

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 5, 1956

FIVE CENTS

THE REVOLUTION IN HUNGARY

FOUR INSIDE PAGES

How the Revolution Unfolded

... page 3

The Revolution vs. NATO and War

... page 4

Stalinism Creates Its Gravediggers

... page 5

In the UN: Look Who's Complaining

... page 6

Hungary Opens a New Era With the First Revolution Against the Stalinist System

Victory!

At press time, Nov. 1

The Hungarian Revolution is winning a smashing and prodigious victory!

If the course of the last 48 hours is reliably reported, the Russian attempt to crush the revolution has collapsed in ignominy, the Nagy regime is proclaiming its complete capitulation to the people's demands, and a dual power exists in the land in the form of the Workers Councils and Revolutionary Committees which have taken over the power in the majority of the nation, and which are now linking up nationally.

Win or lose, we say elsewhere, the Hungarian Revolution is the turning-point of the post-war era. Now, as the possibility approaches that it is a triumph for the people and for socialist democracy, the impact of this stupendous achievement may surpass anything we can foresee.

The Nagy-Kadar government—which took office under Russian guns, and day before yesterday was directing a foreign occupier's massacre against its own people—is now literally groveling before the power of the revolution. No pledge of democracy is too extreme for them to intermingle with their pleas to the people to stop fighting—even though it is only the fact that the people refused to lay down arms in response to previous pleas that causes them to capitulate now. These long-time Stalinists are now promising complete political freedom, multi-party system, even neutrality and a break with the Warsaw pact, the end of collectivization, etc., etc.

NEXT STAGE

There are two big question-marks:

(1) The Russian troops, which may or may not be all out of Budapest, are still in the country in force. Will they yet strike? No final victory can be confirmed until they are out.

(2) Can a revolutionary government be formed to replace the Nagy-Kadar group, and will it be able to consolidate a socialist democracy in Hungary independent of Moscow, or are the Stalinists counting on using any and all concessions to keep their foot in the government and lead it back to totalitarianism?

Final victory will depend on these two unanswered questions. But whatever the answer turns out to be, the triumph of the revolution is already infinitely greater than anyone believed likely when it started.

By HAL DRAPER

The people of Hungary have launched the first revolution against Stalinism—the revolution to which we have steadfastly looked forward. These are the October days of the bureaucratic dictatorship.

A great new era starts.

If the people win, it can be a new era of direct socialist struggle such as was inaugurated by the Russian "October" of 1917. If, despite all, the Hungarian people are turned back, it will yet be a new era of socialist revolution such as was first inaugurated by the Paris Commune, which was in its time the first workers' revolution against capitalism.

The full consequences are beyond immediate reckoning. October 23 gives all politics a new focus.

The Hungarian people are carrying on a battle which has few peers for heroism and sacrificing devotion to freedom in the whole history of revolution, and no peers otherwise.

Their road was prepared by the mass actions in Czechoslovakia in early June 1953; by the history-making "June days" in East Germany the week after; then by the Poznan uprising last June; finally, by the stormy street actions in Poland which were bridled by the Gomulka coup but which impelled the Hungarian workers and students to follow suit.

But it was left to the Hungarian people to rise in the first nationwide, mass insurrection against both the Russian masters who are foreign occupiers and the native Stalinist dictators who are their collaborators and emulators.

The whole world has seen Russian soldiers shooting down a united Hungarian nation demanding freedom, national freedom and social freedom. No Communist Party in the world, no Stalinist movement anywhere will ever get over that discreditment.

It is a body-blow against Stalinist illusions in every nation, not least of all in the nations of the uncommitted world in Asia, perience; not least of all in nations like Italy whose Communist Party embraces hundreds of thousands of workers who genuinely believed that it stands for some kind of greater freedom; and perhaps most of all in the case of an already disintegrating CP like that in this country.

But above all, win or lose, the Hungarian Revolution is a knockout blow against all those tendencies of despair and defeatism, in the face of the seeming invulnerability of Stalinism, which have ripped the guts out of so many ex-radicals since the end of the war and turned them into cynical camp-followers of more "realistic" forms of accommodation to the status quo.

There are those who were overwhelmed by the image of Stalinist power and immunity to revolt-from-below who decided that it was therefore the wave of the future for a thousand years, and that it could not be fought; and who capitulated to Stalinism.

There are, in this country, the far greater number of those who were frightened into a blue funk by the same image of omnipotence, and who fled in terror and despair to the bosom of "the West" to defend them from this horror:

Yes, yes, your socialism would be a good thing if we weren't all menaced by this monster; but how can we fight against small things like capitalist injustice or colonialism or exploitation, and think in terms of seeking a better world through the elimination of this system, when we need these capitalists with all of their "imperfections" to protect us against this terrible colossus of Stalinism which will make eternal slaves of all of us unless we sink our domestic quarrels and build H-bombs?

You talk of revolution against this Fiend as if you were which know the meaning of such a spectacle in their own still living in the 19th century: wake up! Your working class are all indoctrinated zombies manipulated by agit-prop machines which can make them all believe whatever the Politburo decides. Just offer them two bones instead of one, and they will cheerfully cut each other's throat in the service of the hangmen. Besides, the Stalinists have them all convinced that,

since theirs is a "workers' state," they the workers are the privileged ruling class: do you expect them to rebel? The working class of Marx, of socialist revolution, is dead and buried...

Now look at this; and look at Hungary!

With this smug and ignorant contempt for the masses, they inflated and glorified the might and unconquerableness of the Stalinist despotism, magnified its solidity, exalted its permanence, until the only thing left to do was to beg the right to clasp hands with Franco, Chiang, Adenauer, Rhee and other paladins of anti-Communism who could be counted on to shield us from the Fiend, and to get used to the idea that our American haven of contentment and prosperity would have to be defended by such means even if the globe has to be blown apart by H-bombs to do it.

The Hungarian Revolution explodes all that.

Without in the least derogating the phenomenal role played by the students and youth (for which see page 5), it is the working class of Hungary, as it was the working class of Poland last week, which has provided the cadres, the bases, the masses, the embattled brigades and undaunted phalanxes of the first revolution against Stalinism.

So also it was the workers who made the Poznan uprising. It was the revolutionary working class that pioneered in facing Russian tanks in the East German June days. It was the Czech working class which was the first, chronologically, to break out in rebellion against the Stalinist regime in 1953.

Everywhere in every country, as the fever-line of revolution has been mounting against the Stalinist power since the famous 20th Congress, the vanguard is a working class that consciously counterposes, to the Stalinist system of totalitarian collectivism, their democratic socialist aspirations through a democratic program for the overthrow of the bureaucracy.

Everywhere in the Stalinist world, the only live enemy of the tyranny is the workers' socialist revolution.

None of this depends on who finally wins in Hungary in this present battle.

It is only two decades since this Stalinist system came to its maturity in the '30s in the first country which was its victim. It is over two centuries since the growing-up of capitalism in its first cradleland, and it is only in our time that its social disintegration is proceeding apace through much of the world.

Two decades, and two centuries! What an unstable, hatred-ridden, crisis-ridden society is this one that was painted as the impenetrable monolith of the theories invented by deserters and faint-hearts...

They looked upon the people behind the Iron Curtain as if they were cut off from the world forever, lost souls doomed to wallow in a nightmare of mindless oppression without end, a fate from which we could be saved only by reconciling ourselves with the enemy of this enemy, capitalism. But the socialist revolution reaches across all borders.

It is now the socialist revolution against Stalinism which gives new life and new substance to the socialist struggle against capitalism.

The Hungarian Revolution lifts an incubus off the socialist movement in the West. And every advance of the socialist movement in the West will free the Hungarian fighters from the besetting fear that capitalist reaction can take advantage of their struggle—the fear that Stalinism utilizes demagogically to smear the revolution.

It is our socialism they are fighting for.

A new perspective opens for world socialism. A new wind is blowing into the world from the east. This is the big meaning of the Hungarian Revolution.

Chrysler Poses Cruel Dilemma for UAW

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Oct. 28

Preoccupied by the most intensive concentration of work and energy ever seen in a political campaign, United Auto Workers leaders are paying little attention to the significance of the increasing number of wildcat strikes and other signs of unrest in the auto shops.

Chrysler is the main battleground between the ranks and the corporations. In its determined effort to recapture its place as one of the Big Three—it is a poor third now—Chrysler is putting into effect the General Motors and Ford work standards that its president L. L. Colbert said it would.

Consequently, the eight major Chrysler plants—Automotive Body (formerly Briggs), Chrysler, Dodge, DeSoto, Dodge Truck, Plymouth, Nine-Mile Press Plant, and Trenton—are in constant turmoil.

Last week, angered Press plant workers walked out in protest over company upgrading policies (and it's a moot contract point if the company was wrong); the subsequent events shocked UAW leaders. The violence of the feelings of the men came as a surprise. They were so tough on the wild cat picket lines that even state police stayed a prudent distance away.

At a special meeting, international union representatives were booed off the floor. When Chrysler threatened an injunction and law suits, and the UAW ordered the men to return, they did, for a day. After the company fired the alleged ringleaders, the men walked out again. Since this is a key supplier plant, all work schedules in all Chrysler plants were disrupted.

The ranks are torn between the desire to work (for many of them were laid off a long time, and half of Chrysler's area employees have not been called back at all) and the desire for a showdown with Chrysler once and for all. Five local unions already have taken strike votes.

Each demand for more production in the shops brings another speed-up fight; Chrysler keeps insisting that its employees meet GM work standards. Although the UAW admits some GM work standards are too high, it takes time to change that long-established practice in GM.

So the rank and file and the UAW leaders are split by cruel dilemmas. A gap between the ranks and the leadership grows, although the UAW does more fighting to preserve its gains than any other union. It's just that no union, or no limited trade-union policy, can solve the kind of problems that a working class faces in a consumers' goods industry whose ups and downs in production sales and employment keep everyone in a perpetual state of anxiety.

GAP IS GROWING

General Motors is so far superior as a massive industrial machine that it could easily run Chrysler out of business, as has happened to so many companies in accordance with the inexorable laws of the concentration of wealth and capital.

GM is sufficiently worried about this to make offers to Chrysler to build important Chrysler parts at far less cost than Chrysler can make them. In one case, GM's proposal would save Chrysler \$9,000,000. But the logic of that policy is, of course, for GM to build all Chrysler parts, and cars too.

