



## The Counter-Revolution in Hungary in the Light of Marxism-Leninism

Gyula Kállai

1957

The appraisal of the events of October and November in Hungary has engaged the attention of the broad masses both at home and beyond the borders of the country. Imperialist propaganda is doing everything it can to confuse the workers' perspicacity and conceal the essence of the happenings. Therefore for a long time views have been circulated which are incorrect and contradict each other and their influence are still felt today. The appraisal of the counter-revolution in Hungary is a question of principle and practice of decisive importance; and the position one takes on it is in essence the

touchstone of which side one is taking in the class struggle. The events can be appraised correctly and scientifically only in the light of Marxism-Leninism.

## I

In the Marxist analysis of the events of October and November in Hungary one proceed from the basic fact that there is an antagonistic contradiction on one hand between the proletariat, the oppressed peoples of the world and the Socialist camp, and on the other hand is the bourgeoisie, the oppressing capitalist powers, that is, the imperialist camp. In autumn last year Hungary became the focal point of these contradictions and became the theatre of action of the worldwide class struggle between Capitalism and Socialism.

The proletariat struggling to bring about a socialist social system necessarily meet with the resistance of the exploiting classes which have outlived themselves, both within their own country and beyond its borders. The bourgeoisie overthrown and expropriated by the working class - by virtue of their ideological influence, experience, the force of habit and other remaining sources of strength - represent a great force for a long time yet against the power of the working class. The strength of the internal counter-revolution is increased to a great extent by the multifold disruptive activities of international imperialism against the countries building Socialism. These reactionary forces do everything they can during the period of socialist construction to regain their lost power, to restore the capitalist system.

Naturally it does not follow from this that the class struggle constantly sharpens under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We know that in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat the class struggle necessarily grows sharper during the liquidation of the exploiting classes, but this does not necessarily mean that it increasingly sharpens during the entire period of the building of Socialism. This depends largely on the shaping of forces between the classes and the considered policy and tactics of the party.

At the beginning of 1956 international imperialism - in order to counter-balance its defeats during recent years and to reduce the positive effect of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union - launched a comprehensive campaign against the Socialist camp. It bent its efforts to tear away several people's democratic countries from the socialist world system, thus to weaken the Communist movement and curb the national-democratic movements which are strengthening throughout the world. In

the course of this it began an intensified attack with the slogan to defeat the “Stalinist-Rákosiist” system against the people’s democratic order of our fatherland. It increased its propaganda activity, and this was supplemented by the espionage and diversionist activity which was elevated in the U.S.A. to the level of official state policy.

As to how much the counter-revolutionary forces supported by international imperialism can prevail in a given country depends on the policy of the revolutionary working class of that country.

“There is no class,” said Lenin, “which can overthrow us: the proletariat and the majority of the village poor are with us. No one can drive us to destruction, except our own mistakes. ‘If’ is the root of the question.” (Lenin Works Vol. 32, p. 45 in Hungarian.) If our policy correctly expresses the objective requirements of social development, if the dictatorship of the proletariat is strong and growing stronger, if the party can win the confidence of the masses with its policy, if it recognises and corrects in time the errors committed during the building of Socialism, then the influence of the counter-revolutionary forces will be constantly less. The Hungarian Working People’s Party, the Marxist-Leninist party of the Hungarian working class, placed on its agenda the most important task of social progress, the solution of the decisive questions of the nation, it led the working class to power and achieved very important results in the building of Socialism. With this it won great prestige and confidence among the working masses and isolated the forces of reaction more and more. From the end of 1948, however, a policy began to prevail, which, although it correctly expressed the main lines of social development, did not, in many respects, meet the concrete historical requirements, the specific conditions of our fatherland, and therefore led to grave mistakes. These mistakes reduced the great achievements of the people’s democracy and at the same time served as the target of the attacks against the people’s democracy by hostile elements.

An indisputable result of our development is our industrial development, the production level of which surpassed the 1938 level more than three times. It is true that at the same time the resources of our national economy and particularly the resources of industry were engaged to a very considerable extent with preparation of the national defence. In the international situation of that time, one of the main characteristics of which was the Korean war and another the constant threats of the Americans with atomic weapons, the extensive development of our national defence was imperative, although this exceeded our strength to some extent. We also know that the large-

scale industrialisation was accompanied by other difficulties and afflictions as well. Considerable disproportions arose in our national economy and one of the main shortcomings of our development was that in consequence of the foregoing beside the excessive rate of industrialisation the rise in the living standard not only could not keep pace but even declined in 1951—52 and in the first half of 1953.

One of the very great results of our development was that in the period mentioned the Socialist sector of agriculture came into existence, we established a national network of agricultural machine stations, therefore we considerably advanced the mechanisation of agriculture. It is true that this development was hampered by the excesses, compulsion and the occasional use of force which were apparent in the cooperative farm development policy, which decreased the results and the value of the Socialist development of the village. Despite this a great achievement of our social development was the establishment and growth of the Socialist sector of agriculture. The cooperative farm sector has ineradicably struck root in Hungarian agriculture not even the storm of the counter-revolution was able to uproot it.

Tremendous are the achievements which we attained during the past period in cultural development whether we examine the field of public education, book publishing or the growth of our film art and cinema network.

While in 1938 only 34,000 pupils completed the eighth form of primary school, in 1955 there were 98,000 pupils in the eighth form of primary school. The number of college and university students rose from 11,700 in 1938 to nearly 31,000 in 1955/56. The growth of book publishing is also worth noting: in comparison to 8150 books published in 1938, in 1955 it was 17,500. The number of cinemagoers increased from 18.5 million in 1935 to 116 million by the end of 1955. During this period the number of cinemas nearly doubled.

Our results are very great in the development of social insurance.

In the first half of 1953, as compared to 1949, the real wages of the industrial workers was 8.6 per cent lower, but this too was substantially higher than the 1938 standard of living.

The internal antagonisms of capitalist society are irreconcilable stemming from the essence of the capitalist system; therefore they are inevitable and unavoidably give birth to shocks and crises. The situation is different in the Socialist society or the society building Socialism. The faults arising in the social life of our country during the building of Socialism were not a consequence of the economic and social basis of our system, but were antagonistic to it; they hampered and weakened the development of our creative

work, they arose from the fact that we did not recognise correctly the objective social processes, in our practice we violated the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Our party, like all Marxist-Leninist parties, possessed the ability to rectify with a correct policy the errors made in the course of building Socialism, not without conflicts, but peacefully. In June 1953 the party revealed the gravest errors and on the whole correctly determined the source of the errors too: the mistakes committed in agricultural policy, the violation of the Leninist principles of party leadership, the cult of the individual and the violation of law. Yet the June 1953 Resolution did not bring about a radical change in the practical correction of the mistakes, it did not become a starting point for the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In June 1953 Imre Nagy became the leader of the country, who already at that time had shaken the confidence, especially of the intelligentsia and the working peasantry, in the party. A right-wing group began to form around Imre Nagy, in their opportunism petty bourgeois influences were reflected, diverging more and more from the path of representing the proletarian class interests, they openly oriented towards the middle sections of the population and embarked on the road of weakening the dictatorship of the proletariat and abandoning the building of Socialism. The roots of this tendency reach back to Imre Nagy's opportunist views which he admitted earlier. At that time these opportunist views became apparent in connection with one of the most decisive questions of our development: the perspectives of Hungarian agriculture. According to Imre Nagy the path of progress in agriculture *should not be towards the establishment of collective farms, but towards increasing the economic strength and productive capacity of the small commodity producing sections.* According to him "with the exception of the kulak-capitalist farms the cooperative and non-cooperative farms also develop democratically towards Socialism." For this reason, according to Imre Nagy, in the period of building Socialism the collectivisation of agriculture is not a main, but only an auxiliary task, with which the flourishing small and middle peasant farms "are to be supplemented." In 1949 Imre Nagy himself seemingly repudiated these opportunist views: "The central, the decisive question, around which my errors are grouped and which constitutes the essence of my rightist opportunist deviation," he said at the September 1949 session of the Central Committee, "is, what direction Hungarian agriculture should take, which way should it develop... I objectively arrived at the theoretical standpoint of the small commodity producing peasant farm based on private ownership. All my other erroneous standpoints or views may in essence be traced back

to this fundamentally opportunist theoretical basis... that is, in place of socialist, collective, large-scale farming, in the last analysis the direction is toward? individual small peasant farming, which as we know, engenders capitalist farming.” (Imre Nagy’s self-criticism at the September 1949 session of the Central Committee.)

