

---

---

Based upon the right of „self-determination of nations”, three states claim parts of the territory of thousand years old Hungary, namely: Servia, Roumania and Bohemia. Besides this Hungarian territory, Servia claims Montenegro, Bosnia, Croatia-Slovenia as well as the territories of Austria where Slovenes are living and Istria; declares to possess a right to all these territories on the ground of their being inhabited by Yougoslavs. The claims of the Czechs upon the Slovak regions of Upper Hungary embrace the whole “historical” Bohemia, Great-Moravia and Austria-Silesia. And, finally, Roumanian dreams regarding Great-Roumania include Bukovina and Bessarabia besides the territories of Hungary and of New-Dobruđa.

### **The Nationality Pictury of the New States.**

The following tables plainly show how unjustified these claims are and how they violate the so often mentioned „principle of nationalities”. The population of Yougoslavia, in case of complying with all the Servian demands, would amount to 13.254,000 souls, but among all these only 5.130,000 i. e. 38·7% would be pure Servians. Among the 13.724,000 inhabitants of Czecho-Slovakia only 6.299,000 i. e. 45·9% would be Czechs; and among the 15.747,000 inhabitants of Great-Roumania only 10.512,000 i. e. 66·7% would be Roumanians. In two of the three new states the predominant nationality would not even possess an absolute majority, and in the third, in Roumania, it would not reach a two-third majority, since here nationalities quite different

from the Roumanians would represent 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ %. From all these data it is apparent that each of the *three new states would turn out the representative type of the state of nationalities*, much resembling or, perhaps, exceeding the nationality conditions of Hungary, owing to which situation the Allied Powers want to dismember her. *In case of complying with these claims, three new states of nationalities would be established in the place of one*, with three new nationality problems at issue and with three new irredentistic agitations, much more dangerous than the one hitherto carried on in Hungary.

Examining the nationality conditions of the would-be new states we must put down the following facts:

### Yougoslavia.

The territory of Yougoslavia was never united in one state in times of history, and if a great part of it did come under the rule of one power, that power was not Slav, but a foreign one (Hungarian, Turkish, or Greek). The Servians, Croats and Slovenes never constituted one state or nation on the territories inhabited by them now; each of these three nations is possessed of a special and fully developed national character which none of them is inclined to give up for the name and ideal of Yougoslavia. Particularly the Servian nation which is numerically the foremost among them and which up to the present constituted an independent state under its own name! It is true that the Servians, Croats, the Mohammedan Bosnians, with a slight dialectical difference, speak the same language, but their different history, culture, religion and, above all, their different sentiments form a great contrast between them, which in many cases turns to hatred. Though the Slovenes in their religion and regarding their Western culture approach the Croats, their literary language quite differs from the Servian and Croatian tongues and they stand high above these two nations in culture and civilisation.

**There is no Uniform  
Yougoslav Nation Existing.**

Owing to this there is no justification in speaking of a uniform Yougoslav nation, only those idealists may speak of it, who either do not see or do not want to see the real situation. Even if we take all the Servians, Croats and Slovenes as one, in which case they make up 74·6% of the population of the new state, this 74·6% do not represent a uniform nation against the 25·4% of other nationalities.

**The word "Yougoslavia"  
means Servian Hegemony.**

Among the three nations the Servians claim a leading position in the new state, since it was they who had enforced the union. The Servians would like to give all the institutions of state a Servian character; this would surely give rise to resistance on the part of the two other nations. would cause constant disputes and controversies, and in a short time would make it impossible for them to work together. The indicating symptoms of what is coming are already apparent among the Croats and Slovenes.

