

**ROUMANIA  
TEN YEARS AFTER**

# Roumania

## Ten Years After

By a deputation from the  
American Committee on the Rights  
of Religious Minorities

**T**HIS book reveals what four representative Americans and one Frenchman saw during a visit to Roumania, which took them into every quarter of the greater kingdom established by the Peace Treaties. It surveys the political and economic background and gives an account of the political situation under the so-called Liberal Party. The condition of the minority peoples—Russian, Austrian, Hungarian, German, Jewish, and others is set forth as evidenced in the various institutions of their cultural life.

The rights of citizenship, the laws governing them and the way in which these laws are applied, their centuries-old schools and churches are all treated from the standpoint of the rights which the Peace Treaties guaranteed, and the actual treatment which they are receiving from the hands of the Government.

Whether the creation of Greater Roumania has been justified in terms of the happiness and welfare of millions of people may be judged by the reader. The facts as set forth are in the interest of no prejudice and are handled with justice and fairness to all concerned.

THE BEACON PRESS, Inc.

25 Beacon Street

Boston, Mass.

NEW YORK  
285 Madison Avenue

CHICAGO  
105 South Dearborn Street

SAN FRANCISCO  
620 Phelan Building

*Roumania*  
*Ten Years After*



THE BEACON PRESS, INC.  
25 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

*Copyright, 1928*

**THE BEACON PRESS, INC.**

All Rights Reserved

Printed in the United States of America

## THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF RELIGIOUS MINORITIES

REV. HENRY A. ATKINSON, D.D.	HON. JULIAN MACK
DR. CLIFFORD W. BARNES	HON. THEODORE MARBURG
REV. SYLVESTER W. BEACH, D.D.	HON. LOUIS MARSHALL, LL.D.
REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.	REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.
REV. ARTHUR J. BROWN, D.D., LL.D.	HON. DAVID HUNTER MILLER
PROFESSOR PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN	REV. KENNETH D. MILLER
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER	MR. JOHN F. MOORS
REV. HENRY SLOANE COFFIN, D.D.	REV. JOHN A. MOREHEAD, D.D.
REV. LOUIS C. CORNISH, D.D.	HON. HENRY MORGENTHAU, LL.D.
THE MOST REV. MICHAEL J. CURLEY, D.D.	MR. ADOLPH S. OCHS
HON. VICTOR J. DOWLING, LL.D.	MR. GEORGE A. PLIMPTON, LL.D.
REV. SAMUEL A. ELIOT, D.D.	HON. FRANK LYON POLK
HON. ABRAM I. ELKUS, LL.D.	MR. BERNARD G. RICHARDS
PRES. W. H. P. FAUNCE, D.D. LL.D.	VERY REV. HOWARD C. ROBBINS, D.D.
HON. JOHN H. FINLEY, LL.D.	REV. CHARLES E. SCHAEFFER, D.D.
PRES. FRANK J. GOODNOW, LL.D.	RT. REV. JOSEPH SCHREMS, D.D.
MR. LINLEY V. GORDON	PROFESSOR JAMES BROWN SCOTT
PRES. HAMILTON HOLT, LL.D.	DR. ALBERT SHAW
HON. HERBERT C. HOOVER, LL.D.	MR. CARL SHERMAN
HON. MORTON D. HULL	MR. FRED B. SMITH
MR. OTTO H. KAHN	REV. GEORGE STEWART, D.D.
REV. FREDERICK H. KNUBEL, D.D.	HON. WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT, LL.D.
HON. ROBERT LANSING, LL.D.	REV. WORTH M. TIPPY, D.D.
REV. JOHN HOWLAND LATHROP, D.D.	MR. FENNELL P. TURNER
REV. ALBERT G. LAWSON, D.D.	DR. JAMES J. WALSH
MR. IVY L. LEE	MR. SCHUYLER N. WARREN, JR.
REV. FREDERICK LYNCH, D.D.	HON. GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM, LL.D.
BISHOP WILLIAM F. McDOWELL, D.D.	BISHOP LUTHER B. WILSON, D.D., LL.D.
REV. CHARLES S. MACFARLAND, D.D. LL.D.	RABBI STEPHEN S. WISE, D.D.

The members of the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities assume no personal responsibility for the following statements. The Commission was appointed by the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities and presents this report to all the members of the Committee and to the public.

## FOREWORD

At a meeting of the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities held in New York City on April 7, 1927, it was voted to send a commission to visit the Kingdom of Roumania during the summer of 1927 to investigate the condition of the racial and religious minorities embraced within greater Roumania. A similar commission had been sent by this committee in the summer of 1925, but this commission had confined its attention entirely to the minorities in Transylvania. It was felt, therefore, that a study of the minorities within the old kingdom, principally the Jewish and Baptist and the minorities of Bessarabia, Bukovina, Maramuresh and the Banat similar to that made of Transylvania and a survey of such changes as may have taken place in the last two years in Transylvania, should be made.

