

Civilian Lawyer Vs. Military Brass

(See Page 3)

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XXI - No. 2

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 1957

Price 10 Cents

21 Cities in South Order Desegregation of Buses

By Fred Halstead
JAN. 9—The working class weapon of mass action is sparking the spread of bus integration across the South. So far, in addition to Montgomery, Ala., 21 cities in five Southern and border states have ended bus segregation in compliance with the November 1956 Supreme Court decision. This decision, and its enforcement in Montgomery, were the direct result of the historic year-long boycott of Jim Crow buses by the 50,000 Negroes of the Alabama capital.

Leaders of the Montgomery Improvement Association—the mass organization of the Montgomery desegregation fighters—have called on other Southern Negro leaders to attend a strategy meeting in Atlanta Jan. 10 “in an effort to coordinate and spur the campaign for integrated transportation in the South.”

“We have no choice,” said MIA president Rev. Martin Luther King, “but to delve deeper into the struggle.” Rev. C. K. Steele, president of the Tallahassee Inter-Civic Council and Rev. F. L. Shuttlesworth, prominent in the Birmingham bus protest movement, joined in the conference call.

The meeting will take up the

questions of securing voting rights for Negroes and enforcing the Supreme Court decision on desegregated schools as well as the bus integration fight.

An atmosphere of militancy for the conference was provided when, today, about 100 Atlanta Negro ministers began sitting up front in buses in the opening move of a “love, law, and liberation” movement in the Georgia capital. The general Negro public was urged to wait until further notice before joining the action. Atlanta’s metropolitan population is 900,000.

The 21 cities which have promised compliance with the Montgomery-won Supreme Court decision are listed by the Southern Regional Council, an interracial fact-finding organization, as: Little Rock, Pine Bluff, Fort Smith and Hot Springs, Ark.; Charlotte, Greensboro, Durham and Winston-Salem, N.C.; Richmond, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Newport News, Petersburg, Charlottesville, Fredericksburg, Lynchburg and Roanoke, Va.; San Antonio, Corpus Christi and Dallas, Texas; and Knoxville, Tenn.

In many of these cities, the council said, mixed seating is now common while in some, in spite of the fact that the segregation

Senate Votes To Retain Filibusters

By George Lavan

The U.S. Senate on Jan. 4 voted 55-38 to make any effective civil rights legislation impossible for the next two years. This was accomplished by voting to retain Rule 22 under which the Southern Democrats can filibuster to death any bill they really want to stop.

The fight to amend Rule 22 liberal Democrats have been promising since the election returns revealed major Negro dissatisfaction with the Democratic Party, turned out to be a fight in name only. In fact it was carried on not only without harsh feeling on either side but even without harsh words. The whole show took place in the frame of a “unanimous consent” agreement. Senate Majority leader Lyndon Johnson (D-Tex.) got all the Senators from liberals Humphrey (D-Minn.) and Douglas (D-Ill.) to white-supremacists Eastland (D-Miss.) and Talmadge (D-Ga.) to agree unanimously to his plan. This was to permit Sen. Anderson (D-N.M.) to introduce a motion to consider the Senate rules; immediately thereupon Vice-President Nixon, who was presiding over the Senate, would recognize Johnson’s motion to table (kill) Anderson’s motion, however, by unanimous vote the Senate would postpone the motion to table for six hours during which there could be debate on the rules.

BULLETIN

JAN. 10 — Racists are resorting to violence on an increased scale to try to stop the spread of the Negroes’ organized desegregation movement. Today, in Montgomery, six dynamite blasts heavily damaged four Negro churches and the homes of two ministers. Fortunately, no one was hurt.

laws have been officially dropped, the tradition of extra-legal intimidation has still maintained partial bus segregation. The key question for these cities, as well as for those where officials have continued to defy the court decision, remains that of enforcing and securing the hard-won legal victory.

