

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 19, 1956

FIVE CENTS

## THE ELECTION

### End of the Adlai Line: Where Can Labor Go?

By GORDON HASKELL

In the 1956 presidential election a majority of the American people voted for Eisenhower—and peace in world affairs; for the Democrats—and against big business in domestic affairs.

Those pundits of labor-liberal opinion who have come out since the election to bewail the lack of discrimination, or even the "stupidity," of the American people are barking up the wrong tree. What they should be worrying about is not the "intelligence" of the electorate, nor even their "complacency" and "conservatism." They should concern themselves, rather, with the senseless liberal-labor-Stevenson political strategy which presented the alternatives in this election in such a way that no other choice was reasonably possible.

The labor movement went all-out for Stevenson. Yet if there is one thing the outcome of the struggle demonstrates beyond reasonable dispute it is this: The majority of the American people and an overwhelming majority of the workers remain Democrats. That is, they regard the Democratic Party as *more* the party of the "little people," the party which resists the most outrageous encroachments of big business in the political and

economic life of the nation. But Stevenson's "above-class" and almost "above-issues" campaign utterly failed to translate this sentiment into political issues, utterly failed to capitalize it into votes for his candidacy.

It was the lack of political issues in the campaign that made it possible for Eisenhower's personal popularity to play a role which it could not have had in a struggle of real political alternatives.

#### IMPACT OF THE WAR

In these circumstances, the outbreak of the war in Egypt probably turned what might have been a relatively close though assured victory for the president into a landslide. In attempting to dramatize the failure of American foreign policy in this area, Stevenson, while retaining

(Turn to last page)

## THE CPs ARE CRACKING UP

Reports from Rome, London and Elsewhere

... page 3

## Tito vs. Hungary's Revolution

... page 6

## The Infamy of Jawaharlal Nehru

... page 7

## MARVELS OF MORALITY IN THE MIDEAST

... page 7

## MIDDLE EAST MANEUVER:

### Will UN Do the Dirty Work For the Western Invaders?

The issue that is up in the air now, as the powers jockey over the cease-fire in the British-French-Israeli assault on Egypt, is simply this:

Will the United States via the UN, after both have formally condemned the assault, now proceed to extricate the guilty aggressors from the mess they are getting into, and pull their chestnuts out of the fire for them; or on the other hand will the U.S. and UN implement their vote and thus turn the attack on Egypt into the biggest fiasco and disaster for the Western bloc that has been seen yet?

Hence the maneuvering and backing-and-filling over the role of the UN "police force" which is supposed to supervise the stalemate in Egypt. This question will not be resolved very quickly, no matter what decisions are made on either side by the time this sees print.

The dilemma is that of U.S. policy in the first place. Events once more have posed before Washington its typical post-war problem: can it follow a consistently democratic foreign policy or will it always sacrifice every consideration of justice, self-determination and morality to hold together its imperialist war bloc?

Washington's first reaction to the attack on Egypt was an aggrieved outburst against an action which was (1) a piece of short-sighted stupidity from the

viewpoint of the interests of the Atlantic war camp as a whole in its struggle for the world against the Russian empire; and (2) a defiance, by junior partners within this camp, of the overlord of the alliance, the American arbiter—a defiance whose bitterness was motivated by the narrower imperialist interests of the aggressors alone, rather than the broad and over-all imperialist interests of the bloc.

#### U.S. BACKWATERING

Thus the Alsops' Washington column (N.Y. Herald Tribune, Nov. 2) reported that, in an early choleric outburst, Dulles indicated to the French Ambassador Alphan "that our allies had been acting like Russians."

But second thoughts supervened. The whole structure of NATO was shaking.

(Turn to last page)

## Hungary's Revolution Began in Russia

By H. W. BENSON

Now that the Hungarian revolution lies broken under the tread of Russian armor, well-meaning but mournful voices will be heard:

*Theirs was a noble, heroic, admirable fight (it will be said) but was it not futile, useless, and inevitably doomed? Let us face the reality (we will hear in the tones of reluctant pessimism), the people cannot overthrow a powerful dictatorship, certainly not the totalitarian rulers in Moscow.*

But in our hatred of the brutal dictators and their newly imposed puppets and in our sorrow over the fall of revolutionary Budapest to the foreign oppressor, there is no gloom. Hungary is not the end of the revolution against Stalinist dictatorship; it is only the beginning, the new beginning of world socialism, the new rise of the working-class movement for freedom from capitalist and Stalinist tyranny.

No one can guarantee the success of an uprising for freedom; if the peoples awaited such consolation, they would indeed wait forever. The Hungarians were right: they saw the opportunity and they tried to win; and what they have already won, even in defeat, can never be taken away.

They have proved that the people can revolt against Stalinist dictatorship; they have proved that the satellite governments are nothing but quisling Russian regimes; they have shown, too, that the rulers of totalitarian Russia have erected their edifice of power over a seething lava of popular hatred.

The structure of Stalinist lies and hypocrisy has tumbled; its world movement is disintegrating; hostile crowds besiege its representatives in every capital of the world. All this is achieved in only two weeks by the defeated Hungarian working class. If this is what its defeat looks like, what would its victory signify!

On the periphery of the Russian empire, in the satellite nations, we learn of the revolt of the peoples. And yet we know only what leaks through the cracks and gaps in the iron curtain of Stalinist despotism. Only a day after the seizure of Hungary by Russian troops a news blackout falls and no one knows what takes place from one day to the next, except as reported by fleeing refugees. How much less do we know of what takes place in the citadel itself: Russia and the nations held by force within the USSR.

Not the least of the accomplishments of the uprising is the insight it gives into life under all totalitarianism. We know now, in hindsight if we did not know it before, of the pressures and hatreds that forced Russia's masters into their new line at the 20th Party Congress.

#### Touched Off in Kremlin

East Berlin—Poznan—Budapest; Germans—Poles—Hungarians: Each in his own way hates dictatorship and fights against it. Is there any reason to believe that the Russian people are different in their hatred of dictatorship and their desire for democracy?

The Hungarian revolution has its origins in Russia.

It was touched off by signs of wavering and weakness in the Kremlin.

The Russian dictators had been forced to deal with their own pressing problems at home; warning rumblings from below had penetrated the skulls of whole layers of the ruling bureaucracy; they were impelled to make concessions and offer the prospect of reforms all within the framework of the dictatorship. To forestall revolt, they let up on the terror by a few notches.

(Continued on page 4)

# London Labor Thunders Against Eden's Aggression

This London Letter, with its valuable report on the tremendous reaction of British labor and youth against the assault on Egypt, was crowded out of last week's issue.—ED.

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Nov. 4

I have just returned from one of the most important political demonstrations Britain has witnessed for many years. The normal quiet of a Sunday afternoon in London has been shattered by the angry voices of tens of thousands of workers and students gathering in Trafalgar Square to join the Labor Party in its demonstration against the war which the British government has launched against Egypt.

From the four points of the compass long columns of marchers converged upon the square in the center of London. Chanting "We Don't Want War" and "Eden Must Go" and carrying their Labor Party and trade-union banners, the demonstrating workers and students gave noisy and colorful expression to the mighty forces of opposition which have set themselves resolutely against the Tory war.

After listening to Labor leaders making speeches in Trafalgar Square the demonstrators formed up and marched

down Whitehall to Downing Street, where the prime minister has his official residence. Confronted by row after row of mounted and foot police the demonstrators formed up into a solid mass of humanity chanting "Resign, Resign."

Hundreds of them climbed up in the scaffolding of new government offices being erected in Whitehall and made the air vibrate as they hammered in unison upon the sheet iron shuttering. Angry scenes took place as workers and police clashed; at least a dozen demonstrators were hauled off into police custody while the crowd jeered and shouted "Fascists."

Similar scenes and demonstrations have taken place in London and other parts of the country earlier this week, but nothing on the scale of today's mighty expression of anger.

On Thursday thousands of people demonstrated outside the House of Parliament and here again clashes took place with the police and five demonstrators were arrested.

## STUDENTS IN ACTION

The militant action of students has been particularly encouraging. In the university cities of Oxford, Manchester and Birmingham students have held demonstrations against the Tory government and its war. In Oxford the students at Ruskin College stopped their studies and went out onto the streets to demonstrate; 100 of them traveled to London to protest to members of Parliament at the House of Commons. In Manchester students brought mid-day traffic to a halt as they marched through the streets. In Edinburgh anti-war students clashed violently with Eden supporters.

This activity on the part of the students is a new development in British politics of post-war years and explodes the theory that British youth is politically apathetic and "couldn't care less" about what goes on in the world.

In industrial centers and quiet country towns, meetings and demonstrations are taking place as the people rally to the Labor Party's call for action. This call came on Thursday after a special meeting of the National Council of Labor—a body representing the Labor Party, the Trades Union Congress and the Cooperative Union—had announced that the whole Labor movement would wage a campaign against the Tory government.

The National Council called upon the British people to use every "constitutional" means to put pressure on the government, but it asked workers not to use the strike weapon to defeat the government. This latter qualification is intended to answer the hundreds of telegrams which are pouring into the TUC and Labor Party headquarters demanding a one-day token strike against the war.

But in spite of the reluctance of the leaders of the Labor movement to use the strike weapon, it is obvious that large sections of the organized workers are prepared to down tools in order to stop the war. Numbers of Labor MPs have expressed similar opinions.

