

PEACEBUILDING IN AN ERA OF STATE-NATIONS: THE EUROPE OF TRIANON

ILIE BĂDESCU*

*“You can denationalize the individual elements of a people,
nations can never be denationalized. (MILTON G. LEHRER)”*

THE ROMANIAN AND POLISH ROLE IN THE VICTORY OF THE ENTENTE EUROPE. THE CRUCIAL PERSONALITIES OF CEE

In January 1919, in Paris when the Peace Conference opened its doors, the announcement of the end of Great War confronted the Allied Powers with a paradox: the military victory on the front appeared to be inefficient on the civil terrain, as long as the anarchy and assaulting Bolshevik groups were spreading out throughout the Central European Area, in almost all the great cities herein. Not only that the Bolsheviks took power in Russia but Moscow had already signed a separate peace treaty with rival Central Powers at Brest-Litovsk. The civil war and the anarchy that broke in the near collapsing north-eastern empire proved to be the weakness of the Old Russian Empire but the strength of the Bolsheviks inside the country and outside it, especially in Central Europe, where they were advancing threatening to install their government in the great metropolises of the region. Berlin, Vienna, Budapest, Prague were caught by the Bolshevik anarchy and the new Russian power which replaced the Cross with the Red Star on the frontispiece of the revived Russian empire under the soviet scarlet had opened the military conflict in Poland, backed up the Bela Kuhn Bolshevik government already installed in Budapest (whose troops had meantime invaded Transylvania) so that a new frontier was near tracing between two areas separated by the line linking Stetting to Trieste. The military victory was about to transform into a political defeat. Amid such a conjecture a new examination of the evolutions that occurred throughout the year 1919 appears to be imperative. As a matter of fact, the year 1919 reveals itself as

* Institute of Sociology–Romanian Academy, Bucharest, Romania. E-mail: iliebadescu@gmail.com



not a first year of peace but as the fifth year of war. Of course, the Peace Conference and the Trianon Treaty are the most relevant events of this moment but even these events request a new examination under their geo-historical and geopolitical meaning. A new Europe was already emerging and a new interpretation is requested based on a new theoretical paradigm.

The signs of this New Europe can be read in the crucial moments of modern history, as was, primarily, the Peace of Westphalia (1648), a real turning point in Europe's history. From that moment on (1648), the New European order enhanced progressively to culminate, over 300 years, through another peace concluded at Westphalia and completed by the Treaty of Trianon¹ in 1920 (signed on the 4th June 1920 at the Grande Trianon Palace in Versailles, France, and registered in League of Nations on 24 August 1921²). Here it is the parties mentioned as such by the Treaty of Trianon and Protocol: “The United States Of America, The British Empire, France, Italy and Japan, These Powers being described in the present Treaty as the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, Belgium, China, Cuba, Greece, Nicaragua, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Romania, The Serb-Croat-Slovene State, Siam, and Czecho-Slovakia, These Powers constituting with the Principal Powers mentioned above the Allied and Associated Powers, of the one part; And Hungary, of the other part”³; It is obvious the world frame of this peacebuilding process concluded by the most important Peace Treaty of the XXth century and this frame includes the whole Europe not only Eastern Europe⁴. That historical date was not only a milestone in the Central European history but also the moment when what we may call the Westphalian Europe, as a new type of order, based on the Peace of state-nations (concluded in 1648 at Westphalia), has been substantiated, 300 years later, by the Peace of Versailles and the Treaty of Trianon (1920).

¹ Grenville, J. A. S. (1974). *The Major International Treaties 1914–1973. A history and guides with texts*. Methnen London.

² See: *League of Nations Treaty Series*, vol. 6, p. 188, apud https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Trianon, retrieved in 29 September, 2018

³ For the text of Trianon treaty see: https://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Treaty_of_Trianon, retrieved in 29 September, 2018

⁴ “Whereas the Allied and Associated Powers are equally desirous that the war in which certain among them were successively involved, directly or indirectly, against Austria-Hungary...Whereas the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy has now ceased to exist, and has been replaced in Hungary by a national Hungarian Government: For this purpose the HIGH CONTRACTING PARTIES have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries” (which are presented successively in the text), “WHO, having communicated their full powers found in good and due form, HAVE AGREED AS FOLLOWS: From the coming into force of the present Treaty the state of war will terminate” (see in *ibidem*). What is the most relevant in the text of Treaty is that statement which unveils the international frame of the treaty not the allegedly bilateral frame: “From that moment and subject to the provisions of the present Treaty official relations will exist between the Allied and Associated Powers and Hungary” (see in *ibidem*). Therefore, the provisions of Treaty refers to the relations between a type of order supported by the Allied and Associated Powers, on the one side, and Hungary, on the other side as the representative of the old, defunct empire (the old regime supported by an empire of substitution that ceased to exist).

