

Italy and the Scandal of Saint Gotthard

Petra Hamerli

At the beginning of 1928 some European States paid special attention to Saint Gotthard, which was a crossing point between Austria and Hungary. The reason of this interest was that the Austrian toll-keepers discovered five railway carriages, which should have contained machinery, but in fact it was a supply of weapons.¹ Since the surrounding States suspected trafficking of weapons, the case raised dust.²

Beside Hungary, Italy also played a significant role in the scandal, so the examination of contemporary Italian documents on the incident is very important. There are not many documents on the subject, but they can tone and complete the picture living about the scandal of Saint Gotthard. The other State with political ambitions in Central Europe, France, can be considered as the protector of the Little Entente States, which mainly opposed the rearmament of Hungary. That is why the French diplomatic documents, which can be found in the collection of documents made by Ádám Magda,³ deserve an examination as well. These documents can transmit the point of view of the Little Entente on the incident. In my essay I do not wish to present the story of the scandal, which is well-known from other Historians' works,⁴ but I focus on the diplomatic background of the events.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

On June 4, 1920, the Entente States and their allies signed the Treaty of Trianon, which, beside the new Hungarian frontiers, contained orders about the Hungarian Army as well. The number of the soldiers was maximalized in 35 thousand, and it was ordered that the army “*can be used exclusively for maintainaining the order on the terri-*

1 A. J. TOYNBEE, *Survey of International Affairs 1928*, London 1929, p. 161.

2 Zsiga Tibor wrote earlier an essay about the scandal, mainly based on the news of the Hungarian Telegraphic Office (MTI).

3 M. ÁDÁM (Ed.), *Francia diplomáciai iratok a Kárpát-medence történetéről, 1928–1932*, Budapest 2013.

4 G. JUHÁSZ, *Magyarország külpolitikája 1919–1945*, Budapest 1988; D. NEMES, *A Bethlen-kormány külpolitikája 1927–1931-ben*, Budapest 1964; T. ZSIGA, *A szentgotthárdi fegyverbotrány*, Szombathely 1990.



OPEN ACCESS

tory of Hungary, and to the immigration office".⁵ The treaty not only limited the number of weapons and strategical vehicles, but it also prohibited the exportation and importation of weapons. But, it allowed to pass the goods in transit accross Hungary.⁶

In the political conception of the Hungarian Horthy Era's most significant Prime Minister, Bethlen István, the revision of the Treaty signed in Trianon was the most important factor.⁷ Bethlen thought that Hungary was threatened by the emergence of the Slavs who would encircle Hungary, unless it succeeded in getting back the Carpathians, a move which could defend the State from the Soviet Union's breaking and entering into the territory of Hungary. Italy, which was also unsatisfied with the Versailles System, and which — at least in Bethlen's opinion — was the natural enemy of Slavs, could help Hungary with the treaty revision. Bethlen thought that the Slavian hegemony was opposed to the Italian ambitions, too,⁸ because the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes — better known as Yugoslavia, which name became official in 1929 — found on December 1, 1918, obstructed Italy's ambitions for expansion.

Regarding Europe, Italy wanted to get influence in the Danubian Basin, in the Balkans and in the Adriatic.⁹ Yugoslavia meant an enormous obstacle in the realization of these ambitions. So, after the World War I, one of the main political aims of Italy was to disintegrate the Yugoslavian State, and the Badoglio plan was made for it, which intended the encirclement and the dissolution of Yugoslavia by intensifying the inner, ethnical conflicts in Yugoslavia. To realize this, Italy counted on the help of Romania and Hungary,¹⁰ because these two States were in territorial conflicts with the Yugoslavian State. So Italy began to approach Hungary at the end of 1918, which was accepted favourably by Hungary. Their approach did not become a real alliance at the time, since no political treaty existed between the two States. In 1920–1921, the Little Entente was founded, as a reticulation of bilateral agreements, in which Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Romania participated. This organization aimed at the conservation of the status quo created after the First World War.¹¹ Under these circumstances Italy, for some years, wanted to certificate its influence in the Danubian Basin by depending on the Little Entente. It made agreements with Yugoslavia in 1924, and with Romania in 1926. Even so, its relationship with Yugoslavia remained tense because of Italy's ambition to have an influence in the Balcans, and in the Mediterranean.¹² So, by the end of 1926, Benito Mussolini, who became Italy's prime minister in 1922, returned to the Badoglio Plan, thus Hungary got back in the Italian guiders' field of interests again.

