BÉLA RÉVÉSZ*

For the intelligibility of the language of the secret services

Introduction

Words can mean different things to different people. This can be problematic, mainly for those working together in a bureaucratic institution, such as the secret service. Shared, certified, explicit and codified definitions offer a counter to subjective, solitary and/or culturally dominant definitions. It's true that codified secrecy terms for secret services can be seen to involve a number of political, cultural, subcultural "languages", but if words come from unclassified or declassified files, memorandums and/or records, one needs a deep understanding of the secret services. A remarkable feature of this bureaucratic language is the evolving nature of, certain "keywords" as important signifiers of historical transformation. Thus, the changes in the language of the secret services depends at least as much on the internal changes of the secret services as on the transformation in the external political-social environment. In spite of the confusion of Hungarian secret services in the revolutions of 1918-1919 and the disintegration of the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy, in the early 1920's became a stable system.

Between the two World Wars, the Hungarian State Police, directed by the Ministry of Internal Affairs (hereinafter referred to as MIA), the Military Intelligence and Counter-Espionage directed by the Ministry of Defence (hereinafter referred to as MoD), and the Hungarian Royal Gendarmerie directed by both of the Ministries had their own operational service. This structure existed unchanged until 1945. Simultaneously, with the forward advance of the soviet troops, government began to re-establish the former system of the secret services in the eastern part of the country. After WWII, in 1946, the "State-protection Department" as political police became independent from the police. However, from the beginning, they remained under the control of the Communist Party. After 1950, the State Security Authority provided special services for the MIA and the Military Political Directorate of the MoD. After quashing the revolution in 1956, in the spring of 1957, the MIA Political Investigation Department was established which – with slight modifications – kept the structure created during the "state protection era". The MIA III. The State-Protection General

---
* Habil. Associate Professor, University of Szeged Faculty of Law and Political Sciences, Department of Political Sciences

Directorate was established in 1962. The reorganization was finalised in the middle of the 1960's, which resulted in the new system, which – with the structure of Directorates – became the ultimate structure of the state secret police until the abolishment of the MIA General Directorate III in January 1990. These organizational transformations were largely the result of exogenous historical-political changes. Moreover, each new period had a major impact on the organizational communication, language use and vocabulary of the secret services. This study seeks to interpret these historical transformations.

1. Philosophy of language and secret services

Ludwig Wittgenstein, the founder of the modern philosophy of language, in one of his earlier dissertations [105: 230–235.] saw the only, perfectly meaningful use of language as a complete representation of facts. He also stated that any attempt to use it in any other way is necessarily meaningless. In later works [107: 280.], in his preliminary thoughts Wittgenstein already expressed his doubts about the role of language as it described the world exclusively, and rather regarded it as a set in which all activities serve a different purpose than the description of the world and it has rather an "imaging" function. In fact, this latter function has been given priority in Philosophical Investigations [106: X.]: "*Philosophy simply puts everything before us, and neither explains nor deduces anything. -Since everything lies open to view there is nothing to explain.*" Slightly at odds with the decisive logical interpretation over the years, is that not only the everyday "social" language has come to the forefront, but also the emphasis on the fact that in the linguistic structure, the linguistic sign and the object/subject of the language are only conditionally linked. This recognition was leaning towards that which was identifed in later research in conjunction with anthropological linguistics. The discipline of sociolinguistics focuses especially on social factors, which sets out that different forms of speech can be linked to different groups and social strata. As such, language is a set of dialects and styles formed along different variants, territorial and social indicators. Taking this interpretation, the heterogeneous language set of the community as a whole and its variations have already drifted from the original language concept of Wittgenstein. His theory is firmly aimed toward the language as the complete representation of facts. The more general effects of the change in the mind-set of the philosophy of the language described above were experienced in the second half of the 20th century.[1] During this period, which also can be considered as the emergence of sociolinguistics, the representatives of the discipline started focusing on examining the links between language use and society in linguistics around the world. The methodology of this study will use the latter version, when Wittgenstein intended to acknowledge a connotative viewpoint.

In addition to the functions in the process of thinking and exploration of reality, the most basic form of social interaction, language also plays an emotional and expressive role. The sociological, socio-psychological aspect of this phenomenon is how the complexity of social structures are reflected in the social structure of the language, and whether the

---

[1] SÁNDOR KLÁRA: *The paradigm found – or what science history is good for*. Hungarian Philosophical Review. 1999. 4-5. p. 595.

different subcultures are expressed in the diversity of linguistic identities.[2] If we denote the essence of communication at all times in the communication and exchange of information, even in the digital world of the information society, the most appropriate instrument for this is the written and/or spoken signal system; the language. The extensiveness, validity and generality of this instrument depends primarily on the breadth of the social set that needs to communicate and exchange information in the collective action of the society to optimize their interactions. The need for co-operation is the most important integrating factor for community existence and survival. The community's basic need, therefore, is the identical and unequivocal correspondence between the language marking and the phenomenon indicated. If this community is organized by the state power, it will usually interact with each other in the form of the language of the state power and the public language used by citizens. According to some approaches, this pattern is determined by the more demanding linguistic interactions of higher-educated, more cultured people; which can be also defined as the normative language version of the linguistic area.[3]

In contrast to this "linguistic standard", the sociolinguistic approach defining the concept of public language, which eliminates the role of these value factors from this definition and considers the public language as "everyones'" or "peoples'" communication instrument. However, both approaches are generally common in accepting that another special sublanguage also serves to communicate between the groups on the lower levels of the general population. The peculiarity of the sublanguage is that it is a less-written, more spoken, micro community-specialized language, and it is markedly different from the dialects by region, which can be called regional-public languages. In this respect, the structure of society, which is first defined by aggregation of individual statistical characteristics (age, education, income, place of residence, etc.), may also be suitable for describing levels of linguistic structure. Collective criteria, such as the relation of certain social groups to power and inequality, add another dimension to the demonstration of the connections between the two systems. As a result, it can be examined, for example, why users of certain languages or their variants have no social influence or are excluded, while a group speaking another language or variant exercises social, economic or political power.[4] In multilingual communities therefore, it is also possible to study the real and symbolic role that each language plays in the life of the examined community and it is also possible to easier understand how a language variant and social identity are related, or why is it possible, that one minority is able to preserve its language over a long period of time, while another replaces significantly its old linguistically elements to new ones over a few generations?

