

Trianon – An Attempted Murder of a Nation Unmasked

*It cannot be that all in vain so many hearts have bled,
That haggard from heroic breasts so many souls have fled!
It cannot be that mind and strength and consecrated will
Are wasted in a hopeless cause beneath a curse of ill!
There yet shall come, if come there must, that better, fairer day
For which a myriad thousand lips in fervent yearning pray.*
(Vörösmarty Mihály: Appeal)¹

1.

Trianon through the Eyes of the Winner

(Based on the works of Yves de Daruvar)

“Now we know it for sure that the Sarajevo assassination, that is murder – which started the 1st World War – was committed by Serbia manipulating Russia, whose goal was to start the splitting of Austro-Hungary via the extended war. Serbia was only the means of starting the war.”

(GOBRON, GABRIEL: *LA HONGRIE DE DEMAIN*. PARIS, 1932.)

“If Russia won instead of collapsing in 1917, Russia would have gotten enormous lands; it would have possessed the whole of Poland, the Black sea and Istanbul. This European war was mainly the war of Russia, desired by its military leaders, as they wanted to make up for the 1905 defeat against Japan.”

(NITTI F.: *LA PAIX*, PARIS, 1925.)

There have been three wars initiated against Austria before, in February 1909, in December 1912 and in August 1913...

Henri Pozzi tells about the main and incontrovertible charge, based on telegrams he owns:

Without the secret Russian mobilization – this was kept secret from us for 48 hours so that we could do nothing to prevent it – our efforts to maintain peace could have been successful in the last week of July, 1914. There would not have been war. And when in the last moment Austria showed signs to accept a compromise, it was not Germany but Russia who refused that British suggestion to call for an international conference. It was Russia that pushed Austro-Hungary into this fight of life and death. French government – says Pozzi – went along Russian politics. It is beyond doubt – he continues – that our government, or at least the leading politicians knew very well about the July 24 mobilization orders of Russia, when the declaration of war, that forced Europe into war, came out. The proof of the Russian guiltiness was so obvious, that the telegram of Maurice Paléologue reporting the mobilization was simply left out from the Yellow Book, published by Quai d’Orsay, about the origin and reasons of the war; and the authors of which book had no idea that the real truth would revealed by not only Maurice Paléologue but by Sazanov as well. The July 24 mobilization applied to two third of the whole army and was considered as compulsory in four military regions (Moscow, Kiev, Kazan, Odessa) and the fleet of the Baltic and Black seas. This was the first determining gesture towards Europe that showed irrevocably to war, and that defined the German counter-mobilization in an elementary way.”

(POZZI, HENRI: *LES COUPABLES*, PARIS, 1934. 134-135. OLD.)

“...when the winners set the peace-conditions in Versailles, St. Germain and as well as in Trianon, the moral basis for the irrevocable decisions was the axiom of the guiltiness of Germany and Austro-Hungary – or rather their exclusive guiltiness...”

(POZZI, HENRI: *LES COUPABLES*, PARIS, 1934. 72. OLD.)

Hungary was supposed to atone for all the mistakes it had never made but instead, wanted to prevent. It was only Hungary – via count István Tisza – that tried not to get involved into such a “quest”, which would gain nothing to it. ... Hungary had absolutely no conquest-intention in 1914 and entered the war only because of its respect toward its allies and because of its own protection and perpetuance. Hungary knew it very well that its neighbors crave for its territories and are planning to divide it. And yet, in the 161.§ of the Trianon dictate Hungary had to admit its being guilty to provoke the war.

“Garbling the events of July 1914 were done mainly by deliberately misinterpreting documents. ...The mass clung to myths and legends it was fed with... The spreading of the real truth was simply hindered by a censorship, operating smoothly but effectively, and which censorship was in the hands of certain groups... Statesmen long

¹ Theresa Pulszky; John Edward Taylor; *Publisher*: Albion Editions, Manchester; *Source of the quotation*: Hundred Hungarian Poems

stepped down from power still try to mislead us. They managed to trick their coevals, they might be able to trick their children... they are the reason why so many fellow countrymen neglect the past... However, the last words will be told by history...

(FABRE-LUCE, ALFRED: *L'HISTOIRE DÉMAQUILLÉE*. PARIS, 1967. 11-14. OLD.)

... It is a broadly proven fact that Hungary can not be made responsible for breaking out the war, even though historian Ernest Dennis rascally and untruthfully stated first that the storm of June 1914 was made personally by Prime Minister István Tisza. Of course, the rascally untruthful Eduard Benes wrote already in his famous and infamous brochure from 1915, "Destroy Austro-Hungary" and he hypocritically shows István Tisza as one of the main culprits of the war. To top this, Louis Eisenmann adds to this lie with unbelievable cynicism, that Hungary is "terribly responsible for the European massacre." Simply, this is the case of the thieves, who, before anyone, call out "thief!"

"In Middle Europe there was only one person, who desired peace desperately, the honest Tisza!"

