

**CENTRAL EUROPEAN
POLITICAL SCIENCE
REVIEW**

**2017
Summer**

Quarterly of Central European Political Science Alliance

**Volume: 18
Number: 68-69**

**RETORSION AND ESCAPE, EMIGRATION AND
INCLUSION**

International help to the Freedom Fighters of 1956

SPECIAL ISSUES OF CEPSR IN TWO VOLUMENS

CONTENT

An Irregular Introduction – by **Editor-in-chief**

Did really the great Goliath win over the little David?
Lectons of an Insurrection

I. Volume

Gyula Illyés: A Sentence on Tyranny

Chronology of Insurrection of 1956 Hungary - by
Alessandro Marengo

The Countries of Communist Block

György Juhász: Tito's Yugoslavia and the Hungarian '56

Edit Lőrinczné Bencze: The Yugoslav – Hungarian
Relations in 1956

Artúr Lakatos: The Hungarian '56 and his Consequences
in Romania

Csaba Kiss G.: The Monument of the Hungarian '56 in
Central Europe

János Tischler: Warsaw-Budapest, 1956 - The Relations
between the Hungarian Revolution and the Polish October

Attila Simon: The Revolution of 1956 and Slovakia. The
response of authority and citizens for the events in Hungary

Jozef Leikert: Slovakian Writers and their Reactions to
the Hungarian Revolution of '56

László Domonkos: Soviet Soldiers Who Switched Sides
during the Hungarian Revolution

II. Volume

An Irregular Introduction – by **Editor-in-chief**

Did really the great Goliath win over the little David?
Lectons of an Insurrection

Hungary

Tamás Fricz: 1956 Lives - Thoughts on the actuality of
1956

Csaba Varga: The Revolution of 1956 in the Judgement of Ethics and Law Or the Responding Ability of Law as a Post-totalitarian Dilemma

The Western European Countries

Dolores Ferrero Blanco:

Andrea Carteny:

Tibor Szabó:

Peter Zachar: Austria became an adult: 1956

Memoirs of the witness

Csaba Kenessey: Reminiscence of a Witness of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956

György Szapáry: 1956 Gave me a Chance

Appendix:

Sándor Márai: Angels from Heaven

Avanti Ragazzi of Buda – March of Lazio Football Club

Annex – by **Borbála Kossuth**

Abstracts

About the Authors

CEPoliti Review Summer 2017, Vol. 18. No.67-68.

Quarterly of CEPSA

Editor-in-chief: János Simon

General Assistant of Editor: Dr. Borbála Kossuth

International Assistant of Editor: Alessandro Marengo

Executive Committee of CEPSA:

International Advisory Committee:

RETORSION AND ESCAPE, EMIGRATION AND EXCLUSION

International help to the Freedom Fighters' of 1956

SPECIAL ISSUES OF CEPSR IN TWO VOLUMENS

This issues was published with the help of the support of "Memoir-Committee of 1956". (In the Imre Sinkovits sub-program).

The project number is „KKETTKK-56P-04”.

Tamás Fricz

1956 Lives -

Thoughts on the actuality of 1956

Introduction

On the 200th anniversary of the French Revolution, Chinese historians were invited by the French to give their opinion on the historic role of 1789. The deliberated Chinese allegedly responded to this the French Revolution is still too close to tomorrow, it would be premature to judge the significance of it ... What shall we say then in connection with 1956? I wonder whether we could summarize the findings sixty-one years after the revolution and war of independence?

I think we do not have the opportunity to do so not only because of the shortness of passed time but also because 1956 is actually still alive. It's living history, in other words, politics. Live, because the fifty sixes are still live amongst us, just like the revolutionary heroes and villains, and many of them are still active in public life today. Live, because they are still a number of question marks about 1956, of which history could not give a definitive and unquestionable answers. (I would point out only one of them: the role of foreign powers and intelligence services in the development of the process.) Finally, also live because the main objectives of 1956 have not been materialised in their entirety even to this day. In this study I would like to say more about the latter.