From the beginning of the 19th century, in Europe, all professional speaking communities demanded the use of independent terminology as a typical set of specific technical terms for particular purposes linked to the specific speech situations of the profession.[5]

---

[2] CRYSTALL, D.: *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language* (2. ed.). Cambridge University Press. 1997. p. 21.

[3] JAKAB, ISTVÁN: *For the Systematic and Terminological Questions of Literary Language, Common Language, Dialects*. Literary Review 17. Budapest, 1974. pp. 431–442.

[4] SZÁNTÓ, ZOLTÁN: *Stratify and/or Structure*. Replika. 1991. pp. 2–3., 3–17.

[5] Just a few examples to illustrate how different disciplines focusing on the history of their own language of specialty and their peculiarities: *Church Terminology.* Teaching Hungarian – Methodological Journal. 4. Budapest, 2012.; VAJDA HENRIK: *Changes in the Terminology of Hungarian Libraries*. Book, Library, Librarians. 2014. 4.; GRÉTSY LÁSZLÓ: *Reflection of Socio-Economic Changes in the Common Language*

As part of the idea of nationalism, the monopoly of the universal Latin language in the disciplines has been strongly overshadowed by the rise of the national language, but owing to the basic methods of the creation process of terminology – revive already forgotten words, new vocabulary and mirror translations – some elements of the traditional Latin vocabulary also survived in the emerging new terminologies. More or less the same process had taken place in Central Europe, where the German (and Italian) language elements had the greatest impact on terminological changes.[6]

From the extensive literature on terminology, the following cited statement of almost a hundred years ago may be recalled for its lasting validity and accuracy to this day: "*The accessories of artificial word or technical term, are therefore conceptual accuracy, linguistic correctness, purity, furthermore the ease of application and consistency; these are accompanied even by a negative requirement: they should not have an emotional side-tone or mood accompanying words, like the terms of literary, conversational and any other public language terms, as they could obscure their specificity. From an aesthetic point of view, it is enough if it is not complicated and easy to pronounce. Its beauty should be like a machine part, which is consummate if it is perfectly suited to its aim and purpose.*"[7]

2. Research methods and materials

Unlike the so-called "civilian" terminologies, the terminology of the secret services has the specialty that the secret services themselves differ from other state and non-state actors, which is their "unknowability", their confidentiality. The way to understand the linguistic secrecy of the secret services may be through the interpretation of the concept of secrecy.

The secret services (state protection, state security, national defence, national security bodies, intelligence, counter-intelligence, political police, etc.) had been created as part of the prevailing socio-power structures. Since their creation, they have been in continuous operation, under *non-public (internal) regulations, within a secret institutional framework, clandestine staff and the use of special covert techniques* to protect the different types of sovereign state powers. The lack of information had always been created largely in the dictatorships and to a lesser extent in democracies as a "mysterious image" to the clandestine activities of these services. The pursuit of constant hiding from the "enemy" unfortunately also hides the information from "friendly" views, and therefore the most important structured system of human cognition, the science itself, is also restrained from being able to fully gather and analyse the information concerning the secret services.

Vocabulary. Our Hungarian Today. Budapest, 1976.; SZÉP BEÁTA: *Contributions to the History of the Development of the Hungarian Legal Terminology*. Hungarian Linguist. 3. Budapest, 2009.; FÓRIS ÁGOTA–BÉRCES EMESE: *Current issues in Musical Terminology and Musical Lexicography*. Budapest, 2007; HORVÁTH PÉTER: *The Internet and itsTerminology – by a 'Semi-professional' Eye*. Scientific and Technical Information. Budapest, 2005.; TOMOLYA JÁNOS: *Utilization of Experience and Development of Military Terminology*. Military Science, 2004. 2.; SPÄT ANDRÁS: *Topical Issues of Hungarian Medical Terminology*. Debrecen Review. 2002. 2.; SOLYMOS REZSŐ: *The Role of the Forestry Terminology in the Development of Hungarian Forestry*. Hungarian Science. 2000. p. 10.
6 SZÉP, BEÁTA. op. cit. p. 31.
7 TOLNAI, VILMOS: *Artificial Language, Terminology. Hungarian Language*. Budapest, 1923. p. 78.

Strangely enough, in order for this particular research object to be conceived of as verifiable knowledge by rational reasoning, there must also be favourable political conditions. Namely, the secrets of the secret service structures mostly appear in the exchange of power leaders / leaders, but not infrequently during the change of political elites, regimes, systems, at least to the extent, and in the manner deemed useful by the leadership of the new power. In such periods, large revelations may approach objective (half-)truths, however withholding information or their "leak" can also erode the critical independence and autonomy of scientific knowledge. These are the reasons why the "boosts" in the research of secret services are mostly linked to major political and social "shocks", when the new political regime seeks to use the legitimacy of science to criticize the former political leadership or to validate its own power. Moreover, the most appropriate means of doing so is to fully disclose the evil, immoral, corrupt, cruel, and cynical features of the former leadership. The revelations are "delighted" to be joined by a part of the public, which, by virtue of its anti-politicization attitude, considers all power manoeuvres to be immoral, and furthermore the science, for which it is important that so-called but hidden political information is suddenly revealed can be processed by scientific means. It is no coincidence, therefore, that the research field of the secret services is dominated by *social, institutional, and political history* and is relatively marginalized by other scientific research areas.