Since Bethlen — as we could see earlier — thought to Italy to be the supporter of the Hungarian revisionist claims, he soon travelled to Rome to sign the Italian–Hun-

5 M. ZEIDLER, *A revíziós gondolat*, Pozsony 2009, p. 35.

6 ZSIGA, p. 8.

7 M. ORMOS, *Bethlen koncepciója az olasz–magyar szövetségről (1927–1931)*, in: *Történelmi Szemle*, No. 1/2, 1971, p. 133.

8 *Ibidem*, pp. 140–142.

9 G. CAROCCI, *La politica estera dell'Italia fascista*, Bari 1969, p. 13.

10 Á. HORNYÁK, *Magyar–jugoszláv diplomáciai kapcsolatok, 1918–1927*, *Újvidék* 2004, p. 27.

11 M. ÁDÁM, *A Kisantant*, Budapest 1981, p. 5.

12 JUHÁSZ, pp. 105–110.

garian Treaty of Friendship, Conciliation and Arbitration on April 5, 1927. Its public text contained five points. The first claimed the eternal friendship and peace between the two States. The second pointed out that their eventual problems would be resolved by proceedings conciliation, if the diplomatic negotiations would prove to be a failure. If the conciliation would not end in success — said the third paragraph — the signatories could call for arbitration. The fourth paragraph spoke about a protocol which regularized the conciliation and the arbitration, and finally, in the fifth point the signatories agreed to replace the documents of the treaty between each other as soon as possible.¹³ A protocol with 18 paragraphs was linked to the Treaty, which contained instructions on the realization of the conciliation and the arbitration.¹⁴ A secret agreement was also part of the Treaty, which claimed that — since the Italian and the Hungarian political interests were the same in more points — the signatories “*would politically and diplomatically support each other by the solution of the questions in which they are both interested in*”.¹⁵

After signing the Treaty, the Hungarian government could start its programme to develop its army. This development included the enlargement of the armament’s liability, the manufacturing of weapons, and the secret import of war material as well.¹⁶ It must be noted that during Bethlen’s visit in Rome a secret accord was made, pointing out that Italy would help the rearmament of Hungary by transmitting the Austro-Hungarian weapons that Italy captured during First World War.¹⁷ One of these transports was caught in Saint Gotthard on January 1, 1928.

THE SCANDAL OF SAINT GOTTHARD

By the customs examination on the Austro-Hungarian frontier, five railway carriages were discovered that contained machinery, but in reality it was a supply of weapons.¹⁸ The Italian commercial house from Verona called Commercio Universale Ferramento d’Ordini S.A. was its sender,¹⁹ and the addressee was Warsaw, while Nové Mesto (in Hungarian called Sátoraljaújhely) was an intermediate station between the two cities.²⁰ The investigation revealed that both of the two commercial houses were nominal.²¹ The Austrian customers immediately wanted to ship the carriages back to Austrian territory, but Hungary did not agree to it. Its reason — as Hungarians said — was that the carriages were found in Hungarian land, so they had to be exam-

13 D. HALMOSY, *Nemzetközi szerződések 1918-1945*, Budapest 1983, pp. 267-268.

14 *Ibidem*, pp. 268-271.

15 NEMES, p. 63.

16 ZEIDLER, p. 112.

17 NEMES, p. 83.

18 *Ibidem*, pp. 83-84.

19 ZSIGA, p. 47.

20 Hungarian National Archive (Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára; further only MNL OL), Magyar Távirati Iroda (further only MTI), News, Daily comments, K 428.a, January 6, 1928, f. 1.

21 NEMES, p. 89.

ined by Hungarian specialists.²² As a result, the case was made public in Austria, creating an international scandal.²³