I. What were the main goals of the revolution, and what and how they have been implemented, and what have not to the present day?

The original goals of the revolution can be summarized in

four points:

1. Achieving national independence, sovereignty against the domination of Soviet Union.
2. Achieving freedom through the overthrow of Stalinism.
3. Free elections and multiparty system, thereby achieving democracy.
4. Self-government by citizens and employees, participation in public affairs and reorganization of the civil society.

Take these, and let's look at what challenges do the values and goals of 1956 face in the second decade of the 21st century, within the framework of a radically changing, globalizing world order.

It is a fact, on 19th June 1991 the Soviet army left Hungary (why is not this day a national holiday yet?), but since then our sovereignty is under new kind of attacks, which now mainly arrive from outside, the international and global environment. This external challenge has appeared during the regime change of 1989-1990, almost in parallel to the democratic changes, and has intensified especially in the last five to ten years. What challenge are we talking about?

By the second decade of the 21st century the global market and the nation-state, the cleavage between globalization and democracy has developed and in the future this will become increasingly the most dominant conflict, while including other cleavages as well. The global elite is in conflict with the nation-state and democracy at a time, and believes the solution is the reign of international institutions over the nation states. According to their ideas, overshadowing nation-states then eliminating them on longer term, or the creation of a new global order instead of national democracies would mean the solution to conflict

all around the world.

That is, after our dependence on the Soviet Union finally eliminated and we liberated ourselves from the subject of the bipolar world, almost immediately a global elite has appeared advertising a single-poled, single-centered world order, which is again threatens our hard-won independence and sovereignty. Now not by military means, but by economic and financial intervention, manipulation and the one-sided reality interpretation of the media and press, informal, secret service methods, or by fake NGO networks, aim to weaken or overthrow sovereign governments.

The contrary of globalism (global system) and democracy or the global market and the national/ nation-state like being is also complex category because it includes more important conflict and confrontation in itself. These include:

1. United States of Europe or the Europe of nations.
The first would mean the elimination of national sovereignty and the establishment of a focused, super-federal state, which also would become part of the global institutional order. (Note in silence that under the guidance of Antonio Guterres future Secretary-General of the United Nations will want increasingly to comply with their name, that is the “merger” of nations would not be the cooperation of the sovereign and equal countries, but the disappearance of nation-states. - if we allow that.)
2. Multiculturalism or the rule of the majority culture.
The advocates of globalization starting from cultures, religions, ethnic groups, etc. proclaiming the protection of minorities against the current ruling majority, that is from the „oppressive” white, male, Christian middle-class; their ideal is a cosmopolitan citizen who breaks up with the national identity,

religion, culture. In contrast with that, proponents of the constituent (majority) culture in terms of the national existence consider life-threatening and reject the mixing, merger and dissolution of cultures within the country.

3. Elitism or anti-elitism. The advocates of globalization trust the expertise of market leader companies, managers, banks and “investors” the most, and admit that the world should be governed by a knowledgeable elite. However, the starting point of the opposition of the global elite performers is that elitism enhance social differences between an extremely narrow, increasingly concentrating and super-rich layer and the extreme crowds of billions of people that could have disastrous consequences.
4. The migration is an opportunity or risk for Europe. The globalists, the EU elite’s position is clear: The Pan-Europe concept of Coudenhove Kalergi (1920), about a mongrel Europe the stands on one side of the cleavage (the Kalergi award is given in every two years, to one of the members of the European political elite in Aachen); on the other side a camp aims to defend European culture and religion (led by Viktor Orbán and the V4).

In summary: the globalism and the deep abyss between worldview/ world perception of national existence infinitely affects our century. This is a cleavage not only because it is present in the field politics and ideas, but apparently it divides societies as well. However, the advocates of globalization have enormous resources at their disposal, which against the nation states one by one are unable to defend their sovereignty. Therefore, they need to create a

variety of alliances, between equal nations while preserving their own autonomy, thus becoming a “global” force on their own. In this way, sovereignly created alliances from the bottom now are able to self-defence against a global elitocracy, to defend national sovereignty.