# LABOR SCOPE

## They're Fattening Up the Strike Funds for Something

By BEN HALL

James P. Mitchell, secretary of Labor, is convinced that the class struggle is dead. He told *U.S. News & World Report* on September 7, "I think that we are in an era of growing industrial peace. I think that the day of 'hate the boss' and 'destroy the unions' is over or fast disappearing."

Earlier this year, Louis Waldman lectured a management group on "America's Destiny: Labor-Management Cooperation or Class Struggle," complimenting American labor for abjuring the dangerous doctrine of class conflict.

Waldman is eminently qualified to address himself to the subject, having gained unique experience as counsel for the ILA, which has always practised its own peculiar brand of labor-management cooperation.

There have been other contributions to the discussion.

In September, NAM President Cola Parker called on plant owners to invite political candidates to talk to their employees during working hours; he warned against the political aims of unions which, he insisted, would mean "an end to truly representative government in the United States." Louis Hollander, president of the New York State CIO, threatened that workers would strike if forced to listen to management-backed candidates. Just a difference of opinion between two co-

operating classes.

At the Steel Union convention, David McDonald was effusive over the possibility of labor-management peace, a relationship that cannot seem to jell in his industry despite a proliferation of pronunciamentos. But the officers' report at the same convention had to sound a note of caution: "it would be unrealistic," reported *Steel Labor*, "if the union did not always remember that gains achieved to date were won because in the past 20 years thousands suffered and dared and organized and struggled—and, yes, even died—to help make the American labor movement what it is today."

The Machinists' convention last month voted to set up a multi-million-dollar emergency fund to pay out \$35 a week in strike benefits. In August the Glass and Ceramic Workers Union set up a special defense fund by laying aside 10 per cent of gross dues payments.

The United Cement Workers Union has a membership of only 41,000; compared to the mighty Big Ten, it is a comparative midget. Yet at its 8th convention, held this month in Buffalo, it decided to set up a permanent strike fund of no less than \$2 million to provide benefits of \$25 per week to members on strike.

All this, no doubt, to finance a wild spree of labor-management cooperation.

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### Ferment in Steel

To the Editor:

The recent article [LA, Oct. 8] on the Steelworkers' convention referred to a dues increase from \$3 to \$5 a year. Of course, this should have read \$5 a month.

It might also be of interest to your readers to hear about the post-convention negotiations between the Steelworkers and the can companies. The can locals sent their delegates to Los Angeles to negotiate for increased pay in the wage-reopener in their contract. The International union agents and the companies negotiated a contract behind the backs of the delegates—in fact, the delegates were not given the chance to make a single recommendation on the three-year contract presented to them by their own union as an ultimatum!

The delegates voted 17-15 to accept the contract, but this was only because of threats of the union agents and the elimination of geographical wage differences, which elimination greatly aided the Southern locals.

The contract did provide better wages and conditions, but it harnessed the workers to a three-year contract without doing anything about getting a shorter work-week. It also failed to gain the right to hold stop-work union meetings. The present method of holding split meetings for different shifts is awkward, especially when motions are made in the

second meeting that were not made in the first one.

The main objection the delegates had, however, was the totally bureaucratic way in which the contract was imposed upon them. The West Coast delegates were especially angry. Many delegates refused to sign the contract. The Vancouver, B. C., delegate signed only because under provincial law the local would be without a contract unless he did so. Local 2070 from Portland's American Can factory voted to support the action of their delegate in refusing to sign the contract.

There is considerable dissatisfaction in the can locals against the McDonald bureaucracy, but the can locals are few and for the most part small. The can local members rely heavily on the prospect of leadership by their steel local brothers in the struggle against the bureaucracy and class-collaborationism of the McDonald bureaucracy.

REUEL S. AMDUR

### Write-Ins

To The Editor:

The election will be history before LA appears again, but let me say the difficulty of getting people to cast write-in votes is indicated by the fact that Norman Thomas publicly declared his unwillingness to write in the names of the candidates of his own party on the New York ballot. I quote from his words in the November *Progressive*: "I would of course, vote for them [Hoopes and Friedman] if I lived in a state where they are on the ballot." [Italics added.]

VICTOR HOWARD

Chicago, Oct. 30

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

### NEW YORK LABOR ACTION FORUM

There will be no public forum on Thursday, Nov. 22 (Thanksgiving).

Friday, Nov. 23

ISL-YSL

Discussion Meeting  
(Not a public forum)

## UNDER THE WINDOWS OF THE HANGMEN OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION



PICKET LINE IN DEFENSE OF HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION before the Russian Delegation H.Q. in New York City was held on Saturday afternoon, Nov. 3, by Independent Socialist League and YSL, together with Libertarian League.

# The Communist Parties Are Cracking Under the Russian Guns in Hungary

By BERNARD CRAMER

The Russians' murderous repression of the Hungarian Revolution is having its disintegrative impact on the Communist Parties in the West. Center of interest is its consequences for the Italian CP, largest outside the Iron Curtain. The accompanying article from our Rome correspondent, Lucio Libertini, gives the picture on this.

In addition, a N.Y. Times dispatch (Nov. 9) reported from Rome on the disaffection in the ranks of the CP centers particularly around industrial strongholds of the party in the North, especially Mantua, where the local Communist organization issued a statement stigmatizing the Russian intervention in Hungary. Elsewhere, thousands of party cards are being turned in.

According to these dispatches, Pietro Nenni, the leader of the PSI (the Socialist Party which has long been a collaborator with the Stalinists and which is now negotiating about unity with the social-democrats) has come out firmly in support of the Hungarian Revolution and against the Russian intervention.

We have before us at this time only

the text of an earlier article by Nenni, published in his *Avanti* on the first phase of the Hungarian Revolution, October 23-November 3. In this article he clearly ranged himself with the revolutionaries but pleaded for reconciliation.

At this time he described the fighting as "a fratricidal conflict which divides not partisans and opponents of socialism but rather, on the one hand, workers and students who really want liberalization and democratization of institutions and public life (and the purity of their intentions cannot be tarnished by the fascist scum which, quite certainly, has mixed into the limpid current of the popular demands), and, on the other hand, the old group of Communist leaders who, in addition to their political errors and their crimes, have added the insensate appeal to the Soviet troops."

But he called for the rebels to lay down their arms, and for the "repression" and the "foreign intervention" to do the same, on the basis of an appeal to everybody to rally round the democratic demands.

It is to be seen whether Nenni, or rather the socialist workers who follow him now, have drawn conclusions about

the illusions which they shared with regard to the Russians and their "socialism."

In France, the next most important bastion of Stalinism in Europe, the situation is much more difficult. The fact that the French CP leadership under Thorez is the "hardest" Stalinist party machine left, outside the Iron Curtain, is better seen as a symptom rather than a primary cause of this difficult situation.

The basis of it is the sad fact that in France least of all is there any considerable left pole of attraction as against the Stalinists. In this country the Socialist Party is under the sway of Guy Mollet, the premier who is doing the world's dirtiest jobs today on behalf of capitalist imperialism, in Algeria and in Egypt. It is not hard to understand the dilemma of Communist workers in France who are being told about the horrors of Russian butchery in Hungary by "socialist" hypocrites who are themselves leading the slaughter of freedom fighters in Algeria and who have just outraged a good part of even the capitalist world with their desperate aggression against Egypt to seize the Suez Canal.

It is no accident, therefore, that in this one unfortunate land, we see simultaneously the most unregenerate Stalinist leadership in the CP and the most social-imperialist leadership in the SP. Just as the rival war blocs feed on each other's crimes, so do their jackals.

## BREAKS IN FRANCE

But even in the French CP there are reports of cracks. One symptom perhaps is the break announced by Jean-Paul Sartre, the alleged philosopher who yesterday was whitewashing Moscow and its CP virtually down the line, and who now declares his solidarity with the Hungarian Revolution and denunciation of the CP.

Sartre may well be a reflection of the revulsion among Stalinized intellectuals, but the problem in France is the CP's hold on the organized working class in its majority. A hopeful view on this comes via Warsaw (N.Y. Times, Nov. 10) where they are saying that the French CP is threatened by split and/or disintegration.

In France as in Italy, one problem is also the reaction of the types like Nenni. A French similar is Claude Bourdet, of the weekly *France-Observateur*, which often reflects a mélange of Stalinoid, left-socialist and neutralist sentiment independent of or in-between the CP and SP.

At the outbreak of the upsurge in Poland (but before the October 23 revolution in Budapest), Bourdet was writing in his paper along the lines of counseling "moderation" and restraint to the anti-Russian freedom forces in both countries. We have not yet seen his reaction to later events.

## ONE SOLUTION

On Nov. 14 Paris dispatches reported an internal fight in the Stalinist-controlled CGT, the largest French labor federation, over support to Russian intervention in Hungary. Calls for pro-Russian work stoppages by the CGT leadership were "almost completely ignored by the workers," they said.

In Norway the Communist Party made public a protest it had sent against the use of Russian troops in Hungary, calling for withdrawal and for support of the UN resolution to send observers.

In another Communist Party, where doors open on Hungary's borders—the CP of Austria—dispatches from Vienna tell of a major crisis in the organization from top to bottom, from the Central Committee to "a number of Austrian industrial plants [where] Communist workers had protested against Soviet suppression of the Hungarian revolutionaries by publicly tearing up their party membership books." (Times, Nov. 10.)

And as we have reported before, the racking crisis of the CP is out in the open most of all in the U.S. and Britain, where there is a virtually open and public factional fight going on. At Oxford University the Communist Club decided to dissolve because the party is "completely discredited." It is a solution of the CP crisis which ought to spread.

