



## **Criticism of revisionistic policies of Hungary in contemporary Czechoslovak press during third decennium of twentieth century**

Milan Olejník, Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV Košice, [olejnik@saske.sk](mailto:olejnik@saske.sk)

OLEJNÍK, Milan. Criticism of revisionistic policies of Hungary in contemporary Czechoslovak press during third decennium of twentieth century. Individual and Society, 2012, Vol. 15, No. 4.

The main threat, in view of Czechoslovak political representation during inter-war period was a policy of Hungary aimed at revision of Trianon Peace Treaty. This issue was also permanently analyzed, judged and evaluated in contemporary Czechoslovak press. The Czech and Slovak periodicals commented on measures taken by Hungarian politicians in regard to strategy which should led to achieve a status quo ante, that is to re-establish Hungarian Kingdom in its pre-war size. These comments were strictly negative and valued as a dangerous policy toward newly established states including Czechoslovakia. The paper is attempting, in a concise fashion, to draw a picture of Hungarian policy, as was portrayed in articles, commentaries and feuilletons of Czechoslovak press.

Policy of revision. Hungarian community. Trianon Peace Treaty. Iredenta.

A third decade of twentieth century was a period of unabated tensions between Czechoslovakia (CSR) and Hungary. Czechoslovakian state and security agencies, despite victory of Nazi Party in Germany, which had a number of negative consequences for CSR, considered Hungary to be a primary source of danger for the Republic. Minister of Foreign Affairs and after year 1935 President of CSR, Edward Beneš initially judged Nazism as a temporary phenomenon, which will have only a fleeting impact upon situation in Europe. Furthermore, Germany, unlike Hungary, until last years of third decade, did not openly expounded territorial claims toward CSR. For a great majority of Hungarians, however, Peace Treaty of Trianon was unacceptable from its inception and there was no doubt that Hungary will use every means to achieve a revision of status quo. A source of constant frictions between both countries, besides other reasons, was status of large community of ethnic Hungarians living in Czechoslovakia. Most of Hungarians living on both sides of boundary line perceived this situation as a grave injustice and did everything to voice their dissatisfaction. A sort of state of "cold war" existed between both states, which found its expression in sphere of politics, economy and ideology.

During the thirties, the main inseminator of political and ideological propaganda was press, though gradually an importance was gaining radio.

It is necessary to state, that in Czechoslovakia, periodicals reporting on political matters were almost without exception tools of political parties. The news, commentaries and feuilletons followed strictly line of ideology of particular political party to which individual papers belonged.<sup>[1]</sup> The editors-in-chief and key members of redactions occupied important positions in hierarchies of political parties. Even though, in comparison with public gatherings, press lacked charisma of direct contact with public, periodicals, especially dailies, could produce a considerable larger amount of information, could analyze events without disturbing interferences of hacklers and have an impact upon forming of political attitudes of much larger number of people. In fragmented political scene of Czechoslovakia and deep ideological cleavages among political parties, a majority of periodicals waged an incessant "bellum omnia contra

---

omnes". A caustic attitude toward Hungary exhibited papers representing views of Czechoslovak parties. Hungarian internal and foreign policies were severely criticized and Hungary perceived as a constant danger to security and territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia. On the other side, security authorities of CSR did everything in their power to eliminate import of periodicals printed in Hungary. Shortly after establishment of Czechoslovakia, import of all printed materials - books, journals and periodicals issued after year 1918 was prohibited.

Due to democratic constitution of Czechoslovakian Republic, political parties and associations of various kind were allowed to be established, including political parties representing Hungarian minority. In a relatively short period of time after foundation of CSR, an array of political associations representing Hungarian community was created. Similarly,

a number of periodicals writing in Hungarian language sprung-up in Slovakia. Because two most relevant Hungarian parties - Land Christian-socialist Party and Hungarian National Party criticized policies of ruling coalition and stayed during their existence in opposition, periodicals affiliated with them were under strict surveillance of security authorities and were frequently censured. Especially articles positively tuned towards Hungary were under stern scrutiny and when their content was judged unacceptable, they were eliminated.

In regard to Hungary, the main target of criticism were activities of Hungarian governments and non-governmental organizations which could be classified as revisionist. Any revision of territorial arrangement of Peace Agreement concluded at Trianon was unacceptable to Czechoslovakia.

At the close of second decade of twentieth century, an external impulse contributed to worsening of tensions. It was so called Rothermere's Action. A proprietor of several periodicals, [2] Harold Sidney Harmsworth, known as Lord Rothermere, published in *Daily Mail* two articles [3] in which he argued that Trianon Treaty destabilized situation in Europe, because arbitrary inclusion of one million Hungarians into Czechoslovakia is a source of constant tensions and inevitably will become a cause of conflict. Even though articles in Great Britain did not attract much attention, in Hungary created a wave of euphoria. Hungarian public reacted with expressions of joy and more than one million of Hungarians sent telegrams, in which they thanked Lord Rothermere. *Národný denník* (National Daily) - a daily belonging to periodicals of Agrarian Party reported "In Budapest in every office, even in private houses, are exhibited signed sheets of paper, which will be dispatched to Lord Rothermere, as a gesture of gratitude of Hungarian public, for raising the issue of Trianon Peace." [4]

Czechoslovak political leaders initially did not respond to Rothermere's campaign. Minister of Foreign Affairs of CSR, Edvard Beneš on July 14 1927 mentioned Rothermere initiative but he classified the whole affair as a secondary event. Unlike E. Beneš, Slovak periodicals paid to the affair considerably larger attention. In an inflammatory tone reacted *Národný denník* - "Lord Rothermere by his lofty and empty gestures is only showing, that he is a common political adventurer." [5] *Robotnícke noviny* (Workers News) [6] argued that true reason for Rothermere's Action are interests of Hungarian aristocracy - "Hungarian Magnates welcomed Lord Rothermere in Budapest and to their society. He was enchanted by splendor and flattery of old magnate families and blindly took-up their cause. Lord Rothermere is confessing that the primary reason of his campaign is preservation of great estates divided by a land reform." [7] Even periodical of main Slovak opposition party (Slovak Hlinka's Populist Party) - *Slovák*, criticized Rothermere's campaign - "English Lord want to be a liberator of minorities ... He should visit Slovak minority in Hungary and should ask them how they are doing." [8]

Gradually, protests acquired almost irrational dimension. A number of politicians in Czechoslovakia termed Rothermere Action as a dangerous precedent and threat to the Republic. A number of manifestations were organized not only in Slovakia, but also in Czech part of Republic. An illustrative example of mass gathering protesting Rothermere's activities was a manifestation organized on August 20 1927 in Bratislava. Periodicals representing parties of ruling coalition described gathering in superlatives. *Ludová politika* (People's Politic) a periodical of Czechoslovak Populist Party, defined the manifestation as a protest against Hungarian aristocracy and Rothermere "who with furtive hand are reaching upon Slovak homeland". [9] *Robotnícke noviny* declared that manifestation was "an imposing manifest against attacks of Hungarian oligarchy and irredentists upon territorial integrity of Republic and independence of Nation." [10] According to *Národný denník*, "Finally Czechoslovak Bratislava, after one month lasting provocations of Budapest and Lord Rothermere, as well as our Hungarians and Hungarofil irredentists, moved with the resolution to give a clear answer." [11]

Eventually furor caused by Rothermere Action gradually abated. A bleak ray of hope, which roused such

an intensity of emotion in so many Hungarians, was just an illusion. Actually, it was Hungarian community living in Czechoslovakia, who must endure consequences of worsening relations between CSR and Hungary.

