

Interviewer asked respondent to tell something about his life:

"I was born 24 years ago in Debrecen. My father was a businessman. My mother died when I was still a small child. My father was deported by the Nazis in 1944. The GESTAPO murdered him. I spent my early childhood in Berettyoujfalu, not far from Debrecen. I started going to the gymnasium in Debrecen before 1944, that is prior to the German occupation of Hungary. I survived the Nazi rule of terror in Budapest. After the country's liberation from the Nazis in 1945, I went to Kolozsvar in Transsylvania, where I went to school for a year. I was living there with one of my uncles. In 1946 I returned to Budapest and passed the matura in the Trefort Street Gymnasium in 1951."

Interviewer asked respondent to tell something about his experiences during his gymnasium years:

"The most important event perhaps, was that in 1946, when I was 14 years old, I entered the Communist Party. I considered myself a Communist. To be a Communist was quite natural for me, it was the opposite of Fascism and I was strongly anti-Fascist, a feeling which has been only strengthened with my father's murder by the ~~hands of~~ the Fascists. The Communist Party was the ~~most active~~ <sup>force</sup> most active anti-Fascist political ~~movement~~ in Hungary after 1945 and for me to join the Party was something very natural.

I should mention here however that my father had always been strongly anti-Communist and before 1944 I myself was under the influence of my father's anti-Communism. Things have changed, however, radically, during the years of 1944-45. These experiences of my life, when I was 12 and 13 years old, the Nazi occupation, the terror, the siege of Budapest, had<sup>s</sup> decisive influence on me. I have emerged from the war as a convinced Communist. During my stay in Kolozsvár in 1945-46 I have been active in the Communist Party, although I was no member yet. I was living with my uncle [REDACTED], who was a publisher. He himself was no Communist. He was leftist, anti-Fascist, progressive, but no Communist. His 20-year old daughter, however, was a Communist."

**Interviewer asked respondent to discuss more fully the circumstances and experiences which made him a Communist.**

"As I have said, the war experiences, especially the tragedy of my father had<sup>a</sup> decisive role to play. However, I can trace back to my childhood my intellectual development, which led me to Communism. I was a very alert child. Already at the age of six I was an avid newspaper reader. In my childhood I have been raised in a Catholic spirit. My nurse was a Catholic. At the age of seven, eight, I felt very strongly as a Catholic. But there had been other influences which destroyed my religiousness.

My father, to begin with, was not religious at all. In our family there were Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. But they all were sceptics and scepticism surrounded me from my early childhood. Nevertheless I remained religious until 1944. I remember that after my father was taken away by the GESTAPO I was praying that he should come back. I ~~was~~ <sup>lost</sup> completely <sup>faith</sup> in ~~my~~ religion during that fateful year of 1944. But when I look back upon my childhood and formative years, I must come to the conclusion that actually I never have been a religious type. Basically I am a sceptic myself. This is the background against which I <sup>should</sup> explain my conversion to Communism. To shed off my religiousness was the more easy for me, because of the tragic events of 1944. Communism appeared to me as an answer to the problems of the day. However, I did not join Communism out of fanaticism. I should not say even that I joined Communism. I became a Communist. This would be a more accurate description of my development towards Communism. Circumstances made me into a Communist. And, of course, the Hungarian social conditions were also instrumental in pushing me towards Communism. I believed in the necessity of a radical social revolution. The Hungarian society was backward and, as I would say it today, Communism was a backward answer to solving the problems of this backward society. But this, as I say, would be my present definition of the problem. At the time when I felt like a Communist, I believed sincerely that Communism is a progressive answer.

And even today, when I am no Communist anymore, if I look back upon the years from 1945 to 1949, I must say that in the Communist program there were great many things which were absolutely necessary in order to start a new life in Hungary following the second World War. I'm thinking of some of the necessary reforms, such as the land reform and in general I am thinking of the problems of recovery, the rebuilding of the war-ravaged country."

