

The Tapescript of the Mass Meeting of AHUCS – 20th of October 1956

József Perbíró: My friends, we received lots of telegrams! Before we would discuss the rules and regulations, Tamás Kiss reads up them.

Kiss: The first telegram is a celebrating one. 'AHUCS mass meeting, Szeged! Receive our soulful welcome and accord, we stand by you in your fight – Budapest, youth of the University of Agriculture' (huge applause). The second one: the students of the Faculty of Agricultural Technological Engineering salute the students of Szeged. 'We agree that AWY did not fulfil the claims of the students concerning youth organisations. The youth of the universities must create an organisation which is capable of fulfilling the political and cultural and other claims of the students. During the fight for the consequent validation of the spirit of the 20th Congress, the martial alliance of the worker-peasant and intellectual youth is inevitably necessary. Therefore the task of the students is not the secession from AWY, but to create a new organisation within AWY (growl, whispering) and to help the work of AWY and other worker-peasant organisations represent a new kind of spirit, to find their place in the fight for improvement. In our opinion any trepidation and imprudence is good only for those who go for counterrevolution and the restoration of Stalin-Rákosi system.' (noise)

Those university students who think that an up-to-date, intellectual policy should be followed, which is free from other intellectuals and independent from the interests of the working class and peasants... (interruption: 'Get it through quickly!', laughter)

The students of our college will tell their opinion in the National Student Parliament held next week, which is admitted to be the highest negotiating body of the country's university students. – The AWY Committee of the Faculty of Agricultural Technological Engineering (noise).

Perbíró: Remarks follow. The first speaker is József Papp Szekeres from the third grade of the Faculty of Agricultural Technological Engineering, Budapest. Then Áron Mónus, third grade student of mathematics and physics.

András Lejtényi: We haven't heard the justification.

Perbíró: My friends, the justification of the rules and regulations is yet to come as a task of Lejtényi law student and the speakers should only contribute to the rules and regulations to keep order. If there are any remarks considering other points of the programme, then these should be put off!

András Lejtényi: So the next is the justification, discussion and voting point by point. Chapter I. The character, task and aim of the alliance 1. section a) AHUCS is an organisation of the masses of university and college students which includes the whole number of youths participating in education.

Justification: we need a new organisation that only defends our particular interests. No other organisation is capable of it. In AWY not only the problems of university youth are at stake. For example, if a case of a young worker is more important then it would be discussed first, not our case. We cannot wait on every occasion, if we feel that our case is urgent. Anyway, we lost confidence in AWY so the significance of the new organisation is clear. (Applause)

Perbíró: Let us vote. I ask the question, does the mass meeting accept the presented text? Please vote by raising hand. Countervotes please! There are not any. Now the speakers can tell their possible counteropinions. József Szekeres Papp. Áron Mónus. Kálmán Szendrei. (Interruption: 'He is not here!') Are there any contributions? Please, raise your hands.

Sersli: István Sersli, medical student, fourth grade. Dear friends! Dear fellow students! Today the students of Szeged realise things of great significance. Huge waves of energy blow up from our rows. Such forces that have been suppressed for decades by soulless decisions

cottoning up to the East. The wholehearted voice that could have testified the ever optimistic, beautiful, ready-to-act ideas of youth was drowned. Our hands were handcuffed, our mouths were shut, we heard other slogans and hatred rose in our rows. The slogans of the army of betrayers invigorating dark voices forced us to clap our thick hands rythmically and to say out slogans invigorating incoherent and dark voices (hurrahing, applause) ... youth is mighty, it sweeps away the last splatters of this era full of shame. Our spirits, our readiness to act is liberating like a gigantic force and it is coming from so deep ... this pushed us and keeps us still alive. It sweeps away everything and everybody who tries to hold it back. Our work could not remain without results. The clever, thoughtful, sober and rightful claims of the youth have partly been fulfilled already and it should make us feel rightfully proudde, because it is the success of all of us. Nevertheless, this success mustn't stop us; however, it must unify our forces in order to reach further successes. Not everything is in order yet. We definitely have to damn AWY and its leaders, because they still have not woken up ... Where is AWY now? What are the leaders of AWY doing now? I tell you. Most of them are hiding from the storm, because they feel they could get wet, because the youth has lost confidence in them. The necessity of an organisation rises. An organisation that unites our forces, which is a rightful will of all of us. We would stand AHUCS there. But we are grademates too in every grade, not only youth in general. Every grade has already ...

Perbíró: Please, stop! Please speak about the rules and regulations! General phrases should not be told now! (great noise) If the time of general remarks comes, we will listen to them.

Sersli: I would like to talk about a concrete problem.

Perbíró: Concerning the rules and regulations. We want to keep order.

Sersli: Concerning the rules and regulations and AHUCS in general. ('Let us hear it!') The grades elected the most trustworthy people to be representatives for every grade. The AWY grade committees set up.

But AHUCS is not speaking about those cases which occur when these people are called back and we go into AHUCS. These people stand by AWY, they see the opportunities which lay in AWY. We do not have to blast AWY, but the leaders of AWY who weren't and aren't able to take the lead of us and to represent those rightful interests which have arose. I would like to hear about the AWY committees, which are the cream of the grades ... (great noise). This is not only the problem of the medical fourth grade, but also the problem of the college, arts, natural science and law students. ('It is not true!') I speak in the name of the fourth grade medical students. ('It is not true, stop it!') The people who are capable of leading, those can not elect the leading board of AHUCS ... a leading board that represents our interests and we really need that kind. So my opinion is that some students need AWY too and it would cause a great conflict, the unmatched situation, when one part would join AWY and the other would join AHUCS (noise). Those people who were elected to be members of the AWY committees and we feel that it was rightful, we have put our trust in them, so I think tha AWY can also meet those requirements in the basic structure (whispers) ... ('Stop it!')

Perbíró: Quiet, please! I take back the right to speak, because it is not about the rules and regulations. (applause, hurrah) Is there anybody else to contribute to the rules and regulations? Name, please!

Bari: Tamás Bari. My remark is not about the rules and regulations, I would like to suggest that everybody should join the discussion in his/her own name and as we stressed it yesterday during the meeting of intellectuals, not in the name of grademates, because it could cause some misunderstanding. ('Right!', applause)

Perbíró: Are there any additional remarks to the 1st point? Then let us hear the 2nd.

Lejtényi: Section b). Assistant lecturers also join us. Justification: Certain assistant lecturers have already testified our organisation appeals to them. Most of them have a serious organisational past, their experience and advice can really help us.

Perbíró: Please vote! Do you accept the 2nd point? Or any remarks first? Because if everybody would accept it first, then we could accelerate the course of the meeting and if there should be anybody who rejects the proposal by raising hand, then we give the right of speaking to the person (noise).

Boy: It is clear that everybody has to contribute to every point of the rules and regulations. Everyone has to confess their opinion.

Perbíró: Are there any remarks to the 2nd point? Who wants to speak? No one? Do you accept it? ('Yes!') Countervotes, please! It is accepted.

Lejtényi: 2nd point section a). AHUCS is an independent, free organisation. It follows the directions of the pure Marxist-Leninist party in its initiatives. It only moves, decides and declares on the basis of the decisive majority of the members. Justification: The main driving force of our national democratic state is the party. The party follows the right direction. The principles of the 20th Congress cleared away the anti-Marxist, inhuman remains of Stalinism in a stormy way. The procession is right and deserves respect. AHUCS must follow this way, the way of the party. The basic principle of AHUCS is democracy, spreading to the widest range of affairs. As a consequence, and in order to avoid one person leadership decisions can only be made by the majority of the members. So as to avoid the devastating system of instructions coming from above decisions can only be made by the members. Please rise to speak! (applause)

Perbíró: Róbert Hegyi medical student wants to speak.

Róbert Hegyi: Concerning this point, I would like it if we would outline concretely the notion of a purely Marxist party. Let us define it in the spirit of the 20th Congress, because the party was also said to be purely Marxist under Rákosi in 1950 (applause)

Perbíró: Any other remarks? Name, please!

Szendrei: Kálmán Szendrei, pharmacist, third grade. Dear mates! First of all, I would like to stress that I am absolutely promoting the set

up of AHUCS. But this view makes me speak. I heard it yesterday and today that it is lost. I heard it yesterday at the meeting of the Faculty of Natural Sciences that the case of AHUCS was lost. (noise) Certainly, I was not at present so I cannot have a clear opinion about that.

Someone: You cannot have of course, because there was not any meeting yesterday!

Szendrei: But it is without any doubts that recently the case is getting really coiled. AWY leaders came to negotiate, the Petőfi Circle, they advised us to join Attila József Circle. The rules and regulations declare that AHUCS is an independent body of university students. It is quite important, since we have to be extremely aware of such voices like joining Attila József Circle or AWY.

(Interruption: 'Other concern!')

Szendrei: But it is really important not to lose the right political direction. If we form an independent organisation, as the worker and peasant youths did ... Essence gets lost.

Perbíró: Order, please! As I see, you also got lost, because your speech was not about the rules and regulations. Please, concentrate on the matter, on the points! If someone has nothing to add to the points, please, remain silent!

Szendrei: The 2nd point is about the independence of AHUCS. That is what I am talking about. (noise) Because it has not been cleared yet. That it was accepted. Many say, 'Be aware!' etc. This voice can not be allowed.

Perbíró: I am forced to take back the right of speaking, you are against the order of the meeting. (applause)

Lejtényi: So the modified version is: AHUCS is an independent, free organisation. Its initiatives follow the direction of the pure marxist-leninist party in the spirit of the 20th Congress. Moves, declarations and decisions can only be made by the majority of the members. Right? (applause)

Perbíró: Do you accept it? Countervotes, please! I declare that it was accepted.

Lejtényi: 2nd point section b). The representatives of a minority opinion can ask for a public debate. Justification: The proof of democracy is to listen to the opinion of the minority. It is possible that their point of view [...] concerning the defense of student interests in the field of educational, social, cultural and political matters. We know our interests best, it is our task to represent them and to defend them, if it is necessary. Justification: an organisation standing outside of us, with leaders who are not only our the representatives, can not represent our interests as strongly as we can. We are not kids who cannot separate right from wrong. Our experience is that we can only reach what we fight for. Remarks please! (applause)

Perbíró: Any contributors? Name?

Soós: József Sándor Soós. Faculty of Natural Sciences.

Perbíró: Which grade?

Soós: Worker. What was read up by the comrade, I can absolutely accept. But we see that it was really good and necessary for the Hungarian youth to recover. Because AWY dragged the whole youth down. It is important to defend AHUCS whatever are the circumstances! (stormy applause)

Perbíró: Let's vote. Do you accept this point? Countervotes, please. It is accepted.

Lejtényi: 4th point. Our task is to fight for a merrier future of university and college students and to help the healthy plans of the government and the party concerning university matters. I think there is no need of justification, it goes without saying.

Perbíró: Any remarks? Then vote. Do you accept this point? Countervotes, please. I declare the general assembly accepted this point.