Leading Hungarian politicians were aware that they cannot openly raise an issue of revision until international circumstances are not conducive to change of political status quo in Europe. An official periodical of Agrarian party in Czech part of Republic - *Venkov* (Country-side), cited speech of Prime Minister of Hungary István Bethlen, who in Hungarian Parliament declared that though he agree with Budapest City Council request to demand revision, "It would be folly to post such an request to League of Nations till leading countries stand for preservation of present state of affairs."<sup>[12]</sup>

According to *Venkov* the idea of revision of Trianon had an unanimous support in all segments of Hungarian society. As a proof, periodical informed about the congress of Hungarian Social Democratic Party, where a manifest was adopted in which delegates demanded that "social democratic parties of all countries pressed their governments to enact a revision of Trianon Peace Treaty." *Venkov* concluded - "Hungarians as one nation are for revision...Aristocracy, liberals, fascists, socialist even communists."<sup>[13]</sup>

A government supported regional daily *Slovenský východ* (Slovak East) reported on strategy adopted by Hungarian revisionist propaganda. Allegedly, in Slovakia, calls for a violent putsch should be abandoned and replaced by a new tactic - revision of Trianon via legal measures in line with the international law, with aim to convince Slovaks that for Slovakia the most optimal option of her successful development is to unite with millennium Hungarian state. In that sense a periodical of National Socialist Party *České slovo* (A Czech Word) cited declaration of Prime Minister's Bethlen, who proclaimed that foreign policy of Hungary considerably improved and Hungary gained number foreign friends as a result of her diplomatic activities.<sup>[14]</sup> About new strategy of Hungarian foreign initiative wrote daily of Agrarian Party *Slovenská politika*<sup>[15]</sup> (Slovak Politics): "Namely in circles of count Bethlen reigns conviction that Hungary was lately by Western Powers, if not directly supported, at least sympathetically observed. On this base should have been elaborated so called great program of Hungarian irredenta, of which the most important advantage will be, that its political goals will be synchronized with Italian politics and eventually fused with interests of influential countries."<sup>[16]</sup> *Slovenská politika* viewed this strategy as a proof that "A spirit of irredenta remained, even though in Budapest they want to clothe it with a new robe, painted by friendly colors."<sup>[17]</sup> Conciliatory overtures initiated by Hungarian leaders were rebuked by social democratic deputy Czechoslovak Parliament, Ivan Markovič, who asserted that until democratization of political situation in Hungary will not take a place, a meaningful change to peaceful relations will be impossible.<sup>[18]</sup>

Second of June 1930 marked a ten years anniversary of Trianon Peace Treaty. *Slovenská politika*, similarly as other periodicals, wrote about radically different approach to that historic event in Slovakia and in Hungary. Whereas, according to *Slovenská politika*, 4th of June was for every loyal Slovak a day "when in Trianon was signed a peace treaty -the non-destructible charter of our liberty," in Hungary were held mournful speeches and "All communal representations organized gatherings during which demanded revision of Trianon Treaty via "peaceful means". From all these gatherings memoranda addressed to League of Nations were sent, stating impossibility to maintain Trianon Treaty."<sup>[19]</sup> In valuation of *Robotnícke noviny* "Ten years of Trianon were for us and for the whole Republic ten years of repelling of attacks against our freedom, ten years of struggle to reinforce foundations for free further development... Ten years of Trianon were also ten years of official and non-official Hungarian instigations of fight against Slovaks and Czechs."<sup>[20]</sup> *Slovenská politika* informed about declaration made by a member of Parliament Ivan Hrušovský, who commented on anniversary of Trianon Peace Treaty. I. Hrušovský declared: "We hold to be our duty to call attention of the whole public to danger caused by revisionist propaganda of Hungarian Lords to peace and security of Europe. We want to live in peace with all our neighbors, but this peace is not possible to buy by releasing even a small peace of our land. We solemnly warning, that a revision of territorial arrangements made by Trianon Peace Treaty will arouse emphatic and implacable resistance and it is also an endangerment of peace."<sup>[21]</sup>

On 19 of August 1931 Hungarian Prime Minister I. Bethlen resigned. *Robotnícke noviny* summarized 10 years of his rule in a strictly negative tone: "He governed over ten years, with help of violence, corruption and falsifications. Hungary during his regime became a veritable jail, in which was destined to die namely social democracy. Economically he led Hungary to the brink of bankruptcy and politically caused a loss of sympathy, which Hungary had abroad."<sup>[22]</sup>

Critically was valued also a program declaration submitted by a new Prime Minister of Hungary Guyula Gömbös in the article published by journal *Politika*. Government program was allegedly lacking

---

constructive ideas and direction of Hungarian policy was unclear.[23] According *Národný denník*, even though G. Gömbös in his program declaration did not specify what his endeavor to achieve revision of Trianon will be, he asserted that *"the whole Hungarian nation can be reassured that as soon as possible, negotiations about revision will be initiated."*[24]

A strong support for its revisionist policy was Hungary getting from Italy. According to pro-government periodical *Národný týždenník* (National Weekly) this support was motivated by geopolitical interests of Italy in Adriatic: *"Italy is supporting intentions of Hungary, even is enticing Hungarians to be more aggressive. Italy need ally like this, because she has no settled relations with Slovenians and wants to penetrate to region of Balkan. Firstly Italy wants to occupy Albania and then Dalmatia. Italy cannot bear other power on Adriatic coast and its goal is elimination of Slavic presence in Adriatic."*[25]

In context of revisionist agenda, a target of criticism was also character of education in Hungary, which allegedly led to irredentism and xenophobia. *Slovenský východ* in article *"Deti z Československa vychovávajú v Maďarsku k iredente"* (Children from Czechoslovakia are brought-up in Hungary to irredenta) wrote about textbooks with xenophobic content and warned that even children from Czechoslovakia, who attend schools in Hungary, are subjected to such an education.[26]

As a counter measure against Hungarian territorial demands, *Národný týždenník* proclaimed, that there are also righteous claims to include Hungarian regions inhabited by Slovaks into Slovakia, *"because to us Slovaks an injustice was done, when thousands and thousands of our brothers was left to their fate and they were included into Hungary."* *Národný týždenník* concluded, that *"Our yearnings we have to voice also abroad, so foreigners know, that if an injustice was committed, it was committed to Slovaks and it has to be rectified."*[27]

A critical reaction from *Slovenský denník* roused interview of foremost Czech publicist Ferdinand Peroutka, published in Hungarian periodical *Reggeli Ujszág*. In interview