The prospect of the auto industry becoming a Big Two, or more exactly One and a Half—for Ford found out that competing with Chevrolet isn't as easy as its publicists said—frightens the UAW leaders too. It may surprise many people, but the changes in the auto industry are so great that the UAW is not primarily an auto union any more, nor is the East Side region of Detroit the center of the auto workers' strength. It has become one of the smallest regions in America.

In terms of human beings, this means that more and more auto workers with large seniority find themselves jobless and cast-off in their 40s. By 1958 at least 150,000 seniority workers in the auto industry will be permanently displaced.

In this kind of economic process—which

the ranks feel but do not fully understand—trying to solve union problems on ordinary union levels just doesn't answer the questions, and thus the gap between the ranks and the leaders grows. The sharpest manifestation of this trend is the increasing number of wildcats, which are a blind outburst of rage at the changing patterns of the auto industry.

The current issue of *Fortune* magazine has quite a significant article on how the UAW did its part to keep Studebaker in business, by allowing its absolutely fabulous work conditions to return to a "competitive" standard. Later the UAW even tolerated wage cuts, since the UAW feared to take the blame for Studebaker going out of business.

In this case, the dilemmas of the union movement are posed most acutely. In the act of helping keep the company in business, the UAW loses its influence with a sizable minority (if not majority) of workers, who feel let down because their work load is increased. Later, when the company goes under anyway, as is indicated for Studebaker just as it happened to Hudson, Packard, etc., the union still hasn't solved the basic problem of jobs, for it can't.

STUDEBAKER-TYPE CRISIS

On a much larger scale, the crisis at Studebaker is now facing the UAW at Chrysler, with every indication that the final result will be the same, unless the American economy has an upswing that no one predicts, or unless Chrysler pulls a miracle and regains its place.

Nor is the basic problem solved by fighting for a good plank like the UAW's new program of a shorter work-week. That helps in the sense that the UAW shows the unemployed it is doing its part on a trade-union level to bring at least part of them back, by spreading out work. But the impact of automation is bound to have a bigger effect on the total work force than any gains the UAW makes in cutting down the work schedules.

What is indicated is that the time has come when the UAW will have to think in terms of large social solutions to its pressing union problems.

Why should America build more than 6 million cars a year? Why shouldn't the huge production facilities of the auto industry be used for something other than unnecessary cars which people can't buy? The auto industry can build 12,000,000 cars yearly!

Why not combine idle plants and idle workers to build socially useful and necessary products? These questions raise, of course, the rock-bottom question: why allow the jungle laws of capitalism to operate at such a cost to human beings in the auto industry?

ISL, SP SPEAKERS AT PHILLY MEETING

Phila., Oct. 29

A successful pre-election forum held by the Philadelphia ISL at the St. James Hotel heard Albert Gates, national secretary of the League, on "The Choice in the '56 Election." A second speaker, Arthur Berthoff, treasurer of the Philadelphia branch of the Socialist Party, briefly outlined the SP's election platform and explained how to cast a write-in vote for Hoopes and Friedman.

Gates summarized the current U.S. political scene, analyzed the lack of real choice for voters as between the Republican and Democratic Parties, and gave a good introduction to the idea of an independent labor party to those hearing an ISL speaker for the first time. He urged the audience to cast a socialist vote this year by voting for the SP candidates.

The ISL had originally proposed a debate on this subject to the local ADA, which refused even to acknowledge three communications sent to them. A local church forum group and a local pacifist organization has had a similar experience with the ADA.

Rebellion Sweeping Steel Union in Pittsburgh Area

By EMIL MODIC

Pittsburgh, Oct. 28

Organized rank-and-file rebellion against Pres. David J. McDonald is sweeping the big locals of the Steelworkers in the Pittsburgh area.

The issues which have brought the opposition to life are: (1) the \$2 boost in union dues passed at the recent Steelworkers' convention; (2) the \$10,000 raise given to McDonald at the same time, making his salary \$50,000 a year; (3) the undemocratic way in which the dues increase was rammed through the convention.

The rebellion began in the Jones and Laughlin Hazelwood Plant in Pittsburgh when a former vice-president of the local circulated a petition protesting the convention action. A vast majority of the membership signed it.

The movement quickly spread to McDonald's home local, Local 1272 at the J. & L. Southside Works in Pittsburgh, which also signed petitions. Within a few days, petitions were circulating in virtually every mill within 30 miles of Pittsburgh.

About ten days ago, a formal opposition group was organized with headquarters in McKeesport. It first took the name of Steelworkers for Democratic Action (a name reminiscent of the UE Members for Democratic Action, which was the name of the opposition group to the Stalinists in the old UE). At the first meeting, however, the name was changed to Dues Protest Committee.

So far about fifty locals have affiliated. The chairman of the committee is Don C. Rarick of Local 2227, Irvin Works of U.S. Steel. This is the local that McDonald accused of being "Trotskyite" when it opposed him at the convention.

The committee charges that the recent Los Angeles convention was "undemocratic and dictatorial." It says that on the vote to raise dues, opposition speakers were denied the floor, that ineligible members of the staff voted, and that McDonald denied a roll-call vote.

GIRD FOR ACTION

The program of the Dues Protest Committee is two-fold:

(1) It demands a special convention of the union to rescind the dues increase. Under the union's constitution, if one-quarter of the locals ask for a special convention, one must be called. About 700 locals would have to ask for the convention.

(2) The committee hopes to enter a slate against McDonald in the election of officers coming up February next year. The Steelworkers do not elect officers at the convention but do so by membership referendum, like the Mine Workers.

The committee asks that all locals which send protest petitions calling for a new convention notify the committee of this action, addressing Dues Protest Committee, P. O. Box 221, McKeesport, Pa.

By and large, the leaders of the movement seem to be local union leaders now out of office or holding minor office. Probably some of these local union figures see in the movement a way to regain local office, or to gain it in the first place. There is no question that the movement is very popular. Many of the leaders are men who backed the unsuccessful candidacy of Joseph T. Moloney for vice-president in a special election last year.

The committee has attempted to get William J. Hart, district Director of District 19, Allegheny Valley, to announce against McDonald for the presidency. So far Hart has said nothing. It is generally believed that Hart was the moving figure in the candidacy of Moloney last year.

Even if the committee does not succeed in putting together a slate for the top offices, it seems most probable that some pro-McDonald district directors will be toppled next spring. One who seems sure to be defeated is John Sullivan, director of the Monongahela Valley, District 15. At present the Monongahela Valley is the center of the protest movement.

McDonald himself has so far refused

to discuss the protest movement, but staff men and pro-McDonald district directors are working overtime to put out the fire. They have been able to take some locals out of the movement.

In Ambridge, Michael Zahorsky, an employee of Local 1211 of J. & L. Aliquippa Works, has been fired from his job on the local union payroll for supporting the protest movement. It should be stressed that he was on the payroll of the local union, and not on the international staff.

One thing that prevents district directors and their staff from jumping into the fight is the fact that they get raises along with McDonald. And half of the dues increase is remitted to the locals, so there is a strong incentive for local union officers to go along with the increase.

HARD WAY AHEAD

As this is written, it appears probable that the movement will be defeated unless it can win over some district directors to active support. It is very hard for a rank-and-file group to buck an international with 1000 staff people at its disposal, with expense accounts, offices, cars, telephones, mimeographs, lawyers, and the like. (A moderately strong workers' political party, if one existed in the country, could turn the tide in favor of the opposition, however.)

But whatever the outcome, the myth that McDonald represents the mood of the steel workers, and that his pompous class-collaborationist posing is popular, has been broken. We think that it will be a long time before McDonald will dare to tour a steel mill again on one of his famous good-will tours with management. The reception might be very embarrassing.

The Dues Protest Committee has gone out of its way to make clear that it is not anti-union. It is well that it has, as this is the charge that the administration forces are beginning to bring against it.

We think the committee could go further and elaborate a positive program. This might include: (1) yearly conventions; (2) yearly election of officers; (3) drastic reduction of officers' salaries; (4) more autonomy for locals; (5) more attention to organizing the unorganized, particularly in the South; and (6) the drive for a 30-hour week with 40-hours pay to head off the unemployment which automation will surely bring in the next few years.

HOW TO WRITE-IN

The Socialist Party has put out instructions on how to write in the names of its candidates in this election. The following, issued in New York, applies specifically to a write-in on voting machines in New York State:

(1) When you go to the polls, take a pencil having black lead with you.

(2) Once inside the booth, look about six inches above the ballot voting lines (with voting levers or pointers) of the major parties, just above the referenda section. You will see a square slot in the upper left-hand corner and a line of narrow slanting slots across the machine. The square slot, marked "1," is where you write in, with a pencil, for president and vice-president. This slot is directly above the line on the machine where the major party presidential candidates are listed. Lift up the sliding panel covering this slot and write in with your pencil, "Electors for Darlington Hoopes & Samuel H. Friedman."

(3) Now go to the first slanting slot, marked number "2" just to the right of the presidential square slot, lift up the sliding panel, and write in "JOSEPH G. GLASS," the name of the Socialist Party's New York State candidate for U.S. Senator in 1956. This slot, of course, is directly above the place on the ballot where the major party candidates are listed.

From Demonstrations to Barricades to Revolutionary Councils and Armed Combat: How the Hungarian Revolution Unfolded

BY BERNARD CRAMER & SAM TAYLOR

The Hungarian Revolution broke out Tuesday, October 23, in Budapest with the presentation of a detailed political program for socialist freedom backed by mass rallies and demonstrations.

Much is still unknown, the unrolling of events is clouded, there are contradictory reports on many aspects, and any attempt to piece the picture together must be very tentative probably marked with errors. But here is how it looks now.

The events of the historic day seem to have begun with student meetings assembled to launch a program of 16 points calling for a basic transformation of the regime, undoubtedly inspired by the tumultuous mass actions in Poland, followed by general mass rallies in the major public squares.

The program consisted of resolutions centering around demands for complete independence from Russia and basic democratization of all spheres of life in Hungary, up to and including the demand for freedom of political opposition and organization. (See box on this page.)

To Behm statue, a memorial to a Hungarian-national hero, a demonstration of 200,000 marched to listen to the reading of resolutions embodying the demands. As the demonstrators moved through the center of Budapest, Hungarian army tanks appeared. Instead of firing on the crowd, a colonel in the lead tank cried out, "We come to join you, not to oppose the demonstration."

A delegation appeared at the headquarters of *Szabad Nep*, the CP organ, demanding that the program be printed, plus a call for a general strike to enforce it. When this was refused, the building was attacked and sacked, regime emblems destroyed, its bookstore set on fire.