Lejtényi: 5th point. The aim of the alliance is that the youth leaving the universities and colleges, who are dedicated to represent the mind of the nation, should not be an indifferent, passive crowd, a layer of coward, supple and mean ones, but an army fighting bravely and soulfully for the nation, the country and for a merrier future. These people should not fear of talking about the truth, but they should serve the nation and the country with their skills, knowledge and ability (huge applause). Justification: the system of Stalin and Rákosi brought up intellectual cripples and sycophants. They used merciless and inhuman tools against who dared to raise their voices in the name of rationality and humanity against their brutality and failures. They tried to teach us rough selfishness, unprincipledness, repression and how to make a leg with some success. They wanted to tread down the desire of freedom coming from our souls, they wanted to turn us servants accepting their perfidies obediently. The spirit of the 20th Congress swept these intentions away. A free, fruitful atmosphere came into being, but the remains of the past still hamper us in unfolding. The aim of our youth organisation is to sweep these remains away from our consciousness to the perfection of our nation, country and ourselves (applause).

Perbíró: Any remarks? Yes? Name, please!

Mihalik: Ferenc Mihalik, sophomore medical student. In given cases AHUCS should also represent the interests of worker and peasant youngsters in their claims. (applause, 'Yes, hurrah!')

Perbíró: Do you accept this proposal? ('Yes!') Any other remarks? Name, please!

Bucsi: Ferenc Bucsi, third grade pharmacist. I wanted to speak later, but I think it is time to raise my issue. Probably we, all of us read the today edition of Szabad Ifjúság. It tries to propound our yesterday meeting as an initiative of secessionist policy. We stood together and would not care anymore... They say we want to stay away from the renewing theoretical fight which is running off in the whole country,

in mass organisations. I suggest that this article, this form of the article and the statements of the article should be rejected. We do want to represent the interests of every Hungarian worker. ('Hurrah!', rythmical, great applause)

Perbíró: I think it can be stated from this univocal applause that the proposal of the speaker was unanimously accepted. Any other remarks? Name, please!

Goda: Andor Goda, medical student, third grade. I would like to suggest that this point should be reformulated in this spirit. So this questions must be added and stressed! (noise)

Lejtényi: So the 5th point should be. The proposal... Is there another one?

Bakondi: Béla Bakondi, fourth grade medical student. I would like if the words 'wretched' and 'supple' would be deleted. Because we offend the layer of the old intellectuals who have always been fighting for us, but their voice was suppressed by party and government declarations. So they were not wretched and supple intellectuals, comrades, they really were good people, but they could not speak.

Lejtényi: Wretched is not even in the text...

Jancsó: Gábor Jancsó, didactics... The text did express that we brought up wretched and supple people. If we did not manage, it does mean the failure of education. (applause)

Perbíró: Any other remarks? Name please!

Abrudbányai: Iván Abrudbányai, law student. It would be best to stress it even more strongly that we do not want to get distant from workers and peasants. I suggest that AHUCS should appoint contact persons towards workers and peasants. This should be added.

Lejtényi: Right. But it is the matter of the structure of the organisation, isn't it? So, any other suggestions in relation to point 5? Because I would like to read the modified text. So, point 5 is: The aim of the alliance is that the youths leaving the universities and colleges

who are dedicated to represent the mind of the nation should not be an indifferent, passive crowd, a layer of coward, supple and mean ones, however an army fighting bravely and soulfully for the nation, the country and for a merrier future. These people should not be fear of talking about the truth, but they should serve the nation and the country with their skills, knowledge and ability. And here comes the amendment: AHUCS also should represent the interests of worker and peasant youth in certain cases. (In every case!) All right, AHUCS also should represent the interests of worker and peasant youth in every case. Is that OK?

Perbíró: Can this point be accepted including the modification? Any other remarks?

Boy: 'In certain cases' should be corrected: in certain political questions...

Lejtényi: In every case!

Perbíró: Any other contributions? I heard a voice that Géza Tokaji assistant lecturer would like to speak. He can not come in, he probably could not get into the hall. (Laughter.) Is he here? (No!) Then I ask the audience: do you accept the modification and this point according to the reformulation? (Yes, we do!) Countervotes, please! (Noise.)

Lejtényi: Second article. The members. The rights and duties of the members. 1st point. Every university and college student who admits the aims of AHUCS and considers the rules and regulations of AHUCS to be obligatory becomes the member of AHUCS by their free will. Justification: the democratic way of operation of AHUCS requires people who consider the constitution and the rules and regulations of the association to be obligatory. However, we cannot oblige anyone to join us who represent another point of view.

Perbíró: Who would like to speak? Yes, go on!

Soós: László Soós, law student, fourth grade. I would like to add that I disagree with the formulation: everybody accepts the rules and regulations. It is a far too unprecise kind of formulation, because I

think it should be made clear who is the member of AHUCS. It is a far too unprecise kind of formulation that every person who is at present here, at this assembly.

Lejtényi: No, it is not.

László Soós: In a given situation it would be definitely an exaggeration to say that he or she was not a member of AHUCS.

Lejtényi: Well, the whole text is: ‘who admits the aims of AHUCS and considers the rules and regulations of AHUCS to be obligatory.’

Soós: But who joins? It is an unprecise kind of formulation that everyone who is a university or a college student.

Lejtényi: Look, let us consider practice. There is a document and who wants to join AHUCS, signs it. Who signs the joining document.

Perbíró: Any other remarks? Let us vote. Please, vote! Countervotes! I declare this point was accepted by the assembly.

Lejtényi: So the 2nd point. The members of AHUCS can be the members of any other kind of organisation. Justification: almost every member of AHUCS is also the member of AWY and so on. Taking into account that our aims are largely the same, an AHUCS membership does not exclude the possibility to be an active member of another organisation unless neglecting the interests of AHUCS.

Perbíró: Yes, your name?

Szalontai: György Szalontai, college student. I would like to add anyone can be the member of any kind of organisation, the aims and aspirations of which do not go against the purposes of AHUCS. (Applause.)

Perbíró: Any other remarks? Then the answer, please.

Lejtényi: Well, tell me an organisation which goes against AHUCS. Go ahead!

Szalontai: AHUCS has just been set up. How do you know, what kind of organisations are going to be established in the near future? (‘Right!’ Applause.)

Perbíró: Has anyone got another point of view considering this remark, proposal? If there is not any, the rules and regulations should be modified in that way.

Lejtényi: So the 2nd point of the article II is: the members of AHUCS can be the members of any other organisation, the aims and aspirations of which do not go against the purposes of AHUCS. Is that correct?

Perbíró: Can this version be accepted? Countervotes. I declare that this point was accepted by the assembly.

Lejtényi: 3rd point. The members of AHUCS have the right to take the floor and to vote on the assemblies. During the debates the members can represent their own point of view and can ask for voting about them. Justification: AHUCS is the organisation of university and college students. The right to debate must be secured and must be given to every student and every member of AHUCS by which the issue of direct democracy is maintained. The right of voting is also concerned the same way. It was really problematic that the members did not dare to express their opinions. So it can be considered to be correct that let us have a public forum where everybody can tell their point of view without any restriction, without facing reprisal or pushback.

Perbíró: Any contributions? Then let us vote. Any countervotes? I declare that the point was accepted by the assembly.

Lejtényi: 4th point. The members of AHUCS have the right to introduce any kind of wish or injury towards the assembly and to initiate a debate about it. I did not formulate any special justification for this point.

Perbíró: Any remarks? Then let us vote. Any countervotes? There are not any. I declare that the point was accepted by the assembly.

Lejtényi: So, the 5th point. The members of AHUCS have the right to rely on the solidarity of AHUCS in a serious and correct case.

Justification: one of the main duties of AHUCS is to protect the interests of students as much as possible. The alliance consists of the sum of the given members, so a member should rely on its solidarity in every case which concerns the interests and the authority of the alliance. Without it the members would not dare to confess proposals and claims which would be addressed to the leaders of the state or the party, for example the recent question concerning Russian language. AHUCS, of course, will not stand by anyone if the given person breaks the moral standard, the law or any kind of regulation.

Perbíró: Any contributions? Yes, sir, the Chancellor has the right to speak!

Dezső Baróti, chancellor: My remark concerns one detail. It is not about the essence, I agree with it. The given example here is that AHUCS would not dare to claim given questions, for example the facultative education of language. To reveal justice, I would like to say that the the teachers and the leaders of the university have been dealing with the question for years and the fact that the Ministry of Education has accepted it without any hesitation – undoubtedly, at the growing claim of youth – and this outcome is largely the consequence of the visit of the chancellors of some main Hungarian universities. This visit was made before the decision; as comrade Világhy from the University of Budapest; comrade Gillemot from the University of Technology of Budapest and me, so we visited the Ministry of Education and expressed our opinion that facultative language education would serve the absorbing of university education. Furthermore, we asked for certain reforms which had not been initiated by university youth. For example, the problem of general university reform was formulated much more firmly, the supervision of martial education in our appearance, in the appearance of most universities. Otherwise, I find the justification correct, though its contents must be formulated by the youth. It is also correct that the speaker should be protected by the solidarity of youth, but I stress I disagree with the given example and let me tell me in general: I have

really no much fear of having arguments about the true wishes of youth between the professors and leaders of the university and the students, because we deeply agree with them and we have been emphasising it for a long time that the present system of university education needs to be reformed and in the future we want to fight for further steps together with youth. (Frenetic applause.)

Perbíró: Any othe remarks? Go ahead, please!

[...] ... there will be no process or rehabilitation, because there cannot be, if he/she differs from the opinion of AHUCS only in theoretical questions. Because the given person cannot foresee whether AHUCS accepts his/her point of view or not and if we might formulate it this way, it can occur that the given person does not go along with it. We have to secure in every case that either we agree or disagree with it, the given person would suffer no harm regardless what the theoretical background is.

Perbíró: Who has a contrary opinion in connection with this proposal? Yes, please!

(?): ... György, freshman, Faculty of Law. Except one case, when the given person represents an anti-democratic point of view. ("Yes, yes!") Well, it is another concern that just because of it he/she cannot suffer any harm and cannot be brought under any humiliating process.

Boy: This proposal can only be accepted, as it was mentioned in the former parts, if the given person admits his/her position to be wrong, brings himself/herself under, admits the declarations of AHUCS to be obligatory, since they represent a sixty per cent majority. Otherwise we cannot secure asylum to such, theoretically founded claims, because someone can even raise the ridiculous issue of restoring the Hungarian state order. That is impossible. There is freedom of speech, but we cannot give way to wrong ideas and, what is more, to reactionist ideas within the framework of AHUCS, because we would endanger the future of AHUCS with them. (Applause.)

Zólyom: Antal Zólyom, law student. I think it is no use arguing about it, because the proposal of Károly Hámori includes that AHUCS should make a decision in any case whether to take up a position or not.

Tóth: Tibor Tóth, medicine student, third grade. We back up any kind of democratic issue regardless the opinion of the given person. Because if someone blunders accidentally, can not foresee the consequences of it and if we do not even accept it, we must defend that person in the name of democracy and we must even fight! And if someone blunders accidentally, can not be the subject of terror... (Applause, noise, 'move further on the steps!')

