

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 26, 1956

FIVE CENTS

THE CP DISCUSSION ON SOCIALIST REGROUPMENT

... page

Berlin Story: Aid to Hungary ... page 7

Deutscher and Russian Guns ... page 4

By Milovan Djilas: THE STORM IN EAST EUROPE

... page 6

Djilas Arrested — World Labor Must Mobilize to Save Him

Milovan Djilas has been arrested by the Tito regime. It is necessary in every country for the socialist and labor movements to organize massive protests to the Yugoslav government. Only this kind of action can save him.

Djilas is the former Titoist leader who, at the beginning of 1954, was purged by the ruling totalitarians in Belgrade for daring to propose real steps toward political democratization. A year later, he was arrested and put on trial by the regime for making critical remarks against the government and its bureaucracy in an interview given to the N. Y. Times. After some world protest, he was given a suspended sentence, and has been living in Belgrade since then under close police surveillance.

Now, again, he has been arrested by the Tito government for daring to be critical. Although, in the totalitarian pattern, no reasons have been given for his arrest as yet, it seems clear that the immediate cause was the article by Djilas sent to and published in the November 19 issue of the New Leader (re-published in full on page 6 of this issue).

In this article, Djilas not only discussed the Polish upsurge and the Hungarian Revolution as a clear-cut defender of the revolution and enemy of all types of Stalinism, but also, for the first time, analyzed the Tito regime itself as a "national Communism" which is socially

the twin of the Stalinist system and as one which is sure to fall before the democratic aspirations of the people.

The heavy hand of the Tito-Stalinist police descended on him for expressing his opinion, even though suppression at home made it publishable only in a foreign land.

Defense of Djilas is not merely defense of an individual, important as it is that this particular individual be defended. By arresting Djilas, the regime hopes to intimidate all critical voices and dangerous thoughts at home.

Tito has just had to postpone the scheduled congress of his ruling party. He is engaged in vilifying and calling for the destruction of the Hungarian Revolution, in spite of the sympathy that must exist among the Yugoslav people for that glorious struggle. He is under pressure from Moscow at the same time. He reacts to the tightening of circumstances in the Stalinist manner.

We ask all labor and socialist groups and movements to raise their voices in energetic protest to save Djilas. We ask all trade-unionists to bring it up with their organizations.

Hungary's Revolution Still Lives and Fights

By GORDON HASKELL

The Hungarian Revolution, which has already been declared ended several times, is setting a world-historical record for sheer tenacity and stubborn courage.

Since the Russian attack-in-force of November 4, information has been especially fragmentary, coming mainly from correspondents in Vienna who listen to the radio and talk to refugees. The heroism and social character of the revolt shows through their dispatches.

The over-all picture seems to be this: In the third week after massive Russian attack which has devastated Budapest more than the fighting in World War II, the spirit of the revolution remains unbroken.

The weight has shifted decisively to the workers, whose general strike continues to paralyze the government and the Russians, and to symbolize and organize the revolution.

Some form of workers' council or councils, exists which is powerful enough to negotiate with the Kadar puppet government under Russian guns.

Even when driven back to the factories by hunger, the workers refuse to support the government or to give up their demands.

In the countryside, where starvation is a less immediately effective weapon, partisan activity continues, with reports that the Russians do not even control all the towns. The government has been utterly unable to re-establish any semblance of independent authority in the country.

STRAINING MOSCOW

Such is the tenacity of the revolution that even now it cannot be said to be decisively crushed. It is driving a new wedge between Tito and the Russian rulers. From Poland reports continue of stormy protest against the Gomulka government's refusal to support the Hungarians. With every additional day of resistance, the strains are increased in every Stalinist party and regime in the world.

(Continued on page 7)

What Is U.S. Labor Doing for Hungary?

UAW to Act; Also Hits Assault on Egypt

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Nov. 18

More than 500 local union leaders of the United Auto Workers met here last week to take up the crucial issues of the Hungarian revolution and its suppression by Stalinist imperialism. The meeting had been called by Walter P. Reuther, UAW president.

Besides adopting a four-point program on the Hungarian events, after a hard-hitting speech by Reuther, the conference took a turn surprising to the leadership and also passed a motion recommending a special resolution by the UAW executive board denouncing French and British imperialism, as well as all "aggressors." This was interpreted as a slap at Israel.

As an indication of the real sentiment of the UAW secondary leaders, a motion was passed that the UAW go on record against all imperialisms.

Reuther's four-point program included (1) a strong denunciation of Russian

imperialism and its brutal counter-revolution in Hungary; (2) the holding of in-plant protest meetings at lunch time on Wednesday, Nov. 21; (3) the collection of funds from the workers to aid the Hungarian people; and (4) the initiation of a campaign to get the United States behind a move to establish a large United Nations voluntary army to be placed in troubled spots throughout the world.

The denunciation of France and Britain came as a result of the action of Ford Local 600 officials. Carl Stellato and Bill Grant both made speeches pointing out that denunciation of Russia alone did not solve the problems facing labor.

(Turn to last page)

By ALBERT GATES

What is the American labor movement doing to come to the aid of the Hungarian people in their great struggle against Stalinist despotism?

The answer to this, so far, is not a cause for cheers.

There are bright spots. One of the brighter spots (see story to the left) is plans proposed by the United Auto Workers, if they materialize quickly. Financially speaking, the AFL-CIO has taken steps for a Labor Aid to Hungary fund that has gotten over \$127,000 so far, with more coming; and unions are providing funds and resources for aid to Hungarian refugees. A press conference for Anna Kethly, Social-Democratic minister in the last Nagy government that was attacked by the Russians, was held and presided over by William Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO, at which the Hungarian socialist leader told her story of the revolt.

— But if any other significant steps have been taken, or if any are planned, we do not know about it.

This is, to say the least, a regrettable situation.

That must be said even though it is also true that, compared with labor, other sections of American society are doing next to nothing at all. On this, as usual, labor is in the van. But that it is not saying too much.

In some other countries, at the call of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the labor movement has held short work stoppages in solidarity with Hungary: in Austria, Pakistan, and other places.

But not in the United States. Not even a short work stoppage.

In West Berlin (see story on page 7) a trade-union leader at least sought to do something real to help Hungary. It was jointly squelched by the German and U. S. authorities. But great mass labor rallies were held—at least.

(Turn to last page)

Shachtman to Confront Daily Worker Editor and CP Spokesmen at Meetings... page 8

REPORT ON THE ELECTION

In New York State

Liberal Party Unsettled by Adlai's Flop

By PETER WHITNEY

The leaders of the Liberal Party in New York State extracted few grains of comfort from the party's vote in the recent election. Its vote dropped to new lows, despite a strenuous campaign by the Liberals in behalf of the Stevenson-Kefauver ticket. They rolled up 280,373 for Stevenson on their line, compared with 394,471 votes for him in 1952—a drop of over one-third.

Attributing the Eisenhower victory to the "war scare," the Liberal Party leaders are hard put to explain the even sharper decline in their vote for the Democratic Party candidate for U.S. senator, Mayor Robert F. Wagner. He received a total of 286,771 votes on the Liberal line; this compares poorly with 396,811 votes for Senator Herbert Lehman in 1949; 305,300 for Lehman in 1950; and 412,000 votes for George Counts in 1952, when he ran as independent Liberal Party candidate for senator.

In the case of the campaign for U.S. senator, the self-defeating policies of the Liberal Party were cast in high relief.

Republican Attorney General Javits had been their fair-haired boy over and over again when he ran as a Republican for congressman. Three times the Liberal Party had endorsed him, campaigned vigorously for him, and built up his stature and prestige.

Now, in 1956—as he had plagued them when he defeated Franklin Roosevelt for state attorney general—this Frankenstein creation from their past challenged them to successfully oppose him.

He was armed with their credentials, attesting to his "liberalism" and his pro-labor program. Liberal Party campaign workers, especially those active in the Washington Heights area of New York, squirmed when questioned by the very people whom they had educated to regard Javits as their "friend": since when had he changed? After all, he had never concealed his Republican affiliation, nor had the Liberal Party demanded of him that he break with that party. Since when had he become a devil and a main danger to be exposed?

What intelligent answer could the Liberals give? Javits was, in good part, their own creation—the dead-end of their policy of supporting "good" Republicans.

Not only was Javits armed with accolades from Liberal Party campaigns of the past but his Democratic opponent, Wagner, had been roundly denounced by Liberal leaders in the 1953 mayoralty elections as a machine-picked candidate fronting for Tammany Hall. In that election, the Liberals pitted their independent candidate Rudolph Halley against Wagner, basing themselves on the Tammany-machine issue. Wagner was a "bad" Democrat unworthy of support.

BEDFELLOWS

Did politics ever make stranger bedfellows in so short a space of time? Now, in 1956, the Liberal Party had to count on the voters' political amnesia if it was going to persuade them to support a man whom they had vigorously denounced as against a man whom they had vigorously supported.

Javits' victory is, in great part, due to the Liberal Party's policies, and has aroused great discussion within Liberal ranks on the advisability of endorsing "good" Republicans.

The cut in the Liberal vote followed a strong campaign on the part of the Liberals, but it was a campaign devoted to the election of Democratic Party candidates. So anxious were the Liberal leaders to insure a Democratic victory that they eschewed any kind of activity or campaign which might "weaken" the Democratic line.

There were fewer independent Liberal Party candidates, and the few were mainly for local posts or where Democratic endorsement was rejected, as in the case in the Bronx where the Democratic machine spurns the Liberals' support.

Interestingly enough, in some of these local candidacies for assemblymen, the Liberal Party men, as in the Lower East Side districts where there is a tradition of running independent Liberals, re-

ceived more votes than Stevenson and Wagner on the Liberal Party line. On a city and state-wide scale, in past elections, when the Liberals run their own men as "protest" candidates against the Democrats and Republicans, they have consistently rolled up the biggest votes for the Liberal Party. But this capital has just as consistently been dissipated the following year by a return to Democratic or Republican endorsement.