## REPORT FROM ROME

# Split in the Italian Citadel Of Stalinism?

By LUCIO LIBERTINI.

Rome, Nov. 3

The Hungarian tragedy has had profound repercussions on the Italian situation. In the first place, it has brought into the open an already latent crisis in the Communist Party.

The bourgeois press generally exaggerates for its own propaganda purposes, the tensions and factional situations within the CP. This time, however, it is possible to say that the oppositions within the party are even more serious and extensive than the bourgeois press itself has claimed.

After the 20th Congress and the crisis it produced in the CP, the internal situation of Italian Stalinism was stabilized, in the sense that Togliatti had engineered a compromise between the old-line Stalinist group which controls the apparatus (Longo, D'Onofrio, etc.) and the "Titoist" wing. Then Togliatti spread the word that he intended to take the leadership of the latter group at the next favorable opportunity.

Now the popular uprising against Stalinism in Hungary has compelled everyone to face up to their responsibilities and to make an immediate choice. Togliatti, after innumerable hesitations and reservations, has taken sides with the Stalinist group in favor of Russian intervention.

The "Titoist" wing has come out against Russian intervention. At the same time, the revolt of the party "intellectuals" has broken out violently, and has met with widespread public support, while the Communists of the CGIL, the largest trade-union center, including Di Vittorio (the president of the World Federation of Trade Unions) associated themselves with the Socialist Party of Nenni (PSI) in solidarity with the anti-Stalinist movement.

The next congress of the CP (which is scheduled for December 8) is therefore likely to be rather stormy, and may become the starting point of important developments. Still more important, the whole working-class base of the CP is in an extraordinary state of ferment.

## EFFECT ON UNITY

In the socialist camp, too, the Hungarian crisis has had important repercussions, both positive and negative: positive, because they hastened and completed in public the PSI's break with Stalinism; negative, because it threatens to drive important leaders of the PSI (Nenni in particular) toward the reformist positions of Saragat.

These events provide a new context for the now irreversible process of socialist unification which will decide the future of Italian labor for many years.

If the positions of class independence prevail in the process, the socialists will be in a position to give battle against the rule of Christian-Democracy and to pull the Communist rank-and-file into their camp. If unification takes place on different terms, the socialist movement will bog down in a swamp of opportunism, and Italian politics may deteriorate through the treason of social-democracy, as in France today or in Germany under the Weimar Republic.

As for ourselves, the Italian independent socialists, it goes without saying that we are making every effort to hasten the collapse of Stalinism and to safeguard a genuinely socialist position for the labor movement. The prospects are good, but the struggle is difficult and complex.

Our movement (the USI, Independent Socialist Union) will have to decide within the next days on a proposal for organic unity with the PSI. Today, the PSI's positions are fairly close to those which the USI has always stood for; the problem is therefore not so much a political but a tactical one.

The question before us is whether it is easier to influence the socialist movement as a whole by entering the PSI or by participating in the process of unification as an independent organization.

## LONDON LETTER

# Socialist Left Sparks Fight On Eden; CP Disintegrating

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Nov. 11

The events in Hungary and Egypt during the past ten days have left a big mark on British politics.

In the Tory party the pro-Eden leadership is struggling hard to retain control and to prevent open ruptures over the government's Middle East policy. In the Communist Party the leadership is faced with widespread rebellion because of its meek acceptance of the Moscow line that the Hungarian uprising was a "fascist plot." In contrast the Labor Party, because of its firm stand against imperialism both in Egypt and Hungary, is stronger than for a long time in the past.

The past week has, amply confirmed our report from London in LABOR ACTION on October 1 that the Tory cabinet is sharply divided into pro- and anti-Eden camps centering around the issue of the government's line on Egypt. Already the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs and the Economic Secretary to the Treasury have resigned because of opposition to Eden's policies. Another Tory member of Parliament has resigned from the party and several others refrained from voting in the House of Commons in support of their leaders in a motion of censure upon the government moved by the Labor Party.

Most of the British press is now speculating just how much longer Sir Anthony Eden can survive as prime minister in face of the opposition, led by ex-Chancellor R. A. Butler, which exists within the cabinet. The view is widely held that, at a four-hour cabinet meeting last Monday, the Butlerite faction placed the demand before Eden that either he call a halt to British military action in Egypt or else face a major public rebellion by his cabinet members in the House of Commons.

The Butlerite faction was prompted to place this demand before Eden in view of the widespread popular support the Labor Party's anti-war campaign received. This popular support, led by rank-and-file militants, was running way ahead of the Labor leadership itself and building up into a mass movement.

The hand of the Butlerites was strengthened by pointing to such examples as the thousands and thousands of demonstrators who clashed with the police outside of the prime minister's residence in Downing Street last Sunday. The cabinet was in session at the time and one can imagine the Butlerites try-

ing to convince Eden that if he did not climb down a revolution was liable to engulf them all at any moment!

Widespread feeling within the Tory party now is that a sacrifice will have to be made in order to save the Tories from complete defeat at the next election. And the popular choice of the sacrificial lamb seems to be Sir Anthony Eden.

During the campaign of mass agitation built up by the Labor Party on the war in Egypt one thing has been particularly noticeable to the experienced observer—the relative lack of activity by the Communist Party.

Last Sunday, for instance, I saw 40,000 workers and students gather in Trafalgar Square to hear Aneurin Bevan speak at a Labor anti-war rally. Among the hundreds of trade-union and local political party banners carried by the demonstrators as they marched into the square I saw only one from a local Communist Party branch.

## CP HARD-HIT

The fact is that the Stalinists have had the ground cut completely from under their feet by events in Hungary, which have every indications of splitting yet further the already microscopic Communist Party. Publicly announced casualties in the Stalinist ranks so far include the *Daily Worker* cartoonist "Gabriel," who resigned after more than 20 years in the Stalinist ranks because the leadership rejected one of his cartoons on the Hungarian situation.

Another leading Stalinist to break over Hungary has been R. B. Seabrook, a member of the CP for 23 years and, as a full-time officer of the Union of Shopworkers, a key Stalinist in the trade-union field.

The current issue of *The Reasoner*, the organ of a group of "opposition" within the CP, carries a slashing attack upon the British Stalinist leadership for its attitude toward Russian intervention in Hungary.

"One thing only," says *The Reasoner*, "might have restrained the Soviet criminal forces from their final criminal action—an outspoken call for restraint from the Communist Parties of the world. In this crisis, when the Hungarian people needed our solidarity, the British Communist Party has failed them."

*The Reasoner* then demands the withdrawal of Russian troops, the establish-

(Continued on page 4)

# Hungary's Revolution Began in Russia — —

(Continued from page 1)

In Eastern Europe the peoples watched, then stirred. And in Hungary, before the eyes of the whole world, they burst forth. Impressive as it was, a whole people united against their oppressors, it was only a token of the pent-up hostility and hatred of peoples in the whole Stalinist world, including Russia.

**What the Communist puppets of Hungary offered too late—what Nagy proclaimed, too late, to quell the already rising peoples—the Russian rulers had rushed to do in time at their 20th Congress. Now, what the Hungarians learned quickly in the days of revolutionary fighting as one layer of hypocrisy after another was stripped from their lying rulers, the peoples of Russia will learn: no trust in the promises of dictators.**

## First Cracks

The people of Hungary were united in their hatred of national oppression and social exploitation; but it takes more than popular resentment to cause a revolution; otherwise the masses in virtually every country would be in a state of continuing revolt.

If the oppressive regime seems sure of itself, with all power in its hands and at its disposal; if it can answer every question with the whip of terror; if it appears united, invulnerable, invincible, then the people can only wait. But once the people, burning with resentment against their rulers, see unmistakable signs of wavering, and sense that the regime is uncertain and can no longer continue as of old, then revolution becomes possible.

And the first cracks in the monolithic wall appeared in Russia itself.

## Antagonisms Revealed

For more than two years, reverberations of the crisis inside Russia have been registering on the minds of the peoples under its control. When Stalin died, two years ago, the lid was pried off just a little.

What appeared so determined, so self-confident, so unanimous was now revealed to be torn apart by irrepressible inner antagonisms. The rulers were unsure of themselves! This electrifying thought gained new impulse when Beria was executed; Molotov was censured; Malenkov was removed. The precise meaning of each shift and turn remained shrouded in subterranean mystery but the big fact was clear: the rulers were faltering and fumbling for a new road.

With Stalin's death and then with the 20th Congress, when the new regime heaped abuse upon Stalin's whole record, a miscellaneous assortment of commentators, politicians, journal-

ists and writers of many hues were quick to invent and then to welcome a turn toward "democracy" in Russia. We must greet it, they said, we must encourage the rulers along the new road and support them in it. All this was buttressed by profound socio-economic jibber-jabber emanating from deep thinkers in the Stalinoid world. They found it hard to imagine that the "turn" represented anything but the free, generous dispensation of reasonable men to their flock. They had long ceased to expect anything from the masses, whose ability to struggle and whose power to rise they held in utter contempt. Since the new "democracy" could not arise in response to pressures from below, it must, in their view, be a gift bestowed from above.

## Utilizing the Turns

**But the Hungarian working class "greeted" the turn in its own way. They utilized it not to support the regime but to try to overthrow it.**

This was as it should be. They recognized the proffer of concessions as a weakness in the ruling class and took advantage of that weakness to further their own struggle. They overthrew the oppressive regime in Hungary only to have it restored by force upon their backs.