The use of the term "*secret service*" also requires preliminary explanation. Spies, Secret Agents, Operatives, Intelligencers, Exploratories, Reconnaissants, Counter-intelligence officers, Undercover informers, Clandestine Staff, Confidants, Network Members, etc. The institutions that provide the framework for its activities appear in a variety of common and frequently used names in the public and press languages, and sometimes in the specialized literature. Part of the distinction is due to differences in substance. In many cases, however, it is only their conceptual ambiguity that makes these terms meaningful. At the same time, under the term secret services irrespective of the era and political-power context, all forms of *hidden information gathering and/or counterintelligence activities, which have the basic purpose of maintain the prevailing state sovereignty* can be considered collectively. Thus, it does not take into account the degree of institutionalization of the forces engaged in these activities, the form, directions of their activities, nor the legitimacy basis of the given state power - while being bound to the state is an indispensable condition. It is also true that the protection of sovereignty, more or less directly, is dealt with by all governmental bodies, but of these, the use of special, covert, secret, operative forms, methods, forces and means is solely the attribute of the secret services.

"*When we get to know a secret (...), first of all we feel special, which initially feels good. Then knowledge becomes more and more a burden and some become anxious that they cannot tell this secret to others. The reality is that we really want to reveal it, but at the same time, they also know that it would violate their confidence in them. At first glance, one might think that there is no simpler, more childlike thing than secrecy, but then it turns out that they are actually working on very complex processes.*"[8] Philip Zimbardo, the professor of psychology at Stanford University, interprets the essence of the secret as the cognizant

---

[8] ZIMBARDO, PH.: "*You may have something that no superhero has*" – Interview made by Csaba Molnár. Hungarian Nation Weekend Magazine, 4 June 2017. Budapest. p. 4.

of the secret, which phenomenon had also been approached in the Gospel of Luke from the direction of dynamics: "*For there is nothing hidden that will not be made manifest, nor secret, that will not become clearly known, and come into illumination*.". The two types of vision can already well illustrate that the secret phenomenon is based on at least two pillars at first glance; its subject and material aspects can be distinguished. How this can be linked to a well-defined occupation, in this case a particular group of secret services, can be easily read from this duality. The most diligent "secret factory" is the secret service of the prevailing state in which, according to historical examples, not only the "hero" or "victim", but also the actors of everyday life can easily develop some kind of hidden relationship. On the other hand, as the Bible states: these secrets are not eternal, with time they will "come to the light."

If we assume that the essence of the secret is the inverse of communication or simply the "negative communication,"[9] or perhaps "conscious concealment,"[10] we are confronted with the paradox that the most information-blocked areas create the most intense social need, provided we want to dissolve the information vacuum, which has been created. The lack of answers to the relevant "why" question increases cognitive insecurity and the lack of information also increases the social tension caused by the lack of explanations.[11] In addition, secrecy does not simply mean a subjective lack of information, but also requires the actual informant to intentionally become a "decoder", meaning that the possessor of the information deliberately conceals this knowledge. In such cases, secrecy does not simply mean deliberately obstructing normal communication processes, but also includes the active social relationship between them and the *interaction of their conflicts*.

At the same time, the *relative and historical* aspects of the nature of the secret are also visible. Different cultures, subcultures, groups, and institutions with varying demand for information regard the lack of information as non-communication; a secret. A substance, which was previously public, may later be protected by secrecy, while the reverse process is even truer: what used to be secret may later be deprived of this protection. It is no coincidence that Habermas (1962 trans 1989) derives the 18th century significance of the emergence of social publicity from the historical excess of the *arcane and bureaucratic practices* of absolutist state: "*The apological literature defending the secrets of state thematised the means by which the prince could maintain the jura imperii, his sovereignty- that is to say, brought up just those arcana imperii, that entire catalogue of secret practices first inaugurated by Machiavelli that were to secure domination over the immature people*."[12] Therefore, with the strengthening of civilian communities, the practice of the Arcana is increasingly replaced by the principle of publicity. However, as the publicity of common affairs becomes more self-evident, at the same time, on the other side of society,

---

[9] See: NIKOLOV, E.: *The Secret. The opposite of communication.* Mass Communication Research Center. Workshop 3. Budapest, 1987. p. 5.

[10] SIMMEL, G.: *The Secret and the Secret Society.* In. *Selected Social Theory Studies.* Budapest 1973. p. 321.

[11] It is the unanimous conclusion of the literature on attribution that inexplicability and incomprehensibility are as unpleasant and disturbing as when we are uncertain of our values. HEWSTONE, M. – ANTAKI, CH.: *Explanations of Attribution Theory and Social Behavior.* In. HEWSTONE, M. STROEBE, W. – CODOL, J. -P. – STEPHENSON, G. M. . *Social psychology – from European Perspective.* Budapest. 1995. pp. 130–161.