The role of the Liberals in many instances was to substitute themselves for the Democratic machine in New York City, which sat on its hands during the campaign. Trade-union forces were mobilized again and again for rallies, meetings (including the Madison Square Garden rally for Stevenson and Kefauver), and other activities nominally sponsored by the Democratic Party.

The Liberals served as an ersatz Democratic Party, and in analyzing the election

results the leaders frankly acknowledged that much of the work resulted in votes on the Democratic line.

Why indeed expect a trade-unionist to go down to the Liberal Party line to vote for the same set of candidates, from president down to local assemblyman, running on the Democratic line?

Thus, after some ten years of political activity and in the first election where the Stalinist American Labor Party was not on the ballot, the Liberal Party found itself with a "hard core" of fewer than 300,000 voters out of a total New York electorate of some 7 million voters.

DISCUSSION RISES

Even in the lone case where the liberals had an opportunity to run a major independent campaign, in Harlem against Congressman Adam Powell, they dragged their feet. How could their candidate answer Powell's attacks on the Democratic Party, on the Southern Democratic racists, and Stevenson's soft-pedaling on the civil-rights issue? The Liberal candidate numbed weakly, and the Liberals muffed another opportunity in their fear of upsetting the apple cart.

As a result, although Powell's margin of victory was some 15,000 less, the Liberal vote increased by only 1500.

REPORT ON THE ELECTION

On the West Coast

California Underlines the National Pattern

By B. ARNOLD

San Francisco, Nov. 10

California's election results again followed the national trend as Eisenhower swept the state with a 560,000-vote margin over Stevenson. Kuchel, the GOP incumbent U.S. senator, won easily over Richards, labor-backed Democrat. However, the Democrats scored significant gains in the congressional and state legislative races.

Despite a Democratic margin of over 3-2 in registered voters, and almost solid official labor and liberal support for Stevenson, Eisenhower carried every large city and urban county in California, polling over 55 per cent of the vote, a figure slightly less than in 1952. The cities of Los Angeles, San Francisco and Oakland, with their large working-class vote, once the stronghold of the New Deal, all returned majorities for Eisenhower. Preliminary data from these same cities indicate that Eisenhower captured a higher percentage of the Negro vote than any GOP presidential candidate since 1928.

Stevenson's strength was in the rural Central Valley counties, most of which he carried. If there was any such a phenomenon as the "farm revolt" in this state, it was apparent only in this area. Again, as in 1952, the middle-class suburbs of the metropolitan centers voted solidly for the GOP.

It is obvious that the so-called Democratic issues of this campaign, such as the question of Nixon, Eisenhower's health, and Stevenson's H-Bomb and draft proposals, all failed to arouse any real interest here.

Stevenson and Kefauver, strongly supported by the AFL-CIO and liberal groups, both campaigned vigorously in the state. Yet the returns from the cities reveal that large numbers of rank-and-file union members voted Republican, as did sizable numbers of Negroes. Los Angeles provided a noteworthy example of this trend.

However, there is no doubt that a factor in the size of the Eisenhower victory was the unexpected heavy voter turnout caused by the war fears which swept the state following the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East and the Russian moves in Hungary.

All advance signs had pointed to a generally apathetic electorate, indicating a reduced voter turnout. Yet on election day the entire state reported a very heavy turnout, with 82 per cent of those registered voting. San Francisco had a turnout of over 86 per cent, and some areas reported the highest voter participation in history.

It appears that the overwhelming ma-

majority of these last-minute voters brought out by the war scare preferred Eisenhower. What had been once thought of as a fairly close race became an Eisenhower landslide.

While an Eisenhower victory had been predicted, the GOP's easy triumph in the U.S. senatorial race was a bitter blow to the Democrats and AFL-CIO. Kuchel, a conservative nonentity, often referred to as "Knowland's waterboy in the Senate," was opposed by Richards, liberal Democratic state senator from Los Angeles County.

LOCAL GAINS

It was only in the statewide congressional and legislative contests that the Democrat-labor-liberal coalition could claim any significant gains. Despite the Eisenhower sweep, the Democrats unseated two GOP congressmen.

In Riverside County (south of Los Angeles), the contest between Democrat Dalip Singh Saund and Republican candidate Jacqueline Cochran Odum, famed aviatrix and wife of one of America's richest men, aroused national interest since it marked the first time that a native of India ever had run for national office. In spite of the vast personal wealth of Mrs. Odum and a campaign marked by open appeals to race and national prejudices against him, Saund the Democrat won by a narrow margin. As a result of these two victories, the Democrats, in every case backed by effective labor support, cut the California GOP majority in the House to a narrow 17-13 margin.

The collaboration between the Democratic Party and the labor movement was most successful on the state legislative level. It was here that the AFL-CIO conducted its most intensive and, from an electoral standpoint, most effective campaign.

A feature of the California election was the hectic campaign over Statewide Proposition No. 4. This Proposition was proposed as an oil and gas conservation measure and was initiated and supported by the huge international oil companies led by Standard Oil of California. It was opposed by the smaller independent oil

The election results have aroused intense discussion within the ranks of the Liberal Party. The tendency to dump the Liberal Party and work directly in the Democratic Party has become more outspoken.

Such advocates point to the fact that since we have to do the work for the Democratic Party, we might as well be on the inside and not siphon off our time, money, and energy into a "splinter" party, or more brutally, a "rathole." This tendency has been strengthened by the Javits debacle and the growing feeling that never again should the Liberals endorse a Republican, no matter how good he seems.

Countering this tendency are those who insist, for different reasons, that the Liberal Party has a progressive role to play. Leaders like David Dubinsky of the Ladies Garment Workers Union and Alex Rose of the Hatters Union wish to maintain the Liberal Party as an independent pressure group on the Democratic Party and utilize it as a bargaining point.

But many in the ranks feel that a re-evaluation of the party's policies must lead it in the direction of independent labor politics. Such elements are raising the question of a year-round trade-union-based political machine, some kind of an alliance between the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education and the already set-up machinery of the Liberal Party. The issue remains of uniting labor forces on the political field to fight for their candidates on their program.

companies and operators.

Here was an example of an effort to influence the electorate by public relations and huckstering experts on a scale never before seen in this country. Both sides spent staggering sums of money for TV, radio, newspaper and billboard ads.

Despite the millions spent for it, the measure was overwhelmingly defeated by a more than 3-1 margin. While oil conservation is sorely needed in this state, this particular proposition was such an obvious effort by Standard Oil for monopoly control that not even the slickest techniques of Madison Avenue's finest could put it over.

As of this writing there is still no report on the socialist write-in vote for the state, all socialist groups long ago having been ruled off the ballot. Both the Socialist Labor Party and the Socialist Workers Party waged statewide campaigns, while the Socialist Party's effort was confined mainly to Los Angeles. The Stalinist-controlled Independent Progressive Party failed to run any candidates this year, and as a party has now vanished from the scene. In general the Stalinists supported the Democrats.

From this 1956 election in California it is possible to make the following observations.

First, as in the nation as a whole, Eisenhower won a popularity contest; the Republican Party did not win a victory. Aside from the presidential and senatorial races, the GOP lost ground everywhere.

Stevenson, the darling of the liberals, was a definite drag on the Democratic ticket. His unholy alliance with the Dixiecrats boomeranged here as elsewhere.

Perhaps of most significance was the role of labor in this election. The AFL and CIO through their respective political arms (labor unity has not yet been consummated here) participated in politics to a greater extent this year than ever before. What victories the Democrats did achieve in the urban areas were due primarily to the efforts of the unions. Without exaggeration one can say that the AFL-CIO has now become the most important factor in the California Democratic Party.

However, inevitably the California labor movement must make an historic decision. Shall it continue to operate within the confines of the Democratic Party, electing candidates whom it cannot control, supporting a political party whose basic interests are anti-labor? Or shall it strive for political independence and organize a political party of its own?

The Communist Party Discussion on Regroupment in the Socialist Movement

By H. W. BENSON

In the bitter discussion of irreconcilable views that is slowly shaping up inside the Communist Party as its national convention approaches, a prominent place is occupied by the question of "a new united party of socialism" in the United States.

No one tries to define its nature with precision, a task that would doubtless prove fruitless and unnecessary at this stage of the discussion. But in general it is suggested that Communists join together with "other Left groups" in a new broad movement that would combine all "socialist currents" and allow for the coexistence of divergent views within the framework of a united organization.

In the debate, all comers pay at least lip-service to the idea, but for different reasons and with different aims. There's the rub.

The slogan "For a Mass Party of Socialism" was advanced by Eugene Dennis in April at an enlarged meeting of the CP National Committee. The draft resolution prepared for the February 1957 convention speaks of "the perspective of a united party of socialism in this country."

William Z. Foster, who changed his vote from yes to no on the resolution, still endorses the call for a new movement. Dennis, who voted for the resolution but who whitewashes the Russian attack on the Hungarian workers' revolution, is also for it. The National Committee majority seems to be for it. And the Daily Worker board, which offers an unprecedented if straddling criticism of Russia's role in Hungary, is also for it. All seem united; everything seems calm, at least on this front. But is it?

The acrimonious tone of the discussion belies the surface agreement. In fact, the same slogan can serve as an umbrella to cover at least two utterly opposed and hostile perspectives.

FOSTER'S WAY

One way would be to hide behind the call for "unity on the Left"; to gloss over the CP internal crisis; to wait and to hope that the lessons of the 20th Congress and the new lessons of Hungary will be forgotten, and then to go on as before as though nothing fundamental had changed. This is the perspective of all-around lip-service: it means talking about democracy but supporting dictatorship; it means talking about unity of socialism while apologizing for the crushing of the socialist working class of Hungary.

That is clearly the way of Foster and Dennis.

On the other hand, the perspective of a new, broad socialist movement can and does serve those who are honestly and deeply disturbed by the Khrushchev revelations and are horrified by the realization that their party consistently and unwaveringly apologized for every crime against socialism committed by the Kremlin. They are looking for a way out, for a new road to socialism.

In the past they clung to what they now call "dogmas"; they were disoriented by old formulas. For a new orientation they look toward collaboration and discussion among all currents of the "Left."

