
Szilágypanit	395	0	84	3
Vártelek	30	0	1,278	0
Nyírsid	130	1	415	36
Cigányi	136	0	527	1
Haraklány	31	0	513	2
Bádon	3	0	569	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Szilágy- főkeresztúr	581	0	20	10
Szilágy- görcsön	657	0	411	0
Magyar- goroszló	527	0	277	0
Diósad	1,743	2	17	0
Mocsolya	669	0	0	45
Oláhbaksa	54	2	987	14
Kusaly	286	0	525	0
Ökörítő	31	0	618	0
Szilágy- sámson	1,224	0	82	7
Szilágy- erked	515	9	59	1
Szilágykirva	42	0	691	18
Magyar- baksa	33	0	312	0
Kisdoba	524	1	29	0
Szilágyszent- király	212	0	14	14
Debren	54	5	535	4
Szilágy- sziget	45	0	509	0
Szilágy- kövesd	284	3	1,207	0
Szilagyballa	1,139	4	31	0
Nagydoba	319	0	70	0
Sarmaság	1,703	0	152	0
Total	11,799	27	10,636	188
Zilah city	7,477	19	529	37

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Szilágy-Cseh district:				
Egerhát	226	15	529	0
Monó	517	0	502	4
Sülelmed	315	1	577	0
Szilágyújlak	97	0	707	0
Vicsa	11	0	251	0
Szamosardó	597	0	31	0
Szamos- cikó	174	0	267	36
Benedek- falva	119	0	430	0
Bősháza	424	0	277	0
Völcsök	552	0	299	0
Szilágycseh	3,221	6	202	17
Szilágyszeg	185	0	271	0
Désháza	729	0	0	0
Menyő	468	2	531	0
Lele	973	0	118	0
Hadad	1,982	135	132	0
Hadad- nádasd	782	0	62	0
Hadad- győrtelek	23	0	1,262	16
Szér	897	0	79	0
Bogdánd	974	0	0	0
Mutos	31	0	571	0
Szilágy- korond	69	0	376	38
Total	13,376	159	8,270	136

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	Other
Zsibó District:				
Nagymon	208	0	4	0
Nagymon- újfalú	29	6	261	2
Vérvölgy	590	0	2	10
Fürményes	19	0	567	0
Szilágy- pátelek	19	0	917	7
Kucsó	39	0	1,052	5
Zsibó	2,481	20	532	14
Total	3,385	26	3,335	38

Bihar County:
Érmihályfalva District:

Éradony	960	1	0	0
Érkenéz	432	0	605	0
Érkésérű	1,517	0	0	0
Érmihály- falva	6,231	5	13	6
Érselénd	927	28	31	4
Érsemlyén	2,649	2	4	0
Értarcsa	963	1	136	0
Érvasad	278	11	1,303	1
Gállospetri	1,333	0	41	0
Ottomány	981	6	2	0
Piskolt	1,961	0	701	1
Szalacs	3,623	1	85	0
Total	21,855	55	2,921	12

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Székelyhíd District:				
Asszony- vására	1,117	0	2	23
Bihar- csanáros	129	1	297	80
Bihar- diószeg	6,206	2	59	2
Csokaly	1,261	1	0	0
Érköbölkút	1,431	0	6	45
Érolaszi	763	2	1	3
Hegyköz- szentmiklós	1,103	0	4	0
Jankafalva	576	0	0	0
Kiskágya	305	0	0	0
Kiskereki	1,026	0	0	0
Kóly	720	0	0	0
Nagykágya	666	3	11	22
Székelyhid	5,235	19	15	10
Szentjobb	1,786	2	12	8
Total	22,333	30	404	193
Margitta District:				
Albis	1,084	1	3	0
Almaszeg	76	3	646	11
Almaszeg- huta	10	0	0	621
Alsóderna	67	0	678	0
Apát- keresztúr	547	0	9	1
Bályok	1,185	9	89	64
Baromlak	92	0	280	434
Berettyó- dédá	34	0	309	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Berettyó- királyi	117	0	488	0
Berettyó- kohány	117	0	191	0
Berettyó- széplak	1,732	4	342	173
Bisztra- terebes	139	0	304	5
Bodonos	148	16	21	930
Bozsaly	8	29	447	24
Csehtelek	270	4	548	73
Dizsér	132	0	408	6
Érábrány	377	0	253	5
Érbogyoszló	1,053	0	0	0
Érfancsika	91	0	301	0
Felsőderne	826	44	347	85
Forduló	9	0	0	262
Füves	29	0	0	314
Genyéte	45	0	546	0
Höke	0	0	177	0
Kozma- almás	79	34	1,571	24
Középes	189	180	580	453
Lüki	248	0	486	12
Magyarkéc	643	2	411	1
Margitta	5,329	30	264	53
Micske	1,470	1	67	13
Monospetri	949	0	122	0
Papfalva	128	15	703	7
Poklostelek	683	0	41	0
Sárszeg	33	0	468	0
Sástelek	48	0	327	56
Sebesújfalú	18	4	423	2
Széltalló	144	0	551	8

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Szentlázár	52	0	507	0
Szoldobágy	47	0	536	0
Szunyogd	117	0	496	0
Terje	126	0	702	10
Tóti	1,466	45	43	0
Újbártfalva	160	0	394	0
Vámosláz	61	0	693	2
Várvíz	41	0	492	0
Vedres- ábrány	321	1	317	5
Total	20,540	422	16,581	3,654

Szalárd District:

Almás- fegyvernek	278	25	164	259
Alsótótfalu	121	0	852	6
Berettyó- csóhaj	85	0	649	0
Berettyó- farnos	42	0	295	0
Biharfél- egyháza	1,589	1	16	3
Biharvajda	733	1	31	0
Borszeg	191	0	1,005	0
Csujafalva	42	0	316	12
Felsőtótfalu	27	0	276	0
Görbesd	9	0	182	0
Hagymád- falva	244	8	634	0
Hegyköz- csatár	1,554	0	11	2
Hegyköz- szentimre	1,233	0	3	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Hegyköz- töttelek	512	14	7	11
Jákóhodos	1,058	0	17	18
Kövág	60	0	308	127
Köves- egyháza	117	0	133	9
Nadántelek	25	0	267	1
Nyüved	596	0	11	0
Paptamási	1,013	2	57	2
Pelpárthida	385	0	609	0
Síter	1,070	10	83	1
Sitervölgy	17	0	507	11
Szalárd	2,349	3	45	7
Szalárd- almás	18	0	204	6
Szarkó	8	0	188	13
Szóvárhegy	113	1	1,034	5
Tataros	718	27	1,290	65
Total	14,207	92	9,194	559

Biharkeresztes District:

Biharszent- jános	1,303	1	43	0
Bors	1,247	0	42	0
Kisszántó	455	0	13	2
Nagyszántó	656	0	7	4
Total	3,661	1	105	6

Központ District:

Almamező	10	2	438	0
Bihar	3,021	3	1	2
Bihar- püspöki	3,489	31	126	4

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Biharszent- andrás	611	20	1,220	30
Fugyi	536	1	211	33
Fugyi- vásárhely	1,767	21	432	18
Harang- mező	4	0	950	0
Hegyköz- kovácsi	819	3	8	0
Hegyköz- pályi	815	0	3	2
Hegyköz- száldobágy	850	0	1	0
Hegyköz- újlak	1,110	1	0	16
Kabalás- patak	38	0	775	4
Körös- kisjenő	749	1	1,013	54
Körös- kisújfalu	42	1	689	6
Köröstarján	1,261	1	972	0
Mező- bottyán	5	0	509	0
Mező- szabolcs	43	0	491	37
Mezőtelegd	2,528	56	591	92
Pósalaka	569	2	16	1
Pusztáújlak	724	0	31	2
Újpalota	147	446	48	2
Várad- szentmárton	1,075	3	49	14
Várad- szöllős	182	4	87	19
Váradalpár	39	0	852	12

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Alkér	25	1	506	4
Felkér	3	0	610	0
Szaránd	9	0	721	27
Mező- szakadát	101	1	1.233	0
Borostelek	1	0	668	31
Kegyek	30	0	597	0
Telkesd	17	0	852	1
Total	20,578	597	13,911	405

Élesd District:

Alsólugos	76	1	906	58
Barátka	183	3	1,348	2
Báród- beznye	40	0	1,725	0
Báródsomos	24	0	607	21
Bértény	50	0	401	1
Csarnóháza	83	0	2,376	0
Cséklye	4	7	624	3
Cécke	367	1	238	5
Cigányfalva	21	6	491	25
Doborcsány	11	1	632	23
Élesd	2,175	36	112	14
Élesdlok	1	45	1,458	4
Élesd- szurdok	3	0	626	9
Erdődámos	20	1	1,184	2
Esküllő	290	0	446	0
Felsőlugos	18	0	580	26
Felsőpatak	6	0	491	1
Gálosháza	3	4	296	8
Izsópallaga	476	0	553	9
Kalota	3	3	1,148	0
Keszteg	215	1	494	12

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Királyhágó	78	1	731	114
Kisbáród	39	2	676	2
Kiskakucs	0	6	344	0
Kisösi	17	14	617	27
Kőalja	298	0	133	1
Körös- bánlaka	19	0	1,340	9
Körös- barlang	33	4	601	19
Körös- feketető	67	1	2,210	18
Körös- gégény	21	7	173	0
Köröstopa	28	1	401	4
Kövesd	24	1	514	79
Krajnikfalva	5	0	386	6
Mezőtelki	701	0	10	0
Nagybáród	477	23	1,371	1,312
Nagyfekete- patak	16	2	636	11
Nagykakucs	247	0	298	0
Örvénd	787	1	65	27
Remete- lórév	114	32	2,985	12
Rév	842	1	2,236	10
Rikosd	31	0	310	1
Serges	39	0	740	4
Sólyomkő- pestes	113	37	1,064	1,493
Szászfalva	16	0	232	0
Tinód	56	2	593	0
Tötös	46	4	639	40
Úrgeteg	22	0	590	1
Várfancsika	19	0	536	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Várson- kolyos	15	0	1,287	0
Vércsorog	39	1	845	42
Total	8,278	249	39,399	3,455
Nagyvárad city	58,421	1,416	3.604	728
Szatmár- Nagyvárad	445,226	15,134	234,909	19,816

Bihar County:**Nagyszalonta Hungarian Language Territory:****Nagyszalonta District:**

Nagy- szalonta	15,206	41	650	46
Illye	499	16	1,854	69
Árpád	1,638	2	46	0
Erdőgyarak	1,601	8	299	94
Mezőbaj	1,331	0	112	0
Tamáshida	1,047	26	910	5
Ant	1,112	1	55	13
Total	22,434	94	3,926	227

Tenke District:

Tenke	3,338	6	448	15
Bélfenyér	1,519	3	6	3
Total	4,907	9	454	18

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Arad County:				
Kisjenő District:				
Simonyi-falva	2,276	162	30	16
Vadász	1,761	9	552	126
Bélzerénd	489	0	44	0
Nagyzerénd	2,536	5	87	9
Fekete-gyarmat	1,994	5	10	0
Ágya	2,034	9	35	4
Kisjenő	1,376	49	1,355	41
Erdőhegy	1,875	40	473	6
Total	14,341	279	2,586	202
Borosjenő District:				
From Apáti:				
Nagy tanya	54	0	60	0
Nagy-szalonta terr	41,736	382	7,026	447
Arad Hungarian Language Territory:				
Arad District:				
Fakert	981	861	316	2
From Fakert				
Kürtös				
Kutas	269	103	265	3
Almásiratos	28	8	142	1
Sofronya	532	15	210	6
Szentpál	692	2	107	1
Szentleányfalva	769	438	33	4

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
from Mácsa:				
Ábrány- puszta	189	9	172	0
Zimándköz	1,033	9	1	0
Zimánd- újfalú	942	42	27	21
Zsigmond- háza	352	479	349	6
Total	5,787	1,966	1,622	75
Arad City	46,085	4,365	10,279	2,437

Magyarpécska District:

Kispereg	1,839	2	12	6
Magyar- pécska	7,475	57	166	368
Nagyiratos	1,547	13	50	1
Nagyvarjas	1,611	2	137	5
Ópécska	2,442	34	6,503	592
Total	14,896	108	6,868	972

Csanád County:**Battonya District:**

Kisiratos	2,151	14	39	6
Tornya	1,485	16	666	370
Total	3,636	30	705	376

Temes County:**Vinga District:**

Majláth- falva	2,272	34	19	10
-------------------	-------	----	----	----

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Ujarad district				
Német-szentpéter	470	1,966	73	110
Munár	105	15	291	222
Total	575	1,981	364	332
Arad Terr.	73,251	8,484	19,857	4,202
Total				
Bánát Hungarian Language Territory: Torontál Nagyszentmiklos District:				
Porgány	865	48	44	23
Pusztakeresztúr	671	13	1	2
Total	1,536	61	45	25
Törökkanizsa District:				
Óbék outskirts	95	7	14	29
Bánát terr.	1,631	68	59	54
Total				

APPENDIX B.

Distribution of the population in the districts of Central Transylvania.

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Bánffyhungyad district:				
a. Kalotaszeg				
Csucsá	437	12	1,543	9
Kissebes	448	3	775	12
Ketesd	396	0	22	0
Magyarbika	877	0	30	0
l				
Bánffy- hungyad	4,699	28	451	16
Malomszeg	10	0	471	0
Magyaró- kereke	247	0	349	0
Zentelke	667	5	125	0
Kalota- szentkirály	828	1	217	0
Sárvásár	274	0	15	0
Nyárszó	279	4	156	0
Kalota- dámos	338	0	66	0
Jákótelke	211	0	28	0
Nagykalota	20	0	1,023	5
Magyar- valkó	706	0	421	12
Magyar- gyerő- monostor	622	1	1,002	39
w/o Felső- roska				
Kalotabikal	0	0	633	0
Körösfő	1,052	0	21	0
Kalotanádas	24	1	700	1

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Sztána	362	1	186	1
Zsobok	660	0	8	4
Farnas	190	0	258	0

b. Edge of the South Rumanian territory:

Nagysebes	49	0	2,090	0
Sebesvár	27	0	987	0
Tarányos	6	0	1,124	0
Viság	11	0	1,275	0
Székelyjő	11	1	877	0
Deréte	0	4	598	0
Erdőfalva	0	4	307	0
Bedecs	3	4	1,097	12
Gyerőfalva	0	5	640	6
Havasrogoz	0	0	1,229	0
Bocs	4	0	796	0
Kalota- bökény	8	0	535	0
Incsel	65	13	443	2
Meregyő	54	2	1,990	3
Havas- rekettye	50	5	1,687	1
Jósikafalva	282	38	1,391	28
Kiskalota	13	0	772	0
Kalotaújfalú	1	0	395	0
Felsőgyerő- monostor	0	0	1,343	0
Felsőroska	25	1	495	8
Total	14,002	133	30,005	279

Here we can see that the village names are all Hungarian but the population has already become Rumanian.