[12] HABERMAS, J.: *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.* Budapest, 1971. p. 80.

the tendency to protect *autonomous secrets* in the private sphere is growing: "*What is public became more public, while that which is private became even more private.*"[13]

According to Habermas, "*The public sphere of civilian society stood or fell with the principle of universal access. The public sphere from which specific groups would be eo ipso excluded was less than merely incomplete; it was not a public sphere at all*".[14] In principle, everyone has the ability to participate in the public sphere of society. Reasonability, rational thinking is an anthropological (not class or order) property; "*With the removal of the barrier that representative publicity had erected between laymen and initiates, special qualifications—whether inherited or acquired social or intellectual—became in principle irrelevant.*"[15] Namely, common sense is sufficient for public participation. Competence is bound to normality. Anyone who is eligible under the prevailing definition of an era (such an eligibility criterion in most societies, such as adulthood, the competencies of writing and reading) is eligible as well for public participation.

Rationality is thus the second pillar of the public sphere of society alongside universal access to information. The public is constituted in the process of expressing opinions, arguably: the process of enlightenment, in which rationality is the "common façade" of the manifestations of different layers and interest groups, the general equivalence that enables the exchange of opinions at their argumentative value.

The third element of publicity seems to be substantial. In his book, Habermas elaborates on the process of separating the "private" from the "public", focusing on their structural fragmentation. The result of this process is the civilian public sphere. The direction of analysis, as the title of his book indicates, is not to describe the public sphere itself, but rather to determine its structural location. As a result, Habermas always keeps his eye on society as a whole to talk about a narrower topic. "*The bourgeois public sphere evolved in the tension-charged field between state and society*" he writes.[16]

Bourgeois public sphere unfolds in the space of tension between the state and society, and certain people and groups have the power to control this border and to classify some of the public substance as non-public. *Therefore, the secret is the insecure borderline between the public and the non-public*. The secret itself is possible because there is a "preliminary" consensus classification of things in the public and private classes; *only matter, which by their nature are public substance, may be considered secret*. Thus, the concept of secret can be defined not by the substance but by the power aspect of the matter. In the interpretation of Habermas,publicity is debating over a matter; on the other hand, according to the mentioned thoughts above, publicity is about a kind of power struggle, which can be interpreted primarily through the categories of concealment and exposure of a matter.

Although the social-historical censorship of secrecy/publicity may be drawn – according to the Habermas interpretation above – along with pre-modernity/modernity, it gives the impression that a persona in the power structure seems to be less sensitive to this increasingly wider openness. The secret service structure and activities, which form the hard core of the prevailing state-political institutional system; appear to be inert over time in

---

[13] SIMMEL, G.: *The Secret and the Secret Society*. In. *Selected Social Theory Studies*. Budapest, 1973. p. 343.
[14] HABERMAS, J.: op. cit. p. 126.
[15] Ibid, p. 65.
[16] Ibid, p. 204.

response to changes in its social environment. Not all this is undermined by the increasingly public normative regulation of the activities of these institutions, the methods they apply and the gradual increase in their control. The traditional secret institutions are able to adapt to the rational-legitimate forms of government of modern social organization principles, mainly due to their strong cohesion attributions and the continuity of their instruments and techniques.[17] *If power is rationalized, the secret can also become rational* - we can see it in Machiavelli. For him, the secret is already an inseparable mode of the practice of power, which operates continuously throughout the process. The Prince's author emphasizes not only the "raw" secret but also the importance of the "misleading appearances" associated with his structure.[18] By Machiavelli and later on, the secret is almost "wrapping itself into the publicity", since on the one hand the misleading appearances are capable of filtering information and on the other hand provide a qualitatively different unrealistic opportunity to interpret phenomena, and thirdly they are resulting the fragmentation of the publicity. At the same time, the seemingly constant character of the secret services in itself, does not allow for the expansion of the dynamics of secrecy in such a way as to "recapture" the autonomy of the public sphere.[19] Even if current political-power aspirations are temporarily capable of doing so, the democratic core values of the publicity will define a different direction in their relationship.

It is a very early recognition of knowledge theory that the thinking process itself cannot think for itself.[20] Therefore, when we think of our consciousness, we are actually looking at some external sign of current thinking, thinking of the same phenomenon as the reflection of reality, or as an activity, that creates its own object. In both cases, we think of something that exists or has existed, that is, the outer sign of our current thought - as the specificity of matter, as a special connection between two objects, because of it, and so on. In such a case, consciousness is directed to a realistic process of reflection, and, when the question is asked, the answer is always the same. Thus, the "consciousness for consciousness" image of the "consciousness of reflection of reality" in humans is thus the repetition of the "consciousness of self-consciousness" phenomenon that the object of thought - reflection - has been enriched with yet another reflection. Therefore, no thought of any particular manifestation of consciousness is the thought of any aspect of reality reflected within us, no matter how far it has been abstracted from specific forms of reality. It is precisely this nature of consciousness

---

[17] The individual archetype of this adaptability is Joseph Fouché. Zweig writes in the preface to his book that Fouché's figure was brought to his attention by Balzac, who said the politician had "collected more power than the people of Bonaparte." So, Zweig became interested in the "brilliant chameleon," who began his career as a religious teacher, but two years later, in 1792, he plundered temples, who, as a representative of the people, nodded. Louis was executed, and a few years later he became a millionaire, and by the emperor's grace the Duke of Otranto. He served and betrayed Napoleon, paved the way for restoration, but after the Bourbons returned, he had to realize that he was a gray man again, as he was when he was young. ZWEIG, S.: *Joseph Fouché. Portrait of a Politician*. Budapest, 2006. p. 109.

[18] MACHIAVELLI, N.: *The Prince*. Budapest, 1978. p. 58.

[19] For an explanation of this view, see KIRÁLY ISTVÁN: *The secret and its categorical structure.* Hungarian Review of Philosophy 1986. 1-2. In. *Border – Listening – Secret*. Komp-Press, Cluj-Napoca, 1996. pp. 80–81.

