

# On the Recent Incidents in Hungary

*Written in 1956, just after the Soviet Red Army, at the urgent call of the lawful Government of Hungary, had to intervene and smash the counter-revolutionary uprising there and save the socialist state.*

The recent incidents in the East European People's Democratic countries, particularly in Hungary, have caused a great stir among all sections of both the pro-communist and anti-communist people of the world. The enemies of communism and the Soviet Union have once again engaged themselves in anti-Soviet tirades in different countries of the world, centring round this incident in Hungary. Leaving aside these reactionary cliques, it cannot be denied that even those who till the other day were supporters of the Soviet Union have, due to the present incidents in East European countries, become apprehensive and sceptical about the goal and ideology of communism and the foreign policy of the USSR. The bourgeois press and their hirelings are making every effort to give a firm foundation to all these doubts and apprehensions. Even among a section of the communists of different countries, these incidents have caused various types of confusion about the role and character of the leadership of the CPSU and the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that all these have tarnished the image of the Soviet Union, even if temporarily, before the people of the world. At a time when the Soviet Union is the leader of the world peace movement and when its foreign policy is the guarantee to the peace loving and exploited people of the world against the machination of the Anglo-US-French imperialists to gag the emergence of resurgent nationalism in the Asian and African

countries and to crush their struggle for independence, and more so against their conspiracy to unleash a global war – these doubts and apprehensions about the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, the role and character of its leadership that have cropped up in the minds of the people, including even a section of so-called communists, will, no doubt, to a great extent weaken the cause of the peace movement itself. Precisely for this, it is all the more important to make a correct and thorough analysis and appraisal of the recent incidents in Hungary and the role played by the CPSU leadership and the Soviet Union.

A close scrutiny of these incidents, free from the bias of either blind support or blind opposition, will reveal one point glaringly. The movement initiated to reinstate Imre Nagy in power, and which was a manifestation of the internal dissension among the communists, was in the long run seriously influenced by anti-Soviet reactionary national jingoism; and as its inevitable outcome all types of reactionary slogans, alien to proletarian internationalism, such as demands for withdrawal of the Soviet troops, repeal of the Warsaw Pact, the taking of aid both from the Soviet Union and the USA to build the economy, declaring Hungary as a non-aligned country and so on and so forth, were being raised ! The Nagy government was seen to surrender willingly or unwillingly to these reactionary demands. In spite of being aware of all this, the Soviet Union agreed to withdraw its troops at the request of the Nagy government and the Soviet army started to pull out of Hungary. As the Nagy government succumbed to the demands of the reactionary nationalist forces, the majority of the communists who did not fall victim to these reactionary moves — whatever might have been their shortcomings, limitations and mistakes — being backed by revolutionary people, formed a new government under the leadership of Janos Kadar with ministers, most of whom were from the old Cabinet. Realizing the gravity of the situation this new government requested the Soviet army to quell this

counter-revolution, establish peace and help protect the hard-won People's Democratic State. As per the Warsaw Pact, it is obligatory on the part of the Soviet Union to comply with the requests made by the new legal and legitimate government for restoration of peace in the country. Hence, those who are indulging in anti-Soviet slanderous campaign and branding the Soviet action as aggression on a foreign country, are either totally ignorant or deliberately acting as the agents of Anglo-US imperialism. This apart, the doubts and confusions centring round these incidents that are now prevailing among a section of so-called Marxists or communists in different countries, are, in our opinion, mainly for two reasons.

The first reason is the senseless obsession about the word 'people' and the impact of reactionary bourgeois ideology on the nationalist movement. And the second one, their failure to realize that fighting the domineering attitude of the CPSU leadership over the communist parties of other countries (if at all it is a fact) has nothing to do with hostility to the Soviet Union or with the act of supporting or encouraging anti-Soviet hysteria. To fight against domination and interference by any other communist party, whatever its stature, is indispensable to build up dialectical relationship in place of a mechanical one between the fraternal communist parties. But for a communist it is an unpardonable offence to adopt a hostile attitude to the Soviet Union or to support those who have any anti-Soviet bias since it goes against proletarian internationalism or for that matter the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism.