Boy: In my opinion the problem should be formulated with strict precision if the given person theoretically alters from the the point of view of AHUCS, but let him/her tell us, the assembly rejects it at most. If the given person accepts the declarations of the assembly then the assembly should definitely protect the person from the consequences of his/her thoughts. But if the person insists on his/her ideas restively then we can not protect the person.

Lejtényi: The 3rd point includes it!

Perbíró: I just would have liked to get it accepted. Any other remarks!

(The contributor cannot be heard.)

Vető: Miklós Vető, law student. I disagree with the former speaker, because there are given rules among the present laws and moral imperatives considering the last six years which have been changed since then. I think such kind of formulation, such a sharp, principled bound which gives way to any kind of debate and contribution except from going against the present laws and moral imperatives; I do not think it is correct. Of course, it cannot mean that anyone can squarely stand by antidemocratic, fascist or antinational claims.

(Interjection): Please use the hand microphone during speaking, at least around the table because the people outside are shouting they cannot hear anything...

Boy: Stand on the desks and everyone can get in! (Noise.)

Perbíró: Lejtényi law student has the right to take the floor.

Lejtényi: So I would have a proposal standing in the middle which, well, justifies all points of view. We would include in the rules and regulations that 'the member of AHUCS has the right to rely on the solidarity and assistance of the alliance in every lawful and reasonable case'. Though I think it includes that 'lawful and reasonable' but the causes – the cause of solidarity – should be declared by the student assembly. (Noise.)

Perbíró: Quiet, please! (Louder!)

Vető: Eventually we should formulate in the rules and regulations who has the right to revoke the AHUCS membership.

Lejtényi: That is the concern of the organisational part.

Perbíró: Any other remarks? There are not, let us vote. Countervotes, please. There are not any so I declare that the point was accepted.

Lejtényi: 6th point. It is the duty of every AHUCS member to represent, defend and fight for the interests of the university and college students on every forum and in any other organisations. Justification: AHUCS was founded to defend the interests of university and college students. Every AHUCS member has to strive for – on the basis of rationality – ... (Noise, interjection: 'Come on!', 'Stand on the desks!')

Perbíró: Quiet! Quiet please! Please move a little bit closer to each other in the desks. Quiet please, we continue the debate! ('The carrying capacity of the hall cannot bear more!', 'Move further!') Quiet please, continue...

Lejtényi: After this incident I go on. AHUCS was founded to defend the interests of university and college students. Every AHUCS member has to strive for – on the basis of rationality – defending these

interests which are our own. Do not forget that we are all for one and one for all. Let's argue!

Perbíró: Contributions, please. No, then let us vote. Countervotes, please. There are not any. I declare it was accepted. (Interjection: "Go ahead, faster!")

Lejtényi: 7th point. An AHUCS member has to accept the declarations of university masses accepted by decisive majority. Justification: if a theory goes to the wall during a debate, it is obviously unjust. What is right, it is the interest of all. What is the interest of all of us, it is obligatory to fight for it.

Perbíró: Contributions? Let's vote. Yes?

(*Someone*): Another concern, that there is enough room here, why do not they come up here.

Perbíró: Let's vote. Countervotes? (Noise) Please, do not [...]

Lejtényi: [...] university and college students. Experience showed it that the leaders, especially the youth leaders are easily inclined to it. Our envoys should not be leaders (in the incorrect sense of the word), but the faithful and exact executors of the will of youth. The system of commands coming from up is theoretically full of mistakes and practically unjust. (Applause)

Perbíró: Remarks? Any contributors? If there are not any, let's vote. Countervotes! There are not any. I declare it was accepted.

Lejtényi: Chapter III. Forums with the right of accepting declarations. So the structure of the organisation. 1st point, chapter a. Our central and highest body is the student general assembly. Justification: point a and b are justified together, so point b is: the declarations of the student general assembly are considered to be obligatory for all AHUCS members. Justification: all university and college students are at present on a student general assembly. Its declarations must be apprehended as a phenomenon of common will. These declarations are the counterforces to every student.

Perbíró: Contributor? Name please!

Keresztes: Béla Keresztes medical student. AHUCS will become a nationwide organisation and it is beyond any doubt. Then how can the student assemblies be congregated when, as I know, a general assembly means that the sixty percent of all members are at present?

Lejtényi: Well, the answer is that a student general assembly represents the students of a university centre, of a university town, doesn't it? If the students of a given university town are at present on a general assembly then it is obvious that the declaration is obligatory for them. Wait, we are not a nationwide organisation yet. That is why the title of the rules and regulations is: provisional. This temporariness means that we are not a nationwide body yet. Then we will have a complete one which will express the whole. And if the student parliament comes into being, then it will definitely be the highest decision-making forum. Then it will definitely be added that nothing can go against the declarations of the student parliament.

Perbíró: Other remarks? Let's vote. Countervotes! No countervotes. I declare it was accepted.

Lejtényi: 2nd point, section a. The faculty student assembly has a decision-making right. The justification is short: a faculty assembly represents the will of the students of the faculty, section b: the faculty student assembly can make an obligatory decision in faculty matters which decision cannot go against the declarations of the general assembly. These declarations are obligatory for every AHUCS member of the faculty. Justification: it is obvious that a decision of a faculty assembly (which is a fragment of all university and college students) cannot make a decision spreading to all students because it would badly damage democracy. Considering that this kind of declaration is the outcome of the common will of the students of a faculty, it must be observed by all students of the faculty.

Perbíró: Any remarks? Yes!

Soós: Basically I would add that is a kind of negative formulation that it does not go against the declaration of certain bodies. It must be added that a higher body cannot reformulate or annihilate it.

Lejtényi: That is unnecessary because eventually it can only be annihilated by the general assembly.

Perbíró: Yes, from the back rows!

Boy: This is not...what you said before, because it is not added that first the student general assembly makes a decision then the faculty assembly. And if these two are going against each other, then it would result a split now. So this is not possible. On the other hand, if the faculty assembly sits, they already know what their intentions are concerning the student committee and an opposite direction is not possible. So they know what their intentions are.

Székely: László Székely, fourth grade, Faculty of Natural Sciences. I disagree with the modification of this point, namely that it cannot go against the declaration of a higher body, it already includes that if later the higher body – the university student general assembly – makes an opposite decision, the faculty declaration cannot go against it so it is already invalid. Because the given faculty took part in this general assembly and the given faculty also accepted the opposite decision.

Perbíró: Any other remarks? Let's vote. Where is the speaker?

Mónus: Áron Mónus, Faculty of Natural Sciences. I suggest that in a given case, if a student – neglecting the faculty – feels at a student general assembly that a faculty decision goes against the declarations or the beliefs of the student general assembly then the assembly should decide whether it is so or not. Because it may happen, mainly now, at the beginning, that any faculty makes a decision which does not match the declarations of the student general assembly. It may happen because there is still a body which has been brought into action since the birth of AWY by the politics of Rákosi that 'you are youth, the leader of AWY'. They made suggestions and they voted about them and if someone dared to do something else, disagreed, then you could see the consequences – for

example no irregular social payment and things like that. These bodies are still existing and we must watch out that these dark fellows...(delight), who had become the sycophants of this politics, should not have a further influence. They cannot – from the old fashioned politics – ...

Lejtényi: It will be expressed in section b. (Noise.)

Girl: A medical student. What happens if two different faculty decisions go against each other? Which faculty decision will be justified and on the basis of what? (Noise.)

Perbíró: Quiet please! Please listen to the speaker!

(Same contributor): Let me just think about the conflicts between the medical and pharmacy students on the yesterday assembly. (Noise.) Every faculty has its own interest and it may conflict with the interests of another faculty.

(Another girl): I would like to answer. If a faculty has a special interest, it is clear that the given faculty makes the decision. And exactly the medical and pharmacy students are those who – let's say it so – have this conflict, because both faculties have different problems and every faculty is aware of their problems and medicine-pharmacy problems can never clash. (Applause.)

Lejtényi: On the other hand, the formulation of this point is the following: 'can make an obligatory decision in faculty matters'. So only in faculty concerns. So, for example, pharmacy students cannot accept an obligatory declaration within the sphere of law or especially medical students, can they? ...That is logical.

Perbíró: Any other remarks? Then let's vote. Countervotes, please. No countervotes. I declare it was accepted.

Lejtényi: Section c. The faculty assembly can present a proposal towards the student general assembly after it has been accepted by six tenth of the faculty. Justification: a decision of the faculty assembly reflects the will of the majority of the faculty. This decision can be presented in the name of the faculty.

Perbíró: Remarks please. Yes! Name please!

Enyedi: Ferenc Enyedi, Faculty of Arts. It is completely unnecessary in the justification... (Large noise.)

Perbíró: Who wants to speak?

Lejtényi: (technical problem)... the declarations of which do not conflict with the decisions of the higher forums, section b: the decisions of the group gathering are obligatory for the AHUCS members of the group. Section c: the group gathering can lay a declarative proposal before the higher forums. I thought these two points - number three and four - have the same ground as the previous one. So I find it unnecessary to add a separate justification to it in order to spare time. (Right!)

Perbíró: Any comments? Yes!

Soós: I generally cannot agree with the six tenth majority! Practice shows that usually those countries could form qualified majority where decadence has raised its head. I agree with the 51 percent majority.

Lejtényi: It will be the concern of 4th point's 1st point. (Laughter.)

Perbíró: Contributes? Then let's vote, who accepts it? Countervotes. There are not any. It was accepted.

Lejtényi: Section a. Execution.

Perbíró: Just a second, there is a speaker!

Someone: The structure is grammatically not correct. Let's take a dot here!

Perbíró: What?

Someone: 'Decision-making' is not correct grammatically. Present a declarative proposal towards someone or something.

Girl: There was a previous remark: worker-peasant youth [...] and who has the right to revoke the AHUCS membership. I think you said

then it would be presented in chapter III. So I would not like if it would sink into oblivion! (Right, right!)

Boy (law student): I would like to add that the faculty or the student general assembly should also be quorate when 60 or some other percent of the students are at present.

Lejtényi: Chapter IV, 1st point... So the idea has just been raised that connect persons should be sent towards the worker and peasant youth. So let's formulate it now!

(Interjection: Can the outsiders hear the problem? – Yes! The microphone is on!)

Lejtényi: So let's speak about the formulation and the shape, how we should add this idea to the rules and regulations that we send connect persons to worker-peasant youth. So how should it be done? To the organisations or to other bodies? Because their recent organisational form is AWY. So how should we do it... sending connect persons to the AWY?

Boy: I suggest that we should send an AHUCS connect person to every larger factory!

Perbíró: Yes, there is another contributor!

Contributor: I would like to ask the previous speaker how he thinks the realisation. That... you take them to the factory? Or what? It would be good to make a research!

Abrudbányai: It is a question of the future because AHUCS has not gained its final shape in the whole country yet. It will take time until AHUCS becomes a nationwide organisation. We think of it that colleges found AHUCS, peasants establish their own organisation then these would be incorporated into not AWY, but into a unified, embracing organisation, ... (large noise) ... the workers within the factories. After there is an independent organisation, they establish a body according to AHUCS.