SEEKING ANOTHER WAY

For Foster it is a question of filling up every crack with plaster; gluing together the falling pieces and binding up the disintegrating whole with mending tape, all into a reasonable facsimile of the old. For others, it is a question of finding an authentically socialist way out of the undenied crisis into which they have been plunged.

They have a long way to go; one cannot devote the energies of a whole generation toward warping the very conception of socialism and toward wiping out its genuinely democratic content by apologizing for anti-socialist totalitarianism, and then emerge suddenly pure and undefiled, wise and crystal-clear in program and principle. But the tendencies are there to see; they are not as clear-cut as defined here for economy of

space but nevertheless the basic leanings are detectable.

Foster and Dennis are in the unenviable position of men who must admit to 30-odd years of apologizing for crimes against socialism and then request that the whole past be forgotten. In effect they announce:

It is quite true that we denounced honest socialists as fascists; we called true democrats agents of imperialism; we applauded when revolutionists were executed; we explained away frame-up trials; we called those who told the truth liars and those who lied honest men; we undermined socialism and defamed its name by equating it with anti-socialist terror. All right! We have admitted it. Now please be satisfied that we recognize our crimes and errors. Having admitted our shameful course in the past, we call upon all workers to support us in the bright future.

"Just a moment," comes the inevitable question. "How can we have confidence in you? Have you examined the basic causes of your shameful role? What fundamental changes have you made in your policies and principles? And above all, how are your protestations and promises reflected in the position you take on the events of the day? What about Hungary? Are you still an apologist for Russia?"

Away with such talk—that is the essential content of Dennis' and Foster's rejoinder. Haven't we explained that we admit our errors of the past? Now, be content and let us talk of unity and such things. It is enough that we say we once were wrong; do you demand that we make a fundamental change besides? That is un-Marxist, un-Leninist, un-socialist. It is liquidationist; it is a surrender to the bourgeoisie. Anyhow, counter-revolutionaries in Hungary tried to overthrow a Communist regime.

A DREAM OF NIKE

Let us imagine that the 1960 election campaign is on. The Republican Party runs its new beloved leader Nike Eisenhower for president under the slogan "I like Nike" and demands a vote of confidence from the people. Nike comes to the voters with startling revelations:

He reveals that the previous Republican administration was actually paid by big business. It tried to break up unions. It was corrupt and willingly sold out to the highest bidder. It secretly murdered Negroes. It sent unionists to death and to jail. It fabricated evidence against socialists, Communists, New Dealers. It pilfered the national treasury and distributed forged banknotes to its retainers.

"And now," concludes Nike in thunderous peroration, "having admitted openly and honestly all these crimes and errors, we are certain that you, the voters, will see that we now merit a landslide vote of confidence in 1960. Obviously, too, this is a time for national unity."

Among other things, we can imagine the look of unbelieving amazement on the face of William Z. Foster as he put pen to paper in reply.

Yet this absurdity is the underlying content of the Foster position. Fortunately for the reputation of the human race in the animal kingdom, dissenting voices are strongly heard in the Communist Party, even among leading people.

STALINIST VIEW

In 30 expansive pages entitled "On the Party Situation" (Political Affairs, Oct.) Foster outlines exactly three major "errors" of the party during the cold war and ascribes them to precisely seven basic "causes." He catalogues no less than 21 burning questions that must be clarified, ending his list with "etc." and

he points the finger at no less than 16 fundamental errors of the "right" wing in the internal discussion. All this is in accord with a familiar and often effective bureaucratic device for derailing a discussion. To prevent the debate from throwing light on the key, decisive issues and clarifying what is under discussion, he fragmentizes it into an encyclopedia of endless questions, big and small.

Yet, despite this exhaustive detail, he dismisses one of the crucial questions in an off-hand comment:

"Although the situation created by the Stalin revelations presented certain problems, no doubt the party could have overcome them without great difficulty, absorbing the immediate lessons from the Stalin exposure and studying the long-range implications of this important matter."

For Foster, the crisis in the CP is created not by the 20th Congress bombshell but by those who conclude that a big change is necessary and who are groping for a new road. If only one could say, "Yes, we committed unfortunate mistakes," and then go on with business as usual, Foster would be quite content.

DODGING ISSUES

He finds it hardly necessary to "waste" time on this most critical aspect of the discussion in his 30 pages dismissing the whole matter as follows:

"There were errors, too, in connection with the Stalin cult of the individual, especially manifested by the party's uncritical attitude toward developments in the USSR. These mistakes, however, were international in scope, not merely those of the CPUSA. They spread out over 20 years and they were particularly damaging during the years of the Cold War. Inasmuch as they have been widely discussed in our party, there is no need for me to dwell upon them here."

Highest on his list of criticisms of party opponents is what he calls "the cultivation of a sharply critical attitude toward the Soviet Union."

With this background, we begin to understand Foster's attitude toward a "new party of socialism." For him, the Communist Party must remain basically what it has been and he looks upon it as the force to lead the fight for "socialism." The new mass party is put forward as a minor tactical maneuver.

And so he writes:

"The resolution should also de-emphasize the slogan for a new mass party of socialism from its present implications of immediacy to the status of a possible long-range objective."

But the real point at issue is not "immediacy" versus "long-range" but diverging conceptions of the role of the CP today and of the crisis within it.

Foster attacks everyone who looks upon the "new party" as a real possibility:

"Almost certainly," he writes, "in the United States the fight for socialism will be made not by the Communist Party alone, but by a combination of economic and political groupings among which the Communist Party must be a decisive leader. The present immediate path as the workers proceed to the building of a mass socialist movement in this country, therefore, is the strengthening of the Communist Party upon the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the development of broad united-front mass struggles."

To Foster, the Communist Party must be the "leader" and he seeks to strengthen it and dodge the big issues by talking about a new mass party.

WELCOMING IDEAS

But that is Foster. On the other side, for example, there is John Gates who replies to him in the November issue of Political Affairs.

Gates has a different estimate of the state of the CP:

"The advance of the American workers to socialism is impossible without a conscious and organized vanguard. In all candor we must admit that we are not that today. Nor are we likely to be the exclusive channel through which such a leadership will come into existence, but I do

think we are an important and essential part of this process and can make a decisive and distinctive contribution if we face up to our present crisis and make the necessary changes to surmount it."

He adds:

"To achieve this, we need to create an atmosphere which welcomes all new ideas no matter how unorthodox they may be and debates them on their merits without resort to name-calling as a substitute for thinking."

The CP, then, is not the "vanguard"; it can make a "contribution" but only if it "surmounts" its own crisis and considers all new ideas. This is a far cry from the Foster standpoint and is clear evidence of the search for a genuinely new road in the ranks of the CP.

Gates repeats in conclusion:

"The test as to whether we shall succeed in becoming a truly independent American working-class organization dedicated to the immediate struggles of the American people and socialism lies right now in the kind of atmosphere we develop in the discussion, and ultimately of course in the policies we adopt."

AGAINST MONOLITHISM

In the same issue of Political Affairs, in an article entitled "A New Party of Socialism," Steve Nelson argues against "those who say that it was a mistake" to have raised the question:

"This view," he writes, "refuses to concede that there were any serious mistakes in policy and that there ever could have been anything wrong with our organizational concepts. Those who take this view tend to play upon the present discussion in the world Communist movement and treat it as a surface phenomenon. They apparently draw the conclusion that no fundamental problems are to be reconsidered anew. Everything in the past is taken for granted as if everything was answered for all time. There are some in our party who are afraid to examine the causes of our errors in the most fundamental way. They tend to treat them superficially and therefore will not provide answers to our problems."

He goes on to quote none other than Rosa Luxemburg for free elections, free press, free speech, free assembly in the Russia of 1918, and continues, "Unless we change the monolithic concept, we are not going to be prepared to develop a true working-class party that will operate on American traditions and concepts. If we do not, all the talk about our favoring the democratic process in establishing socialism, recognition of the existence of other parties in the U.S.A. is meaningless."

Those who seriously are thinking about the "new mass party" are beginning a genuine process of re-evaluation, but they are only beginning.

FACING HUNGARY

The basic cause of the crisis in the CP is not shrouded in mystery. The ranks are beginning to understand that they were led to support anti-socialist crimes committed by the rulers in Russia.

The crisis is deepened by the re-enacting of the whole scene in Hungary where the tanks and planes of the Russian state mow down worker-revolutionaries. The Daily Worker cannot face the issue squarely; it is ready to criticize Russia in subdued tones but seeks in vain for a tenable niche on both sides of the barricades of the workers' revolution.

Gates, Nelson and their co-thinkers, too, have a long way to go in order to shake off their ideological ties to the Kremlin and its spurious "socialism." Needless to say, they think socialism exists in Russia.

Nelson, for example: "From the present discussion and criticism in the world Communist movement of the errors committed under Stalin's leadership in the USSR, none should conclude that those who supported the Soviet Union from its inception were wrong. . . . The USSR played the chief role in inspiring other peoples to establish socialism in their countries. . . . True errors were committed

(Continued on page 7)

Ask Socialist Int'l to Condemn Mollet Policy

It was time that the international socialist movement spoke up vigorously to condemn the disgraceful course taken by the French Socialist Party leadership in leading the colonialist slaughter of the Algerian people. The initiative toward that has now been taken by the Socialist Party of Uruguay.

This is another big service performed by what is perhaps the best socialist party in the Americas. The Uruguayan socialists direct their views to "the organizations belonging to the [Socialist] International" in what amounts to a call to separate world socialism from the black discreditment that Guy Mollet's social-imperialists are bringing upon it. Dated June 6, this call has just been published in the bulletin of the Socialist International, together with a typical "reply" by the French SP.

The Uruguayans do not pull their punches. The French SP course "is in flagrant contradiction with the fundamental doctrines of socialism," it "discredits the socialist cause throughout the world. It has betrayed the confidence of the peoples in

socialism as an instrument of emancipation and human dignity."

Therefore they do not regard it simply as an internal "family affair" but speak out, in a vigorous indictment of French suppression of the Algerian struggle. The general picture of that indictment will be familiar to LA readers from our own material.