Dr. Henry A. Atkinson of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, was appointed chairman of the commission. Rev. R. A. McGowan of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Dr. John Howland Lathrop, a Unitarian minister of New York, Dr. Graham Hunter, a Presbyterian minister of Fullerton, Calif., and Monsieur Jules Jezequel, the Paris representative of the Church Peace Union, constituted the commission.

We arrived in Bucharest June 12, and the last member of the commission left Roumania the last week in July. We were courteously received by the heads of the

various departments of the Roumanian government and assured that our visit was welcomed by them, since they desired the truth to be known in America concerning Roumania, and felt that that truth, when uncovered by us, would enhance the reputation of Roumania. The use of a government car was offered us and this generous offer was accepted for the first ten days of our travels with the understanding that we should be privileged to make our investigations unescorted by any government official. However, an official was appointed to accompany us but in spite of this fact we were able to carry out our interviews in private. For the remainder of our trip we hired automobiles and travelled unescorted, having been furnished by the government with letters to the civil and military authorities. We engaged for a portion of our travels, where the Magyar language was spoken, two interpreters. In all other sections of the country we found English, French and German sufficient.

Our method was to interview in all cities and villages visited, the clergy, Jewish, Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant alike, the editors of the newspapers, school teachers, lawyers, and such citizens as we were able. Dr. Atkinson was obliged to leave the commission before the visit to Transylvania, the Maramuresh and the Banat, and Dr. Lathrop acted as chairman. We returned to Bucharest after visiting Moladvia, Bessarabia and Bukovina, and made a brief report to the government, and two members of the commission, Father McGowan and Dr. Hunter, returned to Bucharest at the end of our investigation, making a brief official report.

In submitting this report to the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities, we have made no attempt to list specific instances of abuses of the rights of minorities, as was done by the former commission. We have deemed it wise this time to use such instances purely as illustrative material and to deal in this report rather with the general policies and attitudes of the Roumanian government. More important than the correction of any single abuse is needed, it seems to us, a radical change on the part of the government in its policies in dealing with the minorities.

It is our hope that this report may prove not only informative to the committee which sent us, but also of constructive suggestion to the Roumanian government when it has had an opportunity to see how the situation looks to outside and unprejudiced persons.



## CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
FOREWORD.	v
I. THE BACKGROUND. . . . .	1
II. THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM. . . . .	13
III. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF FEAR. . . . .	20
IV. ANTI-JEWISH PROPAGANDA. . . . .	29
V. THE GOVERNMENTAL ATTITUDE AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW. . . . .	34
VI. CITIZENSHIP. . . . .	39
VII. THE SCHOOLS. . . . .	48
VIII. THE CHURCHES. . . . .	90
IX. CONCLUSIONS. . . . .	108
APPENDIX.	
THROUGH FRENCH EYES. . . . .	119

**APPENDIX**

**RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN ROUMANIA**

*APPENDIX*  
**THROUGH FRENCH EYES**  
*Report of the French Delegate,*  
**PASTOR JULES JEZEQUEL**

I visited the greater part of Roumania as a member of a Commission sent by the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities, to study the situation of religious minorities, and particularly the Jewish minorities of that country. I toured the old Kingdom and the provinces of Bessarabia and Transylvania, annexed to it after the war, from the 15th of June to the 10th of July, by railroad and automobile so that I might see the country and the towns.

*Preliminary Remarks*

After such a short and hasty journey, it would be presumption on my part to pretend to know Roumania, great as she now is. The great, difficult and delicate problem, which is commonly called the problem of minorities, also requires several months of persevering study.

I do not flatter myself that I saw and heard everything, but I did discuss the question with more than a hundred persons from many different walks in life. I can say with certainty that all who have conducted like investigations will agree that I am only reporting evidence and facts that would catch the eye of any impartial observer, and which would impress them with unquestionable force.

Nevertheless, before making public the results of our inquiry as to the present status of religious minorities in Roumania, it is important to make several reservations.

It would be very unjust to judge the affairs of this country solely from an occidental viewpoint. If Roumania does not care to be characterized as Balkan, she must recognize the fact that she is oriental. Now the conception of truth in the Orient is not identically the same as that in the Occident. Although this fact must be stated, it is only fair to say that the Roumanians are not responsible for this difference in conception. It may be explained historically, recalling for instance, that Roumania was subject during centuries to the Turkish yoke, that she has only just achieved her full political autonomy. But all explanations which might be made would not eliminate but would serve only to emphasize this difference in conception. Another reservation should also be made. If there are religious minorities in Roumania the fault is not hers. She is not responsible, or if she is to be held responsible, it would be to her credit; showing her to be an hospitable and tolerant country. But she is not responsible in the critical sense of the word, for 800,000 Jews have come and settled themselves in her land. In times past Roumania's strong neighbor, Hungary, took from her and colonized Transylvania, where there were strong Roman Catholic and Protestant Minorities. After the war this province was justly restored to Roumania and the Minorities automatically became an element of Roumania. This accounts for the minorities problem which Roumania now faces. She has not yet discovered how to control that problem. The solution is hard to find. And it is a particularly difficult question for Roumania on account of her social constitution.