**The Disappointment  
of the Croats,**

The Servian predominance will most particularly weigh upon the Croats. The chief aim of the Croats has always been to unite the different South-Slav territories of the Monarchy under Croatian hegemony. They would certainly have attained this in a short time, at any rate could have united the territories which constituted a part of the Hungarian state: Croatia-Slavonia, Bosnia and Dalmatia; the Hungary authorities were always ready to face this eventuality, and the Hungarian government of to-day would instantly have granted such rights to the Croats. Thus the Croats might have constituted a state of about 5,400,000 inhabitants in which they were of absolute majority; together with the Bosnians who stand nearer to them than to the Servians,

they would have represented 61·5% against 29·1% of the Servians. This formation, which has an historical, geographical, ethnographical and economical foundation, would certainly have had more justification in existing than the Yugoslavia established on the Great-Servian basis.

Instead of this we see that the Croats *who had hitherto enjoyed total autonomy in their language and administration within the Hungarian state* and had taken advantage of this connection in a substantial way, are now delivered to the imperialistic politics of the Servians and must in every regard give up their leading position in favour of the Servians who are much their inferiors in culture and economic power. Among the three new Yugoslav nations that nation desires to play the leading role, which has the greatest number of illiterates among its people. In 1900 only 20·3% of the inhabitants of Serbia above 6 years of age could read and write, while at the same time this percentage amounted to 44·8% in Croatia; from the Slovenes above 10 years of age 85·3% could read and write. The Servians are already granting less autonomy to the Croats than Hungary did. They made a local city of Zagreb, the capital of Croatia, favouring their own town Belgrade.

*The Servian claims upon the Hungarian territories are totally illegal because on this territory they amount only to 20·9% of the population.* The establishment of Yugoslavia would be dangerous to Catholicism; about 5·3 million Catholics — 1·2 million of Magyars, Germans and Italians — would be forced under orthodox rule which is highly intolerant regarding ecclesiastic matters.

### Czecho-Slovakia.

The Czechs also think too much of their strength if they want to rule other nations. In Hungary they demand not only the regions inhabited by the Slovaks, but also very extensive Magyar and all the Ruthenian territories. This gave rise to the following situation:

the Czechs constitute only 45·9% of the population in the state created by them; and even if we reckon to them the Slovaks who are a totally independent nation, they represent only 58·3% in the Czecho-Slovakian state against the 41·7% of other nationalities.

**The Czechs and Slovaks are  
Two Different Nations.**

It is a very great mistake to think Czechs and Slovaks one people. Even the Slav linguists and historians, among them Niederle, the well known professor in the University of Prague, admit that the language of the Czechs and Slovaks is different and that their history, their geographical situation developed two different nations of them regarding culture, traditions and sentiments. The "Czecho-Slovak" catchword is of quite recent origin, even the association "Czecho-Slovak Union" (Cesko-Slovenska Jednota) was established in 1896 only. Though this association worked with very extensive agitating means, it was never welcomed by the Slovaks who, for the greatest part, remained true to the Hungarian state. The Slovaks never sympathised with the idea of getting united with the Czechs since they were jealously guarding their own peculiar language and nationality. In many places the Slovaks offer armed resistance against the occupation of their territory by the Czechs. In case of voting, the majority of the Slovaks will in every instance vote against the Czechs. But though the Czechs are against such a voting (and they know why) it is clear that selfdetermination of the nations cannot be thought of without a general ballot.

If compelled to adopt the Czecho-Slovak stateformation, it is sure *that the Slovaks will go with the Magyars and Germans and thus will constitute the majority of the population.* This majority will probably offer resistance to the Czechs. The new Czecho-Slovak state, already in the hour of its foundation, is possessed of a new and serious nationality problem.

## Great-Roumania.

It is true that Roumania wants to annex only such territory which has a majority of Roumanian population. But for the sake of uniting a few far off villages with Roumanian population, very large non-Roumanian territories up to these villages would also come under Roumanian rule. Still more, she declares to have a right to *purely Magyar parts of the Hungarian Alföld (plain), because these territories belong to counties which have one or two Roumanian villages on their eastern borders.* The greed of the Roumanian claims is shown best by the fact that *the territory demanded from Hungary has only 53·2% of Roumanian inhabitants as against 46·8% of others.* In the Bukovina the number of Roumanians amount to 34·2% merely. In Great-Roumania as contemplated Roumanians will represent only 66·7% of the inhabitants; and the new state will include 5.200,000 subjects of foreign nationality, for the greatest part in direct opposition to the interests of Roumania, of hostile sentiments and irredentistic tendencies. This seems sufficient to prove that it is impossible for the new state to develop and gather strength.