An example of this problem facing the Southern freedom fighters, and their determination to meet it is contained in a Jan. 2 news release from the Tallahassee Inter-Civic Council, the mass organization of Negroes in Florida’s capital. “The whites,” says the release, “have organized a campaign to call the leaders [of the integration movement] and the Inter-Civic Council office on the phone every few minutes and hang up immediately and especially during the night. These hecklers have caused a few of us a little irritation, but everyone seems to be taking it calmly and asking the whites to pray for us.”

“These moves,” continues the news release, “followed several events this week. The Negroes voted unanimously to return to the buses upon receipt of the federal court order outlawing segregation on public carriers. . . The Negroes began a successful ‘Ride the Bus Campaign Democratically.’ Some of the white papers implied that only the leaders of the ICC were riding the buses, however, this is far from the truth.”

A long list of “legal” moves then made by the racist city officials—including the arrest of many bus drivers who were not enforcing the illegal segregation law—is cited and the news bulletin continues: “Early in the morning on Jan. 1, some rabble rousers fired upon the grocery store of Cornelius and Dennis Speed. We believe that it was a matter of a mistaken identity. The chairman of the ‘Ride the Bus Campaign Democratically,’ Dan Speed, an active leader in the ICC owns a grocery store. His store was a discharge center during the operations of the car pool.”

(Continued on page 4)

Brass Plans Atomic Arms for Mid-East

Imperialist Policy Makers



Secretary of State John Foster Dulles (left) and Admiral Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, confer with House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Thomas S. Gordon (D-Ill.) before going behind closed doors on President Eisenhower’s proposed “doctrine” of Wall Street domination of the Middle East. Dulles refused to define at a public hearing what countries are covered by the Administration’s Middle East policy. The proposed area is reported to include Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika in Negro East Africa. (See “Negro Struggle” on page 4.)

Dulles Maps New Wall St. ‘Boundaries’

By Myra Tanner Weiss
JAN. 9—The world’s fear of a new atomic war was intensified last week with the announcement that U.S. Marines in the Mediterranean area were armed with nuclear weapons. While the U.S. has insisted on equipping NATO forces in Europe with weapons readied for atomic warheads, this is the first time that atomic tactical weapons have appeared in an area actually torn with war.

On Jan. 5, Eisenhower, too anxious for war-making powers in the Middle East to wait for his regularly scheduled appearance before Congress, opened his speech by saying that “it is well to remind ourselves that our basic national objective in international affairs remains peace.”

Remembering “peace objectives” was undoubtedly difficult on the heels of revelations, Jan. 8, by Marine commander General Randolph M. Pate that U.S. Marines had secretly been shipped last October into the Mediterranean area. Pate, let it be known that Marines moved into the “Egyptian Harbor of Alexandria” with tanks and artillery ready to fight their way to Cairo “if necessary,” says the Jan. 4 New York Times. Pate also revealed that Marines were equipped with atomic weapons.

SECRET DIPLOMACY
The American people have no voice in the preparations of the Administration for war. In addition, they do not even know what these preparations are. The curtain of secrecy that veils the foreign policy of the Administration has extended so far it even evoked a protest from one of the “me too” Democrats supporting the Dulles line.

Congressman Wayne L. Hays from Ohio walked out of a session of the House Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday where Dulles was explaining the need for the Eisenhower Doctrine. Stating that “the Russians know more about the mistakes we’ve made in the Middle East than the American people do,” Hays protested that “there’s entirely too much executive session around here.”

One of the reasons for the conspiratorial secrecy of an executive session is the definition of the area that is included in the term “Middle East.” Just what nations in this area are likely to need the unasked-for “protection” of U.S. atom-powered troops is not for the American people to know. Nor evidently are the nations to be “protected” to know.

It is likely that even Dulles doesn’t know. The problem for U.S. Big Business is still a very fluid one. First, some nations in this area — Iraq, Algeria, Israel, etc. — are still under the “protection” of Britain or France. Then, although Arab national independence movement has still not challenged capitalist and feudal property relations, there are indications that it will.

The Administration has no objections to the nationalist movement pushing out its imperialist rivals. But it wants to make certain that the revolution doesn’t move to claim for the people of the Mid-East the wealth that exists in that area. This is the real reason for the Eisenhower Doctrine, and at this point it requires a great deal of military flexibility.