The year 1920⁵ was the true turning point of European history revealing us as a tipping point of the greatest change of European ethnical-political structures. The great empires that survived up to the dawn of the last century of the second millennium were dismantled and a new configuration was coagulating while the peace treaties were nearing completion. The three empires demised but the north-eastern one had not vanished as long as in its place a new one coagulated, which was not rooted in any local historical tradition or in the return of the old rule but in a soteriological ideology, i.e. bolshevism. The completion of the Versailles Peace took place in the environment of this new threat. The bolshevism and the survival of an old-fashioned empire represented a heavy challenge for the political elites of the new emerging national states close to consolidate their own structures. The Bolshevik menace had taken on quite a military shape and in Hungary this unknown menace seized the power in state and installed itself as a local Bolshevik power by the Bela Kuhn government. In Poland, Pilsudski understood that the change of his country destiny was going on through two moments: the first one depending on the defeat of Russia by the Austria-Hungary empire and the second one depending on the defeat of the Austro-Hungary and Germany by France, Great Britain and United States. In Transylvania the leaders of national movement towards the unification with Romania had already been involved in the main episodes of the fight against Russian Empire to then move on the side of Romanian Kingdom and, therefore, on the side of Entente Powers and, consequently against Central Powers, during the next phase of the First World War. We may consider such a shifting movement, from being on the side of Central European Empire to pass on the side of its own country (nation), as a defining geopolitical pattern of Central European Peoples.

At a meeting of Polish sympathizers in Paris in 1914, Pilsudski declared that war was imminent and that the problem of the independence of Poland will be definitely solved only if Russia is beaten by Austria-Hungary and Germany, and Germany vanquished by France, Great Britain and the United States; it is our duty to bring that about⁶.

This geopolitical assertion proved to express the overview shared by the CEE intellectuals from all the nations within the dualist Austro-Hungarian Empire. The intellectuals from other nations emphasized the same way of thinking. Ioan Boeriu (Ioan Boeriu), a Romanian officer (general) in Austrian Army, looks to be thinking the same way when he was participating to the battle against Tsarist army being awarded with the greatest distinction by the Empire's Army leadership and to pass, in the next moment, on the Romanian side in the war against the alliance of the Central Powers (to preserve the old dualist regime). Ioan Boeriu was general in the

⁵ "Text of the Treaty, Treaty of Peace Between the Allied and Associated Powers and Hungary and Protocol and Declaration, Signed at Trianon June 4, 1920" (retrieved on 29 September, 2018) In: https://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Treaty_of_Trianon

⁶ <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Jozef-Pilsudski>

Austro-Hungarian Army and participated in the great Clash of the Dualistic Empire with the Russian Empire, affirming himself in the Battle of Krasnik with the Tsarist army. His soldiers, lead by himself, succeeded in a 13-hour battle to stop the enemy and after junction with the formations that arrived, in the meantime, to support, brought victory to the enemy. Its value was attested by the promotions and decorations received in 1915–1916. On September 11, 1915, Colonel Ioan Boeriu was decorated for his quality as an officer and his bravery as a soldier, but also for the achievement of victory at Plochina, with the Order of Knight Maria Theresa with the registration in the 184-promotion from August 17, 1918, further with the Order of Royal Leopold of 3rd grade with war decorations (KD) and appointed General of Brigade (General major). By 1916 he was honored among others with the Imperial Order of the 3rd grade Iron Crown with war decorations, the Cross of Military Merit of second class and the Military Order “*Signum Laudis*”⁷. It will also be emblazoned as noble by the title of *Baron de Plochina*, after the name of victory at Plochina, which is owed to him. Boeriu, as Pilsudski himself, and as all the Romanians and Polish, had experienced the subordinationism of the two empires, being that a part of Polish people (and also of the Romanian people) lived in the Austrian-controlled land of their country and another part of them lived in the Russian-controlled part of the country. Begotten in the Russian-controlled part of Poland, being imprisoned and escaping from the Russian prison, Pilsudski rushed to make his way to Cracow, then in the Austrian-controlled part of Poland. Consequently, he made the experience of such a strange claw so that he could come easily to the conclusion of using the conflict of empires to move the frontier of one on the other’s territory, that is, to back first the Austrian battle against Russians and then, in the second phase of the world war, to back the battle of the Entente against Germany and Austrian-Hungary Empire. “In 1914 Pilsudski was predicting that a European war involving the empires of Russia, Austria-Hungary and Germany was imminent. Pilsudski’s plan was to side with Germany and Austria-Hungary in driving out the Russians from Poland, and, then, to turn against Germany to gain Polish independence”⁸.

