

## **The Haunting Past**

**The Afterlife of the Communist Secret Services**



## **The Haunting Past**

### **The Afterlife of the Communist Secret Services**

*International Conferences in the Hamvas Institute*

Hamvas Institute, 2010



# Contents

<b>Ágnes Hankiss</b>	
Introductory Thoughts	7
<b>László Kövér</b>	
Opening Speech	18
<b>Amy Knight</b>	
The Legacy of Secret Police in Post-Communist States	24
<b>Jörn Mothes</b>	
The Political Injustices Committed in the German Democratic Republic (GDR)	34
<b>Wojciech Roszkowski</b>	
The Oleksy Case and the Role of Secret Services in Polish Politics	45
<b>Vitalij Sentalinszkij</b>	
Crime Without Punishment, Russia in the 20th Century	53
<b>Sándor Óze</b>	
State Security Control in Hungarian Historiography from 1956 to the Change of Regime	61
<b>Alex Standish</b>	
Russian Intelligence Strategy Towards Post-Communist Europe Under Vladimir Putin: Partners or Predators?	83
<b>Marius Oprea</b>	
The Fifth Power: Transition of the Romanian Securitate from Communism to NATO	102
<b>Piotr Naimski</b>	
Poland Fifteen Years After the Round Table: Where is the End of the Transition?	121
<b>György Schöpflin</b>	
The Right and Post-Communism	135
<b>Notes</b>	146
<b>Biographies</b>	153



Ágnes Hankiss

## Introductory Thoughts

Culture, if the term is not restricted unnecessarily to matters of intellectual education or arts, is actually nothing else but the embodiment of the *zeitgeist* that permeates, and even creates, either furtively or stentoriously people's actual character, behaviour, attitude, daily life and the complete social institutional system they are part of.

Regime change of 1989 is *change of culture*. Have we succeeded in fulfilling it? Have we done it in depth or just superficially? It seems to be a fair question as changes in spirit and mind are significantly slower than transformations of the economy or of institutional, legal systems.

Visible history, according to Spengler, is nothing else but *spirituality taken shape*. Despite contemporary historical science having already processed quite a lot of the "visible" history, thus of the "shape", "invisible history" of spirit and mind as well as *spirituality and spiritual legacy* of communism are still to be revealed...

Mapping "spiritual regime change" is one of the most important tasks of contemporary cultural research.

Examining the spiritual legacy of communism and socialism we face the *collective* contents within, and beyond, the depths of personal experience and memories. Collective in the sense as Carl Gustav Jung considered all psychic content collective that "*are present in not just one but in numerous individuals at the same time, thus are characteristics of a society, a people or of the mankind... Although we human beings have our own personal life, we are yet in large measure the representatives, the victims and promoters of a collective spirit whose years are counted in centuries..*" The components of the collective unconscious have an important, often fundamental, role in the psychic self-regulation of the community and in the formation of the field of force that determines its behaviour. What has been settled in the collective unconscious of socialism? And how much of this hidden heritage have we taken with us to the other side? Which part of socialism's spirituality remains alive and protects itself?

We lack the term – as Béla Hamvas, a great 20<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian writer and philosopher once put it – *“to signify both great crimes and the acts of the low and filthy grub; one that marks, for example, the hypocritical faces of the Pharisees; and one that prevents these minor deeds from being readily disconnected from crimes that are actually against the criminal code. This term of broader radius is: existential corruption [...] which was understood and revealed by the Gospels. Not the howling and bloody misdeeds, but all of the barely noticeable, filthy little iniquities that are committed minute by minute.”*

The smell of this existential corruption penetrated every level impregnating daily life: no heinous and bloody atrocities but dirty little tricks that circulated in body and soul, dominated one’s will, rejected self-esteem, corrupted the corruptible and overshadowed friendships...However, those who aimed to live nowhere else but here in their homeland, were bound to adapt somehow, and this unwilling adaptation was made acceptable, the moderate and sometimes even loudly advertised issue of common consent, by meaning that compared to the bloody misdeeds of that time one felt as if paddling peacefully in the daily swamp of hypocrisy. But behind the dirty tricks, of course, still lay the memory and unprocessed, distorted reality of the bloody misdeeds. These two seemed to live in strange marriage since the murderers were still in power. Thus, in the shadow of misdeeds the almost imperceptible vines of depravity thrived freely, creeping from one generation to another, enmeshing the whole entity of socialism.

Sándor Márai, one of the greatest Hungarian writers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, made a highly perceptive remark in his diary in the second half of the 1980’s while staying in the US as an émigré. He stated that the communists are just as dangerous when they are not protecting the ideology anymore, but their prey. Sándor Márai painted the true portrait of post-communism with prophetic insight: the perverting morality and socio-politics with which the parties, communities and societies involved in the change of the regime have been in continual and constant fight thanks to the virulence of communist successor parties. From this point of view we can state that the change of regime has not only failed to improve the situation but – with calling for spontaneous privatization through the secret transfers of assets – it has even deepened existential corruption and made it final. The sector where the afterlife of the communist secret services has been flourishing is

the economic and bank sector. This is the field where international *organised crime* and the former communist state security services are interconnected to some extent. Its consequences are culminating quite clearly for instance in the broker scandal of the K&H case... In one of the most serious fraud scandals in the early 2000's in Hungary, an uneducated broker of the K&H banking group was orchestrating a mass money laundering and Ponzi scheme, involving the leaders of the bank as well as local governments, a number of leading private and government-controlled corporations' officials involving mostly people part of the post-communist elite. And they are embodied generally by the former members of the network holding key positions in the Hungarian financial and economical landscape, and also by the former comrades-tamed-billionaires... The complete disclosure of the case was stuck on the way: before the investigation was closed, clinching tape recordings were destroyed due to "lack of space". The under-secretary of national security ordering the destruction of the records has a long history: before the change of regime, he was one of the leaders of the department at the (Communist) Party Centre that supervised – among others – the communist state security services.

On the occasion of the broker scandal, I have attempted to reconstruct the route of the money as far as it was possible for a curious citizen. I started out from the offshore companies appearing in the news through the publicly accessible database of companies. Although the real background of the broker scandal remains in obscurity, I envisaged a model that must have operated in a similar way during the time of the original transfer of the money. The assets of large state owned companies were dispersed among very small companies in the last years before the change of regime. One just could not understand seeing firms registered in small villages and tiny settlements, with small capital and totally unknown managers entering into partnership with the most important players of socialist economy. The model was the following: the assets of large state owned companies were first distributed among small, unknown companies and from there recollected into foreign offshore companies... Members of the network having expertise in the field – many of whom returned to Hungary as foreign executives with foreign cards – had a key role in these operations next to former communist functionaries. A good example is the former party functionary who returned a couple of years ago as a foreign businessman. He had ruled and censored various fields of the arts, decided the fate of intellectuals, given

orders to the appropriate organisations of the communist state security services to control and influence people as the head of the cultural department in the Party Centre before 1990. And nowadays he reappeared on the national privatisation market in the field of energy.

The *zeitgeist* of the fallen regime was undeniably imbued with the world of secret service agents and networks which – considering its *afterlife* – is from many aspects still a serious threat to the functioning and moral stability of democracy of high standard. Apparently, much applies to Hungary of all that was written about the former Soviet Union by Amy Knight in her comprehensive book titled *Spies Without Cloaks: The KGB's Successors*. Following the transition, the retired or demobilized secret service officers are suddenly left alone without masters, their networks collapse. Nevertheless they still possess their professional expertise, although without the control maintaining the “bond”. Whether it is about the retired ones, the demobilized operative agents or those of the top secret stock many of whom remained in their former covert jobs, or, they could even be the former agents released from the network who could be put under pressure any time again... Presumably, they never eliminated neither their former network of contacts – except for those who really went through the pains of facing the past – or their former ideological or political bonds. In her book, Amy Knight mentions the press and media as outstanding examples for areas where many got stuck in their former cover jobs after the change of regime. Also, we can add that many of them retained their positions in the diplomatic corps and boards of trustees, lead non-governmental organizations and sometimes preach to their former victims on the “democratic minimum” on television programmes created by people with similar background. As for the unique knowledge and experience they had earlier obtained in demoralizing communities and discrediting the leaders thereof, they could never make such a good use of them as they do now in democratic public life, already without the bond of service and any formal control. For instance, they are active in election campaigns, gaining positions and marauding for the party pooling their former masters and commissioners.

How did the secret police of the communist system survive the change of regime?

Democratic public life has not been able to come up with a solution for this problem, instead, it was swept under the rug. Some people did so because a clear sight of the truth would have been against their interests while others lacked either the means or the information from the dark past that would have been necessary for the revelation. This is why the post-communist successor party could have felt by the beginning of 2002 that although the skeleton in the closet might not have disappeared, the key to that cupboard had been lost for good. It seems that in selecting their cadres for various functions the old network contacts are still important, which, if revealed, they label as completely non-relevant, far-fetched or a simple political trick with contemptuous cynicism or mostly thin-skinned sensitivity. They want the society to forget meekly all those interconnections rooted in the past which they still make unscrupulously use of in order to support their legions and bonds.

The lustration law in Hungary proved to be unfit for a just, fair and practical handling of the situation not only because, as generally known, a huge part of the documentation was destroyed in 1989, but also because the drawing up of the act itself did not make disclosure easier. On the contrary, it was to (pre)serve the safety of the invisible legion by leaving the real structure of the communist secret police in obscurity.

The spheres of activity of the so-called Department No. III was divided into the following sub-departments: *Intelligence, Counter-espionage, Internal security, Military intelligence and security, Operational support* (telephone tapping, letter interception, etc.). At the dawn of the change of regime, only the infamous III/III sub-department - responsible for fighting against "internal reactionaries" - was dissolved without a successor. The other sub-departments merged into the democratic national security services. The public was somehow made to believe that it was only sub-department III/III, the name of which indicated the handling of the fight against "internal reactionaries", which was blackmailing their fellow compatriots, bugging their homes, reporting on them, discrediting them. This, however, is not true! The sub-departments within the organisation of the communist state security service closely cooperated, exchanged information and tasks. If we look at the question from a purely moral point of view, we can say that there was not such a vast difference among these sub-departments as the Hungarian Socialist Party, which previously commanded the state security services, made the society believe by diverting the attention from the other

sub-departments by sacrificing the one responsible for internal security and pushing it to the front as a scapegoat.

The people working for the communist state security service can be categorised into three different groups on the basis of their status. First, there were the so-called operating officers, the professionals, whose job at the secret service was their main occupation. Then there were the officers of *highly confidential* status, who had ordinary workplaces, professions, which also served as a cover-up for them. There were government officials, bankers, journalists, media people, engineers, teachers, diplomats among them. They could have worked in any segment of public life. People around them, which in many cases included even their families, had no idea of their secret life; from the outside everything seemed all right. The officers of *highly confidential* status received training, which was of course much shorter and more superficial than that of professionals, with whom they kept in touch through their contact officer. These were the people who gave the assignments, briefings, etc. The officers of *highly confidential* status were all staunch supporters of the ideology. They were selected because of their knowledge of languages, their profession, and commitment to the system, the communist ideology. It only turned out after the elections in 2002 that for example Péter Medgyessy, the second socialist prime minister of Hungary after the change of regime, used to work as an officer of highly confidential status in the economic field. My friend, the late Balázs Horváth, the minister of internal affairs of the first centre-right government of Hungary shocked me – and I believe many others – when in a TV interview he admitted that even within the sphere of officers of highly confidential status there was an especially confidential group the names of whom even he, as the acting minister, could not have access to. Finally, there was the third group, that of the *agents*, whom the public simply called stoolies (The time and place does not allow to get into the details of their different types).

Considering the above categories, the scope of the lustration law was limited to sub-department III/III, that had been dissolved without a successor and had been involved in internal security, and even within this department only to the people employed as agents. It was not extended in any form either to officers of highly confidential status, or to agents of the intelligence and counter-espionage departments. What does all this mean? The danger of disclosure threatened merely the “stoolies” most of whom were forced to accept their ignominious role because of blackmailing and

threats (the whole families of many of these agents were looted, relocated, slandered as the victims of the communist regime). One sometimes feels that the “agent quota” of sub-department III/III was reserved for everyday people, and for those whom the system did not like anyway. Faithful comrades and kids of high-ranking communist officials were drafted to the more elite units of intelligence and counter-espionage. The Hungarian Socialist Party and its supporters did everything to focus public attention concerning the whole problem of lustration on those working for III/III, while the others and especially the officers of highly confidential status still enjoy protection even after two decades following the change of regime.

We should not forget for a moment that orders and commands to the communist state security service were given by the Hungarian Socialist Labourers’ Party. Those placing the orders were the beneficiaries as well as the party the successor of which gives the government of Hungary today [between 1994-1998 and 2002-2010] and represents itself in the EU. On the other hand, socialist leaders acted rather cynically even with their own secret services when they attempted to pin the blame on them so that the party’s beautiful socialist democrat remasking would not be spoiled by the shadows of the past. One of the former leaders of the communist state security service interestingly stated something similar in an interview conducted with him at the Hamvas Institute: “...for example in the case of *FI-DESZ*<sup>1</sup>, it was our suggestion to take political steps, but the case was remitted to us and we had to do the job of politics. By extending and inflicting the role of political service on us, we were ordered to notify these people...”

If we want to understand the afterlife of the communist secret services, and the character of this afterlife, we must reach back to the roots, to 1988/89, the “invisible” history of the change of regime, which is still in obscurity. We know the code-names of some of the scenarios, or so called “operative combinations”, but researchers are not given access to these documents.

The reorganisation of the state security services began in the spring of 1989 so that they would fit the requirements of a ‘plural democracy’. The process lasted until the end of February 1990. This actually means that the new, democratic concept was completely worked out and implemented by those leaders of Department No. III who had commanded for years, or even decades the communist secret services, and this is by no means an insignificant element from the point of our topic. The word-for-word minutes of

the commanders' meetings of sub-department III/III, dealing with internal security matters, provide exceptionally interesting documents of the era. A decision was made in the inner circles of the secret services to create such a "new network" the members of which would be dispersed among the newly organised parties and organisations, the media and the various walks of public life. The ways of keeping contact with these agents were also determined. During one of these meetings – taking place on 22 June 1989, that is six days following the reburial of the martyrs of the 1956 revolution – they said for example: *„...officers of highly confidential status are closely connected with this matter. They will have a much more important role than so far, if they can cover a well organised, wide spectrum. Transfers from the official forces have to cease. The way of the future is to attract well-trained people of status from the civilian sphere who are positively disposed towards us, help build their carrier and thus put them in a position favourable to us. Of course, it is not likely that in the next few years we will have a "bishop" as an officer of highly confidential status, but we should not forsake that field either. Anyway, we have to be extremely careful, because one single deconspiration may create such a chaos that would be terribly difficult to compensate."* There is another excerpt about the same topic: *„...it is very important that the number of the staff should not be increased by people we want get rid of and so put them in some kind of a job where everybody knows they came from state security. Such people are not among the officers of highly confidential status, they are only grotesque, ridiculous clowns. The talented person to be appointed, who is positively disposed towards us should be the kind that can become a true state security person, and who is only known as such to his/her contact officer."*

When I got to know these documents, I asked myself whether the fate of the first freely elected Hungarian government was not doomed already at its formation in April 1990. It is by no means a coincidence that following the implacable campaign of hatred carried out from the left in 2002, Prime Minister Viktor Orbán said: *"The network is back and in full armour."* Indeed, it was. Or rather, it had not gone away at all, only reappeared from hiding and leaped to the front of the processes to use its old methods even more unscrupulously and shamelessly as if living its renaissance.

*Disruption and slander* were among the favourite methods of the communist secret services. The disintegration of communities, societies, groups, compromising their authentic, competent leaders and personalities

have worked enormously successfully even during the decades of socialism. The most generally applied way of disruption and slander was to spread the news about an authentic leader of a community or its determinant personality that he or she was a stoolie. The technique itself has not changed much in the democratic system, only its content: the best utilised label and slander in the hands of the left wing became “extreme right” instead of “stoolie”. A basic method is to accuse the centre-right government, or the opposition, politicians, intellectuals without foundation - to the largest possible extent within and outside the country – that they sympathise with, or are allied to the extreme right. People who do not have an adequate grasp of the situation in Hungary, and do not know in their depth the methods transplanted from the devices of the communist secret services, are easily deceived. There has been an almost continual campaign, utilising the most foul and devious methods against Viktor Orbán, administered through the media, which has been controlled by the left for the past decade and a half. Just imagine the situation: the author of a book written to compromise Viktor Orbán and the FIDESZ, established a joint company for the writing and distribution of this book with an ex-officer of the secret services who is involved in other businesses together with former secret service officers three of whom are related to the family of prime minister Ferenc Gyurcsány.<sup>2</sup> Can anything like that happen in a real European democracy? So, this is how strings are pulled together... The following is an excerpt from the minutes of a meeting in 1989 concerning the secret service scenarios of the change of regime: „*The various combinations and activities have to be organised extremely carefully paying special attention to covering up the initiative role of the State Security Service.*” Unfortunately, Ladies and Gentlemen, it seems they were successful.

However, from the point of view concerning spiritual change of regime, the question cannot be narrowed to the issue of lustration: the matter of *spiritual heritage* may be more important than the question of *afterlife*. What have we brought with us unintentionally from the “culture” of persecution, pressure exertion, fear generation, isolation, discrediting and demoralization? Do we still have to take into account the spiritual heritage that the manipulative machinery of socialism imprinted in our behaviour, mentality and spirituality? That dark and destructive tangle that – thanks to the secret activities of communist state security – has infiltrated the soul through the capillaries of daily life. Then by reaching the soul it bloomed

and brought closer – *in a cultural sense* – the perpetrator and the victim, the “corruptor” and the “corrupted”, the “tempter” and the “tempted” much closer than we would think if we examined the issue from a moral aspect only.

The strange turns and sometimes even inexplicable fiascos of the change of regime have confronted us intensively with the strength of the *collective unconscious* and the power of the soul’s invisible realm. Let’s just think about how successful the hate campaign was during the parliamentary elections of 2002... and presumably the explanation will be found in the shadowy realm and dark depths of the collective unconscious. And it also may be found in the projection of envy, defeatism, paranoid phobias, shame and many other feelings and impulses that one may not like to face consciously but which, if manipulated properly, become decisive factors in one’s behaviour. Shortly after the elections in 2002, it was revealed that then prime minister, Péter Medgyessy had been a top secret agent of the communist secret services under codename D-209. Let’s think about how the society reacted on the D-209 case which soon turned into apathy and which therefore can be interpreted even as a defensive reaction and a triumph of socialism’s collective unconscious. The scandal imploded into the unconscious and stirred it up fairly, but the unconscious was not prepared for this as the *zeitgeist* in the previous fourteen years had not accepted the task of revealing and processing the past. The will to disclose, determination and initiative of only a few was not enough to break through the almost impenetrable web of secrecy woven around the remaining documentary evidence by the co-operation between law-makers and archive-owners. A co-operation so strong that it had almost bridged any political differences between the concerned parties.

The *zeitgeist* did not support the act of facing the past. Instead it has protected itself with suppressions again and again. Strangely enough – and most probably not by coincidence – the democratic Hungarian society elected such socialist prime ministers twice – namely Gyula Horn and Péter Medgyessy – who were symbolic figures of the realm of shadows. One was a cadre of the early Kádár era, that of the bloody retaliation after the 1956 revolution, the other had arrived from the world of the late Kádár era and was the elegant agent-capitalist, a secret-service-officer-turned-wealthy-banker... The symbols of the collective unconscious not only stepped forward into the limelight but they even climbed up straight to the very top!

However, the afterlife of the communist era, the communist state security and the ghost of their ideologies and methods can only be successful until spirituality of the Hungarian society is unchanged. In other words, if we manage to throw off *spiritual heritage*, the *afterlife* will be by far not so threatening as there will be nothing left to build on for those who still use the dark techniques of soul possession even during today's democratic political fights.

The Hamvas Béla Institute for Cultural Research held two international conferences on the activities and afterlife of communist secret services in order to promote, by its own modest means though, the process of disclosure and transparency. We could hardly find words describing the aim of our work more clearly and concisely than the following quote of Gyula Illyés:<sup>3</sup> *“The past must be created, too... an era becomes past when it is written about... The badly sorted out, poorly written past resurrects, haunts and continuously disturbs one. The unwritten time does not pass at all; it settles on land and mind like thick fog.”*

László Kövér

## Opening Speech

First of all, let me tell you a personal experience that remarkably determined my way of thinking. On the occasion of the papal visit in 1983 we, Hungarian university students, visited Poland. We were shocked to notice a cult in positive sense that surrounded the at that time recently murdered young Polish priest, father Jerzi Popelusko, who was beaten almost to death and drowned by Polish secret service agents. This experience made us wonder whether there was any fundamental difference between the system of the then Polish military dictatorship, its Polish secret services and the Hungarian regime, which, at that time, was considered to be the happiest barrack of the Communist camp, and its secret services. Sadly, we concluded that there was absolutely no difference between the two countries regarding the system and its services. Therefore, what happened to a Polish priest in the beginning of the 1980's could, in fact, due to a series of unfortunate events, also happen to us, loud-mouthed students in Hungary. This experience, for many of us, is an important reminder which, as I already mentioned, determined our attitude towards the system and evaluation of our present.

When I accepted the honourable invitation to say a few words at the opening of this conference I did not realize how difficult this task would be since I had to clarify for myself in what capacity I would speak in front of you introducing a series of lectures that aims to examine a special segment of processing the past, the still perceptible effect of the functioning and existence of the communist secret services.

I received the invitation for the conference as the head of the National Security Committee of the Hungarian Parliament, and thus I could talk about my view of the success of democratic transition in terms of the transformation of the communist secret services into democratically functioning bodies and the creation of the constitutional parliamentary control over them. As a former minister supervising these services for a short period,<sup>1</sup> I could talk about the problems we faced during the transformation and the solutions we found in order to achieve simultaneously the often contradictory aspects of democratising them and maintaining their operations.

As one of the lucky people having participated in the democratic transformation of the country from the very beginning of the change of regime, I could talk about the ideas and often naive illusions we had in the beginning, and now after twelve years what I consider success or failure of all that we have done and achieved through eight years of opposition and four years of governance.

Finally, as a 43-year-old Hungarian citizen and father of three, I could talk about why I feel uncomfortable in the climate that takes hold of this country again.

I apologize that switching between these roles will not enable me to deliver a totally coherent lecture – which may not be my task anyway. Rather, I'll share with you a fragmented train of thoughts that from the politician's point of view intends to give proper answers to what intellectuals can do in order to expel the shadows of the haunting past. Intellectuals who are able to define and clarify our present by unveiling the past.

"I wonder if anybody can be healed by the shadow of the past"- as sang Tamás Cseh<sup>2</sup> the lyrics written by Géza Bereményi on the album entitled "Full Moon Songs" in 1997. And now, five years later we are preparing to face again all that we were part of between 1994 and 1998.<sup>3</sup> One cannot help to think of the lines from Marx's manifesto: a spectre is haunting, if not all of Europe but at least its one or other East Central European corners, the spectre of communism. Moreover, shadows of the past not only haunt us but they have gained control over our lives again. The current prime minister of the Republic of Hungary<sup>4</sup> is a person who served as a well paid top-secret officer of the communist secret services through years, who managed to hide his past from the electors until he was elected to office and whose former occupation still lies in obscurity. Therefore, we cannot be sure either whether the country's first man is blackmailable by invisible domestic or foreign powers that may be fully aware of his past. The head of the police<sup>5</sup> – appointed by the very same prime minister – was also a secret officer who was more engaged in, so to say, counteracting the domestic democratic opposition of the 1980's rather than working as a counter-intelligence officer fighting foreign secret agents as he claims. One of the members of the current government<sup>6</sup> was not only member of the top communist leadership of the 1980's, the politburo, but was also a member of the top operative committee whose main task was to prepare decisions of the communist state on counteracting the domestic opposition. The *Gleichschaltung* of the

Hungarian press almost reminds us of the communist takeover following 1945, thus I wonder when the editor-in-chief of *Népszabadság*<sup>7</sup> will appear again on the confidential list of recipients getting reports on the domestic hostile opposition's activities.

The suffocating atmosphere of constant lies and intimidation is emerging again but this time, so to say, within democratic boundaries. Meanwhile, the so called democratic West does not bat an eyelid nor pays any attention to the issue, although we have recently seen examples that it does not hesitate to intervene into internal affairs when it does not like what is happening. It is a scandal that Jörg Haider is in government. But it is not considered a scandal at all that Hungarian socialists came into power by constantly threatening in their campaign with a flood of 23 million Romanian immigrant workers coming to Hungary, and whose leader – like Gyula Horn<sup>8</sup> in 1994 – recognized the advantages of the western lifestyle only after having worked for the communist law enforcement organisations. There is a corresponding anecdote: when József Antall<sup>9</sup> was about to form the government, he received phone calls from a European great power's prime minister's office of suggesting that Gyula Horn's – minister for foreign affairs of the outgoing communist government – installation in the new democratic government would obviously help improving the new government's international respect. Despite the polite refusals the pressure remained until one day the appointed prime minister – renowned for being a gentleman – losing his temper somewhat, apparently answered the following: “Okay, this option will be considered carefully but we have not decided yet if we bring him to court for trial.” Obviously – why obviously? – neither Gyula Horn nor other communist leaders were ever brought to court for trial neither at that time nor later; there was not even an attempt for it but at least telephone calls discontinued.

Those who forget the past are condemned to experience it again. The Hungarian society, in fact, has not forgotten it or rather could not forget it since it could not even understand it. We have been so cautious to avoid revenge and showdown that we failed to make anyone accountable for the past. We were so pleased that democratic transition was without any violence that anyone pressing for revelation and exploration of the past was considered more or less extreme provokers. All of us – opposition and government politicians of that era, liberal and conservative intellectuals, foreign diplomats and decision makers – who had responsibility in this issue

committed a sin which even our descendants need to pay for. As Amy Knight quoted Tina Rosenberg's remark on Germany: processing history successfully is of great importance in terms of the long-term health of democracy. Should the new regime ignore that – either because of interests within the government or the still lasting influence of former leaders – it will also take on the former regime's moral corruption. This was the case in Hungary. But why was the new democratic political elite unable to take the initiative of sincerely unveiling the past following a loud, anti-communist and combative elections campaign? First of all the same issue that was analysed by the Russian emigrant writer Vasily Aksyonov regarding his homeland as quoted by Amy Knight: "Without the removal of the Nazis, Germany could not have reached that fast the current level of splendid democracy and quality of life. The removal of Bolsheviks in Russia is impossible. The Soviet Union was not defeated on a battlefield, neither were its territories occupied by forces of democracy. It was not even ruined by an uprising."

Indeed, one reason for this is that similarly to the Soviet Union there was no revolutionary situation in the occupied countries either. Pacts between the great powers deprived us of our sovereignty and human rights which we later regained as a result of similarly tangled and complicated pacts. The surprisingly low turnout figures of the first free elections<sup>10</sup> proved the lack of unconditional trust for the new regime. Amid social problems that were natural consequence of the transition, people were rather preoccupied with struggling for their present than processing the past. Furthermore, an international survey in 1992 indicated already that the majority of the Polish, Czech and Hungarian society had no interest in unveiling the past.

Another reason was a strategic mistake made in the situation assessment. The new democratic elite under the leadership of József Antall believed – taking also into account that Russian troops were still stationed in Hungary – that the main danger for democracy would be a possible orthodox communist restoration attempt against which he was seeking alliance with the so called reform communists even during the course of the transition. By the time the situation was correctly evaluated, the intellectual restoration and moral rehabilitation of the Kádár regime, with the assistance of the Free Democrats,<sup>11</sup> was in full swing.

Under these circumstances, belatedly and rather as a compensation, the first acceptable version of the lustration law was tabled to the Parliament and was adopted amid the first ominous signs of the communists return to

power. The self-confident post-communists regaining power (in 1994) got easily rid of the consequences of a law aiming at processing the past but based on fragmented and substantially decreased amount of documents and codified half-heartedly without any sanctions. Furthermore, the law and its media coverage, independently of the intention of the legislators, suggested that the agents, officially called 'network persons', of the III/III directorate (i.e. the domestic intelligence service) were solely responsible for all the crimes committed during forty years preceding 1990. A telltale sign is that this law is most familiar to the public as "Agent Law" although its scope also applies to those who received, read and used the reports built on the information supplied by the spy network. Typical of this twisted thinking is that a current cabinet member<sup>12</sup> – former member of the Politburo – belonging to the top political panel responsible for managing the entire repressive machinery used to read these reports but refused with indignation and disgust to be mentioned together with the agents. And today the majority of the public feels hostility towards the agents who were often blackmailed and forced into the communist secret service network, rather than against members of the immensely powerful Politburo.

A great "achievement" of the proposed amendment of the law tabled by the current coalition is that former party-state leaders will no longer be subjects of the inconvenient lustration procedure, as they just happened to read reports, even though the information in them was collected with dirty methods. And the big lie of the explanation given for the amendment is that while the activity of secret agents took place under cover, the past of the communist era politicians is publicly known. But do we really know, for instance, in which decisions Judit Csehák<sup>14</sup> took part, as member of the Politburo, the operative committee responsible for preparing actions against hostile opposition forces? Do we know anything about the what kind of political decisions were made on the preparing the communist scenario of the change of regime? Do we know the role of the secret service played in saving and sending abroad the funds and assets managed by the Communist Party? Do we know what responsibility of the then minister of finance and its apparatus had in transferring the Stasi-money to the West? Do we know how many top-secret agents have become media tycoons, CEO's of banks, and billionaire entrepreneurs and do we know what political forces and interests are behind them? What do we know about the links between the former communist nomenclature, the 'dismissed legions' (i.e. dismissed

state security officers), the organized underworld and our newly formed social democrats? And what consequences of past political decisions do we live with even today, on a daily basis?

No, in fact, we know almost nothing at all. The exploration of the real and secret story of the change of regime is still awaited. The system nicknamed socialism was itself violence and corruption organized by the state. Compared to the beginnings the “innovation” of the Kádár regime was that, by gradually diminishing violence, left space for corruption permeating the whole society, thus creating the pacifying power stronger than fear: the collective sense of guilt. In such circumstances the once threatening ‘fist of the party’ (i.e. the political police) could release the tension and could become almost unnoticeable for the majority of the society. At least in Hungary.

But then, does it make any sense to research the activity of the communist secret service in Hungary? Of course, there is. On the one hand we owe the victims of the regime. On the other hand it also makes sense in order to get to know the functioning and the real nature of the system. However, if we forget that these secret services – no matter whether they had real or apparent influence on society – were not the power itself, but only the most repugnant and at the same time effective instruments thereof, then, in fact, we forget about the point: the understanding of the essence of communist regimes. I hope and I wish that this conference be an important step towards understanding and at the same time a strong impulse for Hungarian intellectuals to research the issue.

**Amy Knight**

## **The Legacy of Secret Police in Post-Communist States**

I would like to thank Dr Hankiss and the Hamvas Institute for inviting me and I am very gratified and pleased that the Hungarian translation of my book *Spice Without Cloaks* has been published.

I have of course heard about the controversy in Hungary surrounding the revelation that the Prime Minister once worked for the secret service. The fact that several ministers who have held office since the collapse of communism had worked for the secret police is probably not at all that surprising, giving the pervasiveness of the secret police in Hungary and all over Eastern Europe during the period of Soviet domination in this area. It is hard to imagine how a country could suddenly come up with a whole cadre of qualified and experienced government officials who had no previous ties with the police. This dilemma is faced by all the countries that have emerged from the Soviet empire. What is significant to me is how much debate it has aroused in Hungary and in other states of Eastern Europe. Especially in comparison to a country like Russia where the presence of former police officials in the government is not viewed as a dilemma. Whereas all over Eastern Europe and in the Baltic countries coming to terms with past repressions (either because of Soviet or Nazi domination, or both) this is a burning issue.

But in Russia this is not the case. The fact that Russians could elect a former KGB officer, Vladimir Putin, as their president and that in fact his popularity stems in large part because he was from the KGB, I think says a great deal.

The Russian political structure today is filled to the brim with former KGB officers. Mr Evgenii Primakov is another example. He is the former Prime Minister who was once considered as a presidential candidate and he worked for the KGB for many years. He still has a tremendous amount of influence in foreign policy and he is very well respected.

As I discussed in my book *Spies Without Cloaks*, there are many reasons why the Russian approach to its past history is so different from that of Eastern Europe. The main reason is probably obvious to all of you. Russia and the other states that formed the Soviet Union were under a totalitarian rule for almost 75 years. Russia itself has no tradition of democracy not even before 1917, except for the brief period of the Dumas in the early 1900. So, for Russians to go back and refute its past is to refute their national identity. Also, of course, communist repression was imposed on Eastern Europe by the Soviet Union it was not native-born as in Russia, so it had less national appeal in Eastern Europe. The secret police in Eastern Europe were appendages of an outside power. So, in a certain sense they always lacked that legitimacy.

Today, I am going to touch on two interrelated issues focusing on Russia but also briefly mentioning the other states of the former Soviet Union.

First of all, what is Russia's attitude and official policy towards past repressions? How do Russians approach their past history and how is their approach unique? Secondly, what is the effect on Russia's political development and that of other post-Soviet states of the continued pervasive influence of the state security organs – the successors to the KGB – in society and government?

First, Russian policy toward the past. Well, you know Russians began looking at their past well before 1991. It was after Khrushchov initiated de-Stalinization, that they began to admit repression had occurred under Stalin. But the Soviet elite never fully faced up to Stalin's terror after he died and the victims who returned from the labour camps were not allowed to discuss openly what had happened to them. Interestingly quite a few of the victims of Stalin's Gulag actually embraced the Party again. To quote one historian: "this was because to be in the Party was to be a part of the heroic, forward-looking, glorious nation once again. Even though many knew this struggle was a false one; even though they knew the nation was not as glorious as its leaders claimed; even though they knew that the entire Soviet cities had been built through the forced labour of people unjustly condemned, many of whom had died, it still felt better to be part of the collective effort than to oppose it."

So, in the post-Stalin era the victims and the perpetrators existed together in relative peace. "The two groups got along simply because they

both agreed to adopt the same collective values, despite individual experiences that would seem to lead them to different conclusions.”

During the glasnost era in the late 1980s, of course, the crimes of Stalin received a great deal more publicity. In the years since, Russian historians have explored and published thousands of documents from their archives about the terror. Survivors have also published hundreds of memoirs. But nonetheless, in the end very few people were punished, and very little compensation was given to the victims. The process of coming to terms with the past has been slow. There is still a veil of secrecy hanging over the long period of Soviet rule. Many archives are open, including archives from the communist party. But all of the intelligence and security archives are still closed and key parts of the communist party archives, particularly the sensitive Politburo minutes as well as the presidential archives are not yet available. Even though some of these subjects date back well beyond fifty years.