F. Peroutka, who was called "a leader of Czech revisionists", allegedly suggested transferring of some territory to Hungary. *Slovenský denník* sharply rebuked Peroutka's statements and condemned his ideas: *"In regard to Peroutka - it is known that in an issue of revision of peace treaties he is utterly ignorant."*[28] However, reason that for a certain period of time he is speaking about this issue is caused by his aspiration to be interesting. But, if they are in Slovakia similar revisionists, it is necessary to lock them, together with their leader, to madhouse, because they are needlessly disturbing peaceful citizens of state."*[29]*

To prove that inhabitants of Southern Slovakia are firmly against any revision, Slovak nationalistic organization - Slovenská liga (Slovak League), organized on 4 and 5 of June 1933 a manifestation in city of Lučenec. Manifestation was described as a splendid success and *"shown how amazing large and healthy is moral will of national existence of our nation."*[30] In radically different tone informed about organized protests against revision periodical of opposition Hlinkas's Slovak People's Party *Slovenská Pravda* (Slovak Truth): *"In Komárno, Nové Zámky, Žilina and in some other places were on June 11 organized by Czech or so called Czechoslovak parties anti-revisionist manifestations... We will never manifest together with those gentlemen, to whom Slovakia primarily can thank that is impoverished, that even today is wronged and that since foundation of Czechoslovakia two hundred thousand Slovaks must leaved country whereas two hundred thousand Czechs obtained in Slovakia worm nests."*[31]

In contrary to criticism and open sarcasm of HSPP, pro-government media presented anti-revisionist movement as a movement which had a broad support even in ranks of Hungarian minority members. *Slovenský denník* wrote that *"Revisionist movement is reaching also into newly established states and there Hungarian minority started an action against revision...In the name of this goal Hungarian anti-revisionist movement was commenced, which, in boundaries of these states wants to build a peace of souls and resolution to deflect all attacks aimed against Trianon. Hungarian anti-revisionist league in newly established states via its actions is serving to interests of all working loyal Hungarians."*[32]

Attacks against revisionist policies were a constant preoccupation of Slovak pro-government press. Besides activities enacted in Hungary, attention was given also to international connections of Hungary, which could be utilized in support of revision. *Slovenský východ* paid attention to endeavors of Hungarian representatives to cultivate relations with influential political personalities in Great Britain, with aim to gain their support for Hungary's cause. Even though *Slovenský východ* admitted a certain success of Hungarian propaganda of revision, asserted that it is supported only by several peripheral political figures.[33] In that context it is worth to illustrate how revisionist activities of Hungarian government

were evaluated by Czechoslovak embassy in Budapest. In report elaborated by Ambassador Dr. Bobr, named *“Maďarsko: poznámky k situaci politické, sociální, měnšinové”* (Hungary: notes to political, social and minority situation) is stated, that *“Since Gömbös’s government is in power in Hungary, revisionist policy became an official platform and for this reason today in Hungary this issue is not only more openly discussed but also activated ... By a fact that a revision of peace treaties started to be discussed in official world forum, Gömbös is able, till now hidden revisionist program of former Hungarian governments, openly include into a program of his government. This leads to a situation when Hungarian government is able ... boldly and openly say and proclaim that it is a program and goal of present Hungarian government.”*[34]

Two events were celebrated in Hungary in regard to international support of Hungarian government - a petition of group of deputies submitted in British Parliament requesting to revise peace treaties and Italian critical attitude toward League of Nations. *Slovenský východ* commented these occasions with derogatory remarks.[35] A motion of British deputies roused a bitter reaction from Slovak member of parliament for Agrarian Party, Miloš Vančo, who with “astonishment” registered their support of revision - *“Us Slovaks, especially those who fought on Western Front side by side with our comrades French and British in deadly fight, is greatly hurting that they are in British parliament deputies who forget that we were brothers in arms...We cannot understand this.”*[36]

Hungarian politicians, encouraged by a positive response on part of British political specter to idea of revision, were trying to argue their cause abroad. Former Prime Minister Bethlen travelled to London, where he had a series of lectures depicting a grave injustice committed against Hungary. Supporter of Bethlen’s argumentation that Slovaks were forcibly included into Czechoslovakia, was Slovak emigrant František Jehlička, who declared that almost for a millennium Slovaks lived with Hungarians in *“pure peace, happiness and satisfaction”*. According to *Slovenský denník*, F. Jehlička further asserted, that Slovaks had had in pre-war Hungary only one problem and this was an issue of language. Today, however, Slovak Nation in Czechoslovakia is bleeding from three wounds: is robbed of his language, his bread and his religion.”[37] *Národný týždenník*, citing periodical *Pester Lloyd*, admitted that I. Bethlen during his three weeks lasting journey in London had *“very intimate conversations with all significant members of British Parliament and British society and was able to achieve that three parties, labor, liberal and conservative, included a request of a revision of Trianon Peace in their programs.”*[38]

A support for its revisionist policy received Hungary namely from Italian dictator Benito Mussolini. *Slovenský východ* in several articles sharply criticized Mussolini’s pro-Hungarian stand and especially his declaration that they are outside Hungary *“purely Hungarian regions”*. [39]

*Slovenský denník* informed about strategy of I. Bethlen, who, unlike G. Gömbös, allegedly with understanding that quest for revision is for a majority of European states unacceptable, advocated more forthcoming policies toward Hungarian communities in Rumania, Slovakia and Yugoslavia, which was classified by periodical as an irredentist strategy.[40] Similarly, *Slovenský východ* wrote about a new tactic of Hungary - *“Hungary admitted not so long ago, that its policy of aggressive revisionism from outside is bad and brought to Hungary nothing else than a bitter disappointment. Indeed, a revision of peace treaties as a request was in Geneva often refused... for this reason in Budapest they are of opinion that it is necessary to preserve goal, but to change tactics. So, neighboring states of Hungary should be subverted with the help of Hungarian minorities.”*[41]

A visit of several deputies of British Parliament in Hungary became a topic of article published in *Venkov*. According to periodical British aristocratic visitors were entertained by count Andrássy and had a “friendly” conversation with Prime Minister G. Gömbös. *Venkov* characterized visit as an example of following tactic - lavishly entertain foreign visitors, so they are more willing to accept revisionist claims by Hungary.[42]

In thirties a resistance against centralistic policies pursued by Czechoslovak government was growing in Slovakia. This sentiment was noticeable namely among young educated Slovaks who could find jobs only with difficulties, partly also because a number of job positions in government was occupied by Czech nationals. Therefore, Czechs were perceived by many Slovaks as usurpers. This led to a movement of so called native inhabitants of Slovakia, that is, people who lived in Slovakia before a Czech immigration commenced after year 1918. The union of native inhabitants of Slovakia, which should include Hungarian minority members, will, in view of autonomists, facilitate achievement of autonomy of Slovakia. Young Slovak autonomists, who were overwhelmingly adherents of Hlinka’s Party established a periodical *Nástup* (Line-up), frequently radically critical to government policies. *Slovenský denník* accused members of young Slovak autonomists of ignorance and their recklessness in regard to security and freedom of