Regarding to this and to the sovereignty of our country it is a really important aspect that the Visegrad Four countries coordinate their policies, their actions, their initiatives more intensively within the EU. In the medium term there is also a chance to expand this initiative to a kind of central and eastern European cooperation, involving Austria in a particular case.

Only one motto is possible: to act against global challenges only with a powerful global collaboration, and thus defend the national sovereignty.

II. Have we entirely achieved our freedom sixty years after 1956? Are the individuals, citizens free, do human and civil rights apply to all areas?

Apparently yes, but behind the appearances we meet old and new limits of freedom – on one hand domestically, on the other hand due to the global external effects mentioned above. In terms of domestic barriers, I have to mention three dates: 1956-2006-2017. 1956 does not need to be explained; on the 23rd October 2006, almost everyone remembers the brutal police action against protesters. On the fiftieth anniversary of the revolution, freedom and human rights were trampled under the foot of the police of the Gyurcsány government in abstract and the literal sense as well, especially the rights to freedom of expression and protest.

After these came February 2017, when - eleven years after the events! - the court dismissed almost every police chief from the prosecution’s accusations which were not

sufficiently forceful and worthy of sins in themselves. Not to mention that without the decision of the top leader of police and the Interior Ministry, the Hungarian Prime-minister, Ferenc Gyurcsány, the brutal police attacks would not have happened, no one impeached him, no one even summoned him as a witness in the trials. It is hard to accept and tolerate the court's verdict for the vast majority of Hungarian citizens who now live for 27 years in democracy, and unfortunately I have to refer to my own proverb, Hungary – according to these- still a country without consequences ...

In other words, the freedom within the country is still limited by the original “ancient sin”, the ancient sin of our democracy that at the dawn of the regime change the first freely elected government has made no lustration, historic reparation and elite replacement. It did not replace political decision-makers who played an important role in the dictatorship, the nomenclature, the heads of intelligence services, dominant personalities of the courts and public prosecutors, and it let these post-Communist network to be maintained almost intact and express it's activities - until today. This appears in this unacceptable decision, this shows that historical enemies of freedom are still present and continue their “blessed” activities in Hungary. However, freedom is endangered by the outside, global effects. The most important manifestation of this is multiculturalism that has spread over the last thirty to forty years in the United States and in Western Europe, and has embodied more violent forms in the recent years. The foundations of multiculturalism were set up in the fifties and sixties by a western, Liberal-Marxist philosophical workshop, the Frankfurt School or “Cultural Marxism”.

What is the innovation of Cultural Marxism? It sets a new oppressed to the place of the economic oppressed, the

workers - because it realizes that the workers in exchange of some welfare and concessions will willingly fit into the framework of the civil (Western) culture in and become bourgeois. After that, therefore, the emphasis should be placed on cultural and social repression and the oppressed ones by the culture and oppressors are must be marked. All this is taking place along the model of classical, economic Marxism: in Marx's opinion, the workers and peasants are inherently good, while the bourgeoisie, owners and employers are inherently bad, and in the cultural Marxism some- sexual, ethnic, religious, etc. - minorities are good, while a nation forming, maintaining middle class is "ab ovo" bad, evil. So the "new oppressed" are the feminist women for instance (non-feminist women of course are not, they are the oppressors). Blacks, Hispanics, minorities associated with Islam, gays, the LMBTQI groups, atheists, etc. So they are the embodiment of good, while the middle-class white men, Christians and patriots are the bad, and as a kind of a new bourgeoisie, they severely suppress the aforementioned minorities.

According to the Cultural Marxists the majority of cultural oppression should be rebel against, and universities, the media and the press, the public, civil society, research institutions, every place their views can be extended should be occupied. If this expropriation (as in classical Marxism capital appropriation) happens, a politically correct language must be developed in the public mind, which considers any existing difference by birth, traditions – or by racial, sexual, ethnic, religious - non-existent. It looks, and people individuality, free choice of identity leads to a way of being. All men are equal in the freedom to decide which ethnic group, sex, religion does it bind to, and refuse to accept any funds, derived from the state or the society, originated from regulation, tradition, or moral requirement

from any particular institution.

