

THE "CORRUPTION" OF IRE HAY AND THE

IDEOLOGICAL PREPARATION OF THE REVOLUTION.

By Danee Jones, Terminated Secula, issue number 7-8 for November-December 1957, released to printer Nov. 30, 1957.

The members of the East exerted great efforts for years to popularize the policy and person of Iare Hagg. They were particularly widely assisted by the radio of the American capitalists called "Radio Free Europe," but other Western radios as well, mainly in their Hungarian language broadcasts.

It is an integral part of the undermining activities against the people's democracy to use people in the struggle against communism who were themselves communists, but represent and proclaim a political line in the course of socialist transformation, as a result of their old mistakes or for other reasons, which promotes the rallying round of the counter-revolutionary forces and their attack to overthrow the people's power.

Iare Hagg is also such a person, who, following the line of an opportunistic policy, arrived at an open alliance with the counter-revolutionary bloc of a capitalist bourgeoisie and went as far as the open betrayal of the proletarian power and the open warring of the counter-revolution.

One of Iare Hagg's men who escaped to the East took with him an account of the ideas of his "master" written between 1955-56. This was published there in the summer of this year and subsequently was smuggled back into Hungary where an attempt was made to disseminate them and to use them for renewed factional activities. Iare Hagg was preparing to hand his writings, or perhaps part of them, to the central leadership of the Hungarian Workers' Party, but first of all, he gave them to his friends of the same principles to get their preliminary opinions, or so it seems, judging by the short foreword of the "guardian" of the manuscript in August 1956 asking for his urgent opinion.

It appears that those friends of the same principles did not rush the matter, because Iare Hagg did not forward his exposition to the central leadership of the Hungarian Workers' Party at all. The presenting did take place, but to a different forum, to organs of the masters of the East engaged in directing further machinations against the people's democracy.

The "guardian" of the manuscript fails to reveal his identity. The chronological table which he added to the "work" sheds some light on the question as to who is "protecting" him, or, to use a more common expression, whose agent he is. We learn from this chronological table that Eisenhower proposes an atomic agreement which extends over the whole world, stipulating that the aim of the proposal is not the prohibition of atomic weapons, but the thwarting of a prohibition and the facilitation of unhindered preparations for an atomic war.

Simultaneously, the table fails to convey any mention of lending voice by the Soviet Union as a defender of international peace for the immediate pro-

hibition of atomic weapons, the immediate discontinuation of nuclear test operations, for the cessation of the arms-race race, collective guarantees of a European peace, and so forth. Part of the table dealt with, under the following title expressing, "the accusation of the American atom spies, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg." It answered in white-wash with revolting cynicism the American murderers responsible for the execution of these two American champions of freedom, who were sentenced on the basis of false accusations in support of an anti-Soviet campaign.

I think this is enough to show as clearly that "the question of the manuscript" is an agent of the Western imperialists and primarily an agent of the American imperialists. In addition to this, he could have been one of the advisers of Inno Rago who gave his superiors the reputation of his "betrayal" for further exploitation.

The above mentioned accusations of Inno Rago do not form a structurally connected unity it is a collection of well thought out texts of petitions prepared from time to time, and some answers to articles published soon hastily on the spur of the moment which nevertheless contain, in many respects connected and readily, how these former opportunists prepared "ideologically" for open betrayal during the struggle of principles and persons.

In the course of this he continuously endeavored to play the role of someone "actively further developing" Marxist-Leninism. He achieved this he needed primarily a "justification" of his opportunist policy between 1933-1936. He then tried to step onto the "international arena" and picked up the solid banner of the struggle against the unity of the socialist camp.

The root of the opportunism of Inno Rago, which developed as far as betrayal is the anti-Soviet attitude he adopted on the question of peasantry. Deviating from the point of view of the proletariat, he deviated the point of view of the producing peasantry and, starting from there, he built up his accusations on the subject of "growing" "peacefully" and "democratically" into socialism,

Setting out from there, he assessed the historic position of the country in 1927-28, speaking openly in front of the central leadership, then, that in Hungary it was not socialist building that is on the program, but the replacement of the Russian way of agrarian development with the American way. He worked out a conception according to which the nationalized industrial sector in our country is not a socialist-type sector of our peoples' agriculture, but a state-capitalist sector, which, as regards its character is not at variance with the sector of the peasantry producing on a small scale. [Later in a publication which came out in the spring of this year under the title "From Opportunism to Betrayal" documents can be found on this subject.] He went so far as to persuade the "development" of the state-capitalist industrial sector and the agricultural sector producing on a small scale into socialism by "peaceful" and "democratic" means, without a socialist revolution, without the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Assume the point of view of the small scale production on peasantry, Inno Rago betrayed not only the workers, but also the interests of the toiling peasantry, owing to the fact that only and exclusively on the basis of the proletarian point of view can also their interests be correctly defended, and the progress and future of the toiling peasantry be insured.

Assuming the point of view of the small scale production of peasantry, Inno Rago came to the viewpoint of the middle class "national union" which "developed" into a theory of a "national unity" with forces of a capitalist restoration, into

the surrender of the proletarian power, and the betrayal of the people's democratic system. Along he was careful of turning back on the path leading to freedom, he betrayed at the stage when he was forced officially at the disposal of the counter-revolution. His writings at 1933-34 show how he prepared "ideological" for the betrayal.

In these writings we can find the "theoretical" expositions which have their origin in his original opportunist conceptions and which served as direct "ideological preparations" for the betraying of the proletarian dictatorship and denunciation of the socialist way. These expositions also show that during the days of the counter-revolution it was not the "survival of the fittest" that played here but the stage of betrayal. We know very well that, according to the testimony of his writings, he worked very hard at the end of 1933 and the beginning of 1934 on ideological preparation of betrayal. We can find these expositions primarily in the 1st and 3rd chapters of the "work."

The title of the first chapter of Lave Esgy's "work" is: "A Few Political Questions on the Application of Marxist-Leninism." This Lave Esgy-like "application" is very characteristic.

In the course of the voluminous exposition of his ideas, Lave Esgy makes the following statements:

"The wide, scholastic interpretation of Marxist-Leninism divided the world into two Leninist parts opposing each other to a pronounced degree, namely into capitalism and socialism, between which the contradictions are becoming greater and more acute as a result of a development in the opposite directions of the two halves of the world. These incorrect, anti-Marxist views on the development of society and the struggle between the two systems deny the necessity and existence of a transitional period between the two systems, which is, however, one of the fundamental themes of the construction of a socialist society. They deny the extraordinarily versatile forms of transition, a very wide circle of which has been already, they deny the Leninist theory of disproportionate development... (Transitional forms ellipsis -- ad.) Taken as the whole, they deny that conditions of socialism arise and to some extent, come into being already under capitalism... (Transitional forms ellipsis -- ad.) In proof of this theorem, he refers to the fact that "the people of India start great efforts to create a society on the socialist pattern in their country," he quotes from Malenkov's speech at the UN assembly on Sept. 23, 1955, saying that "as a result of World War II and the important social and political progress connected with it, in Europe and Asia several states of a socialist type were created."

Lave Esgy does not say whether Malenkov's statement refers to other countries as well as to India, to the European and Asian peoples democracies. He merely puts the reference to India before the quotation and after the quotation states: "The economic, political and social changes in progress in former colonial and dependent countries are also taking place in a peculiar manner and form, which are transitional to capitalism, showing the great variety of transitional forms between capitalism and socialism." (page 17-18.)

After this follows:

"Those who fail to pay attention to Lenin's teachings on the peaceful development of the two systems side by side, which have in mind only the application of force in the struggle between the two systems, and which consider the peaceful coexistence only as a transition between two wars are incorrect. Such views automatically reject one of the two possible ways to socialist victory,

the peaceful co-existence, or consider it as only a short transition. Views which regard the application of force not as the liberating revolutionary movement of the people, but as a military class business and two systems are faultless and more dangerous still... (Paraphrasing Lenin's writings -- ed.).

"... (Paraphrasing Lenin's writings -- ed.) a theory of the peaceful co-existence of the two systems and as a socialist victory by peaceful means, which became hegemonic towards 1975 decades behind the development of conditions of society that he worked out and further developed." (page 15).

So much for the first part of the concentrated revisionist policy in the name of co-existence. It is already obvious in this New York Post, Lenin's writings, which "took final shape" in the summer of 1955, observers to discuss the revisionist line and statements of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, and how the "supplements" that is his own revolution. However, he is incapable of substantiating by arguing his "staggering" conditions (they are "deeply" true and "genuine" theory), he does not even dare to say any "determination". He only declares, like "facts and statistics" to render those of a revisionist betrayal, "more magnificent" and "more creditable."

Let us begin with the statement that "the theory of the victory of socialism by peaceful means" Lenin took 100 years ago." Lenin's public knowledge that Bernstein and his associates worked out this "theory." It was after the death of Lenin that they launched their attack in the name of this theory against revisionist Marxism. They succeeded in obtaining a leading role in the great majority of the parties of the 2nd Internationalist, supported by leading these parties into the "way" of "peaceful" and the international into the disorganised and ironic bankruptcy of 1918. Lenin's theory, however, does not write now, that it is this revisionist analysis of the revolutionary defeat of socialism, which we are "theoretical" tendency, "came to a final stage" about 1900 years ago" which we now wanted to "publish" of the people, "under the guise of a "document". This article, however, extraordinarily "difficult".

New York Post says again by saying that "they have in mind only the application of force in the struggle between the two systems and creating peaceful co-existence as a transitional period between two wars". In essence the "transition" was CPSU and the Soviet Union, as well as other communist parties (or their ones which are identical with that of the CPSU, and what is the reality? It is that the Soviet Union carried out a socialist revolution only soon after the death of Lenin for collective centrality, for the disorganization of the capitalist world, for international struggle for peaceful co-existence, and that it is particularly as a result of this struggle that they obtained two decades of peaceful creative work before World War II.

The struggle against an imperialist war was one of the central questions in the struggle of all parties of the second international. Those who represent this are splitting apart in the end. After World War II, at the initiative of and under the leadership of the communist parties, a significant international peace movement developed, the like of which the world has never known. The recognition of that "that cannot be traced from people's minds by any effort of Lenin's and his friends. This "Leninist" theory of Stalin, he says "even" "peace will be maintained and it will be lasting, if people tend to maintain the cause of safeguarding peace and if they stand by it to the last." It is true that Stalin did not yet derive the theorem that in present changed conditions war ceased to be inevitable.