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Gyula district:				
a. Kalotaszeg:				
w/o terr. Of	643	0	455	0
Magyar- kiskapus				
Magyar- kapus	991	0	60	0
Gyerővásár- hely	439	0	364	74
Gyalu	1,144	5	1,773	50
Magyarlóna	1,113	0	484	76
Magyar- fenes	1,269	0	2	0
Szászfenes	929	0	1,512	159
b. Edge of the southern Rumanian territories				
Outskirts of	0	0	152	0
Magyar- kiskapus				
Bánffy- dongó	4	0	606	0
Gyerőffy- dongó	0	0	357	0
Felső- szamos	1	0	344	0
Havasnagy- falu	7	0	2,195	0
Szamosfő	66	0	1,500	1
Egerbegy	8	0	792	0
Meleg- szamos	6	10	575	2

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Hideg- szamos	53	6	1,030	0
Isztolna	5	1	236	5
Total	6,681	27	13,759	367

Hidasalmás district:**a. Kalotaszeg:**

Kispetri	565	0	85	0
Váralmás	728	0	965	86
Középlak w/o Kis- bozolnok	527	0	276	0
Nagypetri	279	0	457	12
Almás- tamási	14	5	595	0
Tóttelke	10	0	411	46
Ferenc- bánya	156	25	175	30
Total	2,279	30	2,964	174

Nádasmenti District**a. Kalotaszeg**

Nádaspap- falva	26	0	635	0
Egeres	524	1	799	50
Jegenye	555	0	3	0
Inaktelke	698	0	8	0
Nádasdaróc	237	0	2	0
Bogártelke	580	0	30	2
Mákófalva	1,343	0	58	1
Türe	606	0	296	1
Magyar- gorbó	35	1	632	25

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Magyar-nádas	160	1	551	7
Méra	1,284	0	98	1
Kisbács	989	0	434	0
Szucság	777	0	413	0
Magyarvista	1,298	0	102	0
Total	9,112	3	4,061	86

Kolozsvár District:**Kalotaszeg**

Kajántó	742	0	471	0
Kolostótfalu	2	0	424	3

Mezőség

Ajtón	642	2	1,487	53
Alsózsuk	127	4	828	0
Apahida	235	8	1,137	137
Bádok	172	0	352	6
Bodonkút	248	5	487	0
Bonchida	1,066	32	1,243	16
Csomafája	130	0	319	36
Dezmér	71	13	950	0
Erdőfelek	19	0	2,203	9
Fejérd	459	0	1,992	11
Felsőzsuk	47	0	460	15
Györgyfalva	1,850	0	233	4
Kide	607	1	186	2
Kolozsborsa	469	0	1,854	10
Kolozsbós	69	1	882	3
Kolozskara	319	0	685	141
Kolozs-korpád	55	0	627	18

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Kolozspata	130	0	632	10
Magyar- macskás	174	0	443	0
Nemeszsuk	24	0	750	30
Rőd	51	2	1,696	1
Szamos- falva	488	2	1,324	111
Szamos- szentmiklós	21	0	362	3
Szentmárton -macskás	1	0	259	0
Válaszút	592	9	844	2
Total	8,835	80	23,216	621
Kolozsvár city	50,704	1,676	7,562	866
Kolozs city	2,271	3	1,808	56
Mocs District				
Magyar- kályán	279	0	989	0
Magyar- szovát	1,460	0	730	26
Mocs	756	84	1,319	70
Mezőgyéres	79	0	389	0
Mezőkeszű	542	6	96	38
Magyar- palatka	422	0	805	41
Vajda- kamarás	902	0	245	0
Légen	89	0	352	13
Báré	25	0	786	24
Visa	413	0	204	0
Kötelend	126	3	768	0
Gyulatelke	59	0	469	0
Mezőszava	98	5	391	17

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Ombosz- telke	15	18	378	0
Marokháza	8	0	452	17
Magyarpete	11	0	259	0
Total	5,284	116	8,612	246

Nagysármás District

Katona	412	18	1,385	64
Gyeke	223	3	613	0
Total	635	21	1,998	64

Szolnok-Doboka County**Szamosújvár District**

Kendilóna	313	17	660	85
Doboka	81	24	1,115	12
Móró	7	0	355	0
Lónapoklos- telke	1	8	530	12
Esztény	147	23	337	0
Magyar- szarvaskend	242	1	220	0
Alsótők	204	11	353	0
Magyar- köblös	308	8	828	22
Felsőtők	182	6	386	0
Nagyiklód	150	13	1,154	36
Kisiklód	279	0	315	0
Szék	3,163	16	494	44
Kisszék	3	14	507	9
Bonenyires	16	5	590	41
Füzes- mikola	19	0	795	43

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Ördögös- füzes	965	1	667	0
Szamos- újvárnémeti	79	19	1,424	28
Coptelke	3	16	444	36
Péterháza	11	10	361	0
Szilágytő	5	2	272	1
Kérő	182	0	287	1
Total	6,360	184	12,094	370
Szamos- újvár city	4,630	190	1,881	156

Dés District

Felőr	919	3	295	0
Retteg	1,149	46	988	135
Baca	493	0	343	51
Szent- margita	437	31	973	0
Nyires	836	0	461	45
Bálványos- vára	1,591	13	66	2
Szent- benedek	114	4	534	1
Désakna	1,118	2	1,563	10
Mikeháza	34	1	503	0
Kozárvár	405	15	1,310	1
Kis- monostor- szeg	77	0	330	25
Csicsó- mihályfalva	146	15	473	47
Total	7,319	130	7,839	317
Dés City	7,991	445	2,911	105

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Bethlen District				
Apanagy-falu	429	20	570	2
Magyarberéte	311	0	90	10
Alsóoroszfalu	18	0	327	12
Felsőoroszfalu	7	15	387	2
Bethlen	1,791	65	1,205	9
Várkudu	477	2	175	9
Almásmalom	527	27	440	12
Magyardécse	1,653	2	9	2
Omlásalja	16	0	558	10
Árpástó	603	1	651	0
Csicsókeresztúr	138	32	659	1
Alsóilosva	276	3	414	0
Somkerék	555	31	512	0
Alsóegres	5	0	195	0
Felsőegres	0	0	155	0
Füge	4	0	396	57
Total	6,810	198	6,743	166
Kékes District				
Melegföldvár	451	0	479	20
Feketelak	465	0	326	20
Vasasszentgothard	104	0	746	22
Kispulyon	276	0	179	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Vasasszent- egyed	122	0	847	29
Cege	133	22	474	4
Götz	53	16	495	5
Noszoly	161	0	688	1
Buza	937	2	1,058	7
Szász- zsombor	271	0	425	3
Kekes	509	5	567	1
Mezőveres- egyháza	471	9	75	25
Újös	418	1	515	1
Aranyos- móric	61	172	249	43
Szentmáté	623	0	248	16
Cente	13	0	440	11
Aranyos- szentmiklós	10	4	376	9
Kisdevecser	6	0	264	0
Nagy- devecser	103	17	516	16
Szép- kenyerű- szentmárton	507	5	328	9
Kékesvásár- hely	57	0	195	0
Mohaly	5	0	389	19
Császári	10	1	291	11
Erdő- szombat- telke	12	6	349	24
Kötke	0	2	329	0
Vice	943	0	130	9
Magyar- borzás	375	0	394	30

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Bőd	38	49	676	0
Csabaújfalu	10	15	303	0
Bátony	14	40	960	0
Bálványos- csaba	0	7	538	0
Total	7,158	386	13,849	335

**Beszterce-naszód Territory
Besenyő District**

Tacs	274	127	29	0
------	-----	-----	----	---

**Torda-Aranyos County
Alsójára District
Kalotaszeg**

Tordaszent- lászló	1,440	1	23	0
-----------------------	-------	---	----	---

Other territories

Járárákos	0	2	384	0
Oláhléta	0	0	672	0
Magyarléta	492	0	1	0
Total	1,932	3	1,080	0

Torda District:

Bányabükk	89	1	1,196	0
Pusztaszentmárton	0	0	240	16
Pusztacsán	6	0	911	0
Komjátszeg	270	0	353	30
Tordatúr	635	0	599	6

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Koppánd	31	0	557	36
Szind	144	7	488	9
Mésczkő	367	0	481	0
Alsószent- mihály	707	2	410	0
Felsőszent- mihály	595	0	185	18
Sinfalva	602	0	212	0
Keresztes	149	3	388	16
Aranyos- polyán	707	0	407	39
Kövend	979	0	27	9
Bágyon	1,154	0	251	13
Aranyos- géres	968	86	708	53
Géresszent- király	157	2	486	59
Aranyos- egerbegy	1,444	1	1,194	152
Total	9,004	102	9,093	456
Torda city	9,674	100	3,389	292

Torockó District:

Torockó	1,343	2	136	31
Aranyos- rákos	732	0	83	0
Csegez	287	7	291	0
Várfalva	901	2	151	1
Torockó- szentgyörgy	973	0	10	0
Total	4,256	11	671	32

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Felvinc District:				
Székely- hidas	23	0	1,581	8
Csákó	0	0	641	0
Felfüged	9	5	547	35
Alfüged	5	0	532	48
Dombró	7	0	818	0
Aranyos- mohács	19	8	890	33
Kercsed	735	0	184	3
Maros- örményes	0	0	395	0
Marosdécse	485	9	320	69
Inakfalva	31	0	322	0
Felvinc	1,775	8	196	109
Harasztos	1,361	2	570	3
Székelyföld- vár	420	8	679	8
Marosveres mart	52	7	724	54
Székely- kocsárd	1,098	1	469	109
Vajdaszeg	43	8	553	14
Sósszent- márton	15	2	520	15
Aranyos- gerend	685	8	596	0
Total	6,763	66	10,537	508

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Marosludas District:				
Hadrév	275	0	631	29
Marosludas	3,116	61	1,385	70
Marosbogát	1,390	0	1,010	2
Marosdátos	29	11	593	0
Maros- lekence	169	0	897	146
Marosorbó	45	7	636	13
Magyar- dellő	328	4	9	29
Oláhdellő	297	0	394	37
Mezőszent- margita	83	0	280	0
Mezőújfalu	10	7	416	11
Kerelős- óspatak	32	0	354	2
Mezőpete	2	4	505	9
Mezőuraly	5	0	323	0
Mezőkapus	333	4	978	28
Kisikland	45	0	739	22
Nagyikland	148	5	1,023	0
Mező- szakály	283	32	908	110
Mező- szengyel	439	22	1,134	62
Mezőtóhát	177	5	825	50
Mezőzáh	388	3	804	199
Kemény- telke	71	2	1,355	38
Mezőbodon	791	1	718	42
Mező- gerebenes	172	0	942	131
Gerend- keresztúr	543	5	751	42

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Mezőméhes	398	19	867	16
Total	9,569	192	18,477	1,088

**Alsófehér County:
Nagyenyed District:**

Miriszló	442	0	403	106
Maros- gombás	263	0	242	0
Kisapahida	0	0	367	0
Felenyed	543	0	977	110
Csombord	375	0	549	67
Magyarbagó	100	0	532	24
Magyar- lapád	1,032	1	34	15
Enyedszent- király	212	2	373	28
Magyarbecse	583	0	60	30
Tompaháza	132	0	799	0
Lőrincrève	248	0	231	0
Magyar- solymos	127	0	76	5
Total	4,057	3	4,643	385
Nagyenyed city	6,497	163	1,940	63

Marosújvár District:

Magyar- csesztve	216	0	411	109
Miklóslaka	20	0	597	0
Marosújvár	2,862	78	1,845	191
Csongva	110	0	995	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Felsőmaros- újvár	261	10	683	11
Maros- nagy lak	343	0	772	0
Maros- káptalan	82	0	515	0
Maros- koppánd	177	0	181	10
Maroscscúcs	201	0	240	42
Gábod	10	0	687	19
Csekelaka	446	1	284	0
Batizháza	5	6	313	9
Hari	162	0	531	3
Magyar- forró	59	3	1,047	15
Magyar- szent- benedek	338	1	640	0
Nagy- medvés	471	5	2	50
Elekes	14	0	781	0
Magyar- sülye	225	3	628	68
Magyar- bükkös	792	0	47	0
Magyar- herepe	92	4	434	0
Magyarózd	856	3	87	0
Lándor	60	0	279	0
Istvánháza	436	2	33	3
Cintos	106	0	674	0
Oláhpéter- laka	31	14	1,086	52
Marosszent- jakab	38	1	398	22

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Marosoroszi	7	0	267	27
Kutyafalva	635	1	105	7
Total	9,054	132	14,542	638

**Kisküküllő county:
Hosszúasszó District:**

Bethlen-szentmiklós	985	0	443	94
Szászvölgy	1	4	353	0
Boldogfalva	213	0	200	6
Szásznagyvesszős	127	355	399	213
Total	1,326	359	1,395	313

Radnót District:

Marosdég	15	7	937	37
Szélkút	18	0	1,039	39
Oláhkocsárd	56	3	976	19
Radnót	1,498	8	595	8
Oláhsályi	67	0	664	18
Bord	11	2	622	0
Kincses	14	1	585	13
Bábahalma	28	0	1,288	0
Marosugra	945	0	353	0
Maroscsapó	419	1	424	62
Kerelőszent-pál	491	1	208	244
Kerelő	35	2	552	39
Vidrátzeg	58	6	544	85
Kiscserged	0	8	437	13
Nagyteremi	478	0	807	6

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Teremi- újfalu	754	0	13	0
Kisteremi	163	0	10	0
Vajdakuta	10	0	486	0
Nagy- cserged	78	21	723	29
Búzás- besenyő	758	5	282	62
Somostelke	61	0	526	43
Lackód	28	0	620	43
Gyulas	70	1	464	20
Erdőalja	25	1	498	26
Total	6,080	67	13,653	811

Dicsőszentmárton District:

Küköllővár	604	3	1,008	152
Magyar- királyfalva	775	9	443	94
Sövényfalva	404	1	723	63
Ádámos	1,319	6	532	36
Küküllő- dombó	829	3	141	28
Magyar- sáros	845	0	402	59
Borzás	82	2	617	5
Csüdötelke	158	1	475	1
Szőkefalva	786	9	126	31
Vámosgál- falva	1,298	5	264	2
Abosfalva	236	0	207	17
Désfalva	526	0	240	208
Mikefalva	452	0	89	8

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Felső- káporna	23	0	189	20
Harangláb	611	1	369	22
Bernád	44	1	272	12
Héderfája	1,070	1	19	0
Leppend	1	7	548	48
Küküllő- széplak	485	0	447	0
Csávás	784	10	34	0
Küküllő- pócsfalva	249	3	218	14
Bonyha	905	5	368	40
Danyán	374	1	213	13
Total	12,860	68	7,944	873
Dicsőszent- márton city	3,210	118	957	132

Erzsébetváros District:

Gógán	249	9	155	0
Gógán- vára	635	9	164	0
Oláhszent- lászló	35	1	705	45
Küküllő- solymos	26	0	674	14
Vámos- udvarhely	146	5	412	55
Kóródszent- márton	443	5	288	84
Kóród	58	0	318	1
Egrestő	504	0	197	30
Kiskend	400	0	2	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Nagykend	802	0	0	0
Pipe	333	0	2	1
Balavásár	929	0	55	0
Bún	508	2	1,275	235
Küküllősárd	238	0	305	31
Total	5,306	32	4,552	496
Közép- erdély terr. Central Tran- sylvania	230,033	5,171	232,204	10,294

APPENDIX C

Distribution of population by district in Székelyföld.