---

Slovakia vis-à-vis Hungarian danger. It remained them, that they never experienced Hungarian domination a warned them to be aware of such a blind attitude.[43]

In October 1935 *Slovenský východ* published a series of articles in which there was summarized tactics and strategy of Hungarian revisionism the as they were perceived by their author B. Šolc. According to B. Šolc Hungary is one of the few European states where political and social changes did not occurred. This is the reason that Hungarian policy was rigidly directed at renewal pre-war Hungary.[44] Hungarian foreign policy is endeavoring to achieve its goal by means of peaceful propaganda in France and England and at the same time to create alliances with states bent on change of geopolitical status quo (Italy, Poland and Germany).[45] Author paid also attention to relations of Hungary with countries inclined to support revisionist policies - to Italy, Poland and especially to Germany. In regard to Germany author quoted one of German leading political figures - von Papen, during his visit of Hungary in autumn 1935, who said that Germany and Hungary are united by "a common historical mission". Despite danger growing from this ominous alliance, B. Šolc asserted that "*Even now we do not have reason to be worried. Present geopolitical situation in Central Europe is guaranteed by Little Entente, France, Russia and also England.*"[46]

Czechoslovak politicians and periodicals painted an optimistic picture in regard to security of Republic because of alliances with states of Little Entente and France. *Venkov* cited Rumanian King Carol stating that Little Entente cannot admit revision of boundary lines in Central Europe and accentuated unity with France when he said that "*Romanian army will be always together with French army.*" In the same article *Venkov* described the position of Hungary in regard to situation if Central Europe - "*...concerning status of Hungarian minorities in newly established states, Hungary refused to give up her right to defend interests of these communities.*"[47]

During the second half of thirties Nazi Germany was becoming clearly a menacing power in Europe. German dictator Adolf Hitler did not hide his "irreversible" decision to free Germany of "shackles" imposed by Versailles Peace Treaty. Growing aggressiveness of Third Reich was welcomed in Hungary. German resolution to do away with status quo offered an opportunity also for Hungary to realize her revisionist plans. Hungarian foreign policy became focused upon building close relations with Germany. *Slovenský východ*, citing international periodicals, reported about visit of Hungarian regent Miklos Horthy in Germany.[48]

As a contrary to authoritative regimes of Germany and Hungary, in his speech from February 6 1937, Slovak leading social democratic politician Ivan Dérer asserted that members of Hungarian community in CSR have all democratic rights guaranteed by a direct secret voting right which is a basis of democracy. Endeavors to revise Trianon Peace Treaty are therefore detrimental also to Hungarians themselves, because they are not based on democratic principle.[49]

As a reaction to growing revisionist activities of Hungary, periodical *Ludový chýrnik* (People's Reporter) [50] argued that there is an acute need to establish a ministry of propaganda in Czechoslovakia, which would effectively deflect revisionist attacks.[51]

For almost two decades security of Czechoslovakia was protected by a system of peace treaties concluded after World War I. However, since 1936[52], when Germany openly embarked on course of destruction of Versailles Peace Treaty, this protection became a clearly illusory. Growing strength of Germany on one side and unwillingness of France and England to take decisive steps to stop Hitler, became a clear signal to Hungarian political representatives, that possibility of revision is more real than ever before. On February 5 1938 Regent Horthy together with Minister of Foreign Affairs of Hungary Kálman Kánya visited Poland. They were, as *Robotnícke noviny* reported, cordially welcomed by Polish leaders marshal Rydz-Smigly and Minister of Foreign Affairs Józef Beck.[53]

A clear sign of an ominous threat to security of Czechoslovakia was also a speech of A. Hitler in Reichstag (German Parliament) on February 20 1938. German dictator in it for a first time unequivocally stated that there are 10 million Germans under foreign rule and this situation is unacceptable to Germany. There was no doubt that A. Hitler meant Germans living in Austria and CSR.[54] It was almost a month since Hitler's speech, when an answer from Czechoslovakia came. Czechoslovak Prime Minister Milan Hodža during a session of Parliament asserted that "*It is a historic fact, that Czechoslovakia is a home of more than 3 million of citizens of German nationality. Czechoslovakia belongs among these countries where in whole large regions lives populations of a various ethnic origin. A Peace Conference could do no otherwise, that to confirm centuries lasting situation also after World War I*" Then M. Hodža reacted to the crux of Hitler's speech "*Because Reich Chancellor spoke about 10 million Germans living in two*

*states neighboring Germany, it can be understood that Reich Chancellor meant also protection of Germans in Czechoslovakia. In that sense it would be an interference into internal affairs of our state... therefore Czechoslovak government wants to emphasize that all attributes of state sovereignty will people of this state protect with all their power."*[55]

Hitler's openly stated decision to interfere into Austrian and Czechoslovakian internal affairs under pretence to protect and unite Germans had an impact upon situation in Hungary. Periodical *A-Zet*[56] informed about speech of Prime Minister Kálmán Darányi[57] in which he declared that "*Hungarian government is monitoring of Austro-German relation naturally with a great attention. A visit of Regent Horthy in Poland reinforced centuries old friendship between Hungary and Poland. Friendly relations of Hungary to Italy and Austria as well as to Germany also deepened.*" In regard to Hungarian minorities Darányi reiterated that "*If a status of minorities will not improve, it would be impossible to normalize a relation between Hungary and states of Little Entente.*" In regard to right of Hungary to rearm, he said that "*Representatives of Italy and Austria during negotiation in January in Budapest asserted absolute right of Hungary to rearm.*"[58] Also political representation of Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia expected much more forthcoming attitude to its requests. As periodical *Slovak* reported, negotiations of Hungarian politicians with Prime ministers Hodža were unsuccessful, because excessive nature of their demands.[59]

A shocking event which had profoundly negative consequences upon Czechoslovak Republic was occupation of Austria by Nazi Germany. Despite fact that Czechoslovakia after occupation with exception of short boundary line with Romania, was completely surrounded by unfriendly countries, pro-government periodicals tried to belittle this disastrous development. *Robotnícke noviny* cited an assertion of Minister of Defense, Franišek Machník that "*...situation of our beloved Republic is in every sense firm and in no way impacted by latest events... And honestly I can assure you that nobody is harboring idea to endanger our security.*"[60] With exaggerated optimism judged situation *Slovenská vlast* "*... we are aware of dangerous situation, which results from our geographic composition and from our economic and cultural needs. Therefore we transformed us during the last years into European fortress of first degree, armed and equipped so perfect as was possible as no other land in the old continent. Among experts of neighboring states and leading powers Czechoslovak defending force is estimated exceptionally high.*"[61]