Demonstrators moved toward the Budapest radio station where they attempted to have their demands broadcast.

A delegation of students went into the building. When they failed to reappear, the demonstrators tried to rush the building. The political police then began to fire into the ranks of the demonstrators.

From this point on, the demonstrations evolved into a revolution.

Soon after rioting spread through Budapest, the Stalinist regime of Erno Gero, general secretary of the CP, and Premier Andras Hegedus began to announce concessions. The first one carried out was the elevation of former Premier Imre Nagy to premier early Wednesday morning.

Nagy, a hardened Stalinist cadre man who had fallen from grace after a turn

in the CP line against his Malenkov-like economic policy and relaxation measures, came back with this much capital to his credit: a certain popularity with the people because he himself had been victimized by the regime. He immediately utilized this capital by calling on the Russian troops to suppress the people's struggle with tanks and cannon; or (if it is true that Gero had already issued this call) by assuming the premiership under the protection of the Russians' murderous guns.

In any case, new CP chief Kadar stressed in a radio speech that the decision "to repulse [the revolt] by all possible means" was taken in "complete unanimity" of the party leaders.

The Hungarian army of about 175,000 could not be used against the revolution. The soldiers either openly sided with the revolution or melted away. The revolutionaries were pitifully armed against the power of the Russian tanks but what arms they did have were supplied by Hungarian soldiers or broken out of arms depots.

The battles which engulfed the city of Budapest were between workers and students on one side, aided by various groups of soldiers, against the Russian army and the Hungarian political police. It is not reported that Hungarian army units fought with the revolutionaries as units, though soldiers did.

HEROES

The fighting in Budapest pitted an almost unarmed populace against an army equipped with the most modern weapons. The bravery and heroism of the workers and students indicates the depth of the hostility toward their Russian and Hungarian Stalinist masters.

Seymour Freidin writing from Budapest on October 27 describes matchless heroism:

"You watch fist-shaking crowds and tank crews staring at each other. Then shots ring out and demonstrators collapse, riddled. You know this is insane but a display of remarkable courage—fists and waving banners against the might of the second greatest power on earth. You believed that the first great whiff of Russian grapeshot was enough. But the crowds keep coming, tens of thousands strong, demanding 'Russkies go home.'"

The next day the fighting was reported to be dwindling. But on Thursday noon a massacre by Russian troops in Parliament Square, against an unarmed crowd, caused the blaze to flare up again stronger than ever.

Nagy announced that any three persons assembling anywhere in Budapest would be shot on sight. For days, there were barricades in the streets behind

which revolutionaries fought.

By Thursday too, and increasingly during the next few days, reports were coming through of the spread of the revolution to the provinces. Centers of the revolution outside of Budapest were mainly other big industrial towns with a large working-class population.

COUNCIL GOVERNMENT

Revolutionary governments were set up particularly in the industrial stronghold of Miskolc and in Gyor, in eastern and western Hungary respectively. In many other towns and cities and areas, the reins of government were taken over by forces variously referred to as Workers Councils, Revolutionary Councils and Revolutionary Committees.

A UP dispatch reported directly from Gyor: "A Workers Council has been set up here, a miniature rebel government. Armed rebels patrol the streets. The people are with them... At City Hall nationalist headquarters has been set up. The Council meets there in a flurry of businesslike activity. Telephones ring, messengers scurry through corridors."

At Hegyeshalom, reported a *Times* dispatch, a Revolutionary Committee ruled; all military and police forces had placed themselves at its disposal, also the officers and soldiers of a nearby army unit; a general strike was complete.

A "Revolutionary Council" was described in Pecs, a southern industrial city. Szeged, Szolnok, and many others followed suit.

RUSSIAN DEFECTIONS?

Reports have it that in many or most areas of the provinces, while the Nagy regime was frantically promising withdrawal of Russian troops if only the Budapest fighters would first lay down their arms, Russian troops outside Budapest were often abstaining from any action against the people; it is not clear whether this was by central order or local initiative.

Although the dirty job of massacring the revolutionaries has been done by Russian troops—described often as young, scared and trigger-happy—there are also some indications that even the Russian troops are not completely reliable.

A firsthand report from the Budapest streets by *Times*' correspondent MacCormac quoted Russian soldiers as explaining that they had been told the uprising was by fascists, and also "We were told that Budapest was full of American troops and have been surprised not to see any."

It would seem the Russian commanders figure that the best way to keep their men reliable is to make them believe they are fighting the U. S.

But there has been a sprinkling of reports of Russian defections. One is quoted from the British legation in Budapest. The AP man who got the first eyewitness story out of Budapest described fraternization between young Hungarians and Russian soldiers. The *N. Y. Herald Tribune's* Marguerite Higgins insisted from the Washington listening post that there "were persistent references to Soviet army tanks deserting to the rebel crowds." A fleeing tourist reached Vienna telling of seeing Russian units fight on the side of the revolution, against other Russian troops.

It may be some time before it will be clear whether this happened to any significant extent.

WORKERS AT THE HEAD

One of the clearest things about the events is that the backbone and mass of the revolutionary forces consists of the Hungarian workers. This is a proletarian revolution in the first place. At their side are the students and a section of the Hungarian soldiers.

Virtually every detailed dispatch and intimate glimpse of the revolutionary side confirms the working-class base of the revolution, as was already indicated by the fact that virtually every important center of revolutionary government outside of Budapest is in an industrial and proletarianized town or area. In Budapest, "Red Csepel," the island in the

river which bears heavy industry, is a major core of the fighting.

A report in the Scripps-Howard press said, "Authoritative dispatches said discontent first flared into armed rebellion when workers on Csepel Island in the Danube took up weapons against security forces. This was the first report of where fighting actually started."

A carload of reporters entering a "slum area" of the city, that is, a section inhabited by the most exploited workers, described it as a seething cauldron of revolutionary fervor, still battling Russian tanks when most of the city seemed to be in a lull.

A UP dispatch said "The rebels appeared strongest in the great industrial section of Borsod" which has the most important steel plants and coal mines in the country.

Accompanying the revolution was a solid general strike, first reported of the railroad workers who shut transportation down hard.

Admissions by the government radio and the press, by their appeals, make it equally clear that it is the working class that is leading this revolution.

PEASANTS

In contrast there is a notable absence of any information about the role of the peasantry in the nation-wide revolution. The only specific reference to it so far has been in a *N. Y. Times* Budapest dispatch, from John MacCormac, quoting some "utterly objective and clearheaded" revolutionaries to whom he talked:

"They deplored the fact that they had had 'no organization and therefore no leaders.' They recognized that the Hungarian army had been on the whole neutral though it had given them some small arms. This they attributed to the fact that it was largely composed of farm boys. 'The peasant is conservative by nature and therefore passive,' they said. 'But the workers have fought with us, even workers of Red Csepel...'"

This is a good deal more negative a view of the role of the Hungarian soldiers than running references in other dispatches would lead one to think. There may well be more information coming in on the role of the peasantry as the story of what happened outside of Budapest accumulates.

But, certainly, the main pattern that recurs in the reports from Budapest and other towns is the triple alliance of workers-students-soldiers.

GOAL IS SOCIALISM

In the town of Sopron, under a revolutionary government, groups of three patrol the streets, "consisting each of one soldier, one worker and one student." When Premier Nagy made a speech promising to replace the hated AVH (secret police) with a new outfit, he promised that the new organization would be drawn from "army, student and worker brigades."

Nowhere and by no one has any report been made of any sentiment among the revolutionaries to de-nationalize the economy or return to the old regime. On the contrary numerous reports emphasize the opposite, as did that of the *N. Y. Times*' Drew Middleton quoting information received by the London government. According to him, one report said of the rebellious Polish people that they rejected both "communism" and capitalism to "seek the middle road of socialism"; while the topography of this description is askew, its meaning is clear.

"A second report, this one from Budapest, emphasized the anti-Communist nature of the insurrection there. But it noted that there appeared to be no desire on [the] part of [the] industrial proletariat to relinquish either the nationalization of industries or long-term economic planning by the government..."

"The interpretation placed upon these reports by qualified sources on Eastern Europe is that the idea of Socialist rather than capitalist democracy is the goal of the masses in the satellites..."

Exactly. To give it its full classic name, this is the proletarian socialist revolution.

The Program of the Revolution

The program of demands around which the Hungarian Revolution broke out has been widely referred to in dispatches as "the 16-point program" which was presented to rallies in Budapest on October 23. It was detailed as follows in a Budapest dispatch in the *N. Y. Times* of Oct. 24:

"Withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary in accordance with the peace treaty.

"Revision of Hungary's relations with the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia to establish complete economic and political equality and non-interference in each other's affairs.

"Publication of Hungary's trade agreements and reparations to the Soviet Union.

"Information about Hungary's uranium resources, their exploitation and the concessions given to the Soviet Union.

"The calling of a Communist Party congress to elect a new leadership.

"A reshuffling of the government with Mr. Nagy as leader.

"An open trial of Mihaly Farkas, former Minister of Defense, and Mr. Rakosi.

"A secret general election with more than one party.

"The reorganization of Hungary's economy based on her actual national resources.

"Revision of the worker's output norms and recognition of the worker's rights to strike.

"Revision of the system of compulsory farm collections.

"Equal rights for individual farmer and members of cooperatives.

"Restoration of Hungary's traditional national emblem and the traditional Hungarian army uniforms.

"Destruction of a giant Stalin statue in a Budapest Square.

"Solidarity with the national movement in Poland."

According to a United Press dispatch from Budapest on October 24, there are three additional points:

"Complete freedom of speech and of the press.

"Revision of all political trials.

"Release of all political prisoners, including those who are still held in the Soviet Union."

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

vs. NATO AND WAR

By PHILIP COBEN

The outbreak of the Hungarian Revolution, following hard on the first stage of the Polish revolutionary upsurge against the Stalinist power, marks a new period not only in the struggle for socialist freedom in the world, but also in the fight against war and the danger of war.

Yesterday, supporters of the Western capitalist war camp and its structure of military alliances with some of the most reactionary forces in the world, like Franco and Chiang Kai-shek, could scoff at the "visionary" idea of a democratic foreign policy which was aimed at blowing the Russian empire up from within—a socialist and revolutionary foreign policy, fundamentally incompatible with capitalism. Yesterday they could feel "realistic" and "practical" in supporting the line of an imperialist military alliance against the Stalinist threat, as the only thing that could save the "free world" from totalitarian conquest and enslavement.

