



*János Kádár*

JÁNOS KÁDÁR

**SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION  
IN HUNGARY**

SELECTED SPEECHES AND ARTICLES  
1957—1961



CORVINA PRESS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
JÁNOS KÁDÁR—A Short Biography .....	7
SPEECH TO THE MINERS OF NÓGRÁD COUNTY. February 2nd, 1957 .....	9
FIRST MAY DAY AFTER THE VICTORY OVER THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION—Address to a Mass Meeting of the Working People of Budapest on Heroes' Square. May 1st, 1957 .....	22
THE POLITICAL SITUATION AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY—Report of the Central Committee to the National Conference of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party. June 27th, 1957 .....	37
REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY. June 29th, 1957 .....	88
POLITICAL WORK AMONG THE MASSES—THE MOST IMPORTANT TASK OF THE PARTY—Speech at the Meeting of the Budapest Party Executive Committee. August 23rd, 1957 .....	107
CONCLUDING REMARKS AT THE SESSION OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY. January 28th, 1958 .....	117
THE GOOD TRADE-UNION LEADER KNOWS NOT ONLY WHAT TO ASK FOR BUT ALSO HOW THESE DEMANDS CAN BE MET—Address to the Nineteenth Congress of Hungarian Trade Unions. March 3rd, 1958 .....	125
HUNGARIAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP IS UNSHAKABLE—Address to the Mass Meeting Held in Celebration of the Thirteenth Anniversary of the Liberation of Hungary. April 4th, 1958 .....	130
THE UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS—THE PLEDGE OF ITS VICTORY—Article Published in <i>Népszabadság</i> . June 12th, 1958 ...	139
STRENGTHEN ACTIVE UNITY OF WORKING PEOPLE—Election Speech in Angyalföld, Budapest. October 15th, 1958 .....	148
ON THE EXPERIENCE OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN HUNGARY—Article for <i>World Marxist Review</i> . February 1959 .....	164

Printed in Hungary 1962  
Kossuth Printing House, Budapest



	PAGE
THE TWENTY-FIRST CONGRESS OF THE C.P.S.U. RENDERS THE PERSPECTIVES OF THE FUTURE CLEARER TO THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE—Statement Published in <i>Népszabadság</i> . February 8th, 1959 .....	183
LET US ENCOURAGE THE CREATIVE POWER OF THE PEOPLE—Speech at the Enlarged Session of the Budapest Party Committee. March 11th, 1959 .....	188
ON THE PLAN, COOPERATIVE FARMS, THE PARTY CONGRESS AND THE RESPONSIBILITY OF LEADERS—Speech at the Meeting of the National Council of the Patriotic People's Front. June 19th, 1959 .....	195
REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY TO THE SEVENTH CONGRESS AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY. November 30th, 1959 .....	202
CLOSING REMARKS ON THE FIRST TWO ITEMS OF THE AGENDA AT THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY. December 4th, 1959 .....	263
OUR PEOPLE HATES WAR AND IMPERIALISM AND WISHES TO LIVE IN PEACE WITH ALL OTHER PEOPLES—Statement by the Chairman of the Hungarian Delegation to the Fifteenth Session of the U.N. General Assembly. October 3rd, 1960 .....	285
FORWARD AHEAD ON THE TESTED PATH—Article Published in <i>Népszabadság</i> . December 25th, 1960 .....	302
SOCIALIST RECONSTRUCTION OF AGRICULTURE IN HUNGARY—Article for <i>World Marxist Review</i> (also Published in <i>Népszabadság</i> ). June 4th, 1961 .....	313
SPEECH AT THE TWENTY-SECOND CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION. October 20th, 1961 .....	328
LESSONS OF THE C.P.S.U. TWENTY-SECOND CONGRESS—TOPICAL QUESTIONS OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC POLICY—Speech at a Mass Meeting in the Csepel Iron and Steel Works. December 1st, 1961 .....	333
LET US RALLY THE ENTIRE WORKING PEOPLE FOR SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION—Speech to the National Council of the Patriotic People's Front. December 8th, 1961 .....	349
EXPLANATORY NOTES .....	359

JÁNOS KÁDÁR (b.1912). First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and Member of the National Assembly.

Born of working-class parents, János Kádár began to work in early childhood, first in agriculture, then as an unskilled labourer and later as a toolmaker. He joined the working-class movement at the age of 17. He participated in the big demonstration held in Budapest on September 1st, 1930, was an organizer of the communist young workers' movement and in 1931 a member of the Central Committee of the Young Communist Workers' League of Hungary. In the same year he became a member of the underground Communist Party. Beginning with 1931 he was under constant surveillance by the Horthyite police: he was arrested on several occasions and sentenced for shorter or longer terms in prison (in 1935 for two years).

During the Second World War, from May 1942, János Kádár was a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Hungary and in 1943 he became the Secretary of the Party which was, of course, still illegal at the time. He had a leading role in organizing the anti-fascist independence movement. Arrested in April 1944, he managed to escape and, beginning with November 1944, participated again in the organization of the anti-nazi resistance movement. After the Liberation he was elected a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party. He was a member of the Provisional National Assembly. Up to May 1945 he was active in the organization of the democratic police of Budapest, and for a while headed the cadre department of the Central Committee.

From May 1945 until 1948 János Kádár was the secretary of the Budapest Party Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party. In October 1946 the Third Congress of the Hungarian Communist Party and in June 1948 the First Congress of the Hungarian Working People's Party elected him Deputy General Secretary of the Party. In 1948 he was appointed Minister of the Interior. In 1951 he was arrested under false charges.

After his rehabilitation he was the First Secretary of the Party Committee of District XIII of Budapest and later of the Party Committee of Pest County (1954-1956). In July 1956 the Central Committee of the Hungarian Working People's Party coopted him into its membership, the Political Bureau electing him as one of its members and the Central Committee as one of its secretaries. In the struggle for defeating the counter-revolution of 1956 it was under János Kádár's leadership that the new Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Hungarian Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government were formed. As First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and (until January 1958) Chairman of the Council of Ministers, he directed the work of consolidation following the counter-revolution. He was Minister of State from January 1958 until September 1961, and since September 13, 1961 he has again been the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government.

At the Party Conference of June 1957 and at the Seventh Congress of the Party held in November 1959, János Kádár gave the report of the Central Committee. At the Moscow Conferences of the Communist and Workers' Parties in November 1957 and in November 1960, he headed the delegations of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party.

## SPEECH TO THE MINERS OF NÓGRÁD COUNTY

February 2nd, 1957

Comrades:

Nógrád County has always constituted a powerful base of the revolution. During my activities in the working-class movement and in public life, I worked in two areas for some length, either in my capacity as a party worker or as a member of the National Assembly. One of them was District XIII of Budapest (known as Angyalföld), and the other was Nógrád County. I am proud of both. In the days of the counter-revolution and the counter-revolutionary frenzy, there were in all probability many places in Hungary where the red flag was not lowered for a single moment. There certainly were two: Angyalföld and the district of Salgótarján. Of this the workers of Nógrád County and every Hungarian revolutionary can be proud.

The past must be dealt with, and it is worth while to deal with it. Now, when we are reorganizing the forces of the revolution, I must recall with reverence those red soldiers of 1919 who defended the cause of the Hungarian revolution and national independence in the Salgótarján district. We must remember those communists and revolutionaries, those underground party workers who during the twenty-five-year era of the Horthy regime safeguarded and held high the banner of the revolution in the Salgótarján district and Nógrád County.

We must remember also, comrades, that in Salgótarján people greeted each other in the streets, the barber's shops, and in the stores with the word "Szabadság" (Freedom) from the very first day of the Liberation. And, when in 1945 an election was held, the Salgótarján district became the country's most powerful communist stronghold: the Communist Party obtained more than 70 per cent of the votes.

I visited Salgótarján in August 1956 also. Our position was not easy. The mistakes and shortcomings of the leadership were known to the people. Yet at this meeting on the main square, which was attended by nearly 18,000 people, I felt that the people of Nóg-

rád were convinced that the party was capable of correcting the mistakes.

There were many mistakes in our party, and we have no reason not to talk about them. But by August 1956, every honest communist felt and knew that at the Central Committee meeting of July the turning point had been reached, and both within the party and within the leadership of the country the conditions had been brought about which would enable us to correct the mistakes of the earlier years in a normal manner, and, having learned from these mistakes and rectifying them, to advance more swiftly.

The comrades have been saying that October 23 did not happen just by chance. They are perfectly right there. The Hungarian counter-revolutionary forces and international imperialism were preparing the ground for October 23 for twelve years. But let us note very carefully that, after many years of preparation, the counter-revolution struck just when it was threatened by the danger that the party had recognized and would correct the mistakes which had been made, and had already begun to correct them. This is a very important lesson for us.

In the West, a campaign of violent agitation and incitement is being conducted against the Hungarian People's Democracy. The central issue of the debate is whether there was a revolution or a counter-revolution between October 23rd and November 4th. Let us simplify the question and consider only the gist of the matter.

What are the chief characteristics of a socialist revolution? In 1919, there was a socialist revolution in Hungary. The dictatorship of the proletariat was born. The counter-revolutionaries crushed it. Between 1945 and 1947, again a socialist revolution took place.

What determined its essential character? The answer to the question is: the social class which had seized power. On March 21, 1919—just as finally as a culmination, in 1947—the Hungarian working class took the power into its hands. Power, comrades, is a very important matter in the class struggle. It is more important than anything else! Because in possession of power a social class can do anything, but if it does not have power it can do perhaps nothing. For this reason the goal in class struggle is always power. The working class captured this power. In possession of power, it first of all placed the means of production into social ownership. This is what happened in 1919, and between 1945 and 1947. The working classes took possession of the means of production, that is of the factories, the mines, the banks, and the land.

As Marx proclaimed already in 1848 and 1849 as the aim of the socialist revolution, the expropriators were expropriated.

Part of the essence of the socialist revolution is that the new ruling class also takes possession of the means of culture: under our conditions, the radio, the press, the schools, the theatres, etc.

This process did take place in our country; the working class took possession of power. Everyone who does not want to obscure the issue, knows this for certain.

Thus, the question can only be raised in this way: who can it be that attacks this power with the force of arms, and what can the purpose of such an attack be? Only a counter-revolution, that is completely clear.

Just as on August 2, 1919, in the same way on October 23, 1956, a counter-revolution began in Hungary. A counter-revolution is a process, too.

It is generally not very easy for the counter-revolutionaries to go before the people, because they do not proclaim their true aims. Not a single counter-revolutionary can say: dear Hungarian people, in the past I was one of the bourgeoisie, I had a large estate of 10,000 acres, or I was a mining shareholder, I had a grand life, I could fleece the people splendidly, so please be so kind as to vote me into power again. For this reason the counter-revolution always conceals, obscures, beclouds its aims and grasps some issue which it expects will be more or less sympathetic to the masses. For example, in 1919 the counter-revolution said: this dictatorship is not a good thing, it is a stern affair, let there be democracy instead. And what did it do? It overthrew the dictatorship of the proletariat, but as its first step it did not establish a counter-revolutionary government, it did not even agitate in favour of one, but offered instead a trade-union government to the country. And it helped into the saddle the Peidl government, which "ruled" for six days. Then came the Friedrich government, after that Horthy, and then followed the massacre and the hounding of communists and progressive-minded people out of the country, counter-revolutionary terror and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie for 25 years.

Why is it worth recalling this? Because not even on October 23rd did the bourgeois appear with the complaint that it was much too unpleasant that the factories were now public property and that he wanted them back. Not even the large estate owner said then that he wanted his 20,000 *hold* back. But they said that we had to fight against Stalinism—if you recall—"the mistakes must be cor-



rected." Of course, they understood correction to mean the smashing of the socialist revolution itself.

We must take into consideration that because of the past mistakes a great many workers, peasants and even students were embittered, and for this reason they were able to mislead many people by means of this attractive slogan. Not in such a way that the people here entered a battle against socialism, for this is only a common lie and slander spread by the counter-revolution. It was not the people but the counter-revolutionaries who fought against the Hungarian People's Republic.

Naturally, the aim of the counter-revolution was to regain power, not to correct this or that kind of mistake but to restore the old world of the landlords and capitalists. This is not a question of theory—for they were able to accomplish it in 1919—but of historical experience. Now, on October 23rd they wanted the same thing. Everybody knows this who heard B. Szabó over the radio. This former Smallholders' Party leader said that he was a supporter of the 1930 programme of the Smallholders' Party. Mindszenty also declared that, in principle, he was for private property. Everybody knows what private property means in respect to the factories and the banks. Then he said: the Church must get back everything, and quickly at that. Naturally not even he was thinking of the Holy Sacrament among the lost treasure of the Church, for that has remained intact; on the other hand, the 1,320,000 acres held by the Church in 1945 have not. It is not so difficult, therefore, to establish whether these were revolutionary events or counter-revolutionary ones. If no mystification is tolerated and we speak clearly about the important things, everybody will understand the counter-revolutionary process that took place.

The recognition of the disguise is very important. In 1930, there was a Weimar Republic in Germany. A bourgeois democracy with so-called democratic rights; one could vote this way, that way, or whichever way he pleased. The dictatorship of monopoly capital prevailed in Germany also at that time, and the "abundant" freedom was becoming too burdensome for it. German monopoly capital had far-reaching war plans, so it launched a fascist named Adolf Hitler. But when they launched him they could not tell the people that now they would go back to the naked dictatorship of monopoly capital, because with this the German workers probably would not have agreed. At that time already the idea of socialism was so strong among the people that they could not circumvent it, and that was

why they invented "national socialism." It has been analyzed a long, long time ago that "national socialism" was neither national nor socialism. I shall not waste time on this because you have had the opportunity of experiencing the blessings of national socialism on your own skin during the Second World War, under German occupation, under the Szálasi regime. This national socialism brought to the German workers, the workers of Europe, to mankind, the Second World War, the slaughter of millions of people.

Nowadays the imperialists have launched a new slogan. In 1956, they made a great deal of propaganda about "national communism." Secretary of State Dulles said in the course of a speech delivered in spring, 1956: we shall have to be resigned to the fact that in these Eastern European countries the leaders of social life consider themselves communists, and we must carry on a struggle to tear away these people, as communists, from Moscow. This was the programme propagated by Dulles. Simultaneously with this they issued the slogan of national communism and began to differentiate among the communists. This is what they said: one is a soft communist, another is a hard communist. One is a Stalinist, the other is a liberal, one is an internationalist communist, another is a national communist, and they proclaimed that they would support the national communist aspirations with all the forces at their disposal. They listed Imre Nagy, among others, among the national communists. They placed their hope in Imre Nagy, as a Hungarian "national communist" "with great prestige," and pursued their policy accordingly.

Let us finish off this national communism at least here, in Nógrád County. That was why I raised the analogy of Germany. Is this so-called national communism not a twin brother of the national socialism which the imperialists concocted in 1930 to bamboozle the masses? I think it is the twin brother, and the Hungarian revolutionaries must take up the fight against the slogan. There is no national communism! National communism is a false slogan. It is only for deceiving the workers, because communism is international, it is the ideology of the workers of the entire world.

It is my conviction that the "Stalinist," "Rákosiist" and similar slogans have run their course. So far they have spoken about this in several socialist countries, but most emphatically in three socialist countries: in Yugoslavia, Hungary and Poland. In Hungary, on November 4th, the revolution struck back, and it became clear that we had to fight against the counter-revolution, and not

against some kind of imaginary Stalinism, or Rákosiism, because, while we were wrestling with such imaginary concepts and arguing, the counter-revolution would stifle the Hungarian dictatorship of the proletariat.

In Poland the *Trybuna Ludu* wrote as early as some time in November: "We cannot tolerate the persecution of honest communists under the concocted slogan of Stalinism." The Poles spoke out, too. The *coup de grâce* was administered by the Chinese comrades with a very valuable Marxist work, which appeared in the *Renmin Ribao*. In this article they exposed and finished off this false slogan and theory.

There are some comrades whose clear-sightedness is confused by the role of Imre Nagy and his accomplices. We have no reason to concern ourselves with analyzing the communist past of these men, because this is now a subordinate, tenth-rate question.

We must proceed according to the facts. Imre Nagy, Géza Losonczy, Gyula Háy, and Zoltán Zelk did incite armed attack against the Hungarian People's Republic, and did defend the cause of the counter-revolution even after the revolutionary forces had stirred into action.

It was not Mindszenty, B. Szabó, Duke Pál Esterházy and Count Takách-Tolvay who turned revolutionaries, when they were joined by Imre Nagy, Losonczy and Gyula Háy, but it was the latter who took the road of counter-revolution.

We have spoken of the class contents of so-called national socialism and national communism. Let us examine the other side of these slogans, the national side. And here too let us view merely the essential. There were some who claimed that October 23 was some kind of national revolution.

Who was it that fought for national independence? A while ago I had already mentioned that it was not Horthy who had fought for Hungarian national independence in the spring of 1919, but the red soldiers of Salgótarján. It was Horthy at the French military command in Szeged, and István Bethlen at the counter-revolutionary committee in Vienna who offered Hungarian national independence for sale in order that they might regain their class rule. Their treason succeeded, because, having sold out the nation's independence, they won the support of the imperialists grouped in the *Entente*, and with the support of the *Entente* they drowned the dictatorship of the proletariat in blood—but at the same time they killed Hungarian national independence, too. In the period of the

Second World War it was not Horthy, not Miklós Kállay, and in general not the large estate owners and the bourgeoisie who defended the cause of Hungarian national independence. At that time they went to Berlin, and sold Hungarian national independence, sold the Hungarian people to Hitler's war machine. On March 19, 1944, Hungary was occupied by the German fascists; this cost the Hungarian people 600,000 lives. This was not the defence of national independence, but its betrayal.

National independence is a great and sacred thing, first of all to us; it is a sacred thing to the communists but not to the bourgeoisie.

At the time of the Second World War the communists Ferenc Rózsa, Zoltán Schönherz, Endre Ságvári and their comrades all fought for national independence and many of them fell in this struggle. And at the time of the Liberation? How was our national independence restored to us?

With the help of the world's first socialist state, the Soviet Union.

And now, on October 23rd, who defended, who supported the cause of Hungarian independence? Was it perhaps Dulles, the American Secretary of State? Or Eden, the then British Prime Minister? Or was it the same French imperialists who are massacring the patriots of Algeria even today? They were seeking a new colony. Or was it perhaps Ferenc Kisbarnaki-Farkas, who has for eight years eaten the bread of the American armaments manufacturers, who has for eight years held his 11,000 gendarmes and fascist officers in arms in West Germany, supplied with American money, American uniforms and American cigarettes? Are these the defenders of the Hungarian nation's independence?

No, comrades, not them. As always, now again it was the Hungarian communists who defended the independence of the Hungarian nation. For this did the socialist revolutionary Comrade Imre Mező, Secretary of the Budapest Party Committee; Comrade József Kalamár, the veteran revolutionary from Csepel; Colonel Asztalos, who defended the Budapest Party Committee Building, and the rest of the communist martyrs die. They died for the independence of the Hungarian nation as well as for the socialist revolution, just like the Soviet soldiers who fell in the struggle against the counter-revolution.

The most loyal soldiers of our independence are here, at this meeting of communist activists, and with them belong all those honest patriots who together with us are defending the nation's independence.



They say that there are foreign troops on the territory of Hungary—that is, Soviet troops. Well, comrades, these are the soldiers of a fraternal, socialist country's army, the sons and daughters of the October Socialist Revolution, our brothers and helpers. To us, they are not foreign troops. As to what the presence of foreign troops means, those duped students would have found out if October 23 had continued for two or three more weeks, and the troops of really foreign, imperialist countries and governments had come here. Then they would have found out what it means to have foreign troops on the soil of a country.

Another way they raise the question is this: well, were there no mistakes in Soviet-Hungarian relations during the past years, were there not some things that infringed Hungary's sovereignty? It must be said, comrades, there were such mistakes during the last years of Stalin's life. But these mistakes were not the kind that threatened the independence of our nation. And as far as these mistakes are concerned, we have already eliminated a considerable part of them, and what remains we shall correct completely.

The Soviet Union has no territorial demands. Talk to any Soviet man and he will tell you: there is no country in the world so rich as his, his people have no need of any kind of territory, they do not want to achieve anything at the expense of other peoples, or their territory. And this is really the way it is, comrades. The Soviet Union wants peace, she wants to live among friendly countries, she has a programme, her tasks are well known, and she is fortunately—fortunately for mankind—working with great success on their realization.

On the question of the party, I only want to say this much: the old thesis that the leading force of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the party, has not changed one bit. Without the party, without the leadership of the party, there is no dictatorship of the proletariat. One of the sources of these troubles which descended upon the people after October 23rd, was that the leadership of the party did not rise to the occasion. On the morning of October 24th, the situation in the party leadership was such that it included both the selfless and devoted supporters of the socialist revolution and the betrayers of the socialist revolution. This explains why at the most difficult time, in those fateful days, the several hundred thousand Hungarian communists did not receive clear and direct guidance from the party leadership. Now in the party, leadership is made up of people who are resolved that they will learn from the mistakes of the past.

We have been and are settling scores with the Rákosi type of sectarianism which disrupted relations between the party and the masses, and we have been and are settling scores with the Imre Nagy type of class betrayal too, which severed the party from all the workers and cast the people as prey to the counter-revolution.

The western imperialists are doing a tremendous amount of writing and talking about our government, about our system. Perhaps I need not say that they are not exactly praising us. But this, too, offers us political information. That we are, by and large, proceeding in the right direction we know partly from the fact that the imperialists are extremely dissatisfied with us. They are now saying that our government is ruthless. Just how do we stand with this ruthlessness? The people who had a finger in the counter-revolution became dreadfully frightened on November 4th, and thought that very, very stern reprisals would follow in a manner befitting the villainy which they had committed. This was what the counter-revolutionaries thought. I must say that there were no such reprisals. If we take into consideration what horrible things the counter-revolution perpetrated within a few days of time, it is a wonder that since November 4th there have not been in the country excesses in the other direction. Still, the imperialists say we are very ruthless. But whenever we turn to the working masses, they tell us that we are very soft-handed and are not dealing sternly enough with the enemy.

The truth is that we really do not want a terroristic regime. We want socialist democracy, a dictatorship of the proletariat, and we believe that the guilty must be brought to justice, they have to be found and their cases must be investigated. This has been started and will continue, but we do not want mass reprisals. Take for example the case of the writers. Now they are raising a great clamour because we have arrested Gyula Háty and others, and they are saying that the Kádár government is intensifying its ruthlessness. I respect the writers and the ability to write, as a profession. I must also tell you that a large part of the writers is not counter-revolutionary, but the aggressive elements like Gyula Háty and Zoltán Zelk terrorized even the honest writers in the Writers' Association. We waited for weeks, because we thought that, although they had committed a serious crime against the people, the confused ideas would pass away, and they would sober up. We waited in vain, they continued their hostile activities. Nobody could reproach us for not providing the means and opportunity for

anyone who wanted to come to his senses to do so and to try to live like a decent person.

If we find that persons who have committed grave crimes do not want to come to their senses, then I can only say: the people's life, blood and happiness is far more important to us than that Radio Free Europe should be satisfied with our democracy.

Comrades, the struggle goes on. They started it with bearded counter-revolutionaries fighting with arms. Then the arms gradually fell out of their hands, and now they are shaving off their beards, too. Then, on December 4th, in Budapest, they put the women into action. Now, more recently, they have been trying to stir up the children.

I must tell you, comrades, that politically the counter-revolution is very active in two places. One is the village, whose calm it is trying to disrupt—and here we must be very alert—and the other place is the school, affecting the seven-year-old first graders as well as students in their last year at the university.

Yes, here the counter-revolution is on the offensive. What it did with religious instruction is simply a tormenting of the soul! How can one plague a seven-year-old child with whether he wants to attend religious instruction, or not?—for this is what they did. We have been forced to declare again that this must stop, and we shall restore the conditions of September 1 in religious instruction. Because we cannot allow the children's peace of mind, the order of instruction and the general order of school to be upset in the middle of the school year. Even if there was some fault in the registration last year, they can stand it until June, and then they will be able to correct it. But we cannot permit them to organize counter-revolutionary agitation here and upset and poison the minds of hundreds of thousands of little children.

The counter-revolution is naturally making extensive use of the instrument of rumour-mongering. It regards as its main task the sowing of constant unrest and the disruption of the internal order of the people's democratic countries. Our duty, on the other hand, is to ensure the internal order of the People's Republic. When they whisper that in March they are preparing this and that kind of uprising, we tell the comrades: be on your guard, be alert, because though the main armed forces of the counter-revolution have naturally been wiped out, yet here and there they still have enough strength to organize provocations. Let us speak to the honest, well-meaning people, first of all to the educational personnel of the colleges, secondary schools

and primary schools. Let us ask them to beware of and to refrain from counter-revolutionary provocations, and to help the state in preserving order. For, if there would be a counter-revolutionary provocation, we would make the counter-revolutionaries pay very dearly for it. It is our duty to the people to be on guard against counter-revolutionary provocations, and if we experience any, we must act—I am not afraid of the word—ruthlessly, because we have to preserve the life of the people, and not be indulgent towards those who disturb the life of the people.

I should like to make a point in connection with our security forces. In our country the security forces in general—both those within the police and those within the army—deserve every respect; on the whole, they are taking an honest stand for the cause of the revolution. There is great need in the security forces for men who are ardent champions of the cause of the revolution. At the same time the indispensable strength of not only the armed forces, but also of the party, the trade unions, and the workers' councils—is revolutionary discipline. This is doubly valid for the security forces. Whoever violates revolutionary discipline, causes the greatest damage to the revolution.

If the counter-revolution pokes its nose out of its rat-hole, they should not only show their fist, but immediately deal a blow. But they should not flaunt their strength in the face of the people, because they must not forget that this force is not aimed against the people, but against the enemies of the people. Let them show at every step, with their appearance and their conduct, that they are aware of this in all respects.

What is the situation with the workers' councils? Comrades, if we are able to draw the workers' councils under the ideological leadership of the party, then they shall by all means perform useful work for the benefit of the Hungarian dictatorship of the proletariat. Think of one thing: there was in the past a great deal of bureaucracy in factory management. It is the task of the workers' councils to take part in the guidance of production, to carry on activity for the good of the working class and help to render the management of the factory and production less bureaucratic. If they help in this, it will be very useful.

By way of conclusion I should like to speak of the perspectives. Internationally the situation is that in the recent past the counter-revolution actually launched serious offensives at three points. Among those launched on socialist countries the attack on Hungary was the

strongest. It also launched an attack in Poland. Finally, with the undisguised, old methods of imperialism it made an assault on the Egyptian people, this was the third point of attack.

Now we can say, comrades, that in Hungary, Egypt and in Poland, too, imperialism suffered defeat. Here in Hungary it was partly the forces of the Hungarian revolution and the counter-revolution that clashed, but in reality the two existing world orders were in battle against each other. For the counter-revolutionaries were supported by the whole imperialist world, with every possible means: radio contacts, money, arms, experts disguised as Red Cross officials, and so on. Our cause, the cause of the revolution, on the other hand, was supported by the entire socialist world. From this struggle the socialist world emerged victorious and the future promises further victories.

As to internal policy, everyone may, with absolute calm and assurance, represent the standpoint that the revolution will achieve an unconditional and absolute victory, whatever the counter-revolution does. For this, however, it is very important that we should be alert and vigilant, and also we should reinforce the dictatorship of the proletariat in both its aspects: dictatorship against the enemy, and democracy for the working masses.

Comrades, I have found that you are very stern judges of people, and that you possess a streak of sectarianism too: here you have closed membership applications, there you have declared that the majority of the intelligentsia support the counter-revolution. This is not true, comrades. The vital force of your system lies in the fact that it relies upon the masses of the workers, peasants and intelligentsia, that it is capable of repressing the enemy, of wiping out its attacks and forces.

I too am very proud of the achievements of the Nógrád County coal-basin. But let us not forget that creative work is not possible without the unity and collaboration of the fundamental working classes. The working people of the factories are in their bulk sons of the Hungarian working class, this does not even require thinking.

If there are people with confused minds, then they must be helped in a brotherly way back to the proper road. The task in connection with the intelligentsia is the same. The fundamental masses of the intelligentsia are not counter-revolutionaries. The fundamental masses of the intelligentsia share the lot of the working people in poverty and in prosperity alike. The intelligentsia, too, knows this very well. And since our future is common, it is natural that we shall also have to work in common. Quite obviously this does not apply to

the counter-revolutionaries but they are not stratified according to occupations. We must not take an attitude of isolation with respect to any working category. Only together with the working masses can we carry our cause to victory and by all means this is the way we shall do it.

As regards the economic questions, we have very serious difficulties, partly because of the old mistakes, the not entirely sound proportions now existing in Hungarian industry. But the decisive part of our present difficulties stems from the damage caused by the counter-revolution, which caused some 14 thousand million forints of damage to the Hungarian national economy at a single blow. This is an enormous sum, and it certainly will not be easy to fix it up! But the conditions for sound development are given, because the fundamental means of production are at our disposal, and fortunately there is something yet that they have not taken exactly into consideration in the planning offices: the loyalty of the working masses to the cause of socialism, their resolution and will-power. This is an enormous factor, and if now we are able to mobilize the working masses, with the assistance of the party, then a year and a half from now we shall recall that certain amount of unemployment that exists now and the danger of inflation, as problems of the past. It is up to us, let's go to work, comrades!



## FIRST MAY DAY AFTER THE VICTORY OVER THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

ADDRESS TO A MASS MEETING  
OF THE WORKING PEOPLE OF BUDAPEST ON  
HEROES' SQUARE

May 1st, 1957

Workers, Comrades, Working Peoples of Budapest:

On May 1, 1890, sixty thousand class-conscious Budapest workers assembled at this spot where we stand today, to demonstrate for the first time in Hungary in support of the idea of international proletarian solidarity. That was 67 years ago. Then the idea of socialist society lived in the hearts of only the most class-conscious workers, and the haughty Habsburg Monarchy, which held the peoples of the Danube Basin in bondage, regarded the whole demonstration as a police matter.

Where is the haughty monarchy today? Those workers who demonstrated here then, have likewise turned to dust long ago, but the Hungarian working class lives and is still here today; the idea fostered in the hearts and hopes of our forebears has materialized, it lives and has achieved victory.

The power of the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the workers' and peasants' state, the Hungarian People's Republic lives and has achieved victory! The idea of international proletarian solidarity lives, and has been transformed into an invincible force!

Since that May Day in 1890, the Hungarian working class, the Hungarian working people have lived through 67 stormy years. The black nights of feudal-capitalistic bondage, wars, the red days of revolutions and the leaden-grey clouds of counter-revolution followed each other. The monarchy, the bourgeois republic, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Horthyist counter-revolution, the Liberation, the Hungarian People's Republic that realized the dictatorship of the proletariat, the counter-revolutionary attack of 1956, and after it the revolutionary counter-attack—this was a stormy sequence, comrades.

During these 67 years the Hungarian workers, the most class-conscious working people of the villages and the offices, sometimes clandestinely and under persecution, sometimes fighting against Horthyist gendarmes and police, sometimes freely, in a festive manner, bore witness on the May Day of every year that the Hungarian working people are supporters of international proletarian solidarity and have always been loyal to the red banner symbolizing internationalism and the common fate of the working class.

I believe that history will long remember a good many militant and outstanding Hungarian May Days. It will remember the first one—recalling always with respect the pioneering Budapest workers—then the May Day of 1919 when the Hungarian working class, striking off the shackles of the monarchy and of capitalism, celebrated its first unforgettable free May Day. History will long remember the May Day of 1945, when with the help of the heroic struggle of the Soviet Army which smashed the raging counter-revolution that had ravaged the country for 25 years and the armed forces of the Hitlerite fascist conquerors, the Hungarian working class and the whole Hungarian working people could once again celebrate in freedom.

Finally, I believe that, alongside the May Days of 1890, 1919, and 1945, this May Day of 1957 will long remain memorable and of outstanding significance.

In this hour here in Budapest, in the throbbing heart of the Hungarian socialist revolution, and in every town and village of the Hungarian People's Republic, hundreds and thousands of sons and daughters of the Hungarian working people are celebrating with militant demonstration the great day of working class internationalism, of labour—May Day.

Comrades:

Wherein lies the special significance of the Hungarian May Day of 1957 for our people, and we can safely say, its international significance, too? In the fact that on this day the Hungarian working people who, with the international aid of the working class, achieved a decisive victory over the unsuccessful October counter-revolution, are celebrating May Day, the holiday of international proletarian solidarity, in freedom!

In the course of the events of October 1956, the fascist Hungarian bourgeoisie, allied on the one hand with the traitorous Imre Nagy group that had sunk into the morass of counter-revolution, and on the other with international imperialism headed by American big capital, had threatened to overthrow the social order of the Hun-

garian People's Republic. Mortal danger, the danger of annihilation threatened the Hungarian workers' and peasants' state, the people's power, the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary. Our people's national independence and the cause of peace were in danger, together with the nationalization of the factories, the banks and mines and the land reform, all the great achievements which our people had won during twelve years of social progress.

It is another question, and we must not forget it, that the grave mistakes of the past years had evoked justified bitterness in the masses, and the counter-revolution was able to make very shrewd and effective use of this in its attack on the law and order of the Hungarian People's Republic.

Even less can we forget that without the treason of the Imre Nagy group—which at the decisive moment paralysed the leadership of the country and misled and reduced to helplessness the masses of Hungarian working people loyal to the cause of the socialist revolution but divested of leadership—never would the counter-revolutionary attack have been able to achieve the success it temporarily did.

All of us still remember the dark and bloody days of the counter-revolutionary attack. In the streets of Budapest counter-revolutionary terror ruled, communists and progressive-minded people were being massacred in large numbers. The militants of the party, cooperative farm leaders, council chairmen, and the champions of socialism were being thrown into prison by the thousands, and preparations were being made to slaughter them. Once again there appeared in the political arena the capitalists, big landlords, bankers, princes and counts, headed by Mindszenty. They appeared in Parliament, in two days they formed as many as 28 counter-revolutionary parties, even announcing the formation of the notorious Hungarian Life Party, and appeared in the villages and in the factories with the slogan "we want everything back."

Just as in 1919 behind Horthy's murderous gang there was the *Entente*—in the same way the sinister forces of imperialism mustered behind the dark forces of the counter-revolution in October 1956, with money, arms and an extensive propaganda machine.

Workers, Comrades:

Face to face with the raging counter-revolution, we communists had to decide whether to tolerate any longer the slaughtering of the leaders of the people, the burial of the People's Republic, the robbing of our national independence and the turning of our country into

a hotbed of war, or whether to fight the betrayal with every imaginable force and wipe out the counter-revolution.

We communists made our decision. We decided to call to battle all the adherents of the socialist revolution in the country who were prepared to fight against the counter-revolution. At the same time, we once again asked for help from the Hungarian people's truest and most unselfish friend, the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government and the Soviet people granted the aid requested in the spirit of international proletarian solidarity. Thus, the Hungarian people, with the Soviet Union's fraternal assistance, defended the cause of socialism in Hungary.

This struggle was not without sacrifices. On this free May Day we must pay tribute to our martyrs, the communists murdered by the counter-revolutionaries, those true Hungarian patriots—Imre Mező, Kalamár, Asztalos, Kállai, Biksza, and the rest of our dear comrades—who are no longer able to celebrate with us. We must pay tribute to those militant members of the party, security forces, soldiers, policemen, and to the members of the emergency security forces who, loyal to their belief and their oath, fought and died for the cause of socialist revolution, national independence and the Hungarian People's Republic. We must pay tribute to those Soviet workers, peasants, intellectuals and regular soldiers who rushed to our aid in this struggle, who helped us to defend our people's democratic order, our independent homeland and our peace. It is with deep respect that we pay tribute to those Soviet fighters who, while helping the Hungarian people, sacrificed their very lives, proving their loyalty to the sacred idea of international proletarian solidarity. May eternal glory surround their memory!

Looking back upon this heroic struggle, one can clearly see that in October 1956, socialist Hungary fought a life-and-death struggle against the Hungary of the landlords and gentry, and socialist Hungary emerged victorious. But it is clear that this struggle was also the clash between plutocratic imperialism bent on subjugating the peoples and nations, and international proletarian solidarity safeguarding the peoples' freedom and peace; and proletarian internationalism was victorious, the forces of social progress and peace were victorious. That is why May Day 1957 in Hungary is of international significance.

Comrades:

On this May Day we are celebrating the fact that the Hungarian people—with the support of the Soviet Union which extended generous

and self-sacrificing aid—succeeded in defending the cause of socialism, and thus the Hungarian dictatorship of the proletariat, its workers' and peasants' state, the Hungarian People's Republic, does live!

The historical significance of May Day 1957, lies in the fact that the Hungarian people overcame the dangerous and bloody attack against the power of the working class, the grave ordeals, and today, as a member of the fraternal family of socialist countries, to the joy of the friends of our people, and the grief of our enemies, they are celebrating May Day in freedom.

Comrades:

Let us survey the road we have covered since November 4th.

If we take stock of the results of this struggle, we can state, without being guilty of complacency, that they are substantial.

If we look at these results, and observe the shortcomings in various areas of life, we cannot be satisfied, we cannot be complacent. For there are shortcomings in such abundance that we even have some to loan out. But if we think of the anarchic state of things on November 3rd, when the raging counter-revolution and its imperialist masters already felt the power and the country in their hands, when the patriots loyal to the cause of socialism became hunted beasts in their own country, when the national economy was in a completely paralysed state, and now take a look back on the road travelled since then, we cannot be mistaken when we say that the main direction followed since has undoubtedly been right and the results great.

What kind of results can we speak of?

Above all we may speak of the power, the state, and about law and order. We may have, and do have, many critics. We also have enemies who are faultfinders. Such people like to revile us as being uncultured, inflexible, incompetent, ruthless terrorists, Stalinists and all the imaginable bad things that exist in their dictionary. But not even our worst enemies, our most malicious critics can say that we are serving the interests of the capitalists and the landlords and that's the very thing that hurts them. Actually the worst result of the Hungarian People's Republic in the development during the last six months as viewed by our enemies, and thus the greatest good and the most important achievement for our people, is that the working-class power is now strong and the possibility of restoring capitalism has ceased.

The lawful constitutional order of our People's Republic is ensured. We have restored the constitutional organs of the people's power and state administration. We have reorganized the armed

forces of our People's Republic, the People's Army, the Frontier Guard, the Police and within these, first of all, the armed units of the emergency security forces. We have removed the traitors from the key positions. We have been, and are enlisting the most class-conscious workers, miners and peasants in the task of ensuring armed power—we have organized the Workers' Militia!

The forming of the Workers' Militia is proof that the party and the government lead the country with far-reaching confidence in, and reliance on, the masses. And the enthusiasm with which the masses of the workers are applying for enrolment in the units of the Workers' Militia indicates that the Hungarian workers are prepared to defend their own power even with arms. All this is at the same time an eloquent refutation of those hostile rumours that express futile longings, alleging that in October the workers attacked the People's Republic and now the country is being led by a government estranged from the masses.

Here are our foreign guests. Let them see the men and women of our party and our government, and the masses estranged from them, hundreds of thousands of which are standing here on the square!

After the strengthening of the people's power, our second great achievement is the restoration of the elemental order and the normal blood circulation of the national economy. Industrial and mining production, and in a like manner the work of agricultural production, transport and trade, have fundamentally been returned to their normal routine.

We were already here at the meeting when the report of the Ministry of Heavy Industry was delivered: our miners celebrated May Day with all our coal mining trusts overfulfilling their production targets for April.

We may speak of our results despite the knowledge that there are still very serious shortcomings. But anyone who examines the development of our national economy just a little objectively, will find that the restoration of our economy is proceeding at a rate faster than anticipated.

Alongside the strengthening of state power, the starting of the blood circulation of our economic life, a very great result of our work during the last six months is the fact that our schools, universities, the country's most important research and cultural institutions are functioning, and in their work they are gradually catching up with the pace of development and the results of political and economic life.



To what may these considerable achievements be attributed?

Above all to the fact that, breaking with our own mistakes, we exposed the revisionist ideas which disturbed our party's policy and clouded the clear-sightedness of the masses, falsified Marxism-Leninism and betrayed the interests of the working class, and we returned to the teachings of the great Lenin. We examined the Hungarian situation and defined the most important tasks to be accomplished, in the light of these teachings.

Without beating about the bush, we called the counter-revolution what it was, we exposed the betrayal, we told everyone in an understandable manner that in our country we have a dictatorship of the proletariat which relies directly upon the working masses and at the same time mercilessly suppresses the class enemy.

We discarded the false slogan of neutrality and said that the Hungarian People's Republic was an inseparable member of the mighty family of socialist countries led by the Soviet Union, and was remaining consistently true to the Warsaw Treaty. We opposed the vile, anti-Soviet, inciting slanders of the counter-revolution and proved that the Soviet troops staying on Hungarian territory were helping, under the given international conditions, to defend Hungarian national independence and our people's peace against the adventurist plans of the imperialists.

We declared without beating about the bush that as long as the aggressive imperialist circles maintained a fund for the avowed purpose of wiping out the order of the Hungarian People's Republic, to this end kept Horthy-fascist counter-revolutionary elements in arms for long years, and shamelessly provided nuclear arms for the Hitlerite fascist hangmen of the European peoples and of the Hungarian people, then we too considered the joining of the forces of socialism and peace, the Warsaw Treaty, the presence of Soviet troops in Hungary as just and legitimate self-defence.

The Hungarian masses are responding to this frankness and resolution with confidence and support that is increasing from day to day. Apart from the frankness, the results are due to the fact that we have clarified the situation in regard to the highest social leading force of the Hungarian People's Republic, the party.

We have settled accounts with the revisionist views that carried on subversive actions within the party, denied the party's leading role and thus played into the hands of the counter-revolution. The results of this militant consistency were that in the fire of the counter-revolution the Hungarian people's leading force, the vanguard of the

working class, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, was reborn. The party, steeled in political, armed and economic battles, reorganized the social forces of the People's Republic, first of all the class organs of the working class, the trade unions and the Young Communist League; and these social forces, under the guidance of the party, the leading force of the dictatorship of the proletariat, defended and reinforced the people's power.

On May Day we greet the trade unions of the working class which can look back upon great traditions, and which have again 1,800,000 members today. We greet the women's movement reorganizing itself, and the Young Communist League which is proudly unfurling its flag. These mass organizations, which represent a great social force, and their constantly improving work have played a considerable role in the results achieved so far.

Apart from the social organizations, the fact that we put to work our country's constitutional organs of state power and state administration, the councils and the ministries, within a comparatively short time, also played a part in our achievements.

Speaking of these achievements, special recognition should be accorded the reorganized armed forces of our People's Republic: the People's Army, the Frontier Guard and the Police, which played a great role in restoring law and order, that is, the conditions for work. The organization of the first emergency security forces and their heroic stand in crushing the counter-revolutionary bands, were a real epic in the reorganization of the Hungarian armed forces.

The chief role in the consolidation of the forces of the Hungarian People's Republic and the restoration of political, economic and cultural life was undoubtedly played by the masses of workers and peasants themselves, as well as the strata of mental workers which supported the efforts of the workers and peasants.

We who worked in the leadership in these days, must say that even though central leadership gained strength day by day after November 4th, for long weeks it was not effective enough. In this period particularly decisive was the voluntary work and sound political action of the workers, miners, cooperative farmers and individual peasants and intellectuals who, recognizing the tasks properly and awakening to the knowledge of their own strength, acted against the counter-revolutionary provocateurs and the so-called "grumblers."

Alongside the efforts of our working class, our people, our party and government, the material, moral and many-sided fraternal assist-

ance, granted in the spirit of international proletarian solidarity by the countries of the socialist camp, and first of all by the Soviet Union, also played a great part in the achievements of these six months.

The political and moral support of the international communist and working-class movement gave the Hungarian people strength too. In addition to visits by leaders of the World Federation of Trade Unions and the trade unions of a number of countries, and their statements of solidarity, we received the declarations of the fraternal communist and workers' parties of 27 countries, in which the whole international working-class movement condemned the counter-revolutionary attack against the Hungarian People's Republic and against the cause of peace, and assured us of their support.

Thus, it can be said that the counter-revolutionary attack, begun against the social order of the Hungarian People's Republic in October 1956, fomented and supported by the imperialists—despite the damage caused—steelled the forces of the Hungarian socialist revolution. At the same time it cemented and strengthened the living, mighty, and invincible international proletariat.

Comrades:

May Day is the militant holiday of international working-class solidarity. On this day the militant demands of the international working class, the working peoples, resound throughout the world.

In the socialist world, extending from the Sea of Japan to the hills of the Austrian Alps, the cause of socialist construction stirs hundreds of millions of people today. In the capitalist countries the political and economic demands of the oppressed workers and peasants; and in the colonial countries, living under the imperialist yoke and under the pressure of aggressive threats, the struggle for national independence, and at every May Day celebration and demonstration the questions and demands of the resolute defence of peace throughout the world, are foremost in the mind.

What main tasks do we Hungarian workers see before us on this May Day?

Our militant May Day programme may be summed up in a single sentence: we shall develop further the achievements of twelve years of social progress, and making use of what was good and carefully avoiding the mistakes of the past, we intend to, and shall, complete the building of a socialist Hungary that is free of every kind of exploitation.

On our May Day celebration today we proclaim loudly, and let friend and foe alike hear, that our people will heal the wounds caused by the counter-revolution, and their resolute intention is that on Hungarian soil, which was soaked by the blood and sweat of so many generations of workers and peasants, and on which twelve years ago the villainous regime of the gentry rascals left but ruins as its heritage—we shall build up our free and independent socialist homeland, a socialist Hungary!

Comrades:

In order to achieve this great aim we must turn our attention to the tasks which face us now, but we should know that amidst the present conditions we must examine all our activity from the standpoint of strengthening the working-class power.

First of all: let us strengthen our state power by further organizing the leading political force, the party, by further extending its contacts with the masses, by strengthening the party's unity, consolidating its discipline and increasing its prestige.

In building the party we have broken with the practice of the past. Formerly the old comrades of 1919 were stigmatized as having sectarian views, a considerable part of the cadres from the period of the underground struggle were pushed aside. At the time of the counter-revolution the loyalty and value of the old fighters of 1919, of Hungary's proletarian fighters on the Spanish front, and those comrades who bravely stood their ground during the years of Horthy fascism, was proved. Now the three living generations of the working class, those of 1919, the fighters of the years of the underground struggle, and the young cadres of the period after the Liberation are fortunately together, and this is one of the most important reasons for the party's present solidity.

Now, at the time when the party's prestige is growing, being on our guard against isolation, we must ensure that all honest working people—first of all from the working class—who are prepared to make sacrifices for the cause of the socialist revolution, are unselfish and able to fight and work, may find their way into the party. But only these should come. Let no one be a member of the party for the sake of propriety or for personal motives. It is better for the party, the working class and the whole people if the party is surrounded by a broad camp of well-intentioned sympathizers and friends, than to have within the party a considerable mass which would vacillate in times of difficulty. This is one of the lessons October has taught us.

The party must be protected from unprincipled careerists, and particular vigilance is needed against those elements who, following Imre Nagy's traitorous line, fought against the party before October, during October and after October, but would now like to join again and fight from within against the party's main line and unity.

Secondly: we must strengthen the government of the Hungarian dictatorship of the proletariat along three lines:

We must strengthen the foundation of our state power, the workers' and peasants' alliance under the leadership of the working class.

While stressing that we must avoid every mistake of the past which weakened the workers' and peasants' alliance and prevented socialist development, we must declare that the construction of a socialist society includes the building of the socialist village in Hungary. Our individually farming peasantry may have seen from many important measures that we have vigorously eliminated the conditions that were harmful to them. At the same time we have made no secret of the fact that we are giving all-out support to their correct objectives, the advance outposts of socialism in the countryside, the state farms, the machine stations and the voluntarily associated cooperative farm peasantry, who, left to themselves in the face of the counter-revolutionary attack, stood their ground bravely.

A strong workers' and peasants' alliance in our state is the political foundation upon which all strata of the people who agree with the objectives of socialist construction may join their forces throughout the nation. We are struggling in order to rally, alongside the fundamental masses of the workers and peasants, the intellectual workers, and even beyond this all the progressive elements of the urban petty bourgeoisie.

The communists must find a method of cooperation, based on friendly and mutual confidence, with all those people who agree with the objectives of building a socialist society.

We must strengthen the state power of the dictatorship of the proletariat along the lines of developing socialist democracy too.

We must enlist the whole party membership and the non-party masses in deciding the fundamental problems, in drafting, carrying out and supervising the implementation of laws and decrees.

Then we must strengthen the state power of the dictatorship of the proletariat by annihilating the counter-revolution and by suppressing even more consistently the enemies of the people's

power. "Radio Free Europe" and the rest of the enemies of the Hungarian People's Republic keep blasting in their broadcasts and in the press that in our country there is dreadful terror and a campaign of bloody reprisals and mass internment. Of course they know very well that these are all lies. They are clamouring because they fear very much for their cadres. You, comrades, know very well that our people object justifiably to the very fact that we have not punished the guilty sufficiently.

Our enemies, and sometimes even those of our friends who are well meaning but do not know our situation thoroughly, say that we are not forgiving enough, that we are not humane and democratic enough. Our people became thoroughly familiar with *their* humaneness and democracy in October.

We believe that the guilty must be punished, and those who are scheming against the People's Republic, against the people's peace of mind and work, must be held in check. It is our opinion that the people's power, their life and peace are the most sacred things in the world, therefore our legal bodies meet the requirements of humanism and democracy when they deal all the more sternly with the guilty persons.

Thirdly: we must strengthen the economic foundations of the people's power.

We must solve, as soon as possible, the tasks of economic construction which face us and which are, I must admit, not exactly easy. There are still places of tension in our economic life. But by our people's work, and largely with the economic assistance of the fraternal countries, we have ensured stability and increased the living standard of the working people. At present there is still a contradiction between the increased living standard on the one hand, and the low level of productivity and high production costs on the other. In this situation the task is to preserve the purchasing value of our money and our increased living standard, and to eliminate the contradiction by improving work, increasing productivity, reducing production costs, economizing better with our materials, and similar measures.

The economic plans we have worked out for this year, will shortly be made public. Following that we shall submit our new Three-Year Plan to an open debate.

However, the most important responsibility of our party organizations and the trade unions is to concern themselves, already now, most seriously with the everyday problems of production,



and to mobilize the entire working class, the working peasantry and the whole working people for the best possible solution of the economic and production tasks.

Speaking of our economic difficulties, we must stress that if the masses seriously take the solution of these questions into their hands, every realistic condition is given for making the Hungarian People's Republic economically sound and strong.

Fourthly: we must create order in cultural life. It is no secret that the counter-revolution and revisionism have set us back seriously in certain areas of education and culture.

In the sphere of culture, too, the bourgeoisie have donned a mask. The sworn enemies of socialist culture came out under the flag of putting an end to "Stalinism," to administrative methods, the flag of correcting the mistakes. But in October it became evident that this was a pirate flag.

It is enough to take a glance at the sphere of culture and it becomes readily apparent that under this pirate flag Horthy-fascists, Arrow-cross press chiefs, and bourgeois hucksters have been—so to speak—rehabilitated.

These elements then scraped together a good amount of the so-called cultural products of the bourgeoisie, out of the cellars and garrets, products stinking with the odour of must, mildew and decay, and unloaded them on the people.

It is obvious that we shall have to create order in this sphere, too. Nobody wants back the schematic mistakes, nor the administrative methods. But let the real appreciators and masters of culture, and the masses themselves be more exacting and speed up the sweeping out of the bourgeois trash from the sphere of culture.

Comrades:

Lastly the strength of the Hungarian People's Democracy must be increased through deepening the Hungarian people's feeling of internationalism.

Let us overcome the remains of bourgeois nationalism, the so-called "national communist" views, and strengthen in the Hungarian people the kind of genuine patriotism which embodies the idea of international proletarian solidarity.

An internationalist working man, in whatever country of the world, is our brother, while the Hungarian counter-revolutionary who betrays the Hungarian homeland and people, is our enemy.

Let us do everything possible in order to strengthen our relations of friendship and alliance with all the countries of the socialist

camp, first of all the Soviet Union, and to consolidate further the unity of the whole camp. Let us not forget for one single moment that the unity of the socialist camp and our belonging to it defended the Hungarian People's Republic, our national independence, our people's power and the cause of peace in the autumn of 1956.

Although there are still differences between us, we must do everything—except for concessions of principle—in order to improve our relations with Yugoslavia, so that these may not merely satisfy the principles of peaceful coexistence but become also warm and friendly. Apart from the common interests of good relations, the common aims of building socialism also link us with the peoples of Yugoslavia and her leaders.

We stand on the platform of Marxism-Leninism, of international proletarian solidarity. In accordance with this, we respect every people, we support peace among the peoples, and peaceful coexistence among countries and peoples with differing social systems.

Comrades:

Great tasks are facing us, but I say with deep conviction that every supporter of the Hungarian People's Republic looks to the future with confidence. The counter-revolutionary attack taught us, tempered us and also welded us together. If we do not forget the mistakes of the past, if we make use of the lessons and experiences in improving our work, then we can advance more confidently in the future.

There is particularly great need for the vigilance of the party, of the state and the whole people. All of us saw in October that wolves lurked in the garden. Let us extend a helping hand to the misguided, but let us be relentlessly stern with regard to the enemies of the people's power. If every supporter of socialism and every patriot unites, then the people will be a hundred times stronger than the counter-revolutionary forces.

Our strength and confidence are increased by the fact that in the fraternal family of the socialist countries we benefit from protection and strength so powerful that there is no greater force in the world today.

Comrades and Fellow Workers:

After the events of October, everywhere beyond our frontiers, both our friends and our enemies are watching this Hungarian May Day today. I believe that this May Day of 1957 will fill our friends with joy, and our enemies with bitterness. I believe, we are not mistaken in saying that this day will give new impetus to our internal devel-

opment and will contribute to the united strength of the peoples and the international working-class movement assembled under the flag of international proletarian solidarity.

Arise, comrades, to new work, to new struggles, to new tasks, and our just cause shall triumph!

Long live Marxism-Leninism and international proletarian solidarity!

Long live the indisruptible unity of the Hungarian People's Republic and the socialist camp led by the Soviet Union!

Long live our party, our homeland, the Hungarian People's Republic, our working people and their main leading force, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party!

Long live the friendship of the peoples, long live peace!

Long live May Day, the great holiday of the working people of the world!

## THE POLITICAL SITUATION AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY

REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF  
THE HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY

June 27th, 1957

### The October Counter-Revolution and the Political Line of the Central Committee

Delegates to the Party Conference, Comrades:

Our Party Conference must—inasmuch as it agrees with them—confirm and approve the decisive steps of November and the political line which the Central Committee has been following since November last year. It must debate and approve the draft Rules and the cooption of members to the leading organs of the party. Thus may we summarize the tasks of our Party Conference.

If we solve these tasks successfully, we shall end all that has hitherto been of a temporary nature in our party and shall establish conditions for the normal life of the party until the Party Congress.

Comrades:

The counter-revolutionary uprising caused extremely serious damage to our party, our people and the whole country. Apart from the great damage, however, this grave upheaval has, though at a great price, provided the party and the people with experiences and lessons, which—if we make correct use of them—make it possible for us to advance more swiftly and with more success along the road of building socialism.

In respect to the lessons of the counter-revolutionary uprising, it should be pointed out that both the internal and the external enemy were saying that the party and communism were in a state of crisis, that Marxism-Leninism had become obsolete. Before all else it must be established that the facts of the counter-revolutionary attack in Hungary have proved the very opposite—the strength



of communism and the truth of Marxism-Leninism. The counter-revolutionary attack has substantiated the century-old teachings of Marxism in every respect, without exception. It was the irreconcilable antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the working class—this thesis established by Marx 100 years ago—that manifested itself explosively in October. Lenin, in the 1917 period of the struggle of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, when revisionists and other petty bourgeois elements attacked the proletarian power with demands for “pure democracy” and freedom, pointed out that under the given conditions these demands were the demands of the bourgeoisie oppressed by the proletarian power. These statements of Lenin have been precisely verified in our case too. Certain highly important conclusions of the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union were similarly substantiated by the October events. Among other things, the adventurist policy of the imperialists, the primary importance of economic questions, and the importance of collective leadership were analyzed at the Twentieth Congress. And also the conclusion over these matters were verified in the course of the grave events that came about in our country. The verification also took place of the theoretical findings of the Chinese comrades in the course of the past years, regarding the conflicts within the people, the conflicts between the people and the people’s enemies, and also on how and under what circumstances a reconcilable conflict may change into an irreconcilable conflict.

It is the task of the Party Conference to examine with the help of the theory of Marxism-Leninism and without personal prejudice the fundamental questions of the events that took place in our country. If the Party Conference accomplishes this, then it will solve the task about which I have spoken, and in our future work we shall be able to use both the good and the bad experiences to advantage.

For a proper evaluation of the October events it is unavoidably necessary to look back a little on our affairs of times long past. In October the enemy buried the revolutionary party of the Hungarian working class. As the comrades know, in 1918 the revolutionary party of the Hungarian working class rallied above all the working class, furthermore the broad masses of the poor peasantry and the people generally; and, marching in the vanguard of the people, overthrew the power of the bourgeoisie and achieved the first glorious dictatorship of the proletariat of the Hungarian working class in 1919. With varying results but with never ceasing resolution, our

party fought against Horthy fascism under conditions of illegality for 25 years. After the Liberation, when as the result of the patriotic liberation struggle of the Soviet Army, the rule of Horthy fascism was also annihilated, together with Hitler fascism, the party of the Hungarian working class, correctly availing itself of this favourable historical situation, rallied the forces of the working class and the people, and during the years 1945 to 1948, step by step again built up the workers’ and peasants’ state, the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the period of the struggle for power, but even after the winning and complete establishment of power, the party fought many great battles and came out of every one of them victoriously. The party led the struggle for the realization of the land reform, the nationalization of industry, the development of heavy industry, and the launching of the socialist transformation of the village. The party fought its political battles in accordance with these great social objectives. After the Liberation it defeated the bourgeois parties then operating in Hungary in a political struggle, with the instruments of political struggle—winning over the masses of the people and gradually reducing the bourgeois influence on them. Finally, in the further period of the political struggle, our party, cooperating with the honest masses of the Social Democratic Party and with the finest comrades working in the leadership of this party, fought for and carried to victory the great historic cause of the Hungarian working class: working-class unity, the union of the two workers’ parties. It was with this act that the full establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the full establishment of the workers’ and peasants’ state, the complete seizure of political power was really concluded.

We may say, therefore, that from 1918 on, ever since the Hungarian working class has had a revolutionary, vanguard party, the party’s objective, as far as its fundamental direction is concerned, has been straight and correct, and that progressing along this road it has achieved great results.

The period between 1949 and 1953 needs a more thorough analysis. This period of our party’s history is also mainly characterized by great positive achievements, but the balance of this period includes the fact that after 1949 negative features began to appear to an ever increasing extent alongside the achievements. Reflecting on the party’s and on our own work, we cannot fail to see that—perhaps first of all in the practical work of the leadership, but ultimately in that of the whole party—it was after the complete achieve-

ment of power that the negative features appeared, that is, in the period when it would have been possible to advance without any great obstacles. On the basis of our experiences, comrades, the way we see it is that the thesis which is valid for every single communist is also valid for the revolutionary party of the working class as a whole—the achievement of power subjects the party and also the individual communists to a critical test. Because if we review the struggle of the party between 1945 and 1949, then we can only recall this struggle with a good feeling. For in this period the party won the confidence and support of the masses by means of political persuasion, and, because it solved this successfully, it was able to solve the rest of its tasks, too. When power was already in our hands we became too sure of ourselves. It was proved that power is not only a great force, but also harbours danger for both the party and the individual communists.

Complacency and cocksureness can be very great dangers for the party after the achievement of power. I believe I can state without exaggeration that for us this is one of the biggest lessons that became apparent particularly in the course of the October events. After the seizure of power the false illusion arose among the comrades working in leading positions—but even among comrades working in lower organizations—that if every instrument of power, the police, the prosecution, the courts, the army, and so on, is in our hands—so that it is possible, as they put it, to “make short work” of the enemy—then it is no longer so important to keep on winning over the masses every day. I think that in the first place it was this that was the root of the mistakes. If this belief had not gained ascendancy in the activities of more or less the whole party, and instead we had paid constant and careful attention to the opinion and valuation of the working people, particularly of the workers, with regard to our party’s work—as we had done between 1945 and 1948 when a reply had had to be given to every question put by the masses—then the winning of power would not at the same time have been the period when serious mistakes appeared.

In the years 1949 to 1953, we achieved enormous successes in the development of industry. We also had very great results in beginning the socialist reorganization of the village and in the sphere of the cultural revolution. These great results, however, went hand in hand with the introduction of the cult of the individual and with the mistakes stemming from this, the violations of legality, organizational mistakes, the unsound development of our

relations with the working class and the peasantry. In June 1953, the Central Committee itself, that is, the party itself—and this is very important—revealed those mistakes which could be found in the party’s practice at that time.

The Central Committee itself declared that the cult of the individual was harmful, that collective leadership should be restored, that the Leninist rules should be restored in the life of the party, that violations of the law must be ended, the organizational mistakes remedied, and that serious attention must be devoted to the improvement of the living standards of the working class. Thus, the Central Committee of the party correctly analyzed the situation as it then was, revealed all the essential mistakes and correctly designated the path, showing how and in what manner the mistakes were to be corrected. This is a very important feature of the June 1953 resolution, which we must recall for several reasons. The analysis concluded by saying that the party must begin to correct the mistakes, and in such a manner that the sincere exposure and radical correction of the mistakes should lead to an increase in the prestige of the party and the prestige of the people’s power. This was undoubtedly correct. Those measures, however, which were taken when the correction of the mistakes was begun were not good, even at the very first step. In connection with this analysis one must also point out that the propaganda so keenly spread by the enemy, namely that it had been the Imre Nagy group which had perceived and revealed the party’s mistakes in June 1953, was entirely mendacious. It is very important to emphasize this, because the Imre Nagy group had nothing whatever to do with revealing the mistakes.

As far as the implementation of the resolution was concerned, it had two basic faults. The first was that Imre Nagy was given an enormous part in the correction of the mistakes. As it later turned out, Imre Nagy was entirely unfit for this role, because he set as his aim not the restoration and increase of the party’s prestige, not the restoration and increase of the prestige of the people’s power, but exactly the opposite, the further weakening of the prestige of the party and the people’s power. This became apparent from the first—and it must be admitted, unfortunate—step, when it was not the party’s Central Committee that turned to the party membership and the people of the country with the mistakes revealed by the party and the necessary measures for their correction, as had until then been the correct practice in the life of the party, but it was Imre Nagy, then appointed Prime Minister, who criti-



cized the party's mistakes in the National Assembly on behalf of the state, not saying a word about the merits of the party, nor about the fact that these very mistakes had been revealed by the party. This initial act was—I repeat—itsself unfortunate, and brought the later troubles in its wake.

The second obstacle to the effective use of the correct analysis was—and this, too, must be admitted—that certain comrades, headed by Comrade Rákosi, were entirely incapable of breaking, or did not want to break, with their old mistakes in good time and to the necessary extent. A situation, therefore, arose when on the one hand Imre Nagy and his political friends followed entirely different political aims than the rapid, correct and courageous correction of the mistakes revealed in 1953, and on the other hand Comrade Rákosi and a few other comrades were reluctant to face up to their own mistakes. All this made it impossible for us to mobilize the forces of the party to rectify the mistakes in the work of the party and the work of the state. As a consequence of this, zigzags and extreme oscillations appeared in the party's political line between June 1953 and July 1956.

These extreme oscillations had an immeasurably destructive effect. The success of the work is naturally decided first of all by whether the political line is correct or not. But such extreme oscillations, even in the event of a sound political line, cause immeasurable damage among the masses. This is not difficult to understand. We know very well that the Central Committee of our party, and generally the party itself, enjoyed enormous prestige and great confidence among the membership of the party and the country's public opinion up to June 1953. When it became known that there were not only achievements but also mistakes in the party's work, this undoubtedly involved a certain shock to public opinion. But if the party and the public opinion of the country had seen that the party was possessed of such great political and moral strength as to make it capable of revealing the mistakes itself and working out the methods necessary for correcting them, then it would have been possible to continue working even with a slightly reduced measure of confidence, but nevertheless preserving the basis of that confidence. For as results would have become apparent in the wake of the correction of the mistakes, so confidence would have grown, and ultimately the prestige of the Central Committee would undoubtedly have increased in the eyes of the party membership, and the prestige of the party would have strengthened in the eyes of the

non-party masses as compared to the past. The confidence which the masses kept even after the mistakes were revealed in 1953, meant that people agreed with the appraisal of the Central Committee, and went about correcting the earlier mistakes in their own sphere of work in accordance with the new general line. Meanwhile the slips that are to be expected at such times also occurred: some carried the new line of the party to extremes, and thus committed mistakes. Still, the general situation was that the people—the party members and also the non-party masses—accepted the new general line and sought to work accordingly. When, however, they had reached a certain stage in this development—they were suddenly informed that the party's political line had not been correct after all, and that in essence a return would have to be made to the previous road. This was by now the second shock. They had hardly understood and begun to carry out the new resolution when it turned out that the party's political line was again not correct. This had an incalculably destructive effect! It is obvious that certain mistakes in planning, in violations of the law, and in peasant policies, which were revealed in 1953, had caused very great damage to the party, the country and the people. But I think I can say that ten times as much harm was caused by what happened in connection with the correction of the mistakes than by the original mistakes. Because the party membership and the people of the country have always understood that work goes hand in hand with mistakes, sometimes serious mistakes, but they will never understand and they will never forgive the leadership for repeating the recognized, denounced mistakes, known and seen by all the world. This wipes out the prestige of the party leadership, the prestige of the country's leadership, and that is why I say that even greater harm was done to the relationship between the party and the masses by the vacillation that went on for three years around the correction of the mistakes, than by the mistakes actually revealed in 1953.

In consequence of this, there was naturally a deep and justified bitterness in a large part of the membership of the party and the working people of the country by the spring of 1956. The delays attending the correction of the mistakes, and the justified bitterness felt over this by the masses, which had greatly increased during the three years, were exploited in a grand and masterly fashion by the class enemy at home and by international imperialism. It was under such circumstances that the July 1956 resolution of the Central Committee came to be passed.

This resolution of the Central Committee could have been a turning point in the life of the party and the whole country. This resolution was good. The July resolution of the Central Committee—and its correct evaluation is also a very important question in our present struggle—established every political condition for us to correct and eliminate the shortcomings and mistakes apparent in the life of the party, the country, and the popular masses, in a normal manner. The resolution is known to you, comrades, we need not go into its details here. But it is necessary to point out the fact that not only the Central Committee, which had drafted it, evaluated this resolution in a positive manner, but also the masses of the party membership and the masses of the non-party workers. Just recall, comrades, the mass rallies and meetings over the July resolutions. I believe everyone present remembers exactly what happened. I, for example, was then sent to Nógrád County by the Central Committee. I remember that on the main square of Salgótarján, 18,000 working people came together, communists and non-communists. Every mistake was mentioned which had occurred earlier in the practice of the party, but it was also pointed out that the July resolution of the Central Committee had established the conditions for the correction of the mistakes in a normal manner. I can tell you, comrades, that the masses welcomed the July resolution with relief and cheers. Mass meetings were held over a period of about three weeks. The masses became acquainted with the resolution, and expressed their intention and preparedness to support the implementation of the July resolution, with all their strength. This was the political situation in the first half of last August. The enemy was to some extent confused. Perhaps you may remember that after the July meeting of the Central Committee for the first time in three years there were neither schemes, nor rumours, nor were new demands connected with Imre Nagy, or of any other nature, made for some two or three weeks. The enemy were confused. Obviously they too assessed the situation and understood that it would be a serious political blow for them if the party worked tenaciously, say, for a year according to the line of the July resolution of the Central Committee, and if during this time it corrected the mistakes and the prestige of the party and the people's power was thus strengthened. The enemy then understood that in this event they would have very little to seek in Hungary. That was why they assembled their forces for the attack, for an assault, in order to prevent the party and the people of the country from remedying the mistakes in a normal

manner, and of course safeguarding and further developing the positive achievements. It was for this very reason that they struck, because they understood that if the July resolution of the Central Committee was carried out, if it was realized from month to month, then the party's prestige would not decline any further, the bitterness of the workers would not increase, but instead the process would be reversed and then the enemy would lose the ground from under their feet.

This is a very important political question from the standpoint of evaluating the revisionists. The American imperialists, or the Horthy fascists, made no big secret of the fact that they wanted to kill, to destroy the Hungarian People's Republic. But the Imre Nagy revisionists claimed that they only wanted to work at correcting the mistakes. If this had been true, then how could it have been that instead of supporting the July resolution of the Central Committee, they simply stepped over into the enemy's camp and helped to precipitate an armed counter-revolutionary uprising against the Hungarian People's Republic and the party? This is a rather important point.

We must also speak of the period between October 23rd and November 4th. This was a critical time for the party and also the people's power, a period replete with retreats and defeats. The party was attacked by the imperialists, the Horthy fascists, the right-wing leaders of the resurrected bourgeois parties, the right-wing social democrats and, unfortunately, together with them in the attack against the party and the people's power were the confused young people—students and non-students—and those misguided working people who did not know that they were supporting the cause of the counter-revolution, but who with their actions were in reality supporting the counter-revolution. A great force gathered against the party and the people's power. But the Central Committee is of the opinion that this force could not have gained the upper hand over the party and the people's power if betrayal had not taken place in the party's leadership. It was in consequence of this betrayal—the treasonable conduct of Imre Nagy, Losonczy, Donáth, and the others—that we were placed into a position where, while our fort was besieged from the outside, they connived with the besiegers from within, and in the end opened the gate to them.

During the night before October 24th, Imre Nagy occupied the Prime Minister's chair, and Donáth and Losonczy joined the Central Committee, on the basis of the Central Committee's resolution.



What is it that needs to be weighed in connection with this decision? First of all the following: the Central Committee, when it made this decision, knew that Imre Nagy, Losonczy and the rest were people burdened with various faults. But despite these known faults—some less serious, others very serious—the Central Committee, when making this decision, assumed that they were nevertheless communists, who had committed grave mistakes, but would now help to overcome the trouble which they had partly themselves brought upon the party and the Hungarian people. This was what motivated the Central Committee, and it is important to know this. That the Imre Nagy group had gone over to the enemy's camp could only be perceived step by step in the course of events.

On the night before October 24th the Central Committee had a programme of struggle. Had we adhered to this programme of struggle the counter-revolutionary uprising could not have developed to such an extent, and caused such damage. What was this programme of struggle of the Central Committee? It was decided that anyone who attacks the institutions of the Hungarian state with arms was a counter-revolutionary and must be destroyed by arms. The forces must be rallied, the army, the state security troops and every available force must be mobilized, and the workers must be armed. We must turn to the Soviet Union so that if need be—because it was evident that it was a counter-revolution initiated not only from within—we could also request the military aid of the Soviet Union. This was the resolution of the Central Committee on the night before October 24th, when they discussed these questions. At this Central Committee meeting, where we worked out the programme of struggle, Imre Nagy was also present. Imre Nagy agreed with this programme.

Following the meeting of the Central Committee, at the meeting of the Political Bureau, where all these aims—among others that the Hungarian government must write an official letter to the Soviet government, because until then the Soviet government was not in a position to extend military aid, furthermore, that the Ministry of Defence must be instructed to put arms at the disposal of the party committees, and the rest—were concretely worked out, Imre Nagy was present. He repeatedly spoke, and categorically declared that the counter-revolutionaries should be crushed, that martial law was needed, that we must turn to the Soviet Union, and so on. Thus Imre Nagy and his group acted as though they agreed with the party's programme of struggle, with the help of which

the counter-revolutionary uprising must be crushed. This is a very important fact. Later on it became clear that this was not the case, but that the Imre Nagy group had gone over to the enemy's camp.

It is very important to understand the methods used by the Imre Nagy group. The method they used was to link external pressure with action within the leading bodies. Apart from this they also employed certain secret factional methods. They put forward various demands in the Central Committee and in the Political Bureau. As a rule what happened was that the Central Committee and the Political Bureau rejected these demands when they were first raised. They then organized various deputations and brought the demands of the representatives of the armed groups, the demands of the Writers' Association, the demands of the Journalists' Association, and other existent and non-existent organizations to the party's leading organs and the government, and by combining this external and internal pressure, forced through the acceptance of their own platform.

What were their demands?

After calling the attack against the People's Republic counter-revolutionary when they came into the leadership, and declaring themselves ready to carry out all the necessary measures stemming from this, as soon as they were inside the organs of the Central Committee and the government, they started the struggle first of all in order to have the party qualify this uprising as a "national revolution" or some kind of popular democratic movement. They fought tenaciously for this demand until they succeeded in putting it through. I have mentioned that in addition to their stand within and their external pressure, they also employed certain secret factional methods. To illustrate them I must mention the two articles in *Szabad Nép* which at the time dealt such a terrible moral blow to our forces defending the People's Republic: to the party, the army, the state security forces and everybody. At the meeting of the Central Committee on October 26th, they raised the demand that we should call this whole movement a national democratic movement. The Central Committee did not accept this. Well, at that time there was no way of knowing, but now we know what happened after the meeting of the Central Committee. With the help of their political friends in the editorial offices of *Szabad Nép* they had an article written which was contradictory to the resolution of the Central Committee. On October 28th, they had an article written which, in contradiction to the Central Committee's resolution, called

the counter-revolution a national liberation struggle. It was as the result of such secret connivance that that certain article, which morally we might say almost completely destroyed the defence of the People's Republic, got into the October 28th issue of *Szabad Nép*. This article did not reflect the resolution of the Central Committee. After the publication of the article, the Central Committee was not in a particularly easy situation. Should they demonstrate to the whole wide world that the official paper of the Central Committee represented an opposing platform? On more than one question and on more than one occasion the party's leading organs were in a similar position.

Among other issues this was how the Imre Nagy group fought to have the counter-revolutionary uprising qualified as a national revolution.

Naturally they fought on other issues too, thus in preventing the destruction of the armed rebels. It is common knowledge that there was a military plan available to destroy the counter-revolutionary gang that had lodged itself in Corvin Passage. I believe the attack was scheduled to take place at 5 o'clock in the morning. At half past four Imre Nagy phoned Comrade Apró—he was in the Ministry of Defence on behalf of the Central Committee—and informed him that if they began the attack at five, he would resign. This, then, was the way they fought—with political blackmail from within, and external pressure and factional methods of conspiracy. It was in a similar way that they demanded and pushed through the declaration of a cease-fire and the disbandment of the State Security Authority. This was in essence what happened over reviving the bourgeois parties as well. This was not a new question, not an October issue, Imre Nagy had had such an idea in mind months before. He had already declared here and there that in his opinion this was the road the Hungarian People's Republic would have to take. They fought in a similar manner for the declaration of neutrality and for withdrawal from the Warsaw Treaty. They applied a similar method in bringing about the party resolution for the formation of the H.S.W.P., which in reality meant the liquidation of the H.W.P.P. (Hungarian Working People's Party), amidst circumstances when it was naturally impossible to engage in the organization of a new party. Finally, they crowned their various demands with their act on the dawn of November 4th, when Imre Nagy personally and Gyula Háy and others appealed to our enemies over the radio, before the whole world, to fight against the Soviet troops, shouted for imperialist aid against the Soviet troops—the same people doing this who, on the night before October 24th, had

voted together with us to request the assistance of the Soviet Union and Soviet troops, and had declared that this was unavoidably necessary. It was thus, under such circumstances that the situation characterizing the period between October 23rd and November 4th came about.

For us it is also very important to estimate how the forces of the bourgeois counter-revolution and the socialist revolution compared in what I might call size in this period between October 23rd and November 4th. I believe it is not difficult to prove that in Hungary even between October 23rd and November 4th, the forces of the socialist revolution were considerably greater and more significant than the forces of the bourgeois counter-revolution. Only, these two forces were not in the same condition. The forces of the socialist revolution, in consequence of the treachery in the leadership, were in a state of disorganization and disintegration, they were not mobilizable, they could not take action. The forces of the bourgeois counter-revolution were organized and were exceptionally active; they had leadership and their people were also present within the organs for the defence of the People's Republic. It was this, then, that brought about a situation where the greater force was placed at a disadvantage compared with the lesser force. Naturally, the forces loyal to the socialist revolution also fought with various means, at various places—at political forums with political means, on the battlefield with arms. However, they fought disorganized, scattered, without proper support, and for this reason, without the necessary effectiveness. It is also generally known that the party's forces: party workers, rank-and-file party members fought their own battles in the capital, in the countryside and out on the farmsteads. Members of the state security forces also fought. Significant units of the army fought, there was a whole division that fought against the counter-revolution; detachments of police fought, and also people who managed somehow to obtain weapons of some sort. But this force was scattered, and could not act with the necessary effectiveness, it could not annihilate the enemy. This can be explained by the fact that traitors had lodged themselves in the leadership of the party and the country, and in the government it was in fact the bourgeoisie that obtained forces in these days. All this paralysed the forces loyal to the socialist revolution.