Following 1953, at the time of his term as Chairman of the Council of Ministers - under the pretext of rectifying the mistakes - he again revived his incorrect, anti-Marxist views on the socialist reorganisation of agriculture to which he had subscribed earlier and seemingly repudiated in 1949. After 1953 Imre Nagy formulated the so-called “peculiarity” of the Hungarian dictatorship of the proletariat, according to which the relatively peaceful building of Socialism is irreconcilable with the oppressive functions of state power and therefore these would have to wither away. Imre Nagy underestimated the forces of the class enemy, in fact he denied the existence of such forces in the country. This is the source of his “9 and a half million Hungarian united heartbeats” and “homogeneous Hungarian national culture” theories. He subscribed to revisionist views also on the question of developing socialist industry when he voiced the priority of small and light industry in opposition to heavy industry. He simply *denied* the necessity of the leading role of the party in state and social life. According to him, not the party but - as he stated at the First Congress of the People’s Front - “the People’s Patriotic Front should be the living conscience of the country, which safeguards the realisation of our great national aims.” Every single one of these views are revisionist views, which served to disarm the working class and its party before the class enemy. Obviously Imre Nagy’s rightist policy could not correct the mistakes - on the contrary: they caused even more serious confusion within the party and throughout the country. At the same time the Rákosi leadership was unable to break with its earlier mistakes. As to the nature of these mistakes they were also petty bourgeois in character: political impatience which is profoundly alien to the proletariat and a tendency to giving orders, neglecting the day to day struggle to win and hold the broadest masses, the incorrect and subjectivist estimation of the political and economic circumstances. They used the criticism of the rightist opportunism to divert the attention of the party from the sectarian mistakes, to put an end to the sound process which began in 1953 - despite Imre Nagy’s right-wing policy - and after March 1955 to return in many respects to the faulty methods used prior to 1953.

In place of a democratic and open discussion of principle, for years a secret

but bitter struggle went on between these two trends. This made united leadership impossible and consumed the strength of the party leadership. It also prevented the rallying of the sound elements of the party to rectify the mistakes on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and to defend the party's ideological-political unity. The oscillation of the party's policy first to the "right," then to the "left" shook the confidence of the working people in the party and their faith in Marxism-Leninism even more.

Even after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the Rákosi leadership was unable to break consistently with the mistakes and to make it possible that the party should further develop in a sound way. Within the party and as well as among the masses of the working people outside the party dissatisfaction has grown because of the mistakes and the procrastination to correct them, on account of the resistance of the old leadership. After the 20th Congress the sound nucleus of the party strengthened. They definitely wanted to put an end to the mistakes of the Rákosi leadership but they wanted to correct the mistakes not on the basis of the Imre Nagy rightist opportunism, but in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. Therefore the power existed within the party which could have removed the obstacles from the way of strengthening the party. This process - especially after the July 1956 session of the Central Committee - was started and in the beginning it progressed successfully on several important questions. But at the same time the group around Imre Nagy and Géza Losonczy embarked on feverish activity.

The Imre Nagy-Géza Losonczy faction professed in words to be the only representatives of creative Marxism and the spirit of the 20th Congress in Hungary; actually, however, they did not struggle to correct the mistakes in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, but to revise the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. In reality they strove to introduce a so-called "national Communist" system in our country in place of the people's democratic regime.

The revisionist views of this group were manifested mainly in the following:

Above all in the denial of the leading role of the party. The first manifestation of this was Imre Nagy's stand in connection with the People's Patriotic Front. This was followed by efforts trying to divert the youth federation of the party's leadership. Certain writers and journalists demanded that the party should not play a political guiding role in literature, art and the press. A typical manifestation was Sándor Novobáczky's article, which denied the vanguard role of Marxist-Leninist theory, and called Marxism-

Leninism “spiritual cod-liver oil.”

At the same time the Imre Nagy revisionists voiced the slogan of “pure democracy” and “full freedom,” that is, they demanded democracy *in general* and freedom for everybody. We need not dwell on how dangerous these views are. Marxism-Leninism teaches that *socialist democracy is only democracy for the working people and is a dictatorship for the enemies of Socialism*. The demand of abstract “democracy,” devoid of class definition, actually cloaks a demand for bourgeois democracy. In a society in which the capitalist elements are far from being destroyed, the demand for general, abstract democracy aids the bourgeois restoration. The demand for “full” freedom is a slogan of the same character aiding bourgeois restoration. The slogan of “unconditional truthfulness” appearing as part of this demand - for the observance of which certain writers concluded a defensive and offensive alliance - was only a pretext for them to speak only of the shortcomings of the people’s democracy and to deny its great results and belittle its achievements. With the slogan of “socialist law” practically they came to the defence of the counter-revolutionaries. Under the pretext of setting right the violations of law - to the greater glory of “full freedom” - during the October days they released thousands of political and ordinary criminals from the prisons. In practice this was how the demand for “full freedom” became a freedom to act for the counter-revolution and for the scum of society.

One of the features of the Imre Nagy faction’s revisionism was the distortion of the Leninist principle of democratic centralism, the transformation of democracy into anarchy, or even the denial of the necessity of any sort of centralism. Under the pretext of “liberalising” party life they denied the necessity of party discipline, they demanded freedom for factions and wanted to transform the party into a shapeless debating body. The hostile campaign to ridicule and discredit party and state functionaries was part of the attack against centralism. The action of the group against centralism was manifested in the attacks against centralised planned economy, which loosened plan discipline and caused tremendous harm to the national economy.

Prominent among the revisionist views of the Imre Nagy faction was the discarding of the principle of proletarian internationalism and its replacement with nationalism. Under the pretext of fostering the national traditions they dished up first and foremost the *bourgeois traditions*. With the slogan of the “special Hungarian way” to Socialism they actually denied the *general validity* of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the building of Socialism, they rejected to adopt the valuable experiences of the Soviet Union and the



people's democracies, and this has found a fitting place side by side with their adoration of the capitalist West. They masked these endeavours, and their purpose and attacks to liquidate the dictatorship of the proletariat largely by glorifying the "Yugoslav example" and contrasting it with the Socialist countries.

The Nagy-Losonczy group deliberately disrupted party discipline and began organised factional activity to undermine the unity of the party. They operated not only within the party, but outside the party they took advantage of the growing dissatisfaction of the masses and organised a so-called "democratic mass movement" which in essence was aimed at liquidating the party's leading role, at undermining the people's democratic power, and which *directly prepared the October 23 armed counter-revolutionary uprising*. "We are the party - our constantly increasing army," said Tibor Tardos at the press debate of the Petőfi Circle. "While practically the main force of our criticism is directed towards persons and against the erroneous political practice, and does not examine it strictly with Marxist-Leninist methods, that aren't there certain errors also in the system of our ideas," continued Tibor Déry at the same debate - "until then it is inevitable that we shall attain only the meagre result of *replacing an evil with a lesser evil*." Losonczy called upon the party's so-called "Leninist forces" to turn more boldly to the people to assist in "realising the line of the 20th Congress."