Let's summarize the main premisses which shape-form-influence western societies:

1. The global market is the most important sector because it promotes individual freedom and liberates from the constraints. You should join the global elite or it's "society".
2. The family is a constraint, which limits freedom. You have to choose gender, sexual identity by own decision, having children must be decided on freely, and live free and devote all energy for own self-fulfilment.
3. To belong to a nation is a shackle, because it emotionally blackmails and ties to the area. It is therefore necessary to become a world citizen, a cosmopolite.
4. The state is repressive because it regulates, restricts, compels to follow community objectives and blackmails. Therefore, there is a need for a global order that frees the individual from any liability of the nation-state.
5. All religions and ethnicities, all cultures can and should be tolerated, none is better than the other, Christianity cannot be preferred over other religions, such as Islam. Cannot be determined which carries the truth, so people with different religion and ethnicity must be accepted openly. In fact, integrating, learning about different ethnic groups and religions is an opportunity to complete freedom; the highest degree of freedom is if we convert to a different religion or live together with a different ethnicity. The cultures, religions, are not fixed, but they can be replaced, are provisional and subject to change as determined by

the individual.

At this point we can understand that in connection with the launched migrant-flood in 2015 from the Middle East, Asia and Africa, the neo-liberals, advocates of the global marketplace are clearly in favour of reception. The reason for this is while a conservative, national and Christian minded people wish to preserve and protect the European culture and civilization, the former do not see any value to protect in these values and institutions, because they think that the openness is the guarantee of individual freedom, and not isolation; the latter is adjusted racism, prejudice and antihumanism. Therefore, they do or would acknowledge the creation of a multicultural, identity lost, mixed-race Europe, because it would also take closer the continent towards the cosmopolitan life form.

In summary: multiculturalism, which is now trying to pave the way for itself in Central Europe, essentially the tyranny of the minority over the majority society, majority nation. According to the “multiculturality” everybody is nice and good, who belongs to the postmodern minorities - that is, who denies the dominant tradition and culture, but in this for instance the indigenous national minorities are longer taken into account, because it relates to the outdated national self-determination - and everybody is an enemy and evil who belongs to middle class white culture which follows the majority culture of the nation.

The extreme preference for minorities and the discrimination of majority society are institutionalized in more and more places in western societies, especially at universities in the United States, and it's signs are clearly visible in public life, the media and in the world of politics also. Multiculturalism is becoming more violent on attempts to break into Central and Eastern Europe, into the former socialist countries, and partners are often find for

their efforts. So it is in our country, in the beginning the Alliance of Free Democrats and its inner circle, and after their termination several small liberal party and intellectual workshop seeks not only to spread multiculturalism and politically correct rhetoric in the country, but also to make it as a norm. On the other hand, using allegedly civilian foundations supported from abroad they try to change the mood of public opinion according to their own preferences. The violent, institutionalized action of the multicultural minorities is nothing but tyranny of freedom that threatens the majority, which preserves the majority culture.

III. We also have to answer the question which is: will democracy be fully implemented in Hungary?

The manipulated elections by Ferenc Gyurcsány and the Hungarian Socialist Party in 2006, and the brutal police action on the demonstrations after the disclosure of the so-called “Öszöd lie speech” threatened not only freedom, but democracy, in fact, it essentially broke, paused that. The “internal” threat was therefore given, plus we can say that after the elections in 2010, after the fall post-communist and ultra-liberal forces the domestic political situation has changed fundamentally, and with the new Basic Law a real democratic era has begun in Hungary. In recent years, internal threats to democracy finally pushed into the background, but external, global challenges have strengthened.