The question arises what did we do, the people who during this time were in the party's leading organs, or the government? What was our situation, and how did we act? From that hour when the



Imre Nagy group entered partly the Political Bureau and partly the government, the elements loyal to the party found themselves in a minority, in a subordinate position even in the Political Bureau, and to a far greater extent in the government. This was not a matter only of numbers, although numerical strength also changed rapidly. In the party leadership, too, changes of personnel took place quickly and it was simply impossible to keep up with the transformation of the government, so rapid were the changes of personnel, so swiftly did the government slide to the right. But from the first moment there was a certain subordination in our position, because the Imre Nagy group relied not only upon their own strength, their own word, but also on those forces which supported them from the outside, with the help of which they applied pressure on the party. Apart from this, our situation was to a certain extent influenced and worsened by the circumstance that, until it became unavoidably necessary, we did not commit ourselves to the grave decision of showing the whole world in such a situation that there was no unity among the communists within the party's leading organ and within the government. This was a grave and tremendously responsible step under such circumstances. Naturally there was some argument. For example, we argued for about a day and a half over the question of the resolution to liquidate the H.W.P.P. When the proposal was raised—there are four of us here now who were present then as members of the presidium—all four of us spoke up against it. And in the course of the day and a half such changes took place that we began this discussion among six people, here in one of the rooms of Parliament, and in the end finished it with about 35. At the end it was impossible to tell who was a member of the Political Bureau and who was not. Naturally they employed every possible means of external pressure. Comrade György Lukács also badgered us every five minutes, saying that at some university people were assembled and waiting for a telephone call, and if we did not decide on forming a new communist party, then they would decide there without us to form another communist party. And so on. We argued for a day and a half, until we finally acquiesced in the resolution.

There was a similar argument over the questions of neutrality and the Warsaw Treaty. Comrade Dobi has already mentioned this in the National Assembly. On this, too, the debate went on for a whole day. For a whole day we had to fight simply to prevent them from taking a decision under any circumstances—which they would have pushed through with a simple majority vote—until the government

had at least conferred with the Soviet Ambassador in Budapest on this question. And this was the way things went in innumerable instances.

Why am I relating all this here? The decision of our Central Committee is not remedied by the circumstance that on the night before October 24th it could not yet be known that Imre Nagy was no longer a communist, that Imre Nagy had already gone over to the camp of the enemy. Our later decisions are not excused by the circumstances under which they were taken. But I feel it is necessary for the comrades to be familiar with what happened, to see what the actual situation was, in order that they should be able also to understand what happened later. Here, in the leading organs of the party, the government, and in the Presidential Council, too, there were a few people who saw that somehow things were headed not towards saving the People's Republic but towards its destruction. And for this reason the time arrived—when the open white terror began, and they commenced to massacre the communists—when the break could no longer be delayed. Let me add here immediately: would that we had broken with them earlier!

The time of the break, as far as we were concerned, took place on November 1st. On the 1st of November, I broke off relations with the Imre Nagy group, although on the 2nd or the 3rd they still included my name in a government list. They had been trying to track me and to seek out my whereabouts for quite some time. The rest, Comrade Münnich and others, also did what I did. On November 2nd we had already begun, partly indirectly and partly directly, to confer with the Soviet comrades, the leaders of the People's Democracies, and other leaders of the international working-class movement, about the necessity of taking up the struggle against the counter-revolution and about the kind of support they would extend to the Hungarian People's Republic. These talks began on November 2nd, on the 3rd the decision was ready, and in order to avoid any loss of time the attack began on November 4th, because every day was costing the lives of hundreds of brave communists and loyal Hungarian patriots. When we arrived at this decision our aim was to crush the counter-revolution with arms and restore the constitutional order of the People's Republic. We had to avert imperialist interference in the country's internal affairs, because the imperialists' agents were rampaging about and coming and going openly here in Budapest. The British Military Attaché and the rest of them interfered in Hungarian internal affairs; the Budapest Legation of the United States

set up two radio stations to service the uprising, and they were able within minutes to inform Radio Free Europe and the rest of the enemy radios about everything that happened in Budapest—if they needed it for their propaganda. This too had to be countered. And it was self-evident that the party had to be reorganized, because without the party the cause of the People's Republic could not be defended. These were our objectives.

In order to accomplish these, it was necessary to organize a new party leadership from which, obviously, the Imre Nagy traitors were excluded. It was necessary to establish a new government from which the Imre Nagy traitors were also excluded. The reason why this has to be discussed here again is so we can tell you, what you know anyway, that the setting up of that party leadership did not take place exactly according to the rules of the Congress. The party rules are a great and sacred thing, comrades, but I believe that the party rules exist in order to defend the cause of the socialist revolution. And it is up to you to judge that if in those hours we did not have any party rules, and we nevertheless organized this party leadership, whether this was right or not? The reason why we are not raising here the correctness of forming a government as a separate question is that, as the final act in restoring the lawful order of the country, we submitted this question to the National Assembly and there the representatives of the Hungarian people endorsed it without a single dissenting vote. The establishment of our party leadership and the new government naturally meant only the beginning of the work. It was also part of our political line that we would turn to the Hungarian working class and the masses of the Hungarian working people who were loyal to socialism, and would request proletarian internationalist aid from the Soviet Union, the socialist camp, and the rest of the fraternal communist and workers' parties. Because it was part of our principles and stemmed from our aims that we would have to fight for the people's power together with the people, and that we would have to take up the struggle against international imperialism with the strength of international proletarian solidarity.

I should like briefly to speak of the group which worked in the leadership of the party and the government in this period, and the circumstances under which it performed its work. We want no misunderstanding, we are under no illusion that everything we did was perfect, that there were no mistakes made. We who work here in the leadership know best where we erred, where we acted too late, where we had to improve, and so on, and if I refer to the circumstances

under which we worked, I do this for a different reason. In recent times, since conditions have been generally consolidated and the party's life is beginning to return to its normal course, we have struck upon many severe critics. They find that, for example, in November one of the decrees was not correct, or that in December there was a bad article in *Népszabadság*, and so on. They point out, among other things, existing questions that really require solution, but have not yet been solved. But, comrades, do not forget the following: how did we gather our forces? I shall tell you. We gathered our forces from among those who were at hand. Whoever was alive and was there, was asked: come on, comrade, let's get to work. And on November 11th we held the first meeting of our Central Committee, where all the 23 then existing members of the Central Committee appeared. And at this Central Committee meeting, as far as I can recollect, four comrades—presumably in full good faith—proposed the following: let us begin negotiations with the Imre Nagy group at the Yugoslav Legation, and agree with them because our base is narrow. The idea was even posed that Imre Nagy ought to be permitted to form an independent peasant party, and there would thus be two parties in the country, the H.S.W.P. and some kind of a Nagy peasant party.

Let me give still another example to illustrate how things went. We suggested in February that there was need for a communist youth league. It was we, the older generation, who raised this. We knew that in the situation prevailing then we would have to wage a sharp struggle among the youth in order to establish a Young Communist League. But we set out from the consideration that for us it would be better if there was a Young Communist League with a greater or fewer number of members—but we could be sure that they agreed with communist principles—than if we had only the kind of youth organization—university, secondary school, and peasant youth associations—which may well organize all the young people among their membership, but nobody would know whether that organization was led by the bourgeoisie or the proletariat, whether it was a supporter of the socialist revolution or of the counter-revolutionary uprising. When we brought this up, the five or six leading comrades working among the youth were split almost evenly in their opinion. There were misgivings that it might frighten the young people away from us even more if we set up a Young Communist League.

I mention these questions, comrades, because we have need of the confidence and support of the Party Conference. Let the comrades tell us what we did not do well, so that we shall do it better, or that



we shall know what needs to be corrected. But it would be necessary and desirable if we gained confirmation in whether the general line we are following is correct or not, whether we replied correctly, for example, on November 11th when we told the comrades that we were not stopping to bargain with the enemy, that we were not going to negotiate with traitors and that it would be for that very reason that the masses would support us. As far as the youth league is concerned, I believe life has verified us. Those young comrades too have been reassured who then had misgivings, and they see that it has indeed been justified "to intimidate" youth with the Young Communist League, and as a matter of fact, they aren't even so scared of it.

To this group of questions belongs the fact—and this too is a very important question—that we did not include in the leadership those comrades from among the old leaders, who were known by the public and by us as persons who had had a share in the dogmatic and sectarian mistakes. As persons we regard all of them as honest people and communists, some of whom can rid themselves of the old faults quickly, and others less quickly. Our position was that now there should not be any people or groups in the leadership of our party who or which are burdened by the old mistakes, and that we should not be exposed to the danger of being pushed now to the right and then to the left. It is necessary that you also tell us your opinion on this question, all the more so because recently comrades dissatisfied with various things for various reasons have been accusing the present leadership—not openly of course, at sessions and meetings, but in comradely conversation—of keeping the old leaders out, and according to them this is not to the advantage of the party. We are convinced that this is good for the party the way it is now, and this is also good because—and I dare to claim this with assurance—the people at present working in the party leadership are the kind who did not seek to obtain office. They are comrades who, heeding their conscience, have set about the job in hand because they felt that if they once became communists, then now was the time to show that that is what they really are. We did not accept posts as a favour, but considered it our duty as communists to take up our office. What I wish to say by this is that if the day comes when we are told in the party, "You are not doing good work, it would be more useful for you to step aside," well, we shall not cling to our positions. It is well that the comrades should know this. Those who are in the leadership today have no lust for power, and it was not for any reasons of power that we omitted certain persons when we reorganized the work, but

because it was a question of the interests of the cause. And if the comrades agree with this, then the party must be led like this in the future too.

Comrades:

When we expect this Party Conference to confirm and approve the political line of the Central Committee, we must refer to the fact that this line is not one of theoretical conceptions, but a political line realized in practice amidst difficult circumstances, whose correctness and weakness it is possible to weigh and to judge. That is why I must speak briefly of our results.

As far as the results are concerned, the decisive thing is that the forces of the counter-revolution were partly wiped out in the armed struggle, have partly been rendered harmless and are in the hands of the judicial authorities, have partly been driven out of the country, and finally, some of them have been driven underground. But a fact is a fact: the counter-revolution has no power in Hungary today. This is fundamental. The forces of the state, the organs of the people's power, the National Assembly, the councils, the administrative bodies, the ministries, the organs that control industry and trade, the armed forces, the army, and the internal authorities have been reorganized, or—for example in the army—the organization is proceeding according to a development plan. We must not forget that those comrades—be they former members of the State Security Authority, soldiers of the army, policemen, or so-called civilian communists—who, in the party's struggle against the counter-revolution, rallied in units of the emergency security forces and defended the Hungarian people's power with arms, have honourable and great merits. In the same way, it must also be stated that the Workers' Militia is a very important factor of the present public security and order, and of the state's armed forces. We believe that the organization of the Workers' Militia was also a correct initiative. The comrades assembled in the Workers' Militia have voluntarily undertaken to safeguard our socialist achievements with arms too, and the Workers' Militia constitutes a part, with full and equal rights, of the armed forces of the Hungarian People's Republic, which at present consist of the army, the armed forces of the Ministry of the Interior, and the Workers' Militia.

At the same time there are results in the restoration of production. Fundamentally, the Hungarian national economy has been restored—although it is not devoid of certain mistakes, of which we shall speak. We have safeguarded our socialist industry and trade, and the socialist sector of our agriculture fundamentally exists, and is developing,

even if the cooperative farms are not developing steadily and perfectly. And it should be specially mentioned that the cooperative farms have also successfully withstood the storm of the counter-revolution, under circumstances when there was no compulsion for them to stay together, and in fact only the counter-revolution applied pressure on them—in the other direction. They stood their ground at a time like that, and among those that were disbanded more than 1,100 have reorganized under circumstances like these. And the central organs were not even able to extend them the aid to which the cooperative farms were rightfully entitled, from the state and party organs.

Among the results also is the fact that in the life of the country the institutions of culture, public education and science, and other organs, have also been restored. The Viennese newspaper *Der Abend* wrote in its article of October 31st that "by the time the sun sets it may well be that the Hungarian People's Republic no longer exists." Well, we can say now, at any rate, that since then the sun has set and also risen many times and the Hungarian People's Republic is here, it exists and has been steeled in the storm of the counter-revolutionary attack, in fact in certain respects it is even stronger than in the period directly preceding the attack. And if we work well, it will be stronger still, and then they will never be able to organize this kind of counter-revolutionary attack against our people's power again.

Naturally, the reorganization of the party, the main fighting weapon of the Hungarian working class and the Hungarian people, must be mentioned among the results. As you know, on June 1st our party had some 346,000 members. Of the 346,000 members about 57 per cent are working-class party members, about 30 per cent of the total party membership are workers engaged in production, and 16.7 per cent are members of the peasantry. The party's social composition may, therefore, be said to be good. The Young Communist League, whose organization was begun only three months ago, numbered somewhat more than 110,000 members on June 15th. If we look at the reorganization of the party and the party's youth organization, then here too we must recall what the so-called Radio Free Europe sarcastically asked in one of its broadcasts of November 1st: "Where is the party?" Well, we are able to give an answer to Radio Free Europe, the reactionaries at home and international imperialism, to this question posed on November 1st. We can tell them that the party is here. The revolutionary party of the Hungarian working

class lives and is fulfilling its functions, it is leading the working class, leading the people, defending the People's Republic and guiding the great and fine work of building a socialist society.

Before closing this series of questions, in which we have talked of the road we have travelled, we must state that we owe the results to the following:

1. The party's consistent Marxist-Leninist line, and the fact that the party leads the non-party masses;
2. the support of the working class and the working masses;
3. the internationalist support of the Soviet Union, the socialist camp and the international working-class movement.

With this, comrades, I have concluded the part of my report with which I have attempted to justify the political line of the Central Committee. I request the comrades who will speak to state their opinions of this political line. Let them also confirm this political line by supplementing it with features which may be lacking from this political line and also by approving it. Let them say whether they agree with this line, and whether they are prepared to support it.

#### The Present Position and Tasks of the Party

Comrades:

In the party's present position there are favourable and unfavourable factors from the point of view of our further work. The forces of the counter-revolution have been shattered, but they have not been completely wiped out. The bourgeoisie who live here, their lackeys, and the forces of international imperialist reaction, have suffered a defeat, but they have not abandoned their aims, and as far as international imperialism is concerned, it is in possession of its forces. In our country the cause of the socialist revolution has triumphed, the enemy is in retreat, the people, the working class and the party are advancing. This is the favourable feature of the situation. But this victory must be made secure because among the unfavourable features of our situation is the fact that significant forces of the enemy still exist, the imperialists commit provocations and launch attacks. It should be enough to enumerate only the names: the Egyptian question, Algeria, Jordan, and South Korea where they have now violated the cease-fire agreement, and numerous other areas where imperialism is carrying out provocations. At present,



here at home the counter-revolutionaries are regrouping their ranks, organizing their forces, and they are fighting against our system with the methods they employed in earlier years. Among these are the spreading of rumours, the seeking of cracks in the party's unity; they are again beginning to classify the party's functionaries: who belongs to which wing, who relies on whom; they are spreading the rumour that there is a struggle among the communists, that there is disunity—in other words, they have resorted to the methods known for many years. Their subversive activities naturally include the different kinds of sabotage—thus the preparation of various kinds of economic sabotage—and provocations, and other methods. Imperialism is also carrying on intelligence and subversive activities in our country, is placing Hungary under diplomatic and propaganda pressure. It should suffice to allude to the so-called Committee of Five of the United Nations, the clamour raised around its report, and so on. The imperialists have espoused the traitors, they are supporting them, providing them with money, placing organizations and radio stations at their disposal, and they are endeavouring to give them a voice in the U.N. and other similar forums. Thus, there are also such unfavourable factors in our present position. The state has become stronger, but it is not yet strong enough. Because of the shock caused by the counter-revolutionary attack, the *putsch*, there is a certain laxness in the forces of the state, even in the armed forces, and we have not yet eliminated this laxness. Discipline, state discipline taken in the broader sense—thus labour and tax-paying discipline, etc.—is not firm enough. We still have to work a great deal in order to achieve proper order in every sphere.

To a certain extent the foregoing can also be said about the party. We can say with assurance that the party is united and active. But at the same time the shock did not pass over the party without leaving a trace, and there is still much to be desired as far as a certain basic order and discipline in party life are concerned. At the same time—and I recommend this as a very important question to the attention of the Party Conference—complacency is making its appearance in the party, and among the masses loyal to the socialist revolution, too. At present this is the foremost danger, because this complacency brings with it a dulling of vigilance towards the enemy, and the striving to win the support of the masses declines. The fact that the basic order of the state has been restored, that our own forces are coming forward, gives rise to an illusion in the ranks of the party membership, and among our party functionaries, but even

among the non-party masses who sympathize with us, as though the counter-revolutionary attack had taken place not just seven or eight months ago, but seven or eight years ago. So that the foremost requirement now is to overcome this complacency.

It must also be mentioned that there is a certain forgetfulness with regard to the mistakes of the past. With regard both to the mistakes of the party generally, and also separately to the faults of each individual comrade. Comrades, we must consider these things carefully. In the past months signs of a certain amount of inner dissension have also begun to appear among the comrades: discord which did not appear on a basis of principles, which did not mean the criticism of certain persons on the basis of principles, but which could simply be called bickering and arguing. A few days ago, at a meeting of the Central Committee, Comrade Cservenka related an interesting episode. She was an eyewitness to a street fight between children of about ten or twelve years old. A grown-up came by and said to the children jokingly: "Come children, don't quarrel, at least let us non-party people stick together!" Comrades, this remark bears the people's criticism with regard to the present, improper conduct of a part of the communists. Another case was that of an engineer from Nógrád County who travelled to Budapest, to the party headquarters, spoke with the comrades and said that, although he had never been a party member and was not one today, he believed that what he now saw of the wrangling among the communists, was harmful from the point of view of the country's interests. These observations are important warnings to us.

Forgetfulness with respect to the mistakes of the past is helped by our present peculiar position. The situation today, comrades, is such that people with superficial thinking—whatever mistakes they may have committed—can easily say that they were always right. What am I thinking of here? Let us say that there are comrades who earlier were up to their necks in certain dogmatic or sectarian mistakes. If these comrades think superficially, they may say without any further ado: "See, we were right, because we always said that this Imre Nagy group would ruin the party." This, by itself, is true, but they forget all about their own mistakes, and this is not good. Then again, other comrades who were a little, or perhaps largely responsible—although not criminals—in revisionism, in compromising with the class enemy, may also say things like these: "See, we told you where the old, dogmatic, sectarian leadership would land the party and the country!" In other words, our position provides an

opportunity for unscrupulous people to forget and deny their former mistakes. Individual people may do this—although naturally not even they can be allowed to retain these views, they must be criticized in a comradely manner and sobered up—but the party cannot do this! And I believe that at present it is the duty of the party membership, and even more of the functionaries, to keep those horrible days before their eyes now and for a very long time to come, and not forget what the party and the people lived through between October 23rd and November 4th!

Let them not forget those lessons flowing from revisionism, from compromise and from class betrayal, nor those mistakes which stem from a sectarian policy and from breaking away from the masses. Of course, comrades, in this unprincipled argument that manifests itself in personal intrigue, there is also a bit of the attitude of sharing in the results and the glory. We recommend to the party membership that they should rejoice at the results, but not forget that we have achieved them not only by our own strength, but also with the help of the international proletariat. To be sharing in the glory is a bit premature. I do not know whether one, two or three years from now it will be seemly, or proper for us communists to be sharing with each other in the glory, but at present—I repeat—this is still far too early.

Therefore, when we examine our tasks, there is very great need for us to do away with complacency, realistically to assess the results, and to judge every single question from the fundamental standpoint that the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat is important above all else. We must deal with all problems in this manner. Our primary task is to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat, the workers' and peasants' state. This requires the absolute enforcement of the general principle that in our country the working people shall share in rights, freedom and democracy, and that there shall be no freedom for the enemies of the people. This is the foremost principle of the strengthening of our power in this period, a principle which must be absolutely enforced. It is particularly important for us that we strengthen the most important political basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat: the alliance of the workers and the peasants.

I should like briefly, in principle, and looking back into the past, to deal with the workers' and peasants' alliance. In our country, this alliance has always existed as a considerable political force ever since the formation of the party. The immediate object of this alliance,

its framework, to whom and to what strata of the population it extends—varies, because it always depends on the situation.

In 1919, the working class, in alliance with the poor peasantry, and fighting against the village bourgeoisie, the kulaks, accomplished the dictatorship of the proletariat. Under the Horthy regime, the party's struggle had other immediate aims, and the realization of a more broadly interpreted workers' and peasants' alliance was the task. At the time of the Horthy regime the immediate aim of the workers' and peasants' alliance was the realization of democratic demands, not, therefore, the realization of working-class power. For this reason the workers' and peasants' alliance embraced a great part of the peasantry; in the period of the Second World War our endeavour was that the working class should also be in alliance with the village bourgeoisie, the kulaks, alongside the poor and the middle peasantry—for example in the struggle against the German occupiers, and in the question of the fundamental democratic reforms. After the Liberation, in 1945—as we know—the party's policy aimed at having the workers' and peasants' alliance rally the poor peasantry and the middle peasantry, and neutralize the kulaks. Let us just recall the aims of our land reform, when we designated the lower limit of expropriation at 200 *hold*. This meant that we did not wish to wage the struggle for the land reform against the kulaks, but in alliance with the poor peasantry and the middle peasantry, while neutralizing the kulaks. This was the situation when we carried out the land reform. Afterwards—you may recall—we could advance together with the middle peasantry, we neutralized the kulaks, in fact, to a certain extent they stood by us, when it was only a question of nationalizing the key industries or the three largest factories and the mines. Later, when our efforts became completely socialist in character, that is, the nationalization of industry and the socialist reorganization of agriculture became the aim, then this class alliance naturally also altered in extent, and the party's principal base was the poor peasantry, while at the same time the party strove to form an alliance with the middle peasantry and fought against the kulaks. Here the realization of a socialist society was on the agenda, with which the kulaks—as a bourgeois category—naturally did not agree, but fought against. Here I am only raising the theoretical side of the question, because this is what we must see, and not to what extent we succeeded in carrying it out. At present, the strengthening of the workers' and peasants' alliance means that the working class, together with the poor peasant and the middle peasant sections of the peasantry,



particularly in alliance with the cooperative farm peasantry, is fighting to accomplish a socialist society. Thus, a struggle of principle must be pursued against those incorrect, revisionist views which precisely the Imre Nagy group introduced into the question of this alliance in recent years. They lost sight of the class approach to the workers' and peasants' alliance, and this made its appearance in the well-known mistakes.

Let us see how this alliance developed. I think the workers' and peasants' alliance grew stronger in the years 1945 to 1949 amid the struggle to achieve the land reform and the establishment of socialist industry, it was strengthened in the period when these achievements had to be defended, for example in 1946 when the distributed land had to be defended, right up to the time of the seizure of power. Afterwards there appeared a loosening in this alliance, too, and for two reasons. On the one hand because of the incorrect methods employed in the socialist transformation of the village (I am thinking of violence, pressure, and similar methods), and on the other hand because of the mistakes of the system of produce collection. Not because of the fact itself that we introduced the system of produce collection, but because of the mistakes in the system of produce collection. For the price system, and the enforcement of the produce collection system, generally were such that in the end they became untenable and caused a serious weakening of the workers' and peasants' alliance. Certain mistakes which appeared in the sphere of violations of the rule of law also played a role in this.

And finally how does the situation stand at present? At present the workers' and peasants' alliance has actually grown stronger as a consequence of the October counter-revolutionary uprising, moreover it has obtained very favourable conditions for continuing to increase in strength in the years immediately ahead. Those mistakes which had existed earlier—forcible methods in the cooperative farm movement, the mistakes of the produce collection system, the violations of the rule of law—have been eliminated, have ceased; and those factors which appeared in the common defence of the fundamental achievements in the period of the counter-revolutionary attack, have begun to make their effects felt. It is also an important circumstance that in the countryside the counter-revolutionary attack made its appearance in a manner that could in some respects be more quickly recognized by the masses than in the towns or in Budapest. In Budapest, the fact that people like Losonczy appeared on the scene confused considerable masses, and was an obstacle to recognizing

that it was a question of a counter-revolutionary attack. In the villages, the counter-revolution immediately made its appearance in a cruder and less disguised manner, because surely when the former chief magistrate of the rural district shows up, or the former gendarme dons his cock-feathered hat which he has hidden for twelve years, every peasant understands that it is not a question of some kind of reform of socialism, but of the reappearance of the old Horthyite feudal-capitalist world. The peasantry sees and appreciates the measures which the party has taken, partly for the correction of the mistakes but even more for the protection of the fundamental achievements, and the great majority approves these measures. For this reason they have grown closer to the working class led by the party than in the period preceding the counter-revolutionary uprising. If we wish to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat—and this is now the central aim and task of the party—then an indispensable part of this is the strengthening of the workers' and peasants' alliance. The strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat also involves the encouragement of the workers' and peasants' alliance in respect of the fact that although power is in the hands of the working class, it rests on the workers' and peasants' alliance, and the working class draws upon the best forces of the peasantry in exercising power. This is a very important point. This means that although there is a dictatorship of the proletariat, the most progressive and best representatives of the peasantry must be drawn into the organs of state power, state administration and other bodies of our People's Republic. This is partly the case even now, for among the council members, the members of the National Assembly and in other places, for example among the officers of the army, the best elements of the peasantry are present in no small numbers. But in the future, too, we must strive to include the best forces of the working peasantry in exercising power.

The strengthening of the people's power today demands a consistent struggle against the forces of the counter-revolution. As far as the struggle against the counter-revolution is concerned, the primary requirement is vigilance. Vigilance on the part of the party, the working class, and the whole people. Thus it is the task of the party to maintain vigilance with regard to the enemy, and not allow it to relax. The strengthening of the people's power includes direct and concrete struggle against the enemy. But in order to be able to pound away at the enemy steadily and consistently, it is necessary to overcome within the party that which can be an

obstacle to consistent struggle against the enemy. The obstacles within the party to the necessary struggle against the enemy are at present the vestiges of revisionist views, and the vestiges of the policy of compromise with the enemy, which stem from these revisionist views. These may now be found in the party. And it is against these that we must struggle first of all in order to be able to fight successfully in the country against the class enemy in general. As far as the class enemy itself is concerned, I believe that the most suitable thing for us is the thesis of the great humanist proletarian writer Gorky, in which he said quite firmly and plainly that in the class struggle, and in the struggle of the proletariat generally, the enemy must—if he does not lay down his arms—be destroyed. Part of this is that the guilty must be punished. The guilty must naturally be understood to be mainly those elements, who are earmarked by many years of activity as belonging among the enemies of the people. But the enemy to be punished also includes those traitors who went over into the enemy's camp.

Part of the struggle against the enemy is that the elements of the counter-revolution who may not now have committed crimes against the people which are a violation of the law, or cannot have such acts proved against them, but whose attitude, conduct and bearing are such that—given the opportunity—they are always prepared to commit hostile acts against the people—these people must be strictly curtailed. It was this consideration that led us to re-establish the institutions of internment and police surveillance. There is need, moreover, of restrictive measures to repress the counter-revolutionary elements and reaction—measures which have been only partially worked out and which must be made fuller and must be enforced—and these are a general restriction of the bourgeoisie. It will undoubtedly be necessary for us to deprive certain elements of certain rights, to prevent them from holding certain offices, and this must be enforced in the most diverse fields. Thus, the class enemy must be oppressed and restricted. This is dictated to us by the situation. Here very peculiar questions will sometimes arise. For example, experience shows that *déclassé* elements have infiltrated into all the factories, where they have, through all kinds of demagoguery, obtained influence over the more backward sections of the workers.

What can be done here? These *déclassé* elements exist. Nothing more can be done than to restrict them, and, if they have earned it, to punish them. But it is conceivable, and on the basis of our experi-

ences we must put it into practice, that *déclassé* elements should not be allowed to work in certain factories, let us say in factories of military importance for national defence. It is conceivable, for example, that we may, on the basis of the experiences of October, prevent certain categories from working in occupations which are of military significance like, for instance, in lorry driving. Nobody compels us to have former Horthyite staff majors and captains and similar elements as truck drivers, permitting them to engage in black-marketeering or similar manipulations, and then to be recruited at the first given opportunity for an attack against the People's Republic.

Thus, the whole system will have to be thought over. In this connection the question arises: is the situation now worse than it was before? We may reply with assurance to this that the standpoint of the party and the people is entirely justified, because the provocation was not made by the party and the people, but by bourgeois reaction. If they had stayed in their places, and made their peace with the system, then they would not be suffering this restriction, but because they did not stay in their places, did not make their peace with the system, but attacked the system, well, they have themselves to thank if the dictatorship of the proletariat now retaliates.

As far as punishment is concerned, comrades, we must be very careful that our sentences are just. Stern, but just. We must enforce the rule of law in two ways. In the way that anyone who violates the law must suffer punishment, and in the way that whoever observes the law must enjoy the protection of the law. We are not permitting unlawful methods of any kind now, and we must not allow any in the future either. Safeguarding the rule of law means safeguarding the interests of the people, safeguarding the dictatorship of the proletariat. We must be just in punishment as well. Let the sentences be stern but just. It can be said that our judicial authorities are now generally working well. Of course there were all kinds of hitches in the process, because in November even the judges were not too willing to assume solidarity with the government. Generally they believed it would be best not to do anything that would result in the least trouble for them. And, when they got under way with the fits and starts that are customary on such occasions, they even overshot the mark a little, and now they will again somehow have to be guided back onto the proper track. There is no practice now—nor would this be correct—of instructing the judges that so and so must be sentenced to this or that punishment. But the assistance of our severe and principled criticism on the basis of their practice is something



that both the prosecutors and the judges must receive from the party, in order that they should in the future be able to do their work in the right manner.

We have discussed in the Central Committee, too, that the principles to be observed in punishment must include the point that even those who have committed crimes, or are at present participants in a criminal conspiracy, may win pardon from the regime if they report to the authorities and help to liquidate the criminal conspiracy. Why is this necessary, comrades? This derives from our peculiar situation. Of course this is not a question affecting tens of thousands, but a great many people were actually only swept into the counter-revolutionary events. And now they themselves do not know whether what they have committed is covered by the amnesty or not. For this reason counter-revolutionary elements descend upon them, blackmail them and involve them in all kinds of criminal conspiracies. I believe we shall serve the state's interests correctly if we pardon those who, although they took an active part in the counter-revolution, now report voluntarily, help to liquidate the hostile conspiracy, and thus endeavour to atone for their crime.

It is very important in the struggle against the enemy not to treat as enemies those who have erred, for then we ourselves will increase the camp of the enemy. Those who have erred must not be punished, but should be helped to find their way back to the right path. This work requires the strengthening of the state's defence organs. This includes first of all the authorities of the Ministry of the Interior, the Prosecutor's Office, the judicial authorities, secondly the army and other organs. The strengthening of these organs at the present time does not mean primarily a numerical increase—although we must increase the army numerically too—but it means that they must make very thorough use of the experiences at their disposal and improve the quality of their work. They should, moreover, devote very much attention to consolidating state discipline, to the establishment of disciplined order, because there is still laxity in this sphere.

A very important part of the struggle against the enemy is the political isolation of the enemy. The destruction of the armed enemy is easy if they are isolated politically. But it is extremely difficult if they are not isolated politically and possess a certain mass basis. I believe that in the course of the October events the comrades experienced this personally too. A very frequent method of attack by the enemy was that about 50 or 60 counter-revolutionaries, with weapons concealed, would mingle in a crowd of 300 to 500 duped

people to demonstrate and shout, and under the cover of the deluded crowd, would begin an armed battle. If the 50 or 60 men with sub-machine-guns had come by themselves, we could have dealt with them easily. But concealed in the crowd, they were much more difficult to fight against. I only mention this as an example, but this thesis is even more valid in the case of hostile political attacks and provocations. When the enemy are isolated they cannot effectively attack us. And if they attack we can defeat them. But if they are not isolated, if they have something of a basis, the fight against the counter-revolution becomes very difficult. For this reason an important condition for ending the counter-revolutionary danger is the isolation of the counter-revolution politically.

The most important task is the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat through winning the masses.

Comrades, this is an extremely important question, and do not let the appearance of the street cause you to fall victims to an optical illusion. If you will recall, in those dark days appearances often indicated that there was no one in the country other than those who demanded the destruction of the party, the State Security Authority, and the People's Republic, and the removal of the Soviet troops. But in reality the situation was different, because the masses loyal to the socialist revolution were not visible as active masses, owing to the reasons mentioned. Compared to this, the situation has now been radically reversed. Go out now into the streets in the town, or to the main square in the village, either on a holiday or a weekday, or take part in any meeting sponsored by the party, and thousands and thousands will say: "Long live the party, long live the People's Republic, long live Soviet-Hungarian friendship." And the masses say this with conviction. But if at that time the enemy forgot that there are hundreds of thousands of people in Hungary who support the socialist revolution—even if they are not visible—let us not make the same mistake. We must know that the fact that on April 4th or May Day seven, eight or nine hundred thousand people demonstrated in favour of our objectives and principles, does not mean that there are no masses in the country who are still under the ideological and political influence of the enemy. Only today they are not so active and not so visible. This, too, is a warning to us not to become over-confident.

Another mistake, a certain kind of pseudo-radicalism, goes hand in hand with over-confidence. Permit me to say, with no offence meant, that there have been cases where even very decent comrades have

adopted an incorrect position on certain questions. Let us recall the debate over the coat-of-arms. In what position was the government then? Certain earlier regulations had legalized the Kossuth coat-of-arms. At the same time there was an increasing pressure from below, on the part of the masses. They demanded the restoration of the old coat-of-arms of the People's Republic. This was a sound and correct demand, because it proceeded from the fact that the old coat-of-arms of the People's Republic had been liquidated by the counter-revolution, and since we had settled accounts with the counter-revolution we should restore the old coat-of-arms. Let us examine the political effect of this otherwise irreproachable standpoint. We, comrades, have to think about those working strata who, deep in their hearts, are still not convinced that the old coat-of-arms of the People's Republic must be restored. I believe that on this question it was the central organs that adopted the correct position when they proposed a coat-of-arms, which precisely expresses the notion of the People's Republic, and in some respects takes into consideration the opinions of those working people who are now fortunately not demonstrating in the streets, but are nevertheless not convinced that the old coat-of-arms of the People's Republic was right.

The situation is somewhat similar with respect to the name of the party. At all the meetings we attended—and where we did not attend, we know from reports—if a comrade stood up and moved that we should change the name of the party to Hungarian Communist Party, the response was always a unanimous storm of applause. Is this a sin? This, in itself, is not a sin. The intention is clear—they would like to have our party called a communist party. But meanwhile the comrades forget that our party is a revolutionary party of the Hungarian working class which, historically speaking, came into existence only a short time ago by way of the unification of the two working-class parties.

We must not forget about this. If you thoroughly examine the work of reorganizing the party, you will see that it has certain negative features, and that is that the former social democratic comrades, who behaved in an honest manner at the unification, took part in the H. W. P. P. and worked there, have—now, after November 4th, when the reorganization took place—re-entered the party in relatively smaller numbers than those comrades who were in the Communist Party before the unification. Naturally, there are various reasons for this. One of them is, for example, that among the former social democratic

comrades there was a far greater proportion of civil servants, employees, and similar people. The shock affected them more profoundly. Perhaps—I do not know whether this can be said—they were a little more uncertain.

Comrades, all the bourgeois parties organized between October 23rd and November 4th—including also the counter-revolutionary parties—together did not represent such a great danger to the dictatorship of the proletariat as did the Social Democratic Party. Because if they had succeeded in splitting the working class into two, then there could be no people's power in Hungary. And now, when we are pondering over the party's name, let us remember that the party has need of those former social democrats, too, who in 1948 became members of the Hungarian Working People's Party. And we have need of them not merely as party members but politically as well, because it is important that substantially greater non-party masses than the party membership should support the party. This, then, is the situation with regard to the name of the party. We could argue about it. But let us say honestly, is not the essence of the matter that the party's theory, policy and practical activity be communist? This is the essence. What do we gain with another name? We can write up on the gate-post: communist—but this in itself does not bring any results. In fact, it gives rise to illusions. Do we believe that if our party is called the Communist Party, then this will make it imbued throughout with the spirit of communism? At the same time, the name communist may keep away from us workers of social democratic rearing whose political support—whether they be party members or non-party people—is indispensable from the standpoint of the party's struggle. Therefore we need to be very circumspect in our work, because it is only with very realistic thinking that we can increase the strength of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We are struggling and fighting for the masses, the support of the masses in every sphere and in every respect. Part of winning the masses is that within the party a spirit must prevail in which confidence in the masses, and lack of confidence in the enemy, is predominant. Let us, therefore, not be afraid of the masses, let us rely upon them with assurance, let us trust that the masses will understand and support us.

Another equally important question is that the first condition of the struggle to win the masses must likewise be established within the party. How? By overcoming and eliminating the obstacle in the way of the struggle to win the masses. What is this obstacle? The



dogmatic method of thinking and the vestiges of sectarian policy which still exist in the party. Thus within the party we must struggle against this and we must overcome it. Certain comrades employ improper, bad methods as a matter of habit. They call the attention of the district police commissioner or the fire commissioner to something, and they believe that with this they have taken all the necessary measures to realize the objective, and they think that this method is the right one, the real one. This misconception must be knocked out of people's heads. Those who lack confidence in the masses, who isolate themselves from the masses, who do not work to the best of their knowledge to convince and win the masses, cause the greatest harm to the party and consequently to the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot exist without the support of the masses. If we thrash the enemy without the support of the masses, this will evoke pity in the masses. But if we thrash the enemy together with the masses, then he cannot count on any kind of pity, sympathy or mass basis.

We also need a different approach to work in the mass organizations. The old classical Leninist theses about the transmission belt, the relationship between the party and the class, are fully valid for our present conditions too.

If, in the past, it was possible to work in such a way that it was sufficient to mobilize the party—for it alone numbered nearly a million people—and there was no need to do anything about the mass organizations, that was a mistake even then, but now it is simply impossible. Now, if it is a question of some militant objective, the mobilization of the party is the first thing, but the party cannot fight without winning the members of the mass organizations and securing their cooperation. The party has three hundred and fifty thousand members, the trade unions one million nine hundred thousand; thus the great majority of the working class are members of the trade unions but not members of the party. The situation is naturally similar with regard to the Young Communist League, the women's movement and other mass organizations.

Work concerned with the Patriotic People's Front is a special task. With the Patriotic People's Front we are in somewhat the same position as with the workers' and peasants' alliance. There are also very favourable conditions for the development of the Patriotic People's Front. Not only the communists have awakened under the influence of the counter-revolutionary attack, but also the non-party people, and even persons who were reared in other parties. Thus,

there is need for the Patriotic People's Front. When after November 4th we declared—and I believe we did so correctly—that in the present peculiar situation in Hungary a multi-party system cannot be realized, and that instead we shall have to maintain a one-party system of government, we also declared that for this it was necessary to have a very strong and very broad Patriotic People's Front which, amidst the given conditions, is an organic complement of the one-party system of government. Without this it is impossible to work well. For this reason we must now strive to activate the Patriotic People's Front centrally and locally, enlist its aid in permanent tasks and draw into it even more people who in this period honestly stood by the Hungarian People's Republic.

If we want to win the masses, it is also necessary to deepen and develop socialist democracy. This may be done in various spheres. In the factories supervision by the workers, the workers' voice and right of control in the management of the factories must be strengthened in comparison to the past. We shall have to consider this question again. The authority of the trade unions, their voice in the affairs of the workers, must also be increased in comparison to the past. Similarly, the independence, the democratic features of the cooperative farms and cooperative farm groups must also be strengthened. There is need to strengthen and develop the cooperative features and internal democracy of the general agricultural sales and purchasing cooperatives too. There is need for all workers in every sphere of scientific and cultural life—party members and non-party workers—to be able to express their opinions, if possible, before the decisions are taken, or when the party discusses the experiences of carrying out the resolutions. Thus, democracy must be broadened, increased and strengthened.

The task of winning the masses also comprises the correct solution of economic and cultural questions. If the economic and cultural questions are not properly solved, then we cannot speak of winning the masses completely and having them follow us. Why? A considerable part of the working masses are interested primarily not in the general questions of politics, but in the correct solution of the economic and cultural questions influencing their everyday life. They form their opinions of the party and the system not on the basis of political questions, but on the basis of economic or cultural results.

The fundamental principle of our economic policy is: the constant development of the productive forces. This is absolutely necessary not only for upbuilding a socialist society but—something that is

closely linked with this—for the best possible satisfaction of the working people's material and cultural requirements as well. Now it is partly a theoretical, partly an economic, and partly a planning problem to see to it that the general requisites of socialist construction which are valid for every country building socialism, and those special requisites which stem from our country's given conditions, should prevail in the economic policy of the party and of the country. Such general tasks in the course of developing the productive forces are the development of industry, particularly development of heavy industry, and the development of agricultural production. We also have some specific problems which arise from the Hungarian situation. It is not necessary, for example, to develop every branch of heavy industry equally in our country. It is necessary in the years immediately ahead to adjust certain disproportions in heavy industry. Moreover, it is necessary that certain traditional Hungarian branches of industry which consume little material but much labour, should be developed better and faster than other branches of industry. It is also necessary that we solve one of our most important economic problems at present: that we should quickly eliminate the relative backwardness of agricultural production, and there are a few more similar questions, which I do not want to discuss in detail here.

A part of the economic policy of the party moreover—and the masses must be told this, too, clearly and intelligibly—is that Hungary wishes to participate, and must by all means participate, in the economic cooperation among the socialist countries. Under the conditions which have generally developed in international life, when the imperialists and big capitalists are centralizing everywhere in their own sphere, for example, by establishing common European economic markets and similar institutions, the economies of the countries of the socialist camp can only be developed in one way—by coordinating the economic plans of the socialist countries and combine the forces which together represent the national economy of the socialist countries.

According to our standpoint, therefore, cooperation hitherto was in principle not incorrect—on the contrary, it was very correct indeed; the mistake was rather that in practice we did not make adequate use of the possibilities and the advantages of cooperation. Even if at the price of several years' work, we must find the method of coordinating the forces of the socialist countries, and develop a production system which will make it possible to manufacture certain articles in great volume, primarily where the conditions are most favourable.

Problems of the kind, for example, that the socialist countries are manufacturing motor-cars in three or four places, whereas production is economical only in great series, are familiar to everyone. The situation is the same in the manufacture of harvester combines and many other products. Our opinion is that a socialist country, if it becomes isolated from the rest of the socialist countries, can ruin its own economy with its endeavours aimed at self-sufficiency instead of developing it. The capitalists, incidentally, generally exercise economic pressure on the socialist countries, and only occasionally depart from this, as now it seems that they wish to give some kind of aid to the Poles. I believe, however, that such assistance is very dangerous and of doubtful value. The acceptance of such aid is possible in principle, occasionally and under certain conditions, but a socialist country cannot rely to any considerable extent on this.

The National Assembly has debated problems of industrial production and economic questions in general, rather minutely and in detail, so that I believe it is not necessary to go into detail here over everything. The main indices speak quite clearly. The real value of wages has risen by about 15 per cent as compared to last year. Industrial production is now about 94 to 95 per cent of last year's, productivity is still five per cent lower than last year. The tasks arising from these figures are quite clear.

The situation is more complicated in agriculture, particularly because the lag in agricultural production is relatively great, moreover because we do not have a homogeneous social sector to deal with there, but partly a socialist and to a greater extent a non-socialist sector. Therefore, influence is more difficult there, and in addition to direct means there is also need of indirect means. At present the lands are tilled, the weather is generally favourable, and the crop promises to be good. The sowing area of bread grain has declined, however, and the sowing area of maize and other fodder crops has increased. This in itself would not even be such a bad thing. But it is simply not justified, and it would not be correct to arrange things in such a manner that the country's bread, or at least a considerable part of it, should be supplied by imports. The best solution will be to increase the crop yield without increasing the sowing area of bread grain, for which we have great possibilities, because in some places our crop results are 50 per cent lower than, for example, in the German Democratic Republic or the Czechoslovak Republic.

Our foremost task in agriculture is the development of production, moreover in such a way that we should also consistently promote



the socialist transformation of agriculture. For this reason the various concessions granted to the individual peasants and the aid given to increase production generally were correct. But it was a mistake that during the past seven months the cooperative farms did not obtain the necessary support from the central organs. As regards the development of the cooperative farms, I believe that in the present period there is something of a standstill. Now that we wish to develop cooperative farming by not allowing the employment either of force, or of the incorrect methods leading to it, it is very important that the cooperative farms, the cooperative farm groups, and the special associations of growers, achieve better and greater farming results. And the effective aid of the state and the party is indispensably necessary for these. The better farming results will then themselves attract the peasants. In any case, after the shocks of the past years—when the public opinion of the peasantry has calmed down—we must not fail to make it our goal that in about two or three years, a favourable atmosphere should develop and the cooperative farm movement should gain a great impetus, through educational propaganda and the actual results of the cooperative farms.

In recent times the principle of giving guidance to economic activity has also been a debated issue. It is well known that in our country certain revisionist views—earlier voiced chiefly by the Yugoslav comrades—have gained considerable ground among the party membership and among economists. The essence of these was that central guidance exercised by the state puts a brake on development, and some kind of lower public administration, or the like, advances it. We have a different opinion on this. In our view Lenin's thesis, propounded during similar debates in 1920-1921, is fully valid: that the best principle for economic guidance, too, is democratic centralism. Naturally, there is need to trim off certain excesses of centralization, to develop local independence, and to promote local initiative. However, there must be central guidance to the whole of the economy. Perhaps I could put it this way: central guidance must be reduced to the extent, and in the sense, that it will strengthen both local initiative and central guidance. There is a possibility for this to be done. For example, if we wish to implement central guidance to the factories on 900 questions, this will only result in bureaucracy. But if we sensibly reduce the number of questions, then central guidance will become more effective and stronger within the narrower framework. I believe this is the manner

in which we must define, work out and realize the methods of economic guidance. This has been the purport of our recent measures. Thus it is necessary that we combat simultaneously both the growing anarchistic endeavours aiming to apply the laws of the capitalist market to the socialist economy, and the bureaucratic tendencies. In this manner we can make good use of the given—and not at all bad—economic possibilities.

A very important part of economic work is the organization of effective state control. As you know, we have abolished the organizing work of the Ministry of State Control. In my opinion this was a correct measure because the control system realized then was, though not entirely senseless, not effective enough. On the other hand, without state control there can be no kind of management and guidance. We have thought, and the people concerned are already working on this question, that in order to promote the work of the government, we would organize the kind of state control which would rely on a staff of not very great size, perhaps only a tenth of the former staff of the Ministry of State Control, but the commission itself would be a voluntary body, which would have one or two professional representatives and a voluntary committee both in the capital and in the provinces. Probably ordinary workers and officials, who know something about economic problems and are loyal to the revolution, would be glad to take part as volunteer workers in the control of state work.

In connection with economic questions, we must also examine such timely tasks as the fulfilment of the year's plan, including the most necessary measures required at present, furthermore questions connected with the reaping, the harvesting, the threshing, and purchasing.

As far as the party's role in the economic tasks is concerned, let me again call to mind that the working people—and according to us, rightfully—demand of the party, as the governing party, that it should assist in the correct solution of economic and cultural questions. This means that even local public opinion among the working people—for example, among those employed in a factory or on a state farm—expects and demands of the local party organization that it should promote the correct solution of economic questions. The present practice of the party organizations must therefore be changed. For example, recently we often heard statements that in the past months the party organizations were occupied with party building, and that this was why they were unable sufficiently to



concern themselves with economic questions. They always added that they were now at the end of this period, and that they would begin to take up economic questions. This is correct, but it is not correct that they should separate the solution of economic tasks and party building from each other. Neither the economic questions nor the tasks of party building can be solved well if we separate the two.

Comrades:

Let us recall the times just following the Liberation. What was the chief reason that the Communist Party quickly won popularity among the masses? First of all the fact that the Communist Party took into its hands the question of public food supplies, the restoration of transport, the restoration of industry, the restoration of the cultural institutions, and generally the establishment of the foundations of normal life. This was the chief reason for the swift growth of our political popularity. Why? So many slanders and so much filth had been flung at the Communist Party for 25 years that at its first appearance it did not have a great appeal to very broad masses. But when the masses saw that the communists took into their hands the solution of questions which were of vital importance to them, then they also understood that the people had need of this party. Now, too, this is the situation. And I believe that the communists acted properly in those places where they began organizing the party by mobilizing the working people to establish the conditions for normal life after November 4th. Because every worker understood from this that the party was not an institution in itself, that the party takes up the struggle for the vital interests of all the working people, and for this reason confidence in the party grew. After November 4th the party generally won the sympathy of the broadest masses first of all by restoring life to normal.

Let me take up party building now. It is an old rule in communist parties that correct party building takes place by the party carrying on mass agitation for its objectives. It mobilizes the masses, for example, to solve economic problems, to strengthen power, and so on. By this means the best, the most active people come into close contact with the party. They are already working for the party's aims, are fighting for them, and this provides the basis for them later to become party members. This is the healthy way. For, if we wished to increase the number of party members by, what I might call, psycho-analytical methods, in other words, by dragging people singly and separately into a corner and beginning to interrogate them about their views, their morals, and so on, this kind of agitation would be worthless.

If someone is called into a communist party organization for such a purpose, and he is asked what took place after October 23rd, a revolution or a counter-revolution, even the most narrow-minded, most stupid and the most malicious person will say a counter-revolution. He will know that he is in a communist party office, and it is not proper to say anything else. Shall we not become better convinced of whether we are dealing with a man whose place is in the party if we examine who is the most active, who has worked best, who has already worked for the party's aims, who has struggled under the party's flag, and who has proved that he is indeed a supporter of the party? In other words, these two tasks cannot be separated from each other.

The trade unions, too, have their tasks in the sphere of economic construction. We may lay down, and this is an important point, that the first requirement of the protection—the correct protection—of the working people's interests, is that the trade unions should concern themselves with the question of production. Because if they concern themselves with the question of production, then they are correctly representing the interests of the working people. This does not mean that the trade unions should not concern themselves with the everyday affairs of the working people, with redressing their grievances. But the protection of interests begins where the unions help to increase the quantity of the goods which we may later distribute among the workers. Because if we deal only with what we can distribute, and do not care about increasing its quantity, then we do not protect the working people's interests well.

Let me say something about the question of the workers' councils. The progress of the workers' councils up to now is generally not very encouraging. They were set up under circumstances and under the control of elements, which placed them at first in the service of the counter-revolution. Later the situation improved, the workers' councils were cleansed, but there was a political struggle between the party organizations and the workers' councils. The workers' councils jealously guarded their power, and fought against the formation of the party organizations.

What would be the proper procedure with respect to the workers' councils? In this question the party can only bring a decision which has the agreement of the absolute majority of the workers. This is very important! Let us not forget, comrades, that to the less class-conscious worker the workers' councils do not mean the same things as they do to the district party secretary. These workers recall that

in those days they received sugar, ham, and double pay, and they did not even work for it. They do not stop to think that this was actually not good but bad for them. What should be our decision then? I consider it wrong that certain workers' councils were liquidated as May Day pledges. This is not a healthy business, although they say that the workers demanded the dissolution of the workers' councils. In a few places the workers did indeed demand it. For example, in certain mining districts the miners became very angry with the workers' councils. In other places possibly 30 communist workers became angry with them, but 700 women textile workers did not. And then they said that the working people demanded the dissolution of the workers' councils. This is not the way to solve the question.

We must soon work out the party's standpoint in connection with this, first discussing it with trade union people, members of workers' councils and ordinary factory workers. I believe the most important thing is that in comparison to past years we should increase organized control by the workers in the factories. We must ensure that the directly elected representatives of the workers should supervise production. This control must naturally not weaken central guidance, it must not liquidate the authority of the manager, but it should mean realistic control, a voice in affairs, including the distribution of certain funds. All this must serve the interests of the working class. This is the decisive point. Whether it is called a workers' council or something else, is a question of secondary importance. In my opinion we may safely call it a workers' council. But we must tell the working people that we are not going to build any kind of pyramid, there is no need for district, borough, or county workers' councils. We must explain to the workers that the experience of Yugoslavia proves that where the workers' councils functioned, there the functions of the trade unions atrophied, were pushed into the background and almost disappeared. As far as we know of conditions in Yugoslavia—there are no traditions of the trade union movement there, with the exception of Croatia. In Hungary the situation is different. Here the trade unions have some 70 or 80 years of tradition behind them. Therefore the party's standpoint must contain also a statement that these workers' council organizations in the factories must at any rate operate under the central guidance of the trade unions.

Regarding the perspectives of economic life, we must not forget that a few more years of good work are necessary in order to straighten out the Hungarian economy. The present situation can be a realistic

basis for improving our economic situation, and if in the most important respects (the increase of productivity, the reduction of costs, thrift, etc.) the state bodies, the trade unions, the workers' councils and the working masses themselves will actively fight under the leadership of the party, then they will be able to show excellent results in a relatively short time. Let us remind the working people of the situation in 1945-1946. At that time every expert said that this was the end of the country's national economy, that 40 years would be needed to restore the pre-war level of industry, and for this an American loan would be indispensably needed. Life refuted this opinion, and, when the party and the people stirred, neither 40 years were needed, nor American dollars: with the support of the socialist camp we swiftly restored and developed the economy. Now, we are actually confronted by a similar question. We must acquaint people with our problems, we must make use of their assistance and then we shall solve our problems.

We have great reserves for the solution of economic questions both with respect to the work of the leaders and the masses. Let us improve and make our leadership less bureaucratic, let us overcome the anarchy that is manifest in leadership, and let the masses display greater activity, more conscientiousness and greater severity in the face of laxness and waste. In this way we can noticeably and rapidly improve the situation.

Comrades, I cannot take up in detail problems of scientific and cultural life. There is very much trouble in this field. The greatest difficulty is that the bourgeoisie have advanced in this sphere, and together with the revisionist auxiliary forces they have captured certain positions and still hold them in their hands today. It happens sometime that a person professing revisionist views does not even know that he is influenced by the bourgeoisie and the imperialists, and is serving their interests. In such instances it is our task to stop this influence. The central issue here, as a matter of fact, is the relationship of the party to the intelligentsia. If we solve this correctly, then we shall also be able to settle the questions of cultural life. Administrative measures are not sufficient if they are not backed by persuasive, educational work.

What was the role of the intelligentsia in the counter-revolutionary uprising? Some were guilty in the counter-revolution. There is no doubt about the guilt of Déry, Háry, and others. The guilty must be punished. A great many, on the other hand, only committed an error. These must be helped to return to the correct road. A great



many intellectuals remained loyal to the socialist revolution all the way, even in the most critical times. Whoever says that at the time of the counter-revolution the whole intelligentsia turned against the people, harms the party and the country. This is not true. We must differentiate between people. The work of the intellectuals is present in every one of our achievements! It is a fact that a certain part of the intelligentsia are passive. Others have worked against us even during the last two months. But the major part of the intelligentsia are on the job in the work of restoration. Our results praise their work, too, which they accomplished together with the popular masses. If in the future our relationship with the intelligentsia will be even better, then our cultural, artistic and scientific life will also develop accordingly.

Under our conditions, the party is a weapon of vital importance for the working class and the people. Under our conditions, the people cannot live in freedom without the party. But the party is not an end in itself, and the people must feel that when the communists, fighting for the interests of the people, strengthen the party, then they are forging a weapon for the people.

Much harm can be done to the cause of the party by a functionary who happens to fall back into the old fault of ignoring the opinion of the working people, disparaging them, insulting them, or takes up a harsh, aloof, gruff, and rude attitude towards them.

We must safeguard the party's political and moral purity. Let us keep the careerists, the criminals away from the party, and we must see to it that the class enemy has no influence on the policy of our party. There must not be a repetition of what happened at the time of the activities of the Imre Nagy group, when the class enemy had influence even in the core of the party. We must see to it that the enemy's influence shall not prevail in a single one of our party organizations.

The counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary has taught us a specific lesson which we must not forget. Here we have a one-party system. No other party existed outside of the Hungarian Working People's Party. The enemy tried both through direct and indirect methods to influence the party, and it was able to launch an assault against the people's power by drawing certain organizations of the party under its influence. Under no circumstances must we allow this to happen again! For example, in the party organization of the Law Faculty of the Eötvös Loránd University there were some who called themselves communists, but even after November 4th continued

to pursue the Imre Nagy policy, and even fought against the formation of a party organization. Around the middle of January they brought into existence a kind of organization which they called a "socialist bloc." Two months later these so-called "comrades" saw that the party and the government were still on the job. They weighed the situation and decided that under such circumstances it was wisest to join the party, so they rechristened their previous organization and formed a local H.S.W.P. organization. Other people also joined the party organization, but the decisive influence was in their hands. In fact certain comrades who had wanted to form the H.S.W.P. organization already in November could not even get into the party. Can such a party organization be upheld just because it is called an H.S.W.P. organization? The Central Committee acted correctly when it dissolved it, because we cannot—neither the party nor the Hungarian working class can—permit the class enemy to establish a base for themselves within a party organization for their fight against the party and the class.

The party's unity can only be unity of ideology, policy, action, and organization. One is inseparable from the rest. Ideological unity means that in every important question the truth of Marxism-Leninism must prevail, we must develop our policy on this basis and must carry out our organizational work accordingly. This is the basis of our unity. But in order to develop a proper standpoint, we must discuss the questions. I believe that the Central Committee has had more discussion since November 4th than during the past five years put together. When 23 of us meet, then 21 speak during the debate. The preparation of the December Central Committee resolution, for example—including also the subsequent debate—actually lasted ten days. It is correct that there should be discussion, because the questions have to be clarified, and the mistaken views have to be overcome by arguments. We must provide an opportunity within the party to present various views and opinions, so that it is not only outside the party that it should be possible to voice opposing views. But if we have discussed a question, agreed on it, and adopted a resolution, then this is binding upon all. There must be discipline and order in the party. In order to provide a sound basis for party unity, we must fight against revisionism, we must expose the dogmatic mistakes, and we must fight to restore democratic centralism. For this it is necessary that, in addition to safeguarding the democratic features, we should also enforce centralism. This is a very important requirement!



As far as the youth is concerned, I should only like to say that the party owes a debt to the youth, and the youth are also indebted to the party and the people. What does the party owe? For a very long time the youth were left too much to themselves, they went through a great political and spiritual crisis. At this time the party did not stand by the youth. During the past few years several party forums established this. Even the older workers said more than once that there was something wrong with the youth, they complained because of the lax morals of present-day youth, but actually the party and the older generation did not help young people enough to return to the proper path. This is the debt owed by the party and the adult working-class generation to the youth.

The debt of the youth is that the young people did not give the party and the adults the proper respect and esteem for those great achievements which the party, the working class and the people's power won for the youth. We must remind our young people of this debt.

Perhaps they can better understand this if they think of those unfortunate, deluded young people who understood within a week what they lost when they left their country, the Hungarian People's Republic. For example, at the Hungarian Legation in Belgium, Comrade Imre Horváth met a young worker who had left the country and now complained indignantly that there was not even a canteen in the Belgian factories. The Belgian workers upbraided him and asked him why on earth he had come there when there had even been a workers' canteen at home?

We must speak openly and sincerely with the youth. It is not proper to try and influence the youth by flattery, like, for example, the article published in the newspaper *Magyarország*, lauding the university youth who fought against the system. We can achieve results only with serious, frank, and friendly talk. Mistakes must be pointed out openly, and also how to correct them. The Young Communist League has a twofold task: it must mobilize the young people for the building of socialism, and at the same time rear a new communist generation for the party. The reason we recommend raising the age limit is that the more serious young people should also work in the Young Communist League, and become party members only after they have gone through the school of the movement.

The Young Communist League's three-month experience also proves that the truths of communism can win the young people.

And the overwhelming majority of the young people can be mobilized for the aims of socialist construction.

Finally, I must speak of the party's internationalist duties. Our party is a Marxist-Leninist party, and internationalism is one of its main principles. It was the founders of Marxism, Marx and Engels, who first formulated the role and significance of proletarian internationalism in the struggle of the working class, and since then history has verified the correctness of their teachings. Our relations with the fraternal parties have been built on the basis of equality. I am thinking not only of the communist parties of the socialist camp but also of the communist parties of the capitalist and colonial countries. We are supporters of proletarian internationalism—and not only along party lines; it is for this reason that our party must support the efforts of the trade union international with all its strength, so that the unity of the working class should strengthen on an international scale.

It is also one of our duties as internationalists to spread our views on the question of the socialist camp—the strengthening of the unity of the socialist camp—among the ranks of the party membership and the people, and have them accepted with conviction. The Warsaw Treaty is part of the unity of the socialist camp. In a given historical situation it may become superfluous. If the imperialists renounce their aggressive blocs and a system of collective security comes into being in their place, then there will no longer be any need for the Warsaw Treaty. But there will always be need for the fraternal unity of the socialist camp, because only by supporting each other can we advance in political and economic questions alike.

Within the close unity of the socialist camp, our relationship to the Soviet Union is naturally a question of primary importance. We are champions of a relationship of Soviet-Hungarian fraternal friendship and alliance; this is our policy, this is what we must represent, and the masses of the Hungarian people support us in this.

The fraternal relationship linking us with the peoples of the socialist countries is not restricted only to the relationship of parties and governments. We observed numerous signs of this fraternal relationship during the time of the counter-revolutionary uprising and its defeat. We were visited by Germans, Czechoslovaks, not only communists, but non-party people too; we were visited by Soviet people, not only communists, but also non-party people; and they gave such testimony of fraternal solidarity which we can never afford to forget.

Comrades:

We must strengthen fraternal relations with the peoples of the countries of the socialist camp. We ask in the draft resolution for the confirmation of the agreements which we have concluded with the communist parties of the Soviet Union and China, the German Socialist Unity Party, the Rumanian, Bulgarian and Czechoslovak communist parties, the governments of these countries and other communist parties. The principles laid down in the agreements are sacred to us, and we must fight for these in the same way as for our people's power, irrespective of when and from which quarter they may be attacked.

I must also speak of our relationship to the Yugoslav League of Communists. Our party is linked in many ways to the Yugoslav League of Communists. Above all, the identity of aims. The aim of the Yugoslav League of Communists is the building of a socialist society. We are also linked by the common cause of the defence of peace. We are linked by mutual interests, good-neighbourly relations, the fact that it is in the interests of both countries that a people's power should exist in the neighbouring country. On November 2nd and 3rd, when we prepared our action in the name of the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government, and we wanted to launch our struggle against the counter-revolutionary betrayal, the leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists agreed with us, and promised to support us in everything. They, too, were interested in seeing that a chauvinistic, irredentist, counter-revolutionary regime should not come out on top in Hungary. Later this support took on a somewhat mixed character. But at any rate we must know that our fundamental interests are identical. And these link us together.

Certain matters separate us. Such are the differences in views on the question of the party. We hold, in the sense of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, that the revolutionary party is the leader, the vanguard of the working class. In December the Yugoslav comrades openly declared—in the speech of Comrade Kardelj and elsewhere—that we were making a futile effort when we were trying to rebuild the party as a leading body in the old manner, instead of relying primarily on the workers' councils in the political struggle. We rejected this view, because our own experiences and views—which are based on Marxism-Leninism—have shown us, and the counter-revolution has also taught us, that without a party there is no proletarian power. That is why the enemy, too, tried to destroy the party. We are separated, moreover, by our different views on

the question of the socialist camp and neutrality. The Yugoslav comrades are not in the camp of socialist countries, and they generally treat it as a military grouping. It is the sovereign right of the Yugoslav comrades to decide whether they wish to be members of this camp or not. But we believe we have right to say that we do not consider the Yugoslav terminology suitable according to which they want to be on good terms with both East and West. To our way of thinking, this standpoint has a neutralist flavour. For us, the world does not consist only of points on the compass, we also know that to the East of us there are socialist countries and to the West there are capitalist dictatorships led by the imperialists. Apart from this—although we do not wish to interfere in these matters—let me refer to the fact that the standpoint in connection with the German question, which stems from this view, is quite incomprehensible, that is, the fact that Yugoslavia maintains diplomatic relations with West Germany which is in the hands of the American imperialists and German monopoly capital. At the same time it has no diplomatic relations with East Germany which has realized the dictatorship of the proletariat.

A very important part of our relationship is mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs. We concurred with the Yugoslav comrades' stand on this. But we believe that this principle must prevail in every respect. And if there is, or has been, some kind of effort to interfere in Yugoslavia's internal affairs, an attempt of which the Yugoslav comrades did not approve, then we only ask of them to respect this principle with regard to Yugoslav-Hungarian relations, too. The truth is that since the summer of 1953, not a single statement has been made in which there was any Hungarian interference in Yugoslavia's internal affairs. But unfortunately, since November 4th—and let us speak only about this period—we could enumerate many instances when various party and state leaders, journalists and others, interfered in Hungarian affairs. And we do not consider this right. Still, the identity of interests linking us together is stronger, and we hope that in the future our relationship will be more effective. Recently, since about April, there have been many statements on the part of Yugoslavia, which indicate that the Yugoslav comrades truly wish to improve their relations with us. Our party, too, must not fail to try and improve relations. Part of this, however, is that in questions of principle, we make no concessions. At any rate we hope that Yugoslav-Hungarian relations will improve and strengthen.

The enemy wanted to deal a blow at international proletarian solidarity also by precipitating the counter-revolution in Hungary. This did not succeed, international proletarian solidarity only grew deeper in the struggle to defeat the counter-revolution and the imperialist provocation.

The 40th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which will be celebrated this year in Moscow and throughout the world, will be a fitting demonstration in support of international proletarian solidarity, of the international working-class movement and the unity of the countries of the socialist camp. On this great and magnificent international holiday—not least as the result of international proletarian assistance—our party, our country and our people, too, will be represented.

Lastly, comrades, let me return to my introductory thought. If we examine the whole struggle of the party, I believe we can conclude that the cause of communism was not in a state of crisis at the time of the October counter-revolution. The party was waging its struggle, with forward lunges, occasional standstills, and even occasional setbacks, but this is a struggle that will undoubtedly result in the strengthening of the cause of the party and communism. It is undeniable that during the past year and a half our party, and also the international movement, have had serious difficulties. But we can overcome the difficulties, and, as we do so, the cause of communism will strengthen in our country, too. Communism is not in a crisis! Communism is the hope and future of mankind! And the socialist camp, which now again has proved indisruptible, will develop, strengthen and grow. The decisive majority of our people—we can assert this with full assurance—can only ensure their own national and social development, that is the safeguarding of their independence, through building socialism, and the completing the building of a socialist society. Examining the position of our party—without losing sight of our still existing weaknesses—I am certain that the party will grow stronger. This does not absolutely mean, nor does it involve, further hundreds of thousands joining the party. The party's strength lies in its ideological clarity, political, ideological and organizational unity, discipline, and perhaps most of all, in the influence it exerts on the non-party masses.

Every condition exists for the strengthening of our party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, which is essentially the party that has fought ever since autumn 1918—in the Horthy era, after the Liberation, and at the time of the October counter-revolution—

for working-class power. This party—despite the wishes, hopes and intrigues of the bourgeoisie—has not weakened, and it will flourish in the future, too. But this requires that we must not be complacent and that we must not forget anything. Neither the crimes which the enemy and the traitors have perpetrated against us, nor the mistakes which we ourselves have committed.



REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION AT THE NATIONAL  
CONFERENCE OF THE HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST  
WORKERS' PARTY

June 29th, 1957

Delegates to the Party Conference, Comrades:

The Executive Committee and the Central Committee decided when organizing this Conference that the radio should not broadcast what was said here, and that the full proceedings should not be published by the press, so that we might discuss the party's present most important problems in a completely informal manner. We wanted the Conference to be really a work conference and avoided all ceremony, we did not even invite delegates from the fraternal parties. We wished to close a whole series of controversial issues in order to establish a clear situation in the party, so that afterwards we should be able with reassurance to engage in the work of construction. In my opinion the debates that have taken place at the Conference verify the correctness of our decision, because we have indeed spoken openly and frankly about the various problems.

Our Conference has received numerous greetings, and I propose that the Party Conference should publish in the press its gratitude for these truly fine and warm greetings.

We have, however, also received some criticism, and many people thought it wrong that extremely little appeared in the press about the Conference. These comrades are right, and we must see to it that we should place the material of the Conference at the disposal of the party membership in some suitable form, possibly in a pamphlet. There has been talk here of a good many questions with which it will be worth while to deal in the future, in fact it is possible that one or two questions will also be included in the autumn educational material.

In addition to this, it is also necessary that a series of meetings of activists should follow the Conference, at which the delegates will outline the more important questions debated. At the activists' meetings they should strive to reflect the atmosphere of the Party

Conference and also the impressions gained here. Following this they should discuss the material of the Party Conference at party membership meetings.

I believe we may conclude without exaggeration that the atmosphere of the Party Conference has been good, that there was an open discussion of principle, and that the delegates were active. We may list among the results of the Conference that it was entirely united with regard to the necessity for further struggle against the counter-revolution. And this is of decisive importance from the point of view of the party.

We cannot, however, remain silent about the fact that there is a difference of opinion in our party over the valuation of the past. Comrade Révai's standpoint diverged slightly, but in essential questions, from the standpoint of the speakers and the contributors. Although here at the Conference only Comrade Révai had a divergent opinion on this question, it was not by accident that I said that there is a difference of opinion in the party over the valuation of the past. We have heard some of these views—although not so precisely expressed—even before the Party Conference.

The mistakes of the past will sooner or later come off the agenda, but the communists must never forget the experiences gained from evaluating the work of the former party leadership, otherwise great danger will threaten the future work of the party. In appraising it, a strict adherence to principles must prevail.

Comrade Révai cautioned us against any misunderstanding in connection with his remarks, because these were in no way intended to be the unfurling of the flag of "Stalinism" or "Rákosiism." We, who stand on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, do not recognize these expressions, although it is a fact that these expressions exist. The enemies of communism invented them, the traitors to the party took them over, and so did those who were confused by the revisionist views. After losing the armed struggle, the enemy attempted through the pretext of persecuting "Stalinists" and "Rákosiists" to force the communists out of their positions. These catchwords, therefore, in essence represented yet another attack by the enemy. Our party—naturally including the Central Committee—immediately took up the struggle against this kind of differentiation between party members.

Our standpoint on this question is unmistakable. In our opinion there are neither "Stalinists" nor "Rákosiists," and, naturally, we can thus not speak of their flag either. Nevertheless, there does exist

another flag alongside the party's flag, and that is the flag of the fallen leadership. But this flag lies broken on the ground, and I am convinced that it will never again be raised. The fallen leadership—and it is no accident that I use this expression, in political life this is not unusual—fell in such a manner and under such circumstances that it can never again return to the leadership of the party.

In the spring of last year, communists, embittered because of the party's difficult position, were angry at Comrade Rákosi. I too was angry, yet up to the last minute I maintained—and beside me others did too—that the struggle must be conducted against the mistakes, and not against Mátyás Rákosi's person. Together, we wanted to find the way of development, because we were afraid that otherwise the party would undergo a great shock. We did not cling to Mátyás Rákosi's person because we liked him. Earlier we did indeed like him, but by the spring of 1956 this was out of the question. Nevertheless, this was our standpoint because we loved the party and the working class. It was not our fault, or the fault of the party membership, but Mátyás Rákosi's fault, that we did not succeed in putting our conception through. And however great the historical merits which Rákosi may have, we cannot forgive him this serious mistake. It is a great pity that such an outstanding leader of the Hungarian working-class movement cannot be included in the textbook of the party school as a model to young communists. But he has only himself to blame for this; nobody can toy with the fate of the party, not even Mátyás Rákosi.

When Comrade Révai stepped up on the rostrum, he held the flag of the party in his hand—figuratively speaking—and said that he was speaking under the flag of the party. Later, however, he waved the broken flag of the fallen leadership in the hall. Comrade Révai declared that he was in agreement with the political line of the Central Committee, in agreement with the report, with the draft resolution, and the draft party Rules. For us this is very important, for Comrade Révai is not just anyone in the Hungarian working-class movement. He is a venerable, sincere communist, to whose name a portion of the party's history is attached. Comrade Révai can, if he wishes, help a great deal in the party's struggle, but exactly because he does not fill just any kind of role in the party, he can also cause a great deal of harm. We ask Comrade Révai to help us in our struggle, and not cause harm.

Comrade Révai raised questions—and this was why I said he waved the flag of the fallen leadership—which we have already heard

from members of the former leadership. He talked of a black list, of internal emigration, and spoke about many hundreds of suffering comrades, undeserved treatment of the State Security Authority, and so on. I have no reason and no right to assume that Comrade Révai deliberately supported the former leadership in his remarks. I believe and hope that that was not the case, yet by repeating these slanders he unwittingly voiced the slogans of the fallen leadership. It is with these that the members of the former leadership attack the party, while they are fighting for their personal interests.

Comrade Révai agrees that in reorganizing the leadership we did not include those former leaders who would have hindered our work. This was tactically correct, said Comrade Révai. We are pleased that Comrade Révai agrees with us in this question, but I must say that this was not tactics on our part, but a stand over a matter of principle, and a politically necessary step.

As far as the black list he mentioned is concerned, it never existed in reality. But we undoubtedly had to examine person by person who should hold posts in the party in the future, and who should not. We were led by considerations of principle and policy in our judgement. Naturally we put down our decision on paper too. When the Executive Committee first called a meeting of activists (at Nádor Street), we discussed with the 280 odd comrades who were present that we must look around to see whom we can count on in the work, who were to work in the party apparatus, and who were not. I announced the names of about 18 comrades who would not work on the staff of the party's headquarters for various reasons. I must stress that there were various reasons, for I even mentioned the names of comrades whom we did not consider simply for reasons of health. It was this list that certain people later unjustifiedly called a black list.

In our country we may speak about internal emigration at the most in the sense that former members of the Arrow-Cross Party, and certain writers also, consider our system servitude and oppression because there is no legal possibility for them to carry on activities against our system. In connection with communists, however, we can in my opinion in no way speak of internal emigration. Yet, as I hear, allegedly hundreds and hundreds of comrades live in internal emigration, that is, there is no chance for them to help make amends for the common mistakes committed together with the party. We have been unable to place many comrades into posts for various reasons. In the overwhelming majority of cases

they are decent, honest comrades, and the party must fight in order that these comrades should as soon as possible be placed in state, economic or party posts in keeping with their abilities.

How were these comrades removed from their posts? In most instances the counter-revolution drove them out. It will be recalled that while we here in Budapest were working on strengthening the central power, down below the counter-revolutionary wave was still raging in full force. For weeks, although at the centre we were the masters of the situation, in the factories the workers' councils ruled. Under the leadership of the hostile elements hidden in the workers' councils, the fight against us went on with full force. Hundreds and hundreds of worker managers were driven out, hundreds and hundreds of people were sacked from ministries and trusts. Since then we have restored these comrades, with very few exceptions, to their positions.

The situation of those, however, who have left the party apparatus, is a different question. On November 4th we considerably reduced the party apparatus, because we did not consider it sound to have an oversized party apparatus. We do not underestimate the importance of the party apparatus, there will undoubtedly be need for a certain number of full-time party-workers—recently in certain places we have even increased their number—but we are very careful not to swell the apparatus unjustifiedly. Party bureaucracy is even more dangerous than state bureaucracy, not only for the party's activity, but also for the people. As a result of the reduction in staffs, many comrades have been left without employment who, even if they have committed mistakes, are decent, honest communists. We shall do everything in order to have these comrades placed as early as possible. But we protest against having anyone forge a weapon out of this against the party. It is not the crime of the party, and of the Central Committee, that such a situation has come about. At the time we said to these comrades: there is a fight on, we are unable to concern ourselves with appointments, you too must seize arms and join the emergency security forces. If the working-class power triumphs, if things come back to normal, your position, too, will be settled. If the working-class power falls, then not only your life, but the life of the whole people will be ruined.

The enemy naturally noticed at once that numerous comrades had joined the emergency security forces. At least six provincial fascist delegations called on me (among them those from Borsod, from Tata, and from Nógrád County), and as many from Budapest,

and they took me to task, wanting to know what the "Rákosiists" and the "Stalinists" were doing in the emergency security forces. Well, I gave them a proper reply so that the whole pilgrimage of delegations ceased.

Let me stress again, however painful it is, that there are at present still a few hundred comrades without jobs—not only those of whom Comrade Révai was thinking, but unknown people in the countryside, who were ousted from machine stations and cooperative farms, who were possibly just helpers at the district party committees, riding their bicycles to and from work—and perhaps the position of these affects us more painfully—still we cannot allow the party to be attacked because of this.