In reality, however, geopolitical situation was getting worse. After "Anschluss" of Austria, German minority "activist" political parties, who cooperated with Czechoslovak ruling parties joined Sudeten German Party led by Konrad Henlein who was secretly collaborating with A. Hitler. In Slovakia a growing autonomist movement was taking place. A periodical *Novosti* (former *Slovenský východ*), informed about activities of Hlinka's party in this regard: "*Slovak National Party organized in Thursday (25 on March 1938) a meeting and after a speech of parliamentary deputy dr. Tiso a debate ensued during which a creation of enlargement of autonomist front was requested. It should include Hungarian, German and Ruthenian minorities.*"[62] *Slovenský denník* characterized this decision as a betrayal "*Leadership of Populist Party has an intention to tear apart all relations which are connecting Slovaks with Czechs and to mix Slovaks with Hungarians Germans and Ruthenians... leadership of Populist Party committed a betrayal of state, betrayal of nation and betrayal of all principles on which our state was built.*"[63] *Robotnícke noviny* quoted Hungarian periodicals *Uj Magyarország*[64] and *Nemzeti Ujság*[65] as a proof that Hlinka's Party is actually an ally of "Hungarian revisionists" - "*As all this is indicating, Hungarian revisionists are putting a great hope in Ludaks' subversives ... But hopes of Hungarian revisionists should finally open eyes of cheated Ludaks in Slovakia.*"[66]

Changing political situation in Europe evoked hopes of "return" of Slovakia into Hungary. As *Robotnícke noviny* reported, "*An exhibit of these new Hungarian hopes was a manifestation organized in Budapest last week by fascists and academic rightists. Leaflets calling to join manifestation had slogans "We have to free from a slavery our race and brotherly nations."*[67] About a new wave of revisionism wrote *Robotnícke noviny* as a result of changed international situation after occupation of Austria and rise of autonomist movement in Slovakia.[68]

In May, a surprising political development occurred in Hungary. On May 13 Prime Minister K. Darányi submitted a demission of government and a new government led by Béla Imrédy was appointed. According to *A-Zet*, demission was caused by necessity to neutralize growing influence of radically pro-Nazi politician Ferenc Szálasi and "*According to some information government of Imrédy will be oriented on cooperation with Little Entente.*"[69]

Meantime representatives of Hungarian community negotiated with Prime Minister Hodža in regard to

---

implementation of so called Statute of Nationalities which should regulate a status of ethnic minorities in CSR. *Slovák* reported that Hungarian leaders requested reform of state citizenship in Slovakia. This should be awarded only to "native inhabitants" of Slovakia that is to Slovaks, Hungarians and Germans. Among other requests were demanded a revision of land reform and new census.[70] Demands of Hungarian community leaders were characterized by *Robotnícke noviny* as "provocative".[71]

Realization that to succeed in plans of revision it is necessary to gain a good will of German dictator, led Regent Horthy to visit A. Hitler on August 22 in Port of Kiel. *Robotnícke noviny* noted that "*Horthy's visit in Germany is rousing a big attention and an exceptional significance is ascribed to it. Especially noticeable is Hitler's endeavor to show to his visitor a military might of Germany.*"[72] *Slovenská politika* reported that "*With the visit of Horthy they are connected various combinations, beside others also a rumor that Germany is trying to attach Hungary more firmly, so in this way Hungary will be not gained for cooperation with Little Entente.*"[73]

As an unexpected surprise came joint declaration of Council of Little Entente and Hungarian government in which both sides stated that "*Negotiations carried since last year between Hungary on one side and Rumania, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia on another side, permeated by a common wish to get rid of anything what could slow down a development of good neighborhood between Hungary and named states enabled to conclude preliminary agreements. These agreements concluded by three states of Little Entente are containing an acknowledgement of equality of Hungary in armament and mutual abstention from any use of force between Hungary and these three states.*"[74] This surprising direction of Hungarian foreign policy was reinforced by Hungarian Prime Minister Imrédy, who in an interview for British periodical *Daily Telegraph* said that "*A goal of Hungarian foreign policy is to remain a neutral.*"[75]

The second half of September was marked by increasing aggressiveness of Germany. Especially attacks upon Czechoslovakia intensified. A. Hitler threatened to invade CSR if his demands will not be met. This was possible primarily by appeasement policies of France and England. Face to face to a flagrant breach of peace treaties by Germany which culminated by occupation of Austria, Western Powers reacted only by verbal protests. Reluctance of these states perceived A. Hiler as a proof that they are not resolute enough to take decisive steps to stop Germany committing acts of further aggression. France and England, decided to accept Hitler's demands. On. September 30 1938 Germany, Great Britan, France and Italy signed so called Munich Agreement in which signatures consented to award Germany regions in Czechoslovakia where members of German minority lived in proportion larger than 51%. This gave Germany a decisive military advantage, because in these regions, located primarily in a western part of Czechoslovakia bordering with Germany - a line of defensive fortification was constructed. This way Czechoslovakia became practically defenseless.

Munich Agreement created a precedent for territorial demand of Poland and Hungary. Whereas Poland demanded a coal rich territory of Teschen, Hungary required that Southern Slovakia and Sub-Carpathian Ukraine became an integral part of Hungary.

Transfer of contested territories should be resolved during negotiation between Czechoslovakia and Hungary, designed to be carried out in City of Komarno.

After Munich Agreement the political development of Slovakia underwent a radically new phase. Till then a main opposition party - Hlinka's Slovak People's Party asserted its political power and took reins of power in Slovakia. Autonomy of Slovakia became a reality. However, parliamentary democracy was replaced by authoritative political system in which HSPP held dominant political power.

A new situation demanded also to solve a status of Hungarian minority in Slovakia. *Slovenská politika* reacted to this necessity - "*In protocols and resolutions of Munich Conference of four powers was indirectly suggested that now an issue of status of Hungarian community living in Southern Slovakia should be solved. Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Kamil Krofta submitted to Hungarian ambassador in Prague a note containing a suggestion of Czechoslovak government to in nearest time to set-up a common Czechoslovak - Hungarian commission with task to resolve issues connected with status of Hungarian community in Slovakia.*"[76] Necessity to solve a status of Hungarian community commented also other Slovak periodicals.[77]

As a consequence of continuous political changes which culminated in abdication of President Edward Beneš, Czechoslovak representatives asked for a postponement of negotiations. Eventually both sides agreed to commence negotiations on October 9 1938.[78] According to periodical *Slovak* "Slovak and

Hungarian delegations commenced negotiations on 10 of October when Hungarian side submitted their suggestions how to set a boundary line between both countries." Almost instantly a discontent occurred. Hungarian delegation insisted that as a base for negotiations should be taken statistic of ethnic composition of Slovakia from year 1910, whereas Slovak side was willing to consider only statistic from year 1930.[79] It was becoming clear, that neither side will be willing to accept meaningful compromise. In this situation most likely outcome seemed to be that decision will be made by Germany and Italy - two countries who had a paramount influence in Central Europe. Therefore both states were trying to gain sympathy of Germany and Italy. Traditionally Italy was a strong supporter of Hungarian revisionist demands. German dictator A. Hitler, who was disappointed by hesitant approach of Hungary during September crisis, was willing to accommodate Hungarian demands only partially.