Today, the revolution that was "unrealistic" yesterday is standing astride Eastern Europe, as big as life—the world's most massive buffer against war.

And NATO is seen to play the role, in this epochal event, of a reactionary barrier to the spread of this revolution which is the hope of the world.

It was the bogey of NATO, and only this argument, that was trotted out by Gomulka in Poland when the time came for him, on the Wednesday of that revolutionary week, to tell the Polish people that Russian troops were going to stay in the country.

It was the anti-Russian demand, above any other single one, that was providing the dynamic drive behind the turbulent mass rallies and stormy street actions behind which the whirlwind of the Polish social revolution was gathering its forces. It naturally took the form of centering around the person of Marshal Rokossovsky, Moscow's military overseer in Poland, but this was only its symbolization.

COUNTING ON NATO

On that Wednesday the new Gomulka-Cyrankiewicz-Ochab regime, relying on its popularity gained from making a stand against the Kremlin's demands, took its fate in its hands by deciding to announce to the Polish people that the Russian troops were going to stay in the country (though at their own bases) in the teeth of the nation-wide cry that they get out, a cry that was making the ground shake underneath the new CP combine.

They did not even decide to announce that Rokossovsky personally was to get out, as a concession. (The report that Rokossovsky had gone back to Russia, "on leave," came only later, after the explosion of the Hungarian Revolution.)

To wash this bitter pill down the throats of the people—a people, besides, who were already in rebellious motion—they had only this to count on:

"Both M. Cyrankiewicz [the premier] and M. Gomulka attempted to justify his presence by saying it was in the interest of Polish security. M. Cyrankiewicz told the Sejm [parliament] the Soviet army had occupied bases in Poland for years for security reasons and cited the remilitarization of West Germany. M. Gomulka amplified this explanation at the outdoor meeting by saying that, as long as the North Atlantic Alliance maintained bases in West Germany, the presence of the Soviet army in Poland was compatible with the national interest." (N. Y. Times, Oct. 25.)

To quiet the revolution, they figure it enough to point to NATO and German militarization.

The question is not whether the Polish people will really be quieted by this, or how much, or for how long. The point is that the role assigned to NATO by the Stalinists, a role which it plays, is that of a barrier to the only force that is now breaking the world out of the deadly circle of the cold war.

In this new era of the mass social revolution for socialist freedom against Stalinism, opened up by the Hungarian people, the danger of the third world war, whose shadow has been hanging over the world, now recedes. This is so not because of NATO but in spite of it; not because of the United States' stock of H-bombs but in spite of it; not because of Western threats of "massive retaliation" but in spite of them; not because the Stalinist camp is overawed or intimidated by a rearmed and remilitarized Germany in the heart of Europe, but in spite of the reactionary effects of this move.

WHAT PRETEXT?

What could Gomulka have told the country if Germany—the terror of whose name still strikes deep in the hearts of a people who have been under its guns for centuries and also in this very generation—was an independent unmilitarized state not tied to any war camp and without a foreign occupying army on its own soil? What excuse could Gomulka have found for keeping Russian troops? What pretext could he have gotten away with, that would keep him from deepening the break with Moscow that he was trying to avoid?

Yesterday, it is true, we would have been told by all eviscerated ex-radicals and highly realistic apologists that a Stalinist regime can get away with telling the people anything: why, all they have to do is put the Propaganda Machine in motion, punch two levers, activate the loudspeakers both human and mechanical, blanket all Media of Communication with Big Lies and the Party Line, and lo! the people become hypnotized zombies stumbling through darkness like George Orwell's "proles" in 1984....

Right now this sounds more like an exaggerated picture of the Eisenhower campaign in the U. S. than it does like the political and social climate in East Europe! This slander against the people is down the drain, now. No thinking person who ever swallowed it can feel anything but self-reproach for falling victim to it.

So the Gomulka regime, let us say, could have found some pretext, but how could it possibly compare with their ability to point the finger to the mirror image of the occupying Russian troops—namely, the German and American troops mobilized to the West?

Thus the Stalinist camp nourishes itself with the existence of the rival imperialist camp, as vice-versa. But this time it is a question of the life of a revolution which is at stake.

THE WAR THREAT

There is another side to the role of NATO at this crossroads in history.

"U. S. SEES REVOLTS ENDING WAR THREAT," was the headline over a think-piece by the N. Y. Herald Tribune's Marguerite Higgins, from Washington (Oct. 28). In it the correspondent, purporting to reflect governmental reactions, gets positively lyrical in hailing the Hungarian and Polish events as blocking precisely that threat of Russian aggression which has always been assigned as the justification for the whole massive structure of preparation for war around which U. S. life revolves.

Very good! But in that case—why NATO?

Nobody has ever "seen" NATO as "ending war threats" except for some vague future dimly described.

The Scripps-Howard foreign editor wrote October 26 from Berlin that the "best-informed diplomats" said "The

biggest effect of the Polish-Hungarian revolts on the world situation will be to restrain Russian aggression in Europe," the East European empire was no longer "a defensive fortress for Russia and a base for attack on the West," but rather indeed "a death trap for Russian armies," all because of the revolution.

Very good! But that which he says is no longer true happens to be the only reason used to justify the existence of NATO and the whole military-alliance policy of Western capitalism.

Now this structure still exists... as Gomulka's instrument to quiet mass anti-Russian action, and hold back precisely that revolution which has done what NATO was falsely cracked up to do by those who peddle the line of maintain-peace-by-organizing-for-war.

WHAT INSPIRES THEM?

What liberal can now find a reason for justifying the "realistic" policy of bolstering up Franco (and thus repressing the Spanish revolution) in the name of "defending the free world" against Stalinist armies pictured as sweeping over Europe?

What inspires the revolution against Stalinism—American aid and friendship to this fascist ex-ally of Hitler, or a democratic and anti-imperialist policy of friendship with the revolutionary forces against this tyranny?

In Stalinist China, just as Gomulka points his finger at German militarization under the American aegis, so Mao Tse-tung points to the fact that the only American-sponsored alternative to his own totalitarian rule is the return of that butcher and hangman of the Chinese people, Chiang Kai-shek. Which would be a bigger blow against the war threat—another NATO division bristling with guns in Germany, or a break with Chiang as part of a genuinely democratic foreign policy?

Which builds that "death trap" for Stalinism? And which permits the Russians to extricate themselves from the crushing hatred of the satellite peoples? Here is a product of deep thought

Nehru's Silence

If the Hungarian and Polish upheavals cast a light on the NATO powers, they also do not spare the leaders of the Asian "neutralist" bloc, who try to stand between the two war camps as a sort of "One-and-a-Half Camp."

On October 28, after five days of Russian massacres in Budapest, after thousands of Hungarian fighters for freedom had been slaughtered by a foreign power's occupation troops—that great democrat and pacifist and humanitarian statesman Nehru told a meeting in India that he had no comment to make on what was happening there!

To be sure, no one can have any doubt that he is made unhappy by the naughty things the Russians are doing there. Some day he may even say so.

But who will speak out to the world now in defense of the Hungarian heroes? Only the same cynical leaders of the same Big Three who justify foreign intervention in Egypt, in Cyprus, in Algeria, in Greece...?

Why not Nehru, who poses as the principled enemy of imperialism of any brand?

Because this Nehru is gagged and tongue-tied by the neutralist conception of "reconciling" both blocs of imperialist oppressors, with both of whom one must therefore maintain a friendly camaraderie.

The Hungarian road of revolution against Stalinism finds Nehru as alien to it as is any other one of the little men who rule the nations of the world.

from the N. Y. Times' Drew Middleton, writing from London (Oct. 25):

"Those studying how the U. S. and Britain can best exploit the ferment in Eastern Europe suggest that now may be the time to remove the fear of Germany's future ambitions.

"The presence of a powerful West German state and the prospect of its eventual unity with East Germany must force many Poles to look eastward to the Soviet Union for protection, it is said. This is especially true of those Poles who live in the Oder-Neisse territories taken from Germany after World War II.

"There is opportunity, it is suggested, for frank and forceful avowal of West Germany's peaceful aims..."

So in this anti-climactic conclusion, Middleton squeezes out the suggestion that Bonn ought to establish diplomatic relations with the satellites and offer "assurances" of German good will."

"ASSURANCES"?

Wonderful conclusion! The fear of Germany is going to be removed by "assurances" and "avowals" by a government which is notorious for infiltration by neo-Nazis and ex-Nazis, which is the leading exponent on the continent of keeping U. S. troops facing east, which was bitterly complaining only the other day against alleged Washington intentions just to reduce these troops (the same troops Gomulka pointed to); assurances and avowals by the same Adenauer who, the other day, was actually put out because a Social-Democratic leader was proposing that West German labor attempt to establish better contacts with East German workers (as we mentioned in LA Oct. 15).

What would inspire the revolution which is the "death trap" for Stalinism—another NATO division on the Rhine or a bigger majority for this Adenauer who is the State Department's pet German; or rather, say, the assumption of power by a Social-Democratic Party which would consistently follow a militant socialist course through an independent foreign policy and anti-capitalist program in action?

Which would hearten the workers and students who are giving their lives for the aim of socialist freedom on the Budapest barricades? Which would add fuel to the flames in Wroclaw, in Poznan, at the Zeran factory in Warsaw? Which would make it harder for the new combines to stabilize new Stalinist regimes in Hungary and Poland?

"U. S." IS A SMEAR

One day after the Gomulka speech referred to above, Moscow faced a similar problem: how to break an unsavory piece of news to the Russian people. For the first time the Russian radio told its listeners that the Kremlin's troops were shooting down Hungarian workers in Hungary. What did its propagandists have handy to wash this pill down?

Nothing, really; but still they had to ask themselves, what lie would serve best to discredit the Hungarian revolutionists if it were believed?

The answer—their stock answer—casts its light on claims for pro-West sentiment behind the Iron Curtain. The most discreditable smear that the Russian liars could invent was the claim that the Hungarian rebels were bought by U. S. dollars and instigated by CIA agents.

This is what the Moscow radio gave out, also repeated by the Russian phonograph sitting on the UN Security Council in the ensuing debate.

One can imagine that a stunning propaganda impact can not be ascribed to Dulles' subsequent offer to provide American economic aid to governments freeing themselves from Russian control!

The American dollar cannot buy a revolution.