On the Hungarian territory claimed by the Roumanians it is exactly the Roumanian race which is the most backward as far as economical activity and mental culture is concerned, and is leading only in the great number of illiterates and peasants; all these conditions are far worse in the Roumanian mother-country. The ethnographical composition of Great-Roumania would resemble that of the former Hungarian state, with the difference that the proportion of Hungarians and Roumanians would be inverted; yet only the numerical proportion and not the great intellectual and economical superiority that was in possession of the Hungarians and the Germans allied with them. Brutal violence cannot check this superiority for a long time. Great-Roumania will have to face the challenge of the una-

voidable irredendistic movements on the part of the Hungarians and that of the perhaps still stronger Hungarian socialism. There are great numbers of Magyar workmen in Transylvania, they will never consent to be oppressed by Roumanian imperialistic tendencies and to the domination of an inferior race. The socialistic movements will sooner or later gain in strength on the Roumanian territories.

### The Unity of Hungary.

When compared with these newly formed states of nationalities that have no historical past, nor an ethnographical, geographical or economical unity, *the former Hungarian state looks back upon a life of thousand years*. Thus it is one of the oldest states of Europe. *The ethnographical unity is existing to such an extent that Magyars are to be found in all parts of the country, thus ethnographically connecting the central parts with the outer regions. Here the ethnographical unity is substituted partly by the amicable sentiments of the non-Magyar nationalities and partly by the use of the Magyar language so much spoken among the nationalities.*

In Hungary (here we do not include Croatia-Slavonia where the official language in administration and in economical affairs is the *Croatian*) 1,875,789 inhabitants of non-Magyar nationality speak Hungarian, which account for 64·7<sup>0</sup>/<sub>100</sub> of the population. The average is yet more favourable if we count those above 12 years of age only; here 66·4<sup>0</sup>/<sub>100</sub> can speak the language. This can not be ascribed to the methods of teaching merely, but in the first place to the bright life of Hungary, to her great commercial traffic, to her zeal in obtaining commercial connections.

According to the statistics compiled for the suffrage-reform, 77·5<sup>0</sup>/<sub>100</sub> of the male literates above 24 years of age could speak Hungarian in 1910 already, and only 22·5<sup>0</sup>/<sub>100</sub> could not. This percentage is yet higher in the

different professions. For example, 84·6% from the independent manufacturers, 86·6% from their employees, 85·9% from the independent merchants, 93·4% from their employees, and 97·6% from the intellectuals.

From the population of the towns 88·1% can speak the Hungarian language, without regard to age or sex. We think it is not very difficult to answer the question which is the better: to leave Hungary in her territorial integrity, in which case there will still remain one state of nationalities, but a state welded by a past of a thousand years, by a total geographical and ethnographical unity, by the much greater strength and culture of the Magyar nation and finally by those newly founded institutions which the new Hungarian government granted to the non-Magyar nations; or to divide Hungary in favour of the neighbouring small nations, in which case Hungary would lose nearly 40% of her Magyar population, would be robbed of her coal and wood, of her trade and, what is still worse, her food too (the Bácska, Banat), *and would not be able to exist any longer; in the place of one, three new states of nationalities would be established*, quite different territories would be welded, where the majority of the population were of hostile sentiments to the new formation. Peoples of higher culture would come under the rule of such of much lower civilisation. These peoples would have to recur to brutal violence in place of the self-determination of nations.