A “People’s” Inauguration



Inaugural stands are being readied for the swearing-in of President Eisenhower for his second term. The stands will cost \$133,000. The President has announced that this year there will be four inaugural balls instead of the customary two. Participation in the three-day inaugural celebration will cost an estimated \$619 per couple.

Socialist Workers Party Statement On Polish and Hungarian Revolutions

The following is the text of a statement, The Hungarian and Polish Revolutions and the Crisis of Stalinism, adopted by the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party at its meeting, Jan. 3-5.

The Hungarian and Polish revolutions have again demonstrated the leading role of the working class in the transformation of society from capitalism to socialism. The world struggle for socialism, which has experienced a rapid acceleration since World War II, has now been thrust forward with renewed power.

The Hungarian and Polish events have confirmed the view taken last April by the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party that a new stage has opened in the Russian revolution. The mortal crisis of Stalinism, which became manifest at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, was interpreted by the Committee as a sign of the intensity of the mass unrest and pressure, both in the Soviet Union and in the East European countries dominated by the Kremlin bureaucracy. The developments in Hungary and Poland, which brought the masses into the political arena on a nationwide scale and lifted the struggle to a higher level, now make it possible to draw new and important conclusions regarding the further course of the death agony of Stalinism and the rebirth of revolutionary socialism as a mass movement.

The general reasons for the renewed motion of the masses in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe were explained in the April resolution of the National Committee of the SWP as follows:

The victory of the Soviet Union in World War II, due primarily to the planned economy, altered the relation of

world forces to the disadvantage of capitalism. The expansion of the Soviet Union into Eastern Europe broke the isolation that had fostered the growth of the parasitic caste in the Soviet Union. The victory of the Yugoslav and Chinese revolutions ended the long series of defeats of revolutions which had further strengthened Stalinism. The repeated revolutionary upsurges in the colonial world weakened world imperialism still more and added to the forces favoring rebirth of revolutionary socialism as a mass movement. Within the Soviet Union the unparalleled rate of expansion of the means of production, again due primarily to the planned economy, increasingly shifted social relations in favor of the growing proletariat. Russia’s backwardness, another source of Stalinist strength, began to give way with the advance of technology and education. The Soviet Union, moving ahead of the West European powers, even broke America’s monopoly in atomic energy. These happenings undermined the foundations of Stalinism, a change that was bound to become reflected sooner or later in the minds of the masses of the Soviet orbit.

Thus, as Trotsky long ago foresaw, the successes of planned economy at home and the advances of the revolution abroad sharpened the internal contradictions of Soviet society, bringing them to explosive political expression against the totalitarian regime of the bureaucratic oligarchy that usurped power following the death of Lenin.

The post-Stalin policy of granting concessions to the masses and correcting the most monstrous abuses was evidence that Stalin’s heirs recognized the gathering resistance to their rule. But contrary to the expectations of the Kremlin the concessions raised the revolutionary

(Continued on page 2)

SWP Committee Outlines Tasks of Socialists in U. S.

Meeting in plenary session in New York, Jan. 3-5, the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party devoted its sessions to an analysis of the major international developments, a discussion of the present situation in the radical movement, a review of the activity of the SWP and plans for stepped-up party work in the days ahead.

The committee adopted a statement on the situation in the Middle East which was published in last week’s issue of the Militant. A statement by the committee on the political revolution in the Soviet orbit is published in the current issue.

The meeting of the National Committee reflected the present strengthened position of the SWP. The rising political revolution in the Soviet orbit and the major setbacks suffered by imperialism at the hands of the colonial revolution have provided major confirmations of the SWP program.

REGROUPMENT QUESTION
The committee discussed extensively the present sentiments for regroupment which exist in virtually all sectors of the radical movement and which came primarily as a result of the revelations of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The committee declared that the SWP will lend its full efforts to a regroupment of the American left that will lead to a strengthened revolutionary socialist movement. Discussing the various views on regroupment expressed by other radical tendencies, the committee expressed its opposition toward any moves to exclude the members of the Communist Party from participation in the present regroupment discussion.

