

"REVISIONISM AND TERRORISM ARE TWO COMPLETELY OPPOSITE POLITICAL IDEAS"

Probably no one has ever given a happier definition of the substance, objects and significance of the Hungarian revision movement than Dr. Tibor Eckhardt, who in his speech at Geneva explained the essence of that movement in the following terms:

"Making use of the worst lies of Mihalus Vinco, the Yugoslav request asserts that terrorism is one of the political weapons of the Hungarian revisionist movement. This is a deliberate calumny, against which I protest most strongly. Revisionism and terrorism are two completely opposite political ideas. In the present territory of Hungary there are hundreds of thousands of Hungarians who were forced, by the cruel execution of the unjust provisions of the Treaty of Trianon, to leave their native land, and in many cases to abandon all their property. There are three and a half million Hungarians living separated from their brothers of Hungary — nearly half of them quite close to the frontier — enduring that minority life of hardship of which I was obliged to give some details at the last League Assembly, and which, unfortunately, has assumed a truly tragic aspect during the last few days. I ask you, in the midst of all the persecutions, have these Hungarians ever lowered themselves to engage in terrorism? Why does the Yugoslav request seek to insinuate that there is a connection between Hungarian revisionism and Croatian terrorism, notwithstanding the fact that, even if the abominable methods of Croatian terrorism proved successful, their success would be of no importance or significance whatsoever from the standpoint of the revisionist policy? Is it not known that the Hungarian Government and public opinion in Hungary have frequently pointed out that the Hungarian revisionist movement has no aspirations towards Croatian territory, and that our only wish, so far as that territory is concerned, is to establish friendly and neighbourly relations with it?

"The Croatian revolutionary movement, Croatian terrorism, has no roots in the Hungarian revisionist movement. It has only been in existence for a few years

"Such is the oppressive atmosphere in which, under the weight of an insupportable burden, the Croatian revolutionary movement came to birth.

"It cannot, indeed, be denied that, at the beginning, the injustices of the Treaty of Trianon provoked a violent and desperate reaction in the soul of the Hungarian people, whose vital interests were very gravely injured. An irredentist movement developed wherever there were any Hungarians; but, even in the early years of the new situation, and in the most difficult circumstances, the Hungarian Government was always sufficiently strong, courageous and persuasive to cut short any ill-judged enterprise. From the international standpoint, it must be counted in favour of the revisionist policy of Hungary that it has transformed irredentist aspirations into a peaceful and constructive policy, and has secured for this policy of moderation the unanimous support of the Hungarian people. The revisionist policy is the only one that can ensure peace; it seeks to gain its ends through international co-operation. It is based upon the Covenant of the League, and reprobates any resort to violence. It is to the revisionist policy that Hungary owes her domestic calm in this highly revolutionary period, and the unparalleled stability she enjoys among the countless difficulties of the present time; it is that policy that gives the nation hope, courage, strength and patience to await better days. The Hungarian nation and all its Governments have been able, in a very grave situation, to maintain the moral equilibrium of the Hungarian people and to preserve peace in the troubled valley of the Danube — a peace upon which the tranquillity and peace of Europe largely depend. Even the countries bordering upon Hungary, the States of the Little Entente, have reason to be thankful to her for pursuing that policy; it is one which ignores all threats and looks to honourable agreements to remedy the troubles of the Danube Valley, and which alone can ensure a lasting peace in that area, to the advantage of all its peoples.

CORRECT INTERPRETATION OF REVISIONIST ARTICLE

In the concluding part of his speech the Hungarian Delegate returned twice to the revision question, making the following statements:

"At the end of his speech on Friday, M. Beneš thought fit to refer to Article 10 of the Covenant and to draw the conclusion that, "in the present

instance, the territorial integrity of a Member of the League was threatened, or at any rate not respected".