The significant thing in such a process was that the involvement in the war of the prominent personalities, as Pilsudski in Poland or Ioan Boeriu and Iuliu Maniu in Romania, substantiated the logic of such a pattern while making their own mind as to the participation to the world war. Their behavior testifies the same pattern of incentivize their decisions however much the facets and steps of the historical process proved to hold and display. Historical figures as well as collective forces (from elites to social classes and whole peoples) passed at a breathtaking speed from imperial structures to national positions. They were already active in various formations, in the fire and ash environment of the two empires, which were

⁷https://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ioan_Boeriu

⁸ *ibidem*

showing evidently twilight signs, beginning with the worst ones, the fatigue and more degradation at elite scale, and ending with those signs displayed by the surface systems, led by with the collapse of the old dynastic consensus on which the old order had relied. The great royal houses entered an era of disturbances and dissension that threatened the old subordinating regime (*l'ancien regime*) based on ancient empires, and the World War made the transition from the clash between the dynasties to the clash between empires and nations.

Throughout the central Europe and in the two Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires were accumulated burdensome tensions and new phenomena appeared, in the forehead with the rise of the first formations of secularism which will hatch the great outbursts of anarchy known as of the October Revolution. In this context of multiple fractures, the clash of the empires is triggered in the process where the presence of great impact figures, recruited from the backgrounds of ethnicities within the empires, as the General in Austrian Army of Romanian origin, Ioan Boeriu, and Polish Josef Pilsudski, was proved. The war itself was going on through a two-step flow of such a historical tide that finally flooded all the Euro-Asian and Euro-American nations. The significance of Ioan Boeriu as a historical personality with a prominent role in the great transformation of Central Europe is linked to the other two phases of universal history in this region of the world: 1) the restoration of order in the great metropolis of the old Empire, Vienna, and 2) the releasing Budapest from the clutches of the Bela Kuhn's Bolshevik regime.

SAVING VIENNA FROM ANARCHY AND THE LIBERATION OF BUDAPEST

Vienna was threatened, that time, by the great Bolshevik tsunami, which began its advance towards central Europe, threatening to cast the entire region into the turbulence of Bolshevik anarchic-nihilism. In a Vienna under the threat of the siege of Bolshevik, with an administration in great turmoil⁹, the rescue intervention of the Army Corps led by Ioan Boeriu and Iuliu Maniu was the only salvation. "Ioan Boeriu, together with Iuliu Maniu, took command of the 60,000 Romanian soldiers from the former imperial army, which were the only organized force in Vienna, caught in the Fever of a Bolshevik revolution. After taking the oath of allegiance to the Romanian nation, Ioan Boeriu soldiers occupied Vienna and Prague. They restored the order and transferred the power to those in right, appointed by law, then went to Transylvania"¹⁰.

⁹ See: "Wide anarchy in Austria" (PDF). *New York Times*. 1 November 1918. Retrieved 29 September, 2018.