(GOBRON, GABRIEL: *LA HONGRIE MYSTÉRIEUSE*. PARIS, 1932.)

It really was the outright upset István Tisza the only man in Austro-Hungary's cabinet who protested against the war from the first day on, and, did everything before, too, to prevent the outbreak of war. He even offered to resign when his advice to step back are not heard. He also handed in a memorandum to Emperor Franz Joseph about the above matters, as this is testified by the cabinet records and some secret diplomatic documents. These were publicized in Vienna, Berlin and St. Petersburg after the war. After July 7, 1914 Tisza protested continuously that they should not send a too hard ultimatum to Serbia; he gave his wry acceptance when he learnt about the Russian mobilization after July 14, 1914. "*The Hungarian government learnt about the fact that Russian troops were being mobilized in Asia and that troops-movements were also observed in the Kiev area on July 14 in the morning end even before, on July 8*", Henri Pozzi wrote.

(POZZI, HENRI: *LES COUPABLES*, PARIS. 1934. 25. ÉS 27. OLD.)

It is also a well known fact, that at the end of 1915 the Gorlice breakthrough meant a fatal disaster to Russia, and after the complete occupation of Serbia Hungary basically considered the war as ended and came down to defense only. Hungary also demanded its German and Austrian allies to start peace negotiations with Entente based on the "status quo ante", except for the Polish regions freed from the Russians, as these should be united with the Austrian Galicia so that the new and independent Polish state could be formed. Based on the parliament records, all Hungarian leading political parties agreed on this matter in December 1915.

... prisoners of war, refugees and civil internees in Hungary were much better treated than anywhere else, during both World War I and II. This is why count István Tisza could state gravely in Parliament on October 17, 1918 the following: "*Yes, we have lost the war. But the Hungarian nation did everything in this heroic combat to gain respect and appreciation from its enemies. The whole world can judge how goodheartedly we treated the wounded enemy, how much we cared for the fate of the alien citizens marooned here. Where is the nation who fought with greater valor, and has more knightly feelings? Where is the people who fought with more nobility for its mere existence and had less hatred in its heart?*"

(GOBRON, GABRIEL: *LA HONGRIE DE DEMAIN*. PARIS, 1932. 138. OLDAL)

"The expression 'Czechoslovakia' appears first on January 10, 1917, in an official announcement of the allied forces, while the French, the English and the Americans admit the Czechoslovakian National Board – which would convert into the temporary Czechoslovakian government – as a party at war only on August 9, 1918 and then on September 9."

(D'ORCIVAL, FRANCOIS: *LE DANUBE ÉTAIT NOIR*. PARIS. 1968. 71-74. OLDAL)

It was the perfect fulfillment of the myth of Benes and Masaryk: they were two simple informers for the allied forces who had been simple emigrants before. But they became real political giants of Middle Europe by the end of the war after they managed to force their views on most of Western politicians, thanks to their connections with the USA and especially to president Wilson. "*It was a difficult job to persuade the allied forces that Austro-Hungary must be destroyed.*" writes Masaryk in his memoir, adding, that "*the 1848 revolution and the memory of Kossuth, who lived in exile in the allied countries, helped the Hungarians everywhere*", thus in spite of all propaganda, the Hungarians kept their good fame in the public opinion of the hostile countries.

"Masaryk could write triumphantly after this, that the main goal of the first World War is the dismemberment of the Habsburg empire." Of course, together with his panders, he saw the severe tumbler of the process. He notes in one of his articles, "*the year 1917 was a dangerous one from out point, since the emperor was working on a quick separate peace treaty to save his monarchy.*" And, yes: "*diplomatically it was not impossible at all to stop the massacre from both sides in 1917 – at the time of emperor Charles's peace suggestions, his brother in law, Sixtus of the Bourbons' Parma line was his mediator – if France got back Elzas-Lotharingia, Triest was attached to Italy and a confederation for the Danube peoples was formed where all members could enjoy equal autonomy.*"

(VALLERY-RADOT, ROBERT: *LES FÉRIEUX DE LA PAIX*. PARIS, 1936.)

It is still Masaryk, who, in his memoirs, puts a sharp light on the real motives of the ongoing horrible massacre, to

our edification: “I was meditating uneasily whether the war would keep as long as I have anticipated... Should the allied forces have a quick victory, I am afraid we would stand here empty-handed. In case of a quick victory we could not have gained our independence and one way or another Austria would have survived.”

(MASARYK, THOMAS: *RÉSURRECTION D'UN ETAT*. 64. OLD.)

So the only reason to drag this war to the extreme was to destroy Austro-Hungary, and to suppress the Austro-Hungarian peace suggestion at the cost of millions of victims.

2.

