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The masters of the West exerted great efforts for years to popularise the
policy and person of Imre Nagy. They were particularly widely acclaimed 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 peoples
democracies 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 peoples power.

Imre Nagy is also such a person, who, following the line of an opportunist
policy, arrived at an open alliance with the counter-revolutionary bloc of a
capitalist restoration and went as far as the open betrayal of the proletarian
power and the open serving of the counter-revolution.

One of Imre Nagy's men who escaped to the West 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. Imre Nagy 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 prelimi-
nary 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 these friends of the same principles did not rush the
matter, because Imre Nagy did not forward his exposition to the central leader-
ship of the Hungarian Workers' Party at all. The presenting did take place,
but to a different forum, to organs of the masters of the West engaged in di-
crecting further machinations against the peoples democracy.

The "guardian" of the manuscript fails to reveal his identity. The chronol-
ogical 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, slyly supressing 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 carry any mention of leading steps by
the Soviet Union as a defender of international peace for the immediate pro-
hition of atomic weapons, the immediate discontinuation of nuclear test explosions, for the cessation of the armaments race, collective guarantees of a European peace, and so forth. Part of the table dealt with, under the following viole expressing, "the execution of the American atom spies, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg." It endeavors to white-wash with revolting cynicism the American murderers responsible for the execution of these American champions of freedom, who were condemned on the basis of false accusations in support of an anti-Soviet campaign.

I think this is enough to show us clearly that "the guardian 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 advisors of Imre Nagy who gave his superiors the exposition of his "master" for further exploitation.

The above mentioned expositions of Imre Nagy do not form a structurally connected unit; it is a collection of well thought out texts of petitions prepared from time to time, and some answers to articles scribbled down hastily on the spur of the moment which nevertheless contain, in many respects somewhat ramblingly, how this former opportunist 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 "creatively further developing" Marxism-Leninism. To achieve this he needed primarily a "justification" of his opportunist policy between 1953-1956. He then tried to step onto the "international arena" and picked up the soiled banner of the struggle against the unity of the socialist camp.

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

Setting out from there, he assessed the historic position of the country in 1947-48, speaking openly in front of the central leadership, thus, that in Hungary it was not socialist building that is on the program, but the replacement of the Prussian 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 to its character is not at variance with the sector of the peasantry producing on a small scale. (Note: 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 proclaim 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 of peasantry, Imre Nagy 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, Imre Nagy 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 peoples! democratic system. Since he was incapable of turning back on the path leading to treason, he arrived at the stage when he put himself entirely at the disposal of the counter-revolution. His writings of 1955-56 show how he prepared "ideologically" for the betrayal.

In these writings we can find new "theoretical" expositions which have their origin in his original opportunist conceptions and which served as direct "ideological preparations" for the denouncing of the proletarian dictatorship and desertion from the socialist camp. These expositions also show that during the days of the counter-revolution it was not the "current of events" that plunged Imre Nagy into the swamp of betrayal. We know very well that, according to the testimony of his writings, he worked out even at the end of 1955 and the beginning of 1956 the ideological motivation of betrayal. We can find these expositions primarily in the 3rd and 4th chapters of the work.

The title of the first chapter of Imre Nagy's "work" is: "A Few Topical Questions on the Application of Marxism-Leninism." This Imre Nagy-like "application" is very characteristic.

In the course of the voluminous exposition of his ideas, Imre Nagy makes the following statements:

"The stuff, scholastic interpretation of Marxism-Leninism divided the world into two hostile 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 the 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 scale of which we know already; they deny the Leninist theory of disproportionate development... (Tarsadalmi Szemle ellipsis -- ed.) Taken on the whole, they deny that conditions of socialism ripen and to some extent, come into being already under capitalism... (Tarsadalmi Szemle ellipsis -- ed.)" As proof of this thesis, he refers to the fact that "the people of India exert great efforts to create a society on the socialist pattern in their country," he quotes from Molotov's speech at the UN assembly on Sept. 25, 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."

Imre Nagy does not say whether Molotov's statement refers to other countries as well, in addition 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 dissimilar to capitalism, showing the great variety of transitional forms between capitalism and socialism." (Page 17-18.)

After this follows:

"Views which 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 in the liberating revolutionary movement of the people, but in a military clash between the two systems are fallacious and more dangerous still... (T. S.)