Germany as well as Italy would prefer successful conclusion of negotiations without direct interference. In that sense Slovak informed that „Italy and Germany suggested to Budapest to look for a positive conclusion of negotiations.“[80] With aim to obtain German support, Slovak delegation led by Prime Minister of autonomous Slovak government Jozef Tiso, travelled to Germany where visited Minister of Foreign Affairs Joachim von Ribbentrop. Ribbentrop promised to Slovak delegation that Germany will take a positive attitude to Slovak interests, but demanded that both countries try to find a solution themselves.[81] Also Hungarian representation was lobbying to gain support for their demands. As *Novosti* reported, Hungarian Prime Minister Béla Imrédy declared that Hungarian representatives look for support of Italy and Germany.[82] Because deep differences in Czechoslovak and Hungarian views on division of Southern Slovakia, even renewed negotiations were not successful. *Slovák* informed, that “*Boundary lines controversy is approaching a final phase. Because Hungary refused all suggestions aimed at solving settlement submitted by our government and Hungary demanded that decision will be made by Germany and Italy, there was no objection from our side.*”[83]

Decision was made by German and Italy on November 2 1938 in Vienna. So called Vienna Arbitrage was a disappointment for Slovaks as well as for Hungarians. The result of Vienna Arbitrage commented all Slovak periodicals without exception negatively.[84] Prime Minister

J. Tiso, did not tried to hide a disappointment when he said Leading powers decided, there is nothing what can be done, we must lower our heads and work.”[85]

As an epilogue, which summarized two decades of live of Hungarian community in Czechoslovakia can be cited words written by periodical *Slovák* “*We are staying in front of day of departure. An attitude with which you Hungarians are awaiting unification with Hungary is surely joyful, your peaceful stand is a sign that you are departing not with feelings of hatred but with respect. Our feelings are painful because we are losing you as a decent partner in a field of general goodness.*”[86]

### **Kritika revizionistickej politiky Maďarska v dobovej československej tlači v priebehu tretieho decénia dvadsiateho storočia**

Predmetom štúdie sú reakcie českej a slovenskej tlače na politiku revízie prevádzanú maďarskou politickou reprezentáciou v období medzivojnovovej Československej republiky. Maďarsko, ktoré stratilo približne dve tretiny predvojnového územia sa nezmierilo s uvedeným stavom. Vo vzťahu k ČSR bola cieľom maďarského úsilia revízia Trianonskej mierovej zmluvy, t.j. pripojenie Slovenska k Maďarsku. České a slovenské periodiká podrobne pertraktovali otázku stratégie Maďarska a zaujímali kritické stanoviská k snahám maďarských politikov o revíziu. Štúdia podáva stručný prehľad článkov, komentárov, analýz a hodnotení maďarskej politiky revízie, tak ako boli publikované v dobovej tlači.

---

[1] Fittingly described political nature of press in Slovakia publicist Peter Prídavok - „*We should not forget, that in Slovakia every journalist is in service of some political idea. And conditions are such, that no every newspaper man can choose political conviction or redaction which would be 100% suitable to his needs.*” *Slovák*, 30. december 1927. Maďarský novinár (Hungarian news media reporter).

[2] Daily Mirror, Sunday Pictorial, Sunday Dispatch, Evening News.

[3] Hungary's place in the Sun. Safety for Central Europe and Explosive point of Europe.

- 
- [4] *Národný denník*, 1. júl 1927. *Maďarsko ďakuje Rothermerovi* (Hungary thanks to Rothermere).
- [5] *Národný denník*, 23. júl 1927. Don Quiote de la Daily Mail...
- [6] Periodical representing views of Social Democratic Party.
- [7] *Robotnícke noviny*, 29. júl 1927. Lord v službe maďarských tisícjutrášov (Lord in service of Hungarian landlords).
- [8] *Slovák*, 27. júl 1927. Naša menšina v Maďarsku a Lord Rothermere (Our minority in Hungary and Lord Rothermere).
- [9] *Ludová politika*, 23. august 1927. Odkázali sme celému svetu (We sent a message to the whole world).
- [10] *Robotnícke noviny*, 23. august 1927. Obrovský prejav proti maďarskej oligarchii and iredente v Bratislave (Giant manifesto enacted against Hungarian oligarchy and irredenta in Bratislava).
- [11] *Národný denník*, 20. august 1927. Obrovská manifestácia v Bratislave (Giant manifestation in Bratislava).
- [12] *Venkov*, 8. február 1929. I Even Bethlen mluví o Velkém Uhorsku (Even Bethlen speaks about Great Hungary).
- [13] *Venkov*, 29. máj 1929. Socialistická touha po revisi (Socialist yearning for revision).
- [14] *České slovo*, 23. august 1927. Odkázali sme celému svetu (We sent a message to the whole world).
- [15] Agrarian Party published several periodicals in Slovakia. The most influential were *Slovenská politika* a *Slovenský denník*.
- [16] *Slovenská politika*, 8. máj 1930. Doterajšia iredenta nestačila - chcú väčšiu iredentu (Up to date irredenta was not enough - they want a bigger irredenta).
- [17] *Slovenská politika*, 8. máj 1930. Doterajšia iredenta nestačila...
- [18] *Robotnícke noviny*, 3. jún 1930. O predpokladoch a možnostiach zmieru s Maďarskom (About preconditions and possibilities of peace with Hungary).
- [19] *Slovenská politika*, 6. jún 1930. Rieka krokodilích slz v Maďarsku (A river of crocodile tears in Hungary).
- [20] *Robotnícke noviny*, 4. jún 1930. Desať rokov Trianonu (Ten years of Trianon).
- [21] *Slovenská politika*, 8. jún 1930. Upozorňujeme svetovú mienku (We are calling attention to the world public opinion).

[22] *Robotnícke noviny*, 23. august 1931. Bethlen odišiel, ale jeho režim má zostať (Bethlen has gone, but his regime should have remain).

[23] *Politika*, 15. október 1932, no. 19, p. 241. Nová vláda v Maďarsku (A new government in Hungary).

[24] *Národný denník*, 23. november 1932. Prastará maďarská pesnička: Revízia a reštaurácia (An ancient Hungarian tune: Revision and renewal).

[25] *Národný týždenník*, 27. január 1933. Plány Maďarska (Hungary's intentions).

[26] According to *Slovenský východ*, „Lately it became acute the issue of textbooks used in Hungary, because they contain articles advocating hatred and irredenta... What has to be especially stressed, is fact that not only Hungarian children are raised to such a hatred, but also children from Czechoslovakia, whom some parents are sending to Hungarian schools... This practice is calling for a special attention to be given to education of children in Hungary.” *Slovenský východ*, 23. február 1933.

[27] *Národný týždenník*, 21. apríl 1933. Ešte o revízii (Once more about revision).

[28] Precise translation is „he understands it as a goose understands beer“ – which is a popular Slovak saying.

[29] *Slovenský denník*, 10. máj 1933. Peroutka vodcom českých revizionistov? (Peroutka – a leader of Czech revisionists?).

[30] *Národný týždenník*, 5. jún 1933. Manifestácie, ktoré burcujú nielen Slovenskom, ale celou strednou Európou! (Manifestations, which rousing not only Slovakia, but the whole Central Europe!).

