



# HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	HANGARII NO KAIKAKU : MINZOKUTEKI DENTO TO "DAISAN NO MICHI" [The Reform of Hungary : National Tradition and "the Third Road"], By Shingo Minamizuka, Tokyo : Sairyu-sha, ix+234+48pp, ¥2,500
Author(s)	HABA, Kumiko
Citation	Acta Slavica Iaponica, 9, 228-231
Issue Date	1991
Doc URL	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/2115/8035">https://hdl.handle.net/2115/8035</a>
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	KJ00000034205.pdf



HANGARII NO KAIKAKU: MINZOKUTEKI DENTŌ TO “DAISAN NO MICHI” [The Reform of Hungary: National Tradition and “the Third Road”]. By *Shingo Minamizuka*, Tokyo: Sairyu-sha, ix+234+48pp, ¥2,500.

This Book consists of many essays which the author wrote for different journals from 1980 to 1990. Though this book is not systematic historical research about the Reform of Hungary, through these essays we can understand the author's sympathy to agrarian *tanya* (particularly the traditional productive place in the plain of Hungarian peasants) and to “the Third Road” which was based on village and national tradition, not Socialism and Capitalism.

At first I would like to summarize each chapter as follows.

Chapter I. “The *Tanya* world revival”

The author visited *tanya*, which are interspersed in the Hungarian Big Plain. *Tanya*, which contained a house, animal pen, and well, is the basis of personal production and agrarian management. Here he asserts the historical importance and new revival of *tanya* in Hungarian reform. The author considers the revival of *tanya* the road of Bukharlin style (Agrarian development is important before industrialization). One can understand the attractive *tanya* world and the importance of personal agrarian management development from this chapter.

Chapter II. The Road to Reform

Here, in the first half the author points out the importance of Hungarian agriculture and the small scale production, and in the latter half he describes the discussion about “the Third Road” and the Hungarian situation under the reform. Németh László, Hungarian “village researcher,” claimed between the two world wars “the Third Road, not Jewish Capitalism, nor Bolshevik Socialism”, and Bibó István, the leader of National Peasant Party, claimed that “the Third Road, not West European Parliament Democracy, nor Russian Soviet Democracy, but is peasants peoples democracy.” These claims have been now revived in the Hungarian reform. In this situation, the author analyzes why the Hungarian Democratic Forum, which regards populism and the peasant as important, became stronger among the opposition parties.

Chapter III. Beyond “the Stalin-type Socialism”

In this chapter, he deals with the different original activities for democracy beyond the “Stalin-type Socialism” of the opposition party by the same focus on “the Third Road” and the Hungarian Democratic Forum. Especially he stresses the political revitalization of the common people who takes on themselves traditional and native values, and he sees that this causes the rise of the “Second Society” against the first, official Society. And, in this connection, he describes “the Third Road” as the following politics: 1. The Revival of the Hungarian Society, on which Hungarian nations' (=peasants') culture is based. 2. Social Reform, which regards national manners, customs and institutions as important. This means opposition to *foreign* systems or institutions. 3. Opposition to the mere capitalization of the economy. 4. Autonomy of the country. 5. Neutralization. Analyzing these, the author says that the nationalism and restorationism are not necessarily reactionary, and if Hungarians will view things realistically,

confusion will be avoided.

#### Chapter IV. Revival of Nationalism and Traditions

Here, it is written that, taking advantage of the Hungarian National Question in West Transylvania in Romania, Hungarian nationalism is growing again and the idea of the historical Great Hungary has been revived, this is connected with St. István who united Great Hungary and got a crown from the Roman Pope in 1000 (1001?) and built up the Christian State. And now, the author says, Hungarian peasants are waiting for a burglar called *betyár*, who makes an attack on the rich or the authorities and makes the peoples' lives better. Here the author stresses also traditional and native things vitalize the society, and realize the reform in the peoples' life. Not to make them chauvinistic and reactionary, he says that the Hungarian nations' realistic judgment is important.

#### Chapter V. East European Socialism and Europe

The author criticizes the article of Shin Fujimura in the journal *Ekonomisto* (Dec. 6, 1988), that it is the unchanged old *Kremlinology* from the viewpoint of Western Europe. Opposing to Fujimura's view, he emphasizes that he has an "inside viewpoint" of East European Society. Analysis from an "inside viewpoint" means that the individual initiative, pluralisation, peoples growing awareness, and the traditional elements are regarded as important. He also emphasizes that one needs to think about the Hungarian reform from the historical viewpoint of East-West European confrontation after 1948. He adds that it is nonsense to consider that the Hungarian economy will become only subordinated to Western Europe again or a division of industrial Western Europe and agrarian Eastern Europe made by a sacrifice of the Third World (But about this no concrete idea is unfolded). He analyzes the reform substance and asks himself where East European reform will go. Here he says that the people who carry on the Hungarian reform are in middle administrative positions, not workers like Poland. He thinks it will be easy for them to find the new way between capitalism and "Stalin-type socialism." Here is no peasant whom the author stressed in the former chapter. It is true that peasants were not the leader of the reform nor carriers of the reform.