[20] PLÉH, CSABA: *Variations. Changes in the Symbol Processing Mind-set and Symbol Concept.* In. KAPITÁNY ÁGNES – KAPITÁNY GÁBOR (Ed.). *"Life is a Hidden Speech". The History and Research Methods of Symbolization*. Budapest. 1995. p.149.

that explains the fact that, by knowing the hidden conditions of thought, we can recognize the events, phenomena, relationships, and conditions that these states reflect.

The position of a person seeking to reveal a secret – no matter what level – is a cognitive position. He is supposed to have some secret, and he tries to justify or refute this assumption. If this is not confirmed, the cognitive process is terminated. We have reconsidered a hypothesis and, to a certain extent, eliminated uncertainty in the horizon. We undertook the task of getting to know, but we didn't find out the secret, because there was no such thing, just a lack of information.

However, if the hypothesis is confirmed, his efforts to find the secret will be different. Immediately he seeks to know the features of the phenomenon called the secret. He will no longer check whether the object of interest exists or not. Entering into a special process of cognition, he begins to study, the purpose of which is not only to know something, but also to eliminate it as a fact. The cognitive person seeks to fully describe the object, thus as an object of cognition and as an object in general, he will "destroy" it. The *"strange" or "alien" secret, once discovered, becomes our "secret,"* and thus no longer exists as our secret or another party's secret.

The bearer of the hidden state of the spirit represents the opposite - anti-cognitive - position of conflict. He carries some knowledge and tries to hide it from the secret seeker. If he succeeds, he will cancel an act of cognition, resisting the means of contradiction. Moreover, if the presence of a hidden mental condition has already been revealed by others, the secretary will at least try to thwart his efforts to describe the knowledge. In both cases, the performers are acting as rivals in a bilateral relationship - which is the hide and reveal - the pursuit of cognition and, conversely, the quest for cognition. In some cases, an interaction occurs, which in game theory is called a "zero-sum game", that is, what one player loses the other wins.[21]

However, the loss and profit in this case is relative and, in some respects quite specific to all other losses and gains. In the rivalry between the carrier of the secret and the revealer,something that is elusive through abstraction can be lost and won. In the case of a successful reveal, the secret will not be the property of the searcher, but will simply be removed. In fact, it could be stated that by revealing the secret, some knowledge was passed on to the rival. However, this does not change knowledge in form or substance. *Knowledge always remains knowledge, whether it is kept secret or not. Namely, it is not a secret.*[22] When the secret is revealed, the only effort that can be made to increase the damage is somehow, to limit its spread. From a functional point of view, the secret phenomenon remains specific to the collision of only two intentions contrary to normal communication conditions. In normal communication, the recipient remains passive while the communicator is the active party, both as a source of information and as an initiator of communication. In communication called secrecy, the two roles change fundamentally. Both parties do things they should not do in normal communication. The communicating party opposes communication instead of initiating it. It becomes a communicator to a "de-communicator". The recipient becomes a known but undesirable addressed of the communication. Many times, the recipient is searching for his own way of knowing what

---

[21] SIMONOVITS ANDRÁS: *János Neumann and Game Theory*. World of Nature. 2003. 3. p. 56.
[22] NIKOLOV, E. op. cit. p. 21.

the addressed information does not communicate to him. The means of communication are also deliberately restricted, making efforts to not be a means of communication at all. Everything is directed against communication, even though all conditions of communication are available. It follows that the process of concealment, which we call secrecy, involves not only the lack of communication, but also the *active and conscious retention of knowledge*, in the form of secrecy, against a real or potential interest.[23]

Hiding the mental conditions presupposes, in most cases, a change in normal behaviour and, in the case of interest from the other "I", an active resistance to communication. In each of these cases, we are talking about different versions of lying. A lie tends to be defined as a moral or rather immoral phenomenon.[24] In addition to moral relations, there is definitely a lie in politics, in art, and even in all of the self-contained experiences of the standoffish selfhood.[25] Logic defines lies as a mismatch between thinking and reality. However, there is no lie in the "object-subject" relationship. In addition, there are many false statements in logic itself, which, despite all logic, cannot be considered a lie. For example, is the widely known "lying" statement really a lie?[26]

In the process of a lie, the author of the statement knows the truth, or at least the probability that his statement may not be true, but he persistently tries to mislead the addressed. In doing so, he seeks to distract his attention from the truth and thereby hide his own mental or spiritual state. Its purpose is to terminate an unwanted communication connection and replace it with another. Psychological and practical circumstances sometimes make the recipient active. However, no matter who is the active or passive party in communication, lying is always a relationship *in which we intentionally conceal some knowledge and intent.* Moreover, hiding thoughts and intentions is always an effort to eliminate an unwanted communication act.[27]

The situation is similar in the case of deception, fraud, disguise, misinformation and every other form of secrecy. From this point of view, for example, misunderstanding can be imagined as a self-contained and imagined communication in which we ourselves have distorted the facts; misleading - masterfully realized lies; fraud - an unexpected result for the recipient; silence - an unspoken lie because the recipient did or conceived what the communicator intended; distortion is the deliberate diversion of a given communication act from the subject; misinformation - partly true, partly false communication. In each case, we are confronted with disrupting or altering a communication process, with the originator of the communication seeking to hide his or her mental state. This means that the secret is not

---

[23] That's why Bok uses "dishonesty" in the same sense as "deliberate injustice." BOK, S.: *Lying. Moral Choice in Public and Private Life.* Budapest, 1983. p. 404.