Some Additional Proclamations from the Winners

(Based on the works of KOLLÁNYI, Károly)

Dami Aldo, a Swiss historian specialized in minority issues wrote: “Had Hungary want to force assimilate the nationalities, it would have had power and centuries to do it... Hungary did not follow the example and politics of either the French kings or that of the empire or the revolution. Due to its thousand years’ political centralism France endured its defeats in 1815 and in 1871. Hungary was punished for neglecting its unifying policies and that allowed the nationalities to grow freely on its territory... Had Hungary really suppressed them, they would be long gone and Hungary would not get between the Trianon borders. The history of suppress by which other nations could suffer so much, is only a simple tale. On the contrary, Hungarians became victims of their liberal politics. The beneficiaries of Trianon have never exercised the patience and generosity with Hungarian citizens subjected to them.”

(DAMI, ALDO: *LE HONGRIE DE DEMAIN*. PARIS, 1932, 97. OLD.)

He also writes this: “... the situation of the nationalities in old Hungary was incomparably better. Any comparison is in favor of Hungary, though Hungary was always fingered as evidence unduly. Hungarians, who belong to the successor states now would be happy to receive similar treatment...”

(D. A.: *LES NOUVEAUX MARTYRS, DESTIN DES MINORITÉS*. PARIS, 1936.)

William J. Fische, well known British international lawyer wrote: “Sovereignty is the favorite word of leaders of states who would not dare to bring their doings in front of the court of international law’ forum.”

(MAGYAR SZEMLE, 1928. IX. [HUNGARIAN REVIEW, SEPTEMBER 1928])

There are some states that protest “against intervention of their internal affairs” when they are reminded to the fulfillment of their obligations.

The plans concerning the Hungarian Czechoslovakian border of the French Ministry of Foreign affairs were the following, dated November 20, 1918: “Slovakia is only a simple myth. Slovak tribes of northern Hungary have never formed any state, they have never been unitary, they are different in each village.” According to this French study the area where there are Slovaks in considerable amount is bordered by the river Ung from the East. Then it winds along [the town of] Sátoraljaújhely to Rozsnyó and Rimaszombat, then reaches and follows to North the river Ipoly by Losonc then goes down towards Nyitra and then towards Pozsony², reaching its outskirts but never reaching its downtown, then finally it turns north and ends at the river Morva. The plans go on: “It is only beyond this line we can refer to as Slovak land. Furthermore, the actual territory inhabited by Slovaks reaches only till the river Garam, as they have always been a minority to the east of the river. The hilly territories of Liptó, Zólyom, Terncsén³ are real Slovak lands. The ethnographic line we drew does not reach the river Duna⁴, which remained a German-Hungarian river. It does not include Pozsony either; There are some Slovaks working in different Pozsony workshops and Slovak peasants are attracted to its markets, but there are only 14 Slovaks while there are 42 Germans and 40 Hungarians in a group of 100 people. Pozsony is not the Slovak capitol, If there is such, it is then called Túrócszentmárton⁵.” This was the knowledge of the experts of the Paris Ministry of Foreign Affairs during the fall of 1918, before Trianon.

(PAIX, VOL. 69. FF. 28. 64., *LES LIMITES EN POINT DE VUE ETHNIQUE DE L'ÉTAT TCHÉ-COSLOVAQUE*. 1918. NOV. 20.)

Wenzel Jaksch, the noted Sudeten politician wrote: “At the end of World War I, why did offices of the Quai d’Orsay and the military staff of Foch accept the suggestions of Benes, thus abandoning France’s own peace plans? Why did they support blindly the demands of their allies, when by rights the decision was theirs?”

(POTSDAM 1945, *OU L'HISTOIRE D'UN MENSONGE*. PARIS, 1966.)

² To make easier the identification of the places on modern maps, the names of the places are the following: Rozsnyó, now Rožnava, Slovakia; Rimaszombat, now Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia; Losonc, now Lučenec, Slovakia; Nyitra, now Nitra, Slovakia; Pozsony, now Bratislava, Slovakia

³ Three counties now in Slovakia: Liptov, Zvolen, Trenčín, respectively

⁴ Duna is the Hungarian name for the river Danube

⁵ Túrócszentmárton, now Slovakia, Martin, or earlier Turčiansky Svätý Martin

We saw above that experts of the French Foreign Office was better informed on the situation on the Felvidék (Highland) than Benes described it lyingly – and yet, he won.

Jordan Theodore wrote still during World War I, in 1916 the following: “Peoples living in the Duna valley have common interests that would always group them into one more or less compact block. One of the compact interests was the Turkish peril. Instead of the Turkish peril they have the Slavic one and this is what fixes the heterogeneous alliance of these nationalities. We have to admit, that this grouping, lead by Wien and Budapest is undoubtedly one geographical unit... Therefore we should not count on its quick splitting... By the way, let us note that it is only virtually a dualist state, since the Austrian part slowly gets absorbed, vanishes, and gets under the rule on the Hungarian element: Budapest is the political capital.”

(REVUE INTERNATIONALE SOCIOLOGIQUE, 1916, 358. O.)