"... (T. S.) a theory on the peaceful co-existence of the two systems and on a socialist victory by peaceful means, which became bogged down and lost decades behind the development of conditions of society must be worked out and further developed." (page 10).

So much for the first part of the concentrated revisionism posing in the name of communism. It is already obvious in this how Imre Nagy, in his writings which "took final shape" in the summer of 1956, endeavors to distort for revisionist aims new statements of the 20th Congress of the GPU, and how he "supplements" them in his own revisions. However, he is incapable of substantiating by anything his thundering accusations (they are "deny"ing this and "deny") that, he does not even dare to try any substantiation. He only declares, distorts and falsifies to render these of a revisionist betrayal "more magnificent" and "more creditable."

Let us begin on the statement that "the theory on the victory of socialism by peaceful means" came to a standstill ten years ago, It is public knowledge that Bernstein and his associates worked out this "theory." It was after the death of Engels that they launched their attack in the name of this theory against revolutionary Marxism. They succeeded in attaining a leading part in the great majority of the parties of the 2nd International, succeeded in leading these parties into the ways of opportunism and the internationals into the disgraceful and tragic bankruptcy of 1916. Imre Nagy, however, does not write now that it is this revisionist surrender of the revolutionary defeat of capitalism, which, as an ideological tendency, "came to a standstill ten years ago" which he now wanted to pull out of the tangle, namely under the name of "communism." This may be, however, extraordinarily pitiful.

When does Imre Nagy accuse by saying that "they have in mind only the application of force in the struggle between the two systems and consider peaceful co-existence only as a transitional period between two wars," he substitutes the "Stalinists" the GPU and the Soviet Union, as well as other communist parties for their views which are identical with that of the GPU. Is this the reality? Is it that the Soviet Union carried out a consistent peace policy even after the death of Lenin for collective security, for the disarming of the armament race, for disarmament, 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 III.

The struggle against an imperialist war was one of the central questions in the struggle of all parties of the communist international. Those who suppose that are splitting truth in the eye. After World War II, as the initiation of and under the leadership of the communist parties, a gigantic international peace movement developed, the like of which the world has never known. Recognition of this fact cannot be erased from peoples' minds by any effort of Imre Nagy and his friends. This "Stalinist" theorem of Stalin is well known, "Peace will be maintained and it will be lasting, if people take in mind 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 unavoidable.

The development of the socialist world system, the cessation of the American atomic monopoly, and the gaining of strength to a special degree of the inter-
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 devise 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 damages? 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 Imre Nagy did not come forward with such ideas. In 1956, 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, encircled by the capitalist states, endangered from East and West alike by the attack of anti-Soviet blocs organized again and again, and looking defiantly in the eye of the entire imperialist world created a socialist society and took care of its national defense as well as insured its peaceful building with, 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 was the Soviet Union's fault that Hitlerite aggression interrupted the peaceful co-existence? Of what does Imre Nagy 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 invader, 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,Advertisement'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 arrival of an unbelievably confused person when we read Imre Nagy'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 Imre Nagy 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 Imre Nagy and which the capitalist world can accept with peaceful resolve, we will be convinced that it is not the nonsense of a maniac. We deal with the "historic" extension of the revisionist conception still openly proclaimed by Imre Nagy in 1947-48, and hidden 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? Imre Nagy did not go as far, at least he did not go as far in those days, as to explain what that road of socialist construction should have been like, to which the capitalist world could have reconciled itself. Knowing, 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 theory on the ability to avoid war does not affect the imperialists; on the contrary, it enranges them, because a gigantic social force backs this theory, which is also able to enforce it. Furthermore, it is not only the terrible Korean aggression of the Americans that indicates that the imperialists cannot refrain from their military adventures, but the French-British-Israeli attack against Egypt, the British attack against Oman and Yemen, the French aggression against Algeria, the American conspiracy against Egypt and Syria, the resurrection 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.

Imre Nagy, however, keeps quiet about the militarist adventurer-policy of the aggressive-imperialist circles. But how can he 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 proceeded to lay down a smoke-screen on imperialist military preparations and began to idealise the capitalist world. If this capitalist world is not, perhaps quite as ideal as those who idealise it imagine, it is easy to attribute this to the fact that the "Stalinists" failed years ago "to work out a clear-cut theory of peaceful co-existence." Thank God there comes an Imre Nagy, however, and makes up the deficiency... (Toreadalni Samle ellipses — ed.) and the entire imperialist camp supports his adoringly! They awaited this person who remedies "the deficiency" as some thirsting for pure truth await a sainted prophet!

