

## Class Forces in Hungarian Revolution

(See Page 2)

# THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XX - No. 47

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1956

Price 10 Cents

## The UN - Ally of Hungarian Reaction

An Editorial

The United States, the capitalist power which dominates the United Nations, has demonstrated marked enthusiasm for the idea that the UN should "lend a hand" to the beleaguered Hungarian people. At the same time right-wing CP and outright pro-capitalist counter-revolutionary forces in Hungary have also called for UN intervention.

The government of Imre Nagy, which represented that section of the native Stalinist bureaucracy that tried to save itself from the masses by breaking with the Kremlin, appealed, as one of its last acts, for UN troops to be sent into Hungary.

The illusion that the UN is a force for peace and justice has long been nurtured by both the Kremlin and the international social democracy. Many workers have, as a result, fallen victim to this reactionary deception. Dispatches from Hungary indicate that even some revolutionary elements in the streets of Budapest have echoed the sentiment for UN aid against the Soviet troops.

During the days of the League of Nations, Lenin accurately described that body as an imperialist "thieves kitchen." The description retains full validity for the UN. The record of the UN demonstrates that any intervention on its part in the Hungarian revolution would be only for the purpose of strengthening the hand of the capitalist restorationist forces as against that of the workers who fight the Kremlin in order to build socialism.

Starting with a million dollar handout from Washington, the UN is now organizing relief for Hungary. The New York Times reported Nov. 14 that acceptance of this relief by the present Hungarian government is viewed by the UN Secretary-General as a possible "opening wedge" to getting UN "observers" into Hungary to check the withdrawal of Soviet troops and the holding of free elections.

The alleged concern of the UN top echelons for national rights and free elections is an utter fraud. When, for example, have the leaders of the UN expressed any concern over securing the withdrawal of the murderous French troops from Algeria? When have they displayed any interest in free elections in South Korea, in Formosa or a dozen other countries where tyrants rule in behalf of Western imperialism?

On Nov. 8, the press reported a final appeal from a besieged rebel station in Hungary. Addressed to the Soviet troops, the appeal declared in part: "Soldiers! Your state has been created at the cost of bloody fighting in order that you shall have freedom. Today is the 39th anniversary of that revolution. Why do you want to crush our liberty? You can see that it is not the factory proprietors, not the landowners and not the bourgeoisie that has taken up arms against you, but the Hungarian people, fighting desperately for the same rights for which you fought in 1917. Soviet soldiers, you have shown in Stalingrad how you could defend your country. Do not take up arms against the Hungarian nation."

It is in this spirit of working class internationalism that class-conscious workers everywhere must give aid to the Hungarian revolutionists.

# Kremlin Tanks Fail to Crush General Strike in Hungary

## A Report from England on Workers' Demonstrations Against Egyptian War

MANCHESTER, ENGLAND, Nov. 6 — "In 1939 the British went to war as a united people; they will not do so today." With this sentence the "Manchester Guardian" began its editorial the day after the French and British Governments launched their imperialist adventure in the Middle East.

This is Britain's most unpopular war. The working class, large sections of the middle class and the youth are all opposed to it. "Millions of British people are deeply shocked at the aggressive policy of the Government," said Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, the Labor Party leader, in the House of Commons. For the first time in its history the Parliamentary Labor Party is officially opposing a war after it has started. That is a measure of the mountain of opposition existing in this country against the cynical and brutal attack on Egypt.

Mass political action can quickly develop out of that opposition. Demonstrations are being called by the labor movement in all British cities. Twenty thousand Londoners assembled on Trafalgar Square last Sunday to hear Aneurin Bevan attack the Government's war policy. Thousands marched down Whitehall (where principal government buildings are located) afterwards and were charged by mounted police.

### WANT GENERAL STRIKE

In the trade unions and in the Labor Party, support for a general strike against the war is widespread. Numerous resolutions have been passed in trade union and local Labor Party branches. The Executive of the Fire Brigades Union yesterday demanded a general strike to force the Eden Government to resign. South Wales and Scottish miners are demanding industrial action. "The workers must strike," declared Mr. W. W. Hamilton, M.P. at a meeting in West Fife, the Scottish coal-mining area, "I think there is

### Main Auditorium at the UN



The eleventh session of the United Nations General Assembly opened in this hall Nov. 12 with the Egyptian and Hungarian crises as the main points on its agenda. The fundamental power in the UN, however, resides not in the General Assembly but in the Security Council whose permanent members are the United States, Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union. The United States is presently utilizing the UN to secure its imperialist interests in the Middle East and to exploit for its reactionary anti-Soviet aims the Kremlin's fierce attack on the Hungarian revolution for national independence.