According to the Hungarian Telegraph Office's (Magyar Távirati Iroda, MTI) report, the French press was the first to deal with the case. These French news told about an attempt to smuggle weapons in Saint Gotthard.²⁴ It immediately became public that the supply arrived from Verona, so France blamed Italy with helping Hungary's revisionist and anti-Little Entente ambitions by giving weapons to it.²⁵ The Duce was not disturbed by the attacks of the French press, and gave the following instructions to Italy's ambassador in Budapest, Count Ercole Durini di Monza: "Regarding the incident of Saint Gotthard I ask You [Durini — H. P.], to let Count Bethlen and the Hungarian political élite know that Italy completely ignored, and watched without anxiety those European — mainly French — news which were blaming Italy with violating the Peace Treaties, and with supporting Hungary's rearmament and its revisionist policy. The eventual consequences of the incident of Saint Gotthard will be borne only by Italy who is responsible for the events. The campaign against the Fascist Government least of all will obstruct us to give a helping hand to Hungary in the future, too, and make [Hungary — H. P.] sure of the solidarity and friendship which connect [the Italian Government — H. P.] to Hungary's nation and Government."²⁶

This letter, which was written by Mussolini to the Italian ambassador of Budapest, reveals more things. On one hand it shows that the French-Italian relations were not the best because of their rivalry in the Danubian Basin, on the other hand, it points out that Mussolini would continue helping the rearmament of Hungary, which meant the essential condition of the treaty revision. Mussolini's main interest was not the correction of Hungary's border lines, but the revision of the whole Versailles Peace System. It could result in the dissolution of Yugoslavia, and it can be supposed that Mussolini considered the Hungarian treaty revision as a key to this move.

The States of the Little Entente were afraid of the eventual rearmament of Hungary, especially Czechoslovakia was anxious about a possible Hungarian attack. These fears were not considered to be valid in every European State, for example the popular Italian gazette, *Il Corriere della Sera* — which was strongly influenced by the Fascist Government in these years — cited the words of the Hungarian legitimist politician Apponyi Albert, who called the anxieties of the Little Entente ridiculous. He thought that being afraid of an attack by the Hungarian army that remained after the Treaty of Trianon was pitiable.²⁷ A great number of the Italian politicians agreed with this, and they thought that Prague wanted to exaggerate the case of the weapons' supply, and the other two Little Entente States just followed Czechoslovakia.²⁸ The three States

22 TOYNBEE, p. 161.

23 JUHÁSZ, p. 111.

24 MNL OL, MTI, News, Daily comments, K 428.a, January 3, 1928, f. 11.

25 *Punte francesi contor l'Ungheria*, in: *Il Corriere della Sera*, January 29, 1928, p. 1.

26 Mussolini to Durini, January 6, 1928, in: R. MOSCA (Ed.), *I Documenti Diplomatici Italiani* (further only *DDI*): 1922-1935, Ser. 7, Vol. 6, Roma 1953, Doc. No. 6, p. 6.

27 *L'Ungheria decise a respingere*, in: *Il Corriere della Sera*, January 22, 1928, p. 1.

28 Durazzo (Italian ambassador in Bucarest) to Mussolini, January 19, 1928, in: *DDI*, Doc. No. 29, p. 29.

wished to make the League of Nations intervene in the incident, in order to restore the Commission of Military Control,²⁹ which terminated its work in March 1927, just before the signing of the Italian-Hungarian Treaty of Friendship.

Yugoslavia, which was principally concerned by the Italian-Hungarian approach, was less anxious than Czechoslovakia. The Yugoslavian minister of foreign affairs, Vojislav Marinković thought that Yugoslavia had to stay in continuous touch with the other two Little Entente States. Since the Yugoslavs also suspected that in Saint Gotthard the Hungarians were involved in the smuggling of weapons, they also supported the delivery of a protocol to the League of Nations in which they urged an investigation. However, Marinković emphasized that Yugoslavia was mainly attentive to the grave disagreements with Italy.³⁰ Moreover, in these times Yugoslavia wanted to ameliorate its relations with Hungary.³¹

At first, Romania, the third member of the Little Entente, claimed the delivery of the protocol urging the establishment of precedent, as loudly as its allies, but within some weeks it began to renege and took a stand on the postponement of the delivery.³² The Romanian minister of foreign affairs, Nicolae Titulescu gave a reason to this: “*Regarding to the policy adopted in Geneva by England, Italy and Poland, [which was to smother up the case — H. P.], his impression was that the Little Entente would be in minority in this question, and he [Titulescu — H. P.] thought that an adventure like this should not be risked, but proceeded with caution.*”³³