Lejtényi: But, first of all, it depends on worker and peasant youngsters whether they found a new organisation.

Perbíró: Yes!

(?): Sándor..., medical student. I think Szabad Ifjúság called us seceders just today. Not completely but that is the situation. We cannot wait till the remaining universities of the country establish their own AHUCS organisations. We have already made it. In order to prevent them from telling workers that we want to deconstruct AWY, that we set up a counter-revolution we should send deputies to the factories. It is all the same whether AWY or they themselves organise a gathering and there the envoys unfold the aims of AHUCS and state that we all back up any actions of workers and peasant youth either within or outside the framework of AWY, if they have rightful claims. ('That is it!', applause.)

Boy: Before we want to send representatives to the factory workers, first we should send them to other important centres because...(noise).

Mihalik: Ferenc Mihalik, sophomore medical student. I suggest that we should copy the here argued and accepted rules and regulations and declarations and spread them to the members and then we send these copies to our young worker and peasant friends to the different parts of the country and they will know that we assist them considering every kind of serious representation of interests. (Yes!) And I would like it if it would be realised really soon. Within days.

Lejtényi: I would like to answer...

Mihalik: Szabad Ifjúság glosses over and Délmagyarország circulates our problems glossing them over! (Standing ovation.)

Székely: I think, first of all, the University Council should send envoys to the factories. Besides, what the previous speaker suggested, these envoys should popularise our rules and regulations and also our claims in the factories, so they should make them conscious of these claims. Furthermore, of course, let's do it, what he said, give copies to

the members. They should also send them to their acquaintances. Besides these, finally, I also suggest that we should popularise these claims and the programme by using the press. We have already started it and we should send the copies to the remaining universities. Several copies to every university. I suggest quite the same realisation as the previous speaker: everybody should send a copy to a friend or a former classmate who is a university student now. And these persons should popularise our thoughts at the given university. (Applause.)

Perbíró: I have to warn the speakers that they should comment the rules and regulations and should not initiate anything diverting the topic. That – what was suggested by Székely natural sciences faculty student –, let you tell me, is going against several laws and would toss the students into such adventures which are not desirable. In the followings the Chancellor has the right to speak, he outlines some aspects of this question.

Baróti: Dear friends! I find it outstandingly important that AHUCS, which is taking shape, should confess solidarity with worker and peasant youth. Temporarily I think there is no need to add more to the rules and regulations. The question of how making contact can be regularised later. It is enough to express the desire of making contact. But actually that is not why I took the floor, more to the point, I find it a right complaint that the press distorts the actions of the university students of Szeged. (Standing ovation.) The seriously taken procession of this gathering has also confirmed us, the present representatives of the circle of professors that this is a firm and democratic gathering of youth. I want to state that I myself will try to make an effort that the press of Budapest and my friends there should handle the action of university youth at the level of its seriousness. They should transmit what you, my friends, have stated here correctly and several times towards the public of the country: that the youth of the universities does not want to split from worker-peasant youngsters. How could it even happen when most of you are the children of the worker and peasant class... (Rhythmical applause.) Dear friends! Let me also tell

you that standing ovation reminds me not the most democratic memories...(delight, applause).

Lejtényi: Let me call your attention to the 5th point of subsection b which includes that until we become nationwide, there would be an organising council which gets in touch with the proper forums you mentioned before. So I suggest the following formulation of Chapter IV, 5th point of section a: 'AHUCS should send envoys to every factory and agricultural centre to get in touch with the youngsters there.' (Interjections: 'No, no! Not yet!', 'Solidarity should be stressed!')

Lejtényi: The problem of solidarity is also in the 5th point of Chapter IV.

Girl: I rise to speak because I think it is not correct to send the envoys now. We have to state in this point that we feel solidarity with the worker-peasant youth but that is all we can do now. That is why you should formulate it this way in the rules and regulations! (It will be included!)

Boy: I would like to ask a question: why does not AHUCS get in touch with secondary schools?

Lejtényi: We do not get involved in secondary school problems. Because we could enrol the pioneer movement as well. The circumstances are not the same in a secondary school and in a university. Neither among workers and peasants as well.

Girl: I would like to add that AHUCS was after all founded to deal with particular university problems. And that is why it differs from AWY. If it included high school students and pioneers and everyone else, it would be unnecessary to look for a new name...(applause, 'Right!')

Vécsei: György Vécsei, faculty of arts. I promote the previous contribution of the high-school student. It is only about making a connection. High-school students will also get on the university so they also have to know our problems and if we get in touch with them

in that way, our life and problems will be displayed to them. It does not mean access to AHUCS for high- school students. (Applause.)

Erdős: Sándor Erdős, pharmacy student. I would like to say that as in the case of worker-peasant youngsters it was proposed that we should join their fight and have solidarity with them – we could do the same in the case of high school students...

Perbíró: It is possible, really. (Applause.)

Boy, biologist, fourth grade: I suggest the followings: bearing in mind that all over the town there are gossips about AHUCS which are far from reality, let us initiate a gathering with present AWY representatives of factories and secondary schools. They and our AHUCS members appointed here could speak about getting in contact...(noise).

Boy: Contacts can be made with worker-peasant youth in Szeged in that way that there would be an AHUCS envoy or committee as it worked in other organisations. It is clear that there is no need to send envoy to every factory, but we could receive the delegates of any factory and peasant youth in a friendly way, regardless what the problem or the question is and these delegates could get in touch with AHUCS or ask for help. That is how we secure cooperation with worker-peasant youth.

Gábor Fodor, member of the Academy: Dear friends of mine, I totally agree with the democratic aims which were mentioned before and I am absolutely pleased by the measured and sober style of every point and justification of the rules and regulations. Well, as I see, the main problem is how it could be possible to have the worker-peasant youth and secondary school students to know that you feel solidarity towards them. Beyond the everyday press products, for example the press of Budapest – as the Chancellor promised it – which will deal with the issue, I think it would be good to appoint your leaders- it is, of course, only a suggestion, I do not want to get involved in the matters of youth – that they should formulate a communique in which

the aims, the basic principles of the rules and regulations, as well as the solidarity with the worker-peasant youth, are stated. (Massive applause.)

Perbíró: My friends, I can declare – hearing this massive applause – that you accepted the suggestion of Gábor Fodor academician unanimously. And you appoint the leaders to formulate a communique in order to inform the press. Before going on with the speeches I inform you that Péter Halász, the workmate of Hétfői Hírlap is at present and would like to... (His voice is suppressed by invigoration: 'Let's hear him! Let's hear! Hurrah!')

Péter Halász: First of all, dear friends, let me greet you from the bottom of my heart! And I would like to secure all participants of this assembly that the public of the country will get a clear picture about the present general assembly in the tomorrow edition of Hétfői Hírlap. ('Hurrah!' Standing ovation.)

[Tape error]

Lejtényi: ... I suggest that we divide the whole issue into two parts. We show our solidarity towards worker, peasant and secondary school youth, let us add it to chapter IV, which contains the given regulations as follows: 'We ensure worker, peasant and secondary school students about our solidarity'. Is it OK? Can it be accepted? Right. The second part, concrete realisation, it should be within the organisational part with the following formulation: 'AHUCS sends envoys to worker-peasant and secondary....'

Perbíró: No. Solidarity...

Lejtényi: Is it not necessary? OK, all right, we stay at the first proposal then that we add it to the chapter of mixed dispositions. Do you accept it?

Perbíró: Any countervotes? No. I declare it was accepted. We go to the next point.

Lejtényi: Well, the next point is subsection b. Executive

representative bodies, point 1/a. In the intervals between two student assemblies, the university student council represents all students. Justifications: The declarations of the student general assembly must be executed. Execution – for example petitions or something like that – can not be performed by the community consisting of several thousand students, it is obvious. During negotiations, it is not possible to talk with all students when quick decisions have to be made, it cannot be made even from a practical point of view. The coordination of the claims of the given faculties must also be done and it is much easier through delegates.

Perbíró: Comments please. No Comments? Let's vote. Any counter-opinions? I declare...

Boy: There is a counter-opinion... Considering that we could not understand the proposal in the meantime it should be repeated in order to avoid the system of voting-machine.

Lejtényi: In the intervals between two student assemblies the university student council represents all students. Was it accepted?

Boy: But when it is convoked? What defines the date of convoking?

Lejtényi: Of the student general assembly? In every month. Well, finally it depends on the will of the members but regularly in every month. Ok? Or, may be as a result of a written petition of at least 10 percent of the members. It is absolutely a parliamentlike process.

L. Soós: I suggest that it should be convoked after the initiative of a two-third majority of any faculty! (Right!)

Lejtényi: Ok. That is a detail.

[End of tape 1]

Lejtényi: I disagree because we have to secure the rights of the minority, so when it is initiated by a smaller group of people, it must be convoked. So we stay at the 10 percent.

L. Soós: I would like to add...

Perbíró: It is always the 10 percent of the member of the given faculty.

Girl: I would like to add that if there is not such initiation then it must be convoked quarterly.

Lejtényi: Monthly. Quarterly or monthly? (Crowd: Quarterly!)

Székely: I stand by the quarterly convocation because the convocation of such a huge mass in every month – sometimes even without any particular reason – would be unnecessary, in my opinion. It would contaminate the system of the gatherings that there is an unnecessary convocation and 50-60 percent of the students wait here for one or two hours...

Perbíró: Let us vote about this proposal. So the student general assembly must be convoked quarterly. Countervotes? No, there are not any. I declare it was accepted in that way.

Lejtényi: So the formulation is as follows: ‘The student general assembly must be regularly convoked quarterly. An irregular convocation must also be executed by the written petition of at least 10 percent of the members...’

(Interjection cannot be heard.)

Perbíró: Written. Otherwise they can not count the 10 percent. Can 10 percent march on? So a written petition is inevitable. Yes!

Boy: When it is necessary to convoke the general assembly, it must be presented by stating what the reason of convocation is. They inform the other grades and they vote about convocation.

Lejtényi: Right. Can this formulation go?

Perbíró: Well, it can go if a faculty wants it then 51 percent of the students of the faculty. Is that all right? Can it be accepted? Countervotes, please! There are not any. I declare it was accepted in that way.

Lejtényi: Article b. The university council is an executive body

without the right of making decisions. Justification: if we give the right to make decision to the university student council we would give a chance to resuscitate the system of commands coming from up we all deeply disapprove. The task of the university student council is to execute those declarations which were accepted by the student general assembly and was desired by all university and college students. Can it go?

Perbíró: Any comments? No. Let us vote. Any countervotes? There are no any, so I declare it was accepted.

Lejtényi: Article c. The university council consists of three-three delegates of all faculties, who are elected on the faculty assemblies by general, democratic balloting. Justification: experience has showed that a smaller body can get faster through doubtful questions. The delegates must be elected according to the principle of operation of the alliance in order to avoid contradiction in terms.

Perbíró: Any contributions? Yes!