Lloyd Gorge, British prime minister admitted both in his speech on October 7, 1928 as well as later in his memoirs: “All data delivered by a certain group of our allies during the peace talks were untrue and false.”

(POZZI, HENRI: LES COUPABLES. PARIS, 1934.)

Jerzy Lukaszewski stated in *The Historical Geography of the Monarchy*, that “the multi-nationality Monarchy broke up only after a four year long horrible war. If it had been a house of cards or a worm-structure it would have fallen apart for the first blow. The opinion that its breaking up would have been inevitable is only rarely heard these days. The idea of splitting up surfaced with the states that were fighting against Austria-Hungary in 1914. only during the last months of the war. In a speech at the trade union conference on January 25, 1918, Lloyd George said, the splitting of the Monarchy was not the goal of the allied forces.”

(L' HISTORIOGEOGRAPHIE DE L'AUTRICHE-HONGRIE, PARIS, 1968.)

Colonel **F. O. Miksche**, well known history writer: “Czechoslovakia is the artificial figment of a peace conference, is the child of propaganda, and its victims were Austria and Hungary. New states were created that were not less ‘mixtures of nationalities’ than the Duna-empire before. However, they missed tradition and uniting force... The new borders, though, were matching the nationality-borders much better than the borders set in 1918-20.”

(DONAUFÖDERATION. SALZBURG, 1953.)

Also by **Miksche**: “It is easy to create new states using money and power. But these states fall at once as soon as the creating power declines or the political circumstances change.”

(WORLD REVIEW, 1951. NOV.)

A. de Menzie, French senator, about the Trianon treaty: “Historians would never be able to find out why politics of France snarled only against Hungary, since they risked playing Hungary into the hands of those – that is Germany – who really threat us.”

(CHARLES TISSEYRE UNE ERREUR DIPLOMATIQUE, LA HONGRIE MUTILÉE, PARIS, 1922.)

Payot said: “Hungary is a wonderful geographical unit, its parts are linked with each other consonantly, and can not be torn away without hurting the whole. Hungary is a closed whole and the separated parts – should the country dismembered – would rejoin with the lame body of the mainland by themselves, automatically.”

(OLAY FERENC: A MAGYAR MŰVELŐDÉS KÁLVÁRIÁJA. BUDAPEST, 1930.[CALVARY OF THE HUNGARIAN CULTURAL HISTORY])

French senator **Ernest Peset**, chairman of the foreign affairs committee: “... the Duna landscape ... used to be a great economic and military unit... the forces of nature, the order of the area, the logic of history, the reasoning of the mind, the strict orders of human geography... these all admonish us to join forces around the Hungarian core, if we want to create long lasting, safe countries. The Duna history created the Duna empire naturally, as a necessity. This empire had its *raison d'être* alone and its *raison d'être* from a European point of view in the role on protecting the East-West road network.”

He wrote later in 1944: “The “small Entente”⁶ stuck obstinately to it without understanding, overweening policy against Hungary. With this impenitence it proved that it was unable to understand European problems. These countries wanted to manage the unity of their states by squelching minorities.

(...ET LA PAIX, PARIS 1925. AND 1945.)

Henry Pozzi, former French diplomat wrote: “To the grand jurors of peace such things as geography, history, folklore, concerning the peoples whose fate they had to decide upon were utterly unknown. Wilson, Lloyd George and

⁶ The expression *entente* originally means the treaty between England and France, signed on April 8, 1904, which was often referred to as *Entente cordiale* (meaning “heartly agreement”). Derived from this name, *Small Entente* is an alliance of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Rumania to make sure the Trianon dictate remained in force (against Hungary, of course).

Clemenceau were all the same from this point of view." We saw before, Lloyd George admitted, they made their decisions on fake, untrue data. Pozzi continues: "It is a terrible charge which had never been mentioned concerning the responsible, but it applies to Entente's negotiators. They should have noticed the deceptive wangling of the representatives of Prague, Bucharest and Belgrade, when they tried to mislead Entente with imaginary statistics, memorandums and lies, and which then lead to the worst injustice in history of diplomacy."

Pozzi continues: "Clemenceau told me in October 1918, 'Among all war criminals the Rumanians are the worst strays! ... They were cowards in battle and traitors in defeat... and yet they dared to claim their shares on the peace conference!'"

Pozzi, again: "Izvolsky – Russian ambassador to Paris – was eagerly animating French public opinion towards war between 1904 and 1914. (Just like Benes and Masaryk during the war.) The corruptible Paris press made this work easier. For the well-informed historians the Trianon conference is the work of André Tradieu. Covered by Wilson and Clemenceau, he organized and created everything. Today we are in such situation that we know how horribly big the mistake was that he used to mislead the allied in Trianon; he also used his blind hatred and eagerness to make sure nothing is taken away from the promised loot of the Slavism of the Czech and the Serbs and the allied Rumanians; he [André Tradieu] had been their colleague, their paid agent."

