

HUNGARY KEEPS STALINIST RULE

Dictator Rakosi Repudiates Line That Class War Need Not Grow With Socialism

By JOHN MacCORMAC

Special to The New York Times.

BUDAPEST, Hungary, May 4 —“Stalinism” may have been repudiated in the Soviet Union and most of its satellites but it seems likely to linger in Hungary. The Hungarian Parliament adopted a law in March, 1953, enshrining the memory of Stalin in the Constitution. There is no indication that it will be repealed.

The twentieth congress of the Soviet Communist party stressed the themes of peaceful coexistence and collective leadership. It also branded as fallacious the Stalinist thesis that class warfare must intensify with introduction of socialism.

As for peaceful coexistence, however western diplomats in Hungary say that the harrassment to which they have always been more or less subject recently has been intensified. Dozens of their Hungarian employes are in jail and the rest are under constant pressure. Several diplomats recently discovered that microphones had been placed even in their own homes. They do not consider these measures to be peaceful coexistence.

The new Moscow policy that class warfare can be expected to relax with the growth of socialism was barely mentioned by Hungary's dictator, Matyas Rakosi, in his report on the twentieth congress after his return from Moscow.

Press Defines Policy

It has since in various ways been repudiated. An editorial two days ago in Szabad Nep, central organ of Hungarian communism, objected to the fact that “representatives of personnel departments, as certain cases have shown, see everybody as a potential enemy or spy.”

After condemning this practice it asked, however: “Does this perhaps mean there is no more class enemy in Hungary? There is, of course, a class enemy and consequently also class war. There live in our country people who are deadly enemies of our system who rejoice at the sight of every mistake we make and find delight in our troubles, who wait for the collapse of the people's democracy and who if they can do everything to promote this.”

In an article in Szabad Nep a day later Mr. Rakosi himself was more specific. He said that attempts to exploit party democracy—“instead of constructive criticism that strengthens the party”—must be resolutely rejected.

What Mr. Rakosi may have had in mind was the continuing revolt of Hungarian writers against his rule. This revolt began last November. Mr. Rakosi repressed it and provisionally installed Alabar Tamas, director of the state publishing company, as secretary of the Hungarian Writers Association. This appointment was greatly resented.

At a meeting on April 27 the regime's representatives proposed the selection of a man named Csabai, who had never, so far as is known, written anything and was reputed to be connected with the political police. His name was not accepted by the meeting. Instead, Geza Kepes, former literary director of the Hungarian radio, who once published an anthology of English poetry, was proposed from the floor and elected.

As for the chances of collective leadership here, Mr. Rakosi has dominated the Hungarian political scene for the last eleven years and will apparently continue to do so as long as he holds any office. No one in Hungary doubts that he was, is and will remain a Stalinist. It is considered unlikely that he has changed the views he expressed in 1949 when he said, “We must know Stalin's teaching that class war under the conditions of proletarian dictatorship becomes even more bitter than before.”

Mr. Rakosi stayed on in Moscow after the twentieth party congress ended. It is believed here that he convinced the Kremlin that Stalinist rigidity could not safely be relaxed in Hungary.

The only innovation that has yet occurred in Hungary as a result of the twentieth congress is a certain decentralization of control of industrial planning.