All the billion-dollar hardware of American military might, with its world-destroying super-bombs and fleets in all the oceans and military bases circling the planet—all this is only an enemy in the eyes of the giant force that rises before the eyes of the world as the "death trap" for Stalinism and the spark for a revolution that would tend to spread further than the precincts of the Iron Curtain—as Walter Lippman frankly admits that he fears.

This revolution against Stalinism will take heart, and take deep root, insofar as socialist movements in the West cancel out the capitalist and Western im-

(Continued on page 6)

Youth in the Hungarian Revolution: How Stalinism Creates Its Gravediggers

By MAX MARTIN

All who have reported and discussed the Polish and Hungarian revolutions have marked the special and important role played by students and young workers. The university youth in particular have been and are to this hour one of the three forces leading the struggle against Russian domination, and beyond that against Stalinism, in Hungary; the other two being the workers and the soldiers.

Not that the students could by themselves conduct the revolution or even be the decisive force in the constellation of groups participating in this popular upheaval which embraces all strata of the Hungarian people. To play this role requires those characteristics which the working-class possesses, as the Hungarian events demonstrate again for the benefit of those cynics who have come in recent years to scoff at the idea of revolutionary working-class action to liberate society. Indeed, the Hungarian and Polish students have themselves shown a high degree of consciousness of the importance of the workers in the revolution, as will be pointed out below.

But nobody can deny that the students have been a vital factor in the revolts of the Polish and Hungarian peoples against their oppressors.

STUDENT CENTERS

In Poland they have been in the vanguard in rallying support against Moscow, and in expressing demands which go beyond Gomulka's program, in calling for a political program of genuine democracy. As LABOR ACTION recounted last week, the Polish student periodical *Po Prostu* had taken the lead in formulating democratic demands in the months leading up to the turbulent events of the last ten days.

The same is true for Hungary. Much of the pro-democratic stirring that has occurred in this country since the 20th Congress has been centered in the Petofti Youth Club in Budapest, a branch of the Stalinist youth organization, the Union of Working Youth (DISZ). Moreover, the revolution began with demonstrations by Budapest students, first in solidarity with the Polish students and workers, and then to make similar demands for Hungary.

In the days that followed, the Hungarian students played an important part in formulating the program of the struggle, in pushing beyond the first demand for the ouster of Russian troops. It was they who began to call for free elections, for "a secret general election with more than one party," for doing away with Stalinism completely.

Nor have the students stopped at providing the ideology for the revolt, they have participated in the fighting and dying for this ideology. The reports from Budapest during the last few days indicate that the students are in the forefront of those who are not ready to trust Nagy and who are continuing the rebellion.

PUZZLE

This phenomena has puzzled many analysts and commentators; it has been a subject of some discussion in the press. In the N. Y. Times of October 28, James Reston pointed out that the Hungarian revolt "was being led by the new generation, which was supposed to be loyal to Communism if not sympathetic to Russian imperialism." And that—

"It had been generally assumed in official quarters here that, once the Soviet Army had presided over the organi-

zation of Communist states in Eastern Europe for a decade, the youth of these countries would be so indoctrinated in Communism that hopes for anything more than a Titoist association of semi-independent Communist states in that part of the world would be in vain."

On October 27 the Times Russian specialist Harry Schwartz devoted a whole column to this question. He formulated the problem about the participation of university students, high-school students and young workers in the events in Hungary this way:

"At first sight these and similar phenomena would appear to be astonishing. Young persons, now 18 or 20 years old, were 7 or 9 years old when the Communists took over their country. For more than a decade they have been regimented in Communist youth organizations, drenched with Communist propaganda in school and through every medium of information, and barred from access to foreign nations' broadcasts, books, newspapers, or other sources of disturbing ideas.

"Westerners who have visited these countries in recent years have usually come away convinced that the young people were being hopelessly lost to communism. The young people had no memories of any democratic society. How could such a generation become the revolutionary force it has become in Poland and Hungary?"

NOT ONLY YOUTH

One point in passing: if young people "had no memories of any democratic society," is this supposed to imply that the previous generation did live under democracy? Schwartz seems to be forgetting or ignoring that the Horthy regime, which ruled Hungary for almost the entire period between the two wars, was as authoritarian, bloodthirsty and dictatorial a regime as any short of a completely fascist one. So Schwartz might as well have asked how the Hungarian people as a whole could rebel.

There is another reason one can say that the bewilderment about the role of the Polish and Hungarian youth is a special case of a general bewilderment over how a people can rise up against Stalinism. There has grown up in the capitalist world a feeling, one from which some socialists and many ex-socialists have not been immune, that the triumph of Stalinism means The End; that those under its heel cannot revolt against it; that it is an invincible system, the wave of the future; and that all political and social factors present in non-Stalinist society disappear under it.

THE ARENDT ERROR

One "sophisticated" version of this view, usually associated with Hannah Arendt, has it that under totalitarianism total atomization of the people takes place, that all social classes either disappear or become irrelevant, that social factors operating in non-totalitarian societies are non-existent in totalitarian ones. There is only a structureless mass of atomized, de-classed, isolated and ir-

rational individuals, molded eternally into a pattern of conformity to the totalitarian structure. Revolution against totalitarianism, struggle for democracy and socialism cannot be expected from such "atoms."

But it is precisely the wrongness of such views that the current Polish and Hungarian revolutions prove, as East Berlin in 1953 also did on a more limited scale. Not merely because the revolutions occurred, but because of by whom they were made and how they took place.

In the Hungarian developments we see a triumvirate of social forces, the students, workers and soldiers, each acting as a socially organized element, responding to the needs of its members as well as those of the country as a whole. They were able to cooperate with each other, to coordinate their actions, and to behave as the socialist and Marxist analysis of society indicates, and not as Arendt predicts.

That is why these events have such a familiar ring to them; why they remind observers of previous socialist and democratic revolutions, including the Russian Revolution.

"IRONICALLY . . ."

Schwartz answers the question he poses about the youth by stating that it is "still obscure" but that some elements are visible. He then proceeds to list these elements, among them: the influence of the family, the role of religion, the passing down of knowledge about "earlier and better years" and national pride from parents, etc. We have already dealt with the "earlier and better years" theme, and some of the other reasons, like the role of religion, do not appear to have been present in any visible form.

But Schwartz does touch upon another factor which is, properly understood, a key to the answer about the role of the youth. He puts it this way:

"Ironically, the Marxist-Leninist education of these young people also played a role. Their Communist textbooks lauded revolutionaries. They painted an idealistic picture of the utopian future when all men would be equal and when there would be abundance for all. Young people in Eastern Europe had merely to look around them in their daily life to see the gross inequality prevailing, the poverty and misery of the people, the contrast between the ideal and the real.

"Similarly, the vast educational expansion in Eastern Europe woke the young people to strange ideas. As part of the Russification program they were introduced to the writings of the Russian revolutionary and humanitarian writers of the nineteenth century: Pushkin, Herzen, Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky. These authors had glorified the struggle for freedom."

STALINISM'S APPEAL

With these lines Schwartz, without fully realizing it, points to the heart of Stalinism's appeal, and likewise to its Achilles heel, not merely among students but among workers and all others also.

Stalinism throughout the world wins support precisely because it is an anti-capitalist movement, because it fights against capitalism and against feudal remnants. It attracts, in the countries where capitalism or feudalism reign, all those who despise the old system and wish to be done with it forever. And when it came to power in Eastern Europe it attracted the sincere and idealistic devotion of thousands and thousands

of young people (and older ones, too)—students, intellectuals, workers, etc. just because it repudiated the old social order, and not because of some hypnotic totalitarian invincibility. (This, of course, makes the "memories of better days" explanation such nonsense; the anti-Stalinism exists because Stalinism did not replace the old order with socialist freedom, having replaced it instead with a new oppressive system.)

THE ENEMY TEACHES

But Stalinism is not merely anti-capitalist. It does something else as well.

Because the Stalinist counter-revolution emerged out of the degeneration of a socialist revolution, and because Stalinism must operate in the labor movement in its campaign to overthrow capitalism, it garbs itself in an ideology which claims to be that of socialism and freedom, it parades itself as "Marxist" and "Leninist," it presents itself as the heir and continuator of 1917. The "Marxism-Leninism" which it teaches and in whose name it invokes support is a perversion, of course, of the ideas of Marx and Lenin, but underlying the perversion is a pointer to the original; because Stalinism is anti-capitalist, and because the mask would be seen through otherwise.

Here enters Schwartz's point about Communist textbooks lauding revolutionaries and painting a picture of equality and abundance. Workers under Stalinism sooner or later learn the reality of the new society which is being created, find that a new exploitation and oppression have been created, that new chains have been forged for them. They learn this in their daily lives, from the conditions in their factories, from their wretched housing, from the absence of food, and from their comparison of their lot with that of the Stalinist bureaucrats who rule over them. They learn it the way they originally learned to hate capitalist society.

And in Stalinland the workers are pointed toward an ideology, which exists in perverted form to be sure, by the Stalinist ruling class itself, in the terms discussed by Schwartz.

WHY THEY REBEL

What is true of the workers applies also, with some differences, to the students. First on the differences, since the students do not face the same situation as the workers:

Indeed, it may be argued that there seems to be no reason for the students to revolt against Stalinism, since they, or large portions of them, are being trained to become the Stalinist ruling class in their countries, they are being trained for recruitment to the ruling class itself. (It must be remembered that in the satellites a "finished" bureaucratic-collectivist class does not yet exist; one is being created, just as it had to be in Russia during the middle and late twenties.)

And thus it may be argued that some of the students are not for an end to Stalinism, but only for an end to national oppression by Russia, only for an independent, Titoist "national-Stalinism" in which they can be the sole masters in their country. It may be so with some, but all indications are that it is not so with most, for it is the students who, as we have pointed out, express the most far-reaching demands for democracy and an end to all Stalinism.

(Continued on page 6)

UN and Hungary: Look Who's Complaining!

By HAL DRAPER

The Hungarian Revolution put on the spot not only the Russian regime whose troops are trying to suppress it and not only the Hungarian Stalinists who are collaborating with the Russians, but also the Western powers.

The West repeated its reaction to the East German uprising of June 1953, which *LA* documented at that time: *the reaction of fear of the same revolution that was frightening the Russians against whom it was directed.* The reaction has been as much more intense this time as the Hungarian Revolution has been more cataclysmic than the East German action.