Pozzi continues: "None of the defeated suffered so much as Hungary did. It was literally quartered, in the name of rightfulness. Its sentence was equal to execution. No fierce peaces have ever been so one-sidedly brutal, such pointlessly wrecking, lead by hatred, such that forgot the teachings of world history, not taking into account, that it awakens old rancour – like this "clever and indemnificatory" piece of 1920. The Trianon dictate left untouched the conquests of the armies of the so-called successor states – after the hostility was over, and, with breaking the ceasefire agreements. The same was done by the consortium of intrigue and greed for power with its propaganda articles and checkbooks – in fore-rooms of offices and editorial offices, at influential papers in Paris, Rome, London and Washington; they faked maps, altered statistics, documents, working with horse-dealer methods, just like in some fair. Clemenceau called them the jackals of our peace – unfortunately too late, only when he saw their manipulations."

(LES COUPABLES. PARIS,1934.)

Elisée Reclus, one of the best known geographers in Europe and spent some time in Hungary, knew the country well, and he said there was no other country on the European continent which was such an unbreakable geographical unit than old Hungary.

"The greatest asset of Hungary is that it is literally a geographical unit. The kingdom of Hungary is one of the most coherent area, from a geographical view. No matter how the fate of Middle European countries will change, it is sure that Hungary will always pay the most vital part in the arena surrounded by the Carpathian mountains

(NOUVELLE GEOGRAPHIE UNIVERSELLE T. III. PARIS,1878.)

De la Revelière: "When we compare today's Hungary to the Small Entene, we'll see it forms the seed, the center for power, and influences a grouping of tomorrow that can neither be neglected nor suppress. The Hungarians live in a fortress, which is the military and commercial center of the Danube basin. These peoples would have enviable economic capabilities, should they live within normal borders. This scheme of different parts should have been kept as one unit." De la Revelière had already seen in 1923, that "... the time will come, when the natural body that used to form Hungary so long, will seek to unite its separated parts, and these parts will find their ways back willingly to the main frame."

(EUROPE CENTRALE: ETUDE D'INCENDIE. PARIS, 1923.)

George Roux was studying the revisions of the peace treaties in 1931, and knowing the preludes to it, wrote, the during the war "governments were eager to increase the fighting spirit of the soldiers with strong, lying propaganda. Faking the facts became a rule, hatred became a holy feeling. Theories were made to make a moral self-justification, for inspiring the own folk and to demoralize the enemy. The allied forces had such a spirit when the Central Forces collapsed in 1918. Victory was unexpected and previously not hoped for. The desire to act quickly gave no time to sit down and think. Peace, the new Europe with unlimited authority was ready in flush of victory, in a few months. It was clear that Hungarians did not notice simply the forced territorial losses that were against all international law and happened without asking the population. Finally, there was one single voting in Sopron⁷, with the victory of the Hungarians and with Austria which was on the loser side anyway. In the new countries, supported by the victorious states, no voting was allowed.

(REVISER LES TRAITÉS? PARIS, 1931.)

Tardieu, one of the main puppets of the peace talks said not in vain: "We had to choose between a referendum and creating Czechoslovakia." He was well paid for the latter.

Saint-René Taillandier: "The Hungarian nation can not perish, and should it be put into the grave, it will wake

⁷ The voting took place between December 14 and 16, and was about whether an area of 257 km² (9 settlements were involved) should remain part of Austria or should be joined again with Hungary. Since then Sopron is often referred to as "the most faithful city".

sooner or later. Hungary, the martyr of the nations, is risen from the other nations of the Habsburg Monarchy by its wonderful political maturity.”

(DR. OLAY FERENC, QUOTED WORKS)

3. **VAE VICTIS – Woe to the Defeated**

(VECSEKLŐI, József: Trianon — Attempting a Nation’s Murder)

Nitti: “There were four horrible disasters Hungary had to suffer: the war, the peace dictate, the Bolshevik revolution and then the Rumanian occupation. Rumanian troops took everything out of Hungary, yet Hungary had to pay 3 billion golden marks as reparation.

Hungary lost everything and made all sacrifices to save its currency’s value, but all was in vain. Every demand of the Reparations Committee devalued the currency. The minister of foreign affairs of Hungary, in his memorandum of March 27, 1922, to the chairman of the Reparations Committee, indicated there was a close relationship between the committee’s actions and the devaluation of the currency. ... Half of the coal-production was demanded for Yugoslavia.

This crippled Hungary should pay at least 3 billion golden marks. The only idea the victorious countries had that they demand the remaining livestock the Rumanians did not seize.”

Nitti” comments on the method of the Reparations Committee:

“... you simply can not imagine a plan goofier, or rather more disgraceful to demolish a country without any reason.”

Some data on the costs for the Reparations Committee:

The salaries of the members of the military mission, compared to the Hungarian salaries:

Monthly wage of the Hungarian prime minister: 12 333 korona⁸

Monthly wage of a Hungarian general: 10 253 korona

Monthly wage of an average official: 5 833 korona, while

Monthly wage of an English general: 6 540 000 korona

Monthly wage of a lower ranking officer: 3 900 000 korona

Monthly wage of a private: 840 000 korona

This type of pillage and extortion is called “reparations” in Trianon.