They did not defeat the Russian power but they wounded it terribly; it can never recover from the blows struck by Hungary's freedom fighters.

The Hungarians rose when they detected wavering in the Kremlin. But the weakness in Russia was forced to the surface by social conflicts inside Russia itself. In this lies the international character of the series of revolts against Russian rule.

## The Russian Reservoir

**When tens of thousands of Russian soldiers deserted Stalin's army during the war with Germany, they revealed the hatred of millions of workers and peasants for the regime. In 1943-4, whole sections of the Ukraine were taken over by the Ukrainian Revolutionary Army (UPA) which arose under the watchwords: "Against Hitler and Stalin—for the Independence of the Ukraine."**

The movement won the support of peasants in the areas they controlled and developed a socialist program against Stalinism. When Russian armies gained control of the areas, UPA supporters organized as an underground political opposition to the regime. In 1949, one of its representatives wrote that the UPA had proved that "a revolutionary underground in the USSR has become possible."

When the war ended, the world was horrified to learn that the Stalin regime had annihila-

lated whole nations within its borders, countries that had been part of the USSR but whose populations had been hostile to the regime. That, in substance, is all we ever learned. Now, we see the Hungarian revolution; now it seems evident that the brutal extermination of whole nations might have been a desperate retaliation against national revolutionary uprisings inside the Russian mainland, cut off from communication and contact with the world.

And when Stalin died, workers in the very slave camps rose in rebellion, notably in the forced labor camps at Vorkuta, and also in others.

**These are the bare bones of fragmentary facts. Some day we too will know the full story of the Russian fight for freedom; but the Kremlin's rulers, as they went to the 20th Congress, were fully aware of the dangers to them, dangers which burst forth in Hungary but which are carefully hidden in Russia.**

## The Emperor Is Naked

In a totalitarian regime, everyone may hate the rulers . . . privately; but no one can be sure how his neighbor feels. The dictatorship exerts its powers of terror in all forms and degrees of subtlety, not only to destroy the possibility of united action by the people but to wipe out the possibility of united opinion. Where it is impossible for the people to discover that they oppose the regime in common, it is difficult for them to form an underground opposition.

Mere courage is not enough to launch an illegal political opposition under conditions of totalitarianism; the brave revolutionary fighters must have some way of checking the mood of the people: are they, the revolutionaries, hopeless fanatics out of tune with the hopes and aspirations of the masses; or are they the militant advance-guard for their people in the struggle against oppressors which all detest? The fanfare of Stalinist propaganda, with its fake mass resolutions, its organized demonstrations, its public frame-up trials, is designed to make it impossible to penetrate through the fog to the minds of the people.

**But in Hungary all that is gone. In defeat, the revolution does not return to the past.**

In their unorganized, universal popular rising, the Hungarian masses have shouted out, "The Emperor is naked." From this time on, socialists and democrats know that their detestation of the regime is matched and overmatched by that of the people.

In defeat, the Hungarian working class is victorious over Stalinist dictatorship. Now begins the organization and preparation of its new revolutionary socialist forces.

# Socialist Left Sparks Fight — —

(Continued from page 3)

ment of a "neutral" Hungary, public repudiation of the Russian actions and special district and national congresses of the British CP to discuss the situation:

"If these demands are not met, we

**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

*specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.*

**Send for our free book list.**

urge all those who, like ourselves, will dissociate themselves completely from the leadership of the British Communist Party, not to lose faith in socialism, and to find ways of keeping together."

**In the Labor Party these agonies of the Tory party and the Stalinists are being watched with interest, particularly by the left-wing militants of the rank and file. For, and make no mistake about this, British Labor upheld the banner of socialism during the past two weeks because of the determination of the rank-and-file party workers and the left wing. When the crisis in the Middle East broke a few months ago it was the left which immediately reacted and turned the pressure on those of its leaders which showed dangerous signs of following the disgraceful attitude of Mollet in France.**

The mass militant movement of the past few weeks has been led by the Labor right-wing leaders because the rank and file of the party made them lead it, and in doing so they raised the Labor Party to a new degree of strength in the eyes of the workers all over the world.

The same rank-and-file workers are now determined that the leftward course set in motion in past weeks shall be pushed to its utmost limits in order to bring the Tory government down.

[The press reports further defections from the British CP: two trade-union leaders, John Horner and Alex Mogat, and "several members" of the London *Daily Worker* staff. A *Times* dispatch from Vienna also reported that the CP organ's correspondent in Budapest resigned on arriving in Vienna.—Ed.]



**LABOR ACTION**

November 19, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 47

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**

**CIVIL RIGHTS**

## Anti-Racist Voices Among Campus Editors in South

The racist front in the South is far from being a monolith. All kinds of elements—varying from the rabid right wing which is anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, anti-rock-'n-roll as well as Jim Crow, to the Southern middle class which goes along with the segregation campaign with an uneasy conscience—are involved in the defense of the "Southern traditions."

A recent article in the *National* (September 29) spotlights another group which doesn't fit the stereotype of a "solid South" of racists: the college newspaper editors.

One of the first instances of Southern student protest against Jim Crow occurred (according to Roger Keith, the *Nation's* correspondent) at the University of Georgia. As far back as 1953, the *Red and Black*, campus paper, spoke up: "With Communism knocking at the Negro's back door, we cannot afford to let educational segregation barriers stand. It is plain as the red flag in Russia that continued segregation and suppression can and will cause the death of democracy by the hands of its own leaders."

Needless to say, this editorial did not go unchallenged. One of the University's regents wrote, "I tried to explain to [the paper's editors] that in their juvenile damn foolery they were hurting the university and the cause of education in the state. I frankly told them that the money for the operation of the *Red and Black* would be discontinued unless they could do a better job."

The editors promptly reiterated their stand. The regent returned to the fray:

"Now there's no question of freedom of the press involved. The question is whether or not the board of regents will be dictated to by a little handful of sissy, misguided squirts who have just enough knowledge to think they know it all. Every time I see one of the little sissy boys hanging around some college, the more I think everyone of them ought to be made to play football."

The "sissy" identification, by the way, would seem to be a characteristic response of reaction in the present period. From the investigation of homosexuals in the State Department, through McCarthy's insinuations about Acheson and Stevenson, to this cracker "educator," dissent is equated with subversion and femininity. The football suggestion is an index to the culture of the defenders of the "Southern tradition."

**OTHER CASES**

The Georgia incident is not isolated. In New Orleans last year, the Tulane *Hullabaloo* conducted a campaign for integration although the editor noted that "most faculty members seem afraid to discuss the subject in their class."

At the University of Mississippi, the student paper did not favor integration, but defended the rights of an integrationist speaker to appear on the campus.

At Alabama, the university paper also backed segregation, but attacked the violence which greeted the attempt of Authurine Lucy to register there.

The *Daily Athenaeum* of the University of West Virginia commented on the Lucy incident in unequivocal terms: "As far as we're concerned, the Alabama

students only demonstrated their immaturity, indecency, inhumanity and perhaps inferiority. If the white race were superior (and it is not) it would not have to fight to insure its position."

A well-publicized case in the South last year, that of the *Daily Texan* at the University of Texas, did not center upon the civil-rights issue, but rather involved the question of the Natural Gas bill. In this case, the Regents clamped down on student opposition to that particular give-away bill because "66 per cent of Texas money comes from oil and gas."

In this case, the issue was one of a complementary piece of Southern reaction (the Dixiecrats in 1948 were probably financed by oil money anxious to get a deal on the off-shore oil law), but it points up the same thing: that the front of racism and reaction in the South is not internally secure.

**PORTENT OF HOPE**

The cases which we have cited are, unfortunately, fairly few in number, yet they are a hopeful portent. As the Southern situation develops, it is absolutely essential that what is now a fifth column of progress should become a majority.

The various editorials in the Southern student papers open up the possibility that those who are now students, the younger generation of the post-Supreme Court decision, will have the courage to fight for a decent position, that they will accept and even welcome the advent of racial equality in the very stronghold of reaction.

## YSL Picket Lines Protest British Attack

By RAY WALSH

Chicago, Nov. 3

In response to a hurried call by the Chicago Young Socialist League some twenty-five YSLers, Socialist Party members and other socialist and liberal students marched for an hour today in an orderly picket line before the British consul general's office.

The demonstration was called to protest the imperialist outrage being perpetrated by Britain and France and their pawn Israel upon Egypt.

Yesterday YSLers distributed over a thousand leaflets at the University of Chicago and Roosevelt University challenging students to decide "Which Side Are You On?"—"the side of the peoples and the right of self-determination or the side of imperialism."

Linking up the anti-imperialist defense of Egypt with Russia's imperialist attempt to throttle the magnificent Hungarian fight for freedom, the leaflet declared:

"There is only one side to be on, in Egypt or in Budapest, that of anti-imperialism, of democracy, of the rights of the people. . . . By demanding an end to the NATO which supplies the troops and guns for the English and French intervention in Egypt, you fight at the same time against the murderers of the Hun-

## Stalinist Student Int'l Is Grabbing for a New Line

The turn of the international Stalinist movement toward a new version of the Popular Front was recently documented in a report on the World Student Congress in Prague, August 26 to September 2. The general line was an attempt of the Stalinist International Union of Students to break out of isolation. The first point on the agenda was "Problems and Aspects of a World Student Community."

In his opening statement Jiri Pelikan, president of the IUS, developed two themes of the current Stalinist line.

First, past policies of the IUS were denounced as "unrealistic," i.e., the former orientation, imposed upon the organization by its adherence to the world CP line, is now out of date and is to be abandoned in favor of a Popular Front approach.