This has not stopped Eisenhower and Dulles from extracting some electioneering out of it all; nor has it stopped Stevenson from denouncing the administration for being caught by surprise (as if he wasn't or as if he had the slightest idea of what to do about it); nor did it stop the Big Three from making a grandstand play before the world by bringing the matter up at the UN Security Council.

The picture of these powers bringing their complaint on Hungary to the UN offers us a short summary of the scope of imperialist cynicism. Actually all they did was put the issue on the agenda without offering any resolution or proposal or even setting a date to offer one.

Everybody is aware of the piquancy of the situation when Britain, France and the U.S. mutter about condemning Russia for using its troops against the Hungarian people. On the 27th a Times dispatch from Washington put it pretty bluntly:

"The view of the State Department is

that there is little doubt that the [Russian] troops have a right to be there. But a question might be raised about the legitimacy of their use to put down an internal rebellion.

"Even this raises a problem, however. The Soviet troops are being used at the request of the Hungarian government. There is little effort in Washington to deny that United States forces abroad could be used in the same way if there were a Communist-led revolution in, say, Italy.

"In 1944 and 1945, for example, British troops, at the request of the Athens government, fought Communist rebels in Greece.

"Furthermore, any possible UN approach is at the moment clouded by French threats to use force in Morocco and Tunisia to protect Europeans there."

One really doesn't have to go back all the way to Greece. Within 48 hours of this UN farce, France and Britain were announcing, in a triple play connected with Israel's attack on Egypt, that they were going to take over the Suez Canal with their troops—naturally, to "keep the peace."

Britain's Pierson Dixon told the Security Council: "Nothing can hide the fact that foreign troops have intervened on a massive scale in Hungary. . . . Our

hearts bleed for the sufferings of the Hungarian people in its struggle for freedom."

SYMMETRICAL PATTERN

Only 48 hours before Sir Pierson's gentle heart was bleeding at this session, British troops in Singapore—a Chinese city in which the British are foreign imperialist occupiers—were shooting down and killing Chinese demonstrators. As the irony of history would have it, these demonstrators were led by a rally of students, as in Budapest. Troops in full battle kit stood with fixed bayonets behind barbed wire. There were barricades in the streets, as in Budapest.

As in Budapest, where the Stalinist liars began by calling the rebels "tools of reaction" and other smear-names, so in Singapore the imperialist press (echoed in the *N. Y. Times*) called the Peoples Action Party of Singapore "Communist" to justify the bloodletting. This is a falsehood.

Rarely does life present us with such pat symmetries!

At the UN farce, France's Cornu-Gentile spoke his piece about Hungary: "By no means does France, finally, wish to encourage rebels, whoever they are, to pursue ideological aims contrary to those of their country and people, but she does maintain that the internal affairs of every country should be settled by that country alone."

In this balanced sentence, the representative of French civilization was thinking first of all of his civilizing mission in Algeria, where his troops are engaged in shooting down and massacring a whole people united against them as

MORE NEXT WEEK

Articles on Hungary and Poland scheduled for next week or following issues include: The End of the "Democratization" Myth; Tito's Role Against the Revolution; Why Western Leaders Fear the Hungarian Revolution; Who is Gomulka?—and many others.

solidly as the Hungarians against the Russians.

Paris does not even have a roomful of collaborators like the Nagy-Kadar team to front for it in Algeria. Moreover, nothing that has yet been charged to the Russian troops' activities in Hungary approaches the atrocities documented for French troops against the Algerian people, from wholesale massacre to systematic torture.

POT AND KETTLE

The pot-and-kettle comedy was played out in chambers other than the UN's, too. In the Italian Chamber of Deputies—

"The neo-Fascists kept shouting, 'You haven't the courage to dissociate yourselves from the murderers of Polish and Hungarian workers.'

"The Communists retorted: 'You've murdered thousands of Italian workers.'"
(*N. Y. Times*, Oct. 27.)

The skit had been played out in the French Chamber the day before:

"The policy in North Africa of Premier Guy Mollet won a 330-to-140 vote of the Assembly tonight after his supporters drowned out Communist demands for an immediate cease-fire in Algeria with cries of 'what about Hungary?' and 'Long live Poland!'"
(*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, Oct. 26.)

And in the U.S. the demand that Washington "press for free elections in Poland" came from no other than that fighter for democracy, James O. Eastland.

Stalinism's Gravediggers — —

(Continued from page 5)

How then explain this?

There is one aspect which applies to young people and students in all class society, which explains why in radical periods in capitalist countries the student sons and daughters of non-working-class parents and intellectuals become radicals. This has to do with the general rebelliousness of youth, and with the special circumstances of life of students and intellectuals: their concern with ideas and ideology, their interest in society as a whole, their coming face to face in the intellectual realm with problems which they do not personally feel as members of a social class.

IDEALISTIC DRIVE

This, however, is a general aspect. There is a specific one present in Stalinism.

Today's students in Hungary, who perhaps would have been tomorrow's bureaucrats, are not appealed to, and cannot be appealed to, on the basis: Get yourself an education and you will lead a luxurious life as a manager or government functionary. They are appealed to, at least in part, on an idealistic basis: Help build a new and better life for our people, get an education and help build socialism, and the like of that.

The Stalinist ruling class in Russia was created on a similar idealistic appeal, again, in part, in the 1920s and '30s. The Russian students who responded to such an appeal then may have ultimately become smug and satisfied ruling bureaucrats, and they form part of today's ruling class in Russia—but this development came later. One has only to recall the great popularity which Trotsky and the Left Opposition enjoyed among the university youth of Russia in the mid-twenties for confirmation of this point.

And so today the Hungarian students are idealistic young people who really desire a better life, who really want socialist freedom. It is for these reasons that they joined the Communist Party and the Stalinist youth organization DISZ, and it is for these reasons that the students of Szeged University left it last week and organized a new independent group. This is why the Polish student paper "Po-

Prostu" played the role it did, and the Hungarian "Szabad Ifjusag" likewise.

This is why one E. Lasota, reporting to the Warsaw Polytechnic University on October 20 about the meeting between Gomulka and a student delegation of which he was a member, as reported by the Polish radio, stated:

"At the same time we expressed in behalf of the delegation, and of all delegations in the hall, our profound disquiet at certain facts which have occurred lately. Above all we have expressed our disquiet at the fact that groups and persons, which since the Third Plenum were retarding the process of democratization and merely wanted to grant certain limited privileges to the nation, those groups or persons have not stopped their activity.

"In this connection we said that the Warsaw student youth, that Warsaw workers, are disquieted by this situation and that they will not remain passive but want to unite so that all the forces of Stalinism, all the old forces are finally eradicated." (Emphasis added.)

It is not too difficult to imagine what the sections of Lasota's report which were not summarized by the Warsaw radio sounded like. And therefore it is not really surprising that the Polish and Hungarian students have acted as they did in the great democratic upsurge which has taken place in these countries. Nor that the first signs of a development in Rumania took place among university students at Bucharest and Cluj. Nor the demonstrations by Czechoslovakian students last spring. Nor the stirrings right now at Humboldt University in East Germany.

GUNS WERE TURNED

Stalinism itself, therefore, provides in distorted form, the ideology of anti-Stalinism to the people under its sway, the students included. But it provides more than that, it educates in terms of political strategy and tactics, in terms of organizational know-how.

An AP dispatch printed in the *N. Y. Post* on October 30 reported on a 13-year-old child who had participated in the fighting, one Michael Misi. The child explained:

"Well, you see, we were going to play with the others when a car with a flag on

it came by. The young gentlemen in it were shouting that anybody who wanted to fight for a free Hungary should join. So we did—who wouldn't? I got a sub-machine gun at first but Lajas, who already is 16, took it away and I was very angry. Then I got only a rifle, which I did not like so much."

But how did he know how to shoot a rifle?

"All us kids were trained in the party."

But it is not merely how to fire weapons that Hungarian youth learned in the Stalinist organizations. In last week's *Labor Action* there was reported the fact that one of the first things the students of Budapest University did after formulating demands to the government was to send delegations to all the factories to explain their program to the young workers and to work out coordination with them.

GRAVEDIGGERS

Now one has to merely think about American students for a moment to understand this point. Would American students immediately think of trying to cement an alliance with the workers, when engaged in some action? Not unless there had been a socialist organization which had educated them on an orientation toward the working class, toward the labor movement. But there is no socialist organization at Budapest University. Nevertheless, this was the students' orientation; for it was Stalinism, the enemy whom they were fighting, that educated them on this question.

This then, is a positive contribution which Stalinism makes toward its own overthrow.

Stalinism like capitalism creates its own gravediggers socially by creating a modern working class, concentrating it in large factories and making the conditions of this class's life intolerable in the long run. Stalinism also creates its own gravediggers ideologically, through the perverted and distorted version of "Marxism-Leninism" with which it imbues its adherents and educates the people in those countries it rules.

This is an important part of the reason why the students of Poland and Hungary have been able to write the magnificent chapter they have just begun.

Vs. NATO—

(Continued from page 4)

perialist threats to freedom and peace which are the Stalinists' ace-in-the-hole against the people who raise guns at their back.

The Hungarian people, facing Russian tanks and cannon, asked the British and Americans for weapons to shoot back with. They will not get such help from the Western camp. We as socialists do not advocate that the Western governments intervene militarily in any case; on the contrary. But the NATO camp knows and can know only such military means of intervening.

The socialist movement can intervene—through its own struggle.

Just as the new era of revolution against Stalinism frees socialists in the West of the dead-weight of all the fears spread by deserters and renegades who have cried that we must support the Western military camp as the insurance against world Stalinist conquest—so also every socialist advance and victory in the West frees the people of the Stalinist empire from the fear that if they turn against their masters it is the old regime of capitalism and outlived reaction that will benefit.

The revolution for socialist freedom on both sides of the Iron Curtain is of one piece. It is the Third Camp. It is the only genuine ally of the Hungarian and Polish revolution. It is the only realistic and practical force that is now pushing the danger of World War III into the distance, in proportion to its rise. It is the living dynamic of the new era which can abolish the threat of war altogether, along with the outlived rival systems of capitalism and Stalinism.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

Socialist Unity and the SP

Readers of LABOR ACTION will recall from reports which appeared in it on the June convention of the Socialist Party that at one of the sessions of that convention a motion was introduced proposing unity between the SP and the ISL and other socialist groups.

At that time, and following the convention the ISL indicated a favorable attitude toward the proposal and has so commented on several other occasions as, for example, in its statement on the elections.