The enemy are seeking a banner, they would like to find a legal forum of some kind, and would be delighted to have it within the party, because they could begin the old song-and-dance all over again. If the party tolerated the unfurling of the former leadership's flag, a new factional struggle would ensue within the party. The various offended people would gather around this flag. There are plenty of people with grievances in Hungary, among them those who fought against the party, and now that we have struck back, they have taken offence.

Perhaps the supposition that the right and the left wing could meet under one banner is surprising, but the idea is not mine. Some time in August last year, when Mátyás Rákosi's removal was still very new, and we had not yet solved the Imre Nagy problem, Comrade Révai remarked: the party must be careful or we might live to see the two of them in one faction fighting against the Central Committee. I am convinced that if they had the possibility, today they would indeed be fighting in one faction against the Central Committee. I am basing my supposition on the fact that I know the present political standpoint of both of them.

Although we are "guilty" in the eyes of Rákosi and of Imre Nagy, our conscience is clear. Naturally we are not infallible, undoubtedly we have all made mistakes; perhaps at critical times we were uncertain, we have taken wrong steps, but we do not regard ourselves guilty, not even in the October events, because we have always endeavoured to act correctly, in the interests of the party and the people.

Comrade Mesterházi raised the point that something ought to be done to make the leadership more popular. I believe that this is not necessary. If the leadership does good work, it will become



popular with the masses, it will win their confidence and respect. Naturally, it is not by any means the same to the party whether the leaders have prestige or not, because this is connected with the party's prestige. The party's struggle is more effective if the leaders are respected, which does not mean that they cannot be criticized. We accept justified criticism if it is made at the proper place and in the proper manner, but we shall not allow the leaders to be discredited.

The enemy, who now have no open political platform, are seeking hard for points to attack. They are returning to their old, tried and tested methods and are endeavouring to foment factional strife. They brand one comrade as being left-wing, another as right-wing, and strive in every way to bring about dissension. For example, when Comrade Révai came home, the very next day three American journalists came bursting in on me and excitedly asked whether Comrade Révai would be included in the government. I said that unfortunately Comrade Révai was ill, so that for the time being this was out of the question—after which they departed in disappointment. The enemy is endeavouring to foment dissension in every way wherever he can. I recall, for example, when László Rajk came home in July, 1945, he had not even set foot in the party headquarters when the enemy struck up the chorus that there were two factions in the party and that there was a life-and-death struggle between them. They alleged that Rákosi was the leader of the "Muscovites," and that the Hungarians acknowledged Rajk as their leader. At that time we all laughed over this, for there was no sign whatever of any factional strife, we actually worked in fraternal understanding, and within the party there was the greatest unity imaginable. But the enemy kept up their song persistently, and I am convinced that finally Comrade Rákosi too succumbed to the enemy's psychological influence. The enemy strove to sow dissension within the party then, and is striving to do so now. In our Central Committee, even if there are differences in views, great debates, there is unity on the main issues, and we shall not allow the members of the party leadership to be grouped according to various shades in the future either.

In connection with Comrade Révai's remarks, I should like to touch upon another complex of questions, and that is the December resolution. Comrade Bakó put things very well in my opinion when she said that the December resolution must not be trifled with. According to some, this resolution is not altogether good, the

February one was better, the later one better still, and so on. Comrade Révai criticized the December resolution, and he is right, that the statement about Imre Nagy, according to which Imre Nagy had played a positive role at a certain period, was mistaken. Newer data are constantly coming to light about Imre Nagy and his group. It was, for instance, from *Népszabadság* that I learned—you can see that the newspapers are more lively now—that back in the 1930s Imre Nagy was in a conflict, entirely similar to the present one, with the Communist International. Then too there was a right-wing deviation: he was unwilling to comply with certain measures of the Comintern.

On November 4th, or December 5th, many things about Imre Nagy's role were not yet clear, and this is the reason that the findings in the resolution in connection with him are not quite exact. Comrade Révai is also right that the formulation of the text of the resolution was not sufficiently precise. At some future time, when the party closes this question for good, perhaps at the next Congress, we shall be more careful in the formulation, so that it should indeed be faultless.

Even if there are faults in the December resolution, in its main lines the Central Committee's evaluation has proved correct, and today nobody can work usefully for the party who does not fully identify himself with the essential points of this resolution. The four factors enumerated in the resolution are closely linked with each other, and if any one of them had been missing, there could not have been any counter-revolutionary uprising. For this very reason, namely that all four factors are important and mutually influenced each other, it is impermissible for comrades to pick and choose among them at pleasure or according to their own earlier work as to which they will accept. I do not claim that the resolution is a political masterpiece, but I repeat that its essential points are valid, and we need not withdraw it.

Let us examine this question more closely. Would not the imperialists have willingly attacked us even earlier, say in 1951, if there had been a possibility for them to do so? Or would not the Horthy fascists have willingly seized arms against us already years ago? And would not the Imre Nagy type of traitors have acted even earlier if the party had been weak? When the party leadership was still united and was welded with the membership, and the party was welded with the people, then there was no possibility for the occurrence of a counter-revolution. This is the historic merit of the

Central Committee led by Mátyás Rákosi. But the fact that in 1956 the leadership was no longer united, and a cleavage appeared between the membership and the leadership as well as the party and the people, is the historic crime of this same leadership. No one can ever wash them clean of it. Had the unity of the party and with it the party's striking power not weakened, then Imre Nagy would have schemed in vain, the Horthy fascists and imperialists would have attacked in vain, they would have had nothing to gain in Hungary. And on the basis of these experiences we declare that in the interests of the party and the dictatorship of the proletariat we do not compromise regarding the party's unity.

This question is very important. Although Rákosi and Imre Nagy are not in the country at present, they still have followers in our party. These two kinds of malcontent groups can splendidly organize into one faction—or at least act together—because they are both opposed to the present party leadership, and to the political line which this party leadership represents. This is why we must safeguard the party's unity with fire and steel, and on the basis of the December resolution at that, because in this we have set out the main questions of our party's policy very well.

It is one of Comrade Révai's old habits that he likes to carry his thoughts to absurdity. Now, exceptionally, I too shall do this. Let us suppose that outside the Central Committee several centres of leadership should come into existence. For example, the Táncsics Circle would become such an auxiliary centre, Comrade Révai would become another auxiliary centre. The reason I mention these examples is because the comrades working in the Táncsics Circle and Comrade Révai himself are irreproachable communists, whose respectability and readiness to help cannot be doubted. How would this supposition look in practice? If somebody were not satisfied with the opinion of the department for agitation and propaganda, he would simply stroll over to the literary department of the Táncsics Circle, and it is quite certain that there they would express an opinion over the same matter that was a shade different. And the person concerned would accept that which was most to his taste. Or let us assume that Comrade Révai's opinion were asked over some question or other, possibly by somebody who is dissatisfied with certain measures of the party and the government. This could happen to a very decent and respectable communist too. Would it be proper if in opposition to the Central Committee they turned to Comrade Révai as a forum? Such a danger exists, and we ask Comrade Révai to

reckon with it. Just because we hold Comrade Révai to be an honest comrade of irreproachable morals, one who enjoys great prestige and has historic merits, this danger exists. It is no secret, comrades, that our Central Committee has debated a very great deal during the past seven months over Comrade Révai's person. And I always stood for the view—and not because I want to make apologies to Comrade Révai, or anyone else—that the party has need of Comrade Révai. I am, of course, not alone in this opinion. We esteem Comrade Révai as an open, straightforward man. However, there are still problems in our cooperation, and Comrade Révai should understand this. I am thinking, for example, about his first article which *Népszabadság* published. We argued a great deal at the time on whether we should allow the article to be published. Not a single person in the Executive Committee agreed with every one of the assertions made in the article, nevertheless we published it, because we thought that the article contained many valuable conclusions. And indeed, it was proper to publish it, for it gave strength to the struggle against the counter-revolution. In my opinion Comrade Révai's contribution here was also useful. Mainly because it evoked a healthy reaction from the participants in the Party Conference in the face of the apologies for dogmatism, sectarianism and the mistakes of the former leadership.

As far as the merits are concerned, as I already stressed in the report, it is still early to be sharing in the glory. In any case, the glory is due first of all to the working people of the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries. If there is anyone in Hungary who has merits in defending working-class power, then it is the Hungarian working class, which has for decades fought unceasingly for the socialist revolution. It is one of our greatest matters of national pride that, after the Soviet Union, the Hungarian proletariat and the Hungarian people were the first to achieve working-class power. This working class fought for 25 years against Horthy fascism. And this working class fought after the Liberation too. And if the leaders of today did not exist, a dictatorship of the Hungarian proletariat would still exist, because the Hungarian working class would even then have found its own people. The government could not have achieved results if the idea of the socialist revolution had not lived in the popular masses.

Now I shall turn to the questions of the fight against revisionism. In this connection Comrade Révai said we must fight against the conciliatory spirit with regard to revisionism. I fully agree with this.



The other side of the struggle against the enemy is that the traitors must be brought to justice. We hold it our task and duty to throw light on all aspects of the October counter-revolution, and whoever is guilty, whoever is a traitor, must receive his punishment. This is now under way.

In the interest of an effective struggle against the enemy, the party must act unitedly. As part of this we must clearly see the old mistakes and must not repeat them. The strengthening of state power and the struggle against the enemy as well as the tasks of economic and cultural construction, must be solved in combination with the constant enlightenment of the people, and in accordance with our own specific conditions. The necessary measures of reprisal must, therefore, be linked with enlightening work, in order that the people might see that the reprisals are being taken in the common interest, the people's interest, and not because of some kind of communist or individual vengeance.

The unity of the party and the armed forces is necessary for the fight against the enemy. At the time when we began this fight, we considered that we should first strengthen the party among the working class and in the armed forces. If the party is strong in these two spheres, we need not fear for the people's power.

We must love, respect and help the army, the police, the Workers' Militia, in a word, our armed forces, and we must instill this spirit in the whole of public opinion. Love of the party, includes severe criticism. If, therefore, we see mistakes in the armed forces—just as anywhere else—we must criticize them severely, but this should take place on the basis of love and should serve the good of the armed forces.

A recent achievement, the Workers' Militia, is one of the greatest achievements of the party and the Hungarian dictatorship of the proletariat, for it is the armed proletariat. But the view that the Workers' Militia alone is our armed force, is wrong. This is an insulting and an unjust conclusion with respect to the soldiers. Our armed forces are first of all the army and the police, and then the Workers' Militia. From the point of view of power, it is most important that we strengthen, foster and help the spirit of comradeship and unity among the various sections of the armed forces. Let us not permit anyone to sow dissension amongst the various kinds of armed forces.

Speaking of the armed forces, I should like to clarify a few matters in connection with the State Security Authority. Never have

any of us made any distinction between our martyrs, whether the persons were enlisted men of the State Security Authority, or not enlisted men. Such a distinction would indeed be a disgrace. We honour equally the memory of the martyrs who fell defending working-class power, whether they were Soviet or Hungarian soldiers, or civilians. But we must not only revere the memory of those who fell, but we must also honour those among the living who were disabled or wounded in defence of our working-class power—or simply took part in the fighting, and later in the armed restoration of law and order. Under identical conditions we must ensure preferential rights to them, or their children, in admittances to the universities, in filling appointments, and so on.

In connection with the defence of the state, I must also speak about something else. In our country the situation now is that there is no State Security Authority. In abolishing the independent state security body we were motivated partly by political and partly by financial considerations. But the Ministry of the Interior and the police have a political department. We believe that these bodies must be the fist of the dictatorship of the proletariat. And the bodies concerned with state security must be supported by both the party and the people. Their work in the interest of the people is made easier if they feel the people's love and support, if we praise and defend them. We must be careful, however, that in the circles of our state security organs the spirit of avant-gardism should not revive—the spirit that every other sphere is unreliable, and only the State Security Authority is reliable. If we allow this view to come to life again, we shall dig the grave of the dictatorship of the proletariat with it, comrades! Our esteem for the members of the State Security Authority, our reverence for their dead, and the interests of the defence of the people's power command us to pay attention to these matters.

Comrades, I should like to deal with a question of principle. Several people have raised the question of what kind of principle the party's unity is founded upon, the unity of will, etc. I should also like to point out another source of danger to this unity. In the summer of last year a few of Comrade Lenin's hitherto unpublished letters were made public. In one of them Comrade Lenin wrote, not word for word, but in essence, that the bare fact that the bolshevik party in its struggle relies on two classes, the working class and the peasantry—and this fact is also reflected within the Central Committee—always carries within it the danger of a split in the party.



It is worth while thinking about this. I do not claim that Imre Nagy was already a stool pigeon or a spy from his early youth on. It is not a good thing to think of people in this way. I believe, however, that to the Hungarian people it is fully clear that in October he betrayed the party and the people in due order. But if Imre Nagy was ever a communist, and if his political line diverged so far that it culminated in betrayal, it happened over this question mentioned by Lenin. The most important question of our party's unity is that within the alliance of the workers and peasants we must never forget about the leading role of the working class, and the fact that although the party relies in its struggle on two labouring classes, the working class and the peasantry, the party is nevertheless the revolutionary party of the working class. The party can only fight and work effectively for the peasantry, too, if we do not forget this. Does such a danger exist? Indeed it does! And in the government and the party leadership I have more than once met with decent, honest communists who drew a line of demarcation between themselves and Imre Nagy, but still did not notice this danger.

For example, the Ministry of Agriculture submitted a proposal to the Council of Ministers that we should give back 280,000 *hold* of forest land to the peasantry. I asked why we should give this back? The reply was: the peasants would welcome it wholeheartedly. I said that this was no justification of principle! We need not fear that in our country agriculture will be pushed into the background. We have active fighters for agriculture in our party headquarters who would provide the peasants with all the earthly goods in the world, from investments and machines to old-age pensions. It is good and necessary, too, that someone should fight so well to solve the tasks he is entrusted with. But the Central Committee must not forget that the party is the party of the proletariat, which leads the workers' and peasants' alliance, and that we are fighting for socialism. We are convinced that it is only on this road that we can honestly serve the interests of the peasantry, too, and that the peasants also will be truly happy people without cares, only in a socialist society.

Two other questions were raised here to which I should like to reply. The question of the youth and the Young Communist League. At the time the Young Communist League was formed, the requirement that we should rally only the most class-conscious young people and those who were most loyal to the cause of socialism in the Young Communist League, was correct. Today, in the period

of consolidation, we may leave off the "mosts," and class-consciousness and loyalty to socialism are sufficient. I believe, in the present situation this is a sufficiently high requirement.

I have one more remark to make in connection with the naming of the Young Communist League. One or another of our young functionaries was concerned that the name of Young Communist League would not be good, the university students might even thrash some of the first people to join, because of it. I replied that would not be such a great misfortune either—they thrashed us too, when we were members of the young communists' organization—let them also fight, and take a courageous stand. If need be, the grown-ups will help them. Now it has turned out that the situation was not so perilous after all. The enemy has been shattered, the confused young people are beginning to come to their senses and to talk in a normal way about the communist youth. But if there is any party member who is ashamed that he is a communist, he must be asked to hand back his membership card, and we must take note that we cannot count on him. But if he professes to be a communist, then he should always and everywhere feel it his duty to fight against mistaken and hostile views, to fight for the objectives of the party and proclaim the truth of the party. Communist courage is needed, comrades, because even the enemy respects those who fight for their convictions.

I also wish to deal with our relations to the non-party masses. In the organization of the party it was—I think, correctly—our basic principle that the number of our party members should be smaller than the party membership of the H.W.P.P. We feel that the numerical proportion of the party in comparison to the class is on the whole sound. It follows from this that we do not even want to enroll every former member of the H.W.P.P. into the party. But if this is our aim, then we cannot be angry with those former H.W.P.P. members who do not want to join the H.S.W.P. They must in no event be placed at a disadvantage because of this decision. Among the non-party people, it is generally the former H.W.P.P. members who stand closest to us, it is particularly with them that we must establish contact, and thus also broaden our basis among the non-party masses.

Everyone agrees that nobody should join the party out of careerism. Nevertheless, proposals have been voiced here that if a former party member in a leading post does not wish to join, then he must immediately be removed from his post. In several instances this has happened. This is not a correct method, comrades. The laws of our

People's Republic ensure that with the exception of party posts, any other public office may be filled by non-party people. This principle must also be made to prevail in practice. This does not mean that tomorrow we should draw up a list in which we demand a non-party prime minister, and similar things, but that this principle—and this is the essence of the matter—should be realized in practice. Why? If we remove a factory manager who is otherwise good at his post because he has not joined the party, we will give such an impetus to organizing the party that we shall be unable to stop it. Because if one manager sees what has happened to the other he will think, "Aha! Kovács has been removed because he did not join the party. Well, we'll see about that." He will rush at once to the party secretary and say to him: "Look here, old man, my mother-in-law has been ill up to now,"—or he will put forward another pretext,—"but now I want to join the party." If they remove one today, tomorrow twenty will join. Are these people enemies? I presume they are not. Of course, there may be some among them. But a man who likes his work and wishes to support his family, and therefore clings to his position, is no enemy yet. However, if somebody joins the party only to ensure his position, he does not strengthen the party, but weakens it. For this reason let us be consistent. It is not correct to say it is a good thing that the party membership is not nine hundred thousand—and at the same time to be angry with every former party member who did not join in November. We cannot say that non-party people can also hold office, and then remove every functionary of any rank who does not join the party. If we do this, then neither the party membership nor the people will understand just what we want! What must we take into consideration in filling the appointments? No person can hold a state, economic or other appointment who is not loyal to the Hungarian People's Republic, not loyal to the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. And I assert that, if we apply this requirement, then we can drive every enemy of the people's power out of responsible offices, without forcing people into the party who would not strengthen the party but weaken it.

If we take a glance at the composition of the Conference, we must conclude that the proportion of women among the delegates is low, it is only just over six per cent. This is not a good sign. The counter-revolutionary period, by its very nature, did not favour the social activity of women, and to some extent this is a redeeming circumstance. But we cannot acquiesce in this situation, therefore

we must quickly make up for the deficiency in this sphere. I propose the application of the principle, therefore, that when there is a possibility of placing a man or a woman into an appointment, all conditions being equal, then—at least until the unfavourable situation changes—the decision should be in favour of the woman.

I shall now turn to the question of national unity which has been debated so much in the youth movement and in the sphere of literature. I shall be very brief! We can identify ourselves with the standpoint in principle of the Chinese Communist Party which says: "Unity—debate—unity on a new basis."

I must say frankly that we made considerable efforts to shatter the "national unity" that existed in October. Why did this "national unity" have to be smashed up? Because it was formed on a reactionary platform. Its leaders were anti-socialist elements. We do not want unity of that kind. We are now in the stage of debate when we draw a line around ourselves in order that the front should become clear and it should be clarified who is on one side and who is on the other. The debate must be pursued over principles with ideological, political means. The aim is to bring about a new national unity on a socialist basis. This, however, is still the task of years. Of course, we shall have to get down to it already tomorrow, and we can already achieve some results this year. But in order to bring about a national joining of forces resting on a socialist basis which embraces the absolute majority of the people—and the overwhelming plurality of the writers—we must continue to work persistently and seriously for a long time to come. We must apply wise methods and wise tactics, which means at present that the guilty must be punished, the misguided helped, those diverging to the Left or to the Right convinced by arguments, while those standing firmly beside us must be strengthened.

Comrades, as regards economic questions I am now unfortunately not able to go into details. I agree with those criticisms according to which, in comparison with our other tasks, we have lagged very much behind in the sphere of economic and cultural work. There is, of course, a historical reason for this. In our present situation the most important thing was the strengthening of the party and the state power. We must begin the solution of the economic questions with the realization of the one-year plan—as Comrade Fehér also said—and for this we must mobilize the forces of all of society. We must make it the personal concern of every worker to protect social property, to be thrifty, and take part in socialist labour emulation.



There is a tremendous amount of initiative in this sphere, which the journalists and the radio people are spreading. But it would be good if we got out of the habit of thinking in terms of extremes, and learned to write and speak with restraint in conformity with the actual situation.

There was mention, in addition to the one-year plan, of the three-year plan as well as the need for a long-range plan for certain tasks. For example, we should prepare a ten-to-fifteen-year long-range plan for the development of Budapest, the better exploitation of the sandy areas, the improvement of alkaline regions, and the solution of our energy problems. After preparation, these plans must be submitted for extensive discussion.

Little has been said at the Conference about a certain strengthening of private capital. The party supports handicraft industry in its activity of satisfying the requirements of the population. We also respect the useful activity of private retail trade. But inasmuch as some types of trading activity cause harm, increase speculation, action must be taken against them. Our action should not at once be administrative, we must strive to convince people like these with wise words and make them see reason. But if speculation continues to grow rampant and causes harm to the working people, it may be necessary to take stern measures. There is no doubt that just as in the political struggle—in economic matters too, we must defend proletarian power. Naturally, the most effective means of the struggle against speculation is to have an adequate quantity of the necessary goods available.

Over the question of the workers' councils I agree with Comrade Révai's standpoint. We cannot approve the tendencies aimed at abolishing them by administrative measures. We must strive to see that the workers' councils carry on their activities in the interests of socialist construction.

Let me call your attention to the fact that in the course of the struggle against nationalism, the peculiar Hungarian conditions must also be taken into consideration. It is true that for centuries the nation was oppressed, and our glorious national uprisings played a progressive role in the history of our country and of mankind. But we have often stressed this circumstance far too one-sidedly, and did not point out that at the same time the Hungarian ruling classes—in the name of the whole nation, and alluding to it—oppressed other peoples. The old ruling classes instilled in the Hungarian people, together with the demand for national independence, a national ar-

rogance, and the false, nationalist consciousness of superiority over the fraternal peoples living together with us. We condemn this; this is not our progressive heritage.

As in every sphere, so on the national question, too, theoretically correct and precise definitions are very important. Without these we cannot call ourselves Marxists. Such a correct definition is, for example, that true patriotism fuses with proletarian internationalism. But, comrades, we must formulate this to be understandable to the whole people, because the unity of patriotism and proletarian internationalism is difficult for the ordinary people to understand. It is understandable to them, however, if we say we are Hungarians, we are patriots, but the Hungarian fascists are mortal enemies for us and our people, in the same way as the fascists and imperialists of any nation. At the same time, however, working people of any country who are fighting for international proletarian solidarity, are our brothers.

Finally I wish to speak about the tasks of the party, about party work. How do we stand in this sphere, comrades?

Not even acknowledging our great results can we forget the fact that there is not a single area of state and economic, cultural and party work where we have achieved the old standard.

We may easily establish how many per cent we have achieved in one or another field of production, but we are unable to show how many per cent we have attained in party work! Unfortunately, today we may not say about any area of party work that things are in perfect order. Now it is particularly in the economic and cultural spheres that party work must be intensified, because in the matters of power, political work, and party building, we are somewhat ahead. Among various strata of the party membership, particularly among the intellectuals, there is still uncertainty. The enemy has infiltrated into certain areas, among the employees, and perhaps the peasant organizations, too. In state affairs and in economic work there is a very great deal of laxness, a lack of discipline. There are still many confused views; in fact, there are even hostile elements in the ministries and elsewhere, too. What is to be done, therefore? What is the way out of the troubles? In such a situation it is even more important that the party's affairs be in order. Only the party can help with its organizing, mobilizing, stimulating and criticizing work. For this reason, too, we must safeguard the unity of the party like the apple of our eye and develop the party in a healthy manner.



About the draft resolution: let me inform the comrades that the Drafting Committee has already incorporated into the final draft resolution about 60 per cent of the proposals received partly in spoken, and partly in written form. I shall enumerate them only by topics: we have incorporated in the text proposals about the patriotic and internationalist education of the youth, about the role of the trade unions and the state bodies in connection with labour emulation, about Hungarian-Soviet friendship, about the duties of individual communists with regard to the everyday troubles and cares of the working people, and other subjects. The Drafting Committee did not take into consideration a whole series of proposals because they were already in the original text in a different form. I ask the comrades, then, to adopt the modified draft resolution. I also ask the Party Conference to approve the party Rules.

In conclusion, comrades, I should like to stress that the heated debate was extremely useful, because it clarified the questions, and on this basis the whole party can act unitedly. In fact we can count with assurance not only on the action of the party members, but also on the masses of the people, because we place in the forefront of our struggle those demands of public interest with which every honest working man can unhesitatingly identify himself, and with the solution of which we can strengthen our whole people's power. As far as our internal affairs are concerned, I propose that, on the basis of the experiences of this Conference, we should establish a clear situation in the party. Let us close the past, and turn our eyes to the future. The important thing now is, by exploiting the favourable circumstances, to activate the party members, the whole working people, to advance, to force back the enemy more and more, and to have courage to proclaim our views and truths everywhere.

And in the party organizations let us debate our affairs wisely, calmly and patiently, then adopt good resolutions and strictly require that they be observed. Whoever infringes the implementation of the party's resolutions, this requirement of party discipline, must be severely dealt with. The task, therefore, is, comrades, to strengthen the party's unity, to fight for the people's fundamental interests—and the party shall be strengthened, in the same way that this Party Conference is also strengthening our party.

## POLITICAL WORK AMONG THE MASSES— THE MOST IMPORTANT TASK OF THE PARTY

SPEECH AT THE MEETING OF THE  
BUDAPEST PARTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

August 23rd, 1957

Comrades:

The Party Executive Committee did well to bring up the matter of political activity among the masses, as this is the most important problem of party work. Our political activity among the masses and the relations between our party and the masses are now, as I see them, better than they were prior to October 1956. It may be possible that the direct influence of our party now extends to a somewhat smaller segment of the working people than it did in recent years, but it is now stronger and more intensive than it used to be. For our relations with the masses two or three years ago were much more formal. These relations, no doubt, present some shortcomings, but before proceeding to an analysis of them, we must be aware that the relations between our party and the masses—and our political activity in general—are not so bad at all today, and that the present trend of development is encouraging. Unless we make some glaring blunder, all the necessary conditions for continued improvement are given.

The internal class enemy and the imperialists have scored success on three issues in this country—and by this they have managed to extend their influence to certain categories of the working people. Their influence has been exceedingly strong among intellectuals, not inconsiderable among workers, and it was felt in some degree also among the peasants.

1. The first of these issues is nationalism. It was in the matter of nationalism that the counter-revolution scored its greatest success because, above all, this idea is very deeply rooted in the minds of the people, and because it is linked with the specific trends of Hungarian history. Wherever nationalism gets the upper hand, class outlook goes down the drain.

In such cases, it goes without saying, communist principles are undermined. Therefore, in our educational and propaganda acti-

vities we shall have to devote a good deal of attention to nationalism, and treat it with circumspection.

If you study the history of Hungary you may realize that there have been some doctrines we ought to have combated long ago, but have failed to do so. Progressive national heritage is one of the matters we have failed to treat in the proper way. Why is this important? I'll tell you why. To take one example, here is the legacy of Sándor Petőfi and the young revolutionaries of 1848. To us, that legacy is a precious national heritage, but it is no longer progressive. If we study the views held by Petőfi and the youth of 1848, we find that those views, absolutely progressive at that time, have in some degree become reactionary under our present conditions. This problem has to be studied as a matter of principle. On the other hand, another very important heritage—the legacy of the proletarian dictatorship of 1919—has somehow been by-passed in our historical outlook and in our educational activity—and this is utterly wrong.

Apropos of nationalism, I wish to comment on the way we handle slogans in our propaganda. Reactionaries plug the idea of "all Hungarians are brothers." That, of course, is a false slogan, but it can be understood by all. As against that, we have another slogan, a correct one: "Patriotism coupled with proletarian internationalism." If we should proclaim this slogan to counter that of "all Hungarians are brothers" on, say, the market-place at Szeged, it would not be understood. This is not to suggest that we should stop using the proper slogans, but that we should make them easier to understand. We should use slogans which make the communist, Marxist, class outlook easier to grasp. Not all Hungarians are brothers! An Argentine worker with internationalist views is a brother to us, whereas the Hungarian bourgeoisie, the ex-manufacturers and ex-landowners, are our mortal enemies. This view is not accepted by everyone, but the majority of the working people will, from first-hand experience, understand that it is right. They know how much harm they came to at the hands of manufacturers, and how often workers of other countries have come to their assistance. These problems will have to be studied more closely and be explored from the theoretical as well as the propaganda angle.

2. The demagogic, rabble-rousing demand of human rights, of democratic freedoms, is the second issue on which our enemies have scored great successes. They want freedom for all, freedom for everybody to be able to preach whatever he pleases, and so forth. At the first hearing, this demand appeals to everyone. What harm could come from everybody being free to speak his mind? We have not

answered this question as yet; yet the answer will have to be given, and the implications of this demand must be laid bare. The democratic character of our system should be contrasted with that of western capitalism.

3. Social welfare demagogy is the third issue on which they have been successful and which we have to continue to combat. Let us examine this issue, too.

The living standard rose considerably during the past year, and it has now ceased to be the chief concern of the workers—at least of the decent majority—to demand more. What they feel concerned about today is that we may whittle away some of their gains, for, as they say, they only got those benefits because we were "scared into granting them." This problem deserves our serious attention. We must bring it home to the people that the actual trend of the living standard has been influenced by the fact that there was no bourgeois revolution in Hungary. The rise of capitalism progressed slowly and it proceeded by fits and starts. Hungary used to be an underdeveloped country saddled with feudal restrictions and limitations and with a miserable standard of living. That was the reason why capitalism in this country could not give the people as much as it is capable of giving elsewhere under certain conditions. That backwardness was the historical inheritance that fell to the share of the Hungarian people with Liberation. On top of it all came the damage caused by the ruling classes through embroiling Hungary in the Hitlerite war. If these circumstances are put in their proper light, and our conditions compared not only with those of some advanced western nations, but also with those in old Hungary, then it must be admitted by one and all that in this country the living standard of the broad masses has risen indeed. Facts, such as were stressed at the mass rally—namely the elimination of the precariousness of living, unemployment and evictions, as under capitalism—are also relevant to this issue.

We must talk about the housing problem, too. Housing conditions in this country are bad—no question of it. In this connection, however, let me point out but one phenomenon. At a local council meeting the question arose whether there was today a single worker who would not undertake, without a moment's hesitation, to pay the rent of a three-room flat. By contrast, housing conditions in old Hungary were such that people lived under conditions worse than today's, and tens of thousands were living without a roof over their heads for years on end, while thousands of flats remained untenanted

simply because workers did not have enough money to pay rent. Now, why not talk about that for once?

As for the readjustment of wages and salaries, it should be pointed out that this was in fact begun in 1956, and not merely after the counter-revolution. We have been straining our resources to the extreme limit, and the present level can be maintained—provided, of course, earnings are backed by actual labour, by production! These questions must be made our point of departure, or we shall not be able to get ahead in our work. It is on the questions of nationalism, the democratic character of our system, and the rising living standard that we have to defend our point of view. There is no reason for us to fight shy of any of these issues, for it is we who are in the right.

Thus, nationalism, democracy, and socialist construction are now the three decisive issues, they will be the ones to claim our close attention for a long time to come. We shall have to work out arguments concerning these matters. In our hands we have the living matter of life itself and if we do not work out our arguments now, we never will.

\* \* \*

The other group of problems concerns the establishment of relations with the masses, problems that were also discussed at the Party Conference. It is impossible to carry on fruitful propaganda activity among the masses, or establish good relations with them, unless the political barriers that obstruct our progress are removed. This is a problem that has to be solved within the party and it comprises the need to overcome self-complacency and to get rid of the bureaucratic spirit. Symptoms of these diseases became apparent at lower party levels early this year and had gone far by the beginning of last May. We have been combating these diseases but have not conquered them as yet.

1. The coercive spirit is the chief obstacle impeding the further progress of political education among the masses. Now I don't want to be misunderstood! I am not suggesting that there is no need to remove some people from their posts or to lock them up. But we have the proper authorities to take care of that, so do not let the party organizations concern themselves with it. The primary responsibility of the party organizations is to win over the masses. And the spirit of coercion has to be exorcised from the party.

2. The question of the relationship between party members and non-party people. The Party Conference thesis that, by and large, draws

the most fire from the body of party opinion is the one which permits non-party people to occupy leading posts. Difficult though it may be, communists will have to accept the principle that, in the eyes of the law, party members have not an iota more right than do non-party people. We must fight to assert this principle; and if it should be found that some people joined the party because they thought that membership would entail more rights for them, then steps should be taken to discourage such people from party membership. What distinguishes party members from non-party people is quite another thing—it is the fact that members of the party work in a proper and exemplary way. A communist who does good work enjoys such respect and prestige in the party committee or the branch organization that no office whatever could give him that much. All members of the party will have to put up with the fact that they are granted no more civic rights than non-party people. Once they have understood this, they will work efficiently.

3. Failure to create an atmosphere of freedom is the third problem listed among the obstacles in the way of political mass work. At membership meetings for members of the party, and at open party meetings for all those present (I mean of course honest people), an atmosphere must be created in which they may freely speak their minds, make their criticisms and advance suggestions. Failing such an atmosphere, we have no means of knowing what the masses think and in that case are unable to win them over. Our starting point shall always be: What is the attitude of the masses? If we hinder the party from knowing what the masses think, we are nipping the party's work in the bud. If, however, the working people see that at the party meeting they may raise any question of vital importance to them and will get an answer, then they will readily come to the meeting. In this manner the party will build up contact with the masses.

There is need to combat the fallacious views that arise within the party. I mean fallacious, and not harmful, views. The report we have heard contains a passage which says that the drive to free the factories from hostile elements has held the attention of the party branch organizations, and so they were not able to devote the proper attention to political work among the masses. Now let us take a closer look at this matter. If the party organization was so engrossed in this process as to be unable to devote attention to political work among the masses, it would have been preferable for it not to have started with it at all! The police may do some mopping-up without



carrying on propaganda to enlighten the people—in fact, it has to do so, since that is its duty. Certain facts come to their knowledge, and as a result they have merely to tell some individuals to take their coats and come along. That constitutes the political work of the police. But a purge by the party organization, unaccompanied by enlightening work, is but an illusory political success that does more harm than good. If the party organizations have cause for removing people from their posts, they must not reduce their work to merely going to the police or the ministry. They should report the case to the next higher party body and expose the culprits. If they fail to do so, the enemy, making the most of such removal, will say: “He got the push for voicing the working chaps’ complaints” or “for challenging the party this time last year.” Now, if the party organization fails to tell the working people the reason why the person in question has had to be removed from his post or locked up, it will have damaged the party’s interests.

This is a wrong attitude because you will just note that this has happened a certain way, and make no comment. This attitude is wrong, it should be counteracted.

The Party Conference also discussed another wrong attitude which says in effect: “We couldn’t devote our attention to economic matters, for we were engrossed in building the party; but now things are easier, and from now on we will concern ourselves with economic affairs.” This wrong attitude must be combated, too. You can’t build the party while ignoring economic problems, for it’s not only that this attitude is having an adverse effect on the very efforts to build the party—it’s like sealing the party up in a greenhouse. What power can a party wield which is being organized with complete disregard for economic problems? This is not a sound way of building a party! People have been admitted to membership in the party after being asked if they loved the Soviet Union, approved of the Revolutionary Workers’ and Peasants’ Government, and if they wished to join the party. But no one seemed interested to know just how well these persons did their respective jobs. Concern for economic problems is part of political work among the masses, for economic problems are of primary importance to every working man and woman. On the whole, conditions in this country are good enough to enable the communists to face any working man and answer whatever questions he may ask. You want to argue it out with people: there is no need for us to shun questions. The view which holds that any vital task may be solved without political enlightenment, should be discarded.

It is time we devoted some attention to theoretical studies and got out our books on Marxism. What, with this mix-up we’ve been through, we haven’t read a book in almost a year. Comrade Lenin, for instance, writing of problems of administration, explains repeatedly that to use force without carrying on political educational work among the masses is—a crime. Now the fault is ours, for if we gave attention to this problem, people would understand us before long.

With regard to the mass organizations. You will have to accept the fact that there are at present—and there will be in the future—two kinds of contact between the party and the masses, namely direct and indirect contact. It is a case of direct contact when, for example, the party announces a meeting, and there, before the assembled masses of people, we give an exposition of our views. Indirect contact means that a great deal—at least half—of the communist propaganda work is relegated to the trade unions, the youth league, the local councils, and the Patriotic People’s Front. Thus one half of the work is performed by the party—the direct way—while the other half is taken care of by the mass organizations—the indirect way. The trade unions have a total membership of more than one and a half million. If the communists will do nothing else than bring those one and a half million people closely under their influence, they will have done significant work. You’ll have to get used to the idea that indirect means are of high importance, too. Yesterday, we talked with members of the Young Communist League, and problems of this kind were discussed in relation to them. Indirect means should be made use of also in political propaganda work among the masses. The foremost requirement put to the working people should not be that they love the party, but that they love our country, the people’s democratic system. This is a moral requirement which can be put to 90 per cent of the population. Once a man has understood this, he has come close to developing respect for the communist party, because this party is the defender of *his* political system. The fields of work in mass organizations acquire extraordinary importance owing to the fact that they enable us to get into close touch with the masses politically. For you cannot demand that the working people accept the communist viewpoint forthwith. There are hundreds of thousands of people who are not communists, and probably will not become communists within a short time yet; for all that, they may be honest people who are loyal to the People’s Democracy. As things are today, most party activists have developed a classification of their own in which people who have joined the party are labelled “honest”; while on

the other hand, they tend to despise the others—non-party people and former members of the H.W.P.P. who have not re-entered. People who think that way are no enemies of the party, they mean well in their own way, but they must be made to understand that in this way they only harm the party.

There are some questions of method. For instance, do we want to have a special body of propagandists (people's educators) within the party or don't we? Already in 1948, I had an argument on this matter. Then I said that we didn't need one; still, the majority convinced me of the contrary. In my opinion, either view has some advantages to commend it. This problem should be studied closely, but even if we are to have no special groups of propagandists, some measure of organization is necessary in our propaganda activity—to the extent, at least, of recruiting active people (party members and also, perhaps, non-party people) for our propaganda work. From time to time, the party committee should call these people together and ask them about their views on certain matters, and inquire after their problems. These people will tell us what they think, and if there should be anything in which they do not see clearly—or in which they do not see eye to eye with us—we shall have to convince them. If they themselves are not convinced of the justness of their cause, then we cannot expect them to do good work as propagandists. Such contingency is not without precedent, you know. It is imperative, therefore, that we be aware of the problems besetting the propagandists, the very people who, in their turn, transmit to us the problems that beset the masses. This work needs to be performed in an organized manner, and we have to make systematic efforts to find an opportunity, other than party meetings, of familiarizing ourselves with people's opinions.

In our work among the masses, therefore, we must ensure a two-way flow: on the one hand, the masses have to be familiarized with the views of the party; on the other, the party must be kept informed about the views of the masses. The two ways are equally important, for if we only state our truths, it may be too late when we realize that the masses have different views.

There is one more topical problem that we might do well to refer to in the resolutions—the special session of the U.N. General Assembly. This is going to be an important issue of our political propaganda among the masses pretty soon. This matter is engaging people's attention, and they are wondering what kind of decision is going to be taken at the U.N. and what may be the upshot of

the resolution. Of course, we are not prophets and can't possibly know beforehand what the decision is going to be. Some diplomats have asked the Americans what they hope to achieve, whether they want to get Hungary expelled from the U.N. From the Americans' answers it would seem that they do not mean to bring matters to a head. They do not want to go so far as to have Hungary expelled from the U.N., neither do they intend to break off diplomatic relations with us. Their motives are propagandistic.

What can they actually do? They cannot have Hungary expelled from the U.N., because such action falls within the competence of the Security Council, of which the Soviet Union is a member, and she can use her veto. They may adopt a resolution which condemns the Soviet Union for having "interfered" in Hungary's internal affairs, calls upon the Soviet Union to withdraw her forces from Hungary, and calls upon Hungary to stop persecuting the "freedom fighters." But they have no right whatever to interfere in Hungary's internal affairs.

Why is this whole business fraught with danger? Because, by dragging it in, they are whipping up a new big wave of propaganda, stirring up enmity and poisoning the international atmosphere. This possibility is something we've got to reckon with. This week, the U.N. is holding a special session devoted to us; that will be followed by the ordinary session whose agenda also includes Hungary, so this question will be debated for months on end. It is to our advantage that the U.S. position concerning this issue has been greatly weakened, even at the U.N., since last November-December. Now the U.S. cannot count on the support of all those nations who stood by it last November-December.

When the report of the U.N. Special Committee on Hungary was published, they got the newspaper editors together in Britain and called upon them to give space to the Special Committee report and to keep it fresh. The editors said they would do no such thing and, indeed, did not do it—because public opinion was not interested. Certain bourgeois circles appear quite dismayed by the fact that there is absolutely nothing they can do. As for the Afro-Asian delegates—and we may count a few other U.N. delegates in this group—they do not like what is going on in New York at all. These delegates may not come out openly for Hungary and the Soviet Union, but they have made it clear beforehand that they do not approve of Hungary being debated at the U.N., as they have got their own troubles to worry about. This, on the whole, is what would

seem to be the prospects. The imperialists should realize that, no matter what they do, we are not going to give up our position.

Now this special session of the U.N. General Assembly, how does it affect the political scene in this country? It encourages and activates the hostile elements—this can be felt already—and these will become more active and bolder still later on. Sitters-on-the-fence, who in the months of April, May and June were leaning our way, will now swing back towards the enemy—though not to the extent they did ten months ago. Our own masses (and by that I mean not only members of the party, but also democratic non-party opinion loyal to the People's Democracy) will be activated too, but in a positive direction. It has been seen at peasant rallies that even non-party people express indignation at imperialist designs and oppose them. Thus, for a period of two months or three, there is going to be some intensification of the struggle, and the political situation is going to become more complex. The hostile forces will increase their activity, but so will we—we have to face up to that. We have to tell the party organizations that they must not take alarm. If we fight well, it will be our positions that will have been strengthened when this period is over.

What I want to ask of the Budapest Party Committee is that, no matter how big the tasks are, it should always concentrate political work among the masses on those issues in which solution is liable to promote our work as a whole. Even the simplest people will find the right method of propaganda if they see things clearly, and are convinced that their cause is just. But on the most crucial issues, they must be helped to recognize the truth, to discern the positive phenomena, and to learn the knack of analyzing the given situation.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS AT THE SESSION OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

January 28th, 1958

Honoured Assembly:

I should first like to touch upon the remarks pertaining to the work of the government.

It has become clear from the debate in the National Assembly, too, that the broad masses of the people evaluate highly the fact that the government's policy is forthright and clear-cut. This fact has been expressed in many forms during the past few months.

In our opinion, relations with the Soviet Union have been a key question for both the peoples of the friendly countries building socialism and the international labour movement in general. This is still a key question today. The issue has expanded, due to the changes ensuing since the Second World War, to the point where relations with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies have become a key question for people living in the non-socialist countries of the world as well. We believe that no one can call himself a progressive—irrespective of which country he lives in—if he does not possess a feeling of solidarity with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.

We participated not long ago in the two conferences of communist and workers' parties of the socialist and other countries, which were held in Moscow. The comrades who took the floor—especially at the second conference, in which practically all communist and workers' parties from all parts of the world participated—said that, at the time when the attitude on the Hungarian question had become the main criterion of progressiveness, people in all countries asked the parties of progress: What is the situation in Hungary, and what is your stand on the issue? All progressive parties throughout the world had to fight out their battle on this issue. The forces of progress and reaction clashed in all countries. It became clear at the conference that the progressive forces of the world gave united support to the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government and to its struggle. Moreover, it developed that those parties which had soonest



and most firmly condemned the attack of reaction and imperialism against the Hungarian people, and had declared their support of the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government, were the very ones which were able to increase their own strength most rapidly.

The question of a person's attitude toward progress is, in our epoch, determined fundamentally by his relation to the Soviet Union, to the Soviet people and their aspirations. As far as we are concerned, life has proved that we took the right stand when we refused to conceal our viewpoint but came out into the open with it. The masses understood this frank talk, and supported our stand.

I agree with what was said here during the debate to the effect that the government's policy has accumulated strength by fighting and acting in harmony with the masses. The attitude and labour of the intellectuals, as well as of the workers and peasants, find expression both in our economic and cultural achievements and in the achievements of political consolidation. There can be no creative labour or productive work without a positive attitude of the intellectuals. And, when we reject as slander the allegation that the entire intelligentsia, or a segment thereof, is reactionary, we are motivated by the profound conviction that neither creative labour nor the building of a socialist society is conceivable without the positive attitude of the intellectuals. We are counting upon the intellectuals, and we can safely say that we shall not be deceived in our calculations.

Consistency is accepted as being one of the virtues of the government's activity and, I believe, with good reason. The foremost and primary demand of the masses on the leadership is that the leadership shall say what it wants in no uncertain terms. Either they approve of it, and then they will give it their support, or they disapprove of it, in which case they will withhold their support or, possibly, oppose it; but at all events, it is good to know just what the leadership wants. The sharp turns during the past few years represented, among other things, a dangerous sickness for our democratic forces, because ultimately neither the masses who were solidly behind us and who, of course, constitute the overwhelming majority in the country, nor those who wavered, knew what was wanted of them. During the past 15 months—which, in many respects, constitute a historical epoch in the life of the country and people—a clearer appreciation has developed as to just what the leadership is after. They—the leaders—speak their minds openly. This excellent quality of the government must be preserved.

There are also critical observations regarding the government's activity; this, however, involves finer nuances. We have often talked with people belonging to diverse groups who agree with us on certain questions, but disagree on other issues. And sometimes they say: we do agree with what is said from above, but it doesn't always have the same look down below. There is something thoroughly wrong if things sound one way on top and quite differently when they get to the bottom. I do not think one can say that the Central Committee of the party, the government, the Presidential Council are saying something different from the executive bodies down below. It is possible that, in some instances, the correct line becomes slightly weakened in the process of implementation. This is, unfortunately, in the very nature of the matter. It is only natural that a resolution or a decision should weaken, to a certain extent, as it passes through many hands in the course of execution. But we ask—and expect—those people who complain about this to think over the matter more thoroughly. For instance, Comrade Münnich and I recently discussed this problem with the leaders of the Academy of Sciences. It became evident, at the end of the cordial conversation lasting several hours that there was agreement on all questions concerning the fundamental and mutual activity of the government and the Academy of Sciences. Then, at the end, they, too, came up with this: What a good thing it would be if things down below were like what the government leaders say. In reply, I said to our scientific friends: "We agree with what you have reported concerning the attitude of the scientific and research workers. Now cross your hearts and swear that everything in your sphere of work is put into practice down below in precisely the way you have told us."

We must strive to make sure that what the leadership says on top is, as far as possible, carried out at the ultimate point of execution, too. This, however, calls for pooled efforts. Both the government and those who make this claim on the government must, each in his own field, see to it that things proceed down below in the same positive way as they admittedly do on top.

As far as the living standard is concerned, we aim this year—and the government report is clear on this point, so there should be no misunderstanding—at consolidating the level attained by December 1957; we further intend to establish in industry the requisites for moving ahead again at a later date.

I have no hesitation calmly to face any group of workers or of other working people and to pose this question: when is the government

acting in good faith and in the interests of the working people—when it says that we are beginning a year of consolidation, or when it talks irresponsibly about raising the living standard again before the material preconditions have been created? I am certain that all honest working men and women who bear their own interests in mind would reply: let us consolidate things and move ahead only after we have established the necessary conditions for doing so.

I would like to speak now about a special matter. A member of the National Assembly stated that the newspapers, too, have come closer to reality. In our opinion, the activity of the newspapers has, in general, improved a lot as compared with, let us say, the first few months of last year—not to speak about October and November 1956. There are, however, shortcomings and weaknesses in their work. We value highly the newspaper profession and its activity. It has an exceptionally important role in shaping public opinion. We ask the newspapermen to act with greater responsibility. We ask them to respect their own profession at least to the extent to which we do. Let me at this point mention a matter which is connected with this issue, though, on the whole, it concerns something entirely different. Comrade Peskó spoke about the important and difficult task of the teachers in developing character and in moral training. I would like to say, here and now, that, personally at least, I do not agree at all with the article published in *Hétfői Hírek* in which, in connection with the tragic case of a schoolgirl, a theory is set forth which does not redound to the public good.

What is the article about? It links up with a tragic incident. It is always tragic when a growing youth—in this case a girl—takes her own life. No one knows why she did it; and no one will ever know, because she did not tell anyone. The article is based on hypotheses, and follows them to the point of concluding that the teacher who sent a note to the parents because the girl went to the cinema instead of doing her lessons is responsible for the child's death. This is, in my opinion, an unjust attack on the teachers in general, who are working under extremely difficult conditions. The article plucks the strings of pathos when it says: the girl could not bear taking the note of admonition home because she was so devoted to her mother. Unfortunately, tragedies of this nature are not unusual among adolescents. But now that we are on the subject of adolescents, the way to display their respect and love for their mothers is not by hesitating to give them an unpleasant evening through another note concerning their children's behaviour—because they went to the cinema

instead of doing their lessons, but rather let them show their respect by doing their lessons instead of going to the cinema. We would like the newspapermen, who are such an important factor in shaping public affairs, to support that general striving and endeavour which, in our opinion, the young people are in greater need of than anyone else.

Now I should like to say a few words on some problems of science. It usually happens that the scientists begin to elaborate a scientific problem, working out the theme theoretically, disregarding real life, and saying that it must be realized in such and such a manner. Then comes the practical application. We look around, and perhaps the idea—such as they imagine it—could be realized by the Soviet Union with her natural endowments, possibly also by the United States—except when it comes to sputniks. But we cannot carry out this ideal solution under our conditions. It would be a crime to suggest that the scientists and scientific workers should creep along the ground. But we ask them to link up the two: let them aspire towards the ideal, but let them never break away from real life. Then they will create things—and Hungarian scientific workers have done quite a bit during the past few years—which can benefit the people and the country, and of which Hungarian science, too, may be proud.

In connection with the financial status of intellectuals, I pose the question whether the position of the scientific workers and of the intellectuals in general is better in the People's Democracy than it was under the Horthy regime.

We can, in good conscience, answer this question as follows: The intellectuals in the lower and middle brackets—and they are the majority—are unquestionably living better under conditions of People's Democracy. The reason for this is that an end has been put to unemployment among the intellectuals, to the humiliation, etc. which young intellectuals faced ten or fifteen years ago as they entered upon their career.

The majority of intellectuals, therefore, live better under conditions of People's Democracy. If we consider the topmost, privileged group—not amounting to a stratum—of the intellectuals, then it can be said that a good many of them enjoyed better material conditions in the past than today. But we put this question to the leaders in the field of science: tell us, do not these scientists, who in the past enjoyed a privileged position and who perhaps are not so well-to-do today, feel that their life is enriched when they look about the country and see that the former labourers, of whom there are hundreds and thousands in this country, are living much better now than in the



past? On Váci Road, at—let us say—4 p. m., they can hardly be distinguished from office workers. Go out there when the workers come off the shift, and you will hardly be able to distinguish a worker from a chief engineer—both of them are well dressed. And here is another fact: let the cultured and learned scientist go to the countryside; let him observe the houses, some of them like villas, which have been built by tens of thousands—and even by the hundreds of thousands—since Liberation; then he will see that the rural working people, who in the past were abject and destitute specimens of humanity, are now living a good life worthy of human beings. Well, do not all these facts make him sleep sounder at night? After all, his work, too, has gone into the making of these achievements. As far as villas and automobiles are concerned, there happens to be no rule in our country to the effect that he should not have a villa or an automobile. We have had to lift up several million people in our country, and therefore our nation is not fully able to offer special advantages as yet, but it will do so in the future.

A member of the National Assembly described the position of our emigrants—ours, in the sense of their being Hungarians—in sharp and, though sometimes joking, nonetheless very serious words. I think that the emigrants can, in general, be divided into two groups. There are people who are living off emigration, and people who are living in emigration. We are not especially interested in those who live off the emigrants, and as a matter of fact, the country will never ask pardon of their like.

If it is a question of Béla Varga being the lifetime chairman of some kind of committee abroad, one should suggest that they look for an heir apparent, for that committee will have to function for a long, long time—unless its members resign from their posts inimical to their native country and they ask that country for pardon.

But I must say frankly that we are very sorry indeed for those people who left the country in bewilderment at the end of 1956. Most of them are not criminals; and it is obvious that some of them, having become familiar with that "paradise," are trying to get home even at the risk of their lives. There have been many instances where, in the absence of legal documents, they are doing things in reverse: they cross our border secretly and report to the border guard, saying: here I am; I've come back; tell me what to do. We are doing everything we can so that people like these can find the path back home.

I agree wholeheartedly with the speech of János Máté, M.P. I would like to repeat in this connection what I said at the meeting

of the National Council of the Patriotic People's Front, namely, that day-to-day cooperation is good between the Government and the Bench of Bishops. We are endeavouring to deal with the contradictions and differences in view in a normal manner: talking matters over, discussing, debating, and, finally, reaching some kind of decision. This is a good and valuable thing. In our opinion, however, a more durable principled basis is required in the relations and cooperation between the State and the Church.

We believe that those Church leaders who relieve both the pastors and the church members of their inner conflicts are acting wisely. These inner conflicts can be eliminated. The only requirement for this is that the Church leaders live up to the tenets of their religious belief—since without doing so they are neither pastors nor believers—while at the same time accepting, as a social programme, the building of the people's democratic system, of a socialist society. In this event, there will be no inner conflict; people will not have to puzzle over such questions like "should I be obedient to the Pope and violate my allegiance to my country, or should I uphold my allegiance to my country and transgress against my duty as a Church member to the Pope."

Public opinion in Hungary, no less than the Hungarian government, has welcomed the unilateral decision of the Soviet government to cut the Soviet armed forces by an additional 300,000 men, in the interest of relieving the cold war.

I would like to repeat, however, that it is, in our opinion, necessary for the Soviet troops to remain temporarily in Hungary, not because of the domestic situation of the Hungarian People's Republic, but because of the international situation. The Hungarian People's Republic and its government would not face any resulting domestic political problems in the event that the international situation were to permit the withdrawal of troops—from both the NATO countries and, of course, the countries signatory to the Warsaw Treaty.

Finally, just a few words about a question directly bound up with the reorganization of the leadership of the government. We see that our aim in reorganizing the leadership is understood by the working people, and finds approval and support. I would, however, like to clarify a misunderstanding. In at least three different places during the past few days, I have heard many people express their best wishes for the success of my new work. There appears to be some misunderstanding here, for I've been doing the other job, too—as a worker would put it—I've been working in two shifts all along.



Now I can, at least to a large degree, go over to one shift, and both Comrade Kállai and I shall, as secretaries of the Central Committee, be able to do more, and do it better. So wish us success, not in our new work, but in the continuation of our old work.

Concerning Comrade Münnich: I think that Comrade Münnich would have been the first to protest against our giving a lecture here on his life. The situation pertaining to Comrade Münnich is the following: Some people, with a propensity for intrigue and jealousy, saw to it that, after decades of absence, he should not be able to live at home and be active here—even after the Liberation of the country. Yet, as everyone knows, he has been a veteran of the labour movement ever since the beginning of the First World War. When we visited the Soviet Union in autumn of last year, people told us that they had fought against the counter-revolutionaries alongside Comrade Münnich in the Ural partisan groups. Then he fought for the cause of progress in the Spanish Civil War. What is not so well known is that he took part in military operations and fought at the front against the Hitlerite fascists during the Second World War. But I shall not go on. Perhaps I should rather point out that when, on November 1 and 2, 1956, we saw the need for a new government, for breaking with the traitors, Comrade Münnich was definitely one of the first to take the initiative and—if we must and can speak about such matters—almost became Prime Minister at that time. I shall now share a “trade secret” with you: It was Comrade Münnich who recommended that I take charge of things as Prime Minister, since he had not lived within the country for a long time and his views and activities were less well known. Well, now the people do know them, and they can and will have confidence in him.

I ask the National Assembly to continue to lend its support to the government. Let us pool our energies and perform our common tasks even better than up to now. We know that the activity of the government can and should be improved. Let us work together, and the results will be forthcoming. In the past there was a lot of preaching—sometimes on a firm basis and sometimes to the empty air—about national solidarity and unity. I affirm that, in Hungary, national solidarity and national unity are a reality, and that they have found convincing expression in all the affairs we have been talking about for the last two days here. Let us strengthen this national unity. When it is striving to defend our socialist achievements, to make further progress in building a socialist society, and to fight for a lasting peace, the government is serving the cause of national unity.

## THE GOOD TRADE-UNION LEADER KNOWS NOT ONLY WHAT TO ASK FOR BUT ALSO HOW THESE DEMANDS CAN BE MET

ADDRESS TO THE NINETEENTH  
CONGRESS OF HUNGARIAN TRADE UNIONS

March 3rd, 1958

Comrades:

The present deliberations acquire added significance owing to the fact that this is a congress held by the trade unions of the Hungarian working class, recently victorious in one of the great battles of the class struggle.

The Hungarian people have decided—and they have acted and fought accordingly—that the workers' power shall stay, and shall be strengthened. Hence it is the paramount task of all trade-union activists—and, even more so, of all trade-union officials—to subordinate every issue to the need to strengthen the workers' power. So long as the working class is in power in a given country, it will always be possible to argue about, and take decisions concerning, the actual size of family allowances and the length of holidays, the charges at holiday centres—whether they should be progressive or regressive. But if the working class is not in power, then we may as well give up all discussion of such matters. That is something we ought to remember all the time.

This Congress will have consolidated in the minds of the Hungarian working people the idea of working class internationalism, too.

That the Hungarian working class, which suffered temporary defeat, has been able to gain the upper hand, is due to the fact that, at the crucial moment, the international working class hastened to the assistance of the Hungarian working class.

As you know, we have just returned from a visit to the fraternal Rumanian People's Republic, and I am discharging an honourable duty and obligation by conveying to you warm fraternal greetings from the working people of the Rumanian People's Republic.

In our encounters in that country, we were told everywhere that in those days when the Hungarian working class power had been in

danger, the working people of the fraternal countries had been deeply anxious for the freedom of the Hungarian people—and also a little for themselves. For—and this realization is gaining ground steadily—our respective destinies are bound together.

We also shared in the joy over the success of the efforts to frustrate the attempts of the class enemy, and over the fact that the Hungarian People's Republic, the socialist camp led by the Soviet Union, and proletarian internationalism were not weakened as the result of the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary, but have in fact been further strengthened.

We are now in a position where material resources, the basic means of production, and the army are controlled by the working class, but there is one sphere where the supremacy of the working class is not yet complete. That sphere is people's minds.

The reactionary bourgeoisie and imperialism—for they too have derived some useful experience from the events in Hungary—do not think now of organizing and launching a new attack against the Hungarian People's Republic, and that is one useful experience they have gained. Yet they have not given up the desire to maintain a hold on the minds of the masses in this country. We must fight, therefore, systematically, very seriously, and at great length so that the views and ideals of the working class should not only prevail with regard to the use of arms and lathe benches but also govern. Failing that, it is impossible to build and work well.

It is my belief that ever since the day on which they came into being at the dawn of the working-class movement, and as long as they will continue in existence, the trade unions have had—and will continue to have—the fundamental task of formulating queries and making demands on behalf of the workers. But it does make a great deal of difference who it is that your queries and demands are addressed to, and under what kind of a social system the trade unions exist and put forward their demands. You can ask and put forward demands any time. But if it is true—as it indeed is—that under our system the people are masters of the country, then trade-unionists, too, must think as masters of the country.

When facing the capitalists—in Horthyite Hungary, for instance—it was enough to be skilled in the art of drawing up claims and demands, and if you did this in a steadfast and honest manner, you were a good trade-union official. Now in my opinion, a good trade-union official today is one who knows what to ask for, what to demand on behalf of the working people, but who also knows how and from

what these demands can be met. That is a new and, I assure you, more difficult art than merely to decide sensibly and well what one is going to claim and demand for the working class.

Ever since its birth, the working class has been fighting the bourgeoisie also in the sphere of ideas. In this struggle the bourgeoisie has the edge on the workers in one respect: as far as it is concerned, all will be well if the workers do not think, for in that case the bourgeoisie can control the minds. On the other hand, the interests of the working class require people to think. Of course, it is easier not to think than to do so. That is why our job is a more difficult one, for we have got to capture people's minds. But in this struggle the working class, too, has the edge on the bourgeoisie in one thing: its truths are stronger.

At one time—more than a century ago—actually only two men were able to formulate the ideas of the working class; those two men were Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Now look about you: in the world today—meaning, of course, the capitalist and colonial as well as the socialist spheres of the world—there are about one thousand million men and women who can formulate the ideas and demands of the working class.

Now a few words about the points under discussion. I do not want to prejudice you—you just go on discussing these matters. Family allowances are, indeed, an important issue. If we were in a capitalist country—though one should make no demagogic gestures even in capitalist countries, for the serious-minded working-class movement is groomed on socialism, not on demagogy—in a capitalist country, one might suggest that we should push family allowances as far up as possible. Under the conditions of socialism, our responsibility is graver. We believe in financial incentives as a lever indispensable for socialist construction. We want to do our work so that socialist construction will be accompanied by the rising living standard of the working people, including families with many children. As for the individual worker, the more he or she is capable of producing for the community, the greater his or her earnings shall be. Thus: produce more, earn more!

Another question that has come up: should trade-unionists have special rights, or should they not? We have been fighting for several months to stop party members from being granted privileges. I have respect for trade-union traditions, but I should think that trade-union membership is no higher than membership in the party. Under our system, in this country all citizens are equal in the eyes of the law. That is something we must not violate. The state can guarantee civic

rights in an equal measure only, regardless of whether you are an organized worker or not. If this were not the case, tomorrow everybody would join the trade unions, and then they would be more like Mussolini's corporations than trade unions. This, therefore, is not the proper way. Still, something *can* be done after all. Let the trade unions offer their members some benefits other non-unionist citizens do not enjoy—that is perfectly legal under our constitution, under our law.

An argument has been going on here as to whether congresses should be held once every two, three, or four years. If I were to ask a rank-and-file worker at what intervals he wanted congresses to be held, I am sure he would say that he didn't care how often they were held as long as they did what they ought to do. Take a look at all the big unions: each of them has held about half as many congresses as the number of years it has been in existence, or somewhat fewer since no congresses could be held during the war. It is a long-established tradition, and a good one, for trade unions to hold congresses every two years. There is no reason why we should break away from this practice. The trade-union leader should think not only with the head of the official—he should also study the feelings and thoughts of the masses. Only that union functions well which convokes its congress annually if need be.

Now we may safely say that the workers' state has the support of the people. Order has been re-established in this country by and large, but several things that are not exactly good have survived from the general slackness that followed the counter-revolution. People do their work, but they don't work quite as hard yet as our people can if they have the will to. And we are still using all kinds of pretexts to sing and make merry more than we ought to. Some slight adjustment is, therefore, called for.

Take the case of old-age pensioners, for instance. I don't want to go into every item here, yet one circumstance ought to be taken into consideration: in Hungary, a comparatively high proportion of the adult population is on pension. Now we may decide if we like that one-third of the population of this country will be pensioned off—I see no obstacles to prevent such action, we have a majority in the National Assembly, so we could get it through. But think! The higher the proportion of the population that goes on pension, the lower the living standards of both working citizens and pensioners are bound to be. The same thing applies to the effort to raise the living standard. Apart from us, many other nations are working and fighting for socialism, too. We are very proud of the fact that in 1919 we were among the first to enter the battle for socialism. That's all very well. But if I

look back upon the last four decades, I see that the Soviet, the Chinese and the Rumanian workers and the workers of other countries have been fighting, too. If we added up everything—battles, losses, sacrifices, labour and all—and compared the entire effort with the struggles, the blood losses, the sacrifices and labour of the Soviet people, we would see that, although we have sacrificed less than they have, still we have a keener appetite for some things.

As regards our future prospects, we have nothing to fear on that score. On the whole, things are shaping up well, even on the international scene. The cause of socialism will make progress, and so will the cause of peace. The Hungarian trade unions are advancing, too.

The party helps the unions. It applies to the party and the unions alike that they must go ahead together with the masses. They must not spare the effort. It is most vitally important that they be on the same side with the working people, and that they discuss at length and most frequently all matters of concern to the working people. They should never put the damper on anyone, but let people voice all their complaints. People will feel relieved if they are free to express everything that makes them sore; if they see that their troubles are known and receive attention; if they receive decent answers to their problems. I believe that there is not a single matter on which we cannot furnish the working people adequate information and provide them proper guidance with a clear conscience, and in conformity with the truth.

It has been said that there are no chances for raising the living standard just now. The chances are given—in principle; only they are not realized. No one can prevent us from working more and better. If we do, we shall have more to spend on social welfare benefits. Who could stop us from doing that? We will fail in this only if we lack the determination, and the ability to sweep the masses along with us. Let us stand firmly on our feet and let us lead the masses, and we shall be able to make something of the given possibilities. This is a beautiful country, it has fertile land, there is opportunity to work, the people are hard-working, and there is the necessary know-how. What else do we want? We want determination. If we work better, we shall make swifter progress.

In January-February, last year, we "had it." Everybody started from the situation existing then. As the year went on, development outpaced the plan we had made. The same thing can be done this year. If so, what is now an unrealized possibility will become reality.

You will see; it will be a real pleasure to watch the fine progress made by the working people.



## HUNGARIAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP IS UNSHAKABLE

ADDRESS TO THE MASS MEETING HELD IN  
CELEBRATION OF THE THIRTEENTH ANNIVER-  
SARY OF THE LIBERATION OF HUNGARY

April 4th, 1958

Dear Comrade Khrushchov, Dear Guests, Dear Comrades Dobi, Münnich, and Marosán:

Comrades, Workers of Budapest:

I greet you on our greatest National Day, the anniversary of the day Hungary was liberated.

Today's celebrations acquire special significance and lustre from the fact that on this day we welcome in our midst a Soviet party and government delegation headed by Comrade Khrushchov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. It is a great pleasure to have with us the delegates of that great people whose sons shed their blood in the Second World War to win freedom and national independence for us and again in the autumn of 1956 when our freedom and national independence were threatened once more.

This is not the first time Comrade Khrushchov is visiting Hungary. He was here early in January 1957, when he attended the Budapest Conference of Five Communist and Workers' Parties. The difficult conditions prevailing at the time prevented us from giving him a befitting reception; this time, however, Comrade Khrushchov and the other members of the Soviet delegation are here for a longer stay. They will have the opportunity to meet not only party and national leaders but the masses of the Hungarian people as well. In the course of these meetings our dear visitors will be able to feel everywhere the warm affection that goes out towards them from the hearts of the Hungarian working people. This sincere and deep affection is meant for the party, the government and the people who have given, and are giving, this country continuous help in every sphere of activity, helping it in its

effort to build up socialism. Also, it is meant for Comrade Khrushchov himself, who, pursuing the policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet government, is fighting so consistently and so unsparingly to ensure peace and security for all nations.

I am speaking for my entire people in expressing the wish that you, dear visitors, may feel in Hungary as one feels in the home of brothers or of loyal friends.

Comrades, Friends:

On April 4th, 1945, when the triumphantly advancing Soviet Army drove the last remnants of the Nazi hordes from the territory of our country, a new chapter was opened in our national history. The anniversary of that day is an occasion for commemorating the birth of a free and independent Hungary, the opening up of broad vistas of social progress before us, and also for celebrating the indissoluble Hungarian-Soviet friendship!

The Fourth of April proclaims with the force of incontrovertible facts that our national independence and social progress are inseparably linked with Hungarian-Soviet friendship.

There are some Hungarian *déclassé* landowners, former capitalists and fascist back numbers who roam about nowadays in the capitalist countries of the West, and would like to sever our national independence both from social progress and from Hungarian-Soviet friendship. They vilify the Hungarian communists and workers and cast unspeakable aspersions upon the Soviet Union—and all this under the pretext of being "concerned" for our liberty, our national sovereignty and independence.

These gentlemen and their imperialist bosses think that the Hungarian people do not know their own history, that the Hungarian people have short memories. But our people know their history only too well, well enough to be able to distinguish false words from the truth. Do these gentlemen believe that the Hungarian people have forgotten how the Hungarian nobility and bourgeoisie sold the country's national independence to the Habsburgs through the so-called Compromise of 1867; and how they sold the country later on to every Tom, Dick and Harry: to Kaiser Wilhelm's German imperialism, then, in 1919, to the *Entente*, and finally to Hitler? The Hungarian people have not forgotten this. Nor have they forgotten that in the Horthy era these gentlemen were not at all concerned for our national independence when it was threatened by the German, Italian, French, British, and U. S. banks and tycoons and the trusts, which were the actual masters of the Hungarian people's destiny. Parading as cham-

pions of liberty, these one-time landowners and capitalists are only continuing in the tradition of their predecessors: like the latter, they are selling their country—this time to some American multi-millionaires.

There is but one difference: this time they are trying to sell something they no longer possess and shall never again possess! Now this country belongs to the people, and will never again belong to anyone else!

At the Liberation, the Hungarian working people took over the government of this country. And the people are truly following the revolutionary tradition of Hungarian history—the legacy of those freedom fighters who fought the Turkish invaders for 150 years, then tried to shake off the Habsburg yoke for 300 years, who fought against the *Entente's* interventionist armies in 1919, and against Horthyite fascism and Hitlerite nazism afterwards.

The working class, fighting for its own liberation, assumed the leadership of the fight for the independence of the entire nation. Those gentlemen trafficking in the West may rest assured that the Hungarian people will indeed defend the national independence won in 1945!

The Hungarian flotsam and jetsam of the western world, as well as their imperialist bosses, pretend deafness and affect not to know who it was that brought freedom and national independence for our people, who it was that spilt their blood to make Hungary free and independent. Was it perhaps those gentlemen who in 1941, despite timely warning from the Soviet government, drove Hungary into the bloodiest predatory adventure in world history, on the side of Hitler, and who held out as the last allies of the nazi usurper? No!

It was the Hungarian communists and patriots as well as the sons of the Soviet people who gave the greatest thing men can give—their lives—to win freedom and independence for the Hungarian people.

And who defended our national sovereignty, our independent and creative life then (and has done so ever since)? Was it, is it, those who continually make attempts to interfere in our internal affairs, and who not only made use of every medium of diplomacy and propaganda to overthrow the people's state of Hungary, but did not even shrink from organizing and actively supporting the armed counter-revolutionary assault in the autumn of 1956? In opposition to these people, it is the Soviet Union who has always backed Hungary, repulsing the attempts at intervention directed by the imperialists against our independence. The Soviet Union has helped us with its enormous international prestige, its moral might and political experience, and, when it became

necessary and we asked for it, she helped us defend our national independence, our people's state, by throwing in her armed forces.

Is there anyone in this country who is not aware of the significance and value of the Soviet aid continuously given to this country, from the first shipments of raw materials made available to us directly after the Liberation to help us restart production in our factories, all the way down to those shipments of raw materials—and other aid—which enabled us speedily to repair the damages caused by the counter-revolution?

Yes, the Hungarian people love the Soviet Union, love it sincerely and from the bottom of their hearts, for they owe gratitude to the Soviet people for enabling them in 1945, and now again for good, to take the road which they had first attempted to take in 1919, under the Hungarian Republic of Councils. Our people love the Soviet Union, as they owe gratitude to her for their freedom and independence and for her helping us to stay free and independent, and for her great contribution to our country's development in 12 years from a backward agricultural country into an advanced industrial country whose population lives now better, under more civilized conditions, than ever before in the course of its history.

Hungarian-Soviet friendship also means that we are bound by ties of brotherhood and of loyal alliance with that country which is fighting most consistently to safeguard peace for the whole world, including our homeland.

The Hungarian people want peace. They need peace in order to make our socialist homeland prosperous. After the horrors of two world wars we now have sufficient experience to be able to conjecture what the possible destruction of our sons and daughters, of our towns and villages would mean. We also know that in the event of a new war there would not be a single place on our globe where man could live in security. The holocaust of nuclear and rocket war would engulf all nations and would be a threat to several generations of mankind.

But mankind can avoid war, for war *can* be prevented. To whom are we indebted, and what gives us realistic ground for believing that a new war can be prevented? We are indebted for that to the policy which, in the Soviet Union, forty years ago wrote on its banner the motto of Peace, and has abided by it ever since. This peace policy has opened the way for all nations to peace and, despite all the plotting and scheming of the imperialists, is winning over additional millions of men and women for the idea of peaceful coexistence. As for the realistic foundation for preventing war, what better deterrent is there to discour-

age the warmongers from embarking upon a murderous adventure than the rapid advances recorded in industry, science and technology in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries; the growing economic, political, moral and military power of the U.S.S.R. and the entire socialist sphere of nations, and the will of the people for peace?

Not so long ago, during and after the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary, certain western propagandists—as so often during the last forty years—piped up in unison once more about the “fiasco” of communism, of the “débacle” of the Soviet Union and the People’s Democracies. We have had opportunity to hear and read about the alleged isolation of the Soviet Union, the loss of its leading position in world politics, the bankruptcy of Marxism-Leninism. Hardly a year and a half has passed since then, and where are those propagandists now? What do we see? The group of socialist nations led by the Soviet Union is now stronger than ever before! The Soviet I.C.B.M. and the two sputniks have astounded the whole western world. The whole world sees that the Soviet Union continues to provide, in world politics, the initiative for every move designed to promote the preservation and consolidation of peace. The teachings of Marxism-Leninism, despite all the exertions of the revisionists, are shedding their bright light over the future of mankind. It is with this Soviet Union, this powerful country which fights for peace and is capable of defending it, that we are bound by ties of profound and indissoluble friendship!

The Soviet Union leads that camp, that fraternal community which includes us among its number—the socialist sphere of nations. The reciprocal relations between the members of this sphere of nations are based upon respect for national independence and sovereignty, on the principles of full equality, territorial integrity and non-interference in each other’s internal affairs. But not only on these. In addition to these principles, mutual fraternal assistance is inseparably embodied in the reciprocal relations among the socialist nations—as this was recently emphasized in the Moscow Declaration of the Twelve Communist and Workers’ Parties, issued last November.

In this mutual assistance the ideal of true proletarian internationalism finds expression. It was just in the dark days of counter-revolution that we, Hungarians, could feel the might of proletarian internationalism. For that, on behalf of the Hungarian working people, we now express once again our warmest thanks to the entire Soviet people, through the agency of the Soviet leaders, our comrades now here with us.

Reactionaries both at home and abroad have done their best to drive our country to bankruptcy and inflation. They wanted to undo all that the people had built in thirteen years. Thanks to aid from the Soviet Union and the friendly nations, and to the self-denying labour of the Hungarian working class, to the peasantry and intellectuals that remained loyal to the people, we did not have to face the spectre of inflation and poverty, but were enabled to make progress in our constructive efforts in the economic, political and cultural spheres. Industrial output for the whole of 1957 bettered the 1955 level by 2 per cent; in agriculture, the crop yields for 1957 were highest since 1945. Real wages and salaries showed an increase of 14 to 16 per cent, and the real incomes of the peasants an increase of 8 to 12 per cent. With the assistance of proletarian internationalism, we have eliminated the economic damages caused by the counter-revolution, and are proceeding with our national effort of socialist construction.

The events that have taken place since the quelling of the counter-revolution, have given the lie to the slanderous claim of the enemy that the Hungarian people were against the communist party and did not want socialism.

Our party, having purged its ranks of the traitors, and having broken with its earlier mistakes, is now stronger than it was before: closely united with the masses, it is performing its great historical task of leading the people along the road of socialist construction.

Our people’s mass organizations—the trade unions, the youth organization, the women’s movement, and the Patriotic People’s Front—have a long and honourable record: these mass organizations are now, under the leadership of the party, effectively contributing towards socialist construction. These indisputable achievements are evidence of the fact that socialism is deeply and firmly rooted in this country.

As early as 1919, at the time when the glorious Hungarian Republic of Councils was established, the Hungarian people committed itself irrevocably to socialism, and for forty years has been fighting under the leadership of the Communist Party for a workers’ state, for socialist construction. Socialism as an ideal is inalienable from the Hungarian working class, from the Hungarian working people.

Hence the absolute futility of every attempt by the western imperialists to press for some kind of “revision” of the internal order of some people’s democratic countries, including Hungary. For four decades, the Hungarian people has been fighting for socialism and has sealed its choice with heavy losses of blood. Our people reached a deci-



sion on this issue as early as 1919, and no amount of plotting and scheming by the western imperialists and their mouthpieces can alter this decision.

The entire world may also see that the attempt of our enemies to ease Hungary out of the great fraternal community of socialist nations, has ended in total failure. Far from that being the case, the Hungarian people has over the last year and a half cemented its ties with the fraternal peoples and countries, and among them primarily with the Soviet Union.