Interviewer asked respondent to tell about his experiences as a Communist during his gymnasium years:

"As I have said, I entered the Party in 1946, when I was 14 years old, and a student of the gymnasium in Budapest. At that time I was the only member of the class who was a Communist. Later on, there were more. In 1949 there were five or six Communists in our class. The Communists in general have been hated by their class-mates who were not Communists, but they did not hate me. I never had the feeling that they hated me. The reason for that was perhaps that I behaved less aggressively than the other Communist members of our class. Most<sup>of</sup> the disputes we had with our non-Communist school-mates were centered around religion, atheism vs. religion. But I seldom took ~~place~~<sup>part</sup> in these disputes because I did not consider them really important. I was a sceptic myself, but did not engage in these disputes. I believed in the revolution, I believed in the Communist program, but I have never believed in using force, violence.

As a result my attitude towards my non-Communist school-mates was different from those other Communists of our class and this is how I explain why I was not hated by the non-Communist school-mates."

Interviewer asked respondent to explain how did he feel as a Communist? What did he consider as his Communist credo:

"I would call myself a rational individualist. I despised emotionalism. Actually here was the beginning of my early conflicts with the Communist Party. I don't have to explain what a great role emotionalism is playing in the Communist movement. But I was not fond of applauding, and applause was something the Communist Party demanded as a matter of routine. I was often wondering, are the applauses sincere? The way I would sum up the main elements of Communism would be this: There are three chief components. First is a religious element. Communism presupposes a religious state of mind. The second element is that of radical socialism. This was incidentally the element which affected me most strongly. The third element is a conspiratory one and this I consider the most important. Communism presupposes a state of mind which I would describe as ~~an~~ complicity. You are an accomplice in a great conspiracy when you are a Communist. This is how you feel and this is how they expect you to feel and to behave. This entails a complete negation of ethical principles. It is based entirely on the principle that the end justifies the means.

Now, since I considered this conspiratory element the most important one in Communism, I should say that in this sense I have never been a Communist. I never had this feeling of ~~xxx~~ complicity and here I see the cause of my conflict with Communism. To me my Communism represented an act of magnanimity. My family was well to do and we lost our property, but I never had the desire to regain this property. I was a Communist and as such I thought and felt that I am doing an act of magnanimity by not having the desire of regaining my lost wealth. Such sentiments, I had to realize early enough, are not appreciated by the Communist Party. What the Party required above all was Party discipline, obedience."

Interviewer asked respondent to elaborate more on his statement that the conspiratory element, the element of ~~xxx~~ complicity, is according to him the most important one in Communism:

"What I mean is that the Communists feel like conspirators against an enemy. Now, to take the example in Hungary: who was the enemy? Now, for Rakosi and his like who were creating Communism in Hungary, the enemy was Hungary herself, the Hungarian people. They believed that the Hungarians are innately Fascist. This did not prevent Rakosi, of course, from acting as if he would be supported and even well liked by the Hungarian people. And here I would draw a sharp line between Rakosi and his like on the one hand and Imre Nagy on the other. The attitude of Rakosi dominated, however, the Hungarian Communist Party.

This was the attitude of the Jewish Communists, the attitude of the Moscovites, of the Moscow group. They have mistrusted the people entirely. They have contempt for the people. This was partly the contempt of the bourgeois intellectual for the people. Now, Rakosi and his clique was small, but they dominated the Party and the Communist movement in Hungary. Also they succeeded in raising a rather substantial group of followers. I would estimate it was about 50,000 people of working class and peasant origin. This was the new class, the new ruling class of Hungary. These faithful Communists were the most dangerous element of the Communist regime. They were ignorant, brutal, blind in following the Party's directives. This is, incidentally, the group upon which Kadar's present regime is relying upon."

Interviewer suggested that respondent get back to his personal story and asked him to tell more about his personal experiences as a Communist; in particular about his conflicts with the Party:

"As I look back now I would say that my conflict with the Communist Party was latent from the beginning. Of course it took time until it came out into the open. I would like to stress also that a conflict within the Party is something normal. There is constant conflict and struggle within the Party. There had been constant struggle and fight within the Party ever since I entered it. Until 1949 I would describe this conflict, or rather this fight, as directed against the old intellectuals of the Party.