Laszádi: László Laszádi, medical student. I would like to add something to this point I previously said to the leaders of AHUCS and I would like to tell it to you now. If every faculty elects three deputies, a contradictory situation can come into being that there can be grades which are not represented at all. It may happen that one person represents two grades and a grade is not represented at all. As a consequence, the leading board can get distant from that grade, more clearly from the masses, from you. I think there is another hindering effect of this thing: if every grade elects, every faculty elects three deputies, the grade does not know itself as the students know each other. So every faculty, every grade should elect a deputy to that council. In that way the leading board would prove to be more democratic. The leaders could not get distant from the crowd even if they would want to. (Applause.)

Székely: I would like to say something though I have already commented the problem previously. In my opinion, the deputies of the grades take part in the faculty assembly. The deputies of the faculty in the university council. The university student council cannot be a mass

organisation in which every grade represents themselves. Now I think of the 20-person grades, there are a lot of them on the Faculty of Natural Sciences. The fact that certain grades are not represented in the student council, results in some insufficiency anyway till the faculty student councils have come into being. But the next point regulates the question of faculty student council and according to it I support the idea of the three persons.

Perbíró: Lejtényi has the right to speak.

Lejtényi: So, why we have settled by number three. As Székely has just unfolded it, there are grades which consist of twenty people. But there is... I want to unfold another problem. The College of Pedagogical Studies consists of three grades. The faculty of medicine of six grades. If every grade would elect a deputy into the university student council, one faculty – namely the faculty of medicine – and I really do not want to suspect the faculty of medicine of anything at all or I would not want to generate any kind of tension, it would be a mistake to suppose. Anyway, if we would elect grade by grade, one faculty would have more representatives in the student council and it would not lead to democratic...(noise). But if every faculty sends three persons, none of the faculties can overbalance university student council, democracy is secured. Of course, the decisive aspect of the election of the deputies – it must be taken into consideration – is that those must be elected in whom the faculties can put tremendous trust.

Perbíró: Yes!

Girl: I also agree with the three persons mainly because if there are more people than 18, 20 or 21 it will turn into a mass event and even those few people – already 18 or 21 or who knows how many – can hardly manage. We experienced it when we prepared the rules and regulations and the others. And you know really well when everyone has a proposal, an idea, the faculties can talk them over and there can be a lively connection through AHUCS delegates. But 18 or 21 people are far enough – so three-three persons – to talk everything over.

Boy: The faculty of medicine has doubts because we were pushed back and it has not been solved yet. And I am nearly sure about it if it will be organised on the faculty of medicine, exactly the problem of AHUCS, then the students will accept it. I am a medical student too, that is why I speak so.

Laszáti: I would like to talk again. I would like to warn you again not to get distant, be aware of the leaders not to get distant from the masses! (Noise.)

Lejtényi: It is all too reactive because the student council is not a decision-making but an executive body.

Laszáti: So I accept the will of the majority.

Perbíró: Please vote. Does someone still want to speak?

Boy: I would like to ask till when is the election is valid?

Lejtényi: The election is valid until the members call back the deputies. Of course in every year, in every sixth month, in every year, maximum. So the deputies are elected for one schoolyear (large noise). Do we elect them in every sixth month? In every year!

Abrudbányi: The one year validity is suitable because a grade leaves the university every year so another election is needed.

Perbíró: Let us vote about it. Can it be accepted in that way? Please raise your hands in time or we never finish!

Boy: I have already raised my hand. It must be modified that they can be called back any time.

Perbíró: That was the point. Please vote. Do you accept it? Countervotes! There are no any. I declare this was accepted by the assembly.

Lejtényi: So. I present the 2nd and the 3rd points together. 2nd point section a: the execution of the declarations of the faculty assembly is the duty of the faculty council elected on every grade; section b: the faculty council has no right to make declarations. Section 3/a: the

execution of the grade assembly is the duty of the faculty council elected on every grade; section b: the grade council has no right to make declarations. 4th point, section a: the execution of the declarations of the group assembly is the duty of the group delegate elected by the group. Section b: the group deputy has no right to make declarations. Since these points are theoretically the same as the former ones, I thought there was no need to write another justification.

Perbíró: Contributions please!

Soós: It is not defined yet, at what intervals should the faculty and grade assemblies be congregated.

Lejtényi: These are special local concerns which can not be regulated by the rules and regulations.

Perbíró: Let us vote about it. Any countervotes? I declare there were no any countervotes, it was accepted.

Lejtényi: 5th point. Until the organisation is not a nationwide one, the organising council operating beside the university student council gets in touch with the university students of the country in order to widen the basis of the organisation. Justification: to make a local, small organisation is going against our aims. Our organisation must be a nationwide one including all university and college students. The task of the organising council should only be to get in touch with them and to conduct the affairs of this concern and to be responsible for operation towards all students.

Perbíró: Any remarks? Yes, please! Well, I ask you to vote. Any contributions? (Can not be heard!)

Lejtényi: Yeah, towards all students, yes...

Perbíró: Let's vote, do you accept it with the modification? Countervotes please! There are not any, I declare it was accepted.

Boy: I would like to talk about something that was totally forgotten. It is the problem of assistant lecturers. According to the

rules and regulations, assistant lecturers are not represented in the university council.

Lejtényi: If they get enough votes, they are.

Girl: Wouldn't it be good to define, how many deputies can they send?

Lejtényi: No, they are included in the faculty...

Boy: I suggest that assistant lecturers should belong to the faculty or grade of the given professorship.

Lejtényi: It goes without saying. Chapter IV. Mixed regulations. An assembly is quorate when 60 percent of the members are at present. There is no need to justify this point.

Boy: 60 percent of the members are at present. So that is general, a whole majority is required. Probably the 60 percent of those who are at present?

Perbíró: Dear friends, two questions must be taken into consideration here. One thing is when a general assembly is quorate and there is another what makes a declaration valid. For a quorate assembly the presence of the 60 percent of the members is needed and for making a declaration the 51 percent of the members who are at present. So declarations are made with simple majority. Can it be accepted concerning this interpretation? Countervotes please! There are not any, I declare it was accepted by the assembly. Any opinions going against it? Yes!

Boy: I only argue with the simple majority, I think 51 percent is not enough. (Insufficient recording.)

Boy: In connection with this point, I would like to add that it could only be accepted if AWY is also willing to receive an AHUCS member on their assemblies, because if AWY admits AHUCS, then they are obliged to receive our members on their assemblies.

Lejtényi: That is correct.

Perbíró: Dear friends of mine, we have received a telegram in the meantime. Let me read it. University of Szeged Student Committee of AHUCS Szeged. Please inform us, we wish you success and we send our greetings to you! – The students of the University of Technology. (Massive applause.) Another telegram: The college of Agricultural Mechanical Engineers – the assembly of the 2nd grade has talked over the 12-point declaration of the students of Szeged. The grade agrees with the claims of the 12 points and we ask you to add the urgent supervision of welfare institutions like youth hostels, diner, fellowship etc. To the 3rd point concerning university reforms. We did not receive a truck due to administrative instructions namely there was no permission to carry persons on it so we could not take part in the Saturday mass gathering. We agree with the reorganisation of AHUCS and we assist. And we very much welcome you as well! – The 2nd grade of the College of Agricultural Mechanical Engineers. (Steady applause.) I ask you to vote about the formerly presented point of the rules and regulations. Countervotes please! There are not any, I declare it was accepted.

Lejtényi: 3rd point. When our alliance becomes a nationwide organisation, our highest decision-making body will be the student parliament. Justification: student parliament will be the will-displaying forum of all Hungarian university and college students.

Perbíró: Remarks please!

Boy: I partly disagree with the idea that the student parliament will include universities which are not the members of AHUCS. So AHUCS cannot be accepted...

Lejtényi: That is impossible. It will be exclusively the student parliament of AHUCS.

Perbíró: Any other contributions? I ask you to vote. Countervotes, please! It was accepted by the assembly without countervote.

Lejtényi: When our alliance becomes a nationwide organisation, the AHUCS parliament will be our highest decision-making body.

4th point. The composition and the operative principles of the student parliament must be decided at the student general assemblies of the certain universities. Justification: the first task is to create a wider university organisation. And then we talk over that...so let us create the wider organisation first and when there is an AHUCS body at every university centre, then there will be unified negotiations and their opinions will be coordinated by the highest body. Is that right?

Perbíró: Any contributions? Let us vote. Countervotes, please! It was accepted without countervotes.

Lejtényi: 5th point. AHUCS wants to have a friendly and mutually backed up connection with AWY. Justification: AHUCS is an alliance of university and college students, it does not split up with and does not stand against its brothers, the worker and peasant youth, whose current organisational form is the AWY. We do not have opposite claims, but they show to different directions.

Perbíró: Any remarks? Please vote. Countervotes, please! It was accepted without countervote.

Lejtényi: 6th point. The basic operative and organisational principle of AHUCS is perfect democracy, which is articulated according to the principles of the 20th congress. One-man leadership was replaced with the leadership of the widest masses, dogmatism with the free and fruitful fight of opinions and ideas. Justification: we have experienced... (Interception: 'There is no need to justify it! Any remarks?')

Boy: I have a proposal considering the mixed regulations, not this one. As we have stood by the whole Hungarian youth alliance, we have to stand by the international youth alliance as well. We should assist them and ask for their assistance as well. (Applause.)

Perbíró: It is clear from the loud applause that this proposal was accepted unanimously, so there is no need to vote about it. There is another proposal.

Boy: I suggest that if AHUCS is going to be a nationwide university organisation, then we should ask for the possibility of joining the International Democratic Youth Federation. (Applause.)

Boy: I would like to suggest something else. Every organisation of the world has a financial background. No one mentioned about the financial background of this organisation in the rules and regulations. Obviously, there should be such a thing. ('Should be!', noise) When it becomes a nationwide organisation, then the student parliament of AHUCS will have to make a decision about it, we, the students of Szeged cannot decide whether the students of the other universities...

Perbíró: Dear friends of mine, let me tell you something in this matter! I do not want to interfere in your affairs, but it is a very important question, indeed, because the youth alliance must have some kind of financial basis. I propose the next formulation: the alliance – AHUCS – requires a membership fee from the members and the amount of the fee will be decided by the student parliament. If you accept it, please raise your hands! Yes?

Boy: I think AHUCS must have a financial basis here in Szeged till then. For example, we have already declared that we should get blanks printed. It needs a financial background. So let us vote a temporary fee now!

Boy: Everybody should contribute according to their present financial situation! ('No!')

Boy: In my opinion, if somebody signs the transcription form, should immediately pay two forints or something in order to establish a financial fund! (Applause.)

Boda: I am Andor Boda from the faculty of medicine. Considering this urgent need for money I suggest that we should vote that everyone could give some money now. ('No, not!')

Girl: If that is the way of solving the problem, it would be much more purposeful and rational that every grade should elect on AHUCS

contact person or call it what you want and the grade gives the money to that person who forwards it to the student council.

Lejtényi: But how much money?

Girl: Well, the amount should be decided by the grade or the unified student assembly should define it right now.

Boy: I would like to say something. AWY has never lived from only its membership fees. We are the legal successor of AWY, we inherit the financial basis of AWY within the framework of the university. They have always backed up AWY, they should back up AHUCS now! (Invigoration.)

Boy: But, for example, the communique should soon be formulated and multiplied.