Solidarity among the socialist countries is not directed against any other country, but is only designed to shield the freedom and independence of the states concerned. The importance and timeliness of the Warsaw Treaty were brought home to us fully in those days when the enemy bore down upon us. But even today we realize its full impact clearly after the *Bundestag* at Bonn had decided in favour of nuclear arms for West Germany. On two occasions already, German militarism has embroiled Hungary in war. Now, that selfsame German militarism is threatening the peace of Europe, including this country. The Hungarian people protests, resolutely and as one man, against nuclear weapons for the German militarists. Let it be said once again that, as long as the aggressive North Atlantic Treaty Organization continues in existence, we will honourably and faithfully meet our obligations under the Warsaw Treaty, the obligation of mutual assistance among the socialist countries, which offers the most effective protection against the threat of resurrected German militarism.

We are loyal and active soldiers of the world-wide peace movement. Expressing the common desire of hundreds of millions of peace-loving men and women, this movement has now become a mighty enough power to be an important barrier in the way of warlike attempts against the freedom and independence of nations.

We are at one with all peace-loving men and women in demanding an end to the arms race, a ban on the manufacture and use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and the liquidation of war bases on foreign territories.

Like other peoples, the Hungarian people is vitally interested in the meeting of a summit conference enabling the heads of governments to discuss the problem of most interest to the nations—the safeguarding and consolidation of peace. We welcome with unanimous enthusiasm the Soviet Union's moves for peace, among them her latest action, one of world-wide importance, to suspend unilaterally her atomic and hydrogen bomb tests. This move demonstrates the awe-

inspiring might of the peoples of the Soviet Union as well as their determination for peace.

World opinion—including that in Hungary—expects and urges the great capitalist powers to take a similar decision.

Comrades, Friends:

The Fourth of April teaches us, among other lessons, that our national independence is inseparable from our social progress. On April 4th, 1945, the possibility was given us of establishing the people's state. The people took over the factories, the mines and the banks; the peasants were given the land. With the establishment of the people's democratic state, the working people finally became masters of their own country—that fact is one of the principal safeguards of our national independence.

So much became evident in the light of the lessons drawn from the counter-revolution. The counter-revolutionary assault was directed not only against our socialist achievements, our socialist system, but also against our national independence. We couldn't have a better proof of what our people want, of the fact that the Hungarian people have no longing for the old order, which meant power for the lord and no rights for the working man, than the utter defeat of the counter-revolutionaries. With the assistance of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, the Hungarian people successfully defended its achievements attained in social progress and its national independence.

We have drawn the lessons from the recent past as we have drawn the historical lessons from more distant periods. Our dear visitors and friends, in touring Hungary, will be able to see for themselves the unity of party and people, the true national unity of the working people rallying behind the correct policy of the party. The policy pursued by the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party is founded upon the confidence and activity of the working masses. The time that has passed since the counter-revolution, the speedy consolidation, and last but not least the latest statistics of our economic development, show that the vast majority of the people accept our programme and approve and support our policies.

We have resolved to steer the same course that was begun and, without deviations either to the right or to the left, always taking into account the realistic possibilities, to struggle, under the leadership of our party and relying on support from the working people, for the continued economic and cultural advancement of the entire nation, for the full establishment of a socialist society.

Dear Guests, Members of the Party and Government Delegation of the Soviet Union:

In touring this country, you will get to know the Hungarian workers, peasants and intellectuals. You will see that the friendship between the Hungarian and the Soviet peoples is built on unshakable foundations. You will see that our people are deeply aware that the Soviet Union's might and its fraternal friendship for us are the surest pledge of our freedom and independence. Our people realize that their devotion to their independent homeland and their sentiments of brotherhood for the Soviet Union mean one and the same thing, both in content and in form—for this very reason, we consider it our real national concern further to cement our friendship with the U.S.S.R.

Let Comrade Khrushchov, let the members of the fraternal Soviet delegation meet the sons of the Hungarian people. Let them visit Hungary's towns and villages, her factories, mines and cooperative farms. They will be able to see for themselves that the Hungarian people are loyal to the cause of socialism, to Soviet-Hungarian friendship, to the socialist sphere of nations, to the many-hundred-million-strong world-wide movement for peace, and to proletarian internationalism. This consistent and steadfast loyalty guarantees the eventual success of our creative efforts: we will build up our socialist country and will preserve its independence.

In the spirit of these ideas I salute, on behalf of our Central Committee, the thirteenth anniversary of the Fourth of April, 1945.

On behalf of the Central Committee, I wish all working men and women of Hungary strength and the best of health for their future work.

Long live the Hungarian people, the builders of socialism, and our beloved homeland, the Hungarian People's Republic!

Long live the Fourth of April, the Day of Liberation and Independence for our country!

Long live the everlasting and indissoluble friendship between the Hungarian and the Soviet peoples!

Long live the socialist camp and its leading force, the socialist world power—the great Soviet Union—and may they grow stronger still!

Long live Peace!

## THE UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS—THE PLEDGE OF ITS VICTORY

ARTICLE PUBLISHED IN *NÉPSZABADSÁG*

June 12th, 1958

Minor successes and history-making victories, failures and severe reverses, mark the road along which the Hungarian working class has been advancing irresistibly, overcoming all obstacles, up to the present day. Our working class is armed with a great deal of important fighting experience. Perhaps one of the most important lessons these experiences teach us is that victory was impossible in the absence of unity, and our working class was always victorious over the bourgeoisie whenever it managed to unite its forces.

The last year and a half has demanded extraordinary effort on the part of the Hungarian working class and the Hungarian people as a whole. A lot of labour and value is still going towards repairing the losses inflicted on the Hungarian people by the reactionary bourgeois forces, the debased traitors of Imre Nagy's ilk, the U. S. imperialists, and other foreign supporters of the counter-revolutionary uprising. Labour and the struggle with matter, with the forces of nature, were combined in heavy battle against the forces of reaction raging both at home and abroad.

Yet, in the course of this extremely difficult year and a half, the Hungarian people—it can be said without bragging—has scored a series of splendid successes and victories in the field of political struggle as well as in every sphere of economic and cultural construction. Today, the Hungarian people, steadily growing in power and self-reliance, are building a socialist society, defending peace and looking with unshakable confidence towards the future. These achievements, increased power and assurance as well as confidence in the future, are all founded upon the momentous political development which has taken place among the masses of Hungarian workers, peasants and intellectuals after the recognition of the errors that played into the hands of the counter-revolution, and the summation of the historic lessons to be drawn from the counter-revolutionary and imperialist on-

slaught. The basis of the achievements, power and assurance is our people's encouraging knowledge that the Hungarian People's Republic is, due to the community of ideals and goals, a respected and equal member of the indestructible 1,000-million-strong socialist camp.

But of all the internal resources of people's democratic Hungary, the political unity and actual leading role of the working class in society is the decisive and ever-operating factor behind general progress.

We are now commemorating the founding of the Hungarian Working People's Party. When the unification of the Hungarian Communist Party and the Social Democratic Party brought about the political unity of the working class ten years ago, it was an event of paramount, inestimable significance that was to have a bearing upon the future destinies of the Hungarian people as a whole. Today, the Hungarian working class exercises its leading role through the activity of its revolutionary vanguard—the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party. In remembering the Unification Congress, held in 1948, we have to bear in mind that the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party is now a living, fighting and leading force due to the fact that it rallied in its ranks the best forces of the Hungarian Working People's Party which was formed at the Unification Congress ten years ago, and because of the reorganization of the party in revolutionary struggle.

The 1948 Unification Congress, of course, did not drop out of the blue; it was an event that had had long historical antecedents. The pioneers of the Hungarian working-class movement, in the second half of the 19th century, followed the course that had been charted by Marx. Marx and Engels, by discovering the causes leading to the inevitable decline of capitalism and the laws of the class struggle, showed that it was the historic task of the working class to overthrow the system of exploitation and build up the classless society of socialism. At the same time as they formulated their immortal slogan calling for the unity of the workers of the world, Marx and Engels assented that the political unity of the working class could be achieved through setting up an independent workers' party and independent labour organizations.

This historic task was fulfilled in Hungary in the last decade of the 19th century by the founders and then leaders of the Social Democratic Party. In the first stage of its development, the Social Democratic Party, by disseminating the ideas of Marxism, by founding and developing the trade unions, performed a valuable, important and positive role.

Lenin, the great continuer and further developer of the works of Marx and Engels, made his appearance in the early years of this century. A merciless opponent of the revisionism espoused by Bernstein and later Kautsky, who distorted the revolutionary essence of Marxism and preached the gospel of compromise with the bourgeoisie, Lenin pointed out that capitalism had reached the last, imperialist, stage of its development—the stage which was at the same time the period of proletarian revolutions, and that the historic moment had come for the seizure of power by the working class. Accordingly, he devoted attention to problems of the party, the chief weapon of the working class. Speaking of the party, Lenin said as early as 1904:

“In its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but organization.

“... the proletariat can become, and inevitably will become, an invincible force only when its ideological unification by the principles of Marxism is consolidated by the material unity of an organization which will weld millions of toilers into an army of the working class.”\*

Lenin stated that, in its attempt to seize power, the working class could enter the battle with any hope of success only if it would rally behind itself all toiling classes—the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie as well—and lead them against the bourgeoisie. However, the leaders of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party at that time did not—or would not—listen to these words of Lenin any longer, since it was precisely in 1904-05 that they finally bowed to Bernsteinian revisionism and thus to the bourgeoisie. One after the other the revolutionary demands of the working class were abandoned and, ignoring even the 1912 flare-up of working-class militancy, in 1914, in the early days of the First World War, they went so far as to support the predatory imperialist war, to the complete betrayal of the interests of the working class, of the masses as a whole.

Naturally, the class-conscious sons of the Hungarian working class who had remained loyal to the cause of socialist revolution, could not put up with this turn of events, and there began the long fight, lasting for decades, within the Hungarian working class against revisionist betrayal and for the unification of working-class forces on the ideological foundation of revolutionary socialism, of Marxism-Leninism.

\* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works in Two Volumes*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1950, Vol. I, Part 1, pp. 644-645.



From its founding in November 1918, to the very end, the Communist Party was a revolutionary workers' party guided by Marxist-Leninist ideology. In keeping with this spirit, it consistently fought throughout its existence to achieve united action with the Social Democratic Party, with the masses of social democrats, and at the same time, to ensure the triumph of the ideas of revolutionary Marxism. It fought to bring about the unification of the two parties, to achieve the complete political and organizational unity of the working class at the opportune historic moment, by defeating the reformist views and illusions. This is the historical truth even if one considers the fact that, under the difficult conditions arising from the party being driven underground by Horthy fascism, unity of action was hampered from time to time by sectarian errors on the part of the Communist Party.

This policy of unity steadfastly adhered to and pursued consistently by the Communist Party under the most diverse historical conditions, met with response and support among the rank-and-file of the Social Democratic Party and also among left-wing leaders who expressed the political aspirations of the working masses. This solidarity between the Communist Party and the left wing of the Social Democratic Party was the source of many brilliant and militant successes in the history of the Hungarian working class. This was expressed in the revolutionary battles fought jointly by the communist and social democratic masses in 1918 and 1919; in the joint action taken against Horthy fascism in defence of the trade unions; and in the feats of arms that sprang from the unity which was forged against fascism, the fascist war, and the nazi occupation of Hungary. This solidarity found expression, too, in the joint activity carried on in the Committee for Historic Monuments; the anti-fascist Christmas 1941 issue of *Népszava*; the enthusiastic anti-war and anti-fascist demonstration arranged at the Petőfi monument in Budapest on March 15, 1942, and many other successful joint actions.

After Liberation, united action between the Communist Party and the left wing of the Social Democratic Party operated effectively throughout the 1945-48 period. That it could be developed broadly and that it scored such significant results, was of course due to some extent also to the fact that the working class now had a share in power, and that since the Liberation the Communist Party was able to take part in united action as a growing legal party, with a powerful mass following.

The unceasing efforts aimed at bringing about the complete unity of the working class are testified to by the fact that the Communist Party and the left wing of the Social Democratic Party had reached complete agreement in principle on merging the two parties, on three different dates, under such totally different historical conditions as March 1919, autumn 1944, and spring 1948. The unification of 1919, and that of 1948 took shape in a manner known by all Hungary. Less known at the time was the agreement reached in the autumn of 1944, which was reached under the conditions of fascist internal oppression, the German nazi occupation and the illegalization of both parties. Thus, it could not be given wide publicity then. The relative passage of this document reads as follows:

"The Social Democratic Party and the Communist Party state that further development of the militant, revolutionary unity of the Hungarian working class calls for the merger of the two parties to form a united, single revolutionary socialist workers' party."

The results of the policy of unity, the entire historical experience gained by the Hungarian working class prove that the political might of the working class multiplied every time the unity of action of the working class was successfully established—if only for certain limited periods and only on specific decisive issues. This experience also shows that the power of the working class grew into an overwhelming, decisive force, one capable of assuming power, whenever it succeeded in raising its unity to a higher plane than unity of action, to the plane of the unification of the workers' parties. This is instanced by the example of the victory of the Hungarian Republic of Councils set up in the spring of 1919, and of the Hungarian People's Republic, established as the result of the political battles of 1945-48.

Apart from this good historical experience, the Hungarian working class has also gained some bad historical experience in connection with right-wing social democrats. After it was founded, the Communist Party—as a matter of course—won over the most advanced, most revolutionary masses of workers. From that time onward, the Social Democratic Party ceased to be unequivocally a workers' party. From that time onward, it rallied in its ranks working-class and petty bourgeois masses, while elements conciliating the bourgeoisie became dominant in its leadership. This was the reason why, in the decades of the split, despite the persistent efforts made by the Communist Party and the social democratic left wing, the relations between the two parties were marked by opposition and hostility for long periods, particularly at the higher levels of leader-

ship. But what kind of unity would have been possible with—and was it not imperative to fight against?—elements like the Peidl-Peyer group, which, acting as a screen for the *Entente*, for Horthy, Friedrich, and the brutal counter-revolutionary White Terror, formed in August 1919, the “six-day government,” the so-called trade-unionist government, with the aim of overthrowing the Hungarian Republic of Councils and wiping out its achievements? Or was it not necessary to oppose the Peyer-Kéthly group, which, betraying the working class and the peasantry, made a pact in 1921 with the head of the government of big landowners, capitalists, and fascists, Count Bethlen, with the aim of consolidating the counter-revolutionary regime? Or Ferenc Szeder, who in 1944 made a pact with the Hungarian nazis Baky and László Endre? But why continue the enumeration, for this social democratic right wing is seen for what it is by the Hungarian working class and is well known as a historical category without us listing any more names.

It was not so long ago that the veteran of class treason, Peyer, waged his last ignominious fight in 1946, against the nationalization of the mines. He failed, and then absconded. Of more recent date is the disgraceful fight waged by Kéthly, another veteran of class treason. In 1956, she supported the counter-revolution, tried to split the working class again, but failed and absconded, and now she is in the West, vilifying the people and the country that gave her life.

History indicated that the rule of the Horthy-fascist bourgeoisie was doomed, and it went under in spite of the fact that for twenty-five years the right-wing social democrats gave it unstinted support to prolong its life. Horthyite fascism was destroyed by the Hungarian working class assisted by the international working class. This was done by the same working class which had for so long been kept split by such lackeys of the bourgeoisie as the Peyers and Kéthlys, but which eventually ousted them and finally in 1948 unified its forces.

The unification of 1948 was accomplished not by the will of just a few dozen people, but in response to the desire of the entire working class, of the masses. This desire was abundantly made clear by the masses themselves when, in January-February 1948, social democratic workers joined the Communist Party by the thousand each day; there were even instances of entire factory party organizations joining the Communist Party as a group. The popular will was evident also from the fact that the merger of the two parties began, and was accomplished, with a merger of the masses, or the branch

organizations; the Unification Congress in June only completed and sanctioned the whole process.

This mass movement of elemental force testified to the political maturity of the Hungarian working class. This meant not only that the masses were sick and tired of the sinister practices carried on for decades by the right-wing social democrats, who attempted at all times to play the social democratic masses off against the communist masses; but it also meant that socialist construction had become the historical issue of the day. The working people understood that, after taking over power, the working class could not march along the road to socialism alone. Socialist construction was not merely the interest and cause of the working class; it was in the interest of every working man and woman, and could only be achieved through the joint efforts of the entire people. The working class had to enlist the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, and the working people as a whole into the work of socialist construction and lead them all. But it was evident that the working class would be capable of leading other labouring classes, the entire people, only if it was united and was led by a close-knit Marxist-Leninist party, a revolutionary vanguard.

The Hungarian working class acted correctly and was historically justified when, in 1948, it created the chief weapon of its political unity, a revolutionary party united on the ideological basis of Marxism-Leninism. This move was vindicated and acquired vital importance later on, in 1956, when the forces of counter-revolution and imperialism rose to overthrow the power of the working class, the state of the workers and peasants. The unity of the working class was of decisive importance in crushing the counter-revolutionary forces. The 1948 unification plays a decisive role in the fact that in the Hungarian People's Republic today the only consistently revolutionary class, the working class, and its revolutionary vanguard, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, are firmly leading the entire people and country on the road of socialist construction.

The Hungarian communists and former social democrats who, in 1948, worked single-mindedly and wholeheartedly for the merger of the two parties, and have remained loyal to that idea in the midst of hardships, may take rightful pride in the thought that they made their contribution towards a great historic work which has promoted the interests of the working class, of the entire Hungarian people. It may suffice to recall that as early as 1948, as an immediate result of the merger, such historical gains were achieved, follow-



ing the nationalization of the banks, as the nationalization of the factories and the schools. And most important of all, the full accomplishment of the proletarian dictatorship, of workers' power, which is the source of all the socialist achievements attained by the Hungarian people, was also realized as a result of the merger.

It is true that, as in other matters, the Rákosi leadership also made some glaring mistakes with respect to the unification. One mistake was the fairly wide-spread practice of classifying the members of the united party in two categories. It was another blunder to neglect the fight against social democratic revisionism and opportunism. A still greater mistake was the collective political condemnation of people who did not deserve such treatment, and the unjust vilification of many former social democrats. These errors, however, have been rectified by our party, and even those comrades who suffered unfair treatment, may feel deep satisfaction at the sight of the great socialist achievements which our people have attained during the last ten years under the leadership of the united party, and which they determinedly defended recently against the counter-revolutionary assault.

As a harmful consequence of the errors committed on the question of unification, the process of forging the complete unity within the party of ex-social democrats and communists was drawn out for several years. The final process of unification—the achievement of the genuine and not merely formal equality of all members of the party—was brought to completion only in the last one and a half years. That the process of unification is now complete and solid, is indicated by the fact that today neither the party membership nor public opinion discriminate against any party member on the grounds of whether he had been a member of the Social Democratic Party or the Communist Party—or perhaps he had joined the party only after the unification. The criterion—and a very proper criterion—by which a person is now judged politically and, if he so deserves, esteemed by members of our party as well as by public opinion at large, is the way he stood the test in resisting the counter-revolution. The communists of today accord respect, as to equal comrades-in-arms, to Comrades Marosán, Rónai and Szakasits and many thousands of ex-social democrats who stood their ground resisting the counter-revolution. This is the same kind of respect as that which was accorded by communists nearly forty years ago to Comrades Landler, Hamburger, Nyisztor and Bokányi and to other comrades-in-arms, some thousands of them at that time, who had earlier been

social democrats themselves, but who developed into Marxists-Leninists, in other words into communist revolutionaries.

Those members of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party who, prior to the unification of 1948, had been members of either one of the two parties have been cemented together in comradeship by the battles and hardships of the last ten years. They are now working and fighting in brotherly unity on the basis of the invincible ideology of Marxism-Leninism. They are marching shoulder to shoulder with many millions of our comrades in the Soviet Union, China, France, and in all the nations of the globe, with whom they are united by the common ideal of Marxism-Leninism, the common goal of socialism, and the common cause of the defence of peace.

All those who once worked as members of either the Communist Party or the Social Democratic Party, or who joined the revolutionary party of the working class only after the unification, or who are growing up in the Young Communist League and are our promise of the future, those who sympathize with our party—all these people may—and do—profess the theses of the Unification Congress of ten years ago, which shall never become obsolete:

“The party professes the ideology of Marxism-Leninism; its aims are to defend and ensure peace, the achievements of the People's Democracy, and the national independence of Hungary; it fights to raise the working people's living standard continuously and systematically, and to establish a socialist society in which the exploiting classes will cease to exist, exploitation of man by man will be abolished, the antithesis between the allied classes will fade away, the common weal becomes inseparable from individual advancement, the road to individual advancement is by working for the common good, and the trend of development is towards communism.”

These theses, elaborated ten years ago, are still in accord with the interests and aspirations of the Hungarian working class, peasantry and intelligentsia, of the entire people, of every honest man and woman, of every true patriot. An entire nation has been working and fighting for these magnificent ideas and aims for ten years. A good many of these aims have already been realized, others are about to be achieved. Recalling the great day of ten years ago, and remembering that in 1956 some of our foremost fighters laid down their lives in defence of these ideas and achievements, we must reassure those who sympathize with us—as well as our adversaries—that we will go on working and fighting more resolutely and more steadfastly until these aims are wholly and irrevocably realized.



STRENGTHEN ACTIVE UNITY  
OF WORKING PEOPLE

ELECTION SPEECH IN ANGYALFÖLD, BUDAPEST

October 15th, 1958

Dear Comrades and Friends:

My affectionate greetings go out to the citizens who have come to attend this mass meeting and to the workers of Angyalföld.

The American big capitalists one month ago again succeeded in having the so-called "Hungarian question" they had fabricated placed on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly. They usually bolster their manoeuvres with the most varied distortions and fictitious horror stories. If only one tenth of all the drivels and nonsense published by them were true, then not a blessed soul would be alive in the region of the Danube and the Tisza rivers. But, as a matter of fact, all our working people—true, their number is not very great, not quite ten million—are living and working in good health and in peace, living a normal life based on their lawful Constitution.

Speaking about the preparations for the elections, I should relate that, at over a hundred thousand nominating meetings the voters choose most democratically the persons they wish to enter on the lists of candidates. About forty per cent of these nominating meetings have already taken place. About twice as many persons attended the nominating meetings in the large towns and the factories as well as in the villages than at the time of the previous election. This does not merely indicate an increase in political interest, but it shows much more than this: it shows that as the result of their grave ordeal, the Hungarian people are much more experienced, better informed, and more mature politically than our enemies might suppose.

Comrades, we are on the eve of an election; we are candidates and must talk about our policy. Perhaps I should mention right away that our policy has been straightforward; we did not conceal our aims. I believe that now, after two years, nobody in the world

doubts that we are adherents of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and support Soviet-Hungarian friendship. We have put our cards on the table; we are fighting honourably.

At this very time, a campaign is on to elect a governor in New York State. There are two candidates: one is a multi-millionaire with a familiar name, Rockefeller, and the other is also a multi-millionaire, but his name is not so well-known in Hungary. I hardly think that they can go to the voters and say: we represent the interests and the dictatorship of the multi-millionaires. Most likely they, too, say that they intend to champion the interests of the working people. How many people believe this, that's a different question. On the other hand, it is not hard to prove that when we stand as representatives of the working class and adherents of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of working-class internationalism, and that we are enemies of bourgeois dictatorship, everybody knows that this is so.

Anyone can judge, at this election, not only the words, but the deeds as well. The leaders of the party and the government took over, early in November 1956, the great task of newly uniting the communists and the patriots, and of administering the country. There has hardly been a Hungarian government which began its work amidst more critical conditions. Horthyite hounds and monsters of the underworld were roaming the streets and raising havoc; there was no law, no security of life and property; all work had ceased and without labour there is no life. The bourgeois counter-revolution was practically in the house, and war was on the threshold. The knell had been sounded; they intended to bury the Hungarian People's Republic, the embodiment of the centuries-old dream of the working people, they wanted to inter the people's power and with it every hope of the people. They vilified the Hungarian People's Republic, reviling all the work and achievements of the last ten years.

I think you know, comrades, that we have not forgotten the mistakes made. We know that mistakes were made in building up the country, but the achievements and results of ten years are sacred, for they are the accomplishments of many millions of workers, peasants and intellectuals, and no one shall raise his hand to desecrate them.

Our Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government was greeted at the outset with savage howls of hatred and by the murderous weapons of the bourgeoisie, the fascists, the traitors and their

imperialist masters. This did not frighten us. What was more difficult and painful for us was that, in addition to the enemy, we had to contend with doubts and loss of hope on the part of many confused and honest people. But our strength was multiplied by the knowledge that what we formulated and began to carry out was the expression and realization of the will of many, many hundreds of thousands of Hungarian workers, peasants and intellectuals who remained loyal, come what may, to socialism.

We based our policy on our communist truth, on the Hungarian working class, on the socialist patriotism of the people, on the support of the Hungarian people's most loyal friend, the Soviet people, on international working-class solidarity—that is to say, on an unshakable foundation firm as a rock.

During the two years we have not left this foundation, nor deviated from our chosen path. Although there existed lack of understanding, ideological confusion, half-heartedness, enticement, and intrigues, and, in fact, threats and force were used against us, we did not leave this path. The firm and consistent policy and the persistent work and struggle of the two years have borne their results. Although in our country sausages do not grow on trees—and we do not claim they do—we live a good and normal life. Law and order reigns; there is security of the law, of life and property; production and consumption are increasing. We have a firm working-class power. Our people live in peace. The Hungarian People's Republic is a respected member of the socialist camp, and the path ahead of us is lighted by the rising sun of socialism, which is becoming ever brighter.

Not the least among the results of the policy of the past two years, but perhaps, the first and foremost, is the mutual confidence between the leaders and the masses, the close contact, unity, and concord between the party, the government and the masses. Two years ago we had to go to the people, after the disappointment caused by the Rákosi leadership and after the criminal demagoguery and treason of the Imre Nagy group, and ask for confidence in the new leadership. We had to prove with deeds—and at the same time take a firm grip—that we meant well, that we were going to put the affairs of the country in order, and that we did not intend to domineer over the people, but to serve them with honour.

I believe now, after the two years, we can say that we have proved the sincerity of our intentions and the correctness of our policy with deeds. This is the foundation for the ever-growing con-

fidence and active support of the masses enjoyed by the Central Committee and the government. Our thanks are due to the working masses for their confidence and active support which is growing daily. The results achieved during these past two years are the fruit of the labour of the millions of Hungarian working people.

We, candidates of the Patriotic People's Front, come before the voters with a clear conscience and upraised head. We are proud of our party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, which led the country and people out of their tragic situation. We are proud of our Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government, which, although it is detested by the imperialists and reactionaries, is loved and respected all over the world by the champions of socialism and of freedom for the peoples.

Our greatest pride is our working class, our working people, who reared us, and who placed us at the helm of the country in that grave situation. We are proud of the Hungarian people because, supported by the fraternal peoples, they defended the cause of socialism and peace in Hungary against the counter-revolutionary uprising. We are confident that this election, the votes of millions of people, will strengthen and back our policy.

We are retaining our political line unchanged, because it has been tested by experience and proved to be correct. The essence of our internal policy is democracy for the people and dictatorship against the enemies of the working people.

On the whole, those guilty in the counter-revolution have by now been called to account. We have pardoned those who were misled, and the majority of them have since returned to the right path. But we shall not forget 1956, and everybody should understand, here within the country and beyond the borders as well, that no one may, either now or in the future, attack the Hungarian People's Republic, undermine the people's power with impunity.

Our system is defended by the reorganized, regenerated people's army, and other armed forces of the state, among them a new force which has proved its worth, the splendid Workers' Militia recruited from the town and village working people. When we organized the Workers' Militia, we again showed that the basis of our policy was confidence placed in the people—for us this was gospel truth! We said then that if the worker, the villager who is for socialism is given a weapon, he will make it a point of honour to safeguard his own system all the better. Almost a year and a half has passed since the first units of the Workers' Militia were organized, but during this

time every single person who received a weapon as a workers' militiaman, used it with honour to protect the people's power, and this is a great political victory.

An essential feature of our social order is the leading role of the working class, which we must continue to strengthen. The party implements the leading role of the working class; therefore, it is our view that the guiding and leading role of the party must be equally and generally implemented in all spheres of social life.

The main political foundation of our social order is the alliance of our two great labouring classes, the workers and the peasantry. We believe that our task continues to be the further consolidation of this alliance—which is again strong. Now the worker-peasant alliance embraces the whole working peasantry, and serves the defence of the workers' and peasants' state and the dictatorship of the proletariat, as well as the building of socialism. Therefore, the working class enlists the sons of the peasantry, too, at all levels of executive power. The people's power protects the whole peasantry from the curses of capitalism and helps the individual peasants in production. At the same time the party and the state support the cooperative farm peasants, the cooperative farm movement itself, as the chief instrument of building socialism in the countryside. We are convinced that the socialist reconstruction of agriculture is in the interest of the country, the whole people, but above all, in the interest of the peasantry themselves.

This year's grain crop showed what large-scale production would mean to the country. This year the agricultural large-scale enterprises, the cooperative farms, produced from 3 to 4.3 quintals more wheat per acre than the individual peasants. The last two years were ample to convince the individual peasants that the party and the state are consistently helping in the socialist transformation of the countryside. This is a constant and central issue. At the same time they could become convinced also of the fact that we are building socialism in the village, and shall do so in the future, by persuasion and with attention to the voluntary principle.

The actual results of industry, agriculture, scientific research, all our productive and creative work are splendid proofs that the overwhelming majority of the intelligentsia is progressing together with the people and is performing its work honourably.

Our intellectuals are busy working. Just take our achievements at the Brussels World Fair. Hungary won 46 prizes, among them 20 grand prizes, 25 other prizes and a Gold Star for the pavilion.

About 90 countries had exhibits at this exposition, and statisticians who know something about sports say that, according to the Olympic system, these 46 prizes mean that we have achieved fifth or sixth place. I think this is a great achievement, and these prizes embody the labour of the worker, the peasant and the intellectual as well.

In certain spheres of culture the situation is a bit less favourable than among the intellectuals in industry, or the scientific research workers. I think it is not hard to guess that I am referring to art and literature. We have made some progress in this field too, and in the future we want to advance even more. We have worked out the directives for our socialist cultural policy which designate our tasks for many years to come. We say frankly that we want to create a socialist culture for the people of our country, and not bourgeois culture. For this reason we are fighting uncompromisingly in the cultural sphere also to overcome all hostile views, but we are displaying patience with people professing mistaken ideas. From the beginning we have been careful not to offend the dignity of the intellectuals who did not see eye to eye with us in everything, or outright opposed us in certain questions. We wanted them to renounce their mistaken views because of their own inner conviction. We think that we were right. We have never sought flattering phrases about the party and government, uttered without inner conviction, and we shall never seek them in the future either. On the contrary, we scorn them! He who does not like our party, our government or our policy, will not be compelled to stand on the public square on Sundays and praise them.

But seriously speaking, I must say that a great fermentation and change are taking place among our writers and in their thinking—and this includes all of them. They, too, see—including those who erred greatly, and, according to us, have done great harm—whither the people are going; they see the results of the efforts of two years; their conscience is more and more beginning to awaken and they have begun to work. Apart from this, there is another factor which should make the older generation of writers think: a new generation of writers has made its appearance—and there are many young poets and writers whose names millions will yet come to know as the poets and writers of socialism and of the people's cause.

The overwhelming majority of the urban petty bourgeoisie played a positive role in 1957, in the period of consolidation, and is doing so in our present normal life.



The urban petty bourgeoisie, or other strata of the petty bourgeoisie, will be able to work for many years to come. We do not want to make the mistake of assigning the manufacture of, say, celluloid toothpicks or pastry brushes, to heavy industry. I remember that in 1954, when I was assigned to this district as party secretary, I was amazed to see the shipyards manufacturing table tennis equipment. It appeared to me this was not altogether right. The handicraft industry, the artisans and other types of petty bourgeoisie have a task which they may perform in peace, and we believe the time will come when they will have to leave the platform of the small capitalist and take their place with the rest of the artisans who have joined cooperatives, where there is no longer capital, only work is the foundation of life. Then, as working people, they will have to be assured the way to personal success for themselves and their children. This will be the just and proper thing to do. When we frankly state this, we must also add that if a member of the petty bourgeoisie should misjudge our standards and should not be satisfied with that certain—as they like to say—“just bourgeois profit,” but wants to acquire three times his investment by black marketeering, or through speculation—we will not permit this! We shall take economic measures against anyone who violates the law; he will be punished. The majority of the petty bourgeoisie understand that this cannot be otherwise.

We consider it one of the notable results of our internal policy that at present the relation between the government and the churches may be described as loyal. On our part this has a political and ideological basis. The government helps the churches to operate, it ensures conditions for them to carry on their religious activities undisturbed. For their part, the churches have the task of supporting those objectives which the majority of the Hungarian people have accepted as their own. The churches must also bolster the people's desire and efforts to build socialism and preserve peace. The contact between the government and the churches is loyal and vigorous at present, and I think this may be sustained in the future as well.

Dear Comrades:

It is commonly known that the counter-revolution caused a damage of about 22,000 million forints. And it did not cause only material damages. Lives were destroyed and others are being tossed about in the world. Let me say sincerely that our Central Committee and government are sorry even for those lives which were lost in

fighting us if they were simple, foolish, misled, and duped young people. We are also sorry for those young people who ran out into the so-called “free world” and then found themselves on the fourth deck of a bed in a refugee camp and learned about the mess-tin system which exists there, but does not exist in our country. From the economic losses caused by the counter-revolution we have recovered. In 1957 the result of industrial production was 6 per cent higher than in 1955, and agricultural production was quite good, too. In the first nine months of 1958, industrial output was 14 per cent higher than the year before. In agriculture the wheat crop was not so good this year. But some crop results, like grapes and fodder, were good. There was a bumper grape crop, and he who likes wine instead of lectures on anti-alcoholism, may rejoice. But speaking seriously, it appears that despite the poorer grain crop, the total value of the over-all crop for the agricultural year will be only one or two per cent below that of the previous year.

The average weight of beef cattle increased by 160 pounds from last year to this one. We still recall the situation when for many years it was a problem how to increase the weight of beef cattle. Now this, too, has been solved. Or take milk production: everyone still recalls what difficult situation there was in this respect two years ago. Now the production of milk increased by 35 per cent in one year. But with this problem, too, it appears that a few of our specialists had grown accustomed to hearing us say something from year to year without anything happening afterwards. For example, they said for a number of years that more milk was needed, but the quantity of milk remained the same. But now the situation has changed a little: we said we needed more milk, and there was more milk, only there were not enough milk cans for milk collection, so that at the beginning we had to solve the milk-can shortage. In any event, it is a great thing that such a change could be brought about in one year in the milk production, so that there is no shortage of milk, but instead we have to organize a proper and wise milk distribution.

The state farms have shown improvement, too. Some of them are operating like model farms, and it can be said that a good number of them are farming properly, well and in an exemplary manner. The cooperative farms have progressed in animal husbandry as well as in crop farming.

Before the counter-revolution, the stocks on hand of retail trade were worth about 14,000 million forints. During the counter-

revolution this figure dropped to 8,000 million forints. Many people thought then that money would lose its value. But we were able to supply enough merchandise to prevent this. At present we have a retail trade turnover of 17,000 million forints, so you can buy all you want.

Before the counter-revolution, deposits in savings banks totalled 1,000 million forints. During the counter-revolution this sum dropped to 500 million. People drew 500 million forints from the banks very quickly in order to spend. Now there are 2,100 million forints deposited in savings banks in the country. This endeavour of the working people is, we think, commendable and good from their own standpoint, and from the country's standpoint as well.

The standard of living increased, as is generally known, 14 to 16 per cent last year. Now the statisticians have calculated it more accurately and say it rose not 14 to 16 per cent, but more than 17 per cent in 1957. In such matters I am a conservative man, and I shall keep to the 14 to 16 per cent. If somebody obtained 17 per cent, he will not be displeased because we first said 14 per cent. On the other hand, if we had said 17 per cent, and he only received 14 per cent, then everybody would be angry about it.

Please, excuse me if I joke about serious things, but there is one field where we are tops again. What is all this about? The per capita consumption of calories in Italy is 2,570; in Holland, 2,910; in Austria, 2,940; in Britain, 3,231, and in the Hungarian People's Republic, it is 3,240. So that we have surpassed Britain—not in per capita production, but in eating—if only by 10 calories.

But to speak seriously again, the result achieved is great in itself, and shows that the principle is beginning to prevail according to which the building of socialism must go hand in hand with the rise in the living standard of the working people. This has been a principle and, I may safely assert, a practice in our country.

There are some things, however, which must be taken into consideration: We can decide on only a feasible rise in the living standard. This is the reason why in January of the current year we stated very clearly that there would be no general rise in the living standard in 1958; that this year would serve to preserve the standard reached by December 1957, and establish the conditions for further progress. We stated this frankly and honestly. It is a sign of the people's maturity that they understood and accepted this correct principle. We achieved, in 1958, the goal which we had set ourselves: we stabilized the living standard.

Now the party has made a study of various questions in connection with the working class. Voluntary workers, both communist and non-party, spoke with about 45,000 or 50,000 working people. They asked the people to state their opinion about certain questions. This inquiry revealed that the working people approved the party's policy. As a matter of fact, they had one main demand, that we should realize this policy even more consistently in every domain. This is a just and proper demand! We at headquarters should see to it that this is implemented consistently.

It was found from these talks that there are a few social questions which engage the attention of a large part of the working population. The Central Committee has discussed these questions and adopted a resolution. It is the opinion of the Central Committee that the results registered in the first nine months of 1958 will develop further. Next year the general rise in the living standard that we envisaged in the Three-Year Plan must be carried out. Apart from that, in the first half of next year a few things must be settled. We believe that we must help the situation of certain categories of pensioners, and we must see to it that more consideration should be given to the number of years spent at work. In the first half of next year we must help families with three or more children, and mothers who are the sole support of two or more children. There are some people who say we should wait with the whole question for, say, another year or even more, so as to be able to increase family allowances for all. They justify this by asking what families with two children will say if we raise family allowances only in the case of three children? We said that families with two children should be mature enough to understand that if the economic position of the country does not permit more at the moment, but it does make this possible, then it is our duty to help about 110,000 families who have many children and have difficulty in making ends meet—and people will understand this. When we shall be in a position to introduce a general increase, we shall not hesitate even for a week; we shall raise it. But I think we should not stand by and look on when a single woman with four or five children is in need of food in our country, while the average of the people are gradually setting a world record in eating.

In the same way, we thought that a wage increase should be given certain categories of working people at the beginning of next year when the results of 1958 have become definitive. We have in mind categories who do not work in the heavy industry, but

perform an important job from the standpoint of the general well-being of the workers and their peace of mind. We refer to the workers in public health as well as to the teachers of primary and secondary schools, because their earnings lag to a certain extent behind others. I believe we must arrange the affairs of the people who treat sick workers and rear our children to become fine men and women. The further improvement of their position is in the interest of all the people, the whole nation.

Mention should be made of the housing problem. We are building 110,000 flats under the Three-Year Plan. This means an annual average 60 per cent higher than that for the last few years. And even some overfulfilment of this target is possible. We believe that in the first half of next year we shall have to enact a plan which will solve the housing problem in Hungary within the next 15 years. A great number of houses were destroyed during the war, and these losses were aggravated in 1956. And the demand has also increased greatly. I say greatly, because we only need to recall the 1930s when the working people lived badly housed in slums, while, at the same time, there were 8,000 empty, unleased flats in the capital. Nobody rushed to rent a flat because he had no way of knowing whether he would still be working the following week. Well, show me an unskilled factory worker nowadays who, hearing from his neighbour about a five-room villa for rent, would not rush to occupy it in a flash—and he would have no worry about being unable to pay the rent, or being unemployed next week.

The demands have increased. And we think that if the demands have increased, then we can double or treble the building of houses, and if the working people save a little and form building cooperatives, so they will build themselves a house of their own sooner. Then the people most in need of housing will receive a flat through the state housing programme sooner. There is no other way, comrades, with rents being so low. And what do the rents amount to? They cover less than 70 per cent of the maintenance. Therefore let the voluntary forces get busy. Under Horthy, people spent 40 per cent of their wages on rents, while now only 5 to 6 per cent of their earnings go for rents. We must face this question seriously and go about solving it.

We have decided that in Hungary this problem must be solved once and for all, although it is true that it will require 15 years and society will also have to bestir itself. We cannot bequeath this problem to our grandchildren. It is bad enough that we have to

suffer from it. We inherited this unfortunate situation from our one-time rulers.

Improvement is evident in the work of the National Planning Office, too. They are passing upon next year's plan in December this year, and preparations are under way on the long-range 15-year plan.

There is sound development in economic life. Production has increased, and so has productivity. Production costs have decreased. However, economic management will have to be further improved. He who is an economic executive ought to have the moral courage to keep order in his own house. He should not be afraid to be called a bad chap because he speaks to a shirker and tells him he is not in a holiday resort but in a workshop. The executives should display a little more responsibility and a sense of justice. We do not want injustice or ill-treatment. Let us be, so to speak, good chaps to those workers—98 per cent of them—who honestly work, and let us not be good chaps to those who do not work honestly. Let us demand good work from them.

You may have observed during the past two years that we are devoting the fruits of labour to what is most needed. We did not build anything superfluous. More work and better results take this into consideration.

Building socialism is a great cause. It merits that the working class and the working people should think over the fact that if we want to live better, we have to do more and better work. In this way we can speed up the building of socialism and improve our life.

Now I am going to speak about the problems of foreign policy. Our foreign policy is known to everybody and will remain unchanged. We are proud that the Soviet people who in 40 years created a miracle in the place of the former Czarist Russia, call our people their friends. We communists and communist sympathizers are proud that in the United States experts are desperately demanding that they should catch up with the Soviet Union in scientific training, public education, and in the field of energy research—with the same country where masses of people were illiterate only 40 years ago. Only socialism can do this. We are proud that this great people calls us their friends, and we are, and shall remain, staunchly and for all time, in support of Soviet-Hungarian friendship. In the same way we uphold the unity of the socialist camp.

The world is changing. The Soviet Union was the first socialist country in the world, but now, in the past few years, they have laid the foundations of a socialist society in Bulgaria and in China;



and China is not a country of ordinary size. They are close to the achievement of this aim in Czechoslovakia, and the whole socialist world is progressing rapidly towards the completion of socialist construction. Everything is ripe for us Hungarians to move quicker along this road than now. Every condition exists for achieving this. We need unity, will-power, and resolution!

As regards foreign policy, we have differences of opinion, both ideological and political, with one of our neighbours, Yugoslavia. The Yugoslavs, for example, do not approve that the 12 socialist countries are joined in a united camp. On the other hand, it is our opinion that if this socialist camp did not exist, then there would be no peace in the world either.

The Yugoslavs have been sending us messages nowadays about wanting to improve relations. We want the same thing and hope that good-neighbourly relations will develop. We are in favour of this. But if there are people in Yugoslavia who think that good relations with Hungary can be established by the press casting aspersions on the Soviet Union, China, Bulgaria, and Albania, then they are mistaken.

The Yugoslav comrades must understand that there is not an iota of difference on fundamental questions and international politics between the Soviet Union, China, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia and Hungary! For us the Soviet, Chinese, Bulgarian, Albanian and Czechoslovak peoples are our fraternal allies—they stood by us in our time of difficulty. We find it difficult to imagine friendship with the Yugoslav comrades when they abuse our brothers.

We hope that the Yugoslav comrades will change this situation and make efforts—and this would really be in the common interest and be a good thing to do—to improve relations with us, and we shall strive for this too.

We express our solidarity with the great China. We believe that the problem of China's off-shore islands, is her internal affair! Right is on the side of the Chinese People's Republic. We condemn the American imperialists for thinking they have the right to intervene in the domestic affairs of a great and free people, a sovereign country.

We have friendly relations with the non-socialist countries of Asia and Africa, and other countries fighting for their freedom. An especially timely question is the struggle for independence of the Algerian people. We stand by the Algerian people; we wish these peoples may be able to achieve independence and arrange their own life the way they want to.

We are staunch adherents of peaceful coexistence. We want to live in peace with Austria, our western neighbour, too, I believe that Habsburg rule was no good either for the Austrian people or for the Hungarian people. Therefore, no hostility remained from the time of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy to stand between our peoples. We wish the Austrian people prosperity and a happy life, and wish that good-neighbourly relations should prevail between our countries.

Nowadays, Austrian government circles have made a few statements to the effect that they wish to promote normal relations between Austria and Hungary. We welcome this. We shall do everything to this end and sincerely hope that we shall have good-neighbourly relations. It is our impression, however, that in Vienna there are elements alien to the Austrian people, and perhaps even alien to the Austrian government, which do not wish good relations to exist between Austria and Hungary. I saw an example of this in the newspaper *Die Presse* lately. It wrote that on the Austrian border the machine guns of the Hungarian frontier guard are pointed towards Austria. What kind of discovery is this? Or do the Austrian frontier guards perhaps turn their machine guns on Vienna? I hardly think so. This kind of rousing of public opinion only shows that often they try to incite the Austrian people against the Hungarian People's Republic with such idiocies. We think it would be proper for the Austrian people and the Austrian government to see to it that such forces do not spoil the good-neighbourly relations between the two countries. Then we will be able to straighten out our affairs. In our opinion this would serve the welfare of both countries and both peoples.

We want good relations with the United States, too, although it is a bit difficult to be on good terms with that country. There are simple reasons for this. Let me cite one example: In 1924, the government of the United States concluded a whole series of agreements with the government of the Horthy fascist regime in consular, payment and inheritance affairs. The government of the United States unilaterally terminated, in 1946, these agreements with respect to the government of the Hungarian People's Republic, although the Hungarian people and the Hungarian People's Republic put an end to the fascist regime. This is a peculiar way of thinking. They could cooperate with a fascist Hungary, conclude treaties with her, and all they have in stock for a democratic Hungary is abuse, attack and slander on all possible occasions. Despite this, however, we have no quarrel with the American people, and on this basis we are

ready to normalize relations between the two peoples and the two states. We are convinced that the day will come when relations between the United States and the Hungarian People's Republic will be good. Only one factor is required for this: that those who are at the helm of the United States should acquiesce in the fact and recognize that there lives in the region of the Danube and the Tisza rivers a people who are adherents of a socialist society, are building one, and will never be swayed from it.

Our working people must realize that hardly a month will pass without the imperialists trying to cause some kind of tension in some part of the world. The fact is that the millionaires who manufacture war materials are faced with the peculiar situation that, when tension relaxes, they are threatened by a crash on the Exchange and political bankruptcy. That is why they try to bring about tension in different ways. This must be taken into account. But we must be strong and self-assured, for justice is on the side of the socialist camp, the peace camp, and this camp is more powerful than the group of warmongers. The building of socialism, the defence of national independence against all aggressive imperialist attempts, the preservation of peace, however, cannot be the task only of party members. The whole people will live in a socialist society. Moreover, it is not only the task of the working class, because there will be peasants and intellectuals living there, too. The leadership of the party and the working class are needed for building socialism, because a socialist society cannot be built without it, but its realization can only be the common achievement of the whole people. We think, therefore, that the policy of popular national unity is a correct policy. Thus, the activities of the Patriotic People's Front will surely be needed, for the joint forces of party members and non-party workers, the joint forces of the broad popular masses, are essential until a socialist society has been fully built.

I believe, comrades, it is proper that the non-party workers should think highly of the members of the party, the communists. Life shows that the members of the party shoulder an extra burden of the more difficult part of life, of work, as compared with non-party people. And since the party members are working for a common cause, they deserve respect for the extra work they voluntarily undertake and perform in the interest of all the people. On the other hand, let the party members also respect the non-party workers, honour them, because, if they are aware that a task cannot be realized by the party members alone, then they must regard the

non-party workers as comrades-in-arms, comrades in struggle, fellow-workers with whom we share a common task and common joy.

The working class has a particularly great task in ensuring our further progress. The working class is that class of society which reaps the glory, and shoulders the responsibility as well for leading and guiding all society. It is desirable that awareness of this fact should be deepened and strengthened in the working class, so that it should be able to fulfil this glorious historic role always better and better. It will soon be 40 years since our working class first spoke up on the question of the new world, and this first word already made the enemy tremble, because this was where they saw the dictatorship of the proletariat arise right after that of the Russian workers. We need not be afraid of the perspective. We must have confidence in it, and we can have confidence in it. There will be only a socialist policy in this country in the future, too.

Dear Comrades:

During the last two years the enemy tried to resort to a wide variety of methods in its attempts to create mistrust against the policy of the party and against the leadership. Perfidiously spreading mendacious lies, they have endeavoured to raise doubts even about the unity of the party leadership. The new friendly atmosphere you experience in the party organizations, has its counterpart in the top leadership. We work now together as comrades and brothers. This means that we argue, and then decide. After we have discussed the issues and have made our decisions, we are united in action. Our political line is no longer the political line of only the party, of only the government; it has become the political line of the working masses of Hungary. Therein lies its strength, and this is a pledge that this policy will not change. Let us cherish this unity—in the party the unity of the party, in the Patriotic People's Front the idea of popular national unity; and in action let us strengthen and deepen the unity of the working millions for the sake of the correct aim. This is the most important task!

We are convinced that the election returns will be such as to make the adherents of socialism and freedom for the people rejoice, and cause bitterness to reactionaries, all over the world.

## ON THE EXPERIENCE OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN HUNGARY

ARTICLE FOR *WORLD MARXIST REVIEW*

February 1959

Even the stranger with only superficial knowledge of the situation in Hungary would not question the fact that in 1948 the working class, led by its revolutionary party and in alliance with the peasantry, won decisive victory over the reactionary bourgeoisie. The laying of the economic foundations of socialist society and the creation of socialist culture were initiated with immense enthusiasm.

It is a similarly undeniable fact that in the autumn of 1956 the proletarian dictatorship was weakened, the programme of socialist construction was overstrained, and the counter-revolutionary *putsch* instigated and fanned by the imperialists threatened the very existence of the Hungarian People's Republic.

Those even slightly acquainted with Hungarian conditions also know that by the end of 1958 the proletarian dictatorship and our Republic had regained their strength and are now stronger than they were before the counter-revolution. This is reflected concretely in all spheres of socialist construction and also in the convincing results of the elections to the National Assembly and local councils on November 16, 1958.

Of course, it would be wishful thinking to imagine that all those who cast their votes (98 per cent of the electorate, of whom 99 per cent voted for the candidates of the Patriotic People's Front) were firm Marxist-Leninists and communists. But it is a fact that the working class and peasantry and the bulk of the intellectuals, having weighed up everything, voted decisively for the policy of our party. This overwhelming majority impelled the vacillating minority to follow suit and thereby isolated the enemies of our system.

Of course, the party cannot be, and is not, satisfied with merely stating that the country is making sound progress and that socialism is on the upgrade. Our party knows that its duty is at all times to analyze the motive forces of events, to analyze the lessons of the

zigzag development—from the peak of 1948, to the low level of 1956, and the new high of November 1958—and the reasons for successes and setbacks. The working masses know that the party, in addition to taking cognizance of the experience, in the past two years has consolidated the gains of its practical work and has abolished or largely overcome the negative aspects. One can well realize that without a Marxist-Leninist analysis, without a decisive improvement in the party's practical work and without the support of the masses it would have been impossible in two years to pull the country out of the morass and redirect it along the high road to socialism.

The political line now pursued by the party is not new. It is true that there were errors and distortions in the course of the socialist construction prior to 1956, but this in itself does not alter the fact that in that period, too, socialism was being built in Hungary under the leadership of the working people's party. Our party is now continuing the policy of building socialism. Hence, its general line has remained unchanged since 1956. Naturally, our party work has acquired new and healthy features, too, which are by no means unessential. These accrue above all from the fact that the party has learnt from the lessons and errors of the past and is now more consistently applying the principles of Marxism-Leninism to Hungarian conditions.

Now briefly about our experience and the new features of the class struggle in Hungary.

### I

The class struggle in Hungary, particularly the 1956 counter-revolution, has proved the general validity of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on proletarian dictatorship and class struggle. "The abolition of classes," writes Lenin, "requires a long, difficult and stubborn class struggle, which, after the overthrow of the power of capital, after the destruction of the bourgeois state, after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, does not disappear... but merely changes its forms and in many respects becomes more fierce."

The abolition of the economic power of the bourgeoisie after the conquest of political power is a relatively simpler task. But expropriation of the bourgeoisie does not yet ensure final victory. As compared with this objective, the task of freeing the overwhelming majority of the working people from the ideological and political



influence of the bourgeoisie and winning them over to Marxist-Leninist ideas is much more complicated and requires longer time. Only when this has been done can our victory be considered final.

The counter-revolutionary experience of 1919 and 1956 clearly shows that the exploiters never become reconciled to the loss of power. A few months before the *putsch* the revisionists preached far and wide the false and harmful view that class struggle dies out already in the period of socialist construction. It was the spread of these ideas that largely accounted for the fact that when the counter-revolution broke out the party was unprepared. In the autumn of 1956, the class struggle in Hungary became more acute than at any time under the people's democratic regime.

During the transition period the class struggle is characterized by various opposing trends. The growth of the socialist forces restricts the resistance and the offensive capacity of the bourgeoisie and frees the petty-bourgeois masses from its influence. All this tends to mitigate the class struggle. At the same time, any weakening of the socialist forces, any shock to which the proletarian dictatorship is subjected tends to encourage and strengthen the bourgeoisie, thereby aggravating the class struggle. International developments likewise affect the class struggle in varying degrees in each country. If the forces of peace and socialism are making gains, the reactionaries are rendered helpless and give way; if the international tension is exacerbated and the imperialists launch provocations in some part of the globe, the reactionary forces in the country raise their heads.

It is not in the interests of the working class and the Communist Party to sharpen the class struggle—their primary concern is peaceful construction of socialism. In 1919 and in the period after 1945 the Hungarian proletariat came to power without a single gun being fired. And what was the reaction of the bourgeoisie? In 1919, as in 1956, it joined hands with the forces of world reaction and imposed a civil war on us. We do not want to sharpen the class struggle, but if an armed attack is thrust upon us, we are obliged to take up arms in self-defence. When the socialist forces in Hungary struck a retaliatory blow at the counter-revolutionaries, reactionaries all over the world raised a hullabaloo about "terror"; the revisionists and bourgeois "humanists" were shocked. But what did the proletarian dictatorship do? It answered the heinous atrocities of the counter-revolution with retaliatory blows. We can use the words of Lenin, who said in 1919: "The accusation of terrorism, since it is just, does not concern us, it concerns the bourgeoisie."

However, the class struggles in Hungary reflect not only these general laws but also the specific features inherent in our country's development, which explain the extreme sharpening of class struggle in certain periods.

The revolution and the national liberation war of 1848-49, which aimed at winning independence and clearing the way for bourgeois development for Hungary, suffered defeat. The development of Hungarian capitalism was complicated by the heavy burden of feudal survivals.

By 1918 all the essential social conflicts were aggravated to the utmost in Hungary: the conflicts between the bourgeoisie and the working class, between the feudal landlords and the peasants, and also between the different nationalities. They were complicated also by the conflict between our people and the alien Habsburg monarchy and the country's dependence on Austria. It was not fortuitous that Hungary happened to feel early, and with the greatest force, the impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution. In 1918, the Communist Party in a short period of time won over the majority of the working class and the masses, and under its leadership the Hungarian Republic of Councils came into existence.

In 1919, the counter-revolutionaries aided by imperialist intervention drowned the Republic of Councils in blood. But the Hungarian Republic of Councils of 1919 left its imprint on the class battles during the inter-war period of counter-revolutionary rule. The exploiting classes were haunted by the fear of another proletarian revolution, while the revolutionary movement gained strength and confidence from the experience of the Republic of Councils.

Two sharply opposed traditions—the revolutionary and the counter-revolutionary—stand out with particular force in the history of Hungary. After Russia, Hungary was the first country to establish proletarian dictatorship; but Hungary, too, was the country in which the first and longest fascist dictatorship came to power as a result of the counter-revolutionary victory achieved with the help of foreign intervention. But even the most brutal persecution failed to obliterate the memory of the Republic of Councils and the ideas of proletarian internationalism from the minds of the Hungarian communists and the best sons of the working class. Still, the temporary victory of the reactionary ruling classes and their more than twenty-five years of counter-revolutionary nationalist propaganda deeply affected especially the urban petty bourgeoisie and the intellectuals. The working class, the revolutionary vanguard of the working people, has rich

traditions, valuable experience and it has had tempering in battle. But the Hungarian bourgeoisie, too, had fighting and terrorist experience and was well versed in the art of deceiving the people.

Nationalism was one of the main ideological weapons of the counter-revolution used both under the Horthy regime and in 1956. The penetration of nationalist ideas was facilitated by the fact that the struggle against the centuries-old foreign (Turkish and German) yoke had developed strong national sensibility. In 1848, when the reconstruction of Hungary on bourgeois lines and the winning of national independence were on the agenda, bourgeois nationalism still played a progressive role. But beginning with the second half of the nineteenth century it became increasingly and unequivocally reactionary. The ruling classes used nationalism to promote their reactionary aims. They sacrificed the country's independence to the Habsburgs, to the Austrian ruling class, and later to Hitlerite imperialism in exchange for the right to oppress the national minorities in Hungary. In home policy nationalism was used to cover up the bitter class antagonisms and in foreign policy, to substantiate ideologically Hungary's participation in the two world wars. This background reveals why the counter-revolution in 1956 was decked in nationalist feathers. The so-called "national communism" inflamed the bourgeois nationalist, chauvinist views that had been cultivated for decades, and turned them into the principal ideological weapon during the process of hatching the counter-revolution.

The class struggle in Hungary was strongly affected by the fact that the working class had come to power under relatively peaceful conditions. Although socialization of the means of production had deprived the bourgeoisie of its economic might, it managed to preserve its political forces, due to the relatively peaceful development of the revolution. In the process of building people's democracy, only a part of the old state machine, namely, the armed organs of coercion, was destroyed; the other part was undergoing a process of gradual transformation. Thus, the bourgeoisie had not completely lost its political influence on state, economic and cultural life. This specific feature of the class struggle emphasizes the need to suppress still more vigorously the resistance of the bourgeoisie, to enhance the vigilance and the militant preparedness of the working class and all working people.

## II

In the period between the Liberation in 1945 and the counter-revolutionary coup in October 1956, the Hungarian people made considerable progress in the socialist reconstruction of the country. The forces of socialism had gained the upper hand. How, then, was it possible for a situation to arise, in which, for a time, the fate of the proletarian dictatorship was threatened?

According to the champions of the bourgeoisie, the counter-revolutionary *putsch* testified to the "disillusionment" of the working people with socialism, to "the crisis of communism." In point of fact the revisionists, too, had arrived at a similar conclusion when they spoke about a "spontaneous popular uprising" against the existing system.

But the theory of "the crisis of communism" proved to be false. During the counter-revolution, too, the forces of socialism had superiority over those of reaction. But the contending forces were not in the same position.

As to the forces loyal to socialism, the following can be said:

For years the Hungarian working class, responding to the call of the party, had put its heart and soul into the socialist construction. The mistakes made in that period caused some confusion in its ranks, and its links with the party were weakened. The confusion was complicated by the demoralizing influence and treachery of the revisionist, which, at the critical moment, paralyzed even the party and government leaders.

Despite this, large masses of workers and above all the seasoned guard of the working class—the veteran group of organized workers—remained loyal to socialism even in the hour of trial. Some of them resisted the counter-revolution with arms in hand, and it was they who were first to regain their ground the moment the counter-revolution was defeated.

The more conscious part of the peasantry—members of the co-operatives and the masses of poor peasants—remained faithful to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Vacillations increased among the middle peasants during the crisis because on some issues many of them had been at variance with the proletarian dictatorship. Such antagonism arose, for instance, during the socialist reconstruction in the countryside because the voluntary principle was violated, and also because of the system of prices for farm products. In the process of suppressing the counter-revolution, particularly at the time of

rearguard action, the middle peasants resolutely allied themselves with the working class.

The intellectuals, from the standpoint of their political views, split up into a number of groups. A small section remained loyal to the people's system to the end. Another section, also small, actively participated in preparing, organizing and leading the *putsch*. Still another section, a considerable one, vacillated. This is explained by the social status of the intellectuals. After the Liberation their status changed: they, together with the rest of the working people, gained freedom. But for a long time the change did not find reflection in their political thinking. A large part of the intellectuals retained, in one way or another, remnants of the old bourgeois concepts: nationalist views and illusions about above-class democracy. This explains why a fairly big section got caught up by the revisionist and nationalist wave and, as a result of the weakening of the dictatorship of the proletariat, fell prey to counter-revolutionary influence and formed a base for the counter-revolution. After the military, political and ideological defeat of the counter-revolution this wait-and-see section gradually turned to us. They did so because in this country the vital interests of the bulk of the intellectuals link them to the working class.

The base of the counter-revolutionary forces widened as a result of the vacillations of the urban petty bourgeoisie. This section is an ally of the working class when working-class rule is stable, but withdraws the moment working-class rule undergoes strain and suffers temporary setbacks. Lenin wrote: "...Decades of experience in all countries testify that it [the petty bourgeoisie] vacillates and hesitates; one day it marches with the proletariat and the next day, taking fright at the difficulties of the revolution, panics at the first defeat or semi-defeat of the workers, becomes nervous, darts to and fro, snivels, and rushes from one camp to the other." Our own experience fully confirms this thesis.

The forces of the counter-revolution were well organized and exceedingly active. They knew what they wanted. Their stooges occupied key positions in important sectors of the People's Republic. The general staff of the reactionaries was made up of spies and saboteurs enlisted by world imperialism, counter-revolutionary *émigrés* and their accomplices at home and also the traitorous Imre Nagy clique which deserted to their side. The armed gangs were recruited from the remnants of the former ruling classes; reactionary Horthy officers, gendarmes, police, criminals, lumpen-proletarians, and from young

people who had been led astray, as well as from the vacillating petty-bourgeois elements and intellectuals. The leading force of the dictatorship of the proletariat—the Communist Party—was paralysed by treachery. In the hour of crisis the defenders of socialism were left without leadership. They were dispersed and for this reason, though they were in the majority, could not fight with due resolve. And so it was that, because the counter-revolution was well organized and our forces were disorganized, a situation arose in which a superior force temporarily found itself at a disadvantage compared with an inferior one.

### III

The preparation, launching and the bitter rearguard action of the counter-revolutionary *putsch* in 1956 shed light on the tactics employed by the international and Hungarian reactionaries in their fight against socialism. The counter-revolutionaries knew that they could not count on success if they openly called for restoration of capitalism. That is why they cloaked their real aims. In the initial stages at least, they proclaimed "democratic socialism," not capitalism, as their aim. "Socialism without dictatorship"—this was their first tactical slogan. In proclaiming it, the counter-revolutionaries calculated that it would create favourable ground for the accomplishment of further aims. This slogan suited them because it could be used to mislead the politically immature masses.

Their second tactical step was the proclamation of "pure democracy," void of class content. At the height of the *putsch*, the reactionaries discarded the mask. True, for the purpose of deluding the masses, they continued to shout about "democracy," but in reality there was not the slightest indication of democracy—counter-revolutionary terror reigned in the streets.

The 1919 counter-revolution, too, had invoked democratic slogans. Early in August 1919, the six-day "trade-union" government headed by Gyula Peidl\* paved the way to counter-revolutionary terror, and the "national communist" Imre Nagy government did exactly the same in October 1956.

\* In August 1919 after the fall of the Hungarian Republic of Councils, Gyula Peidl formed a provisional so-called "trade-union" government, consisting of Right social democrats, which later gave way to an overtly counter-revolutionary government.



In foreign policy, too, the counter-revolutionaries resorted to the same step-by-step tactics. At first, they demanded that Soviet-Hungarian friendship be "based on equality." This, of course, signified a thrust at the Soviet Union, the purpose being to implant the idea that Hungarian-Soviet relations were not based on equality. The next step was overt anti-Soviet instigation, renunciation of the Warsaw Treaty, and the proclamation of "neutrality." For Hungary this "neutrality" could only signify a complete break with her friends and her subordination to the NATO imperialists.

It was on the basis of the tactical principle of gradualness that imperialism, which prepared and organized the *putsch*, selected the main attack forces for particular stages of the offensive. First, they relied on the support from the opposition inside the party. This is what Ferenc Nagy, one of the leaders of the bourgeois *émigrés*, wrote only a few months before the *putsch* in *Látóhatár* (Horizon)—organ of Hungarian *émigrés*—having in mind the revisionist Imre Nagy clique: "We are not at all upset by the fact that today this struggle is still led by members of the Communist Party."

In foreign policy in the initial stage Yugoslavia—a country which had broken with the socialist camp and was now opposed to it—was quoted as an example. As a first step, in the view of some American politicians, they had to be satisfied with changes along the lines of Yugoslavia, thus giving a clear *exposé* of the aims and intentions of the imperialists. The imperialist and counter-revolutionary forces were aware that they could count on success only if they were able to wrest Hungary from the socialist camp. That would have been the first step to the restoration of capitalism in Hungary and her subordination to imperialist oppression.

The internal and foreign reactionaries preparing the counter-revolution adopted the principle of gradualness in choosing the field of action, in changing the direction of the attack, and in selecting the forms and means of struggle.

It was not accidental that the counter-revolutionary offensive began on the ideological front among the intellectuals, among whom there were many vacillating elements and persons who could be used to influence broader sections of the public. The enemy calculated that if they could paralyze the socialist forces ideologically, revive and support the old way of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois thinking in the minds of the people, it would be easier to conduct a general political offensive and, later, an armed attack against the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism.

This aim was furthered already in 1955 and early in 1956 by a group formed in the Union of Writers (Tibor Déri, Tamás Aczél, Gyula Háty, and others), and by the counter-revolutionary propaganda conducted in the Petöfi Circle. At first the outward impression was that these groups were discussing questions of culture in the narrower sense, such as problems of poetry, literature, the historical sciences, philosophy and pedagogy. However, it soon became evident that the discussion of cultural questions was but a cover for a general attack by bourgeois ideology in preparation for the counter-revolutionary *putsch*.

Propagation of hostile ideology was also facilitated by the fact that for a number of years the former leadership of the party had not fought consistently against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology. Open ideological struggle had often been replaced by unilateral administrative measures; bourgeois and petty-bourgeois views were simply suppressed without exposing their reactionary character before the masses. The result was that these ideas disappeared only from the surface, but continued to survive in the minds of many, and, when the opportunity came, broke out into the open. This "second flowering" of reactionary bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideas in 1956, warns us that in the struggle against bourgeois ideology no administrative measures can possibly replace open ideological struggle, exposure and overcoming of hostile ideology.

Whereas during the preparatory period the counter-revolutionaries conducted their ideological offensive without going beyond the "socialist" framework, at a later stage, during the uprising, openly anti-party slogans prevailed. For instance, one of the chief slogans during the rising wave of the counter-revolution was the demand to restore the multi-party bourgeois system.

At one time between 1945 and 1948, other parties existed side by side with the Communist Party in Hungary. But most of the bourgeois parties had suffered defeat in the open political struggle. The Smallholders' and the National Peasant Party, having ousted the Right bourgeois elements, had acknowledged the leading role of the working class, endorsed socialist construction and joined the reorganized Patriotic People's Front. From that moment on their independent activity as parties gradually withered away. By 1956 this problem had become a thing of the past.

Re-establishment of the multi-party system in conditions of a counter-revolutionary offensive could but favour the reactionary forces. Construction of socialism and struggle against reaction were

ruled out with the parties that had been re-established. Their membership included feudal, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois reactionaries of all hues. It was not easy for the masses to identify the true countenance and see the counter-revolutionary role of parties which, at definite periods in their history, had had progressive features (Social Democratic Party, Smallholders' Party and National Peasant Party). These parties were re-established as anti-socialist parties, and were led by rabid enemies of proletarian dictatorship. The Right elements seized the leadership, ousting those who in the past few years had taken part in building socialism.

During the *putsch* it was clear that the attempts to restore the multi-party system were aimed at splitting working-class unity, undermining the links between the working class and its allies, and at abolishing the proletarian dictatorship.

The leading role of a revolutionary working-class party in state and public life is a fundamental question, a general law of the people's democratic system, regarded as a form of proletarian dictatorship. Without this condition people's power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the worker-peasant state cannot survive and socialist society cannot be built. This is absolutely clear. At the same time the fact that some People's Democracies have but one political party (the revolutionary party of the working class), while others have several parties proves that a "one-party system" or "multi-party system" is not a principle deriving from the general law, but a practical political question which is solved on the basis of the political and social relations obtaining in the particular country. Our party had to face this question too.

After the defeat of the counter-revolution the openly Right bourgeois parties disintegrated. The so-called "coalition" parties continued to exist for a month or two, conducting activity in the localities. (In one of the provincial counties there was a group of the Smallholders' Party, in Budapest a group of the National Peasant Party, in Csepel a branch of the Social Democratic Party, etc.). All their activity consisted in their persistent opposition to any consolidation of the People's Republic. In November and December 1956, the former "coalition" parties demonstrated once and for all that in the Hungary of today they can no longer play a progressive role.

That is why in December 1956 our party resolutely and very properly opposed the idea of restoring the multi-party system, and in the course of the political and ideological struggle laid bare the

counter-revolutionary nature under Hungarian conditions of the slogan for a multi-party system. We are now seeking to recruit through the Patriotic People's Front those leaders and members of the former coalition parties who are loyal to People's Democracy, for constructive work in the various spheres of political, economic and cultural life. The growth of the Patriotic People's Front during the past two years shows that here, too, we have succeeded in eliminating the confusion caused by the counter-revolution.

#### IV

The counter-revolution had thoroughly prepared for the attack, had worked out elaborate tactics and achieved temporary success; yet, it was unable to win. In the West there has been and there still is bitter wrangling as to what was the chief tactical mistake. But the main cause of the defeat suffered by the counter-revolution should be sought not in its tactics, but in the fact that it underestimated the pull of socialist ideas, the strength of the working class, of the people, and of socialism, both in Hungary and on the international plane. The counter-revolution based its calculations on a "crisis" of communism, on breaking the unity of the socialist camp. That is why its plans ended in failure.

The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government found the key to success in the counter-offensive: they believed in the masses, in the strength of the socialist camp, and they relied on these firm pillars.

In October and November 1956 in Hungary there was not only a clash between the home forces of socialism and counter-revolution, there took place one of the class battles on an international scale between socialism and capitalism. The counter-revolutionary onslaught, which aimed at overthrowing the Hungarian People's Republic, had been organized by international imperialism. In saving the Hungarian socialist revolution a decisive role was played by the aid, of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, which they rendered in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

In the two years following the defeat of the counter-revolution, we consolidated our people's democratic system and created conditions for the steady advance of socialist construction. Our achievements during these two years in economy and culture, in strengthening the proletarian dictatorship and rallying the working people under the

leadership of the Socialist Workers' Party, unequivocally show that the vast majority of our people have forever adopted socialism.

These successes also prove that our party has been able to learn from both the good and from the bad experience, from the tragic lessons of the counter-revolutionary *putsch*, that it has solved, not unfruitfully, the complex questions of class struggle during the two years that have passed since the counter-revolution.

The party has acquired useful experience also in how to take into account the specific features of our situation with regard to the operation of the basic laws of class struggle and by so doing ensure the functioning of the proletarian dictatorship without any distortions. In this connection it was vitally important to grasp the main link in the chain of interconnections of class struggle and proletarian dictatorship—the link determining the course of development in the given period, so as to concentrate our efforts on this.

Depending on the concrete situation and the character of the tasks of the day, one or another of the functions of the proletarian dictatorship—coercion, organization, or education—comes to the fore. For instance, it is absolutely clear that in the stage immediately following November 4, 1956, the first and inevitable step for the purpose of strengthening the proletarian dictatorship was to smash the armed counter-revolutionary groups. All other tasks were subordinated to this principal task.

The accomplishment of this task enabled the party to concentrate on stabilizing the economic situation. Lastly, the political and economic consolidation paved the way to the solution of ideological and cultural questions. These questions, together with the further political consolidation of people's power and the carrying out of economic tasks, still comprise a major part of our work. True, the different tasks are always interwoven, but it is equally true that the concentration on the main task was a vital and indispensable condition for our advance.

An important factor influencing class struggle in the past two years was that our party waged a consistent struggle on two fronts: against sectarian, dogmatic deviations and against Right deviations. This was decisive for our success in the class struggle. The degree of acuteness of class struggle is determined above all by the attitude of the class enemy. But it is also affected by the policy of the party—a factor which should not be overlooked. For instance, the Left deviations, sectarian mistakes and distortions committed prior to the counter-revolutionary *putsch* undoubtedly aggravated the class strug-

gle. At the same time the spread of revisionist ideas and the weakening of the struggle against the enemy provided the reactionaries with the opportunity to strike more resolutely.

Although the communists endeavour to prevent the class struggle from assuming acute forms, they do not mystify this question; they do not hold that milder forms of class struggle signify strengthening the party's contact with the masses, or that more acute forms weaken contact.

Everything depends on the reasons for the sharper or milder form of class struggle—whether it is the inevitable result of the actual situation, or the consequence of the party's incorrect policy. For instance, the nine months following the defeat of the counter-revolution were characterized by acute class struggle. The proletarian dictatorship led by the party was forced to take severe measures. But since the latter were dictated by the actual situation, and since the party did not take a single step more than was necessary, yielded neither to Right views nor to Left exaggerations, this acute class struggle strengthened the party's contact with the masses because the latter understood and approved these steps. And on the contrary, prior to the *putsch*, there were periods when the party, because of opportunist mistakes, failed to pay due attention to suppressing hostile forces, yet its contact with the masses was not extended.

Guided by its political line, our party has endeavoured to ensure the functions of the proletarian dictatorship without any deviations or distortions. It has been demonstrated that if revolutionary coercion is required, it should be applied without hesitation to anyone who encroaches on the power of the people. When it is a question of the existence of the socialist system, petty-bourgeois concessions are out of the question. The trial and punishment of the enemy and of those guilty of excesses were justified both theoretically and practically as a necessary and correct step which corresponds to the sense of justice of the Hungarian people.

At the same time we have strengthened and will continue to strengthen the democratic foundations of our system. During the past two years, thanks to a series of measures, the role of the working people in solving public matters has grown. The activity of the organs of people's power—the National Assembly and local councils—has developed considerably. The intermediate and local bodies have become more independent. The rights of the trade unions, cooperatives and self-governing bodies have been extended.



Good results have likewise accrued from better relations, now placed on a firm foundation, between party members and non-party people. Only a few months after the defeat of the counter-revolution, and repeatedly since then, the party proclaimed and implemented the principle that party members and non-members enjoy equal rights of citizenship. For example, before the Central Committee discussed such an important matter as the position of the working class, we ascertained and considered the views of party and non-party people alike. The party asked for the views of non-party people even when it criticized them: for instance, in connection with their attitude to the so-called "populist writers." In the aggregate, and only in the aggregate, this led to the isolation of the enemy, to the growth of the ranks of those who rallied round the party.

The party, waging the class struggle from this correct standpoint, has devoted special attention in the last two years to the allies of the working class. In solving this question it proceeded from the fact that the alliance with the peasantry and petty-bourgeois elements has, in addition to general features, a concrete content at all times. It is essential to have a correct and timely understanding of this concrete content. Take, for instance, the question of the worker-peasant alliance.

This alliance, both in the period of struggle for power and during the building of socialism, is based on a community of fundamental interests. During the *putsch*, most of the peasants felt that the noisy phrase-mongering was designed to cloak the demand for the return of the former estates to the landowners. In this concrete case the essence of the worker-peasant alliance was realized in the defence of the land. That is why all the working peasants fought together with the party on this issue. This was not the time for the party in its political work to put emphasis on the cooperatives and the socialist reconstruction of agriculture. As things were, this would not have rallied the peasants for the struggle against the counter-revolution. Defence of the land wrested from the landlords and handed over to the peasants was, in point of fact, the defence not of a socialist but of a bourgeois-democratic achievement. In this sense, the fact that at the end of 1956 this slogan became the basic element of the worker-peasant alliance, signified, to a degree, a return to the stage that had already been passed. It was, however, linked with the defence of the socialist revolution, because the peasants were well aware that it was the working class and not the bourgeoisie that had expropriated the landlords' estates and turned the land over to the peasants.

Moreover, they knew that only a working-class government would defend this achievement.

Gradually, as the working-class power gained strength after defeating the *putsch*, the socialist elements in the worker-peasant alliance—particularly defence of the cooperative farms—began to come to the fore. It goes without saying that the slogan of defending the cooperative farms did not meet with the undivided approval of all peasants, for it expressed the interests only of the more advanced peasants. Then, too, the immediate aim and the inner content of the worker-peasant alliance changed still more when the party, in addition to upholding the cooperative farms, put the emphasis on strengthening them and on the socialist reconstruction of agriculture.