Of course, the reason for Romania changing its statement was not out of being cordial to Hungary. Mussolini was in the background, who pointed out in the midst of January that he would not leave the Little Entente to denigrate Hungary, and fructify from the diving of the weapons’ supply.³⁴ On January 27, Titulescu travelled to Rome to clarify the eventual disagreements between Italy and Romania, and after that, to negotiate about a commercial agreement with Mussolini. Both the *Corriere della Sera*, located in Milano, and the *Giornale d’Italia* printed in Rome — the latter was a daily paper serving the Fascist Government, too — communicated articles on the tension caused by two questions in connection with Hungary concerning the Italian-Romanian relationship. One of these questions was the case of the optants, who were the possessors of the lands monopolized by the Romanian agrarian reform after First World War, and the other one was the incident in Saint Gotthard.³⁵ Supposedly Mussolini communicated to Titulescu that both economic and political agreements between Romania and Italy were only possible just if Romania moderated its policy

29 Ibidem.

30 Dard (French ambassador in Belgrade) to Briand, January 20, 1928, in: *ÁDÁM, Francia...*, Doc. No. 5, pp. 29–30.

31 ZSIGA, p. 12.

32 MNL OL, MTI, News, Daily comments, K 428.a, January 27, 1928, f. 3.

33 Beaumarchais (French ambassador in Rome) to Briand, January 27, 1928, in: *ÁDÁM, Francia...*, Doc. No. 6, pp. 30–31.

34 Mussolini to Paulucci, January 16, 1928, in: *DDI*, Doc. No. 17, p. 23.

35 *Nessuna antitesi d’interessi fra Italia e Romania*, in: *Il Corriere della Sera*, January 27, 1928, p. 1; *Titulescu precisa con una dichiarazione ufficiale la politica romena nella questione di San Gotthardo*, in: *Il Giornale d’Italia*, February 1, 1928, p. 1.

towards Hungary, also in the Saint Gotthard case. That is why Romania, after Titulescu's visit in Rome, sought to react less belligerently to the happenings in Saint Gotthard.

In the articles of the *Giornale d'Italia*, which was mainly concerned with the affairs of foreign policy, and was edited by Virginio Gayda, it was explained that in the Italian political élite's opinion, the scandal of Saint Gotthard was an unremarkable case blown up only by the liberal press of Czechoslovakia and other European States. Italy thought that the Little Entente States had not the right to control Hungary militarily, and they did not have the right for this when the Allied Military Control Commission had been working in Hungary.³⁶ So Italy wholeheartedly supported Hungary, and, by emphasizing that the case was unimportant, it maybe tried to protect itself as well.

The consignment's assumed addressee was the Poland of Marshall Jozef Piłsudski. Even so, the Hungarian political élite continued to stick to the explanation that the weapons were destined for Warsaw when the real happenings were evident for all European States. "*The supply of weapons was — and is — destined for a Polish procurer. The machinery was kept here because the MÁV [Magyar Állami Vasút, Hungarian State Railway — H. P.] suggested sending a common commission together with the Austrian Railways to investigate the incident, which was caused by Austrians who broke open the supply after it had been transmitted to Hungarian territory. After this [investigation — H. P.] the supply goes to its place of destination.*"³⁷ — communicated Khuen-Héderváry Sándor, the constant deputy of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, in his telegraph. Poland gave an extremely fair reaction to the events. Although Piłsudski pointed out that Warsaw did not order weapons from anybody, he did not give an official rebuttal to the press, which meant a significant help to the Hungarian Government being in a grave situation.³⁸ So, regarding to the supply of weapons discovered in Saint Gotthard, Warsaw had good intentions towards Hungary. Later, Piłsudski and his Government explained to the Italian military attaché in Poland that they would have helped readily if they had known earlier about the transit of weapons. In this case, there would not have been a scandal.³⁹ It must be noted that Poland could have ordered weapons directly, without the need for a secret supply. Supposedly, this fact was one of the reasons why Hungary could not negate its attempt for importing weapons. Poland, bore in mind that the orders of the Treaty of Trianon did not allow Hungary to set up an efficient army to defend the country and remained solidary with its Hungarian friends.

Neither the presented statement of Poland was explained, nor was the protocol of the Little Entente States delivered yet, when Mussolini and Bethlen had already made a plan to smuggle a new supply of weapons addressed to Poland. Bethlen sketched out his ideas to Durini, and from these Durini forwarded to Mussolini the one which seemed to be the best. This new plan said that Italy would send two or three monitors

³⁶ *L'incidente di San Gottardo e la Piccola Intesa*, in: *Il Giornale d'Italia*, February 2, 1928, p. 2.