The development of the socialist world system, the cessation of the American World's monopoly, and the gaining of strength to a special degree of the entire

national peace movement brought about the possibility of the final suppression of imperialist war efforts. All these took place already in Stalin's life, yet he did not derive a theory on the general inevitability of war but merely stated the realistic possibility of a lasting peace.

Can we, however, blame Stalin -- since he really did commit some serious mistakes in the concrete judgment of the international conditions and also in his practical policy -- or anybody else, for not coming forward with a theory on the ability to avoid war at the time of the Korean aggression of the American imperialists, when towns and villages of Korea lived through a period of some terrible war damage? At that time the dirty Vietnam war also continued for long years. The reality is that the repulsion of United States aggression in Korea and the forced retreat of the American and French imperialists in Vietnam was the factor which brought to the surface realistic possibilities of the suppression of imperialist war policy and at the same time, that of the ability to avoid war.

During the years of the Korean and Vietnam war even Karel Heger did not come forward with such ideas. In 1954, however, in the course of the revisionist attack, he stood forth asking reproachfully why, together with the principle of the peaceful co-existence of the two systems, did they not declare also a thesis on the ability to avoid war years previously. Why was it not declared at a time, when the Soviet Union was still the only socialist country, the country which, controlled by the capitalist states, endangered from East and West alike by the attack of anti-Soviet bloc organized again and again, and leading defiantly in the eye of the entire imperialist world created a socialist society and took care of its national defense as well as assured its peaceful building work, and which, making use of the increasing differences between the imperialists through its consistent peace policy, secured for itself two decades of peaceful co-existence. Perhaps it's the Soviet Union's fault that Kiliaric's aggression interrupted the peaceful co-existence? Or what does Karel Heger protest? Perhaps about the fact that the Soviet Union also prepared to repel a danger by war? Simultaneously with socialist construction, perhaps, instead of defensive preparations, "the theory of peaceful co-existence of two systems" should have been better worked out? Perhaps this would have helped the Soviet Union more adequately in their fight in the great patriotic war, in the driving out of the Fascist invaders, and in the liberation of several countries, among them our own? Or perhaps "a better worked out theory" of the co-existence of two systems would have caused Fascist Germany to be more lenient (like, let us say, Adenauer's West Germany and Mr. Dulles and similar gentlemen in the United States) and give up the plan of attacking the Soviet Union?

We think that we are looking at the drift of an unbelievably confused process when we read Karel Heger's reproaches in connection with not having worked out better "an acute theory of peaceful co-existence" after the death of Lenin. Let us remember, however, the conception Karel Heger advocated in 1947-48 on the development in Hungary, according to which the nationalized industrial sector would not have become a socialist, but a state-capitalist industrial sector and the small-scale production of peasantry would have "peacefully" and "democratically" "grown into it."

If we know this conception of "socialist" development already represented by Karel Heger and which the capitalist world can accept with peaceful resolve, we will be convinced that it is not the essence of a crisis. We deal with the "historic" extension of the revisionist conception still openly proclaimed by Karel Heger in 1947-48, and listen with painful care after it had been rejected. The essence of all this can be only one thing: why did the Soviet Union not choose a way to socialist development to which the capitalist world could have

reconciled itself peacefully? Why did it go along on a path which induced the capitalist world to form permanent anti-Soviet military alignments, and in the end, led Hitler's Germany to anti-Soviet war? Here Hagg did not go so far, at least he did not go as far in those days, as to explain what that road of socialist reconstruction should have been like, to which the capitalist world could have reconciled itself. However, what he kept offering the Hungarian people with periodic backtracking, it is not difficult to guess where his argumentation leads.

But let us leave this now. Let us merely establish that the setting up of a theorem on the ability to avoid war does not affect the imperialists, on the contrary, it enrages them, because a gigantic social force backs this theorem, which is also able to enforce it. Furthermore, it is not only the terrible German aggression of the Americans that indicates that the imperialists cannot refrain from their military adventures, but the French-British-German attack against Egypt, the British attack against Cuba and Yenan, the French aggression against Algeria, the American conspiracy against Egypt and Syria, the reconstruction of German militarism and its supply with atomic weapons, their consistent opposition to the prohibition of nuclear weapons, and so forth, to quote only their most recent activities.

Here Hagg, however, keeps quiet about the militarist adventurer-policy of the aggressive imperialist circles. But how he can talk about them, when he is the only one who weaves threads of an alliance with forces of a capitalist restoration and builds his policy on the support of Western imperialist powers?

That is why he pretends to lay down a whole program on imperialist military preparations and begins to idealize the capitalist world. If this capitalist world is not, perhaps quite as ideal as those who idealize it imagine, it is easy to attribute this to the fact that the "Socialists" failed years ago "to work out a clear-cut theory of peaceful co-existence." Thank God there comes an Imre Hagg, however, and makes up the deficiency... (Tamas Hagg's alligatores -- st.) and the entire imperialist camp supports his advertising! They omitted this passage who sometimes "the deficiency" as some interesting for pure truth want a painted picture!

Let us proceed further, however. What did Imre Hagg accuse by saying that "they look upon the application of force not in the liberating revolutionary movement of people, but in the military clash between the two systems?" Again, primarily the CPSU and the Soviet Union, which, before socialism became a world system, was the only one representing one of the systems, the socialist system, and he accuses the communist parties which are in agreement with the CPSU, one of which parties, our party, is his also been a member.

On what does he build and with what can he prove his theorem? On nothing and with nothing. This is a machine, chambered destruction, which retortates anti-Soviet and anti-communist slanders proclaimed by international reaction for decades. The guiding principle of the anti-war struggle of the entire international communist movement was and remains the principle that war -- even though it speeds up the development of a social revolution in the capitalist countries, at war -- brings such grave sufferings and losses to the people and the countries, that to avoid a war represents the fundamental interest of the people.

A war between countries of the two world systems would mean extremely grave losses also for the socialist country or countries and it is in the continued interest of the international revolutionary movement as well as the socialist countries to ensure the peaceful development of the socialist countries and to prevent a conflagration of war from interrupting it. Here Hagg knew this very

will not concealed in a sly manner because this fact was not compatible with his consistent revolutionism.

The international communist movement integrated and integrates the solution of the revolution in capitalist countries with a deepening of the economic crisis which unavoidably occurs, with a political crisis which accompanies it, and with the development of the revolutionary forces. Lenin Ragu certainly knew this. It is true that the usual economic cycle became somewhat distorted in the period Lenin with partial wars that followed World War II, that the smaller crises did not deepen and did not take on a more general aspect.

The armament race, a series of partial wars, and a combination of other factors, facilitated a certain extension of capitalist markets. Many people came to the conclusion from this that capitalism could avoid a crisis similar to that of 1929-1933. It also follows from this march of theirs that they deny the fact that resulting from the aggravation of the inner contradictions in capitalist countries, a solution of the revolution is possible, necessary and unavoidable. He has not enough courage, however, to say this openly and directly. Instead, he begs and talks of the fact that socialist progress can be ensured "with a revolution or without one." The fact that it can be carried into effect by a revolution was proved not only in theory but also in reality. The fact that it can be carried into effect without a revolution has been stated for a long time by revolutionaries and Lenin Ragu raked this up now.

The question was brought up before the international communist movement in the following form: from the inevitable crisis of the capitalist world it is a necessity that a socialist revolution unfolds. The consciousness of this is a historic necessity which does not presuppose a clash in war between the two systems. It is in the interest of the people that we prevent this clash in war and spare the population of both the socialist and capitalist countries from the horrors of war.

If we were not successful in preventing the imperialism from unleashing a war, then a devastating war, bringing much suffering, will break out, which would by necessity lead to a revolution annihilating the capitalist system. It is quite natural that the international communist movement struggled, and will struggle also in the future, to avoid an imperialist war, and for the victory of the revolution without a war. The socialist countries join the well-known peace policy of the Soviet Union which, on the basis of the peaceful co-existence and cooperation of the two systems, challenges the capitalist countries to an economic competition. This peaceful co-existence, peaceful cooperation and competition, cannot eliminate these clashes within society which inevitably occurred in the past and will occur in the future as well as in capitalist countries as a result of their inner, irreconcilable contradictions.

It is in the above manner that Marxism-Leninism and the reality raise the question of the revolution. Lenin Ragu does not acknowledge the necessary nature of the fact which is fundamental for the international communist movement: a socialist revolution which originates in the inner contradictions of the capitalist system. For him this is merely a possibility, and a possibility to be avoided at that. He designs the following alternatives: the peaceful co-existence of the two systems or a clash in war. And from peaceful co-existence he deduces the possibility of attaining socialism "with a revolution or without one."

A string of countries which set forth on the path of the revolution have already created a proletarian dictatorship, even though Lenin Ragu and people similar to him regard this. Why could other countries not achieve socialism, however, not through a revolution but without one? Perhaps they could even

creates a "proletarian dictatorship" along some lines like the late Nagy "version," without a revolution!

Or perhaps we are dealing with the achievement of socialism, without a proletarian dictatorship? Really, how else can Imre Nagy's reference be interpreted when he says that India "has created a society on the socialist pattern," behind, without the dictatorship of the proletariat. Why, nobody would presume of Nehru and the Indian nationalist bourgeoisie that they have created or will create a proletarian dictatorship.

As we have been established that the transition from capitalism to socialism will be attended by different parallel features in various countries, and will take on progressively varied forms, a common feature of all of them will be, without a doubt, however, that they will be dictatorships of the proletariat!

Imre Nagy made use of Lenin's thesis on the variety of transitional forms to introduce in its guise the old revisionist "transitional form" without a socialist revolution and a proletarian dictatorship. He carried out this revisionist ideological smuggling in a subtle and cowardly manner. Bernstein stated openly that he was revising Marx, Imre Nagy was revising Lenin with references to Lenin to conceal the deeply revisionist essence of his ideas.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU, as it is well know, established since the fact that in changed world conditions socialist transformation can take place also in a parliamentary manner in certain countries and in certain circumstances, Imre Nagy corrects this thesis: socialism can be victorious "without a revolution, perhaps in a parliamentary manner."

The 20th Congress of the CPSU revised its well-known thesis on the achievement by parliamentary means of the power of the workers' class and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, that is, the victory of the socialist revolution, or rather on its possibility. Imre Nagy "modified," however, the possibility of a victory by revolution using comparatively peaceful and parliamentary means to a rejection of a revolution. He does not say, however, directly and without beating about the bush that he modifies the thesis of principle of the CPSU; he is too cowardly to proclaim his anti-Leninist views without reservation.