"Now the socialists are pulling the chestnuts out of the fire for the imperialist French bourgeoisie," they write bitterly. And "What would the French people have thought if the German Nazis in 1940 had proclaimed the assimilation of France and affirmed that the problem could not be decided unilaterally?"

They riddle mercilessly the favorite line of Mollet that the French massacre the Algerian freedom fighters in order to defend the "rights" of the French minority in Algeria.

"We have great faith in the International and in the unity of socialists all over the world.... This is why we speak out freely," they conclude.

In view of the Uruguayan initiative, it is necessary to point out that the American Socialist Party had, and apparently has missed, its opportunity to anticipate the Uruguayan socialists by "speaking out freely."

The SP convention in Chicago in June, as we reported at the time (LA, July 2) adopted a left-wing motion to "condemn" Guy Mollet's policy and support Algerian self-determination. Its final formulation was referred to the National Committee, which reportedly acted on it a couple of months ago; the motion, however, has still not been published to this day, nor has the *Socialist Call* so far carried any editorial opinion along its line. Request by LA for the text of the official position has been refused.

It is to be hoped now that American socialists will join in with and support the Uruguayan initiative to put world socialism on record against the infamous policy of Mollet in Algeria.

BOOKKEEPING VIEW

The cost of maintaining 400,000 French troops (more than were ever used in Indochina at one time) to carry on the work of civilization in Algeria is now running at the rate of nearly one billion dollars a year.

It is evident why economic affairs in France are now going from bad to worse.

From the point of view of accountants in the Quai d'Orsay, the following bookkeeping reckoning can be made. In the 21 months of conflict up to August, the French troops have killed 12,571 Algerian resistance fighters. At the cost of a billion dollars a year, it took about \$140,000 to spill each patriot's blood.

Mollet just can't afford it. The price of blood is simply too high.

AN HONEST VOICE FROM ISRAEL

The following communications are from the Israeli group "The Third Force," led by M. Stein, a socialist anti-Zionist group which stresses Jewish-Arab unity and justice to the Arab minority.

Tel Aviv, Oct. 31

At this moment we can only say the following:

Our hearts are filled with disgust and shame. It is a lie that our attack on Egypt has been caused by Arab provocations. It is we that have provoked the terrible hatred which surrounds us. It is we that have driven out hundreds of thousands of people from their native country and filled their hearts with hatred and despair. It is we that shoot at children and women who steal their way across the border in order to meet their parents or husbands. It is we that have robbed, oppressed and humiliated the Arabs who chose to live with us in Israel.

For tens of years we did our best to thwart the efforts of the Palestine Arabs to obtain self-government. We not only collaborated with the Mandatory Power, but incessantly clamored for more consistency in its reactionary policy, for a stronger hand.

Now we are acting in the same way on an international scale. It is not the Suez Canal, nor the Suez Company, that is the main concern of the imperialists. Their chief aim is to stop the awakening of the Asian and African nations, to crush in bud the struggle of these nations for freedom and independence, for a human life. And in this battle waged by colonial lords against the most exploited and down-trodden peoples, Israeli Jews serve as spearheads, as shock-troops. Victims of Hitler emerge as his heirs. What a disgusting and dreadful spectacle!

The attack of Israel and her imperialist allies on Egypt is a crime against our Arab brothers and all oppressed na-

tions, a most serious crime against Israel, and may endanger mankind.

We therefore call on sincere socialists and liberals, and on all true friends of Israel, wherever they are, to do their utmost in order that the above wanton attack be stopped, and that all conquest made by the attackers be annulled without delay.

Tel Aviv, Nov. 1

The present events should put an end to the blindness of socialists and liberals as regards Israel. Israel is not ruled by socialists—of whatever denomination—but by Zionists-socialists, i.e., by Jewish national-socialists.

The "kibutzim" are not socialist or communist or anarchist communes, but politico-economical strongholds of Zionist-socialism. It is the "kibutzim" who grabbed most of the Arab land in Israel, and it is members of "kibutzim" who were at the head of Jewish organization for the boycott of Arab work and Arab trade in Palestine, and it is they who led the war against the Arabs in 1948 and are now leading the "second round."

The accusing-excusing assertion that Israel is only a tool in the hands of the imperialists is a misleading half-truth. The rulers of Israel are a tool in criminal imperialistic hands. But it is a tool that seeks to be used by wicked hands. It is a tool in wicked hands. And the Israeli rulers' policy is supported by the great majority of Israel's population.

What Israel vitally needs is not only a change of government, but also and chiefly a change of its public mind. It is therefore most important, not only for the sake of justice but also for the good of Israel, that the wrongs done by Israel to the Arabs should be redressed and atoned for by Israel. Only a just peace between Israel and the Arabs will be a true and stable peace.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Deutscher Sticks by His (Russian) Guns

By L. EIRIKSSON

Oslo, Nov. 12

Two weeks ago, on October 27, Isaac Deutscher lectured here before an overflow crowd of about 900 students at the Oslo University Student Society, on the topic "Whither Russia?" This was after the Gomulka regime had been established in Poland, and after the Hungarian Revolution had been under way for four days against Russian tanks.

The Russian blood-bath in Hungary, however, did not stop Deutscher from continuing to expound his apologies for the Russian leaders, including his notorious theory that these totalitarians are engaged in democratizing Russia from above.

He ended his talk as follows: "I am sure I am a spokesman for an unpopular point of view but I see what is happening in Hungary as a tragedy. I don't believe a victory for the anti-Communists in Hungary will bring anything but another dictatorship, and this is the tragedy of the situation. If Hungary follows Poland's way, there is hope in further democratization of the society."

"The battles which go forward in Budapest, and where Soviet tanks are sent in, can have serious consequences in the Soviet Union. First Secretary Khrushchev's position is compromised. If the fighting were to spread to East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and back to Poland so that the Soviet Union's strategic position was endangered, I would not be surprised if a military dictatorship would

come to power in the Soviet Union."

At this point he made an analogy with the French Revolution and the subsequent Napoleonic dictatorship, and then:

"If on the other hand the reformers in favor of liberalization and democratization, and sympathetic to the Soviet Union, get power, the blood shed in Budapest would not have been in vain."

"The problem in Hungary today is who will win, the anti-Stalinists or the anti-Communists. Whatever the result, there will be no parliamentary democracy. A victory of the liberalizers, (sympathetic to the Soviet Union) would be great and beneficial. If the anti-Communists win, we will get an anti-Communist dictatorship. After a regime is founded on terror, there will come new massacres, new revenges, and new blood-spilling which will result in a series of dictatorships which will not be broken for many years. A victory of the anti-Communist forces can only lead to an impasse. No anti-Communist forces could do more for the people."

[In the body of his talk, according to the above dispatch from our Oslo correspondent, Deutscher re-summarized his general analysis of Russia which is now embodied in his books and already published articles. But, although Deutscher was so concerned about the "new massacres, new revenges, and new blood-spilling" that would follow a victory against the Russians, he did not condemn the massacre and savage butchery being conducted by the Russians.—Ed.]

SILONE DROPS SUIT AGAINST LIBERTINI

Ignazio Silone has finally withdrawn his court case against Lucio Libertini, thereby formally putting an end to the disgraceful episode of his threatened suit for slander against his political critic. He has decided to content himself with a renewed statement by Libertini, such as the latter has made from the beginning, that the alleged "slander" was a political judgment of Silone and not a personal "defamation."

The hassle started with an article by Lucio Libertini, who is a leader of the Italian USI (Independent Socialist Union), editor of the USI's *Risorgimento Socialista*. This was "The Case of Ignazio Silone" (LA, Nov. 28, 1955). Silone, at LA's invitation, made a political reply and a second political exchange ensued. Suddenly, later, when *Risorgimento Socialista* published Libertini's article, Silone announced he was going to go to the courts. There was doubt from the beginning whether the novelist actually intended to go through with this shameful business of settling a political dispute by "slander" charges.

It is a welcome development, therefore, that the thing has fizzled out on basis of formalizing Libertini's "clarification" that the original statement was a political judgment only.

This court statement was published in *Risorgimento* as follows:

"The IVth Section of the Rome Court of Law was scheduled on October 20 to examine the slander suit brought by Ignazio Silone against Lucio Libertini. However, clarifications have occurred between the parties as a result of which Libertini has declared the following: In his article, published in *Risorgimento Socialista* of Feb. 25, 1956, he intended to express only a strictly political judgment on Silone, as he already stated in the article and expressed more clearly later, and he did not intend to designate Silone personally as an agent of the State Department, and took note of the clarifications provided in this respect by his witnesses Messrs. Nenni and Saragat."

This was followed in *Risorgimento* with a note by Libertini:

"For clarity's sake, I want to stress for those who have followed the polemic between Silone and myself that, obviously, the above clarification in no way modifies the political judgment which I expressed, in the articles in question, on Silone's attitude of the last few years. On the contrary, in all honesty I must declare that I am more convinced of it than ever."

The Court of Rome accepted Silone's withdrawal of the charges and made him pay the legal fees.

The 'Pravda' Line

In his first magazine article on the Polish and Hungarian events (*Reporter*, Nov. 15) Isaac Deutscher has followed through on his established pro-Stalinist position with a slanderous account of the Hungarian Revolution. It basically presents the Moscow line that "reactionaries" took over the revolution and thus made necessary the intervention by Russian troops.

Deutscher does not purport to present any facts or evidence to buttress this rewrite of *Pravda*. It is all merely asserted baldly.

He divides the choice in Hungary between the "Communists" and the "anti-Communists," and then proceeds to identify the "anti-Communists" with "the Catholic clergy," with the "religious peasantry," with Mindszenty who he actually asserts became "the spiritual head of the insurrection," with "remnants of the urban bourgeoisie," with the "cry for the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet troops," and with Nagy as "Kerensky in reverse."

—Since nowhere does he define the "Communists" and the "anti-Communists," the implication is that the former applies to the pro-Russian quislings and the latter to the "reactionaries" whose ascendancy in the revolution made the Russian massacre a regrettable necessity. At any rate, there is not a syllable to indicate that a pro-socialist working class was fighting to the end against the "Communists." There is not a syllable implying a reproach against the Russian bloodbath. There is not a syllable exposing the quisling nature of the Kadar regime and its "Communists."