¹⁰ <https://m.rfi.ro/cultura-98388-pagina-de-istorie-generalul-ioan-boeriu-romanul-ocupat-viena-praga-budapesta>

“The end of the war, in the autumn of 1918, found the Romanian general, Ioan Boeriu, at the forefront of the Romanian military Senate in Vienna, where he led the Central Council of Romanian officers and soldiers from Transylvania and Bucovina. In Vienna, Ioan Boeriu and politician Iuliu Maniu wrote an important page of history, which prevented the establishment of communism in the Austrian capital, on the verge of the Bolshevik Revolution. The Austro-Hungarian army was one step away from dismantling, following a huge wave of desertions. The whole Vienna was in chaos, the general strike, caused by Bolsheviks, had caught also the authorities, including the army and the police, and the population was frightened of violence, rapes and plunders”¹¹. Imperial Army was engulfed by anarchy and passed the side of the anarchic groups. “many officers tore the imperial cockade from their hats, and the imperial standard was hauled down from Parliament House”¹². In Vienna “people were parading the streets, shouting: Down with the Habsburgs!”¹³ Army was in full dissolution, reported *The Berlin Tageblatt* and *Vossische Zeitung*, in October 31, 1918. “In these apocalyptic moments, Maniu and Boeriu entered the audience at the Ministry of War, to General von Straeger Steiger, and asked him to give them full power to restore order. They requested and were granted the leadership of the barracks of Charles and Ferdinand, military units in which many Romanians fought. The two leaders formed a true Romanian national army, which had 60,000 soldiers in Vienna and the surrounding area. Plus another 100,000, dispersed all over the empire”¹⁴. Without Boeriu and Maniu military contribution Vienna would have had there and then the fate of Hungary where Bela Kuhn’s Bolshevik soldiers from Austro-Hungarian Army had founded Hungarian Republic of “Advisers” (Sfaturilor), which was the first communist state in Central Europe. This was the second contribution of Ioan Boeriu and of Romanian-Transylvanian troops to the fight against Bolshevik threat in Central Europe.

Those two moments of what we may call the backstage war advanced into a third one consisting in the releasing Budapest from the clutches of the Bela Kuhn’s Bolshevik regime. “On December 1, 1918, the National Assembly of Alba Iulia named Ioan Boeriu commander of the troops subordinated to the Dirigent Council of Transylvania, which he led alongside the Romanian Royal army against the

¹¹ http://www.monitorulexpres.ro/?mod=monitorulexpres&p=mozaic&s_id=141929

¹² See: *Wide Anarchy in Austria, New York Times. 1 November 1918, in:* <https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1918/11/01/97039643.pdf>

¹³ *ibidem*.

¹⁴ http://www.monitorulexpres.ro/?mod=monitorulexpres&p=mozaic&s_id=141929: *Eroi uitati ai Romaniei Mari. Primul general din armata Transilvaniei” (Forgotten Heroes of Great Romania. The First Transylvanian Army General)*. („At the departure of Vienna, the Romanian troops participated to the hallowing of the tricolor flag. General Ioan Boeriu and soldiers have filed oath: “I swear allegiance to the Romanian nation and obedience in all the Romanian National Council. I will stand only in the service of the Romanian people, whom I will not leave under any circumstances and under no circumstances”.

Hungarian Army. He contributed to the occupation of Budapest in 1919¹⁵ with the only purpose to release this CE city from the clutches of the Bolshevik regime established in a country in Central Europe by Bela Kuhn and his team of anti-European, terrorist conspirators. “This republic was to be abolished in the year 1919 also by the Boeriu, at the forefront of the Romanian Royal Army, which occupied Budapest after the Hungarian Bolsheviks attacked Transylvania”¹⁶. As a matter of fact Europe was then compounded by two opposed worlds: (a) a declining one which had amassed what we may call the crashing conditions (economic inequalities, internal contradictions, inter-ethnic and inter-civilizational clashes, a parasitic, burdensome distributive system, etc. etc.) and (b) a salvaging one which lead to a new type of order. When “elites push society toward instability and eventual collapse by hoarding huge quantities of wealth and resources, and leaving little or none for commoners who vastly outnumber them yet support them with labor”¹⁷, we may conclude that such a world is teetering. The European landscape looked like this. In such a situation the carrying capacity of the old order had already reached the point of no return and the Entente Powers proved to be the civilizational forces that rescued Europe itself from the final collapse. Romania along with all former subordinated nations in Austro-Hungarian Empire were part of this pro-civilizational alliance, and Peace Conference from Versailles offered then the only redemptional pattern of peace for a threatened Europe. The redemptional pattern for the CE nations was finally consecrated by the Treaty of Trianon. That Treaty appears as the only redemptive model of peace organization in a world that had just transcended a type of the apocalyptic war, a war of the end of a rusty historical world, based on an unbearable system made of the out-of-use empires.