(See Editorials On the Role of the UN This Page and Page 3.)

nothing more terrible than the prospect of a world war, and if that is agreed, then we should shrink from no attempt to stop it."

To be sure, Gaitskell has informed the Government that the Labor leadership will keep the opposition to the war within "constitutional channels." The National Council of Labor—a body composed of leaders of the Labor Party, the Trade Unions and the Co-operative Movement—has opposed industrial action to end the war. Talk of "constitutionalism," however rings a little hollow. The Government has gone to war in the teeth of widespread opposition embracing a majority of the population. The ranks of the labor movement recognize that something more than speeches is necessary to stop this desperate imperialist gamble in the Middle East.

The first demonstration—strike against the war will take place this afternoon. The workers in the 50 factories of the new post-war town of Crawley, near London, will down tools at 2:30 today for a march to the Town Center. Tomorrow the building workers of Liverpool will stop work and demonstrate. These are short stoppages. Only a few tens of thousands of workers involved. But they are the first political strikes in Britain since before the war and they cannot fail to act as a spur to other sections of the working class.

The youth, particularly the student youth, have been foremost in protesting against the war. Demonstrations have taken place in all the University cities. In Edinburgh, and others, there were battles between the demonstrators and reactionary gangs of government supporters. A one day strike of all Asian and African students in Britain has been called for tomorrow.

Many British students are expected to join it.

It should be added that events in Hungary have had their effect. Undoubtedly, the student demonstrations were inspired by the heroism of the Hungarian youth. And the example of mass action in Hungary heightens the receptivity among the workers to the idea of mass action against the Government here.

British imperialism embarked on this war against the Arab people in a desperate attempt to preserve a toe-hold in the Middle East. In doing so it has unleashed forces at home which, in a very short period, can be threatening its very existence.

### IN THIS ISSUE

Israel's Role In Mid-East Crisis See page 3

## Regime Now Offering Concessions; Peasants Are Feeding Strikers

NOV. 15 — As we go to press, dispatches from Hungary indicate that the workers, students and peasants now have a good chance of winning at least part of their demands. The renewed offer of concessions by the Kadar government is a result of the inspiring tenacity with which the workers have kept up their general strike in the face of Soviet tanks. In addition, the resolute action of the workers is getting the support of the peasants. The New York Times reports today that the workers of Csepel declared they were unconcerned by government threats to withhold their wages because "They [the government] cannot starve us out. Farmers are feeding us without payment. They know our cause is theirs."

By George Laván

Nov. 14 — To the world's amazement the Hungarian revolution goes on even though it has been overwhelmed by the huge military forces thrown against it by the Kremlin. Though Russian tanks, planes and artillery succeeded in ten bitter days of fighting in defeating the military resistance of revolutionists, they have been unable to crush the general strike which has spread throughout the country.

Military resistance ended today as the last bastion of the revolution—Csepel Island, the most industrialized section of Hungary—surrendered. Workers there had fortified themselves inside the factories and held the Soviet tanks at bay. Yesterday firing ceased while both sides held their positions. Today the workers laid down their arms and filed out of the great factories. But they came out vowing to continue the general strike until their demands were met.

In Budapest itself, there is similar evidence that military defeat of the revolution has not crushed the morale of the workers and revolutionary youth. Under the very bayonets of the occupying army, they are carrying on an active political struggle marked by mass meetings, leaflet distribution, picketing and extension of the general strike.

### ZIG ZAG COURSE

The Kremlin bureaucrats appear to be at a loss on how to deal with a national revolution which won't submit even when it has been overwhelmed by naked military force. The quandary in which Stalin's heirs find themselves is shown by the zig-zag course of their puppet regime in Hungary and by the fact that a dozen top Soviet leaders, including Mikoyan, Suslov and possibly Khrushchev, flew to Budapest on Nov. 12 in search of some formula that would end the revolutionary turmoil in the country.

The regime headed by Janos Kadar and backed by the Kremlin has been unable to win any support despite promises, cajolery and threats. As the New York Times of Nov. 13 reported: "The Hungarian government seemed to control little more than the Budapest radio. It had no army, no civil service, nor the slightest vestige of public support."

Since the deposition of the regime of Imre Nagy, which was attempting to ride the revolutionary whirlwind, the Kadar regime has sought to win some semblance of popular support or toleration. At first it promised all the demands of the revolutionists: Hungarian independence, recognition of the workers councils, wage increases, collective-farm reforms, etc., etc.