The party says forthrightly that the aim of the worker-peasant alliance today is to defend and strengthen the people's democratic rule, that this alliance is the foundation for the building of socialism, including the socialist reconstruction of agriculture. Conditions are ripe for a more rapid development of the cooperative farm movement, though not for a tempestuous leap forward. The party adheres to the voluntary principle in organizing cooperative farms, and ensures conditions for individual farming. This will be its policy in the future as well. What is noteworthy, however, is that the peasants, fully aware of this, voted unanimously for the party's policy at the last elections. This shows that they accept our peasant policy, have confidence in it and are not against the socialist perspective. Thanks to this, the worker-peasant alliance now embraces practically all the peasants, with the exception of a negligible number of rural bourgeoisie, the rural rich. All this shows that at definite stages of the struggle against the counter-revolution, the party correctly defined the decisive elements of the worker-peasant alliance from a Marxist-Leninist standpoint, and, by doing so, was able to draw the correct conclusions.

The party's approach to the urban petty bourgeoisie and intellectuals was much the same. Experience has confirmed the party's estimate according to which our attitude towards these sections depends not on the "specific" questions affecting them but chiefly on the question of power. An essential factor in winning over these sections was the consolidation of our system. This convinced many of them that their basic views were unsound. But we could not be satisfied with that. Together with sharp, principled criticism of their erroneous views, we display more confidence in them, show greater appreciation of their services and put before them a clearer and more

inspiring perspective. The result is that today these sections have a better understanding of the importance of their work, and of their role and place in society.

Our practical results and arguments have turned the vacillating urban petty-bourgeois sections and intellectuals from a reserve of the counter-revolution (which they were during the crisis) to a reserve of socialism. As the atmosphere of hysteria fomented by the counter-revolutionaries subsided and the convincing words, words backed by deeds, began to have results, the process of ideological and political purification gained ground. We could see changes for the better taking place among all sections of the intellectuals and, what was most gratifying, among the teachers. Although the majority of the intellectuals cannot yet claim that they have adopted the ideological stand of Marxism-Leninism, their interest in it has definitely grown. Correct methods of combating the enemy and of winning allies, as well as the constant search for these methods and readjusting them in the course of struggle—these are the basic features of the class struggle in Hungary today.

## V

The struggle waged by our party during the past two years centred round two questions in which all the urgent issues were crystallized and which, moreover, were the basic issue of the clash with the class enemy. These were, first, the further strengthening of the party by re-establishing it, ensuring its unity and leading role; and, second, adhering to the principles of proletarian internationalism in party policy and inculcate these principles in the minds of the people.

During the life-and-death struggle against the counter-revolution, the battle was waged on these issues not only against the class enemy and the imperialists, but also against the revisionists. At the beginning of November 1956, when armed fascist counter-revolutionaries were still killing our comrades who were working to recreate the party, both our own and the Yugoslav revisionists "recommended" us to give up the "futile" straining of our forces to re-establish the party. They urged us to "change the political system" and to build up our power by relying on the "workers' councils," which at the time, as was plain to all, were controlled by the counter-revolutionaries. We, however, stood by the indisputable propositions of

Marxism-Leninism concerning the party and proletarian dictatorship, and strengthened our revolutionary working-class party, ensured its unity and leading role. In our work, and in the struggle on two fronts, we sought to implement the invincible ideas of Marxism-Leninism in all their purity, free from dogmatic and revisionist distortions.

The experience of the class struggle in Hungary has reaffirmed that proletarian dictatorship under Communist Party leadership is an indispensable condition, a vital prerequisite for building socialism; it has shown also that the working people are vitally interested in preserving and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Proletarian internationalism is a decisive element of the correct Marxist-Leninist principles on which the revolutionary working-class party is based. The party fulfils its international duty when it uncompromisingly fights for the complete abolition of the political power of its "own" bourgeoisie, for the complete emancipation of the working people and the building of socialist society.

For the past forty-one years the test for the internationalism of a working-class party has been its attitude to the unity of the socialist camp. One of the features of our struggle against the counter-revolution was the unshakable friendship with the Soviet Union and firm loyalty to the unity of the socialist camp—the open and consistent proclamation of proletarian internationalism. We can affirm that in winning the support of the masses, in our advance over the past two years, the firm internationalist policy of our party has played a decisive role.

In the present conditions it is particularly true that in fighting against its "own" reactionary bourgeoisie, the working class and the working people are simultaneously fighting international imperialism. The ruling circles of the United States are now fulfilling the role of "world gendarme." They have taken into their heads to "free" or "liberate" our peoples from communism. This, of course, is wishful thinking, a dream that will never come true. But the counter-revolutionary *putsch* of 1956 supplied further proof that their heart's desire is to realize this dream. This obliges the communist parties of the People's Democracies to make sure that neither internal reaction, international imperialism, nor revisionism is allowed to undermine and sap the unity of the socialist countries. This is the lesson that we, the members of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, have drawn from the experience of the battle against the counter-revolutionaries.

Our party and all its members are boundlessly loyal to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, to socialist patriotism, proletarian internationalism, and this is so because our party is eager to serve the working class and our people. What is more, we know that our party, our working class and people will be invincible as long as they remain faithful to these principles.

THE TWENTY-FIRST CONGRESS OF THE C.P.S.U.  
RENDERS THE PERSPECTIVES OF THE FUTURE  
CLEARER TO THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE

STATEMENT PUBLISHED IN  
*NÉPSZABADSÁG*

February 8th, 1959

*János Kádár granted this interview to special correspondents Anna Bébrits and István Szabó of Népszabadság and to the correspondent of the Hungarian Telegraphic Agency in Moscow.*

*Question:* Comrade Kádár, in what do you see the significance of the Twenty-first Congress?

*Answer:* All those who were able to attend the Twenty-first Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, were participants in an inspiring and truly historical event. I myself was deeply aware of this when I had the great honour to be able to take part in the Congress, together with Comrades Antal Apró and Jenő Fock, as representatives of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, which enjoys sincere love and respect in the Soviet Union, and of the politically conscious Hungarian working people.

With the Twenty-first Congress and the Seven-Year Plan adopted there, the Soviet people are opening a new phase in social development. The workers and peasants of Czarist Russia, led by Lenin and the Communist Party, smashed the ruthless bourgeois landowning system which was burdened with mediaeval remnants. They established, and in hard struggles defended, the Soviet power and its achievements. Having deprived the parasites of society, the capitalists, the bankers and the landowners, of the possibility of growing fat on the arduous toil of the workers and peasants, they built up a socialist order of society in which the sacred law of labour is dominant, and in which everyone has an opportunity to work according to his abilities and to receive of the goods produced in accordance with the work he has performed. The Soviet people are now living in the second, higher stage of socialist society, the period of the



construction of a communist society. In this society everyone will work according to his abilities, and receive goods in accordance with his needs. Thus, the highest form of social justice and the chance for unlimited prosperity are becoming a reality. I am deeply convinced that the Soviet people will attain this lofty aim within a humanly foreseeable time. Our delegation, in their greetings to the Congress, conveyed the best wishes of the Hungarian working people and wished the Soviet people full success in the construction of communism.

The construction of communism is not just a wish, but a realistic, attainable target, for which every condition is assured. The magnificent achievements of Soviet industry, agriculture, and cultural life, the sputniks and the space rocket have made it indisputable that the Soviet people are already in the vanguard of mankind in many fields of creative human labour. There can be no doubt that they will shortly surpass in every respect even the most highly developed capitalist country, the United States of America. Only malignant critics can ask why it is only in the future that the Soviet Union will overtake and surpass America. These malevolent prattlers keep silent about the fact that the Czarist Russia of forty-one years ago was, because of the crimes of its rulers, a century behind the United States in respect to industrial development and many other matters. Nor do they mention the fact that these forty-one years include those of the Civil War, of the intervention waged by fourteen imperialist countries, and of the Second World War, together with the inestimable damage they involved. Nevertheless, in forty-one years the Soviet Union has made up the arrears of an entire historical age, and has forged ahead of all the capitalist states of the world by an entire age in social development.

*Question:* How would you, Comrade Kádár, explain the achievements of the Soviet people which are so widely admired throughout the world?

*Answer:* In our country, the Hungarian People's Republic, the working millions are now carrying out and experiencing the grand process—though fraught with difficulties and jolts—of establishing a new socialist society. The main problem for those peoples who have only taken the first steps along the path of constructing socialism, is how, in what way, the Soviet people were able to achieve the unprecedentedly enormous, almost miraculous results they did, in the face of unthinkable difficulties. The achievements of the Soviet people are

due to the fact that they had at the van of their struggles and their work a revolutionary workers' party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which is armed with the teachings of Lenin, the scientific, communist view of the world, the theory of Marxism-Leninism; is indomitable and united, at one with the people and living with them through thick and thin.

We, the members of the Hungarian delegation, just as the delegates of all the other fraternal parties, followed the deliberations of the Congress with close attention. The splendid report of Comrade Khrushchov, which has also been an ideological contribution to the treasury of Marxism-Leninism, is of further valuable help for us, too. We were glad to see that the delegates to the Congress enthusiastically affirmed their faith in the correct policy of the Leninist Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. which life has substantiated abundantly. They all stressed the fact that the successes achieved by the Soviet Union in the last three years have been due to the consistent application of the policy laid down at the Twentieth Party Congress. It was with the same unanimity and the greatest vigour that the delegates condemned the ossified dogmatists, the factionists who, unable to comprehend the policy worked out at the Twentieth Congress and the requirements of life, had stooped to entering on the path of anti-party activity.

Only with the greatest enthusiasm can one talk of the monolithic unity between the Central Committee and the party membership, between the party and the people, and of the love of the Soviet people for the party, the Central Committee and Comrade Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchov.

The Marxist-Leninist ideological purity of the policy of the C. P. S. U., the unity of its ranks and its oneness with the people serve as an example for all the communist parties of the world.

*Question:* What message do you send the Hungarian working people, Comrade Kádár, before your return home?

*Answer:* I believe that the Twenty-first Congress of the C. P. S. U. will render the perspectives of the future clearer still to our working people, too. The successes of the Soviet Union, the heights already conquered by the Soviet people, also show that it is worth while living and working even better and more enthusiastically for the socialist future. Our people owe a great deal to the Soviet Union, nor can our future development be separated from the progress of

the Soviet Union. Comrade Khrushchov indeed stated in his Congress report that the countries of the socialist camp would attain communism, the highest stage of social development, at more or less the same time. This also means that the countries of the socialist camp may always count on the help of the Soviet Union, the first and most powerful socialist country. It would, however, be very one-sided if we were continually only to stress this. The other side of the question is that the rest of the countries of the socialist camp must also help each other, and the people of each socialist country must, with their own work, play their part in increasing the strength of the socialist camp. In our country all the political and economic conditions are now given for the more rapid construction of a socialist society. If we concentrate our forces and work industriously, we can soon make up for the relative lag that has come about in our country because of the former mistakes and the counter-revolution, and can take our place beside the other People's Democracies which are progressing at a swift rate in the work of socialist construction. For us, this is the main lesson of the Twenty-first Congress.

We have been glad to see from the Hungarian papers sent to Moscow that the historic discussions at the Twenty-first Congress have aroused a great response among our working people. It may already be noticed, and the news coming from home has also shown, that the Twenty-first Congress does not merely interest our working class and working peasantry, but is also having an inspiring and stimulating effect on their work.

*Question:* In your opinion, Comrade Kádár, what part does the Twenty-first Congress play in securing peace?

*Answer:* We must be aware that the Twenty-first Congress has been a further blow to the imperialist aggressors, the maniacs of the cold war, and is an event of inestimable significance for the peace of the peoples of the world. The consistent and repeatedly expressed Leninist peace policy of the Soviet Union, the new, tremendous Seven-Year Plan of peaceful construction, and the strength that underlies all this, entitle all of us to hope with ever greater certainty for the peace that is so important for constructive work.

It was great to be together at the Twenty-first Congress in Moscow with the most outstanding representatives of the revolutionary working-class movement, the communist parties of the world. It was inspiring and—if I may use the word—moving, to see their

internationalist militant unity, their loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, their inexorable stand against revisionism, their adherence to each other and to the Soviet Union. I think I need not be ashamed to admit that we were all deeply affected at the closing session of the Congress when the delegates of over seventy peoples started as one to sing the *International*, this hymn of the revolutionary labour movement, which is ever more becoming the hymn of the whole of toiling mankind.

## LET US ENCOURAGE THE CREATIVE POWER OF THE PEOPLE

SPEECH AT THE ENLARGED SESSION  
OF THE BUDAPEST PARTY COMMITTEE

March 11th, 1959

Comrades:

To begin with, I would like to speak about the work done by our delegation to the Twenty-first Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Hungarian delegation was given an affectionate welcome by the participants at the Congress, the delegates of the fraternal parties and the Soviet people. We went to factories, scientific and technical exhibitions and met workers, intellectuals and party workers. These encounters were highly profitable for us and yielded rich experiences.

The Soviet people—party and national leaders as well as the simplest unskilled workers or the scientists—and delegates of some 70 parties of the international working-class movement asked us when opportunity offered to forward their fraternal greetings and esteem to the Hungarian communists, to the Hungarian working people, for overcoming the difficulties caused by the counter-revolution, and for their encouraging results.

It is this fraternal greeting that I am now conveying to you, comrades, participating in the enlarged session of the Budapest Party Committee.

The historical significance and impact of the Twenty-first Congress are enormous. The Congress has fortified the ranks of fighters for peace and progress throughout the world. Its direct influence is already making itself felt in the conflict between socialism and imperialism.

A momentous change has occurred in the world in the last two and a half years—the balance of forces has shifted in favour of socialism as a result of the successful achievements attained by the socialist camp, particularly by the Soviet Union, and this shift has been increased still further under the influence of the Twenty-first

Congress. Two and a half years ago, at the time of the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary, communists in, say, some South American country were required to answer the question of why there was a counter-revolution in Hungary. We can all imagine the arguments then conducted between progressives and reactionaries, or simply the conversations between progressives and less politically conscious working people, in every part of the world at that time. Now it is the communists, progressive people, who can ask the question in infinite succession: "What do you say to the Soviet Union being the first to conquer space?" "What do you say to the Seven-Year Plan adopted by the Twenty-first Congress?" "What do you say to the splendid leap forward of the people of China?" They may also ask, among other things: "What do you think of the way things have straightened out in Hungary?"

The positions occupied by socialism now are good. Places are getting too hot for imperialists, of which they would not even have dreamt two or three years ago. South-west Africa, South Africa or Latin America are some of these places. Indeed, the inevitable process of the decay of imperialism is taking place before our very eyes. This general trend of development is also recognized by some among the imperialists. Notable columnists have more than once observed that the Soviet Union, socialism, was very attractive to the peoples liberated from colonial status or still living under colonial rule. These peoples are looking at the heart of the matter. They know that 40 years ago the Soviet people were backward, too. But in four decades of freedom they have grown into a socialist great power. The degree of industrialization and the life of the people cannot even be compared with those of old. Now it is not only imperialist columnists who see this, but for instance the black working men of Africa as well. Thus the general trend of events is clear, and knowing this, we are fighting with the proper confidence in the future.

We are fighting for peaceful competition. We are fighting to avoid war. The Twenty-first Congress has stated once more that a world war can be prevented, provided the struggle of the masses for peace does not flag. We must, therefore, be on the look-out and must work so as to keep alive our people's confidence and sense of responsibility for the cause of peace. If we know the trend of general development, and if we courageously face up to the possible sharpening of the various stages of development by the imperialists, then our people may go on working with assurance and confidence, and we may expect further successes in our constructive effort.



Ours is an independent party which is answerable, to both its own people and the international working-class movement, for the destiny of the socialist revolution. The favourable general state of our movement can also be sensed in the talks and discussions we are having at home. It is no longer we, but the reactionaries, who are in an isolated situation, and there is no question which we cannot answer. We are able, therefore, to argue confidently, and we are indeed doing so. The situation here has changed radically, but this does not mean by far that we are no longer obliged untiringly to explain our views. It is our duty to talk to people, systematically and with infinite patience, and, basing ourselves on the successes achieved, on our changed situation, to continue our work to enlighten and rally the masses.

We must consider the question of how our party, our people may turn the experiences of the Twenty-first Congress to good advantage.

We feel sure that, beside the many other factors, the Congress also had a part in the swift progress made by the cooperative farm movement. The abundant material of the Congress should be utilized in two stages. There are lessons and methods which we may use right away; we would do wrong therefore to wait six or nine months. On the other hand, the thorough and profound elaboration of the various questions requires circumspect analysis, and, as regards these, we have thought that we would state our views on them at the Party Congress.

The material of the Twenty-first Party Congress must be taught in the party schools and in education outside the party schools if we want Hungarian communists to keep up with the development of Marxism-Leninism. But the rich treasure of material of the Congress should also be widely disseminated, among all our people.

In our present situation, there are two points of particular importance with which we can and must deal immediately and which are worth dealing with. One is the development of the national economy; the other concerns the results achieved in the cooperative farm movement.

The development of our economy has been sound. The development of the national economy shows that the policy pursued by the party in political struggle was correct. Also, planning and management are better, more realistic and sensible. A freer atmosphere has been ensured for creative work, and very good use indeed has been made of it by the working millions and also by such important

strata as the functionaries and the intellectuals, above all the technical experts. This is very noteworthy. Today, the scientists, the engineers and technicians may carry on their experiments and work in peace, for they feel they are appreciated by the party. We take it for granted that the vast majority of the intellectuals are our allies, with whom we wish to work together, and whom we trust.

It is very important that people—whichever social stratum they may belong to—should feel this confidence. While at work, we certainly have to be on the alert, so that certain individuals should not be able to engage in sabotage, or do anything evil, but it is essential that we have confidence in the vast majority, for without this it is impossible either to work, or to struggle, or to build. The creative spirit has been a very important factor of our successes up to now which have come about due to the efforts, the cheerfully performed labour of millions.

The questions relating to the cooperative farm movement were discussed in detail at the Central Committee meeting. Our Central Committee has, I believe, adopted good resolutions also on problems related to the development of agriculture. As for myself, I am fully convinced that the party can persuade the working peasantry of the correctness of the path of cooperative farming if it works with the individual peasants like with brothers. There would be no socialist Győr County in Hungary today, had not the party and the government in the last two years followed the correct policy of working confidently and courageously with the peasants as a fraternal class even when most of them still tilled their own individual farms. We have created a better life for the working peasants. The earlier errors have been eliminated. The broad masses of the peasantry have been able to realize that the party means well. By means of the correct policy pursued by the Central Committee we have proved to the peasants that our party is working in their interest, for their benefit as well, and this has been the decisive reason why the masses of working peasants have set out towards the cooperatives.

We may state that—although only after a rather painful detour—our Central Committee, too, has been able to implement the Marxist-Leninist line as further developed by the Twentieth Congress. This has been the guiding principle to action in our party since November 4th, 1956. This lends all of us strength and confidence. The policy of our Central Committee is a Marxist-Leninist policy. In its application, in consistency, in the steadiness of the leadership, however, the level of the C. P. S. U. and ours are not yet equal.

We are as yet less consistent, more timid, and slower. Our pace is somewhat slacker and less steady. The ideas that guide us are the same, only the ideas are not yet put into practice at the same pace.

We believe that the leaders—from the Central Committee, the government and the National Assembly down to factory managers—have not been able to make use of all the possibilities existing in the given period to promote the development of the country. What does this mean? Consider it, comrades—political consolidation was accomplished sooner than we had anticipated, and economic consolidation also. On the day of the elections, our people voted in unison. Recently, the development of the cooperative farm movement was better, more successful and speedier than had been anticipated. What is the implication of all this for us? It is that while we have correctly assessed the fundamental tasks, and correctly set the main course, for we have relied on the masses and have had confidence in them, the results have made it clear that the masses deserve still greater confidence from us.

Each major battle has ended with the result that the political maturity and readiness to act of the masses, was at the given moment a few degrees higher than we had presumed. That, I should think, is how we can draw up the balance-sheet from what the Twenty-first Congress has to say to us, and it is from this that there arise the tasks that the Central Committee has incorporated in its resolution.

Improvement of leadership is one of the important tasks. There are two ways of improving leadership. Even without any searching analysis and study, its level can be raised with a little bit more conscientiousness. Greater conscientiousness and a little bit more courage are required for leadership at all levels from team-leaders up to the highest constitutional dignitary of this country, and we must rely even more courageously than hitherto on the masses. That is something we could start right away tomorrow, I believe. This does not need any thorough studying. On the other hand, improving the structure of leadership as a whole requires a lengthier effort, and it would be a mistake to do it in a slapdash way, in a matter of weeks.

Our cadre policy needs further improvement, too. We have taken an enormous stride forward. Many people who were undeservedly set aside, are now back in their places. New people have come forward, too, and I can tell you they do their work independently and are developing. Yet we must guard against the emergence of a “the-

works-is-now-running-by-itself” frame of mind. Nothing will run by itself, and leaders have to work together with the masses, trust the masses and pay heed to what people think.

I wish to deal briefly with the economic tasks designated in the Central Committee resolution.

The speeches also show that the working people believe these tasks to be realistic, although their implementation will require some straining of muscles. Socialist labour emulation will increase the level of production; hence—as speakers have pointed out—we should make full use of it, but in the proper way. The newly formed cooperative farms have to be consolidated. The technical equipment required for large-scale farming is not being supplied at the expense of the working people’s standard of living; on the contrary, simultaneously with the consolidation of the cooperative farms we are trying to raise living standards. Thus, greater speed is called for in developing our national economy, the newly formed cooperative farms have to be consolidated, because this is the basis for further speedy advance.

The party organizations should rally the people, the communists should set an example and supply good advice for labour emulation, but the latter should be organized by the unions in consultation with experts.

The duty of the party organizations is not to specify the right proportions and right indices, but to rally the working people for the fulfilment of realistic and suitable pledges of work.

I must pay tribute here to the responsible way the workers of Budapest have been discharging their duties.

Budapest is one of the loveliest cities in Europe, it is the hub of Hungary. It was here, in 1918, that the working class rose to crush the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, and when it got moving, the echos reverberated throughout the country. In 1919, the workers of Budapest entered the battle in defence of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Admiral Horthy called Budapest a “sinful city” for the part its workers played in 1918 and 1919. This “sinful city” kept up the fight against Horthy to the end. This city demonstrated what it can do in 1945. During the inflation it starved but kept working and fighting for the people’s power. During the counter-revolution also, the workers of Budapest proved that they were capable of rallying the forces of the Hungarian communists. It was here that we set up the Revolutionary Workers’ and Peasants’ Government. It was from here that the working class set out to crush the counter-revolution. Budapest was, is, and will stay the heart of the socialist revolu-

tion, and it must play a part that is in harmony with this function. The entire nation looks to the workers and intellectuals of Budapest to set a good example.

Socialist labour emulation is a lofty and powerful thing. It embodies the will of millions and heightens the zeal of millions of people. Working people in this country are determined to achieve further speedier advance on a sound basis by means of socialist labour emulation. The working people clearly recognize that if they take part in emulation, they will see the result when it comes to drawing up the balance. But there is an even greater incentive than the material one, and that is the cause of socialism, the cause of the entire working people.

Comrades, the objectives which the Executive Committee of the Budapest Party Committee has drawn up are, in my opinion, correct. And it is my belief that they will indeed be implemented. I feel sure that when we meet in conference again this time next year to "draw up the balance," we shall have nothing to hang our heads in shame for.

## ON THE PLAN, COOPERATIVE FARMS, THE PARTY CONGRESS AND THE RESPONSIBILITY OF LEADERS

SPEECH AT THE MEETING OF THE  
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE PATRIOTIC  
PEOPLE'S FRONT

June 19th, 1959

In the Central Committee resolution adopted last March, we summarized and published our principal tasks for this year. We decided that we would recommend to the working people that in a number of main fields the targets set for the end of the Three-Year Plan should be reached this year. Naturally, this does not mean that the Three-Year Plan will be fulfilled in all respects in two years, but in a few most vital fields it does mean that too. This is one of our central tasks. The other is to consolidate the cooperative farms, to consolidate the achievements attained by last spring. All this also involves the further strengthening of the foundations of socialism, of our system, of our state; but it also means that we can improve the working people's standard of living this year. More exactly: on the one hand, we are raising the standard of living, and on the other, are creating conditions for making a somewhat more substantial headway in living standards, after the successful closing of this fiscal year.

The words "we recommend" were not put into the text by chance. They, too, were intended to convey that it is not up to the Central Committee only, nor even the party alone, to achieve these aims. It is up to the masses of the working people! If they will accept our recommendation—and the signs are that they will—and will honour their obligations, then we shall achieve our goal.

I am convinced that every thinking man and woman is aware that the contents of the Central Committee resolution of last March are not designed to serve any narrow party interests, but the interests, in the full sense of the word, of our entire people, the national aims of our people. And they will serve them well. That is why we have recommended them to our people. The Central Committee trusts



that, if our people join their forces, our plans will be realized. We should not forget, however, that our recommendation was made in the last month of the first quarter of this year. The first quarter, however, was at an end very quickly, so that, in actual fact, we shall have to achieve all that we have buckled down to in three quarters of a year. Not that this is impossible, but it will take a bit of an effort. It is especially well to remember this now, when we are entering a time of year—July and the first half of August—when, because of holidays, for instance, output usually does not proceed with the same verve as in other months of the year. Nevertheless, we trust that we will manage. One of the main foundations of our confidence is the fact that a great part of the necessary performances has already been decided by the working people, who laid them down in their pledges, and the actual results show that they will be as good—or even better—as their word. But to achieve this, it is necessary to work.

Since the Liberation, the industrial workers have borne the brunt of the public burdens of our state. We mean no offence, but we must remind the peasants of 1945-46 when the industrial workers, working almost for nothing, and starving, put the nation's life back to normal, repaired transport and communications and rebuilt the factories; while at the same time—and this was the wish of the working class, so it is not meant as a reproach—large numbers of peasants improved their financial position. The very inflation which certainly caused much hunger for the workers, was favourable for the peasantry. Old mortgaged debts and new loans dissolved into thin air in a matter almost of days—the peasantry got rid of their debts. And now look at our March resolution. We suggest that the industrial workers overfulfil their plans, turn out more manufactured articles, and, where necessary, lower costs and improve productivity. These tasks are becoming more and more difficult to achieve every year, for when slackness is rampant and productivity low, it is easier to improve productivity or overfulfil the plan.

By contrast, all we expect of agriculture is to fulfil its plan. That is a tremendous difference. The working class is shouldering a greater burden even this year—that is why we are asking the masses of the peasantry and the intellectuals to show appreciation for the workers. Our working class is making efforts to solve tasks which are calculated to benefit the entire people, the entire nation. This is what gives us communists the moral ground for urging the entire people—the non-party people as well—to do their utmost so that our great objectives may be achieved. Neither will the fruits of their labour be distributed

so that only the communists, party members or only the workers will share in them; everyone will get their share—the peasants and the intellectuals, too. This is natural and correct.

We communists—true to our party's traditions—are preparing for our Congress by again wishing to do something for the public good.

This is our tradition. This is the way we like to celebrate.

Of course, other matters will also be discussed at the Congress which concern not only the communists. One such matter will be the political line of the party. Those of us, of the members of the Central Committee, who are present here have no right to speak on behalf of the Congress. We may, however, speak of the thoughts that engross our attention. We believe that the Congress will endorse the line which the Central Committee has been pursuing since November 1956.

The essence of the main line of our policy is the continuation of the construction of a socialist society, the completion of its construction and the subsequent establishment of a communist society, of a classless society.

That is the essence of our policy, and this does not change—this main line will presumably be endorsed by the Congress. I would like to go into this matter in a little more detail, for, while our political line is known, its interpretation and application in given instances and in given situations is an ever recurring, ever new task.

Take the cooperative farm movement for example, which concerns not only the peasantry—it is a vital question for the working class and the intelligentsia, for the entire people—and we are handling it with a degree of responsibility due to one of the most crucial issues of our national life, as it also has a bearing upon social development and the nation. It was with full responsibility that our Central Committee discussed the development of agriculture on two occasions. We decided what was to be done, and we have carried it out. As for the results, we may say that they have surpassed expectations. We really consider the development of the cooperative farm movement necessary for two reasons. One is our conviction that this is a requisite for the general advancement of the people. The task is, therefore, to carry through the socialist reorganization of agriculture in accordance with the political conditions, if possible without losing either time or momentum. There is also another reason: the interest of our national economy as a whole. In the age of advanced farming methods, the age of machines, large-scale farming alone can secure higher crop yields.

We are steering this course, just like the other socialist countries. We should not permit any misunderstanding on this score. It must be said, however, that we will from time to time decide, with the requisite care and conscientiousness, on the ways and means of further progress, on our tasks.

The decisive factor is, of course, the political condition for progress. This was given last December—that is attested by the results. And what about the economic conditions? Some people held the view that we should create the economic conditions for the cooperative farms first, and that we may only then form the cooperatives. That sounds good enough, but these do not exist in reality, in the cooperative farm movement. We have got to make a start. We have got to establish the socialist form, because the peasants, too, know by now that even if the state should not give them so much as a twisted sickle—even then the strength of the community is from 50 to 100 per cent stronger! Intelligent collective decision, a single will, concerted effort increase your forces many times over. That is the course of life. The state will help you, but you must help yourselves, too.

By all this I do not mean to suggest that the economic conditions can be neglected. They are, of course, important, but they cannot be the conditions determining the development of the cooperative farm movement. We cannot take the position of taking a step forward only when all the economic conditions are at hand. But once we have taken a step forward, immediately the duty arises to consolidate and strengthen our gains economically, as fast as we can! Economic conditions, therefore, must not be placed in the way of the development of the movement, but it would also be a sin to forget about them. Let us send machines, let us provide all the support to promote the consolidation and strengthening of the cooperative farms. That is the course we are following. This is a manifestation of the policy of our Central Committee and the method of implementing this policy.

Contrary to hostile slanders, the development of the cooperative farms does not entail a deterioration of the standard of living. The sum devoted to strengthening the cooperative farms, far from lowering the living standard, will be raising it year by year. The millions of forints expended on consolidating the young cooperatives reveal the healthy features of our economy, which, at the same time, they strengthen. The economy which has so soon got over the shock caused by the counter-revolution, and which today can boast of some fine

achievements, is able to devote substantial sums to strengthening agriculture, without jeopardizing the living standard. Our policy is straightforward and clear. It serves to develop agriculture, and to further the interests of the entire people.

We are developing our existing cooperative farms—that, too, is progress, as it contributes towards the consolidation of the cooperative farm movement. That is our task at present. After that, we will investigate the political and economic conditions of further progress. We are not soothsayers, we are communists, and the basis of our decision is a careful analysis of the given situation, and our correct policy. To a western inquirer I said: "We're not going to do you the favour of spoiling the relations between the party and the broad masses of the working people by advancing faster than is made possible by the actual situation. But neither will we do you the favour of marking time when we are capable of advancing." We are now looking at the facts as they are. At one time, we suffered from the sickness here of not seeing facts as they were in reality, but as we would have liked them to be. We have recovered from this. As for the heart of the matter, we are investigating questions related to the further development of the cooperative farm movement with a full awareness of our responsibilities, with resoluteness on matters of principle, and with the circumspection of a party called upon to lead a country.

We shall also continue to strengthen and deepen the healthy features of our public life. We would like to see useful, substantial and fruitful discussion whenever people are convened to discuss important public affairs—for instance, at conferences of the Patriotic People's Front. Let the participants hear views expressed, let them argue and talk, let them expound their views, and if once they have reached an agreement that will benefit the community, let them work in unity. On the whole, we intend ceaselessly to deepen the democracy of our system. This also involves raising the standards of parliamentary life. The democracy of our system is of a much higher standard than that of any capitalist country. And this we certainly will continue to improve. But if this should make anyone wonder if next year or after that the enemies of our system will enjoy greater freedom, I can assure them that they will not—neither next year, nor any time after that. For just as it is our duty constantly to strengthen the democracy of our system for the benefit of the people, so we are aware of our responsibility for the people and for the future of the country and of our duties with regard to the enemies of the system. There are a few

other characteristics of our policy, and these I only mention so as to confirm you in your conviction that these are going to stay; what is more, some of them we shall try and reinforce. For example, you know about our penal policies. People who went beyond the limits of forbearance were locked up, while those guilty of crimes against the people which cannot be committed with impunity—historical crimes—were meted out the severest penalty. To those who became confused, we said, "Be sensible, and work!" This was a correct policy. That is attested by the results, for there was quite a good deal of muddled thinking, but, I assure you, eighty per cent of those who became mixed up have by now recovered their senses and have in the past two years worked honestly, decently.

Then there was the amnesty. We have gone on record—officially and unofficially—several times as saying that not a single person will be pardoned in this country so long as there are attempts abroad or on the part of hostile circles to coerce us into this. And if they want no amnesty in Hungary, then they're welcome to try to bring pressure to bear on us. Only when this has ceased, and we consider the time has come, will a further amnesty be granted. There was one this year, and it was by no means inconsiderable, as a very substantial proportion of convicted persons have been released from prison. The Patriotic People's Front has scored a victory and the Hungarian people have passed the test with honours at the election. This was something that both permits and justifies leniency towards erring sons of the people. That is the reason for the amnesty last spring.

We take the work of the Patriotic People's Front very seriously, we count upon it and back it. The political alliance of communists and non-party people is doing useful service to the cause of socialism and is speeding up our progress. Cooperation between the communists and non-party people—work in the People's Front, the policy of a People's Front—has resulted in substantial successes. We will continue to pursue this policy.

We communists have also devoted much attention to the problem of the cult of the individual. We are aware not only of what there was, but also of what may still occur. In a difficult situation, people with good intentions begin to work; by and by they do some things well, successes are scored, achievements attained; the masses begin to talk about this and appreciate them because of their good work. Slowly, some of the leaders who are working successfully begin to believe that they know everything, that they are infallible, and they

pay no heed to what people say. In connection with this, during the period of preparation for the Congress, we ask our own people once again to examine their methods of work, their relations with other people, further to deepen their relations with the masses lest the old errors return again.

The appeal of socialism must be made stronger, socialist enthusiasm stirred up more effectively—that is an important thing to do and it will be done successfully! Day after day, our political leaders and economic executives see the enthusiasm with which ordinary people are working at the workbench, and in the villages, on the cooperative farms! It is our duty to be worthy of—not superior to, only worthy of—our people, of the fight the masses of the Hungarian working people have fought these last forty years. If we—whether of the party or of the Patriotic People's Front—are worthy of the people, we will surely be working well for the cause of progress.



REPORT  
OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF  
THE HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY  
TO THE SEVENTH CONGRESS AND THE TASKS  
OF THE PARTY

November 30th, 1959

Fellow Delegates, Dear Comrades:

Membership meetings and party conferences to elect new executives took place in all the party organizations. The delegates to the Congress were elected in accordance with the party Rules. It is a pleasure to note that the membership meetings and conferences showed a growing consciousness and sense of responsibility and a great activity. This is indicated by the fact that 90 to 95 per cent of the party membership attended these meetings and about 30 per cent of the participants, that is 120,000 comrades, took part in the discussions.

The directives were greeted with unanimous approval. Our party membership gave a unified expression of its approval of the policy pursued during the past three years and of the desire to follow this policy consistently in the future. It may be said, therefore, that the Central Committee and the party membership are cemented; that there is a strong and unbreakable unity in our party.

A factor of immense political significance was the hundreds of thousands of non-party people, workers, peasants and intellectuals, who joined in the socialist emulation organized in honour of the Congress, working alongside the communists who initiated it. They all made creative contributions to the fulfilment of the objectives of the Party Congress. This in itself is eloquent proof that the ties between the party and the masses are strong, that the party and the people form a united, powerful force rallied under the banner of socialism.

The great day of our Congress has arrived. It is a historical day because our party, the revolutionary vanguard of the Hungarian working class, is a successor to the Hungarian Communist Party and the Hungarian Working People's Party; and our Congress is the seventh in the history of four decades of the Hungarian communist

movement. That is why our Central Committee decided that this Congress should be called the Seventh Congress, to which it is truly entitled.

Our party is responsible to the Hungarian people for all its activities, for governing the country and for the future of socialism in our country. Together with the other fraternal parties, it is also responsible for the future of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement. Conscious of this great responsibility, the Central Committee believes that it is our duty to take stock of the fighting experiences of the party, regardless of persons and accessory circumstances. It is our duty to analyze the situation on the basis of actual facts, and to take carefully account of our forces, weaknesses and future tasks.

Despite all shortcomings in our work, the Central Committee is reporting with a clear conscience to the Congress, because the policy we followed has been substantiated. If you compare the grave situation faced by the Hungarian People's Republic three years ago to our present secure position, then the aggregate of the results may rightly be called a historical victory of the party, the working class, the Hungarian people and the socialist revolution.

The Central Committee attributes the great achievements to those who supported it during the past three years. Looking back upon the results, we thank the entire party membership for their confidence in us and for the support they gave us. We thank our non-party friends who worked together with us and supported us in the Presidential Council, in the government, in the National Assembly, the councils, the Patriotic People's Front, in the trade unions, in all mass organizations and mass movements. We are deeply grateful to our working class and all the working people for the ever growing confidence and support they gave the Central Committee and the party during the past three years.

On behalf of the party and our people, our Central Committee expresses heartfelt thanks to all the communist and workers' parties, to the people of the socialist countries, to the class-conscious workers of the world and to all progressives for their solidarity and assistance. We realize that we caused considerable concern to our friends abroad. We know that it was only their solidarity and assistance that enabled our people to defend their power, social achievements and the hope of a better future, against the onslaught of the ruthless enemy. We consider it our sacred duty to prove by our labour that the help extended to the Hungarian people was not given in vain, and that it was not given to a people unworthy of it.

## I

### Proletarian Internationalism, Hungarian-Soviet Friendship and Peaceful Coexistence of the Two World Systems Are the Basic Principles of Our Foreign Policy

Comrades:

Let me take now one by one the points of the Central Committee's report.

I wish to deal first with our foreign policy and the international situation.

The Hungarian people regained their national independence and sovereignty in the spring of 1945. They have since then attained power and made great strides ahead in socialist construction. The objective of our foreign policy is to safeguard these great achievements of our people and to ensure the peaceful building of socialism. The fundamental principles of our foreign policy are: Hungarian-Soviet friendship, loyalty to the socialist camp, opposition to imperialism, peaceful coexistence with all countries and peoples irrespective of differing social systems.

The Hungarian people are proud that they may call the Soviet Union their friend—this country of the Seven-Year Plan and of communist construction, the most powerful force of human progress and world peace. The Soviet Union has set itself the task of overtaking and outstripping the most advanced capitalist country in the world, the United States of America, in consumption and production per head of population by 1970. There is not a single serious public figure anywhere who would doubt the reality of these goals. We, Hungarian working people, wish from the bottom of our hearts to the Soviet people to score a speedy and complete victory in this peaceful competition.

At the same time we are pleased to hear of a new American slogan which stresses that the U. S. A. should aim to overtake the Soviet Union in modern technology, in the exploration of outer space and in scientific training. We believe that the Soviet Union has the advantage in this competition. In 1950, 36,000 engineers graduated in the Soviet Union and 53,000 in the United States; by 1958 the figures had changed to 35,000 in the U. S. A. and 94,000 in the

Soviet Union. The Soviet Union can point to many results achieved during the past few years: the hydroelectric station at Bratsk; atomic power plants; the nuclear-powered ice-breaker "Lenin"; three sputniks launched within two years, and three cosmic rockets, one which placed the insignia of the Soviet Union on the Moon, while the other photographed the side of the Moon never observed by man before. The decisive superiority of the Soviet Union in peaceful competition lies in its socialist society which is superior to capitalism and assures the possibility of unlimited development.

Our much cherished Hungarian-Soviet friendship is not of recent origin. It was born in 1917 when wide masses of Hungarian workers, peasants and intellectuals who were prisoners of war in Czarist Russia, grasped Lenin's words and the essence of the socialist revolution. Tens of thousands of them joined the Red Army and the Red partisan detachments to fight for the victory of communism with honour alongside their Soviet brothers and against the Whiteguards and interventionists. This friendship was further cemented during the promulgation and existence of the Hungarian Republic of Councils in 1919. On March 20, 1919, the eve of the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary, the following was inscribed in the minutes recording the merger of the Communist and Social Democratic Parties:

"To guarantee the rule of the proletariat and to oppose *Entente* imperialism, the fullest and closest military and spiritual alliance should be concluded with the Russian Soviet Government."

At that time, the Hungarian Republic of Councils was defeated through foreign armed intervention. But the Soviet Government, even in its message of warning directed to the hostile Horthy government in 1941, strove to safeguard the Hungarian people and the country from the sufferings of war and catastrophe. However, the fascist Horthy government, which did not serve the interests of the Hungarian people, was unable to heed the sound advice and joined Hitler's anti-Soviet war.

The Soviet Union drove the nazi-fascist armies out of Hungarian territory and, at the cost of the lives of its sons, liberated the Hungarian people from the yoke of the invaders. That is why our people consider the Soviet Union their liberator and celebrate April 4th, the day when the Soviet Army drove the last Hitlerite invader from the country, as their biggest national holiday.

As long as a conscious and decent man lives in this country, he will remember with gratitude the assistance extended in 1956

at the request of the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government by the Soviet Union to the Hungarian people who were menaced by counter-revolution and the imperialists. This assistance made it possible to prevent the restoration of capitalism and fascism in Hungary. It also kept the imperialists from turning our country into a base for military operations and a battlefield.

During the past fifteen years, the Soviet Union has twice proved, through shedding the blood of its sons, its friendship and internationalism with regard to the Hungarian people. But in the past fifteen years it also assisted the Hungarian people in a thousand different ways to undo the war damage and to build socialism. Even a few years ago the enemies of the Hungarian and Soviet peoples slandered the Soviet Union by alleging she was "exploiting" our country. The stupidity of this calumny is so obvious that by now even the enemy admits that Hungary benefits the most from Soviet-Hungarian trade relations.

In its economic relations with Hungary and the other socialist countries, the Soviet Union does not proceed from the principle of trade gain but, as the older and stronger socialist country, proffers selfless and liberal brotherly help. More than 82 per cent of the goods imported in 1958 by Hungary from the Soviet Union through foreign trade channels were raw materials and semi-finished goods. Soviet shipments cover the major part of the imported raw material requirements of the Hungarian economy, especially in iron ore, oil and timber. At the same time, more than 58 per cent of the goods exported in 1958 by Hungary to the Soviet Union were products of the engineering and precision mechanics industries. This is how a great socialist power, the Soviet Union, transacts business with a smaller socialist country, the Hungarian People's Republic.

At no time has any capitalist great power in the world developed trade with a small nation by supplying it mainly with raw materials on advantageous terms, and purchasing from it chiefly finished industrial products. That would run counter to the very essence of capitalism. Capitalism, in addition to exploiting its own people, also exploits other peoples. The former is called "freedom of initiative and enterprise," and the latter "freedom of trade," while the whole is summed up as the "free world."

Hungarian-Soviet friendship is stable and enduring. This friendship is the source of strength, the bulwark and guarantee of prosperity for the Hungarian people. To strengthen Hungarian-Soviet friend-

ship ceaselessly, to preserve it as an eternal and unbreakable bond of friendship—that is the paramount task of foreign policy of our party and government.

Comrades:

We are advancing in close unity and friendship with all the countries of the socialist camp: the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, the Albanian People's Republic, the Bulgarian People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

We are pleased that every country of the socialist camp is working with great zeal, attaining fresh and splendid results and marching onward along the path of socialism. The political aspect of the world was significantly changed by the fact that ten years ago the anti-imperialist war of liberation triumphed in China, followed by the victory of the socialist revolution. That country, with a population of 650 million, rose from the status of a feudal and semi-colonial country which had been a sphere of exploitation by international imperialism, to the status of a socialist world power. Its example and its matchless speed of progress are both stirring and inspiring. The example of China, too, testifies to the superiority of the socialist system and the boundless creative might of a people who have got rid of their oppressors. Fighting and overcoming enormous difficulties, China last year produced two and a half times as much grain, nine times as much coal, nineteen times as much oil and forty times as much pig-iron as in 1949.

The solid and everlasting foundation of the unity of the socialist camp lies in the common socio-political system, the common road of building socialism, a common ideology and joint efforts to safeguard peace. Our cooperation within the camp is regulated not only by full equality, territorial integrity, respect for state independence and sovereignty, and non-interference in internal affairs, but, beyond all this, by the principle of mutual assistance. This was well put by Comrade Khrushchov when he said in Berlin that the principle of "one for all and all for one" prevails in our camp.

The socialist camp, whose hub and leading force is the Soviet Union, is the main force of progress and peace in the world today. The Hungarian People's Republic is an equal and respected member of the socialist camp. Loyal service to the vital interests of our people requires that one of the main tasks of our foreign policy



continue to be to strengthen the power and unity of the socialist camp and to repel decisively all attempts against it.

Comrades:

Our people want us to strive to establish good relations with all neighbouring countries and peoples. In addition to the Soviet Union—and I have already spoken in detail about our good and friendly relations with that country—the fraternal Czechoslovak Republic and the Rumanian People's Republic are direct neighbours of ours. We welcome the outstanding successes these countries have accomplished in building socialism, and the fact that our steadily flourishing friendship with these two people's states is firmly based upon the most intimate understanding and proletarian internationalism. Yugoslavia is also a neighbour of ours. Our interstate relations with Yugoslavia have gradually become normalized since August 1953. These relations deteriorated strongly in 1956-58; then, as a result of slow improvement, they reached a point which today may be considered normal in the sphere of diplomatic, state and economic relations, as well as in some social contacts such as sports. We believe it is possible, despite the known ideological differences—to which I shall return later—to maintain normal, good-neighbourly relations between the two countries. We are striving for this, because we are convinced that this is in the common interests of the peoples of Yugoslavia and Hungary. A factor of the favourable trend in good-neighbourly relations is the positive stand taken by the Yugoslav government on several important international issues, thereby promoting the struggle for peace, but at the same time this struggle is aggravated by the fact that they have been attacking our friends, for instance, the Chinese People's Republic and the Albanian People's Republic recently.

Our relations with our other neighbour, Austria, are, to our regret, not satisfactory at present. We believe there is no obstacle in principle to the development of good relations between the two countries, despite the differing internal social systems. The improvement of relations is hampered by the fact that the Austrian government allows its policy, with respect to relations between the two states, to be influenced by the intrigues of western quarters hostile to the Hungarian People's Republic. Another fact gravely disturbing our relations is that the Austrian government still permits espionage agencies and Hungarian fascist organizations scheming against the Hungarian People's Republic to operate and run amuck in Austria. Guided by the conviction that it is in the common interest of the

peoples of the Hungarian People's Republic and Austria, we are striving to establish genuine good relations which will be mutually advantageous.

There is no real conflict of interests between the Hungarian People's Republic and the neutral states of Europe, namely Austria, Sweden and Switzerland. On the contrary. To preserve peace, to promote peaceful coexistence, and to expand relations between the countries is of common interest. We are, therefore, striving to improve our relations with them. It is our opinion that the neutral countries play a certain positive role, and may do so in the future to a greater extent, in advancing peaceful coexistence among the countries and peoples.

Comrades:

The fact that during the past ten to fifteen years a number of peoples, including those of India, Indonesia, Iraq and the United Arab Republic, have thrown off the yoke of imperialism and taken the path of independent national progress, is considered by mankind as an outstanding event of our epoch. Our relations with them are good and we are striving to improve them further. We stand on a common front against imperialism; we wish to broaden our economic and cultural ties. The Hungarian People's Republic can contribute to some extent to the development of the independent industry of the countries liberated from colonialism.

We join in full solidarity the peoples now struggling for liberation from their colonial plight. We condemn the war of terror against the people of Algeria, and support their struggle for self-determination as an absolutely legitimate demand. The Hungarian people indignantly condemn the imperialist, colonial oppression and terror in Taiwan—an integral part of the Chinese People's Republic—South Korea, South Vietnam, South Africa and other countries. We are convinced that imperialism can no longer halt the struggle for liberation and independence, and that the righteous struggle of the colonial peoples fighting for liberation will be triumphant.

Comrades:

Relations between our People's Republic and the countries and governments of the leading NATO powers are not satisfactory. We have serious differences mainly with the government of the United States of America. The U. S. government holds us responsible for the abnormal relations, stating that a few months ago we placed restrictions upon the freedom of movement of its diplomats stationed in Budapest. This is true inasmuch as our Ministry for Foreign

Affairs obliged the American diplomats to a prior announcement of their trips beyond the limits of the capital.

The fostering and improving of ties between the sending and the receiving state has been an undisputed task of diplomatic missions for centuries. During the last two years the American diplomats functioning in Budapest—presumably following the intentions of their government—manifested by all means that they considered it their task not to improve our relations but rather to make them impossible. That being so, they cannot make anyone believe that they intended to normalize U. S.-Hungarian relations on the scene of their adventurous jaunts near military airports and training fields and the Soviet-Hungarian border.

We, on our part, have serious objections. A considerable amount of the annual 125 million dollars allocated by the U. S. Congress is earmarked for subversive activity against the Hungarian People's Republic. Some 5,000 Hungarians who had fled their country were enlisted in the U. S. Army during the last two years. The so-called "Radio Free Europe," which is inciting against the Hungarian People's Republic, is sponsored by the same quarters who pursue the unparalleled practice of official U. S. government delegates challenging the credentials of the official delegates of the Hungarian People's Republic in the United Nations and other international organizations, while diplomatic relations exist between our countries.

Despite all these facts, we sincerely desire to establish normal relations between the U. S. A. and the Hungarian People's Republic, because this is in accord with the interests of the peoples of both countries. We respect the talented American people who have developed a high stage of civilization. We greet the steps taken by those American public figures who have made some contribution recently to the settlement of disputed issues through negotiations and to a certain lessening of international tension. The normalization of relations between the two countries requires that the leading quarters of the U. S. A. review and correct their outdated, unfriendly and pointless policy towards the Hungarian People's Republic which they have been maintaining out of false consideration of prestige.

Essentially what is needed is that the U. S. government respect the principle of equality, and renounce its fruitless attempts at interference in the internal affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic. We believe that, on this basis, it will not be difficult to find the ways and means of normalizing Hungarian-U. S. relations. Our government is ready to study any expedient step towards this end.

We condemn the foreign policy pursued by the government of the German Federal Republic. Chancellor Adenauer ostensibly talks about peace while in Hungary, as everywhere in the world, it is well known that behind these phrases about peace a forced armament drive is proceeding in West Germany and they are striving to maintain cold war at all costs.

The hostile attitude of the German Federal Republic towards the German Democratic Republic is a matter of common knowledge. The aggressive and revanchist incitement going on around the settlement of the Berlin question, the Oder-Neisse frontier, the Sudetenland and other problems, is an everyday occurrence. They keep on organizing "comradely" get-togethers of old-time nazis and revenge-seeking rallies of "Sudeten-Germans" and "Danube-Swabians." We know that Hungarian war criminals, various Hungarian fascist groups and their press are granted free scope of activity and financial support in West Germany.

Everybody, even the government of the German Federal Republic, must realize that the peoples of Europe—including the Hungarian people—are fed up with all the sufferings which German militarism and its aggressive expansionist ambitions have caused in the course of history. In the face of the aggressive spirit of West Germany, the Hungarian people are in full solidarity with the peace policy of the German Democratic Republic. The aspirations of the Hungarian People's Republic and of the first German workers' and peasants' state, the German Democratic Republic, fully coincide. We welcome the great successes they have achieved in building socialism. We are pleased to note how rapidly they are advancing, and that shortly they will overtake and surpass the German Federal Republic with respect to per capita output and consumption. We wish the working people of the German Democratic Republic new successes in building socialism, in strengthening their state, and in their policy aimed at preserving peace and the *rapprochement* of the two German states.

Comrades:

Three years ago, at a time of grave transitional difficulties, the international position of our People's Republic became complicated and difficult.

A campaign of slander was unleashed against us in the United Nations and other international organizations. Reactionary U. S. quarters wanted to press interference in the internal affairs of our country through the resolutions passed by the U. N. against us.

The campaign of incitement, rehashed every year around the resolution, always served an anti-Soviet and cold-war objective. We did not recognize this unlawful resolution which runs counter to the U.N. Charter, and shall not recognize it in the future either.

The NATO diplomats in Budapest boycotted our official functions during two years. The western capitalist press launched against us a new and generously subsidized propaganda campaign. At that time we did not pay much attention to these things, but kept on strengthening our state and our system. Parallel with the internal strengthening of our People's Republic, its international position also became strong. The boycott and the slander campaign of the capitalists belong in part to the past. What is most important is that they were exposed in front of our people and discredited in the eyes of Hungarian public opinion. Even our enemies are compelled to take cognizance of the consolidation and strengthening of our People's Republic. And the friends of the Hungarian People's Republic, who demonstrated their solidarity at the gravest and most serious time, appreciate our achievements and respect our people.

We attribute the consolidation of our international position to the fact that we have consistently stood up against all imperialist attempts at intervention, and that our people approve and support our foreign policy. This obliges us to continue to strengthen our international position, in the future too, on the basis of the policy which we have pursued so far.

Comrades:

A certain easing of international tension came about during the past two or three years. This change is decisively due to the growth of the forces of the Soviet Union, the socialist camp, the international labour movement, the world peace movement, to the policy of peace. However, the anti-peace forces, which are active and effective in the capitalist countries and in international affairs, are no insignificant factor. The people, therefore, must continue to carry on a consistent struggle against the anti-peace forces and push them back even further.

The Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers, Macmillan's visit to Moscow, the mutual invitations extended by Khrushchov and Eisenhower, were events militating in favour of the liquidation of the cold war. Comrade Khrushchov's visit to the United States was an outstanding and significant event which was greeted by peace-loving people throughout the world. Comrade Khrushchov is being regarded far and wide—even by people who are a long way from

communism—as the man with the greatest personal merit in melting the ice of the cold war. We are happy that he is here with us and wholeheartedly congratulate him on the success of his U.S. tour.

The proposal made by the Soviet Union to the United Nations for complete disarmament was a momentous event. It is heartening that the great majority of the U.N. General Assembly approved this proposal and, on a joint U.S.-Soviet motion, referred it by a unanimous vote to the Ten-Power Disarmament Commission. The understanding arrived at by Comrade Khrushchov and President Eisenhower, that disputed international issues should be settled through negotiations, is of great importance.

We believe that it is the task of the Hungarian People's Republic to promote effectively, in unison with the Soviet Union and all countries of the socialist camp, the realization of our peaceful objectives. In the relations among countries and peoples, we support full implementation of the principle of peaceful coexistence. We support the proposals for ending nuclear weapons tests, establishing atom-free zones, prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons and destroying nuclear weapon stockpiles. We support the proposals for settling the Berlin question and concluding a peace treaty with Germany. We support the Soviet proposal for complete disarmament, as well as the recommendation that, until this is realizable, interim measures should be taken, such as the reduction of armed forces, the abolition of military bases abroad and the mutual withdrawal of armies stationed abroad.

The preservation of peace has become a paramount problem of mankind in these days of accumulation and production of terrible weapons of mass destruction. Public opinion in every country is urging negotiations and agreement. People desire the annihilation of weapons of mass destruction and complete disarmament, because they wish to live in peace. The Hungarian people desire nothing more than to be able to utilize their resources for the grandiose aims of peaceful construction.

Our conception of peaceful coexistence is the constant broadening of international relations. At present we are expanding our economic ties with forty-eight countries within the framework of interstate agreements. We are striving to extend this network to include other countries too. It is a well known fact that we are realizing the principle of the international economic division of labour, specialization and cooperation in our relations with the socialist countries united in the Council of Mutual Economic Aid. We are,



moreover, of the opinion that international specialization and co-operation are conceivable and realizable also in economic relations between socialist and capitalist countries. We possess industrial and agricultural products which are bought, and may be bought in still greater quantities in the future, by capitalist countries. At the same time, it would be senseless to manufacture at home, in small series and at great expense, such articles as are produced at smaller cost and in appropriate quality in the capitalist countries. The precondition for the development of such economic ties is obviously the disappearance of the restrictive and disturbing cold-war factors from the economic relations between the socialist and capitalist countries.

We believe that the peoples must live together in peace and, beyond that, must expand their economic ties, trade, cultural exchange, exchange of scientific views, sports contacts and all relations which may advance the peaceful coexistence of the countries and peoples. We are convinced that peaceful coexistence, a principle which has been adopted by the great majority of mankind, will sooner or later overcome all obstacles and will triumph.

## II

### The Lessons of the Suppression of the Counter-Revolution. Consolidation of the Legal Order of the Hungarian People's Republic

Comrades:

I shall now proceed to the discussion of the internal political situation of the Hungarian People's Republic.

The development of the internal political situation during the past three years took a sound direction and resulted in the definite consolidation of our system. The struggle against the counter-revolution tempered and rallied the forces of socialism. The masses developed politically and gained considerable experiences in the class struggle. In the course of that struggle the national unity of our people was further strengthened on the basis of the principles of socialism. This new national unity, arising and developing in the course of historical progress, is stronger today than ever before.

The proper evaluation of the development of the internal political situation calls for a brief outline of the class character and the rise of our state and power.

The Hungarian working class, allied with the peasantry and other progressive strata of society, defeated the bourgeoisie in political struggle between 1945 and 1948, and established its power and state, the Hungarian People's Republic, based upon the chief principle that all power belongs to the working people.

The history of the fifteen years which have elapsed since Liberation, is the history of the conclusion of the democratic revolution, the accomplishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the victory of the socialist revolution. All achievements of our people have been reached under the leadership of the working class guided by its revolutionary party. Under the leadership of the working class, our people liquidated the feudal vestiges and expropriated the large estates for the benefit of the working peasants. The big industries, transportation, the banks and wholesale trade became the property of the working people. The building of socialism began in our country and scored outstanding results in line with the aims of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat, as is known to all, is not a goal in itself, but according to Lenin its object is: "...to build socialism, to abolish the division of society into classes, to make all members of society working people, to remove the basis for any kind of exploitation of man by man."\*

There was in our country a workers' power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and socialism was being built when the well-known events occurred in October 1956. Our party carried out a thorough investigation touching upon all important phases of the events in order to disclose the reasons for the counter-revolution, the incidental factors and the forces at play. Our Central Committee established the following:

The armed uprising unleashed in Budapest on October 23, 1956, and all the events which disrupted the state and social order of the Hungarian People's Republic, were directed against the power of the working class, the people's state and the socialist achievements of the Hungarian people; therefore, they were of a bourgeois counter-revolutionary character.

This fact is not altered by the otherwise regrettable circumstance that the inveterate enemies and deliberate traitors of the Hungarian

\*V. I. Lenin, Selected Works, Moscow, 1947. Vol. II. p. 479.

People's Republic were not alone in the counter-revolutionary actions and the events preceding them, but also participating were a good number of people who lacked political judgement, were confused or misled and were not conscious of the counter-revolutionary character of their deeds.

As regards the causes leading to the events, and the factors involved which affected their course, the following conclusion has been reached:

The mistakes of Rákosi and his group played a substantial role. These were especially expressed in overlooking the conditions and special features of the country, as a result of which after a while they became incapable of applying properly the major international requirements of building socialism in our country. They found expression, moreover, in violations of party democracy and of the socialist rule of law, as well as in distortions of economic policy. The graveness and consistency of these mistakes, and the inability to overcome the errors which were disclosed and recognized, weakened the dictatorship of the proletariat, and led to a deep-going crisis in the life of the party and a grave situation in governing the country. All told, a favourable condition was created for the class enemy to precipitate the counter-revolution.

The unprecedented treason committed by Imre Nagy and his group played a major role. These people traversed the path beginning with forming a faction within the party, through secret and open alliance with the bourgeoisie and the imperialists, to class betrayal in renouncing the workers' power, and treason by urging imperialist intervention. They established a legal organization for the counter-revolution out of certain party organizations, and from the Petőfi Circle and the Writers' Association of that time. They helped in the disguised rallying and deployment of the counter-revolutionary forces. They disrupted and paralysed the forces of the socialist revolution and the people's state, and opened the road to power for the counter-revolution.

The major domestic force of the counter-revolution was the multitude of the former landowning and capitalist class, which had been stripped of their political power, privileges and economic basis, and which aimed with their reactionary hangers-on to restore capitalism and fascism. These people belonging to the former exploiting class, who retained a part of their ideological and political influence after their loss of power and who in their plans for restoration were the allies and supporters of international imperialism, quickly reorganized and mobilized their forces.

Within a few days' time they organized 40 political parties claiming national character. They included the three former coalition parties reorganized on a counter-revolutionary basis as well as the Arrow-cross fascist party which came out into the open in two counties. In addition to their parties, the former ruling classes utilized for their political aims the so-called "workers' councils" and "revolutionary" committees based on a counter-revolutionary platform.

The strongest factor in the counter-revolutionary uprising precipitated in Hungary was international imperialism headed by reactionary U. S. quarters which had supported by all means all sorts of enemies of the Hungarian people from the first day of Liberation. The imperialists had encouraged, incited and organized the counter-revolutionary uprising for many years until they finally precipitated it through their agents and political allies, Imre Nagy and his group, and the domestic bourgeois counter-revolutionary forces. Thus, two allied forces, those of internal counter-revolution and of international imperialism, came out against the Hungarian People's Republic.

The Central Committee of our party presented a comprehensive summary of its Marxist analysis and standpoint on the counter-revolution of October 1956 for the first time in its resolution of December 1956. In this connection we wish to point to three important facts at this Congress.

Firstly: All our statements made early in November 1956 and thereafter, with regard to the counter-revolutionary nature of the events, proved to be correct. The facts disclosed later merely confirmed and verified these statements.

Secondly: The Hungarian working people have accepted and agreed with the evaluation given by our party regarding the causes and motive forces of the counter-revolution.

Thirdly: Our evaluation had been accepted and is approved by the entire international communist movement and by progressive people throughout the world.

Comrades:

All domestic enemies of the party and the People's Republic united in the counter-revolutionary uprising. This was symbolized by its leaders: Mindszenty, Dezső P. Ábrahám, the counter-revolutionary prime minister of Horthy in 1919; Sándor Knob, former director of the National Association of Manufacturers; Bornemisza, former Horthyite minister; Count Khuen-Héderváry, ex-Under-Secretary of Horthy; Anna Kéthly, Béla Király, Maléter, and Imre Nagy. The group of *émigrés*, Ferenc Nagy and his associates, financed by the United

States government and sent to Vienna for the occasion, closely cooperated with them.

Most of these individuals were known capitalists, infamous reactionaries and traitors. They pushed to the fore Imre Nagy—who at that time was still not exposed—and kept still for quite a while about their real aims. The fact that in our days the most vicious enemies of socialism and of the socialist revolution can no longer come out openly before the masses with their real objectives, but are compelled to disguise them with “socialist,” “democratic” and “revolutionary” phrases, is a tribute to the moral greatness of the socialist idea and the unalterable attachment of the masses to socialism. The counter-revolutionary forces, while speechifying about socialism, launched armed attacks against the institutions of the Hungarian People’s Republic and murdered hundreds of communists and progressives loyal to the People’s Republic.

Our party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party, acted according to its duty in the grave situation. Imbued with a sense of responsibility for the destiny of the people, the Hungarian communists set up the new revolutionary centre, organized the leading force in the struggle, the new Central Committee, formed the Revolutionary Workers’ and Peasants’ Government which requested assistance from the Soviet Union, our loyal and best friend and our ally.

Our new Central Committee and the Revolutionary Workers’ and Peasants’ Government received their guide to action from Lenin. Speaking about the policy of the revolutionary party of the working class, Lenin stated: “The best policy is the policy based on principle.” Lenin said about the dictatorship of the proletariat: “This dictatorship of the proletariat implies the ruthlessly severe, swift and resolute use of force to crush the resistance of the exploiters, of the capitalists, landlords and their underlings. He who does not understand that, is not a revolutionary and must be removed from the post of leader or adviser of the proletariat.”\*

The problems which were posed at that time by history, were grave and complicated. We were attacked by deadly enemies with deluded and misled people on their side. One could carry on in such a situation only with a firm policy based upon principle and determination.

We were faced with the problem of whether or not to remain silent about the fact that treason had been committed, that Imre Nagy and his group had gone over to the enemy camp. There could be but

\* V. I. Lenin, Selected Works. *Ibid.*

one answer: a complete and radical break with the traitors; the frank disclosure of the situation to the masses; the exposure and annihilation of the traitors.

The problem arose of whether we should negotiate with those who were attacking us with weapons, and analyze their social descent and intentions. There could be but one answer: to aim our weapons at those who had taken up arms against the People’s Republic or any of its institutions.

The question arose of who should be oppressed and persecuted, and who should be given freedom and democracy? One could only answer that freedom and democracy should be given to the militants of the socialist revolution and to the working people; while the counter-revolutionaries, the bourgeoisie aiming at restoration and their sundry toadies should be suppressed and persecuted.

It is obvious that the fomenting of nationalism and national hatred could be fought with unequivocal and sincere loyalty to the People’s Republic, with the ideas of true patriotism and proletarian internationalism.

The counter-revolutionaries took a stand of “neutrality” which aimed to isolate our country and turn it over to the imperialists. We had to state unequivocally that we would remain loyal to the Warsaw Treaty as long as it would be necessary and we would always march together with the socialist camp.

A clear-cut answer had to be given to the question concerning the basis of the political system of our country. The answer was that the political system of a socialist country could not be based on “workers’ councils” and “revolutionary” committees under counter-revolutionary leadership. We were basing our political system on the Marxist-Leninist party leading the workers’ and peasants’ alliance, on the trade unions, the Patriotic People’s Front and the other mass organizations, and we rejected the system of workers’ councils. We based local state power on the councils, the tested local organizations of popular power, instead of on all sorts of counter-revolutionary committees.

The question was posed whether there should be a one-party or multi-party system in the country. The leading role of the party of the working class is a question of principle, a general law for the people’s democratic system as a type of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The question of one-party or multi-party system is not a principle derived from a general law but a practical political problem to be settled on the basis of the political and social relations within a given country. It became clear during the counter-revolutionary uprising that the



multi-party system under our conditions would bring grist to the mill of the counter-revolution—hence we rejected it.

Instead of the multi-party system we have developed the Patriotic People's Front led by the party. The Patriotic People's Front is fit for, and capable of, rallying in political unity the communists and non-party people who agree with the fundamental objectives such as building socialism, defending the sovereignty and independence of the country, strengthening the People's Republic and safeguarding peace. The positive experiences of the last three years show that the Patriotic People's Front led by the party is a political movement capable of creative work which is rallying non-party public figures alongside the communists, irrespective of their former party affiliation or of the fact that they may never have belonged to any party before.

The issue of punishing or pardoning those guilty in the counter-revolution was a long-debated question. The attitude of our party was, and is, that the vital interests of the people required the punishment of the initiators, leaders and organizers of the counter-revolutionary uprising and of those who have committed murder. We had to pardon those people, however, who had not committed capital crimes, who had been deceived and misled. The judicial organs of the Hungarian People's Republic acted accordingly, and we may state that this corresponded to the sense of justice of the people who approved and supported this penal policy.

The economic situation also raised a number of equally knotty problems. The answer of our party was to take a stand against demagoguery and prevent the handing out of unearned money; production had to be organized and labour and wage discipline established.

To take a correct stand in principle on these problems, or rather to solve them properly, it was necessary for the party to break decisively with the enemy, the opportunists and the traitors, on the one hand, and, on the other, with those sectarian elements who do not trust the masses and are afraid to rely on them.

The party had to face two highly important tasks, simultaneously and in a very difficult situation: to break away from the former errors and to settle scores with the counter-revolution. Our party proved to be capable of this and solved both tasks simultaneously. The courageous, frank and consistent Marxist-Leninist stand and policy were fruitful. The party must keep in mind all the lessons and experiences of the counter-revolutionary uprising for a long time to come, but as far as the counter-revolution is concerned, we can state that it was defeated in all fields and now belongs to the past.

The counter-revolutionary uprising of 1956 remains a dark chapter in the history of our people. However, the fact that hardly three years later we can state that the counter-revolution belongs to history, is testimony to the great political experiences gained by our people; it testifies to the determination and unity of the people in overcoming the troubles and difficulties caused by the counter-revolution—to the fact that our people was able to bury the counter-revolution.

The victory of the forces of the socialist revolution over the forces of the counter-revolution was splendidly demonstrated by the meetings organized in Budapest in March 1957, the unforgettable May Day rally of 1957 in Budapest, and the vast workers' and peasants' meeting held at Kisújszállás on August 20, 1957. The visit paid during the spring of 1958 to Hungary by the Soviet party and government delegation headed by Comrade Khrushchov was an outstanding victory of Soviet-Hungarian friendship and proletarian internationalism over nationalism and chauvinism.

At the May 9, 1957, meeting of the Hungarian National Assembly a unanimous vote of confidence was given to the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government. That vote of confidence was the constitutional and legal condemnation of the counter-revolutionary uprising and approval and support of the policy of our Central Committee and government. The parliamentary and council elections held on November 16, 1958, were an outstanding political victory of the Hungarian people building socialism. In those elections the people elected 338 M.P.s and 106,000 council members to the local organs of state power. In those elections 98.4 per cent of those entitled to vote cast their ballots, and 99.6 per cent of the votes were cast for the candidates of the Patriotic People's Front supported by our party.

The internal political situation of the Hungarian People's Republic is characterized by tranquillity, consolidation and rapid progress. The people's power is stronger than it was before the counter-revolutionary uprising; the foundations of socialism have broadened considerably, and socialist construction is proceeding in an orderly and vigorous fashion. This could not be possible without the political support and the devoted, diligent work of the masses.

This fact is reflected to some extent even in the strongly biased western press. They still print, of course, reports such as the one in the September 13, 1959 issue of *Der Bund*. This paper prints a dispatch from its Vienna correspondent, alleging that there had been a shortage of bread recently in Hungary, and that because of the lack of bread the population demonstrated at Salgótarján in spring.

This news item appeared in the October 8th issue of the *Express*: "The Hungarians always give expression to their desire to belong to the West. . . one must see the penitent and humble expression of the woman who says, 'Mind you, sir, it is only now that we are beginning to see starched skirts.'"

Foreign dispatches of such credulity and standard are taken seriously only by the editors of our comic papers. Alongside such fossil propaganda, the western capitalist press is also printing more realistic reports which come closer to the truth. Thus, one can find the following in the August 13th issue of *Le Monde*: "The Hungarian leaders are optimistic. The economic situation has improved noticeably in two and a half years. Factories are producing at full capacity. Over 40 per cent of the land is state farms or cooperative farms, and the active opposition has been driven into impotence."

Or take the September 7th issue of *Reynold's News*: "The 1956 events left but few marks in Budapest. One can find bullet pockmarks on some walls, but the people do not show the slightest trace of unhappiness or oppression. Budapest is a gay capital; the clothing standard of the population is extremely high. The tenth anniversary of the Constitution was celebrated as a public holiday."

After all, a realistic view will surely do good to those who are not too fond of the Hungarian People's Republic.

These people, in the face of the visible strengthening of the Hungarian People's Republic, are deluding themselves with various day-dreams. They say that "there are differences in the party." There is unity in our party, and if our enemies are waiting for serious differences in our party, they will have to wait for a long, long time. Other reactionaries have reached the point of insanity where they pin their hopes on a war. People who "hope" for war have really arrived at a point of insanity where they are a danger to the public and to themselves. If such people are at all capable of listening to reason, we can only say that we have every reason to believe that even the cold war will be done away with; but, come what may, there will never again be capitalism and fascism in Hungary. The sooner they get rid of such ideas, the better it will be for them, too. Then there are other reactionaries who say that "Khrushchov and Eisenhower have made a deal." We know that Comrade Khrushchov and President Eisenhower have arrived at an understanding on a number of issues; and we hope and trust that they will see eye to eye on many more issues in the future. But we feel that the reactionary whose distorted logic makes him conclude that one of the Khrushchov-Eisenhower meetings will bring

about, in one way or another, a capitalist-fascist Hungary is, to say the least, seriously mistaken. Let him think of the proverb: "The hungry dog dreams of bone." Other reactionaries set their hopes on the "withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary." This problem is worthy of a few serious words. Soviet troops are not in Hungary for internal political reasons, but solely because of unsettled international problems. In accord with the Soviet government, the governments united in the Warsaw Treaty organization and with all socialist governments, we stand for negotiations on the simultaneous and mutual withdrawal of troops stationed abroad. At present there are still open threats aimed at the People's Democracies.

We have said clearly more than once: Soviet troops will be stationed in Hungary as long as it is required by the international situation. As concerns the speculations about what will happen once the Soviet troops have withdrawn from Hungary, we may say that even this will be of no help to the reactionaries. The forces and supporters of the socialist revolution in Hungary have learned a lot, and they are able to defend the system against the enemy from within. If the reactionaries choose to fight again, we shall not shun it, because the Hungarian people are strong enough and still have plenty of accounts to settle with the counter-revolutionaries.

Comrades:

We are making use of our experiences. We shall not repeat the mistakes, we shall forget neither the treason nor the class enemy nor the imperialists. We shall continue to strengthen our people's state and our system on the basis of our experiences.

We shall further strengthen the major political foundation of our state, the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. We will strengthen the alliance of the working class with other strata of the working people, too. Relying on the strength of the Patriotic People's Front movement, we shall continue to broaden the unity of all the creative forces of the nation.

We shall further develop the democracy of our system. We will apply the principle of democratic centralism in state life as well. The rights of law-abiding citizens will be augmented. Likewise the rights of autonomy of the local organs of state power will also expand, while we shall maintain and strengthen central state guidance on fundamental questions.

The organization of our People's Republic, laid down by the Constitution, that is, the system of parliament and local councils, has stood the test. The counter-revolutionary attack of 1956 was a histori-

cal test for the National Assembly and the local councils, and they stood this historical test with flying colours. They proved to be the worthy embodiment and executors of popular power.

During the past three years we developed further the work of the National Assembly and the local councils. Their political, economic and cultural role has grown, their scope of activity widened, and it is our aim to widen this still further. The national widening of the authority of the local councils is at the same time an effective weapon against bureaucracy which we inherited from the bourgeoisie and which unfortunately has not yet been overcome by our system.

We do not intend to increase the armed forces of the country, including the army, the police and the frontier guards. At the same time, they must be qualitatively developed, that is, modernized, as long as this is called for by the situation. The People's Army, the Frontier Guard, the Police, the organs of home affairs and of the judiciary were organized and regenerated during the struggle against the counter-revolution. They acquired outstanding merit in that struggle, and our people are sure they will always make good in face of the tasks incumbent on them.

It is a special merit of the organs of home affairs and the judiciary that, working under difficult conditions, they fully restored socialist legality in our country during the past three years. This worked two ways: no crime was left unpunished and no innocent person was convicted. The essence of our penal policy is defence of the rule of law taken in this sense, and its enforcement under all circumstances.

As regards the punishment of the counter-revolutionaries, there has been no understanding between us and several of our western critics. But it is noteworthy that during the past few years not a single punishment has been meted out where the offence forming the basis of conviction was debatable. Of course, a different problem—and a subject of further debate—is the fact that the offence involved is a criminal act under the laws of our country, while, according to our western critics, it is an act of some sort of "heroism." We shall continue to act in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the Hungarian People's Republic and of our laws, should anyone venture to commit a criminal act against the state and lift a hand against our system.

Speaking about our administrative and armed forces, we should say something about the Workers' Militia. The Workers' Militia was organized in the struggle against the counter-revolution. Those workers, peasants and intellectuals who, after their day's work, are stand-

ing guard over the socialist achievements of the people without any material compensation whatsoever, deserve the fullest respect of the party and the people.

Comrades:

We may state that during the past three years we succeeded in fully restoring the legal internal order of the Hungarian People's Republic. The internal political situation is good and is developing favourably. Public order and public affairs are such in our country as may be envied by any western capitalist country. This is due to the unity of the party, its correct policy, the cohesion of the party and the people, and to the national unification led by the working class. The internal strength of our system and our society lies in the ability of the party, as the leading force, to fulfil its tasks while enjoying the support of the people.

### III

#### Development of Our National Economy and Our Further Tasks

Comrades:

We may say that the economic situation in our country is good. During the economic activities of the past fifteen years, the liberated Hungarian people had to overcome the backwardness and all the difficulties inherited from capitalism. Owing to the previous semi-feudal and semi-colonial status of the country, the structure of the economy was poor. Our industry was obsolete and agriculture extremely backward. The Second World War caused a damage of 300,000 million forints to the Hungarian economy. That is, calculated at the then prevailing standard, it wiped out the national income of five years, all the fruits of five years' labour of our people. Taking the path of the democratic and socialist progress, our people repaired the war damage and restored the national economy within a relatively short time. By 1949, the level of 1938, the last year of peace, was reached and somewhat surpassed with respect to production and the living standard as well.

Since Liberation, tremendous successes have been achieved in economic construction. Industrial production has grown to three and a half times the level of 1938. Since 1949, our people have built hundreds of large new industrial enterprises. New socialist industrial towns were built during this period, such as Sztálinváros, which has a popul-



ation of 34,000 today; Komló with 21,000 inhabitants; and Kazincbarcika with 13,000 by now.

As to the production level of agriculture there has been an increase of only 15 per cent, which is decisively due to obsolete farming on scattered plots of land. Nevertheless, there are several indications of a certain development in agriculture. The tractor park, which in 1935 had only 7,000 tractors, increased to 31,000 by 1959. The utilization of fertilizers, which in 1938 was only 13.5 kilograms per *hold*, rose to 77 kilograms per *hold* in 1959.