Part of Imre Nagy's method of hedging is that he acknowledges since a revolutionary transition and since a proletarian dictatorship since this is a fact in reality in the EU by now, and at the root, he can only express regrets afterwards over the "dogmatic" manner in which the development of the first socialist world power has taken place. In connection with the peoples democratic countries, he is very hopeful, however, that they can still be reconverted from a similarly "dogmatic" path.

As it is known, the major part of the peoples democratic countries have admitted the mistake of mechanically adopting Soviet experiences in the course of their development and have suffered distorted their development. Imre Nagy utilizes these mistakes to state his conviction, namely that our parties prescribed an "identical form and time" in the development of peoples democracies. Peoples democracies learned and will learn from Soviet experiences, more extensively and prudently than before. They will study and utilize, better than before, also the experiences of ourselves. The statement which accuses us of regarding the socialist construction of the EU, China and Hungary as of the same pattern must be branded simply as slander.

It is a fact, of course, that the fundamental characteristics are identical in the development of our countries, because it is socialism that every peoples

democracy builds. The differences are essential, but not fundamental. It is and is not the fact that we did not make sufficient allowances for the diversity of conditions, and that we must make better allowances for them in the future.

We will take good care also in the future, however, that by reference to "peculiar conditions," nobody dares to lead the country away from the Leninist path of building socialism, which path can necessarily be diversified in its forms, but can only be Leninist. This is not "the elimination of the antagonistic interests and contradictions..." (International Herald Tribune article -- ed.) in the interests of close cooperation with the broadest masses of the people," (page 12) as Imre Nagy proclaims it, but isolation of the masses of socialism and the possibilities of their resisting forces in the interests of a cooperation with the broadest masses of the working people. We do eliminate the non-antagonistic contradictions within the people, but do not apply the method of settling such contradictions within the people to the field of antagonistic contradictions between the people and the masses of the people. Also last year's counter-revolution, which Imre Nagy and his associates helped to prepare and unleash in the name of the "elimination of antagonistic contradictions," thereby helping us in bringing to extreme peril the power of the proletariat.

Imre Nagy does not openly confess that he does not find a people's democracy, as one species of proletarian dictatorship, to his liking. While he talks about the work in his country, he does occasionally reveal his true feelings, however. He says: "A people's democracy is the only characteristic form as far recognized by the dogmatic interpretation of Marxism-Leninism as a characteristic way of socialism in the transitional phase between capitalism and socialism." (page 16) It is true that Marxism-Leninism only recognizes these forms as existing, which forms do in actual fact exist. In addition to that, it proclaims that other forms can also come into being in other countries. We must also point out that a people's democratic form is not as stereotyped as Imre Nagy, who is "looking for crimes," tries to make out in a distorting manner. The question is whether there really is another transitional form at present, which the "dogmatists" fail to "recognize?" There is, according to Imre Nagy.

He definitely names India as such and refers to others, but not definitely named semi-colonial and colonial countries, in which the power is still in the hands of the bourgeoisie and in which, according to Imre Nagy, "a transition from capitalism to socialism" is in progress. A transition of a kind which Imre Nagy kept offering to the Hungarian people in 1941-48.

A significant characteristic of the Indian government's economic policy is the increasing of state capitalism to a certain extent, particularly mainly in certain fields of heavy industry, as in the field of metallurgy. For instance, which plays such a major part in assuring the basic material supply of the entire industry, and also in other important fields.

When the workers class, which attained power, nationalized the banks and all their enterprises in Hungary, Imre Nagy stated that the nationalized industrial sector is not of a socialist character but it is a state capitalist economic sector. On the other hand, he declared the state capitalism of the middle class part of middle class India to be "a development of society on the socialist pattern."

When the Hungarian Peoples' Democracy began its socialist-planned economy, he stated that a state capitalist development and a development of a small-scale production of necessity is on the agenda in Hungary. These middle class India

works out and accomplishes economic plans in the interest of state capitalist development, which consist of only a few percent of the entire peoples' economy of India, he sees this as "a transitional phase between capitalism and socialism."

Kare Nagy propagates the avoidance of a socialist revolution and a proletarian dictatorship in both cases, but in changed circumstances. In 1947-48, when the workers were in power in Hungary, it was in the first case that he voted against the proletarian dictatorship. In 1953-56, in the case of India, it was in the second case that he "justified" the superfluousness of liquidating the capitalist system, which is to be avoided. The "justification" in the case of India is in actual fact attributed to the Hungary of 1953-56, instead, to all democratic countries in general, and its essence is the following: For one, they to eliminate the antagonistic contradictions in India and a proletarian dictatorship is not necessary to do so. We can relinquish this "Marxist" way also in this country and then the "peaceful co-existence of the two systems" and the "peaceful replacement of one system by another" can be accomplished, the "replacement" of socialism by the entire capitalist system.

We must also see that, however, in which the positive significance of Nehru's state capitalist development line, which Kare Nagy so perfidiously stresses, and which must not be underestimated. We must refer to the circumstances. The state capitalist development of India strengthens India in its struggle to free areas and put an end to its economic dependence on the imperialist powers. Every success in this struggle serves to strengthen India, which it can use, and already used to an small degree, against imperialist military efforts, and against imperialist economic and political subjugation.

This is of great benefit to India and also of the entire international democratic peace movement. This is one of some very important circumstances. The other is that a substantial change occurs in the character and significance of state capitalist development if the possibility for the workers' bid for power becomes realistic in a peaceful, parliamentary manner.

In certain circumstances state capitalist development can promote the workers' bid for power, and the comparatively peaceful accomplishment of a socialist revolution by parliamentary means. In the political development of India the possibility is at hand that conditions for this will come into being.

The above two conditions, or one of them, which, or rather is in the course of development in other countries as well. It follows from that that the communist parties of many capitalist countries modified their attitude on regard the question of the establishment of state-capitalist peoples economic sectors and the strengthening of such sectors respectively, and are raising concrete demands in connection with the development of a state economic sector.

When Marxism-Leninism states that the world is made up of two world systems, the capitalist and the socialist world system, it means, in fact, that there could be some sort of a transitional world system in between the two. There could be countries in which the workers accomplish comparatively peacefully a socialist revolution, by leading the country from a capitalist into a socialist world system.

Marxism-Leninism recognizes the significance of state-capitalist development in non-socialist countries struggling against imperialism and supports this development, but it does not consider those countries, which are capitalist countries, socialist-type countries! Marxism-Leninism recognizes that in certain circumstances a state-capitalist development can promote the acquisition of political power by parliamentary means and draws from this fact the necessary conclusions. This is, however, not a renunciation of a revolution and a dictatorship of the proletariat. For Kare Nagy, however, the establishment of a state industrial sector serves the purpose of reviving the old thesis of revisionists on "peaceful replacement" of socialism by capitalism by "democratic means," without a revolution and a proletarian dictatorship.

In theoretical analyses of Lave Ragg, an important place is occupied by a "negative" development further of the five basic principles of peaceful co-existence. The third chapter of his "work" deals with this, in which he states that the five basic principles of peaceful co-existence cannot be restricted to the capitalist system, or to the struggle between the two systems, but must include the relationship between each of the countries within the socialist camp. (page 30.)

Lave Ragg conceives, not by a homogeneous wording, as homogeneity and equilibrium is not characteristic the opposition of ideas of a person who indulges habitually in provocations, three camps: the capitalist system, the democratic camp, and the socialist camp. For what reason are there no democratic countries within the capitalist system? Of course there are. What is a person to do who advocates that on the basis of "peaceful co-existence" democratic countries are even now "being exploited" "imperialistically" by socialism. What Lave Ragg does is to separate democratic but still not socialist countries from the capitalist system and no countries proceeding on a new, "peculiar" path of socialist development, which he declares, he places them in a separate democratic camp, between capitalist and socialist countries.

What is the reality, however? It is that there is a capitalist world system and a socialist world system. At the same time, there is: 1) an imperialist war camp, 2) a socialist peace camp, and 3) there are non-socialist but non-imperialist neutral countries, which want peace. The socialist peace camp and non-socialist neutral countries combined compose the peace sphere of the world, which does exist, although this concept is absent from the opposition of ideas of Lave Ragg. It is true that not one of these neutral countries did become countries of war because the imperialists attacked them, as for instance, Egypt and Cuba. They also threaten other neutral countries, like Syria, with an attack.

Lave Ragg states: "the five basic principles stem not from contradictions between the two systems, capitalism and socialism, it is not only these that they express, but they are features independent of social and political systems in the sphere of relations between nations." (page 30.)

First of all, let us ask the question, if the five basic principles are quite as independent of social and political systems, why is it that it was capitalism that prevailed here, instead that two world wars, instead of making the five basic principles the basic principles of the relationship between nations? Could there have ever been any talk under capitalism of equality of rights between small and big nations, between strong and weak nations, which is one of the conditions of the five basic principles?

Why is it that it was a system of imperialism that developed under capitalism and why not a system of equal rights between nations? Is the thesis of Lave Ragg not driven? No, it is not driven, but a guess under which Lave Ragg introduces his "ideas" serving the betrayal of the socialist camp. We will see this further along.

The five basic principles put into words by the well-known statement of Chou-en-lai and Nikita stem from the fundamental interests of people desiring the prevention of military clashes and the peaceful co-existence of the two systems, as well as from the peace policy of socialist and non-socialist, but anti-imperialist states. It was through the birth of the socialist world system and the large-scale breaking up of the imperialist world system that the five basic principles became quite as significant in international politics as they are! Why does Lave Ragg want to obscure this fact? Why does he suppress that it is only in a struggle against the war policy of the Western imperialists, because that the five basic principles must and can be led to victory? Because, while preparing for a betrayal, he spreads illusions toward the Western powers,

and make use of the "five basic principles" to propagate a breaking away from the Soviet Union and the socialist camp, and to prepare this action "ideologically."

Here Hagg dresses up in the robe of a "national politician." How many dirty, anti-popular things were disguised by the robe of a "national" policy. Here Hagg also goes along on this path, but in such a manner that at the same time he also professes to be a loyal adherent of proletarian internationalism. During this he states: "national independence, which is the sum total of the five basic principles, is the decisive and primary factor of international politics, a condition of which is the establishment of national solidarity and unity." (page 11.)

We are in a position today that we have already seen in practice an Hagg-like "national solidarity," and a counter-revolutionary "national" unity with ferocity of a capitalist restoration, which, under the piratical banner of "national independence," almost dug the grave of the cause of the proletarian power and national independence alike.