---

The Roumanian population may be divided into two categories—very sharply defined. On the one hand the peasantry, which comprises nearly the whole of the population. This is an uninformed and uneducated mass: eighty per cent of the men and ninety-five per cent of the women know neither how to write nor how to read. All were serfs only a few years ago. The political rights, which have been given to them, have not yet given them the spirit of free citizens: moreover, these rights are rather more theoretical than effective. The Roumanian peasant appears gentle, tolerant, hardworking, but ignorance makes him the victim of superstition and fear. Since the war he has acquired the right to possess land and the expropriation of great land-owners has put into his hands a part of the national soil. Emancipation will doubtless come later through this great reform, but for the moment it has not uprooted the peasant from his century-old servitude.

Besides this peasantry, there is another small class, which really should itself be divided into two parts. One part is made up of small officials, the police and the administrators of the large and small villages. This part of the second class is very close to the peasantry, only differing in that it holds some power. The other part is composed of great land-owners, high officials, governors and members of the liberal professions. This last category forms really an "elite." Highly cultured, it is intellectually, and socially very far removed from the peasantry. It is this "elite" that the Occident is most familiar with.

How unfair it would be to judge all Roumania by this last class, and how unwise it would be to ask it to apply,

purely and simply, the rules which govern English, American or French minorities, to the minorities of Roumania! A nation which has no public opinion, in which nearly the whole population is unable to understand its duties and its rights, which is nothing but a mob and a herd, has need of a centralized, strong, if not dictatorial government, to prevent the country falling into anarchy. This necessity is all the stronger for the reason that only a river separates Roumania from the country of the Bolsheviks.

Here is a nation, full of promise, of which splendid development may be expected, but which is still an *infant* nation, trying its first uncertain steps on a new and unknown path. Circumstances over which it had no control have thrust upon it the problem of minorities—one of the most perplexing and inextricable post-war problems.

Here another and new aspect should be taken into consideration. I was concerned only with the question of religious minorities, but the question of nationality is so closely interwoven with that of religion that it is well nigh impossible to distinguish one from the other. When one sees the Transylvanian Roman Catholic and Protestant minorities united most cordially for the defence of their religious rights, one realizes perfectly that this unity would not be so complete if these minorities were not of the same nationality. I am not criticizing them, but this is simply one of those explanatory remarks that one feels bound to make at every turn in an investigation of this kind. For, in this oriental Europe, facts are so complex, so confused, and deeply rooted in an obscure past, that it

---

is impossible to pass judgment simply on one of them and remain just and impartial. These facts must be minutely analyzed each time and must be placed in their historical or geographical frame. No estimate should be made without certain qualifications. Under these conditions every study takes on infinite proportions. It is not practicable at this moment to study this question of nationality. A realization, however, of the complexity of the affairs of the Orient serves to remind one that no judgment, having any bearing on this question can have absolute value, but must in many respects be very relative. I hope that the significance of this remark will be borne in mind in its relation to what follows.

It is important not to under-rate any of the difficulties of the problem which Roumania has to solve. There are few countries in which this problem has arisen which have arrived at a satisfactory solution. Therefore it must not be counted a crime because Roumania has not been able to do what others, faced with less perplexing conditions, have not been able to do.

It must not, however, be thought that I am unsympathetic with Roumania, but taking all these reservations into account, I feel obliged to say that Roumania has not shown herself adroit in her manner of solving her problem of Minorities. Supposing she *has* attempted to solve it, it seems to me that she has attempted to solve it in the manner in which Alexander the Great cut the Gordian Knot. This does not appear to have been a good way.

#### *The Jewish Problem*

Let us consider first, the attitude of the Roumanian Government toward the Jewish minorities. I say—the

Roumanian Government. This distinction between Roumania and her Government suggests another necessary remark. One must remember never to confuse the Roumanian people with its Government. This distinction may be easily understood in view of what has been said above about the necessary division of the Roumanian population. The people are there, but they are there inert, passive, without either opinion or will, and taking no part in the direction of affairs. It may be said: but the Roumanian constitution is democratic. It gives franchise to every Roumanian citizen. True. The constitution of Roumania is indeed very liberal. It is one of the best and broadest in the modern world. Its Article 5 stipulates that "all Roumanians without distinction of race, language, or religion, shall enjoy the same liberty of conscience, instruction, press, right of assembly, of association, and of all liberties and rights established by the laws." It is admirable. A people possessing such a constitution might be supposed to have a large part in the direction of its national affairs. In reality, it is nothing; nothing but a scrap of paper. The constitution exists, unquestionably, but it is not applied. I saw with my own eyes, for example, that the political elections are a mere formality. They are managed by the party in power and for its profit. Although the opposing parties exist, they have no liberty. The "citizens" are conducted to the ballot boxes like a herd and drop in the ballot which the official authorities have handed them. Or more simply, the police vote for them. At times they vote with so much zeal, (if without intelligence) that they give the party which is in power a stronger majority than it desires.