Certain historical topics are completely taboo from the point of view of publishing. Topics dealing with crimes by the Red Army or NKVD special troops, for example, are not written about. Marxist-Leninist terminology is no longer in history textbooks, but darker episodes of Soviet history are glossed over. If we made an analogy with tennis – which is one of my favourite sports – the Russians are standing in no man’s land, midway between the net and the base line, where going forward or backward to get the ball is equally difficult.

The recent controversy over the statue of Felix Dzerzhinskii – the first head of the Soviet secret police – is emblematic of the Russian approach to past repressions by the secret police. In early September Moscow mayor Yuri Luzhkov said the fourteen-ton bronze statue of Dzerzhinskii was an outstanding work of art that deserved to regain its prominent place in the heart of Moscow’s Lubyanka Square where it had been before 1991. Leaders of communist nationalist and agrarian parties supported the idea and there had been lively debates in the Duma. It is interesting that since the collapse of communism Russian politicians led by people like Luzhkov have drawn on images from tsarist and Soviet history indiscriminately to boost their own political standing. Their credo is the unity and the wholeness of Russian history. So they go back to these Soviet figures.

Public opinion has also changed quite a bit since 1991 when Dzerzhinskii statue was the focal point of popular discontent against the regime which *was taken down*. A recent poll found that 44 % of Muscovites surveyed

would like to see the statue returned, compared to only 27 % in 1998 when the Duma first raised the idea. This is all very ironic because Iron Felix, as Dzerzhinskii was known, was never a good administrator; the local organs of the Cheka – Lenin’s first political police – were totally out of control under Dzerzhinskii. He was not a very good intelligence agent, otherwise he would have not found himself in prison during the February Revolution. But most important, he symbolizes the terror and repression of the state created by the Bolsheviks. Yet merely, Luzhkov portrayed him as a progressive humanitarian who solved social problems. Luzhkov probably got the idea of restoring the statue from members of the Putin administration. President Putin himself reportedly admires Dzerzhinskii as a great figure in Russian history and has a bust of him on his desk.

Now, by coincidence, just outside President Putin’s hometown of St. Petersburg members of the Memorial society have been digging up the remains of bodies from mass graves. Graves which contain thousands of victims of Stalin’s terror in the 1930s. Memorial representatives say the recently discovered graves near St. Petersburg could hold as many as 30,000 people shot by the NKVD. The Russian authorities have not prevented them from this project but they have not been particularly cooperative either. There has been no official statement from the Kremlin about the graves and the FSB (Federal Security Service) has only stated that it has “no relevant information” in its archives.

Now, think about it. In any other country the discovery of such a mass grave site would spark a huge reaction but in Russia people are indifferent. As for President Putin, he has made social stability and national patriotism a top priority. He seems to have no interest in stirring up controversies from the past. As one Russian observer put it: “You have to understand that most people live in the present. When society becomes agitated it becomes destabilized. To protect themselves people avoid living in the past.” A poll conducted last year showed that more than half of Russians said they regard Stalin with respect, admiration or indifference. Only one quarter of those polled expressed negative views about him.

Now, how does this attitude affect the Russian political system as it operates today? Does this attitude threaten Russia’s progress towards democracy? Yes, I am afraid it does.

Well, first of all as I mentioned, its president, Mr Putin spent most of his career in the KGB, where he was by all accounts a very ordinary em-

ployee who taught the KGB line. He was by no means a *closet* democrat or a rebel. He did not resign from the KGB until August 1991. What is rather interesting to me is the fact that Mr Putin has become a cult figure recently in Russia. One only has to look at the pomp surrounding his 50th birthday that began a couple of weeks ago. If the gifts were striking enough, just as eye-catching were the public tributes and attention given to the event, from cards sent by schoolchildren to laudatory hymns from youth groups – all given extensive coverage in the Russian media. To some, the celebrations signal a return to a Soviet-era cult of personality. Others seem to feel that it was more like the representative of the absolutist eastern-style potentate approach to governance that continues to pervade much of Russian business, politics and society. But the cult around President Putin has reached new post-Soviet levels. In offices across the country an increasing number of portraits and photographs of him are hung on walls. The most recent example, in a village in Ingushetia, where a former head of the FSB security service supported by the Kremlin was elected president earlier this year, a street has been named in Mr Putin's honour.

Now, I am sure you understand that such a cult is really not a good sign of democracy. It is not particularly healthy. We only have to look at the counterexample of what happened to the popular, wartime leader in England, Winston Churchill. He was voted out of office right after the war. Despite his wonderful record and the admiration for him he was simply rejected by the voters because they refused to hold anyone up as the perfect leader who would do right in all situations. So, the cult is not a very healthy phenomenon.

The skills needed to run a democratic state, in my opinion, are very different from those were needed in the KGB. Mr Putin does not seem to have an understanding of what real democracy means. As one journalist expressed it: "Putin believes in capitalism but he does not believe in democracy." This is actually true of most former KGB officers, except perhaps for those few who went abroad after 1991.

Some of the more knowledgeable and sophisticated former KGB officers, mainly those working for the Foreign Intelligence Services, did defect the West. The estimates are well over a dozen such officers who defected in the 1990s. But many high-ranking KGB officials who persecuted dissidents under the Soviet regime stayed in Russia. They left their jobs and went to work for the security services of economic oligarchs. Some former KGB of-

ficers, particularly those who served in the First Directorate, are interested in the capitalization of Russia. And some of them have become inveterate members of the bourgeoisie. In the new market environment in Russia there is a great demand for the former KGB on boards and companies because of their information and their contacts. One interesting example is that of Fillip Bobkov, who was former head of the Fifth Directorate of the KGB which was the anti-dissident directorate. He has become very wealthy now because he is the chief of security for Media Most. This is an example of success of former KGB officials. Another example is Viktor Ivanienko, former head of the Russian Republic KGB, who is now a multimillionaire. He is a shareholder in a large oil company. There are many examples like this.

Someone has observed that the FSB now sort of resembles a corporate political party. It has supporters, a financial base, elected officials and representatives in the government. Another representative is Alexander Gurov, formerly worked in the MVD in internal affairs and later in the FSB, and he is now chairman of the Duma committee on security which is supposed to be the oversight body of the security services. According to one Russian observer "if the FSB were suddenly to form a party it would win a majority in the Duma at the next parliamentary elections." Well, this is probably an exaggeration but one might ask the question: why does the FSB have so much appeal? Well, it has the romantic old Soviet-era image of an all powerful organization filled with people with cool heads, clean hands and passionate hearts. This is the image of Lenin's old Cheka. Russian people see the "organs", as they call them, as the only force able to end the dominance of criminals in the system.

Now, turning to Putin himself, I think he has done a very good job, we cannot deny certain successes. He has done a good job in integrating Russia further with the West. He has shown himself a surprisingly sophisticated diplomat and he responded very well, for example, to 11th September, over a year ago, and I think he has gained a lot of confidence in the West. So, this is to his credit.

Domestically, even Russia has gone quite a way since 1991. In contrast with the Soviet period, Russians have the freedom to travel abroad, they can speak openly and demonstrate in public. But does this mean true democracy? Russia still does not have rule of law, a free press and fair elections. First of all, the criminal gangs who make every small or medium business pay protection money. There are still hundreds of contract murders every year in

Russia. The Russian media now are practically completely controlled by the Kremlin and its allied financial interests. Recently they have taken actions against Novaia Gazeta (a libel judgement) and Obshchaia Gazeta (which was bought by a businessman from St Petersburg who fired much of the staff), the two papers which were the most independent and did courageous reporting. And now, their reporting has been greatly *curtailed*. So, free press, has been, I think restricted considerably more under Mr Putin.

There is also little commitment for free elections. Particularly in the recent regional elections we have seen examples of lot of results that have been fixed. One example was in Ingushetia in April where the former FSB general Murat Zyazikov won the election as the president but it was revealed later that there was massive intimidation by the security forces and also ballot stuffing. In the Smolensk region the new governor Viktor Maslov, who was formerly the head of Smolensk FSB, also apparently won the elections by using violence and intimidation tactics. So, I think that this problem of falsified elections is really one that deserves more attention.

So now, we have the situation where retired FSB generals are not only appointed as ministers in the federal government and board members in the biggest monopolies, but also being elected as regional governors. As a result, the FSB continues to have rather alarming powers. They torture crime suspects and pressure and harass outspoken journalists. The rights of those accused or suspected of crimes are still often flagrantly violated by the Federal Security Service.

Now, last July a new criminal procedure law came into force as part of a major judicial reform. The code aimed to enhance the rights of suspects by requiring a court warrant for searches and arrests by giving more power to defence attorneys, for example. Nonetheless, critics of the new code claim that it does little to prevent human rights abuses and it will be very difficult to implement. Meanwhile there are several high profile cases involving national security and security services, some of which you probably have heard about. One is that of environmental whistle-blower Grigorii Pasko - this is an ongoing case. He was sentenced last December to four years in prison on charges of passing nuclear secrets to Japan and a new ruling this summer upheld the decision. The case was motivated by political reprisal for his exposing the practice of nuclear dumping. Pasko has already been acquitted once and his case was dragged on for several years. He is a very courageous man and a journalist. Seemingly, one phone call from President

Putin and the whole thing would be over. But Putin apparently condones these anti-democratic practices.

Last July a Vladivostok court began to conduct another treason trial, that of a scientist named Vladimir Schurov who was arrested by the FSB a year ago for passing state secrets to China. He actually is the head of a laboratory at an oceanological institute and claims that he has never even had access to secret data.

There is also the case against the Russian arms expert Igor Sutyagin, an academician, who has been accused of passing nuclear submarine secrets to Britain and the US. In early October Russia's Supreme Court rejected a lower court's decision to extend the pretrial detention of Sutyagin and send it back for further consideration, his lawyer declared. But the Supreme Court has announced that he has to remain in jail for the time being.

Now, the recently released US State Department Report for 2001 on Human Rights in Russia reaffirms that the wave of espionage cases against environmentalists, scientists and diplomats as well as probes into religious organizations by the FSB show that people in Russia are still being persecuted for political reasons. The report also talks about the human rights abuses in Chechnya, where the security forces of Russia are involved in extra judicial killings, torture and other abuses. According to numerous sources the repression in Chechnya has intensified since 11th September, with pillaging, murders and round-ups of groups of civilians being an everyday feature of the war in Chechnya. Russia's Memorial society has documented hundreds of cases of persons rounded up in raids who have completely disappeared. Also government pressure on the media reporting on Chechnya has increased dramatically. A recent report from Moscow's Helsinki Group characterized the situation in Chechnya as a disaster. Russian troops – they say – form death squads and continue to torture civilians on a regular basis. So this is really a festering wound that needs to be addressed.

Putin's Russia has been characterized rightly as "velvet authoritarianism, a state where the intelligence and security community shapes the Kremlin world view" - it has the image of austere and incorruptible government, which will remain however hostile to criticism and will continue to intimidate the media. President Putin apparently sees little conflict between his professed friendship with the West and his domestic policies. In the words of one Russian human rights activist, "liberalism toward the West and a leaning toward police state in Russia: this is the real nature of the Putin regime".

Now, just very briefly what about the rest of the Commonwealth of Independent States. Well, it is difficult to talk about it as a whole but I would say that the influence of the special services in the states that were former part of the Soviet Union clearly varies from state to state. But as a rule, officials from the former KGB are still playing a prominent role. The former KGB was an empire that was divided into fifteen republics. And when the Soviet Union existed there was a division of labour with the different republics performing different security functions such as anti-terrorism or intelligence. This is the way things were when independence was achieved by these states.

So, the individual CIS states do not have evenly distributed resources as far as their security and intelligence services are concerned. Russians were sent back and native career KGB officers filled their positions in the security services but the services had large gaps in personnel and resources and they could not fulfil all the functions necessary. Most of the new states had very few trained intelligence officers, for example, or cadres that were trained for counter-terrorism. So, this has made the security services of the former Soviet republics pretty much dependent on Russia. They formed to collect a lot of agreements and they have lot of cooperation. I just give one example, that of Kirgizia.

The security services there are big proponents of integration of intelligence functions within the CIS. They are very loyal to the Russians and last year had joint training courses with the Russians and the Belorussians. Armenia also integrates its security operations with that of the Russians. In fact, Russia has electronic surveillance systems which are located in Armenian soil. They are still very dependent on Russian security services.

As in Russia, the security services in all of these states play a big role in politics. One example is Azerbaidzhan where President Aliev, who was elected in 1991, is a former member of the KGB. The KGB there is now called the Ministry of National Security. The Russians were all forced to leave this service which now consists of natives from Azerbaidzhan but they have close links to Aliev's People's Front. And the security service's power is used mainly to preserve the power of President Aliev. The old habits of the KGB have died hard in the former Soviet republics. And Russia still uses its security services to maintain its hold over these states. As in Russia, human rights and democratic reform are slow to develop.

Now, what about the future? Can Russia transform itself into a democracy with a former KGB so prevalent as it is today? Well, I would say the answer is yes and no. Russians are developing a market economy and this is very encouraging. And a lot of people think that if you have a market economy this will help form the basis for democratic politics. But I should point out that they still have a lot of problems because they do not have a good legal structure for a market economy. So, they do not have laws to support this even though capitalism is very popular.

I would say, that as Russia continues to have contact with the West and its citizens become more familiar with Western democracies, the democratic process will move forward no matter what happens. But it will be incremental and it will not involve any soul-searching about the past. Not until a new generation – a generation untainted and unaffected by the totalitarian practices of the KGB – comes to power in Russia can there be true democratic reform.

**Jörn Mothes**

## **The Political Injustices Committed in the German Democratic Republic (GDR)**

First of all, I would like to say some words about the profile of the authority which I represent here. It is a small office in northern Germany, in the province of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern with a number of 1.2 million inhabitants, where with three colleagues along and based on a special law we deal with the following three assignments:

1. Psychosocial counselling and occupation for people who up to these days suffer the consequences of the violations committed by the communist GDR's political system or still face similar conflicts.
2. Processing the past of the GDR and the operations of the State Security Service (Staatssicherheitsdienst) from historical and political aspects, with special regard to the province of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, in the schools and families thereof.
3. Processing the past and management of regional research projects – especially in our region – that aim to provide information.

I will not talk about the third point as brochures are being distributed during the conference as sources of information. Regarding the second point – political education aiming to achieve the democratic renewal of a country having lived under the conditions of a dictatorship for decades – I would like to summarize it shortly.

My starting point is the message that Vitalij Sentalinskij have sent us with his question: what is freedom for?

This very question is the focus of our political educational activity, because we face it on a daily basis among young people. Day after day they hear from their parents: the GDR used to arrange everything for you, jobs, social benefits, all that is important in life. Today we live in a democracy in which we dispose of freedom, however safety is apparently lost. In fact, why have we fought for freedom? Therefore, my lecture focuses on the first point, the so-called psychosocial counselling to manage conflicts.

Last year only – in 2001 – more than 1,300 citizens from our province turned to the authority I represent for assistance. Our activity is always supported by therapists and other professionals, eg. psychologists, political scientists and theologians. By the way, the authority belongs to the Ministry of Justice of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern and once a year it has to prepare a report for the parliament. Please do not confuse our activity with that of the federal agent – associated with the name of Ms Bürgle or previously Mr Gauck – responsible for the Stasi documents of Berlin. Because this federal authority belongs to the Federal Ministry of Home Affairs, they handle the Stasi files and based on a special law they provide the possibility of personal inspection not only for the citizens, but also for the researchers and the media. However, anything that happens after the release of these documents is beyond the scope of this authority and law. Here is the point to which – figuratively speaking – our work is attached. So, the authority I represent has no files in the basement, apart from the case if we ourselves do relevant research for which we use copies of the Stasi files or if the citizens themselves bring them to the meeting. Let us take a look at the psychosocial counselling and care which intends to help to cope with the consequences of political illegitimacy. Our counselling represents the following objectives:

The counselling is available for everyone and it is free of charge in the province. There are so-called visiting days through all over the province. During these days a large number of people get in contact with us, and last year we had 20-60 visitors a day.

The ultimate goal of the counselling is to reconcile and tackle existing conflicts in our society. It intends to contribute to the new culture of processing the past and dealing with it. It intends to contribute to a greater justice within society and to rehabilitate the politically persecuted, as well as it addresses special attention to those having fought for more freedom and human dignity under circumstances of the former dictatorship. In our society today, there are many who do not know that in the GDR there were political prisoners. Or simply, they do not want to know because there is an existing process of collective suppression. With the counselling we aim to support the victims of political persecution in their efforts to rehabilitation. And it is not about a small minority in our society but about huge numbers of people, and of course we intend to pay special attention to every single fate.

The groups of politically persecuted include on one hand prisoners of the German so-called special camps. The special camps were former Nazi

concentration camps which were still used after 1945 under the legend of denazification. At least 120,000 people were detained in these camps of which approximately 43,000 died.

On the other hand these groups include those deported to the Soviet Union – Eastern Europeans as well as Eastern Germans – who were taken from these special camps to Vorkuta or Siberia. Contemporary science estimates a number of 230,000 people sharing this fate. In the meantime, many of them deceased.

In our psychosocial consultancy work we have been dealing much with those civilians who were convicted by the Soviet military courts in Germany between 1945 and 1952. This is a taboo issue of our post-war history which only now may lead to rehabilitation since the archives in Moscow were opened and these files are brought back to Germany. We also do this at the authority I represent. More than 50,000 people experienced the same.

There is also a great number of soldiers – approximately 200,000 – sentenced by the Soviet military courts in Germany. These are former political prisoners who were convicted by the courts of the GDR between 1949 and 1989.

With respect to the psychosocial conflict management trainings the following groups of people have turned to us:

I have already mentioned the victims of the Soviet military courts in Germany. Based on the Soviet military law they were sentenced to usually 3-25 years of lager in Vorkuta or Siberia. This – on the basis of current knowledge – affects about 50,000 Eastern Germans. According to Soviet military law these people were punishable from the age of 15. Those who returned were released with the order never to speak about anything that happened there.

It is still overwhelming for the counsellor that these people remained silent until 1994-1995 even towards their parents, spouses or children. They were all carrying a deep threat that the tentacles of the KGB would reach them if they talked about this era and their experiences. The official explanation for the deportation was the denazification of Germany. However, we are aware of the fact that out of these 50,000 fates only some cases fall into the category of denazification. Overall, the aim was to meet a quota. The Russians were arbitrarily deporting people from the resident population, especially young people who worked in the coal mines of Vorkuta.

The prisoners of special camps in Germany were detained for years in the former concentration camps until their dissolution in 1948. These peo-

ple lived in precarious conditions – this was also considered to be part of the denazification process without any apparent connection at all having existed in it.

I wonder if you can put yourself in a situation created by such a conversation. When today 70, 80, 90-year-old people come and share their experiences, meanwhile they associate the renaissance of the secret service with the former Soviet Union. Or the thousands of people in Germany who are fascinated by Mr Putin for being such an excellent politician and for speaking German language well. This is a conflict that preoccupies many people. Today we will talk about this issue.

Or take a third group, a group of people who were persecuted in the GDR in the early stages of ideologizing the society. Above all, it affected faithful Christians who were removed from schools and social standing. Hundreds of believers were eliminated from upper-secondary classes, many of whom managed to escape to the West and finish studies there.

Also some civil liberal people are well remembered. For example students of the University of Rostock who represented liberal views and therefore simply did not fit into the narrow ideological thinking patterns of this era. They were arrested and many of them were deported to concentration camps in the Soviet Union.

Many coming to the counselling recall the popular uprising of 17 June 1953 in Germany. Some people report how they became victims of political persecution for being organizers and heads of the uprising. Others – being policeman by then – report how they got the task to ally with the Red Army and put down the rebellion by the Baltic Sea, in the shipyard of Rostock and Stralsund.

Or remember the thousands of families relocated by force who lived in close proximity to the inner German border, and whose members still live in our province and often come to our psychosocial meetings. In 1952 and 1961 – as we recently found out – more than 3,000 families were deported almost arbitrarily without any reason from a 5 km long zone of the inner German border. The main political reason for deporting some families to the interior regions of the country was to maintain peace and discipline in the remaining population living at the border.

In the end, these arbitrary measures were only to achieve disciplining effect. These separated families by deportation still ask themselves why exactly they were involved in all this instead of their neighbours. Many have

been pondering over this question over decades, but it is still unanswered to this day, and thus a subject of ongoing researches.

Or think of the victims of the wall and the border. Those people shot along the East-West border who before and after the construction of the wall in 1961 died because the fire order issued by the GDR's policy. In our province, we deal with several relatives of the 220 victims died during an escape attempt in the Baltic Sea. Such fugitives who used handmade boats and mattresses to get through the Baltic Sea border hoping to reach Sweden, Denmark or the Federal Republic of Germany.

And think about those people who come to the counselling because in 1968 they refused to sign a document promising to distance themselves from happenings in Prague, the Prague Spring. They refused to do it. And from that moment their professional career came to an end.

A less known group to mention includes victims of the so-called psychological and disruptive measures of the State Security Service which from 1976 onwards constituted a new phase of repression in the GDR against those with dissenting opinion. These affected several members of the former opposition and of political opposition groups. State security organs had to invent a new tool because back then the GDR wanted to participate in the OSCE (Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe) process and wanted to become a member of the United Nations that could be fulfilled on one condition: political prisoners are not allowed in the country. So, what does the GDR? It changes its tools, repressions and arrests of those having dissenting opinion are replaced by new psychological forms with which – under the concept of “disruption” – human lives, relationships and professional prospects can be ruined. The victims of disruption can never be rehabilitated.

Or let us mention a group of people who – before or after an insight into the Stasi files – need advice because they do not know what attitude to have towards their former informant reporting on them. Should they ask him frankly? Should they keep the information for themselves? Or should they make an aggressive visit at his home?

Or let us also mention those people who need our help in justifying their application for rehabilitation. Moreover, a considerable number of the GDR's “unofficial collaborators” – simply stoolies – also attend the counsellings. They also have questions. Some need information on employment as they fear that based on inspections in civil service they would be dismissed.

Others try to cope with their own culpability because they transmitted information of third parties.

And finally, former State Security Service officers also come to our counselling and so do sometimes even functionaries of the army, the police and the communist party. However, they constitute a very small percent of people seeking advice.

Among victims, there is a considerable willingness to forgive and to achieve reconciliation. On the other hand, perpetrators' willingness to talk is little and they are characterized by rejection, active denial and suppression of connections. It is very difficult to advise those who may be classified in both categories. These are people who had been victims of political persecution, however once in prison they became spies of Stasi.

### **State efforts and tools to remedy the consequences of political illegitimacies**

Today we know that only a broad social process can constitute the basis of the successful processing of the past. The victims have the right to demand the truth. These people – like Bärbel Bohley, former opposition politician advocating civil rights, put it once – neither received justice nor rule of law. Several citizens fell into collective depression when they noticed that although the united Federal Republic of Germany represented the rule of law after 1991, many expectations towards a just society were not fulfilled.

Former politically persecuted ones today have the sensation that supporting freedom, democracy and human dignity under circumstances of former dictatorships has not been rewarding. They are disillusioned of society and its lack of history and culture, the collective forgetting, and again they feel betrayed. In Germany this process is also intensified by a concept that a French philosopher recently described as “competition of the victims”.

Following the dictatorship, in the German-German society the victims of national socialism still receive more attention than the victims of communism. This process – which is an Eastern European phenomenon – continues to play an important role in Germany. Today, many young people travel on vacation to the Baltic States and to Romania, where they occasionally examine the national socialist invasion. But at the same time, one cannot find a single event in the program of young people, trade unions or tour

guides whose main purpose would be to visit for instance a memorial of the victims of communism. Regarding history we are half blind, and this blindness should be exceeded in the field of political education. Concerning this problematic issue of processing the past we have already been successful.

The German law concerning the Stasi documents is considered to be unique in terms of regulating the opening of the files. Since 1995 two million petitioners sought access to the files. Currently there are 1,800 research applications in the stage to completion. In the last few months restrictions came about because Helmut Kohl, former Federal Chancellor, through the judicial procedure against the “Gauck” office and the federal deputy, managed to lock huge amount of data. These files could be reopened recently – however under more stringent conditions –, following the new additions to the law few weeks ago. All this constituted a paralyzing impact on the processing of the past.

A review have proven to be successful which aimed to examine the cooperation between the public service staff and the GDR’s secret service. The main purpose of the reviews – for which the Stasi files could be used – was to create trust towards a new administration based on the rule of law. Denunciation and cooperation with the Stasi simply should not be rewarded with yet another public service job. This was the objective of the change of regime and of those who wanted to create a new state public service in Germany after 1990.

In Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, in all institutions that belonged to the provincial government 84,500 people were controlled. More precisely, a number of 81,000 responses have been received till the end of June this year, of which 76,000 cases did not reveal any incriminating data. 5,125 people were found to have “non-official” activities at the State Security Service. In other words, 5,125 civil servants and employees of the provincial government in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern began their civil service with lies. These civil servants signed that they had never collaborated with the Ministry of State Security. Now, I leave it to you whether this 5,000 out of 81,000 is many or few. I believe this is a terribly high rate! If we continue to analyze the sequence, we can see that out of 5,125 only 944 people were dismissed from public service and 861 were cast off with very confiding contractual conditions. A number of 2,234 employees remained in public service as their employer considered their cooperation with the Stasi to be insignificant. Thus, they could hold their jobs in public service despite the fact that they had lied to their employer.

Considering our work, two ministries' activity is relevant to us. On the one hand, the Ministry of Education because among teachers there is a high proportion of those having worked as "unofficial collaborators". On the other hand, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, where the police's labour-intensive area also belongs to. The statistical quota of non-official employees is 6% here as well, in other words these are people who in 1994 began to work for the provincial government of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern with fraud.

The problem that in 1989 many referred to with the phrase "Stasi to production!" causes today additional problems because in the economics of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern there is a considerable number of interrelations between the former functionary elite and the intelligence staff.

### **The balance of legal processing**

This process took place in difficult scenes and the conclusion can be drawn that there is no retroactive justice. Due to the illegalities committed by the communist party of the GDR, after the change of regime 26,000 criminal accusations were initiated by the prosecutor's office and 20,000 investigative proceedings were launched, however in the end only 200 guilty verdicts were delivered and in most cases it was suspended sentence. The prosecutor's office of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern launched 3,000 investigative proceedings within the confines of processing the illegalities committed in the GDR which resulted in 13 verdicts in our province, of which 4 were suspended. The rest lead to acquittals either because the verdict could not be brought into effect considering the convicted ones' age and health, or because of other reasons.

The public was especially interested in the trial of Erich Mielke, former head of the Stasi. It was impossible to deliver guilty verdict against him based on forty years of illegal activity in the secret service, thus finally he was sentenced for killing a policeman in 1991 in Berlin.

In the Federal Republic of Germany there are two rehabilitation laws in force that aim to condone political violations committed in the GDR. The first law is to control the rehabilitation of former prisoners. They receive equity compensation. In our province a number of 16,500 petitions have been processed and 73 million DM has been paid. This scale is considered to be positive even if we reckon with a total of about 20,000 politically convicted,

and only 16,000 of them submitted a request for equity compensation or rehabilitation.

It is much more complex to enforce the other rehabilitation law which aims to rehabilitate the victims of the illegitimacies committed by the GDR and of occupational incapacitation suffered for political reasons. In each case the victim has to prove that the illegality is valid. However, the dictatorship – obviously – did not provide any evidence of it. So, when people meet lawyers graduated in Munich, Kiel or Bonn they are told to prove first that the communist state exercised negative influence on their career or took property from them. People, of course, are unable to prove it, thus rehabilitation conditions cannot be met. The narrow interpretation of laws often leads to bad mood and despair.

Similarly, the hope of politically persecuted to receive a so-called “honorary” state pension also fails. This “honorary” pension would be similar to the special pension continuously granted by the former GDR to the persecuted of the Nazi regime. The Bundestag has rejected the adoption of such a law up to this day. There is no political majority that could stand up for granting the “honorary” pension to politically persecuted often living below the poverty line. Instead, in 2000 the Bundestag had to convert into law one of the verdicts of the Federal Constitutional Court that would authorize that more than 770,000 people – coming from the state security organs, the police, the army or from the higher educational sector – who belong to the GDR’s so-called special supply systems, would benefit from a higher pension calculated retroactively.

Based on this action the state – as the trustee of official duties - has to comply with the generous acquittance of 770,000 retroactively calculated pensions. Now, compared to this, the number of 7,000 petitions for pension submitted by the politically persecuted of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the GDR seems few. This unfair situation is prevalent in the reality of 2002, as well as the continuously lacking experience to recognize the existence of traumatic disruption generated by mental upset. Posterior effects caused by respective offices and authorities that harmed health. They do not admit that mental excitement, sleep disorders or other illnesses of the persecuted – who were warned for decades not to speak about their experience in prison – can occur as a consequence of experiences happened decades ago. Offices say that it makes no sense if in the meantime 15 years have passed, however this way any kind of historical truth is being ignored.

## And the current situation?

It is prevalent today that the public is indifferent towards the research on dictatorship and processing of the GDR's past. We did not manage to make processing of the past a cultural issue of our whole society, it is only the isolated struggle of a few political victims and activists. Overall, it is also possible – as happened last week – that an Eastern German having had incriminating connection with the Stasi, Manfred Stolpe, the former prime minister, for a few days has been working as the federal minister in Gerhard Schröder's new government.

Typical situation is the increased expectations imposed in the process. To bring justice forth on levels of society, but this was not possible because actually the citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany – the so-called old provinces – were those who have shown little interest in the historical experience of Eastern Germans, and this lack of historical knowledge characterizes the whole German society up until today.

A further problem is that generally the act of processing the past of the GDR is restricted to processing that of the Stasi. In the state security service they simply found a scapegoat, imposed GDR's every single sin on him, and finally, simply tried to expel him from the country. Then everything seemed to be all right again, so they ignored to look for political sins also among members of the communist party and functionaries of state organs.

Up to this day people do not want to acknowledge the Stasi being only a tool in the GDR's policy and not a state within a state. This deficiency of processing the past characterizes public debate, and there is no possibility to punish former supporters of the political system based on their activities. From a legal point of view, the terms of limitation have slowly expired and from a moral point of view there is no demand for this because it was only the Stasi to be pursued and unfortunately not the strong connections to the system, the political proximity or political responsibility in the GDR. Therefore such a situation evolved where teachers – who possibly reported on their colleagues planning to visit relatives in the West – in some schools were dismissed for having co-operated with the State Security Service. Thus, following the inspection these teachers were laid off while the school's former party secretary responsible for ruining some students' careers – apparently they were not allowed to graduate – today contemplates his own past without any criticism and of course teaches religion and philosophy at the same school.

In our society processing the Nazi past has always received greater importance than that of the GDR. Probably all of you have been following closely the debate on compensation for forced labourers, nevertheless the existing East-West trench – that is, as I have already mentioned it, the big difference between processing the past and the interest shown towards it in the eastern part of Germany, and the lack of debate in the western part – is still prevalent in our society.

Our situation is characterized by the loss of Eastern European perspectives. We need greater solidarity between Eastern European nations based on our common destiny in communist society, in order to consider this act of processing not a national but an international task, and therefore to contribute to create a new culture of remembrance.

*If it turns out  
that my Prime Minister  
with a good-natured face  
of an abbot of a profitable monastery  
really betrayed me  
tell me what am I to do  
how should we proceed*

*Maybe the Prime Minister suffers from logorea  
which means he incessantly speaks  
not knowing to whom  
it is a very unpleasant neurosis  
you cannot punish a sick man*

*he shared a secret  
with his best friend  
righteous people  
see only righteous people  
around them  
maybe it is naïve  
but nice*

*in case he acted  
in bad will  
I can challenge him  
on solid ground*

*but there is no solid ground  
around here*

*it is difficult to make  
pathetic gestures  
of Evgeni Onegin  
sinking  
knee-deep  
neck-deep  
in the mud<sup>1</sup>*

**Wojciech Roszkowski**

## **The Oleksy Case and the Role of Secret Services in Polish Politics**

The traditional division of power into the legislative, executive and judiciary branches seems to be increasingly complicated in modern democracies

by additional powers – business and media – called the fourth and the fifth power respectively. New democracies in East and Central Europe generally follow this trend but there is a general perception in these countries that all the five powers are in fact under a very significant influence of the networks of former communist secret services. To what extent this feeling is justified is for a scholar very difficult to check since the nature of secret services is to remain secret. Moreover, scholars frequently enter a „chamber of distorting mirrors” without a clear understanding of the operation games. Therefore, neither generalization nor exemplification seems well-grounded.

Nevertheless, both political scientists and historians simply have to face the facts of life: special services do play a role in contemporary politics and their files are powerful political weapon. Probably the best known case of this phenomenon in Poland is the case of Józef Oleksy, the Prime Minister from 1 March 1995 to 24 January 1996, who resigned in the middle of a fierce debate over the accusations concerning his contacts with Soviet and Russian intelligence.