But let us now examine the previous "theorem" as well, which shows us precisely the manner in which here Hagg, as a result of a well thought out political conception, arrived at a shameful path leading to the surrendering of the proletarian power, to the breaking away from the socialist camp, and to placing the country under the guardianship of Western powers.

When here Hagg proclaims that the five basic principles of peaceful co-existence are equally valid in connection with the relationship with capitalist states and in the relationship of socialist countries with each other, he proclaims the fundamental principle of the relationship between capitalist countries and socialist countries to be entirely identical, and denies the fundamental differences in the relationship between capitalist and socialist countries.

The logical conclusion of this is, or springs precisely from the fact, that here Hagg intended to change the five principles of the peaceful co-existence of the two systems into the "fundamental principles" of a breaking away from the Soviet Union, and of a disintegration of the socialist camp. That is why he declares the five basic principles to be a factor "independent from social and political systems." That is why he declares that national independence is the sum total of the five basic principles," with which slogan he endeavor to consciously whitewash the practical banner of the disintegration of the socialist camp.

In the course of this, here Hagg does not say openly that the socialist camp must be broken up as he speaks of the "ending involvement" of the socialist camp, of proletarian internationalism, of the socialist bloc as "the provision of international, universal countries of equal rights," as of "national associations," which will have to be established in accordance with his conception, and as he speaks of which he uses in every manner the language of bourgeois liberalism from the socialist camp. His theses at the outset are the following:

4) The workers' class "cannot subordinate the universal interests of the nation to its own class interests, because it is only together with other working classes that it can liberate itself and aid liberate itself, and because it is only in an alliance with them that it can consolidate its state power." (page 12.)

2) Instead of "Socialist dogmas," we introduce the Marxist-Leninist thesis on individual forms of socialism, the five basic principles of national existence, and the principle of ideological non-interference." (page 33.)

3) The policy of power alignments is at variance with the principle of national independence and sovereignty based on the five basic principles, as well as with the principle of peaceful co-existence of nations." (page 38.) "It is a question of existence for small countries like Hungary" not to become "an active participant in the clash between power alignments," (page 38.) Countries of the socialist camp "must strive for the liquidation of alignment policy." "The rivalry between power alignments and their struggle against each other will hardly lead to the dissemination of the alignment and of the alignment policy." (page 39.) Hungary "is convinced by the terrible experiences of two world wars that it cannot and must not become a participant in the rivalry of power alignments." (page 39-40) Lajos Kossuth "formed a social picture for the assurance of an independent, sovereign, self-reliant and free national existence of the Hungarians, not by joining some great power or power group, but by a close alliance with the surrounding people in the form of an alliance [federation] with free people of equal rights." (page 45.)

Lars Hag refused from the fact that the workers' class must subordinate its own class interests to "the universal interests of the nation" and through unilateral disarmament of the Warsaw defense pact of socialist countries, he came to proclaiming a break from the Soviet Union, and to proclaiming a new alignment of countries breaking away from the Soviet Union. Lars Hag refused to the policy of alliances which was a social picture of Kossuth.

We have been able to witness, however, the policy of alignment which was a "social picture" of Lars Hag as far back as January 1958, which he, under the guise of being against power alignments, explained in writing call to advance in the course of the ideological preparations of the counter-revolution, and the accomplishment of which he also intended to carry out as a Prime Minister opening the door far and attending in every sense on the counter-revolution.

By subordinating "the class interests of the workers" and the existence of the proletarian party, to the "national interests of the nation," on all kinds of forms of socialist restoration, together with Lars Hag, demanded and realized it.

We must fight on these issues of Lars Hag in order to show their serious consequences. Before we do that, however, let us see where the establishment of a new alignment, disguised by "being against alignments," would have led to in connection with the aim of separating peoples' democratic countries from the Soviet Union, as followers of Lars Hag actually proclaimed in the summer of last year under the slogan of "anti-Stalinist" because it is a fact that they did realize it and hoped that Hungary, as well as Czechoslovakia and Poland, would break away from the Soviet Union and would try the Warsaw defense pact of socialist countries.

What would have been the consequences if this program were had executed and the Warsaw pact had ceased to exist? It would have meant that the separation of Poland and CZE would have isolated the GDR from the GDR, and a German army would have launched an attack against the GDR. It must be kept in mind that the imperialists are not middle class dreamers, but war politicians who make quick use of possibilities open to them, and who make wonderful use, for their own purpose, of people who become traitors from middle class dreamers.

If they had destroyed the GDR, isolated from the USSR, through the deployment of a gigantic aerial bombardment, and united all Germany in the sign of German militarism, the next step would have been the granting of the Oder-Neisse border, the seizure of Western territories of Poland, and the complete liquidation of the socialist order in Poland. If Polish reactionary forces had not liquidated it themselves by that time, or if the Polish workers class had not accomplished a careful restoration of the alliance with the Soviet Union and insured the armed support of the Soviet Union, Russia would have taken a similar turn in Czechoslovakia as well.

And in Hungary? Here, nationalist-stalinist reaction took a stand openly at the time of the counter-revolution. The counter-revolution of Hungary alone would have changed our country into a hotbed of war. Emphasizing greatly the slogan of "neutrality," it was preparing a war against Czechoslovakia, Rumania, as well as Yugoslavia. The war plans of the Hungarian reaction were only a link in the plans on a much wider scale of the Western imperialists, for the "liberation" of democratic countries, and for their plans for a new world war aimed at attacking the Soviet Union and China.

It is not the nice spot of Imre Nagy that Dulles, Eisenhower and his associates, the Radio Free Europe of the American capitalists and their fellow propagandists outlined and set up ahead, but his political conception and policy of "neutrality," because in the given circumstances it was this policy of the revisionist traitors that would help their anti-people war aim most effectively.

A break from the Soviet Union, liberator of our country, its chief supporter, and defense ally would have not only plunged the existence of the proletarian power into an extreme danger, but would have involved our people in a new catastrophe of war as well.

Let us return now to the thoses of Imre Nagy, however. Imre Nagy does perhaps admit of the alliance with the socialist world power, the Soviet Union, that it is in agreement with the class interests of the workers, but he does not consider it to be in agreement with interests of "other classes" and those with "the universal interests of the nation." Why? An alliance with the socialist world power, which liberated us, safeguards us continuously against imperialist interference, supports far-reachingly our constructive work, and corrects the mistakes we make, in the main course of the peace of our fatherland. Not only the class interests of the workers, but the most universal, most elementary interest of our nation demands this alliance.

If we had broken off the defensive alliance made with the Soviet Union, if we had allowed our country to be torn out of the German East, if we had tolerated Hungary's becoming the prey of imperialism or "neutrality," as Imre Nagy and his followers wanted to see, as an alliance with the middle reaction-revolutionary camp, our fatherland would have become the prey of a white terror, of a fascist barbarism, and of war.

This would have suited the plans of the Hungarian forces of a capitalist restoration and their Western supporters, that which Imre Nagy dignified by the slogan of "the universal interests of the nation."

In the sequence of ideas of Imre Nagy, an important place is occupied by "ideological non-interference," the thesis on the refusal of mutual criticism and debates, the demand that nobody should want to intervene in things we do in Hungary under the guise of "anti-agonism" in the creative development

further of Marxist-Leninism. We have seen so far what Kere Nagy did. It is understandable that he stresses the character of the "inevailability" of the ideology of a revisionist betrayal.

The refusal of actual political or economic advice, which is in itself abstract and unactionable, is not enough for him. The giving of actual advice is customary between all these countries which maintain with each other a relationship of friendship and alliance, and is more important still for the further development of the socialist countries and of the entire socialist world system. Let us come to the subject of "ideological non-interference," however.

One of the chief prerequisites for the development of revolutionary workers parties has always been to exchange each other's experiences, to debate various questions of principle and policy, and to coordinate their attitudes regarding ideological and other questions. Without this cooperation of principles and policy, exchange of advice and debates, the international revolutionary workers' movement could not have developed, the socialist world system could not have been born, and it could not develop further, but would decline. Without an ideological-political cooperation, the international peace movement could not have come into being either and could not develop further, but would also decline. Forms of ideological-political cooperation do change and it is necessary that they change; this cooperation, which is one of the indispensable conditions of our progress, develops further by the elimination of the recurring mistakes or methods that become outdated.

For what purpose does Kere Nagy, the mouthpiece of a capitalist restoration, need an "ideological" cooperation, however? How can a "national communist" venture the criticism of fraternal parties, with other words, an "ideological interference"? He cannot at all, therefore he declares it to be a "national affair."

It is the elementary duty of every communist party to listen to the opinions of the fraternal parties on its own work, attitude and policy, and to take the fraternal advice to heart. This taking to heart does not mean the unconditional acceptance of any advice by any of the parties, including also the CPSU. We have every one agreed this, and the CPSU also specifically warned of this. We have to decide ourselves as to whether we consider this or that advice correct, whether we are going to dispute it or accept it, and in what form we will adopt it.

Nevertheless, an ideological-political cooperation, disarmingly called "ideological interference" by Kere Nagy, is a binding order of Marxist-Leninist parties, and only revisionist parties resisted it. The class basis of this rejection was always the joining of forces with one's "own" bourgeoisie. As for Kere Nagy, he became conscious of the glory of these revisionist parties and followed in their footsteps.

After he rejected "ideological interference" and assumed the role of a nationalist politician, he turned against the policy of "peace alignments" emphasizing the fact that there is an imperialist peace alignment and a socialist peace alignment and while one is an alignment of aggressive war, the other forges the principle forces of peace, forces of the socialist countries into a class unity against the imperialists.

He does admit in one of his statements, under duress and for sake of preservation, but he admits that "in the struggle against the aggressive policy of alignments, the greatest and most stable force is the strength of the socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union." (page 79.) This admission makes it the more important still, that under the general slogan of "being against alignments" he preaches the division of particularly those "greatest and most stable forces" of peace, and that he advocates a "neutral" standing apart from particularly the forces, the Soviet Union, and the forming of a new alignment against it headed under the slogan of "neutrality."

Lars Haeg does very well that the defensive alliances formed under the Warsaw pact are of a provisional nature, and that we would do well if we could come to an agreement regarding the establishment of an all-European anti-imperialist defense system. He still talks of the "peace alignments" as though they would be dangerous to peace regardless of their character. Thus, the Warsaw pact also endangers peace, it must be dismantled. It must be discontinued, regardless of the fact as to whether a mutual all-European defense system can be created.