---

Everything is arranged by the party chief, who divides the offices and favors. The people have nothing to do with it.

Let us recognize the fact that it cannot be otherwise. This uneducated peasant people, (uneducated, not because they are not capable of being educated, but because they are not given the means), has no opinion in political matters. Moulded by a servitude out of which they have only just emerged, or to put it more exactly, out of which they have not yet emerged, they can only obey orders. Could the governing body transform these ignorant peasants into an enlightened electorate in a day if it wanted to? Nor is it certain this body really seriously desires such a transformation. Whatever may be the case, the governing body takes the popular will for what it is, that is to say for nothing, and acts accordingly. Practically, it could not act differently. (One cannot help regretting that it adjusts itself so easily to such an entirely unsatisfactory condition of affairs.) In any case, this throws the whole responsibility for the conduct of public affairs on the Government. This statement accounts for the distinction drawn above and leaves one to deal only with the attitude of the Government, or, at least, with the attitude of the small class in which it originates and for which it governs.

Now I must repeat that the result of our investigation of the acts of the Roumanian Government, particularly as they concern the Jews, does not show the Government up in a favorable light. A great deal has been said about anti-Semitism in Roumania. If one were to believe certain press reports, the situation of the Jews in that coun-

try is intolerable because of all sorts of cruelty to which they are subjected. The words "persecution" and "pogroms" have even been used. I wish to say immediately that I found nothing as serious as that.

There is nevertheless a certain anti-Semitism in Roumania, a sort of extreme anti-Semitism which sometimes manifests itself in very regrettable violence. This anti-Semitism is in no way the act of the Roumanian peasants, who easily adapt themselves to the presence of the Jews. It is not even the act of the educated class, which as a whole condemns it. The Government is not strictly speaking anti-Semitic, but it tolerates the anti-Semitic manifestations of a small group of Roumanians, and it has a narrow and irritating policy toward the Jews which seems to be actuated by a spirit of anti-Semitism.

This anti-Semitism is particularly noticeable in the matter of public instruction. It may also be found in the attitude taken by the Government as to the concession of political rights to the Jews. The above mentioned Constitution accords rights of citizenship to every inhabitant, Jew or otherwise, who has resided from a certain fixed date in any portion of Roumanian territory. Roumanians by extraction have had no difficulty in obtaining recognition of their nationality. But the same is not true of Jews, even those whose parents and grandparents already resided in the provinces which came back to the mother country. In Bukovina, particularly, thousands of Jews have not been able to obtain recognition as citizens. They labor under a grave disadvantage by this act, for they find themselves put outside the law and are citizens of no country. To justify this state of affairs,

---

---

the Government replies that a large number of the Jews from Bukovina are suspected Bolshevik refugees and that their case must be dealt with with great circumspection, lest undesirable elements should enter the country. That is possible. But years have passed and the miserable conditions of these unhappy persons has not improved. And when one takes in account the fact that this ostracism applies only to Jews, or above all to Jews, one is inclined to regard it as an anti-Semitic manifestation.

Anti-Semitic feeling, moreover, although constitutionally forbidden, practically bars Jews from entering public office or attaining the higher ranks in the army. In reality, and with rare exceptions, commerce alone is open to them. In latter years, a few have been able to become lawyers and doctors. The magistracy and teaching professions are closed to them. And this, because they are Jews.

But it is above all in the matter of public instruction that anti-Semitism is manifest. Here we touch on a very delicate question and one in which it is very difficult to keep a clear vision. Public instruction in Roumania is in the hands of the State. Primary, secondary, and higher education is entirely dispensed by the State. Such a system should not present great difficulties. But this State instruction is not lay. The Orthodox religion is officially taught in the schools and colleges. Here is the first and most serious obstacle. It can be readily understood that un-Orthodox families cannot bring themselves to allow their children to receive religious instruction which is not their own. The Government asserts that un-Orthodox pupils are not obliged to follow the Orthodox religious

courses. I believe, however, in the face of many complaints and recriminations on this point, that this assertion is perfectly gratuitous. It may well be that here and there Jewish pupils have been granted a dispensation from attending religious courses, but such dispensations cost them so much irritation and vexation that they have been obliged to leave the school. From my own observation it was perfectly evident that actually only Roumanian and Orthodox pupils attend the public schools.

