

# THE TIMES AND HUNGARY

WHAT DOES the N. Y. Times want in Hungary?

In an editorial yesterday, the Times warned that "there is reason for concern, too, in the sudden concerted Communist cry—coming from such diverse sources as the Daily Worker in New York to President Tito of Yugoslavia—for 'an end to the bloodshed'."

Naturally, we are for an end to the bloodshed, just as we were against its starting in the first place. But what does the Times want? Evidently that organ of big business would like to see the tragic fighting continue until it might result in an overthrow of socialism.

The Times says we raise the cry for an end to the bloodshed "only when it is obvious that the revolutionists have the great majority of the Hungarian nation on their side. . . ."

But what is wrong about our being on the side of the "great majority of the Hungarian nation?" That is exactly where we have sought to be from the beginning, although all the facts were not immediately clear to us about the situation any more than they were to the Times itself.

It has become increasingly evident that the present events started as a great popular upheaval against Stalinist repression. The armed fighting itself began only when the now ousted Stalinist, Erno Gero, in a manner typical of those policies, called upon the Soviet troops for intervention against the just demands of the people. (Contrary to what happened in Poland, where the Gomulka government led the popular movement).

We challenge the New York Times, which is so concerned about the presence of Soviet troops in Eastern Europe, to join in demanding of our own government that it enter an agreement whereby ALL foreign troops—ours in Western Europe and the Soviets in Eastern—will return behind their own borders. The Soviet Union has proposed this repeatedly—the State Department has said no.

Will the Times join us in an appeal for both American and Soviet troops to leave the countries of Europe?