And secondly, Pelikan placed great emphasis on the question of colonialism. (See the report in *Challenge* last month on the meeting in Bandung for a report on the struggle between Stalinists, pro-American bloc and socialist students at the Bandung conference.)

How far the new Stalinist line goes was graphically demonstrated in one very interesting case.

A discussion was held concerning an IUS project for some kind of world-wide, Olympic-type student athletic meet. Dur-

ing its consideration, the IUS leadership came out in favor of the participation of the Spanish SEU, i.e., inclusion of an official Francoite youth group.

Evidently, no group of students, regardless of their politics, is to escape the current Stalinist net. It is being thrown as wide as possible, and, in the interest of the Popular Front, literally everyone is to be invited in.

All, however, was not peaceful at the conference. There were pro-Western delegates present at the conference, and the suggestion of a North African student that a minute of silence be observed in honor of the Algerian youth fighting for freedom precipitated a bitter fight.

Another issue which menaced the conference was that of the Arab-Israeli struggle. This question, however, was handled in a typical Stalinist fashion. The Executive Committee simply took it off the agenda.

All in all, the brief reports available in the United States on the Prague meeting confirm what one would have guessed: that the IUS, obedient to its Stalinist direction, is now engaged in a general turn toward the world student movement.

However, as noted last week in *Challenge*, this maneuver will be complicated by the fact that the Stalinist youth movement, in England and the United States at least, is torn by factional conflict engendered by the events of the last six months. Whether or not the Stalinists can succeed in extending their influence over the students of the world depends, to a large degree, on their ability to keep their own organizations intact.

garian people. For the Stalinist hangmen justify their actions on the ground that they fear the Western pact."

Some 1800 copies of an additional leaflet demanding "HANDS OFF EGYPT" and calling "FOR A THIRD CAMP AGAINST IMPERIALISM OF BOTH THE RUSSIAN AND THE WESTERN BLOCS" were distributed to passers-by at the demonstration.

Placard signs demanded "STOP NATO" . . . "NO ARMS TO ISRAEL" . . . "BRITAIN-FRANCE OUT OF MIDDLE EAST, RUSSIA OUT OF EASTERN EUROPE" . . . "AGAINST IMPERIALISM BOTH RUSSIAN AND WESTERN."

The demonstration did not meet with hostility from the public. Several strangers told us we were doing the right thing and said they were glad to see us there.

Evidently in response to the many press releases sent out, the arriving pickets were greeted by a barrage of newspaper photographers, and the reporter for the *Chicago American* interviewed leaders of the Chicago unit at the line. Brief news notices and photographs of the demonstration appeared in the Sunday and Monday *Chicago* newspapers.

So far, to the knowledge of the Chicago unit it has been the only organization to publicly express itself in opposition to the imperialist assaults against both Egypt and Hungary.

The YSL unit here is engaged at present in intensive efforts to encourage all democratic socialist groups, labor unions and Hungarian-American organizations to unite in staging a large protest demonstration or meeting specifically aimed at the criminal Russian assault on the Hungarian revolution.

### Picket in New York

In New York City, the Young Socialist League unit sponsored a picket line at the offices of the British and Irish Railways in Rockefeller Center, on Friday, Nov. 9. The pickets carried signs denouncing the British and French invasion of Egypt. A leaflet which was passed out related the actions of the British and French imperialists to those of the Russian imperialists in Hungary. About twenty-five marchers were on the line.

### THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

### Get The Challenge

every week — by subscribing to *Labor Action*. A student sub is only \$1 a year.

# AFTER EIGHT YEARS, THE PAY-OFF TITO vs. HUNGARY'S REVOLUTION

By HAL DRAPER

Besides everything else, revolutions are acid tests. The Hungarian Revolution puts all politics to the proof.

One of the things tested is the meaning of "Titoism." Yesterday this was a moot theoretical question on the nature of Stalinism and national-Stalinism. Today it can mean the life and death of a revolution.

Yesteryear we Independent Socialists, who took a "hard" attitude on the essential identity of Tito-Stalinism and Moscow Stalinists with respect to their social systems, had very little company on this even among socialists, not to speak of Stalinoids. But the march toward socialist democracy which so many claimed to see under Tito has now been going on for eight years. Eight years in the hectic life of a revolution is equivalent to a geologic era.

Some time or other, conclusions will have to be drawn by those who, not long ago, were busy convincing themselves that every new declaration about democracy and decentralization from Belgrade was a great new contribution to socialist thought; some of them even after the purging of Djilas and Dedijer for daring to propose some real steps toward political freedom.

Ninety percent of the apparent "anti-Stalinism" of the Tito regime vanished like false-whiskers in proportion as Moscow softened its hostility. This does not change the nationalist content of Tito-Stalinism which distinguishes it from Moscow and which has had consequences of its own within the framework of the system. But it has meaning for the hopes of those people who looked to the same "democratization-from-above" by Belgrade that others later looked to by Khrushchev.

Today there is one and only one full-fledged and undiminished "cult of the individual" in Eastern Europe: not in Russia, where it has not yet come back in its one-man-one-god form, and certainly not in any of the precarious satellite regimes, but only in Tito-Yugoslavia.

After eight years, and after all of the "steps toward" which were supposed to be tokens of democracy ("do you want everything to change overnight?"), there is today under Tito not a single, solitary, lone channel of opposition, for any worker in Yugoslavia, against the will of the ruling bureaucracy. This defines undiluted totalitarianism.

Now this fact is capped by Tito's lineup at the side of the Russians in open support of the bloody suppression of the Hungarian Revolution.

This did not come from a clear blue

sky. Already in reaction to the Poznan revolt, the Belgrade regime had reviled the Polish freedom fighters as "reactionary and destructive."

The outbreak of the Polish upsurge in October caught Tito out on a limb. As it happened, as a result of Tito's sudden

The news out of almost all of the Eastern European satellites has recently included references to plans for instituting "factory councils" and "decentralization" on the Yugoslav model, as one of the steps being taken to placate discontent and avoid the crises that have burst out in Hungary and Poland. In the two latter countries, such programmatic planks have especially been stressed by the "Titoist" regimes of Gomulka and Nagy.

This trend has been called "economic Titoism." Sometimes it is used to include also the ease-up on Stalinist collectivization and the squeeze on the peasantry which has been enforced by the Stalinist crisis.

The turn of the Stalinist puppets in this direction serves to illustrate also the real content that these measures had in Tito's Yugoslavia itself. There the regime was forced reluctantly to turn in this direction when it was shaking under pressure from the 1948 break with Moscow, and had to consolidate mass support at home as against the Kremlin.

The necessity was to pull back on grandiose industrialization projects and economic schemes which could only have been possible by intensifying exploitation of the workers, to stop inflation, reduce the vastly inflated government bureaucracy, and dress this forced economic retreat up with new theories about "decentralization" and "economic democratization." In part also, such measures stemmed from a real desire to

and mysterious sojourn with Khrushchev & Co. at Yalta, Eisenhower had remarked that Russian designs on Yugoslavia were "not adequately appreciated or defended against" by Belgrade. It was Washington's way of issuing a polite warning. The Yugoslavs reacted in their press with vehement and indignant defense of the purity of intentions of their Moscow friends.

While they were still registering indignant postures (at the "slander" against Moscow, not themselves) Khrushchev mobilized troops in Poland and publicly shook the mailed fist at the Gomulka regime.

It is fairly clear now that at least one of the things agreed on at the Yalta con-

fab was the assignment of a sub-empire to Tito within the Stalinist sphere. Yugoslavia was to be the regional boss for the Balkans—Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary and (as soon as it could be brought into line) probably Albania. In exchange, Tito was to use his influence to keep the satellite system in line for Moscow, with hands off Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany.

The leaders of the first three Balkan satellites had made their pilgrimages to Belgrade and done their salaams by the time the crises broke out. Indeed, Gero of Hungary had just come back to Budapest on October 23 when the revolution burst in his face. Kadar, at Gero's side in Belgrade, fulsomely praised the Yugoslav "application of Marxism" and promised to apply in Hungary what he had learned.

Thus Tito tried to help them cover their regime with his nationalist prestige; but it was too late.

At the same time, while stormy mass actions went on in Poland, Tito's press kept silent, until it heaved a big sigh of relief and hailed the stabilization of the Gomulka regime.

(Turn to last page)

## 'Economic Titoism' in the Satellites

slough off some of the excesses of Stalinism which had been mechanically imposed from Moscow.

Thus real and important changes were involved, but not the kind of change which was touted: namely, the introduction of democracy from above. The idea that democracy could be injected into the factories through these forms, while the political life of the country was firmly kept in a one-party totalitarian vise, was a deception.

This deception was openly explained—in clear enough language to anyone willing to understand—by the Titoist leaders themselves when, this past June, Edvard Kardelj undertook to expound in *Pravda* the meaning of "economic Titoism."

Kardelj is the No. 2 man in Belgrade. He was writing in *Pravda* of June 2, in the context of the new amity between the two dictatorships, to assure the Rus-

sians that the Tito regime has not deviated in principle from the same Stalinist system which still prevails in Moscow.

Above all, he was assuring them that the "democratization" of which the Yugoslav national-Stalinists boast was kept securely within the bounds of the one-party state by the ability of the unchallengeable ruling party to control any abortive efforts to make unauthorized use of the theoretical rights.

Note also that he specifically admits that the very term "decentralization" is a deception. This is something of a rude slap in the face for those dupes of Titoism who have made so much of this well-publicized "decentralization" as if it really existed.