Józef Oleksy was born on 22 June 1946 in Nowy Sącz. In 1969 he graduated from the Foreign Trade Department of the Central School of Planning and Statistics (*Szkoła Główna Planowania i Statystyki*, SGPiS). He joined the Polish United Workers Party (*Polska Zjednoczona Partia Robotnicza*, PZPR) already in his fourth year, in 1968. For a while he was an assistant in the SGPiS Chair of International Law and employee of the Ministry of Education and Higher Schools, but then chose a party career. From the ranks of the party apparatus at the SGPiS in 1977 he joined the staff of the Department of Ideological and Educational Work of the PZPR Central Committee. In November 1981 he became the head of the office of the PZPR Central Revisory Commission. In July 1986 he was dropped from it but in January 1987 became the 1st Secretary of the PZPR Provincial Committee in Biała Podlaska. During the Round Table Talks, in March 1989 he was appointed minister for contacts with trade unions. When the PZPR was dissolved in January 1990, Oleksy was among the founding fathers of the Social-Democracy of the Polish Republic (*Socjaldemokracja Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, SdRP).<sup>2</sup> After the parliamentary election of September 1993, won by the postcommunist coalition of the Democratic Left Alliance (*Sojusz Lewicy Demokratycznej*, SLD), including SdRP, and the Polish Peasant Party (*Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe*, PSL), Oleksy was elected the Speaker of the Lower House. After a series of conflicts between President Lech Wałęsa and Prime Minister Wal-

demar Pawlak (PSL), in early March 1995 Oleksy was appointed a new head of Polish government. At that time he was generally perceived as a well-balanced spokesman of the most civilized wing of the post-Communists. In the early 1990s he confessed he had been an altar boy in his youth and that it was almost by accident that he fell into the “velvet paws” of the Central Committee apparatus.<sup>3</sup>

When after a fierce campaign and a loss in the second round by the skin of his teeth to post-Communist Aleksander Kwaśniewski, Wałęsa was about to leave the presidential palace, on 21 December 1995 Minister of Interior Andrzej Milczanowski made a dramatic parliamentary speech in which he accused his boss, Prime Minister Oleksy, of being a conscious informer of a “foreign” intelligence service.<sup>4</sup> Oleksy vigorously denied the accusations. Instead of waiting for a more complete clarification of these accusations, he dismissed deputy Minister of Interior Henryk Jasik and the State Protection Office (*Urząd Ochrony Państwa*, UOP) functionaries who collected evidence against him.<sup>5</sup> On 23 December Kwaśniewski was sworn as new President. Now the whole executive power was in the hands of former Communists. As a result of the Oleksy case and the transfer of power from Wałęsa to Kwaśniewski a political earthquake changed the Ministry of Interior. Among those who soon stepped down were Minister Milczanowski, the UOP head Gromosław Czempiński, and the head of counter-intelligence, Konstanty Miodowicz. Kwaśniewski announced that all evidence concerning the case, should be disclosed which would mean destruction of the credibility of Polish special services. Due to a strong political reaction, he changed his mind but expressed his solidarity with Oleksy. The Russian side did not remain passive and boosted the turmoil, which negatively influenced the image of Poland, as the candidate to the NATO.<sup>6</sup>

Despite hesitations in the SLD, finally Oleksy was pressed to give up his position. On 24 January 1996 Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz of SLD became new Prime Minister. The UOP was taken over by Zigniew Siemiątkowski (SLD). On 22 April 1996 the Prosecutor of the Warsaw Military District discontinued investigation concerning Oleksy’s alleged cooperation with Russian intelligence. Some believed this was an act of justice, others thought it a result of political pressure from the post-Communist executive branch of power. Since some crucial information about the case had already been made public, four days later, Minister of Justice - Attorney General, Leszek Kubicki, decided to publish declassified documentation related to the case under

the title *Biała Księga* [White Book].<sup>7</sup> On the one hand this decision was welcomed by the media and the public, on the other hand there was a lot of doubts due to the fact that by doing so Kubicki jeopardized Russian sources of information gathered in the case. Though Kubicki stated that the documents published did not disclose identity of Russian agents who talked to the UOP people, it was obvious from the published acts that their identity could be detected.<sup>8</sup>

For months a special parliamentary commission to explain the legality of the UOP activities concerning the case could not agree to a common statement and finally announced solidarity with Oleksy, its opposition members submitting their separate opinion.<sup>9</sup> Despite some signs of Oleksy's declining ratings, the post-Communists almost univocally elected him the leader of the SdRP. For some time the Oleksy Affair hang as a dark cloud over the Polish political life and divided the society into those who believed in the innocence of the Prime Minister and those who believed in his guilt. At first it looked as if this time truth in this key issue for Polish security would be pursued, either leading to the condemnation of Oleksy or of Milczanowski. An outburst of contradictory information has nevertheless resulted in the exhaustion of the topic and of the audience. The case disappeared from public view for several years.

What were the grounds for the accusation?

According to the motion of 19 December 1995 by Milczanowski, in 1982 or 1983 an agent called "Olin" entered into cooperation with the KGB agent Vladimir Alganov who worked subsequently as the third, the second, and the first secretary of the Soviet embassy in Warsaw. Milczanowski quoted a memo by Colonel Marian Zacharski<sup>10</sup> who led the investigation team on behalf of the UOP and included a number of other documents, including memos by Captain D.I. and Major J.N. (elsewhere in the "White Book" called Janusz Nasiadko), as well as Lieutenant-Colonel J.F. and other sources. In 1993 D.I. learned from Alganov that a high-ranking PZPR official was recruited by the KGB. The UOP investigators believed that "Olin" could have been Oleksy and that this cooperation was to help him improve ratings in the PZPR hierarchy. In 1992 Alganov left Warsaw and the contact with "Olin" was allegedly taken over by a new first secretary of the Russian embassy, Grigory Jakimishin. In his motion Milczanowski stated that 18 meetings of "Olin" and Alganov in 1991 and 1992 had been documented "beyond any doubt".<sup>11</sup> This thesis was based on the memos by Zacharski and D.I.

On 4 September 1994 the UOP head Czempiński, told Oleksy, then the Speaker of the Sejm, that Alganov was an officer of Russian intelligence. Oleksy confirmed having met Alganov on private grounds and stated that he would not meet Alganov again. On 21 July 1995 Alganov called Oleksy who was very upset and told Alganov not to contact him any more.<sup>12</sup> Meanwhile the UOP investigation continued. Also in July 1995 Zacharski met Alganov in Majorca and gained confirmation that the agent who used pseudonym "Olin" was Oleksy.<sup>13</sup> On 9 August 1995 Alganov repeated an UOP officer that his contact whom he called Łysy (Bald) was Oleksy. In fact Oleksy is bald.

These are the hints that lead to a suspicion that "Olin" might have been Oleksy but we do not know for sure. There is a *post scriptum* to this story but not a final one. Various contradicting facts and opinions have been added ever since. Various top Communist officials stated that the KGB never recruited agents from the ranks of the ruling party elite. Whether Oleksy could have been ranked among this elite in early 1980s is hard to say. Others pointed at the fact that the KGB would not have had to recruit people such as Oleksy as agents since they could have extracted information from them by other less formal means. This may be partly relevant to the story but on the other hand a formal obligation to inform was always more welcome by the KGB that could have then used more pressure on a person to gather or check information. After all, we should not forget that the power of the Polish United Workers' Party (*Polska Zjednoczona Partia Robotnicza*, PZPR) had not hang in the air but largely relied on the security apparatus that was directly linked to the KGB headquarters in Lubyanka. "Friendly" memoirs by one of the last KGB residents in Warsaw (1973-84), gen. Vitaly Pavlow, leave no doubts about that.<sup>14</sup>

Polish Communist special services started disintegrating in 1989. Some of the former top officers of the Ministry of Interior, its Security Service, the military intelligence and counter-intelligence, were negatively scrutinized and retired from service in 1990 into other fields of activity, mainly into armed private protection agencies and business.<sup>15</sup> Many of those who stayed, retained their former loyalties, but also retained the control of the files. The last trace, so far, trace of this phenomenon is an instruction by the Deputy Minister of Interior General Henryk Dankowski, dated 26 June 1989, in which he ordered to remove the files of secret police collaborators (in Polish *tajny współpracownik* or *tw*), mainly those of the former opposition, but recommended continued co-operation.<sup>16</sup> As Prime Minister Ta-

deusz Mazowiecki had initially little control of the Interior Ministry and as the retreat of the old security apparatus was slow, the top officials of the Ministry of Interior had enough time to take over or to destroy a significant portion of files.

Some of the security people gradually chose new masters. Post-„Solidarity” governments (1991-93) were also introducing new cadres that gradually changed the proportions and introduced confusion into the loyalty of the services. Apart from the foreign affiliations, which remain the least clear, it seems likely from the logic of facts that some of the old security apparatus was taken over by the presidential office of Wałęsa. The investigation against Oleksy, directed by Minister of Interior Milczanowski, himself a „Solidarity” man, but carried out by General Zacharski, seems an indirect proof of this. Also the energetic counter-offensive of post-Communists against Zacharski and his aides, followed by a purge in the UOP after Kwaśniewski’s installment in presidency, confirmed old loyalties of many top UOP officers who now advanced. The sad result of the post-communist restoration is the return of the partisan character of the secret services.

Crucial for the explanation of the influence of secret services on Polish politics is the mechanism of leakage of sensitive information to the media. Judging by the circulation data, post-communist press is far from a monopoly position. In 1996 it was estimated that the circulation of *Nie* was a mere 4 percent of all weeklies and that of *Polityka* a further 3 percent. Most of the Polish weeklies are in the hands of foreign publishers. This also holds true for the dailies, where the major German and Norwegian media groups control about 41 percent of the circulation.<sup>17</sup>

Nevertheless, the political role of information is not only a matter of circulation but also of who plays with crucial information and who creates events. All of a sudden a seemingly unimportant story may be blown up to an enormous size, while lots of key questions remain unanswered. The presidential campaign of 1995 and the Oleksy Affair have shown that there has been very little secrecy in the secret services. Journalists had an amazingly easy access to the operation data that were leaking out from the services. The two main actors in this game appear to be Jerzy Urban and Marek Król. Urban’s *Nie* does not conceal having access to secret police files. This comes as no surprise since until 1989 Urban had access to top state secrets and his major legal advisor is Hipolit Starszak, Head of the Investigation Bureau of the Ministry of Interior and then Deputy Attorney General in the

1980s. On the other hand, there can be little doubt that Król and his *Wprost* magazine have also used information acquired from secret police files and operations.<sup>18</sup>

After a short interlude of the post-“Solidarity” government (1990-93), former Communists managed to reinforce their political influence by restoring many former agents to top positions in the government. When in 1997 the SLD and PSL had to share power with the Electoral Action “Solidarity” (*Akcja Wyborcza Solidarność*, AWS) and the Democratic Union (*Unia Demokratyczna*, UD), some of these agents stayed in the presidential palace,<sup>19</sup> others were formally excluded from the executive power. Nevertheless, secret files were still in use that among others led to the fall of vice-premier Janusz Tomaszewski in early September 1999.<sup>20</sup>

Front pages of Polish papers are frequently red hot with political and economic scandals. What is really peculiar about the system is that even the most scandalous news is rarely followed by official lawsuits and that top stories disappear in what is sometimes called the Polish „Bermuda Triangle”. The list of never answered questions is very long. Whose money was used in the FOZZ operations? Where did it go? Whose interests were helped by the gas agreement with Russia negotiated from 1993 and signed in 1996? What happened to the PZPR property? How much money did the former Communists transfer from and to the Kremlin? Where does the SdRP money come from? The lack of answers and the unlikelihood of hearing them soon is another feature of post-Communism in a broader sense of the word.

This hold true for the Oleksy Case as well. After a long struggle with post-Communists, on 3 March 1999 the Sejm passed a law on “lustration”. It stipulated that people running for public offices had to submit a declaration whether they had cooperated with former Communist services or not. If they confessed this, they could run without problems counting on the tolerance of their constituency. If they denied having had links with the Communist services, a special “lustration” court would investigate the matter on the ground of all classified materials to be consolidated in a special Institute of National Remembrance (*Instytut Pamięci Narodowej*, IPN). In case the court could prove a “lustration lie”, such a person would have to give up the elected office. A hysterical campaign against “lustration” was launched by the post-Communists who found an unexpected ally in Adam Michnik and his “*Gazeta Wyborcza*”, the largest-circulation daily in Poland.

In late October 2000 Oleksy was found guilty of lying in his “lustration” statement. In other words the lustration court found enough evidence to state that he worked for the Polish Communist military services. Oleksy called this verdict “appalling” and appealed. The case continued and was believed to be one of the reasons the post-Communist majority in the new Sejm elected in September 2001 insisted on excluding former military intelligence agents from the “lustration” procedures. This amendment of the “lustration” law has been passed by the Sejm and Senate and only waits for the final signature of President Kwaśniewski. Meanwhile the regional prosecutor’s office in Warsaw accused Milczanowski of exposure of state secrets in his speech of 21 December 1995. Milczanowski claimed he had done his duty and that he was acting on behalf of President Wałęsa and refused to testify until both President Wałęsa and Kwaśniewski were interrogated.<sup>21</sup> The return tide of post-Communism seems likely to carry away the secret files into oblivion. We may wait very long to know the truth in the Oleksy Case. It may also take very long before Poland’s politics is removed from the shadow of former communist special services.

## Vitaly Shentalinsky

### Crime Without Punishment, Russia in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century

The Hamvas Institute chose a very important topic for this conference. It may be the most important issue today, especially because we all may face real threats. Amy Knight has given us an insight on Russia. These stories offer plenty of examples I could add in order to show how the past is restoring itself. The Dzerzhinsky<sup>1</sup> statue generated indeed a lot of discussion. It is simply awful that a country that experienced terror, once again wants to set up a monument to the brutal oppression. From my point of view Felix Dzerzhinsky was unquestionably a terrorist, no matter how lofty the goal was, it is not enough to justify the means, namely killing millions. Such an act would be a clear return to the totalitarian past, an acknowledgement of the sad fact that we have not learnt the lessons of history.

In 1917, in a revolutionary situation, the Reds and the Whites were confronting each other. The plan to rebuild the Dzerzhinsky statue reminds us of those times. These are signs. These are signs we necessarily must consider and must decide whether we want to go back to 1917, or we choose a different path. The links interlock. Today the memorial of political repression in St. Petersburg is ornamented with various inscriptions engraved on it. These inscriptions say that we have not suffered enough, not enough people had been exterminated in the era of KGB. Moreover, cigarette boxes with the tsar's portrait are also on sale. So, these and similar things are challenges we need to face. Opening of the Lubyanka archives indicates that the topic of unveiling the past is very much on the agenda today.

More attention needs to be paid to the different forms of threats as we must ask ourselves several questions about freedom. One of them: where is our freedom originated from? The second is: what do we want to use freedom for?

The change of regime gave us two tasks: to get rid of something and to set ourselves free for the new. The first task is completed: we got rid of the totalitarian system. We united in denial thus we came together. But then everyone took a different direction, the building of the new system divided us. We thought a miracle was about to come, chains would be dropped and freedom would take over. Superficial freedom, however, is not enough, we

must free ourselves from inside to accommodate the new, the creative. We are not yet ready to do so. Euphoria of perestroika was followed by the grey everyday life of democracy and disillusionment. Following the years of flaming enthusiasm people became apathetic and apolitical. This is the situation in which we have to face our past. The lack of historical memory and the disease of crime without punishment plague us. We had neither purification nor repentance, and we did not fully understand everything that happened. As we peeked into the deep well of the past we got scared and we thought it would be better not to think about it. We have lost our memory and we are being swallowed by the past. It continuously haunts us and we are not immune against it.

Russian history in the 1920's meant, unfortunately, perhaps the most tragic historical experience to us. In terms of changes, the establishment of the Soviet power was of cosmic proportions. This fantastic imaginary ideology, namely that a new type of human being was to be created, to transform the personality, envisaged the implementation of artificial Bolshevik patterns. They wanted to change people's lives and define people's happiness with iron hands. They attempted to apply one single pattern on the whole country. This of course affected all of the intelligentsia, primarily literature, because the word of writers and poets was of special value in Russia. Each people, nation chooses a certain kind of art. Throughout the development of civilization, the Russian people primarily expressed themselves with the help of words. Classical Russian literature, which is indeed beloved around the world, was an evidence for this. The Russian soul was able to express itself through literature. If a foreigner speaking Russian were asked why he began studying Russian, the usual reply would be that reading Chekhov, Dostoyevsky, Pushkin, and Gogol made him learn Russian. Therefore this also indicates the significance literature had in Russia.

For the Russian people literature meant not only art, but also self-awareness. Literature was a form of expression for the Russian community and society. It was a certain kind of power. In our country, power never represented people's wishes and will; therefore one had to find the way to drain the accumulated bitterness. For this purpose, literature served as the means. Russia suffered to a great extent and Russian literature suffered the events just as much. An American reviewer, in connection with my book, wrote that Russia was a country which killed its poets and bred people ready to die for their poems. This is absolutely true. And it would be very

bad if the second half of the same quote did not exist, namely that Russia breeds people ready to die for their own poems.

In Soviet times, in 1921, many writers were killed. Many were killed because they refused to give up their art, while many were driven to suicide, for instance Mayakovsky, Yesenin. In 1922, Lenin and Trotsky draw the conclusion that the entire intellectual problem would be solved if the best Russian scientists, philosophers, writers and poets were chased out of the country in the direction of Germany. This also added to the mutilation of the Russian people. And indeed, our best ones were forced in exile. From the end of the 1920's mass destruction was given the green light. Creative intellectuals were practically destroyed. This was the period when the collectivization of agriculture set off. Destructions distorted the intelligentsia, the peasants, the best ones. The system considered those intellectuals possible enemies who were unable to adapt to the terrible conditions. It was the task of literature to express all this but literature suffered collectivization through the creation of the Writers' Union. Several attempts were made to force practically everyone into the Writers' Union. This was all based on a usual script. I could refer to Fadeyev, for example. For Stalin, it was crucial that everyone took a slice from the cake of horror. He tried to find the means to achieve this. The Writers' Union served the same purposes as well. The scale of repression was extremely wide. In addition to the executions, prisons and labour camps, it was impossible for writers and poets for many years to publish their works. The repression also triggered suicides. I refer to Tsvetaeva. Many writers were forced to tie their own oeuvre with Stalin as a sign of praise in order to survive, but once they obeyed, they were unable to cope with it which led to a number of suicides as well. Talents lost their foothold to such an extent that no other perspectives and solutions were left for them.

I still remember how this society took me by means of my fascination towards pioneerism, followed by the Komsomol,<sup>2</sup> and so on. Resistance was not an easy option. One was not even born yet, but already had a small notebook for adapting to the system, behind these bars, these cages. Not to mention that by then we lived in a revolutionary protected area, as Platonov once put it. I do not even know how to call it; mostly it could be regarded as an open-air museum. Nevertheless, Russian culture is a part of global culture. For us this was a terrible tragedy. And not only for us, but for all those who did not realise the brainwashing which had made their life miserable.

Well, this was the milieu in which we got to perestroika and glasnost. We knew that perestroika could not be achieved by revolutionary means, because so much blood had been spilled that many people already feared such sacrifices. As a result, of course, perestroika was triggered by those previously working as communist party secretaries and employed in other communist spheres. I am referring to Gorbachev in the first place.

At that time Gorbachev was welcome as a hero, but today his mistakes are more apparent than ever. These mistakes were the reason why his plans were never realized. He experienced the same as the majority of Russian politicians. He missed the evolution of history. Thus the Russian troika dropped him, and then Yeltsin took up the reins, but he was sooner than later gone with the wind as well. Now we have a new coachman trying hard to drive the horses. Nevertheless, perestroika was a truly historic and crucial opportunity to change and adjust our lives to the contemporary age.

The whole process was not as democratic as expected. However, from a historic point of view it must be recognized that there was no other solution available. Lower layers of society were not willing to shed more blood. While the real struggle for power was in progress, real intelligentsia in Russia stood aside, and did not engage as leaders of the movements. Perestroika offered a very serious and historic opportunity for our country. This historic opportunity had to be leveraged to some extent. I have written books, poems and prose to cover this issue. Back then, I personally had very little contact with social life, but still could perceive at that moment that something must be done, something could be done. And then I thought it was time to open up the black box of the Russian intelligentsia.

The Lubyanka archives offer a fountain, where even sociologists, economists or writers, journalists find relevant documents. Millions of transcripts are to be found here. Trials, which span our entire lives, accompanied us from the cradle to the grave. There had never been such an example of the total control over society as to what we had to experience. The records of mass accusations stored in the Lubyanka archives are also part of the history and thus can be said that they are historic documents on the one hand. On the other hand it was a phenomenon directly affecting our lives. These can be regarded as disgusting and mean papers preserving the proofs of accusations, but someone must undertake the task of unveiling them.

The archives indicate that the number of arrested and imprisoned poets, writers, intellectuals in Russian history had never been more, as from

1917 onwards. I could refer to such writers as for instance Okudzhava. Even after the perestroika, one had to fight for two years to get access to the Okudzhava dossier. Not being able to resurrect someone, at least historic justice shall be done. Okudzhava's words are more important now than they were throughout his life, because today his words reflect his death as well. This archive is a place where his words are buried, and where they need to be brought to the surface. Stories of martyrs cannot deserve their proper place in history without real disclosure.

Many people say the horror and sufferings of the past are exaggerated. However, we need to acknowledge that thousands died in labour camps and prisons, we need to know that all the sufferings Russia went through are still far from being explored. The whole system of the Soviet regime was, by definition, against any kind of exploratory work or historical fact-finding. Millions of cases occurred which dug the grave of the system. Previous researches in the Lubyanka archive were made up to underpin the Stalinist measures. Of course, at that time there were many who did this successfully and many who did not. Social issues, sooner or later, must be decoded.

It was important for us to be able to gain access to the Lubyanka archive and to publish the truth in the ocean of lies. This truth must be revealed for our descendants. For me personally, this has become very important following the perestroika. I think we need access to the secrets of our own lives. Individuals do have privacy and others are not allowed to search their secrets. These secrets are an individual's own business, and this private sphere has hardly been respected in the past few decades.

I remember, having started the research in the archive, I thought many people would be pleased. But I turned out to be wrong as I received various accusations from all sides. Truth is practically neither satisfactory nor comfortable for anyone. And in connection to this I realised something very interesting. People escape from the truth, people do not need the pure truth, the home truth, but a tiny piece of truth that applies to their lives, that does justice to them. People, fearing for their own little lives, do not want to fight for historical justice. The mirror of truth is broken, by looking in it the image is distorted from an individual's perspective. It may happen very often that when looking in the cracked mirror we do not like what we see, in the fragments we do not sense precisely ourselves beside our distorted image, so we just do not get the full picture. Therefore, many people never

look in the mirror. This is the reason why we had such a big fight during the research in the archive.

Nevertheless, as a result of this work we managed to clarify a lot of things in an encyclopaedic way since many lies existed in public opinion practically as facts. Those lies created at Lubyanka were organized to such extent that even those with critical thinking treated them as facts. Now I refer to the socialist realism. These writers were also manipulated and used for the purposes of Lubyanka. And those who resisted in any way were instantly labelled anti-Soviet, antidemocratic and so on.

When I started the research in the archives it became clear to me that a variety of considerations must be taken into account and a new category has to be defined. As an example, there is the label of peasant writer or folk poet. These were categories which the poets and writers were forced into. Maybe, it should be treated from a broader aspect. I refer to Ahmatova. Recently I finished a book about Anna Ahmatova's inevitable arrest. Many were arrested and even those who tried to get on within the Writers' Union. Moreover, those who one day served the system, the next they found themselves at Lubyanka and finally were executed together with those members of literary groups who truly stood up against the system. So, friends and enemies were executed at the same time. Most writers were neither angels nor devils, they also submitted reports to the (secret) police against fellow writers and Stalin simply opened his arms saying he had no other kind of writers but these. In fact, he was the one selecting and forcing them to report against each other.

So, what have we finally managed to find out from the vast amount of documents and facts based on which we can revise our knowledge and rewrite the twentieth century? Manuscripts, primarily manuscripts. For instance, we managed to find Bulgakov's diary who had experienced amazing things. This diary was once taken from him during a house search and later he tried to get it back with the help of Gorky. When it was returned, he burned it immediately, as it is known... But before it was given back to him, a copy had been made. Thus, the original one does not exist but now it is still available through the copy. Such things often happened, namely that what the author wrote about in his book was repeated even after his death. I see a mystical connection here.

We also found Isaac Babel's notes put down just before his execution and a previously unknown novel of Andrei Platonov. Moreover, we found

official statements that show a different image of a great poet of the twentieth century who is less known because most of his poems were destroyed and he was finally executed. But now his works are found and published and he turns out to be one of Russia's greatest epic poets. We have also found material even of Lev Tolstoy. After all, documents of classics were stored as well. I found letters of Gorky and Korolenko; correspondence of authors even from the nineteenth century is also in the archives. These letters were confiscated usually from the addressee. Practically not even Cheka's<sup>3</sup> staff was aware of what the archives contained, there was no time to arrange them. The Cheka mainly collected, murdered, sometimes burned materials or kept them in the basement. Then came Yagoda<sup>4</sup> again to collect, murder, burn and store. Then Beria...<sup>5</sup> They did not have time to read as they were very busy sentencing people to prison or shooting them. Therefore, this archive is a tremendous asset that is still waiting to be sorted out. It has always been used solely for the purposes of public and state security. So, our exact task was to separate what society, history and literature need from what authorities do. Dossiers are normally classified top secret and they are to be retained forever. What we have said: give us what needs to be retained forever and keep the secret documents. We do not need your secrets, we want the writers! The fact that we do not know who the moles were is not a problem but we need to know our writers because they can only be preserved forever if they are shared with the society. Should these documents remain at the Lubyanka archives, they are likely to get burned.

Overall, for me the essence of this work was actually not history or the KGB, but the Russian word, the Russian classical literature which the country can really be proud of. In the Soviet period about three thousand writers faced revenge, and fifteen hundred of them were executed. The material collected at Lubyanka is also an evidence for the excellence of Russian literature. Although our writers were tortured and executed, still, everlasting works were born under such circumstances. For me, this was the important thing: to find and to preserve some of it. I have to admit that this task is so powerful that it simply has absorbed me. In the first volume of my book I wrote up eight files of twentieth century Russian writers from Babel through Bulgakov to Pilniak. The second volume is mainly about the fate of authors of the "silver age" such as Bely, Tsvetaeva, Voloshin, and the third one goes even further. More and more names are revealed, and I think that even if they could not have been saved at least their works should be, since

for a writer there is indeed one single thing more sacred thing than physical existence, that is word.

Lubyanka is unfortunately still a grave of our historical memories; it is often still inaccessible and mysterious. What we have achieved is only a fragment. And now, again, work is becoming increasingly difficult due to the continuous attempts to close the archives. We peeped in and managed to save something but now prohibitions reached us again. Instead of saying it is not allowed, they say that first order and legal frame must be created. Recently, talk is about managed democracy but what is that exactly? Who will manage people and who will manage democracy? Well, the former KGB agents. This is the kind of democracy we have. You may ask why this is happening and why to worry. Why do we see the return of the past? Because this is the general trend in the country.

And I think that this, to some extent, also applies to Hungary. What the first speaker said was very familiar to me. Maybe Hungary's fate is not that tragic. Maybe the risk of return is not that big. In case the spirit of communism returns it will not stop at the borders of countries. It equally threatens everyone. It goes on until we stop it.

Public opinion is not able to cope with the experience of millions of tragic fates since purification and the reconsideration of the past has not happened yet. We just keep asking questions but practically never get a response. We missed the moment of truth, the historical opportunity. The communist regime should have been condemned not only in words, but also legally, moreover Stalin's acts should have been judged as crime against humanity with no statute of limitation. This does not mean the imprisoning of poor old people. But we did not manage to follow Nuremberg's example. We missed this opportunity, so we are now doomed to repeat class in the school of history. This happens with Russia very frequently. The suppressed past returns at night crawling like a snake, and makes our future impossible.

Finally, I would like to quote from the novel of Andrei Platonov I found at Lubyanka: "Where is freedom? Somewhere far away, ahead, somewhere beyond the mountains, the mountains of work, somewhere behind the graves of the dead. If no miracle happens, if the miracle of freedom does not happen to us then we lose the chance to clarify our past and to build up our future. There is an unquestionable need for this work in order to make our future better than our past."

Sándor Óze

## State Security Control in Hungarian Historiography from 1956 to 1989

Recent research in intellectual history has internationally focused on the national memory and its insertion into a system of national symbols. The research of cultures of memory and the investigation of collective memory have relied on the sociological methods of M. Halbwach. Memory has become the object of political struggles. The process of historicising politics has run parallel with the retrospective political reinterpretation of history, as a consequence of which the notions of political myth and the “politics of myth” can be established. The reinterpretation of the past is always future-oriented. If the major figures of the establishment of the day intend to stabilize and legitimize their supremacy or a given constellation of power, on the one hand, or loosen and shake it on the other, the inevitable question is what historical symbolic systems and models of interpretation they can mobilize, and for what end they wish to use them. The goals may vary considerably: constituents of historical memory can be used for legitimizing power or social mobilization as well as for their contrary, i.e. for the confrontation of groups and the ideological denunciation of society.

As a matter of fact, the concept of the historian is usually not the product of a process during which the scholar subordinates himself to a regime and, deliberately or under pressure, rearranges facts to support it. Historians study primary sources and scholarly literature of their field of interest, and on this basis form their opinion which is necessarily affected by their personality and education, which are influenced by the ideological and political milieu of their historical era.

The historian's concept is then interpreted (or misunderstood) by the recipient community that relies on its learned or inherited system of codes. In many cases events of the ancient past are recycled by substituting the agents and parties for their equivalents in contemporary events or those of the recent past.

A society under communist dictatorship looks for second thoughts beyond the party jargon and the rigid historical construct of the class struggle.

This society thinks symbolically. Its members tend to see mythical emblems in past watersheds and in the historical events gaining symbolical status. Thus, they not only discharge the emotions elicited by a metaphoric reaction, but also project their own alternatives into a situation of exigency which resonates with their past experience. The framework of both the past and present tensions is similar, which immediately suggests solutions or insolubility. Dictatorships intend to appropriate, annihilate, or manipulate this symbolic field of thinking.

State security services in Hungary therefore vigilantly watched over historical events related self-definitions of various groups, and were poised to interfere in their formations. The Hungarian nation has reserved their Finno-Ugric language in the intersection of the Slavic, Germanic and Turkic language families, and kept their occidental Christian identity on the religious border with Eastern Orthodoxy and Islam. In spite of the fact that the oriental ethnogenesis has been a cornerstone of the identity of the country's population, it has always confessed itself as constituent of the occidental culture. After ousting the Ottoman troops in 1699, the notion of Hungary's geographical location has always been bound to phenomena that have shaped the modern identity of local people in political terms as they were determined by political changes. This is not uniquely a Hungarian phenomenon, but it also characterizes other small nations of the region. Since early modern times, and especially the enlightened absolutisms of the 18th century, governments have been taking active role in shaping the awakened interest in national history and elements of group identities based on denominational cultures by influencing education, printed media, book publication and, last but not least, by secret services manipulating the new intellectual circles.

### **Nationalist Internationalism**

The seminal historical work of the post-1945 communist dictatorship was Aladár M3d's *400 Years of Struggle for Independent Hungary*, published in 1943. Implicitly meaning 400 years of struggle against German colonisation and written with a communist popular front approach, the book aimed to mobilize anti-German forces into a communist lead union during German occupation of Hungary in World War II. This is why the 17<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> century anti-Habsburg (Habsburgs to be understood as Germans) movements of the

Hungarian estates appear in the core of this work's narrative. The protagonists of the repainted periods, as e.g. the leader of the 1514 peasant war György Dózsa or the prince of the War of Independence of 1703-11 Ferenc Rákóczi II, fight against the colonizing Habsburgs only in the interest of the future socialist order. This ideology permeates the discussion of the centrally controlled culture of the period. Since the "career" of the Habsburg dynasty in Hungary started practically with the Battle of Mohács (1526), and they were present in the entire modern period, the pro-Soviet historian interpreted the events of Hungarian history as a chain of anti-Habsburg movements, and identified the target of protests with Hitler's Germany. The fact that the language of the Habsburg court in Vienna was only exceptionally German (and much more characteristically Spanish, Italian, or French) does not seem to have disturbed him. The communist clique in Hungary, helped into power by the Soviet occupation, was actually a "Muscovite export", its many members had Soviet citizenship, as well. In order to make their ideology more acceptable in the country, they put a much stronger emphasis on the historical nationalist arguments, originating from the one-time gentry view of history, than the more respected national leaders of other communist countries of the region.

Mód's basic concept is to emphasize the economic disadvantages. "The natural line of the national development of state power was broken, as the absolutist monarchy was established under a foreign dynasty, which, taking its support from foreign industrial and commercial progress, became the impediment to home economic development." The counter-reaction to this colonization was the formation of national unity. As a next step, the "popular front" had to be broadened, which, according to the author, was successful in the course of the 16<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> centuries: "during the Rákóczi insurrection (1703-11) as well as the War of Independence of 1848, it united the majority of all classes and layers of the Magyars." The ultimate national goal was – of course - the internationalist Paradise, communism itself, and the doors of this heaven were opened by the Soviet liberation of the country. Those doubting in this statement were nabbed by the state security and added to the number of people totalling 800.000 (15-20% of the adult population) who were sued before the Revolution of 1956.

## **A Regime from the Blood of the Revolution**

The Revolution of 1956 swept away the Muscovite communist clique, and the Kádár consolidation decided to tread upon a narrow ideological path between right and extreme left. After softening its terror, the new regime was eager to split up the intellectuals of the resisting society, united in its national sentiments during the days of revolution, on the one hand, and to confront its sections. It endeavoured to blur clear front lines, to smudge facts and memories, and to besmear the ethical judgments of the major participants in the events. This “loosening strategy” yielded fully its expected results by the 1970s. By then the up-start yes men and opinion leader generation, brought up by the former but retiring Muscovite elite, had assigned everyone - according to their inclinations, past, views and ambitions - the fitting role and position where they were allowed to act within certain limitations. In this epoch-making historical situation, the eroded political elite were willing to dictate from the back stage in order to maintain their ideological orientation. Their retirement was balanced by the empowerment of a new and yet weightless layer in order to counter-effect the diverging views and reform plans of a potentially maturing middle generation. But there is no doubt that as their predecessors, they were attached to a handful of pro-Moscow cliques and families who bathed in the blood of the revolution. Their legacy was bequeathed to the new generation as illustrated by the family of Antal Apró, which gave two of the Prime Ministers of post-communist Hungary: Gyula Horn and Ferenc Gyurcsány.

The dissolved authorities formerly incorporated into the Ministry of the Interior successfully preserved their staff and spying networks. Historiography continued to be controlled by undercover men of the old system. Moreover, the agitation and supervision of the new historian generation became open to coercion due to their deeds or those of their fathers or wives during the revolution. Their engagement was mostly bound to certain confidential services (writing reports and denunciation). But even if they were free from such obligations, they were pressured into respecting certain boundaries in their writings and into confessing the ideological changes. Only upon such prerequisites could they obtain university degrees, be employed, publish their works, and hold passports in order to maintain foreign professional relationships. All this was communicated by the Kádár regime as a proof

of the radical change of the political system and of an entirely uncensored intellectual world.