The breeding ground of the Imre Nagy-Losonczy faction's activities was petty bourgeois anarchism. The "mass movement" directed by them did not rely on the working class (although here and there they did influence certain groups of the workers), but first of all on a part of the intelligentsia - writers, journalists and university students - and various petty bourgeois elements, which by virtue of their class background are prone to vacillate and in a critical situation can form a social basis for the counter-revolution. Lenin said that the petty bourgeois counter-revolution was more dangerous than Kolchak and Denikin together. The representatives of this section of the population were the most influential at the debates of the Petőfi circle, and the anti-party and anti-Marxist campaign which began in the press in the spring of 1956 reflected the mood primarily of this section. The Nagy-Losonczy faction made it a rule in the press and radio to strike a demagogic, criticising tone, to magnify the mistakes, to belittle the results, to display mistrust towards the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, unconditional admiration for the capitalist countries and doubt in the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Part of their methods consisted of *morally discrediting*

*the party and state authorities*, the state security organs under the slogan of struggling against “Stalinism” and the “Rákosi restoration,” and of *fomenting sentiment in a demagogic fashion against everyone who opposed their anti-Marxist revisionist views*. And the party and state organs did not struggle consistently against either the hostile, bourgeois views or their disseminators. The dictatorship of the proletariat was distorted in this respect too.

The Western imperialist circles completely approved and supported the activities of the Nagy-Losonczy faction. The imperialist propaganda organs themselves - Radio Free Europe, the Voice of America and other hostile radio stations - practically spoke like those belonging to the Nagy-Losonczy faction: they struck an attitude of being adherents to Socialism and were only striving to correct the mistakes. Actually, however, with their slogan of struggling against the “Stalinist-Rákosiist” system they were endeavouring to *discredit and disrupt the institutions of our people’s democratic society: the party, the state, the mass organisations and socialist ideology*; and at the same time gradually to restore the capitalist system and tear our fatherland away from the Socialist camp. They bent their efforts to make extensive use of existing mistakes and rally to their support the backward elements of certain classes and sections of the population and forge them into a *united camp* against “Stalinism.” The Western reactionary circles led by American imperialism made extensive use of the “opposition” movement within the country to achieve their aims, in fact they built their plans largely on the successes of the opposition movement. The “liberalisation” proclaimed by the anti-party faction which gradually loosened the people’s democratic system, and “national Communism” which represented a gradual departure from the socialist camp, were in conformity with the conception of the imperialists that Socialism would have to be overthrown in two stages. “Our immediate goal is to loosen up the Soviet bloc...” they said. “The best we can possibly hope for in satellite Europe is nothing other than the birth of new forms within Marxism. In this territory it must constantly be stressed that there are circumstances when this pays off.” (The New York Herald Tribune, April 23, 1956.) The noted American journalist, Walter Lippman, even defined the tactical line of the imperialists: “We have every reason to believe that the liberation of the ‘satellites’ will have two stages. The first stage is Titoism, that is, national freedom, which is not anti-Communist and which will remain in the Soviet sphere of military and political influence. The second stage is complete freedom, with regard to domestic and foreign policy.” The opinion of the dissident Hungarians was in complete harmony with this. “Whether

we want to, or not, we must recognise the fact that there are institutions and systems which are accessories not of a Western type liberal democracy, but of a state with a socialist structure,” “The emigration can only interfere in the home events and become an assistance to the democratic transformation if it raises feasible demands in every stage of development,” wrote Gyula Borbándi in the periodical *Látóhatár* in the summer of 1956. “This method of struggle is based on the assumption,” continued Imre Kovács in the same periodical, “that Communism in consequence of the contradictions which appear in it almost as a matter of course, moreover with the systematic use of ‘legal’ possibilities presented by movement and activity, can be so loosened that the Kremlin will have no choice but to negotiate and accept the terms of the West.” Ferenc Nagy concluded this thought thus: “The spiritual freedom movement at this moment is *still* led by Communist party members. They are *still* demanding greater freedom within the party for the time being. Regarding to changes of personalities this demand is *still* manifested only in the fact that they want to replace one Communist with another... It causes us no anxiety that the struggle today is *still* led by Communist party members.” These remarks vividly prove the general validity of Lenin’s conclusions drawn in connection with the Kronstadt uprising. At that time Lenin said the following about the tactics of the capitalists and the landlords: “Let us support anyone, even the anarchists, let us support any Soviet power, only let us overthrow the Bolsheviki, *only* let us bring about a *displacement of power!* It is immaterial whether power is displaced to the right, or to the left, towards the Mensheviki or the Bolsheviki, only remove power from the hands of the Bolsheviki, as for the rest - ‘we’ Milyukovs, ‘we’ capitalists and landlords, will take care of the rest ‘ourselves’.”

Thus from September to October 1956 in preparing the demonstration and armed uprising the efforts of the Nagy-Losonczy faction towards a “complete change of the guard” became fused with the campaign launched by the imperialists against Socialism.

## II

After such preliminaries the demonstration of October 23 took place, which introduced the armed uprising aimed at overthrowing the people’s democratic state order. The events in Poland only provided the favourable occasion for the organisation of the demonstration and the precipitation of

the armed uprising. Reactionary forces - from the internal counter-revolution through the Western Hungarian emigration to international imperialism - endeavoured already well before the events of October to utilise the errors committed by the party to realise their own aims. These counter-revolutionary forces from the very beginning had infiltrated the so-called "democratic mass movements" calling for the correcting of mistakes, but their operations were disguised by the so-called "party opposition" activities of the Imre Nagy-Losonczy faction. For this reason the control of the demonstration passed into the hands of the counter-revolutionary elements already in the afternoon on October 23. On their initiative the "democratic" slogans were gradually replaced by more and more rightist slogans, more and more frequently nationalistic, chauvinistic and anti-Soviet slogans and summons to armed uprising were voiced. They burned the red flags and knocked the red stars off the buildings. During the demonstration the armed attack on strategically important points, the previously organised armed uprising against the people's democracy, was begun.

The demonstration itself was part of the counter-revolutionary uprising. It was impossible to separate one from the other even temporally, for the two went on at the same time, nor in persons, for well-meaning, but misguided people and organised, deliberate counter-revolutionaries took part in both. But no distinction could be made between them regarding their essence either, because the demonstration prepared the counter-revolutionary uprising, even if they voiced democratic slogans. From the very beginning there were anti-party and anti-government slogans too, but - apart from this - even the truly democratic demands objectively served the bourgeois counter-revolution, because the majority of these demands rested not on the soil of socialist democracy but some sort of *general*, "super-class" democracy, *and there was not a single slogan which demanded the defence and strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat*. On the whole, therefore, these slogans expressed the demand to revert to bourgeois democracy. "However slight, or insignificant, let us say, the displacement of power would have been in the beginning," Lenin said of the Kronstadt uprising, which the Kronstadt sailors and workers approved - they wanted to correct the Bolsheviks on the question of freedom of trade - therefore apparently no great displacement was involved, apparently the very same slogans were voiced: 'Soviet power', with insignificant modifications, or only an improved version - "but in reality the non-party elements here only served as a springboard, a step or a bridge for the white guardists. This is unavoidable politically. We saw in the Russian

revolution the petty-bourgeois, anarchist elements... All of them came forth with the slogans and equality, freedom and constitutional assembly, and not once, but many times it turned out that all this was a springboard, a bridge to revert to the white guardist power.” (Lenin’s Works vol. 32, page 188, in Hungarian.)