Nitti: “The charges of the reparations committee, the borders setting committee and the military committee are so enormous, we simply feel humiliation and horror reading it.”

Senator **La Folette** of the opposition’s Republican Party hand in to the Senate the memorandum of the American Hungarians’ National Committee, which includes the following: “Hungary was so perfectly robbed, that they had no linen to make longclothes for the newborn; they were wrapped in tissue-paper; there was no linen to dress the wounds of the wounded, the Hungarian wounded literally rotted on the cold and hard hospital beds.”

The National Convention of American Citizens of Hungarian Descent looked upon the tragedy from a different view. In the preface of its memorandum it quotes Nitti, Italian prime minister: “International financiers simply hate Hungary.” The memorandum then continues: “So, it is the international financiers who hate Hungary This hatred brings misery, distress and intrigue to Hungary... Why do international financiers hate Hungary, when the Bolshevik wringed them when they victimized femininity and dishonor motherhood, when Hungarians coming out of church were hanged on the closest trees... Is it possible, America does not like Hungary just because it is a deeply Christian country? Christian civilization must not love where? Must Hungary stand armless, crippled, wounded, bleeding, haggardly and hungrily, as a deterrent of the international financiers’ hatred? Must Hungary be nailed to the cross for being Christian and because... international financiers hate it? Has Christian civilization no conscience left? Does Christian America want to see Hungary nailed to the cross just because international financiers hate it? Does Hungary have to die just because it remained Christian after glorious fights of long centuries?”

Baker, US defense minister in his statement of January 15, 1920 to the regulations committee of the House of Representatives shows data on Budapest child mortality in the first 6 months of 1919. According to this data, from 1000 child in January 1919 died 812, in February 966, in March 784, in April 577, in May 567, in June 635. Some official data: the Hungarian Child-health Council stated in its 1922 meeting that in the year 1921 80 220 children died between the age of 1 and 2. Profound examinations show, there are areas and towns where no healthy child can be found. This all, though, did not interest the politicians implementing the Wilson ideas. Even, it looks as though Wilson came rather close to his scarcely hidden goal, that is the physical elimination of the Hungarian people.

Turner: “We have to share responsibility with our allies for this massive killing of children.”

⁸ ”korona” – “crown” – is the name of the Hungarian currency those times

And now, back to Yves de Daruvar

The subject of the chase was the defeated Hungary. It lived to see that the Trianon dictate took 71,5% of its territory, and 63,6% of its population; the latter meaning a decline from 18 million – not counting Croatia-Slavonia – to 8 million people. As a comparison, Germany, according to the Versailles treaty, lost only 13% of its territory and 9,5% of its population, and according to the treaty of Neuilly Bulgaria lost 9,9% and 8,9% respectively. The Frankfurt treaty of 1871 cost France 2,6% of loss of territory and 4,1% of loss of population only. The only losses that were comparable to Hungary's are that of Austria with 72,6% and 77,6% and of Turkey with 61,6% and 39,6% respectively. We have to note, though, that in these cases the territories were all well separated both geographically and ethnologically-historically. The new borders, though, that were set for Hungary in Trianon were geographically absurd, humanly loathful and were a real provocation against common sense – and remained like that ever since. “*It was the most abominable and dumbest aggressive piece.*” – Pozzi wrote, with sound reasons, as we'll see later on.

(POZZI, HENRI: *LES COUPABLES. PARIS, 1934. 256. OLD.*)

Hungary lost 62,2% of its rail system, 73,8% of its road network, 64,6% of its navigable waterway. This way not only the economy of the new Hungary created by the Trianon pact was rummaged from cellar to loft, but also the lives of all people living on the periphery regardless if they were Slovaks, Rutenians or Transylvanians. They all gravitated to the Hungarian Plain as this was their natural market and “way out”. Between the two world wars the situation got even worse due to the dumb and frightening protectionism of the successor states. These territories that were force-attached to them, still communicate with Budapest, using the shortest, quickest and most natural ways rather than with the new capitols, like Prague, Bucharest or Belgrade.

At one sweep Hungary lost the majority of its woods, coal-mines, water power plants and mines. All salt, gold and silver mines were confiscated, that were the sources of its wealth ever since the Middle Ages. Hungary was cut off from its seas, too. The harbor of Fiume – attached to Hungary in 1822 – had the same role as Trieste had with Austria. 134 steam ships of the Hungarian commercial fleet were stationed here, and they carried 140 000 tons of goods in 1914. This port went bankrupt since then being meaningless to both Italy and Yugoslavia.