It is not enough for Jewish parents that their children do *not have to* receive Orthodox instruction. They insist quite legitimately that they ought to be taught the tenets of their own religion in the public schools. But the Government replies that this complaint is not valid because the Jews are at liberty to establish their own private schools.

In the towns in which they are numerous, particularly in Bessarabia and Bukovina, the Jews have established many private schools. But at what sacrifice and at what price? Visit these schools and talk with their directors and professors and learn the facts. In spite of the Constitution, these establishments are subjected to a capricious and arbitrary regime. Authority for teaching is only given for one year: it must be renewed each year: it may always be refused for reasons which the Government is never at a loss to find. In spite of official affirmations to the contrary, these private schools never seem to receive any subsidy from the State. This is contrary to the stipulations of the Treaty on Religious Minorities. And that is not all. A law dated December 22, 1925, closed all the Jewish normal schools. All efforts to repeal this law

---

have been ineffectual. Thus, the Jewish private schools are seriously hampered. They are doomed to a very short life through being unable to find the teaching personnel necessary to their existence.

The Jewish secondary schools have been closed. If Jewish families decide to send their children to the State High schools they are confronted with the "numerus clausus" (closed number) law, which certainly is not in the Constitution, but which has nevertheless been constantly applied since 1922.

But a much more serious condition exists as regards the higher education. Here it is not a question of a more or less insidious anti-Semitism, it is organized violence. Outrages and brutalities have persisted in these institutes of learning. The various Roumanian universities, particularly that of Jasi, have at times been the theatre of bloody scenes, of which the Jews have been the constant victims. These anti-Jewish movements began at Cluj, (Transylvania) in December 1922. The motive, it is true, which actuated them, has value in the discussion. The Orthodox medical students complained of being hampered in their studies because they were not supplied with a sufficient number of cadavers for dissection. Now all cadavers placed at their disposal were the cadavers of Christians, the religious law of the Jews standing in the way of Jewish cadavers being brought to the amphitheatre. Nevertheless, the numerous Jewish medical students practised dissection on Christian cadavers. The other students protested and summoned the Jews to either work on the cadavers of their co-religionist, or to go.

That is the alleged motive for the trouble which persists in all the universities. There is something unquestionably just in the protests of the Christian medical students, but one cannot but feel that this motive is only a pretext. Besides, the partisans of Professor Cuza, organizer of the avowed anti-Semitic movement, proclaim the fact publicly that it is really against the Jews that they are working and for the sole reason that they are Jews. Our people, they have told me, are a peasant people, poor and ignorant. These peasants naturally live in the country. This hands the towns over to the Jews and permits them to invade the banks and to take possession of commerce and industry. We saw the danger of our country being led and exploited by the Jews, strangers who hate us, and whose race are sowers of ruin and anarchy. This is a mortal danger to our country. We have notified the Government of the danger, but it has not moved in the matter. We have appealed to the intellectuals, to the "elite." We have met with only silence and inertia on their part. Therefore, seeing that no one will act for the good of the country, we have taken the only course which remained to us, that of violence. We do not pretend to solve the question in that way, but to establish it a fact. It has been so established, and brutally. During the years 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926 and 1927, with or without pretext, disturbances have not ceased in the universities of Roumania, which have had to be closed several times.

Without any provocation on their part, Jewish students have been insulted and beaten unmercifully. The authorities have not tried, or have tried only feebly, to stop these

---

outrages. Nevertheless these have gone sometimes as far as murder. On the 24th day of October, 1925, an anti-Semitic student, Cordeli Cordeanu, shot and killed the prefect of Jasi and his two agents on the pretext that he had allowed his agents to beat students who were making a demonstration. This officer was not a Jew, but he was not showing sufficient admiration for the anti-Semitic methods. His murderer instantly assumed the part of a hero. After several hearings had been put off and and after several changes of tribunal, the accused was brought to trial. He was triumphantly acquitted and then sent to France with a Government subsidy. No lawyer had dared to plead the cause of the widow of the prefect, who had brought a civil suit. Only M. Costa Faron, a great citizen, and not a lawyer, tried to make the voice of justice heard. He was made the victim of odious aggression. When this defenceless old man of seventy was in the buffet of the station awaiting the departure of a train for Bucharest, he was set upon by some twenty students and savagely beaten.

One can readily understand that it was then impossible for the Jews to remain in the universities. Of course, the Constitution did not close the doors against them. It may even be that the names of some Jews are entered on the university registries. But the fact is that there are few Jewish students in the Roumanian universities. They go and study outside the country.

Here again, the responsibility for this state of affairs must be placed on the Government. The students are not all anti-Semitic. Of the 30,000 who attend the vari-

ous universities, hardly a fifth are partisans of Professor Cuza.