[31] *Slovenská pravda*, 18. jún 1933. Čechoslovácke manifestácie proti revízii (Czechoslovakist manifestations against revision).

[32] *Slovenský denník*, 28. jún 1933. Ruky preč of trianonských hraníc (Hands away from Trianon boundaries).

[33] „I is known,” asserted *Slovenský východ*, „that Hungarian revisionist propaganda placed London to the primary position. This is caused by several circumstances: foremost it is old relations among British and Hungarian aristocracies and then fact that in London it can be found always enough rich people who, not having enough to do and not know how to kill time, are willing to establish some new association and deal with issues of which they are absolutely ignorant. However, official British policy do not have with these circles nothing in common.” *Slovenský východ*, 28. júl 1933. Cesty maďarskej propagandy v Londýne (Roads of Hungarian propaganda in London).

[34] Archív Ministerstva zahraničných vecí Českej republiky (A MZV ČR), II. sekce 1918 – 1939 II. řada, š. 436, č. 809/1933 – dův. 1. XI. 1933. Predmet: Revisionistická a iredentistická činnosť maďarská – její rozšíření a prohloubení (Topic: Revisionist and irredentist activity of Hungary – its broadening and deepening).

[35] „Several events in European politics roused Hungarians to euphoria based on wrong conviction that a moment of “Hungarian justice and revision of Trianon Peace Treaty” arrived. With euphoria was met an Italian attack upon League of Nations and then Hungarians are going crazy with joy, that several misled and uninformed deputies in England submitted a petition in regard to revision of peace treaties... This

---

revisionist boom however exists only in sick brains of agents of Hungarian propaganda, who by a majority are not interested in a true national enthusiasm, but in a low hatred and even (morally) lower financial gain, because Hungarian government even at the time of its bad financial management of Hungarian national property is generously rewarding revision propagandists." *Slovenský východ*, 2. december 1933. Maďarsko proti trianonskej zmluve (Hungary against Trianon Treaty).

[36] *Slovenský východ*, 3. december 1933. Nový protest proti maďarskej revíznej agitácii (A new protest against Hungarian revisionist agitation).

[37] *Slovenský denník*, 3. december 1933. Bethlen a Jehlička v Londýne (Bethlen and Jehlička in London).

[38] *Národný týždenník*, 22. december 1933. Bethlenové úspechy (Bethlen's achievements).

[39] *Slovenský východ*, 25. marec 1934. Mussolini a „naprosto maďarské územie“ (Mussolini and „purely Hungarian territory“). Also *Slovenský východ*, 17. apríl 1934. Mussolini o revízii - vojnou (Mussolini about revision - via war); *Slovenský východ*, 18. máj 1934. Maďarsko do revizionistickej ofenzívy? (Hungary into a revisionist offensive?); *Slovenský východ*, 21. jún 1934. Pozor na Budapešť (Attention to Budapest).

[40] „Former Hungarian Prime Minister count István Bethlen, because of foreign situation, ringed a death-knell over revisionism and again raised a banner of irredenta. He is requesting that “newly established states do not hinder support of Hungarian blood brothers in Rumania, Slovakia and Yugoslavia”... What Bethlen presently stated is actually denouncement of foreign policy tactics of Gömbös. Gömbös instead of irredenta is advocating open revision, whereas Bethlen, when he was in power, supported irredenta. A policy of revision is an open fight; its aim is renewal of pre-war Hungary. On the contrary, irredenta is a hidden policy, is poisoning souls of Hungarians in newly established states and is supporting their anti-state attitudes. And such an irredenta wants István Bethlen resurrect to life.” *Slovenský denník*, 16. september 1934. Miesto revizionizmu iredentizmus (Instead revisionism irredenta).

[41] *Slovenský východ*, 2. október 1934. Maďarsko na rozcestí či na scestí? (Hungary at crossroads or at skid row?).

[42] Venkov wrote – „On the ground of various pretentions foreigners are tempted to visit Hungary and they are subjected to various influences. Hungarian aristocracy and high clergy became propagators of revision. Journeys of foreign visitors have a similar scenario - entertainment, hunting, flirts, czardas, banquets and omnipresent casual talk about revision. Every word of visitors is appearing in Hungarian press and is used as a proof of injustice committed against Hungarian Nation.” Venkov, 1. máj 1935. Čardáš v službách of revise (Csardas in service of revision).

[43] According to *Slovenský denník* „Our young Slovaks do not know „Hungarian ways“ of governing. For this reason they are clamoring for „united front of native inhabitants of Slovakia“, because they have no idea what kind of trap they are preparing for themselves and to the Nation... primarily they are members of our young autonomist intelligentsia, who are adhered around periodical Line-up. They unconsciously absorbed a spirit of Hungarism... They want an union - allegedly for reasons of achievement of autonomia - even with our anti-state Hungarians.” *Slovenský denník*, 12. júl 1935. Maďarské plány so Slovenskom pre prípad uskutočnenia revízie (Hungarian plans with Slovakia in case of revision enactment).

[44] B. Šolc asserted, that „Whereas in all European states occurred after war more or less deep political and social changes, in Hungary rules same spirit, people of same class with help of same electoral system as was before war. Peasants remained landless, large estates were not divided, even an assimilative policy toward minorities was preserved to the last point... Since year 1920, this policy has only one goal: to remove a state of affairs which was in Central Europe established by Trianon Peace Treaty.” *Slovenský východ*, 8. október 1935. Maďarský revizionizmus a Československo. I. (Hungarian revisionism

and Czechoslovakia. I.).

[45] In second part of his series author further stated that described strategy had only slight success, with exception of British aristocracy positively inclined toward Hungarian aristocracy „*which is for natural reasons the most devoted pursuer of revisionist principle*“. *Slovenský východ*, 10. október 1935. Maďarský revizionizmus a Československo. II. (Hungarian revisionism and Czechoslovakia. II.).

[46] *Slovenský východ*, 13. október 1935. Maďarský revizionizmus a Československo. V. (Hungarian revisionism and Czechoslovakia. V.).

[47] *Venkov*, 18. február 1936. Malá dohoda nepripustí žádnou revisi hranic (Little Entente will not allow any revision of boundary lines).

[48] „*Magazines are vividly commenting visit of Hungarian Regent Horthy in Germany where he met German Chancellor Hitler. All attention is devoted to relations between Hungary and Germany. According to periodical “Matin” Regent Horthy informed Hitler about implementation of general military duty in Hungary and asked Hitler’s support in case of Little Entente reaction. Periodical “Ouvre” stated: It seem that revisionism is entering to a new period.*“ *Slovenský východ*, 28. august 1936. Nové fázy maďarského revizionizmu (A new phase of Hungarian revisionism).

[49] *Robotnícke noviny*, 7. február 1937. Maďari v Československu a ich úloha (Hungarians in Czechoslovakia and their role).

[50] *Ludový chýrnik* was a periodical voicing views of Czechoslovak Populist Party.