### KADAR GETS TOUGH

The gimmick was that the crucial demand without which all others remained in jeopardy—withdrawal of the Soviet Army—was to be negotiated after the revolutionists had laid down their arms and gone back to work. This plus the counter-revolutionary origin of the Kadar regime, which had been imposed on Hungary by the occupying army, set

at naught all the honeyed words and promises addressed by it to the Hungarian masses.

Resistance to the Soviet Army continued; the appeals for an ending of the general strike were fruitless. Thereupon the Kadar regime essayed a get-tough line. On Nov. 10 it proclaimed that the deadline for voluntary surrender by rebels had

(Continued on page 2)

## Montgomery Fighters Win In High Court

NOV. 13—While 64,000 boycotters in Montgomery and Tallahassee are continuing their fight for equality, the Supreme Court today ruled that it is unconstitutional for a state or city to require racial segregation on intrastate buses. The court's unanimous decision was a legal victory for Montgomery's eleven-month-old protest movement which led to this favorable decision.

The court's action affirmed a June 5 decision by a special Montgomery Federal Court which held segregated seating to be illegal. The Supreme Court in upholding equal rights cited its own 1954 decision outlawing racial segregation in public schools.

The new ruling forbids use of government authority to require segregation on any buses. Racist Southern officials in various states have pledged to maintain the Dixiecrat pattern despite the court's action.

The Supreme Court ruling coincides with the climaxing of attempts to smash the two protest movements, by declaring the Negro voluntary car pools in Montgomery and Tallahassee illegal. The city of Montgomery filed a petition in Circuit Court to dissolve the car pool there. It was directed against the Montgomery Improvement Association which organized the bus protest, and against 13 churches and 23 individuals, including Rev. Martin L. King, MIA president and E. D. Nixon, treasurer. A hearing was set for Nov. 13. The bus company estimated a \$750,000 loss in revenue since the start of the boycott by 50,000 united Negroes with a motor pool of 300 private cars and 25 station wagons.

In Tallahassee, 21 bus boycotters on Oct. 20 were fined \$500 each and 60 days suspended sentences with one year's probation, on charges of running an illegal transportation system. The convictions are being appealed. Rev. C. K. Steele, Tallahassee boycott leader, told a New York meeting yesterday: "We are committed to waging our battle against evil principles. Right cannot be destroyed. Crushed to the ground, it will rise. On a scaffold it will sway the world." Under the banner of "We'll walk in humble dignity rather than ride in shameful humiliation" 14,400 boycotters are staying off the buses. As E. D. Nixon of Montgomery said: "Our people are no longer afraid."

# The Election Results -- Blow to AFL-CIO Policy

By John Thayer

Eisenhower wins by a popular plurality of almost 10 million. The Democrats retain their control of the Senate and House. Republican jubilation is beginning to be countered by liberal and labor claims that the Congressional vote is a great Democratic victory and a "repudiation" of the Republican Party. Leaders of both parties speak in awed voices of Eisenhower's "personality" as an almost suprapolitical factor. What happened in the election and what lessons can workers draw from it?

The obvious fact is that Eisenhower's landslide victory was a stunning defeat for the Democratic Party and in particular for the top officialdom of the labor movement. Instead of wielding more political influence in 1956 when labor is united the labor movement now wields less. One of the prime motives in unification was to strengthen labor's political hand. Yet the AFL-CIO political policy resulted in unprecedented ticket-splitting by union members themselves and by a disastrous melting away of labor's political allies—the Negro people and the working farmers.

### WAR SCARE FACTOR

The working class vote remained solid enough on the state and Congressional levels to preserve the slim Democratic majorities. But for the enormously powerful office of the presidency substantial numbers of workers felt that the "friendliness" of the Democrat Stevenson to labor was outweighed by the danger that he was more apt to involve the



EISENHOWER

U.S. in war than Republican Eisenhower.

All observers agree that the magnitude of Eisenhower's victory can be credited to the Middle East war scare that dominated the last ten days of the campaign. Millions of undecided voters, or those who lukewarmly were going to vote for Stevenson decided that a vote for Eisenhower was a vote for keeping American boys from being sent to Egypt. Eisenhower's TV-radio promise on Oct. 31 that the U.S. would not be militarily involved reinforced the widespread illusion that he is a "man of peace."

Stevenson's reply, on the other hand, bemoaned the administration's loss of its allies, British and French imperialism, and

made many suspect it was doubletalk in favor of sending troops.