³⁷ MNL OL, K 64. 31. pack. 35.a item. 5049/4, No. 9, res. Pol.

³⁸ NEMES, p. 90.

³⁹ Archive of the Italian Foreign Ministry (Archivio Storico Diplomatico del Ministero degli Affari Esteri, further only ASDMAE), Affari Politici 1919-1930, Busta 1764, Fascicolo „Armi e munizioni”, No. 102. Telegraph of Mario Roatta (Italian military attaché in Poland), May 7, 1928.

[a type of warship — H. P.], and Hungary would buy them. The ships would fly Italian flags, and they would be stationed on the Danube until Hungary had the right to use them. The monitors — with the aim of a political propaganda — would cross the river every year, and the Hungarians would welcome the Italian flags. At every turn, the Hungarian Government would declare that the Italian ships could remain on Hungarian territory as long as Mussolini wished. The minor weapons, hidden among other iron components, could be delivered to Poland on railways, via Austria, Hungary and Romania. Another possibility to transport minor weapons would be supplying them through Germany.⁴⁰

But this plan referred to weapons' imports in the future. First, it was needed to smooth away the scandal of Saint Gotthard. On January 17, an Austrian–Hungarian mixed committee, with railway specialists, investigated and closed the case,⁴¹ but even so the Little Entente States delivered their protocol to the League of Nations on February 2, 1928. The Czechoslovakian and the Yugoslavian protocols were literally the same. They said that Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia “*thought to be obliged to attract the attention of the League of Nation’s Council to those consequences which can originate from this [case — H. P.] and, to prevent the graver happenings and consequences, they [the two States — H. P.] are referring to the right of the Council to intervene...*”⁴²

The Romanian protocol was different from this: [the Romanian State — H. P.] “*set out that by this moment there is no real conflict between the two States directly interested in the case [...] thus [Romania — H. P.] attracts the attention of the League of Nations’ Council to its obligation to intervene in the happenings to prevent the consequences...*”⁴³

So, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia wanted the League of Nations to give precedent for the future. Their aim certainly was to disincline Hungary for weapon-smuggling attempts, and so the two States could feel safe from the casual Hungarian attacks. The Romanian protocol shows that it was created to do the other two Little Entente States a favour. The Romanian text emphasized that the scandal of Saint Gotthard did not cause any conflict, so the intervention of the League of Nations was necessary to prevent any deeper conflicts between the States involved. Certainly the wish to gain the favour of Italy was in the background of this moderate Romanian protocol.

Although earlier France had reacted angrily to the Italian weapons supplied to Hungary, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Aristide Briand, extenuated the significance of the case after the protocol’s delivery. He explained that he had only known about the incident just from the columns of different daily papers, and these sources of information were not reliable enough to initiate the intervention of the League of Nations based on these allegations.⁴⁴ This statement was probably formed due to the successful intervention of England to smooth away the case.⁴⁵

Since the Little Entente States said that the League of Nations’ prestige would be damaged if the incident was not deeply investigated, on 10 March a three-membered

40 Durini to Mussolini, January 30, 1928, in: DDI, Doc. No. 73, pp. 72–73.

41 MNL OL, MTI, News, Daily comments, K 428.a, January 14, 1928, f. 15.

42 ZSIGA, p. 67.

43 Ibidem, pp. 67–68.

44 MNL OL, MTI, News, Daily comments, K 428.a, February 3, 1928, f. 7.

45 *L'affare di San Gottardo a Ginevra*, in: *Il Corriere della Sera*, March 6, 1928, p. 7.

committee was asked to examine the details of the case. These members were from the Netherlands, Finland, and Chile.⁴⁶ The committee called in two military, and two railway specialists into the investigation, who were English, Dutch, Swedish and Swiss by their nationalities.⁴⁷ “*It will be very surprising if new proofs will be found four months after the case*”⁴⁸ — said the Hungarian Telegraph Office (MTI). This skepticism was well-founded, because the weapons had already been destroyed by Italy’s request.⁴⁹ The neutral committee, which, together with the specialists, counted seven members, pointed out that there had been an attempt to supply weapons,⁵⁰ and with this statement the investigation of the case was closed.