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Székelyföld (Szekler land)				
Kolozs County				
Teke District				
Dedrád- széplak	393	2	292	6
Dedrád	25	1,927	45	46
Kisfülpös	350	0	278	3
Tancs	653	6	18	80
Total	1,421	1,935	653	135
Maros-Torda County:				
Lower Maros District:				
Ákosfalva	875	22	1	0
Backa- madaras	1,169	8	24	10
Bede	308	0	0	0
Cserefalva	371	4	7	3
Csiba	319	9	0	0
Csitszent- iván	865	0	185	23
Egerszeg	75	0	100	0
Fintaháza	493	1	5	0
Folyfalva	430	0	0	0
Göcs	375	0	0	0
Gyulakuta	1,154	0	0	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Hagymás- bodon	326	0	0	16
Haraszt- kerék	951	0	0	50
Harcó	213	8	175	27
Havadtő	738	23	1	11
Kaposztás- szentmiklós	646	0	0	0
Kelemen- telke	723	0	5	2
Kisgörgény	493	0	4	0
Lőrincfalva	516	0	1	0
Lukafalva	698	0	15	0
Malomfalva	101	0	406	114
Lukailenc- falva	418	0	15	0
Maros- keresztúr	514	0	362	20
Maros- kisfalud	44	0	515	0
Maros- szentkirály	534	4	357	1
Meggyes- falva	463	18	699	82
Mezőbánd	1,845	9	1,230	441
Mező- bergenye	695	0	297	6
Mező- kölpény	468	6	210	75
Mező- madaras	1,712	7	1,133	83
Mezőpanit	1,601	6	117	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Náznánfalva	181	0	394	0
Nyárad- bálintfalva	29	1	191	4
Nyárad- karácson	551	0	5	90
Nyárádszent benedek	515	0	23	9
Nyáradtő	321	0	757	93
Somosd	1,001	0	1	0
Száltelek	63	0	249	23
Székely- csóka	499	0	0	14
Székely- kakasd	539	0	1	34
Székely- kövesd	452	0	121	63
Székely- sósptak	0	0	163	8
Székely- uraly	1	4	449	26
Székelyvaja	995	0	13	0
Szentgerice	1,326	3	14	26
Szent- háromság	1,235	0	5	5
Szövérd	599	0	0	10
Vadasd	487	0	0	55
Total	28,927	133	8,250	1,424

Upper Maros District

Csejd	398	0	23	10
Galambod	292	0	163	30
Ikland	368	2	7	0
Jedd	632	0	29	44

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Kebele	119	0	96	0
Kebele- szentivány	17	3	176	31
Kisadorján	146	0	0	0
Koronka	740	5	75	91
Marosagárd	88	0	241	0
Maros- bárdos	6	0	409	0
Maros- sárpatak	1,332	7	110	78
Maros- szentanna	503	0	747	0
Maros- szentgyörgy	891	8	812	241
Mezőcsávás	608	2	490	8
Mezőfele	652	0	9	0
Mezőménes	167	0	325	0
Mező- sámsond	909	10	1,167	0
Mezőszabad	28	0	812	65
Nagy- adorján	254	0	0	6
Nagyernye	1,583	1	31	0
Nyárádgál- falva	838	0	3	0
Nyárad- szentlászló	561	0	0	0
Nyomát	685	2	1	0
Póka	633	0	69	0
Póka- keresztúr	347	1	28	0
Sáromberke	970	17	43	0
Szabéd	979	0	8	0
Széklybós	223	0	28	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Székelykál	913	0	6	11
Székes	511	0	1	11
Udvarfalva	611	2	33	8
Várhegy	209	1	329	37
Total	17,214	61	6,171	671
Marosvásár- hely city	22,790	606	1,717	404

Nyárádszereda District

Atosfalva	342	2	4	0
Bere- keresztúr	314	0	0	2
Buzaháza	535	0	3	11
Csikfalva	677	0	0	0
Csókfalva	785	0	0	0
Demény- háza	648	5	10	4
Demeter- falva	150	0	0	0
Ehed	415	0	5	0
Erdő- szentgyörgy	2,179	20	351	21
Geges	664	2	0	0
Havad	490	4	0	2
Illyésmező	259	0	1	0
Iszló	437	0	3	9
Jobbágy- falva	730	0	1	0
Jobbágy- telke	1,091	0	0	0
Kendő	259	0	4	5
Kibéd	2,633	0	0	0
Kisszent- lőrinc	37	0	236	10

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Málya	461	0	5	12
Makfalva	1,818	0	3	0
Márkod	641	0	1	8
Mikháza	662	1	1	0
Nyárad- andrásfalva	718	0	4	0
Nyárad- köszvényes	1,033	0	11	1
Nyárad- magyaros	1,418	8	1	38
Nyárad- remete	1,929	0	14	0
Nyárad- selye	1,054	0	1	0
Nyárad- szentanna	457	1	2	0
Nyárad- szentimre	630	8	2	0
Nyárad- szentmárton	532	0	8	4
Nyárad- szentsimon	234	0	0	0
Nyárad- szereda	1,510	5	8	1
Rigmány	419	1	0	0
Seprőd	143	0	0	0
Sóvárad	1,946	0	0	0
Süketfalva	132	0	0	0
Székely- abod	506	10	0	0
Székelybere	449	0	0	7
Székelybő	238	0	0	0
Székely- hódos	581	0	1	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Székely- moson	224	0	244	0
Székelysárd	344	0	118	0
Székely- szentistván	508	0	0	0
Székely- tompá	376	0	1	0
Szováta	2,763	28	11	24
Torboszló	421	3	2	0
Vadad	481	0	1	0
Vece	6	0	230	0
Total	35,279	98	1,287	159

Lower Régen District

Abafája	853	4	366	12
Alsó- bölkény	747	0	212	88
Alsóköhér	23	0	761	18
Alsóoroszi	7	0	615	0
Beresztelke	877	4	297	0
Erdőcsinád	790	1	0	0
Erdő- szengyel	123	2	274	57
Felső- bölkény	2	6	479	59
Felsőköhér	146	0	714	0
Felsőoroszi	16	0	911	0
Gernyeszeg	1,141	3	368	19
Görgény- adorján	6	5	324	51
Görgény- hodák	44	10	3,070	27

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Görgény- kakucs	13	0	307	18
Görgény nádas	13	0	467	1
Görgény- oroszfalu	3	5	940	150
Görgény- orsova	8	1	930	4
Görgény- sóakna	15	10	1,109	3
Görgény- szentimre	1,215	15	560	27
Görgény- üvegcsűr	1,064	2	188	0
Hétbükk	6	0	658	0
Kásva	27	7	1,144	0
Kincsesfő	6	0	523	3
Kisillye	288	1	14	12
Kisszederjes	9	8	220	8
Körtvelyfája	1,201	0	9	1
Libánfalva	163	21	3,320	49
Magyar- fülpös	383	16	367	73
Magyar- péterlaka	797	2	15	2
Marosjára	924	2	8	4
Marostelek	24	0	658	0
Nagy- szederjes	14	4	220	31
Petele	98	1,135	524	258
Radnótfája	837	207	546	37
Soropháza	5	0	631	9

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Szentmihály	4	3	501	0
Toldalag	308	0	317	19
Unoka	184	1	63	15
Vajda- szentivány	1,256	1	358	114
Total	13,640	1,476	22,988	1,170

Upper Régen District:

Alsóidecs	53	913	16	37
Déda	361	88	1,986	56
Disznajó	1,259	3	188	0
Felsőidecs	61	799	6	50
Füleháza	160	12	1,339	11
Gödemester -háza	734	73	1,297	29
Holtmaros	717	0	69	10
Idecspatak	12	16	1,685	0
Magyaró	1,884	7	575	59
Magyar- régen	1,340	75	133	62
Maros- felfalu	762	6	345	120
Maroshéviz	2,417	651	4,194	126
Maros- kövesd	9	0	448	18
Maroslaka	0	6	344	9
Maros- oroszfalu	40	48	1,508	0
Marosvécs	1,039	4	122	25
Monosfalu	3	15	549	13
Oroszidecs	1	6	632	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Palotailva	650	119	735	48
Ratosnya	464	23	390	30
Total	11,966	2,864	16,561	698
Szászrégen city	2,947	2,994	1,311	58

**Udvarhely
Parajd District:**

Alsósófalva	1,981	0	0	0
Atyha	1,600	6	2	1
Felsősófalva	2,176	0	0	1
Korond	3,750	1	1	0
Küsmöd	702	0	16	0
Parajd	2,858	17	8	5
Siklód	1,656	1	0	7
Szolokma	688	1	1	0
Total	15,411	26	28	14

Székelykeresztúr District:

Alsóboldog- falva	708	0	1	1
Bencéd	337	9	0	0
Bétfalva	532	0	6	0
Bordos	480	0	0	1
Bözöd	1,274	0	0	4
Bözödújfalv	678	0	1	0
Csehétfalva	422	7	0	0
Csekefalva	567	1	3	0
Csöb	311	0	1	0
Énlaka	643	0	0	0
Etéd	1,604	3	0	7
Fiatfalva	984	0	1	31

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Firtos- martonos	610	3	0	0
Gagy	647	2	0	1
Kadács	421	0	0	0
Kisgalamb- falva	664	0	0	0
Kiskede	217	0	0	0
Kissólymos	1,081	7	1	0
Kobátfalva	528	2	0	0
Kőrispatak	1,311	0	2	0
Magyar- andrásfalva	161	0	0	0
Magyar- hidegkút	268	0	170	0
Magyar- zsákod	761	2	6	0
Medesér	630	10	0	0
Nagy- galambfalva	1,439	0	2	0
Nagykede	202	0	0	0
Nagy- sólymos	948	2	0	1
Rava	841	8	25	0
Rugonfalva	667	2	0	0
Siménfalva	915	0	0	0
Szederjes	537	1	14	0
Székely- keresztúr	3,766	71	25	24
Székely- szállás	277	0	0	0
Székely- szent- erzsébet	1,120	0	22	1
Székely- szentmihály	451	7	0	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Székely-szentmiklós	159	0	0	0
Székely-vécke	829	9	0	0
Szent-ábrahám	626	3	0	0
Szent-demeter	719	1	8	3
Tarcsafalva	379	0	0	0
Tordátfalva	462	0	0	0
Újszékely	834	1	0	1
Total	31,010	151	288	75

Székelyudvarhely District:

Abránfalva	132	0	1	0
Agyagfalva	946	0	0	0
Árvátfalva	215	0	0	0
Béta	380	0	0	0
Bikafalva	413	0	1	0
Bogárfalva	439	0	0	0
Bögöz	1,111	0	1	0
Décsfalva	140	0	0	0
Farcád	521	0	0	0
Farkaslaka	1,326	1	0	0
Felsőboldogfalva	440	1	0	0
Fenyéd	767	0	0	0
Firtosváralja	348	0	0	0
Hodgya	444	0	0	0
Homoród-szentlászló	207	0	0	0
Jásfalva	108	0	0	0
Kadicsfalva	506	0	0	0
Kányád	444	0	0	2

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Kápolnás- falu	1,876	1	0	0
Kecsetkis- falu	749	0	0	0
Küküllő- kemény- falva	591	0	0	0
Máréalva	1,419	0	0	0
Mátisfalva	311	0	0	0
Miklósfalva	285	0	0	0
Nyikó- malomfalva	771	0	0	0
Ocfalva	244	0	0	0
Oroszhegy	2,128	2	0	0
Patakfalva	364	0	0	0
Petek	844	0	0	0
Sándortelke	127	0	0	0
Sükő	268	0	0	0
Székely- bethlenfalva	892	2	6	0
Székely- derzs	1,389	0	1	0
Székely- dobó	773	0	0	0
Székely- fancsal	196	0	0	0
Székely- lengyelfalva	503	0	0	0
Székely- magyaros	215	0	0	0
Székely- muzsna	1,010	0	1	0
Székelypál- falva	570	0	6	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Székely-szentkirály	1,028	0	0	0
Székely-szenttamás	251	0	0	0
Székely-várság	1,221	2	0	10
Szentegyházfalva	2,288	0	0	1
Szentlélek	594	0	0	0
Tibód	140	0	0	0
Ulke	625	0	0	0
Vágás	606	0	0	0
Zetelaka	4,714	1	1	8
Total	35,874	20	16	21
Székely-udvarhely city	9,888	212	115	29