A Polish emigrant (Giertych) expresses the same thing with these words today: “How much can be accomplished, how many things can be achieved if we proceed patiently, inconspicuously, step by step - even if we remain in the Russian political system! More and more religious teaching in the schools, more and more Catholic spirit in legislation. Fewer and fewer kolkhozes. More and more freedom for private initiative, the peasant, the handicraftsman, the merchant and small entrepreneur. Ever greater freedom of speech, ever greater truly free press which is not tied to concessions, ever more publishing enterprises. More and more freedom in scouting, in the Actio Catholica, in the activities of social, scientific, philanthropic and religious organisations. Greater and greater true self-government in the workers’ trade unions, in the villages and towns. And naturally we must not omit from our national programme the actual political freedom, the right to political opposition and participation in the Government.” (Quoted the Trybuna Ludu on March 14, 1957.)

At this point we shall have to settle a few slanders spread by the counter-revolution. It is not true that on October 23 the party disintegrated. Although large masses broke away from the party as the effect of the armed action of the counter-revolutionaries, although as a consequence of the Imre Nagy-Losonczy faction’s demagogic agitation in the earlier period there was great ideological confusion in the minds of many - still there were enough convinced Communists, loyal to the party and the dictatorship of the proletariat, who were prepared to wage an armed battle against the counter-revolution, if with proper leadership they could reorganise their ranks.

The speedy reorganisation of our ranks in the fighting phase following the November 4 turning point proves the correctness of this assertion clearly. And if this was true after November 4, then it was no less true before November 4 either. We had forces which, however, needed mobilisation and leadership.

The party leadership made attempts to arm the Budapest workers and crush the counter-revolution. But by drawing Imre Nagy and his associates into the Central Committee, then into the Political Bureau, then by entrusting Imre Nagy with the leadership of the Government they condemned the execution of the resolution to crush the counter-revolution to failure. With

Imre Nagy and his associates in the leadership there appeared a second force, which - relying on its allies which had infiltrated the army and the police - completely paralysed all the attempts of the party's united forces to defend the power of the proletariat. To mention only a few examples:

The Central Committee adopted a resolution already during the night of October 23 to arm the workers. To carry out the resolution it sent a delegation to the Ministry of Defence, but there the delegation met with such obvious sabotaging on the part of Imre Nagy's men that they were forced to leave without accomplishing their purpose. A necessary pre-condition for the liquidation of the counter-revolutionary forces was the curfew. On October 25 Imre Nagy lifted it arbitrarily. Comrade Apró was justified in saying at the October 26 session of the Central Committee that there was treason afoot, and that the traitors were seated in the Akadémia Street Party Headquarters.

The military plan to wipe out the Corvin Köz counter-revolutionary concentration point was approved at first by Imre Nagy, but on the morning of October 28, at 5:30 in the morning - a half hour before the attack was to be launched - he notified Comrade Apró by telephone that if the attack is begun he will resign. Thus the attack was called off. It is easy to determine today, but still it must be stated, that Imre Nagy's resignation should have been urgently accepted and we should not have acquiesced to the policy of capitulation.

Almost from the first minute of the uprising Imre Nagy did the opposite of what a true Communist would have done in his place. He defended the counter-revolutionaries and armed them - against the Hungarian troops loyal to the Government and the Soviet troops providing fraternal assistance. From the inside together with his associates he sabotaged the liquidation of the counter-revolution. The Imre Nagy faction, at the same time when it assumed a decisive role in the leadership of the party and the Government - was in close contact with the armed counter-revolutionaries and made open concessions to them. It connived with the treacherous leaders of the army and police: with Maléter, Kopácsy, Béla Király and their associates. Secretly it negotiated with counter-revolutionary gang leaders like Józef Dudás. In other words: it camouflaged and supported the counter-revolution, concluded an alliance with it, that is, *committed treason*.

At the October 25 meeting of the Central Committee the Imre Nagy-Losonczy faction already put forth the demand that the party should recognise the counter-revolution as a "great national democratic movement." Then their attempt met with failure. Despite this the party's central daily, the *Sz-*

*abad Nép*, in its editorial articles of October 28-29, attacked the Central Committee from behind, it glorified the counter-revolution and compared those participating in it to the heroes of March 1848. The article of the 28th had destructive effect on the armed forces loyal to the people's power, which it branded as counter-revolutionary forces. This *Szabad Nép* editorial prepared the October 28 session of the Central Committee, which upon the insistence and pressure of the Imre Nagy-Losonczy faction adopted a resolution which capitulated ideologically and politically to the counter-revolution. This was followed by the Imre Nagy government programme which announced the implementation of the immediate demands of the counter-revolution: the dissolution of the state security authority and the forces loyally defending the people's power, as well as the withdrawal of the Soviet troops to their bases. In his radio proclamation Imre Nagy took the counter-revolution under his protection: "The Government condemns the views according to which the present tremendous popular movement is a counter-revolution. This movement set as its aim the safeguarding of our national independence," he said.

At the same time the Government declared a cease-fire, which the counter-revolutionaries had not the slightest intention of observing, one after another they occupied and destroyed the party centres, in fact, on October 30 they launched a concentrated attack on the Budapest Party Committee Building with artillery support. Imre Nagy decreed the organisation of the "new armed forces." The armed counter-revolutionaries were drawn into the new armed forces, who could now "legally" continue massacring the Communists. Most of the students who were armed in the early days of the fighting and participated in it, laid down their arms between October 25 and 27, but their places were promptly taken by the activated masses of the defeated capitalist classes and their petty bourgeois followers, and to an ever increasing extent by the criminals released from prison and other déclassé elements. At the same time, on the request of the Government the Soviet troops began to withdraw from the territory of Budapest.

On October 28 illusions with respect to the Imre Nagy faction within the party leadership and the Imre Nagy Government prevailed, therefore the elements capitulating to the counter-revolution took over the leadership; as a consequence of this the revolutionary forces were completely disorganised. Two days later instead of mobilising the forces of the party they carried out its dissolution. When the parties of the bourgeois restoration began to make their appearance by the dozens, the revolutionary party of the working class, with whose leadership we carried the socialist revolution to victory - was

dissolved, all its party committees, all its organs awaiting militant leadership and wishing to fight were declared dissolved. This too could be regarded as nothing else but capitulation to the counter-revolution.

Simultaneously with the dissolution of the Hungarian Working People's Party they passed a resolution to form the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party. It was an open question though *who* would form the HSWP, and consequently *what kind* of party it would be.

The dissolution of the HWPP was carried out by those belonging to the Imre Nagy faction; the very same persons wanted to bring about a *revisionist party* in the form of the HSWP. In some places their groups had already begun, before the dissolution of the HWPP, to form a so-called "National Communist Party," the continuation of which was halted only after the dissolution of the HWPP, for they were confident that the HSWP would be such a "national Communist" party anyway. Before November 4 it was not yet a decided issue whether the HSWP would be a Marxist-Leninist, or a revisionist party, but the relations of forces were indicated by the fact that the party's first leadership, with the exception of Comrade Kádár, consisted of members of the Imre Nagy faction.

Two days later, on November 2, the Government was reshaped, which in the meantime had been altered several times and with each change it went more and more to the right. In its last constitution the Government had not a single Communist member. Comrade Kádár's name was listed as a member of Government, but prior to it he and Comrade Münnich had already left the Parliament building and had begun to organise the Workers' and Peasants' Government. In the November 2 Government there were three revisionist pseudo-Communists: Imre Nagy as Prime Minister, Losonczy as Minister of State and Maléter as Minister of Defence. The remaining eight members were of the Smallholders' Party (Tildy, Béla Kovács, B. Szabó) the right-wing social democrats (Kéthly, Kelemen, Fischer) or the former right-wing Peasant Party (Bibó, Farkas).