Reviewing the discussion that has taken place so far between the various radical groups, the committee concluded that the present stage of discussion has demonstrated the need for a clarification of the programmatic basis for a left regroupment.

The organizational reports presented to the committee detailed the present growth of interest in the SWP program and activities. The report on the SWP’s recent Presidential election campaign revealed that this campaign produced the most solid results of the three Presiden-

tial races that the SWP has now participated in.

There were over 2,300 persons in 47 states who responded to the SWP radio and TV programs. Of these, 125 have subscribed to the Militant. The Militant’s campaign in support of the Socialist Workers ticket resulted in over 500 new subscribers for the paper. Also as a result of the campaign the number of active sympathizers of the SWP has grown significantly and a number of these have already joined the SWP.

The marked growth of interest in the views of the SWP was also reflected in the report that the sale of Marxist books and pamphlets had increased in 1956 almost 100% over the previous year. The writings of Leon Trotsky have been especially in demand.

The committee also noted that the SWP campaign had provided a significant opportunity for socialist unity in action. The formation by Vincent Hallinan and Clifford T. McAvoy of the Independent Committee for Dobbs and Weiss, the active campaigning for the SWP ticket by numerous other members of the Progressive party, and the support extended by individual members of virtually all the radical

Anti-U.S. Mayor Elected In Okinawa Capital City

TOKYO, Jan. 1—On Dec. 25, a mayoralty election took place in Naha, a city of 130,000, in Okinawa. It is the capital of the Ryukyu island chain, currently governed by U.S. military authorities. In the election, Kamejiri Senaga, Secretary of the Ryukyu People’s (Communist) Party was elected. The vote was as follows: Senaga 16,600; S. Nakaima (Conservative), 14,600; and T. Nakamoto (Conservative), 9,600.

All inhabitants of Ryukyu are taking part in a bitter struggle against enlargement of American air bases. Moreover, the working people are demanding that Ryukyu be returned to Japan.

Workers and peasants support Senaga and his party because they championed the demand for reintegration with Japan and did

tendencies contributed much to an effective independent socialist campaign.

The committee endorsed a program of action designed to encourage and strengthen the regroupment process, to reach the newly awakening layers of workers and youth with the socialist program and to lend maximum support to the epic struggle of the Negro people for equality.

The National Committee also voted to convene a national convention of the Socialist Workers Party during the month of May.

JAN. 11—Soviet and Hungarian troops occupied a number of factories on Csepel Island, biggest industrial concentration in Hungary. This action followed wholesale resignations of members of Workers Councils. According to John McCormack in the Jan. 10 New York Times, “The reason for the resignation of the Csepel council was said to be that the government had deprived it of all authority. Rather than become a powerless adjunct of the state apparatus it decided to dissolve.”

It is likely that even Dulles doesn’t know. The problem for U.S. Big Business is still a very fluid one. First, some nations in this area — Iraq, Algeria, Israel, etc. — are still under the “protection” of Britain or France. Then, although Arab national independence movement has still not challenged capitalist and feudal property relations, there are indications that it will.

The Administration has no objections to the nationalist movement pushing out its imperialist rivals. But it wants to make certain that the revolution doesn’t move to claim for the people of the Mid-East the wealth that exists in that area. This is the real reason for the Eisenhower Doctrine, and at this point it requires a great deal of military flexibility.

... SWP on Polish and Hungarian Revolutions

(Continued from page 1)

spirit of the masses and brought them closer to open revolt. The first evidence of this was a widespread strike movement in Eastern Europe that culminated in the uprising of the East German workers in June 1953. Use of violent repressive measures likewise did not halt the movement of the masses, for the East German uprising, put down by military force, inspired dramatic strikes in the prison camps inside the Soviet Union. In consequence of this ferment, the Kremlin decided to go even further in granting legal and economic concessions. In an attempt to associate themselves with the popular hatred of Stalinism, the top bureaucracy under Khrushchev's leadership at the Twentieth Congress opened an attack on the Stalin cult and raised the slogan of "Back to Lenin."