Let us proceed further, however. When did Imre Nagy 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, he has also been a member.

On what does he build and with what can he prove his theory? On nothing and with nothing. This is a mendacious, slanderous declaration, which reiterates 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 remained 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 combined interest of the international revolutionary movement as well as the socialist countries to insure the peaceful development of the socialist countries and to prevent a conflagration of war from interrupting it. Imre Nagy knew this very
well but concealed it in a sly manner because this fact was not compatible with his mendacious revelations.

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. Imre Nagy certainly knew this. It is true that the usual economic cycle became somewhat distorted in the period of 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 would avoid a crisis similar to that of 1929-1933. It also followed from this surmise 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 hedge and talks of the fact that socialist progress can be enacted "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 revisionism and Imre Nagy 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 occurrence 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 imperialists 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 those 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. Imre Nagy 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 alternative: the peaceful co-existence of the two system 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 Imre Nagy and people similar to him regret this. Why could other countries not achieve socialism, however, not through a revolution but without one? Perhaps they could even
create a "proletarian dictatorship" along some lines like the Imre 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 "also creates a society on the socialist pattern," behold, 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 know Lenin established that the transition from capitalism to socialism will be attended by different peculiar features in various countries, and will take on pronouncedly 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 swindling 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 also 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, thus: socialism can be victorious "without a revolution, perhaps in a parliamentary manner."

The 20th Congress of the CPSU devised 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 prevarication.

Part of Imre Nagy's method of hedging is that he acknowledges also a revolutionary transition and also a proletarian dictatorship since this is a historic reality in the EU by now, and at the most, he can only express regret at what 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 committed the mistakes of mechanically adopting Soviet experiences in the course of their development and these mistakes disturbed their development. Imre Nagy utilizes these mistakes to state his accusation, 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 adequately and prudently than before. They will study and utilize, better than before, also the experiences of each other. 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. We can and must talk of the fact that we did not make sufficient allowances for the diversity of conditions, and that we must make better allowances for them in our future work.

We will take good care also in the future, however, that by references 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... (Terra incognita - silence - ed.) in the interests of close cooperation with the broad mass of the people." (page 19) as Imre Nagy proclaims it, but isolation of the enemies of socialism and the annihilation of their resisting forces in the interest of a cooperation with the broad mass 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 enemies of the people. Also last year's counter-revolution, which Imre Nagy and his associates helped to prepare and unleash in the sign of the "elimination of antagonistic contradictions," thereby helping so in bringing to extreme peril the power of the proletariat.

Imre Nagy does not openly confess that he does not find a peoples democracy, as one species of proletarian doctasrship, to his liking. While he beats about the bush in his analysis, he does occasionally reveal his true feelings, however. He says: "A peoples democracy is the only characteristic form so far recognized by the doctasr interpretation of Marxism-Leninism as a characteristic way of socialism in the transitional phase between capitalism and socialism." (page 18) It is true that Marxism-Leninism only recognizes those forms as existing, which forms do in actual fact exist. In addition to that, it presumes that other forms can also come into being in other countries. We must also point out that a peoples 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 "doctasrists" fail to "recognize?" There is, according to Imre Nagy.

He definitely names India as such and refers to others, but not definitely named semi-colonies 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 1947-48.

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 insuring the basic material supply of the entire industry, and also in other important fields.

When the worker class, which attained power, nationalised the banks and all their enterprises in Hungary, Imre Nagy stated that the nationalised 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 power of middle class India to be "a development of society, on the socialist pattern."

When the Hungarian Peasants' Democracy began its socialist-planned economy, he stated that a state capitalist development and a development of a small-scale production of peasantry is on the agenda in Hungary. When 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 rates this as "a transitional phase between capitalism and socialism."