By this, the aggressive alignments of the imperialists will not cease to exist. Lars Haeg is "honest" in that matter, however. He cannot break NATO, but he can break up the Warsaw pact, the defensive alliances of the socialist powers. He does that he has done "all he could." Being a communist, he cannot openly say that he joined the camp of the imperialists' "peace alignments." He can only say that he must break away from the most important defensive alliance of the socialist camp, Warsaw and must not "participate in the division of power alignments" because "it was not a joining of forces with a great camp of power groups" but because of a neutral stance in front of America. He carefully avoids calling the Warsaw pact, the breeding ground of which he advocates, by its name. He carefully avoids calling by name the "great group" or "some group of great powers" from which Haeg and the other small socialist countries must stay away. In connection with this position, he keeps his provocative row of exceptions within the frame of "an analysis on principle." Every schoolboy knows, however, that socialist Hungary is not allied with a Western imperialist great power, but with a socialist great power, the Soviet Union.

They know equally well that the "some group of great powers" with which Hungary is in the same camp and from which Lars Haeg stated to stay away, are the two socialist world powers, the Soviet Union and China. Lars Haeg did dare to say this openly and directly. He did, however, when the counter-revolutionaries asked him to do so.

It was many months before, however, that he prepared "biologically" the treacherous policy of disruption against the socialist camp and the coming against the Soviet Union, in support of a developing anti-party faction and a conspiracy that was being organized to restructure the peoples democratic order.

This is then the former opportunist who "developed" as far as betrayal, he did not dare to speak take over the heritage of Bernstein's opportunism, which was smashed a long time ago and was combined with a lot of well-known betrayal, because he is too cowardly and wanting to do such a thing. He put on the mask of a "socialist" and disguised new editions of perdition by Marxist phrasology, the essence of which is the surrender of the basic principle of the proletarian dictatorship, an "ideological" preparation for attacking the dictatorship of the proletariat from behind and its betrayal, in aid of a break with the socialist camp and the serving of the counter-revolution. In this respect, he did indeed try to create "a unity" of his words and deeds.

It did not rest on him that his endeavor became frustrated, in spite of the atheism and support of the whole imperialist world,

FROM THE HISTORY OF THE IDEOLOGICAL PREPARATION
FOR THE SOCIAL REVOLUTIONARY
MOVING IN HUNGARY

by V. A. Karamyan and
V. S. Shkolnyer

Problems of History

No. 12, 1957 (Passed for publication, 12 Dec. 1957)

One of the main reasons why the counterrevolutionary rising took place in Hungary is the fact that within the Hungarian working class party itself there was an organized opportunist group which took upon itself the shameful role of a pioneer of capitalist restoration. A resolution of the plenum of the CC of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party observed that "a large part in the development of the events of October and the tragic coup was played by the party opposition group which was formed in recent years and had grown constantly stronger, choosing Nagy, Nagy and La. László as their banner."¹⁰ The destructive ideological work of the opportunist Nagy-László group led to serious ideological confusion among the Hungarian people and in the last analysis served the interests of counter-revolution.

Describing the work of Nagy, László and their supporters in the October period in Hungary, James Kadar observes "By resorting to nationalist investigation, by the revisionist denial of the leading role of the party contrary to socialist democracy, and by disturbing the conceptions of freedom and democracy in a reactionary manner they provided the ideological weapons for the counter revolution. They carried out inflammatory propaganda amongst those strata of the population which had become ideologically confused, for example, amongst university students, and as a result of their treacherous work they paralyzed the party, the state and the effectiveness of all the masses true to socialism at the decisive moment."¹¹

Nagy and his group prepared the soil for the anti-party and anti-popular action in Hungary over a long period. The work of this group mainly reflected the interests of the Hungarian kulaks. The reactionary ideology of the Nagy-László group is one of the forms of petty bourgeois opportunism.

The revisionism of Nagy, which was so clearly manifest last year in Hungary, is not a fortuitous phenomenon. The root of the opportunist vines lie in the past. This is shown in particular by material in the two volumes of his work published in 1954.¹²

It is well known that a most important condition for the existence of peoples democracy, as one of the forms of dictatorship of the proletariat, is a guarantee of the leading and directing role of the revolutionary party of the working class. The leading role of the Hungarian communists came about historically in the course of a long and tough struggle for national freedom and democracy, in the fighting against the German invaders, Horthyites and Szabistas, against the land owners and bourgeoisie, against the leaders of the right-wing socialists and bourgeois nationalists. The agrarian reform and nationalization of industry, the banks and transport, were carried out on the initiative of the Hungarian communists. Thanks to the leadership of the communists the Hungarian people achieved broad democratic freedoms and formed a people's democracy. The group of Nagy, which strove in every way to dislodge the role of the party in all spheres of the economic, ideological and national life of Hungary, opposed this leading role of the CP. A member of the CC of the HWP, Bela Blasko, in his lecture on "The contemporary problems of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary" observed: "The revisionist and treacherous Nagy group, although it verbally advocated socialism, had for a long time waged an ideological and political offensive against the dictatorship of the proletariat."¹³ Nagy and his

¹⁰The introductory part of the article, a long but serious attack on KFE-FKE has not been translated.

supporters attempted to associate the revolutionary content of the dictatorship of the proletariat and to diminish the role of the Party, they slighted the (local) Councils and at the same time flirted with the petty bourgeois strata of the population.

In his book, Nagy gives the following definition of the dictatorship of the proletariat: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is a broader class alliance which rests on the alliance of workers and peasants, a component part of which is the intelligentsia, the petty bourgeois and non-proletarian elements who take part in the building of socialism. Without their active participation it is impossible to build socialism."⁵⁴ However, Nagy attempted to base his revisionist views on quotations from Lenin, deliberately distorting the meaning of the latter's speech "On the Reception of the People by Means of Slogans of Freedom and Equality", made in May 1917. In the foreword to the text of this speech, Lenin, disclosing the revolutionary essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat, described it as a special form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working people, and numerous non-proletarian strata of the working people, with the working class taking a leading part in the alliance. "It is an alliance", Lenin wrote, of firm supporters of socialism with wavering allies and courtiers with 'neutrals' (they form an agreement on the struggle, the alliance becomes an agreement on neutrality), an alliance between classes which are economically, politically, socially and spiritually unequal.⁵⁵ Nagy deliberately ignored two important features of the dictatorship of the proletariat which were stressed by Lenin—the leading and directing role of the working class and the hesitations and instability of its non-proletarian allies. Ignoring these principles of Lenin, Nagy gave a false, anti-Marxist evaluation of the role of the party of the working class in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat.⁵⁶

Nagy openly denied the ability of the revolutionary party of the working class to rally the workers of the country and to lead them along the road to the building of a socialist society. He asserted that "The party has had to take upon itself the task of rallying and educating the broadest patriotic and democratic masses of the people, utilizing them to carry out great national tasks, due to the lack of any other all-embracing organization. These tasks have exceeded the strength, organization and influence of the Party."⁵⁷

Relittling the role of the party and the working class in this "national unity", Nagy simultaneously strove for the transformation of the non-party Fatherland People's Front into a detached political organization, violating the resolution of the III Congress of the Party. He proposed the introduction of individual membership in the Fatherland Front, and that it should be given tasks which would set it above the local councils, the youth organizations, the trade unions and the party of the working class itself. In granting such views, Nagy and the opportunist group which he headed, aimed to disrupt the rallying of the main masses of the workers, peasants, and working class intellectuals, as well as all progressive elements in the urban petty bourgeoisie (belonging to the Fatherland Front headed by the revolutionary party of the proletariat).⁵⁸

Thus, Nagy and his supporters insistently strove for the revision of the Marxist Leninist teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat. The right-wing opportunist group in Hungary attempted to revise the most important Leninist principle of party construction—the principle of democratic centralism. The members of the group wished to create a situation in the party in which the resolutions of the party leadership would not be obligatory for all party organizations. Such a revisionist viewpoint threatened a crisis in the ranks of the party of the working class. Nagy himself repeatedly opposed the decisions of higher party organs. As an example one could cite his article in *Iskolás*, the main thought of which ran counter to the resolution of the III Party Congress and the third plenum of the CC in 1934.⁵⁹ Right wing elements took this article as a signal for new attacks on

the unity of the party. Nagy also held anti-Marxist views on the main problem of the development of the economy of the Hungarian people's republic, and in particular, on agriculture. Thus for example he asserted that expanded reproduction is characteristic of individual peasant farms in the conditions of people's democracy. Contrary to Lenin's teaching on small peasant farming which gives rise to capitalism, Nagy and his supporters defended the idea that the individual peasant farms develop together with the production cooperatives in the direction of socialism and that in the end, it is also building socialism. Nagy saw the future of Hungarian agriculture in the development of individual medium farms and of consumer sales cooperatives. At the same time he attempted to prove by every means the inexpediency of collectivizing the peasants with the purpose of combined conduct of the whole process of agricultural production. His article "The Attitude to the Medium Peasant" which summed up his speeches in the discussion of the CC of the KMP in 1948-49 concerning the policy of the party in the countryside, is characteristic in this respect.⁴⁰ In essence Nagy advocated the postponement for an indefinite period of the collectivization of the peasantry in production cooperatives and repudiated the consistent implementation of a policy of restricting the kulaks.

Repeatedly stressing that the "medium peasant is a central feature in agriculture during the building of socialism" Nagy completely ignored the leading role of the working class in the socialist reconstruction of agriculture, and moreover he asserted that the peasantry should adhere to its own Wirtschaftswirtschaft and should not show solidarity with the proletariat. "The working class," he wrote, "should not repudiate the idea of socialism and should not desert the Wirtschaftswirtschaft of the peasantry, and vice versa the peasantry should not do so either, in order that the alliance should be firm and stable."⁴¹

Such a "theory" had a very pernicious influence on the development of socialist agriculture in Hungary. The dissemination of such views led not only to the standstill in the expansion of agricultural cooperation in 1954, but also to some retrogression. At the same time, the kulaks, who had again begun to grow rich at the expense of the small and medium peasant, raised their heads. The practical work of Nagy followed entirely from this "theory". In describing this work, Szabó Nép wrote that Nagy, "beginning from his government statement in July 1953, launched a real struggle against the socialist reconstruction of agriculture, supporting the departure of peasants from the production cooperatives."⁴²

Criticizing Nagy's opportunist views on agriculture, Lajos Fehér, a member of the Politburo of the CC of the KMP, in his work "The Factors for the Development of Hungarian Agriculture" wrote "One of the greatest anti-Marxist errors made by Nagy in the 1949 discussion was his statement that with the appropriation of the capitalist and land-owning classes "we have already blocked the road to capitalist development in the countryside" and that "the peasant farms cannot develop in a capitalist direction."⁴³

The opportunist and anti-Marxist views of the Nagy group were particularly clearly manifest in 1950-55, on the eve of the counter-revolutionary rising, when Nagy was Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Hungary. His theoretical and practical work and that of his supporters was directed against the interests of the Hungarian working class and slowed down the development of Hungary along socialist lines.