"This set in motion forces that will inevitably pass beyond the control of the bureaucracy," the April resolution declared; "for the Congress pronouncements on Stalin will become a banner for the masses in marching forward to completely cleanse the Soviet Union of the hated Stalinist system. It legalizes their demand for an end to Stalinism and a return to Lenin. They will know how to put this significant concession to full advantage. The Congress thus marks the beginning of a new, profoundly revolutionary stage in the Soviet Union."

The correctness of this estimate was quickly confirmed. On June 28 the workers of Poznan, Poland, went out on a general strike that grew into an uprising. Their action was symptomatic of the popular urge to extend the concessions made by the bureaucracy and to convert the paper promises about a return to Lenin into living reality.

Not a "Self-Reform" Movement

The pattern of events was much the same as in the East German uprising three years before. The workers' struggle began with economic demands; and, in face of resistance from the regime, was converted into a political uprising, culminating in the demand for the withdrawal of Soviet troops; that is, freedom from the grip of the Kremlin bureaucracy. At first the Polish Stalinist leaders acted like their East German counterparts. They slandered the rebellious workers as "fascist" agents and their rebellious actions as "imperialist-inspired." As in East Germany they relied primarily upon the Soviet Army with its tanks to crush the uprising.

Despite the tough line of the Kremlin, fresh concessions, much more extensive than in the case of East Germany, were won in Poland. Stalin's frame-up system having been renounced by Khrushchev the trials of participants in the uprising could not be converted into frame-ups and window dressing for a mass purge. Instead, the defendants were able to reveal in open court how the police had tortured them into "confessions" following arrest; they were able to voice their feelings about the conditions that had driven them to revolt. Some were freed and others given relatively light sentences. The nationwide support of the Poznan uprising forced the regime to acknowledge that the Poznan workers had been slandered and that they had just grievances.

This restraint on the part of the Polish regime was not evidence of any Stalinist "self-reform." It was occasioned by fear that the Poznan events might touch off a general revolutionary conflagration that could spread throughout Eastern Europe and into the Soviet Union itself. The Stalinist bureaucrats decided to make another public display of anti-Stalinism and deal gently with the heroes of Poznan. But the concessions following the Poznan uprising represented a significant gain by the Polish workers, a by-product of their revolutionary struggle, and it inspired them to press for more.

In a bold move, the leadership of the Polish Communist Party deposed the Kremlin proconsul Rokossovsky. They replaced him on October 21 with Gomulka, a popular symbol of resistance to Moscow's rule because of his long years of imprisonment on charges of "Titoism." Gomulka demanded a greater measure of independence from Moscow, while the workers began mobilizing for a struggle. Stalin's heirs, including the top generals, flew to Warsaw to put pressure on the new government. Gomulka responded by keeping the armed Polish workers informed of the hour-to-hour developments. Minor clashes occurred between Soviet and Polish troops. In face of this resistance, which marked the high point to date in the Polish revolution, Khrushchev and Co. backed down, but on their return to Moscow they began mobilizing troops on the borders of Poland.

Hungary Aided Polish Revolution

The outbreak of the Hungarian revolution cut across these developments. If Stalin's heirs had thought of resorting to force in Poland, the experience in Hungary changed their minds. They made their peace with the Gomulka regime, granting new and significant concessions although these are far from meeting the demand of the Polish workers for independence and equality in a free association of the Eastern European countries, the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China.

The Polish revolution thus made big gains, in part due to the struggle of the Hungarian workers. It is now gathering fresh power for the next advance along the road of political revolution.

In Hungary the pattern visible in the East German and Poznan events appeared again, but on a greatly magnified scale. Much that was previously implicit now became explicit, above all the power of the working class and the forms its struggle tends to take against the bureaucracy. Just as the preceding uprisings were previews of the Hungarian revolution, so the Hungarian revolution is a preview of the coming struggle in the Soviet Union, a struggle in which we can confidently expect the appearance of what was lacking in the Hungarian revolution — a revolutionary socialist party capable of guaranteeing success.