It would have been very easy for the Government to suppress and to stop these disturbances. Particularly since everything is possible for the Government in Roumania. It did not suppress them. It tolerated all the assaults against Jewish students. This, in spite of the fact, that the members of the various governments who have held office since 1922 were not, with but a few exceptions, personally anti-Semitic. But the Government is in the habit of making use of the students when it wishes to create a diversion. It therefore tolerates all their acts. As for the anti-Semitic students, it is naturally easier for them to get rid of intelligent and hard-working fellowstudents by violence than to surpass them in examinations. They complain that the vital forces of the country are in the hands of the Jews. Why do they not fit themselves to occupy these strategic positions. Why do they not become bankers, doctors, lawyers, industrial leaders and merchants, and the Jewish question would be truly and loyally settled. But the Roumanian intellectuals have a very pronounced tendency to believe that all positions and honors are theirs by right of birth.

### *Minorities in Transylvania*

If we pass now to the consideration of other minorities we will find ourselves faced with a totally different situation, but one just as complex and delicate.

The victory of Roumania's allies brought her several vast provinces which really belonged to her, for their population was undoubtedly in a large majority,



Roumanian. Transylvania, one of these provinces, was part of Hungary before the war. She had been colonized by her conqueror who had established himself firmly. Important German groups had also established themselves in certain parts of Transylvania. Of the five million inhabitants of Transylvania, when she was given back to Roumania, 57.50% were Roumanians, 25.53% Magyars and Szeklars, 10.45% were Germans (Saxon and Swabs). There were also 3.60% Jews, 2.92% Ruthenians, Serbs, Bulgarians, etc. This made a very mixed population, as far as race was concerned, and not less so from the viewpoint of religion.

The Roumanians are Greek Orthodox; the Hungarians are Roman Catholics numbering about a million, Protestants, divided into Reformed, more than 700,000, and Unitarians about 74,000. Those of the population who are Germans by extraction, but have become Hungarian subjects, are Lutherans, numbering 260,000. To these about 200,000 Jews should be added. Relations between the Government of old Roumania and the Orthodox Roumanians of Transylvania were easily established. In the meantime, a Transylvanian peasant party has been formed which is not always in harmony with the Central Government. Serious difficulties however, are not likely to occur on this hand. But the relations with the Magyar, the Germans, and the Jews, were at once found to be very intricate.

Of the Jews, I will say nothing. The lot of the Jews of Transylvania is that of the Jews of the rest of Roumania. Of the Germans, there is not much to say, as they are treated in the same way as the Magyars, and

when I speak of the Magyars I am also speaking of the Germans. It should however, be noted that the authorities are perhaps a little less severe with the latter than with the other minorities. This is perhaps because they have behind them Germany, a more imposing power than Hungary. It is quite natural that the Magyar minorities are the most disturbing element the Roumanian Government has to deal with. They were torn from their country by force. This force, it is true, was that of justice. It was right that a province, in which the large majority was Roumanian, should be returned to Roumania. But this justice was none the less hard for the Magyars of Transylvania. It was naturally very sad for them to be torn from their mother country. They are in this way, it is said, expiating an old sin. But because a sin was committed far back in the past, one can hardly hold the present Transylvanian Magyars responsible, and one cannot hold a grudge against them for not rallying with enthusiasm and without regret to the new regime.

On the other hand, one cannot hold it against the Roumanian Government for regarding these newcomers with some mistrust. The situation is one of great delicacy. The Roumanians are in the majority in Transylvania, but these Roumanians are peasants. Their ancient masters left them systematically, one might say, in total ignorance. It is true that in old Roumania the directing class did not trouble itself to teach the miserable peasant. But this statement is not an excuse for the Magyars, however much they pride themselves on a superior civilization to their neighbors. Established in the towns, when

---

they were not in their chateaux, the Magyars of Transylvania, great landowners, officials, industrials and merchants reigned for their own profit alone.

Now, by a sudden turn of affairs, the disdained and despised Roumanian peasants take precedence over the superb Magyar. It is the Roumanian who has become master. The Magyar must bow before the uneducated and rough Roumanian gendarme. It is perfectly comprehensible that this gendarme, and the government for whom he acts, cannot wholeheartedly believe in the loyalty of these enforced Roumanians. Mistrusting their loyalty, and moreover, annoyed by the deep-rooted as well as irritating habits of these people, the Government has taken a distrustful and vexatious attitude toward the Magyars.

The different Hungarian religious denominations deeply resent this feeling. They have raised bitter complaints. Their lamentations are not, properly speaking, about ecclesiastical questions alone. They include also questions of instruction and of property. On these two questions they are most bitter.

The Central Government in matters ecclesiastical has respected things as it found them, equally for Roman Catholics, as for Protestants. But the Greek Orthodox Church is the church of the State. Other churches are only tolerated. All the Orthodox archbishops and bishops have a constitutional right to sit in Parliament, but only one Catholic bishop has been admitted. But that is only a small inconvenience. The essential point is that liberty of creed should be respected. And it seems that it is so respected. The Churches, provided they con-

fine themselves strictly to their religious functions, seem to have all the liberty that they can legitimately expect.