But after all these, a question still remains — how could the reactionary nationalist ideology make so much headway even after seven or eight years since the establishment of People's Democratic State under the leadership of the Communist Party? So, without caring to resolve the fundamental questions involved, any attempt to somehow get over this problem immediately is liable to lead to a similar perilous situation in future and similarly worsen the

relationship between the East European socialist countries and the Soviet Union.

Here we feel it necessary to recall particularly that aspect of the observation made by the Central Committee of our party on the Report of the 20th Congress of the CPSU to which we drew the attention of all communists abroad. There we showed that, while pointing to Stalin's mistakes and opposing these using the cover of Leninism, they interpreted the Leninist concept of "different forms of achievement of socialism" virtually from the standpoint of reformist nationalist outlook. Hence, it is not unlikely for communist parties of different countries to become influenced by this reformist nationalist trend of thinking and outlook. *And we shall not at all be surprised if these communist parties, as an opposite reaction to the present practice of dittoing, develop in them an "ultra-independent" and extreme trend of opposing whatever comes from the CPSU, on some pretext or other.* Because, this opposite trend is the inevitable outcome of blind authoritarianism that still influences the international communist movement, as before.

The nationalist feeling of the people of the Balkan States that remained suppressed for a long period because of the oppressive and exploitative rule by Czarist Russia and the Western imperialist powers, found a natural and easy outlet after the Second World War with the defeat of fascist Germany and establishment of People's Democratic States under the leadership of the communist parties with the help of the Red Army in these countries. The impact of nationalist feelings was also noticed to a great extent among the communist parties of these countries. Many of the leaders of the East European communist parties could not free themselves from this, although national jingoism is alien to proletarian internationalism. The demand for "Separate Balkan Federation" under the leadership of Tito was a glaring example of the presence of national chauvinism in the communist movement. This ultranationalist feeling which is

alien to proletarian internationalism was rendered very much subdued both inside and outside the party during Stalin's lifetime due to a fierce ideological struggle conducted under his able leadership. But the way Comrade Stalin was criticized in the name of eradicating the cult of individual not only undermined Stalin but also tarnished to a great extent the image of the CPSU in the estimation of different communist parties and the people of the world, and more so before the people and the communist parties of East European countries. Moreover, as a result of the change in attitude towards the Communist League of Yugoslavia and other Titoite communists of East European countries and also due to the nationalist reformist interpretation given by the Khrushchev leadership to the Leninist theory of "different forms of achievement of socialism", the ultra-nationalist feelings that had to a great extent been rendered very much subdued through intense ideological struggle, flared up with redoubled intensity in the form of outbursts of anti-Soviet anger. Comrade Stalin was condemned very much as bureaucratic by the Khrushchev leadership for suppressing the reactionaries with a strong hand but paradoxically, the same Khrushchev leadership resorts to hundred times more ruthlessness in suppressing the counter-revolutionaries of Hungary.

In fine, we would like to reiterate what we said earlier and appeal to the leaders of the CPSU and other communist friends of different countries to realize that the responsibility for eradicating the cult of individual does not end with a mere verbal declaration. It should be borne in mind that the cult of individual is still exerting its influence in diverse forms in the thought-process of the international communist movement. Blind authoritarianism in different forms is still intermingled in the thought process of the communists. In fact, it has developed almost into a system of thought. None of the shortcut methods of either dittoing or blindly opposing the Soviet leadership can save the communist parties from the

impasse that has developed in their mutual relationship. The influence of ultra-nationalism or Titoism which manifests itself in the present trend of anti-Sovietism is nothing but the opposite tendency of blind authoritarianism. If we, the communists, fail to hold aloft collectively the banner of proletarian internationalism while there is still time, freeing the communist process of thinking and movement from authoritarianism and reformist nationalist outlook by conducting intense ideological struggle, then the existing complex relationship between us, the communists will assume greater complexity in future.

Article first published in  
*Ganadabi* in its November  
Revolution Special Issue of  
November 15, 1956.