Homoród District:

Abasfalva	486	0	0	0
Bágy	561	0	0	0
Bárdóc	883	7	2	0
Bibarcfalva	883	0	0	0
Ege	205	0	0	0
Erdőfüle	1,228	0	2	1
Felsőrakos	1,270	0	0	0
Gyepes	578	0	0	0
Homoród-almás	2,379	2	0	0
Homoród-jánosfalva	367	0	0	0
Homoród-kéményfalva	424	0	3	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Homoród-remete	286	0	0	0
Homoród-szentmárton	889	0	0	0
Homoród-szentpál	740	0	0	0
Homoród-szentpéter	289	0	0	0
Homoród-újfalú	401	0	0	0
Karácsonfalva	993	7	6	0
Kénos	342	0	0	0
Kisbacon	760	0	0	0
Lókod	239	0	1	0
Lövete	3,389	30	13	2
Magyarhermány	1,138	0	2	0
Oklánd	939	6	3	2
Olasztelek	837	0	1	0
Recsenyéd	291	1	3	0
Székelydália	588	1	5	10
Székelyszáldobos	871	0	56	8
Székelyzsombor	910	7	269	3
Telekfalva	340	0	0	0
Vargyas	1,782	4	7	0
Városhalva	522	0	0	0
Total	25,855	65	373	26

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Csík County:				
Gyergyótölgyes District:				
Borszék	1,702	23	126	11
Gyergóholló	500	6	889	1
Gyergyó- tölgyes	2,572	237	1,032	37
Total	4,774	266	2,047	49
Gyergyószentmiklos District:				
Ditró	6,560	46	362	19
Gyergó- alfalu	6,392	11	15	24
Gyergó- csomafalva	3,894	2	1	20
Gyergyó- újfalú	6,195	0	2	10
Kilyénfalva	885	0	0	1
Szárhegy	4,420	139	155	39
Tekerőpatak	2,116	5	502	27
Vasláb	110	8	803	19
Total	34,585	282	1,861	279
György- szentmiklos city	8,549	115	155	86
Felcsík District:				
Csikcsicsó	2,224	1	1	0
Csikcsó- mortán	698	0	0	8
Csikdán- falva	2,685	5	0	10

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Csikjenő-falva	2,227	0	0	10
Csík-madaras	2,254	0	1	0
Csík-mindszent	1,190	0	0	0
Csíkrákos	1,604	0	0	0
Csíkszent-domokos	5,532	11	8	20
Csíkszent-imre	1,782	0	1	5
Csíkszent-király	1,601	0	0	5
Csíkszent-lélek	696	0	0	0
Csíkszent-tamás	2,791	0	0	0
Csíktapolca	1,754	3	0	3
Csobotfalva	395	0	0	26
Göröcsfalva	474	0	0	0
Karcfalva	1,242	3	0	0
Mádéfalva	1,855	12	3	38
Vacsárcsi	776	0	0	0
Várdotfalva	938	2	0	9
Zsögöd	1,199	11	2	1
Total	33,737	48	15	136
Csíkszereda city	3,591	45	44	21

Szépviz District:

Csík-borzsova	639	0	0	0
Csíkdelne	699	0	0	0
Csíkpálfalva	651	0	0	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Csík-szent-mihály	2,206	3	334	0
Csík-szent-miklós	1,100	0	0	0
Gyimes-bükk	4,373	109	1,725	91
Gyimes-felsőlok	2,279	0	4	5
Gyimes-középlök	2,979	73	22	6
Szép-víz	2,974	8	92	4
Total	17,900	193	2,177	106

Kászonalcsík District:

Csatószege	980	0	0	0
Csík-bánfalva	1,487	0	0	8
Csík-csekefalva	1,262	3	2	0
Csík-ménaság	2,176	0	2	0
Csík-szentgyörgy	2,099	0	5	23
Csík-szentmárton	1,028	2	3	1
Csík-szentsimon	1,495	6	1	2
Csík-verebes	378	2	0	0
Kászonal-tíz	980	1	3	1
Kászonal-feltíz	1,247	0	0	0
Kászonal-impér	1,132	1	10	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Kászon- jakabfalva	1,230	1	7	1
Kászon- újfalva	1,755	0	3	0
Kozmás	1,391	0	0	0
Lázárfalva	835	0	0	1
Tusnád	2,281	2	0	2
Total	21,756	17	36	40

Háromszék:**Kézd District:**

Alsó- csernáton	1,919	1	9	20
Bélafalva	718	0	0	0
Bereck	2,087	2	1,186	0
Czomortán	677	0	0	0
Dálnok	1,359	1	2	12
Esztelnek	1,121	12	4	10
Felső- csernáton	1,286	0	0	0
Futásfalva	731	0	0	0
Hatolyka	470	0	0	0
Ikafalva	630	0	0	0
Karatna- volál	1,418	0	0	0
Kezdialbis	707	0	0	2
Kezdialmás	1,328	0	0	0
Kezdikővár	1,217	0	0	0
Kezdi- márkosfalva	830	0	0	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Kezdi- mártonfalva	508	0	0	0
Kezdi- mártonos	739	0	358	0
Kezdi- oroszfalu	422	1	2	3
Kezdi- árfalva	479	0	0	0
Kezdi- szárazpatak	879	0	3	0
Kezdi- szászfalu	256	0	0	1
Kezdi- szentkereszt	1,727	0	4	0
Kezdi- szentlélek	3,002	1	1	2
Kurtapatak	537	1	0	7
Lemhény	2,836	16	50	41
Nyujtód	1,084	0	10	1
Ozdola	2,441	0	191	1
Szent- katolna	978	1	2	4
Torja	2,581	0	3	0
Total	34,967	36	1,827	108

Orba District:

Barátos	1,280	4	119	24
Csomakörös	602	1	0	16
Cófalva	360	0	0	0
Gelence	3,357	44	93	169
Haraly	406	0	0	0
Hilib	689	0	15	0
Imecsfalva	420	0	2	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Kovászna	4,154	48	1,105	144
Orbaitelek	757	0	0	16
Papóc	3,635	59	544	139
Páké	585	0	2	0
Páva	1,024	3	36	26
Székely- petőfalva	342	0	0	0
Székely- tamásfalva	589	0	1	0
Szörce	615	0	1	7
Zabola	2,650	29	425	62
Zágon w/o	2,855	9	884	34
Zágon- bárkány				
Total	24,320	197	3,227	637

Sepsi District:

Aldoboly w/o Vámos- puszta and Farkasvágó	799	10	53	0
Angyalos	546	0	2	0
Árkos	1,713	2	5	1
Bikfalva w/o	827	0	19	0
Tálpatak				
Bitá	459	0	0	0
Bodola	1,065	4	838	2
Egerpatak	505	0	0	0
Erestevény	221	0	0	0
Étfalva- zoltán	477	0	0	0
Feldoboly	503	1	3	3

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Fotos- mártonos	430	0	1	1
Gidófalva	879	0	0	46
Illyefalva	1,340	4	8	8
Kálnok	659	0	1	5
Keresztvár w/o Egres- tekep	1,482	1	1,088	1
Kilyén	479	12	9	0
Kis- borosnyó w/o Nagy- patak and Saramás	559	6	13	0
Komolló	479	6	2	0
Kökös	1,038	0	169	0
Lécfalva	976	1	0	8
Lisznyó	905	0	19	0
Maksa	759	0	1	0
Málnás	837	7	1	9
Mikóújfalu	1,557	2	6	5
Nagy- borosnyó	1,533	6	5	0
Oltszem	634	2	1	1
Réty	903	0	0	0
Sepsi- besenyő	455	0	0	0
Sepsibodok	965	0	0	0
Sepsi- bükkszár	1,952	4	9	6
Sepsi- kőröspatak	1,259	8	9	1
Sepsi- magyaros	401	0	29	0

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Sepsi-szentkirály	435	0	0	0
Szacsva	282	1	10	0
Szentiván-laborfalva	879	8	2	0
Szotyor	423	0	0	0
Uzon	1,698	9	77	1
Zalán	793	0	0	0
Total	32,106	88	2,386	100
Sepsiszentgyörgy city	8,361	158	108	38
Kezdivásárhely city	5,970	37	50	22

Miklósvár District:

Arapatak	695	4	824	0
Barót	2,501	22	2	6
Bodos	570	1	0	0
Bölön	2,341	0	12	1
Előpatak	209	3	553	0
Erősd	235	7	239	0
Hidvég	1,148	7	1,100	7
Köpetz	1,286	3	7	3
Középajta	1,471	0	1	1
Miklósvár	688	1	8	0
Nagyajta	1,385	8	9	15
Nagybacon	2,144	4	24	0
Szárzajta	1,792	0	0	0
Zalánpatak	344	0	0	0
Total	16,809	60	2,779	33

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Brassó County:				
Hétfalus District:				
Bácsfalu	1,223	20	684	90
Csernátfalu	1,981	28	545	7
Hosszúfalu	2,854	58	3,080	29
Pürkerec	1,072	9	1,016	0
Tatrang	2,157	16	1,243	140
Türkös	1,880	21	1,333	1
Zajzon	988	4	231	3
Total	12,155	156	8,132	270
Felvidék District:				
Barcaújfalu	831	13	220	0
Alvidék District:				
Apáca	1,561	11	354	4
Barca- szentpéter	40	1,241	947	0
Botfalu	85	1,416	878	20
Földvár	247	997	1,182	65
Krizba	1,211	6	680	0
Prázsmér	203	2,032	1,528	60
Szász- hermány	54	1,225	1,058	2
Szász- magyaros	59	955	548	57
Szász- veresmart	21	428	543	0
Total	3,481	8,311	7,718	208
Brassó city	17,831	10,841	11,786	598

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Nagyküküllő County				
Kőhalm District:				
Ágoston-falva	76	2	832	74
Ürmös	1,545	0	0	0
Alsórákos	1,844	7	117	5
Datk	494	1	196	5
Olthévíz	1,310	19	110	0
Oltbogát	24	5	297	85
Total	5,293	34	1,352	169
Segesvár District:				
Héjjesfalva	836	9	620	69
Sárpatak	345	4	201	0
Total	1,181	13	821	69
Székelyföld:				
Total population by district				
Ugocsa County				
Tiszántúl	13,190	810	9,694	863
Máramaros County				
Tecső	343	353	120	815
Sziget	5,357	3,432	6,474	3,201
Tiszavölgy	151	194	2	2,058
Máramaros-sziget	17,542	1,257	2,001	570
Total	23,373	5,226	8,597	6,644

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Szatmár County:				
Szatmár-németi Dist.	24,547	63	4,309	62
Szatmár-németi city	33,094	629	986	183
Csengeri	6,656	3	1,584	86
Nagykároly Dist.	30,008	261	6,693	86
Nagykároly city	15,772	63	216	27
Avas Dist.	5,199	928	17,886	352
Erdőd Dist.	13,361	3,461	9,716	112
Sinérváralja	6,682	66	11,583	11
Nagybánya Dist.	4,034	109	8,540	97
Nagybánya city	9,992	175	2,677	33
Felsőbánya city	4,149	19	230	24
Total	153,492	5,787	64,420	1,026
Szilágy County				
Tasnád Dist.	19,471	121	18,719	518
Szilágy-somlyó dist.	15,949	24	17,052	1,932
Szilágy-somlyó city	6,030	20	759	76
Kraszna dist.	6,595	43	6,348	298
Ziláh Dist.	11,799	27	10,636	188
Ziláh city	7,477	19	529	37

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Szilágycseh Dist.	13,376	159	8,270	136
Zsibó Dist.	3,385	26	3,335	38
Total	84,082	439	65,648	3,266

Bihar County I.

Érmihály- falva Dist.	21,855	55	2,921	12
Székelyhid Dist.	22,333	30	404	193
Margitta Dist.	20,540	422	16,581	3,654
Szalárd dist.	14,207	92	9,194	559
Bihar- kerestes dist.	3,661	1	105	6
Központ dist.	20,578	597	13,911	405
Nagyvárad city	58,421	1,416	3,604	728
Élesd Dist.	8,278	249	39,399	3,455
Total	169,873	2,862	86,119	9,012

Bihár County II.

Nagy- szalonta dist	22,434	94	3,926	227
Tenke dist.	4,907	9	454	18
Total	27,341	103	4,380	245

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Arad County I.				
Kisjenő dist.	14,341	279	2,586	202
Borosjenő dist.	54	0	60	0
Total	14,395	279	2,646	202
Arad County II.				
Arad Dist.	5,787	1,966	1,622	75
Arad City	46,085	4,365	10,279	2,437
Magyar- pécska dist.	14,896	108	6,868	972
Total	66,768	6,439	18,769	3,484
Csanád County				
Battonya dist.	3,636	30	705	376
Temes County				
Újarad dist.	575	1,981	364	332
Vinga dist.	2,272	34	19	10
Total	2,847	2,015	383	342
Torontál County				
Nagyszent- miklós dist.	1,536	61	45	25
Török- kanizsa dist.	95	7	14	29
Total	1,631	68	59	54

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Kolozs County I.				
Bánffy-hunyad dist.	14,002	139	30,005	279
Gyula dist.	6,681	27	13,759	376
Hidalmás d.	2,279	30	2,964	174
Nádasmenti	9,112	3	4,061	86
Kolozsvár dist.	8,835	80	23,216	621
Kolozsvár city	50,704	1,676	7,562	866
Kolozs city	2,271	3	1,808	56
Mócs dist.	5,284	116	8,612	246
Nagysármás	635	21	1,998	64
Total	99,903	2,095	93,985	2,758

Kolozs County II.

Teke dist.	1,421	1,935	653	135
------------	-------	-------	-----	-----

Szolnok-Doboka County I.

Magyarlapos dist.	1,416	20	431	5
-------------------	-------	----	-----	---

Szolnok-Doboka County II.