[24] "Is it possible to tell the unbiased truth about lies? Man is constantly struck with lies, however much he wants to avoid. As I recall, in my world life, I was taught that lying is a bad thing, we must always be honest." In: NÁBRÁDI MÁRIA: *The Psychology of Lie.* Budapest, 2007. p. 7.

[25] "Self-deception creates difficult definition problems. Is it deception or not? Intentional or unintentional? Is there any communication here? Recent studies of brain function show that this is not a case of deceiver and deception, but two different processes coordinated by the brain. " DEMOS, R.: *Lying to Oneself.* Journal of Philosophy, 1960. 12. p. 405.

[26] See "epimenides paradox": Epimenides was a Cretan who made one immortal statement: „All Cretans are liars." This paradox can be also called the „Liar paradox."

[27] NÁBRÁDI, MÁRIA: op. cit. P. 45.

the state of a separate individual, but an active relationship between two parties in a relationship of conflict.[28]

Of course, conflicts are not always about secrets. However, if there is a secret, the conflict will be present a real or potentially hazard. Conflict is, in fact, the objective basis of the secret, a secret that is one of the manifestations of the conflict. Therefore, apart from the conflict situation, the secret can only be talked about conditionally, or as a reference to circumstances that are close to the secret in their form. Any deliberate disruption of communication results from some kind of conflict. Two participants of the secret - the initiator (the owner of the secret) and the potential recipient of the hidden state of mind - act as real opponents in a fight whose outcome can be defined, or at least related, to the disruption of communication. *Essentially, revealing a secret is one party's success, while preserving it is the other party's success.*

The owner of the secret always has certain advantages over the uninformed. The degree of erudition may be lower than others, but in some cases better. If this advantage is manifested among people in a formal or informal organization it will inevitably become an exercise of power over someone. History and practice provide many examples where power was based on the mere possession of a secret and the ruling authority was convinced that a person knew something more or something that was important but inaccessible to others. Secrecy is also one of the most important factors in the cult of certain individuals. In such cases, the paraselene of mystery is not only a natural accompaniment to power, but also a means of gaining it. In the realm of domination, the secret (hidden knowledge or intention) *is not only an indirect but also a direct means of gaining power.*[29]

Given the aforementioned characteristics of the secret-phenomenon, perhaps we need not have gone further from the aforementioned Wittgenstein-axiom, which was supposed to see and portray in language only one meaningful use of mapping facts. It turns out that the language of the secret services is a means of disinformation, which is constantly intended to

---

[28] "Anti-communist conscious influence assumes that people's perception of reality is distorted, its ideological-political knowledge, its moral and emotional state manipulated. On the other hand, consciousness manipulation presupposes a complex disinformation process that can only achieve partial results if the fact of manipulation and the internal context of the process of realization remain completely hidden from the target persons and target groups. This is partly because the sharpest part of the implementation of conscious manipulation has come into the hands of the imperialist secret services, and partly because they have the secret means and methods by which the fact of manipulation can be kept secret" – writes the state security literature. OPÁL ISTVÁN: *Considering the ideological and philosophical aspects of the US anti-communist psychological warfare after World War II in perfecting the method used by the professional service.* Candidate thesis, Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security. Budapest. 1978. pp. 134–135.

[29] "Sharing information is one of the most important symbolic expressions of political position and prestige in any dictatorship. Although somewhat offended, Vladimír Farkas, who was the head and then deputy leader of the National Protection Authority's cross-border reconnaissance organization, drew a credible picture of this in his memory, and from 1950 to 1953 he was also a member of the State Security Authority College: "I considered it a ridiculous manifestation of mistrust in the country that I, as the head of one of the most important departments of the State Security Authority, did not get access to MTI's confidential information reports, which primarily contained news from Hungarian-language foreign radio broadcasts and the press. It is true that more and more Hungarian emigrate press products were available to me at that time." FARKAS VLADIMIR: *„There is no excuse". I was a colonel of the State Security Authority.* Budapest, 1990. 18. p.; see more: RÉVÉSZ BÉLA: *Criminalization of the ideological function of the proletarian dictatorship. ideology – politics – law in Hungary in the fifties.* Szeged University, 1997. pp. 8–9.

consciously conceal and hide facts, partly to preserve its own secrets and partly to influence the opposing party, to develop a false attitude and to make manipulated decisions.

The appearance of the written version of the secret of the secret service language, the cryptography, coincides with the appearance of the writing itself. In some respects, the era of the wise division of labour coincides with the beginning of the writing era, with the discovery of a way to deliver important news to their destination by interlaced messengers. This relay messenger system evolved first in the Persians, then used extensively by the Greeks, but it also evolved into an entire system in the some of the most remote countries and parts of the world: China, India, South America. The acquisition of these documents was henceforth the most important task of the spy organization in every state, and cryptography, which made the substance of the documents indelible to strangers, was quickly developed to counteract them. The essence of cryptography is that although the substance of the message is real, only the target person can decipher the information that is encrypted. Until now, Caesar cipher is the correspondent method in which Julius Caesar used to tell the number of letters in the cipher besides the secret message. From a linguistic-substantive point of view, cryptography is no different from public speaking, since only the formal-morphological aspects of the system of expressing ideas become secret.[30]

Similarly, the formal aspects of the secret language were represented by codes, abbreviations, numbers, and symbols that blocked not only enemy forces, but also uninitiated persons within the services from information, documents, files, target persons, and objects; they wanted to make identifiable collaborators and operations outside. One of the most well known markings in the secret services world is MI5 and MI6. Elizabeth I of England commissioned Sir Francis Walsingham to set up an imperial secret service in 1568 to deal with the impending external and internal threats. This organization had operated from the outset within the army, serving as a ground and maritime intelligence service. In 1910, as part of preparations for the World War, "civilian" services were set up to carry out external intelligence and internal counter-intelligence tasks. At the same time, remembering their military origins, they retained the flag in their name, leaving Military Intelligence in their name and MI5 for the domestic division and MI6 for the espionage (at that time in Ireland intelligence. was conducte by the Scotland Yard Special Division).[31]