These external challenges come from the neo-liberal global elitocracy, just like in the case of sovereignty. The global elite is on the view that the independence of nation states should be abolished, global governance is needed, however, it only works by breaking a nation-state based on democracy. For that, the theory of “liberal democracy” provides the basics. The idea of classical liberal democracy

are two principles, the necessity and balance of liberalism and democracy. Democracy is based on the idea of the sovereignty of the people, which means in the political practice the majority will have primacy against minorities, while the liberalism was intended to protect the rights of individuals, minorities and rule of law against the majority - governmental if you prefer - will, in worst case against tyranny. Majority and minority, the balance relationship between government and opposition is guaranteed by the functioning of these two co-equal principles. Although starting from the '70-s in the West initiatives have appeared in the field of politics where priority was given liberalism instead of democracy, as setting precedence over the arbitrariness of majority, however, until the Central and Eastern European regime changes and the Soviet Union's collapse the balance of the two principles largely remained.

With Europe's convergence, with the globalization of Western value system the emphasis has changed. The global elite, relying on the neo-liberal economic philosophy and the "success" of cultural Marxism attempts to convert the political situation. The goal since then is nothing more than the expansion of the rule of the market on the nation-state, which in theory still has sufficient legal and coercive force within its own territory, to go against the will of the global market participants. In addition, the decisions of the state are well founded by the power majority support gained on elections, this gives legitimizing force to each nation's step towards protecting economy and national culture. So, if global elite wants to terminate on the long run the nation-state then they have to attack democracy's majority principle based on popular sovereignty, as the democratic nation state and sovereignty are interrelated and condition each other.

The question is, in what way can these attacks happen?

So, that they drill into the international public opinion that the balance of the two principles has turned over, rights of minorities and opposition do not prevail, and the despotism of the majority has been created. It is not a coincidence that the global elite and its servants (politicians, political parties, governments, media, at non-governmental organizations, international organizations, the elite of the European Union, etc.) are attacking the countries with the arguments above, which persistently defend their nation-state sovereignty and insist on their own democratic game rules (as that most of the Central European countries in Europe, especially Hungary does).

The critics of the countries concerned are conspiring. On the one hand they claim that the government elected by the majority suppress the voice of minorities and individuals, there is a dictatorship of opinion in the country. On the other hand, they claim a growing number of countries is overwhelmed by “populism”, a neo-liberal keyword of our age, which is vague in its content, and in fact is not more than condemnation. This means that some governments are in the “drift” of the majority opinion of people and electorate and they follow rashly, unprofessionally the people’s expectations, which ultimately brings the country into economic bankruptcy. Thirdly, these countries have too much referendum, they ask people’s opinion too often, thus giving again space to a hasty mass will against the elite’s expertise (the European Commission spoke about the admission of migrants in Hungary, and regarding to the referendum about mandatory quotas in the autumn of 2016 talked about fraud, abuse almost).

And the top of this, the criticism also says that in some countries the election is manipulated, voice of the minority is suppressed, and people put such populist forces to power who have no idea about the global market economy’s

system requirements. (The delegation of Papademosz and Monti to the top of the Greek and Italian governments in 2011 can be interpreted yet as the global elite's alternative political model, a substitution for democratic elections...).

The conclusion is that the countries concerned are no longer liberal but illiberal democracies, autocracies or dictatorships in the worst case (this criticism is not only received by Russia and Turkey, but also by Poland and Hungary). If you think about it, you will notice that this view is basically calls the democratic principle populist. However it wants to save democracy in words, but in fact substitutes democracy with liberalism and “overrides” democracy this way.

The latter is also can be stated, because for the neo-liberals the real social knowledge lies not in the hectic and uninformed majority of voters, but in a thorough and professionally competent individual who is rather an economist, financial expert, and oversees complex global economic and financial processes and also a market operator (Think, for example French philosopher Jaen Cloude Lévy's harsh sentences in connection with the Brexit on to the English average people! (Lévy, 2016), and the flood of desperate liberal voices after the election of Donald Trump as president.) In this context, the (neo) liberal democracy is nothing more than the empowerment, service of global market players and experts, if need be against the majority. In other words, in democracy the rule of the most talented and dynamic individuals and groups has to prevail, not the people's.