The standard of living rose considerably during the ten years, despite the stoppage and a certain decline observed in the case of certain labour categories in 1951-1953.

The hitch in the rise in the living standard between 1951 and 1953 could have been avoided, and economic development could have been more proportional and greater, if planning had been more realistic and if the leadership of that time had extended greater consideration to our internal possibilities, economic resources and the potentials inherent in economic cooperation among the socialist countries, and made better use of these. Still, history-making economic successes were recorded between 1949 and 1956; only a socialist planned economy is capable of such progress. The immense economic achievements registered since Liberation are concrete evidence of the great superiority of the socialist system over capitalism.

Mendacious denial of the facts, slander of our popular system and the heroic efforts of the Hungarian working people, made up the economic and social demagoguery used in 1956 by the imperialist propagandists, former exploiters and the revisionists. The truth is, however, that the counter-revolution and its decomposition products caused extremely serious damage to our economy and produced a breach in socialist construction. The economic "contribution" of the counter-revolution to the Hungarian people was 22,000 million forints worth of damage.

Three years ago the economy was paralysed and production was at a standstill; the so-called "workers' councils" and "revolutionary committees" hindered the resumption of production, plundered the national economy and disrupted the organs of economic management. The country and the working people were threatened with devaluation of the currency and economic bankruptcy.

The Central Committee and the government took energetic measures to restore the national economy already in the midst of the armed struggles waged against the counter-revolutionary bandits.

They appealed to the miners, the workers, and peasants, and requested economic aid from the leaders and peoples of the fraternal socialist countries. The Hungarian working people became aware of the situation and responded to the appeal of the Central Committee and government. The workers gave coal, power and industrial products; the peasants supplied food, and the transportation workers restored communications.

Primarily the Soviet Union, but also China and all the People's Democracies, came to our assistance without exception. In addition to non-repayable emergency assistance, the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies extended aid in the form of 1,200 million rubles worth of goods and foreign currency on long-term credits. We extend heartfelt thanks to the leaders and peoples of the fraternal countries for that assistance.

By the end of 1957, the national economy was restored, socialist industry had recovered and was working, and agriculture was producing. We replaced the produce-collecting system by a system of state purchase at fair prices, and raised the living standard of the working people in the city and countryside alike. By the end of 1957, the level of production and the living standard of the working people reached and surpassed that of 1955, the last normal year prior to the counter-revolution. Only the socialist system and international socialist solidarity are capable of such achievements within one year's time.

After restoration of the basis of the economy and of the conditions of normal economic work, we elaborated the line to be followed in the economy and the Three-Year Plan based upon it. Our objective was:

(1) to improve the economic structure, utilizing as far as possible our domestic conditions and the possibilities of economic cooperation among the socialist countries;

(2) to increase productivity and reduce production costs through better organization of labour and by raising technical standards;

(3) to concentrate available investment funds on the most important projects;

(4) to ensure a balance in foreign trade and payments;

(5) to plan realistically and build up reserves;

(6) to raise the living standard of the working people realistically and in accordance with our economic potentials.

With these principles as a guide, we accomplished the following by the end of 1958:

Output of state industry rose 14 per cent above that of 1955. Productivity increased 8 per cent compared to 1955. Total investments

were 2,300 million forints higher than in 1955. Our foreign trade balance was passive in 1957 to the extent of 2,000 million forints, while in 1958 we had an active balance of 580 million forints in hard currency. Retail trade was 26 per cent higher than in 1955, while the value of commercial stocks was 3,500 million forints greater than in 1955. Savings bank deposits, rising to 2,100 million forints, tripled compared to the 700 million forints of 1955.

Thanks to the good results attained in 1958, we were in a position to commence 1959 under better conditions. In addition to the good economic results, the confidence, readiness to work and enthusiasm of the working people were stimulated by the great election victory, the outstanding progress made in the socialist reorganization of agriculture, and the inspiring Twenty-first Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. All this gave the Central Committee a basis for appealing in its March 1959 resolution for the consolidation of the many new, and considerably larger, cooperative farms, and for greater momentum in building socialism.

The March resolution of the Central Committee met with favourable and wide response among the masses of the working people. The Budapest Party Committee, the Central Council of Trade Unions, the workers of the Csepel Iron Works and other large factories initiated a broad movement which they named socialist emulation in honour of the Party Congress. The sum total of the many thousands of pledges made by the workers amounted to 3,200 million forints in socialist industry, although some factory and trust executives were unusually cautious in their commitments.

However, what is even more laudable than pledges is the fact that the working people fulfilled 97 per cent of their annual pledges by November 1st, amounting to 3,100 million forints in output above plan. Grand pledges were also made in the socialist sector of agriculture: state farms, machine stations, and cooperative farms pledged a total of 305 million forints, primarily in the form of reducing production costs.

These pledges and their fulfilment are strikingly fine examples of socialist consciousness and enthusiasm on the part of the workers, peasants and intellectuals, both in Budapest and the countryside. It is impossible to single out justly any one of them. The workers' teams, the brigades in agriculture, the so-called "complex brigades" organized for the solution of a given task and usually consisting of physical and intellectual workers—all did a fine job. It was a pleasure especially to observe how the politically most conscious young workers lived up to

their commitments. Special reference should be made to the good work of the youth export brigades. Over 2,000 such brigades are operating in Budapest alone, involving about 13,000 young people.

New pledges are being made constantly. A comrade from the Telephone Factory said at the Budapest Party Conference that if the Congress should last at least three days, they would complete their annual plan during that time. We did not want to let him know that this particular condition for fulfilment appeared to be assured. I read in the paper that—just to be sure—they had in fact fulfilled their annual plan by now.

This spring we witnessed a wonderful thing in the development of socialist emulation. Our newspapers carried a report that the workers had initiated communist brigades in the Soviet Union, and socialist brigades in Czechoslovakia. Two to three weeks following the news, hundreds of brigades were formed simultaneously in various parts of the country without any initiative from above, and they are now competing for the title of "socialist brigade." These brigades have very correctly gone beyond production targets and the development of work by setting the goal of deepening socialist attitude and moral standards. There are approximately 3,500 to 4,000 such brigades in the country.

The first nine months of annual plan fulfilment shows the following picture:

In agriculture we carried out the task of consolidating the cooperative farms. Industrial output rose 12 per cent and productivity 4 per cent, compared to the same period last year. During the same nine months, retail trade rose 10 per cent, the total money income of the population 8 per cent, and savings bank deposits 69 per cent, compared to the same period of 1958.

The result attained during the first nine months indicate that we shall reach the aims set by the March resolution with respect to industrial production, production costs and, probably, productivity as well. This means that with respect to a few major index numbers we shall reach the targets set for the end of 1960 by the Three-Year Plan, one year ahead of schedule.

Comrades:

The position consistently maintained by our party during the past three years was that building of socialism must go hand in hand with a steady rise in the working people's living standard.

Let us see how the living standard of the working people has developed in our country.

As has been pointed out, the living standard has reached the 1938 level by 1949. Subsequently the most significant success was that, whereas unemployment during the Horthy regime averaged 200 to 300 thousand yearly, reaching 700 to 800 thousand during the 1929-33 crisis, this scourge of the working classes was practically eliminated under our system. During the 10 years following 1949, the number of bread-winners rose by 650,000.

For three or four years after 1945, the living standard of factory and office workers lagged behind that of the peasantry. By the end of 1958, the real income of factory and office workers went up 56 per cent, while the real income of the peasantry increased 26 per cent, and thus the temporary lag in the living standard of factory and office workers was eliminated.

The rise in the living standard is strikingly indicated by the trend in per capita consumption of a few staple foodstuffs. In 1938, per capita annual meat consumption in Hungary was 33 kilograms; by 1958, it rose to 42 kilograms. The average annual per capita consumption of fats rose from 17 to 21 kilograms, sugar from 10.5 to 24.8 kilograms, eggs from 93 to 147. Wine consumption was at the same level as it had been in 1938—it may have been very high at that time as well. Beer consumption in 1958 was exactly ten times the 1938 level.

The per capita average calorie intake in our country compared to a few other European countries is also remarkable. As is well known, during the Horthy regime the common people of Hungary were, together with the working people of Spain and Turkey, the most underfed people in all Europe. Today the situation is as follows: the per capita calorie intake in Italy is 2,560 daily; in Yugoslavia 2,710; in France 2,830; in Austria 2,950; in the German Federal Republic 2,970; in Britain 3,210; and in Hungary even higher, 3,240. In this respect we have reached a pretty high level in the world.

In 1958, the wages of factory and office workers amounted to 41,900 million forints, while allotments besides wages totalled 11,600 million forints.

The living standard of factory and office workers, peasants, artisans, members of cooperatives, of almost every working man, is raised by various services supplied by the state practically free of charge. In 1938 only 31 per cent of the population was insured under the social insurance scheme; now the figure is 71 per cent. The number of physicians in our country rose about 40 per cent since Liberation. In the Soviet Union—which in this respect occupies the best position in the whole world—there are more than 17 physicians for every

10,000 inhabitants, but our country can also stand comparison with any other country in this respect. France has 10 physicians per 10,000 of the population, Denmark has 12, Belgium 12, and Hungary 14.

During the past three years, the masses saw from their own experience how consistently the Central Committee and the government enforced their standpoint in raising the living standard. At a time when counter-revolutionary damage had not yet been repaired, when production and its increase—the only sound foundation for the living standard—were hardly guaranteed, we did away with the produce-collecting system, established better purchasing prices and introduced a system of profit-sharing.

In 1957 the real wages of factory and office workers increased 14 to 16 per cent, and the real income of the peasantry 8 to 10 per cent. Early in 1958 the report of the government to the National Assembly pointed out that the living standard could not be raised in 1958, but at the same time the year must be utilized to consolidate the living standard reached by the end of 1957 by increasing production to give it real backing. The masses understood, accepted, approved and supported this standpoint. This made it possible to overfulfil the 1958 plan, and even to raise the real income by more than 2 per cent.

The good results attained in 1958 made it possible for the Central Committee to place on the agenda a number of urgent problems connected with the living standard. The Political Bureau has recently examined the implementation of the Central Committee's resolution on the situation of the working class.

On behalf of the Central Committee, I can report to the Congress that every item of the resolution dealing with the living standard has been carried out.

The resolution specified the first six months of 1959 as the time limit for fulfilling the tasks. The following was done: 25,000 workers in the low income brackets received wage increases of 8 to 15 per cent from January 1st on. Working time was reduced for some 50,000 workers employed on jobs harmful to health. Salary increases were granted to 82,000 teachers also on January 1st. Salary adjustments of 55,000 public health employees became effective on February 1st. On January 1st, 408,000 people were given higher old-age pensions. A partial increase in family allowances, affecting single working women with children, and employees with three or more children, took place on April 1st. These wage and salary increases, supplements in pay and pension increases, total 1,487 million forints a year.



Living conditions now are good in our country. Work has a meaning for everyone, as it is obvious to all that the values created by labour are in part allocated to develop production, that is, to guarantee a higher living standard in the future, and in part to assure a better life today, to raise steadily the living standards of the working people.

Today there is actually only one problem seriously affecting living conditions, the basic solution of which still calls for a lot of effort and time—that is housing—to meet the increased and constantly growing requirements. This is an extremely difficult task, but one which can, must and shall be solved.

Comrades:

I wish to deal now with the tasks of economic construction. Parallel with the consolidation of the people's power, the problems of economic and cultural construction have more and more come to the fore in party activity and will continue to become more pronounced in the future. This applies to party activity as a whole and to the work of each party organization. The problems of economic and cultural construction are of such political significance that, under conditions of peaceful development, the growth of the party's influence among the masses and the further political strengthening of our state and system mainly depend on the proper solution of the problems of economic and cultural construction.

Considering the great importance of economic problems, the Central Committee has proposed to the Congress that they should be dealt with as a special item on the agenda. Therefore, I shall only outline our economic tasks in this report.

Production and economic construction serve our social objectives as well. Within the next few years our people must complete laying the foundations of socialism and speed up the work of building a socialist society.

Our immediate economic and production task is to overfulfil the Three-Year Plan by carrying out the plan for this year and next year and thus to create a sound point of departure for the new Five-Year Plan on a higher level. We have to propound a suitable new Five-Year Plan and mobilize the masses for its implementation.

The document published by the Central Committee contains the major directives for the new Five-Year Plan to be drafted. Following approval by the Congress they shall serve as a guide for communists who are engaged in drafting the plan, moreover, they shall serve as directives for the entire party membership in their economic work.

The plan should ensure that, by the end of 1965, industrial output will rise at least 65 to 70 per cent and agricultural production 30 to 32 per cent, compared to the 1958 level. The national income will have to be increased at least 50 per cent, while industrial output should rise primarily through a 37 to 40 per cent increase in productivity.

We must continue to expand industry. We should ensure a faster pace in the growth of the heavy industry, while considerably raising light industry output as well. Productivity in the entire national economy should be increased by developing the technical standards; thrift in production will have to be improved and production costs reduced. In the years ahead our national economy as a whole should be brought closer to the economic level of the most advanced countries. To overcome the relative lag in agricultural production within the entire national economy, is now a decisive problem of our development.

There are a number of problems which we must face and solve in order to ensure a more rapid economic development. As far as the increase in productivity is concerned, we have been lagging behind the pace of development of all socialist countries because of the shocks and breaks of the last six years. The decisive precondition for overcoming the relative lag in the rise of productivity is to improve technical standards considerably.

Our industry can boast of a number of excellent products which can compete on the international market, such as the Csepel programme-controlled milling machine; the new tempering equipment of the Metal and Machine-Tool Works; enamelled chemical equipment; and radio transmitting and receiving tubes. The E-400 lathe, the VF-221 milling machine, the GH-400 planing machine, the Erosimat spark-machining equipment, the transformer plate tester, the Rajkai grain-slicer and the Orion radio sets, were a success at Brussels and won Grand Prizes.

At the same time we must realize that the majority of our products are below international standards. Although steps have been taken in this direction, we have not yet succeeded in building up a demand on the world market for a number of articles for which we possess up-to-date manufacturing possibilities, namely: precision instruments, weak-current equipments and a few heavy-current installations, and some agricultural produce which are in wide repute. When comparing our investments with those of the more advanced socialist countries, and even with a few of the advanced capitalist countries, it appears that still a greater than desirable part of the

investments is being used for erecting buildings, rather than for purchasing machinery.

In order to solve the problems indicated above, we must overcome several weaknesses in our work, the cumbersome and bureaucratic traits still prevailing primarily in the state and economic management.

We must definitely improve planning and state- and plan-discipline in the economy. The obstacle in this sphere is the professional narrow-mindedness which extends from the lowest bodies up to the ministries, as well as the erroneous view of placing local, regional interests above national interests. A characteristic example of this in industrial management, including the trusts and ministries, is that in most cases all items affecting the increase in the national income are planned lower than necessary, while those pertaining to investments are planned higher.

If we expect all working people to think about how to raise the funds when they submit requirements, then we should demand that people in leading economic posts plan in a realistic manner, while considering the potentials and interests of the national economy.

Our wage, salary and bonus system should be developed so that material incentive should contribute towards the development of the socialist economy and not the other way round. Let me cite two examples. It is a fact well known to those dealing with economic matters that the method of rewarding the engineers working in designing offices is such that their incomes are increased by preparing more expensive designs which require more time, and not by designs which are less expensive in execution and can be realized in less time. One and a half years ago the government instructed the competent authorities, primarily the executives of the building industry, to draft a better incentive system which would comply with the interests of the employees of the designing offices and the national economy. The adjustment has not been made yet.

Let me take another example. It was certainly not due to any law of nature that our purchasing agencies bought up 14,000, 16,000 and 17,000 pigs respectively, on September 28th, 29th and 30th of this year, and only 2,000 to 2,800 on October 1st and thereafter. This fluctuation is detrimental to the national economy, because a part of the accumulated meat goes to waste because of storage difficulties and the delay in processing. The obvious reason for the mysterious phenomenon, the unevenness in purchasing, is that the third quarter of the year closed on September 30th, and the buyers received their bonuses on the basis of the results registered up to the end of the quarter. There

are still too many such contrarywise "incentives" in our economy, and they must be eliminated.

Our economic executives must definitely learn to rely to a greater extent and more boldly on the greatest motive power of our development—the consciousness, opinion and enthusiasm of the masses. They should consider and utilize the wonderful experiences gained this year in socialist emulation and in the movement of contestants for the title of "socialist brigade." The working people have overfulfilled every plan during the past two years. We must realize that the great motive force of progress is the growing socialist consciousness of the working people.

Our economic executives must learn how to make better use of the possibilities inherent in economic cooperation among the socialist countries. We must work towards far greater economic specialization and cooperation within the organization of the Council of Mutual Economic Aid. Although substantial progress has been made in this respect, there are still many industrial products which are manufactured in our country and in other socialist countries in small series and at high cost. We are thinking here primarily of articles in respect of which the clumsiness and conservatism of Hungarian economic executives and specialists stand in the way of a better international division of labour.

The Central Committee is of the opinion that conditions are favourable for our economic development. The solution of the problems in the sphere of economic development is also a prerequisite of the further realistic increase in the living standard of our people.

Comrades:

The directives for the Congress state that in the new Five-Year Plan, besides assuring an appropriate development both in quantity and quality of the means of production, we will have to increase per capita real income at least 26 to 29 per cent, and raise the population's consumption fund at least 40 to 45 per cent by the end of 1965. The Five-Year Plan housing targets will improve the living conditions of the people considerably. Our Central Committee proposed that priority be given to drafting the fifteen-year housing development plan. The governmental agencies drafted the plan and it has been approved by the government. Under the fifteen-year housing plan, we must construct from state and private resources: 250,000 flats in the next Five-Year Plan, 350,000 in the ensuing plan, and 400,000 in the following one. A total of one million modern flats complying with up-to-date sanitary requirements must be built under the three Five-

Year Plans. This means that during fifteen years, about 40 per cent of the population shall be able to move into newly built flats. To put it another way, under the fifteen-year housing programme each family requiring a flat of its own shall get one.

The rise of the living standard will also be promoted by the considerable increase in the production of durable consumption goods under the Five-Year Plan. During 1961-65, we shall supply the population with 460,000 washing machines, 150,000 refrigerators, 300,000 motor-cycles and 39,000 passenger cars, partly from home products and partly from imports.

These few data illustrating our future plans testify to the fact that our party is fully aware of the legitimate requirements of the working people and is striving to direct production towards their speediest fulfilment. To achieve this, it is necessary that our people accept the tasks of economic construction outlined here and proceed to implement them with full enthusiasm.

#### IV

#### Questions of Our Cultural Development

Comrades:

An essential problem of our social progress is for our party to pay proper attention to the timely and unsolved tasks of cultural development, part and parcel of the welfare of our working people.

The tremendous quantitative development which has come about in the educational and cultural advancement of the Hungarian people since Liberation, signifies a qualitative change as well. This progress means that we are approaching the versatile, cultured man of the coming society, the man with a socialist mentality—it means that we are approaching the victory of socialist revolution in culture.

There were six hundred thousand adult illiterates in our country at the time of Liberation. By now illiteracy in Hungary has essentially disappeared. The People's Democracy introduced the eight-grade primary school. Secondary school and higher education have made great strides forward in our country. In 1938 there were 11,700 university and college students, today there are 31,100. In 1938 only 3.5 per cent of the university and college students were of working-class and peasant origin; now the figure is 52 per cent. At that time only 14 per cent of the students were women; today 32 per cent of

them are women. Remarkable progress has been made in science, scientific training and research, too. Our People's Democracy established three new large universities. The Hungarian Academy of Sciences has thirty-five institutions, seven of which were established after the counter-revolution. The important accomplishment of scientific research render direct assistance to the general advance of industry, agriculture and the national economy.

Our experimental atomic reactor has been completed; the production of isotopes is going on and we meet the domestic need for isotopes with short half-value period. The Hungarian-made ionosphere-research instrument won a Grand Prize at Brussels. Progress has also been made in cybernetics. Important Hungarian products, which have won international repute, have been manufactured by utilizing the results of scientific research, like geodetic instruments, the modern Eötvös torsion balance, the seismic table and such inventions as the Kummer mine-safety device and the Heller-Forgó air-condensation installation for power-plants.

Scientists and research workers attained important achievements in the field of agronomy: they developed excellent varieties of hybrid maize, high-quality sugar-beet seed, and made sandy, marshy and alkali soil fertile. The maize reaper-thresher which may be attached to an all-purpose tractor, recently constructed with the cooperation of our scientists, is also very promising.

In addition to the achievements in public education, science, scientific training and research, encouraging progress has been made in literature and the arts. Many new socialist-realist works have been produced with especially valuable accomplishments registered by the dramatic arts.

Let us cite from the recent crop of plays: "Smoky Sky," "The 39th Brigade," "Yesterday," "Storm," and the "Budapest People." The appearance of a new young party-minded generation in social science, art and literature is heartening.

The statistics of our book publishing are also indicative of our cultural development, the cultural progress made by our people. While 2,400 books were published in 9,200,000 copies in 1938, as many as 2,700 works were published in 27,300,000 copies in 1958. There is a public library in nearly every village of the country, even in 94 per cent of those with less than 1,000 inhabitants.

The number of theatre-goers during the last ten years rose two and a half times and reached 6,800,000 in 1958. There are seven times as many cinemas as were during the Horthy regime, and the number



of cinema-goers trebled during the last ten years. In this respect we hold our ground when it comes to international comparisons: in round figures, one inhabitant in Holland goes to the cinema six times a year, in Sweden ten times, in France ten times, in Hungary thirteen times.

Comrades:

The advance and victory of the socialist revolution on the cultural front, despite great achievements, has relatively lagged behind the achievements in the political and economic sphere. In part this is natural. It is not easy to defeat capitalism in a political struggle and in economic affairs, but its defeat in the cultural field, in the consciousness of the people, is the most drawn-out struggle of all.

The destruction caused by the counter-revolution and the confusion spread by the revisionists in the field of ideology, are still making their effects felt. At the same time it was beneficial that the Marxist core of our intellectuals, our scientific and cultural life, became stronger in the struggle with the counter-revolution. This was also a great school for the masses. We have a number of new effective weapons: the party's directives on cultural policy, the party documents dealing with the problems of literature, with the populist writers and with the problems of nationalism.

Science plays an inestimable part in laying the foundation of our socialist construction. Ideology and culture have the task of educating and mobilizing for the building of socialism. It is indispensable for our science and culture to serve better the needs of the working masses and of our socialist construction. It must help elevate the new socialist relationship to labour to a higher level, improve the fulfilment of our social obligations, strengthen our patriotism and internationalism, and better our dissemination of a scientific world outlook.

We must overcome the cultural heritage of the bourgeois system, the vestiges of nationalism, chauvinism and anti-Semitism. We must wage a consistent struggle against the petty-bourgeois views and the selfish conception of the small property owners which is hampering socialism.

To accomplish these objectives, it is indispensable for the ideas of Marxism-Leninism to become the dominant world outlook in the ideological field, in all spheres of science and culture.

Our public education must be reformed, our schools must be made consistently socialist as to the content of ideological education. We must bring the schools closer to life. In essence, this goes hand

in hand with the securing of a modern culture, the introduction of polytechnical education in the primary schools. In the secondary schools we must enable the students to learn a trade in addition to the curriculum. Our institutions of higher education must give well-trained and at the same time communist specialists to the country.

A reform of our school system calls for very careful preparations and requires the thorough consideration of the experiences of our own public education and of international experiences. This is why the party initiated and the Council of Ministers decided to set up a broad committee, which has been given sufficient time to elaborate the fundamental principles of the reform.

We must broaden those educational forms, such as correspondence courses and the system of evening schools, which assure the possibility of study for youth and adults employed in production.

The development of the technical standards requires higher technical knowledge even from the workers on the machine. We must create the proper forms to enable the workers in production to secure technical extension training.

In our Five-Year Plan we will assure the necessary conditions for the development of science. The country sets higher demands for science, scientific and research workers, in the sense that they have to adjust research programmes of the basic and applied sciences as much as possible to our social needs, to the problems of the development of our economy and culture. The technical and agrarian sciences have a great part to play in assisting the technical development of our national economy, in increasing the production of a modernized, large-scale agriculture.

It is especially important that those engaged in the social sciences should analyze the course of our most recent development in socialist construction, so as to give help to the practical specialists. The carrying out of correct scientific propaganda against religious and other idealist views remains an important task.

Art and literature play an important role in shaping the consciousness, the feeling and the taste of our people. The present key problem of the healthy development of our literature and art is that the communist writers and artists have to join in a close-knit Marxist-Leninist ideological unity, so that they be able to exert the proper influence and attraction upon the non-communist cultural workers. Of course, our party relies primarily upon the communist writers and artists, but at the same time depends upon the creative work of all writers and artists of good will; it supports everyone who

is promoting with his work the main, socialist line of development of our people.

The class-conscious workers, the working people welcomed those creations which embraced the revolutionary struggles of the people: the new literary works and works of fine art born in connection with the 40th anniversary of the Hungarian Republic of Councils, and those depicting the struggle against the counter-revolution. These works indicate that our literature and art is finding itself and is developing along socialist lines. Our literature and art, however, still owes the people a great deal: little has been reflected of the processes which have taken place in the life of the people, of our cities, factories and villages during the past two or three years.

The thinking of our writers and artists has developed under the influence of the policy of the party and of life. They had a significant effect even on such literary circles which turned against the party at the time of the counter-revolution. But there are still people who are lagging behind. They must face the principal question and determine for themselves whether they will march along with the people building socialism, or whether they will break away from them. There can be no half-hearted acceptance of the cause of the people, of socialism: there can only be an unequivocal yes or no. No one should think that they do a favour to the people building socialism by standing on their side; on the contrary, it is an honour for the greatest artist or writer if he can serve socialism. The people expect every writer and artist to take a clear-cut position—evident in their works in the first place—on where they stand in the class struggle, whom they support and where they are going to.

In solving the problems of cultural life and in developing culture, the party relies upon the effective support of the reorganized Writers' Association and of all artistic federations.

The requirements of socialist education must be respected in the raising of the cultural level of the masses. The press, the radio, television, film, theatres, houses of culture and the amateur cultural ensembles—all have their part to play in this field. Artists, writers, journalists and cultural functionaries working in these fields must make far more deliberate contributions to the advancement of socialist, progressive culture. They must fight more effectively against the vestiges of bourgeois ideas, petty-bourgeois trash, ignorance and unscientific ideology.

## V

### Socialist Reorganization of Agriculture and the Class Composition of Our Society

Comrades:

During the nearly 15 years that have elapsed since Liberation, our people made great strides forward under the leadership of the party and the working class on the road of social progress. After the overthrow of the class rule of the bourgeoisie, our people, now in power, by and large laid down the foundations of the socialist order of society, and advanced a long way in the building of socialist society. The decisive task of the next few years from the point of view of the development of our socialist system, is to complete the foundations of socialist society in our country through the socialist reorganization of agriculture.

Our final objectives—the complete abolition of exploitation, the complete victory of socialism in our country, the creation of the material and technical basis of socialism, the carrying out of the cultural revolution, the reshaping of the consciousness of the people, and the creation of a high level of prosperity—all call for the completion of the socialist reorganization of agriculture in the next few years.

Our objective is to reach and surpass in our country the highest level of production and consumption ever reached by capitalism. We have long surpassed the level that capitalism had reached in Hungary, but the Hungarian People's Republic must also reach the level of production and consumption attained by the most advanced and most powerful western capitalist countries.

The completion of the socialist reorganization of agriculture is of tremendous political significance, for the development of a new, socialist peasantry will solve the existing contradictions and will make the supreme political foundation of our state, the worker-peasant alliance, unbreakable for ever; it will make our workers' and peasants' state, the Hungarian People's Republic, invincible.

The socialist reorganization of agriculture is also necessary from the point of view of the national economy. The backward relations of production carried on at present on the small plots of land, are the major obstacle to a considerable rise in the level of our country's agricultural production. This also acts as a brake upon the speedier

development of our entire economy and holds back a further considerable rise in the well-being of the people.

Modern agriculture operating with more machines, better irrigation, the use of more manure and fertilizer and improved select-seeds, can only be accomplished within the large-scale units of socialist agriculture. The disparity between large- and small-scale units is demonstrated by this year's crop results. The average yield of winter wheat amounted to 13.4 q. per *hold* in the state farms, 11 q. in the cooperative farms, and 8.6 q. on the small individual farms. The average yield of winter barley was 15 q. per *hold* in the state farms, 13.5 q. in the cooperative farms, and 11.8 q. on the small individual farms. The average maize yield in the state farms amounted to 17.5 q. per *hold*, in the cooperative farms to 16 q., and on the small individual farms to 14.4 q. And the individual farming peasantry only reached this production level through strenuous, inhuman labour.

Our peasantry is also conscious of what is going on in the world. The Soviet Union completed the socialist reorganization of agriculture more than 27 years ago, and the same thing has been accomplished in the interests of the peasantry and the entire people of China, Bulgaria and Korea in the recent past; Czechoslovakia, Albania and other socialist countries are approaching this goal.

The situation is entirely different in the capitalist world. There too, large-scale agriculture prevails over small-scale farming, but the peasantry is not going to unite their forces in socialist cooperatives in order to become the owners and masters of the land and enjoy the benefits of large-scale production. In capitalism, large-scale farming wipes out the small peasants and makes the small farmer landless. Our peasantry remembers 1929 when, during the months and years of the great crisis, millions of peasants became bankrupt in Hungary and the entire capitalist world alike. The seal of the bailiff drove them out, out not only from their lands, but often from the house in which they had been born. In the United States of America, the number of farmers owning less than 72 hectares of land diminished by 1,220,000 during the 30 years from 1920 to 1950.

The party and the working class must, through the educational work of enlightenment, with the guarantee of the voluntary principle, with assistance in organization and economic consolidation, help the individually farming peasants take the path of socialist agriculture.

The socialist reorganization of agriculture is the cause of our entire society. Everyone who has any connection with the peasantry and agriculture must lend a helping hand. It is extremely important

that people who carry on work of enlightenment among the peasants should talk to them as brother to brother with tact, patience and friendliness. Everyone must realize that the decision to take such a step is a matter of great importance for every peasant.

The vestiges of two old conceptions have very deep roots within a considerable part of the peasantry. One which clings in the minds of many peasants is a capitalist feature. There are peasants who, thinking like capitalists, would like to get wealthy by exploiting other people. They never think of what would happen if capitalism were to have its full sway. In vain would a hundred peasants toil and moil, for only five or, at the most, ten of them could become well-to-do farmers and ninety would inevitably become servants. The worker-peasant state, which is duty-bound to defend the interests of all working people, cannot permit ninety peasants to become bankrupt in order that ten might accumulate wealth.

Then there is another leftover from capitalism, the fear of the future. There are peasants who struggle through a large part of their life according to the jungle law of capitalism. They know that only those people were considered as somebody in the village who had their own plot of land, no matter how small. The brutality of this inhuman life often made a man exterminate his own parents, his own blood brother, for a plot of land. But those days, fortunately also for the peasants, are gone forever. It is not property but the working man who is the master of our society. He who is not a loafer and joins forces with his fellow men becomes the master of his own destiny, a happy, prosperous man in the cooperative.

One must patiently and convincingly explain to the individually farming peasant the perspective of the beautiful new life offered him by socialism, when he will free himself from the shackles of the old peasant life and when he will not be in any way the slave of another man, or even of his own cattle. This is obvious enough to cooperative peasants, to those who have had qualms and misgivings before joining the cooperatives. In a few years, the cooperative peasants will either be ashamed of, or look back and laugh at, the misgivings they had before joining.

Comrades:

The working class is the leading class in our society, the "ruling class" which holds the state power. Under the leadership of its party, it held aloft the banner of freedom and national independence that had been betrayed and trampled upon by the capitalist landowning class a long time ago. The working class assumed the responsibility



and sacrifices entailed by its leading role. They shed their blood and worked hard for the socialist revolution. They faced privation and hunger in 1945 and 1946, during the inflation. Often sacrificing their immediate interests, they have helped the fraternal class, the peasantry, and have built the greatly expanded socialist industry of our country. They have given tens of thousands of men to the various posts of state administration, to the army, police and frontier guards, to leading posts in the management of factories and plants, to the machine stations, to the construction of new factories in the countryside and socialist cities. The working class carries on an immeasurable amount of voluntary work for the benefit of the entire society.

The working class heading its allies, continues to lead the struggle for the creation of a new, socialist society. It is the task of the party to continue to assist in the raising of the consciousness, political training, technical knowledge and cultural level of the labouring masses.

The peasantry as an ally of the leading working class had its share in the struggle against the Hitlerites, the domestic fascists, the bourgeoisie and the landowners, for the creation of the people's power.

In 1956, during the counter-revolutionary attack of the bourgeoisie and fascist forces, the peasantry turned out to be a faithful ally of the working class and participated in the defence of the socialist achievements and in the struggle for consolidation. Its most conscious sons are party members in the front ranks of the struggle for social progress. They are in the National Assembly, in the councils, in the committees of the Patriotic People's Front, the officers' staff of the armed forces, the Workers' Militia, and on responsible posts of our workers' and peasants' state and our advancing socialist society.

The fundamental content of the worker-peasant alliance is the joint defence and strengthening of the people's power. It is an alliance for the building of a socialist society. The task of the most conscious of our peasantry who are employed on state farms, in the cooperative farms, machine stations and in the villages is now to help to overcome in the minds of the less advanced peasants the remnants of selfishness and to establish the socialist Hungarian countryside. They should help raise agriculture and with it the entire economy and the living standard of the working people to a higher level.

Comrades:

The intelligentsia is a significant and, because of its role, an important sector of our society. As a result of the correct policy of

the party, overcoming false generalizations and sectarian isolation, and of the political stand taken by the working class and the main masses of the peasantry, the great majority of the non-party intellectuals have recently taken a loyal stand and contribute with their work to the building of socialism.

The progress of socialist construction constantly increases the social role and the creative possibilities of the intellectuals. We wish to carry through the encouraging process which has begun for the complete fusion of the "old" and "new" intelligentsia on the basis of the ideas of socialism. This process can show noteworthy results in the case of the teachers. The party and the government look upon the intellectuals with confidence and appreciation and strive to improve their material circumstances further.

The party organizations must overcome the reserve and lack of confidence which still exists in some places with regard to the intellectuals. At the same time, it is necessary for not only the communist intellectuals, but for the non-party intellectuals as well, to participate in the solving of our social problems, in the efforts of our people in building socialism, wholeheartedly, with greater consciousness and greater responsibilities, and to a greater extent.

There are still a large number of petty-bourgeois small craftsmen and shopkeepers in our country. There are 114,000 independent craftsmen, half of them in the villages. The small craftsmen and shopkeepers played an active part in the economic consolidation during 1957 and 1958. The overwhelming majority of them continue to carry on socially useful activities.

The party and the government take a stand and fight against speculation and illicit money-making. They expect the small craftsmen and shopkeepers to abide by our laws and help in the work of our people. At the same time, they support and will continue to support the necessary and useful work of the urban and rural small craftsmen and shopkeepers to meet better the requirements of the population. The party is striving to re-educate, through ideological and political persuasion, the petty bourgeoisie and lead them, in a manner acceptable to them, to the road of socialism, assuring their individual prosperity and the future of their children.

Comrades:

We must deal with the policy towards members of the former exploiting classes. During the past decade we eliminated the capitalist and landowning classes. A part of the former exploiters and their supporters adapted themselves to our society, while another part

fought against the people's power in 1956, and have remained hostile to it up to now. Those whom we had met in the struggle as enemies of our system have been dealt with as enemies.

We shall continue to be vigilant in defending the interests of our system and our people against former exploiters. He who takes a stand against this must be prepared to face the hard blows of the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the same time, the defeat of the counter-revolution, the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the successes in socialist construction, enhance the possibilities of the re-education of the former exploiters.

The defeat of the counter-revolution did not put an end to the class struggle in our country. It is a social law that a classless society is born in class struggle. The same holds true in the international field also. The peaceful coexistence of countries and peoples, which we are striving to make permanent, does not lead to peace in the struggle of ideas.

We must take into consideration that our objectives, the completion of laying the foundation of socialism, and the building of socialism are class objectives, the objectives of the working class, and their realization will take place in class struggle. The interests of socialism, the interests of our people do not call for the sharpening of the class struggle. On the contrary, it is a good thing if it becomes less violent and its forms less sharp. The party and the people's state will never strive for the sharpening of the class struggle; this, however, does not depend primarily on us but on our class enemies, the international imperialists.

Therefore, the struggle of the classes continues. Only people who fail to understand the nature of the class struggle can think—as the inveterate enemies of socialism are busy rumouring—that the class struggle is conducted against individual members of the former capitalist class. The laws of our people's state consider the members of the former exploiting classes as citizens with equal rights if they do not violate these laws but respect them and loyally adapt themselves to our social order. We showed this in our policy with respect to the kulaks. It is known that we left it to the working peasants whether or not to admit them to the cooperatives. We also made it possible, through a decree, for the former kulaks to bury their own past and to become, after two years of honest labour, full members of the cooperatives, eligible to the various posts. As concerns the children of former exploiters, our party endeavours to help them find their place without any brand of their past in the new socialist world.

Comrades:

I have to touch upon the problem of the so-called "absconders." We divide the absconders into two groups. The smaller group consists of the inveterate fascists and criminals for whom we shed no tears. We consider, however, the great majority of them as people who went astray as a result of the propaganda of imperialism and that is why they absconded. Their lot is a bitter awakening from false illusions, insecurity of existence and helplessness. Their deranged, uncertain life and uprootedness is regrettable. We want to help them return to their homeland and find their place again in our society.

Quite a few of the absconders were already agents of the imperialists in Hungary or became political hirelings of imperialism abroad. We advise them to consider the obvious and unavoidable developments of the future. No other possibility remains for them either but to return to their country some day. They should carefully consider the crimes they commit against the Hungarian People's Republic, so that, should they once face the Hungarian working people, they will not be guilty of unpardonable crimes.

## VI

### Questions of Party Work, International Relations of Our Party

Comrades:

Let me speak finally about the party, its leading role and a few questions affecting the ties between the party and the masses.

It is a fundamental teaching of Marxism-Leninism that without a party, without the leadership of the party, the working class cannot achieve and cannot maintain political power; socialist society cannot be built without the leadership of the party.

The revisionists try to minimize the significance of the leading role of the party in the daily life of the countries building socialism. The Hungarian experiences obviously and convincingly prove that the leading role of the party, after accession to power, does not diminish, but on the contrary, it grows. This is fully evident, especially if we consider that, after coming into power, the party has to lead the class struggle, to govern the country, to take the responsibility for providing for the people's well-being, and to direct the whole complicated process of socialist construction. Lenin referred to the

complexity of building socialism and to the many-sided tasks of the working class when he taught:

"Without an iron party tempered in the struggle, without a party enjoying the confidence of all that is honest in the given class, without a party capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses, it is impossible to conduct such a struggle successfully."\*

It is no secret that, during the days when the counter-revolutionary uprising was gaining ground, the forces loyal to socialism, though numerically far greater, were not able to make an effective stand against the counter-revolutionary forces which represented a minority. The decisive reason for this situation was the fact that, owing to various earlier mistakes and internal treason, the party could not properly fulfil its vanguard role during the days of the counter-revolution.

The first and indispensable prerequisite for the effective counter-attack of the revolutionary forces was the reorganization of the party, the leading force of the working class. We reorganized the party in the course of the struggle waged against the counter-revolution and concluded this successfully on the whole by May 1st, 1957.

The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party is guided by the scientific ideology of Marxism-Leninism. Its theoretical basis and communist policy are not new. What is new in the situation is that, following a series of deviations and errors, the Central Committee led the party back to the correct Leninist path and methods. The party also introduced such new elements in its style of work as now unite it with the broadest masses of workers.

The past is a source of strength for the party. The party continues to rely upon the great revolutionary experiences of 40 years. At the same time, during the period of the re-organization of the party, while safeguarding the good revolutionary traditions, it was also necessary to liberate the party from everything that sullied its banner, especially from the cult of the individual and the shame of the revisionist treason.

We learned, though at our own expense, that a class enemy can seriously endanger the people's power only if the leadership of the party continuously and for a long time commits such errors which harm its ties with the masses and spread confusion into the ranks of the membership and the masses, and the class enemy succeeds, even if temporarily, in drawing a part of the honest workers to its side;

\* V. I. Lenin, Selected Works. *Ibid.*, pp. 589-590.

if the class enemy succeeds in disguising itself at the beginning of the attack; if the class enemy is able to get a footing in the revolutionary party of the working class and to use this as a basis for its attack; if the class enemy succeeds in paralysing the ability of the party to take action, and in making it unfit for leadership.

Today our party, learning from experience and tempered in battles, is strong, united, fulfils its vanguard role, and supported by the confidence of the people, it leads successfully the momentous work of building socialism.

The vanguard character of our party and its preparedness for leadership are assured if it functions as a well-organized force whose entire membership is cemented by unity of will and action. The foundation of party unity is, above all, the ideological and political unity of the party membership. The ideological foundation of our party is Marxism-Leninism, which is an invincible idea, a living, developing science, and has been the weapon of the working class for more than a century now. The ideas of Marxism-Leninism have materialized in the Soviet Union and are victorious in a whole series of countries, including our own.

In order to safeguard the ideological foundation of party unity, the party waged a fight on two fronts during the past three years, namely against revisionism and against dogmatism—for the purity of Marxist-Leninist ideology.

The ideological weapons of the working class are made dull by dogmatic and revisionist tendencies within the party. Of these, revisionism is the main danger both in Hungary and internationally. Modern revisionism revives the still undefeated old bourgeois ideas and plays into the hands of, and relies upon, international imperialism and internal reaction. It is especially dangerous because it parades in Marxist-Leninist cloak before the masses.

The social basis of revisionism consists of the still existing bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements. Revisionism falsifies the basic tenets of Marxism, denies the leading role of the party, the role of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the significance of the socialist camp. Revisionism is closely linked with bourgeois nationalism and leads consistently to the betrayal of the interests of the working class in politics.

Revision is an international phenomenon which is attempting to undermine the position of the communists within the working class in different countries. Revisionism is actually nothing else but a falsification of Marxism by the bourgeoisie. It is doomed to failure



in its most modern form, just as all the attacks on Marxism over the past one hundred years have all suffered defeat. This is clearly illustrated by the Hungarian revisionist group. A considerable part of this group fully traversed the normal road of revisionism from the falsification of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, through organizing factions within the party, to the complete passing over into the enemy camp and to treason.

The Central Committee and the decisive masses of the party membership are today free from revisionist views. The dark shadow cast by the revisionists upon the party is the disgrace of these traitors and not of the party and the masses supporting it.

Dogmatism also distorts and falsifies Marxism-Leninism. Although it does not spring from the bourgeoisie, but grows in the soil of the working class, dogmatism can cause tremendous damage to the party, the working class and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The cult of the individual developed around Mátyás Rákosi and the ensuing dogmatism and sectarianism caused serious damage to the party during the past few years. In the course of the struggle waged against the counter-revolution, the party had to get rid of the mistakes of the past as well. Conscious of our responsibility, we can report to the Congress that the Central Committee is free, and the decisive masses of the party membership have also been freed, of the harmful views of dogmatism and sectarianism. The Central Committee has restored the Leninist principles of party work, democratic centralism and collective leadership, in the entire party; it has rehabilitated all those who were unjustly accused by Rákosi and his supporters.

There is another disturbing aspect of this problem which should be discussed and settled. There are hundreds of thousands of people in our country who trusted Rákosi during many years, hailed him and supported him, and who today dwell on his harmful deeds with harsh words and sharp criticism. How does the matter actually stand? Mátyás Rákosi fought for the Hungarian Republic of Councils in 1919, played an outstanding role in the struggle against Horthy fascism and took a leading part in the political struggles following Liberation. After the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, however, he at first tolerated, then himself encouraged the cult of the individual, thus doing serious damage to the cause of socialism.

People were essentially right when during the early years they supported Rákosi in his correct deeds, but they were also right when, realizing his serious mistakes and his stubbornness in repeating them,

they withdrew their confidence in him as a leader and condemned him. The blame for the cult of the individual, for its consequences, and for the shadow cast upon the party, does not fall upon the Hungarian communists, the party, and the masses who followed Rákosi earlier. The disgrace shall fall upon those who were responsible, Mátyás Rákosi himself and the group which supported him and his mistakes.

The rejection of the Marxist theory of knowledge and a subjective view are a common feature of revisionism and dogmatism. Subjectivism is that way of looking at things which ignores the facts and laws of objective reality. The Marxist theory of knowledge calls for the continuous study of the objective facts of reality. Knowing and analyzing the facts of reality, the party draws the conclusions necessary for the elaboration of its correct policy.

The present situation calls for strengthening of Marxist-Leninist propaganda. The task of the party is to deepen the Marxist-Leninist knowledge and understanding of its members and to help those large numbers of non-party people who wish to do so to acquire Marxism-Leninism.

We have accomplished results also in party education. We have a two-year school, a one-year school and four five-month schools. In addition, we have established a wide system of extracurricular forms of party education organized outside of schools, and what is also very good, they included over 77,000 non-party people. The popularity of the course on "Current Questions" is shown by the fact that approximately 180,000 people studied there theoretical and practical questions and the various party resolutions.

The Marxist training and cultural level of our propagandists have improved considerably. Results have been accomplished in doing away with formalism, the use of *clichés* and the sticking to formulas. Party propaganda has come closer to life and, alongside the theoretical training, gives more direct support to the solving of the practical tasks before the party.

The raising of the theoretical level of the party, the party membership, calls for further relentless struggle against revisionism, dogmatism and all other distortions of Marxism. We must strengthen the present healthy traits of party propaganda and overcome the existing weaknesses.

Comrades:

the strength of our party organization is now the following: the number of our party organizations is 16,805; our party has

402,456 members and 35,500 candidates. Sixty per cent of the members and 56 per cent of the candidates are workers by original occupation. Fourteen per cent of the party members and 19 per cent of the candidates are working peasants.

To some extent the party press, too, reflects the organization and strength of the party. The *Népszabadság*, our central organ, is printed in 622,000 copies, the total circulation of party papers published in the counties is 365,000. The *Társadalmi Szemle*, scientific periodical of the party, is printed in 34,200 copies; the periodical *Pártélet* in 63,000 copies. The circulation of the party press at present is two and a half times as large as the membership of the party.

We know from experience that the numerical strength of the party membership has a significance in whether the party is able to fulfil its vanguard role. It is the opinion of the Central Committee that the organizational framework of the party in the earlier years was so large that it endangered the vanguard character of the party. In the summer of 1948, following the merger of the two workers' parties, the membership of the Hungarian Working People's Party was too large, amounting to 1,100,000, which corresponded to 17.5 per cent of the adult working population of our country. Following the general revision which took place later, the party membership amounted to 900,000 and remained so until the counter-revolution of 1956.

In reorganizing the party, the Central Committee, mindful of this experience, deliberately strove to keep the organizational framework of the party within the proper limits. The reorganization of the party took place in the midst of sharp struggle with the class enemy, and, while causing many difficulties, it also had its advantages. Today the most conscious and the most steadfast comrades are in our party who during the trying days of the struggle against the counter-revolution grasped and held aloft the banner of the party, of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

As far as certain strata of the party membership are concerned we consider as a big gain that, after the mistakes of the former years had been made good, the old revolutionary core of the party, communists of 1919, those who had fought against the Horthy regime in illegality, our comrades who had participated in the Spanish Civil War, and also many once unjustly slighted comrades were given a proper place in the party.

It is considered a great achievement that, in the course of the struggle, we made good those errors which had taken place in connection with the merger of the two workers' parties. It is very good

that people are now judged by the loyalty they showed to the cause of the working class during the fight waged against the counter-revolution and not by their former participation in the communist or the social democratic movements. The merger was fully completed during the last three years, in the sense that by now our party consists only of members who have equal rights in all respects and are cemented together, including all those who—though belonging earlier to two parties—prompted by inner conviction, realized together the great historical task—the merger of the two workers' parties.

The old main body and the youth which became communist after Liberation are also united. As we would express it in other words, the three living generations of the 40-year-old Hungarian communist movement are together and work in close harmony in the party.

We can rightly state that our party is stronger than before the counter-revolution, despite the fact that our membership at present is only about the half of what it was before. This is so because we do not have in the party (1) those anti-party elements who wormed themselves in before 1956; (2) nor do we have in our party those careerists who joined it before 1956. The vigilance of the communists who had learned a lot during the struggle helped keep them off. It was also helpful that the revisionists boycotted the reorganization of the party. The class enemy also unwittingly helped by attracting the careerists at that time. (3) The party is also stronger because it does not include the hundreds of thousands of wavering people who were members before. They are decent and honest people with whom we have succeeded in establishing friendly and comradely relations, and we must maintain these contacts in the future. As a matter of fact, these hundreds of thousands, while in the party, brought uncertainty and vacillation into the party. As non-party people, they can and do give effective support to the work of the party.

We can, therefore, rightly state that our party is strong because it is today indeed the voluntary fighting alliance of people advocating identical principles. The Leninist principles of party organizations, the principles of democratic centralism, now prevail in our party. Accordingly, there is unity, discipline, freedom of discussion, a free atmosphere, and freedom of criticism. Decisions are passed after many-sided examination and thorough discussion. Hence, the decisions of our party organizations are generally better, and there is a greater consistency in implementing them.

It is also a good thing that the work in our party is directed, from branch executives to the Central Committee, by communist collectives

which were cemented in the defence of the Marxist-Leninist line of the party and in the struggle against the counter-revolution. This became evident at the membership meetings held to elect new executives before the Congress, and in the local, regional party conferences. Seventy per cent of the members of the party executives and of the party committees were re-elected by secret ballot. About 22 per cent of the former executives were replaced because of age, state of health or because, and these were the majority, they had changed jobs. About 8 per cent were replaced by the party membership, after proper criticism, because they proved unfit for leading posts.

It is heartening that the style of work of the party developed a lot during the past three years. Characteristic of this communist style of work are the policy based on principle, confidence in, and frankness with, the masses and a lively practical attitude.

It is worth pointing out that the party's full-time apparatus is 40 per cent smaller than before. The party has given this smaller apparatus a sound political complement by increasing considerably the number of voluntary permanent activists around the party executives and party committees. The party executives and party committees now carry on their work with a permanent group of activists 4 to 5 times the number of full-time functionaries.

The development of the inner life of the party and of party work demands a struggle against existing erroneous views; we shall raise the theoretical, political and professional level. Every party organization must pay far greater attention to the economic tasks and the problems of cultural development.

The work with cadres must be further improved. It is also a good thing that the guiding of people in their everyday work and cadre work are done together and not separated from each other. Cadre proposals are prepared by those party organs which carry on the party work in the region concerned, those who know best the people working there. The decisive matter in cadre work, according to our experience, is to judge the people primarily on the basis of their work and their attitude and not through various records. The entire person must be considered, his good qualities and possible shortcomings must be weighed. It is most important to do away with secretiveness and mystification, the one-sided judgements in cadre work for good and all. One must definitely avoid the state of affairs that one day a man is praised to the skies for his good qualities and the next day the same person is, because of some mistake, condemned forever. A decisive problem in the improvement of party work is to ensure

a far greater consistency in the execution of party decisions and to improve the control of this execution. It often happens that the workers express their approval of the fundamental resolutions of the party, while the local organs still fail to carry them out properly. Functionaries and members of our party must realize that the correct implementation of party decisions is a political issue of the greatest importance, because it affects the ties of the party and the masses. Let us not forget that there can be no discrepancies between the words and the deeds of the party. This is a decisive factor in increasing the mass influence of our party.

Comrades:

The party has indirect and direct connections with the masses. Both kinds of contacts have their peculiar importance and place; both must function effectively.

The party has indirect connections with the people through the mass organizations and mass movements. The mass organizations and mass movements have special functions of their own. Their additional task is to transmit the message of the party to the people and to transmit the opinions and problems of the masses to the party. The unhealthy swelling of the number of the party members in the past coincided with a certain amount of underestimation of the mass organizations as political channels. This obviously led to an underestimation of party work in the mass organizations, to disregarding the independence of the mass organizations. During the past three years the party succeeded in effecting a radical change in this fundamentally erroneous conception and the ensuing incorrect practices. Today the mass organizations and mass movements, operating under the ideological and political guidance of the party, and at the same time working independently, fulfil their specific role which arises from their character: on the whole they carry out well their function of linking the party and the masses.

Time does not permit me to discuss separately the question of all mass organizations and mass movements. Here, I shall dwell on the work and significance of the trade unions, the Communist Youth League and the Women's Council. The experiences and tasks, however, can be usefully applied to the work of all mass organizations and mass movements.

The trade unions are the mass organizations of the greatest importance for the party, the revolutionary vanguard of the working class. The trade unions embrace over 2,000,000 people, physical workers and employees, agricultural workers and intellectuals. There



is a sound relationship between the party and the trade unions. The party organizations correctly value the importance of the trade unions and in general support their work properly. The trade unions protect the correctly conceived interests of the workers and contribute effectively towards building socialism in our country.

The trade unions are entrusted with extremely important tasks. These include the safeguarding of the health of the workers and the developing of a socialist attitude to work. Production conferences play an important role in the factories and institutions. There, workers discuss thoroughly their tasks and all the problems connected with the increasing of production and thus the raising of the people's well-being. It is desirable that the trade unions should develop, with the support of the party organizations, the activities of the workers' councils.

Communists active in trade unions have been instructed to put forward the position of the party through persuasion and not through general references to the party's position. This is generally the situation in practice. If the party members active in the trade unions continue to work in this way, the influence of the party will grow in the trade unions, and their work will also gain momentum. Communists must look upon the trade unions as the bodies which will gradually assume tasks and responsibilities so far discharged by state organs.

The Communist Youth League is, on the one hand, a mass organization but, in another respect, the party's own youth organization. The Communist Youth League has 11,658 local organizations with roughly 380,000 members. Somewhat over 8 per cent of its members are members or candidates of the party. In actual practice, the implementation of the party's policy in the activities of the C.Y.L. is their responsibility. Thirty-five per cent of the members of the C.Y.L. are girls.

Experience has shown that it was correct to establish the C.Y.L. in the spring of 1957. It has an authority among the youth, and the party relies upon it in its work. The activities of the C.Y.L. are sound, and this can be attributed to the fact that it was born and is developing in the struggle against anti-communist views and trends.

The principal task of the C.Y.L. is to help the party to liquidate the vestiges of hostile views which are still doing damage here and there among the youth. An additional task of it is to help the party to encourage all youth to study, to teach them appreciation and love of work, unflinching loyalty to the idea of socialism, to their people and to their homeland.

In the opinion of the Central Committee, the organs of the women's movement, the women's councils, are doing useful and effective work. This is why they have great prestige in the party organizations and among the masses.

It is their function to deal with the central social problems of the building of socialism, and to mobilize the women to support the policy of the party and for creative work. At the same time they have to deal with the social problems of women. Women are guaranteed equal rights by the Constitution and laws. It is the task of the women's councils to enforce fully this equality assured by the law in all spheres of life and in the daily conduct of affairs.

It must be frankly stated that a satisfactory solution of the social problems of women still calls for a great deal of work. The full emancipation of women and their equality of rights in the true sense of the word is one of the principal tasks of the socialist revolution. We have not solved this as yet, and it is not an easy, short-term task. Conservative views and habits inherited from a past of a thousand years must be overcome, and that on two fronts.

The assuring of full equality for women in many respects calls for the creation of such material conditions which will enable the women to carry out better their twofold role in society and in the family. This is why we must assist them in alleviating their concern with children and housekeeping, by means of proper institutions, the building and organization of nursery schools, day nurseries, and catering enterprises, and the large-scale application of modern household appliances. This calls for huge funds which the national economy can raise only in the course of many years.

On the second front, we must overcome backward, reactionary views denying the equality of women which prevail in the thinking of both men and women. This requires persistent and consistent ideological struggle and political work which will take many years.

The party relies upon the assistance of the Hungarian women in realizing the socialist objectives and considers it a major duty to fight consistently for the realization of the full political, economic and social equality of the women.

Comrades:

The party maintains also direct contacts with the masses. These contacts take manifold forms, such as the press, radio, meetings, open party meetings, the everyday work of the party groups in residential areas, as well as the constant work of enlightenment which

every communist must carry on, and the personal contacts of the communists with non-party people.

It is of extremely great importance for the proper development of the direct mass contacts of the party that the party may establish a correct relationship in principle and in practice with the non-party people. The party, as is known, has confidence in, and a correct appreciation of, non-party people. It speaks frankly, directly and openly to the broadest masses of non-party people about achievements and difficulties alike. During three years, it was this sincerity and frankness that created a great moral capital of mutual confidence between the party and the non-party masses. The successes of the party depend to a decisive extent on the further strengthening of this mutual confidence.

Complacency, which is reappearing here and there in our ranks, is an obstacle to the development of the healthy relations established with the non-party people. There are comrades who forget the teaching of Lenin that the party must fight to win the confidence and the support of the masses day by day. It is regrettable that we should find, though occasionally, that some party members do not understand the position of the Central Committee with regard to non-party people, and therefore do not act properly.

There is in some places a certain lack of comprehension of, and a reluctance to, the position of our 1957 Party Conference, according to which any public office, excepting party functions, may be filled by non-party persons. There are comrades afflicted with conservative views who do not understand that communists cannot do everything by themselves. Considering the great importance of this question permit me to quote Lenin on the matter:

"One of the biggest and most dangerous mistakes of communists... is the idea that a revolution can be made by revolutionaries alone. On the contrary, to be successful, every serious revolutionary work requires the understanding and translation into action of the idea that revolutionaries are capable of playing the part only of the vanguard of the truly virile and advanced class. A vanguard performs its task as vanguard only when it is able to avoid becoming divorced from the masses it leads and is able really to lead the whole mass forward. Without an alliance with non-communists in the most diverse spheres of activity, there can be no question of any successful communist constructive work."\*

\* V. I. Lenin, Selected Works. Moscow, 1943. Vol. XI. p. 71.

Comrades:

We have to condemn the impatience shown here and there towards non-party people. One cannot expect everybody to become a communist overnight, to rise at once to the level of the vanguard. The construction of socialist society, on the other hand, is the cause of the entire people. It can only be accomplished through the work of the entire people. It is the task of the party to lead the non-communists in this great work with persuasion and patience, and to place those who have abilities, knowledge and talent into posts in which they can do the most for society.

Much greater patience is necessary in dealing with the everyday problems of the people. There are no statistics about the host of problems, about matters of public or personal interest, with which people turn daily to our party organizations. In 1958, almost 20,000 letters were sent directly to the Central Committee, and over 30,000 to the party newspaper *Népszabadság*. Various people turned to us in these matters for advice or assistance. Obviously, the party and the party organizations cannot take up everything, but all requests and wishes which mostly non-party people present to us in words or in writing must be looked upon, above all, as a sign of confidence in the party.

Taking a sharp stand against bureaucratic and soulless attitude, we must pay the most detailed attention to the affairs, problems, complaints and requests of the people. The party organizations must take these matters seriously and put people on the right track. They should forward the problems to the competent bodies and follow up their settlement with care.

It is through the mass movements and direct contact with the masses that the millions of threads which link the party with the people are spun and strengthened. Mutual confidence and lively contact between the party and the people is the thing without which the party can neither live nor operate.

Comrades:

Our party is a patriotic and internationalist party. Our socialist revolution can develop only together with the international communist movement and in unity with it. The Central Committee is pleased to be able to report to the Congress that our relations with every one of our fraternal parties, the communist and workers' parties throughout the world, are intimate and friendly and are developing on the basis of proletarian internationalism.

We consider it our task to learn from our own people and learn from the experiences of the international communist movement. If

we constantly learn from our own experiences and from our people, we cannot lose sight of our domestic conditions and national particularities which have evolved in the course of history. If we were to ignore them it would be impossible to build a socialist society in our country. If we were to overlook the experiences of the international communist movement and forget about the major international requirements of the building of socialism, we would shut ourselves within the walls of national isolation. In this case it would also be impossible to build a socialist society in our country and defend the socialist achievements of our people.

Our Central Committee is of the opinion that in the struggles of the last three years we have correctly interpreted and applied the international experiences of the class struggle, the main international laws of the building of socialism, taking into consideration our domestic conditions and national particularities.

When dealing with the international ties of our party, I must report that our relations with the Yugoslav League of Communists have deteriorated and there are at present no official ties between our parties. This is due fundamentally to the fact that the leadership of the Yugoslav League of Communists have revised Marxism. They have developed theoretical theses and taken steps in practice which have been harmful to the entire international communist movement and to our party.

Discussions arose between us. In December 1956, they publicly advised us not to make "futile attempts" for the reorganization of the party, to base our political system upon the so-called "workers' councils" instead of on the party. We debated with them on the anti-Marxist theses elaborated in their programme, including their theory on the state, their negative evaluation of the socialist camp. Our opinion was that the adoption of their ideas would disarm the working class in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and international imperialism.

It is known that, during the period following the autumn of 1949, many mistakes were committed by the Hungarian side which injured the relationship between the two parties and the two countries. It is also a matter of fact that since the summer of 1953, we have been striving continuously to improve our relations. There has not been a single case since where any attempt was made on the part of Hungarians to interfere in the internal affairs of the Yugoslav party. The same cannot be said on the other part, because during 1956-57 a series of interventions, and attempts at intervention,

were made in the internal affairs of our party and our country by their side.

We hope that the Yugoslav comrades will be able to understand better the problems which brought them into opposition to the communist movement throughout the world.

On our behalf we wish to re-emphasize:

The ideologico-political basis of the activities of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party lies in the teachings of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, our party resolutions embodying our experiences, the resolutions of the Twentieth and Twenty-first Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the Moscow Statement of November 1957, which is the most recent summing up of the most important experiences of the international communist movement. We take for our basis the internationally valid laws of the building of socialism and strive to implement them in practice, keeping in mind our national particularities and domestic conditions. Our party is a Marxist-Leninist party; proletarian internationalism is a major corner-stone of principle of a Marxist-Leninist party. Hence, our party has always been internationalist and will continue to be so in the future.

Comrades:

I have arrived at the end of the report.

To sum up the tasks before the party: In the next few years we must complete the laying of the foundations of socialist society. With a better and more vigorous solution of the tasks of economic and cultural construction, we shall bring closer the day when the socialist revolution will have scored a full and complete victory in our country.

The prerequisite for this is the safeguarding of the purity of Marxism-Leninism which is the ideological foundation of our party, and the implementation of a clear-cut and consistent communist policy by constructively applying our scientific theory.

In our policy we are striving to be consistent and unanimous. In the ideological struggle we continue to aim the main fire at the remnants of hostile bourgeois and revisionist views. At the same time, we shall yield neither to dogmatism nor to sectarian practices.

Our Congress will obviously put an end to many questions of the past. We shall not forget the experiences, but those questions which belong to the past will be turned over to history. We look forward to the tasks of tomorrow and are concentrating our efforts on dealing with them.



The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Hungarian People's Republic are strong, and the international conditions are good. It is necessary for our party, every organization and member of our party, to work with even greater enthusiasm than before.

It is necessary for the party to rely even more upon the masses and for the people to rally even more firmly around the party. It is necessary for the Hungarian people to cement further their friendship with the peoples of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp, and to rally more closely to the ever mightier international forces of socialism and peace. We are confident that it will be so. We shall see the full triumph of socialism also in our country within a reasonable time; the happiest and truest dream of several generations of the Hungarian people, socialist Hungary, will become a reality.

## CLOSING REMARKS ON THE FIRST TWO ITEMS OF THE AGENDA AT THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY

December 4th, 1959

Comrades:

The first and second items of the agenda of our Congress have been under discussion for three days. Remarks have been delivered by 47 delegates. The speakers discussed the Report of the Central Committee from many aspects and touched upon all important issues. The debate was characterized, following the overcoming of some preliminary self-consciousness, by a clear attitude, a critical communist spirit and courage in matters of principle. A striking characteristic of the debate was also the fact that the comrades, practically without exception, spoke of the problems of today and tomorrow, and not of the past. In the Report of the Central Committee we stated about a few, otherwise not insignificant, questions that, in our opinion, these already belonged to the past. The debate accurately reflected that, in the thinking of our party membership, these are indeed already closed issues. This is gratifying because the comrades, avoiding empty, captious and under certain conditions already senseless debates, concern themselves with the tasks at hand.

To deliver the closing speech to the debate on the Report is easy in some respects and difficult in others. Regarding the ideological basis of the activity of our party, the general line of our internal and foreign policy, and the major questions of our economic and cultural construction, all the speakers, either directly or indirectly, expressed the complete unity of our party on all these questions. The Seventh Congress of our party thus approves the general line pursued during the past three years, and at the same time wishes a more resolute, more consistent and more vigorous continuation of this general line. So far the delegates of 35 fraternal parties have addressed our Congress, among them Comrade Khrushchev. They expressed the opinion that they regard the general line of our party as Marxist-Leninist, they approve its policy, and what is more, they have expressed their solidarity with it. And this is exceptionally important to us,

because in the person of the delegates of our fraternal parties actually the international working class is present at our Congress and gives its opinion of our policy.

With this I have practically finished with the main question of the three-day debate. I could as well conclude my closing remarks. But the comrades have raised thousands of questions, drawn important conclusions, and reported on concrete experiences. And all this was made in support of the party's policy.

One has the feeling that life itself, the ever fuller, richer and more radiant, new, socialist life of the Hungarian people has pulsed here in the hall of the Congress, and the results and shortcomings of this multi-coloured, rich life have been under discussion. This is proper and good.

We attach great importance to the speeches delivered and the conclusions drawn. May I ask the Congress to permit the newly elected Central Committee to group the various questions from the debate material and forward them to the competent bodies.

I believe the wish is justified that they should examine these and within a short time answer them on their merits. The final answer may also be that one or another wish, remark or criticism was not acceptable. Such a thing has already been known to happen in the course of history, in fact even here in the congress hall. I recall, for example, Comrade Sándor Petőfi's speech—and also that the foreign delegates here did not know why the Congress smiled at hearing his name.\* Comrade Petőfi is an enthusiastic, young expert. Unfortunately, I do not know him more closely, although I have been urged a number of times to get acquainted with him. He grew excited, came forward with demands, and said some things in which one could hardly say he was right. If our agriculture were generally as well equipped as the experimental farm where Comrade Petőfi is working, perhaps we would even kiss the hand of the person who would announce this to us. I do not wish to say by this that they no longer need anything, but if the question is as to where we should expend our means and resources, then we have to endeavour to strengthen those farms which are much worse off than they are.

I mention this only because there are some questions to which it is possible to answer: wait a bit, brother, we'll get around to that, too. But the majority of the proposals and remarks deserve a clear and

\* His name is identical with that of Hungary's greatest revolutionary poet of the 19th century.

definite answer. It doesn't matter either if the reply is not a display of self-criticism, but a proper and good measure. We'll accept that, too.

In industry, agriculture, trade and foreign trade, too, what is important now is to exploit the possibilities better. Let us lend greater momentum to the work of building socialism, let us develop our national economy and thereby establish a realistic basis for the further systematic raising of the working people's living standard, let us carry on with the central and major task of our struggle: the building of socialist society. This has been the topic of party meetings and other deliberations of the workers for some months. Thus the Congress has most correctly and emphatically underlined the importance of more rapid progress. A decisive link in this chain is the raising of productivity. I do not wish to go into details, I am only reminding the comrades on the basis of the debate—Comrade Nemeskéri related it—that the Lenin Metallurgical Works has registered a 13 per cent improvement this year. The manager of the Central Transdanubian Coal Mining Trust, Comrade Hidasi, also gave us some gratifying information: in their area, too, productivity last year increased 11 per cent. Their circumstances partly differ from other branches of industry, but their resoluteness is an example for all comrades engaged in production. The collective of the Lenin Metallurgical Works has concentrated its attention on increasing productivity for about two and a half years already, and have practically been fighting for every single penny. Consistent, far-sighted work bears fruit.

A very important question was brought up—and, I think, in a very proper formulation—by Comrade Szócs, an engineer from Salgótarján. He said that the experts, the engineers, technicians, in fact even the workers, looked upon the draft of our new Five-Year Plan as a fundamentally correct and realizable goal. But it has not been fully to their liking that we are developing the technical standard—and, together with it, productivity—not primarily with the building of new factories but with the reconstruction and modernization of the existing factories and equipment. It is certainly clear that this is the more difficult way. Despite this, it is proper and good that people take this kind of attitude. I am convinced that the people who, though they hold the view that it would be easier to build new factories and equip them with new machines, and still approve that under our circumstances we have chosen the slightly more difficult but sensible solution—these people will work more consciously and resolutely to carry out the tasks. It is not always the work of the man who jumps up at the first word and shouts, "Hurrah! Hear, hear!"

That's right! I agree with everything!" that is worth the most, but rather of the one who listens to the voice of the party, thinks about it for a while, and then says: "That's right, I approve of it, let us carry it out."

A central issue at the Congress was the socialist reorganization of agriculture and the development of agricultural production. There has been so much talk about it that in some of the Budapest delegates the question must have arisen: "What is this? Have we happened to come to some kind of agricultural congress?" Comrades, this is no agricultural congress but a party congress, still it is good to see clearly that for our whole party the foremost issue is now the socialist reorganization of agriculture. This is not an easy thing; it is a complex, militant task.

Comrades, this is so difficult that sometimes I too have begun to think—for instance, when Comrade Khrushchov's men go knocking at I don't know which crater of the Moon—all right, let us go to the Moon or to Venus, but let us settle things in such a way that we should no longer have to organize cooperative farms. Where does the difficulty of this work lie? If in the course of carrying out some difficult task we have to battle with the enemy, that is a difficult matter. We, Hungarian proletarians, have already found this out during more than forty years. But even more complex and difficult is the carrying out of a task in which we have to argue with our friends, the working people. After all, a brother is a brother, one cannot go knocking him on the head to make him get wiser more quickly, he can only be convinced. There is no other recipe for this, and herein lies the difficulty of this task.

As is well known, the production of our industry, as compared to the capitalist era, has already risen to the 350 per cent level, while that of agriculture only to 115 per cent. If we want the whole national economy to advance, we must absolutely progress in agriculture, raise the level of agricultural production as well. And this is possible in no other way but through the socialist reorganization of agriculture.

A few months ago an American journalist named Alsop came to our country and honoured me with his visit. He is no particular friend of communism, but for some reason or other he is interested in it. We talked, among other things, about agriculture, and the subject of the situation of our cooperative farm movement came up. I said to him: Look here, we are talking to everybody, to those who agree with us and to those who do not. The fact is that if somebody can say something wiser and better than we do, we are willing to accept it. How-

ever, we feel that we cannot be reconciled to the fact that, while you in America are producing with 80 to 90 per cent and even higher mechanization in agriculture, we in Hungary are working with ancient hoes, scythes and ploughs. We have secret ambitions that one day we shall also overtake you. Large-scale production is indispensable to us. In the old days there were in Hungary large estates of counts and capitalists. Should we call back the counts, the bailiffs and big landowners and ask them to be kind enough to farm with large-scale methods—or is it we ourselves who will have to establish the socialist large-scale production units? The former solution is not to the liking of the Hungarian people, they do not wish the counts with their big estates, the overseers and the gendarmes to come back. We prefer to have cooperative farms instead. There is nothing else we can do. It is interesting that Mr. Alsop—although he did not mention this in his article—said: As a matter of fact, I quite understand you. Even a man with an anti-communist view like Alsop is compelled to acknowledge the correctness of this aim if he thinks it over and his opinion is not published.

Just what is now the situation in our agriculture? I do not know exactly when the newest type of the Pannonia motor-cycle was developed. I do not think that it was much more than a year and a half ago. And in the recent past I too have come across the phenomenon that a peasant, a hoe over his shoulder, was leaving for his fields riding a Pannonia motor-cycle. I reflected on when the hoe must have been invented. It would be difficult to calculate accurately, because in those days there was neither "Innovation Bureau" nor "Patent Office" where such things could be registered, but it is certain that it was invented a long time ago, a few thousand years back. It is a private affair of the peasant—just as it is everybody's private affair—how he gets out to his place of work. The fact is that today he may get there with the most up-to-date technique. There is no denying it, two and a half or three kilometres is not a distance to travel by aeroplane or helicopter—over such a distance the Pannonia motor-cycle is the most modern technique. At the same time, to pursue the socially decisive activity of production, he is carrying on his shoulder a hoe—who knows how many thousand years old. This is not a normal situation, comrades. If the peasant thinks about this, he too must understand it. Society could more easily sustain it if the peasant would walk his one and a half kilometres out to the field on his two sound feet, but out there he would work with the most modern tractors and ploughs. Thus, there are lots of convincing arguments; we only need to make use of them.



At the end of last year the Central Committee discussed the situation of the cooperative farm movement and found that the political and economic conditions were ripe for us to take a step forward.

Then in March, "philosophical" debates began on whether the development had been a step or a leap. I believe that, on a national scale, it was undoubtedly a step forward, and was no kind of leap. It is our opinion that at present, too, the situation permits us to take a step forward again if we solve the task intelligently and well. Already at the Twenty-first Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—when I spoke in your name—I remarked that we could advance as our own circumstances allow it: if all we can do is to take a step, then we cannot leap, because we may easily land in the middle of the ditch instead of stepping forward. Even in the fairy tales the lad is told—when he wishes to win the hand of the princess—that he may make three attempts to solve the riddle. You know, comrades—and this is no longer in jest—that in the case of the cooperative farm movement our party and our people are embarking for the third time on the road upward, and this road must never again be broken because of our mistakes.

Already there are certain results at the beginning of the present autumn development: in about two weeks' time some 11,000 peasants joined the cooperative farms, contributing 60,000 *hold* of land. Thus, the start is promising. The report from which I have taken these figures speaks also of the fact that there are certain discrepancies between the results of the counties. I promise not to disclose the numerical results achieved county by county, because if any kind of misinterpreted rivalry were to begin in this sphere, it could completely ruin the possibilities that present themselves. With the intelligent use of our present resources, however, in the coming months we can take a step forward enabling the cooperative sector to achieve a decisive superiority in our agriculture. We recommended and we now recommend to the comrades to take into consideration the possibilities and to think in the manner of communist revolutionaries. We recommend to the responsible men of the counties, after completing a certain work, to stop a bit, examine where they stand in the realization of what they have imagined, talk over the experiences and go on working by taking them into consideration.

Comrades, this circumstance, careful consideration is exceptionally important. In this connection I should like to call the attention of the comrades to two things. First, when after a certain phase we assess the experiences and survey the work done, it is found that at one place

the work goes more easily, the progress is more rapid than was assumed. In this event the possibilities must be exploited, because neglecting them would be a crime against the socialist revolution. In another village, because of some kind of peculiar circumstances, things go on with more difficulty. In such cases great damage may be caused by rigidly clinging to some previously conceived idea. The other point which should be born in mind is that the various phases of work should be closely linked to one another, for example: organization and consolidation. This cannot be left out of consideration.

You will recall, we said a year ago: the cooperative farm movement cannot be organized in such a way that first we build the centre of the cooperative farm, the hot-house or the pig pens, and then invite the individually farming peasants: please be so good as to walk into the cooperative farm. This conception of the work is not serious. Decent peasants do not have this conception of life. Socialist development cannot be conditional on the raising of material means beforehand. The ensuring of political conditions, on the other hand, is very important. If this did not exist, cooperative farms could not be established because a sound cooperative farm movement can come into existence only in agreement with the working peasantry. And by ensuring this, as shown by experience this year, the movement can be developed effectively. Our cooperative farms organized in the winter and early spring are all, without exception, thriving, working and developing. Therefore, it is possible, in agreement with the peasantry, to develop and consolidate the cooperative farms. The important thing is to ensure the political conditions. But just as the organization cannot be dependent on the ensuring of material means in advance, in the same way the newly formed cooperative farms cannot be left to themselves either. After their organization they must be aided, the consolidation of the cooperative farms must be started at once.

From the standpoint of consolidating the cooperatives, it is very important—perhaps even more important than the material means—what kind of leadership they elect. The situation on the whole is—and this may be safely stated—that the working peasants who at present are still farming individually know that they, too, will be cooperative farm peasants, and secretly they have already committed themselves to it. There is still conservatism in them, thoughts like: "First I'll marry off my daughter, or I'll put by another one or two thousand forints in the bank, put a few more quintals of grain up into the loft, and after that . . ." But we know that the Hungarian peasant no longer fears the cooperative, he is not afraid of the state and has confidence

in the party. What, then, is he afraid of? He fears that in the cooperative farm he will get a poor leader. And honestly speaking, comrades, one has to beware of this a little. Because the situation and the life of a cooperative farm peasant will develop according to what kind of brigade leader he happens to get. For, comrades, somehow one can tolerate it for a while if, say, the secretary of the Central Committee, or one of the ministers is a "difficult" person. But if the brigade leader is like that, it cannot be borne for long. And also, the peasant will tell you: I'm not afraid of that Dobi, Münnich, Marosán and Kádár. They won't bother me; they didn't bother me for three years, why should they bother me after this? But it's very important how the chairman and the brigade leader will treat me.