Szamos-újvár dist.	6,360	184	12,094	370
Szamos-újvár city	4,630	190	1,881	156
Dés district	7,319	130	7,839	317
Dés city	7,991	445	2,911	105
Bethlen dist.	6,810	198	6,743	166
Kekes dist.	7,158	386	13,849	335
Total	40,268	1,533	45,317	1,449

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Beszterce-Naszód County				
Besenyő dis.	274	127	29	0
Torda-Aranyos County				
Alsójára dis.	1,932	3	1,080	0
Torda dist.	9,004	102	9,093	456
Torda city	9,674	100	3,389	292
Torockó dis.	4,256	11	671	32
Felvinc dist.	6,763	66	10,537	508
Marosludas	9,569	192	18,477	1,088
Total	41,198	474	43,247	2,376
Alsó-Fehér County				
Nagyenyed distr.	4,057	3	4,643	385
Nagyenyed city	6,497	163	1,940	63
Marosújvár dist.	9,054	132	14,542	638
Total	19,608	298	21,125	1,086
Kis-Küküllő County				
Hosszú-asszó dist.	1,326	359	1,395	313
Dicsőszentmárton dist.	12,860	68	7,944	873
Dicsőszentmárton city	3,210	118	957	132

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Erzsébet- város dist.	5,306	32	4,552	496
Radnót dist.	6,080	67	13,653	811
Total	28,782	644	28,501	2,625

Maros-Torda County

Lower Maros dist.	28,927	133	8,250	1,424
Upper Maros dist.	17,214	61	6,171	404
Marosvásár- hely city	22,790	606	1,717	404
Nyárad- szereda dist.	35,279	98	1,287	159
Lower Régen dist.	13,640	1,476	22,988	1,170
Upper Régen dist.	11,966	2,864	16,561	698
Szászrégen city	2,947	2,994	1,311	58
Total	132,763	8,233	58,285	4,583

Udvárhely County

Parajd dist.	15,411	26	28	14
Székely- keresztúr D.	31,010	151	288	75
Udvarhely Dist.	35,874	20	16	21
Székely- udvarhely city	9,888	212	115	29
Homoród D.	25,855	65	373	26
Total	118,138	332	464	165

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Csík County				
Gyergyó-tölgyes dist.	4,774	266	2,047	49
Gyergyó-szentmiklós dist.	34,585	282	1,861	279
Gyergyó-szentmiklós city	8,549	115	155	86
Felcsík dist.	33,737	48	15	136
Csíkszereda city	3,591	45	44	21
Szépviz dist.	17,900	193	2,177	106
Kászon-alsó dist.	21,756	17	36	40
Total	124,892	966	6,335	717
Háromszék County				
Kézd dist.	34,967	36	1,827	108
Orba dist.	24,320	197	3,227	637
Kézdivásárhely city	5,970	37	50	22
Sepsi dist.	32,106	88	2,386	100
Sepsiszentgyörgy city	8,361	158	108	38
Miklósvár dist.	16,809	60	2,779	33
Total	122,533	576	10,377	938

	Hungarian	German	Rumanian	other
Brassó County:				
Hétfalus dis.	12,155	156	8,132	270
Felvidék dis.	831	13	220	0
Alvidék dis.	3,481	8,311	7,718	208
Brassó city	17,831	10,841	11,786	598
Total	34,298	19,321	27,856	1,076
Nagyküküllő County				
Kőhalm dist.	5,293	34	1,352	169
Segesvár D.	1,181	13	821	69
Total	6,474	47	2,173	238
SZÉKELY-FÖLD TOTAL	540,519	31,410	106,143	7,892

APPENDIX D

Opinions of Foreign Politicians and Writers

Prime Minister Aristide Briand of France spoke about the Hungarian borders:

“Who doubts that the Hungarian borders were made arbitrarily? It is enough to look at the map and follow the borderlines which cannot be final because they do not serve the truth.”³⁶⁹

Charles Tisseyre, a member of the French Parliament:

“The animosity of the one side joined with the other side’s ignorance of the facts caused Hungary’s miraculous geographical unity to be divided in the name of imagined oppression. They tore apart that nation which had kept her political and administrative unity for ten centuries, with the objection that she was made up of many nationalities. What did they do after that? They created three new states with a populace even more mixed than it had been in Hungary. They destroyed a strong, healthy nation’s political and economic unity and from its ruins they created new states who lag far behind the former united country. It is not without reason that Hungary holds France to be responsible for her mistakes and injustices. This situation cannot be a lasting one. Why did France do this or why did she allow this to happen? This agreement was our work. With this awkward political action we turned a nation away from us which should have become closer to France. . . . It is true that Hungary was a loyal ally to the Germans during the War. We do not dispute that. We do not want to forget that. But can we blame Hungary for becoming the ally of Germany?”

³⁶⁹ Raffay, Ernő: Magyar Tragédia, Trianon, 75 éve, p. 185

Didn't we turn them in that direction when we supported the Pan-Slav movement in Austria-Hungary? With Trianon, again we pushed Hungary into the arms of the Germans. Was Hungary able to make a decision not to fight alongside Austria? Now we understand the behavior of Count István Tisza after the events of Sarajevo. The war from the point of view of the Hungarians was not directed against France but rather against Russia and the attacking Serbia. During the war, the French citizens of Hungary were able to live freely, without any hostility in Budapest. They were able to speak their language. The Hungarian theaters were able to continue to present French plays. We can say that Mihály Károlyi's revolution sang the slogan "Vive la France!" It is understandable that we French wanted to punish Hungary because they took part in a war against us but why did we have to punish her more than we did Germany and Austria? Hungary did not receive from France a mite of justice. With time it will appear to the Hungarians that we are responsible for all those sufferings which the Hungarians have endured since Trianon. . . . The French media especially has used very angry anti-Hungarian slogans. . . . In Hungary, the impression is that all the misfortunes have come about because of the actions of France. . . We may ask what kind of idiotic motive was behind the senseless creation of the Trianon Peace Treaty?"³⁷⁰

David Lloyd George wrote, on March 25, 1919,

"There will never be peace in southeast Europe because the Hungarian irredentists are appearing in the territories of Serbia, Czechoslovakia and Rumania. I wish that when the Peace terms are stated, we will stick to that plan that different nationalities should be connected to their own mother nations. This humane view has to come before every economical, strategical and financial consideration."³⁷¹

³⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 179-180

³⁷¹ Pozzi, Henri: *A háború visszatér*, Budapest, 1935, 1994, p. 188

László Bárdossy, Hungarian Prime Minister, in his speech before the representatives on November 2, 1941:

“We have lived for a thousand years in the valley of the Danube, not only as a nation but as a state. We accepted its glory and its burdens. We stood here and defended Europe. We kept the balance among the peoples of the Carpathian Basin. We were the intermediary between East and West. We never considered solely our own interests; we always served the interests of the whole of Europe. Our duty was assigned from on high. This was the reason that God brought us to this land and made us strong and held His hands above us in blessing. Many times the storm roared above us, tore at us but our back was never bent. Today, so deeply, so inseparably, we have grown together with this land which is ours, just like the mountains have grown into the depths of the earth. This land marks our calling and our duty. The duty which awaits us we can do well or not so well, depending on the kindness of fate or depending on what kind of obstacles appear before us. Be it as it may, this work, whatever form it takes, this duty which awaits us, only we Hungarians can fulfill and nobody else. The duty on this land is ours alone. Until now, every attempt to take this duty away from us has failed badly. Every attempt to organize the peoples of the Danube Valley without considering the strength and the situation of the Hungarians, was unsuccessful.”³⁷²

László Ottlik, Ph.D., University Professor:

“The Hungarian political organization was based not on ruling over another people but on a civilized concept: to place the Carpathian Basin, the unified geographical territory which was on the border of the Western cultures, into a western,

³⁷² Kollányi, Károly: A Kárpátmedence Európában, Budapest, 1991, p. 6; Orbók, Attila: Igy beszélt hazádról, Budapest, 1942

Christian, royal political organization. . . . and fill this territory with the Hungarian concept of freedom, not one people ruling over other peoples. This is what we call the Hungarian state concept. We have to start out from the elementary fact that the peoples who live together in one geographical territory are, of necessity, interdependent. Peoples who are interdependent have the concept of freedom, the ancient Hungarian concept of rights. This materializes in the ancient federal, county system, in the state of the Holy Crown, within which there is the possibility of territorial division. It was called the ‘Una eademque libertas’.”³⁷³

Charles Danielou, in an article in *The Daily Mail* on June 21, 1927:

“Those who intended to apply the principle of self-determination made the biggest mistake when they excluded three million Hungarians. The ratio of the three million in the new states to the eight million who remained in Hungary is too great. Who would believe that these eight million Hungarians would accept a situation where they would be separated forever from the three million Hungarians in the new states? It is especially ironic that the Czech border was pushed 40 kilometers further toward Budapest so that the city would be within firing range of the Czechs. At the same time, Bácska was annexed to Yugoslavia so that Belgrade would be far from the firing range of the Hungarians.”³⁷⁴

Charles Danielou, reporting about the Trianon Conference, stated in 1921:

“The Little Entente came forward every day with new proposals. Every day they cut deeper and deeper into the flesh

³⁷³ Ibid. p. 9; Ottlik, László: “Pax Hungarica”, *Magyar Szemle*, 1934

³⁷⁴ Raffay, Ernő: *Magyar Tragédia, Trianon 75 éve*, Budapest, 1996, p. 179

of the thousand year old Hungarian body. That border which Masaryk was demanding at the beginning in the name of the Czechs, was a totally ethnographic border. The pure Hungarian cities such as Pozsony, Léva, Ipolyság, Rimaszombat and Kassa, would have remained within the borders of Hungary. So the entire east Slovakia and Ruthenia would have remained with Hungary.”³⁷⁵

Gyula Zathurezky, a Hungarian journalist:

“In order for the Danubian Basin to fulfill its two functions, the first condition has to be a politically closed unity. Only in this way can it act in the service of the unity of Europe, as a bridge, or as a bastion. The sovereign and normal development of the Danubian Basin ceased when Hungary’s influence in this territory ceased to exist.”³⁷⁶

Harry Elemér Barnes, an American professor:

“In the course of my studies and research, I came to the conclusion that Austria and Hungary cannot be blamed for causing the War. I believe that Hungary, separate from Austria, is completely innocent of the outbreak of the War.”³⁷⁷

Edward Benes:

“The true Slav politics were unimaginable without their advocates accepting their final practical results because their demands were identical. They demanded the destruction of the territorial status quo, and at the same time, either the establishment of a Russian-ruled Great Pan-Slav Empire or the

³⁷⁵ Pozzi, Henri: Op. Cit. p. 191

³⁷⁶ Kollányi Károly: Op. Cit. p. 10; Zathurezky, Gyula: *Uj Europa*, July 1963

³⁷⁷ Ibid. p. 12; Barnes, Harry Elemer: *Pesti Hirlap*, August 7, 1926

creation of unified Slav national states. They were to erase the old borders and achieve this in a democratic and progressive way. There was never any other solution for the Slav politics.”³⁷⁸

General Bliss, a member of the American Delegation sent to Hungary on March 27, 1919, reported to Wilson:

“Hungary’s present situation is a direct result of the February 28, 1919 decision of the highest council of the Entente. This decision was politically senseless. We cannot present this to the people of the United States. The demarcation line is completely unjust and we should not continue to ruin the situation by forcing the Hungarians to accept this unjust agreement with armed force.”³⁷⁹

William Bullitt, a member of the United States delegation, resigned his position and wrote to President Wilson:

“I belong to those millions who completely trusted and believed you. We believed that we wanted nothing less than a lasting peace. We believed that we were to provide an unbiased, impartial service but our government contributed to further oppression and subordination of a suffering people and to the mutilation of their country. The danger of war will exist for another century. At the Peace Conference, the unjust decisions about Santung, Tyrol, Hungary, East Prussia, Danzig and the Saarland, and the freedom of the seas are no doubt going to result in another international conflict.”³⁸⁰

Archibald Cery Coolidge, an expert in Central European history

³⁷⁸ Ibid. p. 12; Benes, Edward: Ou vont les Slaves? Paris, 1948

³⁷⁹ Ibid. p. 13; Miller, D.H.: My Diary at the Conference of Paris, with Documents, I. – XVII. New York, 1926

³⁸⁰ Ibid. p. 13; Halmai, Elemér: A mai Magyarország, III., p. 7, 1925

and politics, stated that the United States Department of State, on November 16, 1918, sent him to study the situation in Eastern and Central Europe. He sent his report to President Wilson in January, 1919. His report stated:

“The Hungarian Kingdom is a perfect geographical and economical unit. Only Great Britain is superior in this respect. . . . This unit demands a unified system of administration. The level of the Danube and its tributaries suddenly rises and falls. Therefore it is necessary to create a system of reservoirs which necessitates a central administration. . . . Most of the landowners are Hungarian who live in harmony with the peasants. Hungary, since most ancient times, compared to other nations, has been a completely self supporting state. The plains provided food and the mountains provided wood and metals. The Danube and its tributaries bound the people together and the people has been united over a long period of time. In modern times, industry and industrial products have strengthened this unity. . . . The administrative system of the Carpathian Basin was centered in Budapest which has grown from a small city to a major capital. It is the center of the railroad network. Transylvania which is quite far away is closely connected to the Great Plain toward which most of the rivers flow. . . . We can understand what it would mean to the people, if this territory were broken up and parts given to the Czechs, Rumanians and Serbs. We can understand their anxiety when they have to face the reality that they have been stripped of their trees, railroads, industry and the only thing remaining to them is the Great Plain and a city which is sentenced to sure destruction.”³⁸¹

Aldo Dami, a Swiss historian whose speciality is minority questions:

“If Hungary had intended to assimilate her minorities, she had plenty of time and power over the centuries. Hungary did not follow the example of the French kings, the Emperors, or the French Revolution. The French can thank their thousand

³⁸¹ Ibid. p. 15; United States Foreign Policy, 1919, Paris Peace Conference

year centralized politics that in 1815 and 1871, they were easily able to survive their losses. Hungary was punished in 1920 because she had neglected the centralized politics and had given her minorities the possibility to progress in her territory. **If Hungary had really suppressed them, then they would have disappeared a long time ago and Hungary would never have been reduced to the Trianon borders. The history of suppression which the other nations are supposed to have suffered under Hungarian rule is a fairy-tale. On the contrary, the Hungarians became the victims of their own liberal Hungarian politics.** The beneficiaries of the Trianon decision, do not give the same tolerance to the Hungarian populace who came under their rule, as they received under Hungarian rule.”³⁸²