It would take long to list all the treasures that were confiscated from Hungary in Trianon. We can say that except for its agriculture almost its entire natural source of raw materials; that is 88% of its woods, 83% of its mines became parts of the successor states. “*Goods of Hungary that were taken away after the changing of the borders have an estimated value is 3,43 billion ‘gold crown’, evaluated by the Reparations Committee, of which we think was based on lesser values. Economic clauses of the dictate imposed on the country an onerous title of 210 million golden francs as well as other atonements in specie.*”

(DUPUI, RENÉ: *LE PROBLÈME HONGROISE. PARIS, 1931. 47-48. OLD.*)

You also need to add to this the shocking authoritarianism of the committees setting the new borders; they did not only cut the arteries of economy, rivers, roads and railways; they also cut channels, dams and flood gates as well as administrative and possession boundaries. We saw towns parted from their outskirts and surroundings, villages cut in two, private estates cut off from the mansions, mines cut from their smelters, population from its churches and cemeteries – this all because of a satanic desire to humiliate and that to make a martyr out of Hungary, which martyr is always at the mercy of some huge grace. Such sentences could be read in those days: “*New borders felt like real tombstones everywhere, carved in: ‘Here lies the Truth’... The borders of yesterday followed nature – says Georges Desbons – while the new ones cut through fields and houses, roads and railway stations with autocracy.*” The setting of the new borders was done obviously with endless injustice, which – we can not repeat it often enough – similarly to the whole of the peace dictate, was inspired by blind and unaccountable hatred, vile malice, ignorance and unacceptable bias. It was an absolutely terrible behavior against an old and valuable country, which protected the West for centuries. Georges Desbons, after listing several unbelievable incoherencies and extravaganzas, quotes the following numbers : 52 villages cut through along the Rumanian border, 22 villages by the Austrian border, 76 along the Czechoslovakian border, and more than a hundred villages and small towns that were separated from their railway stations, water supplies.

(DESBONS, GEORGES: *LA HONGRIE APRÈS LE TRAITÉ DE TRIANON. PARIS, 1933. 114. OLD.*)

Charles Danielou, the contracted rapporteur of the treaty writes the following: “*The greatest misunderstanding of the people who wanted to use the nationality theory fully was that they let 3 million Hungarians beyond the new borders, right by the borders, torn away from their homeland. 3 million compared to the 8 million who live today's Hungary. This proportion is a bit heavy. Who could believe that these Hungarians, with a deep national drive known worldwide, would accept forever that they would live torn away from their compatriots?*” He then adds, rather ironically, “*the Czech border was pushed forward 40 km-s from Budapest, just to make sure that in case of a war, Czech cannons could definitely reach the town. On the other hand, the reason to attach the Bácska territory to Yugoslavia was to make sure Hungarian cannons could not reach Belgrade.*”

(DANIELOU, CHARLES: *LE TRAITÉ DE TRIANON. PARIS, 1923. 11. 13. OLD.*)

All successor states were eager to create strategic bridge-heads so they could enter deeply into Hungary's body. Which means for instance, that a complete mass of 800 000 Hungarians were attached on the north to Czechoslovakia, a body of 400 000 Hungarians on the south to Yugoslavia and a third liminary body of 600 000 on the east to Greater

Romania – simply because the latter could have a north-south liminary railroad connection which also serves as a strategic traffic connection between the former two countries.

Renouncing the referendum and adverting to the borders of the continuous Hungarian ethnicity on the Hungarian Plain, Hungary should have preserved – beyond the Trianon borders, and except the Croatia side along the Dráva river – a regional band of 15-70 km-s wide (including the towns with Hungarian majority), which means a territory of 23 000 km²-s and with 2 000 000 inhabitants, who thus could have remained in Hungary.

On the whole, and just using round numbers, Trianon gave two million Hungarians to Romania, one million to Czechoslovakia, half a million to Yugoslavia, tearing 35% of the Hungarians away from the motherland, meaning one of three Hungarians became a citizen of a foreign country. On top of this, only 14 counties remained from Great Hungary's 64. While the territory of Hungary decreased from 325 000 km²-s to 93 000 km², Czechoslovakia and Romania doubled their before-the-war territories, Serbia quintupled it, growing from 48 000 km² to 248 000 km², its inhabitants grew from 4 million to 13 million. The Hungarian territory of 103 000 km² alone, given to Romania, is greater than Hungary's own that remained after the Trianon pact. The worst is that these astounding territorial growths, never seen before – and that have not been ratified by any referendum – led to the coming up of horrible political monsters that could blow up any minute.

On the title of ruining the ethnic mosaic of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the newly created countries became even more multi-colored and divided, and due to the autocratic method these countries could show no unity – neither geographically, nor ethnically or historically. Greater Hungary's population – without Croatia and Slavonia – before its discription contained 55% Hungarian, 10% who registered as German and 35% other nationalities, and the Trianon Pact created a Czechoslovakia with 43% Czechs and 17% Slovaks, a Yugoslavia with 39% Serbs and Romania with 69% Romanian – in Transylvania only 53%. Aldo Dami deduces from these numbers the following: a compromise pursuing equality should have taken only 35% of Hungary's population at the most, and this Trianon Dictate took 63% of it. It should have been enough to reduce its territory by one third only instead of the two thirds.