As regards the problem of raising the standard of living of the population, the Nagy group one-sidedly reduced the scope of this task to increasing agricultural output, completely ignoring the necessity for the development of industry as a basis for an increase in agricultural production. "The decisive factor for in-

creasing the standard of living in agriculture," Nagy said, while Chairman of the Council of Ministers. "This is a necessary condition for carrying out the government's program. The whole program is built upon this, this is its cornerstone, the main problem for our further advance. Therefore agricultural production is being put in the foreground of our economic policy and of our whole national economy."⁴³

As is well known in June 1953 the plenum of the CC of the RWP adopted important resolutions, the main task of which was to narrow the distance formerly committed in the socialist construction of the country. However, the implementation of these decisions ran up against direct resistance from the Nagy opportunist group. Becoming head of the government in June 1953, Nagy attempted to shake confidence in the party and the people's democratic system in his first speech. His supporters, like himself, strove in every way to defame the great gains of the Hungarian people under the People's democratic regime. Extremely characteristic in this respect was the notorious article by one of Nagy's closest colleagues, G. Locomony, in the weekly "Népszabadság", published in autumn 1953. The author dealt only with the errors and defects of the past, with the need "fundamentally to transform our policy", with the "decisive aims of the whole of our policy, which affected the whole of our people", with the "general settlement" of the position of the intelligentsia, etc.⁴⁴ Thus Locomony did not even mention the socialist gains of the Hungarian people, which naturally created the impression of a need for fundamental reconstruction of the whole social and political system. Moreover, the article put forward the conditions for the implementation of the party's program to the intelligentsia, displaying an obvious lack of confidence in the resolution of the CC and in the authority of the whole party. Dealing with the prospects for carrying out the resolution on the intelligentsia, Locomony adopted the position of an observer outside the party for whom the resolution of the CC was not compulsory and who needed further proof of the possibility of carrying it out. As was noted by the resolutions of the December Plenum of the CC of the RWP (1954), the Nagy-Loconony group openly criticized individual errors in the former leadership of the party, thereby enabling reactionary elements to take part in their criticism. The content of the criticism was distorted and constituted a great threat to the whole of the party, to the positions of the working people and to the whole people's democratic system. "This group of the Party opposites", the resolution said, "without putting forward a positive program for the correction of errors, has one-sidedly attacked the party alone, without distancing itself from reaction. It has encouraged reactionary forces and to a considerable extent contributed to an outbreak of counter-revolution."⁴⁵

One of the Hungarian communists, describing the impression made by the Nagy program of the summer of 1953, writes "There will naturally be a single essential one in not based by this program. It does not even mention socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the results of the 17 years struggle of the working class. But it deals more with the crimes which have been committed, with the so-called new course and the new policy. We all still recall how on the day after the publication of the government program the hounds came to life in the villages and various bourgeois hostile elements became liquid in the towns."⁴⁶

For a number of years a right-wing opportunist group preaching petty bourgeois ideology had been forming around Nagy. This group did not regress and still less defended the class interests of the proletariat. It set out to weaken the dictatorship of the proletariat, to retreat from the socialist development of the country. It is therefore not surprising that the hounds and the petty bourgeois elements in the town called Nagy "their own".

2. Nagy and his supporters, like the other revisionists, have striven to conceal their retreat from the principles of Marxism-Leninism by referring to

to the "special features" of the development of Hungary toward socialism. As N. Kállai pointed out in his work "The Hungarian Counter-revolution in the light of Marxism-Leninism", Nagy saw a "specific" feature of the Hungarian development of the proletariat in the fact that the comparatively peaceful construction of socialism does not accord with the positive functions of the state and that therefore they should be discarded. "Nagy," Kállai states, "under-estimated the strength of the class enemy and moreover he denied that such forces existed in the country. Hence his theory about '9 1/2 million Hungarian hearts which beat as one' and 'the unity of Hungarian national culture.'"⁴⁰

Nagy approached the problems of the history of the Hungarian state and the evaluation of the 1948 revolution from bourgeois nationalist positions. Thus for example, in his speech on the 100th anniversary of the revolution he stated that the building of the people's democratic system in Hungary should follow the road of the ideas of the revolution of 1948. "We, the descendants of the March generation," he said, "will be able to be worthy of them only if with unshakable faith and firm resolution we follow the road to the formation of a people's democracy, which has been started by them and illumined by their bright genius."⁴¹

Nevertheless, it is well known that the 1948 revolution in Hungary was a bourgeois revolution which in the event of victory would have led to capitalist development. It is obvious that an appeal to follow this road of development (which was progressive in the middle of the 19th century) was clearly reactionary in socialist Hungary. It is also well known that one of the main reasons for the defeat of the revolution and the liberation war in 1948-49 was the faulty policy of its leaders as regards the national problem. Therefore, by equating the tasks of the socialist and bourgeois revolutions, Nagy could not fail to stir up nationalist chauvinist moods among the petty bourgeois. Individual Hungarian cultural leaders began to portray the past of the Hungarian state in a distorted manner, to look up the national liberation struggle of the national minorities against the past Hungarian aristocracy, to idealize certain Hungarian political leaders who expressed the sentiments of Hungarian great-nation chauvinism.

In putting forward the slogan of "national communism" the Nagy-Laczkovics group essentially covered the unity of the countries of the socialist camp and prepared the soil for the counter-revolutionary rising in favor of international imperialism. Imperialist propaganda and the work of the Nagy-Laczkovics group were aimed in fact by democratic demands for "de-stalinization" they attempted to undermine the influence of the communist Party across the European continent. Insisting on the necessity for "rebuilding the workers regime", Nagy and his supporters essentially began the liquidation of the people's democratic system in Hungary. Under the guise of "national communism", kindling nationalism in the country, the Hungarian opportunists attempted to create an atmosphere of tension and conflict favorable to imperialism in the heart of Europe.

Describing the nationalist and revisionist views of the Nagy group, L. Kise, a member of the politbureau of the CC of the CPSU in his article "The NSRP" observed "Under the pretext of searching for the 'Hungarian road' to socialism, this group arrived at the anti-Marxist conclusions of 'national communism' and proclaiming nationalist views, adopted an anti-Soviet standpoint. They pretended that their revisionist nonsense was 'the creative development of Marxism-Leninism' and 'application of it to Hungarian conditions.'"⁴²

Although the right-wing opportunist work of Nagy and his supporters was condemned by the plenum of the CC of the CPSU in the Spring 1955, it should be noted that the Hungarian workers party had conducted a most feeble open ideological struggle against opportunist, revisionist and anti-party views. As a result of this, the subversive counter-revolutionary work of the Nagy-Laczkovics group which began to be gradually particularly intensive in the Spring of 1956, paralyzed the party, and a tendency towards liberal appeasement of this group spread through-

out the country. As the Chinese press correctly noted, the Hungarian People's Democracy, prior to October 1956, was not sufficiently honest and consistent in its attitude to the masses of socialism. In Hungary recently there has not been a real dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., the masses of the dictatorship of the proletariat who had combined more and more with internal and international reaction had not been ideologically rooted within the Party.

Describing the organization of the Nagy-Losonczy group B. Kallai wrote that "Nagy and his group of bourgeois liberal democrats, liberals and counter-revolutionaries over a long period they consistently and deliberately destroyed the party, the organs and institutions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and undermined confidence in socialist ideology. In 1956 they deliberately and according to plan prepared for the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They organized a political army and in complete agreement with the Western imperialists and internal counter-revolutionaries during their drive on the streets and leading for the overthrow of the system proclaimed and organized after another a second time the party and the people's democratic system. In the summer of 1956 they began to organize political demonstrations and on October 23 they began the offensive for the overthrow of the regime."

The defects of ideological work in the Hungarian workers' Party had as one of their consequences the dissemination of the views of the opportunist Nagy-Losonczy group amongst a proportion of writers, philosophers, historians and other cultural workers. Their ideas of revolution and liquidation received widespread currency among that section of the intelligentsia in Hungary which was still captured by petty bourgeois idealism. In its turn the reactionary group of writers and authors played a large part in the ideological preparation for the counter-revolutionary rising in Hungary. It is possible fully to agree with the opinion of Marton Levas, who wrote in an article entitled "Why the Work of the Union of Writers was Stopped" that "the destructive ideological work of a section of the writers was an organic element in the preparation for counter-revolution, regardless of whether ideological and concrete arguments of a section took part in it or whether they were honest people of good will."

At that time a section of the Hungarian writers inaccurately interpreted the above mentioned resolutions of the June (1956) plenum. Among some writers "opportunist" and "the critical spirit" became fashionable, and the false theory, according to which the tasks of literature and art were confined exclusively to disclosure and exposure of mistakes, gained currency. Under the influence of the bourgeois-nationalist views, the glorification of small peasant farming, the underestimation and negation of the leading role of the proletariat and its vanguard - the Party - in the social life of the country, etc., were more and more widely disseminated in literature. Some of the works of Hungarian writers seriously belittled the achievements of the people's democratic system, the great gains of the working class, peasantry and intellectuals of People's Hungary. More and more books began to appear which were filled with pessimism and depression, portraying Hungarian reality in a distorted light.

Gradually, under the influence and with the support of the Nagy-Losonczy opposition group, an anti-party factional headed by Nagy, Imre, Adorcs, Bay and others, many of whom were members of the MWP, began to form among the writers. At the end of 1956, 6 members and 3 secretaries of the Presidium of the Union of Hungarian writers deservingly resigned their membership in the Presidium. After their resignation, this group continued its anti-party work by sending a memorandum to the CC of the MWP. The collection of signatures to the memorandum and the wide-spread discussion of this document outside the framework of the Party constituted a gross violation of party discipline and of the principle of democratic centralism. Not merely the form of the appeal to the leadership of

The party led primarily the content of the neo-reaction gives evidence of the existence of the National anti-Party group.