Encouraged by the successful consolidation in the last third of the 1960s, the regime recruited with renewed vigour a young generation of historians who had been distrusted because of the lives, origins, positions or the confrontational past of their fathers. These youths were assigned the task of consolidation. Following the model of the Federal Republic of Germany, the authorities of the Ministry of the Interior announced that the integration into the new elite and professional career were opened up in front of these youngsters provided that they expressed their repentance of the legacy of their fathers from the Horthy regime and embraced the anti-nationalist and antifascist ideology. However, they usually had to face with expectations of a different kind as well, which is why many of this generation became addicts of deviances, and passed away prematurely in their fifties, among them the most talented ones. At the same time, the state security agencies endeavoured to artificially confront groups in debates excited by their own circles. The know-all people impeded any contact between the intellectual circles and were vigilant to keep the artificially triggered conflicts and their solutions in their hands. The setting up of groups was always justified by a carefully elaborated pre-history. The arguments proving an internally cohesive system were constructed on intellectual predecessors and tendencies as well as symbols of historical events and groups. Up to most recent times, the shapers of the official ideology have attempted to force these artificially created group alignments on the interpretation of the past, even if the intellectual ruptures lay often elsewhere.

### **The Erik Molnár Debate (1958-1965)**

The attempts of consolidation were marked by the debates exploring the stimulus threshold of social reactions and defining the meanings of historical symbols. One of the most significant debates of historians was labelled after its initiator Erik Molnár (1894-1966). He was the embodiment of unconditional reliability: he conscientiously carried out, signed and consented to all orders. His brother, a Hungarian communist émigré in Moscow, became victim of the Stalinist purges in the 1930s. Molnár himself had been prisoner of war during World War I in the Far East; he was well acquainted with the Soviet system from its very beginnings. He learnt how to survive.

After 1945 he headed several departments but not for his many-sided expertise, but because he was a trustworthy person in the hand-controlled system. He indulged his sense of history also in his legal career. Legend (and “the grateful posterity”) had it that as a Justice Minister he used to sit over the legal files on his desk and a drawer drawn open underneath filled with historical works so that he may shut it in case someone entered. In the meantime, however, he signed the death sentences in cold blood. As President of the Supreme Court he (or someone in his name) made a motion to lower the age limit of the death penalty to 14 according to the Soviet model. Molnár became the head of the Ministry of Justice in 1950, after members of the political police had beaten his predecessor, István Ries to death, in a period when jurisdiction instead of the Supreme Court was administered by harsh and ruthless methods of the Ministry of Justice. In 1953 his appointment to the President of the Supreme Court was meant to secure the continuity of the merciless passing of sentences despite the declaration of Imre Nagy’s “new phase.” His person was the guarantee that the retrials would not incur any danger for the party leadership. “Erik Molnár was a determining leader in the most prominent positions of the judiciary between the summer of 1950 and the autumn of 1956, who, similarly to the leaders of the State Security Authorities, executed unconditionally all wishes of the political lead. His responsibility in shaping the theory and practice of criminal procedures and punitive sanctions, or to put it more directly, his sin, weighs much heavier than that of the prosecutors and presidents of court divisions who took part in the “fake legal suits” on superior party orders, delivered their charges, and announced the prearranged sentences” – as the fact-finding commission established after the collapse of communism in Hungary reported.

The activity of Erik Molnár is still surrounded by myths invented in the period of consolidation (which had probably been confabulated on the command of the state security). He is portrayed as an absent-minded professor whose hated public duties (i.e. being a bloodthirsty judge) prevent him from pursuing his true self and interests, as a man of theories who is lost in the complexities of practical life and, therefore, cannot bear any responsibility for his decisions. Furthermore, he is the old colleague who uses his authority to defend the people of his institute and to save his fellow historians from death. He is also the professional, strict and uncompromising in debates, but unaffected by vengeance in his private life. The Molnár myth

was nourished by the younger generation who owed their quick career to him. Later this younger generation who got into the highest positions without due merits encircled the elders (usually fatigued and amortized figures of power after the political changes) with an almost legendary glory in order to justify their hold of the key positions and to cover up the crimes by means of which their allied old bosses whom they blindly served annihilated the dangerous middle generation and replaced them with command-abiding, grateful and inexperienced youths easily controlled from the back stage. The legendary conceals the shared sin of the predecessor and the successor. While being an active prosecutor and judge, Molnár joined the group that supervised historiography. In this position he did not confront with the official line. His appointment to the head of the then established Institute of History in 1949 indicated the “lining up” of a Budapest grouping of historians who, instead of the nationalist communist line, followed a pre-World War I, bourgeois-radical, Austro-Marxist interpretation of history.

Thus Zsigmond Pál Pach, a grammar school teacher, became the vice-director and the actual head of the Institute. His former students Iván T. Berend and György Ránki were given career possibilities under his aegis. By the age of thirty they had already been awarded with the highest state award, the Kossuth Prize. The Institute of History was the legal successor of the Teleki Institute, founded between the two world wars and renamed as the Institute of Eastern Europe, which had been filled with new people immediately after World War II and put under pressure in various ways. The new members sponging on the Institute were expected to report on their colleagues. A new communist colleague Péter Hanák was caught by the porter at searching through the drawers at night. (After this scandal and de-conspiracy, his documents can be searched today.) Reports of the state security portrayed the former leader of the Institute, Domokos Kosáry as a man of the British intelligence, and supposed that this was the reason why he had acquired his position at the age of 30. Indeed, something else than pure talent might have paved the way to his directorship, as he married into the Huszti family, his father-in-law being key member of culture minister Bálint Hóman’s cultural administration before World War II.) After the restructuring of the Institute in 1949, Kosáry and his deputy, Kálmán Benda were removed.

Molnár’s historical work discussing the period of the Árpád dynasty (9<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> century), an openly Slavophile book applying the Marxist jargon,

demonstrates very close similarities with the concept of Aladár Mód (1908-1973). They were written in the same intellectual milieu of the interwar years. A second point of similarity is that Molnár's book also attributes the negative influences on the country to German interferences as opposed to the "native and friendly" Slavic (i.e. Russo-Soviet) ones. Indeed, Molnár was a mysterious and inscrutable person. We can hardly recover how he had been affected by his four-year imprisonment during the war. Neither do we know how he had lived the Russian revolution. There are no traces of how he had communicated with his brother, and after his execution, with the Soviet Union. We are ignorant of any contacts whatsoever with the Soviet state security. This latter hypothesis seems to be ascertained by the fact that Molnár was transported by the Soviet Army from his dull and tranquil country life to the newly established National Assembly in Debrecen in the midst of the military manoeuvres in 1944, and was made there minister of welfare, and later moved to the head of four other departments before 1956 as well as to the position of the President of the Supreme Court.

The claim that communist leader and prime minister Mátyás Rákosi did not even know about Molnár's membership of the Communist Party – a claim widely held by his biographers up to nowadays – seems to me naïve, if not a sheer common manipulation of the state security. Ignorant of Molnár's party affiliation, Rákosi appointed him to the most confidential party positions, which is hardly believable. Molnár's career offers a much more off-hand explanation: the threads of his life seem to have been woven in the Soviet Union, even beyond Rákosi's reach. The orders may have come from there, and he had undoubtedly learnt – if not otherwise, by his own vicissitudes in the prisoners' camp or by the example of his brother – that he had to obey unconditionally. All this lacks the traces of humanity, solidarity or a positive personality. His reserved nature and middle-class attitudes also support this possibility.

True though that Molnár as well as his future opponent Aladár Mód was a native and not a Muscovite emigrant communist, while Mód represented the antifascist popular front during World War II, Molnár had rejected it in a doctrinaire way already between the two world wars. Aladár Mód, a country boy of Jewish origin, created a major work of the popular front which radicalised the anti-German resistance in World War II and became the ideological manifesto of the communists. Subsequently he actively participated in the resistance of the Újpest (New Pest) partisans. On the other

hand, Erik Molnár, descendant of the noble Jeszenszky family, survived World War II and the German occupation in Kecskemét undisturbed and under relatively comfortable circumstances without any insults. If Molnár was a sleeper agent of the Soviet system, he naturally did not have to march in the front line but wait for his moment to come, the arrival of the Soviet Army, in order to be reactivated and put on the highest level.

Anyway, after the Revolution of 1956 the community of historians received in Molnár's person its umpire to control and conduct the "free" discussions. Due to his reliability he did not have enemies among his colleagues. This enabled him to act as a protective "cover" for his professional inmates. But because of his political past, after 1956 Erik Molnár was called back from the front benches; seemingly, he was put on the side-track. Whether he wanted to break out from this situation with his ideological proposals, or whether the words were put into his mouth cannot be decided any more.

The historians' debate on national identity took place between 1959 and 1963. It was a long episode of the politicized discourses which supported the intentions of the government, empowered by the presence of a foreign army, to transit from the phase of totalitarian terrorist sanction into that of a social consolidation. For this, they were looking for a broader ideological basis, acceptable by larger masses of people. The debate was a scholarly one, and its focus was not contemporary history, but a seemingly indifferent period in the transitory zone between the Middle Ages and the early modern period. The related lectures, not considering their ideological preambles and conclusions, represented a high academic quality. They attested to a wide range of methods, and provided also Western European case studies as examples. Erik Molnár's historical concept was conceived to prepare the foundation for the ideology of the new party leadership after the defeat of the Revolution on 4 November 1956; he accused the previous historical discourse, labelled by the names of Aladár Mőd and Rákosi, with nationalism, but surprisingly, he derived the national concept of the 1956 internal party opposition from the same (nationalist) stem which led to the Revolution. His theory, unlike Mőd's, did not consider the gradually developing forms of the protests of the Hungarian estates against Habsburg absolutism as the progressive line of Hungarian history. On the contrary, he identified them with retrograde and inhibiting factors. The centralizing forces of the Habsburg Monarchy, in Marxist terminology the monarchic ab-

solutism catalysing the growth of the bourgeoisie, were in Molnár's concept historically progressive, while the resistance movements of the Hungarian nobility conserved feudalism.

Molnár discussed events of early modern history in frames of the accustomed class war syllabus. He opened the way for a broader social consolidation by giving the views he criticized into Rákosi's mouth, and accused him of an ideological derailment. He is named the major responsible for the outbreak of the revolution due to the "false consciousness" deriving from his nationalist conviction. This "false consciousness" stands in the centre of his argument: the nobility used it to deceive the subdued peasantry and applied the ideas of nationalism, valid only to the nobility in a self-referential way, to the peasants as well. As a consequence of this deception, the serfdom, abandoning the class struggle with their antagonistic enemies, became temporarily the basis of the nobility, and borrowed its phraseology. This tragic delusion, according to Molnár, is far from the bourgeois nationalism emerging only after the French Revolution, the chances for which, and for a Western type democratisation, are scarce or belated due to economic underdevelopment. Consequently, Molnár claims that Hungarian national consciousness have only been an illusion. He is convinced that the chimeras of this false consciousness will only be dispersed by the new sense of socialist patriotism. A last endeavour of the reaction to maintain this illusion was the Revolution of 1956; therefore, he was determined to repel false consciousness for good.

Molnár borrowed his concept from the bourgeois radical Austro-Marxist Ervin Szabó (1877-1918), who engaged himself all throughout his life with questioning the common interpretation of the 1848-49 Hungarian Revolution and War of Independence. He considered the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> century movements of the nobility as precedents of this revolution. As a left-wing theoretician of the shaping Hungarian social democracy, he denied the national character of the revolution. His criticism was sounded in a liberal system, in the safety of an imperial position. Even if with a later eventual publication in mind, Szabó wrote his work to test an idea in frames of private intellectual experience. His debasement of the common heroic interpretation of the past in a doctrinaire mentality targeted the heavy and blustering rhetoric of the National-Independence Party of 1848, which he did not spare in any way. It was Molnár's belated reception of Szabó that, in a historically different context and employed to different purposes, yielded different results.

The theory had several advantages for the party leadership aiming at consolidation. It made the extreme left-wing Rákosi regime culpable and placed it on the same platform with the revolutionary forces, accused with nationalism. Furthermore, it solved at a blow the problem of the millions of ethnic Hungarians annexed to neighbouring countries after World War I, claiming that they were detached before the formation of a true sense of national consciousness, wherefore neither they nor the mother country have to take responsibility for fostering the Hungarian culture, which remains a problem to be solved by the successor states. Erik Molnár's sabre was sharpened on both edges: its essence was to exile the formative role of the traditions of independence from the core of national consciousness as well as from the Hungarian perspective of history. This concept attacked Aladár Mód's approach with reason, and focused on the post-revolutionary and pro-Compromise phase of Hungarian history with better prospects of an economic growth which coincided with the intellectual "package" of the Kádár regime.

A few years later, in the phase of the post-revolutionary political roll-back, the major scene and basis of Erik Molnár's activity became the Institute of History. Molnár's "expertise and experience" could best be deployed in this position for "chairing" the consolidation debates. This time, the formerly removed leadership was not dismissed, although Zsigmond Pál Pach was called back as a vice-director, and according to the testimony of state security reports, historians were strictly watched over. (E.g. Kosáry was spied on by three independent agents at the same time.) The unreliable colleagues were given very concrete and professionally restricted tasks (as e.g. the translation of Latin sources) so that the atmosphere of consolidation could be achieved in the Institute. The explosion of the debate served the same goal. The so called "nation debate" of the 1960s later grew into the project of preparing the new ten-volume Marxist series of the history of Hungary, which, after the death of Erik Molnár in 1966, was directed by Pach. (It needs to be added, though, that in spite of the fact that the party's ideological line officially determined the interpretation and terminology of the 1956 Revolution up to the 1980s, some historians, among them a few ones participating in the "nation debate," did not use them. The official ideological interpretation was appropriated only by those who wanted to build up their careers in the service of the regime from the very beginnings.)

## Central European United States

The “nation debate” however, could not be closed, it continued until the early 1980s. This academic dispute was a proof of freedom of academic thinking and plurality of methods only to the West, as the documents of the State Security Historical Archives reveal, that informants even reported in detail on which position each historian took in the debate.

According to the reports, as in high politics the Kádár regime managed to break out of the isolation towards the Western international left via France, also the French were the ones that made contact with the Institute of History. Reports speak about French scholarships, and rejoice at Fernand Braudel being a leftist.

Mentioning just one document from this period, an agent with the pseudonym “Vili” reported in 1968 that Péter Hanák, one of the actual leaders of the Institute, expected that following the Prague events a bloc similar to the Habsburg Empire would be formed, which, though not independent from the Soviet Union, would dissolve the national borders and establish a confederation. Hanák was convinced that the split-up of the Monarchy into nation states was disadvantageous for the region. The events of Prague gave hopes of a historic reunification, as the agent writes, with the probable push-back of the national characteristics in the background. This is basically a late example of the concept of “Czechoslovakianism”, which was proposed as an alternative to 1956 by an intellectual circle following left-wing, bourgeois radical ideals.

In September 1959, the periodical *Társadalmi Szemle* [Sociological Review] published the theses of the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party about bourgeois nationalism and socialist patriotism. Its tenor determined for a long time the approach of the works to be written on national consciousness. The debates were also tuned to the Party’s stance. Thus the “nation debate” went on. But the fact that the period in question was not the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but early modern history, guaranteed that no one could fall into the trap of “inconsiderate opinions.” The system of symbols referred to in the debates was understood by a much larger public who followed the steps of the debate. Nevertheless, the implicit ideological brain-washing remained very modest, even euphemistic, and the power did not have to interfere for the sake of its prestige. It did not even need to understand, let alone revenge, the eventual attacks. At the same time, the debate and its

display of opinions of certain intellectual concepts and historical symbolism provided the regime with feedbacks about the problems dangerously irritating the population and about processes of group formation along the dissenting lines.

The abating emotions were stirred again in the 1970s by István Nemeskürty's studies on Mohács, and further whipped by Géza Perjés's book entitled *Országút szélére vetett ország* [Country flung to the edge of the land road]. The polemic, already in its journalistic stage, revolved around the concept of nation. It mirrored the turns of daily politics; one can almost feel its turbulences. 1959-63: the consolidation phase; 1967-68: the launch of the second wave of the debate coinciding with the new economic mechanism; 1972-73: the breakdown of the economic mechanism. The testing of the national identity was always at close hand, mostly with the purpose of letting off the collective steam, whenever the legend legitimizing the Kádár regime, i.e. the relative welfare of the goulash communism sponsored out of foreign credits, seemed to falter, and the national-independent discourse was prioritized before that of the economic legitimization. In such instances the slow growth subdued to imperial interests became second to the need of national self-determination.

### **The „Mohács Debate,” or the Treason of the Intellectuals (1966-78)**

The debate was revived after the publication of István Nemeskürty's book entitled *Ez történt Mohács után* [This happened after Mohács], and it lasted for almost one and half decades. As suggested by the title, the author accuses the community of the nation with the inability to act in a situation of crisis. According to him, the society of the early 16<sup>th</sup> century was overcome by short-sighted carelessness and the total dissolution of collective interests into individual drives. The author presents a plethora of egotistic crimes and a leadership incapable of exerting its control and guidance. On the other side, we can see an audience enduring only a half-time: they leave in the break for fear of rain, and hide in their homes to wait for the end of the tempest. The charges are directed principally against the nobility and the elite who are buried beneath the ruins after the collapse, but are unwilling to take responsibility for what had happened. The metaphor of Mohács is self-evident. The author draws a parallel between the defeat of the independent Kingdom of Hungary in the Battle of Mohács and his own era.

The book was first published in 1966, its polemic shortly followed in the second part of the ensuing year. Géza Perjés laid his criticism of the work on a strictly scholarly ground of military history. Nemeskürty, a literary historian and expert of the early modern period, was not an outsider. He was an erudite, well-versed writer, one of the “midwives” of the Hungarian motion picture in the Aczél period, and an important figure to shape the cultural consciousness of the age. Beyond the data accumulated in his book, the atmosphere of the consolidating-compromising period of 1956-1965 is palpably present there. Episodes of the Ottoman times after Mohács are telling juxtapositions to the author’s contemporaneous events surging between terror and a readiness to compromise as well as to the measures of the foreign occupying power. (Punitive expedition, taking prisoners of war, the appointment of a foreign governor, the institution of a native collaborate government, the tuning of opposition groups against each other, and the symbolic kissing of the regime’s hand by the dominant internal opposition three years after the lost battlefield – just as it had happened between Sultan Suleiman II and the Hungarian King John I in 1529 on the plains of Mohács.) The model is the same; so is the social reaction. The author portrays a controlling layer of intellectuals who betray the common cause and are absorbed in the pursuit of individual desires. And finally, the society of the past appears sly, turning a blind eye to the evident crisis, unable to make sacrifices, and unmindful of their own death. The book applied the idiom of symbols, and was therefore understood by everyone.

The attackers also had to take it. Géza Perjés retired because of the barrage of criticism laid down on the book. The editor of the work was Kálmán Benda. He indicated the historical mistakes in his editor’s report, but the author left many of them uncorrected, as the book was not only, or not primarily, about the age under its scrutiny. It did not falsify facts, but gave voice to the moral condemnation of a society that had laid down the weapons by 1968. “When they got to know who the editor was, the charges were immediately silenced, and the two army officers of the Horthy era arranged the debate among themselves. I was very annoyed by two things: they were dismissed as professionally outsiders in Hungarian history; secondly, they were accused of contributing only a subordinated role to Transylvania in the history of Hungarian culture.” – Benda said several years later. At the same time, Domonkos Kosáry had a communication at the Eger conference on History and Mass Communication in defence of his disciples. It remains a

mystery why the power consented to the publication of the book, and why it tolerated (or even urged) the debate, which was carried on by a younger generation in the shadow of the “elders.” Did it ultimately serve the integration of this talented group of youngsters who had come of most renowned middle-class families and had been kept in reserve as descendants of the 1956 parent generation? Or was it to test the unity of national identity of the revolutionary days? We cannot conclude with certainty.

In 1964, the power was still afraid of the outbreak of a new revolt; at the same time, released prisoners were received with suspicion and not as heroes of the Revolution. Then, the year of 1967 brought the compromise which permeated the whole society. Its consequences were self-censorship and a total amnesia. On the individual level, the regime achieved its economic legitimization. In the official propaganda of the power, this solution was labelled as the separate Hungarian way, the new economic mechanism within the socialist camp, a instead of the one that was dreamt of and felt in the enthusiasm of 1956, a politically independent Hungary, aiming to position herself between the great powers. In 1966 Nemeskürty spoke about body snatching. The author depicted a society without a moral backbone, giving up its aims, and suffering from an all-pervading amnesia. Perjés realized only with much delay that Nemeskürty’s work was not a strictly academic study. It was rather a book *in memoriam*, a *requiem* for a country, and a *requiem* for a revolution. Ferenc Szakály responded to the book in the name of the professional historian. We can read Erik Molnár’s still binding doctrines between his lines. (Szakály (1947-99), Kosáry’s son-in-law, had not been admitted to the university for many years, as his documents were put aside due to the imprisonment of his father after the Revolution of 1956. His career was launched only after having worked together with his father-in-law in the Archives of Pest County.)

The hopes in the new economic mechanism had faded by the early 1970s. The political change revived a new debate. This debate revolved around the cultural rehabilitation of the *kuruc*-insurgent tradition (*kuruc* was the collective name of the insurgents of the 1703 independence movement). The debate was preceded by a party resolution passed at the same time with the ongoing Erik Molnár debate in 1958, which dismissed the group of “peasant writers” for preparing the 1956 Revolution with their nationalist ideology. The committee established by the party consisted of three politically active literary historians: István Király (1921-89), son of a country minister of the

Calvinist Church, Pál Pándi (1926-87) and Miklós Szabolcsi, the latter two being representatives of the so called “urban or cosmopolitan” wing of writers originating from the bourgeois radical tradition. Király sympathized with the “peasant writers”, while his two colleagues disliked them. Király had published a study of several hundred pages in which he assessed the significance of this group of writers. The other two members of the committee made him formulate the dismissing party resolution. (The history and the view of nation held by the populist writers were in many respects related to the *kuruc*-insurgent tradition, which was attacked also by Erik Molnár.) Király prepared another study in which he advocated the rehabilitation of this tradition, and urged the condemnation of cosmopolitanism. György Aczél, the omnipotent cultural politician of the period, however, did not give in. But after the removal of a circle of intellectuals labelled as a Budapest cosmopolitan group from the Institute of Philosophy in 1972, Aczél gave a lift to Király after a reception, and encouraged him to publish his study. In this publication of 1973, the author concludes that cosmopolitanism is as dangerous as the nationalism declared a major threat by the 1958 party resolution, and urges another party resolution against it.

The exchange of political views took place in Vácrátót, for which the War of Independence led by Rákóczi provided historical arguments. István Király was countered, not accidentally, by Zsigmond Pál Pach, Miklós Szabolcsi and Pál Pándi, while the professional background was guaranteed by Jenő Szűcs (1928-88), who can be distinguished both by the circumstances of his early career and his academic quality from this camp. His grandfather was professor of Calvinist theology; his father, a judge of the Court of Appeal, died in 1944. Mother and son were interned. According to a report of the Ministry of the Interior, Szűcs intended to deny the dark memories of his father by his active work in the Democratic Youth Organization. This gained him university admission, after which he entered the Party. The 1956 past of his wife put him even more at the mercy of the power. He was invested with a central role in the “nation debates” of the 1970s. His book on the topic was published in German, as well. Before the collapse of communism he committed suicide.

At that time, the Communist Party already supported the *kuruc*, as the *labanc* (the collective name of the pro-Habsburgs during the 1703 insurrection) were blamed for their “faults.” In the later phases of the debate, there has always been a palpable orientation to national legiti-

zation, also backed up by the party, but it has never managed to break out from its secondary position within historiography. Due to the declining standards of living in the late 1970s, Erik Molnár's concept was gradually pushed into the background, and the debate came to a standstill. (In the course of the debate, since the appearance of Erik Molnár, the superior national value of state independence had been substituted for the materialistic values of the bourgeois development. The legitimization of the regime of the day pressed the integration of economic achievements into the national psyche. This is why the quest for political analogies projected into past history had started.)

### **False Consciousness but with the Criticism of the Empire**

The reception of the major critic of the post- World War II national consciousness, István Bibó (1911-79, state minister during the 1956 Revolution) was fatally delayed. After being released from his long imprisonment, he was working at the Central Statistical Office in the 1970s, where he got a cardiac infarct, while he was rearranging a store in the cellar of the Office. The publication of his historical works was refused by a committee of historians with reference to the disrespect of certain academic standards, while Zsigmond Pál Pach, on top of his life and career, after being promoted from the directorship of the Institute of History into the vice-presidency of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, widely disseminated Bibó's views in the West – a theory claiming that Hungarian history deviated from the European historical development. This theory resembled in its basic idea and its arguments Bibó's study entitled "Eltorzult magyar alkat, zsákutcás magyar történelem" [Distorted Hungarian character, deadlocked Hungarian history] very much. Later, the circle of Pach, delegated by the party to the top positions, went on several conference tours in Western Europe to propagate the idea of regionalism, the fundamental concept of Bibó's "A kelet-európai kisállamok nyomorúsága" [The misery of the Eastern European small states]. Jenő Szűcs was the only one to make a reference to Bibó's theory in his study on the three historical regions of Europe. Szűcs's study was to be published in Bibó's *Festschrift*, which was expected to prepare the compromise of the two intellectual wings – the populists (national radicals) and the "urban" (bourgeois radicals) – formerly confronted by the party and the state security.

The authorities, orienting towards the West, and put under pressure of the 1956 intellectual émigrés, finally consented to the Bibó debate. Belatedly, however, as the international and national context had entirely changed by the 1980s. E.g. Bibó's carefully balancing arguments of the article entitled *A magyar demokrácia válsága* [The crisis of Hungarian democracy] seemed to be naive and almost incomprehensible after forty years of sophisticated communist dictatorship. The proposal of the political third way was nothing but senseless and idealistic in the shadow of the presence of the Soviets, garrisoned massively in the country. It was also untimely as it wished to survey the state of the country through historical national consciousness of the populist movement – in spite of the growing insignificance of the peasantry ruined after 1956 and the demographic rearrangement of the countryside. Nevertheless, Bibó's oeuvre was impressive and rich, recyclable even its fragments, but no visible attempt was made to examine it in its unity and context. Therefore, the reception was also doomed to be crippled, not only because Bibó was incorporated into the ideology of those who had hitherto been silent on him, but because the critic of national consciousness, the point that concerns our paper, was used only selectively. Bibó interpreted the 1867 Compromise with the Habsburgs as the abandoning of the aims of the 1848-49 Revolution. The antidemocratic character of this pact and its "false realism" led to the national catastrophe of World War I mainly through the emergence and patronage of a contra-selected leadership.

Bibó's reception, however, was indifferent to the criticism of the Compromise as "false realism" partly because official historiography, since the Erik Molnár debate, could envision the country only within the Habsburg Empire, and partly because Bibó's anti-Compromise attitude symbolically reflected on his own life, which negated the compromise with another Empire, the Soviet Union. Thus the compromise Bibó rejected had multiple and very complex connotations. Firstly, it referred to the nightmare of the shaky Habsburg Empire, luring with false illusions, the price of which was national cataclysm. Secondly, it implied the possibility of the reform of the Soviet system, which he did not wish to legitimize. The third layer of connotations was that of a Euro-American globalization, the integration into which could only be modelled with the example of the Habsburg Empire by the cultural ideology of György Aczél, who was already eager to listen to the expectations of both east and west as if appropriating the image of the

Habsburg two-headed eagle. The small circles of democratic communities implied a national context as Bibó advocated. His concept inherently denied the possibility of any theoretical compromise with imperial conglomerates established on the basis of dynastic succession or ideology.

### **Overture Also to the West**

The academic community of historians was also suitable for probing and forming the image of the international community about the country and the dictatorship. As we have seen, the overture happened first towards France, since it was the French Communist Party that firstly established relationship with the Soviet-backed power which had defeated the Revolution of 1956. While the leftist intellectuals of Europe showed solidarity with the people of Budapest, the French leftist movement established relationships with the new government, and paid a visit to the ruined Hungarian capital. In return, the French professional relations were to be developed first by granting scholarships to this country.

Later, Germany gained in its importance. The Federal Republic of Germany, the economic catalyst of Europe, was an attractive model of modernization in the last third of the century. Among the countries of the capitalist bloc, it was the most significant trade partner of Hungary. Munich had a colony of 40.000 Hungarians, mostly 1956 émigrés. The Bavarian capital was not only associated by the Hungarian state security service with the professionally politicizing circle of people based on Radio “Free Europe”, but also with a centre of publication and research which provided ideal research possibilities and relative intellectual latitude for the Hungarian historians. The activity of the Südost Institute, founded with the help of the Hungarian government in the interwar years, as well as that of the Ungarn Institute, established after World War II, was carefully spied on by the Hungarian intelligence service, and these two undercover spy centres in Munich were the destinations permitted to visit by the Hungarian historians, as well.

Besides controlling the German colleagues, the Institutes also acquired information on strategies of constructing national self-images that could have thwarted Hungarian endeavours, as e.g., the intention of Ceaucescu’s Romania to transform the historical concept of the country and all of its ethnics. In order to achieve this, as was reported to the Hungarian secret agencies by a German leftist – self-admittedly internationalist - historian

and a committed adherent of Tito's Yugoslavian model, the Romanians used to delegate three to four persons to conferences, instead of the one invited, and never failed to excite an anti-Hungarian atmosphere so that they could press their own views in professional debates. The note of the Hungarian high ranking state security officer reads on the margin: "very dangerous spy", and he was convinced that the German scholar dealing with Hungarian history, thus an expert of the Hungarian past, "wants to cause strife between us and the Romanian comrades". This remark also proves that the leading officers of the Hungarian secret service were undeniably committed to the idea of internationalism still in the 1980s. This ideology constituted the basis of their identity in a time when most countries of the socialist bloc, perhaps with the only exception of the German Democratic Republic, had already abandoned it. In Hungary, the notion of national identity still counted as abusive.

Towards the end of the regime, relying on the background financial support of DFG and the Volkswagen Stiftung, György Ránki established a second similar research basis in Mainz. But by this time, Hungarian historians had been researching also at the Hungarian Academy of Rome, the Collegium Hungaricum of Vienna and in Bloomington, accomplishing similar mission during their state granted scholarships. As the frames of this paper do not permit to list all the documentary materials related to these institutions, I will only evoke the career of Ervin Pamlényi, director of the Viennese Institute. At a very early stage he became an informer of the agencies of the Ministry of Interior. (He wrote his reports for free on people in his environment, and was the most malevolent informant in the Institute of History.) He was then recruited and after a promising "test period" he was positioned on top of the Collegium.

## **The Change of Regime**

Unlike in most of the neighbouring countries, no effective clearing of public life happened in Hungary after the change of regime. A considerable number of people once active in the secret service were working in the surroundings of the historical sciences, as it was heavily exposed to politics, consequently, many agents established themselves here with secret identities. At the funeral of Domonkos Kosáry, several speeches highlighted the greatest merit of the deceased, i.e. as a right-hand man of József Antall he

did not launch witch hunts. (As for now, no documents have been found that could reveal Domonkos Kosáry's relations with the communist secret intelligence service. But it is known about him that after 1956 the organs of the Ministry of Interior agreed with him on cooperation. The Minister of the Interior ordered to sentence him to imprisonment for conspiratorial reasons. This was carried out, and Kosáry was released only after having filled the length of the sentence, including the time of his detention.) In 2006, on the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Revolution, Kosáry was obliged to deliver a public speech, while masses of people were demonstrating in the streets and demanded that Prime Minister Ferenc Gyurcsány, relative of Antal Apró, head of the military committee defeating the Revolution, should not use the national symbols of the same Revolution (and benefit from its European reputation), from whose blood he built up his power and wealth.

In his unmasking article, the contemporary historian Krisztián Ungváry draws up a very deplorable picture about the relationship between Hungarian historiography and the communist secret intelligence service, especially about the historians delegated abroad and doing research in foreign institutions. But public access became possible only to the files of the de-conspired agents mentioned before. The documents of the others may still be in use. Although it is surprising that Ungváry recommended the example of Ferenc Glatz, as one who resisted the recruitment of the secret service, while he was the party secretary of the Institute of History, and is up to nowadays its principal professional leader. Indeed, it was impossible to recruit Ferenc Glatz, since he was member of the highest leadership. (His father-in-law, General Máté Borbás, became after the Soviet intervention of 1956 commanding officer of the armed forces with a responsibility to organize the capturing of the revolutionaries. Thus he became one of the most trustworthy persons of the Soviet and Kádár dictatorship.) This is why the name of Glatz can possibly appear only among the commissioners in the system of the state security.

The elderly "Kosáry" generation has gone. But there remained no vacuum after them, even if the middle generation was not allowed to grow up (there is hardly any historian aged between 40 and 50). Following the good old system of *familiaritas*, the new generation was appointed by the old-new power elite. As after the change of regime the old master returned (or seemed to have returned) home, a new one had to be found. According to the well-tried methods, the conspiracy went against the national in-

terests and traditions, this time orienting towards the great power structures, which was manifested by an opening to floating “adventurer” capital. Their automatic reflexes put them on this track. The historians of the newer course were easy to be treated by the government in power, they could be used for whichever political line, and naturally, they bricked in similarly minded people as their successors. The major threat of their stance as historians was still the strengthening of national identity.

As a result of the Erik Molnár debate, two communist conceptions of the history of early modern Hungary were formed: the national-communist view and the internationalist one which adjusted itself to the imperial model. Both can be used to shape national consciousness. One of the models and its related historical background is appropriate to cope with internal crises: the half-legitimate government profited from it when their legitimizing economic resources were exhausted, and therefore wanted to take the lead of the forces of mass cohesion. The internationalist concept could provide support for the manoeuvrings and the survival mentality of the bureaucratic elite. There is no need for further explanation why the former state security service, transmitted into the new system, benefited from the second model even after the collapse of communism.

**Alex Standish**

## **Russian Intelligence Strategy Towards Post-Communist Europe Under Vladimir Putin: Partners or Predators?**

Honoured colleagues, ladies and gentlemen.

I would first like to take this opportunity to thank Dr Agnes Hankiss, Director of the Hamvas Institute for her kind invitation to participate in today's conference and Anita Orban for her hard work in making all the necessary arrangements. I also wish to thank you all for joining us today.

It is always a personal pleasure for me to visit Budapest – a city which is not only beautiful and historic, but which took such a proud and defiant stand against Soviet occupation in 1956. What more appropriate location to hold a conference on the topic of the haunting past? And could there be a better place in which to discuss the many challenges of the present – and of the future – both for Hungary and for the rest of Europe?

The subject of my contribution today is 'Russian intelligence strategy towards post-communist Europe under Vladimir Putin: Partners or Predators'. I hardly need to remark that this is an enormous topic and we would be hard pressed to cover such a wide ranging variety of issues in a conference lasting for weeks or even months. However, my aim is to provide an insight into the foreign policy objectives and *modus operandi* of the present Russian administration and the wider implications for the countries of central and eastern Europe during an era of expansion of both NATO and the European Union.