By this time, when meanwhile the various bourgeois parties and groups were springing up like mushrooms, the Social Democratic and Independent Smallholders' parties were reorganised - entirely with right-wing leaders, the Hungarian Life Party and the notorious Barankovics Democratic People's Party and several other fascist parties also made their appearance. These parties, each and every one of them, were parties of the bourgeois restoration; they united in their struggle to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat and began to squabble over the division of the spoils of power which they



felt to be within their grasp.

The right-wing social democrats demanded that the Communist leaders be called to account, and with this they also contributed their “obol” to the bloody altar of the white terror. The notorious “Democratic People’s Party” demanded that the state sector be reduced and that compensation be paid to the former factory owners and landlords. The counter-revolutionary group which called itself the Revolutionary Party of the Hungarian Youth demanded that Mindszenty should be the country’s prime minister. The other parties also put forward similar demands.

One of the foremost tasks of Imre Nagy was to pass into the hands of these parties the material assets of the HWPP at their demand, in order to be assured of the counter-revolutionary parties’ “good will.” The cabinet meeting of November 2 decided that the “financial assets of the HWPP deposited with the National Bank shall be declared by the cabinet as the property of the Government. The cabinet would decide on this day yet through division among the coalition parties on its use.” The party’s press and publishing enterprise were confiscated and given to the Petöfi Circle, at the same time Imre Nagy immediately obtained a printing press, a paper and publisher for the right-wing Social Democratic Party.

The building of Socialism can be done also with a multi-party system in certain circumstances. This is proved by the Chinese and Polish examples. But in our country they demanded and brought about a multi-party system when a counter-revolutionary attack took place against the people’s democracy, when the counter-revolution incited a pogrom atmosphere against the Communist party; they demanded this because it was also a part of the counter-revolutionary attack. It was amidst such circumstances and with such an aim that the formation of the bourgeois parties took place after October 23, which the Imre Nagy Government freely permitted, and with this it paved the way for eclipsing and eventually liquidating the Communist party.

The counter-revolution launched an attack against the people’s democratic parliament and demanded its liquidation. This was the purpose of its demand of “free elections” - and particularly “under the supervision of the UN,” that is, under the supervision of the Western imperialists, which was also accepted by the Imre Nagy-Losonczy faction. Naturally the “extension of socialist democracy” was not the aim here either, on the contrary, its complete liquidation, a type of “democracy” was envisaged which, following the armed putsch, would have provided some sort of “parliamentary” or “legal” form for the liquidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and

the restoration of capitalism. In other words such a kind of “democracy” was wanted which would have restored the dictatorship of the bourgeois. Does anyone believe that Socialism can be built with the leaders of a parliament in which a reactionary Smallholders’ Party, an even more reactionary Mindszenty Christian Party and a bitterly anti-Communist right-wing Social Democratic Party hold a majority? Or can anyone doubt that when power goes into the hands of the various representatives of the bourgeois restoration, and the party of the working class is dissolved, that the new elections can be won amidst the ideological confusion, under the leadership or with the collaboration of the Imre Nagy elements, in the face of the white terror, by the HSWP organising in illegality? Surely nobody in his right mind would dare to assert such a thing!

After the counter-revolution had obtained decisive influence for itself in the Government and had taken the control of the armed forces, after local power had been taken over by counter-revolutionary “national” committees, “revolutionary” councils, the *mass* arrests of Communists was begun. In Budapest there were 1400 Communists under arrest on November 3 and the number of Communists under arrest in the provinces was even greater: the execution of many of them was set for November 5 and 6. On November 6 they wanted to stage a great provocative funeral in the Vérmező (in Buda) for the fallen insurrectionists and after that, on the basis of prepared lists of names, they wanted to execute several thousand still not arrested Communists. Similar bloodbaths were planned in the provincial towns and villages too. It was amidst such circumstances that Imre Nagy uttered the following horrible lie on the afternoon of October 30 from one of the balconies of the House of Parliament: “We are living the first days of our freedom and independence.” In reality we were then living the first days of the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat, our re-lost national independence!

The shape of things indicated that the liquidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in our fatherland was becoming an accomplished fact and fascism would again come to power. The dictatorship of the proletariat could not even be followed by a bourgeois democracy, only fascism. This is especially true of Hungary, where there is no historical heritage of bourgeois democracy. After the change which took place in the character of the power it would only have been a question of time before the bases of the socialist economy would have been liquidated and the capitalist economic system gradually restored.

Let us see what was the opinion of Imre Nagy’s namesake, the other

traitor Ferenc Nagy, regarding this question? “Under the given conditions he (that is, Imre Nagy) is the most suitable person...” he said in one of his statements. “He is doing Hungary a great service during this transitional period, until they reach a *final solution* of the Hungarian question... If the other parties are returned to the government, the leadership will remain at first in the hands of the Communists. Step by step, however, it may go over into democratic hands.” (Ferenc Nagy’s statement to the U.S. News and World Report, November 2 issue.)

“Most certainly Nagy can play a role and he was given a mandate by the non-Communist members of the Government for it. He is more suitable than they to negotiate with the Russians to achieve their withdrawal.” (L’Aurore, Nov. 2.)

The Western imperialists knew well that so long as Soviet troops remained on Hungarian territory the counter-revolution could hardly win.

Imre Nagy, complying with the urgings of the imperialists, therefore demanded the immediate withdrawal of the Soviet troops defending the people’s democracy, and the intervention of the UN troops. This was why Imre Nagy’s Government declared - unlawfully - that our country could withdraw from the Warsaw Treaty and declare itself a “neutral” country. The Warsaw Treaty is a protective alliance of the countries building Socialism against an imperialist attack, withdrawal from it - which is tantamount to breaking away from the Socialist camp - would have turned our country into the free prey of the imperialists, and would have provided for them a possibility for armed interference in the affairs of our country at a time favourable to them and turn our country into the hotbet of a new world war. Apart from this the counter-revolutionaries together with the Imre Nagy-Lozonczy faction wanted this interference most urgently.

It is an ineradicable shame that in those days when the counter-revolution massacred with bestial cruelty such comrades as Imre Mező, József Kalamár, Kálmán Turner and János Asztalos, and when Mindszenty, Prince Eszterházy, Count Takách-Tolvay, and the other representatives of the old regime were ready to spring again to hold the knives of the oppressors to the throats of the Hungarian working people, when in Győr a counter-revolutionary “provincial” government had been formed to open the way for the Horthy-fascist armed forces streaming in from Austria and to occupy the country with them, so that at a command from the West they could possibly tear the country into two, there were traitors in the party who undertook to perform even the most shameful roles.

The November 2 cabinet meeting decided to send two delegations abroad. They wanted to send one of them to London and New York under the leadership of Imre Nagy, in order to request the aid of the Western powers and UN to oppress the Hungarian working people, the other headed by Géza Losonczy would have gone to Warsaw in order to cancel the Warsaw Treaty arbitrarily and demand that the Soviet troops be withdrawn from the country for good. The November 4 appeal to fight against the Soviet armed forces was only the continuation and culmination of the Imre Nagy Government's treacherous policy.