Lejtényi: It is needless to be multiplied, one copy is enough. The newspapers will publish the communique, the press will deal with it...

Péter Halász, journalist: Certainly a newspaper cannot publish the whole communique or the whole text of the rules and regulations because it would fill the newspaper entirely. However, I would find it a correct thing to formulate a shorter communique then we should have a look at it together whether it can be published or not. But I do not know that the publication of the communique would mean more than a colourful, exact account about the significance of the today assembly? ('An account would mean more!') Recently we read a lot of communiques. Usually they are not colourful, amusing readings. It would be good now to turn back to journalism. I am here to transmit and mirror this event towards the readers.

Székely: First of all I would like to tell you that it is true that the communique costs nothing but, for example, some people got in touch with other universities by visiting them on their own expenses. Another concern is that somehow it should be secured for AHUCS to take part in the distribution of the still existing university cultural and sport funds. So the cultural and sport fund can be harmonized in a

better way than in the current situation that they are distributed on the grades.

Perbíró: The Chancellor has the right to speak.

Baróti: Can I speak now? Dear friends! Perhaps, in order to avoid unnecessary debates over that matter, I could make an announcement, though I wanted to come up with it later. As far as I am concerned, I de facto admit the foundation of AHUCS and I consider this democratic gathering of youth as a representation of the youth of Szeged and I will lay it before the university council. Of course, the establishment of AHUCS raises several difficult legal problems, which I myself can not make clear. Such a problem is the future of the university cultural and sport fund and several other questions. The adjustment of AHUCS to the structure of university life will be launched on Monday during my negotiations with the local university student council and we will find out together where AHUCS could be temporarily fitted in the university, which, of course, can only gain a legal status if the Ministry of Home Affairs admits the status of AHUCS. I promise you that I will promote the organisational form of AHUCS when I send it to the Secretary of Education. I will back up the endeavours of AHUCS because I have been convinced that the youth of our university takes the questions referring to them seriously and I believe that the university student council will help me to maintain complete order and tranquility at the university during the following days and weeks. It is very important because the execution of dispositions concerning the facultative language learning, for example, and several other youth claims can only be made if the university youth shows immaculate discipline in order to help those leaders of the university who agree with them and cannot even imagine university without cooperating with youth. I believe and everything I have heard convinces me that the university youth of Szeged is ripe for cultivating its own cases and ripe for realising educational discipline and everything else which is required for peaceful university work. So that is why we should not start talking over the relationship between the university, the university council and

AHUCS – as I said I can not make a one-man decision in this matter. I think it is enough at the moment that I will add all important questions to the agenda with the youth council with my really strong appeal and love of youth. (Applause.)

Boy: I would like to ask the journalists to publish the telegrams in their newspapers we have already received. Not their words, but the faculties that sent them so the country could see that... (Noise suppressed by applause.)

Perbíró: My friends, we interrupt contributions for a while and I pass the right of speaking to the editor of Délmagyarország.

Tibor Markovits: Just a few words. The reason of being late is that I could hardly get in here. The Délmagyarország totally agrees with the claims of the university youth of Szeged. Undoubtedly, we only published a short writing about the previous gathering. The editorial board decided to publish all claims of suggestions of university youth in the tomorrow edition. We also publish an account about the recent assembly. We deal separately with the events of today and the previous days in our editorial. We also mention the contributions, claims and words of youngsters in the account about Attila József Circle. That is what I wanted to tell you. (Massive applause.) We also ask in the editorial for larger circulation and larger extent. The columns of the newspaper are not made of rubber – as journalist slang says. As we say, six columns are six columns, not even a row can be added. You may have seen the today edition, there is so much to mention but the space is limited. Numbers, ads. We can not put more in it than what the size of the paper lets. That is why we publish every event according to our possibilities and the details of the events concerning the programme of AHUCS if we get the declaration form which announces the passing of the rules and regulations, mainly the details. Probably not in the tomorrow edition because we cannot jam everything in, but in the next one. So we absolutely agree with the proposals and we try to do our best and tell the story in the tomorrow edition without any kind of self-restrictions. (Massive applause.)

Perbíró: Let us continue the remarks. Yes!

Boy: AWY should have represented the interests of youth. First of all, the interests of university students. It has become clear for all of us that AWY has failed to achieve these goals.

Abrudbányai: Here at the university we have dawned on the fact that we have found each other because our interests point to the same direction. We would like – and I think we all would like – if we would exterminate the – here and there – still existing lawyer-doctor oppositions and we would shake hands finally! (Great enthusiasm, applause.)

Boy: My contribution is not about the rules and regulations. The rules and regulations are nice and correct. We see that the youth of all universities has stood by us, and we should... (Great delight suppresses his voice.)

Perbíró: Please continue your contribution.

Boy: Let us make a remarkable monument and we have the opportunity, it may cost lots of money, comrades, but we do not have to realise it at once. There is a clock in the institute, this clock plays music, it is famous all over Europe, and it has never come to anyone's mind for the last twelve years that the clock should have been repaired, we should gather the money. I make use of the present situation that we are all here together, it is the investment of the basic organisation, we should make a declaration after talking the programme over that we get the clockwork repaired. Everybody gives in some money depending on their current financial situation. This clock should work till the AHUCS fullfills its task. (Applause.)

Girl: I would like to answer...

The previous boy: Comrades! I did not mean to go there and destroy the clock, if something... I did not mean it, anyway, to stop the clock...(Noise, interjections.)

Perbíró: Dear friends, I am forced to withdraw the right of speaking from the contributor because it is absolutely another concern. I do not

want to cause any harms but I think you speak like daydreamers. There is no room for such thoughts on this general assembly! We discuss the rules and regulations now. Order please! We talk about the rules and regulations, please keep focusing on this point!

Girl: I would like to get an answer ...

Boy: I wanted a remarkable monument...

Girl: The Chancellor mentioned that the university council dealt with the restoration of the clock and its total costs are one hundred thousand forints. (Astonishment.)

Boy: It costs ten thousand forints. And although it is another concern, I would like to tell you at last: it costs ten thousand forints to create a new clockwork and the person who made it is willing to restore the clock, to make a new clock, but the materials cost ten thousand forints.

Baróti: Move on by closing this matter that if the person repairs it for ten thousand forints then he should come and see me!

Boy: In the meantime, an assistant lecturer made a suggestion. He said that... And I would like us to declare what everybody wants to say, we should pay an AHUCS membership fee! (Large noise suppresses the speaker.)

Lejtényi: I have a bridging proposal: the original fee was one forint per month, but let us make the following... considering that we want to maintain the friendly relationship with AWY: let us pay fifty fillérs for AWY and fifty fillérs for AHUCS! (Laughter.) That is a clear situation. (Interruption: 'Please finish it!')

Kiss: Tamás Kiss, law student. We have already stated that there is an application form at every grade and we have a proposal now considering its text: 'Declaration of Entering, I, the under-mentioned – future profession, grade, student – now join AHUCS. I accept its rules and regulations and I consider them as to be obligatory regarding myself, signature.' It is the task of the grade contact person or the

faculty council when it is gathered on the faculties and it is also possible – if you accept it – that the given person gives one forint when he/she signs the declaration. ('Right!', applause.)

Perbíró: The applause asserts me that we are finished with this matter now. The membership fee is one forint per month. (Contribution cannot be understood, noise.) Dear friends, discussion is finished! It is no use debating over the question further. I think the points of views can now be summarised. By András Lejtényi.

Lejtényi: So I suggest that we should accept the following formulation: 'AHUCS requires financial contribution from its members, namely a membership fee which is one forint per month'. ('Right!', applause.)

Perbíró: One last additional proposal.

Girl: This is not an additional proposal because it was mentioned previously. Every contributor has the right, it was postponed and we still owe. So who has, have the right to withdraw AHUCS membership? This is not clear yet. Please argue it!

Lejtényi: The general assembly should have the right – I suggest.

Perbíró: Yes, Tamás Kiss rises to speak!

Kiss: I have a proposal. Withdrawal is the duty of the faculty assemblies. Here we do not know everyone, that is why the general assembly cannot do it. The faculty assembly can withdraw certain AHUCS members if it is properly justified and they can exclude them – sorry, they cannot withdraw them – they can exclude them. But those members who were excluded by the faculty assembly or council can appeal towards the general student assembly. We deal with it only then.

Perbíró: I ask you, do you accept this proposal? ('Yes!') Countervotes, please. There are not any so I declare it was accepted.

Lejtényi: There is something else. So...

Horváth: Ede Horváth, fourth grade, faculty of medicine. I would have liked something. In the name of the strong unity initiated by the common difficulty I accept the friendly hand offered by the lawyer students – I think I represent a strong majority of the medical students – because we have been searching the way of shaking hands for four years. (Applause.)

Perbíró: Dear friends! I close the argument regarding the rules and regulations and I declare that the presented text modified by the current additional proposals is unanimously accepted by the general assembly. Does anyone have an opposite opinion in connection with the proposal of the declaration? If not, I consider the first point done and we move on to the second point. The programme of AHUCS. Presenter: Tamás Kiss.

Kiss: Before I start to present the programme plan of AHUCS – and I want to stress it is just a plan –, just a few words to let you know that the programme plan we are going to state or argue is claimed by the students of Szeged in general, and it does not deal with the particular problems of the faculties. These particular problems unfolded, for example, on the medical assembly or at the assembly of the College of Pedagogical Studies are the concern of the faculty assembly because if we include them, we will have 99 points. Therefore, above all, I would like to present the inherency of the plan.

1st point: The political screening of university youth should be done in the spirit of the party declaration concerning intellectuals published in August.

2nd point: The periodical Szegedi Egyetem should be the forum of university and college students, which must be reflected in the content and outlook.

3rd point: The members of the student welfare committee should be elected by the faculty assemblies.

4th point: We claim the right of arranging free theoretical debates.

5th point: Overexertion must be terminated – here come a lot of subpoints:

a) martial education should be terminated in the case of girl students and should be reduced to two lessons per week in the case of boy students,

b) in the case of extracurricular subjects the graduation should be: meets demands or does not meet demands (applause),

c) the education of Marxism should be freed from dogmatism, the graduation should be: meets demands or does not meet demands. (Applause.) We want more special elective lessons and less mandatory lessons.

6th point: a) We establish a housing committee which declares the maximum rent of flats.

b) The youth representative of a Youth Hostel can veto the appointment of the manager. (Applause, 'Yes!')

c) Youth hostels should be made out of free public buildings if it meets demands.

7th point:

a) Travels should be organised abroad, to the East and West as well. (Applause.)

b) We claim a 50% allowance for interior travels. (Massive applause.)

8th point: We claim a general ticket price allowance for every cultural event. Cinema, theatre, concert etc. (Applause.)

9th point: We claim that the school of music should be regarded as a college and we demand proper university student rights for its students.

10th point: We claim that the nurses' training school should be regarded as a college and we demand proper college student rights for its students. (Applause.)

These were mainly the educational problems and programmes.