Since then the Political Committee of the ISL has conducted a rather full discussion of the matter in order to express its views more fully and to reply to the many inquiries received on what the ISL's position is on such unity. The Political Committee adopted a unanimous resolution on the question which it believes states its views on unity. We are publishing the resolution below, so that our friends, sympathizers and readers may become acquainted with these views.

ALBERT GATES
Secretary, ISL

(1) We welcome the initiative taken by left-wing comrades in the Socialist Party in proposing to explore the possibility of unity between the Socialist Party and the ISL and other socialist groups.

(2) We are for such unity, as a step toward revitalizing a militant socialist movement in this country against both capitalism and Stalinism.

(3) We are ready at any time to enter into discussion with representatives of the Socialist Party to explore the possibilities of such unity, without laying down any conditions in advance of such

discussion, programmatic or organizational. We think that every opportunity should be taken, both by the comrades of the Socialist Party and our own, to explore such possibilities, and to mutually clarify our respective points of view with each other. Our attitude in favor of unity is not conditioned on any change in the program or leadership in the SP; what we have in view is not unification exclusively with the left wing or any other single section of the SP. We are in favor of uniting with the SP as a whole as it is now.

(4) The socialist unity we stand for is intended to further a lasting regroupment of socialist forces, and must be the antithesis of any kind of "raid" by one socialist group or another. We are for such an organizational merger as promises to lead to a stable and lasting coexistence of the merged forces on a healthy and mutually agreed basis; it is this whose possibilities we want to explore. While we would want the most favorable possible unity from our point of view, we do not condition our attitude on securing it.

(5) This statement is, therefore, not put forward as a temporary or conjunctural expedient, but as a statement of continuing policy for the Independent Socialist movement, to make clear that among the tenets of Independent Socialism is also this one: that we stand for socialist unity. Short of unity, or until it may become possible, we stand, by the same token, for a maximum in amicable and cooperative relations with the SP, in spite of or above and beyond our legitimate political differences and argumentation, and we favor measures which will contribute to such amicable and cooperative relations for the future.

DISPATCH FROM DUBLIN

Discontent Bubbling in Dublin

By M. M.

Dublin, Oct. 7

The Provisional United Organization of the two trade-union congresses (in the process of merging) has in recent weeks been reluctantly forced into the open to call a halt to the deflationary policies of the Labor-supported coalition government. These policies have been creating widespread unemployment. The united leadership's hand was forced by an irate membership given a lead by the 80,000-strong Dublin Trades Union Council.

Playing possum for two and a half years the upper crust of the two congresses have for their silence been on the receiving end of the political-patronage queue, while their members were being funged out of employment and forced to emigrate in tens of thousands to Britain. The most odious and vicious anti-working-class measures of the Labor ministers in the coalition could not induce the boys in clover to utter a peep. Silence is golden.

Now the wrath of members and local leaders who see the looming economic storm that will shatter their domestic fortunes has exploded in the august precincts of PUO headquarters. Binks, last year's PUO president, politely admonished the two governments in the country (Dublin and Belfast, to show no favoritism) on their lack of sensitivity for workers' needs. One can expect a lack of sensitivity from the archaic Tory Unionist regime in Belfast; but when among the Dublin ministers are ex-TUC presidents, whose governmental policies are less humane than the doubledyed Tories in Belfast, why the attempt to whitewash them?

Binks referred to the crisis at all because the Dublin TUC had issued a call for demonstrations and protest meetings to head off further measures being contem-

plated to dismiss workers from public and government services being contemplated to dismiss workers from public and government services. The Council further demanded that the national trade-union centers, in line with long-standing policy decisions, move against the government and put the squeeze on the Labor ministers, or break with them completely.

Larkin, a member of the PUO and a Labor deputy to boot, sensing the mood of the ranks, came out at a Regional Labor Party Conference with a sharp attack on the government, including its Labor contingent, to head off the harmless speculation of the rank-and-file movement for militant action. This is Larkin's Stalinist training being applied against the left. He has been a consistent and demagogic supporter of the coalition and it was he who laid down the blueprint for Labor's participation in the present government at the 1953 Labor Party conference paving the way for the right-wing leadership (Norton & Co.) to lash the small socialist opposition.

In preserving this government setup, he has used his trade-union position to head off and damp down any militant anti-government movement. Now threatened with the loss of his parliamentary sinecure he publicly criticizes what he privately upholds and created and what he voted to continue at the jamboree which the cabinet convened to bolster their trembling fortunes in the face of trade-unionist revolt.

To help sustain the rank-and-file revolt, the Dublin Trades Council is sponsoring a mass protest meeting on the eve of the autumn reassembly of Parliament. On the other hand the TUC has convened—so the story goes—two special conferences for both parts of the country to discuss the situation—this only in the face of clamor from its unemployed and emigrating members, and perhaps too late to avoid complete breakdown in living standards.

It is indeed time for the Irish trade-union movement to reorient its political thinking and put socialism on the agenda. When Irish workers cease to be pariahs in their own land, they will also cease to be a threat to the living standards of the English brethren who have placed the struggle for socialism as a top priority on their political list.

BOOKS AND IDEAS

Bowdlerized Labor History

Union House, Union Bar: The History of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, AFL-CIO, by Matthew Josephson.—Random House, 1956, 369 pages, \$5.

By BEN HALL

When the hotel and restaurant union was chartered by the AFL in 1891, it numbered only a few thousand; in 1956, its 400,000 members put it among the top ten labor organizations in the country. This is the story of its growth, in crisis, struggle and change.

As a straight factual account, this history is highly informative and illuminating. Although the author was commissioned by the union's 1953 convention to undertake the job, and in that sense he writes an "official" history, his work is far superior to the average accredited and duly accepted product.

He tries to maintain a studious objectivity; he expresses a continuing admiration for those thousands of men and women, exploited, tired, hot and sweaty, who fought their way up to a measure of human dignity through their union.

But he gives more than facts and sympathy; he has a point of view, one which corresponds almost exactly with the outlook of today's more socially conscious union leader: for industrial unionism; political activity within the limits of bourgeois politics; for democracy in general but for limitations on the rights of Communists in the unions; non-socialist, taking capitalism for granted, but always critical of big business.

As he presents it, such is the union today, just as is the American labor movement. But it was not always so.

In the hotel and allied trades there was once a strong socialist spirit; in the AFL union there was a significant socialist trend. How to account for it, how to describe its evolution and decline?

Here the author's objectivity fails him. In his view the past dovetails neatly into the present in one smooth logical process. He sees the union evolve in struggle from dependence upon a narrow section of bartenders and skilled cooks into a modern industrial union based upon the mass of sweated workers; unionism, just as it is today, appears as the culmination and completion of the story. In that lies the whole content of its past and of all its inner turmoil.

At significant points, however, his account breaks down and his point of view serves no longer to illuminate but only to becloud. The policies accepted so unambiguously by labor today were not always acclaimed by progressive unionists. Were they wrong then? Are they wrong now? And why?

A CLOUD FALLS

Such questions are not even touched upon, although they should arise in the minds of thinking unionists as they read this book.

Just two examples:

•At one time, the top union leadership rejected every proposal to limit the rights of Communists in the union and stoutly defended the unlimited democratic rights of all. Later it modified its position to impose restrictions upon them. The author records both policies in the same matter-of-fact uncritical spirit.

•In passing, we learn that Hugo Ernst (president of the union at his death in 1954) had run for Congress on the Socialist ticket in 1922. We note, in a fleeting phrase, that he opposed support to Roosevelt in 1932. Some 140 pages later, as though it were the most natural transition imaginable, we discover he supported Roosevelt in 1940. Why? How? What? Here falls a cloud.

Socialism, once a strong current within the labor movement, is today a negligible factor. Socialists played a decisive role in the development of the hotel union. Author Josephson seems embarrassed by this fact; yet some of the main heroes of his story, those for example who made the critical turn to industrial unionism possible, were socialists.

But whenever he reaches this turn of the story, his writing becomes murky and

strained, as though the plain facts were a bit off-color.

On page 68 we learn (always in passing) that Jere Sullivan, union secretary in the early 1900s who blocked the path to industrial unionism and union growth, "kept a sharp eye out for socialists."

A rank-and-file leader, John Bookjans, who later became editor of the union paper, is a prominent and admired figure. We learn on page 102 (in passing, of course) that another union official said to him "Bookjans, you would be a fine fellow if only you weren't so much of a socialist!"

Was he a socialist or not? Josephson never tells us! Even the index is cagey. It lists Bookjans, "alleged socialist activities."

Later we are informed that boss Sullivan criticized all industrial unionists as "socialists." Were they? The author won't tell us; he turns enigmatically to a description of the influence of socialism in general in 1912 and continues abruptly to a discussion of Bookjans' campaign for industrial unionism (1914).

And the man who led the way in getting rid of Sullivan and opening the road to industrial unionism was Hugo Ernst who, as the author let slip, once ran on the socialist ticket. Was he one of those "socialists?" The reply is vague: in 1923 he "had his own philosophy of labor, at any rate a more liberal and progressive one than that of the International's leaders."

Even the three sentences that mention his candidacy on the Socialist ticket are careful to point out, "There was no Democrat in the race."

Josephson is painfully careful that the Ernst of 1922 be absolved from violating the AFL-CIO line of 1956!

If we want full value for our money, we must read between the lines of *Union House, Union Bar*; diligent research is seriously marred by subjecting the history of sixty years to the censorship of 1956.

FOR A SOCIALIST PROTEST VOTE

VOTE SOCIALIST! To cast a socialist protest vote, Labor Action recommends a vote for the following Socialist Party candidates:

Write in Darlington Hoopes and Samuel H. Friedman for president and vice-president.

In Illinois, write in Kellam Foster for governor, Donald R. Anderson for lieutenant-governor.

In New York State, write in Joseph G. Glass for senator. And vote for independent Liberal Party candidates, not on other party tickets.



LABOR ACTION

November 5, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 45

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

Don't miss a single week of
LABOR ACTION
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

LONDON LETTER

Britain and European Unity

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Oct. 25

The proposals for a European free-trade area, now being widely canvassed in political and business circles here, appear to have caught British Labor leaders napping. In sharp contrast to the active propaganda of the Tory government and its friends the newspaper owners, Labor so far remains officially noncommittal and largely silent.

The only Labor leader of any consequence to make a public statement on the proposals to date has been Aneurin Bevan; and his contribution was more of an aside than a general pronouncement on the fundamental principle involved.