Imre Nagy propagates the avoidance of a socialist revolution and a proletarian dictatorship in both cases, but in changed circumstances. In 1947-46, when the workers were in power in Hungary, it was in the first case that he acted against the proletarian dictatorship. In 1955-56, in the case of India, it was in the second case that he "justifies" the superfluity of liquidating the capitalist system, which is to be avoided. The "justification" in the case of India is in actual fact addressed to the Hungary of 1955-56, indeed, to all democratic countries in general, and its essence in the following: you see, they do eliminate the antagonistic contradictions in India and a proletarian dictatorship is not necessary to do it. We can relinquish this "dogmatic" 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 lies, which Imre Nagy so perfidiously abuses, and which must not be underestimated. We must refer to two circumstances. The state capitalist development of India strengthens India in its struggle to decrease 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 no 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, exists, 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 as regards 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 denies, 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 recognises the significance of state-capitalist development in non-socialist countries struggling against imperialism and supports this development, but it does not consider these countries, which are capitalist countries, as socialist-type countries; Marxism-Leninism recognises 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 Imre 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 Imre Nagy, an important place is occupied by a "creative" development further of the five basic principles of peaceful coexistence. 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.)

Imre Nagy describes, not by a homogeneous wording, an homogeneity and explicitness do not characterize the exposition of ideas of a person who indulges habitually in procrastination, 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 replaced" "democratically" by socialism. What Imre Nagy does is to separate democratic but still not socialist countries from the capitalist system and as countries proceeding on a new, "peculiar" path of socialist development, which he declared, 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 anti-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 exposition of ideals of Imre Nagy. 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 China. They also threaten other neutral countries, like Syria, with an attack.

Imre Nagy states: "the five basic principles stem not from contradictions between the two systems, capitalism and socialism, it is not only those that they express, but they are factors 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 independent of social and political system, why is it that it was capitalism that produced war, among them 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 about 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? In the thesis of Imre Nagy not driven? No, it is not driven, but a guise under which Imre Nagy 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 Nehru stem from the fundamental interests of people demanding 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 did! Why does Imre Nagy want to obscure this fact? Why does he suppose that it is only in a struggle against the war policy of the Western imperialist powers 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 makes 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."

Imre Nagy dresses up in the robe of a "national politician." How many dirty, anti-popular things were disguised by the robe of a "national" policy. Imre Nagy 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 31.)

We are in a position today that we have already seen in practice an Imre Nagy-like "national solidarity," and a counter-revolutionary "national" unity with forces 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 Imre Nagy, 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 Imre Nagy 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 pronounces the fundamental principles of the relationship between capitalist countries and socialist countries to be entirely identical, and denies the fundamental difference in the relationship between capitalist and socialist countries.

The logical conclusion of this is, or springe precisely from the fact, that Imre Nagy 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 endeavors to continuously whitewash the piratical banner of the disintegration of the socialist camp.

In the course of this, Imre Nagy does not say openly that the socialist camp must be broken up, no, he speaks of the "healthy development" of the socialist camp, of proletarian internationalism, of the socialist camp as "a grouping of independent, sovereign countries of equal rights," as of something non-existent, which will have to be established in accordance with his concepts, and as an example of which he uses in every manner the absence of Yugoslavia from the socialist camp. His theses at the outset are the following:

A) 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 did liberate itself, and because it is only in an alliance with them that it can consolidate its state power," (page 32.)
B) Instead of “Stalinist dogmas,” “we introduce the Marxist-Leninist thesis on individual roads of socialism, the five basic principles of national existence, and the principle of ideological non-interference.” (page 33.)

C) The policy of power alignments is at variance with the principle of national sovereignty and independence based on the five basic principles, as well as with the principle of peaceful co-existence of nations.” (page 39.)

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 discontinuation of the alignments 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 Kosuth “formed a mental 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 peoples in the form of an alliance (federation) with free people of equal rights.” (page 40.)

Imre Nagy set forth from the fact that the workers' class must subordinate "its own class interests" to "the universal interests of the nation" and through underhand disengagement 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. Imre Nagy refers to the policy of alliance which was a mental picture of Kosuth.

We have been able to witness, however, the policy of alignment which was a "mental picture" of Imre Nagy as far back as January 1956, which he, under the guise of being against power alignments, explained in writing well in advance in the course of the ideological preparation of the counter-revolution, and the accomplishment of which he also intended to carry out as a Prime Minister opening the door for and attending in every sense on the counter-revolution.

He subordinated "the class interests of the workers" and the existence of the proletarian power, to the "universal interests of the nation," as all kinds of forces of capitalist restoration, together with Imre Nagy, demanded and proclaimed it.

We must dwell on these theses of Imre Nagy in order to show their essence appropriately. 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 Imre Nagy actually proclaimed in the summer of last year under the slogan of "anti-Stalinism" because it is a fact that they did proclaim it and hoped that Hungary, as well as Czechoslovakia and Poland, would break away from the Soviet Union and would bury the Warsaw defense pact of socialist countries.