This however, does not mean that the religious minorities do not suffer from the new regime. From the first they were hit, and often hard hit, by the agrarian reform. Before the annexation, they possessed vast lands, whose revenues contributed to their maintenance. I believe that with the old regime, certain churches enjoyed bigger revenues than their needs demanded, but today it is certain that their revenues are insufficient. In many cases they did not have anything left because the expropriation laws were applied to them without mercy.

Have they the right to complain? The principle of expropriation was just. The peasant who cultivated the land, in the old Roumania, as well as in the new, did not possess a bit of ground. It was all in the hands of the great landowners, of the officials and of the Churches. To avoid a threatened peasant-uprising after the war, the Government took over the lands for distribution to the peasants. It was right in so far as principle was concerned. But the application was not always so. The State took into consideration itself and its friends, but it struck heavily at those whom it considered its enemies—namely, Magyar land-owners, and the Churches of the minorities. As far as the latter were concerned, the blow was particularly heavy, as it also struck the church schools. Now in Hungary, all the schools are church schools. They were equally so in Transylvania. Thus in a day these schools lost the most valuable of their resources. And the churches, impoverished themselves, had so much less for the support of their schools. And

---

they needed more than ever, because in these schools alone could suitable religious instruction be given in their own language. Another example of the complexity of Roumanian affairs! The Churches and the schools, left to their own devices, are thrown back on themselves, and for better or worse have become centers of Hungarian culture. Hotbeds of "Irredentism," says the Government.

Would it not have been wiser on the Government's part to have become the protector of these churches and schools? It has not thought so. It has preferred to adopt an antagonistic attitude.

It has tolerated the creation and functioning of private church schools, but has surrounded them with a meddling supervision. It has subjected them to annoyances and vexation. For example: no Roumanian child is allowed to attend a private church school. If any official discovers in one of these schools, a child whose name has a Roumanian sound, even though it is proved to him over and over again that the child is a Magyar or German by extraction, the child has to leave his school to go to the Roumanian public school where the Orthodox religion is taught. And it is only by good fortune that the private school he has left is not closed. I was told with such sincerity of an instance of this kind that I was obliged to believe it. A Roman Catholic orphanage had taken in Roumanian children afflicted with ophthalmia, for treatment. It had imprudently accepted for the care of these children, a subsidy from the Government which thereupon took the opportunity of taking over the orphanage. I gathered evidence of a number of acts of this sort. I can-

not guarantee that they are all true, but they are too numerous not to be significant.

Here is another instance of hardship. It is asserted that the secondary church schools, of which many are very important, have not the right to give graduating diplomas to the universities. The Government denies this. What is true, and this possibly explains the contrary statements of both parties, is that pupils, in order to acquire diplomas, have to pass examination before professors, who belong to the Department of Public Instruction, and are appointed for this purpose by the State. It is true, this system is not illiberal in itself. It can be justified with good reason. The minorities are wrong to complain of it. But, if, as they assert in all seriousness, the authorities profit by the system to disqualify as a foregone conclusion, the candidates drawn from the church schools, then the minorities have a right to protest.

These lamentations and recriminations are not voiced by just this or that minority. This fact in itself gives them additional weight. All agree in denouncing the bad spirit of the Government toward them. The harmony between Roman Catholics and Unitarians, which I observed everywhere in Transylvania, would not be so close if they did not both suffer from the same vexations and annoyances. If these annoyances affected individuals only, it would be a small matter, but they affect the most cherished convictions and most essential principles of the minorities. It is not surprising that after treatment of this kind these minorities are rebellious and restless, and that they do not always strive for an adjustment which should be their special work.

*Conclusions*

After conducting an exhaustive investigation for four weeks among the most authoritative Jews, among the anti-Semites, the Catholic and Protestant Minorities, among members of the Government, Orthodox clergy, among believers and free thinkers, I am convinced that all is not well in the greater part of Roumania. No matter what the officials of this country say, there is a minorities question and it is a very dangerous and disquieting question for the future of the nation. Certainly, the minorities are not numerically so strong that the Government need fear them, but they nevertheless form an important element of the population and it is important that they should not remain a foreign body. If assimilation does not take place, the health of the nation will be seriously menaced.

