TWO CRIMES THAT WILL LIVE IN INFAMY:

Russian Butchers Crush Hungarian People As Western Imperialists Assault Egypt

By HAL DRAFER

The joint attack on Egypt by the British, French and Israeli forces is an act of imperialist aggression against a small country as any in the history of colonialism.

Led by Britain and France, with Israel acting as their catapaw and junior partner in behalf of its own aims, the attack by the Western allies is a continuation of their three-month-old drive to blackmail Egypt over possession of the Suez Canal and the reverse nationalization of the Canal Company, to put the waterway under "international" (i.e., imperialist) control.

"But Egypt had and has a sovereign right to take over control of this piece of Egyptian territory. Cairo was willing to, and proposed to, concede various guarantees of free shipping through the canal, of compensation for the Canal Company coupon-clippers, (Continued on page 7)

As we go to press, British Labor’s great struggle against the war has forced a conciliation on the Eden government short of seizure of the canal, with the outcome still in doubt. Arab Prime Minister Gareen has made official the Egyptian aim to graft Suez and other territory.

North Korea: Blood-Relations

Margurite Higgins of the N.Y. Herald Tribune:

"Would the Russians have dared invade new bloodshed in Hungary had they not had an excuse British and French unilateral attempt to intervene? The British and French timed their ultimatum to Egypt so as to take advantage of Soviet pressures with the Satellites. How the Russians have turned the tables and are taking advantage of the West’s pressures with the Mid-East to try and create another spirit of racism in Europe.

The British Labor Party’s Daily Herald: Without the Western split over the attack on Egypt...

"The police action in Egypt provides the Soviet Union with a pretext for its own active. This we must realize with great bitterness in the very hour that Hungary’s fight for freedom ends.

Communist Militants: Which Side Are You On?

By GORDON HASKELL

Russian tanks, in crushing the revolution in Hungary, have also dealt a mortal blow to the world Communist Parties from which they will never recover. The shells exploding in Budapest have blown up the last myth with which this movement was trying to paste itself together: the myth that “Stalinism without Stalin” was in fact, or was in the process of becoming, democratic socialism.

Ever since the world leaders of the Communist movement “revealed” that Russia, the “socialist bastion,” had lived under a brutal totalitarian regime for twenty years, this movement in the United States and throughout the world has been in the grip of ideological turmoil and disintegration.

Thousands of members and leaders who had lived, fought and sacrificed for this movement because they believed it offered an infinitely more democratic, more humanitarian method of social evolution than that which prevails in the capitalist world, began to re-think what they had been taught, and what they had taught others, about the relationship between socialism and democracy.

As is to be expected, individuals and groups in and around the Communist Party have differed in the speed and depth with which they were willing or able to re-examine their political ideology. As the further implications of the “revelations” about Stalinism presented themselves, some began to hesitate, and others to draw back. The discussion in the American CP (and in most others) swung away from the central question of the social character of the Russian regime and of the others built up in its garb, the statement adopted by the CP as the correctness of the domestic policies of these countries for democratization, for a solution to their economic problems, for full national sovereignty and equality in their relations with the Soviet Union.

"This is so despite the fact that in Poland and more successfully in Hungary, reactionary forces and others influenced by agents and propaganda of capitalist countries including our own, have been trying to use these democratic movements for the purpose of restoring capitalism in these lands.

"Nevertheless, the basic cause of these upheavals is to be found in the fact that the Communist Parties of these countries have followed the experiences of the Soviet Union... as well as the course of restoring capitalism in these lands.

"The election results, and Labor’s course (Continued on page 7)

NEXT WEEK IN L.A.
The Election Results and Labor’s Course
Eго сложные войны, в которых он постоянно перемещается, не позволяют ему стать неизменным в глазах своей аудитории. Его политические решения часто вызывают споры и недовольство, особенно среди его оппонентов. Он не стесняется принимать трудные решения, даже если это приводит к критике со стороны общественности.

Po своему характеру, он склонен к авантюризму, а иногда и к риску. Он верит в силу воинственного духа и всегда готов к нападению, несмотря на то, что это может привести к проблемам. Его политика подразумевает постоянное противостояние с ними, и он не боится защищать свои интересы при любых обстоятельствах.

Он также считает, что его политика является необходимой для обеспечения безопасности и стабильности в своей стране. Он уверен, что только сильная и жизнеспособная армия может гарантировать его безопасности и престиж.

Подводя итог, можно сказать, что Нассер был не только политиком, но и военачальником, который постоянно боролся за свою страну и ее интересы. Его политика, хотя и вызвала много споров и критики, также способствовала укреплению роли Египта в международной политике.

**Biography:**
Nasser was born in Minya, Lower Egypt, on 15 September 1918. He attended the Egyptian Military Academy and served in the Egyptian Army until his retirement in 1960. He was the founder and first President of the People's Republic of Egypt, serving from 1956 until his death in 1970.