What would have been the consequences if this dangerous game had succeeded and the Warsaw pact had ceased to exist? It would have meant that the separation of Poland and GDR would have isolated the GDR from the SU, and a German-American 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 SU, through the deployment of a gigantic numerical superiority, and united all Germany in the sign of German militarism, the next step would have been the crossing 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 quick restoration of the alliance with the Soviet Union and insured the armed support of the Soviet Union. Events would have taken a similar turn in Czechoslovakia as well.

And in Hungary? Here, nationalist-chauvinist 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, Romania, 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 eyes of Imre Nagy that Dulles, Adenauer and his associates, the Radio Free Europe of the American capitalists and their fellow propagandists enthused and enthuse about, but his political conception and policy of "neutrality," because in the given circumstances it was this policy of the revisionist traitors that could help their anti-people war aims 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 peoples in a new catastrophe of war as well.

Let us return now to the thesis of Imre Nagy, however. Imre Nagy does perhaps admit of the alliance with the socialist world peer, 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 thus 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-reaching our constructive work, and corrects the mistakes we make, is the main assurance 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 Warsaw pact, if we had tolerated Hungary's becoming the country to disintegrate the Warsaw pact, as Imre Nagy and his followers wanted to act in an alliance with the entire counter-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 disguised 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-dogmatism" in the creative development
further of Marxist-Leninism. We have seen so far what Imre Nagy did. It is understandable that he became the champion of the "inviolability" of the ideology of a revisionist betrayal.

The refusal of mutual political or economic advice, which is in itself absurd and unmaintainable, is not enough for him. The giving of mutual advice in customary between all those 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 attitude 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 occurring mistakes or methods that became outdated.

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

It is the elementary duty of every communist party to listen to the opinion 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. No party can expect this, and the CPSU also specifically warns 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, disparagingly called "ideological interference" by Imre Nagy, is a binding order of Marxist-Leninist parties, and only revisionist parties rejected it. The clear basis of this rejection was always the joining of forces with one's "own" bourgeoisie. As for Imre Nagy, he became envious 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 thundered against the policy of "power alignments" supposing the fact that there is an imperialist power alignment and a socialist power alignment and while one is an alignment of aggressive war, the other forces the principle forces of peace, forces of the socialist countries into a close unity against the imperialists.
He does admit in one of his statements, under duress and for aims of prevarication, but he admits that "in the struggle against the aggressive policy of alignments, the greatest and most stable forces in the strength of the socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union." (page 39.) This admission makes it the more impudent still, that under the general slogan of "being against alignments" he proclaims the division of particularly these "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 masked under the slogan of "neutrality!"

Imre Nagy knows very well that the defensive alliance formed under the Warsaw pact was of a provisional nature, and that we would disband it if we could come to an agreement regarding the establishment of an all-European collective defense system. He still talks of the "power alignments" as though they would be dangerous to peace regardless of their character. Thus, the Warsaw pact also endangers peace, it must be disbanded, 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. Imre Nagy is "innocent" in that matter, however. He cannot break "NTZC," but he can break up the Warsaw pact, the defensive alliance of the socialist powers! By doing that he has done "all he could." Being a communist, he cannot openly say that he joined the camp of the imperialists' "Western democracy." He can only say that we must break away from the most important defensive alliance of the socialist camp, because one must not "participate in the rivalry of power alignments" because "it was not a joining of forces with a great power or power group" that counted as a mental picture in front of Kossuth. He painfully avoids calling the Warsaw pact, the breaking up of which he advocates, by its name. He painfully avoids calling by name the "some great power" or "some group of great powers" from which Hungary and the other small socialist countries must stay away. In connection with this question, he keeps his revolving row of conceptions 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 Imre Nagy wanted to wrest it, are the two socialist world powers, the Soviet Union and China. Imre Nagy did not dare to say this openly and directly. He did, however, when the counter-revolution enabled him to do so.

It was many months before, however, that he prepared "ideologically" the treacherous policy of disruption against the socialist camp and the masquerade against the Soviet Union, in support of a developing anti-communist faction and a conspiracy that was being organised to overthrow the people's democratic order.