Political demands:

- 1) We claim that the persons being responsible for the crimes of the previous era must be arraigned and their trials must be arranged in front of the widest public. (Massive applause, invigoration.)
- 2) We want the freedom of information, the press should account and comment everything. (Applause.)
- 3) We claim that Imre Nagy and György Lukács must be elected into central leading board. (Steady applause.)
- 4) We want a wage reform. The upper limit of total income deriving from the state must be defined and the raise of low salaries must be accelerated. (Applause.)
- 5) We want the abolition of death penalty in political cases. (Applause.)
- 6) We want a reestablished, free, democratic elective system. (Massive invigoration, steady applause.)
- 7) We claim that university youth should get a greater role in conducting the political and other cases of the country. (Applause.)

Perbíró: Dear friends, before giving way to the remarks, I let József Papp Szekeres speak, the third year student of the College of Agricultural Mechanical Engineers of Budapest.

Papp Szekeres: Dear friends, first of all, I would like to inform you that you have already received two telegrams from our college and I am here with one of my friends. I said there would be no any telegrams coming from my college and the telegram did not refer to my arrival. Something was messed up. The first telegram was sent by our AWY leaders (by the way, this AWY leading board will be replaced next week). It can be told from its style. You were right when you

booed it. The second one was sent after I had left Budapest by the sophomore students who held an AWY meeting as a result of hearing about the events that happened in Szeged. I am actually a third grade student and I was sent here by the third and the fourth grade. My duty is to express their solidarity and thanks in connection with your activity and with what you have started. Our students would like to build a strong relationship with the students of Szeged, which would be dedicated to helping each other through the struggle and fight. It would absolutely make no sense to fight separately, without any contact. The student parliament was also established at us. And we want it to work on the basis of the same principles as you. And I would like to tell you, since we are all people of agriculture and the issue of agriculture may not have been stressed properly in the programme, the conditions of the peasants and the improvement of their situation as we would have liked it to be stressed. We will work in the countryside, will work with peasants. Those people who feed everyone in this country. So we would like to ease their circumstances somehow. We thought we would carry on the issues of the debate of the Petofi Circle, the remark of Zoltán Vass that the taxes of the peasantry should be abolished...(Massive applause.) And in the end I would like say my greetings and thanks that...[...]

Girl: [...] they were rejected but when the semester started, they were accommodated in the great hall of Apáthy Youth Hostel, in the so-called learning room. That is not sufficient at all. I think a lot of us know about this situation, I do not want to unfold it [...] fifty bunk beds in a room. Well, to cut it short – I finish it soon. So again... Today our directress took over the Youth Hostel in Tolbuhin Boulevard at ten a. m. as an accommodation for us. But it is not enough. We have no idea how to gain new places. Unfortunately, we have to solve the problem because we have not received any assertion since 17 September. The answer was the today report of Délmagyarország, in which we could read the statement of Mrs. László Rajk and she offered ten thousand forints for the people's college. We all cheered up and sent a telegram to the ministry, I do not read it up but now I

ask for assistance from AHUCS, from the general assembly. Well, that is it what I would have liked to give you in the name of the first grade, we ask for assistance! (Applause.)

Perbíró: Zoltán Lukács, a fourth grade student from the Faculty of Natural Sciences has the right to speak. He will speak in general.

Lukács: I would like to comment the today article of Szabad Ifjúság. The article stated that the university students of Szeged were the first in the country who established AHUCS. Our step was revolutionary, it goes without saying. But we have to protest against every accusation which stigmatizes us with bull-headedness and thoughtlessness. We were strong and brave enough to make something new and bold against them. Whoever doubts this, I let them know we will have the strenght and bravery to go on and widen the fight we have started. That is why I propose and we have to stress it with the strongest determination that we want to work together with worker-peasant and intellectual youngsters. I suggest – going a little bit against the previous issue – that we should invite delegations from the youth of factories and agricultural co-operatives of Szeged to the faculty assemblies. (Noise.) My further proposal is that the general assembly should send a message to the city party committee and ask them for undertaking protectorate over our new alliance! (Laughter, noise, whistle.)

Perbíró: Géza Tóth, a freshman from the faculty of medicine has the right to speak.

Tóth: Honoured general assembly! We know that we haven't been let celebrate the 15th of March worthily in the last 5-6 years, at least. Therefore I suggest you that we should claim that 15th of March should be declared officially to be the feast of youth. (Applause.)

Boy: I would like to answer. The Hajnóczy Circle of the Faculty of Law of Budapest had forwarded this claim to comrade Sándor Rónai, the president of the Parliament, long ago and it is likely to be discussed during the next session of the Parliament. The lawyers will put across this claim and the 15th of March will become a general public holiday. (Noise.)

Kiss: I suggest that it should be included as an 18th point. (Massive applause.)

Girl: Let me make a correction. The previous speaker, the medical freshman said: to be the feast of youth. Currently the 15th of March is the feast of youth. We want it to be a national feast, not only a feast of youth! (Steady applause.)

Perbíró: I inform the general assembly there are three contributors left who want to speak in general. After them please do not go on because we have to discuss the details of the programme points. We hear György Halász now!

Halász: György Halász, fourth grade, medical student. I would like to comment the political aims. I think one of the strongest desires of all Hungarian people is that the tens of thousands of Russians staying in our country should be withdrawn! ('Yeah!', great invigoration; long, rhythmical applause.)

Perbíró: Dear friends! Let me warn you not to fall for provocative suggestions. (Some approvals.) Please think it thoroughly over before you rise to speak!

Boy: Let me say that you must have heard in connection with our assembly kept on last Tuesday that there was some sort of deviation at the end of it. That is why I really ask you that if you suggest something, your suggestion must be real – and ours! (Noise, objections.) Let me just add a little comment to this question: the withdrawal of the Russian troops is not a kind of problem what we can solve. The Warsaw Treaty is still existing, it has not lost its legal status yet. (Interjection: 'It cannot be denounced unilaterally!') We have to wait that those bodies of the power that have the right to make a decision do it. I have to warn you very seriously not to go too far! We should rather think it over three times before making a step! (Applause.)

György Halász: I am a very simple man. I protest against calling me a provocateur. I think I am an honest person and I think those are also

honest people who applauded massively and did not fall for my provocative suggestion. The comrade called it provocation. Tell this in front of workers and peasants, too. (Long applause.) There are no Russian troops in every people's democracy. And now, when comrade Gerő had a visit in Moscow – so it is not only me who sees it that way –, he had negotiations with Soviet leaders in this matter. (Noise.)

Perbíró: Order please!

Boy: So let us declare it that the goal of our recent assembly is to discuss the organisational problems of a student-youth organisation. If the other organisations of the country claim this and if this question rears its head in any other way – in parliamentary or in any other form –, our organisation will join them, of course. But now it is not our task to talk this problem over and it would only hamper the fast solution of our organisational problems. (Sparse applause.)

Perbíró: Abrudbányai law student has the right to speak!

Abrudbányai: I suggest that – like in Yugoslavia – the obligatory delivery of agricultural surpluses should be abolished. We really share solidarity with the peasantry through this claim.

Perbíró: Attila Kádár has the right to speak!

Kádár: Honoured general assembly! I really regret that this problem has not been raised yet but I try to unfold it now. I suggest and I myself demand it that not only here in Szeged but all universities of the country should get autonomy. An autonomy which secures sovereign university civil rights to university students. I myself demand that it be included in the next point.

Girl: Unfold it more precisely, how do you mean?

Lejtényi: Concretely!

Kádár: As far as I am concerned I represent the older generation. I asked an older person, a university person, but rather a university leader who is an expert of its legal environment to define the notion.

At least to unfold what university autonomy, what sovereign university civil right means.

Perbíró: Dear friends, I think there is no need to dwell upon the question because the establishing of the university autonomy is under way. It means the right of self-governing for the university. The secretary is only a supervisor but the university council makes decisions of first instance in every case concerning the university. Regarding the old context of university autonomy it also meant a certain degree of exterritoriality: namely that armed forces cannot enter the university without the permission of the chancellor. (Applause.) Anyway, please let me spotlight the currently operating version of university autonomy at our general assembly today. This is the widest autonomy when the students of the university organise a general assembly of their own free will and nobody puts obstacles in the way of it as far as the state leaders of the university are concerned. It is also a manifestation of the right of autonomy. Of course, these are only the first steps, but these organisational questions cannot be solved in the first moment according to the requirements of youth.

Kiss: I suggest that we include it as the 19th point that we demand university autonomy. ('Yes!', applause.) We can accelerate the course of an already started process and we will achieve an outcome as in the case of the Russian language, about which they have been negotiating for years now, and when we demanded it, they solved it.

Kádár: I would like to stress it again that armed forces should not get in here.

Boy: Dear friends! I prepared for this question, at least I tried to do my best during the preparations. I asked some older teachers who used to be students what sovereignty really means. According to them, it consists of two parts. First of all it means a territorial sovereignty, namely that nobody could enter the university without the permission of the chancellor, for example an armed soldier or a policeman etc. But after a crime, if a student had committed a crime out there and after he fled – to use this word – or came back within the territory of

the university, this student could only be captured with the permission of the chancellor. The second part of the notion is entirely touches the sphere of the university. It represented special interests. For example the lecturer made his plan of tuition, sorry, not the plan of tuition but his syllabus for the whole year. It was discussed on the dean's gathering and it was accepted by the chancellor.

Perbíró: No, absolutely not!

Same boy: No? I may have been misinformed, but that is what I was told.

Perbíró: I think there is no need to talk this question further over because our friend's information does not fit reality. We are old university people, we lived in the atmosphere of the old university, too, the previously described autonomy was another thing. Namely, it was mainly the same thing but these questions do not fit the sphere of autonomy. It is true that the lecturers presented their subject without any kind of restriction, they were not bound by any kind of programme. They did not make any kind of syllabus, so if I, as a trade exchange lawyer, talked about the holding through twenty lessons, I was not bound. And if I wanted to talk about the limited, I could talk about it through forty lessons as well. At worst the students did not hear about what they had to know at the exam. So there was not a bound syllabus or programme in the old university order. We could, of course, have a long discussion whether it was right or not but I think it is another concern. Let me continue remarks and let me inform you that Tibor Kurucz wants to speak, though he did not raise his hand.