The Hungarian revolution was inspired by the October 21 success of the Polish workers in ousting Rokossovsky and putting Gomulka in power in Warsaw. On the following day, October 22, students and intellectuals in Budapest, most of them members of the Communist Party, staged meetings demanding the restoration of Nagy to the premiership and the withdrawal of Soviet occupation troops.

The Siege of Kilian Barracks



The fierce resistance of the Hungarian people to the Kremlin invasion was dramatically symbolized by the five-day siege of Kilian Barracks in Budapest. The central barracks of the Hungarian Army was held by the soldiers under the leadership of a Revolutionary Military Committee against heavy Soviet attack from Oct. 23 to Oct. 28. This photograph was taken after the revolutionary forces were finally overwhelmed and driven from the barracks.

The revolutionary committee which led the Kilian Barracks defense issued a manifesto Oct. 23 calling for "the creation of a Hungarian socialism on a really democratic basis." Leading the revolutionary soldiers at Kilian Barracks was General Pan Maletier, a long-time Hungarian Communist Party member who became a national hero because of his courageous role in the underground struggle against the Nazi occupiers during World War II. The Revolutionary Military Committee, after the Oct. 23 Kremlin attack, demanded of the Nagy government that Maletier be made Minister of Defense, and Nagy complied. He was arrested, Nov. 4, by the Soviet forces while negotiating for withdrawal of Russian troops. His present fate is unknown.

The next day, October 23, parades began. Demonstrators appeared at the Budapest radio station to ask that their demands be broadcast. Security police gave a typical Stalinist answer. They arrested the delegation. As the aroused crowd moved forward, the police opened fire. This touched off the revolution.

Subsequent developments can conveniently be divided into three stages: (1) the Nagy regime and the armed uprisings; (2) the crushing of both the Nagy regime and the armed uprisings; (3) the struggle between the Kadar regime and the Workers Councils.

(1) In face of the fighting in the streets, the hated Gero government sought to combine concessions with repressive action. On the one hand, it installed Nagy as Premier; on the other, it invited Soviet occupation troops into Budapest to put down the demonstrators. This was in accordance with the general policy followed by Stalin's heirs since the dictator's death.

Nagy at first collaborated with Gero. He called on the insurgent people to disperse. But as Soviet tanks began rolling into Budapest October 24, the masses took up arms in self-defense, spearheading the mass insurrection. Nagy responded with appeals to lay down arms and surrender on the promise of amnesty.

The refusal of the Hungarian masses to place confidence in Nagy demonstrates that they trusted no one in the political arena but themselves. This is the classic hallmark of popular revolution.

Three more equally significant things happened — the Hungarian army went over to the revolutionists, the Soviet troops began manifesting sympathy with their cause, and on October 25 the workers launched a general strike.

Role of Workers Councils Decisive

Most important, the masses began organizing themselves. Councils — organs of workers' power — appeared on a nation-wide scale in the factories, the army and neighborhood areas. Dual power thus arose on the foundations of socialized property. Although capitalist restorationist elements maneuvered for advantageous positions in government, they were an insignificant force in contrast to the working class and its allies. The workers proved that in a revolutionary showdown they could crush all attempts at capitalist restoration just as they could defeat the native Stalinist bureaucracy, steering the political revolution on its true course toward the establishment of workers democracy. It was to preserve bureaucratic rule that the Kremlin intervened in Hungary, using the presence of restorationist elements as a pretext for its brutal assault on the working class.

In the absence of a revolutionary socialist party, the Workers Councils lacked the clear leadership and the clear declaration of aims that would have made the uprising unequivocal from the beginning. Nonetheless, all the available evidence shows that the working class, which was the decisive power, was bent on defending the social conquests already achieved, such as the planned economy, that it would not tolerate any attempt to return to the horrors of the fascism it had experienced under Horthy and under the Nazis, that its movement was in the channels of political revolution; that is, the building of a workers state freed from the bureaucratic abominations of Stalinism. Later events showed that the peasantry gave open sympathy and even direct support to the workers.