Last year we gained very useful experiences in this sphere, too. We were bold and said to the peasants: go, find the man you want to be your chairman, brigade leader or agronomist. This method proved to be correct. And it is understandable too, for in this it is the peasants, and not we, who are interested in the first place. It is they who will work with that man, that leader. If the brigade leader works well, he will do so for them; if he works poorly, it is they who will suffer damage. If he is wicked, it is they whom he will treat wickedly; if he is decent, it is they whom he will treat well. The peasant is not his own enemy; therefore, he will think over carefully on whom he wants to rely, to whom he wants to entrust his fate, his income, his means of livelihood.

Last year's and this year's experiences are good. The majority of the cooperative executives have proved competent. And these good experiences will help now. In the intervening period the peasants were watching very carefully what the chairmen were like, how they were behaving and what they were doing with the others. Of course, there were even peasants whom they had been inviting to join the cooperative for some seven years, and who always said: "I don't want anybody to go giving me orders." And when, finally, with great difficulty, such a peasant was persuaded to join, the next day the membership decided to elect him chairman. Then it was his turn to despair because he would have to give others orders. Such wonders occur too.

The majority of the leaders have proved to be good, and this is very important because, I repeat, the fundamental problems of the peasants no longer concern socialism, but certain question of detail within it. And sometimes these questions of detail are very important indeed.

In our country there has been People's Democracy for nearly 15 years. The regime, the people's power, has been good up to now too, but certain mistakes occurred which from time to time hurt certain people. Naturally, this caused damage. Care must be taken that such mistakes are not repeated. The peasants must be helped. The best help is if we trust them and are bold. There were a good many peasants who believed that for about ten years at least we would not dare to entrust them with anything because they had argued with us for about five or six years whether "they should join the cooperative that year or the next." And our confidence in them represents a moral obligation to them which spurs them to be worthy of this trust.

Simultaneously with the socialist reorganization of agriculture, the development of production is also very important. Our enemies say that we are unable to find a solution to placing agriculture on the path of socialism and at the same time increase production. I must add that now even the propagandists of our enemies, such as Radio Free Europe, no longer say: "what are those cooperative farms good for," but argue that "they will not be able to provide them with investments," "they will not be able to increase agricultural yields at the same time," "the living standard of the workers will suffer because of them," etc.—in other words they have these and similar "worries" in connection with us. Thus the debate has shifted to another plane. Naturally, the socialist transformation of agriculture and the simultaneous increasing of yields is no easy task. This year's results, however, prove that it can be solved. In fact, the cooperative farm movement has grown about threefold and agricultural production also increased this year. In the crop results, in the rise in yields this year, favourable weather conditions have also been a contributing factor, but the results of agricultural production could not have improved if things had not gone in order.

The so-called twofold task is thus realizable, but not easily. It is a fact that in the midst of the socialist reorganization of the village there may appear periods of standstill in the production vigour of certain peasants. But this loss we can make good, and we must make up for it with the help of the socialist basis. An agriculture in which more than half the ploughing area is already socialist can, with the development of the production level of the state and cooperative farms, eliminate and overcome the standstill mentioned above. Therefore, the cooperative farms must be further consolidated, the country must receive more commodities from the cooperative farms.



Comrades:

Book-keeping before the masses is unusually simple. That is why you can ask yourselves: do cooperative farms give more to the people, or do they not? If the cooperative farms are not capable of giving the country more commodities, then—I tell you frankly—we would all do better, instead of doing work of enlightenment, to go out hoeing a little, because this, too, might result in about ten kilos of maize—although we have dropped out of practice a little. Of course, this is in jest. But the fact is that socialist agriculture gives the people much more in commodities than do small farms, individual farming. This is the way it is, and this is the way it must be.

At the beginning of the summer, comrades of Győr County, delegates from the country's first socialist county, called on us at the Council of Ministers. They are self-confident people, and they are in the right; they accomplished no small feat—and in this they personally had no small share. But still, we put the question to them: well, you've had your victory, we celebrated too when Győr County had become the first socialist county. But now let us go one step further. Will Győr County give more wheat to the country than last year? Will it give more maize, more pork, more beef and more milk? The final accounting of the whole struggle, the whole work, will appear in this! If it gives more, then the whole people will say: come on, let us try to organize one or two more socialist counties! If, on the other hand, it so happens that it does not give more, then many people may ask: why did we organize this socialist county if it does not produce more for the country?

The communists grasped the question correctly, and the cooperative peasants of Győr County replied in a worthy manner: they fulfilled their plans, and at the Congress they could justly refer to their results. Already this year it has become evident that the development of the cooperative movement goes hand in hand with the rise in agricultural production. We usually say—and with inner conviction—that the Hungarian peasant likes to work and is intelligent, he does not oppose a wise thing, and if he wishes he can accomplish wonders! Already in the new cooperative farms they set to work, and in many of them they achieved very fine results. I believe that if our peasantry embarks on the socialist path and works with good central leadership and good local guidance, then we shall very soon surpass that certain 115 per cent level which agricultural production has achieved in comparison to 1938. Naturally, we calculate this "very soon" in years.

There has been much discussion at the Congress on the questions of science and culture. Our Central Committee is aware that abstract scientific research is also very necessary. The type of research work which has no fixed direct economic aim is also needed. This can yield information which later can become the basis of better work, the development of production and technology. We request the scientists, however, to coordinate their research work with the tasks facing the national economy, as far as possible. The scientists—and not only the scientists, but also other researchers, engineers and technicians—know very well: we are aware that results can only come from experiments. In fact, the great results do not come from the first experiments. We know that for great achievements time, work and experiments are needed.

I agree with Comrade Novobátsky in what he expressed as follows: we must be aware that from year to year more extensive material possibilities must be placed at the disposal of science and research. The differentiation of human labour is increasing, technology is gaining ever broader spheres, and it cannot develop without scientific research. It is clear, therefore, that research must be supported with constantly greater material assistance from year to year. But this is only one side of the coin.

During one of our conversations with our scientists we told them that we cannot manufacture gold, and we requested the academicians, the members of the Presidium of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, to be so good as to link the ideal with the feasible. This is the other side of the problem. To express myself figuratively: it is a good thing if our scientists besiege the heavens with their thoughts and daring imagination, but still they should remain on the earth with their feet.

Hungarian scientists are internationally recognized. The trouble is, however, that one or two researchers think up things which, if they were to be realized, would need at least the possibilities of the United States or, if those are insufficient, of the Soviet Union. For the realization of the ideas of some, however, the possibilities of both countries would be required, and not those of the Hungarian People's Republic. There is not much we can do with such plans. Therefore, we request them to link their ideal strivings—for one cannot even wish a scientist not to aspire to the best possible—with our real possibilities. If they do this, then the government will be able to support science to an extent increasing from year to year.

And as to what kind of possibilities there are before us, let me mention just one example. The Physical Research Institute of the



Academy is producing very praiseworthy and useful things. In the course of their research, the scientists working there turn out instruments which are connected with their experiments and which we also can already export. Thus, an institution engaged in theoretical research, with its practical work, skill and resourcefulness, can bear part of the costs of its own maintenance—even if the smaller part. I believe that considerable results could be achieved if this example were taken into consideration by our scientists working in the rest of the scientific institutions, too.

There was discussion about our cultural workers, too. Many people spoke about this question; so, I do not wish to go into details, because in my opinion Comrade Kállai's remarks contain the full essence of the work to be performed in this sphere. I should like to add only a few thoughts.

It is commonly known that among the writers there are one or two who have assumed an attitude of some kind of opposition. We mean by this that they are obstinately not doing anything. They remind us of a sad pelican which, with its head tucked under one wing, is standing on one leg thinking: should I take a step next week? Of course, there are not many of them; in fact, they are so few that I could even name them, but I do not want to hurt them.

A few months ago we argued with the writers "in opposition." In the first stage of the debate we enumerated their faults, and they told us ours. Their main problem is that the party leads, and it wants to direct literature as well. Since then they have taken up positions in the second line of defence and say: we agree with what the Central Committee says, but on a lower level, in the department, and there at the publishers, there are some who follow an incorrect line. It is true, we, too, have things to make amends for, because in the past 15 years it also happened that we mistrusted them as a matter of routine, we needlessly insulted them or praised them undeservedly. The still recalcitrant writers who are not on too good terms with us must also be regarded realistically. And if we have to deal with them, we must strive to make our position unassailable and just.

During the three-day debate of the Congress many words of acknowledgement were spoken about the leadership, but there was criticism as well. Both are very important. Acknowledgement lends security and strength, it strengthens the conviction that the leadership is essentially correct, and it is a great help also if we receive criticism.

Comrade Söjtör very nicely determined the essence of leadership when—understanding the matter as the leadership of the people too—

he said that our party consists of 400,000 steady and sensible people who know what they want and correctly guide the work. I believe this formulation is fundamentally correct, with a slight addition. Let us be steady and sensible when the situation has to be analyzed and the task must be fixed, but I suggest we should be irritated and impatient when we find mistakes, and wrathful when we find the enemy or some crime. For there are mistakes here. These are partly of revisionist or sectarian origin, but sometimes they stem from roots which were "invented" much earlier than either revisionism or sectarianism: namely ordinary human stupidity, carelessness, irresponsibility—and these have to be combated.

I think what is most important is for every single member of our party to act in conformity with the party's general line, the party's resolutions, to live and work in conformity with the party's spirit and morals. This is decisive, this is the most important from the point of view of leadership.

We have always stressed the necessity, the indispensability of the power of patient, convincing talk. Only by this means can we establish comradely, fraternal relations with the working peasants, and what is even more important, only in this manner can we realize our policy in mass proportions. Still, mistakes occur in this sphere, too. Every comrade must understand that in the eyes of the peasants the party is represented by those comrades, those communists, whom they know there locally, who give them guidance on the road of life. If they receive impatient or improper replies, they might think that it is the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party that is speaking to them in such a voice, whereas this is not true at all. It is decisive, therefore, that every member of the party should act uniformly and represent the party's general line correctly. Whoever is a member of the party, cannot pick and choose among the individual sections of the party's policy and say: "I shall agree with these, let somebody else struggle for the others." There can be no haggling here. If somebody agrees with the party's policy, let him agree with the whole of it and act accordingly! If he does not agree, let him say so, in order that we may argue and talk—after that, if nothing helps, let him leave our ranks. In 1957, we included a point in the party Rules: every member of the party has the right to withdraw from the party of his own free will without any moral condemnation. But whoever says that he agrees with the party's policy, must not choose the points which please him, and must not ignore the rest, because it is the duty of every party member to follow the party's policy in its entirety.

As far as the state and economic leadership is concerned, here, too, we have things to do. Do not misunderstand me, the state apparatus is not in the hands of an alien class. I make this remark only because after Comrade Prieszol's speech some people might think that in our state apparatus it is not even our people who are running things. This is not the case at all. In the ministries, too, it is our comrades, our very close relatives, our fellow workers, who are working. It is true that something went wrong with one or the other of them after they had exchanged the workshop for the office. But if we recall the road travelled we must see that tens of thousands of comrades in the state apparatus worked admirably and honestly in the past three years. Otherwise our results could not have come about. Alongside the people doing good work, there is a minority which is not conscientious, works superficially, or is not fit for leadership. Such things can happen too, but the majority is not like this. Then why can we not get rid of the still existing mistakes? Because, comrades, an illness persists among us: for example, if we ask some state or economic leader whether there is any bureaucracy in the state apparatus, he replies: "There certainly is a little." But if we ask: "And in your ministry?"—then everyone replies: "There isn't any there, everybody works well there."

If we ask someone else, he, too, says there is none at his place. And if we mention the concrete mistake, I often know the reply in advance: "That's a slander, it's a lie, it's not true, somebody has invented it." . . . Or: "It's true, but four months ago we discussed this at the meeting of department heads and it's already settled. . . ." One cannot work with these kinds of recipes.

I know some state leaders whose heart and soul belong to their work. I know they would be ready to give their lives for the working class if necessary. They are capable of everything except, sometimes, for one thing: and that is to admit that there can be mistakes in the sphere administered by them. With this they cause harm to themselves, put their office into a bad light before the working class and do not help to correct the mistakes. When a man is at the head of a large company or ministry to which tens or hundreds of thousands of workers belong, he must become accustomed to taking it seriously if somebody makes an observation regarding the guiding work of his apparatus! He should take it that the observation made is true. If later it should turn out that it is not true, then he should be glad, but he should not receive criticism by calling it a "slander." And he should not defend the "honour of the flag" out of false prestige.

Comrade Dezső Kiss and others did well to mention that there was at present a contradiction between the activity, enthusiasm and impetus of the masses and the mistakes of our economic leadership. We shall eliminate this contradiction, and not by preserving bureaucracy, carelessness and destroying the working people's enthusiasm, but by destroying bureaucracy, carelessness, and raising enthusiasm higher. Just think what large masses stirred in the socialist emulation preceding the Congress, and what splendid examples they gave of human steadfastness! Both on the state and party level, leadership is needed which is worthy of the zest and enthusiasm of the conscious workers. If each leader imagines his own task the way hundreds of thousands participating in that emulation understood the meaning of the party's word, then we can look forward to the future with a reassured conscience.

Comrades:

The system of leadership must also be developed, but this must be correctly understood. We have already had a few reorganizations in our country, and it also happened that after completing it, another one was begun a month later. This went on for a few years. We are of the opinion that our system of leadership gradually becomes ripe for a certain development. But how should we carry this out? As the saying goes: once bit, twice shy. Therefore, some think that in the great reorganizations we are going to copy the example of the fraternal countries.

In the reorganization of the system of leadership we are endeavouring to make use of their experiences too. But we cannot compare our own circumstances with those of the Soviet Union where the conditions are entirely different. We know that there are certain reorganizations in the German Democratic Republic, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and we should like to use their experiences too. But now we shall try to be so cunning as to save our own tuition fee.

We are not going to carry out such a reorganization of leadership—for we have already had this kind too—that we are dismissing tens of thousands from one day to the next. There is not even any need of this. If people need to be regrouped from one area of work to another, this must be planned and carried out regularly, normally. Some people in our country, reading in the paper some morning that in one of the neighbouring countries they have begun the reorganization of public administration, fall into panic by evening. They say: well, our country will probably cease to exist, too. This fear is unwarranted, because before we carry out any important task, we discuss it with the people first, we collect the experiences, and only then



do we begin to act. Therefore, we may say that we were capable of carrying out great tasks in the past three years, and those interested agreed with us.

It is very gratifying and healthy that the content of everyday party life and party work is constituted by the party's political, economic and cultural tasks. This is good, and in the future we must strive to make it even more so: in the activities of the party organizations in the future let economic and cultural work play an even greater role. If this kind of content permeates party work, then education, organization and even the paying of membership dues will go in proper order. We are somewhat in the same way with the paying of membership dues—if you will pardon the comparison—as we were one time with the pledging of government loans. For years the party membership, together with the most resolute non-party workers, did nothing for a whole month but deal with the pledging of loans, and the only result of the whole thing was that in the last years of the loans about 700 to 750 million forints were added to the state's circulating fund. Since this ended we have gained a full month for genuine party work. Perhaps this is the reason why the work is going better. Those 700 to 750 million forints are also raised somehow; one plays on the state lottery, another plays on the football pools, and a third just simply puts his money in the savings bank. Generally there is order in the country, and if the regime is strong, if the currency is stable, if people live normally, then there is no need to argue with them about something that they will cheerfully overfulfil fivefold and sixfold of their own accord.

But let us return to dues paying. People with a strict conscience, particularly those who work in the party's financial department, have become accustomed to working with figures and to seeing that those are in order. In 1957 and 1958, I read the report on the trend in dues paying from month to month, and I would always find the strict conclusion: in at least six Budapest districts and four counties the payment of dues has dropped as compared to the previous month. I studied the figures again. But all I saw there was something like this: 97.8, 98.2, 99.6 per cent. I took out the previous month's report, and truly enough there was a decline of two tenths—in other words there had been a drop. But let us think a little! Globe-trotting is on the upswing, many comrades travel abroad either officially or at their own expense, for their own amusement. Some are ill or in hospital, or other reasons prevent them from paying membership dues promptly. Therefore, if the statistics show somewhere between 96 and

100 per cent, then everything is in order. We have already said that we would not set ourselves up to having one half the membership engage in collecting dues from the other half every month. This is not even necessary because the party members regularly pay their dues.

As far as inner party life is concerned, we may say that the party is generally sound, strong and is fulfilling its historic task. In our thinking the awareness that the party is not something for its own sake, has struck deep roots. We may consider the party as an instrument, a weapon. It is a pride of our party that it is an instrument and weapon in the hands of the working class, the people, to achieve their historic aims. And our party is fulfilling this task: it is governing the country by the will of the working class, in accordance with the militant aims of the working class. But it does not rule, it serves the people. I believe this ancient, feudal expression can remain in this context: we are proud that we serve our working class and people.

The opinion formed of communists frequently changed during the past four decades. We still recall that in Horthy's time even our enemies respected the communists because they were tenacious and struggled selflessly for the people.

The communists need not be different from the rest of the people, they need not be anything special—just people in the real sense of the term. Why must we talk about this? I think we cannot believe any man who says of himself that he became a communist in order that he might suffer for the people, I do not believe that anybody with a normal human mind and feelings would commit himself to anything only to suffer. Communists are human beings. I am convinced that the writers and poets are somewhat right when they say: every man pursues the blue bird of happiness. I believe we do not have to be ashamed of the fact that the communists are whole people, even in this respect—people seeking their own happiness. Still, there is a very essential difference between the communists and individually thinking or selfish people. And that is that the communist can be happy only when he will be happy with every working man. This is the enormous difference between communists and individually thinking persons. I think that a man who likes to fill his stomach and can eat with zest when around him working people are hungry, does not deserve the name of man. At present the calorie level is satisfactory. You have heard that we have already surpassed Britain. The communists, too, have a share in this good level. In my opinion there is in this no sin whatsoever, because the communist is a man, but he is a man who cannot swallow a single spoonful of food with relish if another work-



ing man is hungry. Let the communist be like this—such a man, a whole man.

We need not stand over people, nor under them! We must become worthy of the name "whole man." If such an opinion develops—and I hold that after three years of work there already exists such a public opinion—that the communist is looked upon as a man who thinks and labours for a common cause; and if this is said about us by non-communists, then I believe, comrades, that this is our highest praise.

Comrade Prieszol said they have decided to work in such a way that never again must there be an honest man who fears the communists. This is a correct, praise worthy decision and is in conformity with the present actual situation. In our country people regard the communist as their friends to whom they can sincerely turn with their questions and problems for advice and assistance. What is good is that honest people not only do not fear the communists, but like them and seek their company too, and dishonourable scoundrels do fear them indeed. For those whom everyone likes cannot be good communists either.

Permit me to say a few words about our system. In this congress hall nobody criticized, nobody attacked the system; therefore, it does not have to be defended. But there are questions with which there is no harm in dealing. In the Report of the Central Committee—that was my duty—I annoyed the delegates with ample statistics. The statistical data reflect the results of our system. But statistics cannot convey their real essence, their taste.

Before long the people's power will be 15 years old. During this time we carried out such changes and achieved such results that, for example, young people cannot imagine what the situation of a working-class child or a poor villager's child was like in the old world.

One who has lived under capitalism knows it completely differently from a young person who has only been told about it. If he listens carefully and thinks, of course he will understand its essence. But he cannot feel and see it. The absconders, for example, have gathered very valuable experiences for us, too. What kind of things they object to abroad, is quite revealing. From these it appears that we have generally cured them of capitalism. A young worker wrote from Austria and, as it was, implored us to allow him to come home. He wrote about only one grievance, but it gives food for thought. He wrote that he had received some kind of job in a factory. He wanted to ask his foreman something, and had begun to say it. But the foreman had interrupted him saying: after the shift is over, in the office! He could not finish the sentence. Then at the end of the shift he went up to the

office. There an office attendant told him to take off his cap and hold it in his hand. He went into the room, and there the foreman spoke to him, but he had to stand while the foreman was seated. This is all that the letter was complaining about. When this young, 20-year-old man spoke to one of his superiors in our country, he received a reply in a human manner. Whatever mistakes there were in our regime, the worker had grown accustomed to being treated like a human being.

But we have other kinds of results, too. For instance, the children. Let our guests visit Hungary, Budapest or the countryside, say, on a sunny spring day. They might even go to the smallest village. It is worth looking at our children of three or four scampering about to the great irritation of the kindergarten teacher. In the past it was the children of aristocrats and bankers who lived like this. Now the situation is different. This, too, is part of our regime. In the past the children of workers and poor peasants went bare-foot, in winter they shivered from cold, and quite often their mother put them to bed saying: "My son, the bread is already asleep." Yes, those children fell asleep hungry and weeping. Not one, but ten thousand, a hundred thousand children lived like this in Hungary in those days. And how do the children live now in our country? Are there in this country any children whose mother has to say to them: "My son, the bread is already asleep?" There are none like this in our country. Comrades, if this were the only result of the 40-year struggle of our party and the 15 years of our people's power, then we could say: this was worth fighting for and making every sacrifice for.

These children are not only in good condition physically, but they are developing differently from the past mentally, too. On April 4th, when we laid wreaths on the monument to Soviet heroes, there were some little kindergarten children present there. We went over to them and I asked one group, by way of a joke: Where do you work, children? One of them, a boy of about three and a half, looked at me and said: In the heavy industry. I was taken aback. What's that? Then this tiny young man consciously explained to me that he went to the kindergarten of some heavy industrial trust.

Or yesterday, for example, I got a few stalks of beautiful and willingly given flowers undeserved and free. The pioneers of the Ilona Zrínyi school had been waiting for two days to meet Comrade Khrushchov. Then they asked me when Comrade Khrushchov would be here, and since I could not tell them they honestly told me that they would have liked to give these flowers to "Uncle Khrushchov," but since he was not here, they gave the bouquet to me.

I agree with Comrade Komócsin and Comrade Óvári—the embittered and youngest delegate to the Congress who said she would like to be the oldest—in what they spoke about the youth in general. It is proper to emphasize outright that anyone who lumps together the whole of our youth and says they were all counter-revolutionaries, and now they are hooligans, is either mad or a scoundrel. Everybody knows young people who are working in our brigades. Hundreds of thousands of them working splendidly in production, and they stood their ground in the Hanság and in other kinds of voluntary work. We practically have to go searching for marshes, because these young people will gradually have drained everything. Naturally, there are some among them who are not like this. But among adolescent boys it may easily happen that if you tell them they are well-behaved, they may be ashamed of it, and if you tell them they are rogues, they may be proud of it. They may easily become addicted to all kinds of silliness, gaudy shirts, and other things. This is a disease of young people, but it is of a temporary nature; this is not typical of the youth.

In the period before the elections we visited Budapest and the countryside with various groups of the Central Committee. As we would get started, about five minutes later at least thirty secondary-school youngsters would spring up in the street, I don't know where from, but the fact is they were there. I would ask them: "Where are you going, boys?" "Nowhere, we just happened to be around." "All right, then, bye-bye." Half an hour later they would still be tagging along beside us. They are observing, listening, and at the meetings they keep their ears open and are interested in what is going on, but they are a bit ashamed of being decent kids. We must help them not to be ashamed of being decent. And these young people—let's admit it honestly—know their way around in the realm of the newest technological and scientific achievements better than we do. Our young people are training themselves better and better, their spheres of interest are constantly expanding, they are becoming more and more skilled and cultured. Can we not rely on this youth? This youth is our pride, we consider it a great achievement to have such a youth. This in itself was worth the party's four decades of struggle, it was worth fighting for this youth.

The women have also been liberated in the Hungarian People's Republic; this, too, is a great achievement of our regime. Our Central Committee holds the view that we have to enforce the equal rights of women, as guaranteed by law, fully and in every sphere of life. Women now live differently from the old world. Once on a May Day we met

working women of the Hemp and Jute Factory. I told them that in 1931, I had held an illegal meeting in front of their factory. Many working women attended it. I still remember you, I even recall one or two faces. Who was then 30 years old looked 50, and now those who are 50 look 30. Yes, a 30-year-old working woman in those days was an old woman in the true sense of the word. Not only because she wore a black kerchief, but because she was crushed and crippled, body and soul. Look around in our country today: the women have been liberated and become human beings.

If the four decades of our party's struggle and the fifteen years of our People's Republic had no other achievement than this, comrades, then too we could say: it was worth working and struggling for.

Comrade Dobi said that the Hungarian question would not be decided by the U. N., but by the Hungarian people. And truly, how was a worker in the factory, or a simple peasant in the village, allowed to have his say, for example, 30 years ago? Now the workers, peasants, engineers, technicians, teachers, professors are sitting here in this hall, they are in Parliament and wherever the affairs of the country are settled. It is they who say what should happen in this country!

This is our social system, this is our achievement, and if we had not accomplished anything else, comrades, this too was worth the struggle.

As far as our future work is concerned, we must preserve the purity of the party's fundamental principles, communist steadfastness, because so long as these exist we need not fear any difficulties. The tasks are great, but our strength is great, too. Our people are familiar with our party's political line, they agree with it and approve of it. We are struggling and advancing together with the masses. We are struggling together with our Soviet brothers and the international working class. And as to questions regarding Hungary, they will not be decided in the U. N. in the future either, but here in Hungary—at the Party Congress, in the National Assembly, in the Central Committee—the representatives of the Hungarian working people, our working people, will decide them.

Our Congress has been given considerable importance abroad. From the *Pravda* to the papers of the fraternal British and French parties and to the organ of the Communist Party of Indonesia, the whole friendly press has taken a stand in our favour. The comrades wrote—and their representatives also related here in words—that they concurred with our struggle, they felt solidarity with us, that they were pleased to see our results. You may have observed, they also told us to be careful, not to be self-complacent, not to commit any

foolishness, and then no force whatever could stand in our way. There has also been another kind of response. A capitalist response. This response is rather varied. In the capitalist press there are some reasonable, sensible voices, and there are others. In fact, there are in the West some crest-fallen prophets who are now in an embarrassing position and would like to get out of it by talking nonsense.

The following happened: a month ago predictions were issued that at the beginning of the Congress Kádár would announce the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Hungary. Later they said: "He will announce it at the end, not at the beginning." Then, when they began to get a feeling from the indications that we would not make such an announcement, they said: "Khrushchov will announce it." They have got themselves so worked up about it that now they are at a loss on how to continue. The first step towards a way out was taken by the good old *Daily Herald* which wrote the following: "Kádár's announcement regarding the Soviet troops caused a great surprise among the delegates."

Now let us get it clear, comrades, while we are together. Was it really a great surprise? This did not cause any surprise to our masses. They know that the Soviet troops are in our country under the Warsaw Treaty, and they know that this question is our own affair and concerns us exclusively.

What our further progress needs is to intensify the great enthusiasm of the masses for the speeding up of socialist construction. Let us carry out our plans, let us work out our new Five-Year Plan and establish its solid foundations. This is the task. Let us plan even more conscientiously, let us work with even greater devotion than up to now, and in the future let us preserve that community spirit which has developed today in the party and in this country.

I am very confident that the tasks submitted in the first two items of the agenda will become reality; in fact, if we work well, these aims will be attainable sooner and at a higher level than scheduled. The main duty of the party, of the communists is to see that the possibilities for progress do not remain unexploited, and that we do not take any adventurous, inconsiderate leaps. We should not take up tasks which, considering our resources, are not realistic. If we observe these principles in the future, too, and if the Central Committee ensures their realization throughout the party and in state leadership, then the aims outlined here and—permit me to put it this way—adopted by the Congress with one accord, will materialize.

I ask you, comrades, in my own behalf and in Comrade Fock's behalf to accept our reports and to adopt the draft resolution.

## OUR PEOPLE HATES WAR AND IMPERIALISM AND WISHES TO LIVE IN PEACE WITH ALL OTHER PEOPLES

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE  
HUNGARIAN DELEGATION TO THE  
FIFTEENTH SESSION OF THE  
U. N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY

October 3rd, 1960

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates:

It is beyond doubt that the present, Fifteenth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations is the most important one since its inception and may well become one of historical significance. This follows from the international situation itself and from the fact that two questions of paramount importance in the present-day life of mankind—general and complete disarmament and the complete liquidation of the colonial system—are on the agenda.

It is an important fact that the leaders of many countries of the globe, intent on discussions and negotiations, have assembled for the first time in such a large number in one place. It is of no less importance that together with the newly admitted countries, the United Nations has now delegates from 98 countries participating in its discussions. As equal members of the United Nations, the delegates of countries which through long generations had been excluded even from shaping their own fate may, by their admission, make their opinions heard on the great issues of international life. The government and the people of the Hungarian People's Republic warmly welcome the peoples of the countries newly admitted to the United Nations, and wish them many successes in their independent development.

The Hungarian delegation wishes the General Assembly and its elected officers success in their work.

In our world, armed and fraught, as it is, with conflicts, the question of the maintenance of peace is the one that keeps public opinion in all countries active to the highest degree. In this situation the peoples first of all expect the United Nations to do all in its power to promote disarmament. The representatives of the big powers are



probably more familiar than I am with the extent of the present-day arms race, and with the fact that great quantities of the terrible weapons of mass destruction are already piled up. The great danger inherent in the present situation is, however, known to us all. Public opinion is pressing for agreement on disarmament. We know that the realization of general and complete disarmament calls for further persistent efforts by the peoples and for a sober attitude by all responsible governments.

World public opinion demands from the leaders of nations even greater responsibility in the present situation. Consequently, a responsible leader, when addressing his own people or the United Nations, cannot evade the great issues of peace. Upon the initiative of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, the untiring defender of peace, a great number of heads of states, prime ministers and other statesmen vested with considerable powers are taking part in the present work of the General Assembly. People all over the world expect them to say frankly whether or not they are in favour of disarmament. I repeat, they must answer this question and nothing else: do they want disarmament or not? And if they say "yes," people everywhere expect the leaders also to act in that spirit. Unfortunately, this question sometimes fails to receive a clear and unequivocal answer, but even more often words and deeds do not coincide.

In words almost everyone stands for peace, but deeds speak more clearly than words. Everyone knows that while the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have, in recent years, considerably reduced their armed forces, the responsible leaders of the NATO powers come up with slogans of peace only in order to cover up the arms race conducted by them. It is instructive for the peoples that while the governments of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries prepared for the 20th of September, the opening of the General Assembly of the United Nations, with new proposals on disarmament and other constructive proposals, the leaders of NATO scheduled for this same day, military exercises which they themselves described as the biggest ever. True, in his statement Admiral Dennison called this a pure coincidence, but we wonder whether there is a single man in the world who believes this. This demonstration was obviously designed to be a show of strength, but in this respect it was a waste of expenditure and a futile effort, because the other party cannot be frightened. And those who can show the peoples nothing else than military exercises, do not give evidence of their strength, but reveal their complete lack of goodwill and their political weakness.

The most urgent task of the United Nations in the defence of peace, a task which cannot be further delayed, is to condemn most resolutely the sabre-rattling, the cold-war manoeuvres and aggression against the sovereignty of states. One of the greatest dangers to the peace of the peoples is represented by aggressive German militarism, revived and increased in strength with the money, weapons, political and administrative support of the NATO powers. Revanchist declarations are an everyday occurrence in West Germany. The memorandum of the West German generals demanding atomic weapons aroused even western public opinion. How is it possible that leaders of nations could so soon forget the sacrifices, the lessons of history, the solemn declarations on the destruction of German imperialism, and the international treaties concluded to that end? Is it really so long ago that French, British, and American soldiers—not to mention the immense sufferings and sacrifices of other peoples—were killed in large numbers in the murderous war of German imperialism? No, this was not so long ago. The widows, orphans, the invalids are still alive, and the peoples, including the Hungarian people, have not forgotten. On the contrary, they demand a decisive curb on revived German imperialism, the liquidation of the remnants of war, the conclusion of a peace treaty with the two existing German states.

The Hungarian people witnessed how their total national income of five years, all the results of five years' work of the entire nation, was burnt to ashes in the Second World War. They lost nearly 8 per cent of the adult population, over half-a-million human lives, approximately as many as did the United States with a population 17 times as great as that of Hungary. In their own country our people have already wiped out the imperialistic rule of monopoly capital, the source of war. In our country there is no one profiting by armaments and speculating on war. Inciting hatred among peoples and warmongering is prohibited by law. Our people have every reason to hate war and imperialism. They want to live in peace with other peoples. They want to work and enjoy the more and more abundant harvest of their work in peace in the future as well.

It is also the view of the Hungarian people that mankind now has but two alternatives. The issue is whether the epoch-making achievements of science will cause the unprecedented destruction of human lives, or a rich and happy future is in store for mankind. The choice is not difficult for the peoples, and the solution can also be found. First of all, it is necessary that the influential circles in the United States return to their senses from the bankrupt policy of strength, realize the

failure of "cold war," apparent to all, and show, right at this General Assembly, readiness to start negotiations on general and complete disarmament. This would strengthen peace and would result in new economic prosperity, would give a stimulus to the peaceful competition of the two social systems, and the working people would immensely gain by it both in the East and in the West.

On behalf of the government of the Hungarian People's Republic, our delegation fully supports the Soviet proposal on general and complete disarmament submitted to the last session of the General Assembly and then unanimously endorsed in principle. We also support the latest proposals of the Soviet delegation because they are designed to enhance the possibility of achieving disarmament.

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates:

The whole of mankind follows closely and with sympathy the large-scale and dramatic struggle of the colonial peoples for their liberation. The time is indeed ripe for the complete and final liquidation of the colonial system, all the more so because the colonial system, this shameful product of imperialism, is an ever-present source of conflicts. Its liquidation will represent a great stride forward on the road to the final elimination of wars threatening the lives of millions of people.

The colonialists have for long hampered the oppressed colonial peoples in their development, subjected them to economic exploitation. In a barbaric way they exterminated the populations of colonial countries by the millions. We have heard here the representative of the Belgian imperialists who had for so long kept the Congolese people in serfdom, praising his masters for giving the Congolese people independence and saying that they performed their latest military actions only in order to protect Belgian women and children. However, they forgot to mention that the security of the Belgian citizens living there was not threatened by the peaceful people of Congo, but only, and solely by the provocations of the imperialists.

They forgot to speak about the fact that for many years the Belgian colonizers had cut off the hands of thousands of Congolese men, women and children for refusing delivery of ivory and latex. No word was said either of such horrors as were disclosed by the contemporary author Edmund D. Morel in his book entitled "The Black Man's Burden." It appears from data given in that book that at the beginning of the Belgian rule even the most modest estimates did not put the Congolese population at less than 20 million. According to the data of the 1911 census, however, which were not published in Belgium

but were reported in a British consular dispatch, the inhabitants of the Congo numbered only 8 and a half million. This means that nearly 12 million Congolese were killed in less than 25 years. And this is only the lowest estimate.

Some colonialists, in their hypocrisy, now don the white toga and claim that it is they who liberated the people of the former colony in question. This is false presentation. The colonialists only robbed the colonial peoples of their freedom, and it is not they who "give" it to them, but the colonial peoples themselves in a strenuous struggle are regaining now the freedom of which they were robbed.

The colonialists claim that they have "civilized" and "educated" the colonial peoples. Moreover, they are even contemplating whether the peoples of their colonies are mature enough for an independent national life. But everybody knows that long before the appearance of the colonizers there already existed the ancient Chinese, Indian, Indonesian cultures and civilizations, the high-standard Arabian astronomy and mathematics, and mighty and well-organized African states. They are speaking about education. All of us listened here, in turn, to speeches by Mr. Nkrumah, President of the Republic of Ghana, by Mr. Fidel Castro, Prime Minister of Cuba, by Dr. Sukarno, President of the Republic of Indonesia, and other prominent representatives of former colonial, semi-colonial peoples. Many of the unsolicited "teachers" and "educators" may well learn from their humaneness, sense of responsibility, and the able judgement of true statesmen. Last but not least, they deserve high respect for their great moral courage in the face of imperialism.

Those who thus far profited by the colonial system should understand that false excuses or the distortion of truth have no longer any effect in this question. They should take cognizance of the fact that the time for the complete liquidation of colonial rule has come. The course of history has quickened. The foundations of the colonial system have been shaken so much that any attempt to obstruct the progress of liberation will not stop but accelerate it.

Some delegates in the general debate attempted to divert attention from the colonies and from the real colonialists by casting rude slanders at the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. This is a futile attempt. Even children know that the colonies and semi-colonies are in Asia, Africa and South America, and that the main footholds of the colonizers and the colonial system are not in Eastern Europe but in Western Europe and North America. It cannot



be laid at the door of the colonial peoples that the countries which were for a long time objects of the colonizers' exploitation, have, so to say, no industry, their agriculture is backward, primitive, more than 90 per cent of their population, as is often the case, is illiterate and starving, and the average span of life is 30 to 35 years.

In my country nearly two thirds of the national income is produced by industry. Our agriculture is progressing. The annual rate of industrial development on the average of the years 1920 to 1945 was one per cent, while during the period since the liberation of Hungary the yearly increase in industrial production has been 11 per cent on the average. During the 15 years since Liberation, the number of secondary-school students has risen from 52,000 to 204,000, that of university students from 11,500 to 34,500; illiteracy has completely vanished. The average span of life has increased from 48 in 1930, to 65 years of age by now, that is by 17 years. Not even in their own countries can the gentlemen of colonialism claim such a rate of development, not to speak of the nations they held in subjugation.

How dare anybody slander the relationship between my country and the Soviet Union when my people owe their vigorous development of the past 15 years to a great degree to the manifold unselfish economic and cultural assistance given by the Soviet Union in accordance with the principles of socialism? There is no foreign capital in our country, and we pay dividends to no one. Within the framework of the Soviet-Hungarian trade relations, more than 80 per cent of what the Soviet Union delivers to Hungary is in the form of raw materials, energy and semi-finished products, in exchange for products of which over 80 per cent are industrial. The leaders of the capitalist countries are proficient in trade, and they know what this means. They cannot name a single capitalist country which would maintain such favourable trade relations with a smaller and less developed country. None exists, for this would be in contradiction to the plundering nature of imperialism.

The government and the people of the Hungarian People's Republic uphold the idea of freedom. They warmly welcome the victorious Cuban revolution, and are in solidarity with the peoples of Algeria and the Congo. They wish all peoples who are still in colonial or semi-colonial subjugation to win their complete national independence soon.

From the point of view of the liquidation of the colonial system, our delegation would consider it desirable for any country whose

imperialists were formerly oppressors of a given country, to be excluded from all activities concerned with the liberation of that colonial country. In such a way the United Nations could prevent various possible provocations and the maintenance in some other disguised form of former oppression. The principle of rendering assistance to the former colonial countries is just, in so far as it is ensured that such assistance is rendered without conditions violating the political or economic independence of the recipient countries. It could be done, and would be a real proof of goodwill, if the party which earlier extracted large profits from that country would pay a fair and reasonable compensation to the people of the liberated country.

The Hungarian delegation is in support of the Soviet proposal for the complete liquidation of the colonial system, of its discussion by the General Assembly and of the adoption of the draft declaration. By adopting the proposal, the General Assembly of the United Nations would increase the prestige of this world organization in the eyes of the peoples.

When, by way of the liquidation of the colonial system, all peoples capable of independent national life have been freed and their countries have become members of the United Nations, the universality of this organization will also be realized in the true sense of the word. It is absurd, however, to talk either about the universality of the United Nations or about the representation of the whole of mankind, unless the representatives of the People's Republic of China, comprising 650 million people, have taken their rightful seat in the United Nations Organization. We have only to think of it, and it becomes evident immediately, that he who is opposed to the People's Republic of China taking her seat in the United Nations, is opposed also to the attainment of a comprehensive agreement on disarmament. The spokesmen of the People's Republic of China are absolutely right in saying that they consider themselves bound only by those international agreements in the preparation of which they have participated.

It is the duty of the United Nations to put an end to that narrow-minded, selfish great-power policy injurious to all, by which the delegation of the United States has for years prevented the People's Republic of China from taking her rightful place in the United Nations. Great responsibility devolves upon every delegation in dealing with this question. The delegation of the United Kingdom, for instance, whose government maintains diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China, knows very well that the so-called



"question of Tibet" is an artificially conceived product of cold war and the slandering of the People's Republic of China. It is at the same time a question fiercely debated among U.N. member states. In spite of this, the delegation of the United Kingdom in the General Committee pronounced in favour of inclusion of the question on the agenda. On the other hand, it went so far as to oppose inclusion of the question of Chinese representation on the grounds that it was a question much disputed among member states and that the debate on this question would spoil the atmosphere of the General Assembly. What is this? Is there nothing wrong in creating antagonism by a debate on the "question of Tibet?" Is it only the question of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China that we should not discuss in order not to "spoil" the atmosphere of the General Assembly? It is high time to cease to deal with important questions in such a manner. The question of Chinese representation in the United Nations is already over-ripe: it should be solved, and it would increase the prestige of the United Nations, the efficiency of its deliberations and the strength of its decisions. My delegation stands for the enforcement of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China, and is in support of the admission to the United Nations of the People's Republic of Mongolia.

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates:

I should like to raise another question as well. In accordance with the rules of procedure the so-called "provisional agenda" was already distributed to the member states in July this year. In that agenda the respective agencies of the United Nations and different member states proposed 73 items to be included on the agenda of the Fifteenth Session of the General Assembly. Whoever is interested in the pressing issues concerning mankind, disarmament, Algeria, the Congo, and in other great issues, took this document in hand with expectation. We were surprised that the government of the United States, which in words is a follower of peace and has a high opinion of the United Nations, had not submitted any question for this provisional agenda.

It is not without interest, however, that when thereafter, on August 20th, the Soviet Union proposed a new item, on that very day the United States submitted another proposal, so to speak, in reply to the former. The proposal of the Soviet Union was numbered 8, and that of the United States bore Number 9. The Soviet Union proposed that the General Assembly should discuss the aggressive actions of the United States against the Soviet Union. The United States pro-

posed a debate on the so-called "question of Hungary." This in itself makes it clear to anybody concerned with questions of international life when and for what purposes the United States needs the "question of Hungary" in the United Nations.

Everybody is well aware that the much disputed 1956 events in Hungary are outworn questions, settled by history, and belonging to the past. It is also commonly known that the so-called "question of Hungary" in the General Assembly or in its Committees, is nothing else but a pure intrigue in the service of the cold war and the campaign of slanders against two member states of the U.N., the Hungarian People's Republic and the Soviet Union. The main target is, of course, not the Hungarian People's Republic. We, Hungarians, are sometimes inclined to believe that the earth revolves around us, but even we do not believe that the influential circles of the United States see Hungary as the main obstacle in the realization of their plans for world domination.

Everything that has happened in the United Nations so far in the so-called "question of Hungary" is unworthy of this world organization, but is equally unworthy of the government of the United States of America. The people in different countries, including the Hungarian people, today would expect this government to take clear and positive steps with a view to lessening tension, to promoting disarmament and a lasting peace. The responsible leaders of the United States are gravely mistaken if they believe they can substitute for these expected positive steps U-2 flights in springtime and the hasty raising of the trumped-up "questions of Hungary and Tibet" in autumn. Today people are familiar with politics to such an extent that no government can save its prestige and influence with such actions. The so-called "question of Hungary" in the United Nations has to do with the cold war and many other things, but it has nothing to do with Hungarian reality, nor has it anything to do with the objectives laid down in the Charter of this world organization. It has also something to do with U.S.-Hungarian interstate relations, which, as is commonly known, are not yet good. There are, indeed, a number of unsettled issues in our relations. These issues with one exception can be settled extremely easily. We are ready to settle them, and we are firmly confident that, sooner or later, they will be solved in a manner satisfactory for both parties. We are confident because we are aware that even the most malevolent people are unable to point out any single question in which the interests of the American and the Hungarian people are in conflict. On the contrary,

we are of the opinion that the Hungarian and the American people have common interests in safeguarding peace, shaping friendship between them, normalizing relations between the two countries.

I have something to say about the only serious issue of U.S.-Hungarian relations, an issue difficult to settle because it also has international aspects. In times of peace, U.S.-Hungarian relations were correct when it was possible to establish them. These relations have deteriorated only since 1947; I must stress, since 1947, not—as many seem to believe—since 1956. U.S.-Hungarian relations were good, even cordial, at a time when aristocrats, landlords and big capitalists were in power in Hungary. These relations have been giving trouble only since the government and power in Hungary passed into the hands of workers and peasants. From this we have drawn the conclusion that what lies behind our unsatisfactory relations, and even behind the pressing in the United Nations of the so-called “question of Hungary,” is actually the fact that only one thing really annoys the governmental circles of the United States—they do not like the social system of the Hungarian People's Republic.

As is well known, the United Nations Organization was created by various countries, some with socialist and some with capitalist systems, precisely with a view to ensuring peaceful coexistence among countries with differing social systems, their friendship and cooperation in solving the common problems concerning the vital interests of mankind. The founding members knew full well, and it is time for everybody to acknowledge, that there exist in the world countries with differing social systems. Moreover, they have all to understand that these countries must coexist simultaneously, in peace, in normal interstate relationships, side by side. This is inevitable.

The Hungarian working people have definitely put an end to the power and exploiting activity of big capitalists and landlords, and have created for themselves a socialist state and society. In this they live now and will live in the future as well. This is a historically accomplished and unalterable fact, a product of the laws of society which are effective independently of the will of individuals. U.S.-Hungarian relations would at once return to normal, and even the U.N. would at once extricate itself from a conflicting cold-war issue imposed on it, if the government of the United States, listening to reason, were to acknowledge this fact, the alteration of which is actually beyond its competence and possibilities.

The social order of the Hungarian People's Republic is a domestic affair of Hungary, in which the Hungarian people and their constitu-

tional organs alone are competent. I rendered account of the government measures, much discussed here, to the Hungarian National Assembly on May 9th, 1957. The National Assembly, whose session was attended by all but two of the representatives, unanimously approved of all measures taken by the government. Under Hungarian law, the Hungarian government is responsible only to the National Assembly, and to no one else in the world. The latest general elections in Hungary were held in November 1958. In our country there is universal and equal suffrage by secret ballot, and all citizens over 18 years of age have the right to vote. The candidates of the Patriotic People's Front received 97 per cent of the votes cast by those enfranchised. This is how the present National Assembly was constituted which elected our present government. Our lawful government conducts the affairs of the country, enjoying the confidence of the people. This is known also to those who are intriguing against us. They also know full well that in vain do they cast aspersions on us, neither slanders nor resolutions imposed in the U.N. can alter this fact.

The Hungarian delegation has come to participate in the work of the General Assembly with the intention of contributing as best it can to a constructive solution of the really great and important problems. To cold-war intrigues and slanders the Hungarian delegation answers, fully aware of the justice, of the moral and material strength of the Hungarian people and of the whole socialist camp, in the spirit of the efforts to ease international tension. These efforts require us to take a clear position. I have to say frankly that we regard the resolutions adopted so far by the General Assembly on the so-called “question of Hungary” as inadmissible attempts to interfere with the domestic affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic. We are confident that the day will come—if not now, then at a later date—when the General Assembly itself will invalidate its own unlawful resolutions on the so-called “question of Hungary” as actions contrary to the Charter.

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates:

There are some who ask for information on the situation in Hungary. Is there indeed anybody here who does not know that for several years in Hungary a legal order and regular public life have been prevailing which would seem enviable for many a capitalist country?

Our people are working unremittingly and zealously, and as the result of their work industrial production has increased by about



36 per cent, agricultural production by 12 per cent during the last four years. Living standards on the average have gone up by 24 per cent, and the real wages of industrial workers increased by 32 per cent in the last three and a half years. Health and cultural conditions are equally good. Seventy-five per cent of the population is covered by the free health and accident insurance. May I mention, for example, that the eminent American scientist, Dr. Sabin, has been to Hungary recently. He could see that in our country there was not a single case of infantile paralysis in the critical months of this year. He suggested that Hungarian physicians should undertake to instruct specialists of other countries, since they had given an excellent example of how to organize vaccination covering all children, and other relevant measures.

Let those who are interested in our conditions come to us and see the situation in our country with their own eyes. Since the well-known events thousands of tourists and hundreds of newspapermen from the West, including many Americans, have visited Hungary. There were among them U.N. high officials, U.S. State Department aides, senators, public figures, etc. In Hungary there are diplomats of the United States and of all the big western capitalist countries. Represented in the General Assembly are a number of neutral countries whose leaders, eminent statesmen, have been to our country in recent years. Please ask them about the situation in Hungary.

I admit, we did not furnish official information to some gentlemen who had been charged with so-called "commissions." Neither did we give information to Mr. Munro in respect to whom, the other day at a meeting of the General Committee, the representative of the United States, in reply to the question as to whom Mr. Munro actually represented said—obviously in a slip of the tongue—that he represented the United States. Nor did we supply information to Mr. Hammarskjöld at the time when he had been commissioned to investigate. The General Assembly must know, however, that since Mr. Hammarskjöld got rid of his burdensome commission, we have repeatedly invited him to visit Hungary. It seems, he has been unable to come owing to pressure of work. I can assure you that whenever any officer of the United Nations wishes to visit Hungary without being specially commissioned to deal with a cold-war issue, we shall receive him with due courtesy and hospitality.

I stress all this in order to make it clear that we do not raise objections to certain personalities, nor do we have secrets to hide, but it is simply our firm standpoint that we do not allow anyone to

interfere in the domestic affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic. Many recent experiences have only strengthened the Hungarian government's belief in the correctness of its attitude.

It was not long ago that Mr. Lumumba, prime minister of the legal Congo government, relying on the justice of the cause of his people, found it advisable to ask the United Nations for assistance in overcoming certain difficulties. The Secretary General of the United Nations complied with the request and the fundamentally correct decision of the Security Council in such a way that all the difficulties have remained, even increased; he has completely undermined the foundations of that government and, ignoring even the standpoint of the legislative body of the country, he has made its functioning impossible. Everybody knows that it happened like that. No one should be surprised then if the peoples and the countries, however just their cause may be, are compelled for the time being to have reservations concerning any cooperation with the U.N. apparatus.

#### Distinguished Delegates:

There are some who are eager to know when the Soviet troops will be withdrawn from Hungary. Soviet troops are stationed in Hungary pursuant to the relevant agreement concluded by member states of the Warsaw Treaty. Their withdrawal is subject to the decision of the contracting parties, including the government of the Hungarian People's Republic, not to the desire of western strategists. This, in fact, is a problem only to western military leaders, not to the United Nations, let alone the Hungarian people. The Hungarian people get on well with those Soviet troops that liberated them from the rule of terror of nazi-fascist armies and from the counter-revolutionary, fascist forces of the Horthy regime which had placed the country into the hands of the Hitlerites. Our people are indebted to the Soviet Army for their reconquered national independence and their present peaceful and secure life.

As is well known, the member states of the Warsaw Treaty proposed to the member states of NATO the conclusion of a pact of non-aggression, and even to liquidate the organizations of the Warsaw Treaty and of NATO simultaneously. In concert with the governments of all socialist countries, including the Hungarian People's Republic, the Soviet Union in her proposal on general and complete disarmament also proposed the withdrawal, behind their own frontiers, of all military units stationed abroad. Well, here are the ways and means, here are the proposals which are still valid. All that is necessary is to accept and implement them, and then there



will be no foreign military units in any one of the countries of the world.

Some say that with the help of Soviet troops we defeated an uprising they claim to have been "national." What we defeated, however, was not a "national" uprising but a counter-revolutionary *putsch*, and we did so in a couple of days. This counter-revolutionary *putsch* was organized abroad; it had been prepared for many years by international reactionary forces. International reaction mobilized for this attempted *putsch* the small groups of reactionaries existing in the country, misled a few people, but it could not get close to the main masses of the Hungarian people which are loyal to socialism.

Perhaps the French delegation could tell the General Assembly what a really national uprising looks like. Let anybody cast a glance at Algeria. What is happening there? Not a couple of days, but even six years have not been enough for the French colonizers' army, half-a-million strong and equipped with all kinds of modern weapons, to defeat that uprising, even after having killed hundreds of thousands of Algerian patriots. They cannot and never will defeat it, for it is a really national uprising that is going on there with the support of the main popular masses, not a counter-revolutionary *putsch* as was the case in Budapest in 1956.

Certain well-known quarters, to whom Chiang Kai-shek, Adenauer, Speidel, the nazi general, and their like are democrats, maintain that we are not democrats. To be quite frank, we do not even wish to be democrats to their liking. Our system, however, is more democratic than the systems of those who are accusing us. The Hungarian people's power brushed aside the dictatorship of monopolies—fascism. It put an end to religious discrimination and racial persecution, to privileges derived from birth and financial standing, and has ensured free development for the whole nation, for every citizen of the country.

True, the courts of the Hungarian People's Republic passed and will pass sentence upon those who plot against the lawful order of the country, upon murderers of progressive people. There was much ado about this in certain quarters. Our slanderers, however, keep quiet about the fact—although they are well aware of it—that more than three-quarters of those who had been taken to task for their counter-revolutionary acts committed in 1956, have been set at liberty, for the most part by amnesty, and have returned to normal life. They keep quiet also about the fact that the number of those

in prison in Hungary now is less than at any time since Hungary was established as an organized state.

What lies behind all this is, of course, not the humanitarianism of our accusers. The present-day critics of the Hungarian People's Republic were very much reconciled to Horthy, the sanguinary hangman of the Hungarian people, and his fascist system. He butchered the best sons of the Hungarian people, indeed, and caused them to languish in prison. This, however, did not annoy our accusers, because those people were not enemies of the people's power, but communist and non-communist patriots, fighting against fascism.

These are our accusers, and such are the charges laid against us. We also could put a question of pure principle to the General Assembly without naming anybody. Is it all right for a government, if it does not like the lawful government, say, of Guatemala, Laos, or any other country, to finance a *putsch* by supplying arms and hiring traitors in order to overthrow that government? Is it all right for a government, if it does not like the social system of the socialist countries, to allocate a fund of 100 million dollars a year, to maintain radio stations to incite against it, and to hire fascist, counter-revolutionary renegades to undermine that system?

If it were not known whom all this concerns, and if some were not dependent on them or were not afraid of them, everybody would say, "No, that is not quite right." Everybody would say that this is contrary to all accepted rules of international law and to the Charter. We would suggest to the U.N. General Assembly that, instead of tolerating aspersions to be cast at the government of the Hungarian People's Republic, which does not threaten any single country, it should denounce the government which even at present is bringing from outside discord, unrest, civil war and bloodshed into the life of the peoples of so many countries.

Despite the cold-war campaign, the Hungarian People's Republic is strengthening and developing further. But there are also victims in the cold war. We regard the overwhelming majority of Hungarian defectors as unfortunate victims of cold-war propaganda. From among the people who under the influence of mendacious imperialist propaganda had left their country, more than 40,000 have already returned home, and a still greater number of them would gladly return if they were not prevented from doing so for the time being by various obstacles and financial difficulties. Every Hungarian living far from his country, unless he has definitely lost his human character, is waiting for the day when he will be able to go home. The defectors

lead mostly a storm-tossed life. But even those who get along financially know full well that their place is wherever their people live, and there is no amount of richness that can substitute for the homeland, the home bread, the relish of the waters of the Danube and Tisza rivers. The affairs of my country are in order. It offers every honest working man rights, human dignity, good living and a home not to be found outside the country, and waits for the return of its sons who went astray.

I am going to speak of two more questions concerning Hungary. Our delegation has come here to attend the U.N. General Assembly session. The United States and the Hungarian People's Republic maintain diplomatic relations. The U.S. authorities should have, therefore, even a double reason for ensuring us, here in New York, the rights and conditions required by international practice. Despite all this, the U.S. authorities informed me of a measure restricting my movements, a measure offensive to my people and my government. Although it is not to us and to our colleagues who have been treated similarly, and even not to our peoples, that this measure is a disgrace, but only to those who devised it—I protest against it on principle.

I personally have often been a target of attacks in this hall. Allow me, Mr. President, therefore, to make a personal remark. I am a Hungarian worker. For my ideological convictions I had to suffer a great deal of persecution by the Horthyite fascist system and by German fascists who occupied my country at the time. But I have always acted in accordance with my conviction and conscience. Man can make mistakes and be in error, but I feel I am serving a just cause, and I am proud that at a grave hour of history, taking a stand for my working class and my Hungarian people that had suffered so much, I was together with my faithful colleagues where I had to be, and did what I had to do.

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates:

I am going to conclude my speech. Our delegation is of the opinion that the General Assembly, putting aside the issues which serve only cold-war purposes, must concentrate its attention on questions of really high significance. We must strive for success in the questions of disarmament and the colonial system.

Certain quarters are trumpeting in the western press that the U.N. has come to a crisis because the socialist countries have proposed to create, instead of the post of Secretary General, three Secretaryships. As a matter of fact, the present situation absolutely requires

that, in order to avoid partiality, the NATO block, the socialist countries, and the countries that do not belong to either group, be represented by one Secretary each. Such an executive body could very well function, possibly with the three Secretaries alternating with one another in presiding at the monthly meetings of the Secretariat. Why should there be only one Secretary General who, in interpreting and implementing the resolutions, is partial to the interests of one of the existing groups of states, and prejudiced against the interests of the two other groups?

The United Nations has not come to a crisis, rather it can now become what it ought to have always been according to the intentions of its founders. True, a crisis is confronting the conception that has thus far been prevailing here, namely that the United Nations should not be anything else than a dependency of the State Department of the United States. This might have been good for the Government of the United States, but was not good for the whole of the member states, for mankind. The United Nations will come to a crisis only if it allows its activity to be paralysed and allows itself to be reduced to the rank of an arena for mere talk.

A dangerous attempt to achieve this aim is, in fact, the plot concocted in the General Committee by the U.S. delegation in order to paralyse the work of the General Assembly. The General Assembly must not tolerate that the problems of vital interest to mankind be submerged in the maze of committee deliberations, and that it should be able to discuss in plenary session, besides the question of the Congo proposed by the Soviet Union, only the two cold-war issues fabricated by the United States, the so-called "questions of Tibet and of Hungary." This would be a fatal mistake. A considerable part of the delegations here are unable to accept such a proposal, and this could place the United Nations itself in a grave and, at the same time, a ridiculous situation before the whole world. Perhaps this is the intention of the United States delegation?

It is obvious that the imperialist forces and tendencies are still present and active in international politics, and in the United Nations as well. Those who cling to the past, do not easily give up their aims. But, fortunately for the peoples, one of the main features of the international situation is the fact that the forces of peace and progress are immense and are growing stronger. They are able to curb the sinister forces of war. Mankind has every reason to nurture the hope for a peaceful and happier future.

## FORWARD AHEAD ON THE TESTED PATH

ARTICLE PUBLISHED IN *NÉPSZABADSÁG*

December 25th, 1960

The historic Moscow Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of 81 countries ended not long ago. The Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties focused its attention on questions determining peace and socialism, the future of all mankind.

The present is arduous and laden with troubles and anxieties, and the future is insecure for people still living in the capitalist world today. But people in the capitalist countries, who are groping for a firmer footing in life, are coming to realize more and more that capitalism signifies humiliation, and communism freedom for man; that capitalism means insecurity, and communism a secure future and good life; that capitalism spells the everlasting threat of war, and communism eternal peace for mankind. That is why, over and above the most class-conscious members of the working class, wide masses of people in every country welcomed the achievements of the Moscow Meeting with great satisfaction.

The Moscow Meeting reaffirmed and strengthened the hopes of all people who believe in social progress and look forward to the triumph of peace. It is the great—we may really say epoch-making—achievement of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties that, following a thorough and comradely exchange of opinions and on the basis of three years of experience, it unanimously reaffirmed the main line of the international communist movement as given in the Moscow Statement and Peace Appeal adopted in 1957. The Meeting performed a great historical act by reinforcing the ideological unity and unity of action of the international communist movement, strengthening solidarity among the socialist countries, and ensuring closer unity in the struggles ahead.

Practice is the test of theory. The creative application of Marxism, as expressed in the 1957 Statement, brought about new successes of world-wide importance in improving the international situation,

speeding up constructive labour in the socialist countries, in the stormy upsurge of the world communist movement, in the achievements of the anti-imperialist national liberation struggles, and in the defence of peace. The correctness and effectiveness of the 1957 Statement are demonstrated by the strengthening of the world socialist system, its striking technical and scientific superiority over the capitalist world, the intensified disintegration of the colonial system, the ever deepening political crisis of imperialism, and by the rapid growth of the camp of the anti-war forces and the champions of social progress.

This political line strengthened the unity in ideology and action of the international revolutionary working-class movement and has made the socialist camp into an invincible power. It was only by pursuing this policy that the revolutionary working-class movement could triumph over the tendencies of Right opportunism, over the treacherous activity of the modern revisionists disguised as "supporters of communism." It has also become evident that only creative Marxism-Leninism is able to overcome the rigid "Left" errors and methods which have caused serious harm to the international communist movement. The continued consolidation of the socialist camp and the broadening of the peace zone have given powerful support to the colonial peoples fighting for national independence, and has also contributed decisively to a number of peoples winning their freedom during the last three years, despite the enraged resistance and the intrigues of imperialism.

The 1957 Statement, which embodies several new theses of Marxist-Leninist theory, has proved correct in all domains. This enables us to conclude that the international communist movement must continue to follow this path which has proved correct in practice. It was this that enabled the Meeting held in November 1960, on the basis of the new factors and by further elaborating the theoretical concepts given in the 1957 documents, to lay down, in the recently issued Statement and Appeal, a new and magnificent plan of action for the next few years for the entire world communist movement, and for every communist and workers' party.

The membership of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Hungarian working people enthusiastically greeted the results of the Moscow Meeting and its Statement and Appeal.

In the years following Liberation, the Hungarian people soon became convinced by their own experience about the superiority of socialism over capitalism. In less than a decade the Hungarian work-



ing masses wielding popular power, transformed their homeland from a backward agrarian country into an industrial-agrarian country. Industrial output more than trebled, and the national income almost doubled. Unemployment was wiped out, and the living standard and consumption of the Hungarian workers, working peasants and the entire population, were raised considerably. Illiteracy was abolished in our country, and the cultural revolution made sweeping progress. Early in the 1950's, however, there was a break in the socialist development of Hungary, owing to the extensive spread of the cult of the individual. Moreover, the mistakes that were committed made it possible for the revisionist traitors and the class enemy to launch a general attack against the people's power. Under the circumstances which are well known, they pushed the country to the outbreak of the counter-revolutionary uprising.

Hungary is today securely progressing along the path of socialist construction, and having completely laid the foundations for a socialist society, the country will soon enter on a new and higher stage of development. We, Hungarian communists, and, we may unhesitatingly say, the broad masses of the Hungarian working people as well, trace the favourable turn in the situation back to the struggle initiated in 1953, and consistently waged by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, headed by Comrade Khrushchov, with the aim of eliminating the cult of the individual, which distorted Marxism-Leninism, and of removing the barriers to progress.

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. took the bold initiative to restore the Leninist norms in party life and to relax the rigidity that paralysed party activity and public life, thus liberating enormous creative power. This struggle gave fresh impetus to the great constructive work of the Soviet people and to the struggle of the entire international working-class movement as well. The historic Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was an epoch-making milestone in this true Leninist policy. Analyzing the new historical conditions and generalizing the new experiences and possibilities of the revolutionary struggle, this Congress with its theoretical conclusions laid down the up-to-date strategy and tactics of the international revolutionary working-class movement. The Moscow Statement of 1957, which gave great inspiration to every communist and workers' party of the world, was formulated with consideration for the conclusions of the Twentieth Congress and the common fighting experiences of all the communist and workers' parties.

The difficulties which came to a head in autumn 1956 in Hungary assumed a grave form and proportions because the then leaders of our party ignored the lessons of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U., and failed to overcome the harmful cult of the individual and its consequences.

The obvious achievements of our party in the last four years spring from the ideological guidance given by the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and subsequently by the main line set forth by the Moscow Statement adopted in 1957. We believe that the regeneration in the international communist movement, which brought so many valuable attainments to the cause of the international working class, commenced with the Twentieth Congress and was reinforced by the Statement adopted in 1957. This new upswing speeded up the development of the world socialist system, added to the superiority of the socialist camp as compared to the imperialist camp, broadened the peace zone constituted by the socialist countries and the neutral countries, and strengthened the forces of peace and their organization throughout the world.

At the Moscow Meeting we, the representatives of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, were also able to state that, following the principles of the Moscow Statement adopted in 1957, a new and sound development came about in recent years in our country as in the other countries of the world socialist system. The Hungarian People's Republic has in the last few years not only recovered from the shocks caused by the 1956 counter-revolution, but in fact has made vigorous new advances. Since 1957, industrial output has gone up some 40 per cent, agricultural production rose about 12 per cent in Hungary, and the living standard of the population has increased correspondingly. The links between the party and the masses have become stronger than ever before, and social transformation in the countryside has also advanced considerably. Today, about 80 per cent of the country's arable land belongs to the socialist sector, and the time is close at hand when the socialist transformation of the countryside will be completed in our country, too, thus laying the groundwork for a socialist society.

We relearned from the lessons of a bloody counter-revolutionary uprising that neither Right compromise nor Left deviation can be tolerated, for both may cause serious harm not only to one party and to one people, but to the entire international working class as well.

All the good experiences of our party prove that the key to successful progress is consistent devotion to principles, the preserva-

tion of the ideological purity of Marxism-Leninism. Thus, historical experience of the recent past explains why the Hungarian communists, and public opinion in the Hungarian People's Republic, welcomed with such great joy the Statement and Appeal, based on the unimpaired ideas of Marxism-Leninism, which was issued by the Moscow Meeting a few weeks ago.

For over 40 years, imperialism has ceased to be the undivided ruler of the world. Today the world socialist system exists and is becoming a more and more decisive and determining factor in social development. There is full realism and deep truth in the thesis of the Statement of the Communist and Workers' Parties that the forces of socialism are growing rapidly, while "...A new stage has begun in the development of the general crisis of capitalism... This stage is distinguished by the fact that it has set in not as a result of the world war, but in the conditions of competition and struggle between the two systems, an increasing change in the balance of forces in favour of socialism, and a marked aggravation of all the contradictions of imperialism. It has taken place at a time when a successful struggle by the peace-loving forces to bring about and promote peaceful coexistence has prevented the imperialists from undermining world peace by their aggressive actions, and in an atmosphere of growing struggle by the broad masses of the people for democracy, national liberation and socialism."

These changes in the balance of forces, and the growing scope of the laws of socialism, make possible a new way of solving the various vital problems of society; it becomes possible to put an end to wars destroying mankind, and more favourable conditions arise for promoting social progress.

The fundamental principle laid down in the Statement adopted by the communist and workers' parties is that the existence, increasing power, military potential and international influence of the world socialist system, and the broad and growing front of the anti-imperialist, peace-loving forces fighting for national independence and for economic and social advancement, constitute a powerful deterrent in the world today. And if we rally these forces, they will be able to remove the threat of a war that promises to be more destructive than any previous one.

The historical evolution has already taken place of the actual forces which are capable of curbing the aggressive forces of imperialism. In the age of triumphantly advancing socialism, wars between states are no longer fatalistically inevitable. Imperialism still

exists and is strong; the economic basis giving rise to wars—capitalism—exists. War is, however, not merely an economic phenomenon. In his report to the Twentieth Congress, Comrade Khrushchov said: "Whether there is to be a war or not depends in large measure on the correlation of class political forces, the degree of organization and the awareness and resolve of the people. Moreover, in certain conditions the struggle waged by progressive social and political forces may play a decisive role." These words were spoken almost five years ago, and life has substantiated them. In five years' time, there has been a tremendous growth in the organized strength and resolve of the people in their struggle against destructive wars and to defend peace; the relations of class and political forces have shifted in favour of the working class, that is, in favour of peace. All this shows that the vigilance and determined peace struggle of progressive forces is capable of thwarting the imperialists.

Communist activity aimed at preventing war is not a tactical move. As given in the Statement adopted unanimously by the recent Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties: "The communists regard it as their historical mission not only to abolish exploitation and poverty on a world scale and rule out for all time the possibility of any kind of war in the life of human society, but also to deliver mankind from the nightmare of a new world war already in our time. The communist parties will devote all their strength and energy to this great historical mission."

This endeavour of the communists follows primarily from the fact that, in the struggle for the triumph of the socialist revolution, the communist parties, the parties of the working class, always regarded it as their principal duty to protect the vital interests of the working people. The major burden of war was always placed on the shoulders of the workers, and working people generally. Therefore, the communist parties have fought to prevent war as long as they have existed. The goals of the communists have always been deeply humanitarian.

We should never forget the grievous consequences modern war would bring to all mankind. The communists know that should the aggressive forces succeed in unleashing a world war, it would mean the final doom of imperialism, for the peoples would refuse to tolerate any longer the survival of this destructive system.

The communist parties, while acknowledging the possibility of averting world war, do not discount the aggressive nature of imperialism. The Hungarian people have also learned through its own



bitter experience that American imperialism, the main force of world reaction, is not relinquishing its aggressive aims; that it interferes in the internal affairs of the peoples, organizes conspiracies, supports all and sundry enemies of the peoples, and time and again commits lawless acts in international affairs. Only the active struggle of the peoples can stay the hands of the aggressors.

In our epoch the peaceful solution of disputed issues between nations must be encouraged by all means, and the mass struggle of the peoples must make peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems a reality. This may not only save mankind from a major catastrophe, but it will also create more favourable conditions, under the given circumstances, for social progress in every country.

Great successes have accrued to the international revolutionary working-class movement from the Leninist policy pursued by our parties: constantly to take the initiative and fight for relaxing international tension, stopping and preventing local wars, and for settling disputes through negotiations. The entire international working-class movement is assisted by the Leninist policy which promotes wider economic, cultural and other contacts; aims at reducing armaments, and to attain disarmament; turns the forums of international diplomacy and social life into platforms for the forces of progress.

At the same time this policy does not yield an inch to the aggressive attempts of the imperialists; it supports and defends the just liberation struggles of the colonial peoples and dependent countries, and champions the anti-imperialist actions of the masses against the pillage of the monopolies, against social backwardness and neo-fascism.

There is not a single detachment of the international revolutionary working-class movement, nor a single people or oppressed class whose battle for immediate and long-range objectives is not aided by the struggle to maintain peace.

The militant unity developing on a wide scale against imperialist reaction is capable not only of preventing the outbreak of a new world war, but at the same time of attacking the capitalist system at its weakest point. The progressive forces are directing their blows at the most reactionary, leading forces of monopoly capital, the chief exploiters and gendarmes of the peoples. These blows are undermining the striking power of monopoly capitalism, restricting its scope of activity, obstructing its predatory endeavours, and are at the same time deepening the internal contradictions of imperialism. This struggle also helps the working class to establish an alliance with

all the progressive forces, including those which are only relatively progressive and oppose the imperialists only temporarily and with vacillation.

In the last three years the mass influence of virtually every single fraternal party has grown considerably, and their contacts with the masses have strengthened both in the socialist and in the capitalist countries. This increased mass influence rests, in the case of every party, on the Leninist policy given in the 1957 Statement and the Statement adopted in 1960. The essential and decisive factor in that policy is the tenacious struggle to prevent imperialist war.

A major basis for cementing the communist party and the broadest masses of the working people, both in societies based on exploitation and in the countries that are building socialism, is the unswerving struggle to avert war and ensure peace, that is, a consistent peace policy. The party can rally through this struggle even segments of society which have not yet reached a level of consciousness necessary for a consistent understanding of all facets of socialist ideology. We may say that, also in our People's Republic building socialism, an all-embracing national unity is developing around the common interest of defending peace and on the platform of socialism at that.

Socialism on the path of realization is proving by the force of example, by the economic and cultural achievements of the socialist countries, by the higher living standards ensured the working masses and by genuine freedom, that it creates better conditions for people than capitalism. The Leninist policy pursued by our parties to ensure peaceful coexistence and further to develop peaceful economic competition, and the series of victories won in the competition, are gradually increasing the power of attraction which socialism holds for the masses of people in the capitalist world; they are revolutionizing the consciousness of the masses, and creating better conditions for the struggle for socialism in these countries.

We, Hungarian communists, are deeply aware of our responsibility in this question. We know that the patriots from capitalist countries with whom we sat together at the Moscow Meeting, and those whom they represent, are also counting on the Hungarian People's Republic.

They expect us, too, to work well and with success in the future—the oppressed people of the world should regard the Hungarian People's Republic, too, as a good example. This is particularly



important, among other reasons, because international reaction tried right and left to blacken the Hungarian People's Republic in connection with the counter-revolution of 1956; and they attempted to use the negative phenomena in Hungary at that time to blacken the ideas of socialism and socialist construction in general. While defending and consolidating its power, the Hungarian people gave a resounding answer to these slanders by recording fresh achievements in socialist construction and will do the same in the future as well.

The strength of the socialist countries is multiplied by the unity of the socialist camp. This unity ensures the independence, peace and internal social order of the fraternal countries against all attempts at imperialist intervention from outside. The failure of the attempted counter-revolutionary *putsch* precipitated with imperialist assistance in Hungary in 1956, and the internationalist aid given the Hungarian revolutionary forces are historic examples reaffirming the conclusion set forth in the recent Statement adopted in Moscow by the communist and workers' parties: "The combined forces of the socialist camp reliably safeguard every socialist country against encroachment by imperialist reaction."

The Central Committee of our party stated in its March 1959 resolution that the existence of the world socialist system and "the complete and final victory of socialism in the Soviet Union also signifies that the accomplishments of socialist construction in Hungary and the other countries building socialism will be permanent, too, to the extent that we remain loyal to proletarian internationalism and faithful and stable members of the socialist camp." The Hungarian people have rallied their ranks since the defeat of the counter-revolution and have proved their devotion to socialism and to the socialist camp in many ways, but primarily by speeding up socialist construction.

The countries of the socialist camp, constituting a unified and unbreakable force, are continuing to build socialism, communism; they are bulwarks of the colonial peoples fighting for liberation, and are safeguarding mankind from the menace of a new world war.

Today, imperialism fears complete collapse, the victory of the socialist revolution in additional countries. The crisis of capitalism is deepening rapidly; the upsurge in the anti-imperialist, democratic and national liberation struggles is shaking the entire system of imperialism to its foundations. In the changed, new conditions of our times diversified and more favourable opportunities have opened up for social progress and the socialist revolution.

The Marxist-Leninist precept which teaches that the socialist revolution is not exportable, and cannot be imported into any country from the outside, remains in force for the future, too. The socialist revolution will develop and become victorious if the objective and subjective conditions for it have come into being within the given country.

The imperialists, however, especially the American imperialists who have adopted the role of policemen of the world, have not given up trying to export counter-revolution. They tried to export counter-revolution to Iraq and Indonesia through conspiracies and stirring up military uprisings. Today they are threatening the victorious people's revolution in Cuba. They want to curb with armed force the national democratic movements of the peoples of Algeria and the Congo. With their intervention they have provoked a civil war in Laos. Day after day the imperialists are slaughtering the best sons of the peoples fighting for their freedom. These crude interventions in the internal affairs of certain countries bring untold suffering to the people, but in the long run cannot hold up progress. The imperialists are becoming more and more exposed before the peoples, and this, too, will hasten the destruction of their rotten system.

The outcome of the Moscow Meeting has dealt a crushing blow to the hopes of the enemies of socialism and of peace who counted on disunity and dissension in the vanguard of the progressive forces, the international communist movement and the socialist countries. The ideologico-political unity of the international communist movement has become still firmer.

The Hungarian communists, our working class and all the working people are proud of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the gigantic accomplishments of the fraternal Soviet people who are building communism. They have a profound respect for the tremendous efforts and outstanding achievements of the great Chinese people and their communist party. They have a feeling of solidarity for, and are working shoulder to shoulder with, the peoples of the countries building socialism and with their communist and socialist parties. They express their militant solidarity with the peace- and freedom-loving masses and all revolutionary detachments of the peoples in the capitalist countries, those liberated from the colonial yoke or who are still kept in dependence. They are convinced that the pledge of our triumphant advance is the solidarity of all forces of progress, loyalty and devotion to our common goal, and above all the firm unity of the international communist movement leading the revolutionary struggles.

We who had the opportunity to attend the Moscow Meeting felt almost tangibly that invincible force shared also by our party and the Hungarian working people. As we listened to the representatives of the communist and workers' parties from five continents, we became more firmly convinced that the torch of communism, of Marxism-Leninism, which was lighted by Marx and Engels and raised on high by Lenin, now burns inextinguishably in every country in the world.

The thorough analysis and the line of struggle given by the Moscow Statement has justified and reaffirmed the policy pursued unceasingly by our party for some four years, in close unity with our working class and working masses. Our people have become convinced through their own experiences of the correctness of this policy, and they expect us to implement it even more consistently.