The title of Kardelj's article in *Pravda* was "On the Leading Role of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia [the Titoist CP] in the Socialist Structure." Italics are added for emphasis.

### KARDELJ ON THE 'DECENTRALIZATION' FAKE

"...our party placed as the main task before itself and before all of society the struggle against bureaucracy. . . . The chief weapon and political instrument in this struggle was the effort to broaden the mass basis of the executive function of power in general and of executive power in the sphere of economic administration in particular. In other words, a course was taken toward the decentralization and democratization of the executive function of power in general, and particularly in the administration of the national economy. In line with this orientation, a system of workers' councils, communes, and various agencies of self-government . . . developed; the system of administrative agencies was abolished and the state administrative apparatus was drastically reduced, and the role of the people's assemblies and people's committees was strengthened.

"This does not mean, of course, that we Yugoslav Communists are in favor of the atomization and breaking down of society into isolated, decentralized areas. . . . The process which we call decentralization, a name which does not reflect its true nature, does not therefore involve the abolition of centralized functions which are necessary in a contemporary socialist society, but it does lead to their democratization.

"Thus the purpose of the whole reorganization has been to ensure, through the transfer of a whole series of executive functions from a single state executive apparatus to numerous agencies of self-government of the working people . . . direct control and direct influence of workers over production and over the implementation of decisions and tasks in all spheres of social life, above all, in the realm of the national economy.

"Despite all this, however, it is still clear that the decisive factor in the end is the guiding activity of the conscious forces of socialism, first of all the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and the Socialist Alliance of Working People. This activity is essential both in

the molding of socialist consciousness and in the struggle for constant socialist progress, in the struggle to overcome static tendencies, distortions due to habit, obsolete views, ideological survivals of the past, inertia, etc., not to mention the struggle against the emergence of antisocialist elements.

"The actual power . . . is vested in numerous agencies of popular government of many different types, such as workers' councils, people's committees, councils of people's committees, large committees and councils of self-government which direct institutions and various public services. . . .

"Thus the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, which had changed its name in the new circumstances to the League of Communists of Yugoslavia precisely in order to emphasize by this change a new phase in the development of socialist relations and in the social role of Communists, was able to ensure the success of a specific political course only if the Communists concentrated first of all on persuading the broad masses of the working people through organization of the Socialist Alliance of Working People and of the numerous agencies of self-government. . . . The League of Communists of Yugoslavia turned toward the masses on the entire front of socialist construction and social life, in an effort to ensure, first by the method of political activity among the masses and within their organizations, that their representatives in the agencies of popular self-government would adopt socialist decisions. . . . Since the organizations comprising the Socialist Alliance of Working People are not monolithic in the ideological sense—it is united only by a joint and common attachment to socialism—it is clear that various nonsocialist views and opinions break out there. The task of the Communists in this respect is to expose the true nature of such views to the masses and to struggle to eliminate them. It happens only rarely that the activities of the Communists in these cases are not successful. . . ."

## Djilas on Poland and Hungary

In contrast with the reaction of the Tito regime, we can point to an interesting article by Milovan Djilas which was published by the Tribune de Geneve (Switzerland) on October 23—hence written earlier, of course, apparently after the Poznan revolt and the rehabilitation of Gomulka in Poland and the fall of Rakosi in Hungary.

Djilas is the former Yugoslav CP leader who, with his friend Dedijer, was purged from all posts and power when he dared to propose real steps toward democratization of political life. He is still allowed to publish articles abroad, as a journalist.

Djilas specifically counterposes his expectation of new freedom movements like Poznan as against the false expectations of democratization from above by the satellite leaders. He writes, referring to the steps taken by Moscow which appear to grant more leeway to the satellites:

That does not mean that Moscow aims at real independence for the satellites, nor that Russia herself is becoming democratic, but only that Moscow, in collaboration with the satellite governments, is seeking to re-tie together and harmonize their respective economies.

They would like to create a unified region and economic bloc; in Eastern

Europe as in Russia, the Communist bureaucracy wants to reinforce itself in order to maintain its totalitarian power.

Personally, I do not believe that it will succeed in doing so. I recognize that it would be naive to believe that the changes already made can divorce East Europe from Moscow. However, it is not foolhardy to hope that, such as they are, the present changes are creating the necessary conditions for real changes.

Under the apparent modifications, a more significant phenomenon is already taking shape. Movements are surging up which seek independence and liberty.

The Poznan revolt, the open criticisms formulated against the government by the Budapest intellectuals, the agitation among the youth of Prague are the visible symptoms of a development toward true freedom.

The aim of the so-called democratization undertaken by the Communist leaders is, at one and the same time, to try to decapitate any rising for freedom, and to consolidate the Communist bureaucracy on the economic and political fields.

But I do not believe they will succeed. The individuality of the captive countries, always alive among the people, has shown itself running through the Communists themselves.

# Marvels of Morality in the Middle East

## Mostly About Macbeth, Marlon Brando, Mayor Wagner and Other Moral Men

By PHILIP COBEN

As everybody knows, the ruling passion of all Western statesmen is international morality. The greatest world good that can be envisioned by newspaper editorialists is international morality. It is getting so that a respectable government cannot shoot down a colonial resistance nowadays without thinking up reasons to prove how ineffably moral it is to do so, and how beneficial to the colonials (or their heirs) to boot.

For just a blessed little while the other week, we had something of a respite from this sticky stuff,

James Reston of the N. Y. *Times*, for example, who also reported that Eisenhower had used some naughty language when first apprised of the Israeli attack on Egypt, was himself stirred to unusual invective. Britain and France, he wrote in an editorial column November 4, "follow policies as cynical as anything seen in the Atlantic community since Chamberlain and Daladier."

But cussing the allies got our moral

people in Washington nowhere, and about the same time second thoughts began intruding. Since the horrid deed was done, why not use it?

Walter Lippmann, the N. Y. *Herald Tribune's* thinker, set it down as follows on November 2:

"What, taking the situation as we now find it, is the American interest? In the first place, to refrain from moral judgment."

This, as you see, is a refreshing note. The Russians must have read it with interest, for the next day they hurled

200,000 men at Budapest... No, pardon the mistake, that's a different subject, and let's get back to the Middle East. Of this part of the world, Lippmann shows how to go about refraining from moral judgment:

"The Franco-British action will be judged by the outcome—in the first instance whether the military objectives are achieved in a reasonable time and at not to great a cost. If they are not achieved, the decision will have been a gigantic blunder which may well have catastrophic consequences. The American interest, though we have dissented from the decision itself, is that France and Great Britain should now succeed. However much we may wish they had not started, we cannot now wish that they should fail."

We have now listened to two very hardheaded men, no gushing do-gooders they. France and Britain are cynical aggressors, but they are OUR cynical aggressors. As moral people, we are opposed to their committing a crime, but as good Americans we are in favor of their committing the crime successfully.

### IS THIS A DAGGER?

Inspired by similar talk in London, the *Times* correspondent Drew Middleton wired November 4: "From the standpoint of Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden the watchword is from *Macbeth*: 'If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well it were done quickly.'"

As we all know, this reference is to a dastardly murder, oh most foul deed.

As this same London correspondent (who, by the way, is still incapable of referring to the British Labor Party without dripping venom off his typewriter) had written three days before:

"The Government is convinced that this, unpopularity [of the Egyptian adventure] will evaporate when it is seen that intervention works, that the policy goals will be achieved and that a catastrophic war with an Arab coalition headed by President Nasser will be avoided."

This is a splendid tribute to the pragmatic morality of the British people from a reporter who is accustomed to depict Aneurin Bevan as simply a demagogue....

A good portion of the British people, it actually turned out, were demonstrating in the street against the policy that was so sure to "work"—obviously because of a deplorable lack of the proper sense of morality.

As to what the proper conception of morality is, no definition surpasses that given November 5 by the London *Daily Express*, whose firm support for free enterprise and empire is solidly founded on the moral grandeur of the British imperial idea.

The *Daily Express* said in defense of the action in Egypt and in defiance of the UN's chiding:

**"The United Nations has no authority. UN commands no respect anywhere...."**

**"All UN can do is to pass resolutions. When these are directed at Britain, they have no moral force and should be treated with contempt."**

It follows from this that when UN decisions are directed against enemies of Britain (or fill in your own favorite country), they are lofty and unselfish crusades for noble and exalted ends.

### MORAL TITAN

To prove just how lofty all this is, Winston Churchill himself was trundled out of his library where he sat industriously writing a moral history of Britain; he was blown up with a bicycle pump and allowed to leak out the following communication to the people as he endorsed the waylaying of Egypt:

"The British connection with the Middle East is a long and honorable one. Many of the states there owe their origin and independence to us."

If incorporated into his current project on the History of the English-Speaking People, a statement like this can delight whole generations of historians as a classic example of the whopping lie. Thus best sellers are made.

If, however we turn from moral giants like Churchill to detestably cynical people like Reston, we find the latter ex-

plaining that "The explanation of the rift between Washington and the other allies, however, goes back a long way. The British feel strongly that their national survival as a major power depends on the maintenance of their position and their oil receipts in the Middle East." (*Times*, November 1.)

But no one should think that Reston is so softheaded as to put much store by such details. He exhibited no editorial qualms when he reported this week that, morality—shmorality, "this is a good day to declare an armistice on any more recriminations within the Western alliance."