"The representative of the Czechoslovak Republic may perhaps permit me to remind him—there are some things which are unfortunately forgotten only too soon—that, in the first drafts of the League

Covenant, the text of Article 10 also included the provisions which were finally inserted in Article 19, with the difference that, unlike the present Article 19, the original text referred expressly to the territorial clauses of the treaties.

"It was thus the intention of the authors of the Covenant that the provisions of Article 19 should form the counterpart of the stipulations of Article 10 and should thus be incorporated in that article. It is therefore utterly futile to attempt to interpret Article 10 in the restrictive sense which M. Beneš endeavoured to apply to it in his speech on Friday and which would close the door to any pacific revision of the treaties in accordance with Article 19.

"In the course of his speech. M. Beneš also made another observation which calls for an explanation on my part.

"In my speech on Friday, I showed that the revisionist policy is based upon the Covenant of the League of Nations. It is inspired by the noble

ideal which presided over the creation of that truly international institution; its action is constructive and pacific and it has always brought its national interest into harmony with the general interest of Europe. No nation of goodwill would have anything whatever to fear from Hungarian revisionism.

"One of the greatest, if not the greatest, statesmen of our time referred to the revisionist policy as an active policy of peace as opposed to the decadent policy of peace, which by its stubborn conservatism will ultimately give rise to serious conflicts.

"If you ask me, Mr. President, as to the real reason why it has hitherto been impossible to reach a better agreement between Hungary and the countries of the Little Entente; if you ask me why, sixteen years after the great war which threatened the ruin of the whole of mankind, the Danube Basin has still not found real peace while, I am convinced, all the nations aspire to peace, I can reply by stating a single fact.

"YOU WILL GO THROUGH HELL!"

"A great ambassador of the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy left for the instruction of his successors the following lesson, which he had drawn from history and from the long experience of a busy life: after gaining a victory in war or on the field of diplomatic battle, the first thing to be done is to obtain a sincere reconciliation with the adversary.

"What has been the Hungarian nation's experience for the last sixteen years? Has a single act of appeasement been recorded? The post-war period is full of events which show that, far from desiring reconciliation with Hungary, our neighbours have aimed at condemning Hungary, an active and valuable factor in international life, to play a purely passive and inert rôle in the policy of Europe.

"I regret that M. Beneš, who plays such an active part in the life of the League of Nations and who has rendered such eminent service to the cause of peace, in cases where he was not directly concerned, should never have been capable of adopting an objective point of view where Hungary was concerned. I will remind him of his statement at Prague on October 22nd, 1921, to the Hungarian Minister when, for the second time in that year, he addressed threats to Hungary: "You will go through hell".

"I must agree that since that time M. Beneš has done everything he could to convert that statement into fact. The present campaign, which has been unloosed against Hungary, is the anteroom of that hell. But M. Beneš has forgotten that, in order to

make Hungary go through the ordeals of hell, he must himself lead the way. The States of the Danube Basin have so many imperishable bonds in common and depend to such an extent upon each other that the misfortune of one destroys the happiness of the others. On the other hand, it is equally true that, in order to proceed to a better future, our efforts must be combined in order at last to create true peace.

"The Roumanian representative, supported by his Czechoslovak colleague, has to-day made a statement which I cannot for one moment leave unanswered. He expresses his desire that a *rapprochement* should take place between Hungary and the countries of the Little Entente. I affirm that the Royal Hungarian Government has always been a partisan, in principle, of co-operation between the Danube States, and it has on many occasions stated that this was its firm desire. But, in order that this *rapprochement* may become a fact, it is not sufficient to utter certain words at Geneva expressing such a hope; these words must be followed by acts in the Danube Basin. I am glad that M. Titulescu desires to arrive at the spiritualisation of frontiers; but would it not be simpler to begin at home and to efface the difference of treatment between the nation which forms the majority and the Hungarian minority? Hungary is prepared to reply to and associate herself with every sincere effort for improving the present position and, in so doing, she will not be held back by the ill-treatment she has just received from the Governments of the Little Entente".