If we think about it, in this thinking the liberal democracies might change to non-liberal democracies or to autocracies - thus implementing they want us to avoid. What is in the background of the neo-liberal criticism against the “majority” democracies is the intent to weaken

and make nation states disappear, but this of course will not be assumed in front of the public, instead they “worry about” democracies of each country with assorted words. While it is clear - what about I disserted in the previous chapters - that today, in the 21st century a great variety of democracy exists and can exist, only one of them is the liberal democracy, but it cannot be misjudged less than the ‘populist’ – which is actually based on popular sovereignty - democracy, democracy or electoral democracy (aligning with historical, economic and cultural situation of the individual countries).

What the overrating believers of neo-liberal democracy actually profess is that the world should be left to be controlled by those who are at the helm of global processes and define them. In a word - freely after Aristotle - a modern-day aristocracy is required which today we could call elitocracy. Elitocracy is the right word here, because it is the opposite of democracy, so it means the rule of the elite rather than the people’s rule. And here the circle closes.

The lurking threat to democracy today is therefore primarily from the outside, from the circles global domination. Recognizing this is the first step, the second is to create the federation of democratic nation-states – as well as in the case of defending national sovereignty. The two tasks are closely connected and points towards solutions in the same direction.

4. Finally, we must ask: has citizen participation in the political process been realized, does a civil society exist, is there any employee say in the affairs of companies?

The answer is not always positive, although there are positive signs. On one hand it is a fact that with the arrival of multinational giga-companies to Hungary the workers’ rights have been significantly chipped, and we know that the

case was not reassuring in previous periods either. The not dismissed unions left here from the communism were weak and they are not particularly strong even today – except for some sectoral trade union with good blackmailing potential - and with the appearance of multinationals their lobbying capacity has deteriorated further. The new trade unions established on democratic foundations, unfortunately, has not quite been able to gain strength and gives a character for Hungarian trade unions of today.

On the other hand, civil society is gradually reviving: first the birth of civil circles in 2002, and since 2009, the Civil Solidarity Forum (CSF) spectacular acts in public places can be considered as an emergence of a new era. The CSF is an important phenomenon, because immediately started its activity with large mass demonstrations, and made it clear that it forms strong opinions on the most important political, public, policy and international policy issues, and perform actions, if necessary, even in the direction of European Union's executives. With this CSF immediately gave a strong political charge to the civil existence, showing that civil person is actually a “zoon politicon”, also a political person who actively involved in discussing and deciding on matters concerning him. The CSF is active along the national and conservative values, and after 2010 as a natural reaction left-wing and liberal non-governmental organizations has appeared, with public content also, but they could not approach the Civil Solidarity Forum's mass demonstration success ever since. However, it can be stated that more and more lively in Hungary the civil society has started having a bit like party political struggles on civil level which now in longer term projects the possibility of developing a healthy democratic Hungarian public life.

However, the challenge in recent years that has appeared not only in Hungary, but in the public life of other countries

as well, NGO-s, who call themselves civilians are supported from abroad and serve the interests of international and global forces try to intervene in specific countries, such as in Hungary's internal affairs for example. These networking organizations generally act against the governments who defend national sovereignty, right-wing and conservative and they do it in the name of the protection of "human rights", multiculturalism and "liberal democracy", and they vigorously engage in the defence of minorities and migrants, supporting the latter on every single way to help them get into the Schengen borders of the European Union. (Behind these organizations most often the multi-millionaire György Soros and members of the global elite show up.)

In summary

The employee and civil self-governance shows an ambiguous picture, as long as the employee-union rights and representation are still on the low point in our country, there is a chance that instead of an extremely elite and state-centric democracy, a gradually strong participatory democracy based on civil society can form in Hungary.

One comment for closing: it seems that implementing the noble values and goals of 1956 with the regime change in 1989-1990 did not mean the "end of history" neither in Hungary. Sixty years after the revolution we solved a lot of problems so new ones can come in their place and so old problems can be revealed to us in a new look. Sensing the flowing, never-standing course of history, let's face it wisely and staring out into the distance: there is really only road - and there is no final destination.

And, there is no history, only politics which will in due time be named history.