In conclusion, Deutscher argues vehemently that Moscow's return to "Stalinism" (undefined here) is not possible; but he no longer seems to insist that "democratization" is in the cards. But the only alternative to it, he asserts, is "some form of military dictatorship, authoritarian but not Stalinist."

One can wonder how long Deutscher's credit as a scholar can survive his functioning as an open purveyor of Moscow's lies.

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

November 26, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 48

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER Business Mgr: L. G. SMITH, Associate Editors: GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Young Socialists Protest Russian Atrocities in Hungary

Los Angeles YSL and YPSL Send Joint Protest Telegrams to Mollet, Ben-Gurion

Los Angeles, Nov. 3

Two groups of young socialists today joined in a criticism of the prime ministers of France and Israel, both socialists, for their countries' attack on Egypt. The Young Socialist League and the Young Peoples Socialist League together signed telegrams to Guy Mollet and David Ben-Gurion opposing the Middle East war.

In a telegram to Premier Mollet of France, the young socialists contended that France's wars in Algeria and in Egypt "have made French socialism despised throughout the world." The wire demanded Mollet's resignation to end the dirtying of the name of socialism by his conduct of an imperialist war.

A telegram to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion defended Israel against Arab attempts to destroy it, but accused Ben-Gurion of destroying Israel's moral credit by becoming a tool of the same British colonialism against which Israel had had to struggle to become a nation.

A Young Socialist League spokesman explained that the groups felt a special responsibility to criticize Mollet and Ben-Gurion because the latter called themselves socialists. Socialists cannot fight Russian imperialism effectively without also clearly opposing the imperialism of capitalist countries, he said.

"The recent statements of Bulganin, Gomulka, and other Communist leaders," he added, "make it obvious that the military threat from the West is their only pretext for keeping troops in Eastern Europe. The events of the last week have proved that Communism would not last many hours without the support of Russian troops."

The telegrams, jointly signed by the YSL and YPSL, were as follows.

TO PREMIER GUY MOLLET

AS SOCIALISTS AND AS DEMOCRATS WE PROTEST YOUR DIRTYING OF THE NAME OF SOCIALISM AND OF THE TRADITIONS OF 1789 BY YOUR COLONIAL WARS AGAINST THE ARAB PEOPLES. YOUR WAR AGAINST ALGERIAN FREEDOM AND NOW YOUR AGGRESSION AGAINST EGYPT HAVE MADE FRENCH SOCIALISM DESPISED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD. YOU HAVE SET YOURSELF AGAINST OUR SOCIALIST COMRADES IN BRITISH LABOR WHO STAND FOR INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD AND PEACE. YOUR IMPERIALIST ASSAULT ON EGYPT HAS ALSO GIVEN YOUR COLONIAL COUNTERPARTS

YSL TOUR

The Young Socialist League is sponsoring a tour for Comrade Don Harris. Following is the schedule for this tour, which will commence on November 24 and end on December 7.

Philadelphia	Nov. 24-26
Pittsburgh	Nov. 27-28
Dayton Area	Nov. 29-30
Chicago	Dec. 1-4
Cleveland Area	Dec. 5-6

Comrade Harris, a YSL NEC alternate, was national secretary of the Socialist Youth League in 1951-3. He is a member of the *Anvil* editorial board, issue editor of the Winter 1956 issue of the magazine. He has written for *Anvil*, *Labor Action* and the *New Internationalist*.

Comrade Harris will speak on the following topics: The Revolution in Hungary; The Meaning of the 1956 Elections.

IN RUSSIA A COVER UNDER WHICH TO CRUSH HUNGARY'S NEW INDEPENDENCE. WE DO NOT EXPECT YOU TO STOP DOING THE WORK OF FRENCH REACTIONARIES, BUT WE ASK YOU TO STOP DOING IT IN THE NAME OF SOCIALISM. FOR THE SAKE OF SOCIALISM MOLLET RESIGN.

TO PRIME MINISTER BEN-GURION

AS SOCIALISTS AND AS DEMOCRATS WE HAVE SYMPATHIZED WITH YOUR PARTY'S EFFORT TO BUILD SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY IN ISRAEL. AS SOCIALISTS AND AS DEMOCRATS WE HAVE DEFENDED ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO EXIST AS A NATION AND HAVE OPPOSED ARAB EFFORTS TO DESTROY ISRAEL. BUT ISRAEL'S NATIONAL SECURITY CANNOT BE PURCHASED AT THE EXPENSE OF THE RIGHTS OF OTHER PEOPLES. ISRAEL GAINED THE WORLD'S RESPECT BY ITS BIRTH IN STRUGGLE AGAINST BRITISH COLONIALISM BUT BY BECOMING A TOOL OF THAT COLONIALISM YOU ARE DESTROYING ISRAEL'S MORAL CREDIT. BY JOINING THE BRITISH AND FRENCH ASSAULT ON EGYPT'S RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION YOU HAVE ALSO GIVEN RUSSIAN COLONIALISM A COVER UNDER WHICH TO CRUSH HUNGARY'S NEW INDEPENDENCE. REPUDIATE THE IMPERIALIST ATTACK ON EGYPT.

The following letter was sent to the Russian ambassador by the Young Socialist League in condemnation of the deportation of Hungarian youth currently being perpetrated by the Russian army in Hungary. The YSL is sending copies of its letter to the following youth and student organizations, urging that they make similar protests: International Union of Socialist Youth, National Student Association, Students for Democratic Action, Student League for Industrial Democracy, New York State Young Liberals, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Youth Council, Young Men's Christian Association, Young Women's Christian Association, Labor Youth League.

THE RUSSIAN AMBASSADOR
RUSSIAN EMBASSY
WASHINGTON, D.C.

SIR:
Accustomed as we are to reports of the brutality and inhumanity of the regime which you represent, we must express our particular revulsion at the deportation of Hungarian youth to Russia.

Such a crime calls immediately to mind the infamies of the Nazis and their forced deportations. It places in an in-

teresting light Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin's policy of transporting Russian nationalities during the Second World War. It is a corroboration of our opinion that the Moscow claim to be putting down "reaction" in Hungary is a slander against the youth, workers and peasants of that nation, a bold-faced lie.

At the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party we heard the confirmation of the worst charges of brutality and barbarianism which socialists had leveled at the Russian government and the Russian Communist Party. And now, if any doubt ever existed, we have proof that the denouncers are of the same inhuman stripe as those whom they denounced.

We do not address this letter to you in the hope that the government which murdered the Hungarian people in the streets will be moved by an appeal to mercy. We do so in order that you will know that you have rededicated the young socialists of America in their implacable opposition to the regime which you represent. We hope that other American youth groups will write similar letters, that your government will be found guilty of inhumanity before the youth of America and the world.

Long live the Hungarian Revolution!
Long live the fighting spirit of the revolutionary youth of Hungary!

NATIONAL ACTION COMMITTEE
YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE
Michael Harrington,
National Chairman

ACLU Lists Student Rights

Challenge publishes here some excerpts from "Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students," a pamphlet published by the American Civil Liberties Union under the direction of its Academic Freedom Committee. Louis Hacker is chairman of the committee.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT

Students should be offered opportunity to participate in the total work of the educational institution. Participation in the planning and evaluation of the educational process, and in the general activity of the college, will be a direct incentive toward a sense of responsibility to the institution....

In operation, student government is sometimes defective, but it provides a first training in political expression and should be led toward growth in democratic form.

It is recommended that student government should be established at each college. In the election of such government, the electorate should consist of the entire student body, or other academic corporate units, and should not be defined in terms of membership in clubs or organizations. (although representatives of clubs and organizations may be invited to participate without a vote). The election of all student officers, committees, and boards should be solely by the students themselves, and it should not be subject to administrative or faculty approval. Academic authorities may, of course, set up a uniform system of academic eligibility requirements for major student offices.

STUDENT CLUBS

1. *Freedom of Student Association.* Students should be free to organize and join associations for educational, political, social, religious, cultural, and other lawful purposes. The fact of affiliation with any extramural association should not in itself bar a group from recognition on the campus. Any group which plans political action or discussion of

whatever purpose or complexion, and whether or not affiliated with a particular lawful party, should be allowed to organize and be recognized in any educational institution. The administration should not discriminate against a student because of membership in any such organization.

2. *Registration and Disclosures:* All student organizations may be required to register with the appropriate faculty-student committees their names, purposes, by-laws, affiliations, officers and activities....

3. *Membership Lists:* Organizations should not be required to file a list of members, but, if number of students is a condition of chartering or affects financial aid, officers and the faculty adviser may be required to attest to the fact of such numerically sufficient membership. The names of officers (and of members if known) should not, without the consent of the individuals involved, be disclosed to any non-college person or organization or to any college persons having no direct and legitimate interest therein. The name of any officer who resigns or retires from office, or of any member, shall, at his request at any time, be deleted from the records.

4. *Organization Use of Facilities:* The use of rooms and other facilities should be made available, as far as their primary use for educational purposes permits, on a non-discriminatory basis, to registered student organizations. Bulletin boards should be provided for the use of student organizations, and school-wide circulation of all notices and leaflets which meet uniform and non-discriminatory standards should be permitted.

5. *Advisers for Organizations:* A student organization should be free to choose its own faculty adviser. No organization should be forbidden to function when, after reasonable effort, it has failed to secure a faculty adviser. An adviser should consult with and advise the organization but should have no authority or responsibility to regulate or control its activities.

STUDENT FORUMS

In deciding how to face the problem of free speech for students and guest speakers at meetings both on and off the campus, college administrators face the difficult responsibility of measuring the degree of freedom that students should enjoy. They also have responsibility for defending this freedom against hostile and often irresponsible forces in the outside community; they must interpret to the general public the importance that freedom on the campus has in the process of education for life in a free society....

STUDENTS AS OFF-CAMPUS CITIZENS

1. No disciplinary action should be taken against a student of a college, although he is descriptively identified as such, for engaging in off-campus activities such as political campaigning, picketing, participating in public demonstrations, providing the student does not unauthoriously purport to speak in the name of the college or some student organization of the college. In short, no student should be penalized for exercising his rights as a citizen, even when this involves political or economic activities or criticism of the school administration.