Aldo Dami also states:

“The borders established at Trianon cut off large territories with large numbers of Hungarian population from Hungary and a whole line of such territories where the populace was mixed but the people were so firmly on the Hungarian side that, in the case of a plebiscite, there would have been no doubt of the results. Therefore this decision was not based on ethnographic considerations nor on the desires of the different minorities, yet we know that they would have known their own interest.”³⁸³

³⁸² Ibid. p. 15; Dami, Aldo: La Hongrie de Demain, Paris, 1932, p. 97

³⁸³ Ibid. p. 15; Dami: Op. Cit. p. 133

Aldo Dami also states:

“The life of the minorities in Historic Hungary was unquestionably better when we compare it to the life of the minorities in the Successor States although for a long time these states pointed the finger at Hungary. Those Hungarians who now belong to the Successor States would be happy if they were to receive the same treatment as the other nationalities received in Hungary.”³⁸⁴

Pierre Delattre, a French historian, in 1931, at the Hungarian Academy of Science:

“Hungary bled for Christianity for four hundred years. England, France and Hungary had the same number of population in the Middle Ages. Today, England has 44 million, France 40 million and Hungary just 9 million, because the Hungarian populace was destroyed while defending civilization and culture. With her own body, Hungary opposed the Turkish rule. At that time, her population of 4 million decreased to 2 million and Serbs, Germans and other foreign peoples came and settled on the depopulated territories. This is why Hungary came under foreign influence.”³⁸⁵

The plan of the French Foreign Ministry, on November 20, 1918, stated:

“Slovakia is nothing more than a myth. The Slovak tribes in Northern Hungary never formed a state. The Slovak people is not unified. They are different from village

³⁸⁴ Ibid. p. 15, Dami, Aldo: *Les nouveaux Martyrs, Destin des Minorités*, Paris, 1936

³⁸⁵ Ibid. p. 16; Delattre, Pierre: *Keleti Figyelő*, September 1961

to village. According to the French study, to the east of that territory, where the Slovaks live in considerable numbers, is the River Ung. The line of Slovaks goes from above Sátoraljaújhely to Rozsnyó and Rimaszombat. At Losonc, that line reaches the River Ipoly and goes to the north and then turns down to Nyitra and goes toward Pozsony. It reaches the suburbs of Pozsony but does not go into Pozsony. From here it goes to the north, to end at the River Morva. Only behind this line can we talk of Slovak land. Moreover, the true Slovak territory stretches to the River Garam. East of this territory, there were only minorities living in the past. The mountainous territories of Liptó, Zólyom and Trencsén, can be called Slovak territory. The territory just described never reaches the Danube which remains today a Hungarian and German river. The Slovak territory does not include Pozsony, but there are Slovaks working in the manufacturing companies. The markets of Pozsony attract the Slovak peasants. Here, for every 42 Germans and 40 Hungarians there are 14 Slovaks. Pozsony is not a Slovak capital. If there is such a capital, it is Túrócszentmárton.”³⁸⁶

According to André Doboscq, the Hungarian Prime Minister, Khuen Héderváry told the French Ambassador, René Miller, in 1910, that the reason for the Hungarian-German alliance was the following:

“The alliance between Hungary and Germany is like a dam against the Slavs whom the Hungarians have the most to fear.”³⁸⁷

³⁸⁶ Ibid. p. 17; Paix, Vol.69, ff. 28. 64., Les Limites au Point de Vue Ethniques de l'Etat Tchecoslovaque, November 20, 1918

³⁸⁷ Ibid. p. 16; Doboscq, André: Budapest et les Hongrois, Paris, 1913

Philippe Gaillant wrote in 1968:

“The Treaties of Trianon and St. Germain committed the first crimes against the geography and history of the Danube Valley. Everything went according the wishes of the victors who here, paradoxically broke their own principle of self determination. They carved up Hungary in the actual meaning of the word. It is enough to glance at the map and it is understandable why there is no longer a land which could defend the civilization of Western Europe from the Russians. **When the time comes, and it will come, to rebuild a strong Europe, there will have to be functionally regulated connections between the peoples of the Danube Valley, so that that territory would become the bastion of the West and would defend Europe against the remaining barbarians.**”³⁸⁸

Gabriel Gobron, in his study which deals with the Hungarians, writes:

“We now know that it was Serbia, secretly supported by the Russians, who prepared the assassination at Sarajevo, which caused the outbreak of the First World War. The purpose of this assassination was to destroy Austria-Hungary with the war. Serbia was just a means in the Russian provocation of war.”³⁸⁹

Sir Robert Gower, Member of the British Parliament, wrote:

“The Entente powers acknowledged the Czechoslovak Republic in the summer of 1918. It is also known that on August 16, 1916, in the secret agreements, they promised

³⁸⁸ Ibid. p. 17; Gaillant, Philippe: Fallait-il détruire l’Autriche-Hongrie? – *la Revue du Xxme. Siecle Fédération*, no. 395, decembre, 1968

³⁸⁹ Ibid. p. 18; Gobron, Gabriel: La Hongrie Mystérieuse, Paris, 1933

Rumania the entire territory of Transylvania and a significant part of the Hungarian Plain. At the meeting of the highest council of the Entente in June 1918, they announced, as a military goal, the establishment of the State of Yugoslavia. That goal could only be achieved by the dismemberment of Hungary. They made a decision over a country without a hearing.”

“It is difficult to understand why the Hungarian request was rejected when it was based on the Wilsonian principles. That opinion that in the case of a plebiscite, the nationality negotiations would be unnecessary, cannot be accepted. That fact that three and a half million Hungarians were cut off from their motherland can in no way be justified.”³⁹⁰

Francesco Nitti, Prime Minister of Italy, stated:

“In Trianon, the great intriguers of international politics met by appointment. Europe was pushed into the serious danger of decadence, not so much by the war as by the Peace Treaty. The right of self-determination, which the Entente echoed during the war, was just a lying formula which they advocated in the time of danger. They did that to win the trust of all those involved but they did not make the Peace Treaty as they had promised. Those who made the agreements betrayed the concept for which men sacrificed their lives. The conditions which were forced upon the defeated nations were humiliating. No Englishman, Frenchman or Italian would accept for his own country such conditions which were forced upon Hungary. From a Cardinal Primate to a simple peasant there is no Hungarian, who is worthy of the name, who could accept these conditions.”³⁹¹

³⁹⁰ Ibid. p. 18; Gower, Sir Robert: La Révision du Traité de Trianon, Paris, 1937

³⁹¹ Ibid. p. 21; Nitti, Francesco: La Paix et suivantes, Paris, 1925

Francesco Nitti also said:

“Russia, especially in the Balkans in Serbia, followed cynical and shameful corrupt politics, taking every opportunity to cause a rebellion against Austria and Hungary. The Russian and Serbian politics were really very sinful. Wilson did not know anything about the European problems. His first decisions convinced us that he had no idea about the problems in Europe.” . . . “It is a fact that the defeated nations suffered such a peace that they were never able to accept. There is no peace in Europe, only a temporary acceptance of force. There will be no peace in Europe until the continued injustices of the war will be corrected, until the different European nations settle their differences on a reciprocal basis.”³⁹²

Keynes, Treasury Minister of England, stated:

“It is worth mentioning the mental slowness of the President. He was unable to comprehend quickly what others told him. There has hardly ever been such a powerful statesman who acted in such an ineffective way at the negotiation table. He was too slow and helpless to come up with any answers.”³⁹³

Lord Weardale stated:

“It is my duty to object that the Foreign Ministry did not study more intensively those arguments which seem to prove that the principle of self-determination, which was the reason for which we went to war, was disregarded in countless cases, none of them so obviously as when the borders of Hungary were

³⁹² Lángi, Mária: Trianon, MET Publishing Corporation, Hungary, 1996, p. 8; Nitti, Francesco: Nincs Béke Európában, Pallas Irodalmi Nyomda, Rt. Budapest, 1925, p. 215

³⁹³ Ibid. p.8; Vecsekői, József: Nemzet gyilkossági kísérlet, Lakitelek, 1993, p. 112

decided.”³⁹⁴

Lord Bryce summed up the Millerand letter in the following way:

“Since we cannot leave Hungary in her former state, we can give her nothing which is due to her. Since we cannot make perfect order, we must simply cut off large territories from Hungary which, according to our own principles, we should return to Hungary.”³⁹⁵

René Dupuis states:

“The Trianon Treaty’s most merciless wound was the annexation of Transylvania from Hungary. This territory was the homeland of Ferenc Rákoczi II and Gábor Bethlen, where the Hungarian language is the purest and the Hungarian folk art is in its most original and perfect form. Before 1914, France enjoyed in Hungary a great empathy which reflects an inherited friendship. The war made us forget that and today France may be no more misinformed about any country as it is about Hungary.” . . . “At the end of the war, everybody chose France to be the decision maker for Central Europe. Unfortunately, the government of France did not understand this outstanding but difficult position. She was weak. She accepted the emotional pleas of her local allies and gave them all they asked for. She did not care about justice and compromised the peace of Europe and her own good name.”. . . “It is a duty of France to make reparations to Hungary and in the future provide justice and help Hungary to a renewal.”³⁹⁶

³⁹⁴ Ibid. p. 11; same source p. 246

³⁹⁵ Ibid. p. 16; Viscount Bryce: The Hungarian Peace, Budapest, 1922, Speeches of the Members of the British House of Lords on the Trianon Peace Treaty, pp. 24-30

³⁹⁶ Ibid. p. 36-37; Dupuis, René: La Probleme Hongroise, Ed. Internationales, Paris, 1931, pp. 15, 18, 30

Maurice Pernot says:

“Hungary is located at the meeting-point of three great currents of thought, the western Pan-Germanism, the northeastern Pan-Slavism and the Balkan political pressure and perhaps she will be forced to join one of the three to defend herself against the other two.”³⁹⁷

Theodore Roosevelt, U.S President, 1901-1909, said, on April 2, 1910, in the Hungarian parliament:

“The entire civilized world is indebted to Hungary and her past. When America was in the womb of Europe, Hungary was that factor which stopped the spread of barbarism and which guarded the security of civilization. I know this history and I would not declare myself to be a cultured man if I did not know it.”³⁹⁸

Georges Roux wrote in 1931, about the Peace Treaty:

“. . . The victory was completely unhoped for and unexpected. The sudden events did not give enough time to consider it logically. The Peace was made within months in the intoxication of victory. The new Europe was formed with full power. It was obvious that the Hungarians did not accept the forceful mutilation of their country and the decisions which were made without a plebiscite were contrary to the international law. There was only one plebiscite in Sopron which brought the Hungarians victory. This plebiscite was against Austria which was also a defeated nation. In the new

³⁹⁷ Kollányi, Károly: Op. Cit. p. 21; Mousset: *Le Monde des Slaves*, 1945, IV.

³⁹⁸ Ibid. p. 24; Olay, Ferenc: *A Magyar művelődés kálváriája*, Budapest, 1930

states, which were supported by the victors, not a single plebiscite was allowed.”³⁹⁹

Tardieu, one of the creators of the Treaty, said:

“We had to choose between a plebiscite and the creation of Czechoslovakia.” He was paid for the latter.⁴⁰⁰

Pierre Sequeil stated, when he was studying the question of Transylvania:

“Before the war, the Rumanians were 53.8% of the population of Transylvania. The Hungarians, in Historic Hungary were 54.4%. In Transylvania, the Hungarians were 33%, the Saxons, 11% and there were 3% of others. This can be explained once more by the fact that for many centuries, Hungarians opened the borders to foreigners, and respected the traditions of the newcomers. Therefore this should not give them the right to take away this territory from this nation which rightfully governed this territory for a thousand years.”⁴⁰¹

Lord Sydenham wrote:

“With the deepest sympathy, I am looking at this proud nation which is now closed within the ring of the Little Entente which is very well armed. The tyranny of these people threatens Hungary, although they are on a lower cultural level than the Hungarians.”⁴⁰²

³⁹⁹ Ibid. p. 24; Roux, Georges: Reviser les Traités? Paris, 1931

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid. p. 24; Tardieu, La Paix

⁴⁰¹ Ibid. p. 24; Sequeil, Pierre: Le Dossier de la Transylvanie, Paris, 1967

⁴⁰² Ibid. p. 25; Lord Sydenham: My Working Life, 1928

Sazonov writes:

“In Vienna, at the Assembly of the Council of Ministers, with a very fast decision, it was decided to break Serbia. **There was only one person, Tisza, the Hungarian Prime Minister, who opposed the plan of Berchtold.**”⁴⁰³

Saint René Taillandier stated:

“The Hungarian nation cannot be destroyed. Even if they put her into the grave, sooner or later she will resurrect. Hungary is the nation of martyrs. Her amazing political maturity lifts her above the peoples of the Hapsburg Monarchy.”⁴⁰⁴

Louis de Vienne wrote:

“Hungary of necessity should get into the situation in which, in the future, in any kind of reorganization of Central Europe, she could play that role which history and her own value and geographical location decides.”⁴⁰⁵

Csáky reported the words of Montielle, Paleologue’s chief cabinet minister:

“. . . he (Montielle) said that we may rest assured that we could tear this treaty to pieces whenever we felt sufficiently strong to do so and when that time came, we could rely on the wholehearted support of

⁴⁰³ Ibid. p. 25; Sasanov: *Végzetes évek*, p. 239

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid. p. 25; Dr. Olay, Ferenc. Op Cit

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid p. 25; De Vienne, Louis: *Le Guepier de l’Europe Central*, Paris, 1937

France.”⁴⁰⁶

⁴⁰⁶ Csáky, P.D.H. doc. 368, pp. 371-372 quoted by Magda Ádám in her essay “France and Hungary at the Beginning of the 1920’s”, in War and Society in East Central Europe, Vol. VI. P. 161, *Essays on World War I: Total War and Peacemaking, A Case Study on Trianon.*, edited by Béla Király et al. Brooklyn College Press, 1982