In Hungary, even between the two world wars, similar marking was used by the Central Investigative Command Staff Subdivision to assign - the Group "A" of Ministry of Defence (hereinafter referred to as MoD) Department VI-2 - the Intelligence and Counter-intelligence Centre of the MoD Chief of Staff - Department VI-2, and later simply Department 2. After 1953, the supervision tasks of the State Security Authority within the activity of counter-reaction in ideological and scientific areas had returned to the fundamental responsibility of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and they were providing for Department 4 of General Department IV, even the economic-intelligence tasks had been designated immediately before the change of the regime to Department II/I-14. Following

---

[30] DONÁTH REGINA: *Usage of Diplomatic Cryptography in the XVII. century.* Budapest, 1964. p. 17.; RÉVAY, ZOLTÁN: *Encryption – chapters from the history of encryption.* Budapest, 1978. p. 69.; MAO, W.: *Modern cryptography – theory and practice.* Prentice Hall, 2004. p. 46.; BAUER, F. L.: *Decrypted secrets – methods and maxims of cryptology.* Berlin-Heidelberg, 1997. p. 3.; LÁNG BENEDEK: *Encryption in early-modern Hungary.* 2015. Budapest, p. 42.
[31] THOMAS, G.: *Inside British Intelligence.* Budapest, 2008. p. 102.

the infamous "Danube-gate" interception scandal in the year of the regime change in Hungary, public opinion throughout the country knew that the State Security General Directorate III/III Department had the task of political counter-reaction, but decoding the other cover numbers remained largely unsuccessful.[32]

Moreover, more mysterious is the generation methods of the alias or cover-name of the people in the agent network (agents, confidents, and clandestine staff). The cover-name was given by the case officer at the time of recruitment, included not only on the 'Cardboard sheet No. 6' – which was used for documenting his recruitment -, but also in the work file containing his reports and in the record of all operational measures with which he had been involved. There were no more detailed rules in the terms of "aliasing," but obviously the recruited person could not use his own name as a pseudonym, and the given cover-name could not be offensive, disobliging, or in any way an opportunity for deconspiration.[33] Initially, the cover-name had been chosen using the names of historical figures ("István Széchenyi"), former politicians ("Pál Teleki") or widely known artists ("Katalin Karádi"). However, a 1964 deputy interior Minister's order put an end to this practice: "The person being recruited should be consulted on the use of the cover-name. In most cases, the cover-name is chosen by the recruitment candidate himself from a set of alternatives provided by the case officer. It is forbidden to choose or give the names of prominent figures of historical and public life or of cultural history.[34] Interestingly, Russian emigrants from the Soviet system frequently travelled under the pseudonyms "Ludendorff" and "Horthy" between Munich, Vienna and Budapest in the early twenties.[35] In addition to the cover-names of the agents in his network, the secrecy concerned the designation of the target person, the target objects, but also the operative designations of cover works, cover stories ("legends").

However, covert communication with language symbols primarily contains peripheral elements of the secret service language. The true nature of the language concerning the secret services can be learned mainly from the regulatory environment, from the pursuit of the institutions, and of course from the related files and documents. However, it is difficult to fully recognize the regulations of the secret services or their applied language because these regulations are, by their very nature, only in exceptional circumstances available to the public. The general public are forbidden access to the overwhelming majority, or the most important parts, of the wide range of internal norms and ordinances. With all these complex research conditions in mind, it seems essential to clarify who is communicating with whom, when, where, and for what purpose. One of the tasks concerning the

---

[32] RÉVÉSZ, BÉLA: *Manipulation techniques in the early period of Cold War*. Szeged University, 1996. p. 73.

[33] MURÁNYI, GÁBOR: *Naming of agents. Service fondling*. In. *The Texture of the Past – Stories From the Cracked Twentieth Century*. Budapest. 2004. pp. 191–194.

[34] *Order No. 001 of the Deputy Minister of the Interior of the Hungarian People's Republic*, February 12, 1964. In: *Ordinance of Police Criminal Agencies Work* Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security 4.2. 10-23/1/1964. p. 21.

[35] Hungarian Military Historical Archives. Directorate of Military Staff II. group. 702/403. ny. – 1920. and Directorate of Military Staff. I. group. 266/hdm. – 1921. In: CSIMA JÁNOS: *Additions to the Horthysta Staff's role in the war policy of the counter-revolutionary system*. Journal of Military History. 3. 1968. Budapest, pp. 488–489.

interpretation issues of agent files considers the following aspects essential for understanding the communication situation in which these reports have been created:[36]

– It is worthwhile to distinguish between the author and the narrator which, in the case of network reports has the dual name of the citizen and the cover-name, and whose relationship is far from problematic. The "voice" that speaks on the sound recording belongs to the name that authenticates what it is written: the agent's; even if, in the historical discourse, the self of the agent cannot be completely separated from the self-designated by the civilian name.

– Speech is always for somebody, and during the speech, we always take into account the perceived or real expectations of the real or virtual audience. Thus, the audience exercises "control" over the speaker to such an extent that most people regard him as a co-author.

– The agent did not write (or orally present) his report during the observation, but afterwards; his narrative was necessarily retrospective. Thus, the act of memory cannot be bypassed when reading and interpreting agent reports. Monitoring, storage, retrieval - no hassle-free processes.