2. The administration should exercise extreme care in any projection of the campus record into the outside world.

By Milovan Djilas

The STORM in EAST EUROPE

By MILOVAN DJILAS

With the victory of national Communism in Poland, a new chapter began in the history of Communism and of the subjugated countries of Eastern Europe. With the Hungarian people's revolution, a new chapter began in the history of humanity.

These two events, each in its own way, sharply express the internal condition of the East European countries. If the events in Poland encouraged the aspirations of

Communist parties—particularly those of Eastern Europe—for equality with Moscow, the Hungarian Revolution made a gigantic leap and placed on the agenda the problem of freedom in Communism, that is to say, the replacement of the Communist system itself by a new social system. If the former event had encouraged both the people and certain Communist circles, the latter encouraged the popular masses and democratic tendencies.

Between the two events, although they happened almost simultaneously, there lies a whole epoch. The changes in Poland mean the triumph of national Communism, which in a different form we have already seen in Yugoslavia. The Hungarian uprising is something more, a new phenomenon, perhaps no less meaningful than the French or Russian Revolution.

In short, these events have brought to the fore the following new questions: (1) the further possibilities of national Communism; (2) the replacement of Communism by a new system, and, along with this, the right of a people heretofore under Communist rule to choose its own—non-Communist—path of development; (3) the problem of the future foreign (and, in my opinion, internal) policy of the Soviet regime.

The experience of Yugoslavia appears to testify that national Communism is incapable of transcending the boundaries of Communism as such, that is, to institute the kind of reforms that would gradually transform and lead Communism to freedom. That experience seems to indicate that national Communism can merely break from Moscow and, in its own national tempo and way, construct essentially the identical Communist system. Nothing would be more erroneous, however, than to consider these experiences of Yugoslavia applicable to all the countries of Eastern Europe.

MEANING OF TITOISM

Yugoslavia's resistance to Moscow in 1948 was possible, first of all, because the revolution took place in the course of the struggle against foreign occupation; in this revolution, an independent Communist country was formed, and with it a new class, the Communist bureaucracy. Not one of the Eastern European countries had this kind of a class, because their Communists received power from the hands of the Soviet regime. For this reason, a united, autonomous Communist bureaucracy could not have been formed. Therefore, there were and still are essential differences between Yugoslav national Communism and that of the East European countries, even though their common keynote is equality with Moscow.

Yugoslav national Communism was, above all, the resistance to Moscow of the Communist party, that is, of its leaders. Not that the people opposed this resistance, not that they did not support it and benefit from it—quite the contrary. But the interests and initiative of the leaders played a crucial and leading role. The resistance of the leaders encouraged and stimulated the resistance of the masses. In Yugoslavia, therefore, the entire process was led and carefully controlled from above, and tendencies to go farther—to democracy—were relatively weak. If its revolutionary past was an asset to Yugoslavia while she was fighting for independence from Moscow, it became an obstacle as soon as it became necessary to move forward—to political freedom.

In the countries of Eastern Europe, the reverse is true. There, Communist resistance to Moscow resulted from the discontent of the popular masses. There,

from the very start, unbridled tendencies were expressed to transcend the bounds of national Communism itself. The leaders cannot everywhere control and subjugate the popular masses; therefore in some cases they try to halt any further estrangement from Moscow. That is the case, for example in Czechoslovakia and Rumania. In Bulgaria and especially in Albania, further de-Stalinization and the strengthening of national Communism have been halted—only partially because of fear of Yugoslav domination, although that plays some role. Other motives were decisive: The victory of national Communism in these countries would probably have meant the beginning of the end of the existing system.

SO FAR, NO FURTHER

Yugoslavia, both as an example and through the initiative of its leaders, played an indispensable and important part at the beginning of the transition of Eastern European countries to national Communism—but only at the start. As the price of reconciliation with Belgrade, Moscow was induced to recognize verbally the equality of Yugoslavia and its "independent path" to "socialism." In that way, the deep disaffection of the East European nations received legal possibilities for expression. Limited but sanctioned protests against inequality with Moscow began to turn—and in Hungary did turn—into protest against the system itself.

Yugoslavia supported this discontent as long as it was conducted by the Communist leaders, but turned against it—as in Hungary—as soon as it went further. Therefore, Yugoslavia abstained in the United Nations Security Council on the question of Soviet intervention in Hungary. This revealed that Yugoslav national Communism was unable in its foreign policy to depart from its narrow ideological and bureaucratic class interests, and that, furthermore, it was ready to yield even those principles of equality and non-interference in internal affairs on which all its successes in the struggle with Moscow had been based.

The Yugoslav experience has thus determined the tendency of the national Communists in both their internal and external policies—that is, it has determined the limits to which they are willing to go. But wishes are one thing and possibilities another.

GOMULKA'S CROSSROAD

In all this, Moscow, with its imperialist appetite, is not a passive observer but an active participant. In order to avoid an uprising in Poland and to gain time, it yielded to national Communism there. Gomulka's accession to power was not only the result of the efforts of the Polish Communists; to a larger extent, it represented a compromise between Moscow and the turbulent masses of the Polish people. Given independence from Moscow, Gomulka took a historic step forward. But with half-hearted reforms he will soon reach a dilemma—which Moscow had foreseen. He will have to choose between internal democracy, which has become inseparable from complete independence from Moscow, and the ties with Moscow required to maintain the Communists' monopoly of power. The events in Hungary have only accelerated this dilemma, which Gomulka will not be able to avoid. The victory of national Communism in Poland is not the end, but rather the beginning of further disagreements and conflicts inside the country and with Moscow.

It is difficult to say whether national Communism in Poland will choose freedom and independence rather than to-

talitarian rule and dependence on Moscow. But without a doubt many Communists in Poland will not hesitate to choose their own country and freedom. Knowing Gomulka, a man who is unusually honest, brave and modest, I am convinced that he himself will not long hesitate if he is confronted with such a choice.

MOSCOW'S MASK

In Hungary, however, such internal conflicts are over: Not only did the so-called Stalinist set vanish, but the Communist system as such was repudiated. Moscow at first tried to cover its intervention by bringing national Communism to power through Imre Nagy. But Nagy could only install national Communism with the assistance of Soviet bayonets, and this threatened the very end of Communism. Having finally arrived at the choice between Soviet occupation and independence, Nagy courageously decided to sacrifice the Party and Communist power—which had already been crushed—for the sake of his country and freedom. Sensing Moscow's equivocal game, he asked for the withdrawal of Soviet troops, declared Hungary's neutrality, and appealed for the protection of the United Nations. His government, up to that point insignificant, became overnight the symbol of national resistance.

Moscow could no longer preserve Hungarian Communism; it now faced the choice of either leaving Hungary or occupying it. Thus, its imperialism dropped its last "socialist" mask.

Had the Hungarian Revolution not only brought political democracy but also preserved social control of heavy industry and banking, it would have exercised enormous influence on all Communist countries, including the USSR. It would have demonstrated not only that totalitarianism is unnecessary as a means of protecting the workers from exploitation (i.e., in the "building of socialism"), but also that this is a mere excuse for the exploitation of the workers by bureaucracy and a new ruling class.

DANGER FOR KREMLIN

Moscow fought the Hungarian Revolution not only for external but for internal reasons. Just as the Yugoslav revolt revealed Moscow's imperialism with regard to Communist countries, so the Hungarian Revolution threatened to reveal the Soviet internal system as the totalitarian domination of a new exploiting class—the Party bureaucracy.

Had the Hungarian Revolution been saved from Soviet intervention, it would have been difficult indeed for Moscow to obscure its internal conflicts by means of foreign conquests and the "world mission." The Soviet system would soon have been confined to its own national boundaries, and there, too, the citizens would be forced to reflect on their position and their destiny. And not only the citizens, but the leaders. They would have to break up into different groups which could no longer carry out mutual purges within their own closed circle, but would be forced to bid for popular support. Thus, new processes would begin in the Soviet Union, too.

The attack of Israel, Britain and France on Egypt cannot permanently divert attention from the events in Eastern Europe, although it certainly encouraged the most reactionary and aggressive elements in the USSR to settle accounts with the Hungarian people. Human history is changing in Eastern Europe, and that is its center today. The outmoded colonial war in the Middle East will have to be stopped.

IT CAN'T BE HALTED

Moscow and all the other Communist regimes, each in their own way, now face a dilemma which they never faced before. The Communist regimes of the East European countries must either begin to break away from Moscow, or else they will become even more dependent. None of these countries—not even Yugoslavia—will be able to avert this

The publication of this article in the New Leader (Nov. 19) was probably the reason for the Tito regime's arrest of Djilas. But that is not the reason we reprint it here (by permission). It is an incisive and brilliant analysis of the East European upsurge which deserves the widest circulation. It is also the first time that Djilas has made such an analysis of the Tito regime itself, in a noteworthy passage. It marks, in general, a tremendous growth in his political thinking and views, and his complete break with all remnants of Stalinist and Titoist politics. With it Milovan Djilas assumes full stature as a clear voice for socialist democracy ringing out of the Stalinist jungle.—ED.

choice. In no case can the mass movement be halted, whether it follows the Yugoslav-Polish pattern, that of Hungary, or some new pattern which combines the two.

The view that the movement in Bulgaria and Rumania must be slow because of their undeveloped working classes seems dubious to me. In these countries, the peasantry is deeply nationalistic and, once the process starts, may well play a more important role than it did in Hungary. In Czechoslovakia, despite an advanced working class, no significant movement has yet emerged. But if it does, it is likely to go much farther than that of Hungary.

Nobody can predict precisely what Moscow's ultimate course will be. At the moment, it is playing a dual role: recognizing national Communism verbally, simultaneously undermining it by not renouncing its hegemony and imperialism. Of course, the USSR falsely depicts its intervention and pressure as "aid" to and "security" for Communism as such in the subjugated countries. But that plays only a minor role in its actions. Moscow's policy toward Communist countries clearly reflects a will to resist the breakup of the empire, to preserve the leading role of Soviet Communism—a will demonstrated in its efforts to use national Communism as a means and a mask for its imperialist, expansionist policies.