GLOSSARY

Politicians

ANDRÁSSY, Gyula, Count, Foreign Minister of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, (1878)
APPONYI, Albert, Count, Leader of Hungarian Delegation to the Trianon Conference,
BALFOUR, Lord, British politician,
BENES, Edward, Czech politician,
BERCHTOLD, Leopold, Foreign Minister of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, (1914)
BERINKEY, Dénes, Prime Minister of Hungary, 1919,
BERTHELOT, Philippe, General, Commander of the French Army,
BETHLEN, Gábor, Prince of Transylvania, (1613-1629),
BETHLEN, István, Count, Prime Minister of Hungary, (1921-1931)
BISMARCK, Otto, (1815-1898) German Statesman,
BRATIANU, Georgiu, Prime Minister of Rumania, (1919)
BRIAND, Aristide, (1862-1932), French Statesman,
CEAUSESCU, Nicolae, Rumanian Dictator, died 1989,
CLEMENCEAU, Georges, (1841-1929) French editor and statesman,
d'ESPÉREY, Franchet, General, French statesman,
EICHMANN, Adolf, German persecutor of Jews,
HLINKA, Andrej, Father, leader of the Slovak National Party,
HODZSA, Milan, Czech nationalist,
HORTHY, Miklós, Admiral, Regent of Hungary, 1920-1944,
HOUSE, Edward, Colonel, American statesman,
IONESCU, Take, Rumanian statesman,
IZWOLSKY, Russian Ambassador to France,
KÁROLYI, Mihály, Count, Prime Minister of Hungary, 1918-1919,
KOSSUTH, Lajos, Hungarian Statesman, leader of the 1848 Revolution,
KRAMAR, Karel, Czech statesman,
KUN, Béla, Communist leader in Hungary, 1919,
LANSING, Robert, American statesman,
LLOYD GEORGE, David, British Prime Minister, 1916-1922,

MASARYK, Thomas, Czech statesman and President of Czechoslovakia,
METTERNICH von, Klemens, Austrian statesman,
MILLERAND, Alexandre, French statesman,
MILOSEVIC, Slobodan, President of new Yugoslavia,
MUSSOLINI, Benito, Italian Fascist leader,
NITTI, Francesco, Italian Prime Minister,
OBRENOVIC, Mihály, Prince, Serbian leader,
OSUSKY, Stefan, Czech statesman,
PALEOLOGUE, Maurice, French Statesman,
POINCARÉ, Raymond, President of France, 1913-1920,
PRÓNAY, Pál, Commander of the Hungarian National Army,
RIBBENTROP, German Foreign Minister, 1939,
SAZONOV, Foreign Minister of Czarist Russia,
SETON-WATSON, Hugh, British historian,
SMUTS, General, South African general and statesman,
SZÁLASI, Ferenc, Hungarian nationalist and statesman,
TARDIEU, André, French Statesman,
TELEKI, Pál, Count, Hungarian Prime Minister, 1920-1921 and 1939-1941,
TISO, Jozef, President of Slovakia,
TITO, Marshal, President of Yugoslavia,
TÖKÉS, László, Reverend, opposed Ceausescu regime in Rumania,
TRUMBIC, Serb politician,
WICKHAM STEED, Henry, British statesman,
WILSON, Woodrow, American President, 1913-1921

Foreign words and other phrases

bán, governor,

bánság, territory,

Bánát, name of territory in southern Hungary,

cadastral hold, measure of land equal to 1.42 acres,

Drang nach Osten, push to the East,

fait accompli, accomplished fact,

fanars, rich men from Turkey,

franc, unit of currency in France,

golden crown, monetary unit in the Kingdom of Hungary, from 1892 to

1927,
hétszék, the seven seats, or ancient settlements of the Saxons in Transylvania,
hold, see *cadastral hold*,
korona, unit of currency in Hungary,
Lajta bánság, territory in Western Hungary which declared its independence in 1921
leu, unit of currency in Rumania
mágus, shaman or wise man,
march, *marchland*, territorial border or frontier land,
Matica Slovenska, Slovak Cultural Society,
Narodna Obrána movement, Serbian Nationalist movement,
pound, unit of currency in Great Britain,
Quai d'Orsay, French Foreign Ministry,
ruble, unit of currency in Russia and Bessarabia,
soym, Ruthenian parliament,
táltos, shaman or wise man,
vajda, governor, ruler,
vásárvonal, market-line,

BIBLIOGRAPHY

English

- Baross, Gábor: Hungary and Hitler, Astor Park, FL. Danubian Press, 1970
- Borsody, Stephen et al: Transylvania and the Theory of the Daco-Roman-Rumanian Continuity, Committee of Transylvania, 1980
- Botos, László: The Homeland Reclaimed, Rochester, NY. Patko, 1995
- Burghardt, Andrew F.: Borderland, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI. 1962
- Chászár, Edward: Decision in Vienna, Astor Park, FL. Danubian Press, 1978
- Dayton, John: Minerals, metals, Glazing and Man, London 1978
- Du Nay, André: The Early History of the Rumanian Language, Lake Bluff, IL. 1977
- Endrey, Anthony: Hungarian History, Melbourne, Australia, Hungarian Institute, 1978
- Haraszti, Endre: The Ethnic History of Transylvania, Astor, FL. Danubian Press, 1971
- Haraszti, Endre: Origin of the Rumanians, Astor Park, FL. Danubian Press, 1977
- Hokky, Charles: Ruthenia, Spearhead towards the West, Gainesville, FL. Dan. Press, 1966 (Translated by Sándor Gallus)
- Kazár, Lajos: Facts against Fiction: Transylvania – Wallachian-Rumanian Homeland since 70 B.C.? Sydney, Australia, Forum of History, 1993
- Király, Pastor, Sanders: War and Society in East Central Europe, Vol. VI., Essays on World War I.: A Case Study on Trianon, Brooklyn College Press, 1982
- Kostya, Sándor: Pan-Slavism, Astor Park, FL. Danubian Press, 1981
- Krantz, Grover: Geographical Development of European Languages, Peter Lang, 1988
- Lakatos, Géza: As I Saw It, The Tragedy of Hungary, Universe Publishing Company, Englewood, N. J. 1993
- Macartney, C. A.: Hungary, A Short History, Edinburgh University Press, 1962
- Marácz, László: Hungarian Revival, Nieuwegein, Holland, 1996
- Nanay, Julia: Transylvania: The Hungarian Minority in Rumania, Astor

- Park, FL. Danubian Press, 1976
- Nagy, Sándor: The Forgotten Cradle of the Hungarian Culture, Toronto, Patria, 1973 (Translated by László and Margaret Botos)
- Potter-Daggett, Mabel: Marie of Roumania, New York, George H. Doran, 1926
- Szilassy, Sándor: Revolutionary Hungary, 1918-1921, Astor, FL. Danubian Press, 1971
- Szöllösy, Alexander: Hungary Versus Panslavism and Pangermanism, translated by Anna E. Csobánczi, Sydney, Australia, Hungarian Publishing Co. 1961
- Várdy, Stephen Béla: History of the Hungarian Nation, Astor, FL. Danubian Press, 1969
- Vassil, Gyuzelev: The Proto-Bulgarians, Sofia, Bulgaria, 1979
- Wagner, Francis S.: Toward a New Central Europe, Astor, FL. Danubian Press, 1970
- Wass de Czege, Albert, Moderator – Danubian Research Centre: Documented Facts and Figures on Transylvania, Astor Park, FL, Danubian Press 1977
- Wass de Czege, Albert: Our Hungarian Heritage, Astor Park FL. Danubian Press, 1975
- Roberts, Wess: The Leadership Secrets of Attila the Hun, New York, Warner, 1885
- Young, Ernest W.: The Wilson Administration and the Great War, Boston, Badger, 1922
- Zathureczky: Transylvania, Citadel of the West, Astor Park, FL.

Hungarian

- Badiny-Jós, Ferenc: Káldeától Ister-Gamig, p. 171
- Badiny-Jos, Ferenc: Trianon és a harmadik világháború, Buenos Aires, 1984
- Bartha, Miklós: Kazár Földön, San Francisco, CA. Hídfő, 1970
- Bartucz, Lajos: A Magyar Ember, Budapest, Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, 1938
- Berzy, József: A jövő szolgálatában, Buenos Aires, A Magyar Jövő Munkaközösség, 1956
- Berzy, József: Európa felszabadítása, Argentina, 1966
- Cseres, Tibor: Vérbosszú Bácskában, Budapest, Magvető, 1991
- Csobánczi, Elemér: Östuránok, Garfield NJ, Turán, 1963

- Csobánczi, Elemér: Nagymagyarország vagy nemzethalál, Marrickville, Australia, 1965
- Dabas, Rezső: Burgenland álarc nélkül, Montreal, 1984,
- Daruvár, Yves de: A Feldarabolt Magyarország, Lucerne, József Balogh Publisher, 1976
- Encyclopaedia Hungarica, 1996, Teleki, Pál, p. 580
- Fehér, M. Jenő: Középkori magyar inkvizíció, Buenos Aires, Transsylvania, 1956
- Grandpierre, K. Endre: Magyarok Istenének Elrablása, Budapest, Titokfejtő, 1993
- Joseph Báli, József: A gúzsba kötött világ,
- Kocsis, István: A Szent Korona misztériuma, Budapest, Püski, 1997
- Kollányi, Károly: A Kárpát-medence Európában, Budapest, Kráter, 1991
- Kostya, Sándor: A Felvidék, Budapest, Montázs, 1990
- Kovács, Ernő: Erdély, egyetlen végtelen szerelmem, San Francisco, Hídfő, 1985
- Kovács, Ernő: Trianon, 1920; Párizs, 1947, Toronto, 1986
- Hernádi, Tibor: A Második Világháború Igaz Története, Baja, 1996,
- Horthy, Miklós: Emlékirataim, Buenos Aires, 1953; Toronto, Weller, 1974
- Horthy, Miklós: Titkos iratai, Hungarian Archives, Budapest, 1963, p. 121
- Lángi, Mária: Trianon, MET Publishing Corp. Hungary – USA, 1996
- László, Gyula: A kettős honfoglalás, Budapest, Magvető, 1978
- Lázár, István: Kiállt Patak vára, Budapest, 1980, p. 247
- Málnási, Ödön: Országveszejtés, Munich, p. 25
- Málnási, Ödön: A magyar nemzet őszinte története, Munich, 1959
- Nagy, Sándor: A magyar nép kialakulásának története, Buenos Aires, 1956
- Novotny, Elemér: Szumir nyelv, magyar nyelv, Buenos Aires, 1978
- Orbók, Attila: Ki árulta el a hazát?, Budapest, 1919
- Padányi, Viktor: A nagy tragédia, San Francisco, CA. Hídfő, 1977
- Palotás, Zoltán: A trianoni határok, Budapest, Interedition, 1990
- Pozzi, Henri: Századunk bűnösei, translated by Dr. Frigyes Marjay, Budapest, 1936, 1996
- Pozzi, Henri: A Háború visszatér, translated by Dr. Frigyes Marjay, Budapest, 1936, 1996
- Prónay, Pál: A határban a halál kaszál . . , Budapest, Kossuth, 1963

- Püspöki Nagy, Péter: A tények erejével, New York, 1985
- Raffay, Ernő: Trianon titkai, Budapest, Kovács Sándor, 1990
- Raffay, Ernő: Magyar tragédia, Trianon 75 éve, Budapest, Püski, 1996
- Raffay, Ernő: Trianon, (Magyar tragédia – Trianon 75 éve vitája)
Budapest, Püski, 1996
- Révai Nagy Lexikon, under “vármegye”
- Sakharow, Konstantin: A Cseh Légiók Szibériában, Garfield, NJ,
Turán, 1988
- Szigethy, György: Szemtanuja voltam, Cleveland, 1956
- Szabó, Dezső: Az egész látóhatár, Lyndhurst, NJ, 1975
- Szóllósy, Sándor: Ez az igazság, London, Hídfő, 1968
- Szóllósy, Zoltán: Az Erdély Dákok Története, Munich, 1978
- Toronyi, Etelka: A Kárpáti Medence, a kultúrák bölcsője és a magyarok
őshazája, Buenos Aires, 1974
- Török, Sándor: Településtörténeti tanulmányok és határproblémák a
Kárpátmedencében, Astor Park, FL. American Hungarian Literary
Guild, 1973
- Végh, Antal: De mi lesz a harangokkal?, Debrecen, Magyar
Nepköztársaság Művészeti Alapja, 1988
- Wass, Albert: A Magyar örökségünk, Astor Park, FL. Danubian Press,
1975

Periodicals and Papers

- Amerikai Magyarság*, June 13, 1998
- Badiny-Jós, Ferenc: “A Magyar Ősvallásról”, *Ősi Gyökér*, April-June
1997
- Bakos Gyula: “Előrelépés vagy vissza a történelemhez?” *Szittyakürt*,
July-August 1977
- Balogh, Sándor: “Separating Facts and Myths in the History of
Transylvania”, (Paper) Youngstown, OH, 1989
- Erdélyi, István: “Kárpátalja”, (Paper) New York, 1984
- Halmi, Dezső: “Trianon Gyökerei”; *Ősi Gyökér*, Jan -Feb., 1978
- Halmos, Milan: The Truth About Transylvania, (Paper) 1982
- Hapsburg, Otto: “Önrendelkezési jog”, *Kanadai Magyarság*, August 29,
1998
- Heckenast, Dezső: “Nyugatmagyarország - Burgenland”; *Kronika*, Jan.
1980

- Kazár, Lajos: Transylvania, the Facts, (Paper) Canberra, 1989
- Kindles, József, article in *Transsylvania* January, 1999, p. 6
- Kocsis, István: “A trianoni pszichózisok”; *Trianon Kalendárium*, 1997, p.37
- Koszorús, Ferenc: “Washingtoni Kisebbség Politika”, *Transsylvania Review*, 38, 4
- Major, Tibor: “Nemzet szolgálatában a vértanúságig”, *Szittyakürt*, 1996, March-April
- Nagy, Olga: “Eredetünk kutatási nézetkülönbségek”, *Hunnia*, No 58, Sept. 1994
- Ősi Gyökér*, Jan. 1973, p.12
- Ősi Gyökér*, October-December 1998, p. 155-156
- Osterhaven, M. Eugene: Transylvania, Holland, MI. (Paper), The Reformed Review, 1968
- Pungur, József: “A Keleteurópai nacionalizmus és a nyugat felelősége”, *Hunnia*, June 25, 1998 p. 6-7
- Püspöki Nagy, Péter: Nagymorávia Fekvéséről, New York, Püski, 1982
- Rozgonyi, András : További érvek a határrevízió érdekében, (Paper) Australia
- Stern, Samuel: “Race with Time”, *Hungarian-Jewish Studies* III.; p. 38
- Thoroczky, Éva: Levelesláda
- Varsányi, Gyula: “Regionalism in Practice. – The Ethnoprotective role of the semi-autonomous County System of Historic Hungary”, *Revue de Droit International*, Geneva, January-March, 1985, summarized by Dr. István Mailáth in *Kronika*, September, 1985