I am aware that my title is provocative and I'm hopeful that a lively and informative debate will be encouraged. I wish that I could deliver this paper in Hungarian, but the British are not noted for their language skills. I can only apologise.

### **Why Putin?**

Despite the initial optimism which followed the dissolution of the Soviet Union, it has become increasingly clear that Russia under President

Vladimir Putin is not the benign partner which many had hoped it would become. Rather than developing a politically pluralistic, democratic and economically liberal culture, the 'Putin years' have witnessed a resurgence of domestic repression, combined with the reactivation of foreign intelligence networks of a scale which would have appeared implausible back in the heady days following the breaching of the Berlin Wall.

Perhaps much of this could have been predicted, particularly in the aftermath of the relative chaos of the final Yeltsin years. However, the scale of the threat posed by Putin and the co-called 'siloviki' (men of power) – mostly drawn from the ranks of the former KGB and senior military cadre – is only now being fully appreciated by both the USA and the long-standing member states of the EU.

The West had hoped for a police man who could address Russia's domestic problems. Instead, we actually got a secret police man. If you would understand Putin, I would commend to you these two memoirs: Leonid Brezhnev and Vladimir Putin. The language is very similar. These Russian leaders are both from the same stable. "As the father, so the son". They both speak of 'democracy', but it is a very different kind of democracy to ours.

Of course, there were always some people from those countries in central and eastern Europe which had more direct experience of Russian occupation during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century who were never taken in by the fiction that Putin was a genuine democrat with whom we could do business. There is also the equally dangerous myth that a country like Russia always needs a 'strong man' – whether a tsar or a president – who can impose order throughout the land. Similar views were often advanced by foreign apologists for Stalin. How short political memories can be.

Although there is a growing recognition that Putin's current strategy of expanding and revitalising Russia's influence (both diplomatic and military) across the CIS – or the 'near abroad', as these often nominally independent states are regarded in Moscow – there has been a more gradual realisation that Russia also presents a resurgent security challenge within future member states of NATO and the EU. Old intelligence networks are being reactivated; new spheres of influence are being created; the biographies of elected politicians are being rewritten (and sometimes falsified). On the economic front, the siloviki strategy of regaining direct or proxy control over vital sectors such as energy distribution continues unabated.

## Putin's foreign policy doctrine

Since he rose to power – initially as Russian prime minister, then acting president and finally, in 2000, president – Vladimir Putin has pursued a radically different foreign policy agenda to Yeltsin. The day I took over as editor of Jane's Intelligence Digest – a few weeks after Putin became president, I authored an editorial entitled 'What is Putin's game?'

I would like to revisit two key paragraphs from that article:

*The priorities of the new administration will be markedly different from those pursued during the Yeltsin era. Whereas previous post-communist policy makers have focused primarily on developing a westward-looking foreign policy, it seems certain that Putin's master plan will revise this strategy. The West may have to step up its own intelligence operations in response...*

*It remains to be seen whether Putin will be able to play his game with equal success on all fronts. It is certain that he is a much more skilful operator than his ailing predecessor, but in confronting Russia's wide range of problems, the new president may have to use all the tricks he learned as a career officer in the Soviet KGB.*

It soon became clear that Putin was fully committed to reversing the steady decline in Russia's global influence. Within a few months of becoming president, he had embarked on a major tour of Asia, visiting China and North Korea. In contrast to his predecessor, there were to be no more drunken embarrassments conducting orchestras or falling down in public. Putin meant business and was determined to reassert Russia's claim to – if not full superpower status – then at least the role of a major regional broker.

Despite the so-called 'Putin Plan' to re-establish Russia's influence abroad – particularly within the CIS – it initially appeared that domestic issues would continue to demand his attention. Rampant corruption, the reform of the inefficient, underfunded and demoralised armed forces and the conflict in Chechnya all suggested that the reactivation of Russia's foreign intelligence networks would not be a top priority. However, such complacent assessments proved misguided.

Although financial constraints ensured that Moscow would be unable to compete directly against the USA or NATO in the military arena (Russia's defence budget in 2000 was \$7 billion; the USA's was \$270 billion), rebuilding intelligence networks is a cheaper and often more effective alternative.

In recent years, there has been a series of Russian intelligence operations across central and eastern Europe of which only a tiny proportion has been exposed.

By February 2001, JID had launched a series of investigations into the resurgence of Russian intelligence activity and on 23 February 2001, we published a feature entitled 'The New Russian Offensive'. In this we observed:

*In recent months, there have been indications that Russia is either trying to undermine its westward orientated neighbours or is already establishing forward outposts from which it can more effectively operate against Western Europe's interests once the European Union expands, or when NATO undergoes its next enlargement.*

I should like to present some case studies.

### ***Czech Republic***

Back in August 2002, Czech security officials were expressing grave concern over the rapid expansion of Russian influence within the country's economy, as well as renewed espionage activities. Jane's covered these events in an investigation entitled 'Russia's velvet revolution'

*The Czech Republic risks once again being pulled into the Russian sphere of influence owing to a series of political and economic decisions. JID reveals the evidence in the latest in a series of special features on Moscow's strategic aims for central and eastern Europe.*

Despite joining NATO in 1999 and being a first wave candidate for membership in the EU, the Czechs are increasingly – wittingly or unwittingly – flirting with Moscow when it comes to compromising their economic and political sovereignty. A number of Czech intelligence and security officials have expressed their grave concern that the country continues to be drawn closer into the Russian camp.

“We had written and submitted a number of security reports to the government regarding the level of Russian intelligence activity and organised crime activity in the country,” said one former Czech Security Information Service (BIS) officer. “These Russian activities appear to be penetrating Czech politics at the national, regional and municipal levels,” the former BIS officer complained. He eventually left the security service out of frustration at the lack of action being taken to combat the threat.

Czech ties to Moscow are in some respects stronger than they were prior to 1989 when the former Czechoslovakia was a member of the Warsaw Pact and COMECON organisations dominated by the then Soviet Union. At present Russian capital is flowing into the country at an alarming rate. These deals range from property buy-outs to investments in strategic industries such as the energy and petrochemical sectors.

Prior to retiring from office, in mid-June former Czech Social Democratic Prime Minister Milos Zeman officially broke ground on the costly D47 highway project that will link the country’s economically depressed region of Northern Moravia with the rest of the country.

Ostensibly the company selected by the government to build the new highway is an Israeli construction company, however, what most people do not realise is that the company’s management consists of Russian émigrés who have strong links to the Russian government of President Vladimir Putin.

Another example of encroaching Russian influence into the Czech Republic is the deal which was brokered in October 2001 to settle the \$3.6 billion debt dating from the Soviet era and now owed by Russia to the Czechs. In late 2001, Zeman’s government selected Falcon Capital, a financial group known to enjoy close relations with the Russian government, to resolve the issue. The deal involved the sale of \$2.5 billion of the debt to Falcon in exchange for an upfront payment of \$547 million. A further 46% of the total sum owed by Moscow was written off.

As part of the resulting deal – which will run until 2020 – the Czechs also agreed to accept Russian arms and a fleet of civilian transport ships as partial repayment. Throughout the 1990s the Russians attempted to coax the Czech into accepting weapons as a means of settling the debt issue. However, their offers were always rejected on the grounds that the Czech Republic intended to join NATO and preferred to procure Western weapons systems compatible with those of their new allies. Aside from not wanting to import Russian weapons due to their high maintenance costs – in addi-

tion to serious concerns over the availability and timely delivery of spare parts – the Czechs wanted to send a clear message to the West that they were severing their military ties with the Kremlin.

I should like to quote from Jane’s Intelligence Digest (August 2002):

*“The failure and unwillingness to reform the country’s four intelligence services (two civilian and two military) by the Social Democratic government of Vladimir Spidla is clear evidence that a continuity exists in successive Czech governments since the fall of communism to closely and quietly co-operate with the Russians,” observed Petr Vancura, Director of the Prague Institute for National Security.*

*“Today no objective police investigator or intelligence officer will investigate Russian espionage or organised crime activities in the Czech Republic for fear of losing his or her position – or worse,” added Vancura.*

*According to leading regional intelligence experts, the mounting evidence points to a marked stepping-up of Moscow’s activities in the economic and intelligence fields even as the Czech Republic heads towards full EU membership.*

*“The Russians today are behaving with incredible openness and confidence, indicating they have absolutely no intention of releasing the Czech Republic from their sphere of influence,” warned Vancura.*

### **Slovakia and the SIS**

JID’s recent investigations into Russian influence in Slovakia began during the Meciar era. In February 2001, we observed that:

*Far more disturbing are actions occurring on the fringes of government and commerce, two fields which in Russia can hardly be separated from one another. The fact is that Russian governmental bodies – and most specifically those related to the intelligence community – have been found to be active in areas outside of their remit, or at least outside the remit that Western governments understand as pertaining to such authorities.*

*It is well known by now that under Meciar’s leadership, the Slovak Republic became a seething hotbed of Russian interests, as it seemed*

*that with NATO's first post-1990 expansion, Slovakia would make an ideal and less than democratic outpost of Russian interests in the heart of a rapidly stabilising and westerly committed neighbourhood. Since then, Meciar has been fortunately dethroned and Slovakia is now making progress in its military and political relations with Brussels. The Russian influence is still there, however, but is having to come to terms with a changed political environment. Subsequently, tactics are being refined.*

In December 2002 JID played a role in the exposure of a mounting crisis within the country's intelligence service, the SIS. A significant number of serving officers had formerly worked within the ranks of the communist-era StB – which was controlled by the Soviet KGB.

One of the features of this case was the involvement of SIS personnel in the shipment of weapons which found their way to Angola, Iraq, Libya and Sudan and other states under US, EU or UN embargos.

The then SIS Director Vladimir Mitro was recruited by the former communist regime and received his training during the 1970s when Czechoslovakia was undergoing a period of Moscow-imposed 'normalisation' following the Soviet invasion that crushed the Prague Spring in 1968.

Mitro was originally appointed as SIS director by Vladimir Meciar in 1993 but was replaced a year later by Ivan Lexa following a bout of party intrigue. After being sacked as director, Mitro established a 'shadow' service consisting of former SIS members that had been purged by Lexa. Mitro was subsequently reappointed as SIS chief by the current Slovak coalition government of Prime Minister Mikulas Dzurinda. Once back in post, Mitro recruited many former StB intelligence officers back into the service.

The SIS under Mitro continued to carry out electronic eavesdropping in the form of telephone wiretaps, collecting compromising information on individuals who stand in the way of irregular economic activities such as the questionable privatisation deals that are a part of everyday life in Slovakia. It has also been active in recruiting Slovak journalists to do the service's bidding. Compromised journalists are used to spread disinformation and are able to shape public opinion against NATO membership or other important political issues.

Prior to his resignation in March 2003, Mitro also became engaged in a bitter battle with the head of the Slovak National Security Office (NBU), Jan Mojzis. The NBU is responsible for vetting all Slovak public officials including

politicians, members of the government and military who come into contact with classified information related to national security.

Until he was also dismissed in October 2003, Mojzis had been calling for increased state scrutiny of the controversial weapons shipments that have been damaging Slovakia's reputation internationally. There was grave concern throughout the SIS that the NBU's vetting procedures might uncover the past activities and Soviet-era links of many current SIS officers.

Recent unrest in Slovakia following price liberalisation may lead to further destabilisation and additional opportunities for the Russian intelligence services to infiltrate and encourage conflict.

### **Hungary**

JID provoked considerable media controversy here in Hungary in February 2001 in the context of our ongoing investigations into Russian intelligence activities in Europe. In our issue of 23 February 2001, we observed:

*In Hungary, the most recent related scandal is still unfolding with reference to one of the nation's most strategically importance chemical facilities. Behind the scenes it has emerged that recent changes in the ownership of the shares of the company BorsodChem which favour one Millford Holdings – nominally of Ireland – were in fact transacted on behalf of Russia's state energy giant Gazprom, which had tried previously, but unsuccessfully, to buy an even more significant Hungarian industrial giant, the Tiszai Chemical Company (TVK). The legally dubious tactics employed and hidden nature of the takeover has led to the Hungarian government becoming involved and investigations of money laundering allegations have been initiated by the National Financial Supervisory Agency.*

*And if surreptitious acquisition of industrial influence or illicit deployment of surveillance hardware were not enough, we have it on good intelligence community authority that recent events surrounding the Hague and the Zámoly Roma of Hungary has also been to a large extent engineered by Russian operatives. Members of the gypsy community of Zámoly appear to have been encouraged to plead persecution and violation of human rights before EU bodies and even to request political asylum so as to make Hungary look much worse than it is during the*

*crucial EU accession negotiations which are currently taking place. This perhaps is one of the most damaging methods employed by Moscow of late, one that was tried in the aspirant Czech Republic first and subsequently transplanted to Hungary.*

Despite the media frenzy which followed publication of this article, and very vocal threats made to sue Jane's, no proceedings were ever launched. In fact, JID has never been sued for libel since we were founded in 1938.

On 9 March 2001, we followed our original story with a piece entitled, 'Questions in Budapest'. We provided further details of the background to the Zámoly Roma issue:

*The head of the delegation from Zámoly has since been reported as alleging that the article revealing Russian intelligence links was planted in JID by the Hungarian authorities. We can state categorically that allegations that JID or our staff were offered financial inducements to publish our investigation are totally without foundation.*

*What is interesting, however, is that the political patron of the Zámoly group in Paris and Strasbourg, is the French Communist Party, which according to credible military intelligence authorities is known to have had strong associations with the KGB in the past. Add to this the information that the Zámoly group appears to have been financed by sources from Israel, which with the recent influx of Russian émigrés is known to be highly penetrated by foreign intelligence, and the story takes on a new dimension.*

In April 2001, Hungarian national television followed up the theme with an interview with the former KGB defector Oleg Gordievsky. When asked about the question of Russian penetration, Gordievsky – the UK's highest ranking Cold War agent – stated that paradoxically the KGB's successor organs are even more active in central Europe now than they were prior to the USSR's collapse.

According to Gordievsky, Moscow now considers the new NATO members (Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic) as their principal enemies and are using active measures to weaken their standing internationally and to delay EU membership while Moscow surreptitiously penetrates their economies. Its intelligence services tried to block the expansion of the

NATO alliance, but having failed they are now “on the attack”, according to the former KGB officer. The SVR, the Russian foreign intelligence service is now actively attempting to recruit new agents amongst local government employees, academics and even MPs.

More was to come. In June 2002 there was the controversy concerning the past career of Hungary’s Prime Minister Peter Medgyessy which emerged shortly after his election following the publication of documents in Magyar Nemzet. I should like to quote from JID’s coverage of this particular issue in our issue of 28 June 2002, following Mr Medgyessy’s admission that he had been agent D-209 of the communist-era secret service:

*In an amazing twist, the prime minister followed his admission with a justification that he only served in the so-called ‘III/2 section’ of the Third Directorate and, as such, was a counter-intelligence officer who had promoted Hungary’s interests against those of the Soviet Union and had not been active against the West.*

*Outside of the left-wing ruling parliamentary coalition – and sympathetic supporters in the media – Medgyessy’s explanations were greeted both domestically and internationally with consternation and disbelief. Former intelligence agents and analysts have emphasised that even until the late 80s all of Hungary’s intelligence branches and key ministries were saturated with Soviet KGB officers who ensured that all security activities conformed closely to Moscow’s interests.*

*Additionally the point is being made that within the Third Directorate there were extensive overlaps between its various sections and that counter-intelligence officers such as Medgyessy could not possibly have spent their entire careers engaged in just one task – such as anti-Western counter-intelligence – but that they would also have been expected to spy on their fellow countrymen as well.*

*Disregarding the major inconsistencies in the story as outlined by the prime minister, the latest scandal highlights several significant problems still prevalent in many ‘post-communist’ countries, even Hungary which is regarded as being economically and politically among the most successful. In addition to fears that the KGB’s former networks and present reincarnations remain very active in the region, as JID’s warnings about Russian activities in Hungary have pointed out – it is becoming more and more apparent that ‘reformed’ Communist parties are largely unre-*

*constructed and that they may therefore continue to present a threat to current Western security interests.*

*... it is entirely possible that other Reformed Communist politicians could be similarly compromised and, given that 70% of all Third Directorate files were burned between December 1989 and January 1990, the truth about the extent of Soviet-era penetration now rests solely in the copies filed in Moscow.*

*This state of affairs must raise serious questions about the extent to which Russian President Vladimir Putin (himself a former senior KGB official) might be able to apply pressure to members of the new Hungarian administration, including the new prime minister. These revelations are unwelcome news for NATO and less than encouraging for the EU.*

Mr Medgyessy is understandably keen on developing closer relations with Moscow. He made that clear during his visit to Russia in December 2002. As Pravda noted on 20 December:

*Hungarian Prime Minister Peter Medgyessy believes that Hungary and Russia must mend their relations in order to guarantee fruitful cooperation in the future. Medgyessy made this statement yesterday while speaking at the Russian Foreign Ministry's Diplomatic Academy. Medgyessy said that over the last ten years Russia and Hungary 'have stopped understanding each other.' 'I came to turn over a new page in our countries' relations,' said the Hungarian Prime Minister.*

*'Today a democratic system is taking root in Hungary and Russia,' said Medgyessy. 'Reforms are being carried out, a market economy is developing.' He believes that all the conditions are now right to re-establish trust between the two countries and improve economic and cultural ties. However, the Prime Minister stressed that the most important thing was 'to re-establish friendly, respectful relations.'*

*Medgyessy also added that after the New York terrorist acts of September 11, 2002, Russia's position in world politics changed. He said that Russia had begun to play 'a stabilising role in the world, and it is very important for Hungary to have closer relations with her.'*

I wish to stress that this is not simply a question of Mr Medgyessy's personal character. The more important issue is a recognition that those

who worked closely with Moscow during the period of Soviet occupation present a high degree of risk owing to the possible existence of ‘Kompro-mat’ in the files of the Russian intelligence services. Such individuals are more vulnerable to blackmail.

### ***Poland and Russian intelligence***

Our investigations in 2001 also encouraged a reaction in Poland. The country’s former Defence Minister Jan Parys confirmed that it is known that Russia’s intelligence services have agents ensconced within the Polish banking sector, the government and even Poland’s security services and parliamentary parties (especially inside the reformed communist Socialist Party).

Attempts had been made to uncover sleepers and active agents alike during the Polish lustration campaign, but it can now be revealed that thousands of pages of relevant documentation “disappeared” before a proper investigation could be effected. Jerzy Karp, director of the Eastern Studies Institute – a well-informed academic quango briefed by the Polish government to monitor developments in Russia – publicly confirmed JID’s report on Russia’s state-owned giant Gazprom’s activities in central Europe. This is alleged to include intelligence gathering. As Karp observed, “the game is afoot”.

Former Polish Prime Minister Jan Olszewski also added his view that it is no accident that dozens of those government officials who regulated the gas and oil sector are now working for the Gazprom joint venture in Poland. A key project was the laying of a massive fibre optic trunk across the territory of the new NATO state. This is the same Gazprom that President Putin admitted in September 2000 will be used as a tool in the execution of Russian foreign policy.

### ***Lithuania destabilised***

Recently, JID has focused on the risk of Lithuania being destabilised by Russia:

*As relations between Russia and the European Union (EU) continue to deteriorate, this study focuses on the latest example of Moscow’s strategy to rebuild its influence in former Soviet republics by covert means. It*

*also raises the question of wider implications for both NATO and the EU on the crisis in Lithuania.*

Ronaldas Paksas won the Lithuanian presidency in January 2003 with 54 per cent of the vote compared to 46 per cent for the incumbent, Lithuanian-American President Valdas Adamkus. Paksas' election platform appealed to the 'transition-losers' (the poor, elderly, those on low income, rural communities).

Critical of the political 'establishment' and the West, Paksas's support came from outside the mainstream left and right Lithuanian parties. These included the Labour Party, the Freedom Union, his own new Liberal Democratic Party and small parties representing the Russian and Polish minorities.

In October 2003 Lithuania's State Security Department (VSD) submitted a dossier to parliament concerning Paksas. Based on this dossier Lithuanian members of parliament (MPs) began impeachment proceedings in January, supported by 86 of the 141 MPs. He was impeached successfully in March, but is permitted under the constitution to stand as an election candidate.

The list of charges against the Lithuanian president included posing a threat to national security, leaking state secrets, illegally influencing private businesses, preventing state institutions from functioning properly and turning a blind eye to his aides abusing their positions of office. The constitutional court has already ruled that the president violated the constitution by granting citizenship in April 2003 to the largest financial donor to his election campaign, Russian businessmen Yuri Borisov.

After obtaining a court order, the VSD legally monitored the president's conversations. The taped conversations showed that Borisov was the largest single donor to Paksas's election campaign. With funds channelled through Paksas's national security adviser, Remigijus Acas, Borisov donated between US\$500,000 and \$1m, a sizeable sum by Lithuanian election campaign standards. Paksas is accused of bypassing legal procedures and security vetting when he conferred Lithuanian citizenship on Borisov.

The VSD was given intelligence on Borisov by an unnamed Western intelligence agency. Based on these suspicions the VSD followed him to Moscow where they recorded his conversations with various individuals alleged to have links to organised crime groups in Russia.

In addition, a Russian public relations company - Almax - also provided services to Paksas's election campaign. According to the VSD, Almax has links to the Russian intelligence services.

A similar public relations company with links to the Russian presidency and intelligence services offered its services to pro-Russian groups during elections in CIS states. Paksas stands accused of allowing Almax undue influence within the presidential office and also within the Lithuanian political process.

This scandal has raised five fundamental questions:

- Russia's continued use of Soviet-style methods to destabilise neighbouring states. If Russia is willing to undertake such actions against Lithuania (a NATO member) what of Georgia under pro-Western Mikhail Saakashvili (elected in January in a massive landslide after a peaceful revolution in November removed Eduard Shevardnadze) or Ukraine if pro-Western Viktor Yushchenko is elected president in October?
- Despite Russian President Vladimir Putin's rhetoric against corruption and the selective imprisonment of a few oligarchs who became wealthy under his predecessor, Boris Yeltsin, the Russian intelligence agencies continue to closely work with organised crime. At a time when the West's relations with Russia are deteriorating these links should be a cause for concern as they raise serious questions about Russia's commitments to the international war on terrorism.
- How should NATO members, particularly the USA, react to Moscow's attempts to destabilise one of its members? It remains to be seen whether NATO will raise the issue in the NATO-Russian Council.
- Lithuania has been seen as the Baltic state with the best relations with Russia because it has far fewer Russian and Russian-speaking minorities than Estonia or Latvia where they account for one-third and half of the population respectively. If Russia is prepared to destabilise Lithuania, it can only be concluded that fellow NATO members Estonia and Latvia could be also likely targets since they are even more vulnerable given their larger Russian minorities.
- In May, all three Baltic states will join the EU. The EU's latest policy evaluation of its relations with Russia are pessimistic in their assess-

ment of what has become in effect a ‘virtual partnership’ built on empty rhetoric and hollow statements adopted by both sides, but which leads to no action.

There are some positive signs that Lithuania, at least, has recognised the dangers posed by the Kremlin’s attempts at infiltration and espionage. At the end of February, three Russian diplomats were expelled from Lithuania after being accused of “activities that are not in line with the diplomatic service,” according to the foreign minister, Antanas Valionis. The three Russians were specifically alleged to have attempted to obtain confidential information concerning the president’s impeachment from parliamentary sources, as well as “illegally influencing privatisation”.

### **Focus on Russia’s energy strategy**

Parallel with Moscow’s renewed intelligence activity in eastern and central Europe is the growing role played by Russian investment in the energy sector, particularly throughout the CIS. A little over a year ago, we launched an extensive investigation into this area and the following are the highlights of what we discovered.

Putin is pursuing a strategy throughout the former USSR to reassert Russian dominance via control of the energy sectors, particularly the distribution networks.

Gaining control of the strategically vital energy sector is part of a broader strategy of Russian participation in privatisation across the former Soviet republics. Moscow already controls - directly or indirectly - gas distribution systems in Moldova, Belarus, Armenia and Ukraine.

In Moldova, Russian energy giant Gazprom has long held control over Moldova’s gas pipelines. As elsewhere, Moldovan gas debts led to its pipelines becoming Russian assets. Moldova’s foreign debt current stands at around \$1.6 billion and its liabilities amount to \$729 million, of which \$270 is owed to Gazprom.

The Transdnestr region’s liabilities are even higher at \$1,118 billion. Of this, \$800 million is owed to Gazprom, including \$350.6 million in penalties for late payment of earlier gas supplies. Of this substantial sum, \$100 million has been written off in exchange for Russian military equipment evacuated from the Transdnestr.

Meanwhile, the Moldovan authorities refuse to accept liability for gas exported to the separatist enclave which has been outside central control since 1992. Most of the energy supplied to Transdniestr is in the form of a hidden Russian subsidy to keep the separatist region afloat. All of its pro-Moscow leaders also hold Russian passports.

The energy supplied to the Transdniestr is either resold as a source of corrupt income for its ruling elites or else used to maintain the region's large military-industrial complex. Illicitly exported weapons have become the mainstay of the Trans-Dniester economy. In the Soviet era, the region's military-industrial complex only produced military components. Currently, it has closed production cycles for small arms, a full range of different types of mortars, 43 Grad multiple missile launchers and grenade launchers.

Belarus was, together with Armenia, Russia's closest ally in the CIS. However, even President Aleksander Lukashenko has complained about Russian pressure to transfer his country's pipelines and gas sector infrastructure to Russian control. Lukashenko was furious at Putin's plans to build new gas pipelines to bypass Belarus after a Russian-Ukrainian gas consortium was established in October 2002.

Gazprom warned in October that it has fulfilled its gas contract for 2002 and halted further deliveries. This would have meant a very cold winter in Belarus and the threat of Lukashenko's popularity, already the lowest it has ever been, declining rapidly against a background of mounting popular discontent. Belarus receives gas at \$30 per 1,000 cubic metres, half what Gazprom charges Ukraine and less than a third of the price charged to western European customers. Cash-strapped Belarus cannot even afford to pay these prices and has traditionally resorted to barter deals.

In November the Belarusian parliament agreed to transform Beltransgaz, the country's gas transportation system, into a joint venture with Russia. Gazprom is to receive 30% of Beltransgaz shares in return for cancelling \$80 million in Belarusian energy debts which presently stand at \$282 million. A recent political dispute over currency union resulted in the gas supply to Belarus being shut off for a day. This is where real risk to national sovereignty can be seen clearly.

In the same month Russia took over five large enterprises in Armenia in return for a \$100 million energy debt. These enterprises once belonged to the Soviet military-industrial complex. Other enterprises of strategic interest to Russia include the nuclear power industry, for which it is the sole sup-

plier of nuclear fuel, and an aluminium smelter. Prior to this latest debt-for-assets deal, Russia had already taken control over ArmRosGaz, Armenia's gas distribution system in which it holds a 55% controlling stake.

In the three Baltic states – newly invited to join NATO and the EU - regulating the flow of Russian oil has been used as a lever to obtain a share in the oil refining and transportation systems. Threats to cut off oil supplies mean the oil refineries either go into liquidation or are forced to accept Russian control. Russia's main targets have been oil refineries in Lithuania and Latvia.

In Lithuania, Gazprom has pressured the authorities to agree to it taking a 34% share in the privatised Lietuvos Dujos (Lithuanian Gas) company. Gazprom is also purchasing the Kaunas thermal nuclear plant while United Energy Systems is bidding for control over Lithuania's electricity distribution grids.

Russian strategy towards Ukraine has always aimed at taking control over its pipelines through which most of Russia's gas exports are sent. This leverage has enabled Ukraine to avert a total cut off of Russian gas supplies as this would also deny Russia a major source of export earnings. Russia has therefore been unable to prevent Ukraine building up substantial arrears for energy supplies.

Since Ukraine is the largest transit route for gas in the world, in order to force Ukraine to agree to Russian control of its gas pipelines, Moscow threatened to build alternative pipelines through Belarus. To reinforce this Russian pressure, in May 2002 former Gazprom chief Viktor Chernomyrdin was appointed Ambassador to Ukraine.

At the 7 October CIS summit in Chisinau, Moldova, the Russian and Ukrainian presidents signed an agreement to create an inter-state gas consortium. Ukrainian sources have revealed to JID that in return for Putin's support for the internationally isolated and scandal-prone President Leonid Kuchma, the pipelines have been placed under Gazprom's control. Kuchma caved in on the most crucial aspect of the consortium when he gave up a demand for a 51% shareholding that would have allowed Ukraine to exercise a controlling stake. Instead, Kuchma agreed to Russian demands for 50:50 parity control. Russia is now in a position to influence and even veto Ukraine's energy deals with other countries.

Strong criticism of the gas consortium deal is evident among the anti-Kuchma opposition in Ukraine. To circumvent this, Kuchma insists that as an inter-governmental agreement it does not require parliamentary approval. The agreement continues to remain secret even for parliamentary depu-

ties, who have pointed out it is a violation of Ukrainian legislation since the country's pipelines are not subject to privatisation. The deal remains top secret despite promises made by Kuchma in August to introduce a more "transparent" regime.

One factor leading to Prime Minister Anatol Kinakh's dismissal a month after the deal was signed was his objection to the terms of the gas consortium which he felt worked against Ukraine's interests. Kinakh complained only days before the CIS summit that, "we must not allow any of our partners to exercise a monopoly influence over the results of the activities of the consortium".

Serhiy Baulin, deputy state secretary at the finance ministry, calculated that Ukraine stood to lose 6 billion hryvni from the consortium and another 2 billion on extra subsidies from higher prices. He was fired four days after making this statement. Other sources have told JID that Ukraine will lose an estimated \$1 billion in transit fees.

Opposition to the consortium within the government was dealt with by sacking Kinakh. Pro-Russian Viktor Yanokevych, brought in to replace Kinakh from the Donbas, supports the gas consortium. According to Oleksandr Hudyna, a member of the parliamentary committee on the energy and fuel sector, Ukraine's national interests are being sacrificed to Moscow in order to ensure Kuchma's personal security after he leaves office in 2004.

Can we speak of any country's political or economic independence when it has surrendered control of its strategic energy distribution networks?

## **Conclusions**

In the course of this presentation – and I apologise for the length – I have endeavoured to highlight some of the key issues and I hope that I have answered my own question in the title of this paper.

Does Russian intelligence strategy under Vladimir Putin mean that Russia is a partner or a predator? Ladies and gentlemen, you must draw your own conclusions, but I believe that there is more than sufficient evidence on which to base a realistic assessment of Russian foreign policy since 2000.

Moscow has not succeeded in derailing the accession of the new member states to either NATO or the EU. But in my view, the real struggle for power, influence and economic control may only be beginning. I am as de-

lighted that Hungary will join the EU in a matter of days, as I was when this country became a NATO member in 1999.

However, there will be further pressures, both economic and political, ahead. Domestic tensions and internal political crises will provide opportunities for further infiltration and exploitation by Russia's intelligence services. My advice is: never underestimate your opponent.

In concluding, I would remind you of the warning given by the American democratic and anti-slavery campaigner Wendell Phillips: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

**Marius Oprea**

## **The Fifth Power**

### **– Transition of the Romanian Securitate from Communism to NATO**

“Those who after December 22, 1989, believed that they would do away with the Securitate harboured illusions. The Securitate in Romania, just like all of the similar institutions in the former socialist countries, is organized in such a way that even if a few of its leaders disappear, it goes on functioning without them. Its hierarchy is organized in accordance with the Indian-file principle. When one of its leaders vanishes, the whole file takes one step forward, and thus the places are occupied automatically. This type of organization, however, has a defect, which destroyed the unity of the apparatus: if the chief at the head of the file changes course, all the others follow suit”.<sup>1</sup> It is thus that a man belonging to the Securitate apparatus, a colonel from the county of Dolj, defined the transformation process that took place in the political police in the years of transition in Romania. The recovery of the Securitate structures by the authorities that came to power after 1989 is a fact expressed and proved many times and by many people in hundreds of press articles, which showed how important zones of the society were “contaminated” by the presence of the officers of the former communist political police.

Nowadays, the officers of the former Securitate are divided in three big categories. The first category includes those officers that succeeded in life as politicians or businessmen. The second category is comprised of those who were successful in both their life and their career, going from the rank of captain, major or colonel to the rank of general or even the position of chief of an intelligence service of information in Romania. The third category is composed of the few people retired from any activity, who prefer to live simply on the pension money, to which they sometimes add the income from their parents’ household in the country or, in the happiest cases, a lucrative activity such as a position of administrator of an apartment house or chief of personnel, responsible for employees’ attendance and discipline in small and medium enterprises. Practically, this sorting into categories re-

flects – in the author’s view – the sociological “grid” of the composition of the former Securitate apparatus before 1989. The first two categories are generally occupied by officers who had affirmed themselves in the beginning of the 70’s, many of them taken from the Securitate School at Băneasa with promises from among the students and best graduates from colleges. For example, Alexandru Tănăsescu, former general in the espionage compartment of the Securitate, who – until he was put in the reserve in 1999 had occupied the position of first deputy of the director of the Foreign Intelligence Service – graduated *magna cum laude* from the History College of the Bucharest University and, on graduation, was appointed researcher with the Institute of Historical and Sociological Studies until January 3, 1973. On this date he was appointed to the General Direction of Foreign Intelligence,<sup>2</sup> and was assigned numerous missions of espionage in the Western countries. The active policy of attracting intellectuals in the Securitate apparatus was hatched by the former chief of the State Securitate Department [SSD], General Iulian Vlad, who in 1969 – the climax year of the structural reforms in the State Securitate Department – filled the position of chief of the Cadres Education and Improvement Direction. The third category, atypical in the context of the general evolution of the Securitate apparatus, is dominated by people who had come to work in the Securitate as a result of some “combinations of circumstances/events”, perceived by the mentioned people themselves as a compromise assumed for a little better life or, simply, by officers who in the past had been “renowned” for their utter incompetence. Without the shadow of a doubt, the third category belongs to history. The first two categories, however, go on implementing in practice a custom attributed by legends to the KGB instructors: “Some people are writing history, we are making it.”

On December 22, 1989, the State Securitate Department had a total of 15,312 employees, of which 10,114 officers, 791 military foremen, 3,179 non-commissioned officers, and 1,228 civilian personnel. In the central units of the Securitate worked 6,602 persons, in the territorial units, and at the Securitate of the Municipality of Bucharest 6,059 persons, in the cadres education and improvement schools 225 persons, and in the undercover special units 2,426 persons, of whom 1,892 were officers.<sup>3</sup> The day of December 22, 1989, caught many of these employees of the Securitate unawares, in a state of complete unreadiness. An example: the unfolding of the events was so fast that – two hours after the yard of the Securitate

Inspectorate at Braşov was teeming with people – a car driven by a military foreman fetched from one of the farms of the Party Household near Braşov a pig for the holiday dinner of the cadres. The lack of imagination in evaluating the events that preceded Ceauşescu's flight, originating in the sentiment of belonging to a immutable caste of each Securitate operative, brought about the blocking of the system.