After 1949 the struggle was going against the new Kaders, against the new Intelligentsia of working class and peasant origin. As for my own case, I had been a deviationist from the beginning, but my deviations were tolerated out of respect perhaps for my intellectual position. I was a **Marxist theoretician** at the age of 15. I have read Marx' "Capital" (Das Kapital) and I have understood it as few Communists in Hungary did, and the Party knew it. Now, as for my conflict with the Party, it began in earnest when I got convinced that I can do nothing in reforming, improving the Party, when I had realized that my role as a reformer is futile, my estrangement from the Communist Party began. My conviction grew stronger that I must leave. In a way I would say that I was a Communist until I believed in the impossibility of my contribution to the reform of the Party."

Next Interviewer asked respondent to elaborate his conflicts with the Party in detail:

"I had many conflicts, but I will perhaps elaborate only on the most important incidents. The first such incident occurred in 1949, while still a student in the Trefort Street Gymnasium. For half a year I was DISZ secretary. I have disliked this position, because I did not think that the circumstances of my election were fair. I felt I was appointed by the Party rather than elected by my fellow students.



I resented this and got rid of the secretary/<sup>ship</sup> after half a year. One of my major conflicts while secretary was on the occasion of a May demonstration. The Party Secretary told me that the school must be represented at the demonstrations by atleast 50% of the students. My answer was that this is impossible because the students would not come. He said that I must see to it that they should come, but I refused to exercise pressure. This the Party Secretary resented and he upbraided me. Thus my disgust for them began and their suspicion of me was no doubt growing ~~hourly~~ <sup>parallelly.</sup> My second incident was in 1951 during the deportation of middleclass elements of Budapest. I protested at the Party Headquarters against the deportation of a young girl, with whom I was deeply in love. As a result of my intervention I was put on a black list, no doubt, altho the Party did not tell me so or did not make me feel that I am blacklisted. Incidental.y, my intervention was unsuccessful. After 1 1/2 year, however, when deportations came up for revision, I succeeded to bring back my girl-friend to Budapest. My third and very grave incident occurred in 1951, following my matura. At that time I was a member of the DISZ District Committee in charge of admitting students to the university, or rather sifting the students whom we considered eligible for admission to the univerity. Now what happened was this: while I was sifting others, someone else sifted me, because, surprising as it may sound, I had been refused admission to the universit.

The official notification which informed me on this matter, described me as a person of bourgeois-capitalist origin. I was terribly surprised, because I was 100 % certain that I will be admitted. My surprise grew even greater when I failed the second admission test. Only my rage was greater than my surprise. I decided to take steps. I ~~launched~~ <sup>lodged</sup> a strong protest. I saw personally the Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education, Mr. Laszlo ~~Orban~~ <sup>Orban</sup>. My strong protest created something of a surprise. After a while Mr. Oryan<sup>b</sup> apologized and my case came up for revision before a committee of the Ministry. I got a hearing, and was told that the refusal to admit me was a misunderstanding. Thus I was finally admitted to the economic university. In spite of my success to redress the injury I have suffered, my contempt for the Communist Party remained strong and as a result I decided not to take any active part ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> the Party life at the university, moreover I began to ponder whether it would not be better not to be a Party member. At that time, however, I did not consider seriously yet to leave the Party. After all, at that time, I still felt as a Communist. My fourth incident occurred during my **first** year at the university of economics, of which I became a student, in 1951. Shortly after the winter semester began, the Party instructed me to accept the post of DISZ Secretary of my freshman class. I accepted this position grudgingly, because I saw no possibility of refusing it.