The main fire of the Nagy-Isak-Isak group was directed against the Party leadership of literature. The ideas of Nagy were embodied in the work of a section of the writers. Their demands ran in the same direction--against the leading role of the party. That one of the leaders of the anti-Party group, Nagy, admitted that he and his supporters were fighting for the liquidation of the party and state guidance of literature.¹⁷ A similar point of view was expressed by Nagy. "We, and our every-growing group are the party,"¹⁸ said Tibor Erdos in the summer of 1956 at a discussion of problems of the press, thereby setting the group of the writers opposition off against the party and the working class.

This point of view of the Hungarian writers group was not original. The negation of the class and ideological content of literature has always been characteristic of the majority of reactionists of Marxism-Leninism. The idea of a literature without "partisanship" is an idea of the bourgeoisie, because the bourgeoisie is not interested in the correct portrayal of life, in laying bare the social contradictions of society. Bourgeoisie partisanship, the ideology of the bourgeoisie is concealed behind this so-called "absence of partisanship".

Fifty years ago Lenin in his article "The Party Organization and Party Literature" stressed that literature should show partisanship, and should be a component part of organized, planned and integrated Party work. Some Hungarian writers thought themselves "superior". These writers demanded a special attitude toward themselves and a special place in the party. "The representatives of writers should meet political representatives and draw up a platform" said Nagy.¹⁹ The impression was formed that this referred to two organs which are in some way opposed, to some kind of "autonomy" for writers within the party and within the state. Lenin, as is well known, fought resolutely against such "autonomy". When in 1930 some Soviet writers began to show a tendency to break away from state leadership, Lenin sharply condemned the point of view the Proletkult, which considered itself a state within a state. Lenin thought that contrasting the Proletkult with the Karkompro which control had literary problems was absolutely inadmissible. In his draft resolution at the Congress of the Proletkult, Lenin described as theoretically wrong and practically harmful "all attempts to develop a special culture, to confine oneself to specialized organizations, to define the spheres of operation of the Karkompro and Proletkult and to establish "autonomy" for the Proletkult within the institutions of the Karkompro."²⁰

The anti-party trend for "autonomy" of the writers' organization in Hungary became more and more obvious as the eve of the rising. The Union of Hungarian writers sought itself to a very small extent with literary problems; gradually it became an anti-popular organization. One of the active participants in the anti-party group among the writers, Fajta, who fled abroad during the suppression of the counter revolution (sic), was compelled to admit in his book that "the Union of Hungarian writers was a state within a state".²¹

The National group of Hungarian writers attempted to revise one of the important theses of Marxist-Leninist theory--the idea of the guidance of literature. Saying that the idea of partisanship is a proletarian idea, i.e., that the proletariat and its party are interested in the correct portrayal of life, these Hungarian writers preached an essentially bourgeois ideology. Nagy writers portrayed Hungarian reality in a completely distorted light and slandered the Hungarian people. Characteristics of such slanderous articles was the borrowing before reactionary Western culture and civilization, which in some cases was more

and in some cases was less obvious.

The falsification of Hungarian reality was essential to the members of the Nagy-Losseny group and their supporters among the Hungarian writers, in order to raise the problem of the need for fundamental change in the political and economic system in Hungary.

Keeping the leading role of the party in literature and calling for the "fundamental democratization" of social life, members of the anti-party group presented counter-revolutionary views. While the Hungarian people, led by the communists, was building a socialist society and fighting for the formation of its ideology, they and his supporters were advocating freedom for anti-Marxist elements. Thus, the Hungarian writer--factionalists, in advocating the "free" and isolated existence of literature, and disguising themselves behind the ideas of "non-interference" strove ideologically to disarm Hungarian workers, to undermine their political activity. It is clear that the preaching of such views was grist to the mill of the restorers of the capitalist order. Ignoring the real lines of life, repudiating them and considering their subjective world to be the only reality, the Hungarian schismatic writers adopted the positions of decadence.

As a result of the work of the anti-party group of writers in 1954-56, exactness as regards the content of books of art and literature was reduced in Hungary. This contributed to the fact that some leaders of the ideological institutions of Hungary understood the democratization of culture to grant freedom even for counter-revolutionary opinions. As a result, works which preached reactionary bourgeois culture appeared in the book stores, cinemas and theaters.

The champions of various petty bourgeois opportunist views, realizing that open anti-socialist slogans would be rebuffed by the Hungarian working people, attempted to mislead the masses by referring to the 20th Party Congress, to the "interests of socialism", to "democratization", describing themselves as "supporters of Lenin" who claimed to be applying the decisions of the 20th Party Congress to Hungarian conditions.⁵¹ This was clearly shown during the numerous discussions held throughout 1956 in various scientific and other institutions. In itself the holding of discussions on various problems of the political or economic life of the country is a positive factor and is widely practiced in all socialist states. It is furthered by national and local conferences of progressives in various professions, production conferences at factories and institutes, and finally by broad discussions of particularly important problems. In the history of Hungary, this form of active participation of the working people in the government of their country has been repeatedly used. But of course any discussion, in a socialist society, should serve the tasks of building socialism, of consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat. Some leaders of the Hungarian intellectuals attempted to use the platform of the discussion clubs to disseminate views hostile to the people. In this respect one should dwell especially on the work of the Petofi Circle of the Union of Hungarian Working Youth. It was formed in 1956 and intended to propagate political knowledge and the discussion of the most important problems of contemporary Hungary. In the course of its life it remained an obstructive phenomenon in the life of the country, was a kind of expanded political educational study course for youth.

At the end of 1955, and in the summer of 1956 in particular, as a result of poor ideological work amongst youth, the Nagy-Losseny group was able to use this circle for their own purposes. At meetings of the circle opportunist writers and other hostile elements who set the tone for the debates began to appear. By means of various "sensational" statements they attempted to mislead public opinion in the country and to recruit adherents from wavering elements. In the course of many debates in various halls, opposition speakers denied the leading role of the party and working class in the socialist state, preached counter-revolutionary bourgeois views and finally called for a "new revolution" i.e., in practice for a rising against the people's democratic system. The enemies of people's

democracy deliberately exaggerated and distorted the significance of the mistakes committed in the socialist building of Hungary. At the same time they completely brushed up and even denied the revolutionary gains of Hungary in the last decade. During these so-called "free" discussions, organized groups of anti-party and anti-democratic elements did not allow speakers who defended views inconsistent to these elements to be heard. Open provocative attacks were made. For a complete description of the Petofi circle it is essential to add that the discussion of 23 October, which began the counter-revolutionary rising in Hungary, was organized by this circle, the head of which drew up a program in which the main item was a demand that Nagy should take over the leadership of the country.⁵²

The discussion of the problems of the press organized by the Petofi circle at the end of June 1956 was particularly un restrained. One of the main speakers, Nagy, going far beyond the agenda, sharply attacked the Leninist principle of democratic centralism in the party and called for the revision of the most important foundations of party construction. Nagy completely denied all the gains of the young socialist culture of the Hungarian people.

Another speaker, the writer Tardos, shamelessly asserted that in Hungary there were no basic Democratic freedoms and in particular no freedom for the press. He called for the removal of publishing from the control of the state, and proclaimed the "need for a new revolution", etc. The "new revolution", for which he longed and during which he called for the removal of publishing from the control of the people, would have meant nothing but a counter revolution, a reactionary rising against the socialist state. Similar anti-Party and counter-revolutionary speeches were delivered during other debates. In a debate of economists many of the speakers cast doubt on whether the right-wing opportunist deviation had done any damage to the economic development of Hungary.⁵³ During a debate of historians some speakers denied the achievements of the historical sciences of the people's republic and even spoke of the collapse of Marxist historiography in Hungary.⁵⁴ However it is well known that in a short time the Marxist historiography of the Hungarian people's republic had achieved important successes. It had provided a new and scientifically based history of Hungary, had interpreted in a new and very bright pages of the heroic past of the Hungarian people, had produced the first Hungarian Marxist books on history, etc. D. Szirmai correctly stated that it would have been an error to underestimate what had been produced at the cost of much labor.

It was impossible to agree with the assertion of some historians that the defects of dogmatism in a number of works of Hungarian historians, which arose from the fault of the personality, were characteristic of the whole of Marxist historical sciences. Individual nationalist assertions were made during the debate, and the ideas of Marxism about patriotism were wrongly interpreted.

The anti-Party and counter-revolutionary speeches were not properly rebuffed during the debates and did serious harm to the socialist development of Hungary. It would however, be an error to think that during these discussions correct Marxist views on the main principles of politics, economics and literature were not put forward. But the feeble work of the SWP over a number of years, the serious mistakes of the former leadership, the inability of this leadership to draw the necessary conclusions from the experience of socialist construction in Hungary, all formed a favorable soil for the demagogic chatter of the opportunist anti-party group, complicating the struggle against the heritages of bourgeois ideology.

The negative influence of the discussion was aggravated by the fact that the Hungarian press was insufficiently active against the propaganda for bourgeois ideology. Moreover some of the papers themselves became the mouthpiece of bourgeois views. This primarily applied to Proletár Híradó, the pages of which carried a large number of articles which aroused the enthusiasm of the masses of Hungary. This is a fact which the paper was compelled to admit in one of its own articles: "Of course the paper also has readers whose 'opinions' are of very doubtful origin," an editorial on 7 July 1928 stated. Articles of a revisionist nature which misled the Hungarian people also appeared in Harál Hap.

It should be observed that the central organ of the NKP, Harál Hap, also published individual articles which contributed to ideological confusion and disorganization. Some articles of this paper contained untruthful information about various debates, and in a number of cases the paper passed over in silence important problems of ideological work, without properly rebuffing the bourgeois views of individual Hungarian cultural workers.

One cannot say that opportunist articles were not rebuffed at all by the Hungarian press. A number of comrades made the correct Marxist criticisms of these articles. However, it should be regretfully admitted that party criticism was unable utterly to smash the hostile character of the anti-Party opposition and to avoid the dissemination of counter-revolutionary and anti-Party views.

In the autumn of 1928 articles began to appear in the press which essentially openly preached the advantages of the bourgeois system. Finding no proper opposition, the champions of bourgeois ideology became more and more impudent in their attacks on the people's democratic system. On the eve of the counter-revolutionary rising there was a further surge of the right-wing opportunists of the Nagy-Losonczy group with the writers' opposition. At a conference of writers in September 1928 many members of this opposition--Nagy, Adorjai and others--discussed the problem of Nagy, demanding his rehabilitation and that he should take over the government. Incidentally the September conference of writers paid little attention to literature, devoting itself basically to the discussion of political problems. Again the voices of members of the anti-Party factional group, who strove for the recognition of the special place and role of writers in the state, and who contrasted themselves with the part of the Hungarian working class, were heard.