The Moscow bureaucrats were aware that a successful workers revolution in Hungary would immediately sweep across the borders into the rest of Eastern Europe and into the Soviet Union. They realized that the revolutionary forces were beyond control by Nagy or any other sector of the native Hungarian bureaucracy. The masses had taken matters into their own hands, were exercising their sovereign will, and had begun the process of elevating a completely new leadership out of their own insurgent ranks. Moscow, therefore, prepared to abandon the Nagy regime and resort to Soviet tanks as they had in the case of East Germany and Poznan.

On October 26, just three days after being co-opted into office, Nagy announced formation of a new "peoples front" government that would include leaders of former peasant parties. He abolished collectivization of the land,

promised free elections and a "multi-party" state. On October 29 he demanded the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Budapest. However, when reinforced Soviet troops again moved toward Budapest November 1, Nagy repudiated the Warsaw pact, declared Hungarian neutrality and appealed to the United Nations for guarantees and defense.

In a showdown crisis, this typical Stalinist bureaucrat showed his fears both of the rank and file of the Communist Party and of the working-class fighters on the barricades. He sought support among capitalist restorationist elements and their foreign imperialist backers. Nagy's course played directly into the hands of world imperialism which had already been seeking to convert the turmoil to its own advantage by picturing the revolt against Stalinism as a revolt against the planned economy of Hungary. It made such counter-revolutionary figures as Cardinal Mindszenty appear to the outside world to have much greater weight than they actually possessed. For a time it confused the picture enough so that in the absence of a revolutionary socialist party it could appear that the aims of the revolution itself were those implicit in the politics of Nagy.

Above all, Nagy's announcements and actions gave invaluable material to the Stalinist propaganda machine, which, as in the case of Eastern Germany and Poznan, slandered the Hungarian revolution as "fascist," "imperialist-inspired," and a reversion to "Horthyism."

The truth is that some 11 years after the Hungarian workers welcomed the Soviet forces as liberators of their country, Moscow's power lay shattered in Hungary. The puppet Nagy regime was torn between the restorationist forces and the proletarian revolution. The Communist Party of 800,000 members had suffered an internal explosion, virtually the entire rank and file and the lower stratum of the apparatus going over to the cause of the working class. The workers, together with the students, intellectuals and the Hungarian army, were in full-scale revolt and the peasants began supplying them with food. Workers Councils had appeared on a national scale and had begun to formulate revolutionary demands. These offered powerful confirmation of the validity of the program of political revolution against the Stalinist bureaucracy long advocated by world Trotskyism.

(2) Stalin's heirs had already made their decision. The second stage of the Hungarian revolution opened on November 4, three days before the thirty-ninth anniversary of the 1917 Russian revolution. As part of the Nagy government, lured into a trap by a promise of negotiations, were placed under arrest, Moscow ordered the overwhelming military forces that had been concentrated during the previous week on Hungary's frontiers to move on Budapest. These troops, spearheaded by some 5,000 tanks, appear to have been carefully selected from among the most backward sections of the Soviet armed forces. They had been lied to, being told that their task was to defend Hungary against a bourgeois counter-revolution inspired by American imperialism.

The Spirit of the Paris Commune

The blood bath began. Once and for all, Stalin's heirs demonstrated the idiocy of any belief in the possibility of their "self-reform." They showed in the harshest way possible the correctness of Trotsky's view that they resemble a ruling class in the tenacity with which they cling to power and the special privileges it assures.

What was remarkable was the heroic resistance of the Hungarian people, headed by the working class, in this unequal military contest. Their spirit was that of the Paris Commune which served to inspire generations of class-conscious workers. Though overwhelmed by vastly superior military force, the workers did not end their political resistance. They refused to accept the Kadar regime that rode into power on Soviet tanks.

(3) The third stage of the Hungarian revolution is extraordinarily instructive. All the figures of the Nagy regime vanished from the scene; some of them in Stalinist hands were either shot or imprisoned; some took refuge abroad; Nagy himself took asylum in the Yugoslav Embassy only to be later tricked into capture by the Stalinist invaders. The weight of the restorationist elements

that participated in the revolution for their own reactionary ends turned out to be in inverse proportion to the noise they inspired in the capitalist press abroad. The real power proved to be with the working class, organized in Workers Councils.