Neither the generalized chaos that reigned on December 22, 1989, nor subsequently the manner of dissolving and setting under control the structures of the State Securitate Department was spelled out in the succession of normative acts issued by the provisional power. The apparatus of the Communist party was in the same situation. First of all, in the Communiqué to the country of the National Salvation Front, read on TV by Ion Iliescu on December 22, 1989, in the evening, it was only stated that “the whole state power has been taken over by the Council of the National Salvation Front [CNSF], to which is subordinated the Superior Military Council that coordinates the whole activity of the army and of the units of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.” Though this formulation was confusing enough to amplify the boundless uncertainty and rout of that period, the CNSF returned only on December 24 with a different communiqué, where it was pointed out that: “The units of the Ministry of Internal Affairs will be integrated into the Ministry of National Defense, which takes over the sole command over all the troops and combat means of the country.”<sup>4</sup> In the two days following Ceauşescu's flight, the former Securitate was anathematized, but the demonization was limited only to the level of public conscience. As the dissolution of the former political police in the waters of the power had already begun, since then and until now an official condemnation of its repressive actions has lacked.

Directly after General Nicolae Militaru, one of the former clients of counter-espionage due to his connections with the agency of Soviet military espionage, was appointed Minister of National Defence, he signed – together with Ion Iliescu – a new CNSF decree (No. 4 of December 26, 1989) regarding the fate of the former SSD. Under Article 1 of this decree, it was pointed out that: “The State Securitate Department, the Command of the Securitate Troops, along with the organs and units reporting to them, are being transferred into the composition of the Ministry of National Defense. In the above-mentioned formations are included the structure, budget, personnel, armament, ammunition, technical equipment, and fixed assets, as well as the assets and liabilities in the country and abroad.”<sup>5</sup>

In the background of the manipulation of public opinion, which was shown on TV images with dismantled centres for bugging phone conversations, in the first months of the year 1991 an intense activity of regrouping the structures of the former Securitate was conducted, in parallel with the efforts of some provisional dignitaries to control these structures. Formally, the former Securitate had already been transferred into the subordination of the Ministry of National Defense on December 22. On December 31, right after Iulian Vlad and the persons in his entourage had been arrested, Ion Iliescu appointed Gelu Voican Voiculescu – who at the time was vice prime minister of the Provisional Government – commander of the State Security Department.<sup>6</sup> In the evening of the same day, at 22.00, Voican Voiculescu organized an extraordinary meeting at the Ministry of Internal Affairs, convening to it the highest-ranking officers of the Securitate. At this meeting, he promised the SSD officers that the new power would not wage war against them, but would only abolish the structures of this institution. As from January 2, 1990, General Militaru and Voican Voiculescu coordinated the takeover of the Securitate by the Ministry of National Defense. Concretely, an analysis of the organizational diagram of the Securitate was conducted, and the future intelligence structures of Romania were outlined. These structures had, as a basis, the Securitate personnel and logistics, which – formally – had never been abolished. We remind the fact that via the decree signed on December 26 by Ion Iliescu and Nicolae Militaru, the State Securitate Department was transferred as a whole to the Ministry of National Defense, and became a part of the composition of this ministry. The documents stocked in the archives of the SSD, the vast network of informers, the potential services that could be rendered by the intelligence officers and, in the last analysis, the businesses of the Securitate could not remain unvalued, and the new power was quick to grasp this thing.<sup>7</sup>

The fate of the Securitate, which disappeared by itself without its disappearance being confirmed by a law, was shared by the former Communist party as well, for the same reason. The decree of dissolution of the Romanian Communist Party, signed under the pressure of the street on January 12, 1990, was abrogated after five days as a result of a decision of the Council of the National Salvation Front.<sup>8</sup> A possible dissolution would have entailed the issue of succession and the establishment by law of the way of dividing the patrimony of the Romanian Communist Party. In both cases, aside from the political reasons of the new power, which hesitated to bring about a real

split with the past, there existed one more reason. We would call it the privatization of the communist régime, in keeping with the pattern according to which such a process was unfolding at the time in the USSR, too.<sup>9</sup>

\*

A large number of Securitate operatives were recovered and utilized by the provisional power then, in the first months of the year 1990, being integrated in the structure of the “new” intelligence services and in the governmental apparatus, in the Ministries of Internal Affairs, Justice, Foreign Affairs, and Foreign Trade.<sup>10</sup> The intelligence services have taken over, almost entirely, the personnel and logistics of whole departments in the Securitate. In Romania, according to Law No. 51 of July 29, 1991 regarding the national security, no less than seven secret services operate (officially), as follows: Romanian Intelligence Service, Foreign Intelligence Service, Protection and Guard Service, as well as other three, in compliance with Article 6 of the said Law, developed at “the Ministry of National Defense, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the Ministry of Justice, by means of specialized internal structures”. There is, in addition, a separate structure, the Special Communications Service whose task is to ensure the protection of official communications. The first of these services, established with the accord of the Provisional Government and of the president of CNSF, Ion Iliescu, in the beginning of the month of February, was the intelligence service of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. This service took over 260 of the 566 officers of the Securitate of the Municipality of Bucharest.<sup>11</sup> The new service was officially headed by Admiral Cico Dumitrescu, but actually it was led from behind the scenes by Voican Voiculescu, assisted by his advisers – the Securitate General Nicolae Doicaru, former chief of the communist counter-espionage, and Colonel Viorel Tache.

The policy of assigning former Securitate operatives to governmental structures continued in parallel. In the following years, lots of Securitate operatives found refuge in the government and the local structures of the power or in the Romanian representations abroad. For example, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Foreign Trade, and the Ministry of Tourism appointed in August, 1993, a number of seventeen former high-ranking officers of the former Securitate in positions abroad, as military attachés or commercial counsellors. Another eleven were transferred to the Central of the Ministry of Foreign Trade, in leadership positions, strength-

ening the ranks of the Securitate officers already extant in these structures. Peter Ciobanu, a director in the Ministry of Foreign Trade, was known to be a former spy. Another two Securitate officers held important positions in the reform and finance system: Radu Herghelegiu was appointed coordinator at the Reform Department, and Petru Rareș – as director of Eximbank.<sup>12</sup> Practically, the structures of representation of Romania remained dominated by former Securitate operatives. The policy of the régime on that score was actually an explicit policy assumed in 1990, when as chief of the newly established External Intelligence Service was appointed the famous Mihai Caraman, the Romanian spy, who – in the 60's – caused the greatest prejudices to the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, managing to purloin a huge quantity of secret documents, which afterwards were delivered by Ceaușescu to the Soviets. This appointment, as well as the regrouping of the former Securitate operatives, was a clear signal to the West regarding the pro-Soviet orientation of the new power in Romania. In fact, our country was the last one to sign the dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty and the only country in the Soviet block that could sign, in April, 1991, a basic treaty with the USSR.

Let us revert, however, to the former Securitate. The Securitate operatives that were not employed in the structures of the intelligence services, in the central and territorial apparatus of the government or included in the lists of voters for elections, entered into the world of business. They came to constitute an “elite force”, dealing with everything that was more profitable in the market, from the bankrupting of state enterprises – by overvalued supply and sales contracts – to large-scale import-export operations and the control of privatization. Consequently, the “crisis period” through which the Securitate passed in December, 1989, did not last long.. The new power structures have very quickly understood the benefits of utilizing the specific capabilities of the Securitate operatives from the very moment they felt their position threatened by the re-establishment of the historical parties, in the conditions of political pluralism. The competition of these parties had to be annihilated, as far as it was possible without the violent implication of the state institutions, which imposed controlling and discrediting them, an action for which the SSD cadres were both trained and willing to do.

The complicity of the new authorities with the structures of the former Securitate resulted in actions that proved that the latter put themselves, unconditionally, in the service of the power. We would remind only the slandering campaign which became permanent in 1990-1992, typical of the former "D" (= disinformation) service, headed by the Securitate officer Mi-hail Stan, who in the meantime had become a general and deputy director of the RIS. Sometimes these attacks were verging on the absurd. Here are, in a succinct inventory, the preferred targets and themes of the slandering campaign: about the well-known dissident Doina Cornea it was affirmed that she had distributed money for political purposes and had gone about the country to buy enterprises, that in fact she was Jewish and, along with Radu Câmpeanu and Ion Rațiu – whose real name allegedly was Racz Janos – signed with a clerk of the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs a treaty stipulating a detailed "sale" of Romania's territory, for the benefit of the three. The fraud was published several times, in facsimile, in the NSF official newspapers, and was distributed in the big towns as an alleged manifest. In a similar vein, it was affirmed about Corneliu Coposu that he had lived almost his entire life in the West, without knowing the difficulties of the Romanians, occasion on which the syntagm of great popularity "You did not eat soya salami." was launched. In the official daily newspaper "Azi" of the NSF, Constantin Ticu Dumitrescu – the leader of the "Association of the Former Political Prisoners" – was denounced, by means of some fake photos, to have participated in the assassinations perpetrated by the legionnaires in 1940, omitting the fact that – at the time the assassinations took place – he was only 12.<sup>13</sup>

The years went by and as in the post-communist régime the occult power of the former Securitate increased, infiltrating parties, power structures, to say nothing about the coordination of the activity of the intelligence services in Romania, such means for the arsenal of the political police were no longer necessary; meanwhile the Securitate penetrated the Parliament, the Securitate lead from the Government, the Securitate executed the orders of the power inside the secret services, the Securitate privatized. Any attempt at breaking to pieces the huge occult power the Securitate had accumulated has so far ended in failure. In the first years after 1989, the Securitate operatives won immunity for the abuses committed in the past (which are not only far from being punished, as the unfolding of the trial in the case of the assassination – in 1985 – of an anti-communist dissident,

engineer Gheorghe Ursu shows, but they were not even seriously investigated. The (belated) setting up of a National Council for the Study of the Securitate Archives (NCSSA) with unveiling the activity of the communist political police in view was a failure: the new institution has no object of activity, since under various pretexts and with the tacit agreement of President Ion Iliescu, the secret services refuse to abide by the law and hand over the archives of the Securitate to the NCSSA. This protection of the past is only a part of the reward given by the power to the former Securitate for the services rendered by the latter in consolidating and regaining of power by the present-day social democrats, who are the inheritors – by direct filiation – of the former Communist party. Under the cover of a genuine conspiracy of silence, the object of which is constituted by the last years of the communist régime, authors and instigators of a long series of criminal abuses that the Romanian people was subjected to in the years of communism were maintained in the structures of the secret services as *specialists*, conducted their activities in the shadow of the power, becoming “honourable” businessmen or they came to be equally “respectable” politicians. The question, therefore, arises: How do the Năstase Government and President Iliescu intend to respond today to NATO’s requirements, which expressed its concern as regards the strong influence the former Securitate operatives still have in the Romanian society? Do they really want to do this? And if they want, are they in a position to do it?

Unfortunately, no declaration of President Iliescu or of the Prime Minister Adrian Năstase does touched this subject. The Romanian authorities rather insist upon laws of defending NATO secrets, bypassing the essential: those who represent a real danger for these secrets are the very Securitate operatives who guard them. Trained as rivals of NATO, as they betrayed Ceaușescu so can they betray the secrets of the Alliance.

The Securitate currently dominates the market economy.<sup>14</sup> When the declarations in Washington refer to corruption, they move over immediately to the theme of the former Securitate with which they implicitly connect bribe and name-dropping that took roots in Romania in the last ten years and underwent a prodigious flourishing during the transition. The privatization process the Securitate participated in is a carbon copy of the way the so-called transition took place, in numerous stages in the Soviet Union. The only exception is the non-violent character of this process in Romania’s case. A possible explanation of this non-violent character is the

fidelity of the private structures of the Securitate towards the new protectors, a fidelity increased by the fact that they were recovered and saved after December, 1989, by the new power, in conditions where the majority of the population requested the dissolution of the political police and the arrest of the Securitate operatives.

In policy or in business, the Securitate people act in accordance with their own rules, which have nothing to do with either democracy or market economy based on contracts. Those who stand in their way or those they need are either bought or compromised, as the case may be. Sources of corruption and onerous business, involved in smuggling cigarettes, diesel oil, alcohol and even weapons, bankrupting “advisers” or organizers of financial embezzlements masked as investment funds, always with a sizeable political and logistical support, the Securitate people are the fifth power in the Romanian state today. They brought about, among other things, the bankruptcy of Bancorex, the most important bank with state capital in Romania, which disappeared as a result of granting huge loans without security, especially to some companies, where former party activists and Securitate operatives were share-holders as well as directly to officers in the intelligence services, magistrates or policemen. According to the report of the International Monetary Fund for the year 2000, the bankruptcy of this bank cost Romania’s budget two billion USD.

This fact would not have been possible without political protection and command. The links of the Securitate operatives with the Iliescu régime are as durable as the ones in the past with the Ceaușescu régime, if not even more durable as they are based not only on a simple military subordination but on common interests. In the process of privatization of communism, the non-violent character of the transfer of the state patrimony from the régime of socialist ownership to the one of private ownership (unlike the situation in the former USSR), either of funds, accounts, profitable business or buildings find its explanation in the close link between the Securitate operatives who chose the way of business, their colleagues that remained in the intelligence services and the political protectors of both categories, they themselves exponents of the old communist elite. Between these chain-rings there are no competitive relationships, but collaboration ones, based on close personal relationships, with a history that has old roots and which the moment December 1989 did not modify, but opened for them a new dimension.

When a name of a former Securitate operatives in secret services or power structures is compromised by press publication, he is saved by a “rotation of cadres”, to take him out of the visible position but not out of the influence and expertise zones as well. It happened thus in the case of General Victor Marcu.<sup>15</sup> He was born on June 28, 1943, in the village of Ulmi, Dâmbovița County. His real family name is Butucea. He graduated in 1970 from the Law School of Bucharest University, and worked for a while at the Direction II of counter-intelligence in the economic sectors in the Securitate, from where he was transferred to the Direction of Foreign Intelligence on March 15, 1975. Here he worked as an officer, chief of department at UM (military unit) 0626, a special unit that was concerned with operative actions of annihilating “hostile emigration”. Practically, UM 0626 dealt with the identification and assassination of the persons sentenced to death by Ceaușescu, either because they deserted from the Securitate or their activities against the régime in Romania made the dictator crazy. After 1989, he was “recovered”, becoming – as from May 29, 1992 – a RIS general and deputy of Virgil Măgureanu. He was removed from the Interior Intelligence Service (IIS) for the dubious businesses he had made with the Arab Mafia. The Năstase Government appointed this presumptive assassin to the position of Secretary General of the Authority for Privatization and Administration of State Participations. The appointment of Marcu was justified by his chief by the fact that the credit-worthiness of the clients should be verified, and the intelligence protection of the authority must be ensured. He was changed from his position only after September 11, 2001, when his notorious and so close links with the Arab smuggling connections in Romania – which, very probably, supplied terrorist networks – got a different relevance. It is superfluous for us to imagine that these links were not known by the authorities at the moment he was appointed to his position.

The former Securitate operatives supported and maintained in Romania the climate of corruption in which they move like fish in water, in order to feed with immense amounts of money the political class detaining power. They make, practically, the connection between the political and business zones, situated on the fringes of law, with great potentials of gaining quick profit. Any action against the Securitate-Mafia groups failed for this very reason, so as not to “cut” the substantial incomes that fed the welfare of the social-democratic dignitaries. The number of villas, luxury cars, and the size of their bank accounts are directly proportional to the degree of close-

ness of these links, sometimes based on personal affinities, as in the case of premier Adrian Năstase, counselled even today by the godfather of one of his sons, Colonel Ristea Priboi, although Premier Adrian Năstase knows very well the request of the North Atlantic Alliance and of the European partners to diminish the pole of power of the former Securitate operatives.

After the elections in 2000, a simple enumeration of the cases where former Securitate operatives were appointed in key positions is enlightening as regards the coming back in force of the officer constellation that changed the logo of their former arm, two crossed submachine guns, into the three social-democratic roses. Between 1996 and 2000, they put together even a paramilitary structure within the framework of the present government party, which was in the opposition at the time, more precisely within the framework of a *Department for Guard, Protection, and Propaganda of the Romanian Party of Social Democracy*, which thus utilized the compromise and disinformation means of the Securitate to the full. After the success in the elections, many of these officers were reactivated in the intelligence services.

There is a fundamental contradiction between the declarations of official persons regarding the hot desire of entering into NATO and the reactivation of the former Securitate operatives. There are numerous examples on that score. One of the most notable cases is that of the above-mentioned Securitate officer Ristea Priboi. He was born on May 9, 1947, in the village of Brădești in Dolj County, graduated from the Securitate school at Băneasa in 1968, and obtained – in 1971 – a diploma of graduation in law. A year before, on January 1, 1970, he was appointed officer in the External Intelligence Direction (EID). He was assigned espionage missions in his quality as cadre of EID, in England (from 1974 to 1978), then in Sweden, France, Spain, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, and Greece. December 1989 found him ready to put himself in the service of the new power, which at the time seemed more interested in the preservation of the Warsaw Treaty (the dissolution of which was signed last by Romania), than in the integration into NATO. His last mission, this time as an officer of the External Intelligence Service (EIS) was to Yugoslavia, where – in 1994 – he “cemented” the friendly relationship between the Iliescu and the Miloshevič régimes and contributed to the organization of fuel smuggling to former Yugoslavia, in a deliberate act of infringement of the embargo. This action was conducted in

1995 by the Romanian authorities, with the help of the secret services and of some private companies controlled by former Securitate officers. After he was put in the reserve, Priboi put his expertise in the service of Adrian Năstase, becoming a counsellor of the latter in “issues of national security”. Prime Minister Năstase tried to support him to obtain the position of chairman of the Parliamentary Commission for the Control of the EIS, and only the prompt reaction of the press prevented this from happening.

When he was a Securitate operative, Ristea Priboi was – among other things – the deputy of the chief of that department in EID, which was concerned with “Radio Free Europe” in a period corresponding to that in which Romanian espionage organized, among other things, not only the bomb attack at the Munich headquarters of Radio Free Europe, perpetrated by Carlos the Jackal and coordinated by the Securitate, but also attempts to assassinate some employees of Radio Free Europe or of the dissident writer Paul Goma. The author’s investigations pointed out that Priboi, habitué, mentor, and hunting mate of Premier Adrian Năstase, conducted – in his quality as Securitate operative – not only espionage actions against Western countries but also political police activity in Romania. He was involved in the actions of the Securitate against a large group of intellectuals in 1981.<sup>16</sup> Two of the protesters of the revolt that took place at Brasov in 1987 assert that they were investigated by him, and one of them accused him of participation in torture acts.<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, Ristea Priboi swore on his investiture as deputy in the Romanian Parliament, that he did not collaborate with the structures of the former Securitate. Priboi thinks with cynicism that he did not commit perjury since there is a difference, he says, between “to collaborate” and “to be employed”. Symptomatically, Ion Iliescu and Adrian Năstase joined their forces in defending Priboi, rightly accused by the press, the civil society, and a part of the political opposition. Ion Iliescu, for example, urged us “to free ourselves from the emotional and psychological burden that lies heavily on the climate in the country”, maintaining that “a man should not be blamed” for working with the Securitate. This tone differs from the tone of the declarations regarding the integration of Romania into NATO.

Furthermore, after Priboi was installed as head of the government Adrian Năstase promoted still another counsellor who had formerly been a spy. Constantin Silinescu, a division general put in the reserve in 1977, when he was a deputy director of the EIS, was born on March 30, 1948, at Potcoava in the Olt County. He graduated from the Securitate School at Băneasa

(1966-1974), from the Law School (1972), as well as from the Special School for Spies (1973-1974); afterwards, he was sent on espionage missions in the West. First of all, together with his colleague Ristea Priboi, with whom he teamed up for espionage activity in Great Britain (1974-1984), under the cover of Secretary III of the Romanian Embassy at London, then he was sent to Czechoslovakia (1979-1984) – under diplomatic cover as well – and as from 1985 until 1989 he made various trips on mission in the former USSR, Bulgaria, China, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Mongolia, and the USA. After the publication in the press and especially as a result of the presidential adviser, Ioan Talpeș's opposition on issues of national security, whose relationship with Silinescu – the daughter of whom had divorced his son – was characterized by strong adversity, the former spy lost his position as an adviser on “special issues” of the Prime Minister. In exchange for this loss, he became a director of the National Agency for Environment Protection, an activity for which he suddenly discovered his expertise, also publishing a book on this subject, for which – however – he was accused of plagiarism.

The list of Securitate operatives that were reactivated after 2000 in the power structures may continue with Marian Ureche. In the beginning of the 80's, he worked at the Securitate of the Municipality of Bucharest. In December, 1989, Ureche was deputy of the commander of Direction I of the State Securitate Department, which was concerned with persons inconvenient to the régime. As the College of the National Council for the Study of Securitate Archives has recently proved, Marian Ureche inspired and participated in the political police actions, including the political persecution of the philosopher Ioan Petru Culianu. In 1994, he became a shareholder of the Argirom Holding, along with the former Minister of Internal Affairs Doru Ioan Tărăcilă and the social democrat deputy Iosif Armaș, one of the richest Romanian Members of Parliament. At the same time, Marian Ureche was a professor at the National Intelligence Institute, the cadres school of the Romanian Intelligence Service. He contributed towards the establishment of the Argirom company with a capital input of 179,820,000 Lei, a huge amount of money at the time, when the average wages per economy did not exceed 15,000 Lei, which could not be justified by Ureche's licit income. Subsequently, Ureche transferred his shares to his wife. After the elections in 2000, he became chief of the Independent Protection and Anti-corruption Service in the Ministry of Justice, from where he resigned in December, 2003, as a result of the author's publication about his past as a Securitate

operative. Marian Ureche's businesses did not escape the eye of the press either. Another business refers to Ureche's involvement not only in the administering of a number of contracts to import oil products, but also of oil export to Yugoslavia during the embargo period. A company controlled by him was credited by the State with nearly 22,000,000 USD. The money has never been paid back.<sup>18</sup>

Marian Ureche is not the only chief of a secret service to be compromised by his past in the political police. After the elections in 2000, President Iliescu appointed as chief of the Special Communications Service General Tudor Tănase, who was a member of General Nicolae Pleșiță's team at the time the latter headed the External Intelligence Direction and was in touch with the terrorist Carlos. Tănase joined the Securitate operatives that had worked as spies in the West, and were members of specialists team, with whom Iliescu and Năstase sought NATO admission. The number of reasons for bewilderment in connection with the way the Euro-Atlantic integration of Romania will take place equals the number of Securitate operatives reactivated under the generous umbrella of the Social-Democratic Party, to whom must be added the promotion to extremely important positions of official persons who, in the past, declared their visible hostility towards the NATO Alliance. Ion Iliescu appointed as chief of the Romanian Intelligence Service Radu Timofte, who had violent anti-NATO reactions during the conflict in Kosovo; in the same situation is the present Minister of Defense, Ioan Mircea Pașcu.

An unexpected pretext used by the authorities to justify the reactivation of the former Securitate operatives as part of the state policy by invoking a national necessity was offered by the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. The actions of reactivating a number of notorious Securitate operatives, and of promoting them in command positions were accompanied by the ever greater possibilities of action granted to the secret services under the pretext of an "antiterrorist strategy".<sup>19</sup> At any rate, the terrorist attacks made visible the duplicitous policy of the authorities as regards the organized networks of the "Arab Mafia", which enjoyed immunity in Romania in exchange for the exclusion of Romania from the map of countries targeted for terrorist actions. This policy was inherited from the Ceaușescu régime through the agency of the former Securitate operatives. Ceaușescu's privileged relationships with the Arab world in the 80's are known; they existed in a period of external isolation of Romania from the West and even from

the partners in the communist block. Our country could not help being a propitious terrain to Islamic terrorism, all the more so as – from 1980 up to the Revolution – more than half a million Arab students passed through Romania. All of these students were under the magnifying glass of the Securitate, which utilised some of them as informers or as channels of communication with the Arab secret services and with the international terrorist networks. After 1989, part of these students chose to remain in Romania and became citizens of it. Most of the Arabs living in Romania have no affinities for fundamentalist movements, have no connections with terrorist movements or illicit businesses. But, until 1996, some of them developed such businesses and connections under the very protection of the Romanian authorities. And it was not by accident that Ossama bin Laden mentioned Romania among the countries from which Al Qaeda had received financing. The organization of the networks of financial support was the price paid for taking Romania out of the map of the countries targeted for terrorist attacks.

A few days after the tragic events on September 11, 2001, one of the most authorized voices, more precisely the voice of the director of the Romanian Intelligence Service, Radu Timofte, declared that Romania was not exposed to terrorist attacks, but also that the terrorist groups had never been supported from Romania's territory. Subsequently, he was to change his declaration. He had probably discovered in the meantime that there were close relationships between the former Securitate and Arab terrorism. On September 20, 2001, the author published – in an important Romanian daily newspaper – an article<sup>20</sup> directly referring to the support granted by the Ion Iliescu régime to the Arab Mafia until 1996. The following day, RIS published the following communiqué: "The Service regretfully remarks that from an excess that can only be harmful, authors of some so-called sensational revelations or signatories of documentary materials and investigations-analyses, entered – perhaps involuntarily – into a dangerous game of communication of false information that could be detrimental to the national security and the foreign relationships of Romania." After one more day, the author was the object of a denunciation made by Romania's Presidency to the General Magistracy for *divulgement of State secrets*. This means, implicitly, the recognition of these links. The prosecutors decided, however, that no crime had been committed by the publication of that evidence, and the author was not subpoenaed to any investigation on that

score. Actually, two months after the terrorist attacks on September 11 the RIS director, Radu Timofte, finally admitted that “important amounts of money” from Romania fed accounts abroad of integrist organizations: “Important amounts of money flowed from [Romania] to bank accounts abroad of some international organizations, possibly of a terrorist nature.”<sup>21</sup>

The raising of funds for Arab terrorism was possible especially during the Ion Iliescu’s previous mandates. As it is apparent from the numerous revelations published in the Romanian press of the time, smuggling was a state policy. The power won as a result of the elections was used not for fulfilling the generous electoral promises, but for making easier the illegal business, which brought immense amounts of money to governmental officials or persons holding other positions of public dignities. Many of these illegal actions were perpetrated by genuine Mafia-type networks, organized by Arab citizens. One of these Arab citizens came himself to be a dignitary of the Iliescu régime. Kamel Kader, born on March 9, 1960 at Rafah in the Ghazzah strip, the son of Ahmed Mohammed and of Aisha, has the only known permanent domicile at 31 Mureş Street, Timișoara (at least this was the situation in 1993, when he was granted the Romanian citizenship). He graduated from the Medical School at Timișoara, obtaining a doctor’s diploma. He was an informer of the Securitate officers Traian Sima and Radu Tinu. One of the “favours” afforded to him in exchange for reports about his Romanian and Arab colleagues were the obtention of visas and passports for the entry into Romania of other Palestinian citizens (against payment), through the agency of Colonel Orleanu, chief of the Timiș Passport Direction. During his academic years, Kamel Kader openly introduced himself as leader of the Palestinian students in Romania, but for his friends he did not hide either his quality of member of two terrorist groups (Al Fatah and Abu Nidal) or his quality of former combatant of the West Front in Lebanon. In fact, both before and after 1989 he maintained more or less open relationships with the officials of the Organization for the Liberation of Palestine and afterwards with the officials of the Palestinian Authority. The relation became more frequent after the arrival at Bucharest (on February 26, 1990) of the official Palestinian representative, Fouad al Bittar, but there also followed confidential links with officers of RIS and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, generally originating in the former Securitate. As a matter of fact, probably “not even he knew for whom he was working”, asserts a former intelligence officer who knew him at the time.<sup>22</sup>

Kader intensely concerned himself with smuggling via Romania's Western connections. Just like another big smuggler, Zaher Iskandarani, at once a Syrian intelligence officer and a Securitate agent, Kader contributed big amounts of money to the electoral campaign of the Social Democrats in 1992. As it was asserted, his close relationships with the chief of the Presidential electoral campaign at the time, Viorel Hrebenciuc, brought for Ion Iliescu – from the Palestinian community in Romania – a “contribution” of about one million dollars. As a reward, for three years – from 1992 to 1994 – Kamel Kader had positions with both the Presidency and the Government, where he filled – in separate offices – the function of “adviser”, representative of the “Palestinian minority in Romania”. At the Government he could be seen in the ministerial cabinets, he came in through the official entrance, armed with gun and a cell phone, a rarity at the time, without subjecting himself to any control and having the regimen of a Romanian state dignitary, with direct access to the telex and fax machines of the Government. In 1994, he controlled fourteen companies at Timișoara and Bucharest, he obtained – thanks to his function – sizeable loans from the banks controlled by the Government, and was the main beneficiary of the export licenses for timber, calves, and little rams, licenses that he either ceded to another Arab businessmen or utilized through his own companies.

The decision of taking back the position of adviser with the Government and the Presidency of Kamel Kader was made only in December 1994, without it being possible to avoid a notorious scandal, which put the authorities in a delicate posture as it had been proved that Kamel Kader had had unhindered access to secret documents. In the meantime, several confidential acts had disappeared from the Government building, a fact that subsequently brought about their “declassification” so that the social democratic dignitaries may not be blamed for complicity in espionage. After this scandal, Kamel Kader left for Palestine, where he became an adviser on intelligence issues to Yassir Arafat.

The list of the Arab Mafia businesses, especially the actions of smuggling cigarettes, supported from the level of leadership of the Romanian Intelligence Service through General Marcu, is impressive. Sometimes, with the money obtained weapons were bought even from Romania, as it happened in the case of the network organized in 1993 by the Lebanese Elias Nassar. The traffickers, also in the cases where they were caught, escaped

punishment, and were offered the possibility of leaving Romania. Nassar was set free in 1994, after he had paid – in the accounts of the Romanian Intelligence Service – the amount of three million dollars. Subsequently, another big smuggler under investigation, Victor Michelle Issa, was freed from custody and left the country, shortly after having sent a birthday letter to President Ion Iliescu.<sup>23</sup>

These close relationships and the toleration of the business and financial networks of the Arab “Mafia” in Romanian territory, were part of the strategy continued after 1990 by those intelligence officers in Romania, who came from the former Securitate and had – from the past – close links with the Arab students. The unwritten non-aggression pact concluded by the Securitate operatives in the intelligence services with the terrorist networks, which did not exclude the possibility of promoting personal interests, since a lot of people got rich themselves, too, as a result of these illegal transactions, proved its deeply noxious character on September 11, 2001, in the USA, and on March 11, 2004, in Spain.

During the whole transition period, Romania was exposed to the huge and constant pressure of the structures of the former activists and of the communist *nomenklatura*, which dictated the decisions in both the internal and external policy and strategy. On the other side, in the Parliament, Government, Justice, secret services, and press, large groups of former Securitate operatives can actively influence making decisions on things they are interested in. Over the years, these structures constituted and consolidated themselves in informal power networks. They are, by themselves, a decision factor, a fifth power. The force and harmfulness of this power was signalled in several circumstances. During Bill Clinton’s visit to Bucharest, Jim Steinberg, deputy adviser for national security of the White House, declared for example that “the Romanian secret services are full of former Securitate officers, to whom no NATO secrets can be entrusted”. As they were, so they remained. A divorce between the Securitate and its present political protectors in the ex-communist Social Democratic Party is highly improbable. That is why I tried to imagine a life scene with Securitate operatives in today’s Romania, freshly admitted to NATO. It was strange: my former Securitate investigator (currently a banker) and a former subordinate of his (still active in the secret services) told jokes to Americans in the break of a football match, the result of which

they already knew as it was they who had negotiated it. They were eating sunflower seeds from paper bags bearing the mark “top secret” and were wearing American “Red Bull” caps.

**Piotr Naimski**

## **Poland Fifteen Years After the Round Table: Where is the End of the Transition?**

On April 7, the “Gazeta Wyborcza” daily has published an anniversary photo collage. The full-color President Kwaśniewski gives an address to the balding and grey-haired audience. In the background, the black-and-white photograph taken inside the presently Presidential, but formerly known as tsarist Governor’s Palace with the 57 participants of the 1989 Round Table Talks. Kwaśniewski declared his satisfaction and pride in having been able to participate in the event that took place 15 years ago.

Of the 57 participants in the negotiations, 17 have passed away. The anniversary reunion saw general Wojciech Jaruzelski and general Czesław Kiszczak, Jerzy Urban, Stanisław Ciosek and Zbigniew Sobotka meeting Bronisław Geremek, Władysław Frasyniuk, Zbigniew Bujak and Andrzej Wielowieyski. Lech Wałęsa was not present, having no intention of meeting with Aleksander Kwaśniewski, Jacek Kuroń was battling an illness, Adam Michnik had to attend to some important business, while Tadeusz Mazowiecki simply did not show up. The fifteenth anniversary of the Round Table Talks passed virtually unnoticed. Most apparently, the widely publicized, and not so long ago, conviction that this particular piece of furniture deserves a special place as the symbol of a turning point in Poland’s history, is unable to withstand the passing of time. And perhaps the now evident crisis on the Poland’s political scene does not encourage anniversary festivities to celebrate the birth of that conviction.

The Prime Minister of Poland, Leszek Miller, of the post-communist Democratic Left Alliance (SLD) declared his resignation as of May 2. The Alliance itself observes opinion poll ratings that fall below the electoral threshold, prompting SLD to split into two separate parties. The polls give lead to the populist Samoobrona (Self-Defense) party, headed by Andrzej Lepper – a Polish hybrid of Meciar, Paksas and our own Tymiński, the latter running as a presidential candidate in 1990. The post-Solidarity parties do not seem to take pride in their descent, remembering the defeat of the Solidarity Election Action (AWS) in the election of two and a half years ago. In fact, they have

undergone yet another 'reorganization' scheme. The largest, apart from the post-communist, parties in the Sejm, or the lower house of the Polish Parliament, include the Civic Platform, Samoobrona /Self-Defence/, Law and Justice, as well as the League of Polish Families. Recently, senator Romaszewski, along with some friends of his, undertook to establish a new party by the name of Law and Justice. Intriguing, how close we have come to the Italian practice in the aftermath of the collapse of Italy's political system in the early 1990's. Instead of the 'olive branch' we can probably expect an 'oak leaf', or something just as accurately describing the helplessness of the politicians seeking the areas of public life that might still have not been contaminated by scandals. The public opinion is constantly shaken by yet another politico-mafia-related corruption swindle. In effect, the public is able to learn the hitherto unknown details of the mechanisms centered around mafia-clique social relations, that all too often come to permeate and substitute only theoretically observed constitutional, democratic procedures. All the more often, the spotlight turns towards the question: whose Poland is this?