[51] „*We are living in serious times and because Hungarian revisionist propaganda and irredenta is beginning against us more sharply attacking...Slovakia and her youth is calling for establishment of ministry of propaganda. Its role would be to fight continually against confabulations and lies of Hungarian revisionist propaganda... Slovak deputies should adopt this request and make shure that establishment of ministry of propaganda in the interest of Slovakia would be established.*“ *Ludový chýrnik*, 14. február 1937. Ako úspešne čeliť propagande iredentistov a revizionistov (How to successfully face-of a propaganda of irredentists and revisionists).

[52] After January 30 1933, when A. Hitler became Chancellor of Germany, Nazification of the whole country commenced. In following years Germany enacted a number of measures which violated Versailles Peace Treaty and led to a military build-up. On March 7 1936, at dawn, German troops marched over Rhine bridges and entered the demilitarized zone. Neither France nor England tried to prevent this transgression of Versailles Peace Treaty.

[53] *Robotnícke noviny*, 6. február 1938. Horthy nápadne slávne vítaný v Poľsku (Horthy conspicuously cordially welcomed in Poland).

[54] „*Leader of National socialist Germany,*“ wrote *Slovenský denník*, „*did not proclaimed in his speech nothing what would not be known from his previous speeches...However novelty and a very serious novelty is, that a leader of German state for the first time officially proclaimed right of Germany to protect members of German nation living beyond the boundaries of Germany and to secure of freedom of Nazi ideology also in neighboring states.*“ *Slovenský denník*, 22. február 1938. Hitler prehovoril (Hitler had spoken).

[55] *Slovenská vlasť*, 11. marec 1938. Odkazujeme všetkým: Nedáme sa!(We are saying to all: We will not give up!).

---

[56] A periodical belonging to press concern Melantrich, close to Czechoslovak National Socialist Party (Československá strana národně socialistická).

[57] Kálmán Darányi held a post of Prime Minister of Hungary during period 11. október 1936 - 13. máj 1938.

[58] *A-Zet*, 6. marec 1938. Darányi o Židech a maďarském zbrojení (Darányi about Jews and about Hungarian rearmament).

[59] According to *Slovak*, „.....negotiations of Prime Minister dr. Hodža with representatives of United Hungarian Party collapsed. Prime Minister as of today had a talk with Hungarian politicians, but without result. Hungarians in regard to further negotiations are placing condition that government adopted a program of complex solving of situation in Slovakia.“ *Slovák*, 11. marec 1938. Hodžovo vyjednávanie s Maďarmi stroskotalo (Negotiation of Hodža with Hungarians collapsed).

[60] *Robotnícke noviny*, 13. marec 1939. *Zostávame bezpeční a pokojní* (We remain secure and relaxed).

[61] *Slovenská vlasť*, 18. marec 1938. *Zachránime sa?* (Will we save us?).

[62] *Novosti*, 26. marec 1938. *Ludáci do autonomistickej fronty s Nemcami a Maďarmi* (Ludaks into autonomist front with Germans and Hungarians).

[63] *Slovenský denník*, 27. marec 1938. *Na cestách zrady* (On roads of betrayal).

[64] Uj Magyraság published a proclamation to „Slovak people“ to take into a consideration „a millennium of fateful community Hungarian and Slovak peoples“.

[65] *Nemzeti Ujság* wrote that „for twenty years fought Slovaks form their guaranteed rights“.

[66] *Robotnícke noviny*, 30. marec 1938. *Ludáci nádejou maďarských revizionistov* (Ludaks are the hope of Hungarian revisionists).

[67] *Robotnícke noviny*, 14. apríl 1938. *Z Budapešti volajú „slovenských bratov“ do boja za „spoločnú vlasť“* (From Budapest they are calling „Slovak brothers“ to fight for a „common country“).

[68] *Robotnícke noviny*, 22. apríl 1938. *Susedstvo Hitlerovho Nemecka a Hlinkovo spojenectvo s Henleinom a Esterházym vyvolali nové vzplanutie revizionizmu v Maďarsku* (Neighboring of Hitler's Germany and Hlinka's union with Henlein and Esterházy evoked a new eruption of revisionism in Hungary).

[69] *A-Zet*, 14. máj 1938. *Demise vlády v Maďarsku* (A demission of government in Hungary). Tiež *Slovenská politika*, 18. máj 1938. *Nový maďarký minister predseda Imrédy vyhlásil vojnu nacistom* (A new Prime Minister Imrédy announced a war against Nazis).

[70] *Slovák*, 1. júl 1938. *Národnostný štatút a Maďari* (A Statute of Nationalities and Hungarians).

[71] *Robotnícke noviny*, 6. august 1938. *Provokatívne požiadavky Esterházyho Maďarov* (Provocative demands of Esterházy's Hungarians).

- [72] *Robotnícke noviny*, 23. august 1938. Horthy u Hitlera v Kiele (Horthy is visiting Hitler in Kiel).
- [73] *Slovenská politika*, 23. august 1938. Horthy k Hitlerovi (Horthy to Hitler).
- [74] *Slovenská vlasť*, 26. august 1938. Dohoda s Maďarskom (An agreement with Hungary).
- [75] *Slovenská politika*, 4. september 1938. Maďarsko - neutrálne (Hungary - neutral).
- [76] *Slovenská politika*, 4. Október 1938. Hlásia sa i Maďari (Also Hungarians are presenting demands).
- [77] For example *Národné noviny*, 4. október 1938 Čo dáme Maďarsku?(What we will give to Hungarians?).
- [78] *Robotnícke noviny*, 9. október 1938. Vyjednávane s Maďarskom začne sa v nedeľu (Negotiation with Hungary will commence on Sunday).
- [79] *Slovák*, 12. október 1938. Za pozornosti svetovej verejnej mienky rokuje sa v Komárne o revízii hraníc (Under scrutiny of world opinion negotiations are going on in Komarno).
- [80] *Slovák*, 12. október 1938. Za pozornosti svetovej verejnej mienky...
- [81] *Národné noviny*, 22. október 1938. Diplomatický boj o hranice Slovenska (A diplomatic war for boundaries of Slovakia).
- [82] *Novosti (Slovenský Východ)*, 22. október 1938. Košice zostanú naše (City of Košice will remain ours).
- [83] *Slovák*, 29. október 1938. Plebiscit nebude (Plebiscite will be not realized).
- [84] *Robotnícke noviny*, 4. november 1938. Po viedenskom výroku (After Vienna decision); *Národné noviny*, 4. november 1938. Vo Viedni padlo ukrutné rozhodnutie. Slovensko ožobráčené (A cruel decision was adopted in Vienna. Slovakia was impoverished); *A-Zet*, 4. november 1938. Ministerský predseda dr. Jozef Tiso „Stali sme sa obeťou nespravodlivosti.“ (Prime Minister J. Tiso „We became a victim of injustice.“).
- [85] *Robotnícke noviny*, 4. november 1938. Po viedenskom výroku (After Vienna decision).
- [86] *Slovák*, 4. november 1938. Rana, ktorú dostalo Slovensko, je veľká(Wound which Slovakia suffered is big).