SPLIT IN RUSSIA

At the same time, however, all these actions involve Moscow not only in external strife, but in internal conflicts. One can declare with certainty that there is a split within the Soviet leadership, and that even the most reactionary and imperialist (the so-called Stalinist) group is hesitant in its actions. The influence of this group prevails today, especially in regard to the East European countries. But that does not mean that the other group is for the independence of these countries. The difference between them lies in their methods: whether to stick to the old army and police methods (Stalinist imperialist methods), or apply new ones in which economic and political elements would be dominant. Attempts at introducing the new methods led to the Polish case, the return to the old ones to Hungary. Both methods proved ineffective. From this spring the splits and conflicts in the USSR.

Hesitation, duplicity, ideological and political controversies, inconsistency in the use of methods, reversals of attitude, and a consistent and feverish insistence on keeping their own positions—all of these things reveal cleavages and contests among the leading group of the Soviet Union. Further changes in this group seem most plausible, and they will be of great importance both for the USSR and for the rest of the world.

There can be no doubt that the rest of the world—perhaps for the first time since the Bolsheviks took power—can directly and positively influence the direction of these changes. Despite the Soviet repression in Hungary, Moscow can only slow down the processes of change; it cannot stop them in the long run. The crisis is not only between the USSR and its neighbors, but within the Communist system as such. National Communism is itself a product of the crisis, but it is

(Continued on next page)

Hungary's Revolution Still Fights - -

(Continued from page 1)

Here is an attempt to summarize some of the highlights of the period between November 4 and 20.

General fighting in Budapest from Sunday, November 4 on. The Russians pour 200,000 troops with 5000 tanks into Hungary, concentrating on Budapest. The fighting continues for ten days, with the last organized resistance in workers' districts, especially on the industrial island of Csepel.

The Kadar puppet government promises all kinds of reforms, and sets repeated deadlines for surrender of the revolutionaries without reprisals. Finally, on November 14, the last organized resistance ends when the Csepel workers lay down their arms. The "workers' council of the industrial area of Buda" issues a manifesto in which it offers to resume work immediately and unconditionally on cleaning up the capital and restoring supplies.

It states that the resumption of all other work must be preceded by the following conditions:

"1. Reorganization of the Kadar government to meet the will of the people.

"2. Free elections in which those parties that have declared their readiness to accept 'socialist' achievements should participate.

"3. Release of Nagy and his colleagues, including officers of the Hungarian army and all insurgents.

"4. Immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from Budapest and negotiations for withdrawal from the whole of Hungary."

WORKERS ADAMANT

November 16: Kadar promises "free elections" in the above sense, dissolution of the secret police, publication of all Russo-Hungarian treaties. The general strike has been on for three weeks. Railroad workers who had returned to work go on strike again when it is discovered that the Russians are transporting Hungarians to the east.

November 17: Kadar promises that a regime will be set up like that in Yugoslavia with "factory councils." His government announces that henceforth food will be distributed only through government stores, and that workers who return to their jobs will be given a hot meal and food for their families. These decrees are intended to stop delivery of food to the workers by farmers, and to starve the former into submission.

November 18: Leaflets are distributed in the streets of Budapest stating that, in an all-night session, Kadar had threatened the Budapest Workers Council with arrest and deportation unless they called off the general strike. It was this threat which had led to their decision, by a slim majority, to call off the strike on November 16.

A workers' delegation protests to the

council against the decision, and demands that delegates be elected by factories and offices to a "Workers Parliament," which should meet in a few days and choose new representatives to negotiate with the government.

Though some workers are returning to the factories, they do no work. They stand around in the courtyards and by their machines, discussing the course to take. In any event, the lack of coal and transport makes it impossible for most factories to do any sustained work.

Miners' and oil workers' delegations from Tatabonya, Komlo, Varpalota and Darog protest the deportations of Hungarians to Russia, and threaten to blow up oil fields and flood coal mines if their demands to stop these deportations are not met.

A secret radio report that on November 15 freedom fighters blew up the railroad track near Kisvarda, and freed about 2500 persons from a train.

UNITED FOR GOOD

November 19: Despite threats and promises, less than half the factory workers have returned to work. "Kadar didn't convince us," one worker tells a reporter, "but winter is here and misery

comes." "The whole country can't live on relief," another says. "The workers were so much united by last week's events that they will never fall apart again. The government must realize by now that the use of force is pointless."

According to refugees pouring into Austria, the Russians are able to control only what is within range of their guns in a country completely united against them. They control a few rail and highway arteries, but some lines have been so disrupted by sabotage that no trains are running.

Increasing reports are circulating of fighting among Russian troops. Although correspondents warn to treat these rumors with caution, they say they are widespread among the refugees. The cause of the fighting is reported to be refusal of garrison troops to return to Russia. Russian troops are also reported to be escaping to Yugoslavia in the hope of getting asylum.

The present hope of the Hungarian Revolution lies in its extension. The Hungarian workers, backed by the whole nation, are doing everything that lies in their power to make that extension possible.

How They Killed Aid to Hungary

There were ways to come to the aid of the Hungarian Revolution other than intervening militarily. The answer was not to start the third world war. There was a political answer. The U.S. authorities helped to squelch it.

This is the damning charge made from Berlin in the current *New Leader* by Rainer Hildebrandt, the well-known author of *The Explosion*, an account of the East German revolt. It is of first-rank importance.

The question is what the West German, particularly West Berlin, workers could have done to help bring the East German workers to active support of Hungary.

The ground was fertile, says Hildebrandt, who maintains organized contact across the border. On October 29 there was a movement in East Germany toward a solidarity strike with Hungary which "was prevented by the authorities."

Moreover, in West Berlin the workers were straining at the leash imposed on them by their own authorities. On Nov. 5 at a mass torchlight demonstration, more than 100,000 demanded "action" and were restrained from making a march to the Brandenburg Gate only by cops and water hoses.

But Hildebrandt does not mention this to advocate adventurist intervention by Western arms, as do some desperate

people. He condemns the fact that "the West Berlin government, supported by U.S. authorities, has been working to forestall any active movement" to help the freedom fight across the Iron Curtain.

One such proposal was made, by none other than the chairman of the West Berlin trade unions, Ernst Scharnowski. On October 27 Scharnowski proposed that an appeal be broadcast to the East German workers for a "peaceful general strike" of solidarity.

"But," says Hildebrandt, "the West Berlin radio stations, including RIAS [Radio in American Sector], were not permitted to broadcast the appeal and Mayor Otto Suhr was so upset that Scharnowski was forced to retract it."

The West Berlin radio, that potentially powerful weapon, "remained stubbornly silent" while the Hungarian people waited two weeks for solidarity strikes in other satellites.

"I personally believe," adds Hildebrandt, "that if at the end of October there had been sit-down strikes in Germany, the Soviets would not have been able to launch their bloodbath in Hungary. The Soviet military forces are not homogeneous. Soviet soldiers joined the Hungarian freedom-fighters in the first days of the revolt, and many Russians in uniform showed sympathy for the Hungarians. It would have been a great risk to proceed with such an army against several oppressed peoples simultaneously.

"Once before, the West passed up such a magnificent opportunity: On June 16, 1953, when the construction workers of East Berlin called for a general strike, Western government quarters knowingly suppressed the words 'general strike.' The radio stations were not allowed to broadcast this slogan. Today we know that if the forces which on the following day created 'June 17' had assumed the form not of an explosion but of a strike lasting several days, the strike would have spread to the major plants of the satellites and the forced-labor camps of the Soviet Union."

And he concludes: "Only a political innocent can believe that today the only choice is between abandoning the Hungarian people or supporting them with Western weapons."

There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—
Subscribe now!

CP Discussion

(Continued from page 3)

ted in the USSR in this period but in spite of that, the positive things remain." And more of the same.

And Gates: "The historic role of the USSR in blazing the trail for socialism, and in transforming the world situation to where lasting peace is now possible, has fully justified the high regard we have always had for the Soviet Union and its Communist Party. Humanity will be forever indebted to the Soviet Union for those services."

This is only a small sample of how a fundamental Stalinism without Stalin persists in all tendencies in the CP.

Still, Gates can write without noticing any difficulty:

"The violations of democracy and justice in the USSR cannot be explained by the deficiencies of Stalin alone. How could one man have achieved the power he did and why was a whole country powerless before him? How could such flagrant violations of socialist ideals take place for such a long time in a socialist country?"

One wonders: was the USSR "blazing the trail" during all this, during "such a long time"?

Gates and his friends see the need for big changes. In a devious, contradictory, even self-defeating way they see the solution in a new party of socialism and for that they admittedly need new policies. But what policies?

They are engaged in discussing everything under the sun and Foster is quite willing to raise bigger, better, and more numerous questions. The whole repertory of issues can only be fully settled in time, if ever.

THE PRECONDITION

Yet the fundamental question, we repeat, is clear: Will you or will you not break in every respect from the bureaucratic dictatorship in the Kremlin, and completely your political dependence upon it, and cease apologizing for it?

A new broad movement could play a tremendous role in reinvigorating socialism in the United States and in reviving it as a significant tendency in the working class. But if one factor more than any other caused the decline of socialism, it was the rise of the bureaucratic dictatorship in Russia.

"Is that your socialism?" demanded every intelligent militant in the labor movement. "If so, we want none of it." Every bourgeois ideologist, from right to left, identified socialism with the totalitarian dictatorship in Russia in order to defame and discredit socialism, and up to now they have succeeded.

The CP, in this country, as in all others, helped to put over the hoax.

No mass movement for socialism is possible, in this country, unless it clearly and without evasion rejects the social system that exists in Russia and unambiguously denies that the Kremlin dictatorship has anything in common with socialism in any respect whatsoever.

Socialism will begin anew in the United States as a democratic, anti-totalitarian movement against capitalism and against the social system of Stalinism, or it will not rise at all. If the discussion in the CP moves the ranks in that direction it will serve a worthy cause. And for that, the voice of democratic socialism must be heard.