– Recalling circumstances greatly determine what someone talks about and how. One of the main findings of the science of memory is that memories are formed when they are evoked, they are created.

– The context basically determined by the goals of state security and by what the reports were about and what was left out of them (i.e. what the agent was experiencing). The question is how well the network agent was aware of the goals of state security. In addition, the agent's goals should not be overlooked. Not only did the state security use the agent network, but its members also sought to exploit the situation for their own purposes.

In any case, the author of this study notes in advance with regard to research, that:
1. The secret services, by virtue of their close proximity to power, shall at all times be direct or indirect representatives of the dominant ideological value system in their language.
2. As a result, the language of the secret service is multiplied. Public speaking can be more propagandistic and internal language can be more professional.
3. There may be a significant additional difference between the speech actors in terms based on inequality and their relationship to power.
   3.1. The style, vocabulary, and objectivity of internal commands for subordinates within an organization are obviously different than:
   3.2. A preparatory interview with a recruitment candidate or,

---

[36] TAKÁCS, TIBOR: *What are agent reports about? Aspects for the interpretation of "agent files".* Presentation in the Historical Archives; Budapest, 2013. 98: pp. 7–59.

3.3. A handwritten agent report or,

3.4. The confessions and records of interrogations or,

3.5. The propaganda materials addressed to the public, created by the secret service, and

3.6. The text of operational information intended to mislead the enemy/opposing party.[37]

4. Due to the complexity of the secret services, the language of military intelligence/counter-intelligence agencies tends to have an affinity for the terminology of the military and contains specific elements of the general secret service language.[38]

***

Further research intends to use the methodological considerations mentioned above, in order to examine and present the linguistic changes of the State Security Services of the 20th century's Hungary from the Hungarian Soviet Republic (March-August 1919) through the Horthy period (1919-1945) to the One-Party System (1949-1989).

RÉVÉSZ BÉLA

A TITKOSSZOLGÁLATOK NYELVÉNEK ÉRTHETŐSÉGE

(Összefoglaló)

A modern nyelvfilozófia megalapítója, Ludwig Wittgenstein egyik fiatalkori értekezésében (Notes on Logic, 1913) a nyelv egyetlen, hiánytalanul értelmes használatát a tények hiánytalan leképezésében látta. Mindenféle más jellegű használatára irányuló próbálkozás szükségképpen értelmetlen. Későbbi munkáiban azonban (Blue Book, 1933-1934) a korai gondolatokkal szemben már kételkedik a nyelvnek a világot kizárólagosan leíró feladatában és a nyelvet inkább olyan halmaznak tekinti, amelyben minden tevékenység más és más célt szolgál, amelyek a világ leírásán túl ún. „leképezési" feladatokat töltenek be. Sőt, ez utóbbi funkciónak a Filozófiai vizsgálódásokban (Philosophical Investigations, 1953) már elsőbbséget biztosít: „Mivel minden nyíltan előttünk van, nincs is mit magyarázni…" Az

---

[37] *Активные мероприятия (Meropriyatiya aktivnyye) – Active measure*: Operational measures to influence intelligence-relevant aspects of political life in a target country, including addressing foreign policy and internal issues in an intelligence-related manner, misleading, weakening or undermining the opponent positions, and destroying enemy plans, and achieving other goals. MITROKHIN, V.: *KGB Lexicon. The Soviet Intelligence Officer's Handbook*. London, 2004. p. 206.

[38] For example, military language speaks of "reconnaissance" rather than "intelligence", while the use of "psychological operations" is the same in the language of civilian and military intelligence services. OLYSÓI-GABÁNYI JÁNOS: *The military language of Hungary*. Budapest, 1923. p. 55.; MARKÓ, ÁRPÁD: *Additions to the History of the Development of the Hungarian Military Language*. Journal of Military History. Budapest, 1958. 1-2.; 1958. 3-4.; 1959. 1-2; 1960. 1-2.; 1961. 1-2; SEREGY, LAJOS: *Usage of Military Terminology and Soldiers' Language*. Defense Review. 1985. 2. p. 76. passim; TOMOLYA JÁNOS op. cit. passim.

évek során a meghatározó logikai értelmezéstől kissé távolodva nem csak a nyelv mindennapisága, „társadalmisága" került egyre inkább előtérbe, de annak hangsúlyozása is, hogy a nyelvi struktúrában a nyelvi jel és a jelölt csak feltételesen kapcsolódik egymáshoz, amely felismerés már a későbbi nyelvi antropológiai kutatások irányába is mutat. A szociolingvisztika már kifejezetten olyan társadalmi tényezőket vizsgál, amelyek alapján a különböző beszédformák különböző csoportokhoz, társadalmi rétegekhez kapcsolhatók. A nyelv ennek alapján különféle változatok, területi és társadalmi indikátorok mentén kialakult dialektusok, stílusok összessége. A közösség egészére jellemző, a változatok összességéből álló heterogén nyelvi készlet pedig már valóban távol került a nyelvtől a tények kizárólagos leképezését elváró Wittgensteini kiindulóponttól. A nyelvfilozófus gondolatmenetében bekövetkezett változásnak általánosabb következményei majd az XX. század második felétől láthatók igazán, ugyanis ekkortól lesz egyre erőteljesebben jelen a világ nyelvtudományában a nyelvhasználat és a társadalom összefüggéseinek vizsgálatára fókuszáló szociolingvisztika. A tanulmány módszertana ez utóbbi változatot, az érett Wittgenstein gondolatmenetét kívánja alkalmazni a titkosszolgálatok nyelvének történeti vizsgálata során.