President Nitti writes between the two world wars: *"This discription was so horrible and dishonest that no one wants to take the responsibility for it and everyone is pretending they have no idea what this is all about. You can ask before this general shame, who wanted this horrible and unjust discription?"* He later added: *"To judge other peoples, we always have to put ourselves in their place. Let's suppose France find itself in a similar situation, that is forced back to one third of its national territory and population. What state of mind would they have? ... There would be no English, French or Italian, who could accept these conditions on the long run which conditions were forced on Hungary. Also, there is no Hungarian worthy of this name who could put up with this, should this be the Budapest archbishop (sic!)⁹ or the most humble peasant"*

(NITTI, F.: LA PAIX. PARIS, 1925. PAGE 104. AND FOLLOWING PAGES.)

"Trianon, on the international level, is put into the category of bad deeds of which no one speaks of, as if based on a secret agreement. This guilty silence, however, tells way much more than any allegation."

(DUPUI, RENÉ: LE PROBLÈME HONGROISE. PARIS, 1931. 47-48. OLD.)

4. VÉGSZÓ

We still not dare to declare, though there will be no cure as long as we delay: Trianon is the shame of the whole mankind. In the 20th century this was the only attempt to eliminate a nation, prepared methodically and done with cold blood. The executors and their successors – the beneficiaries of the outrage with unprecedented import – are persuaded to hide it, understate it, and above all, cover it with events with much less importance. And the news of these covering events – let them be either real or fake – are blared at us daily, hourly, minute by minute. Where these news, compared to reality, make you shake your head, every once in a while.

Whether there is a reason to talk about sins that never lapse, the sins of the drafters – and mainly the sins of the ones directing from the background – definitely belong to this category. Has any of them expiated ever? How long does mankind – and not the Hungarians – have to put up with this shame? Because Trianon is not our shame, we do need to emphasize it.

The word "Tria-non" means "three times 'No' "

"No!" – first it means no to the divine order, which created the Carpathian basin as a single unit, together with its – in all aspects – interdependent people.

"No!" – secondly it means no to reason, since it could be foreseen, that man – created to God's own image – can never defer to this gross injustice. They cast wind, and, as it could be expected, they would harvest a storm. Who will be responsible once the storm breaks out – as it really has broken out?

An finally, the third "No!" was said to fairness. If there was a nation which was undoubtedly innocent in breaking out the first world war, the prime minister of which nation objected to the declaration of war till the last minute – this nation was us, it was Hungary. And who was punished the most severely, the most unfairly of all the belligerent ones...?

We can not rate all the symptoms– referred to under "Trianon" – more convincingly as it was done by a

⁹ Budapest has no archbishop, it belongs to the Esztergom diocese

contemporary French historian a few years ago. “*At the end of the first world war we punished Germany, but we did not punish Hungary as there was no reason to it. Instead, we nailed Hungary to the cross.*”

[FOREWORD BY PÁP, GÁBOR TO „PALADIN FATE” BY RÓZSÁS, JÁNOS(NAGYKANIZSA, 2005)]

On November 3, 1918, in Padova the ceasefire treaty was signed by the Entente countries and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy which was on the verge of economical disaster. At the time of the signing there were no foreign soldiers within the borders of Hungary.

The Károlyi government was naïve (?? – editor) enough to trust diplomacy, to trust the keeping of the ceasefire treaty signed in Belgrade on November 13, 1918, which treaty guaranteed that the majority of Hungary will remain under Hungarian rule till the decision of the peace conference. This is why 700 000, till the end of November and further 1 200 000 soldiers were demilitarized till the end of December. It was when Linder, Béla defense minister said the following infamous sentence, “*I never want to see soldiers again.*”

In October 25, 1918 there were 53 regiments with Hungarian majority in the Monarchy’s Army. Once its demilitarization was completed, it became possible for hostile troops to pour in to the country and it soon became obvious that the victorious powers wanted to log not only the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy – which was the largest and most dynamically evolving country in Europe – but Greater Hungary as well, or rather the Hungarians.

(DR. SZOMBATH, TIBOR: *TRIANON BORDER TOWN WITH A POLICEMAN IN A DECORATED HELMET*, NAGYKANIZSA,

Edited by PáP, GáBOR

Quoted from:

vitéz KOLLÁNYI, KÁROLY: *Kárpáti trilógia (Carpathian Trilogy)*, (Kráter kiadó/publisher, 2005.)

Dr. VECSEKLŐY JÓZSEF: *Nemzetgyilkossági kísérlet (An Attempted Murder of a Nation)* (Antológia kiadó/publisher 1993.)

YVES DE DARUVAR: *Trianoni magyar sors (Hungarian Fate of Trianon)*, (Püski kiadó/publisher, 1999.)