In connection with the fiftieth anniversary of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution in 2006, the several new books have been published on a variety of aspects of this heroic event, among which the edited volume, *The 1956 Hungarian Revolution – Hungarian & Canadian Perspectives*, a collection of articles from twelve scholars from Hungary, Canada, the USA, and Finland, is one important contribution. The collection of papers, which were originally presented at an international colloquium held in Ottawa, Canada, between October 12 and 14, 2006, is divided into two parts, with Part I titled “The Revolution, Hungary and the World” – a group of seven papers discussing the events of 1956 and its effect on Hungary and Hungarians living in or outside the country, and Part II titled “The Canadian Context” – includes five papers describing the impact of the Hungarian Revolution on Canada, its immigration and diplomatic policies.

The volume opens with the keynote lectures given by János Rainer, the director of the Institute for the History of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution in Budapest (which was closed in 2011) and Csaba Békés, the founding director of the Cold War History Research Center, also in Budapest. Csaba Békés’s paper refutes the most frequently mentioned myths about the revolution, namely that it would have succeeded had the West intervened militarily, or had the UN played a more active role, or whether the Soviet Union would have agreed to an independent, but politically neutral Hungary. Given that the goal of American policy, and therefore of the West, was to stabilize the political situation in Europe and military intervention was not an option considered by the American government. Békés proves that at the UN, János Szabó, Imre Nagy’s interim appointee, sabotaged the instructions received from Hungary, preventing the UN from playing a more active role, while in the Soviet Union, the newly accessible documents from debates in the Soviet Presidium, prove that an independent Hungary was never considered by the Kremlin. Békes’s paper convincingly proves that all of the above were myths or wishful thinking.

János Rainer examined the events of 1956 as a consequence of the political developments within Hungary, and in his brief history of the revolution looks at decisions and actions of the Communist Party and its impact on the various participant groups, such as the students and armed freedom fighters, and reached the conclusion that the revolutionaries wanted a welfare state with limited privatization combined with a multiparty democracy. Susan Glanz’s detailed analysis of the economic platforms of the newly formed or re-formed political parties published during the revolution supports the same conclusion.

Mária Palasik’s paper looks, literally, at the contribution of women to the revolution by analyzing archival photographs. While she found that 10% of the close to 4,000 photographs she examined at the Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security and the Institute for the History of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution had images of women, her paper focused on 25
photos, which are included in this volume. All 25 photographs have women in them, but only four show women bearing guns, even though photographs of women soldiers were much publicized during the revolution and remain vivid in many people’s imagination. The percentage of women actively taking part in the Revolution cannot be evaluated as to how many took up arms, but Mária Palasik found that close to 15% of the women who were indicted by the courts after 1956 were indicted for participating in the armed conflict. The 21 other photographs studied by Palasik show women in traditional roles, as nurses, care-givers or women leaving scenes of potential conflicts.

Júlia Vajda’s presentation is an analysis of oral testimonies of two Holocaust survivors about their views of the 1956 revolution. Unfortunately she does not provide the date of the interviews and why the interviewers did not ask about 1956, the interviews collected under the auspices of the “Totalitarianism and Holocaust”, which was a project within another project. The oral testimonies of these two women were chosen by Vajda, because they mentioned the revolution. Both women were of similar age and are Jewish and after 1945 were communists, while after the revolution one of them broke with the Communist Party, and the other remained a supporter of the regime but neither felt that the Revolution played “an essential and crucial part in their lives” (137).

Judith Kesserű Némethy studied the impact of the revolution on the politically-divided Hungarian communities in Argentina, which managed to find in a unifying cause in supporting the revolution by means such as providing scholarships to immigrant children, organizing mass demonstrations after the defeat of the revolution, keeping the revolution and its spirit alive in the local Hungarian and Argentinian press. Heino Nyyssönen from Finland analyzed the post-1989 impact of the revolution in the Hungarian public memory, in particular how the goals and events of the revolution were politicized after 1989 and how this politicization was reflected in public commemorations of 1956.

Part II of the volume looks at the impact of the Hungarian Revolution on Canada. Of the 200,000 refugees who left Hungary, 35,000 choose Canada as their new home. This was the first time Canada accepted so many refugees from a single country. Harold Troper and Nándor Dreisziger analyze the various waves of immigration from Hungary. Troper’s paper emphasizes the conflict between the demand for labor and the Canadian government’s racially and ethnically selective immigration policies, preference for British, north European immigrants, in the late 40s and 50s, which was out of synch with the public’s perception of the immigrants. By 1956, with nearly every household owning a TV set, the public view of Hungarian refugees, perceived as freedom fighters, were viewed as “desirable” immigrants. Nándor Dreisziger briefly summarizes the demographic, social and religious characteristics of the various waves Hungarian migrants, and he found that the ‘56ers were the largest group and were better educated than previous groups, they were, nevertheless, similar to earlier groups in that the majority were young males. Other similarities compared between the 1956 refugees and other post-World War II immigrants versus earlier immigrants was that a large proportion of ’56ers had upper-middle class and middle-class backgrounds and many were Jewish. Both authors agree that this group was welcomed in Canada which made their initial settlement easier.
Peter Hidas’ presentation, based on historic documents, analyzes the nitty-gritty of daily arrivals and settling of the Hungarian immigrants. The Canadian government’s plans were to disperse the refugees all over the country, and thus the federal government and provincial governments and private agencies “bargained” about settlement numbers and funding. Greg Donaghy’s paper also looks at the Canadian government’s reaction to the Hungarian Revolution from the point of diplomacy. The paper studies the behind-the-scenes debates in the government on the “proper” reaction to the revolution and refugees. The consequence of the revolution on Canadian foreign policy was twofold, a change in policy towards the Soviet Union, a policy constructive engagement, and opening Canada’s borders to immigrants from Communist countries, which ultimately made Canadian refugee policy more open.

Christopher Adam’s contribution is an analysis is of the coverage of the events in a Canadian Hungarian newspaper, the weekly, Kanadai Magyar Munkás (Canadian-Hungarian Worker), the second largest Canadian-Hungarian paper, which was affiliated with the Canadian Communist party. The dual goals of the paper’s articles were to convince the Canadian readers that the refugees were brought to Canada as cheap labor and to destroy the unions and on the other hand to convince the refugees to return to Hungary. Despite all of the testimonies of unhappy Hungarian immigrants, we know that vast majority stayed, and the Munkás “paid” the price, it closed. The paper was replaced by the Új Szó (New Word), another publication of the Canadian Communist Party, in 1968.

The academic level of scholarship presented in this interdisciplinary, edited volume is excellent. The two parts represent cross-disciplinary approaches giving an added value to the existing literature on the 1956 Revolution. The editors close the book with an Appendix they title “Conference Notes, where conference presenters whose papers are not included are listed and their papers are briefly summarized.” In sum, the chapters provide the reader with deep, historical, economic, political, and sociological analyses of the events, by commemorating the heroic aspects of the Revolution as well as its affect on the ordinary people’s life in Hungary and abroad. I would recommend the book for everyone interested in the events and the aftermath of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, and fortunately it is available open access through the Project Muse at http://muse.jhu.edu/books/9780776618463).