NEW YORK LABOR ACTION FORUM

Thursday, Nov. 29 — 9 p.m.

Albert Gates

Secretary, ISL

on

REGROUPMENT FOR A
NEW SOCIALIST MOVEMENT?

Current Discussion Among
Socialists and Communists

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Djilas: The Storm - -

(Continued from page 6)

only a phase in the evolution and withering away of contemporary Communism.

It is no longer possible to stop the struggle of the people of Eastern Europe for independence, and only with great effort their struggle for freedom. These two struggles are gradually becoming one. If Moscow's imperialism suffers defeat and is prevented from war adventures, the USSR, too, will have to undergo considerable internal changes. For, just as it is compelled to be national in its forms, in essence Communism is one and the same, with the same historical origins and the same destiny. The events in one Communist country necessarily affect all other Communist countries, as in one and the same living organism. And just as Yugoslav Communism, separating itself from Moscow, initiated the crisis of Soviet imperialism, that is, the inevitable birth of national Communism, in the same way the revolution in Hungary means the beginning of the end of Communism generally.

As in all other great and decisive historic events, the Hungarian fighters for freedom, struggling for their existence and country, may not have foreseen what an epochal deed they had initiated. The world has rarely witnessed such unprec-

edented unity of the popular masses and such heroism. The unity of the popular masses was so strong that it appeared as though there had been no civil strife, as though a ruling class had not been wiped out overnight as if it never existed. And the heroic intoxication was so high that bare-handed boys and girls were stopping the tanks of the interventionists who, like the Cossacks of Nicholas I in 1848, tried to suppress their liberty and enslave their country.

This event will probably not be repeated. But the Hungarian Revolution blazed a path which sooner or later other Communist countries must follow. The wound which the Hungarian Revolution inflicted on Communism can never be completely healed. All its evils and weaknesses, both as Soviet imperialism and as a definite system of suppression, had collected on the body of Hungary, and there, like festering sores, were cut out by the hands of the Hungarian people.

I do not think that the fate of the Hungarian Revolution is at all decisive for the fate of Communism and the world. World Communism now faces stormy days and insurmountable difficulties, and the peoples of Eastern Europe face heroic new struggles for freedom and independence.

What Is U.S. Labor Doing? - -

(Continued from page 1)

We do not mean that the Western labor movement abroad has done a fraction of its duty to the Hungarian Revolution; on the contrary.

For us, however, it is more important to speak out to the American labor movement and its leadership.

The Hungarian nationalist and church organizations instantaneously took the streets in militant expressions of support for their countrymen. It should be noted that they were not concerned whether the uprising was led by the working class or anti-Stalinist socialists; whether it was a socialist revolt against Stalinism or not. They did not hesitate, for whatever reasons, to declare their solidarity with their brothers. They knew only that there was a revolt against the Russian oppressor; it was enough.

The tiny Independent Socialist League, Young Socialist League and Libertarian League demonstrated before the Russian UN headquarters. But we, unfortunately, had to do it alone, in the absence of any action by the trade-union movement. We could not even enlist the cooperation of the Socialist Party in this anti-Stalinist action in support of the Hungarian working class.

And these, sad to say, are the only socialist groups capable of such action. The Socialist Workers Party, saddled with its theory of the "degenerated workers state" in Russia, wouldn't even think of picketing or demonstrating;

nor would the Socialist Labor Party, which disdains such activity.

No doubt, we will be told that the American labor movement most certainly supports the Hungarian revolt; that the European labor movements do also.

But what we find missing in the labor movement is the mobilization of the entire American working class behind the uprising with material aid and the strongest expression of international class solidarity to insure that the Hungarian fighters had instantaneous knowledge that millions of the American workers support them without reservation. Not only the workers in the United States, but with the help of the swift actions of the American labor movement there could have been mobilized the workers of the entire hemisphere from Canada to Argentina.

WHERE WERE THEY?

Why, for example, did not David Dubinsky's ILGWU rally the New York Labor movement, together with Potofsky's Amalgamated, the UAW, IUE, IBT, Transport Workers, to call their workers into the street to march by the UN and the Russian headquarters to show Kremlin's representatives and their servants from the satellite countries that millions of American workers stand behind the Hungarian revolutionaries?

Why didn't Reuther call the auto workers into the streets in Detroit and other UAW centers?

Where were John L. Lewis and the coal miners?

We could list all the great international unions and ask the same question. If the labor leaders felt that taking the American workers into the streets was too radical a step, why didn't they at least call upon the entire labor movement to halt work for even a brief period as a symbolic gesture of solidarity?

Was it the dead hand of the AFL-CIO international committee headed by Jay Lovestone that cautioned care?

Was it the wish to act in tune with the administration of the State Department?

Was it plain provincial conservative inertia?

Or was it simply the failure of the labor leaders to understand the nature of the Hungarian uprising and their responsibilities to it?

Whatever the cause or causes, we know this: the American labor movement had a duty to express its unequivocal solidarity with the Hungarian workers. It was not enough to deplore the Russian intervention and counter-revolution. It was not enough to talk about the independence of labor, of democracy and freedom.

It was not a question of military intervention from the West. Such a course was not possible, nor even desirable.

MISSING INGREDIENT

The question was a moral and political one of enormous magnitude. The Hungarian people had to know that the people of the world supported them unreservedly and were ready to show them solidarity in the infinite ways that the working class finds. That solidarity should have been expressed in the vastest world-wide demonstrations, in resolutions, meetings, conferences; in the immediate despatch of all kinds of material aid to the people.

That is what was lacking: the sense of urgency, the sense of fighting solidarity. To this day the American labor movement has called not a single mass meeting, not a single demonstration, not a single work stoppage, not a single conference to seek aid for the Hungarian workers. Not a single prominent labor leader has taken to the hustings to speak for the American working class and the organized labor movement in behalf of the rebellion. Not one TV appearance, not one radio speech—nothing.

In New York, it is true the Workers Defense League did take the initiative to call labor leaders together in conference to work out a program of such aid to the Hungarians. But this effort has not yet gotten off the ground and the most precious time has gone by.

Oh yes, the International Rescue Com-

Order ALL your books from Labor Action Book Service, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

mittee held a rally at Madison Square Garden through a committee filled with conservative admirals and generals, which labor was also allowed to support. Because of the way the rally was set up, on the one hand, and because the labor movement was involved in it only perfunctorily and did nothing, on the other, this rally heard little that was inspiring.

Indeed, it was unfortunate that one of the more newsworthy events of the meeting was the booing of Anna Kethly, Hungarian Social-Democratic minister under Nagy just arrived in this country, by an audience which apparently had a great number of militant reactionaries among it. The glaring deficiencies of this meeting were as much the fault of the labor movement's do-nothingness as of reactionaries who tried to give it their own tone.

AMERICANS FAILED

It is Senator Knowland that has sought to become the "American spokesman" in behalf of the Hungarians! He has not been behindhand in demanding such things as the expulsion of Russia from the UN, breaking of diplomatic relations, and the mobilization of "volunteers" to fight in behalf of the people in the satellite countries. The extreme right-wing Republican organ *National Review* hails Knowland for it. They try to become the voice of America by the failure of the American labor movement to act quickly and massively.

This failure is the American part of the tragedy. As far as the Hungarian fighters are concerned, they did far more than anyone had a right to expect. What they did is only a great beginning. Stalinism has been shaken everywhere. But in this first great revolt against Stalinism, the American labor movement and the labor movement of the West have failed in their duty so far.

To reverse their course, they must act with a sense of immediacy. It is the sense of urgency that has been missing.

UAW to Act--

(Continued from page 1)

Grant made the interesting point that the UAW ought to take a stand similar to that of the British Labor Party. Stellato argued, among other things, that the people of Egypt has as much right to have their own free country as anybody, and that the colonial empires were wrong in starting war there.

Reuther insisted that the more important concentration on Hungarian events was necessary, and that was why the UAW board had passed a special resolution on that specifically, although he had no personal objection to a denunciation of France and Britain's policy in the Middle East. He did make, however, a vigorous defense of Israel.

What was especially gratifying about the meeting was both its size and the lively discussion that took place. A bitter November storm raged in Detroit that night, and yet this large gathering of leaders took place, although most of them are head-over-heels in plant problems like speed-up, etc.

Shachtman & CPer In Detroit Meeting

On December 10, Detroit will see Max Shachtman of the ISL participating in an unusual confrontation of speakers on one platform, discussing "Which Way to Peace?"

The other panelists are Norman Thomas, Carl Winter of the CP, A. J. Muste, and Bert Cochran.

Sponsored by the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the discussion will take place 8 p.m. at the United Dairy Workers Hall, 15840 Second Avenue.

Shachtman and CP Editor To Speak at Dec. 3 Meet

At two broad discussion meetings scheduled in New York City for December, Independent Socialist speakers will participate in a confrontation of views among panelists including Communist Party and Stalinoid representatives.

The first, on December 3, will see Max Shachtman, ISL chairman, on the same platform with John W. Gates, editor of the *Daily Worker*, and Paul Sweezy, editor of the *Monthly Review*, plus three other panelists.

Under the auspices of *Liberation*, the pacifist monthly, and under the chairmanship of A. J. Muste, they will discuss the topic, "The Meaning of the Events in Hungary and the Middle East," at Community Church, 35th and Park Ave.

The other participants will be two pacifist spokesmen: John M. Swomley, national secretary of the F.O.R., and David Dellinger of *Liberation*. It's scheduled for 8 p.m. on Monday, December 3; admission free.

The second New York meeting, also to be held at Community Church, is scheduled for Friday, December 14, under the auspices and chairmanship of I. F. Stone, editor of *I. F. Stone's Weekly*.

Convened for the anniversary of the Bill of Rights, the topic of discussion will be "Socialism and Democracy—East and West," and is designed to invite discussion of the problem as it exists on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Conceived in terms of inviting editors of "Independent Left" publications to express their points of view on the question, the following have already accepted and will be represented on the platform: *Labor Action*; *Monthly Review*; *American Socialist*; *Militant*; *Liberation*. (Names of speakers will be announced next week.)