INDEX

—“—

“Guests”, 3, 31, 32
 “re-Slovakization”, 345

—1—

1848 Hungarian Revolution, 60, 200
 1910 Census, 184, 195, 302, 332

—A—

Adelhaid, 31
 Admiral Koltsak, 211, 216, 217
 Admiral Miklós Horthy, 283
 Adolf Eichmann, 405, 407
 aggressive nationalism, 372
 Aggtelek, 18, 27
 agrarian reform, 316
 Al Ubaid, 27
 Alföld, 19, 22, 23, 131

—Á—

Álmos, 22, 109, 110, 111, 117,
 128, 168, 169

—A—

Alpine race, 20, 21, 23
 Alsace-Lorraine, 246, 247, 257, 267,
 276, 331, 374, 426, 433
 amulets, 27
Anabasis., 211, 218, 219
 André Tardieu, 206, 254, 255, 257,
 281, 335

Andrej Hlinka, 174, 175, 203, 339,
 350

Anonymus, 22, 109, 111, 112, 168
 antimony, 26, 136
 Archduke Franz-Ferdinand, 100
 Aristide Briand, 420

—Á—

Árpád, 1, 2, 5, 28, 29, 34, 36, 38,
 79, 90, 111, 117, 118, 128,
 130, 131, 133, 134, 136, 137,
 145, 146, 163, 164, 168, 169,
 334, 408, 477
 Árpád dynasty, 18, 21, 22, 23, 27,
 53, 108, 109, 165, 439

—A—

articles, 240
 Arzén III, 95
 Arzen IV., 96
 Atilla, 35, 128, 129, 131, 164
 Austrian census, 149, 377
 Awarische Mark, 127

—B—

Balázsfalva, 46
 Bánát, 58
 Battle of Mohács, 33
 Batu Khan, 40
 Béla Kun, 212, 286, 314, 329, 441
 Béla Linder, 329
 Berlin Conference, 43, 50, 100, 214
 Bessarabia, 35, 41, 44, 46, 50, 253,
 305, 385, 421, 554
 Bishop of Ochrida, 79
 Black Hand, 100

Bolshevik Revolution, 280
 Bolsheviks, 209, 210, 211, 214,
 216, 255, 287
 Border Committee, 237, 238
 Bratianu, 68, 80, 232, 234, 254,
 261, 262, 263, 266, 268, 270,
 275, 297, 306, 423
 bribed press, 254
 bribery of the press, 268
 Bronze Age, 18, 19, 22, 23, 27, 28,
 117, 136

—C—

cadastral holds, 61, 62, 93, 336, 346
 Carpathian Basin, 3, 4, 5, 7, 13, 18-
 41, 62, 72, 86, 88, 103, 106,
 108, 117-119, 124, 125, 128,
 129, 131, 137, 145, 147, 162-
 164, 167-170, 195, 196, 198,
 220, 225, 239, 245, 248, 254,
 300, 304, 310, 311, 314, 320,
 334, 335, 371, 389, 408, 413,
 417, 427, 429, 431, 436, 439,
 442, 445, 446, 449, 450, 454,
 536, 537, 540
 Ceausescu, 358, 372
 Charlemagne, 86, 103, 125, 126,
 127, 134
 Charles Robert, 90
 Chateau Madrid, 235
 China, 18, 319, 368, 369, 370
 Chiselled Stone Age, 22
 Chorezm, 113
 Clemenceau, 74, 232, 233, 234,
 237, 244, 246, 262, 263, 266,
 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 276,
 279, 280, 282, 331, 335
 collective rights, 368, 370

Colonel House, 267, 268, 271
 Committee of New States, 297
 Corfu Agreement, 273, 274
 Count Albert Apponyi, 122, 234,
 236, 286, 307, 336, 448
 Count Gyula Andrásy, 175, 264
 Count Gyula Károlyi., 285
 Count István Tisza, 323, 324, 325,
 326, 424, 535
 Count János Esterházy, 350
 Count Pal Teleki, 384
 Csallóköz, 21, 222, 227, 367, 401
 Csángó, 34, 36, 38, 85, 365
 Czechization, 75
 Czech-Yugoslav territorial corridor,
 226

—D—

Dacia, 29, 43, 54, 81
 Daco-Roman, 63, 77, 79
 Daco-Roman theory, 28, 46, 60, 72,
 80, 81, 82
 Danube States Economic Alliance, 426
 Danubian Federation, 444, 450
 Deák, 179
 Deák-Eötvös law, 179
 Declaration of Independence, 289,
 327
 defensive nationalism, 372
 Dentumagaria, 28, 38
 Deportation, 347, 348, 350, 402
 Dictated Peace, 167, 212, 213, 250,
 283, 296, 298, 337, 389, 426,
 429, 433, 438, 448
 Dinaric, 19, 21, 22, 23
 Division of Czechoslovakia, 383
 Drang nach Osten, 222
 Dream of Emese, 109

—E—

Edward Benes, 15, 73, 170, 175,
199, 325, 328, 333, 438, 538
Eichmann, 402
elementary and secondary schools, 156
elementary schools, 98, 157, 158,
159, 295, 307, 334
Emese, 110
Emperor Joseph II, 48
Emperor Rudolf Hapsburg, 57
Empress Maria Theresa, 47, 60
Endre II., 53
Endre III., 90
equal rights, 46, 69, 97, 179, 339,
370
Etelka Toronyi, 19, 22, 117

—F—

fait accompli, 224, 231, 305, 553
famine, 319
fanars', 58
Ferenc Deák, 178
Ferenc Rákoczy II., 33
Ferenc Szálasi, 403
final ratification, 343
Finno-Ugric, 20, 36, 72, 108, 111,
168, 408
First Vienna Award, 4, 221, 340,
381, 397
fish ponds, 28
Fiume, 14, 256, 322, 351
Four Powers Pact, 373, 374
Fourteen Points, 11, 14, 15, 73, 279,
330, 411
Frantisek Palacky, 72, 204 166
Fрати De Cruce, 49
Freedom Fight of 1848, 72

Friedrich Babenberg., 41
FUEV Plan, 452

—G—

garrison territory, 128
General Berthelot., 74
General Franchet d'Esperey, 223
General Géza Lakatos, 407
General Mackensen, 226
genocide, 97, 149, 274, 297, 344,
353, 358, 452
gens fidelissima, 314
geographical names, 36, 82, 83, 101,
108, 112, 137, 145, 309, 353
George Bratianu, 68
Germanization, 158, 159
Giesel, 34
Gizella, 34
gold rings, 27
grave of Álmos, 169
Great Rumania, 336
Great Serbia, 100, 275
Great Wallachia, 79
Greek Orthodox Church, 44, 60, 65,
96, 177, 196
Grover Krantz, 23
György Basta, 45
György Brankovics, 91
György Rákoczi II., Prince of
Transylvania, 45
Gyulafehérvár, 29

—H—

Havasalföld, 35, 38, 41, 44, 46, 50,
79, 92
historic Hungary, 13

Hitler, 134, 158, 160, 199, 227,
303, 339, 340, 346, 350, 367,
373, 379, 380, 387, 388, 393,
398, 401, 405, 407, 555
Hittite, 19
Holy Crown, 69, 138, 152, 439,
440, 441, 453, 455, 537
Horthy, 233, 283, 285, 287, 288,
289, 291, 292, 296, 329, 373,
386, 392, 399, 401, 402, 406,
438, 557
Hungarian census, 377
Hungarian County-System, **293**, 383,
439, 442
Hungarian Freedom Fight., 61
Hungarian People's Republic, 329
Hungarian railroad, 182
Hungarian State Railroad, 300

—**I**—

Ice Age, 26
Imre Thököly, 33
István Báthory, Prince of Transylvania,
44
István Bethlen, 287, 292
Izwolszky, 252

—**J**—

Jamdet Nasr, 27
János Hunyadi, 92
JENŐ, 109
John Dayton, 22, 117, 136
Josef Tiso, 350

—**K**—

Kagan Géza, 32, 132
KALIZ, 112

Karl Hohenzollern, 49
Karl Marx, 198
Károly Huszár, 233
Kárpátalja, 13, 38, 210, 213, 220,
287, 310, 322, 334, 351, 354,
558
Kassa, 271
Kassa Government Program, 343, 346
KÉR, 109
KESZI, 109
kidney, 81
King Béla II., 89
King Béla III., 90
King Béla IV, 40 90
King Carol I. of Rumania, 50, 232
King Charles III., 96
King Géza II., 32
King Imre., 90
King István I., 32, 34, 85, 101, 108,
122, 132, 151, 169
King István III., 90
King István V., 90
King László IV, 133
King Mátyás Hunyadi, 46
King, Samuel Aba, 113
Kolozsvár, 29
Körös, 26
KÜRTGYARMAT, 108

—**L**—

Lajos Kossuth, 61, 204, 312, 444,
446, 451
land reform, 320
Lansing, 267, 270
Lechfeld, 31, 131
liberation of Buda, 33
liberty of the press, 318

Lloyd George, 204, 207, 236, 276,
280, 281, 310, 336, 420, 421
Locarno Pact, 420
Lord Balfour, 271

—M—

mágus, 16, 554
Magyarization, 154, 159
marchland, 104
Maria Theresa, 98
Marjalaki-Kiss, 23
Market Line, 300, 302
Marshal Pilsudsky, 283
Matica Slovenska, 174
Mátyás Hunyadi, 93
MEGYER, 101, 108
Mensheviks, 212, 213
Mesopotamia, 22, 26, 27, 276
Metternich, 171
Mihály Károlyi, 11, 14, 15, 223,
228, 265, 266, 327, 328
Miklós Duray, 352
Milan Hodzsa, 174, 175
Millerand letter, 237
Milosevic, 274
minority rights, 5
Moldavia, 35, 36, 38, 41, 44, 46,
48, 49, 50, 54, 55, 61, 370, 435,
437
Munich conference, 373

—N—

Nagymarosi Dam, 401
Nagysáp, 18, 27
Nándorfehérvár, 90, 92
Narodna Obrana, 100
nationality rights, 341

NATO, 454
NYÉK, 108

—Ö—

Őrség, 128

—O—

Ostmark, 133
Otto I, 31

—P—

Pál Teleki, 286, 287, 288, 339, 384,
386, 387, 392, 407
Palóc Magyars, 38
parochial schools, 69, 157, 174
Parthians, 113
Partium, 182, 186
Pasic, 258
Peter the Great., 72
Pilsudsky, 283
Pittsburgh agreement, 203, 278
Pittsburgh., 206
pollution, 450
Populace exchange, 347, 348
Potsdam Conference, 345
Pozsony, 227
Preamble, 297
President Millerand, 237
President Wilson, 14, 15, 204, 206,
210, 268, 278, 279, 313, 327,
328, 539, 540
Prince Obrenovic, 446
Principle of Self-Determination, 11
propaganda organization, 203

—Q—

Quedlinburg agreement, 31
Queen Marie of Rumania, 269

—R—

railroad line, 182
Raymond Poincaré., 326
religious freedom, 150
relocation, 345, 348
Reparations Committee, 242
Re-Slovakization, 347
Robert Lansing, 267
Ronyva Creek, 222
Rumanization, 57, 67, 423
Russ, 35
Russian mobilization, 248, 250

—S—

Saint Stephen, 32
Samo, 162
Samuel Stern, 402
Sarajevo, 261
Sazonov, 246, 247, 250
sclavus, 89
Second Vienna Award, 367, 393,
395, 397
servus, 89
Seton Watson, 73, 155, 156, 162,
202, 203, 273, 274, 275, 278,
280, 281, 425
seven languages, 316
siege of Budapest (, 403
Slovak Cultural Society, 174
Slovak-Americans, 203, 206, 277,
278
Slovakization, 353
sort of Switzerland, 206

Soviet Russia, 399
Soviet Union, 450
Soym, 313
Spalaikovic, 258
Stalin, 6, 212, 227, 303, 320, 321,
345, 354, 358, 371, 380, 401
Stone Age, 34
Successor States, 3, 4, 5, 8, 17, 121,
151-160, 167, 184, 221, 225,
226, 230-242, 257, 260, 267,
294-309, 328, 329, 333, 334,
341, 345, 364-370, 398, 408,
409, 411, 422, 423, 426, 429,
432, 436, 437, 444, 448, 449,
451, 453, 542
Supplex Libellus Vallachorum, 45
Svatopluk, Zwentibold, 162
Svatopluk., 164
Szekler runic script, 16
Szomotor, 169

—T—

Take Ionescu, 252, 261
táltos, 16
tannery, 450
Tardieu, 269, 272
TARJÁN, 109
TÁRKÁNY, 112
Tartar, 33, 40, 41, 44, 58, 85, 112,
113, 132, 165, 385, 408, 429
Tartaria, 27
Tartarlaka, 27
Tartars, 40
Taurid, 19
the Commune, 329
the level of literacy, 196
the *Slovenska Matica*, 180

Thomas Masaryk, 15, 199, 216, 328,
333, 438
Torda National Assembly, 150
Torockó Hungarians, 26
Treaty of Paris, 343
Treaty of Saint Germain, 206
trepanation, 23
tribal settlement names, 101, 108
Trumbic, 273, 274
Turanid, 19, 22
Turkish-Russian War, 100
Turnu-Severin (Szörénytornya), 387
Turnu-Severin Negotiations, 388
Túrócszentmárton,, 327

—V—

vajda, 40, 46, 55, 57, 59, 91, 92,
554
Vajk, 32
Vásárvonal, 300
Veznic, 258
Vierburgenland, 120

—W—

Wends, 163
Wess Roberts, 11
White Huns, 35
Wickham Steed, 268, 274, 278, 280
Winston Churchill, 407, 455
Woodrow Wilson, 204

—Y—

Yalta Conference, 401

—Z—

Zsófia Torma, 27