TRIANON SYSTEM AND ITS ENEMIES. GEOPOLITICS OF PEACE-BUILDING IN THE EUROPEAN STYLE

The Trianon Treaty has created the framework for an extended European type of international organization based on the idea of free nations. Instead of an old-fashioned system controlled by the perpetual collisional empires, there emerged, at the end of the First World War, by the common will of European Peoples, a new order of integrated European nations, legitimized by the League of Nations. Trianon Treaty is the pillar of the New Europe and a confirmative framework for

¹⁵ Ibidem: “After the Dirigent Council was abolished, he received command of the Live Army Corps in Sibiu. He retired in 1921, when he was awarded the Crown of Romania by the king of the Great Union, Ferdinand I”.

¹⁶ http://www.monitorulexpres.ro/?mod=monitorulexpres&p=mozaic&s_id=141929>: „Eroi uitati ai Romaniei Mari. Primul general din armata Transilvaniei” (*Forgotten Heroes of Great Romania. The First Transylvanian Army General*)

¹⁷ <https://homerdixon.com/how-western-civilization-could-collapse/>

EU. An alternative path to this structure is an unsustainable and uncertain path and will lead to a collapse of EU. There emerge from the shadowy of real Europe the two enemies: an exclamatory organization based on the old “empires of substitution” and a dissolutive network based on a sort of neo-Kominternist aggression that claims to replace the National and Judaeo-Christian-based cognitive-onomasiological model¹⁸ for the designation of the true foundational units of collective life in Europe. This revisionist onomasiology promote distinct interpretations for the configuration of European peoples within EU structure, therefore for what is actually the *identitarian Europe* (deeply disputed by the revisionist ideas). To understand the real significance of the Trianon Treaty we need to look at the milestones of European History, that is, to get from history, throughout certain cycles, the knowledge about the megatrends of a sustainable European order. Such milestones of European History are not the internal military conflicts, that is, the European Wars, but the periods of European Peace, the moments when conflicting parts set out the peace treaties.

The Peace of Westphalia (1648) and the Trianon Treaty (as the most significant result of Versailles Conference at the end of the First World War) appear to be the real watersheds of the New European Order. We hardly find out anything else to bolster the tenets of a peaceful Europe beside of such moments of peace-building in modern Europe. Both these types of peace have put an end to long and unbearable periods of troubles that threatened the order throughout entire European continent. These two moments and types of peace stemmed from the European mind as the most illustrative European ways of organizing a peace based on the true justice for the nations and of the nations. This was a peace for the European nations and not for the salvage of the old European Empires, namely, for a new beginning of the old type of suborder under the guise of the peace of Empires. Both types of peace, Westphalian one and the Trianon other, sustained the European order of and for the European Nations instead of imposing those particular types of subordinationism warranted by the superposed colliding empires. We may consider therefore the Trianon Treaty and the Westphalia Treaty as the two tipping points of a European geo-historical and geopolitical axis. These two types of peace in the History of Europe gather up the diplomatic tenets of a new world order and bring into the open the real treasury of European thought about the collective freedom (of peoples) in history. On the second hand, these two types of peace in modern Europe put an end to a harmful thought coming over

¹⁸ <http://inmyownterms.com/mysmarterms/mysmarterms-4-the-onomasiological-and-semasiological-approaches/> (“Onomasiology comes from the Greek *ónoma* (name) and *logos* (study). So it is the study of designations. Its goal is to find the words that describe a given concept, idea, or object. It answers the question “How do you express X? The point of departure for an onomasiological approach is always a concept. When creating a termbase we are presented with concepts and once a concept has been clearly defined we have to come up with a term to designate it. In some cases, there might be more than one term, but there will always be a preferred term”).

European order the in form guise of what we may call the “colliding Europe”, a Europe threatened to be multiple fractured by a colliding thinking which would bring forth destruction of real European Unity. This geopolitical unity called Europe Union is based on the respect of the Nations and relied on the Judaeo-Christian background. Before Westphalian Peace, the colliding Europe embraced the form of the Thirty Years’ War that was one “of the most destructive conflicts, as well as the deadliest European religious war in history. It took place in Central Europe between 1618 and 1648 and resulted in eight million of casualties”¹⁹. Historians consider this war as one between the catholic and protestant states. As a matter of fact it was caused by a colliding thinking not by the differences of Christian confessions.