What was so good about this day? "The bitter recriminations of ten days ago against the British and French, therefore, have been tempered, if not removed, by the Soviet Union's brutal assault on Hungary and its open threat of force in Egypt."

Let all good men, therefore, quit bickering about the British-French-Israeli brutal assault on Egypt in order to denounce the godless barbarism of the Russians' brutal assault on Hungary.

### TRIPLETALKING

When it comes to morality, the Israeli leaders and their Zionist friends are behind no one. As Norman Thomas once remarked about the Israeli regime's treatment of the Arabs of Palestine: like the Puritans, "first they fell on their knees and then they fell on the aborigines."

As everybody knows, the modern popular archetype of sneaky diplomacy is the behavior of the Japanese envoys to the U. S. while their compatriots were loosing bombs on Pearl Harbor. As it happened, at the moment when the Tel Aviv radio was announcing the attack on Egypt, Ambassador Abba Eban was assuring State Department officials in Washington that the Israeli mobilization was "purely defensive." We may or may not want to assume that Eban, who is very good at moral speeches, was or was not put wise by his government. But it doesn't matter in the least, because he is a patriot and a diplomat, and as the amoral pun goes, a diplomat is a man who lies abroad for his country.

Eban, however, is an apprentice after all. The master has been doing his stuff this past week. In a bewildering succession of statements, as Eisenhower twisted his arm, Prime Minister Ben-Gurion has been expertly tripletalking on whether or not Israel intends to defy the UN orders and grab whole gobs of Egypt anyway. In his speech to the Knesset, Ben-Gurion even denied that they had invaded any Egyptian territory!

Here in New York, a fellow traveler, Mayor Wagner, in the midst of his campaign for the Senate, bethought himself of an especially moral way of defending and justifying the Israeli attack on Egypt. "He likened the situation to the invasion of Mexico in 1916 when United States troops were in pursuit of the outlaw Pancho Villa." (*N. Y. Times*, Nov. 5.) Since then, an American Jewish Congress official has done the same, in gruesome detail, in a letter to the *Times*.

This is most astonishing. The incursion into Mexico was one of the dirty little episodes in which American imperialism blackjacked its southern neighbor. But what makes it astonishing is not simply this fact, but rather that not even Marlon Brando could convince these people of Villa's bonafides.

The analogy reminds one that Zionists have a habit of justifying Israel's atrocious treatment of its Arab minority by referring Americans to the concentration-camp treatment of the Japanese-Americans in World War II. On the other hand, in Japan Eban's colleagues would have Pearl Harbor itself at their disposal.

Moral people need never lack for suitable precedents, when it comes to such things. The British, French and Israeli professors of ethics have a whole world at their disposal. And in their spare time they can always fill in by denouncing the moral horrors of the alleged "Bolshevik" principle that "the end justifies the means."

### MARVELS OF MORALITY IN INDIA:

## Nehru's Infamy

Among the casualties of the Hungarian Revolution is the Nehru myth—the image of Nehru as the idealistic, moralistic, humanitarian, broad-visioned statesman of peace. Now this international morality-spouter has knifed the Hungarian people in the back while the Russians have been bludgeoning them.

Before and after one remark on November 10 (not before!) regretting the Russian intervention in Hungary, this alleged disciple of Gandhi and his foreign-policy spokesman have been making speeches expounding whole sections of the Russian line on their crime: it is a "civil conflict," it is just an "internal matter," Russia and the Hungarian quislings must be allowed to settle the quarrel by themselves, etc. And then India voted in the UN against asking the withdrawal of Russian troops.

There are not many Americans, to be sure, that can afford to wax indignant against Nehru's hypocrisy in condoning the Russian butchery with silence while properly denouncing the Western aggression on Egypt. In part, the U. S. press' acrimony against Nehru has been a cover for whitewashing the British-French-Israeli attack in the Middle East.

An especially unsavory case in point is the N. Y. *Post*. This model organ of imperialist liberalism begins a Nov. 13 editorial on "Nehru, Hungary and Egypt" with denunciation of Nehru's course as "shocking and disheartening" and gets around, before its close, to painting the Middle East attack as simply "counter-measures against Nasser's expansionist crusade."

In fact, by the time it's through, Nehru is being denounced not for condoning Russian barbarism in Hungary but for speaking up on the crime committed by the *Post's* heroes. This is the mirror-image of the Russians' present exercise in justifying their bloodbath in Hungary with references to Egypt's national rights.

All of these people with blood on their hands are trying to wipe them off on the other fellow.

And Nehru?

### HOLDING HANDS WITH THE RUSSIAN ASSASSINS

All through the Hungarian Revolution, Nehru refused to comment on what Russia was doing.

On Nov. 5, the N. Y. *Times* reported "a remark by V. K. Krishna Menon [Nehru's foreign-policy spokesman]. Asked by a newspaperman for comment on Hungary, Mr. Menon snapped that he was not traveling to that country. He then boarded a plane for New York where the cases of both Egypt and Hungary are on the United Nations agenda."

But Nehru did do one thing: he sent a note straight to Bulganin; in return the Russian premier had no trouble assuring Nehru that Moscow was doing its best to restore "peace and order" in Hungary, that the intervention was only against counter-revolutionists, etc. In a speech in India Nehru passed on Bulganin's version in detail without questioning it publicly!

At a meeting of the National Committee of Nehru's governing Congress party, "A resolution specifically denouncing the Soviet attack was introduced. Not one of about 230 members voted for it. The party whips saw to that. A weaker official resolution was introduced, calling for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Hungary, Egypt and other countries and denouncing military pacts." (*N. Y. Times*, Nov. 12.)

Several days after the attack on Budapest, Nehru had no scruples about again assuring Bulganin that he thought Russia was a leader in the fight for "peace."

In the UN, India abstained on motions such as the one to investigate the Hungarian situation. But on Friday, Nov. 10, Krishna Menon outdid himself in the UN debate. These are the infamous words in which Nehru's mouthpiece spoke of what Russian troops were doing in butchering a whole people fighting for freedom:

First he intimated that "the sovereignty of states" forbade UN concern in the Hungarian matter. Then he went on to expound Bulganin's assurances to his leader: "Soviet troops are to be withdrawn from Budapest as soon as order is restored"—those classic words.

Krishna Menon continued: "In agreement with Yugoslavia, Poland and other countries, who are very near to Hungary and whose problems, though not identical, are of a similar character, we think we should not do things here merely out of emotion or other reactions or out of our political predilections, forgetting the interests of the Hungarian people and of the Hungarian state." (Italics added.)

This is the language of a cynical international scoundrel, not a whit better than the oily speeches of Eden as he pretended to invade Egypt in order to keep the peace.

Nehru is following this vile course as a leader of the "One-and-a-Half Camp," the neutralists, who want to hold on to the coattails of both war camps, to reconcile them. His own "political predilection" is to butter up Russia, at this time, and it is only a nuisance if Hungarian blood is flowing.

While Nehru keeps silent about the crime of Hungary, will Nehru's many vocal admirers and sycophants keep silent about this despicable depravity of their little "great man"?

# The End of the Adlai Line — —

(Continued from page 1)

ing his usual impenetrable vagueness on exactly what policies he would propose, nevertheless created a clear impression that he leaned toward intervention in some way or other. Eisenhower stated flatly that America was not going to get mixed up in this war.

This was enough, and more than enough, to offset whatever impact Stevenson may have had on the "peace vote," with his opposition to continued H-bomb tests. This was the single "bold" or "creative" proposal put forth by the candidate who substituted vague talk about "boldness" and "creativity" for a political program incorporating any of these qualities in its concrete proposals. But his H-bomb-test position was an isolated, belated political jab which was in no way supplemented by an alternative foreign policy for the United States which would have given it a real context, a real meaning.

One of the notable aspects of this campaign was the way in which the labor

movement poured its resources into the struggle. There can be no doubt that many a Republican candidate failed to ride into office on Eisenhower's coattails only because of the electoral activity of the unions.

The most striking example is Detroit, where the labor-endorsed candidates took all six congressional contests, all seven posts in the State Senate, and 36 out of 38 in the State Assembly. In Detroit, also, Stevenson piled up a majority of 180,000 over Eisenhower, an increase of 14,000 over 1952, despite the fact that Eisenhower swept Michigan by over 300,000 votes.

## LABOR'S WORK

The Detroit example was not duplicated everywhere. Far from it.

In city after city, traditional Democratic majorities were whittled down, in the presidential column at least, or even reversed. This relates to a trend which was clearly visible back in 1952: a growing disintegration of the traditional big-city Democratic machines.

In Detroit the labor movement's political apparatus has taken over the Democratic Party lock, stock and barrel, and infused as much of a new content in it as is possible, given the general politics of the labor movement. In other cities, where labor still regards itself not as the Democratic Party, but rather as its ally, it was unable to offset the effects of this disintegration.

The full story of labor's participation in this election will only become clear as detailed analyses are made of the elections on a local basis. There is some evidence at hand, even at this early date, however, which indicates that the organizational unity of the labor movement has yet to result in a real political unification. This may account for Republican victories in a number of cases in which,

given the general pattern of the election, labor might have been expected to carry the day for the Democrats.

In Ohio, for instance, the state AFL endorsed C. W. O'Neill, the Republican who won the gubernatorial election, while the state CIO backed Michael V. DiSalle, the Democrat who lost. The Illinois Federation of Labor endorsed Governor William G. Stratton for reelection, while the Illinois CIO Council "took no public stand for either" Stratton or his Democratic opponent Austin. Veiled references in the labor press indicate that similar conflicts took place elsewhere.