I have resigned, however, after half a year. And I have withdrawn almost completely, I did not go to the lectures, I hardly studied, I began to study on my own. I have read a lot and I have been engaged in extensive research. The result of my research was a longer paper, which was awarded by the Academy of Sciences. The award consisted of 1,000 ft. Meanwhile I have neglected entirely my duties as a Party member, I did not go into the Party meetings. The conflict with the Party was growing stronger in me, altho I should stress that I still felt as a Communist. The fifth and decisive conflict was a long one, and actually it started as a period of new hope, only ending in conflict far more serious than any of the preceding ones. The period of new hope began in me in 1953, when Imre Nagy became Prime Minister. I was rejoicing, I was filled with hope and faith again that the mistakes of the past could be corrected, that my role as a reformer of the Party could be resumed. I was elected as a member of the Executive Committee of the university's Student Association in 1953. It was a committee comprising about five members. This was the time when the crisis of education became one of the major concerns of the regime. The regime had realized that the educational system was a failure, the youth was passive and apathetic. I had been asked by the Party to start a discussion at the university, a discussion which would be instrumental in arousing the university students from their apathy.

I wrote an article which was supposed to lead off this discussion. The main theme of the article was that we need a new program, but, as I pointed out, let us be aware of the following: We cannot correct the old mistakes as long as the old people who had committed the mistakes, remain at their places. I was urging a thorough and sincere reappraisal of the situation in order to discover the roots of the troubles. In this article I have done some theoretical discussion too, I expressed the view that Communism is not<sup>a</sup> religion, but it is a **rationalist** creed. I have also expressed the view that we must be tolerant of the opinions of others. I have strongly defended the right of everybody to express freely his opinion. I concluded by saying that without such a climate of freedom the youth cannot acquire convictions nor can the educational process be successful. Before that article was published in the students' paper, the Party was raising many objections. I had to make many changes, basically, however, the main theme of the article remained intact. But even in this revised form the Party did not like the article, proof of that was that after it had been published the Party ordered the copies of the paper in which my article had been published, to be seized. This happened in 1954, at a time when the Nagy regime was already declining and proving a failure. I knew I'm in trouble and that the Party is watching me, nevertheless I was continuing my criticism of the situation, **along** the same lines I have evolved in

my article. My position as a critique of the regime's educational policy became precarious when Nagy's Ministry fell and Rakosi was restored to full power. Shortly after March 1955, when Rakosi returned to power, I have been expelled from the Party as a class alien. Prior to the expulsion, three or four times the Party ordered me to exercise self-criticism, which I refused to do. Thus ended my fifth conflict and my membership in the Party."

Interviewer asked respondent what were the consequences of his expulsion from the Party:

"The gravest consequence was that when I received my diploma in 1955, I was unable to get a job. For three or four months I was working in a factory for optical instruments. I was grinding lenses. This was not what a student of economics was supposed to do. Thereafter I received a job in a state collective in the vicinity of Kapuvar in West Hungary, close to the Austrian border. I was chief accountant in the collective's business office. I got this job thru an acquaintance of mine. He was Attila Szigety, a member of the Parliament representing the Peasant Party and an influential politician during Imre Nagy's Ministry. With Nagy's fall, of course, Szigety's position had been shaken too. He did not give up, however, to continue to struggle against Rakosi. He was active in reorganizing the Peasant Party as a nucleus of resistance. I was in full agreement with Szigety's policy and supported him wholeheartedly.

From the state collective in Kapuvar I visited Budapest quite often and took part in the foundation of the Petöfi Circle. Gabor Tancos, who became secretary general of the Petöfi<sup>Circle,</sup> was a close acquaintance of mine. All the people who took the initiative belonged to the circle of Imre Nagy."

Interview<sup>was</sup> interrupted at this point. When the conversation was resumed, respondent expressed the desire to say more about his paper he wrote in 1954, which was mentioned earlier:

"The paper I have written in 1954 was entitled "The Five-Year Plan". I have discussed in this paper the changes in the national income and the distribution of the national income as a result of the five-year plan. I was dealing with changes in the standard of living. I have also dealt with the changes in the occupation of the population, the division of labor. My conclusions were the followings: As a result of the economic, social changes, which were supposed to raise the living standard, the living standard of the country's Intelligentsia in comparison with 1938 was 60 % lower. Another conclusion was that the living standard of the workers between 1950 and 1953 decreased by 25 to 40%. My third conclusion was that altho the productivity of the country has increased since 1949, by 15%, the general standard of living was decreased by atleast the same percentage. These conclusions created quite a sensation and needless to say that they did not endear me to the Party.