---





**POLAND**

**UKRAINA**

**SLOVAKIA**

**HUNGARY**

**ROUMANIA**

**SLAVIA**

**BULGARIA**

**CZECHOSLOVAKIA**

**AUSTRIA**

**YUGOSLAVIA**

**ADRIA**

Praga

Krakau

Lemberg

Vienna

Budapest

Zagreb

Triest

Fiume

Belgrad

Sarajevo

Bukarest

Roumanians

Varna

Germans

Germans

Germans

Roumanians

Roumanians



1. Former Hungary.

State	Total population	From these are															
		Magyars	Germans	Slovaks	Roumanians	Ruthenians	Croats	Servians	Others	Magyars	Germans	Slovaks	Roumanians	Ruthenians	Croats	Servians	Others
		in numbers								in %							
Hungary, Croatia-Slavonia included . . . . .	20,886,487	10,050,575	2,037,435	1,967,970	2,949,032	472,587	1,833,162	1,106,471	469,255	48.1	9.8	9.4	14.1	2.3	8.8	5.3	2.2
Hungary, without Croatia-Slavonia . . . . .	<sup>1)</sup> 18,264,533	9,944,627	1,903,357	1,946,357	2,948,186	464,270	194,808	461,516	401,412	54.5	10.4	10.7	16.1	2.5	1.1	2.5	2.2

<sup>1)</sup> From this population 64.7% can speak Hungarian; from the men above 24 years of age who read and write: 77.5%; from the men of 18—40 years of age: 85% (the latter are data of 1917)

2. The Contemplated New States.

a) Yougoslavia. (The State of the Servians, Croats and Slovenes.)

Territories	Total population	From these are																	
		Servians	Croats	Bosnians (Mohammedans)	Bunevacians and Sokacians	Slovenes	Hungarians	Germans	Bulgarians and Macedonians	Others	Servians	Croats	Bosnians (Mohammedans)	Bunevacians and Sokacians	Slovenes	Hungarians	Germans	Bulgarians and Macedonians	Others
		in numbers									in %								
1. Servia } territory before 1913	<sup>1)</sup> 2,911,701	2,684,588	722	—	—	608	2,283	8,764	754	213,982	92.2	0.0	—	—	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.0	7.4
territory after 1913 . . . . .	<sup>2)</sup> 1,532,739	155,000	—	50,000	—	—	—	—	700,000	627,739	10.1	—	3.3	—	—	—	—	45.7	40.9
2. Montenegro } territory before 1913	<sup>2)</sup> 285,000	255,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30,000	89.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.5
territory after 1913 . . . . .	<sup>2)</sup> 150,000	80,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	70,000	53.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	46.7
3. Bosnia . . . . .	1,898,044	825,418	385,009	612,137	—	3,108	6,443	22,968	96	42,865	43.5	20.3	32.3	—	0.1	0.3	1.2	0.0	2.3
4. Dalmatia . . . . .	634,855	101,000	509,669	—	—	542	4	3,081	—	20,559	15.9	80.3	—	—	0.1	0.0	0.5	—	3.2
5. Croatia-Slavonia with Fiume . . . . .	2,671,760	645,380	1,651,280	—	—	18,112	112,441	136,393	322	107,832	24.2	61.8	—	—	0.7	4.2	5.1	0.0	4.0
6. Slovene Territories with Istria . . . . .	1,670,893	—	168,608	—	—	1,151,479	20	134,563	—	216,223	—	10.1	—	—	68.9	0.0	8.1	0.0	12.9
7. Hungarian Territory . . . . .	1,499,213	383,569	88,235	—	57,000	62,400	457,597	304,111	2,800	143,501	25.6	5.9	—	3.8	4.1	30.5	20.3	0.2	9.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,254,205</b>	<b>5,129,955</b>	<b>2,803,523</b>	<b>662,137</b>	<b>57,000</b>	<b>1,236,249</b>	<b>578,788</b>	<b>609,880</b>	<b>703,972</b>	<b>1,472,701</b>	<b>38.7</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>11.1</b>
Without Hungarian Territory . . . . .	11,754,992	4,746,386	2,715,288	662,137	—	1,173,849	121,191	305,769	701,172	1,329,200	40.4	23.1	5.6	—	10.0	1.0	2.6	6.0	11.3
											74.6								
											79.1								