The beginning of the new era was itself symbolical marking an anniversary. On August 31, 1988, eight years after the August Agreements that paved the road towards establishing the Solidarity, general Czesław Kiszczak met with Lech Wałęsa. The former was accompanied by Stanisław Ciosek, while the latter by bishop Jerzy Dąbrowski. The meeting was to end the wave of strikes, and communicate to the public the decision made by the communist authorities to end the isolation of Wałęsa, thus acknowledging the existence of "constructive and liberal opposition in Poland". In parallel, an announcement was made about the preparations for the Round Table Talks between the 'governing coalition' (a coalition of Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP/PZPR) and its satellites) on the one hand, and the 'opposition Solidarity' on the other. At this stage yet, the generals had no intention of submitting to the postulate of reviving the Independent Self-Governing Trade Union "Solidarity". More willing were they in submitting to the suggestions of their "older brothers" in Moscow, who, with Gorbachev at their lead, had for some years been trying to redirect the Russian empire away from the Bolshevik standards towards a more modern model of the party, the state and the imperial ties. "Perestroika" was making it to Poland – Poland run by generals.

PUWP was making thorough and due preparations, awaiting the "break-through". First of all, the several years long process of inducting the future

interlocutor representing the opposition came to the end. The underground community of the martial law was utterly exhausted by the years of playing to survive. And the time was on the side of the general Kiszczak's secret police. For the most part, the people surrounding Lech Wałęsa came from what Adam Michnik termed as the "lay Left", the middle-age dissidents of the Communist party, in some cases people active within the democratic opposition of the years 1976 – 1988. The circle of "constructive opposition" failed to encompass the distinguished leaders of the "Solidarity", chosen in democratic election of 1981 as the movement's executive. At the end of the 1980's, some of these people stood behind the initiative of creating the "Task Group of the National Commission of the "Solidarity" Trade Union", a rival structure to Walesa's circle. It would be interesting today to find all of those 107 members of the National Commission of the "Solidarity" Trade Union from December 13, 1981. How many of them made it to the "Solidarity" at the end of 1988?

The action plan of the III Department (secret political police) at the Ministry of Internal Affairs for the year 1989 (sic!), a plan prepared in November 1988, considered "a more wide-scale molding of the constructive opposition groups, which [...] were to give support to the reformatory undertakings of the political and state authorities".<sup>1</sup> December 18, 1988, saw the creation of the Civic Committee with the Chairman of the "Solidarity" Trade Union, that is a Committee that would work with Lech Walesa. 135 persons were invited to join, with Bronisław Geremek, Jacek Kuron and Adam Michnik being the structure's animators.<sup>2</sup> An evaluation prepared at that time by the Ministry of Internal Affairs under general Kiszczak, concluded that "a dialogue could be established" with 63 of them, 40 were considered to be "extremist", as to a further 10 of them, allegedly they were informers of the Security Services. The membership in the Committee represented an agreement reached between the "lay Left" group headed by Geremek, Michnik and Kuron, the catholic circles connected to such periodicals as "Tygodnik Powszechny", "Znak" and "Wież" (including, among others, Jerzy Turowicz and Tadeusz Mazowiecki) and some of the underground activists of the martial law period (including the Kaczynski brothers and Lech Walesa himself). Representatives of the Episcopate were invited to take part in the proceedings of the Committee, which was brought into being in one of the churches in Warsaw. The leading role was to be played by the "lay Left", whose representatives took advantage, on more than one occasion, of the acquaintances with the

activists of the Communist party. The initial reluctance of general Kiszczak to accept the participation of Michnik and Kuroń in the talks, was overtaken by complete fraternization, one that often caused repulsion even among adherents of compromising with the government.

Within the PUWP, certain changes were introduced, with the proper explanation for the rank and file, holding that new times are approaching, thus necessitating flexible tactics when dealing with the “enemies of the system”. Yet not all were to accept the new concepts, and those who did not were leaving the ranks of the party at the end of 1988 and the beginning of 1989 – leaving with the attitude that was far from hostility, especially that decent living was to be assured for the comrades, regardless of their parting.

In parallel, a wide-scale plan was undertaken, aiming to provide financial means for “our people” and party activities. Numerous joint ventures were established, nesting comfortable positions for the then as well as today’s post-communist left activists (only to give the example of Jerzy Szmajdzinski, presently heading the Ministry of Defense, or Marek Siwiec, today with the National Security Bureau in the chancellery of President Kwasniewski). On more than one occasion, it turned out, that those newly created ventures, taking in money transfers straight from the party accounts, employed family members and good friends of communist activists. The cash was transferred to companies which either underwent consequent ownership changes, aiming to cover the origin of the financial assets, or went bankrupt, with the funds that were transferred by the post-communist party (Social Democracy of the Republic of Poland - SDRP) simply disappearing.<sup>3</sup> A number of the scandals being presently uncovered is rooted in those times.

Spontaneous economic privatization was also characteristic. Agros, the foreign trade company, serves as a good example. Under communism, such government-run companies were continually used as cover for intelligence activities. Hence the special care given to them by the security services. The Agros company was privatized by issuing employee stocks. The board of the new stock company was in majority composed of the people directly connected with the communist special services. This, as may be sadly concluded, was then the norm. However, in the first half of the 1990’s, George Soros, a well-known philanthropist and a profoundly successful financier, declared his intention to invest in the Central and Eastern Europe. Perhaps by sheer luck, the first dozen millions of dollars he chose to put in the Agros

company run in Poland by the secret political police. Is that a coincidence or a rule?

Special attention was also given to the media. In March of 1989, Janusz Roszkowski, the chairman of the Radio and Television Broadcasting Committee, wrote: "The attempt at institutional presence of the opposition within the organizational structures of the Committee has been averted. Declarations given to the Solidarity opposition are general enough to assure proper arena for maneuvering, at least for the time being".<sup>4</sup> This "time being" came to last for some 15 years, and despite of the numerous organizational and legal changes, the domination of the post-communist circles in the electronic media in Poland does not seem to be fading.

At the close of the Round Table Talks, 33.8% of the people in Poland held to the belief, that the agreement will help to solve the key problems of the country.<sup>5</sup> The Poles were extremely tired with the everyday struggle to support their families, with the struggle for a piece of bread and a pair of shoes for the children.

Only after some years, we saw the publication of the photographs made during Round Table Talks held in a secret service managed villa located in Magdalenka, in the proximity of Warsaw. A well-laid table, endless toasts, laughing faces and merry gestures of fraternity on behalf of general Kiszczak and the representatives of the "Solidarity opposition side". Its leaders thought back then that they have just reached the desired end – having established cooperation with the reformatory wing of the Communist party, incidentally the wing represented by the long standing head of the communist security services. Such were the beginning days of the Republic of Poland – often referred to as the Third Republic.

On June 4, 1989 Poland was facing with an election, held in accordance with the principles agreed upon at the Round Table. To satisfy the communist stance, the election was to be "non-confrontational". In practice, the opposition was allowed to have candidates running for a mere 35% of the total number of seats in the lower house of the parliament. It goes without saying, that the communists had their 65% guaranteed, and still put officially independent candidates to compete for the seats of the opposition. It was also agreed that the election to the Senate will be unconstrained under distinctive electoral regulations. The Civic Election Committee, having Solidarity origins, won all that was to be won. In the first round acquired 160 out of 161 seats available for the opposition in the lower house, and 92 out of 100 in the Sen-

ate. Yet more important is the fact that the attempt to force through the so called national slate was derailed, with 33 out of 35 communist candidates on this list acquiring less than the mandatory 50% of the votes. The national slate featured prominent PUWP personas and activists of other satellite parties, which were hoped to have an easy guarantee of being elected.

With the announcement of the results, in a spontaneous impulse, a young and popular actress came to proclaim on national television the “end of communism in Poland”. That night, many Poles felt a profound satisfaction, while the hopes for a change in the situation of the country were further heightened.

Yet on the very day after the results were made public, practically both sides of the Round Table Agreement began considering, soon jointly, the possibility of returning to the terms of the accord established two month earlier. The result of this particular joint venture was a scheme of significant complexity – thus the Council of State (formally the highest authority in the communist state) was allowed to change the electoral regulations before the second round, allowing the communist side to reinstate the candidates running for the seats under the national slate. The Poles were deeply disappointed, believing to have been stripped off of their success.

The June 18 round saw a mere 25% of the eligible voters attending the election. In the end, the opposition formally won all that it was allowed to: 161 seats in the lower house, 99 in the Senate, and it had a certain number of “favorably disposed” representatives on the part of the communist side. The remarkable success in acquiring parliamentary representation took over the social and political realities. Voter attendance in the first round reached 62.7%, with the candidates of the Civic Election Committee acquiring 60% of the votes. This means that 37.6% of the eligible voters voted against the communists. At the same time, an equal number (37.3%) did not attend the elections. The communists received the support of 25% of the eligible voters. Only having seen such a breakdown of the results, the true meaning of the June '89 election comes to light. We won but the nation was found to be roughly divided into three camps of equal size. The active supporters of departure from the times of communism and the building of a new, independent state, constituted a third of the nation. A similar evaluation of the results in the first elections in, let us say Slovakia, shows a significantly smaller proportion of the supporters of “novelty”, approximately 20%.

During the June 5 meeting of the Central Committee of PUWP, Aleksander Kwasniewski was to say: "The issue of utter importance seems to be a need of preventing spontaneous demonstrations, following the announcement of the election results, which neither side would be able to control. The opposition dreads it as well".<sup>6</sup>

At a press conference on June 5, Lech Walesa declared: "'Solidarity' shall not get in the way of the government and intends to remain in opposition".<sup>7</sup>

All the while, a series of disappointments continued with the infringements made on the freedom of expressing one's joy, and more importantly, availing of the electoral victory. In July, with the help of the "Solidarity" members in both houses, the National Assembly elected general Jaruzelski for president by a majority of a single vote. This was more than a normal person was able to comprehend. It came to be believed, that the opposition leaders became active participants in the dilatory game, thus unreasonably, in light of the election results, complying with the demands of the governmental side. It needs to be admitted that even part of the Church hierarchy held to the position that discretion and continual work will serve better than prompt availing of the weakness on the part of the governmental side. That was the time, when some began to state the question about the end of the transition. In any case, that end was out of sight, lost in the uncertain future. We only began moving, and the active and anti-communist part of the nation was hinted at that it would be for the best if it stayed out. The Poles had their hopes too high, in the view of the high contracting at the Round Table parties. Consequently, many of the active members of the opposition resigned from politics. I dare state that the best left, the negative results thereof still being felt today.

It was not long before the Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki declared that a "thick line" should mark off the past – the past, for which his government can take no responsibility. The devious practice in public life would soon have the words of the Prime Minister understood to indicate a "thick line" marking off the responsibility of the people behind the indecencies and crimes of the communist dictatorship. The communists who have undergone a metamorphosis, were allowed to keep the money, the buildings and the posts in the administration and the economy. The communist secret services was to submit itself for verification, one that would too often be a mere *pro forma* process, allowing a significant part of the functionaries to find employment in the formally new institutions. The remaining were

quick to establish and find employment *en masse* in the rapidly expanding market of private “security agencies”. In the privatization process that was underway, the people of the communist party structure were often privileged, etc.

The politicians with “Solidarity” origins, having endured the first shock of the only apparent breakthrough, began their struggle for survival, with no money, no structures, no access to the media, no experience in administering or governing. On numerous occasions, the newly founded post-Solidarity parties were being devastated by the remains of the communists’ agents working from inside. Most unfortunately, some of the active members of the opposition are still unable to break the dependency ties that date back to the beginning days of the new Poland.

The first head of the government after the “breakthrough” was a Prime Minister of the Polish People’s Republic! In the Fall of 1989, Prime Minister Mazowiecki made a visit to Moscow with the aim of prolonging the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance with the Soviet Union. Only on December 29, 1989 was the Polish parliament to change the name of the state from Polish People’s Republic to Republic of Poland. Many came to refer to it as the Third Republic of Poland (with the Second Republic of Poland dating back to the interwar years 1918-1939).

In December of 1990, during the first truly free elections in the past 50 years, Poles chose Lech Walesa as their president. Admittedly, everyone was happy, except for, perhaps, the supporters of the communist candidate, Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz (now the Minister of Foreign Affairs), the defeated Tadeusz Mazowiecki, and some of the “Solidarity” members familiar with Walesa’s direct contacts with the secret police in the past. Part of this happiness could be attributed to the belief in Walesa, and part to the ability of containing the threat brought about by Stanisław Tyminski, a person molded by circles close to the former secret police to represent the saviour of the nation. Having won the election, Walesa gave a toast: “Into your hands, and into our throat!”. As millions of Poles watched this spectacle on television, many felt a cold chill running down their spine.

The myth finally fell into ruin in May of 1992, when President Walesa took a stand that publicly opposed the government of Jan Olszewski, the first one to attempt to part with the Round Table Compromise. Walesa was to defend strongly the view that Russians should have the right to establish free enterprises founded on the assets of the ex-Soviet military bases.

Under the pressure exercised by the Prime Minister, the President had to give in, signing an agreement in Moscow that was advantageous to Poland. However, in June of that year, opposing the vetting procedure aimed against former agents of the communist secret services and initiated at the order of the lower house in the parliament, the President was successful in overthrowing the cabinet. The result of the night-time voting over the motion to dismiss the government was a dramatic proof of the great divide between the supporters of the “thick line”, entangled in the communist past, and the adherents to the “speeding up of the transition”, the latter sadly remaining a minority. Gone were hopes of concluding the transition process in a time frame that would be at all predictable.

Fifteen years have gone by. The Presidential office is occupied by Aleksander Kwasniewski, one of the ministers in the last communist government, the chairman of the post-communist party in the first half of the 1990's. Two and a half years ago, Leszek Miller once the secretary and a member of the Politburo at the Central Committee of the PUWP, formed government following a crashing victory by the Democratic Left Alliance (SLD) post-communists over the ruling coalition under Jerzy Buzek. Miller's party lost the support of the voters in a time much shorter than anyone dared to expect. The past year and a half has witnessed a growing wave of information about the ever new scandals, swindles, public lies and misdeeds, about the exploitation of publicly held positions in the administrations for private, caucus and even criminal ends. The post-communist activists of the Democratic Left Alliance are constantly searching for new forms of activity. It may not be disregarded that perhaps Poland's entry into the EU will also further the process of yet another transformation of this political group. The infighting for control of the new party structure, as well as over which remaining part of the Alliance has the “legitimate” right to be the successor as a political umbrella for the post-communist circles, results in the public opinion ability to see much more practices being uncovered than it hitherto was able to. The Prime Minister was forced to resign as of May 2, primarily due to the split-up in the ranks of his own parliamentary club. Active counseling, aimed at forming a new government, has been undertaken by the presidential candidate Marek Belka. Józef Oleksy (a former Prime Minister, forced to resign in 1995 on the basis of accusations as to his contacts with the Russian secret agents) is appointed the new Speaker of the Lower House. It seems that even the hidden actors of the post-communist

group has become engaged in the infighting for a legacy of PZPR-SDRP-SLD. This may be part of the reason for the willingness of the media to uncover the ever new scandals.

A large part of the editorial boards, including the ones which often defended the legacy of the Round Table have given active support to the Civic Platform, a party created prior to the last parliamentary elections. It still holds true that the position of a majority of political parties depends primarily on the publicity they receive in the media, rather than on their organizational qualities or political programs. The Civic Platform reanimated the circles of the former Freedom Union, Liberal Democratic Congress and the People's Conservative Party. In other words, the politicians whose "Solidarity" opposition heritage dates back to the Round Table. Many of them consented to the Prime Minister Mazowicki's declaration that "*pacta sunt servanda*", which was to signify the lack of conviction that it may be possible, nor indeed desirable, to surpass the compromise reached with the communist side, despite of the entirely different internal and international situation.

There is much to indicate, that although the political scene in Poland has observed many changes, its key elements remain constant. Post-communists have a chance to salvage most of their resources. For the time being, it is probable that their party may retreat to opposition. As a reserve, they still hold "Samoobrona" (Self-Defence), a party that is constantly gaining support. Allegedly, the party's leader, Andrzej Lepper, has been receiving significant assistance from the Democratic Left Alliance. The unexplainable drowsiness of the judiciary in initiating prosecution procedures against the members of "Samoobrona" who are suspected of common crimes, is highly disturbing. It is a known fact, that in many cases, the Democratic Left Alliance is able to influence the decisions made by prosecutors and judges. During key-issue voting in the parliament, the verbal opposition of "Samoobrona" turns to join or support the interests of the Alliance. The Civic Platform will most probably dominate the future ruling coalition. Such state of affairs poses no threat whatsoever for the post-communist circles. The politicians of the Civic Platform have on more than one occasion proved themselves to be unable to confront unwaveringly the Round Table partners. "Solidarity" has retreated to the strictly trade unionist positions, and it seems very unlikely that it could regain the political grounds lost in 2001. With much probability, faced with the threat of Andrzej Lepper winning the position of the

Prime Minister, the majority of the non-communist parties will join in coalition, if not prior to the elections, then after, as part of the ruling coalition.

Such state of affairs in Poland would once again delay the establishment of the clearly delineated divisions on the political scene, divisions based on ideological and program-founded differences. Polish politicians are still unable to discard the “Solidarity opposition side” syndrome. Perhaps that is precisely the most dangerous legacy of the early period of building the Third Republic. Due to subsequent successful maneuvers undertaken by the post-communists accompanied by the often displayed awkwardness of the rest, the successive elections will see Poles choosing between on the one hand, a party with a direct heritage in the tradition of the Polish People’s Republic, and, on the other, an amorphous levy *en masse*, one with no clear ideological or program-founded character.

At moments of political crisis, the vague connections between the world of party politics and grand business come to be exposed, with the background reserved for the “invisible hand” of the so called foreign and nationally-based special services. Those nationally-based come to include autonomous structures, individuals with a résumé full of communist security services positions or their former secret collaborators, as well as new agencies that manage to escape practical control of legitimate institutions, agencies run by old-time functionaries. When the head of the Military Information Services, general Dukaczewski, reveals that the deputy chief of the Internal Security Agency, colonel Tarnowski, was secretly collaborating with the military services prior to 1989, it seems like a cruel joke. For it means that Dukaczewski decided to use the information acquired at his former post to block the promotion to the position of a general for a colleague from the parallel counter-intelligence structures.

In his analysis of the difficulties associated with attempts at understanding the transition mechanisms present in the regions which are trying to regain liberty from the remains of the communist legacy, professor Andrzej Zybertowicz of the Torun University writes: “Although they were created for the protection of the party and the system itself, the communist special services played an active role in the process of dismantling the system. [...] I argue that the secret operational techniques of the special services, which were used for years to support the communist regimes, from some point on, became an important instrument of a relatively efficient dismantling of the system. The dismantling process was partly pre-planned, yet in many

respects it was partly spontaneous, one escaping control from above".<sup>8</sup> All I can add to the above is the fact, that the dismantling of the system aimed at guaranteeing, under the new circumstances, the control over the public life and the economy, control that was to be exercised by the beneficiaries and functionaries of the old system. It is not desirable to try to explain the whole of political, economic and social complexities of life based on a coherent conspiracy theory perspective. Yet denying the facts that professor Zybertowicz so accurately point out would lead the intellectual comprehension of reality astray, bringing about further political defeats.

Once again Poles are tired. This time it is the everyday problems (with the unemployment rate in Poland reaching the horrifying 20% mark) accompanied by the lack of willingness towards all forms of political and public activeness. Fifteen years of endless transition left the citizens disillusioned. A politician is a swindler or a loser at best. After all, a simple person has no say, no influence on anything. When talking about our country, we refer to "them" and unfortunately that is a far more vague a-recipient of our anger than was the communist party in the Polish People's Republic. Back then, we at least had no difficulties identifying the enemy. Now lost in the transition, which came to blur the criteria by which to judge right from wrong, we hope that the savior will come from outside. Recently I met a farmer who is wholeheartedly convinced that after May 1, "the Union" will come and will stop the local people from throwing away their garbage in the nearby forest. No, it will not come. It is either us who will manage to cope with all those problems, beginning with the illegal garbage disposal and ending with the establishment of clear rules to guide the politics, the economics and the public life, or else we risk falling down from the "post-colonial state" category to the "failed state" category.

We face the problem of overly excessive pathology. It is reaching the degree, where the established criminal and even mafia structures, scandals concerning special services, large-scale corruption, etc. are becoming a standard and not an exception to the rule, in other words they seize to be a pathology. The organism of our state is evolving in the highly undesirable, indeed dangerous direction.

The "Rzeczpospolita" daily, in its issue of April 12, published a piece by Krzysztof Kłopotowski, whose main character is Citizen M. The piece is itself a draft of a film script recounting one of the most intriguing life-paths of the Polish transition. How did it happen that a dissident of the communist cir-

cles became an oppositionist and a member of the Workers' Defense Committee? What paths lead him to drink the toast of friendship with generals and came to head a media enterprise that is quoted on the stock exchange and valued at one billion dollars? How was it possible that the enterprise was founded on a daily newspaper, which was given to the "Solidarity opposition side" by general Kiszczak precisely at the Round Table? How did it happen that Lew Rywin, acting on behalf of the "group in power", chose no other than Citizen M. to ask for several millions of dollars in bribe for a legal act that would allow Citizen M. to buy a television broadcasting station? And how is it possible that having learned all that the earth upon which we stand does not quake, and all is seemingly normal, a bit like in a theatre? I come to wonder if anyone would dare to film Kłopotowski's script. It would be a film much more effective in explaining the difficulties associated with making the transition from communism to normality than many of the expert analyses.

"Present-day Poland was born out of the act of suppression directed against "Solidarity" under the martial law, and out of the numerous successes on the part of the coalition government in inducing the "Solidarity" opposition in 1989 and thereafter. Elitism, anti-democracy, anti-pluralism and lack of the skill among the post-Solidarity representatives, all served well the post-communists." Those are the words with which Jakub Karpiński, who passed away last year, concluded his last work in 2003.<sup>9</sup>

Those Poles who had the courage to think independently under the communist regime, had dreams of Independent Poland, the Majesty of the Republic, honorable and just. The miners of "Wujek" coalmine sacrificed their lives in 1981 in the name of that dream. Recently general Kiszczak has been sentenced to 2 years imprisonment (in suspension) for participating in this crime. Is that the measure of success in the transition? Those directly responsible have thrice been acquitted thrice due to lack of evidence.

The oppositionists who gave in to the fear brought by the martial law, suppressed the thought of independence and sat at the Round Table. They chose to compromise with communism, at best chose the finlandization of the state. History gave Poland opportunity to do something significantly more.

As if by sheer luck, with no evident input on its part, Poland found itself part of the NATO Alliance, its borders virtually secure, and the thought of sovereignty generally expressed in economic rather than military terms. Yet those proved to be right who predicted that independence comes only at

a price. We chose the credit, and now we repay the installments, and will continue to do so for a long time yet. The price is the transition, and there is no end in sight. At least, I hope very much that its goal, in the name of which They died in "Wujek", shall remain unaltered.

**George Schöpflin**

## **The Right and Post-Communism**

Methodologically, I shall argue that the nature of the post-communist right is best understood (a) in the context of its emergence and activities in and after 1989 and (b) in interaction with the post-communist left.

(a) What seems to offer the best insight into the trajectories of the post-communist right is close scrutiny of the actual transformation - above all, the balance between continuity and discontinuity of the ruling, monopoly communist party. The determining question is how much of the power (money, property, networks, know-how, organisational skills) that it had under the previous system the ruling party was able to convert into power under the new system. In this sense, the legacy of the nature and intensity of the transformation continues to play a role in how the post-communist right has been able to define itself.

(b) The post-communist left in many ways determined the patterns of political behaviour adopted by the right, not least because the left had superior access to political capital and had a significant role in the institutional design and subsequent operation of the post-communist systems.

[1] No revolution can ever be complete and elements of the old will always coexist with the new, so that what one should be looking for is the balance between the two, for some measure of how far the end of communism as legitimating discourse also meant the end of communism as a way of thinking, as a thought-world. Here the record is very varied, with a wide spectrum of continuity and change. At the furthest end of the spectrum is probably the GDR with the least continuity, followed by Estonia and the Czech Republic; Romania looks like having the highest continuity; the others fall in between. In all the cases, the nature of the transformation constituted the cognitive framework within which political actors behaved and sought to pursue their ideological objectives.

I am assuming that communist parties sought to retain as much power as they could get away with and would use whatever instruments that were

available to attain this, including radical shifts in ideology (from communist to nationalist or capitalist) or ignoring the rules of self-limitation. In effect, they treated competing parties as a necessary evil, but not as legitimate contestants for power. It is possibly relevant that communism was never really defeated, but eroded or collapsed from within. Thus a good deal of the cultural capital accumulated under the old system could be transferred to the new, where, however, it functioned negatively by the criteria laid down by Western democracies (and still does).

The moment of transformation, then, can be regarded as the baseline or benchmark against which the newly emergent right had to define itself. The right began with a multiple weakness. It was inexperienced in politics, in understanding what politics is for; it was uncertain what legitimacy it had; its model of political power was that of the monopoly party; its commitment to democracy, which it understood only vaguely, made it use moderate language, but moderation as measured against what? In many ways the right emerged into an ideological void as well as an organisational one.

From this perspective, the design of right-wingness adopted was always partly determined by the strength or weakness of the carry-over from communism. The left, by contrast, did have a clear idea of what power was for – an idiom that it could deploy and a constituency that it could satisfy. Overall, the left was much better placed to benefit under the new system than was understood at the time by the right and, for that matter, by Western observers. What the left has found difficult has been to shed all the habits and assumptions that it inherited from the Soviet-type system and equally from the transformation. These include a certain tacit assumption that it and it alone is the legitimate bearer of democracy, that once elected it should enjoy monopoly power and that it should as far as possible control the media (the primary instrument of communication between rulers and ruled). The post-communist left also shows a propensity to disregard society and to rule in a strongly elitist fashion.

Not surprisingly, the post-communist right has adapted to these habits of the left and mirrors some of the unilateralism that it has learned in opposition.

[2] The smoothness or radicalism of the change furthermore determined the strength or weakness of the communist successor party (CSP) and the consequent freedom of choice in party design. Western models of

class alignment or dealignment tell us nothing here. The criteria of choice are definitely ideological, like history, justice, nationhood, sources of insecurity. Where the CSP was weakest, as in Estonia (where the communist party was unable to keep its property), the choice was the widest, though it was not absolute, of course.

[3] The dilemma of the new-fledged right was what to conserve, which past to choose, even while that choice was partially determined by the conservatives' opponents. Where a CSP ruled or was strong, then conservatives would necessarily have a harder time finding a past on the basis of which they could offer the electorates continuity - the pre-communist past was largely useless, given that it was pre-modern (the Czech Republic was a partial exception and the Baltic states opted for legal continuity). This meant that going back to the 1930s could not resonate, because communism did bring about an externally designed and distorted, but real modernisation (this was the bane of the Antall government in Hungary).

The one past that was not available, on the other hand, was the communist past, because this was precisely the one that the right was attempting to escape, even while sizeable sections of the population had made their entry into modernity under communism and thus felt that they had much to lose from any radical change. This dilemma has had the result that the post-communist right is potentially likely to reproduce its initial ideological void, to find it difficult to offer its constituency a resonant set of values and to be vulnerable to a radical temptation, that of trying to construct a usable, non-communist past that might be open to nationalism and/or populism, but thereby lose the support of moderate opinion.

However, the CSPs could not claim the entirety of the past, so that there was some space for the centre-right, usually though not invariably, by defining itself as the bearer of a national (not nationalist) past; this is difficult for the left to appropriate. Indeed, except where the left shifted overtly towards nationalism, nationhood became the obvious space for the right to occupy, not least because the discursivity of nationhood offered a language of access to the public sphere.

The CSPs, by contrast, also have a problem with their past - they have been compelled to screen out or protect those aspects of the past that make them vulnerable to criticism both from the domestic right and potentially from the West. These, in sum, are human rights violations during the

communist era; the role of the secret police then and now; the power and property resulting from the grab for resources by the nomenklatura during the collapse. By the same token, these are areas that the centre-right is free to attack, but that too could lead to radicalism.

[4] The Western centre-right can hardly be categorised along a single dimension and varies greatly from country to country. Thus British conservatism is often very different from Christian Democracy, and whichever case one looks at, the moment of the move towards modernity played a strong framing role in determining what type of centre-right evolved. In much of Western Europe, the legacy of the French revolution has been a key threshold (the Anti-Revolutionary Party was still active in the Netherlands till the 1960s) and the Second World War proved to be another boundary event (Germany, Italy). The long domination of Social Democracy in Scandinavia has tended to make the centre-left conservative and the centre-right more inclined to outspoken reform in the direction of de-etatisation. Thus conservative parties can sometimes launch quite radical transformations, as in the UK and it is hard to detect much more than a family resemblance among the parties of the right, though the rise of the “Peoples’ Party” concept may be a change in this respect. Thus the Western European right is quite diverse, but shares the experience of quite a lengthy period of democratic rule and of entering politics in conditions quite different from those in the post-communist world (Portugal may be a very partial exception here).

[5] We are inclined in seeking definitions of the post-communist right to forget that the moment of collapse was equally a moment of fluidity, opportunity and intellectual novation. “Left” and “right” had to be invented and imagined (to use Hobsbawm’s and Anderson’s language) out of raw materials not well suited to the task. The left had to reinvent itself as a non-monopoly, non-Soviet-type, non-Marxist-Leninist entity, while finding the means to hold on to as much power as possible, whereas the right had to construct a usable past, to design itself effectively from nothing and simultaneously to erode the power of the left. Both had to satisfy expectations from the West (Copenhagen criteria) and the physical presence of (often ill-advised) Western advisers.

A further burden for the right was that the collapse of Yugoslavia made too explicit a reliance on the national past unacceptable. This meant that

the West was far more sensitive to the articulation of nationhood in post-communist Europe than at home and tended to impede the evolution of anything resembling a post-communist Gaullism. The double standard of accepting Berlusconi's coalition, which included the neo-Fascists, but vetoing the post-communist far right was not lost on the post-communist world. At the same time, nationalist policies pursued by the post-communist left were screened out and failed to attract the same disapprobation as the national policies of the right (eg. Romania).

### **Western left, post-communist left**

Why the Western left does not respond to the excesses of communism and why it accepts the post-communist left without any serious scrutiny is a complex issue that can only be understood by looking at the deeper cultural and historical dimension of east-west relations. In the first place, the left has long felt that it has owned the intellectual high ground in Europe since the Enlightenment. It claims to be the sole bearer of modernity and rationality and regards conservatism as at some level tainted by pre-Enlightenment attitudes of irrationality and a denial of individual sovereignty. The outcome of this perspective, which is seldom articulated in this way, is to predispose the Western left not to examine its own past mistakes. If, after all, you are the principal agent of enlightened thinking, then the proposition that you may have been mistaken is not easy to accept. Among these unacknowledged errors is the relatively forgiving attitude that the Western left took towards Soviet communism, including its worst excesses like Gulag. It took a long time for this to be admitted and then was screened out as rapidly as possible. Not least, if an offshoot of Enlightenment thinking can produce mass killing, then the entire set of assumptions should be looked at, but then that might undermine the current epistemology and axiology of the Left.

Then, closely following on the above, there was the relative inaction or indifference of the Left towards past violations and crimes against human rights normativity on the part of the communists. This may have given rise to a certain sense of guilt and equally enhanced forgetfulness or a selective view of the past. Certainly, while much of the Western left was ready to see Pinochet punished, this would never even be considered with respect to Gorbachev and his responsibility for the deaths in Vilnius. 1989, further-

more, provided the impetus for the West to re-examine its right-wing tyrannies and for the moment, this is still the dominant trend.

Throughout the *détente* period, especially after the Helsinki Final Act in 1975, the Western left believed that communism was somehow reformable, that the invasions of Hungary and Czechoslovakia were non-repeatable errors. Despite the quashing of Solidarity in Poland, this optimism persisted and was understood finally to have been proved right in 1989, or so it appeared. The agents of this were thought to be the reform communists and, once in power after elections, they gained instant acceptability, so that their pasts and other credentials were not scrutinised. They were simply integrated as “normal” politicians. The post-communist right, on the other hand, was much more closely examined, particularly when a relationship was detected between the right and nationalism. Where a right-wing party made libertarian noises, like the Czech ODS, that was equally acceptable, even if in practice it pursued protectionism.

Then there are factors of self-interest. Thus the presence of self-styled left-wing parties from Central and South-Eastern Europe in the Socialist International creates an impression that social democracy remains a vital and intellectually viable movement at a time when sociological and economic changes have eroded much of the classical Social Democratic programme. Thus while deprivation remains a serious problem throughout Europe, with sizeable sections of the population not having access to goods of consumption that the rest take for granted, primary poverty (insufficient food, heat, light, shelter) is very largely resolved. This means material factors have declined in importance and non-material factors, like access to cultural goods, have come to play a role in determining equality. Social Democracy appears to have no idea how to face this new situation - Blair’s Third Way is one attempt - but at least the Central and South-East Europeans provide a semblance of resonance in the attractiveness of the movement.

The post-communist left, furthermore, has manoeuvred itself successfully into the position of having become the primary supplier of information on the post-communist world to the Western left. The inertia factor, that once a supplier is in place, we become reluctant to change it, has helped the post-communist left to sustain its favourable image in the West. Correspondingly, dispassionate Western views of the post-communist right are more difficult to establish when Western opinion makers’ cognitive models are still structured by what they hear from their left-wing sources. Above

all, they find it difficult to recognise that “left” and “right” have qualitatively different meanings in the post-communist world (see above).

Also helpful to the post-communist left has been the visceral fear that marks the West’s attitude to ethnicity. Throughout the 20th century, the image of Central and South-Eastern Europe has been of a place that is disfigured by ethnic nationalism, a view strongly reinforced by the collapse of Yugoslavia. The post-communist left, by denying its own national quality, has played on this fear and has sought to establish itself as the principal bulwark against a resurgence of a right-wing nationalism, populism, xenophobia that are seen as the greatest threats to democracy. The stories told by the post-communist left, therefore, find a ready audience already predisposed to hear the message among their Western interlocutors.