My other literary activities, I would like to mention, added to my conflict with the Party. In 1954, in the fall of 1954, I wrote two satires. They were never performed or published. They were circulated, however, and the Party knew about it. The subject of my first satire was the following: Karl Marx rose from his grave, and came to Budapest, where he had a conversation with a Rakosi stipendist, university student. Marx was appalled by the student's views, as the student was appalled by Marx' views. My other satire was set in the editorial office of the university students' paper. The editors were discussing the question whether they should publish an article. One of them read the article, which, as it turned out at the end of the satire, was an extract from Adam Smith's writings. One of the editors throughout the satire is trying to say something, but he doesn't succeed because of the other editors who are violently criticising the piece, which they think was written by one of their fellow students. Finally the editor who did not get a chance to say a word, succeeds to explain that this is an extract from Adam Smith. I was trying in this satire to illustrate the ignorance of the university students."

Now the Interviewer suggested that the respondent resume his story of his conflict with the regime:

Even prior to my exclusion from the Party, I was in a very depressed mood. I saw that Nagy's regime is failing, I knew that the return of Rakosi to power is inevitable. I came to the conclusion that nothing could be done to arrest the trend towards disorder. I was anticipating complete economic failure, sometimes I even felt that the situation may become so grave that it may come to an uprising. ~~consequently~~ I have decided to withdraw completely. I did not go to the university, I excused myself by saying that I am sick. Meanwhile the Party invited me several times to exercise self-criticism. They levelled against me the charge of demanding liberal reforms. I refused, however, to exercise self-criticism. Thereupon the Party ordered disciplinary action against me on account of my absence from the university. To avoid trouble I asked a doctor-friend of mine to help me. I told him that I need a certificate that I am sick. My nerves were in a very bad shape indeed. So there was some truth in this certificate which stated that I am in need of medical treatment in a sanatorium. I was a patient in the sanatorium at the time when the Party excluded me from its ranks."



Respondent mentioned that he was active in the foundation of the Petöfi Circle. Interviewer asked him to tell more about his role:

"The action began in the summer of 1954. The idea was that the Youth needs a new forum. We were thinking first of founding a new Galilei Circle. As you know, there was a Galilei Circle before the first world war. It was an organization of progressive students. It had been revived after the second world war, but suppressed at the time the Communists took over the power. We were planning the revival of the Galilei Circle in support of Imre Nagy's new-course policy. After the failure of the new-course policy we were convinced that an organization of this kind would be of no lesser importance. Among the organizers the lead was taken by Laszlo Kardos, and Gabor Tancos, a former partisan who fought with Tito during the second world war. The Party did not approve the aims of the new organization. They have consented, however, to allow the new organization under the name of Petöfi Circle. The Party believed that such a new organization would be instrumental in revitalizing the activities of the university students. However, the activities of the Petöfi Circle turned out to be very different from what the Party expected it to be. From the spring of 1955, when the Petöfi Circle had been founded, until the spring of 1956 the activities of the Circle were not significant. Its real role began in the spring of 1956, and this was the time also when the activities of the Circle took a direction which was in no way in line with the intention of the Party.

The turning point in the Petöfi Circle's activities was the Party resolution on the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party in February 1956. The Petöfi Circle wholeheartedly embraced the program of the 20th Party Congress and the chief objective of the Petöfi Circle from then on was to de-Stalinize the Hungarian Communist Party, in other words, to oust the Hungarian Stalin, Rakosi, and his entire clique. Or to put it in a still other way, to replace the Rakosi clique with Nagy and his followers. I was very sceptical of the chances of success. As a matter of fact, my experiences in the State collective at Kapuvar deepened my conviction that the whole regime is on the verge of collapse. The meetings of the Petöfi Circle were in some respect encouraging. Also Rakosi's fall was holding out some promise, but Gerö as a successor to Rakosi was a setback. My mood in the fall of 1956, on the eve of the Revolution, was anything but optimistic. Actually my desire was to leave the country, to go abroad, to go to England and to study economics."