As we have seen, Imre Nagy and his faction degenerated from opportunists to revisionists, to renegades, to traitors and then to counter-revolutionaries. Throughout a long period they deliberately and systematically disorganised the party, the organisations and institutions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and undermined confidence in socialist ideology. In 1956 they deliberately and systematically prepared to overthrow the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They organised a political army, in complete harmony with the Western imperialists and the internal counter-revolutionary forces they worked out the strategy and tactics to overthrow the system and one after the other they organised campaigns against the party and the people's democratic system. In summer 1956 they embarked on the organisation of political mass demonstrations and on October 23 they made their charge to overthrow power. Imre Nagy passed himself off as a Communist, and that was why he could become the head of the Government during the night from October 23 to 24. At first he voted to have the Soviet troops called in and he proclaimed martial law, then when his position of power strengthened temporarily he promptly did the opposite. Therefore he deliberately aspired to power so that once it was in his hands he could use it to betray the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is not true that Imre Nagy and his faction were "drawn by the events," "thrust" into the counter-revolution. They deliberately and systematically aspired to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to establish some sort of bourgeois democratic system afterwards. This too is betrayal of the power of the proletariat, this too is counter-revolution. Besides, this possibility was precluded, because Hungarian history had already proved once that the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat could only be followed by a fascist dictatorship. Events in the early days of November clearly showed this again. Imre Nagy and his faction undertook to defend also the evolving bourgeois dictatorship, they requested aid from the UN against the

dictatorship of the proletariat, against the Soviet Union, they undertook everything until the fascist counter-revolution would have cast them aside too. It was indeed not because of them but because of the formation of the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government and the fraternal assistance of the Soviet Union that the transpiration of the events was reversed and the plans of the counter-revolution were thwarted.

We must also answer the question of who took part in the counter-revolution? This question is much debated.

The counter-revolution and Western imperialism cast vile slander on the Hungarian working class, the working peasantry and the whole democratic minded intelligentsia already at the time of the armed uprising. They claimed that in October the "entire Hungarian people" rose in arms against the party and the Government, against the people's state power, against the dictatorship of the proletariat; we even heard tales according to which the working class, the Budapest working class was at the "head" of the attack against the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is a rude slandering of the Hungarian working class which is building Socialism. It is true that the history of revolutionary struggles contains classic examples of considerable sections of the popular masses confused by counter-revolutionary agitation becoming tools of their own oppressors to assist in preserving or bringing back the rule of their own oppressors. No doubt *a section* of the workers confused by the counter-revolutionary agitation came under the political influence of the counter-revolution in our country too. *But the main masses of neither the peasantry nor the working class* took part in the armed counter-revolutionary fighting. They did not struggle actively against it either because clear, militant guidance, a leading and mobilising force was lacking, because the party was paralysed, it was paralysed by betrayal. Confused and demoralised politically, and without clear militant guidance, the main masses of the working class and the small peasantry displayed passive conduct, and the more advanced sections could only wage a struggle of local character, and in many places they fought such battles very bravely and effectively. The truth is therefore that the main body of masses of the Hungarian working class and the peasantry had nothing to do with the crimes committed in October by the counter-revolutionary bandits, robbers, murderers and thieves.

Unfortunately the industrial workers were unarmed in the critical days of October. The counter-revolutionary and treacherous elements within the army and the police, the Pál Maléters, Béla Királys and Sándor Kopácsys saw to it that the arms did not reach the hands of the industrial workers.

The truth is that a very considerable section of the industrial working class wanted to fight in defence of the people's power but was unarmed, because the traitors delivered the arms to the enemy. We are convinced that if we could have succeeded in arming only a few thousand workers of the large industrial plants we could have cleared the streets of Budapest very shortly of the counter-revolutionary bandits together with the American journalists and photo-reporters.

In our opinion we must restore the honour of the army and the police also in the face of the slander of the counter-revolution. At the time of the armed attack of the counter-revolution not the body of officers and enlisted men of the police force and the army proved a fiasco but the leadership. The police and the army did not commit treason, but the followers and collaborators of the Imre Nagy faction: the Pál Maléters, Béla Királlys and Sándor Kopácsys did. Those units of the armed forces where the leadership was firm fought bravely all the way. The ordinary soldiers, policemen and officers loyal to the people's democracy also stood their ground honourably in these critical days and fought with arms or fell in the battle waged against the counter-revolutionary forces. There are new Communist martyrs of this struggle to whose memory we shall always dip the party's red flag with reverence. They truly sacrificed their dearest treasure for the purity of the flag: their lives and their blood.

The mass basis of the counter-revolution was constituted not of the industrial workers and the peasantry but chiefly of the petty bourgeoisie, first and foremost the urban petty bourgeoisie, which parallel with the weakening of the dictatorship of the proletariat joined the counter-revolution. Certain sections of the youth played a great role in the counter-revolutionary events - particularly the youth of colleges and universities - who had not been schooled in militancy like the older, more experienced workers. The déclassé and disreputable elements, among them several thousand common criminals who were released from prisons, also played an important part in them. Petty bourgeois anarchism, revisionist views and with these the ideology of the bourgeoisie, as we have said, influenced a considerable section of the working class. The reasons for this are to be found, apart from the disruption of party unity and the precipitate decline of the party's leading role, also in the shaping of the class relations in Hungary. During the recent years the working class was considerably diluted by masses of petty bourgeois, peasant and déclassé elements. Between 1949 and 1954 the manpower demand in the manufacturing and building industries was 460,000; this requirement was met

by regrouping 200,000 workers from agriculture, 75,000 from the handicraft industries and the recruiting of 110,000 who had not worked previously. The number of natural replacements was only 75,000.

At the beginning of 1954 the background data of 93,000 workers were examined and it was found that 37.2 per cent of them had not been workers before 1949.

It must also be taken into consideration that the fascist regime of Hungary had built its own counter-revolutionary, political and military organisations through 25 years and employed every possible means to poison the masses with its reactionary, chauvinistic ideology. Naturally this did not take place without leaving its effects.

Moreover: the Hungarian people achieved the overthrow of the power of the exploiting classes and the establishment of the people's democratic power relatively easily and peacefully. Thus the major part of the Hungarian reactionary forces was not destroyed physically, part of them fled the country, but most of them adapted themselves to the new situation and prepared for the favourable moment when with large-scale assistance from the foreign imperialists and the collaboration of the dissident fascists they would attempt to restore their old power.

In reviewing the development of our people's democracy we cannot disregard the fact that we were unable to isolate the old capitalists and other hostile elements from the people either. On the contrary: these remnants of the class enemy infiltrated the masses, a large part of them became "workers" externally, but poisoned the genuine workers around them with counter-revolutionary ideology and at the end of October they swaggered in the name of the workers. It was largely they who became the leaders and representatives of the first factory and regional workers' councils. Naturally all this had a strong effect on the attitude of the class leading the building of Socialism.

### **III**

On November 4 the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government was formed and this was an important turning point in the life of our people. Now the conditions were established so that - after overcoming the petty bourgeois trends manifesting themselves in the form of rightist opportunism and "left-wing" sectarianism - finally a consistent Marxist line faithfully expressing the interests of the proletariat could prevail in the Hungarian revo-

lutionary working-class movement.

The Hungarian revolutionary forces with the friendly assistance of the Soviet army crushed the counter-revolution, which, however, continued a bitter rearguard battle for a long time. After the defeat of their armed resistance for a long time the strike paralysing the country's economic life was the main weapon of the counter-revolutionaries. The workers' councils elected in an anti-democratic fashion of mostly anti-popular and counter-revolutionary elements at the time of the counter-revolution, and chiefly the so-called "Budapest Central Workers' Council," succeeded for a long time - often only after the application of armed threats and force - in restraining the workers from resuming production. An important part was played in this by paralysed transport, which was brought about by the attacks of armed gangs and lasted for several weeks. The strike was distinctly a political character, it was directed against the Government of workers and peasants and served the counter-revolutionary forces. The "Budapest Central Workers' Council" demanded that the Government should resign, that the betrayer of the working-class Imre Nagy be made prime minister again, that the Soviet troops be withdrawn from the country immediately and that "free" elections should be held. With all this they wanted in reality the return of the counter-revolution to power in our country, although again they cleverly disguised this in front of the working class and the people. Later they "only" demanded that the Government should recognise the illegal regional "workers' councils" as some sort of "state power" organs. By doing this they wanted to create some "dual power" in the country, in the hope that the "workers' councils" will succeed in wresting power from the hands of the lawful Government and opening the way again for the forces, parties and armed units of the bourgeois restoration, of course, once more to the accompaniment of the slogans of "democracy," "multi-party system," "free elections," etc.