The Statement, with its analysis of the experiences accumulated in socialist construction in the various countries, lends additional assistance to the continued development of our countries. The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party considers it a revolutionary duty to follow the guidance of this Statement and to do our utmost for the prosperity of our people and for the advancement of international progress as a whole. It is our revolutionary duty to increase, as rapidly as possible, industrial and agricultural production in our country—the material basis for raising our people's living standard; and to utilize better the advantages and internal reserves offered by the socialist system.

Our entire people regard it their revolutionary duty to share, according to their ability, in solving the great historic task facing the socialist countries: to outstrip the total industrial and agricultural output of the world capitalist system and, later, to outstrip the most advanced capitalist countries in per capita production and in providing a higher living standard for the people. Our people also wish to do their utmost to create this important condition for social progress and the victory of socialism, to achieve and uphold a lasting peace.

In essence, the documents of the November 1960 Moscow Meeting of Representatives of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties mean for us that the world communist movement is moving ahead toward new, greater victories on the path which life has proved correct. It is the national pride of the Hungarian communists, of all the Hungarian people building socialism, that they are advancing in the ranks of this vast, invincible army which is shaping the future of mankind.

## SOCIALIST RECONSTRUCTION OF AGRICULTURE IN HUNGARY

ARTICLE FOR *WORLD MARXIST REVIEW*  
(ALSO PUBLISHED IN *NÉPSZABADSÁG*)

June 4th, 1961

The socialist sector in Hungary's agriculture now embraces more than 90 per cent of the total cultivated area. This, the result of the rapid growth of the cooperative farms, together with the consolidation of the workers' government, is unquestionably the biggest development in our country since the suppression of the counter-revolutionary *putsch* in 1956.

Socialist relations of production now predominate both in industry and in agriculture, marking a new stage in the development of our socialist revolution. The way to this hard-won victory was long and arduous, and it may, perhaps, be useful to glance back over the path traversed and sum up the experience gained in the process.

### I

Until the end of the Second World War, Hungary was a capitalist country burdened with mediaeval survivals very much like Czarist Russia, like Poland before liberation, or like Spain today. More than 30 per cent of the land belonged to the landlords, who were but a thousandth part of the population; 6 per cent was owned by the Church. At the same time, one-third of the population were landless peasants and farm labourers. Hungary was known as a land of "three million paupers." The large-scale feudal land tenure was one of the main reasons for the general backwardness, for the poverty of the labouring classes and for the retarded development of capitalism in Hungary.

A decisive turning point in the development of the country and the age-old struggle for land came in 1945 when the Soviet Army expelled the nazis from Hungary. The capitalist-landlord system, which had leagued itself with Hitler, suffered a mortal blow.

The working class and its ally, the peasantry, established a new, democratic rule which abolished the feudal system of big estates. With the agrarian reform law of March 1945, justice triumphed and the land became the property of the tillers. All estates over 200 *hold* were divided up among the rural poor. The land reform was a lever of political, economic and social progress, for it launched the peasantry on the road to a new and better life.

The next few years showed, however, that small-scale peasant farming offered little opportunity for real progress in agriculture. It acted as a brake on economic development generally and hampered any further rise in the standard of living of the bulk of the peasantry. Grave contradictions arose in the economy. While industrial production in 1955 had trebled compared with 1938, agricultural output had risen by a mere 1 or 2 per cent. The only way the people's government could solve the contradiction between the rapidly-growing socialist industry and the stagnant small-scale agriculture, and thus ensure well-being for the peasants and the people as a whole, was the way of cooperative farms, large-scale socialist farms.

The socialist reconstruction of agriculture was begun in 1948 when the working class had taken full power into its hands, and industrialization, the basis for rebuilding the country along socialist lines, was under way at a rapid pace. The cooperative farms, however, developed unevenly. The sectarian mistakes of the party leadership as well as the revisionist attempts in 1953 and the counter-revolutionary *putsch* of 1956 caused serious setbacks. By 1953 the cooperatives were tilling 30 per cent of the total cultivated area, but by the end of the year the percentage had dropped to 21, and by the spring of 1957, as a result of the counter-revolutionary *putsch*, to 10 per cent.

An analysis of the growth and reverses of the cooperative farm movement shows that the advance has been due to the implementation of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, to the efforts of the communists and the entire working class, while the setbacks were caused by distortion of the principles, by Left sectarian mistakes which the class enemy and its revisionist accomplices seized upon to further their own ends.

## II

Assessing the situation in December 1958, the Central Committee of the Socialist Workers' Party pointed out that the political and economic conditions had ripened for a step forward in the socialist

reconstruction of agriculture and worked out a political programme for carrying it out.

In the two-and-a-half years since then this complex task has been solved in the main chiefly because the Central Committee exposed and, in the difficult conditions of the fight against the counter-revolution, corrected the mistakes of the previous leaders in the sphere of agrarian policy, in forming the cooperatives and generally in worker-peasant relations.

The dogmatic mistakes of the earlier leadership derived from the incorrect concept that the growth of the cooperative movement could be accelerated by a wholesale restriction of individual peasant farming. In practice this meant ignoring the needs of the individual peasant. Apart from combating profiteering and capitalist tendencies hardly anything was done. The alliance with the individual peasants was seriously impaired, and this prevented utilization of the existing, albeit limited potential of small commodity production.

The revisionists seized upon these mistakes of the dogmatic trend in order to sow discontent among the peasants, to set back the cooperative movement and put off the reorganization of agriculture indefinitely. Both the Left and the Right distortions of the party's policy in regard to the peasantry were used by the counter-revolutionaries to further their own ends.

In 1956, however, their hope of setting the peasantry against the workers' government was bitterly disappointed. With the exception of a few small reactionary groups, the peasants, far from supporting the counter-revolution, rallied solidly around the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government. Significantly enough, the members of the cooperatives, even the waverers, took an organized stand in support of the people's government.

In view of the situation at the end of 1956 and the beginning of 1957, when the key task was to reinforce people's rule, the Central Committee came to the conclusion that before pressing ahead with the cooperative movement, it was necessary first to prepare politically for it. The organization of cooperatives on a country-wide scale was put off for the time being. But the party made it clear that a new spurt in cooperative development would set in since this was vitally essential both for the country and for the peasants.

During 1957-58 the party's policy gave a certain, limited encouragement to individual farming.

The system of obligatory deliveries to the state was abolished—a system which, owing to gross distortion by the previous leadership,



deprived the producer of any incentive and thus retarded both cooperative and individual farming. Contracts for the purchase of farm produce by the state were introduced and became the main means of building up state stocks of products. These measures stimulated farm production, including private farming. At the same time the revival of capitalist tendencies was combated through taxation, price control, etc. Thus, in our relations with the individual peasants we combined support of their production efforts by giving them every incentive, with due restraints on profiteering. The aid given to private farmers and the scrupulous fulfilment of the promises made to them reinforced their faith in the party, and this in turn provided the political and moral groundwork for a new advance in the cooperative farm movement.

Besides aiding and encouraging the individual farmers, the party and the government naturally sought to strengthen the existing cooperatives and state farms. These were already playing an important role in production for the market, and it was imperative to transform them into a reliable base for the socialist reconstruction of agriculture in general.

Above all, the cooperatives were helped to increase production. In the course of 1957-58 they proved their superiority over individual farming by ensuring for their members a better life. The former agricultural labourers and poor peasants who formed the bulk of their membership netted incomes equal to and in some cases exceeding those of the middle peasant. As a result, part of the peasants who had left the cooperatives had rejoined by the end of 1958. The conditions had matured for a new advance in the cooperative movement.

The setting up of cooperative farms throughout the country again became the order of the day. However, to ensure success, the ideological confusion and political uncertainty that still made themselves felt here and there in the party had to be overcome; clarity on questions of theory was needed.

First the survivals of sectarianism had to be uprooted. Some of our comrades, apprehensive of the private farmers getting firmly on their feet, felt that the incomes of these farmers should be kept down, for otherwise they would not join cooperatives. The party denounced these erroneous views. Those who held such views failed to see the essence of the changes that had taken place. Whereas under capitalism the possible enrichment of a few small peasants is accompanied by the impoverishment of increasing numbers and the complete pauperization of some, in a People's Democracy the masses of smallholders are not

threatened by ruin because they can rely on the help and the protection of the state. In other words, the socialist policy of our party leads to the peasants living better. To work for the reverse would be to trample on our own principles. We believe that the individual peasant making a decent living should be won for the cooperative not by reducing his standard of living, but by ensuring a still better life in the cooperative. Experience has fully proved that we were right. Nowhere has the steady rise in the standard of living prevented the peasants from joining the cooperatives. On the contrary, seeing for themselves that in advocating and organizing the cooperatives the party is working for a better life for the peasants, they realize that its counsel is worth heeding.

Other comrades, fearing a repetition of the pre-1956 sectarian mistakes, tried to hold things back. They believed that a slower pace would be safer. In addition to these fears, which arose from the best of intentions, revisionist views opposed to socialist development as a whole and the views of hostile bourgeois elements still made themselves felt in December 1958. The Central Committee had to combat both the Left and the Right worries and wage an ideological and political struggle against petty-bourgeois pressure and bourgeois attempts to block our progress.

Clarity had to be achieved in interpreting the Leninist principle of voluntary association in cooperatives. It is self-evident that strong cooperatives can be built only if the peasants, convinced of the advantages of cooperation, give it their full support. As it was, however, many people confused voluntary association with spontaneity and preferred to let things simply drift. And this, in spite of the fact that it is a Marxist-Leninist axiom that the peasant, being at once property-owner and worker, is bound to waver between the working class and the bourgeoisie, between socialism and capitalism.

Since the only consistently revolutionary class is the working class, this class is destined to lead the other classes, to guide the class struggle for the victory of socialism. The organizational efforts, initiatives and all-round assistance on the part of the working class and its revolutionary party were essential if the peasants were to be united in cooperatives and to take the path of socialism. Left to drift, years would be needed for them to overcome their hesitations. Therefore, in December 1958, the Central Committee again called upon the party, the working class and all progressives to help build the cooperative farm movement. The decisive thing in the victory of socialist production relations in agriculture was that the small and middle peasants

found the strength to break with their small property-owning past and give up their old mode of life, hard though it was for them to overcome their doubts and prejudices. But behind it all was the consistent, purposeful leadership of the party and the explanatory and organizational work conducted for years in the countryside by the hundreds of thousands of workers in industry, on the state farms and in the machine and tractor stations, by schoolteachers and other intellectuals, and by the peasant members of the party.

The link between the material and the political prerequisites for the reconstruction of agriculture was another much debated issue in 1958. Some believed that the economic preconditions were most important and hence advocated forming cooperatives at snail's pace. Others estimated the outlay per *hold* needed to cultivate land by large-scale socialist farming methods and, simplifying the issue, suggested that the funds available for investment be made the criterion of how large an area can be brought under cooperative tillage. Both views made everything depend on state outlays.

One can hardly visualize a cooperative being set up by first building cattle barns, pig pens and granaries in the middle of a village where all the land is privately tilled and only then inviting the peasants to join. Could the party advise the working class to put the thousands of millions of forints so urgently needed elsewhere into creating the economic foundations of future cooperatives in the hope that one day the peasants would join them? Moreover, to have done so would have excluded the peasants from a movement that is specifically their own. Their initiative would have been hamstrung and the revolutionary mobilization of the creative energies and the economic resources of the countryside retarded. In general, these views tended to overrate the role of the economic prerequisites, and to underrate the importance of the political prerequisites for the socialist reorganization of agriculture.

The party could not accept these views. It held—as it had ever since the defeat of the counter-revolution—that of prime importance in the socialist reconstruction of agriculture were the political conditions: the correct political relationship between the party and the peasantry, between the latter and the working class, their solidarity and alliance.

This, however, does not mean that we relegate the economic aspect to the background and think that there is nothing more to be done than to unite the peasants in cooperatives. Certain material reserves must be allocated in advance on a national scale for the purpose and

every attention paid to consolidating the cooperatives from the day of their founding. The party has never lost sight of this. For example, in the past three years more than 15,000 million forints have been invested in agriculture.

Setting the proper pace is of prime importance. Overestimation of the potentialities of small peasant farming and lack of faith in the leadership of the working class tend to slow down the rate of development, while any administrative compulsion to speed things up would only do harm.

To find the correct medium it was necessary to take into account the mentality of the smallholder and to overcome the pernicious sectarian tendency to regard the wavering of the peasantry as evidence that they were "reactionary" and "hostile." It was necessary to bear in mind that in the past the peasant lived in constant fear of the morrow; all his life he toiled to acquire a plot of land, for experience had taught him that existence depended on it. His very personality was split: one half of him reached out to socialism, which promised him a decent life, the other half gravitated to capitalism, which offered him the bait of "becoming rich" and rising above his fellows. Conscious of this, we could not allow ourselves to be too impatient with the working peasant. We had to persuade him again and again, to dispel his doubts.

Our cooperative building campaign conducted from December 1958 to February 1961 was planned so as to make use of the winter months, when the peasants have more time to discuss things, for mass organizational work. From spring to autumn efforts were concentrated on consolidating the newly-formed or amalgamated cooperatives and helping them put the work on an effective footing. Experience has shown that this method of organizing cooperatives by stages was the correct one.

In the winter of 1958-59 some 343,000 peasants joined the cooperatives, and their land area rose to 34 per cent of the total.

The following winter the membership of the cooperatives increased by another 380,000 and their land area amounted to 56 per cent of the total.

Last winter yet another 340,000 peasants joined, bringing the total cultivated area of the cooperative sector to more than 76 per cent of the over-all figure for the country. Only 3 per cent of the cooperatives are of the elementary type.

This method of staging enabled us to put the newly-established cooperatives on their feet in their first year.

### III

The rapid advance of the cooperative farm movement in 1959-61 was backed by a sound national economy and in particular by a rapid expansion of socialist industry. The Three-Year Plan (1958-60) was overfulfilled, with industry in the lead with a 40 per cent increase in gross production. This made it possible to allocate to agriculture machines and mineral fertilizers over and above plan and to render assistance in building barns and other premises necessary for the large-scale expansion of livestock farming. Other aid was also given to the cooperatives to strengthen them organizationally and economically.

During the three-year-plan period when most of the cooperatives were formed, agricultural production increased roughly by 11 per cent (one was a good-crop year, one average, and one was a poor year). We still have much to do to strengthen the cooperatives, but for all that this advance shows that farm production can be increased simultaneously with its socialist reconstruction.

Although the reorganization of agriculture is by no means a simple matter, the difficulties involved are of a transient nature, whereas the difficulties arising from the limitations of small peasant farming are insuperable and persist until the socialist reconstruction is completed. Having reorganized agriculture in the main, we can now concentrate on strengthening the cooperatives. As it is, we are creating the conditions for rapidly doing away with the lag in agriculture compared with industry, for making Hungarian farming in a number of branches rate high in the world. This calls for hard work, but the reward will be worth the effort.

In addition to the correct policy of the party, the practical steps taken to remove the obstacles to the development of the cooperative movement are of cardinal importance. One of these is a government decision entitling the cooperative members to receive a rental for the land turned over to the cooperative upon joining. This measure has acted as an incentive especially to the middle peasant. Last year the rent payment amounted to 7 to 8 per cent of the total income distributed by the cooperatives to their members. The sole exemptions in this respect are a few cooperatives which previously paid no rent and whose finances would be disrupted by introducing the system.

Important, too, was the extension of social security, including old-age pensions, to cooperative members. Fear of old age always haunted the peasant, who in the past often became a burden to his family when no longer able to work. No wonder that the decision entitling

members of cooperatives to receive old-age pensions was warmly welcomed. This, as well as the payment of sick and disability benefits, was for the peasants an object lesson in socialist humanism and helped to bring them into the mainstream of socialist development.

Moreover, the leading positions in the cooperatives were again made elective and this, too, helped to strengthen the spirit of collectivism and improve the work of the farms. Instead of the district and regional authorities choosing the farm managers, as was the rule in the early 1950's, the cooperative members now elect them from among candidates best fitted for the job. The peasants rightly regard this as a token of trust in them.

The party has carried out a series of measures aimed at consolidating the cooperatives economically, and a special decision of the party and the government has systematized the various kinds of state aid. Whereas formerly a sizeable part of the aid rendered by the state went to augment the income distributed by the cooperatives to their members rather than to expand production, this unsound practice has been ended. As a result, the cooperative members pay more attention to improving their farms and are working more conscientiously. Indicative in this respect is that while the real income of the entire peasantry has gone up, the average real income from agricultural sources per cooperative member exceeded that of the individual peasants by 12 per cent in 1957, 11 per cent in 1958, and 10 per cent in 1959.

The increased efficiency and better organization and management of the cooperatives could not but win growing recognition among the private farmers.

### IV

Far-reaching developments such as the socialist reconstruction of agriculture inevitably change the balance of class forces and influence the course of the class struggle. In what way has the balance of class forces changed in Hungary?

The political situation in the Hungarian People's Republic is determined primarily by the relations between the two basic classes of working people—the working class and the peasantry. The importance of the alliance of the two for the victory of socialism was stressed time and again by Lenin. The entire course of the struggle waged by the Hungarian working class shows very well how the content of this alliance varies according to the different periods of social development.



During Horthy's fascist regime the party worked to rally the working class in alliance with the whole peasantry (the poor and middle peasants as well as the rich peasants) against the landlord-capitalist system and, later, against the Hitler occupation. After Liberation, the working class was able in the class battles of 1945-48 to smash the landlord system, to overthrow the rule of the capitalists and landlords and to win power because, in addition to the favourable international situation, it enjoyed the support of the poor and middle peasants and had neutralized the rich peasants.

At the end of 1956 and the beginning of 1957, the main task confronting the worker-peasant alliance was defence of the people's government. By the end of 1958, the immediate aim of this political alliance was, besides further consolidation of people's rule, the socialist reconstruction of agriculture. Today, with the overwhelming majority of the peasants having taken to the socialist path, this alliance has risen to a higher stage, setting as its aim the building of socialism.

To understand the dynamics of this process it is essential to distinguish between an identity of interests and an identity of views, inasmuch as the two do not always coincide when social classes are in question. If we look to the past we shall see that the basic interests of the peasantry never differed from the interests and the aims of the working class. In keeping with its interests the working class stood for socialism also in the countryside, and it made this amply clear to the peasants. At the same time socialism was in the best interests of the overwhelming majority of the peasants. Seen from this angle, it is clear that the interests of the working class and the majority of the peasants were identical. Yet many peasants did not realize that only socialism could fully meet their interests, hence their views on socialism did not coincide with those of the working class. In other words, there was a divergence of views despite the fundamental identity of interests. Now, however, the completion of the transfer of agriculture to cooperative lines shows that the working class and the peasants are united not only by community of interests, but also by identity of views on socialism. The peasants, conscious of their true interests, share the aims of the working class and are for socialism. Clearly, the worker-peasant alliance has risen to a higher level.

With cooperatives predominating throughout the country the former small and middle peasants have become cooperative farmers. The class of kulaks has been abolished. The former members of this class who sincerely wish to find a place for themselves in socialist society are free to join the cooperative farms provided their fellow

villagers agree to their admittance. After two years of honest work in the cooperative they acquire full membership rights and may be elected to leading posts.

The victory of the cooperative farm movement has put an end to the differentiation among the peasants, who have become a fundamentally united class. True, survivals of the former distinctions still remain, but they are no longer decisive. The decisive fact is that we now have a basically united class of peasants living within the sphere of socialist relations of production. From this a number of important conclusions should be drawn.

For one thing, each member of a cooperative should be judged by his work for the good of the collective, his ability and attitude, and not by the amount of land he used to own or whether he was rich or poor.

But we still have people who, with the best intentions and citing what Lenin said about our attitude to the poor, middle and rich peasants, tend to classify the members of the cooperatives by these tokens. We have faithfully followed this Leninist precept throughout the long years of class struggle, but to apply this principle literally, in our conditions, as a ready-made pattern at the present time, would be a grave mistake indeed. Lenin never suggested that we should base ourselves on the former poor peasant, to form an alliance with the former middle peasant, or to combat the former rich peasant. If we, instead of furthering the fusion now under way, were to divide the peasants according to their former class affiliations, we would be setting one cooperative member against another, reviving their differences springing from past class distinctions. It is precisely in accordance with Lenin's teachings that we put the emphasis on the complete eradication of all vestiges of the old differences.

As a result of the reorganization of farming along cooperative lines the irreconcilable class contradictions—the contradictions between the exploiters and the exploited—have been abolished in the main. The class struggle is taking place in new conditions. In a sense it has entered a new phase and, since the economic roots of the basic contradictions have vanished, it need not take the same violent forms as before.

The people's democratic state, of course, vigilantly guards the inviolability of our system and shall ruthlessly punish any offenders against it. But the focus of the class struggle is shifting more and more to the spheres of ideology and economy. The fight now is basically against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois views and tendencies (egoism,

profiteering, deception, squandering of public property), to safeguard the socialist economy against criminal negligence, irresponsibility and sabotage. At the same time, especially in view of the object lesson which the success of the powerful socialist camp and our own success provide for all of us, it is fully possible to re-educate through labour at least some of the members of the former capitalist class, certainly their children, and make them useful members of the socialist society.

## V

The socialist reconstruction of agriculture is a big step forward in building socialism. But important though it is, the development of mass cooperative farming is only a stage in the creation of a socialist agriculture. So far the roots of socialist production relations have not struck deep enough in our countryside. There still are in the cooperatives many survivals of small peasant farming which have to be eradicated, not at once, of course, but gradually, as the conditions ripen. For example, a considerable part of the commonly-owned cattle is still kept in the barns of the members of cooperatives since there are not enough cooperative barns. It will take some years to change the situation. There are still things in the cooperatives which cannot be described as socialist. Hence the task of the moment is to consolidate the socialist features and steadily to strengthen the socialist relations of production.

To a certain extent this applies also to the payment of land rent, justified and necessary though it still is. Rent is a constant factor, determined by the area of land, whereas the role of labour and its productivity are bound to grow with the consolidation of the socialist character of the cooperatives. Consequently the share of rent in the members' incomes is bound to diminish.

To reinforce the socialist character of the cooperatives their members must be educated in the spirit of socialism. Although the very act of joining a cooperative signifies a sharp change in the peasant's mode of life and cannot but influence his thinking, it would be a mistake to assume that people thereby completely rid themselves of the old ballast and that their attitude becomes socialist overnight. On the contrary, much of the old will persist for a long time, the negative features included. Those who have consistently believed in cooperation will work hard for socialism, for communism, and the success of the cooperative movement will but confirm their convic-

tions, and this is a very good thing. But those who have wavered will continue to do so, though in lesser degree. And the spivs will want to continue profiteering even in the cooperative. Not until all the pernicious habits and hangovers have been overcome will the obstacles hampering the development of genuine socialist cooperation be removed.

It will also take time for full democracy to be achieved in the cooperatives, i. e. for all members to acquire sufficient knowledge and experience to play a competent part in directing the affairs of the cooperative and effectively to assist the managers they have placed at its head. But this, too, must be done in order to consolidate the socialist production relations.

Our immediate task is to transform the cooperatives into highly efficient large-scale socialist farms. Farm work should be organized accordingly, the income distributed according to the work done so as to stimulate maximum production, and management improved. More experts should be made available to the cooperatives, a conscientious attitude to labour encouraged and full use made of the great advantages of large-scale farming by employing the latest methods of cultivation. Our aim is to increase production with utmost speed and in particular to raise yields far higher than those obtained by the individual small farmer.

Within the next few years socialist agriculture should fully satisfy all our growing requirements in the main types of agricultural produce, leaving a substantial surplus for export both to socialist and capitalist countries. Our class enemies often claim that the situation in Hungary has deteriorated, on the grounds that we formerly exported farm products whereas we now sometimes import them. But this argument will not hold water. The old Hungary was able to export large quantities of certain foodstuffs because the majority of her own people went hungry. Today, home consumption has substantially increased. Annual consumption of pork, for example, rose from 136,000 tons in 1938 to 234,000 in 1958, that of fats, from 118,000 tons in 1938 to 188,000 in 1959, and sugar from 95,000 to 257,000 tons.

Our aim is to increase exports while meeting the increased requirements at home. With our favourable climatic conditions we can easily do this if we develop large-scale socialist farming.

Those who level all sorts of slanderous accusations against the Hungarian People's Republic and clamour about the absence of agricultural exports say nothing about the fact that sixteen years ago the rulers of capitalist Hungary left us a backward, almost mediaeval

agriculture. Our people and their government have already done much to overcome this backwardness. Take, for instance, mechanization. In 1935 there were only 7,000 tractors on Hungarian farms, but by the end of 1959 the figure had risen to 31,000 and by the end of last year, to nearly 40,000. In 1938 only 13.5 kilograms of chemical fertilizer were used per *hold* of land, in 1960 the figure was 81. Between 1946 and 1960 the people's state allocated 41,000 million forints for the construction of publicly-owned barns and other farm buildings and for the purchase of farm machines. More than 6,000 crop and livestock experts were trained. The full benefits of this aid will be reaped in the coming years.

## VI

In common with the other fraternal parties of the socialist camp, our party is concentrating its efforts—in line with the Moscow Statement of 1960—on organizing and leading the economic development. It is our purpose to ensure an abundance of the good things of life for the people and thereby prove the superiority of the socialist system of economy over the capitalist system.

In promoting progress in agriculture we are not only working in our own interests; this is also our internationalist duty. We are fully aware that, in addition to our own efforts, the favourable international situation has been the decisive condition of the substantial successes we have achieved in a comparatively brief space of time. The socialist reorganization of our agriculture would have been impossible if our peasants had not had before them tangible evidence of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp generally, on the one hand, and of the decline of capitalism, on the other. No little influence was exercised also by the progress made in rebuilding farming along socialist lines in the other People's Democracies.

The Central Committee of the party considers it its revolutionary duty to consolidate the newly-formed cooperatives and thereby ensure a rapid growth of agricultural output. This is necessary, on the one hand, because fast-growing farm production is essential for the further building of socialism and raising the standard of living. On the other hand, there are millions who will be convinced of the superiority of socialism over the old social system only when they see for themselves how much better and more cheaply socialist agriculture can provide for the nation's needs.

Strong, prosperous cooperative farms and the further development of the state farms—in a word, the complete victory of socialism in the Hungarian countryside—this is our aim. Its accomplishment will further strengthen our system politically, advance our economy and guarantee a prosperous life for our people.

Consolidation of socialist production relations in the countryside with a simultaneous increase in agricultural output will be a new victory hastening the completion of the edifice of socialism in the Hungarian People's Republic.



SPEECH AT THE TWENTY-SECOND CONGRESS  
OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET  
UNION

October 20th, 1961

Dear Comrades:

First of all let me express sincere thanks on behalf of the Central Committee of our party and the members of our delegation for the invitation, the friendly welcome and the great honour of participating in this historic gathering of our Soviet comrades. Let me convey the warm fraternal greetings and best wishes of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the whole Hungarian people to the Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and to the great Soviet people.

Comrades:

The Hungarian public is familiar with the draft programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the two congressional reports delivered by Comrade Khrushchov. Knowing the response I am in a position to state that not only our delegation, our party, and our Central Committee, but every Hungarian communist, every honest Hungarian worker who cherishes the cause of socialism and peace, fully endorses the general line of the reports, of the draft programme and the Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Comrades:

We are convinced that the Twenty-Second Congress has given new strength to the entire international communist movement; it strengthens and unswervingly follows the tremendously significant general line of the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Twentieth Congress liberated the international communist movement from the fetters of dogmatism and enriched Marxist-Leninist theory with new, important theses. The Twentieth Congress opened a new, victorious phase bringing splendid results in the life of not only the Soviet people, but also of the whole socialist camp; it gave fresh impetus to the struggle for socialism and peace throughout the world.

On behalf of the Hungarian communists and our people let me thank the leading Soviet communists, who headed by Comrade Khrushchov, have fought with unshakable courage and steadfastness to principle in the past years to win complete acceptance for the ideological and political heritage of the great Lenin, against the personality cult and all its harmful outgrowths.

The internal unity of the communist parties, just as the internationalist unity of the world-wide communist movement, has always been and will be of tremendous significance for the success of our struggle. The internal unity and the international concord of our parties can develop only on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles, on a practical communist policy founded on these, on a community of principle and an identity of aims. Although the uncompromising struggle of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union against the personality cult was disquieting at times, because it stirred up stale and stagnant waters and swept in mouldy and dark corners—this was a kind of disturbance which was unavoidable.

Let us take the question of the anti-party group in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which emerged in the summer of 1957.

It is obvious that the harmful trend of this group could not be sheltered by patient waiting, but only by a relentless struggle on a principled basis. Moreover, only this principled struggle could safeguard the firm unity of the ranks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. And this holds good for our international unity, too. In view of the present harmful actions of the Albanian leaders, which the imperialists are trying to utilize against the socialist countries, anyone who really has our unity, the interests of socialism and peace at heart, can do only one thing: fight against the incorrect views without yielding on principles.

We can state today that the unity and cohesion of the international communist movement, of the peoples of the socialist camp, is stronger than ever, and is continually gaining strength, and that is due in the first place to the fact that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union took a stand for the defence of the party of Marxism-Leninism with exemplary courage and patience, but without compromising on questions of principle—in the only manner worth of Lenin's teachings.

Comrades:

Following Liberation a people's power came into existence in

our country, and a splendid socialist development unfolded. This development which was tantamount to a national rebirth, suffered a serious setback due to the personality cult. The revisionists, the reactionary bourgeoisie and international imperialism, exploited the serious break caused by the personality cult and by sectarian policy and in 1956 precipitated a counter-revolutionary rising which caused our people great suffering. But this too now belongs to the past!

In Hungary we still have problems connected with our work of construction and difficulties that have to be overcome. But the counter-revolution is buried, the party and the people are united. Our People's Republic is stronger than ever. During the Three-Year Plan which ended in 1960, industrial output increased by 40 per cent, agricultural production by 12 per cent, and per capita real income by 19 per cent. The cooperative farm movement has scored a great victory: 95 per cent of the agricultural land is now cultivated by socialist large-scale methods. Socialist relations of production now predominate throughout our national economy. During our present Five-Year Plan we shall complete the laying of the foundations of a socialist society and shall enter into the phase of building an advanced socialist society.

We are grateful to our Soviet brothers for the assistance extended to the Hungarian people in their difficult situation. This assistance played a decisive role in the defeat of the counter-revolution by the Hungarian people, who are today marching firmly and confidently on the road of socialism.

Our party and our people have been tempered in this battle: socialist ideology and internationalism have taken deep root among the Hungarian masses. The workers understand our party, they follow its line and agree with it. And this is due to the splendid ideological weapons which our party received in its struggle against the revisionists and the dogmatists from the Twentieth Congress and the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties.

Comrades:

Our party and people paid dearly for the mistakes and betrayal: they want neither revisionism, nor the personality cult nor the dogmatic, sectarian line. We are advancing together on the same road with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which is leading its people resolutely and irresistibly on the path charted by Marx, Engels and Lenin. There is no way to give more faithful, more just

and better service in the interests of the Hungarian people today than by our determination to strengthen and reinforce Soviet-Hungarian friendship in our party and state relations and in all spheres.

Comrades:

We are convinced that the Soviet people will carry out the new programme of their glorious party and will arrive within a historically short period to the ideal land of free man to the new world of an accomplished communist society. We wish strength, health and speedy success to every Soviet citizen, to the entire Soviet people in the realization of this epoch-making programme.

Comrades:

The splendid programme of building communism points the way and awakens new hope in all the peoples struggling for social progress. The thesis that the socialist countries will arrive at communism more or less simultaneously, in a historically identical period, lends fresh impetus to the building work of our people too. This thesis sets a splendid goal to all the peoples of the socialist camp.

The programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which aims at ensuring peaceful coexistence, general and complete disarmament and a world without wars and arms, will, inspire the peoples of the entire world, because the realization of these aims is the universal desire of every working man and woman who love their family and people.

Our people still have plenty of struggle and work ahead to establish the much-dreamt-of world of communism, which is now actually within reach. Today the immediate and common task of the peoples is the urgent solution of the questions which are poisoning the international atmosphere; the most urgent being the elimination of the remnants of the Second World War, the doing away with the revanchist hotbed of war in West Germany. On October 7th the National Assembly empowered our government to sign a German peace treaty. Our people are prepared to meet their obligations in defending peace.

Comrades, dear Soviet brothers:

The Hungarian people achieved the Hungarian Republic of Councils as early as 1919. This is a source of great pride for our nation. For four decades our people have travelled along a difficult, rugged historical road. During this time they fought against two counter-revolutions, but today they are advancing firmly on the road to socialism. A good indication of this is that on Tuesday, the

first day of your Congress, splendid work pledges were made in our country, Hungary, in honour of the Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The telegrams I have received state that many brigades in our country, which are out to win the title of socialist brigade, have adopted the name of the Twenty-Second Congress of the C.P.S.U. This is the way our working people have sent their sincere, heartfelt greeting to their great Soviet brothers.

Our delegation again wishes good work to all the delegates to your Congress, and the best of success to the Soviet people in implementing the decisions.

Long live the Soviet people and their glorious Communist Party!

Long live unbreakable Soviet-Hungarian friendship!

Long live the proletarian, internationalist unity of our fraternal parties!

Long live communism and peace!

## LESSONS OF THE C. P. S. U. TWENTY-SECOND CONGRESS—TOPICAL QUESTIONS OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC POLICY

SPEECH AT A MASS MEETING IN THE CSEPEL  
IRON AND STEEL WORKS

December 1st, 1961

Dear Comrades:

I heartily greet the working people of Csepel on behalf of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the government of the Hungarian People's Republic.

Comrades:

There lies, close to five hundred kilometres from Moscow and almost two thousand five hundred kilometres from here to the east, a large Soviet industrial town with one million inhabitants, bearing the name of the great proletarian writer Gorky. No doubt, many of you have read Gorky's novel *Mother*, and I recommend that those who have not, should do so, because this book is an epic of the life and struggle of a revolutionary worker. In this book Gorky wrote about living people and events that actually took place. Its heroes are the workers of the Sormovo Factory. The factory has revolutionary traditions. In the revolution of 1905 the workers of the factory were among the first to rise against czarist tyranny, later they fought for the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and today too, they are in the forefront in developing the Soviet Union's industrial production. It was this town and this factory—which today bears the name of Red Sormovo—that I visited, as a representative of the Hungarian communists, of the Hungarian working people, at the time of the Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. I took part in a factory meeting similar to the one being held here today. We talked about our common problems, and at the end of the meeting one of the workers of the Red Sormovo Factory said that on behalf of the factory's workers he wished to give me a red flag and a model of a ship built in their factory. He asked me to present them to the working people of Csepel who live far away, yet are so close.



I thought it would be fitting and proper if I also conveyed in person this heartfelt, fraternal greeting to the working people of Csepel which the workers of the Red Sormovo extended to me.

In recent years I had two particularly memorable meetings with the Csepel working people. The first was a meeting of communist party workers in January 1957. The second was a friendly get-together in the spring of 1958, when I came out to Csepel with Comrade Khrushchev. Local party and economic executives frequently urge visits by government leaders, stating that this helps them in their work. I believe there is some truth in this! But when we attend such meetings, our purpose is not only to help the comrades working here, but also to gain fresh strength for our own work. For we, members of the party's Central Committee and the government, gain strength and confidence when we feel that our cause is just and has the approval and support of the Hungarian working people.

The present international situation is characterized by the struggle between two social systems: the rising, new socialist system, and the dying, old capitalist system. Today the main feature of the international situation is the struggle between the forces of socialism and peace, and the forces of imperialism and war. Today socialism has become a decisive, determining factor in shaping world events. The forces of socialism and peace are mightier today than the forces of imperialism and war. But imperialism still exists, therefore the danger of war persists. This is the main feature of the international situation.

The Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, our entire party, fully and without reservation agrees with the line of the Twenty-Second Congress, with the new Party Programme adopted at the Congress. We are firmly convinced that our party, our government are working in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, and their activities have been imbued for over five years with the revolutionary principles laid down by the Twentieth C.P.S.U. Congress which have further developed Marxism-Leninism.

The Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is following and further developing the line of the Twentieth Congress. Consequently, we are convinced that the line of the policy pursued by the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party has also been strengthened by this Congress.

What was the central issue of the Congress? At the Twenty-Second C.P.S.U. Congress the central issue was the new Party Pro-

gramme, the theoretical and practical programme of building communism. This programme defines the tasks of the Soviet people for the next 20 years; at the same time—in our judgement—it has very much to say to the peoples of the socialist countries and all mankind. With the realization of the new Party Programme, communist society will no longer be a dream, a Utopian conception, but will become a living reality. In 20 years' time there will be a communist society in the Soviet Union!

Communism, communist society, however, shows not only the future of the Soviet people; communism is the road of development of all mankind. Communist society will realize the genuine equality and fraternity of mankind, the world of peace and happiness for the working man; a new society will evolve in which everyone will work according to his ability, and will share according to his needs. This is the future society which the programme of Marxism-Leninism and the Soviet people are pointing out to mankind.

The new programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the plan for the realization of communism, is a beacon light for our people as well. The Hungarian people will complete the laying of the foundations of socialist society and will proceed to the advanced stage of building socialism. This is the essence of our present task. It is also a part of the future as Comrade Khrushchev told the whole world first from here in Csepel: if we, the peoples living and working in the socialist camp make proper use of the possibilities inherent in mutual fraternal cooperation, in assistance and in the division of labour, then our peoples will arrive at the new society of the working man, communist society, in a historically identical period. This is the most important message of the Congress for the peoples!

Peace was the second most important message the Congress had for the peoples. At this Congress the peace policy of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries was once again emphasized and placed on a firmer foundation. They proclaimed, far and wide, that the policy of the Soviet Union is one of peaceful coexistence, which calls for peaceful competition between the socialist and capitalist camps, and considers negotiation as the chief means of solving controversial international issues; thus it does not wish to settle controversies by arms and by wars, but by negotiations.

The Twenty-Second C.P.S.U. Congress reiterated that the Communist Party and the Soviet state are steadfastly and relentlessly championing a world without arms and wars, general and

total disarmament. The Congress stressed the need for vigilance and preparedness, the fact that our peace policy must be backed by adequate strength, a strength which will guarantee that the imperialists who are toying with war adventures shall never dare launch an armed attack against the socialist world.

This is the purpose of the measures taken to develop national defence. You know that in recent months the Soviet Union has carried out nuclear weapons tests. The Soviet government when it announced its decision declared that this step was made necessary by the international situation aggravated by the imperialists. Simultaneously with the tests, the Soviet Union unequivocally stated that it would never be the first to make use of nuclear weapons, and—jointly with the other nuclear powers—was prepared at any time to bury all arms in the bottom of the sea. The imperialists, however, are not willing to do this. For this reason the Soviet Union, in the interests of her own security, the security of the socialist world and the peace of mankind, is compelled to maintain her armaments at the proper level. We fully agree with this. Let us think for a moment: what kind of "peace" could one enjoy if the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp did not possess the most modern, most powerful weapons in the world? The correct policy is to fight with unflagging steadfastness for general and total disarmament, for a world without arms and wars. However, until we—together with all the peoples of the world—have achieved this we must keep our defences at the proper level, because this is the most effective means of restraining the imperialists.

Comrades:

The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, as I stated, fully agrees with the line of the Twenty-Second Congress. We agree with the Soviet Union's peace policy all the more because this is also the policy of our people and our country. The aim of the government of the Hungarian People's Republic, supported by all our people, is that our country shall live at peace with all peoples in the world, and maintain normal relations with every country in the world. We need peace to accomplish our aims in common with the other socialist peoples. We sincerely desire and wish that the peoples of every country in the world, including those of the United States and West Germany, might live at peace, work and prosper. Let every people live in the kind of social system it desires. We are convinced that communism will win on a world scale, but we hold that every people has its own task of achieving and establishing

the new social order. We wish to have normal relations with the great capitalist countries too, and we want the people working there to live in peace.

We wholeheartedly express our solidarity with the peoples fighting to rid themselves of the imperialist yoke, and we are convinced that the peoples of Algeria and the Congo will achieve their full independence and freedom. We wish that they may shake off the yoke of imperialism as soon as possible.

The imperialists are in a situation where they fear peaceful competition with the socialist world system. Obviously they also fear the armed strength of the socialist camp. They are concentrating all their efforts to obstruct the normal course of social development. The colonial system of imperialism is in the process of disintegration. Those peoples which have liberated themselves from the yoke of imperialism have embarked on the road of social development. The imperialists bear ill will towards the people of Cuba who shook off the yoke of the United States and chose the road of freedom and of social progress. The people of Cuba have become masters of their destiny in their own country; they smashed the rule of the big landlords and the big capitalists and have embarked on the road of socialist development. The United States is not pleased that Laos has become independent either and therefore is interfering in the internal affairs of Laos. It is sending officers and arms to South Vietnam, because it fears that the reactionary South Vietnamese system will collapse and that communism will gain ground there. Of course, they label every move with which the oppressed peoples want to achieve their independence as communism. But they are not having their own way even with these small peoples, for they cannot act as they please, because there exist the Soviet Union, a socialist world and the independent, free peoples who have declared their solidarity with the peoples fighting for their freedom. If the imperialists touch Laos they are bound to burn their fingers there just as if they touch South Vietnam or the Congo. In other words, they are indeed in a tight spot, and we hope that in the future they will be in an even more difficult situation.

But the imperialists are not idle; they are continuing their rearmament. In West Germany they have restored and armed a state which inherited militarism and revanchism from Hitler's fascist Third Reich, whose foreign policy is hostile to the socialist countries, and is bent on altering by force the state boundaries established after the Second World War. The German question is,



therefore, perhaps the most complex international question today, because it constitutes a sore point between the imperialist powers and the socialist world. The imperialists plan to turn West Germany into an advanced military outpost, but the socialist countries and all peace-loving people wish to hold West-German imperialism in check.

We Hungarians are very much affected by the German question. The Hungarian people fought in the course of their history a great deal against German imperialism. Therefore it is no secret that the Hungarian People's Republic, as a state, and the Hungarian people are in full solidarity with the German Democratic Republic, this new German state which, in the heart of Europe, has embarked on building a socialist society, and which is resolutely fighting against German imperialist, revanchist aspirations. The first German workers' and peasants' state is an ally of all those peoples who want to bury fascism and militarism once and for all. But we most resolutely oppose the policy of the present government of the German Federal Republic, a policy which is but the preservation of the cold war, rearmament, revanchism and the sharpening of antagonism between the peoples. At the recent election Adenauer's party lost its majority in the West German Parliament. The new coalition government, formed after prolonged efforts, released a statement not long ago which again reflects the spirit of the cold war. It is true that in this statement there is also something to the effect that they must negotiate with the Soviet Union and the countries of the Warsaw Treaty, but at the same time they loudly proclaim all their earlier demands. We most categorically condemn and reject such government statements.

The Soviet Union and the rest of the member states of the Warsaw Treaty are determined to solve all issues which can no longer be postponed on the German question. The West Berlin hotbed of war must be eliminated and the spread of German imperialism must be checked. The best solution will be to establish a normal situation on the West Berlin question and to conclude a German peace treaty which will ensure the state boundaries that were established in Europe after the Second World War.

Speaking of this at the Twenty-Second Congress, Comrade Khrushchov said that although we have resolved to sign the German peace treaty, its deadline need not necessarily be December 31. Certain elements seized upon this and spun tales about it. I wish to reassure everybody—both people who long to see order in Eu-

rope on the German question and in West Berlin and those who prefer the cold war—that if we do not sign the German peace treaty by December 31, and the deadline is causing concern to some, let everyone note the following: the West Berlin question will be settled, the German peace treaty will be signed at the appropriate time.

The Hungarian people fully endorse the line of foreign policy restated by the Twenty-Second Congress. Incitement to war and to hatred against other peoples is prohibited by law in our country. We want peaceful coexistence, we are fighting for peace. At the same time in line with our duty we are developing and strengthening the defence potential of our country. There could be no peaceful negotiations with the imperialists if the defensive strength of the countries in the socialist camp were weak, for the imperialists believe in a policy of strength. The Soviet Union, and the countries of the Warsaw Treaty—including the Hungarian People's Republic—must have a defensive strength which will keep the supporters of the policy of strength in check.

We have devoted energy, work and money to maintain national defence at an up-to-date level. We trust to see the day when we shall not have to spend a share of our people's labour for such purposes. But the situation today calls for up-to-date national defence. Therefore we have equipped our army with the most modern aircraft and rocket weapons. Our country is no open passage for the aircraft of the imperialists, and will be even less so in the future! The morale of our army is good. Our soldiers are prepared not only morally to defend peace and the socialist achievements of our people, but in military skill as well. They performed extremely difficult and up-to-date manoeuvres with excellent results.

The Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union repeatedly and firmly condemned the personality cult. If the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had not overcome the personality cult in good time, then the Twenty-Second Congress could not have decided on accomplishing a communist society within 20 years, and it could not have taken such a firm stand in support of the policy of peaceful coexistence. The personality cult, and everything stemming from it—dogmatic distortion of theory, sectarian views, arbitrariness in the party and in state life, the violation of socialist rule of law—retards and obstructs socialist, communist progress, disrupts the party and harms contact between the party and the masses.



We can hardly appreciate fully the great achievements registered by the Central Committee, headed by Comrade Khrushchov, which has been fighting since 1953 to eradicate the personality cult. Not everyone agrees with this, however. You know that the Albanian leaders, Enver Hoxha and Mehmet Shehu, do not agree with the condemnation of the cult of Stalin's person, and the personality cult in general. They do not agree with it first of all because the personality cult, and everything that goes with it, is thriving in their country at present. I need not describe to you what the personality cult means in the life of a party and a people, for you were able to see and judge for yourselves in the early 1950s. The Albanian leaders are not pleased with the condemnation of the personality cult, but the international communist and working-class movement agreed with the Soviet Union and the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. when they publicly criticized and condemned the Albanian leaders for being unable to rid themselves of the personality cult. It should also be noted that among the 80 delegations attending the Congress there was one, the fraternal delegation of the Chinese party, which did not find it proper to criticize publicly the Albanian leaders.

We Hungarian communists, the overwhelming majority of the international communist movement and almost every one of the fraternal parties supported the stand that public criticism indeed was necessary. In the case of a mistaken attitude, patience and internal discussion are possible—perhaps even necessary—for a time in order that people in the wrong may come to their senses. But if there is no sign of a change of attitude, then an open stand and public criticism are undoubtedly in place. The C.P.S.U. has taken an open stand before the whole world against the faults of the Albanian leaders that stem from the personality cult. With this it has shown a moral courage which indicates that we are right, and the masses, the peoples support us.

I can assure you, on behalf of our party's Central Committee, that our party's membership, the Hungarian communists, just as the entire Hungarian people, are familiar with the personality cult and want no more of it! People had too much of arbitrariness within the party and the practice of failing to observe the law, which had begun to thrive in our state life. We have done away with the personality cult. Work is proceeding normally both in party and in state life. I believe all of you feel and know this. Whoever takes part in party work or public affairs knows from experience

that the kind of situation which should prevail in a socialist state has developed in our country, both in the revolutionary party of the working class and in public affairs. The rule of law is a matter of major importance for the people. By this we mean, of course, not only that no one will be jailed for something he did not do, but also that a spy should continue to tremble and thieves should go on being afraid, because part of socialist rule of law is that the guilty should fear the power of the law. We have done away with the personality cult and we shall prevent its return! What problems do we have in connection with the personality cult, once we have done away with it? There is a decision that in our country neither streets nor factories can be named after living persons. We adopted this decision five years ago, and we have observed it since. But such names have remained from earlier times, and after a while we shall change them. It is, however, not the name that is decisive, but the spirit that prevails in the factory or on the cooperative farm. Even more attention must be paid to overcoming the erroneous views persisting in people's minds. Although the personality cult no longer exists, there are still people who think in a dogmatic, sectarian manner. We are fighting against these views, because they can cause very great harm.

Seven or eight years ago many people in our country believed that everyone alive was suspect. Do you still remember that? Some people would have best liked to organize a party of ten members in our country, because at the end perhaps they no longer trusted even themselves. What went on at that time? Take a man and begin to tell him: you are suspicious, you are flirting with the imperialists. At first he becomes frightened, then he trembles. With these methods they kept pushing him over to the enemy, until finally a few of them actually stayed there.

We have overcome this harmful attitude. Now it is not the Central Committee that needs to interfere when, for instance, in one of the branches of the Metal Works somebody longs to play the big boss, the dictator. For there are communists in the Metal Works who put such persons in their place. And that is how it should be.

This is an opportune time to keep an eye on how people are acting in public affairs, how they are administering the public funds. Generally, officials are performing their job in a normal fashion. But there is still a tendency towards selfishness, towards extortion, that is, to grab everything which can be acquired for nothing. When such an inclination is combined with a leading position, it becomes a pub-

lic menace. We must see to it that nobody shall misuse his position. We have certain service enterprises, like pipe-fitters, plumbers, electricians. Nowadays—and this must be said frankly—the plumber still goes out more quickly when the ceiling of the manager of an enterprise begins to leak than if something goes wrong in the flat of an unskilled worker. Everybody knows this is true.

Therefore we demand that people in leading posts who exercise authority should sooner forego the rights they are entitled to, rather than misuse their authority and those possibilities inherent in their position.

How do we picture the struggle against the old views? We should not call a man to account for the sectarian views he held eight years ago. We have already overlooked that. He should be called on the carpet though if he continues to profess his sectarian views today. If five years ago we told people who committed Left or Right mistakes: look, you made mistakes, but we do not consider you enemies, come back to the right path, work, and we shall forget what happened, then we cannot take them to task now after five years for the old mistakes, because this would not be fair and honest. Everybody knows who committed mistakes, what kind these were and how he went about correcting them. He who has corrected his errors should be left in peace; while those who have not corrected their mistakes should be taken to task in the light of the lessons of the Twenty-Second Congress and warned to correct these wrong views and practices, otherwise they are bound to face unpleasant consequences. We shall not tolerate anyone in the party who does not regard all activities of the party as being based on confidence in the masses. We can only advance together with the masses. It is most important that relations between the party and the people should be strengthened constantly and continuously.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has once again given great help to all the communist and workers' parties by its firm stand against the remnants of the personality cult at the Twenty-Second Congress. In this connection various questions arise. We hold the view that the C.P.S.U. is a party which has accumulated tremendous experiences owing to its historical past; therefore it is a party from which every communist and workers' party may learn.

So the question arises: is there a leading party in the international communist movement; are there possibly more leading parties? The parties throughout the world in the international communist movement are acting now with full independence and equal rights.

So there are no super or subordinated parties in the international communist movement, and there is no need for a special leading party, neither for one, nor for more. What is needed then? From time to time the communist and workers' parties of the world should convene, discuss common experiences, draft a common line and a common resolution, and each should consider these obligatory—just as at present the Moscow Statement of 1960 is considered binding by the communist and workers' parties in their activities. In our opinion the responsibility of each communist party is equal: each communist party is responsible to its own people and to the international working-class movement.

Another question raised was whether the resolutions of one party's congress are binding upon another party; are the resolutions of, say, the Twentieth or the Twenty-Second Congress binding on other parties? The truth of the matter is that not a single party has ever put forward such a demand. It is self-evident that the resolutions adopted by the congress of a party are binding only on its own members. They are binding on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its members; they are not binding on us. But in our opinion, we Hungarian communists are obliged to study and apply in practice all the revolutionary experiences that can be made use of. If the Twentieth or the Twenty-Second Congress of the C.P.S.U. gave us an ideological weapon which can help us in our struggle, it is our duty to study and apply this to conditions in our country. This is how we look upon this Congress. We are convinced that the Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union gave a powerful ideological weapon to all the communist and workers' parties in the world, thus to the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party as well. This Congress gives tremendous new strength and impetus to the struggle of our party as well.

Why do I say we are duty-bound to take the good experiences into consideration? The Communist Party of the Soviet Union achieved the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Had we not taken its experiences into consideration—how to overthrow the power of the capitalists and landlords and to build a socialist society, then we would still be citizens of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and would still be enslaved, together with all our people, by the Manfred Weisses and other capitalists and by the big landlords. It is to our own interest, therefore, to consider the valuable experiences and apply them in our party's struggles to speed up our progress.



Of course, some people are speculating. Their line of reasoning is as follows: see, they have removed Stalin's coffin from the Mausoleum, so a new season is opening for the Right. I have even heard the opinion expressed that we ought to rehabilitate the persons who demolished Stalin's statue here. Please do not mind my speaking about this now, but it is a very important matter. I say that if that statue were still standing, then we could now adopt a decision to have it removed in January or February. But those who demolished Stalin's statue here did not do it because Stalin had faults, but because they hate communism. We shall, therefore, never rehabilitate them.

One can hear nowadays that perhaps the revisionists were not sinners after all, for they too were cursing the personality cult. There are quite a few people who did not join the party after 1956 and are thinking now that there will be some sort of a liberal trend in the communist parties, including our own. This, of course, is an error. Our principles of party building are still the same after the Twenty-Second Congress as they have been during the last five years. You know who can be a member of our party. I do not wish to dwell on this in detail, but I could put it quite simply. I suggest that we observe the following: we must aim to have as many non-party people as possible whom we should be pleased to see in our party. This is one of our aims. The other is that there should be as few party members as possible whom we should be pleased to have outside the party. On this basis we can orientate well. Let us judge people on the basis of our policy and always consider whether the party will become stronger if one person or other becomes a party member, or whether the party would be stronger if we expelled others. This is the foremost requirement of party building.

We must make use of the ideological weapons of the Twenty-Second Congress to speed up our work of construction. Our results so far fortify us for our tasks ahead. Our party, precisely by making use of the experiences of the Twentieth Congress, has achieved great victories during the past five years. Now our task is to continue this work on a higher level.

In recent years there has been a great deal of talk about our difficulties, about strains and stresses in the national economy. What is the truth? We have difficulties and we shall continue to have them, because the building of socialism will always require all our efforts. You are working here, you are building and modernizing the factory. It is the new department which must be completed by January that is causing problems for the Metal Works, and then the other one

which will be completed by March. But if we meet again in February or March there will be new problems, another department of the factory will have to be modernized.

We also have difficulties which stem from a certain general lag. Let us recall that from the summer of 1953 until that of 1957 our development took a zigzag course, the prow of the country's ship was turned now to the left, and now to the right. In those years we lagged behind in both industrial and agricultural development. We could say the same thing about the building of schools. We did not develop our national defence either. We have had to make up for all this. In five years we have overcome an immense lag. Yes, a tremendous lag! We have overcome perhaps the greatest part of this lag, but not all. Our tasks flow from this. You are, by and large, familiar with our results of this year. You are aware that we have raised industrial production 12 per cent, as compared to last year. In the first ten months we overfulfilled the plan targets. And what is perhaps even more important, 70 per cent of the output growth came from greater productivity. We took a big step forward in the socialist reorganization of agriculture. We developed production in many respects. Unfortunately, this year we were retarded by a drought which destroyed part of the fodder crop. Various difficulties and troubles have occurred from this. In the first eight months of the year market prices were lower than last year. Owing to the drought there are difficulties in the supply of potatoes, onions and a few other items. In October and November market prices were higher than last year. So we have problems because of the drought. Under such circumstances we are compelled to import certain foodstuffs—potatoes and onions too—in order to overcome the difficulties caused by the drought. There is nothing else we can do.

The socialist reorganization of agriculture, however, has brought results even in this year of drought. If we did not have a socialist agriculture, tens of thousands of individual peasants would have been ruined because of the drought with fifteen years needed for recovery. But today, as members of cooperative farms, they are not facing ruin; they are working together, and this year's agricultural yield—thanks to the good grain crop and the increase in livestock—will equal last year's, in spite of the drought! This has been the first great test and result of the reorganization of socialist agriculture. The total value of this year's purchases of agricultural products also equals last year's, which is likewise a great achievement after such a serious drought.



The strength of socialist agriculture is evident in the fact that now the autumn work—which provides for next year's bread, fodder and livestock husbandry—is going much better than did last year. We have completed 99.6 per cent of the sowing of bread grains, and 53 to 54 per cent of the deep ploughing. In other words, the basis of next year's bread and fodder crop has been well laid.

We have accomplished results, and good ones too, and we also have problems. We are living and working under these conditions and, what is most important, we are continuing our correct policy. The masses know from experience that this policy is correct and expedient. The majority of the working people want this policy to continue, because they understand it and they see its results from year to year.

Comrades, I should like to state that after the Twenty-Second Congress the general line of our policy has been stabilized for a long time to come. It is possible, therefore, to live and work undisturbed and to study ways and means how to implement this policy even better. Our party's Seventh Congress has designated the correct path. We have a Five-Year Plan which meets the requirements of socialist construction in our country. We shall carry out this plan and overcome our difficulties. The party and the government are continuing to work on the basis of the tested policy we have been pursuing up to now, in reliance on the entire working people, upon the best among them. Who are the ones I regard the best? I say that in this factory the main standard-bearers of our party and the government are the party members, the members of the Communist Youth League, furthermore people who have joined the socialist-brigade movement, whether they be party members or non-party people. These are the people who are doing the most, who are working most intensively to advance our political, economic and cultural development and to improve the attitude of people. Their great merit is that, as a matter of fact, they are the leaders. Their exemplary work and conduct is a great source of strength.

We do not conceal from friend or foe that we are relying on Hungarian-Soviet friendship. We are relying on the Warsaw Treaty Organization, on the socialist camp, the international communist movement, and the strength of the peace camp. And if we are able to rely upon such forces as the unity of our people, the solidarity of the socialist camp, and the world peace movement, then we can overcome all difficulties and we can solve every task. In our country the laying of the foundations of a socialist society is nearing comple-

tion. I am convinced that our progress will be speeded up in the next few years. In international relations we shall solve the German question and defend peace. We are convinced that communism and the cause of peace will triumph throughout the world. These are our perspectives, this is what we are working for. The rate of our advance depends on us.

At one time we used the term: Red Csepel. In this matter, of course, one can always tack on the adjective "Red" to the name if he wants to, but this is not absolutely necessary. It is much more important that it should really be Red Csepel in work, steadfastness, culture and socialist firmness. On the basis of Csepel's revolutionary past and its achievements in socialist construction I can say: the workers of Sormovo sent this flag to a good place, and I resolved to take it and hand it over to Csepel, because Csepel deserves it for its historic past, and present accomplishments.

Csepel's work also left its imprint on this year's results. It is a great thing that you have increased production 11 per cent instead of the planned 8 per cent, in comparison to last year. Just before the meeting we toured the Metal Works. This factory has grown so vast that one day is hardly enough to go through it. This factory is, both in a figurative and in an actual sense, a battleground for the new, for the new Hungarian industry.

What did I like in this factory? First of all, the perceptible flow of socialist creative work. You are full of plans helpful for the development of socialist industry. There are many young executives in the factory. Of course, youthfulness is a relative concept. I do not know whether your idea of a young person is the same as mine. To me, people around 40 years of age—who are executives of big departments and shops—are still young. Here, they say "he is young, but he knows his job." Yes, he is driven by socialist, communist enthusiasm. He has the training, and he knows how to handle people!

Comrades, cherish and cultivate this spirit in this factory, as we must cherish and cultivate it throughout the country. Then progress will be faster.

I would like to ask you now to accept officially from me this red flag which the best Soviet working men and women in the city of Gorky have sent to you with a genuine fraternal love, as a symbol of fraternal Hungarian-Soviet friendship. I ask you to be loyal to this friendship, to be loyal to the socialist ideals of our people in your work, in your conduct and in your culture.

You shall take great pleasure yet in those results which we have achieved up to now, and which we shall achieve in the future.

I wholeheartedly wish every worker in the factory good health and the best of success. I ask you constantly to bear in mind that the Central Committee and the government cannot be shaken in upholding the cause of communism. The foundation of our struggle is the confidence which you and the whole Hungarian people will give us in the future as you have given during the past five years.

## LET US RALLY THE ENTIRE WORKING PEOPLE FOR SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

SPEECH TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE PATRIOTIC  
PEOPLE'S FRONT

December 8th, 1961

Members of the National Council, Dear Comrades, Friends:

There are a few questions on which I would like to comment.

We are convinced that the line of our foreign policy is correct and is bolstered by great strength. Its objective is to preserve peace for our people, to hold the aggressive forces of imperialism in check and to keep working for universal and complete disarmament.

We can make our foreign policy more effective in the first place by reinforcing our internal unity and consolidating our system, and also by further strengthening the international front to which we belong. Above all, we shall deepen our friendship with the Soviet Union and, loyal to the Warsaw Treaty, enhance the unity of the socialist camp and also our solidarity with the international working-class movement and with all forces fighting against imperialism. We are convinced that our foreign political aims will be realized and, together with all the peoples, we shall finally be able to achieve universal and complete disarmament and to rid mankind of the curse of war.

Our most immediate foreign political aim is the conclusion of the German peace treaty and putting a stop to the abnormal situation in West Berlin, and the repulsion of West German militarism in general.

This is a clear-cut objective, and one which meets with the approval of our people, which they regard as necessary and just and to which they give their backing. Our people realize and feel that our foreign policy protects the interests of our country, our socialist achievements, our independence and peace.

We regard our internal policy, the political struggle of the party, as a struggle on two fronts. We are proceeding along the road which is charted by Marxist-Leninist theory and by the polit-

ical experience of our party, government and people. In the meantime, however, we are accompanied by gadflies which like to trail "processions" of this size, and they keep on stinging us from both the right and left. We shall keep fighting against these in the future, too. For it must be stated openly that, although we have put an end to the personality cult, we have not yet completely liquidated the dogmatic way of thinking and sectarian attitude, nor have we completely done away with revisionism. There is a lesson to be learned from the personality cult, which we must keep in mind even now that the tree of the personality cult has been uprooted and cut down.

During the period of the personality cult tens and hundreds of thousands of people who played a role in society regarded themselves as exempt from the obligation and responsibility of thinking. The fact is that, when it is said that there are five people, or there is just one person, in the country who know, or knows, and who see, or sees, everything and think, or thinks, of everything, this means that there is actually but little need for us to use our heads. This kind of thinking was not accidental during the personality cult, for where decisions are not preceded by extensive discussions, where people have no say in what is to be done, they feel no sense of responsibility whatever with regard to the job to be done.

A new situation exists now that the personality cult has been abolished; people must really think, in order to arrive at correct conclusions; they have to make decisions in their own fields of work and must accept the responsibility for them.

In the last three years a process of great portent, one which concerns all of society, has taken place in our country, namely the socialist reorganization of the countryside. One feature of this is worth noting because of the lesson to be learned from it. When conditions were ripe, the Central Committee of the party decided that mass organization of cooperatives must begin. However, the Central Committee did not in a single instance set percentage targets for the individual counties or the country as a whole.

We realized that, if we had set such targets, it would have been useless to list all the requirements, namely, that no pressure should be employed, but persuasion should be used, etc. Any kind of percentage targets would merely have led to the enforcement of the same pattern for the whole country, although conditions are different in every county, borough and village. Therefore every county prepared its own development plan with due attention to local con-

ditions and to the differences between the rural districts. The rate of progress was uneven during the three years; some counties went ahead very fast, others at a much slower pace, but none of them were reproached for this.

I happened to be in Zala County this year and talked this matter over with Comrade Iván Darabos, the secretary of the County Party Committee. He told me two things. First, they were very grateful to the Central Committee that, although they had been lagging behind for a considerable length of time, no one had put them to shame, and no one prodded them. Moreover, he said, "Do you know, Comrade Kádár, what a load you put on us when we were not told just how much was expected of us?" I said that we knew it, and, as a matter of fact, this had not been done accidentally.

Believe me, we can be a hundred times more assured about the fate of the country when we know that hundreds of thousands, or I can safely say millions, of people are worrying about the fate of our country than if it is the concern of only fifteen, five, or perhaps just one person.

The socialist aspiration, which is able to mobilize the resources of the entire liberated people, can be a tremendous power if its wings are not clipped by the personality cult.

With reference to our policy, one can still often hear remarks like: if things went everywhere in line with the directives of the Central Committee, the National Assembly and the government, we could really give our wholehearted support, but things don't go that way everywhere. That is, there are still people who do not exactly implement the policy proclaimed by the party, adopted by the government, and endorsed by the Patriotic People's Front, in accord with the party. We are fighting against such people, too. And we shall also fight against those who are still motivated by views which hamper progress, who are too lazy to think and who shirk responsibility.

Naturally we shall continue our struggle against Right views as well. Lately we have observed a certain stir among the exponents of such views. Of course, they still know more or less how to behave. But, nevertheless, somehow there is some commotion because they think that with the severe and correct criticism of Stalin's mistakes at the Twenty-Second Congress, they can come forth and say: "After all we criticized the same thing, so, as a matter of fact, we too were right. Consequently you should give us more elbow-room." But what they actually did was to attack the workers' power under



pretence of fighting against the mistakes and allow the enemies of socialism to lead them by the nose.

We are fighting on two fronts against the gadflies and whatnots annoying us from Left and Right alike. But there is a third kind of nuisance, too. Whom does it consist of? Of people who are neither Right nor Left, who are on no particular side, but somehow find their place in various areas of public affairs and are interested only in grabbing and villainy. Once in a while they even don some kind of a political cloak, acting more radical than anyone else, while at other times they miss no opportunity to warn us to go slowly. In fact, they have no ideology of any kind and have never done any fighting for any cause. This is a group without a political countenance, and there has been a proper term for them in the Hungarian vocabulary for several centuries. They are idlers, thieves and swindlers. They are hypocrites who occasionally still manage to put a word in, to act and sermonize in public affairs, although all they are interested in is their own position and their own pockets. They are small in number, but we must fight against their ilk, too. He who claims a share in public affairs must be the kind of man that wants to work and is able to work, is ready to accept responsibility and act for the common good and for the realization of our plans.

We must develop closer ties between party members and non-party people, strengthen the idea of the People's Front and its influence upon the masses, strengthen the various committees and their work. Basically this means that we must have more confidence in the masses because this is fundamental to our policy. Without this confidence in the masses we cannot exist. And we must have more confidence in individuals, too.

There was, for instance, the reorganization of the government. One aspect of this was, as you know, that a few communist leaders of the younger generation were entrusted with greater responsibility. This is, of course, a sign of confidence in those persons, and also a consequence of the fact that some people grow up without our really noticing it. We found out, for instance, about one of the deputy prime-ministers only on the day he took his oath that he had just celebrated his fortieth birthday. I said to him: "My greetings to you, for it sounds better to say of a statesman that he is already in his forties."

Recently, the office of a deputy speaker of the National Assembly was vacated due to the death of an M. P. As you know, we recommended our friend Miklós Beresztóczy for this office; this was

a joint nomination by the Central Committee of the party and the Patriotic People's Front and was unanimously accepted by the National Assembly. I am not speaking about his person, for all of us know that Beresztóczy is not a communist, but he is a man working for socialism and peace. That is why we nominated him for this honourable office. Some people when they heard about this nomination posed the question whether it was a good idea. "Why shouldn't it be good?" I asked. "Well, after all, a priest will now be the deputy speaker of the National Assembly." They added, "Some people may misinterpret this, and church-going may be given a new impetus."

I do not know whether more people will go to church now than before, but the matter touches upon something entirely different, and that is the essence of our policy. If we can work together for ten years with certain people as good fellow-fighters for the socialist future of the country and for the peace of the people, I don't see why they should not be good enough for public office.

Let me tell you frankly that if at the session of the National Assembly the bell is in the hand of a priest for a few hours, that does not make me worry about the fate of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary. And anyone who worries about its fate because of this can say what he will, but he does not really believe in the principles which he thinks he serves.

I think it is clear what I mean by this. You know very well that I am a communist and that I am fighting for the influence of the party in society as a whole. But I know that this does not depend on whether in a committee of eight there are eight party members, or only four. I recall the time when all the members of all committees were formally party members, and nevertheless, communist influence was not so great as if only half of them had been party members. What on earth would be the use of impressing into the party people who are not convinced communists? That won't make our party stronger, nor will it make them real communists. At long last we must realize that the influence of the communist party does not depend on such external factors; it depends on our safeguarding the purity of our ideology, on our pursuing a correct economic and cultural policy. Then the supporters of communism will increase by the millions in our country and even non-party people will work wholeheartedly for socialism. That is sound progress. But to achieve it, we must have unshakable faith in the cause of communism and confidence in the working class and the entire Hungarian people.

The proper approach is, after all, to consider that 95 or 96 out of a hundred people are out to do good, and not the other way round, to have confidence in only two persons out of a hundred.

Publicists in the West keep pricking us, and it really does no harm, because we consider them volunteer assistants who are getting paid by imperialism to look for the errors of communists. Well, now they say: "This Kádár regime is very shrewd, they want to cheat everybody. For the Rákosi group used to say, 'Those who are not with us are against us'; and now this Kádár bunch says, 'Those who are not against us are with us.'" Such are the "errors" on which the western publicists are harping nowadays. We can face this charge with complete assurance. Yes, as a matter of fact, that's just what we think: those who are not against the Hungarian People's Republic are with it; those who are not against the H.S.W.P. are with it; and those who are not against the People's Front are with it. Of course, some of the sympathizers are more conscious and agree even with our far-range objectives, while others side with us on ordinary everyday affairs. For instance, there are hundreds of thousands of people who are not Marxists, but respect our party and government for having established law and order and a normal atmosphere in our country. They are with us, and it is in this spirit that we must develop our policies.

At the Seventh Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party very important theoretical conclusions were voiced about this, and we said that we must safeguard the purity of Marxism-Leninism because it is our guiding light. We must watch over our party, the revolutionary party of the working class, which is the leading force in the social life of the Hungarian people and one of the main guarantees of a socialist future. We also said that the Patriotic People's Front is a major factor in social life and in implementing our objectives.

The only correct interpretation of the aforementioned is that Marxist-Leninist theory, the party and the Patriotic People's Front are, separately and together, only instruments in the struggle. The main task of the party and, in a certain sense, of the People's Front is leadership, mobilization and organization. The Seventh Congress of the H.S.W.P. especially took pains to make it clear: these are not things for their own sake; they are subordinate to the great objectives, ensuring a better life and a socialist future for our people. We are building a socialist society not because there is Marxism-Leninism which prescribes this, or because there is the

party which must lead the people in a certain direction, or because there is a Patriotic People's Front which helps to lead the masses in a definite direction; it is the other way round: there is need for a good theory, a good party and a good People's Front; a socialist society has to be built because that ensures a better life for people, and the country's and the nation's prosperity. If this view will prevail among the hundreds of thousands of people who work and act on behalf of the party or the People's Front, then this feature of our work will become stronger, its mass appeal will grow, the cohesion of the people and the development of the national unity which we urge will gain in strength. Leadership is not synonymous with domination, and the work we are doing is service for something which is our most sacred duty: to serve the socialist homeland, the Hungarian People's Republic and our people. We must always keep in mind that we are not a new group chosen to rule, but are men and women called to serve the people.

This aim, the optimal service of the people, must be kept in mind in every public forum, at every conference; this is the yardstick for measuring the success of such talks. Fine words are not the substance of conferences, no more than of life; it is rather what we can achieve through them. These conferences should be permeated by the awareness that they will help to get a little more wheat, perhaps more maize, more meat, more milk, a few better books, or—a few generally comprehensible and ideologically acceptable poems. This gives sense to a conference.

The growth of the mass basis for our entire policy in these years depends in the first place on how we can solve the tasks of economic and cultural construction. People judge on the basis of economic and cultural progress, because this has the most direct bearing on their life.

The yardstick for judging what and how much a person has created is his efforts, no matter what his occupation may be.

I have, for instance, a great deal of respect for the members of the socialist brigades. Not only for what they are doing today, but also because they are paving the way for improved production standards on a mass scale and the training of socialist men and women. The socialist brigade movement was initiated by workers, but we are glad to note that it is no longer a workers' movement only, but is winning followers in the villages and even in the ranks of the intellectuals. Many peasants are actually leaders or members of socialist brigades, although they may not even be aware of this

and may not call themselves that because they have not organized such a brigade.

During the intermission I met my friend Comrade Kelemen here who is a cooperative farm chairman. We had time for only a few words. They founded their cooperative farm two years ago and called it "Peasant's Honour." This name is very much to my liking. And now I hear that at home in their co-op they keep on saying that they must work so as to deserve not only the first part of the name, "peasant," and at the same time forfeit the "honour" part. This cooperative farm is not yet one of the strongest ones, but their attitude does give a glimpse of the socialist peasant and helps to form his way of thinking.

Without a doubt a similar process is taking place among the intellectuals. Just recently I received a letter from a teacher who wrote that they too were wondering about how to form a socialist brigade. Their idea is to form a brigade of socialist character called "Moulding the New Man" in the teaching staff, in order to demonstrate real socialist public education and teaching.

I am speaking about all this because I think that this trend, the socialist brigade movement, is a wonderful thing, and it will become even more wonderful when it really permeates the town and the village, workers, peasants and intellectuals alike. That is what is moulding the new man, who will create the new society.

In its latest resolution the Central Committee raised the idea that it would be a good thing for the socialist brigade movement to develop further, and for the brigades to try to give entire shops or factories, possibly entire villages and cooperative farms, such a character. I do not know whether this form will develop, and if so when, but I am sure that when it does come into being, the title of Shop (Factory or Farm) of Socialist Labour will be one which will win the highest social recognition.

Members of the National Council:

We are convinced that our domestic and foreign policy, our economic and cultural objectives are correct, that they correspond to the interests of the people and serve socialist progress and socialist future. This is a very important prerequisite for enabling one to do his work wholeheartedly. If one has a clear objective and a policy tested in practice which has proved to be correct, one is able to work with complete devotion for these goals.

Who are the adherents of this policy? In the first place the conscientious, sincere, true and loyal adherents of socialism. More-

over, hosts of people who are not Marxists in their thinking, but are drawing closer to socialism. Our policy is a Leninist policy because we, too, work in such a way as to rally all the working people to build a socialist society. Five years of practical work in this country should convince everyone that we are indeed beginning to learn this policy, this work, and that not only convinced communists support the party and the People's Front, but also large masses of non-party people. They, too, realize that we wish to work for the benefit of the entire people, including them. And those who understand that our policy is of and for the entire people should also understand that this policy can be implemented only by the entire people; only the people as a whole can build socialism.

What is the Patriotic People's Front? This has been a much-discussed problem in our country. By now everybody is beginning to see that, since its re-establishment, the People's Front has been active every day, and that it has created a great many new things for socialist construction; it has helped in the great cause of the socialist transformation of the countryside. Everyone who has been active in the People's Front movement these last few years may stand before the people with a clear conscience. We have left behind an entire phase of development; great and important events have taken place in our country these last few years. People judge our activity first of all on the basis of results, but not merely on the basis of results, for they also judge our intentions and efforts. People understand that there was a drought; since it was impossible to draw water from the skies, there was less maize. But the yardstick of the opinion about our work is also whether everyone had, under the given conditions and with the given possibilities, intended and endeavoured to accomplish the most and the best possible results. At a time when some people said, "We are almost like demigods," even the people knew that we were just ordinary mortals, and they still know it. People expect of us only what can and must be expected of human beings. They expect us to be conscientious when we make decisions and fully accept the responsibility which we certainly cannot avoid. This is the criterion by which people form their opinion of every leader, of the Speaker of the National Assembly, the Minister of State, the cooperative farm chairman, the foreman, and others. Let us work in such a way that, as far as possible, we shall be praised by our achievements; but our intentions and efforts should be beyond reproach even when our achievements are occasionally more modest. People blame us less for that, but find it



hard to forgive us if there is any fault with our intentions and efforts.

I think this should be the thinking of all of us, as a group and as individuals, so that we may say with clear conscience that we have endeavoured to carry out our duties honourably. And, I repeat, let us never forget that what we call leadership must be also regarded as duty and service. I believe that the record of the Patriotic People's Front is not a bad one. Let us all buckle down to make this record still better.

## EXPLANATORY NOTES

*Angyalföld*—popular name of District XIII of Budapest, an industrial district

*Hanság*—swampy area in North-western Hungary. An extensive reclamation project took place in the *Hanság* with the participation of large groups of young volunteers

*hold*—Hungarian unit of land measure: 1 cadastral *hold* = 0.57 hectare = 1.42 acres

*Népszabadság* — central daily of the H.S.W.P.

*Szabad Nép* — central daily of the H.W.P.P.

q.—abbreviation of quintal (Hungarian unit of weight-measure); 100 kg.-2 cwt.

C.P.H.—Communist Party of Hungary (Hungarian initials K.M.P.)  
from November 1918 to September 1944

H.C.P.—Hungarian Communist Party (Hungarian initials M.K.P.)  
from September 1944 to June 1948

H.W.P.P.—Hungarian Working People's Party (Hungarian initials M.D.P.)  
from June 1948 to November 1956

H.S.W.P.—Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party (Hungarian initials M.Sz.M.P.)  
from November 1956

Y.C.W.L.H.—Young Communist Workers' League of Hungary (Hungarian initials KIMSz) from 1918 to 1936

C.Y.L.—Communist Youth League (Hungarian initials KISz)  
from 1957