Interviewer asked respondent about his experiences during the Revolution:

"I was in Budapest on October 23rd. My job at Kapuvar had ceased some time before. I was on the Parliament Square on the evening of Oct 23rd, when Imre Nagy spoke and his speech did not fill me with confidence. I witnessed also the shooting at the Radio Building, but I

did not realize that this is the beginning of a revolution. During the Revolution I roamed the streets of Budapest. I joined several times fighting groups which were formed adhoc. I was no militarist, but I knew how to handle a rifle. I have had namely military training. I was inducted in the army in 1955. But altho not a militarist myself, I was swept away by the waves of the Revolution. You could not help being swept away when you saw young teen-aged boys, and girls sometimes, fighting and saying "We will fight until we die!"

As for my own opinion, I thought the Revolution was a madness. But the people did not lay down the arms, you just had to go with them and take part in the madness. I took part in the formation of the Students Revolutionary Committee. I was spending a great deal of time at the apartment of Laszlo Kardos. He held a great authority among the students and his apartment was one of the revolutionary centers. His authority dated back to the years of 1945, 1948, when he was director of the NEKOSZ, the National Association of People's Colleges. He was a long-time Communist and a Party member since 1941. It was thru Mr. Kardos that an agreement was reached between the police and the students. According to this agreement the students were to get arms from the police and also arm-bands with the label "Rendor", that is "policeman". The aim of the measure was to organize a new policeforce, which would help to restore order and above all to disarm the freedom fighters,

who had no organization and no authority above them. During the week from October 27th to November 4th, when it looked as if the Revolution would be victorious, I was sent by the Revolutionary Committee of the Students to Győr. Several of us were sent to Győr, my appointment was with view to my acquaintance and close relationship with Attila Szigety, who became the president of the Revolutionary Council in Győr. Szigety was making great efforts in stabilizing and consolidating the Revolution in the city of Győr as well as in the adjacent areas. After what I have seen in Budapest and saw in Győr, I must say I was rather pessimistic as to the chances of consolidating the Revolution and the power of a new regime. The confusion was almost hopeless. Before I left for Győr, I had an interesting meeting with Gyorgy Lukacs, an old acquaintance of mine. He was sceptical, as much as I was, of the chances of consolidation. He thought that the stabilization of Imre Nagy's power would be highly desirable, but he foresaw two dangers: one, the Russians would intervene and not let Nagy stabilize himself in power. Second, that the Revolution would move too far and too fast to the right, making thus the stabilization of Imre Nagy's gov't impossible on the one hand, and the intervention of the Russians more likely on the other. Mr. Lukacs imparted me also an interesting information. According to him it was his intervention, together with Zoltan Szanto, that convinced Mikoyan, the Soviet emissary in Budapest during the Revolution, that the

Russians had no other choice but to withdraw from Budapest and to wait and see what Imre Nagy is capable of doing."

Next Interviewer asked respondent to tell more about his experiences in Győr:

"As I have said, the confusion in Győr was very great. On the other hand Szigetey had made a superhuman effort to consolidate the situation. I cannot speak in high enough terms about him. He was remarkably well informed and well suited for the part he took upon himself during the Revolution. A gentry by origin, he was progressively minded. He was a faithful follower of Nagy and convinced that there was no other solution but to help Nagy's regime to consolidate itself. Unfortunately this was as difficult a job in Győr as anywhere else in the country. A major crisis developed in Győr during my stay there, when a certain Lajos Sonogyvari attempted a Fascist coup. He was an adventurist, a madman, rather than a scoundrel. He pushed his way into the chamber of the City Council, accompanied by four armed guards, and demanded that he should be able to speak to the people. He recorded a two-hours long speech, which he was trying to broadcast. It was a crazy speech, it appealed to the West for immediate help, and incited to programs against the Jews, it demanded terror against everybody, it demanded vengeance against all the people who had anything to do with the former Communist regime.