But the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government - relying on the truly revolutionary and democratic forces - gradually frustrated these attempts of the counter-revolution too. It started production, dissolved the regional "workers' councils," built up the armed forces of the workers' power, secured law and order and began to repair the unusually great damage caused by the counter-revolution and to clear away all the remains of the counter-revolution. The Government has been performing this work with iron consistency in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. The Government is not to be persuaded to any concessions or appeasement towards the counter-revolution and revisionism allied with it, but at the same time it is careful not to commit



the old sectarian mistakes.

The home and international reactionaries are talking much about the “achievements” of the October uprising. They regard the establishment of the workers’ councils, the ending of compulsory produce deliveries, etc., as such. The truth is that these changes, although in various forms and to a different extent, were all in preparation already, and without the counter-revolution they would have been introduced much more correctly and with more consideration. In fact a part of the changes - through the circumstances of their origin - became at first instruments of the counter-revolution (for example, the workers’ council), and without the liquidation of the counter-revolution they would have become more and more the instruments of capitalist restoration. Only with the consistent elimination of the remnants of the counter-revolution can we make these measures exert a positive effect on the life our people.

The counter-revolutionary uprising did not achieve results, on the contrary it aggravated enormously the otherwise already difficult economic situation brought about by the old, in many respects faulty economic policy. It retarded the process of the extensive unfolding of socialist democracy, and caused a temporary shock to the whole international revolutionary and working-class movement.

But the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary has some important lessons to teach which affect the whole international working-class movement. If we assess correctly the events which took place in our country and draw correct conclusions from them then we shall truly serve the class of the Hungarian and international revolutionary working-class movement. We may say this much, and only this much about the positive features of the October events.

The positive features also include the fact that we learned through our own bitter experience: revolutionary vigilance must be increased and the dictatorship of the proletariat must be strengthened. In future the working people must feel much more that there is democracy for them, and the class enemy must be made to feel that there is a dictatorship against it. We also learned as an achievement of October that the direct arming of the proletariat is also a part of the realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. A new feature of our proletarian dictatorship is the fact that beside the police and army the working class itself also takes its place as an armed force. We are not convinced that members of the Budapest workers’ militia not only know how to sing the old revolutionary song: “Red Cspel, lead the

struggle!” but in future they will relentlessly act against every counter-revolutionary attempt. The newly organised army and police force and the recently organised workers’ militia are one of the chief guarantees that there will never again be a counter-revolution in Hungary. This is an achievement, however, for which the counter-revolution will not thank us.

## IV

International imperialism, in order to mislead and delude the workers, committed the greatest swindle in determining the character of the October events. It alleged that what took place in Hungary was a “revolution,” a “national liberation struggle.” What took place in Hungary in October and November was incontestably a *counter-revolution*. Not only and not primarily the acts of terror proved this, although the fact that the terror was aimed at the Communists and other consistent supporters of the people’s democracy, that the red flags and the red stars, the symbols of the international working-class movement, were trampled in the mud, was enough to show the character of the events and the direction they could be expected to take. The decisive factor is the class content of the events. The revolution is the great social change which is prepared by the development of the productive forces, and in which the oppressed class representing social progress overthrows the power of the old ruling class and radically changes relations of production and the social order based on them. The Socialist revolution places power into the hands of the proletariat; but the counter-revolution puts the bourgeois into power. Last autumn the latter process took place in our country. With the assistance of the revisionist traitors the members of the former ruling class, the former factory owners, landlords, bankers, army officers, gendarmes, arrow-cross fascists and various disreputable elements and adventurers made their appearance everywhere and in many places they assumed control.

Those who wish to defend the counter-revolution even concocted a complicated “theory” according to which the October armed uprising was actually the second stage of the Socialist revolution occurring in our country, that is, “revolution within the revolution,” and this was made necessary by the bureaucratism of the state and party leadership before October. This is essentially the position of Comrade Kardelj too. But in our country there was a people’s democratic system before October too, which is a specific form of

the dictatorship of the proletariat, even if in many respects in our country the dictatorship of the proletariat was distorted. *But errors cannot be rectified with an armed uprising; the armed uprising is the means employed by one class to overthrow the rule of another and obtain power, for itself.* An armed uprising against the dictatorship of the proletariat can necessarily be nothing other than counter-revolution, which was extolled to the skies by all international reaction. The armed struggle of October in Hungary was not a “second stage” of the socialist revolution, but the first stage of the bourgeois restoration.

None of this is changed by the fact that the counter-revolution employed “democratic” slogans to disguise its aims. The character of the events should be judged not on the basis of the slogans but of the acts of those participating in them. The armed uprising did not want to “democratise” the people’s democratic system, it wanted to overthrow it and replace it with a bourgeois system.

The French newspaper *Le Monde*, which can hardly be accused of sympathising with the people’s democracies, wrote the following in an article on October 27: “It is becoming more and more apparent that the rebels are fighting not against the way the system functions but against the system itself.” But in the November 1st issue the following could be quoted from its October 31 report: “By the time dusk, masked by the smoke of the battles, descended on Budapest it was clear to everyone that the people’s democracy was no more.” It was really not their fault that it did not happen this way.

The counter-revolution also voiced “national” slogans, but the character of the events did not in any way become national. The only error in the relation between our country and the Soviet Union was that certain Soviet technical experts - apart from much useful guidance - sometimes gave us incorrect advice and we accepted it. Our state and party organs committed even greater mistakes when - despite warnings by the Soviet comrades - they uncritically copied the Soviet model and slavishly imitated the Soviet methods which had evolved amidst completely different circumstances. Despite this the relationship which had arisen between our country and the Soviet Union following Hungary’s liberation - was a relationship of a new quality between socialist countries; this was one of the sources and conditions for the great results we achieved in the building of Socialism. The economic agreements concluded with the Soviet Union were especially advantageous for our country. The real truth is that the Soviet Union provided far-reaching support for the people’s democratic countries, including Hungary to the prej-

udice of her own immediate interests. The most recent shining proof of this was the aid extended in crushing the counter-revolution, when Soviet soldiers again shed their blood for genuine freedom of the Hungarian people, and beyond this the great economic assistance which the agreements concluded on the occasion of the Moscow talks will provide us. The deeds of the counter-revolution did not serve but betrayed the true interests of the nation. By breaking away from the Socialist camp and relying on the imperialists they did not safeguard, but sold out the country's independence and freedom. The interference of the UN would have placed our country into a state of dependence on the imperialists for a long time. The chauvinistic cries and territorial demands aimed at the neighbouring countries - which became louder and louder during the counter-revolution - threatened to precipitate war, and this was not in the interest of the Hungarian people, any more than the armed struggle into which many young people were dragged against their own true national interests.

The Imre Nagy-Losonczy faction - well before the October events - made every endeavour to overshadow the great idea of proletarian internationalism, to weaken the spirit of proletarian internationalism in the masses, loosen our relations with the countries of the Socialist camp and first of all with the Soviet Union, so that in the end they could tear our country away from the camp of the peace-loving peoples building Socialism. The days of the October counter-revolution showed where separation from our friends leads, they showed that from the renouncing of proletarian internationalism a straight road leads to capitalist restoration. The capitalist restoration did not succeed only because our friends and brothers, first of all the Soviet Union, fulfilling their international duties, provided assistance for the Hungarian revolutionary forces in defeating the counter-revolution.