This assimilation will not take place unless each party contributes a great deal of good will. Good will is a primary and indispensable ingredient. But that alone will not suffice. Jews, Catholics, Protestants and the Government must understand that they each must undergo a serious self-examination. They must ask themselves if they have not a certain state of mind or habit or prejudice which militates against the desired assimilation. To begin with, the Jews cannot hope to enjoy all the rights of Roumanian citizens and still refuse ever to become real citizens. They are perfectly justified in demanding respect for their religious convictions and the free use of their own language, but as soon as these rights are assured, they should not refuse to allow themselves to be assimilated. Now it seems to me, that to

many of the Jews, Roumania is only a country of temporary residence. They should choose either to become Roumanians—it being understood that the Government should lend itself to this assimilation and make it possible—or they should go and found a Jewish State somewhere else. That is more easily said than done, I know. But the best solution of the Jewish question, both for the Jews and the Government, seems to me to be a loyal assimilation. Roumania would find what she stands so badly in need of at the present—a middle class.

As for the Christian Minorities, the question, although it has a different aspect, is not any easier to solve. Here again the solution demands good will on both sides. It is evident that the Government regards these minorities with deep distrust, not because they are Christian, but because they are Hungarians. These minorities cannot help being Hungarian, and they have not had to forget it. Perhaps they do not want to forget it. But their treatment by the Government is not likely to make them forget it. How shall this dead-lock be broken? Time must be taken into account. Time will smooth the way. But the minorities have also something to do. And I am certain they are willing to do it. Even those that remain Hungarian at heart, are beginning to bow before an accomplished fact, and expect to become loyal Roumanian citizens. It will be easier for the next generation to accept the fact, and the problem will solve itself. This will happen if there is an abandonment on the one hand, of an obstinate policy of vexation and annoyance which keeps the minorities in a state of irritation and hatred, and on the other hand, the abandonment of a cult



---

of customs and traditions in which "Irredentism" will find a fertile soil.

But above all, the Government must apply itself to the solution of the minorities question and to making Roumania a homogenous nation. I have said much of the Central Government. There is no other authority in Roumania and therefore none other is responsible. But I do not wish my thought to be misunderstood. I do not mean to say that each individual member of the Government is responsible for the anti-Semitic policy or for the antagonistic attitude toward the Christian Minorities which I have had to denounce. I know, on the contrary, that the majority of them deplore this policy because they know how fatal it is to the best interests of their country. But they themselves are not free. They are bound by old traditions. For past centuries, violence and brutality have been the instruments of Roumanian Government. Whoever holds a position of authority thinks he should be arrogant and imperious. Now the time has passed when superiors could beat their inferiors with impunity. The high officials are beginning to understand this, and undoubtedly many of them prefer to use methods worthier of the democratic liberty for which Roumania will stand. But the smaller officials are still inclined to use the old methods of brutality. When one sees it close at hand, one sees that there is much more occasion for blaming these methods than for denouncing anti-Semitism and the systematic persecution of minorities. The administration is bad, not only because it is unintelligent, annoying and violent, but also because it is a field for bribery in which this practice

flourishes abundantly. In a country where too often liberty is theoretic, the officials are strongly tempted to follow this regrettable practice. And because they have not yet the high civic pride which would protect them against this temptation, they yield to it. A practice which is a great misfortune for the masses.

But Roumania has an upper class capable of acting against these bad political customs. It is for that class to set itself resolutely to that task. The task is indeed a difficult one. The Government, all governments, must learn that order is not achieved by violence, authority is not born of brutality. A Government cannot be selfish, or bloody revolution will follow. A Government must not be blind, haphazard, following the course of events. Above all a Government cannot function by means of lies and craft. It is only by the force of established right, by far-sightedness, by wisdom, that a nation can be led. Solutions of problems by means of the policies of the past are only empty solutions. To preside over the lives of peoples requires work, vision and courage to guide them into lands of justice and liberty. Roumania is not without men endowed with these virtues. Let these men disfranchise themselves from out-of-date prejudices and dare to arouse themselves to action and their country will know a glorious destiny. And they have a force at hand which ought to help them. The Orthodox Church has preserved a profound influence over the people. She is its heart and soul. She can become its teacher and spirit. But she also must uproot herself from pernicious habits. She must enlarge her point of view and vivify her methods, not draw in upon herself through fear of strange

---

influences. Tolerant by tradition, democratic in constitution, she is ready to be the re-animation and the inspiration of the new Roumania. She is ready for a spiritual and intellectual awakening. May she have the audacity and intelligence to accomplish it. She will save the people in saving herself.

However, since I have no thought of giving advice, but simply intend to set down some reflections, there is one last one which I set down here because it seems to suggest itself. The occidental nations, and amongst them I include the United States, proud of their development and their progress, ought not to abandon their weaker sisters of oriental Europe. If these have not kept step in the march of civilization, the occidental nations are in a large measure responsible. They have not known how, or they have not cared, to hold out a helping hand when the need was there. It is imperative for them to adopt another attitude. Let them give their moral and material support to peoples too long despised. It will mean an assured future for these peoples. It will be for the health of Europe. For, it is very certain that Europe will not be able to resist the dangers which are gathering around her, unless she becomes a united and harmonious Europe where no nation will want to enslave another but where each will help the other so that all may attain to liberating Progress.