Mussolini was glad that the dust settled after the scandal, and regarded it as his own success. “*I hope that Your Grace [Durini — H. P.] will find a way to inform the Hungarian Government and the journalists: the success of Hungary reached in Geneva was due to the solidarity of Italy. Always as a result of the Italian support, the incident of Saint Gotthard finished with the defeat of the Little Entente, and the liberal press which campaigned against the Horthy-regime.*”⁵¹ This statement is not completely true. It is true that the case was closed, but the Little Entente strengthened, and its States acted in close co-operation during the investigation of the incident.⁵² In the opinion of Durini, the scandal influenced well the development of the Italian-Hungarian friendship, because Hungary was touched by the fast and heartfelt help it received from Italy in the form of the weapons’ supply. So Hungary could be convinced of the worth of the Italian support, and about Italy’s international prestige.⁵³

As we could see, in January the leaders of the two States had already began to plan how to send the next Italian weapons’ supply destined for Hungary. In February, Mussolini and Bethlen agreed that the Hungarian leader would spend the week of Easter — from 1 to 9 April — in Italy to negotiate the rearmament of Hungary.⁵⁴ Bethlen wished to send the supply again to Poland, following prior consultations.⁵⁵ Italy was negotiating with Warsaw as well, in order to have Poland accept the role of addressee of the weapons’ supplies destined for Hungary. However, Italy was afraid of Poland’s negative response, because “*the incident of Saint Gotthard is too recent an event to be forgotten*”.⁵⁶

46 NEMES, p. 96.

47 MNL OL, MTI, News, Daily comments, K 428.a, April 10, 1928, f. 8.

48 Ibidem.

49 NEMES, p. 94.

50 JUHÁSZ, p. 111.

51 Mussolini to Durini, March 12, 1928, in: *DDI*, Doc. No. 155, p. 135.

52 JUHÁSZ, p. 111.

53 Durini to Mussolini, January 30, 1928, in: *DDI*, Doc. No. 70, p. 70.

54 Durini to Mussolini, February 15, 1928, in: *DDI*, Doc. No. 108, pp. 98–99.

55 ASDMAE, Affari Politici 1919–1930, Busta 1764, Fascicolo „Armi e munizioni”, No. 102, Telegraph of Roatta, May 7, 1928.

56 ASDMAE, Affari Politici 1919–1930, Busta 1764, Fascicolo „Armi e munizioni”, No. 940/365, May 12, 1928.

CONCLUSION

The Italian documents confirm that on January 1, 1928, an attempt to smuggle weapons was discovered. Italy tried to give weapons to Hungary, which was almost completely disarmed by the orders of the Treaty of Trianon. The Little Entente States tried to use the case to denigrate Hungary, and they were afraid of an attack by the rearmed Hungary to get back the territories taken away from it. This was the main reason for the Little Entente's claim to investigate the case.

The protocol of the Little Entente was delivered to the League of Nations, and the incident was investigated. But neither France, nor England were interested in a deeper conflict caused by the case. Poland that got involved in the incident in a nasty way stood up for Hungary as well. Italy expressed its support, too, strengthening the Hungarian-Italian relations. The organization of Bethlen's visit in Milano in April 1928 proves that Italy wanted to continue helping Hungary's rearmament after the scandal, too.

ITALY AND THE SCANDAL OF SAINT GOTTHARD

ABSTRACT

The Treaty of Trianon signed on June 4, 1920, limited not only the headcount of the Hungarian army, but also the number of weapons of war and armaments, and their import was prohibited by the peace treaty as well. The rearmament was a crucial condition of the treaty revision wanted by Hungary, so after signing the Italian-Hungarian Treaty of Friendship, the prime ministers of the two countries, Benito Mussolini and Bethlen István agreed that Italy would help rearming Hungary. A supply of weapons cloaked to be machinery was revealed on the Austro-Hungarian frontier of Saint Gotthard, and the States of the Little Entente — being afraid of a future Hungarian attack — decided to ask the League of Nations to examine the incident. The main question of my essay is the Italian attitude to the question: did Italy stand out for Hungary, and took responsibility for helping its rearmament? In my essay I would like to answer these questions after examining Italian documents as well.

KEYWORDS

Scandal of Saint Gotthard; Hungarian-Italian Relations; Rearmament of Hungary; Italian Attitude to the Scandal of Saint Gotthard

Petra Hamerli | University of Pécs, Faculty of Arts, Interdisciplinary Doctoral School, Rókus u. 2, 7624, Pécs, Hungary, petra.h@hotmail.hu