Backed though it is by the might of the world's greatest army, the arrogant Kadar regime finds itself forced nevertheless to deal in all questions pertaining to the rule of the country with the very antagonist it sought to crush, the Hungarian workers. The workers won this position by refusing to place confidence anywhere except in their own elected Workers Councils.

The blood bath — to the consternation of the Kremlin, we may be sure — failed to prostrate the working class or to drown its Workers Councils. The new leadership of the Hungarian workers, born in struggle only a few weeks before, continued the general strike, continued to hold meetings, to issue militant leaflets, to protest the arrests and deportations, to organize new mass demonstrations, and to repeat the demands which the workers had raised in the early days of the revolution — withdrawal of Soviet troops and the institution of workers democracy. The central demand of the general strike was for legal recognition of the Workers Councils as permanent political bodies with sole authority in the management of industry.

The role of the Workers Councils after the armed conflict was over demonstrated in the most convincing way that the Kadar regime has no base of support in the populace whatsoever. All the Stalinist propaganda about saving Hungary from "fascism" is thus shorn of the slightest shred of plausibility. Moscow's real target, as the whole world can see in the relation between the Kadar regime and the Workers Councils, turned out to be the rebellious Hungarian workers.

The capacity of the Workers Councils to sustain themselves in face of the worst military and police terror is a lesson that will not be lost upon the workers throughout the Soviet bloc. The Hungarian workers made a priceless discovery in the course of their struggle — they discovered the form through which the political revolution against the Stalinist bureaucracy will be organized. The form is the same as that previously used by the Russian workers in 1905 and 1917 against Czarism — Soviets or Workers Councils. This form provides an arena in which a revolutionary party can develop with extraordinary speed.

Whatever the immediate fate of the Hungarian Workers Councils, they will undoubtedly prove to be the greatest single contribution made by the Hungarian workers to the political revolution in the Soviet sphere that will finally accomplish the aim they have so courageously and brilliantly advanced.

The Need for a Marxist Party

The absence of a revolutionary socialist party was costly to the Hungarian workers. This is not to say that they can be held responsible for its absence. As experience has shown, it is not easy to build such a party under the totalitarian rule of Stalinism. Lacking conscious revolutionary-socialist leadership, the Workers Councils failed to assert their power. They continued to negotiate for concessions from Moscow's puppets. This proved disastrous. While the leadership of the Workers Councils wasted time in futile negotiations with figures who had no real power within the country, the Stalinist counter-revolution mobilized its repressive forces.

(a) The leadership of the Workers Councils failed to proclaim clearly the aims of the revolution: national freedom and workers' democracy; the overthrow of the bureaucratic caste and the vesting of power in the Workers Councils.

(b) The leadership of the Workers Councils failed to systematically issue revolutionary appeals to the workers of all Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, explaining the aims of the revolution and asking for socialist solidarity in the common struggle.

(c) The leadership of the Workers Councils failed to systematically appeal to the Soviet forces, reminding them of their heritage in the 1917 revolution, of their socialist convictions, and of their own deep-seated grievances against the Kremlin.

(d) The leadership of the Workers Councils failed to turn toward the workers in the capitalist countries for help in preventing the imperialists from taking advantage of the situation.

(e) The leadership of the Workers Councils failed to arouse every section of the populace to its stake in the victory and failed to mobilize the nation for all-out military defense.

(f) The leadership of the Workers Councils made a fatal mistake in taking for good coin the promises of the Moscow bureaucrats to reform and to end the occupation.

(g) The leadership of the Workers Councils failed to

(Continued on page 3)

New York Symposium
"Can the Left Unite?"

Speakers:

Farrell Dobbs
Socialist Workers Party

A. J. Muste
Fellowship of Reconciliation

Max Shachtman
Independent Socialist League

John T. McManus
National Guardian

Chairman:
Clifford T. McAvoy

FRIDAY, JANUARY 18, 8 P. M.
GREAT NORTHERN HOTEL
118 West 57th Street, New York City
Contribution: \$1.00
Auspices: Socialist Unity Forum