The armed assistance of the Soviet troops again saved the national independence and freedom of our country and saved our people's democratic order. *The military aid given us in the November days is tantamount to the second liberation of our people.* It is no wonder that in the hearts of our people the feeling of gratitude and love is growing ever stronger towards those who led by the great ideals of proletarian internationalism again extended their protecting arms towards us and did not permit our country and people to become the prey of the counter-revolution.

The whole Socialist world camp stirred to support us, in defence of our cause, from the mighty Chinese realm of 660 millions to Albania of one and a half million. The progressive forces of the working class throughout the

world, every progressive person to whom the cause of freedom and national independence is sacred and precious, stirred to support us. In the Hungarian question proletarian internationalism stood the test so brilliantly that it is without parallel in the history of man-kind. *Our great friend, the Soviet Union, defended us with arms, the entire socialist camp supported us and all progressive man-kind was with us and this was why - we triumphed.*

The aid of the Soviet Union and the Socialist camp obliges us to strengthen the ideals of proletarian internationalism continuously in our party and in the masses of the working people and to do away with the mistaken ideas spread by Imre Nagy and his faction as quickly as possible. We must make every honest person understand that the Soviet Union has never threatened the independence of other peoples, on the contrary, the Soviet Union has been and will continue to be the most resolute defender of the independence of threatened peoples. The examples of history also prove this. Before the Second World War the Soviet Union alone championed the independence of such countries as Austria and Czechoslovakia which were threatened by the Hitlerite fascists. The vigorous action of the Soviet Union saved Egypt's independence too. Our country was able to regain its national independence and liberation from the fascist yoke because the Soviet Union defeated Hitlerite Germany. The fact that the Soviet Union is our friend and helper is not an obstacle but the best guarantee of our national independence. The military assistance provided the Hungarian people by the Soviet troops was the action of socialist forces against the counter-revolution; the action of forces of which the revolutionary forces of the Hungarian people are an organic part. The forces rallied around the Soviet army and the Hungarian Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government are two detachments of unified forces of identical nature. Anyone who calls the assistance of the Soviet Union "alien interference" casts aside the essence of proletarian internationalism.

One of the main lessons of the October counter-revolutionary events is that the unity of the Socialist camp must be strengthened. The most experienced, most influential and strongest member of the camp and therefore the leader and centre of this camp is the Soviet Union which is building a Communist society. *Accordingly we must consistently foster and continually strengthen Hungarian-Soviet friendship.*

Similarly we must clarify the situation in the question of the mutual relationship between proletarian internationalism and true patriotism. The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, as the preserver and perpetuator of the nearly four decades heritage of the revolutionary Communist movement, is

following the principles of proletarian internationalism, but at the same time it declares itself patriotic. In this country, just as in every other country, the Communists fought the most for the country's genuine interests, independence, and prosperity. There is no political party or group and there never has been any in the country which has given as many martyrs for the country's independence and freedom as the Communist party. This also obliges us to strengthen in our people the ideals of proletarian internationalism, *which are in most complete harmony with the ideals of true patriotism.*

The Imre Nagy-Losonczy faction never said openly that it wanted to break with Communism, but it said that it would realise Communism in a "national" form. In reality "national" Communism meant separation from the socialist camp, which would have provided a possibility for the imperialists to subjugate the separated, unsupported country and restore the capitalist system in it. The October events proved that national Communism is a figleaf which disguises counter-revolutionary terror, just as, for example, in 1933 when the Hitlerites' "national socialism" masked for a time the essence of fascism assuming power. The Imre Nagy-Losonczy faction linked the idea of "national Communism" with the search for the *special Hungarian way* to Socialism, making use of the fact that the former leadership of the HWPP had made mistakes, it had not analysed the realities of Hungary and in many places it had applied the principles of Marxism-Leninism mechanically and schematically to Hungarian conditions. The Imre Nagy-Losonczy faction also used this fact, like it did many others - to forge from it a counter-revolutionary weapon.

*The fundamental features of the theory of Marxism-Leninism and of the building of socialism are generally valid for every country, just as the capitalist social system has generally valid features for every capitalist country. The realisation of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, the building of Socialism, however, takes place amidst concrete, national conditions. The generally valid tasks of the building of Socialism should be carried out amidst concrete national conditions in such a way that just because they are in conformity with the concrete, national, local characteristics, their general validity will further grow and strengthen. The concrete characteristics must prove the general international validity of the fundamental truths of Marxism-Leninism.* In contrast with this the Imre Nagy faction used its assertion of the Hungarian characteristics to discard the generally valid experiences of the building of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Their demand for the "special Hungarian way" was manifested first of all in the discarding of the proletarian

dictatorship and in hostility towards the Soviet Union.

The counter-revolution in Hungary unmasked the class-betraying, anti-popular essence of revisionism. Practice showed where the “national Communism” of the Imre Nagy faction laeds: to the denial of the party’s leading role - to the liquidation of the party and the dictatorship of the proletariat; the demand for abstract democracy - to capitalist restoration; the attack against democratic centralism - to anarchy; the demand for a “complete change of the guard” - to the massacring of the Communists; the nationalistic slogans - to the betrayal of the country.

The party has drawn its lessons from the events. It is firmly resolved: it shall not permit the mistakes to be repeated so that the counter-revolution, making use of them, may again get the upper hand. It is firmly resolved also to establish unity in its ranks which rests on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and shall not tolerate any sort of factionalism. For this it is indispensable that the party should strictly observe, and it must make others observe the Leninist rules of party life, that it should consolidate its ties with the masses, relentlessly fighting against revisionism as the main danger, and against dogmatism, consistently and creatively applying the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. This is the only guarantee that the party will pursue a policy which correctly expresses the timely requirements of social development.

In conclusion I wish to deal briefly with two additional questions.

One question: Where do the Hungarian masses stand, whom do they support? It must honestly be stated: following November 4 the correct policy of the party and Government and the efforts they made to carry it out would not have been enough to consolidate the situation had not the working masses followed and supported it. During the past six months the working people themselves refuted the allegations of the imperialists. During the critical days of the country they rallied more and more not around the imperialists but around the people’s power, for the establishment and consolidation of which they struggled so persistently for 12 years, despite the errors committed. In the past months our working class, working peasantry and progressive intelligentsia proved with deeds, creative work and by standing their ground in opposition to the counter-revolution that *in Hungary the people’s power and the working people are one and the same, a solid force inseparable from each other, which the counter-revolution will never succeed with any sort of machinations to separate and pit against each other.* The Hungarian People’s Republic has survived, the Hungarian dictatorship of the proletariat is alive

and flourishing because the overwhelming, great majority of our working people are standing by it more and more firmly and steadfastly.

The other question:

International reaction has been babbling for over 100 years about the bankruptcy of Marxist ideology. Naturally this is what it did now too. The October-November counter-revolutionary events do not prove the bankruptcy of Marxism-Leninism or the non-viability of the socialist society, as certain bourgeois ideologists, the spokesmen of imperialism try to affirm. On the contrary: they prove how important is the unrelenting struggle against the critics appearing under the banner of the fight against “Stalinism” and the policy of betrayal of the newfangled revisionists; *they prove the truth and vital force of creative Marxism-Leninism which is growing together with social progress. In the light of the events in Hungary once again the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the dictatorship of the proletariat, the leading role of the revolutionary proletarian party and proletarian internationalism have been substantiated. It has been proved once again that only with the leadership of the party and the working class in power, relying on the international solidarity of the working class, it is possible to build Socialism. And if we build Socialism in this way, our people’s power, our socialist order - will be invincible.*

Transcribed by RedLibrary.xyz