## THEY WON WHAT?

While the labor leadership are congratulating themselves on their success in getting "their" candidates elected in the face of the Eisenhower landslide, they admit that the total effect of the election will be to return a Congress which will reflect and represent the interests of the working people of this country no more than the last one did.

Thus, the post-election issue of the *AFL-CIO News* begins one of its articles:

"The 85th Congress will be a carbon copy of the 84th both in terms of party control and political outlook." And George Meany, in a classic understatement, said after the election: "While the 85th Congress will not be predominantly liberal, we now have renewed hope for accomplishing this objective in 1958."

The blunt truth of the matter, however, is that far from being "predominantly liberal," the Congress will be predominantly conservative, with Southern Democrats heading the committees as usual. This is the pay-off on labor's herculean services for the Democratic Party: even when they win, they get the minimum possible out of their victory

for the people they represent.

Aside from Eisenhower's victory, a significant factor in the election was a marked swing of Negro voters away from the Democratic ticket. Although full reports on this are also lacking, it appears that the swing was strongest among Negro voters in the South, and less strong in the North, where the identification of interest between Negroes and the labor movement is greater.

Negroes who voted for Eisenhower did so for the same reasons as their white fellow citizens, and for the additional reason that the Democratic Party in the South represents the strongest and most fanatical racist elements in the country. Those who switched their votes to Eisenhower did so not because they have become more conservative than in the past, but because they sought the most effective method they know of to register a protest against the Democratic sell-out of their interests.

Senator Humphrey is reported to have said, after the election, that the Democrats "are digging their own grave by inaction on civil rights." That this patented phony should have waited till after the elections to pronounce himself on this issue is typical of him and his ilk, and his convictions on the question will remain firm up till the exact moment when he thinks he can derive a personal advantage by abandoning them.

To be taken more seriously is the lead article in the *AFL-CIO News* for November 10 by assistant Editor Willard Shelton who writes:

"With Eisenhower's second consecutive cracking of the Solid South—including actual Southern gains over 1952—the national Democratic Party presumably will be driven to ask itself whether it can safely base itself on the South.

"Northern and Western liberals will be compelled to ask whether the burden of carrying Southern Dixiecrat committee chairman such as Sens. Harry Byrd (D-Va.) and James O. Eastland (D-Miss.) and Reps. Howard Smith (D-Va.) and Graham Barden (D-N. C.) is not an intolerable handicap."

It is not just that the labor-liberals had "an intolerable handicap" on the issue of civil rights by their alliance with the Southern Democrats. They have been and will continue to be handicapped on every important economic and social issue as long as they are willing to subordinate their own interests and program to those of the conservative wing of the party.

## MISSED OPPORTUNITY

We do not contend that the country, or even the working class, is pressing for drastic alterations in the socio-economic structure, and that their desires have been thwarted by the lack of alternatives offered them in this election. The Negroes are the only group who have demonstrated that they are willing to fight here and now for a radical change in their circumstances. The election demonstrates that there has been a swing away from the hysteria of 1952, a year in which the most reactionary elements in the country were setting the tone with their "twenty years of treason"—a year in which the witchhunt and the cry of "anti-Communism" were a transparent cloak for the drive against civil liberties, all liberal ideas, and the labor movement itself.

The general mood today is one of relative complacency in the midst of the economic boom, relief at the slowing down of the cold war, and at the recession into the distance of the danger of World War III.

But the continued backing of the Democratic Party by a majority of the people shows that they have not swallowed the idea that this prosperity is guaranteed, and that they can rest their political fate in the hands of big business and its most direct political representatives.

The tragedy of labor's policy in this election is not that it failed to win the presidency, nor even that its "victory" in Congress can only return the country to the tender mercies of the Dixie-GOP coalition. More important is the tragedy of one more missed opportunity in educating and training and giving a clear programmatic and organizational leadership to the basically healthy and progressive sentiments which the election showed remain so strong in a majority of the population.

# Tito vs. — —

(Continued from page 6)

With the outbreak of the Hungarian Revolution, the Titoist regime showed the jitters openly, as reported in numerous press dispatches. On the second day of the revolution, "one prominent Yugoslav" told a *Times* correspondent that unlike the Poles, "Hungarian labor lacked a revolutionary tradition" (this of the only country outside Russia that had a Soviet republic after the First World War!) and indicated "definite nervousness."

On October 27 the Titoist organ *Komunist*, while Russian troops were shelling Budapest, found occasion to write of the ever more friendly relations with Russia and the progressive democratic and socialist changes that had been taking place there since Stalin's death (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, Oct. 28).

On October 29 Tito took the unusual step of publicly addressing a letter to the new Hungarian Communist leadership, which was carrying on the anti-Russian rebellion, appealing to them to end their fight. There can be no doubt that this was direct payment to the Russians for the Yalta deal.

In addition the Yugoslav press was openly expressing its fear—on the eve of the massive Russian assault of November 3 on the victorious revolution—that Nagy was going too far in granting freedom to "different political and other groups," i.e., in breaking the totalitarian framework (*N. Y. Times*, Nov. 3.)

In the Nov. 4 *Pravda* editorial heralding the assault, it was Tito's *Borba* that was cited, in order to make clear that the action had Tito's OK.

And when the Russians unleashed their all-out blow, the Tito regime endorsed the repression as a necessity, though a regrettable one. It did this first by endorsing the new quisling Kadar regime, though for the better part of the week the Yugoslav press did not even reveal that new Russian forces had attacked Budapest. In the UN, the Yugoslav representative has opposed, abstained on, or qualified his way out of, any action to help Hungary.

Yet Tito may not get his pound of flesh from his Russian friends. For no matter how staunchly he upholds the Kremlin's iron gauntlet, the very existence of national-Stalinism is a disease that rots the Russian power.

There are reports and signs of a recrudescence of strength, or at least continued factional struggle, by the "hard" Stalinist group of the Kremlin. The wolves may tear themselves apart.

If Moscow succeeds in stabilizing and quieting East Europe, with Tito's aid, then they will be in position to take care of Tito in any case. The "hards" may be arguing that this should be done now in order to stabilize East Europe.

Meanwhile Tito has postponed for a year the quadrennial congress of his ruling party, which is due now. This is not done because everything is under control.

The future ahead for both Tito-Stalinism and Moscow-Stalinism is one of revolutionary upheaval.

# UN and Mideast — —

(Continued from page 1)

Was disgruntlement against London and Paris worth the death of NATO, and with it the open and complete collapse of all American policy? Obviously not for these people who had nothing to replace the corpse with.

Eisenhower began backwatering. This was indicated in his Nov. 7 speech when he conceded the "manifest right" of Britain and France "to take such decisions and action" even though the U. S. might "dissent."

It became a disagreement to be smoothed over. But how?

The *N. Y. Times'* James Reston, as often, had already expounded the change that was taking place in a Nov. 4 dispatch headlined "Capital Softens Mideast Position." The administration, he communicated, is "modifying its original tendency to think in terms of punishing the Israelis, thinking about the opportunities provided by the military developments rather than about the differences of the past, and subordinating its grievances with Britain, France and Israel." (Boldface added.)

## "REALISM"

A *Times* editorial the next day was practically an unofficial release from State Department circles:

We don't like how affairs have been handled in the Middle East but "it is only realistic to make the best of them." Our concern must be "to achieve the results for which we all should hope." "The questions of right or wrong . . . are, of course, enormously important" for history but "what they have done cannot now be undone." As Churchill said, "the test" is in the results. And the editorial winds up with the call for "saving the Suez Canal from the capricious hands of a hostile dictator."

The way to smooth over the little spat had already been indicated by British and French spokesmen themselves. Both of these countries knew in advance that an attack on Egypt, if successful, would not end their problem but only begin it: how to hold on to the canal permanently in the face of the united hatred of the whole Middle East with the exception of their catspaw Israel. The idea was to

turn the canal, once conquered, over to a UN front.

UN intervention can therefore mean either one of two things: (1) ousting the aggressors from the scene of their crime, and turning sovereignty back to Egypt, or (2) stepping in to do the imperialists' dirty work for them.

There is a very simple test to find out which of these it will be: Will all foreign troops be immediately cleared off Egyptian-controlled territory and full Egyptian sovereignty over Suez restored entire? or will some "compromise" be imposed on Egypt which will mean forcing through some version of the imperialists' previous plans to grab the canal back?

There is no doubt that Washington is hoping that Egypt can be maneuvered or blackjacked into some such capitulation behind the cover of a UN "police force." This would solve its problem: how to give its noble NATO allies what they want, and still pose as champion of justice and peace.

There are three factors which militate against the success of this strategy:

(1) The revulsion in the world against the attack, spearheaded by the British Labor movement inside England itself, and naturally powerful in the whole of the uncommitted world of Asia and Africa. A sellout of Egypt in this next stage will put the U. S. into the same pillory as the attackers themselves.

(2) Russia's threats—of sending "volunteers" and so forth—through which it is trying to utilize the Western crime in order to advance its own totalitarian imperialist interests in the region.

(3) The unlikelihood that Nasser can accept any kind of capitulation, however sweetened, without being discredited at home and in the Arab world, irremediably.

But if Egypt is freed of the aggression, then the whole episode becomes a historic fiasco for the West of gargantuan proportions.

The U. S. is between the frying-pan and the fire. There is an easy way out, of course—cut loose from all imperialist interests and defend justice for oppressed peoples everywhere—but this is the one thing that is impossible for the leader of the capitalist imperialist world.