This is then the former opportunist who "developed" as far as betrayal. He did not dare to openly take over the heritage of Bernstein's revisionism, which was unmasked a long time ago and was combined with a lot of well-known betrayals, because he is too cowardly and cunning to do such a thing. He put on the mask of a "Leninist" and disguised new editions of revisionism by Marxist phraseology, the essence of which is the surrender of the basic principle of the proletarian dictatorship, and "ideological" preparation for attacking the dictatorship of the proletariat from behind and its betrayal, in all 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 enthusiasm and support of the whole imperialist world.
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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 János Nagy and G. Lénánczy as their banner."30 The destructive ideological work of the opportunist Nagy-Lénánczy 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, Lénánczy and their supporters in the October period in Hungary, Janos Kadar observed: "By resorting to nationalist instigation, by the revisionist denial of the leading role of the party contrary to socialist democracy, and by distorting 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."31

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-Lénánczy 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 his opportunist views lie in the past. This is shown in particular by material in the two volumes of his work published in 1954.32

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 tense struggle for national freedom and democracy, in the fighting against the German invaders, Horthyites and Szabites, 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 diminish 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 MSWP, Pént Miksa, 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."33 Nagy and his

*The introductory part of the article, a long but routine attack on RFE-FEC has not been translated.
supporters attempted to emasculate 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 bourgeoisie and non-proletarian elements who take part in the building of socialism. Without their active participation it is impossible to build socialism." Moreover, Nagy attempted to base his revisionist views on quotations from Lenin, deliberately distorting the meaning of the latter's speech "On the Deception of the People by Means of Slogans of Freedom and Equality", made in May 1919. 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 waverers and sometimes with 'neutralists' who 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." 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.

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, mobilizing 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." Belittling 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 preaching 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 bourgeois strata belonging to the Fatherland Front headed by the revolutionary party of the proletariat.

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 schism 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 Sebesdét, the main thought of which ran counter to the resolution of the III Party Congress and the third plenum of the CC in 1954. 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 problems 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 farm develops together with the production cooperative in the direction of socialism and that in its way, 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 collectivising 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 HWP in 1943-49 concerning the policy of the party in the countryside, is characteristic in this respect. In essence Nagy advocated the postponement for an indefinite period of the collectivisation 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 Weltanschauung and should not show solidarity with the proletariat. "The working class," he wrote, "should not repudiate the idea of socialism and should not absorb the Weltanschauung of the peasantry, and vice versa the peasantry should not do so either, in order that the alliance should be firm and stable."

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, Szabad Nep 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.

Criticising Nagy's opportunist views on agriculture, Lajos Feher, a member of the Politburo of the CC of the HWP, in his work "The Path 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 expropriation 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'."

The opportunist and anti-Marxist views of the Nagy group were particularly clearly manifest in 1953-55, 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 whole 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 is 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 corner-
stone, the main problem for our further advance. Therefore agricultural production
is being put in the forefront of our economic policy and of our whole national

As is well known in June 1953 the plenum of the CC of the HWP adopted
important resolutions, the main task of which was to correct the mistakes formerly
committed in the socialist construction of the country. However, the implementa-
tion 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 con-
fidence 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. Losonczy, in the weekly "Hvanzat Nap", published in autumn 1956. 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.46 Thus Losonczy 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 decree on 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 intellectuals,
Losonczy 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 HWP (1956), the Nagy-Losonczy group openly criticised
individual errors in the former leadership of the party, thereby enabling
reactionary elements to take part in this 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 opposition", 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."47

One of the Hungarian communists, describing the impression made by the
Nagy program of the summer of 1953, wrote: "There will scarcely be a single
communist who is not dismayed by this program. It does not even mention socialism,
the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the results of the 10 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 still recall how on the
day after the publication of the government program the kulaks came to life in
the villages and various bourgeois hostile elements became impudent in the towns."48

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

1. 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 D. Kallai pointed out in his work "The Hungarian Counter-revolution in the Light of Marxism-Leninism", Nagy saw a "specific" feature of the Hungarian dictatorship of the proletariat in the fact that the comparatively peaceful construction of socialism does not accord with the punitive functions of the state and that therefore they should be discarded. "Nagy," Kallai states, "under-estimated the strength of the class enemy and moreover he denied that such forces existed in the country. Hence his theory about 19 1/2 million Hungarian hearts which beat as one! and 'the unity of Hungarian national culture.'"49