According to the census of 1900. — <sup>2)</sup> Hübner-Jurashek statistics; the distribution of nationalities is calculated on the base of several sources. — <sup>3)</sup> The other data are the official ones for 1910.

b) Czecho-Slovakia.<sup>1</sup>

Territories	Total population	From these are															
		Bohemians and Moravians	Slovaks	Germans	Hungarians	Poles	Ruthenians	Others	Bohemians and Moravians	Slovaks	Germans	Hungarians	Poles	Ruthenians	Others		
		in numbers							in %								
1. Bohemia . . . . .	6,769,548	4,241,918	—	2,467,724	48	1,541	1,062	57,255	62.7	—	36.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8		
2. Moravia . . . . .	2,622,271	1,868,971	—	719,435	42	14,924	563	18,336	71.3	—	27.4	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.7		
3. Silesia . . . . .	756,949	180,348	—	325,523	14	235,224	255	15,585	23.8	—	43.0	0.0	31.1	0.0	2.1		
4. Hungarian Territory . . . . .	3,575,685	8,000	1,702,064	266,047	1,084,343	27,000	435,892	52,339	0.2	47.6	7.4	30.3	0.8	12.2	1.5		
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,724,453</b>	<b>6,299,237</b>	<b>1,702,064</b>	<b>3,778,729</b>	<b>1,084,447</b>	<b>278,689</b>	<b>437,772</b>	<b>143,515</b>	<b>45.9</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>1.1</b>		
Without Hungarian Territory . . . . .	10,148,768	6,291,237	—	3,512,682	104	251,689	1,880	91,176	62.0	—	34.6	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.9		
									58.3								

<sup>1</sup> According to Austrian and Hungarian statistics.

c) Great-Roumania.

Territories	Total population	From these are															
		Roumanians	Hungarians	Germans	Ukrainians and Russians	Jews	Bulgarians	Servians	Others	Roumanians	Hungarians	Germans	Ukrainians and Russians	Jews	Bulgarians	Servians	Others
		in numbers								in %							
1. Roumania . . . . .	<sup>1)</sup> 6,966,000	6,270,000	152,000	30,000	30,000	300,000	76,000	7,000	101,000	90.0	2.2	0.4	0.4	4.3	1.1	0.1	1.5
2. New-Dobruzsa . . . . .	<sup>2)</sup> 274,090	7,000	—	600	2,000	700	116,200	300	147,290	2.6	—	0.2	0.7	0.3	42.4	0.1	53.7
3. Bessarabia . . . . .	<sup>2)</sup> 2,441,200	1,162,000	63	75,700	678,700	288,000	129,400	67	107,270	47.6	0.0	3.1	27.8	11.8	5.3	0.0	4.4
4. Bukovina . . . . .	800,098	273,254	10,391	168,851	305,101 <sup>4)</sup>	—	—	1	42,500	34.2	1.3	21.1	38.1	—	—	0.0	5.3
5. Hungarian Territory . . . . .	5,265,444	2,800,073	1,704,851	559,824	16,318 <sup>4)</sup>	—	18,200	54,874	111,304	53.2	32.5	10.6	0.3	—	0.3	1.0	2.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>15,746,332</b>	<b>10,512,327</b>	<b>1,867,305</b>	<b>834,975</b>	<b>1,032,119</b>	<b>588,700</b>	<b>339,800</b>	<b>62,242</b>	<b>509,364</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>3.2</b>
Without Hungarian Territory . . . . .	10,481,388	7,712,254	162,454	275,151	1,015,801	588,700	321,600	7,368	398,060	73.6	1.5	2.6	9.7	5.6	3.1	0.1	3.8

<sup>1)</sup> Population of 1910: It is calculated from ecclesiastic data and from the earlier official census of 1889. — <sup>2)</sup> According to the Bulgarian statistics of 1900. — <sup>3)</sup> Calculated in 1910 on the base of the Russian census of 1897. — <sup>4)</sup> Here the Jews do not account for a separate nationality. — The other data are from official Austro-Hungarian statistics.