Such differences do not result into conflict by themselves unless different interest groups use them as a pretext and transfigure them into colliding differences in order to conclude on who would ultimately govern Europe. In the end, we may conclude not that the conflict but the Peace, more exactly the new type of making peace known in history as the Peace of Westphalia, was the one which “changed the geopolitical face of Europe and the role of religion and nation-states in society”²⁰. When Ferdinand II, as the head of state decided “to force citizens of the empire to adhere to Roman Catholicism, even though religious freedom had been granted as part of the Peace of Augsburg”²¹, he committed a sort of colliding thinking and this was the starting cause of the war not the difference between the two Christian confessions. Even the Augsburg’s tenet, “whose realm, his religion”, was sprouting a sort of colliding style of thinking, and when Ferdinand II considered the Holy Roman Empire and Catholic Church as the only true realm, the colliding thinking proved to be prepared to hatch the war.

The Westphalia Peace (the series of treaties signed by the various parties in the conflict) put an end to this colliding Europe and what is its valuable contribution to the history of that types of peace, the true watersheds throughout universal history, is the new style of thinking and organizing peace, based on the idea of the state-nation not on the supremacy claim of a single Empire or on the colliding Entente of Empires. The nucleic pattern of this kind of peace consists in “decreeing that residents of a state were subject to the laws of that state and not to those of any other institution, secular or religious”²². This was the

¹⁹See: <https://www.history.com/topics/reformation/thirty-years-war>. Retrieved on 2 Nov. 2018

²⁰Ibidem.

²¹Ibidem (see also Sommerville, J.P. “*The aftermath of the Thirty Years’ War*” <https://faculty.history.wisc.edu/sommerville/351/351-05.htm> (Wisconsin.edu).

²²Ibidem (“the Peace of Westphalia laid the groundwork for the formation of the modern nation-state, establishing fixed boundaries for the countries involved in the fighting and effectively decreeing that residents of a state were subject to the laws of that state and not to those of any other institution, secular or religious”)

novelty as to the peace-building and type of international order and to such a pattern of international organization. The Peace of Westphalia displays to the rest of the world the seal of the European type of peace-building based on the nation-states. That European “stamp” (seal), that signifies for anybody the New European Order, is uniquely representative for what we may call the European pattern of international order²³. This novelty as to the conception of peace-building reached its culmination point in the other type of peace through which Europe was secured from another colliding threat, the Bolshevik one. The new colliding phenomenon threatened again, at a new tipping point of European history, the Central Europe, endangering to clench the nations as it had happened in the long period of troubles that had culminated in the Thirty Years’ War put out of daily life of Europeans by the Westphalia Peace in 1648. The threatening flooding of Bolshevism towards Central Europe was the conjuncture of the Polish and Romanian intervention in the defence of the United Europe of Nations against the Colliding Europe of Bolshevism.

The advance of Romanian troops towards Budapest to liberate this European nodal city from the Bela Kuhn Bolshevik regime has but this meaning, being that, immediately, after the victory against Bela Kuhn and its dismissal from Central Europe, a true type of a new defenestration (after the Prague Defenestration when “bohemian nobility thrown Ferdinand’s representatives out of a window at Prague Castle”²⁴), the Romanian troops withdrawn from Budapest leaving there the legitimated power of this country, represented by Hungarian Parliament. The spirit of Romanian troops was the one synthesized in the Westphalian-Trianon pattern of peace and just such a spirit spurred the Romanian soldiers into battle of Budapest. This is the difference between Bela Kuhn troops and Romanian Troops. The Bela Kuhn troops were spurred into battle by the colliding spirit threatening the new European order while the Romanian soldiers were spurred by the spirit of United Europe of Free Nations. The colliding Bolshevik thought had entered the crucial collision with the Judaeo-Christian and National mind of the profound Europe of nations.