This last factor has been helped by the capacity of the post-communist left to learn and use the discourses and vocabulary of the Western left, often with a quite different underlying truth-position. In this sense, the West hears something that is familiar and what it wants to hear from the post-communist world. The post-communist right, on the other hand, has to innovate against the mainstream and is thus at a disadvantage.

### **A case study: The Hungarian left elite**

The Hungarian media elite defines itself as left-wing and as liberal, but these descriptions should be seen only as a part of a self-legitimizing discourse. What is remarkable about this elite as a sociological and cultural phenomenon is its extraordinary conservatism and the very high boundary walls that it has erected around itself. The elite, further, has a marked degree of cohesiveness internally, it shrugs off criticism, which implies that its self-legitimation is in no serious way affected by its role in society, thereby ignoring democratic accountability. This means that it is ideologically determined and politically it has a sense of mission, if not actually of election, of being chosen, to lead Hungarian society into a kind of modernity for which it and it alone possesses the maps.

It should be added that this elite has been successful in reproducing itself, but it is beginning to run out of resources as it refuses to innovate and to adapt to new Hungarian realities. It has placed itself in a position where it cannot rely on the traditional Central European modes of legitimation,

by reference to a role of being conscience of the nation, because it defines itself by a thoroughgoing rejection of nationhood, so that it claims its role as a universalist representative of Europe and progress (both concepts as defined by itself in ways that are under its control).

How is one to explain this phenomenon?

Mental map theory, institution theory and cultural capital theory constitute a way into understanding this elite. It should, first of all, be regarded as a social-cultural institution with its own regularities and, therefore, open to investigation not on its own terms - which it controls and uses to protect itself - but as a social process. Mental map theory basically argues that people construct maps of the world in which they live as a way of decoding the world and making safe by making it predictable. Once these maps - cognitive models - are in place, they are difficult to change, because they have become a part of the individual's cultural capital. What applies to individuals can be fairly applied to collectivities. People dislike change once their maps are established, because change devalues their cultural capital, which then requires a redrawing of the map and reassessment of their store of knowledge. The point to be relied on for this analysis from institution theory is that institutions establish their own rationality, impose their rules on their members and make their cultural reproduction the highest priority - well above the ostensible purposiveness of the institution.

For the Hungarian left elite, the formative experience was challenging the communist party in terms of its monopoly of the public sphere, of control of the language of the public sphere and of the introduction of new discourses. This applied to political, economic and to some extent legal issues. The counter-argument was legitimated by reference to a democratic alternative. The map was delineated as one in which the left elite - a combination of the democratic opposition and reform communists - remained ideocratic and logocratic, but challenged the party on its own ground of intellectual and symbolic monopoly. It successfully attained the delegitimation of communist rule and expected that its own power and authority would be guaranteed as a result. In this sense, much of the value system of this elite was determined by its contest for power and authority with the

communist party and it inevitably took on some, not all, of the features of the mind-set of the Soviet-type system.

The success of 1989 had the effect of being a signal to the elite that its discourses had superiority over others, that it was properly the bearer of rationality and modernity and it had the social authority to implement these ideas politically. The success further had the consequence of confirming the elite in its rather narrow understanding of democracy, as something defined by (a) its own sources of domination and (b) a reductionist concept of European democratic tradition over the parameters and content of which it had monopoly control. This attitude is, of course, very familiar to students of Soviet-type systems.

In effect, this added up to a monopoly definition of legitimate intellectual knowledge, of power and the language of the public sphere that made no reference to public opinion or to alternative intellectual inputs. The map further informed the left elite that issues are either ideologically determined or are explicable in terms of persons. Human motivation was thereby given a constricted, reductionist definition, which ignores the complex, divergent set of reasons which explain human action. The left elite believed, and continues to believe, that the proper way of dealing with issues is to apply to correct ideology, while simultaneously opposition to these ideas is either malevolent or the derivative of a false, potentially evil, ideology. The application of these propositions had far-reaching consequences in shaping the public sphere, in which the personalisation of politics proved very destructive, in as much as it produced a humiliation of people and thereby added personal hostility to political.

The approach just sketched explained the left elite's treatment of the right and the concept of right-wing opposition - they were seen as illegitimate, as inherently wrong and as something to be eliminated from the political scene as impure. In a very real sense, the left elite regards its claim to intellectual and ideological monopoly as a claim to wield sole and unconstrained power in the political process by controlling the language of the public sphere. What we are witnessing, at the same time, is a bid to exercise mediated power that is at variance with popular aspirations and indeed popular sovereignty.

If we accept that popular sovereignty is articulated through elections, then the gap between mediatised power and elected power becomes starkly visible. The striking aspect of this is the continued self-legitimation of this elite, a success that is only partly dependent on the success of the left in the electoral process. Simultaneously issues of accountability and transparency are brushed aside, legitimated by the belief in intellectual monopoly and the rightfulness of the ideology.

In sociological terms, the elite has built high walls around itself, it has constructed a set of interlocking narratives that are connected more to a mythicised view of Europe than to Hungarian realities. In this process, which has become defensive and to some extent rejectionist, the elite may well have lost its capacity for adaptation and updating its values - it largely remains where it was in 1990, protecting discourses that are out of touch with society.

Thus the elite makes no reference to the changing nature of Hungarian society, which is increasingly ready to demand civic norms; it has only a sketchy understanding of the European Union and the obligations that Hungary has taken on under the Copenhagen criteria; it ignores or seeks to marginalise the counter-elites that have arisen in the last 15 years; its concept of citizenship is hierarchical and exclusive; it pays no attention to the transformation of the conservative right, but demonises it; it ignores generational shifts; and it has no understanding of the changes in popular culture that have brought Hungarian tastes much closer to the European mainstream than ever.

Where next?

Change tends to arrive from the margins and the longer a sociological institution exercising power shuts itself off from the sociological reality around it, the more vulnerable it becomes to radical transformation. The forces sustaining the left elite are still there, but as they are increasingly internal to it, they are also eroding. The social ideas in the name of which the elite claims to be the bearer of European modernity and rationality are less and less sustainable in the context of globalisation, because that would need a Hungarian state closed-off from external influences.

In effect, the left elite is deeply marked by its conservatism, its rejection of change, and its now outdated concept of modernity as something that is fixed and final - a feature clearly inherited from communism. Hence the elite can be seen as static, unresponsive and attracts support primarily within intellectual and professional groups. The question is whether this elite is capable of reproducing itself along existing lines, of repelling challenges, of finding the resources to adapt itself to the transformation of Hungarian society or, alternatively, whether it is so isolated as to have become the victim of its own, self-generated perceptions. At this time, the latter outcome looks more likely, in which case the elite can look forward to becoming a footnote in Hungarian history.

# Notes

Ágnes Hankiss

## Introductory Thoughts

- <sup>1</sup> Political party founded in 1988 by young law students. Fidesz was the main governing party in Hungary between 1998-2002 and has been in power since 2010 again.
- <sup>2</sup> Prime Minister of Hungary 2004-2008
- <sup>3</sup> Gyula Illyés (1902-1983), Hungarian writer and poet.

László Kövér

## Opening Speech

- <sup>1</sup> 1998-2000
- <sup>2</sup> Tamás Cseh (1943-2009), composer and performer of songs whose poetic lyrics about the strangeness of life in Socialism were written by Géza Bereményi (1946). They worked together for decades.
- <sup>3</sup> Reference to the 4 years of (post) socialist government rule in Hungary
- <sup>4</sup> Reference to Péter Medgyessy, prime minister of Hungary 2002-2004
- <sup>5</sup> Reference to László Salgó, head of Hungary's national police (2002-2004), assistant deputy director of Europol since 2004
- <sup>6</sup> Reference to László Kovács, former foreign minister of Hungary (1994-1998; 2002-2004), commissioner of the European Union (2004-2009)
- <sup>7</sup> Hungarian daily newspaper, founded in 1956 as the communist party's official paper. Since 1990 it is still closely tied to MSZP, the post-communist party of Hungary.
- <sup>8</sup> Socialist prime minister of Hungary (1994-1998), foreign minister of the last communist government (1987-1990)
- <sup>9</sup> The first democratically elected (conservative) prime minister of Hungary (1990-1993)
- <sup>10</sup> Reference to the Hungarian parliamentary elections held in 1990. The turnout rate was 65.11%.

- <sup>11</sup> Alliance of Free Democrats. Originally an anti-communist liberal party founded in 1988 which later governed Hungary between 1994-1998 and 2002-2009 in a coalition with the post-communist socialist party.
- <sup>12</sup> See reference no. 5.
- <sup>13</sup> Reference to the socialist-liberal coalition (2002-2009)
- <sup>14</sup> Leading communist politician in the 1980's, health minister in both the communist era (1987-1990) and later in one of the post-communist governments (2002-2003)

**Wojciech Roszkowski**

## **The Oleksy Case and the Role of Secret Services in Polish Politics**

- <sup>1</sup> Zbigniew Herbert, „Bezradność” [Helplessness], Tygodnik Solidarność, 1996, No 1 (author's translation)
- <sup>2</sup> Tadeusz Mołdawa, Ludzie władzy 1944-1991, [People in Power, 1944-1991], (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1991), pp. 405-406; Włodzimierz Janowski, Aleksander Kochański, Informator o strukturze i obsadzie personalnej centralnego aparatu PZPR 1948-1990 [Guidebook on the Structure and Personnel of the PZPR Central Apparatus, 1948-1990], (Warsaw: ISP PAN, 2000), p. 101.
- <sup>3</sup> Knowing Oleksy's cv it was hard to believe this was a matter of accident. Jerzy Morawski, Portrety w podczerwieni [Portraits in Infra-Red], (Warsaw: NOWA, 1994), p.p. 5-16.
- <sup>4</sup> According to Wałęsa's interpretation of the 1992 “small” constitution, ministers of interior, defense, and foreign affairs were under President's control. Thence as Prime Minister, Oleksy had to deal with three ministers who were in fact chosen by Wałęsa.
- <sup>5</sup> “Milczanowski oskarża Oleksego o szpiegostwo” [Milczanowski Accuses Oleksy of Spying], Rzeczpospolita, 22 December 1995; „Oskarżam” [I Accuse], Gazet Wyborcza, 22 December 1995; „Komu bije dzwon w MSW” [For Whom the Bell Tolls in the Interior Ministry], Życie Warszawy, 23-26 December 1995.
- <sup>6</sup> Cf e.g. statement by Deputy Director of the Russian Foreign Intelligence, Viacheslav Trubnikov, who routinely called the accusation a “political

provocation". "Polityczna prowokacja" [Political Provoication], *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 23-26 December 1995.

- <sup>7</sup> Biała Księga. Akta śledztwa prowadzonego przez Prokuraturę Warszawskiego Okręgu Wojskowego w Warszawie w sprawie wniosków Ministra Spraw Wewnętrznych z dnia 19.12.1995 r. i 16.01.1996 r. [White Book. Documents of the Warsaw Military District Prosecution Investigation referring to the Motions by Minister of Interior dated 19 December 1995 and 16 January 1996], (Warsaw: Centrum Informacyjne Rządu, 1996), quoted further as White Book.
- <sup>8</sup> On 19 July 2002 the Polish Sejm, dominated by post-Communists, turned down a motion to call Kubicki and Siemiątkowski to constitutional account in this case. *Rzeczpospolita*, 20-21 July 2002.
- <sup>9</sup> Cf. Radosław Januszewski, Jan Strękowski (eds.), *Szara księga* [The Grey Book], (Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Most”, 1996).
- <sup>10</sup> Marian Zacharski, born in 1951, worked for the Polish Communist intelligence from his twenties. In 1976 he came to the United States as director of a Polish-American trade and engineering company Polamco, a cover for military intelligence. Zacharski made friends with William Bell, an expert in radar systems, who worked for the American military industry. Between 1977 and 1981 Zacharski passed to Poland a lot of most sensitive information referring among others to the “Patriot” rockets. Since this information was shared with the Soviet intelligence, Zacharski must have won high esteem among his Soviet colleagues. In June 1981 Zacharski was arrested by the CIA and in December 1981 he was sentenced to 25 years in American prison. In June 1985 Zacharski was exchanged in Berlin for 25 American spies and returned to Poland. Between 1985 and 1990 he was director of the “Pewex” company, selling luxury good for hard currencies in Poland. Scrutinized positively in 1990 he joined the State Protection Office (UOP). Ryszard Badowski, Ałganow, Jakimiszyn i inni. Wszystko o sprawie Oleksego, [Alganov, Jakimishin and Others. All about the Oleksy Case], (Warsaw: „Kto jest kim”, 1996), pp. 133-136. Cf. also: Witold Bereś, Jerzy Skoczylas, *Generał Kiszczak mówi ... prawie wszystko* [General Kiszczak Tells ... Aklmost Everything], (Warsaw: BGW: 1991).
- <sup>11</sup> White Book, p. 7.
- <sup>12</sup> In an interview of 27 January 1996, Oleksy rather naively claimed that meeting Alganov on private ground he had had no idea Alganov could

have been a Soviet agent. This seems most unlikely for a man in his forties, experienced in various political manoeuvres and explaining to the journalist how former Communist secret services changed loyalties after 1990. Oleksy also claimed that he learned about the investigation referring to himself from President-elect Kwaśniewski in early December 1995. Zacharski and Czempiński stated otherwise remembering their meetings with Oleksy back in 1995 and early 1995. "Pod ścianą" [Pressed to the Wall], *Polityka*, 27 January 1996, p. 15.

<sup>13</sup> White Book, p. 15

<sup>14</sup> General Pawliw: byłem rezydentem KGB w Polsce [General Pavlov: I was KGB Resident in Poland], (Warszawa: BGW, 1994).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. e.g. Bertold Kittel, "Ochroniarze z desantu MO" [Protectors Landing from Citizens' Militia], *Życie*, 24-25 July 1999.

<sup>16</sup> For the authorized copy of this instruction cf.: *Spotkania*, 22 May 1991, p. 3.

<sup>17</sup> Mieczysław Prószyński, „50 milionów czytelników czasopism”, [50 Million Magazine Readers], *Rzeczpospolita*, 20 December 1996.

<sup>18</sup> Piotr Najsztub, „Lustracja „Nie”, [„Nie” Scrutinized], *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 8 February 1993. Urban was even tried and sentenced for revealing secret documentation in February 1996. *Rzeczpospolita*, 7 February 1996; Stanisław Janecki, Artur Witoszek, „Wielka gra”, [Great Game], *Wprost*, 21 January 1996, p. 19-23.

<sup>19</sup> Several of President Kwaśniewski's aids openly confessed this.

<sup>20</sup> „Na każdego coś jest” [There Is a File on Everyone], *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 28-29 August 1999; *Rzeczpospolita*, 1-2 September 1999.

<sup>21</sup> “Czy prokuratura przesłucha prezydentów” [Will the Prosecution Interrogate Presidents?], *Rzeczpospolita*, 10 June 2002.

## Vitaly Shentalinsky

### Crime Without Punishment, Russia in the 20th Century

<sup>1</sup> Dzerzhinsky was the founder of Cheka, the Soviet security police

<sup>2</sup> The Communist Union of Youth

<sup>3</sup> Soviet state security organisation founded in 1917

<sup>4</sup> Head of NKVD, the internal secret service 1924-1936

<sup>5</sup> Head of NKVD after Yagoda

## The Fifth Power – Transition of the Romanian Securitate from Communism to NATO

- <sup>1</sup> Marius Oprea, *Moștenitorii Securității*, an article in *Analele Institutului Român de Istorie Recentă*, Vol. 1, Polirom Publishing House, Jassy, 2003, p. 13.
- <sup>2</sup> Alexandru Tănăsescu was born in Bucharest on March 17, 1945. After December 1999, when he was put in the reserve, he manifested himself as a close supporter of the former Party of the Socialist Democracy of Romania, currently the Social Democratic Party, the government party.
- <sup>3</sup> Data extracted from the Organization Diagram of the State Securitate Direction, which the author published under the pseudonym B. Petriceicu in "*România Liberă*", issue No. 4187/2003.
- <sup>4</sup> Domnița Ștefănescu, *Cinci ani din istoria României. O cronologie a evenimentelor, decembrie 1989 –decembrie 1994*. Mașina de Scris Publishing House, 1995, p. 34 (hereinafter indicated as *Cinci ani...*).
- <sup>5</sup> *Ibidem*.
- <sup>6</sup> "*România Liberă*", issue No. 1207/1994.
- <sup>7</sup> See details on the process of taking over of the former Securitate by the new power installed at Bucharest after December 22, 1989, in Marius Oprea, *Moștenitorii Securității*, pp. 13-36.
- <sup>8</sup> *Cinci ani...*, pp. 46-47.
- <sup>9</sup> The participation of the Securitate in the privatization and its implications was elaborated upon by the author within the framework of a conference on the theme "The post-revolutionary businesses of the Securitate" that took place at the New Europe College at Bucharest on January 7 2004. Important parts of this conference were published in the daily newspaper "*România Liberă*" of January 22, 2004, under the title "Onorabilele familii...cu epoleți.
- <sup>10</sup> Numerous officers were taken over in the Central of the Ministry of Foreign Trade, where – in 1990 – the leaderships of Asia, the Far East, Africa, and Europe Directions were directly led by Securitate operatives. Former Securitate officers were also appointed in the leaderships of some foreign trade enterprises subordinated to the Ministry of Foreign Trade (such as FRUCTEXPORT, AGROEXPORT, METALIMPORTEXPOR or

- TERRA). The same thing happened in the case of the above-mentioned ministries themselves as several press articles revealed at the time (“România Liberă”, issue No. 130/1990, Securitatea există! Lângă noi..., “Evenimentul Zilei”, issue No. 345-1993, Numirea unor foști securiști în străinătate aduce României imense prejudicii).
- 11 “România Liberă”, May 26, 1998.
- 12 “Evenimentul Zilei”, issue No. 345/1993, Numirea unor foști securiști în străinătate aduce României imense prejudicii.
- 13 The perusing of the collection of the daily newspaper “Azi” (official newspaper of the NSF) of the months February-May, 1990, is enlightening as regards this slandering and disinformation campaign.
- 14 See footnote 9.
- 15 Numerous press articles have appeared regarding the activity of this Securitate officer, as it happened after 1989, too, including articles connected with his involvement in supporting some illegal smuggling operations.
- 16 In a Plan of measures for the prevention and counteracting of the hostile activity performed against our country under the cover of the “Transcendental Meditation” sect, drawn up by Iulian Vlad in 1982, Ristea Priboi’s name appears as main pillar of the unveiling of the criminal activity of the “Transcendental Meditation sect” conducted by the Securitate a year before (See Marius Oprea, Banalitatea răului. O istorie a Securității în documente (1949-1989), Polirom Publishing House, Jassy, 2002, p. 396.).
- 17 Marius Oprea and Stejărel Olaru, The Day We Won’t Forget, November 15, 1987, Brașov, Polirom Publishing House, Jassy, 2004, p. 100 (English version).
- 18 “România Liberă”, November 5, 2003: Ministerul Justiției a pierdut o... ureche.
- 19 Because the secret services in Romania are no longer allowed to conduct “special operations” with the help of the “Arab Mafia”, they were authorized via urgency ordinances to set up their own business network. By the Urgency Ordinance (UO) No. 154 of November 21, 2001, EIS is authorized to conduct economic activities. A similar present for RIS followed, through the agency of UO No. 72 of June 13, 2002, then the urgency ordinance regarding the private service activities that can be conducted by the Protection and Guard Service (UO No. 103 of Au-

gust 29, 2002). Even the Special Communications Service got the right to “render services” in private conditions via the UO No. 7 of January 30, 2002.

- 20 The article, bearing the title *Brațul de sprijin al lui bin Laden în România*, gave rise to harsh reactions and criticism on the side of the social-democratic officials.
- 21 Radu Timofte’s contradictory statements regarding the terrorist networks and their connections with Romania were published in detail in the press of the time.
- 22 For the links between Arab Mafia and the Romanian authorities, with direct reference to the case of Kamel Kader, see also [www.tripod.ro](http://www.tripod.ro), *Regimul Iliescu – paradis al terorismului internațional*.
- 23 The author keeps a duplicate of this letter in his personal archive.

**Piotr Naimski**

## **Poland Fifteen Years After the “Round Table”: Where is the End of the Transition?**

- 1 Antoni Dudek, *“Reglamentowana Rewolucja”*, Kraków 2003, p.242
- 2 *ibidem*, p.234
- 3 Arnost Becka and Jacek Molesta, *“Sprawozdanie z likwidacji majątku byłej PZPR”* (The Report on the Liquidation of the PUWP Assets), Warszawa 2001
- 4 Antoni Dudek, *„Reglamentowana rewolucja”*, p. 264
- 5 *ibidem*, p. 269
- 6 *ibidem*, p.318
- 7 *ibidem*, p.328
- 8 Andrzej Zybortowicz, *“Paradoksy niewiedzy i ukryci aktorzy”* (Paradoxes of lacking knowledge and hidden actors), p.5
- 9 Jakub Karpinski, *“Polska po przejściach”* (Poland that has been through a lot), Lublin 2003, p.257

## Biographies

### Ágnes Hankiss

Ágnes Hankiss is a writer, clinical psychologist and has been a Member of the European Parliament since 2009. As a MEP, she is a member of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE), the Subcommittee on Security and Defence (SEDE) and the Committee on Petitions (PETI), for which she also serves as vice-chairwoman.

After the suppression of the Hungarian revolution and war of independence in 1956, as a child, together with her mother and the families of the executed Prime Minister, Imre Nagy and his fellows, she was deported to Snagov, Romania, and was kept in custody for more than 2 years. She earned her university degree at the Faculty of Humanities at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest. Later on she earned her PhD degree in Social Psychology. From 1974 to 1985 she worked as a university teacher of Social Psychology at the Faculty of Law at Eötvös Lóránd University. She was a FIDESZ party member of the Budapest assembly between 1990 and 1994. After that, between 1994 and 1998 she served as political advisor for the leader of FIDESZ parliamentary group, József Szájer. In 1998 she was appointed Government Commissioner of the Europalia Hungaria, a year-long event series presenting Hungary's rich cultural heritage in Brussels. Since 2000 she has been the director of the Béla Hamvas Cultural Research Institute, which she founded. The key research area of the institute is concerned with machinery of repression under communist rule, especially the function of the communist state security, and its heritage and afterlife in the democracy.

She has had a number of television programmes on political analysis and debates in the recent years.

Ágnes Hankiss has been awarded with several prizes in recognition of her literary achievements, including the Award for the Literature of Future (1989), and the Attila József Prize (1992). She is the author of more than a hundred essays and several books, including:

Anatomy of Trust (essays), Sad Farewell to the Prince (novel and film), Tightrope Walking (essays), Scientia Profana (short stories), A Hungarian Romance (novel, published in the USA, Canada and the United Kingdom), The Map of the Soul (short stories).

## **László Kövér**

László Kövér is a Hungarian politician, graduated as a lawyer at Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest in 1986, a founding member of the Fidesz party from 1988, member of the Hungarian parliament since 1990. As a Fidesz representative he took part in the Round Table Talks in 1989, that ended in the creation of a multi-party constitutional democracy.

He was a minister for the supervision of the intelligence services between 1998 and 2000 in Viktor Orbán's first government. Between 2000 and 2001 he was elected as the chairman of Fidesz. Between 1990 and 1998 and then since 2002 he has been member of the Parliament's national security committee, serving as the chairman between 1990-1993 and 2002-2006.

László Kövér has been the Speaker of the Hungarian Parliament since July 2010.

## **Amy Knight**

Amy Knight earned her PhD in Russian politics from the London School of Economics in 1977. She has been a Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars in Washington, and is a world expert in Soviet and Russian security services. She has taught at the LSE, Johns Hopkins University and Carleton University in Ottawa and also worked at the U.S. Library of Congress as a Soviet/Russian affairs specialist. She has written for The New York Times, The Times Literary Supplement, The Washington Post, and The New York Review of Books. Her books, *The KGB: Police and Politics in the Soviet Union* (1988), *Beria: Stalin's First Lieutenant* (1993), *Spies Without Cloaks: The KGB Successors* (1996), and *Who Killed Kirov? The Kremlin's Greatest Mystery* (1999), *How the Cold War Began: The Igor Gouzenko Affair and the Hunt for Soviet Spies* (2006) have all received prominent international attention.

## **Jörn Mothes**

Jörn Mothes, born in 1962 in Stralsund, is a German theologian, former GDR civil rights activist and environmentalist. Between 1998 and 2008 he was State Commissioner for the Records of the State Security Service of the former GDR in Vorpommern-Mecklenburg. He studied theology between 1983 and 1986 in Rostock then, from 1986 to 1989 in Jena.

In 1989 he joined Neues Forum. Between November 1989 and March 1990 on behalf of the Lutheran Church he was member of the civic committee responsible for dissolving Stasi in Gera and Jena. In 1993 he was moved to the then new office in Schwerin supervising Stasi documents and became deputy head. He was responsible for civil consulting and public works in the area of education. Between 1998 and 2008 he was Province Commissioner for Stasi documents in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern.

### **Wojciech Roszkowski**

Wojciech Roszkowski is a Polish economist and politician. He graduated at the Main School of Planning and Statistics (now called Warsaw School of Economics) in 1971. He earned his PhD degree in 1978 and became a university professor in 1996. Between 1980-1993 he was a member of the independent self-governing trade union NSZZ Solidarność and served as the chairman of the 'S' group at the Socio-Economics Department. In 1988-1989 he was a lecturer at the Wilson Center, Washington, D.C., USA. Roszkowski was the vice-rector of the Warsaw School of Economics between 1990 and 1993, then the director of the Institute of Political Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences (PAN) (1994-2000). Between 2000 and 2002 he was Kościuszko Chair of Polish Studies at the University of Virginia, USA. Between 2004 and 2009 he was a Member of the European Parliament for the Silesian Voivodeship. His areas of research are Central and Eastern Europe, Poland and history of economy. His main publications include the History of Poland (1914-1980, later 1914-2005) which was an underground publication he published under the pseudonym Andrzej Albert between 1982 and 1986; Landowners in Poland, 1918-1939 (1990); Land reforms in East Central Europe after World War One (1995); Half a century. The history of global politics since 1945 (published in Polish in 1997); Biographical Dictionary of Central and Eastern Europe in the Twentieth Century (2007); and several university textbooks with Anna Radziwiłł.

### **Vitalij Sentalinskij**

The Russian writer and poet Vitaly Shentalinsky was born in 1939 in Siberia. He is the Chairman of the Committee for the Literary Inheritance of Writers of the Russian Writers' Union. He grew up in a small town in Tatarstan, studied at Arctic Maritime Institute in Leningrad and at the Fac-

ulty of Journalism at the Moscow University. As Pole explorer he wintered at the Wrangel Island and took part in five expeditions. He was as a journalist for many years, worked as an editor at the radio and television and as a contributing editor at the journal *Vokrug sveta* (Around the world) and had a column at the the flagship magazine of glasnost, *Ogonyok* (Little flame). He spent more than twenty years on investigating on how a large number of Russian writers such as I. Babel, M. Bulgakov, M. Gorky, O. Mandelstam, N. Berdyaev, A. Platonov, and M Tzvetaeva were persecuted during the Stalin era. He was the first one gaining access to KGB's literature archives and published a number of manuscripts on the lives and works of the aforementioned poets and writers. In 1995 he wrote a voluminous book with the title of *The Slaves of Freedom*. It became a trilogy, because in 2001 he came up with *The Denunciation of Socrates*, and in 2007 with *Crime without Punishment*. The three books are illustrated with rare documents and photographs from the archives of the KGB. The first two were in French and English translation, the translations came on the market much earlier than the Russian originals. *The Slaves of Freedom* is translated in English as *The KGB'S Literary Archive*, and *The Denunciation of Socrates* as *Arrested voices*.

### **Sándor Óze**

Óze Sándor, Professor of History at Pázmány Péter Catholic University, was born in 1963 in Szentés, Hungary. He acquired his MA degree in History and Hungarian literature in 1988, and his PhD degree in 1996 at Eötvös Loránd University. In 1996 he defended his CSc dissertation on early modern cultural history. He has been an associate professor of early modern history at Pázmány Péter Catholic University Institute of History since 1995, and habilitated there in 2004. The main field of his research is Hungary in the 16th and 17th centuries, especially its intellectual and cultural history. Before 1995 he worked as an archivist at the Hungarian Central Statistical Office and as a museologist at the Hungarian National Museum. Besides university teaching, he was the exhibition director of the central exhibition of *Europalia Hungaria* in Brussels in 1999, and the project leader of the House of Terror Museum under construction one year later. Between 2001 and 2003 he was deputy director general of the Károlyi Palace Cultural Centre and Béla Hamvas Cultural Research Institute.

He was scholar and visiting professor at Babes-Bolyai University in Clausenburg, Romania; at Galway University, Ireland; at University of Leipzig, and at Ludwig Maximilians University in Munich, Germany.

Óze Sándor is the author of numerous volumes, his last work, entitled 'National Consciousness and Historiography' was published in 2010 by Hamvas Institute.

### **Alex Standish**

Alex Standish is an intelligence analyst and military expert. He is current project manager for returns and reintegration in the United Nations Development Programme in Kosovo. He is editor of Strategic Intelligence Review, is a former BBC Panorama producer, a former foreign correspondent for the BBC and The Economist, and occasional TV and radio personality. From 2000 until 2006 he was editor of Jane's Intelligence Digest. He particularly reports on geopolitical, global security, and terrorism issues in the Balkans, Russia, Central Europe, and the Middle East. He is a Fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute and the Royal Institution. He is an Honorary Research Associate in Durham University's Department of Anthropology. From 1995-1997 he was the associate editor of Metal Bulletin and chaired the International Aluminium Conferences in 1995 and 1996. He also provides regular current affairs analysis for BBC Newsnight; the BBC World Service; BBC Radio 4; CNN; CNBC and other international news services. He was a principal ITN news analyst in the aftermath of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks on the USA and the main BBC Radio 4 and World Service commentator during the invasion of Iraq in 2003. Alex Standish is a Fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute and Senior Research Fellow and Director of Development at St Chad's College, Durham University. He is also Editor of Strategic Intelligence Review and he reviews for the Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute and is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Centre for research into Post-Communist Economies. His publications include Kosovo one year on: the crisis and its consequences (2001); The Kanun: Blood, Honour and Death within the Albania Communities (2005); Ethnography in Albania: a brief introduction (2006) and he is joint author of Albanian Identities: Myth and History (2002).

## Marius Oprea

Marius Oprea (born 1964, Târgoviște) is a Romanian historian (specializing in recent history), poet and essayist. As a university student he was arrested several times by the Romanian secret police, Securitate in 1987-1989. After 1989 he was a journalist for the Romanian Cuvintul (Word) while also working for Radio Free Europe. He studied history at the University of Bucharest, and earned his PhD degree with a thesis on the role and evolution of the Communist-era secret police, the Securitate between 1948 and 1964. He published a volume about old Romanian books (*A Stroll on the Printing House Alley*; 1996) and a poetry book titled *Tambourine Solo* (2000), which was awarded the ASPRO award for debut. Between 1995 and 1997, Marius Oprea was Senator Constantin Ticu Dumitrescu's personal counsellor in drawing up the law regarding the disclosure of the Securitate. In the interval between 1998 and 2000 he was a counsellor of President Constantinescu and also the Head of the Communication Department. In 2004 and 2005 he wrote the leading articles for the *Ziua* daily paper. Marius Oprea is also the author of more than one hundred articles referring to the history of the Securitate, which were published in the written press, broadcasted on Free Europe Radio Station or comprised within various collections of studies and academic publications. Until early 2010, Marius Oprea was the Prime Minister's counsellor on national security issues, research programmes co-ordinator for the Romanian Institute for Recent History, as well as the President of the Institute for the Investigation of Communist Crimes in Romania. His main publications include *The Commonness of Evil. A History of the Securitate based on Documents. 1949-1989*, (2002; winner of the prize for the best history book of the year, according to The Publishers' Association of Romania); *The Day We Won't Forget. 15 November 1987, Braşov*, (co-author Stejărel Olaru; 2002); *The Party's Securitate Officers. The Cadres Department of the Romanian Communist Party as Political Police. Case study: The archive of the Municipal Party Committee Brasov* (2002); *The Successors of the Securitate* (2004); *L'héritage de la Securitate: Terreur en Roumanie*, in *Le jour se lève. L'héritage du totalitarisme en Europe (1953-2005)*- a volume coordinated by Stéphane Courtois (2006); *Zorba and the Cathedral* (2006).

## **Piotr Naimski**

Piotr Naimski is a Polish politician and professor. He studied biochemistry at the University of Warsaw. Between 1976 and 1981 he was a member of Workers' Defence Committee of which he was also a founder. In 1980-81, as a member, he was working for the independent self-governing trade union NSZZ Solidarność in its centre for social sciences in Warsaw. In the 1970's and 1980's he published underground papers and books. In 1992, he was head of the National Security Office in Prime Minister Jan Olszewski's government. Between 1996 and 2009, he taught international relations and security studies as the vice rector of the National Louis University in Nowy Sacz, Poland. Between 1999-2001, he was Prime Minister Jerzy Buzek's national security advisor. Between 2005 and 2007 he was state secretary for economy.

## **György Schöpflin**

Professor György Schöpflin was born in Budapest in 1939 and lived in the UK from 1950 to 2004. He graduated M.A., LL.B. from the University of Glasgow (1962) and pursued postgraduate studies at the College of Europe in Bruges (1962-1963). He worked at the Royal Institute of International Affairs (1963-1967) and the BBC (1967-1976) before taking up university lecturing, at the school of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London (1976-2004), including latterly as Jean Monnet Professor of Politics and Director of the Centre for the Study of Nationalism. He is currently teaching in Forlì, University Bologna, Faculty of Political Sciences. Professor Schöpflin's principal area of research is the relationship between ethnicity, nationhood and political power, with particular reference to post-communism. He is the author of *Politics in Eastern Europe 1945-1992* (Blackwell, 1993) and *Nations, Identity, Power* (Hurst, 2000), and co-editor of and contributor to *Myths and Nationhood* (Hurst, 1997, with Geoffrey Hosking) and *State Building in the Balkans: Dilemmas on the Eve of the 21st Century* (Longo, 1998, with Stefano Bianchini), among many other publications. His latest book, *The Dilemmas of Identity*, is forthcoming in English and has already appeared in Hungarian as *Az identitások dilemmája* (Attraktor, 2004).

Professor Schöpflin was elected a Member of the European Parliament for Fidesz-Hungarian Civic Union, in 2004, and re-elected in 2009.

This book has been published with the support of The Group of the European People's Party in the European Parliament.