There was <sup>a</sup> crowd of 200 or 300 hysterical people in ~~the~~ front <sup>building</sup> of the radio <sup>in</sup> Győr, demanding that <sup>m</sup>Sojogvari should be allowed to broadcast his speech. While in Győr, my main job was to quiet down the hysterical masses, I was working closely with Szigety and I was delivering many speeches in support of Szigety's Revolutionary Council and the so-called Transdanubian Parliament, thru which Szigety was trying to consolidate the powers of the new regime throughout the Transdanubian area. It was at one of the meetings of this Transdanubian Parliament, which was meeting in Győr, that <sup>m</sup>Sojogvari was allowed to speak. His speech was a flop, because the crowd did not respond to <sup>m</sup>Sojogvari's emotional, wild words. Szigety's speech, on the other hand, was a great success and it looked, for a while atleast, that the situation could be kept under control. As a matter of fact, <sup>m</sup>Sojogvari was ousted from the meeting-place. This important meeting took place on October 29th. The speech, held by Szigety, outlined the policy that Nagy's gov't was trying to follow during the subsequent days. The program, as outlined by Szigety, was not of his invention. His ideas were very much in the air. He came out for neutrality, and, of course for the withdrawal of the Russian troops from Hungary. He demanded democratic elections, also demanded that Hungary should leave the Warsaw Pact. Szigety's speech was a tremendous success, the Transdanubian Parliament approved his program and it decided to send a delegation to Imre Nagy asking him to embrace the program <sup>e</sup>andorsed

by the Transdanubian Parliament. The delegation was led by Szigety personally. Two days later Szigety came back from Budapest and at the meeting of the Transdanubian Parliament he announced that Imre Nagy accepted the program and this assurance had such great an effect that the situation in Győr had become stable for the next days, until Nov 4th. Here I would like to interject that when Szigety left for Budapest to inform Imre Nagy about the program of the Transdanubian Parliament, there were voices heard to the effect that if Nagy would not accept the program of the Parliament, the Parliament would detach itself from Nagy and form its own gov't. Unfortunately greater forces than those Szigety could control in Győr, decided the future of the Revolution."

Next Interviewer asked respondent what happened to him after the Russian attack on Nov 4th:

"I left Győr on the day of the Russian attack and found refuge in the collective farm at Kapuvar, where I have been working earlier. This was close to the Austrian border and already on the next day, on Nov 5th, I crossed the border and arrived to safety in Austria."

In conclusion Interviewer asked respondent what he thought of the future of Hungary and of the future of the whole Soviet orbit in Central and Eastern Europe:

"Only an East - West agreement, an agreement on a European collective security system, would ease the situation in Central Europe in general and in Hungary in particular."

As a result of such an agreement Russia would be perhaps willing to withdraw her troops from Central and Eastern Europe. In such a case, perhaps, the chances for democracy in Hungary could be ensured. As to the political and economic system which would develop from Hungary's liberation from Soviet occupation, I would envisage a mixed economy, a combination of collectivism and private enterprise. The freedom for private enterprise is of particular importance because only in such a case would it be possible to invite the foreign capital to invest in Hungary, which is absolutely necessary in achieving prosperity in the country."

Interviewer asked respondent whether he would return to Hungary in case such a development would take place:

"Yes, by all means."

Finally, interviewer asked respondent to sum up his political opinions as of today:

"I'm a former Communist, but I don't think that I am very much to the left today. I came to the realization of the following: The most important thing is political democracy. This is much more important than the socialist program. I am in sympathy with the socialist program, but if this program would curtail democratic freedoms, would curtail political democracy, I do not support it. Freedom cannot exist, democracy cannot exist, if political democracy is curtailed, no matter what the intention or justification of such a curtailment would be."



INTERVIEWER'S RATING: Rapport, frankness, cooperativeness were good, no sign of compliance or flattery. Respondent is regarded as one of the most outstanding members of the so-called Oxford ~~Group~~ ~~Group~~, a group of students who found refuge in that ancient English university town. He is no doubt a brilliant and promising young intellectual and his story a very revealing one. It is a story of a young man who is greatly pre-occupied with his own significance. In evaluating the interview, this circumstance should be taken into consideration.