Speaking at a meeting in Bristol five days ago, Bevan said rather scathingly that he thought too much fuss was being made about "this small idea of a common market in Europe." Britain's gain would be greater, he suggested, if it threw aside the present embargoes on "East-West" trade.

The press was quick to note that Bevan's statement did not really come to grips with the issues involved, and the *Manchester Guardian* pointed to the fact that "Mr. Bevan was careful not to say he was against British participation in a European free-trade area." It also said that he had omitted to explain why he thought the proposed free-trade area should necessarily conflict with increased trade with the "Communist countries."

A couple of days after Bevan's speech the interest of British trade unions in the subject became apparent when members of the economic committee of the Trades Union Congress went to the Treasury for talks on the matter with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the President of the Board of Trade.

As yet no official report is available on what passed between the two sides, but it is generally believed that most of the two-hour talk was taken up by explanations from government spokesmen on how the proposed free-trade area would affect Britain's economy.

LABOR DUBIOUS

Yesterday the TCU General Council held its normal monthly meeting at which it decided to seek a special meeting with members of the Labor Party Executive Committee and Parliamentary Labor Party in order to discuss the government's attitude and to try to establish a common policy for both the TCU and the Labor Party. This is taken to indicate that the trade unions regard the matter of great importance and one upon which the whole Labor movement should speak with a single voice.

Insofar as can be determined, a number of union leaders at yesterday's TCU meeting expressed doubts about Britain's participation in the contemplated European free-trade area. The biggest doubts were expressed by union leaders from the heavy industries who posed the question whether such participation would depress British wages to the lower levels now prevailing on the Continent.

An official announcement of the TCU's attitude may be forthcoming after a special meeting of the General Council which has been called for November 2. By this time the TCU hopes to have had its discussions with the Labor Party leadership.

In previous considerations of the subject of "European economic integration"—as it is generally designated over here—the Labor Party has placed a great degree of emphasis on how far this would involve loss of control over domestic policies by the British government. Perhaps

the greatest point, insofar as the Labor leadership is concerned, is the limitations which would be placed upon a British government in the use of import restrictions, a method of direct control much favored by the Labor Party to avoid a trade deficit and to manage the balance-of-payments problem.

At rank-and-file level in the Labor Party, objection to economic integration with Europe in present circumstances usually centers around the fact that it would endanger full employment in Britain and would hamper efforts to secure the redistribution of income and property here. This appears to have found expression at yesterday's TUC meeting when some union leaders are said to have pointed out that a European free market presupposed common economic policies; and this would tie the hands of any future Labor government and might well hinder any program which contemplated an extension of public ownership of industry.

This question of Britain's nationalized industries is said to have been featured when the TCU leaders held their talks with government spokesmen earlier in the week. Backstairs gossip has it that one of the points raised by the TCU was the effect which participation in a European free market would have upon the price of British coal.

In spite of the fact that British miners are the best paid in Europe and that \$987 million worth of new capital equipment has been installed in the mines during the past seven years, the coal dug from Britain's nationalized mines is the cheapest in Europe. This gives the whole of British industry an advantage over the remainder of Europe. In a free-trade area this advantage would disappear, for it has always been stated that in such a market British coal prices would have to rise to the higher level of the area.

British trade-unionists, naturally, do not like this idea. It would mean a general increase in the transport and manufacturing costs of British industry and a consequent rise in living cost for workers as prices rose. In addition, prices of British goods sold overseas would increase, the balance-of-payments position would become more difficult, and employment prospects more uncertain.

JOB FOR THE LEFT

It appears however, that the government spokesmen assured the TUC leaders that British membership in the contemplated free-trade area would not mean an increase in the price of coal sold at home. If this assurance was given, and really meant, it proves that even the Tory government realizes that a European free-trade market would have to exclude certain items, such as coal. In this case it would not be a "free market" and thus capitalism would once again be caught up in its own contradictions.

Although the Tory party in general is in favor of Britain's participation in a European free-trade area, there are opponents of the idea within its ranks. Most influential of these opponents is probably Lord Beaverbrook, boss of Britain's second largest daily newspaper and outspoken believer in strengthening "Commonwealth bonds." It is this insistence that "the Empire comes first" which leads Beaverbrook and a section of the Tory party to view the idea of any ties with Europe with great suspicion.

So far no section of the Labor Party left has attempted to analyze the current plans for "free trade," either on a broad theoretical basis or in terms of immediate economic consequences for both Britain and Europe. However, there is a current of opinion within the Labor Party which has never ceased to advance the idea of a United States of Socialist Europe whenever it seemed pertinent to a current problem. The present state of propaganda for "European unity" by the bourgeoisie presents an admirable opportunity for such people of the Labor left to explain what this means from the viewpoint of an international socialist.

LABOR SCOPE**LONG-TERM CONTRACTS ARE IN BAD ODOR NOW**

By BEN HALL

A favorite token of labor-management cooperation, for those who predict a long period of classless labor "peace," is the long-term contract. We remind our readers that the United Auto Workers at its last national convention repudiated long contracts and in its last negotiations reduced the term of auto agreements from five to three years.

Now comes an official report from the Research Department of the AFL-CIO on "Duration of Agreements" published in the September issue of its periodical *Collective Bargaining Reports*.

The AFL-CIO is uneasy at the trend to increase the length of contracts. "Agreements for more than a year," reports the Research Department, "have been favored mostly by management." And the union should not accept them, at least not unless it gets plenty in return. "A long-term agreement is a very substantial union concession and must not be sold cheaply."

The Bureau of Labor Statistics and the National Industrial Conference Board surveyed thousands of recent union contracts and concluded that an impressive number were written for three years or more, almost 25 per cent. But the AFL calls this view "incomplete," pointing out that many long-term agreements allow periodic reopenings to take up wages and conditions and permit strikes in the event of a deadlock.

In substance, the AFL is not enthusiastic over long contracts. It reports, with obvious approval, a statement of the Newspaper Guild:

"The trend toward contracts covering periods of more than a year is alarming... this trend must be reversed. Great caution must be exercised in the entertaining of any management proposals for contracts for longer than a year. To negotiate a contract every year may be tough. But not to negotiate every year

may mean gradual death by hardening of the union arteries."

Under the headline "This Is the Price Labor Pays to Back Stevenson and the Democratic Party" (*LA*, Oct. 22) we surveyed the attitude of the labor union press on the Southern struggle for democracy, pointing out that the unions were closing their eyes to the fight. They are too busy beating the bushes for Democratic votes to pay attention to the struggle for democracy.

One of our readers sent us an interesting article from the March issue of the hotel union magazine *The Catering Industry Employee*. It is such stuff that is lacking now in the unions' publications. Here are a few short excerpts from it:

"... the court, ordering Dixie to shed its double standard of public education, threatens the entire power structure which has kept the South in thrall for 100 years."

"Taken all together, the fabric of Jim Crow is meant to keep Southern power where it is by insuring to employers, large and small, urban or rural, factory, or hotel, or office or store, an ample supply of cheap, unorganized, non-voting and not-to-well-educated labor. Beginning with this, Jim Crow governs the South like a greedy spoilsman. It robs most Southerners, Negro and white alike, and it levies tribute on the rest of the nation as well. Only a handful share the loot."

"... the 'one-party' South will be an early casualty once Jim Crow is gone. When it is, the whole nation will gain. For Dixiecrats elected by a tiny minority in Southern districts, sure of reelection year after year, are the main roadblock in Congress to the social legislation needed by all our citizens, North and South alike. Their seniority puts them in key committee posts where they can block all bills the 'briefcase Klansmen' don't like."

A FREE DEBATE IN LABOR RANKS IS NEEDED

By JACK WILSON

The more one reads labor papers, the more difficult it becomes to find out what is going on in the union movement. They imitate corporation papers too much. Any big corporation's house organ for employees always presents everyone working for the firm as a member of one happy family. Union papers give a similar impression of everyone in the union movement being just one happy family, united behind a wise and progressive leadership in whom the ranks have full confidence.

Recently in the union movement we've heard a lot about how the rubber workers want to go back to an eight-hour day, and how everyone in the rubber shops in Akron is working two jobs because there they still have a 30-hour basic work-week. "And what are you going to do with the workers? They are money-hungry and always work two jobs when they can!"

If a high official of the UAW hadn't said this, we wouldn't bother repeating it or discussing it. But it's surprising how the inadequacies of the labor press enable false stories to get around.

The plain truth of the matter is that any survey of a comparable rubber shop in Akron and an auto shop in Detroit, will show that the percentage of workers who do other work are almost the same: around 20 per cent, according to a survey this writer made. So obviously, the question isn't settled by seeing which plant has a 30-hour week and which has a 40-hour week.

In both cases, the number of workers who feel the pressing need for killing themselves by working extra is about the same. (The two plants we studied each had about 9000 employees.)

Secondly, most rubber workers in the Akron area don't work 30 hours. They work 36 and get paid time and a half for the last six.

After a vigorous debate at the recent Rubber Workers' (URWA) convention, the delegates turned down by a 14-vote margin the proposal of the top union leaders to negotiate 8-hour 5-day contracts, where the basic work schedule now is 6 hours and 5 days a week.

Likewise the leadership tried to get the constitution changed, for in the constitution the goal of a 30-hour week for the entire industry is a mandatory policy.

Without a smile, and without the slightest comprehension of what they were saying, the top leaders of the rubber workers' union argued that by going to an 8-hour day—establishing a uniform work schedule in the entire industry—they would then be in a better position to uniformly reduce the work-week later!

After the URWA convention, a test vote on these issues was conducted at Firestone Local 7 in Akron, which employs around 9000. The vote against the top leadership's proposal was 4772 to 1313. This reaffirmed a trend that was indicated by the elections for delegates to the URWA convention. Most Akron area delegates ran on a slate opposing that particular policy of the top leaders.

Although Walter P. Reuther and some UAW leaders are concerned over this trend in the URWA, since it contradicts the policy now adopted by the UAW to make a shorter work-week the major goal in 1958, there is also substantial minority opinion in top UAW circles that this whole policy is wrong, and that the rubber workers' leadership is on a sound track.

A good full and free debate on these issues in the labor press would seem indicated. We doubt if it will be held.

**Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review**

**NEXT WEEK:
The Attack on Egypt
by Israel, France and
Britain**

**NEW YORK
LABOR ACTION FORUM**

Thursday, Nov. 8

**The Minority Parties
and the Election**

The Socialist Groups discussed by
GORDON HASKELL

The Stalinoid Groups discussed by
DON HARRIS

Labor Action Hall

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.