The opportunist anti-Party work of the Nagy-Losonczy group and its supporters among writers on the literary front was fully supported by Hungarian reactionary emigres, one of the leaders of whom, Ferenc Nagy, advocated collaboration between emigres and the internal opposition in the summer of 1928, well understanding that this was not a question of individual differences within the NKP. He stressed the complexity of the situation and the need for flexible tactics to overthrow the people's democracy. The support of the views of the opposition group given by reactionary Hungarian emigres is a characteristic proof of the counter-revolutionary nature of the views of Nagy and his supporters.

Thus for a long time before the counter-revolutionary rising there was in Hungary fairly widespread dissemination of various anti-Party views and propaganda for bourgeois ideology. The errors of the former leadership as well as the rotten liberalism concerning those propagating hostile views and defects in the ideological work of the party led to a further increase in the work of the opportunist Nagy-Losonczy group and of their supporters. International imperialism utilized ideological diversion to weaken the forces of socialism in Hungary. These are some of the facts of the history of the ideological preparations for the counter-revolutionary rising in Hungary. They show once again how immensely important to the successful development of socialism is the timely and resolute exposure of the intrigues of the champions of bourgeois ideology, and how necessary is the leading role of the revolutionary party of the working class in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, particularly in ideology. The founders of scientific communism

have shown that historical experience, including the events in Hungary, have confirmed that the ideological struggle is one of the most important forms of class struggle.

Referring to the internal significance of the Hungarian events, Khrushchev observed: "The lesson of the Hungarian events during which counter-revolution utilized some workers for its dirty aims, reveals us whether political carelessness, lack of principle and lack of character in relation to the intrigues of the forces hostile to socialism may lead."²⁰⁰

The opportunist views and work of the Euro-Communist group, the organized attacks of some Hungarian writers and journalists on the main principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the slanderous campaign of imperialist propaganda against the Hungarian people's Republic—all these are links in the same chain. For a long time ideological diversion against Hungary was aimed at the undermining of the people's democracy in Hungary and was a most important prerequisite for the counter-revolutionary uprising.

One of the main tasks of the contemporary International working class movement is resolutely to rebuff the intrigues of bourgeois ideology, in whatever veiled form they may appear, and to struggle for the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory.

FOOTNOTES

- 30 Ungarische Revue, 9 December 1934.
- 31 Ungarische Revue, 28 March 1937.
- 32 L. Nagr. Magyar Szocializmus, Valogatott Beszedek az Erszak. T. I, II. Budapest, 1934.
- 33 Ungarische Revue, 29 May 1937.
- 34 L. Nagr. ibid., vol. 2, page 104.
- 35 V. I. Lenin, vol. 29, page 231.
- 36 L. Nagr. ibid., page 104.
- 37 ibid.
- 38 ibid., page 109.
- 39 Das Erzbekomm., 24 October 1934.
- 40 L. Nagr. ibid., vol. 2, pp. 84-85.
- 41 ibid., vol. 1, p. 379.
- 42 Erzbekomm., 18 April 1933.
- 43 Yves L. A magyar szocializmus fejlodesenek ujja. Budapest 1937, pp. 15-16.
- 44 missing.
- 45 L. Nagr. ibid., vol. II, p. 390.
- 46 Erzbekomm., 2 September 1934.
- 47 Ungarische Revue, 12 December 1934.
- 48 Ungarische Revue, 10 March 1937.
- 49 Kallai G. A magyarorszag ellenforradalom a marxizmus-leninizmus fegyelem Budapest, 1937, p. 13.
- 50 L. Nagr., vol. II, p. 7.
- 51 Ungarische Revue, 7 May 1937.
- 52 One More On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat Moscow, 1934, p. 21
- 53 Kallai G. ibid., p. 79.
- 54 Ungarische Revue, 4 March 1937.
- 55 Aradskai szemle, 1935, No. 12, p. 24.
- 56 quoted from Kallai, G; ibid., p. 18.
- 57 V. I. Lenin, vol. 10, p. 77.
- 58 Aradskai szemle, 1935, No. 12, p. 29.
- 59 V. I. Lenin, vol. 33, p. 292.
- 60 Y. Fajta. La tragedie hongroise ou une revolution socialiste anticorruptive Paris, 1934, p. 227.
- 61 See, for example, the article of L. Nagr. Budapesti Szag, 5 May 1934.

⁶² E. Friester-Hungarian Reports, Moscow, 1937, p. 1

⁶³ Dashed line, 3 June 1936.

⁶⁴ See Szassnik, 1936, No. 3, pp. 425-443.

⁶⁵ Dashed line, 3 July 1936.

⁶⁶ E. S. Kravtshov: "For the Close Ties of Literature and Art with the Life of the People."

LESSONS AND CONSIDERATIONS OF NECESSITY AND CHANCE

By A. Guly
G. Taksh
E. Ivany
Economist, No. 17, 1957 (excerpt)

Granted that the policy of the socialist state is entirely correct, it is impossible, given the world-wide system of capitalism, to foresee all the turning points in international relations, and therefore there is still room for chance-events. The latter may be expressed in the non-observance of trade obligations, in subversive activity or in military aggression.

It is understandable that the establishment of a firm guarantee against any chance event is of primary importance in all countries belonging to the socialist system. This is shown particularly by the events in Hungary in the summer of 1956. Some comrades ask whether they should be regarded as a fortification or an inevitable phenomenon. For example the authors have received a letter from a teacher, Gyorgy Fejérfür, which states that at a seminar for categories of materialist dialectics in the Keres party school of the Hungarian cabinet committee of the CPSU the students were interested in whether the events in Hungary in the summer of 1956 should be regarded as a fortification or an inevitable phenomenon.

In reply to these comrades we should first of all observe that the question is put in a somewhat unrealistic manner. It is impossible to "forecast" events in political life, just as it is with other phenomena, to a particular individual category, to draw them into the Procrustean bed of necessity or chance. Dialectics demands a thorough, concrete approach to phenomena, in analyzing which it is important to find out what is basic and essential and to be able to distinguish it from what is fortitious.

In examining the road followed by the Hungarian people in the last 22 years we see how historical necessity which determined its development, unswervingly biased its own trail. After the defeat of the Hittlerite hordes by the Soviet army, the Hungarian people overthrew the hated fascist regime and established a people's democracy. The laws which are common to all countries in the transition to socialism governed the emergence in Hungary of a dictatorship of the proletariat.

The broad masses of the people were drawn into the building of a socialist society, the working peasantry received land, the factories and works became national property. During the years of the people's regime the volume of industrial output has increased more than three times, important steps have been taken in the socialist reconstruction of agriculture; the living standard of the people has been significantly raised. All these successes were a necessary aspect of the building of socialism.

In history there has not yet been a case in which an overthrown class has yielded its position without a struggle. In Hungary the dictatorship of the proletariat was established by peaceful means; the country did not experience a civil war in the course of which the basic cadres of the exploiting classes perished. The country had a considerable number of former landowners, manufacturers, officers of the Horthy army, kulaks, and senior civil servants; they were the main forces of the counter-revolutionary rising in October-November last year. People of various social strata were also drawn into the rising. They included the representatives of the petty bourgeoisie, i.e., intellectuals who had isolated themselves from the masses, students who had come under the influence of bourgeois

vices, groups of workers from among those who had recently come into production but had not yet become part of the cadres of the Hungarian proletariat. The main bulk of the working class and working peasants did not take part in the rising. Thus the correct meaning of the events in Hungary was that it was an attempt by the forces of reaction to halt the move of the country towards socialism by force of arms and reestablishment of the capitalist system. The class struggle in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism is natural, necessary, but this inevitability, like any other, is manifested in a fortuitous way. The absence of chance can be found in all of the concrete circumstances which developed in Hungary.

The actions of the insurgents were facilitated by the fact that in the course of building socialism in Hungary serious errors were committed. These were manifest in the weakening of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the isolation of the former leadership of the Hungarian Workers Party (HWP) from the masses, in the slackening of the struggle against the reaction of society. The conspirators had succeeded in the ranks of the HWP in the shape of the Reactionary Party-Communist group. Of course, all of the errors committed by the previous leadership of the HWP did not arise from the people's democratic system and therefore were of a fortuitous nature.

But the main investigators of the counter-revolutionary rising in Hungary were the imperialist circles of the Western powers. The Hungarian events have shown once again that imperialist forces did not abandon their attempts to halt by any means the progress of the people's democratic system. The espionage-diversionist work against the socialist countries arises out of the very nature of contemporary imperialism and is an inalienable and essential feature of it. Imperialists would not be imperialists if they did not without this subversive activity, if they did not attempt to organize counter-revolutionary risings, to split the states belonging to the world-wide socialist system, did not conduct preparations for a new war. But for people's Hungary the foreign intervention was a historical chance, which by no means stems from the natural laws of progress towards socialism. If indeed this chance could have been foreseen and it was a serious error on the part of the previous leadership to blunt its vigilance towards the intrigues of its enemies.

A necessary aspect of the events in Hungary was the rebuff met with by the insurgents among the masses of the people, the overwhelming majority of workers and laboring people. A people which had gained its freedom could not voluntarily be enslaved by imperialists, the resistance and victory were completely natural and to be expected. It is true that at the beginning the masses of the people were disorganized and this is explained by the absence of leadership and by the confusion caused by the Party-Communist group. The true strength of the people was only shown when the resistance was aided by the political party of the Hungarian proletariat - the HWP, which was reorganized in the course of the battle, and when the Revolutionary Workers and Peasant's Government was formed. Comrade J. Kadar had every reason to state that the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasant's Government arose "as a result of historical necessity".

The support given by the Soviet state, which extended the hand of aid to the free Hungarian people, was just as necessary and natural. Close cooperation and aid in the latest struggle is a law for all the countries which have discarded the yoke of imperialism. The Soviet army, which acted in response to the appeal of the government of Hungary, aided the Hungarian people to rout the forces of counter-revolution and to establish law and order in the country. With the

Fraternized assistance of the Soviet army which carried out its international duty, the Hungarian people defended the independence of their country and the ruins of the bourgeois democratic system. Therefore the danger of the transformation of Hungary into a region of aggression and a military base for the imperialists in the very heart of Europe was averted and the real danger to the vital interests of all the peoples of the socialist countries and to the peace throughout the world was liquidated. The great comradelyship of socialist nations clearly showed that it is able to resist resolutely and firmly all attempts to encroach upon its vital interests.