

DANUBIAN REVIEW

(DANUBIAN NEWS)

VOL. IV., NO. 4.
B U D A P E S T
SEPTEMBER 1936

PUBLISHED BY THE HUNGARIAN FRONTIER
READJUSTMENT LEAGUE

SINGLE COPY 50 FILL.
SUBSCRIPTION:
ONE YEAR 6 PENGÓ

C O N T E N T S

- A Response *Ferenc Herczeg*
- The Danube Basin Problem *Dr. Andrew Moravek*
- James Fitzjames in the Christian Army at the
Siege of Buda *Fr. Endrődi*
- Political Mosaic *Országos Széchényi Könyvtár*
- How Minorities Live
- Political Economy
- Sports

A RESPONSE

by

Ferenc Herczeg

Privy Councillor, Member of the Hungarian Upper House, President of the Hungarian Revision League

Replying to Sir Robert Gower and Mr. Procter, Mr. Edgar P. Young, in a letter to the Times of 5th September, made the following assertion about the Hungarian Revision League of which, at present, I am President:

“Even the Budapest Revision League has confessed that if Hungarian newspapers refrained from reproducing foreign newspaper articles and speeches concerning revision, the enthusiasm of the Hungarian people would die away.”

As President of the Hungarian Revision League I feel it my duty to say that the League never made this statement or any impossible statement of the kind. I pray Mr. Young to tell us on what he bases his allegation, or if he is not in the position to do so, may I, without wishing to be presumptuous, advise him to treat the source of his information about Hungarian matters with more scepticism in future.

Another astonishing statement in Mr. Young's letter is that there are “a considerable number of intelligent and patriotic Magyars who realize that the only practicable policy to pursue is one of abandoning all talk of frontier revision...”

Allow me to assure Mr. Young that “intelligent and patriotic” Hungarians of that description are inventions of the imagination. The many British politicians and tourists who have visited Hungary of late and have met Hungarians of all sorts and conditions, from the aristocracy to the Social Democratic labouring classes, have not seen anything of them. It would be a dangerous illusion were European public opinion to look for a satisfactory solution of the Danube problem from a spirit of meek renunciation on the part of Hungary, such as no normal nation could ever be expected to show. All who wish to take an interest in the Danube question must be prepared to accept the given and immutable fact that the Hungarian nation will never, under any circumstances whatsoever, be able to acquiesce in frontiers that have thrust three and a half million Hungarians under alien yokes and have pushed the political frontiers

of Czecho-Slovakia so far into territories inhabited purely by Hungarians that the capital of Hungary is within the zone of fire of the Czech long-distance batteries. To protest against this is a point of honour with every patriotic Hungarian, and nothing is more natural — although Mr. Young disapproves of it — than that we strive to bring up our children in a spirit of honour and patriotism. And, as it happens, where irredentism is concerned, the Hungarian nation is influenced and encouraged by the lessons of the past. For 150 years Hungary groaned under the Turkish yoke and then, too, there were those who advised our forefathers, as Mr. Young advises us, to pursue a practicable policy and give up vain talk about ridding the country of its oppressors.

The most striking thing about Mr. Young's letter is that he, a British subject, understands why the Little Entente Governments remove “unreliable personnel from the frontier regions and from key positions in the State Services”. Would it not be a more reasonable and honest solution to restore those dangerous frontier zones inhabited by unreliable Hungarians to the country to which for a thousand years they belonged and where the Hungarians would be neither dangerous nor unreliable? Mr. Young seems to approve of the plan of compulsory settlement with its attendant confiscation of property. In his opinion Hungary's policy is a violent one. But it is a wellknown fact that the fundamental principle of Hungarian revisionist policy, which we take every opportunity of emphasizing, is that we wish to gain our ends by peaceful means and with the concurrence of the nations of Europe. Peaceful revision is the safety valve which would relieve the pressure of destructive energies in the Danube Valley. The choice lies between a policy of revision or of war.

Anybody who sees violence in a peaceful desire for compromise and finds it understandable that the autochthonous Hungarian inhabitants of the Czecho-Slovak frontier zone are being driven out and ruined financially, will find it difficult to make us understand what he considers a policy of peace and what he means by democracy.