Last, in the Supplement Chapter, the author asks how the "Stalin-type Socialism" in Eastern Europe is treated in historical studies, and claims that now we need to search for "the Third Road" not "Stalin-type Socialism," nor "Western bourgeois society." Comparing the present reform of East European Countries (in February 1990), he said that the reform was delayed in East Germany and Czechoslovakia in spite of the developing civil society and the reforms are going very smoothly in Bulgaria, a Balkan country: "at the same pace" as East Germany. From this, he reaches the conclusion that whether the reform establishes itself effectively or not depends on whether they could take over the heredity of reform from previous ages or not, and its does not matter if a civil society has been developed or not.

In all articles, the author stresses the Hungarian village tradition and native life represented by *tanya*. He argues that agrarian peasants are very Hungarian "people" and the revival of the agrarian traditional way is the Hungarian "Third Road." His introduction and investigation of the agrarian and village life style is very interesting and the agrarian economy is really very important for Hungary in

the future, but in spite of this, I would like to argue a little.

Between the wars and just after the Second World War, Hungary might have been a "peasant country" (peasants were over 50% of the population). But now peasants are about 18% and about half (7-8%) of them are farmers with a side job (Kovács Dezső). Now the people who stress the revival of village Hungary are not many, I think. Still more: in my opinion, the traditional, native Hungarian village system was not politically so democratic, as the author says; discrimination in sex and class, and the patriarchal system remained, not only in regions, but also in houses. Virtually, most of the village peasants did not accept the *peoples democracy* in the past. Most of them supported the Smallholders Party between wars and after the Second World War, not the National Peasant Party. After the experience of 'formal' equalism of individuals and liberty from region or old house system in the socialist system, it seems that the young, women, people in towns, and even peasants will not support the revival of the mere "village Hungary" system in the fact.

There is the very confrontation of "urban" vs "village" in historical Hungary. Budapest, one of the metropolises of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, was the sixth biggest city in Europe in 1900. There was both radical intelligentsia and high culture among the liberal aristocracy and radical bourgeoisie and workers. Hungary is not only a agrarian village country, but has also a big modern European city. But the city contained many Jews. So Németh's "the Third Road not Jews Capitalism, nor Bolshevic Socialism" is not a general opinion, but a very concrete issue. He rejects both the Jewish bourgeois in the city (who created the democratic revolution in 1918), and communists (who carried out the socialist revolution in 1919), because, it was said, *they* destroyed the Big Hungary, and made introduce the Trianon Treaty in 1920. After that Németh asserts that the real "deep" Hungarians are peasants. Therefore, the Hungarian "Third Road," based on Németh's view, is easy to lead the mass sentiment of anti-city, anti-(bourgeois) democratic, anti-semitic, anti-communist. It is not the generally understood "Third Road," nor Socialism, nor Capitalism. From "the Third Road" easily leads to village-ism, regionalism, anti-city, sometimes, nationalistic chauvinism and clericalism (expulsion of Jews).

Is there the possibility of the Third Road?

It is completely true and hopeful that each state must be able to go one's own way, but it is not "the Third Road," that is completely different. Many Hungarians wanted to have the industrialization, modernization of society and a *well-balanced* development of agriculture and industry.—especially industrial development. (in Sept. 1990). Many of them hope that Hungary will become a social welfare and security-oriented country like Sweden or a country developed tourism like Austria and Switzerland under the third industrial development. It is also completely natural their own way, but not "the Third Road." Overestimation of the village Hungary is very attractive, but a little unreasonable at least at the moment. Furthermore, stressing traditional and native Hungarian culture makes nationalism chauvinistic and desire for restoration easy. The author says that, from the Hungarian nations' realistic judgement, the chauvinism will not grow. Quite recently, however, inside and outside of the Democratic Forum, big Hungarian nationalism, chauvinism, clericalism, anti-semitism and even revisionism of the

national border are slowly growing, and many of the intelligentsia and conscious people are concerned about that. If a peasant democracy based on restorationism and traditionalism comes to pass, it might oppress the "*minorities*"; for example, national minorities, Jews, communists, and urban dwellers under the influence of *foreign* idea. Seeing the situation of Hungary in Sept. 1990, though agrarian production and peoples might be essential, but revival only of agrarian Hungary is not realistic, and stress of the traditional Hungary is a little dangerous.

For all of these, however, this book shows very interesting historical and attractive agrarian life in Hungary and people activities especially in countrysides in Hungary. In this regard, this is a valuable volume.

There is a translation of the new organizations and Party's program and declarations in the Appendix, and they are very useful.

Kumiko HABA  
Hosei University