Nagy approached the problems of the history of the Hungarian state and the evaluation of the 1848 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 1848. "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 charted by them and illumined by their bright genius."50

Nevertheless, it is well known that the 1848 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 1848-49 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-chauvinism moods among the petty bourgeoisie. Individual Hungarian cultural leaders began to portray the past of the Hungarian state in a distorted manner, to hush 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-Losoncsey group essentially opposed 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-Losoncsey group were united in that by demagogic demands for "de-stalinization" they attempted to undermine the influence of the communist Party among the Hungarian people, 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 opportunist 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, K. Kiss, a member of the politbureau of the CC of the HSMF in his article, "The HSMF" 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.'"51

Although the right-wing opportunist work of Nagy and his supporters was condemned by the plenum of the CC of the HSMF 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-Losoncsey group which began to be gradually particularly intensive as from 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 harsh and consistent in its attitude to the enemies of socialism. In Hungary recently there has not been a real dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., the enemies 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-Losoncsey group, D. Kallai wrote that "Nagy and his group of opportunist became revisionists, traitors and counter-revolutionaries. Over a long period they consciously 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 the 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-revolutionary forces they drew up the strategy and tactics for the overthrow of the system creating one after another against the Party and the people's democratic system. In the summer of 1956 they began to organize political discussions 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-Losoncsey 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 captivated by petty bourgeoise Weltanschauung. In its turn the reactionary group of writers and authors played a large part in the ideological propaganda for the counter-revolutionary rising in Hungary. It is possible fully to agree with the opinion of Marton Lóves, 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 hypocritical and absurd expressions of communism took part in it or whether they were honest people of good will."

At that time a section of the Hungarian writers incorrectly interpreted the above mentioned resolutions of the June (1953) plenum. Among these writers "opportunism" 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 opportunist views of Imre Nagy and particularly of his speech in the summer of 1953 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 work of Hungarian writers obviously belittled the achievements of the people's democratic system, the great gains of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia 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-Losoncsey opposition group, an anti-party factional headed by party, Zak, A. K., and others, many of whom were members of the HWP, began to form among the writers. At the end of 1955, 6 members and 2 secretaries of the Presidium of the Union of Hungarian writers demonstratively 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 HWP. 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 but primarily the content of the memorandum gives evidence of the existence of the factional anti-Party group.

The main line of the Bory-SzékJ-Ackzel 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. Thus one of the leaders of the anti-Party group, Bory, admitted that he and his supporters were fighting for the liquidation of the party and state guidance of literature. A similar point of view was expressed by Hay. "We and our every-growing group are the party," said Tiber Tardozs 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 revisionists of Marxism-Leninism. The idea of a literature without "partiизност" 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. Bourgeois partiизност, the ideology of the bourgeoisie is concealed behind this so-called "absence of partiизност".

Fifty years ago Lenin in his article "The Party Organization and Party Literature" stressed that literature should show partiизност, and should be a component part of organized, planned and integrated party work. Some Hungarian writers thought of themselves "supermen". These writers demanded a special attitude toward themselves and a special place in the party. "The representatives of the Writers should meet political representatives and draw up a platform" said Bory. 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 1920 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 Narcompros which control led 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 specialised organisations, to define the spheres of operation of the Narcompros and Proletkult and to establish 'autonomy' for the Proletkult within the institutions of the Narcompros."

The anti-party trend for "autonomy" of the writers' organization in Hungary became more and more obvious on the eve of the rising. The Union of Hungarian writers occupied 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, Fejős, 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."

The factional group of Hungarian writers attempted to revise one of the important theses of Marxist-Leninist theory—the idea of the partiизност of literature. Denying that the idea of partiизност 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. Many writers portrayed Hungarian reality in a completely distorted light and slandered the Hungarian people. Characteristic of such slanderous articles was the kowtowing 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-Loesneczky 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.

Denying the leading role of the party in literature and calling for the "fundamental democratization" of social life, members of the anti-party group preached counter-revolutionary views. While the Hungarian people, led by the communists, was building a socialist society and fighting for the formation of its ideology, Hay and his supporters were advocating freedom for anti-Marxist propaganda. Thus, the Hungarian writer—factionsalist, 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 laws 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, exactingness as regards the content of works of art and literature was reduced in Hungary. This contributed to the fact that some leaders of the ideological institutes 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. 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 practised 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 platforms 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 1955 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 unobtrusive 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-Loesneczky 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 inconvenient 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 board of which drew up a program in which the main item was a demand that Nagy should take over the leadership of the country. 