Kurucz: Dear friends of mine! My first sentence is that my contribution is... we should demand a public press forum for AHUCS [...] Yesterday we were accused in this hall of wanting to split up with worker-peasant youth. We strive for our individual aims, we scorn physical workers and AHUCS has no demands which would touch the problems of the workers' class or the peasantry. On what basis do we want to get involved in state politics? I think we all know who the

sources of these accusations are and why they want to open a gap between young workers and us. First of all, we have the right to vote. So we have the right to come up with nationwide problems and demand remedy for them. On the other hand, we have programme points which deal with general ... social questions, as the withdrawal of foreign troops from our country, changing the direction of our economic policy, calling Mihály Farkas, Mátyás Rákosi to public account. I do not continue. Thirdly, how could we split up with worker-peasant youth when we ourselves are mostly worker-peasant youngsters, too? [...] We are all Hungarians. And we demand the same, that foreign armed forces should not assist [...] the behaviour of our teacher, namely going against the party had an influence on the students, nurtured the emerging of right-wing views existing within the circle of students. (Noise.) Some students picked up the habit of mocking the socialist work of building and enlarging and distorting mistakes that happened during the building process because of the deficiencies of our party work. Many of our good will students became discouraged and others joined the groups that spread these views. The account and the debate sharply spotlighted that some students using indecent demagogy ... I do not know whether rehabilitation was mentioned [...] and of course, there is no signature. And the article informs us about the session of the active party group, according to the party secretary it was Lajos Székely, who else, it cannot be imagined that he has not a hand in the case since he has it in every dirty case... (massive applause), who is almost a member of the dynasty due to his family relations. (Laughter.) I would like to call his attention, he published a not too friendly article, titled The problems of a Study. In this he writes with great enthusiasm while citing from several studies that professor István Vajtai has nothing to do with aesthetics because he is illiterate and can not formulate. If he wishes, I can read it up, which is surely the literary fundamental of the article suggested by Lajos Székely ('Let us hear it, let us hear it!') 'This infinite civil, aristocratic empathy... is the persistently pregnant symbol

of theoretical uneducation and silliness of thoughts, it represents the swamp of aesthetic enjoyment in the declining citizen aesthetics in which everyone who has no feelings or thoughts suitable for being expressed precisely can feel good.' So professor Vajtai can not formulate, he is thoughtless, therefore he is not able to express his feelings. These people are maleficent. I have just been informed at the end of the session and it is obviously interesting though it just partly touches the case. The last contribution of Lajos Székely was that AHUCS is only a temporary boom. Some days ago there was an article in *Délmagyarország* signed as Ferenc Németh – Stones in the luggage –, it is clear that he is Lajos Székely, too. And there is another interesting thing... about the Vajda-Vajtai case, according to comrade Stróbli this case was not added to the agenda of the party committee at ten a.m., though it has been constantly discussed since Tuesday and everybody wishes Vajda and Vajtai could get a department. In the meantime I was informed and I would like to ask professor Baróti whether Baróti, Halász and Kótai – I mean Koltay – declared they were going to resign if professor Vajda would be restored and would get a department at the college? And Sőtér plays up with them in the ministry.

Perbíró: Who? Sőtér? What was the last sentence? Plays up with them.

Baróti: I would like to answer right now. There was no petition from Baróti, Halász and Koltai, there was not any, it is the case of the college and we have nothing to do with the rehabilitation of a college department. The other thing: here I stated on the statutory meeting of Artilla József Circle yesterday on the basis of the licence of Sőtér deputy-secretary that professor Vajda was going to regain his position at the college department... (massive applause) from where he had been removed in an irregular, lawless way. This question is now the question of filling in a new designation document, so it is merely a technical question. We can say that the Vajda case is now finished. And there is no Vajtai case because Vajtai has never been removed from his previous position.

Valkói: That is not true.

Baróti: If the college wants to give him a higher qualification, the associate professor or the professor degree, it is certainly the concern of the special college committee. So I think this answer is quite fulfilling and I am really surprised that nothing has been heard about it at the college yet, because professor Vajda also took part at the meeting of the Attila József Circle yesterday, among others, and several college students were there. (Applause.)

Tibor Kasza: I want to speak! We thank you, comrade Baróti for closing this case.

Someone: I do not know but I was interested in the problem and we have to state that Szegedi Egyetem has been brought down to the level of a country gutter-paper. It cannot perform its mission and it will not be able to do it even in the future if AHUCS does not stand up and withdraw the right of going on like that. We demand that Lajos Kiss resign. We demand the removal of the Székely dynasty, their removal from political functions, we claim that Szegedi Egyetem should be passed to the hands of AHUCS and eventually I suggest that the general assembly of AHUCS should appoint the new editor. (Tremendous applause.)

Pál Bóday: Honoured assembly! I would like to add something to the Vajda affair shortly that the widest range of gossips has been thrown up lately concerning this case and we did not get a clear picture about how this case could come into being at all, under what circumstances and what was the driving force which put the matter in motion. We were all glad to hear comrade Chancellor Baróti that László Vajda was finally rehabilitated and yesterday he informed the gathering of intellectuals that he was going to get a department. But I do not find this statement correct, that comrade Chancellor Baróti [...]. That was correct but I do not find it correct that the Chancellor of the university, in front of the students, who had not heard an honest statement... because they had not heard honest

statements for years, he says the university has nothing to do with the Vajda case at all.

Baróti: I did not say that.

Bóday: You said he had no say in the matter. You said that, excuse me. That is true. But did the university have no say in the removal of Vajda from the college department at all? So this is my question after citing improperly, that is why I took the floor. Did the university have no voice in the removal of Vajda? It did have, as I know. It did have as I know and if we do not tell the truth, it does not matter who it is, we lie to the students. Then going away is the best we can do because things are still on the same way as they were. Sorry... (Massive applause.) Then there is no Petőfi Circle, no Attila József Circle, no AHUCS, nothing is worth if we do not make a clean breast of these things honestly and in a sincere way. Do not take the fashionable, regular habit of demagoguery. Take it as a sincere contribution and a sincere indignation because comrade Chancellor Baróti said he had and has nothing to do with the Vajda affair... (Interruptions: 'He did not say that!')

Baróty: Probably you find it natural that I do not fit the irregular voice of this non-academic contribution compared to the seriousness of this gathering. I said professor Halász, Koltay and I did not send a petition to the ministry that we were going to resign if Vajda would be restored or something like that. Furthermore, we could not do that because reappointing someone to a college department is not the task of the university. This is not the aim of the assembly, but indeed, make a clean breast of this matter! I did not say at all that certain university teachers, including me, had no role in the Vajda-Vajtai affair. I did not say that, did I? I said we are not concerned in the matter of appointing someone to a college department. Yesterday, after the chancellor's meeting, I made a statement in the name of comrade secretary Gyurkó. Let us say, I did a favour when I undertook this action. But let us see the Vajda-Vajtai affair. Comrade Ladányi made a remark on a party

meeting in connection with the declarations of March, that it was a right-wing deviation to publish the article of comrade Vajtai and it was an anti-Marxist article. And then he asked the literary history department of the university to organise a public debate in the room of the Knowledge Propagating Society. The public debate started with the lecture of comrade Halász. Later comrade Vajda admitted to comrade Földi that the lecture of comrade Halász had remained within the boundaries of possible scientific discussions. I only added a few sentences to the question and I still shoulder that I disagree with the items of the article I commented. It cannot be doubted that after that a massive tide of abuse was let loose against Vajda and Vajtai but who were at present and can talk about it without letting emotions out, can prove it that neither Halász nor I reviled Vajtai. If I made a mistake, then it was that I did not stand more firmly by the article under the given circumstances. So it would have been much more difficult for me as I still disagree with several items of the article. On the contrary, I immediately expressed my opinion and I told it to comrade Vajtai, too, that I am against any kind of so-called administrative measures in connection with the Vajda-Vajtai article and comrade Vajtai remained in the college as an assistant professor. After a long debate, a long conversation the Ministry of Education finally suspended comrade Vajda. When the suspension of comrade Vajda was at stake several persons from Szeged, first of all comrade Ladányi demanded that comrade Vajda, Professor Vajda should be immediately removed from Szeged to a primary school. Then I had a conversation with the secretary of that time, with Tibor Erdey-Grúz – going against the intentions of the city party committee – that the university would secure comrade Vajda a job in the library with a reader degree, which is equal to a college teacher degree and secures him the possibility of research. Until his case could be rediscussed, free from feverish points of view. And for a year I was constantly being accused of being a right-wing deviator by comrade Ladányi and his environment, and some people from Szeged tried everything to keep back Professor Vajda from getting

a decent salary and working peacefully. The case was added to the agenda in September. The Ministry of Education sent out a special committee to investigate the matter. A nationwide rehabilitation of previously removed university and college teachers is now going on. There are several concerned teachers and some of them stand on the edge of starvation while they are waiting for their cases to be cleared. It was almost natural that mainly these cases were reconsidered and not the case of Professor Vajda who could work here and got a fairly high salary. Since different rumours have appeared lately and we could hear some from comrade Bóday... I myself asked the vice-secretary, Professor Sótér on Tuesday to clear this affair at last. And he immediately accelerated the process while I was staying in Budapest yesterday morning and he empowered me to state that the case is now coming to an end. Because I think several professors were personally insulted. Though this was not the topic of the assembly, I would like to ask you, please tell me honestly, is my answer satisfying? ('Yes!')

Perbíró: Do you want to add something to this matter?

Boy: Just a few words to remind you that we demanded the right of arranging free theoretical debates but this is now the constituent assembly of AHUCS, so let us cancel this debate and let us return to the point of this wonderful gathering. (Applause.)

Perbíró: I wanted to come up with the same suggestion because we turned away from the programme of the general assembly. I think we got to the sphere of personalities erroneously. Fodor academician has the right to speak.

Fodor: I do not want to continue this debate rather to give you a satisfying answer in connection with the excluded Russian major student, Vajnai, whose name was mentioned. I would like to tell you here, in front of a large publicity that the university party committee has established a rehabilitation committee. I am the president of it. This committee is working and we have already taken up positive positions in several cases, for example in the Vajda case as fast as we

could. We have also taken up a positive position in the case of student Vajnai and I can reassure everybody that as we rectified as fast as we could the unfair offences of Péter and Vajda and several others or we suggested remedy for their cases, the same will happen in the further cases. Partly officially, without any kind of appeal and partly on the basis of an appeal. (Applause.)

Perbíró: Dear friends! I ask you whether you accept the previously presented programme in general? (Interruption: 'Yes!') Please raise your hands! Then you can contribute. Do you accept it in general? Please raise your hands. Countervotes, please! There are not any so I declare it was accepted by the general assembly. Now let us see the details. First of all I give the right... (Large noise.) Not as the rules and regulations, you can comment details. First of all József Veres can take the floor.

Veres: Dear friends, I would like to tell you something about a problem concerning the faculties and all of us, touching section c of the 5th point of the programme plan. The point is: 'the education of Marxism should be freed from dogmatism, the graduation should be: meets demands or does not meet demands'. This is a burning problem. I do not want to talk about a faculty problem but it can be added to our question. There is no philosophy lesson in the 5th grade at the faculty of medicine. The political economy studies were divided into four semesters. In the last two years we finished the given material of political economy. We would like to demand in the name of the 4th grade that philosophy lectures should be reduced to facultative subject! ('Yes!')

Perbíró: If you accept this proposal, please raise your hands! Countervotes! There are not any then I suggest that it should be added to the programme points. The next speaker is György Jobba, medicine student.

Jobba: Just a few words. Honoured assembly! Let us talk about the parallel operation of AWY and AHUCS. We should not forget what

was published in the today edition of Szabad Ifjúság. I was astonished when I read that Szabad Ifjúság questioned... the movement of the youth of Szeged. Let me quote it: 'Will the most educated, most literate and currently most militant part of Hungarian youth, the university students stay away from the fight for renewal, will they choose an own path, will the university youth of Szeged reach its goal, its honest goal?' So if we talk about the co-operation of AHUCS and AWY, we can not expect such a voice from AWY?

[End of tape.]