The colliding Europe of anti-Judaeo-Christian ideology was fighting against the Free Europe of Nations. The Bolshevism and Nationalism reached the tipping

²³ Sommerville, J.P. “*The aftermath of the Thirty Years’ War*”: “The Peace of Westphalia did not involve any major territorial losses or gains. However, it entailed the Spanish conceding that they could never recapture the United Provinces, the Habsburgs acknowledging that they would never be absolute rulers over a unified Germany, and Catholic admission that Protestantism was here to stay. The recognition of these obvious facts of life was very important to future peace and stability in Europe”. <https://faculty.history.wisc.edu/sommerville/351/351-05.htm> (Wisconsin.edu)

²⁴ See Defenestration of Prague in <https://www.history.com/topics/reformation/thirty-years-war> (“The so-called Defenestration of Prague (fenestration: the windows and doors in a building) was the beginning of open revolt in the Bohemian states – who had the backing of Sweden and Denmark-Norway – and the beginning of the Thirty Years’ War”).

point of a direct clash in just that moment of the war carried out in the year 1919 and ended with the victory of these two eastern representatives of the Entente Alliance, Poland and Romania, the true *defensor pacis* in the region at that moment. This was the victory devoid of which the New Europe Order had failed to come into the world under the guise it unveiled us in the short interwar period, a true *belle époque* for the European peoples before the new threat which was trundling over the Europe of Free Nations at the end of the second world war by the peace of Yalta. There and then, Bolshevik colliding type of order in Europe triumphed episodically over the Eastern area of Europe submerging the peoples of the area into a suffocating Dead Sea of antinational and anti-Judaeo-Christian ideology.

TRIANON TREATY AGAINST THE RISK OF IDENTITY AMBIVALENCE

The Trianon Treaty reveals to be a true Manifesto of the Free Nations within a United Europe securing it from the colliding temptation which would bring forth again the multiple fracture of European structure. Such a fracture would bring forth a new Period of Troubles and Disturbances in Europe and by the way of consequences in the entire world. It appears to be a dangerous attitude concealed in the illusion of a securing new isolationism, like that in the 1930s, when isolationists resurfaced the “Farewell Address, by which the President George Washington had advocated non-involvement in European wars and politics”²⁵. As a matter of fact, isolationist temptation comes back recursively in the history of every nation certifying the mechanism of identitarian ambivalence. This mechanism is also testified by the raising of the child who passes through such ambivalent process during his own process of self-identitarian structuration.

So it is the identitarian process in the history of the peoples, who are moved by the same pulsion’s cycle, the same ambivalent impulse. The mechanism consists in the alternation of ego-expansion, on the one side, teetering on the brink of losing its own identity into so many alterity temptations (a lot of “me”, sheltering different “egos”, extraneous to him, of a foreign substance), and the reversed process of coming back to him, a return into its own self, on the other side, a movement that equates with the process of identitarian individuation. By such a process of returning to himself, the nations’ being (as the child being itself) looks like lingering to be themselves, to go back into their own selves, to express by their own identity, un-wasted into so many imitations, by experiencing so many extraneous “egos” (emerging the risk of no more knowing who you are by wandering away of your own way of being, lost in such a polymorphism).

²⁵ <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/american-isolationism>.

Powerful peoples, like the vigorous children, pass over both processes in a pushful way. The weak peoples get lost through such a polymorphy, into different identities, lagging many times and for too long to come back at their own identity. The process of returning to itself, of self-centrism, is, in this way and because of that lagging, belated, diminished, devoid of vitality, that such a people falls into the bondage of extraneous “egos”, of other foreign interest centres, nurturing that alterity affirmation. The teetering process between hegemonic expansionism of the great powers and the recovering and recollecting process of returning to the own identity affirmation appears to be like a Geo-cultural and Geo-historical law of civilizational dynamism. Amid the hegemonic expansionisms, persistent throughout the XIXth century, the process of returning fully to their own identity of the European peoples was carried out. This metanoia-like process of *returning to the self* had taken place during the long tri-century period of time, between Westphalia Peace (1648) and Trianon Treaty of Central European Nations (1919-20). This interval of 300 years (from Peace of Westphalia, in 1648, to Versailles Peace with Treaty of Trianon, in 1920) equates with an historical cycle of the modern European state-nations building.