The discussion of the problems of the press organized by the Petofi circle at the end of June 1956 was particularly unrestrained. One of the main speakers, Dery, 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. Dery completely denied all the gains of the young socialist culture of the Hungarian people.

Another speaker, the writer Tadosa, slanderously 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. At 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. During a debate of historians some speakers denied the achievements of the historical science of the people's republic and even spoke of the collapse of Marxist historiography in Hungary. 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 many bright pages of the heroic past of the Hungarian people, had produced the first Hungarian Marxist books on history, etc. D. Nemec correcty 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 cult of the personality, were characteristic of the whole of Marxist historical science. 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 HWP 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 oppositionist anti-party group, complicating the struggle against the harbingers 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 Irodalmi Hírű, the pages of which carried a large number of articles which aroused the enthusiasm of the enemies 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 'sympathies' are of very doubtful origin," an editorial on 7 July 1956 stated. Articles of a revisionist nature which misled the Hungarian people also appeared in Népszabadság.

It should be observed that the central organ of the HMP, Szabad Nép, also published individual articles which contributed to ideological confusion and disorganization. Some articles of this paper contained uncritical 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 criticism of these articles. However, it should be regretfully admitted that party criticism was unable utterly to unmask the hostile character of the anti-Party opposition and to avoid the dissemination of counter revolutionary and anti-Party views.

In the autumn of 1956 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 impatient in their attacks on the people's democratic system. On the eve of the counter-revolutionary rising there was a further merger of the right-wing opportunist of the Nagy-Loasconczy group with the writers opposition. At a conference of writers in September 1956 many members of this opposition—Nagy, Acksel 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 voice 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-Loasconczy 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 1956, well understanding that this was not a question of individual differences within the HMP. 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-Loasconczy group and of their supporters. International imperialism utilised 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 intrigue 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 writers for its dirty aims, reminds us whether political carelessness, lack of principle and lack of character in relation to the intrigues of the forces hostile to socialism may lead." 86

The opportunistic views and work of the Nyery-Losonczi 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 bourgeoisie ideology, in whatever veiled form they may appear, and to struggle for the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory.
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LECTURES AND CONSULTATIONS: ON NECESSITY AND CHANGE
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Komunist, 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 autumn of 1956. Some comrades ask whether they should be regarded as a fortuitous or an inevitable phenomenon? For example the editors have received a letter from a teacher, Comrade Helmikov, which states that at a seminar for categories of materialist dialectics in the Saran party school of the Moldavian oblast commit of the CPSU the students were interested in whether the events in Hungary in the autumn of 1956 should be regarded as a fortuitous or an inevitable phenomenon.

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

In examining the road followed by the Hungarian people in the last 12 years we see how historical necessity which determined its development, unwaveringly biased its own trail. After the defeat of the Hitlerite 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 perish. The country had a considerable number of former landowners, manufacturers, officers of the Horthy army, kulaks, and junior 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 bourgeoisie
views, groups of workers from among those who had recently come into production but had not yet become part of the cadre 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 element 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 (MWP) from the masses, in the slackening of the struggle against the enemies of society. The conspirators had accomplices in the ranks of the MWP in the shape of the treacherous Náray-Leóczy group. Of course, all of the errors committed by the previous leadership of the MWP did not stem from the people's democratic system and therefore were of a fortuitous nature.

But the main instigators 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-dissident work against the socialist countries arises out of the very nature of contemporary imperialism and is an ineliminable and essential feature of it. Imperialists would not be imperialists if they did not conduct this subversive activity, if they did not attempt to organise 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. Of course 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, its 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 Náray-Leóczy group. The true strength of the people was only shown when its resistance was aided by the political party of the Hungarian proletariat - the MWP, which was reorganized in the course of the battle, and when the Revolutionary Workers and Peasant's Government was formed. Gomulka J. Kadar had every reason to state that the Revolutionary Worker's 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 to the joint struggle in 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
fraternal assistance of the Soviet army which carried out its international duty, the Hungarian people defended the independence of their country and the gains of the peoples democratic system. Therefore the danger of the transformation of Hungary into a nucleus 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 cause of peace throughout the world was liquidated. The great commonwealth of socialist nations clearly showed that it is able to rebuff resolutely and firmly all attempts to encroach upon its vital interests.