But it is also agreed, and in this case the pollsters would seem to be correct, that even without the Middle East war scare Eisenhower would have won. In all analyses of this mass preference, explanations come back to Eisenhower's "personality" as the deciding factor. Just what is this "personality"? Is it a political or a purely personal attribute?

In the absence of important differences of program between the major parties and in the absence of major economic discontent (which works against the party in office), people, faced with grave problems, are forced to choose between candidates on the basis of their "personalities." Involved here, however, is something quite different from the usual concept of "personality." Here the masses wishfully put into their concept of a candidate's "personality" a political content. The very alternative which they are denied by the similar and meaningless programs of the two parties, they seek to discover in one or the other candidate's "personality."

What is the political content that so many millions of Americans have put into their image of Eisenhower?

### EISENHOWER POPULARITY

Outstanding is the belief or hope that Eisenhower is a "man of peace." This originated in the 1952 campaign when Eisenhower condemned the Korean War, promised to go to Korea, did so, and later presided over the ending of that war. That Eisenhower was the fortunate

beneficiary of a major change in the foreign policy of Wall Street, which had been stalemated in its war drive by the colonial revolutions and by Soviet atomic development, is not realized by the mass of the American people.

The ending of the Korean war is credited to him personally, as is the subsequent lessening of tensions with the Soviet Union. His pre-election promise that the U.S. would stay out of the Middle East conflict capped the popular conception that "Eisenhower will keep us out of war."

A second element in the public image of Eisenhower is that he is "sincere." This is another way of saying that he is not a "politician." The American people very justifiably have a hearty distrust of capitalist politicians. Eisenhower's non-political background, his supposed lack of relish for "politics," even his golf playing reinforces the popular illusion that he is no politician, but is "above parties," and only concerned with the welfare of the country.

Finally Eisenhower, despite the fact that he heads the Republican Party, does not appear as a reactionary to the public. This is a result of the lack of sharp class conflicts in the general prosperity which has marked his four years in office. Though labor has made no important gains, neither has the steady offensive against it that began during Truman's administrations qualitatively increased. Eisenhower's program of "moderation" does not seem much different from Stevenson's program of "moderation." Moreover, under Eisenhower the extreme right wing of the Republican Party and the

McCarthyites have been pushed into the background.

Of course, the popular conception of Eisenhower is a false one. He is not a man of peace but a militarist. His peace talk has no more validity than did Roosevelt's "I-hate-war" declarations of 1940 or the "He-kept-us-out-of-war" propaganda for Wilson in 1916. The ending of the Korean war and subsequent U.S. policy, including that on the Middle East, is based not on Eisenhower's "love of peace" but on U.S. imperialism's new gambit after the debacle of its old policy in Korea and Indo-China. Should Wall Street's policy require a heating up of the cold war he would preside over new "police actions" just as he presided over the liquidating of the Korean stalemate.

The prosperity that redounds to his popularity is based on the huge armaments budget and economic factors beyond his control. That the anti-labor drive has not accelerated tremendously during his administration is based on the policy of the Eastern wing of the Republican party which pursues an anti-labor program but not at such a reckless pace that it might provoke a major counter-offensive from the workers.

The main credit for Eisenhower's popular "personal" appeal must go to labor's failure to present the American people with a real political alternative. By imprisoning labor in the Democratic Party the union bureaucrats have deprived the American people of real alternatives on the momentous issues confronting them. Can the voters be blamed if, out of wishful thinking, they try to find alternatives

in the candidates' "personalities"?

The overwhelming fact shown by the election results is that labor leaders were unable to sell the Democratic ticket to workers and the Negro people as in previous elections. Hundreds of thousands of good union men and women who subscribe generally to the proposition that the Republican Party is a party of Big Business nevertheless split their tickets. This was shown by the Eisenhower vote in union strongholds and urban centers that have gone heavily Democratic for years.

The vote of the Negro people, which in past elections has been 70-80% Democratic showed an even steeper decline. It is estimated that here Eisenhower increased his vote from 22% in 1952 to about 45% this year. (For an analysis of this, see The Negro Struggle on page 4.)

Further evidence of the diminishing differences between the two Big Business parties and voter indifference to the party loyalty of candidates is the increase of "switch" candidates. Thus in Oregon Senator Wayne Morse was elected on the Democratic ticket this time. Last time he ran as a Republican. In Ohio Gov. Lausche was elected Senator on the Democratic ticket despite his open praise of Eisenhower and collaboration with Republicans. Similarly Congressman Powell of Harlem was re-elected without trouble in New York despite his support of Eisenhower. Added to this list of politicians who transcend party lines is Javits, just elected Senator in New York. Though a Re-

(Continued on page 3)