The Ottoman, Habsburg, Russian and Soviet expansionist process could no longer weigh down the will of self-centring of European peoples. Every man and the peoples themselves have to solve the same issue, the ego-alter dualism, the problem of the relationship between oneself and the other. This is, essentially, what we call the identitarian ambivalence. Such an issue couldn't be solved by the eliminating a part of the relationship. It could evolve contending or dialogical, but the phenomenon itself cannot be eliminated. The illusion of the colliding thinking that the self-centrism of identitarian (national, ethnic, religious) manifestations could be eliminated has brought about nothing good, unveiling itself to be one facet of the conflictual manifestation of identitarian dynamism itself. Neither the opposite side inviting to the elimination of alterity is efficient proving to be but the other side of the same radicalization of the conflict. More adequate is to avail the dualism as an objective phenomenon, which in certain periods of time reaches a tipping point by drawing on the shape of a generalized structural conflict, and to recognize that the postmodern elite does not know to solve it. The empires deepened the clash by nurturing the disunion and by splitting the ethnical diversity sowing the seeds of strife between different ethnical groups in order to dominate them better, in accordance with the adagio: *divide et impera*, *divide and rule*. The only solution to such a conflictual/ contending strategy of ruling, assumed duplicitously, shrewdly, by the empires, was to call European nations to make peace, to live in peace with each other. This is the spirit wherefrom the Trianon Treaty has sprung and there is no alternative to such a pattern if we wish truly the order and peace in Europe.

THE CHALLICE VERSUS THE BLADE PARADIGM

The Trianon pattern of organizing peace is the real test of Europeanism. We may call this sort of peace by a common but highly valuable word: “co-existence”. It is proposed instead of the other one: “hegemony”. Whenever, in cyclical moments of this ambivalence dynamism, different segments of the European elites take up a colliding pattern of interactions represents a facet which discloses that the ambivalence issue is approached by the blade strategy instead of the chalice strategy. Therefore, during the different cycles of identity ambivalence dynamism, the elites could adopt either the strategy of chalice or the strategy of blade. In 1987, Riane Eisler issued a book with such a title: *Chalice and Blade: Our History, Our Future*. Eisler’s book, quickly becoming a bestseller, proposes this conceptual couple for the studying the way a society could solve the construction of roles and relations between “complementariness”, the “halves” such as man-woman, or, generically, the dynamic of the domination pattern. More precisely, the Eisler method inquires how the components of the living systems, our consciousness being included, interact to support one another and the whole they are parts of. Social systems are distinguished as they support dynamisms such as those of care, creativity, inclusion or, at the opposite pole, of insensitivity, cruelty and destruction, i.e. they have as the emblem the chalice or the blade, the blade of the sword²⁶. Eisler’s paradigm proceeds by ordering societies along an axis, a polarized continuum: domination-partnership²⁷. There are, the author says, societies that are oriented towards the partnership pattern and societies that are inclined towards the dominating pattern. On the eve of the new era, which was to come after the end of the First World War, we might distinguish on the European axis at one pole the empires (empires’ mind-set) oriented towards the dominating pattern of solving the duality between rulers and ruled, state and ethnicity (ethnic groups) within different empires, and, at the opposite pole, the societies inclined to the partnership pattern promoted by the Entente Powers (Allies) and led to fulfillment by the Treaty of Trianon. The European states had to solve such a problem of polarity or dualism that we have chosen to call identity ambivalence. The European states

²⁶ For a sampling of sources for this ongoing research, see e.g. Eisler, R. 2000. *Tomorrow’s Children: Partnership Education for the 21st Century*; Eisler, R. & Levine, D. (2002) *Nature, Nurture, and Caring: We are not Prisoners of Our Genes*. *Brain and Mind*, Vol. 3, No 1, April; Eisler, R. (2007). *The Real Wealth of Nations: Creating a Caring Economics*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler; Eisler, R. (2013) *Protecting the Majority of Humanity: Toward an Integrated Approach to Crimes against Present and Future Generations.* In *Sustainable Development, International Criminal Justice, and Treaty Implementation*. Marie-Claire CordonierSegger and Sébastien Jodoin, editors, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 305–326. Cf https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Chalice_and_the_Blade.

²⁷ *ibidem*.

have proved to be divided between those who unveiled to be oriented towards harmonizing nations within a new European unit called Europe of the Free United Nations, at one pole, and the state that have rather oriented towards the subordinationism pattern, that is, by keeping peoples in the bondage of the empires of substitution or of different *pan-ideas*, as Haushofer called them. To defend the Treaty of Trianon equates with defending the Europe of co-existential unified nations, namely the European Union. This is geopolitically at stake in EU today, tomorrow and after tomorrow. The Europe of Trianon is actually the profound Europe and whosoever contests Trianon is challenging and oppugning the EU, namely, the European type of order relied on the United Nations. The Trianon spirit reveals therefore to be the true test of Europeanism.