**Career Highlights:**
- Served as a military officer and achieved the rank of brigadier general.
- Played a key role in the 1950s revolution that overthrew King Farouk and established the Free Officers Movement.
- Led the 1952 revolution that toppled the monarchy and established a republic.
- Promoted modernization and rapid industrialization in Egypt.
- Nationalized foreign-owned companies and industries to control their economic policies.
- Struggled against Western imperialist policies and supported Arab nationalism.
- Supported the UN call for Israel to withdraw from all the territories it occupied in 1967.
- Proposed a Pan-Arab Federation and advocated for a single Pan-Arab state.
- Criticized the US-led intervention in the Middle East and supported the Palestinian cause.

**Legacy:**
Nasser's legacy is complex and controversial. He is remembered for his role in modernizing Egypt, for his support of Arab nationalism, and for his opposition to US imperialism. However, his policies also led to repression, censorship, and human rights abuses. His death in 1970 marked the end of his presidency and the beginning of a period of relative stability in Egypt.
The Future of the Russian Empire: REFORM or REVOLUTION?

By TONY CLIFF

Author of "Sталистинский Марксизм: Анализ" and "Русский от Сталина до Хрущева"

Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—exclusive property rights in the land they held.

The Polish national revolution ended in defeat. But the blood of Poland did not flow in vain. Two years later the defeat of the insurrection, on April 4, 1946, the first revolutionary attempt on the life of the tsar in modern times, was avenged by the Red Army on Poland. He faltered and was executed, but his was the first act in a revolutionary drama that ended with the overthrow of tsarist autocracy.

Even this brief historical outline shows quite clearly that the forces of revolution, as the trend from 1917 increasingly tend to waken revolution from below.

One cannot cross the abyss separating autocracy from democracy in a number of small steps. (Of course the autocracy does not want to make that crossing.) And the expression from the top, instead of avverting the revolution from below, kindles the flames of liberty; and that is the beginning of the end of the armed insurgent people.

The similarity between the first years of rule of the "Tsar Liberator" Alexander II and those of the First Secretary "Democratizer" Khrushchev is indeed great.

Two such autocratic men could not be pushed too far:

— Russian of the horse age moved far more slowly than the person of the jet age.

— Poland of the nobility was a weakened compared to the mighty Polish people's movement.

— The different oppressed nationalities, isolated from each other geographically, economically and spiritually in the past, are now bound closely to one another.

— The social content of the revolt against autocracy in the twentieth century differs enormously from that of the nineteenth century.

— The mighty working class of all the nationalities operating in the Russian army and above all the Russian working class is a wakening giant which is now ready to break the chains of social and national oppression.

HOW REFORMS WAKE REVOLUTION

Yet the reforms carried out by the tsar, however shadowy they were, inspired many a Pole, and their movement was a step toward liberation. The people in the Polish towns, who had attained a far higher degree of political consciousness than in Russia, could not but hope to see in this first ray of light piercing the black clouds of tsarist oppression the approach of a new day.

More and more societies were founded in Poland, illegal leaflets were issued, and demonstrations took place. And immediately the Cossack's scimitar and gun played their usual part. Already in February and March 1861 mass demonstrations in Warsaw were shot down.

Two years later, in January 1863, a Polish national insurrection broke out. The insurrection was doomed to defeat.

The Poles did not possess a regular army and the whole of the country was garrisoned by Russian troops. But even more serious for the fate of the insurrection was the fact that only a small part of the Poles supported it actively; the Polish peasants were quite indifferent to a movement that would cause the downfall of a population of some five million members, only ten thousand badly armed and inexperienced insurgents joined the armed struggle.

The rebels managed to hold on for eighteen months in a guerrilla war. This was partly due to the lack of enthusiasm that many of the Russian garrison showed for their job of killing. A number of officers expressed sympathy with the Poles, and were court-martialled; others escaped to the insurgents and even assumed command over their detachments.

Again the "revolutionary contagion" spread, even if not very widely, beyond the borders of Poland. In March 1864 insurrection spread to Lithuania, and the same year saw an upsurge of nationalism in Germany, near the Volga—but this was nibbled in the bud.

Alarmed, the government made some concessions. It granted the serfs in the so-called Northern Provinces —with the words: "Long live the social and democratic movement!" (Khrenikov, p. 4.)

But the tsar "Liberator" showed himself most vicious in his attitude towards the serfs.

Tsar Nikolai's brutality, his method of governing by means of the rod, had earned him the epithet of the "Pan-Pole". His son, who was not a fool, realised this and started his rule wooing Polish public opinion. He mitigated the severity of Russian rule over Poland, and curtailed somewhat the powers of the tsarist viceroy in Warsaw. He even repaid him with a new "liberal" face.

But it was obvious, even in the early days of his reign, that the Russian Tsar II intended to curb his "reforming zeal" even more strenuously in Poland than in Russia. He made all possible promises to the representatives of the Polish gentry and bourgeoisie at their first meeting in 1856: "No change!"
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Herzen went so far as to write letters full of admiration to the tsar, and then suffered a rude shock a few years later when the terms of the emancipation of the serfs were made known. But the political conclusions that they drew from the new situation were poles apart.

Herzen, whose following had dwindled to nothing, went into exile, and the Tsarist court seemed to have lost the thread of the affair, and to place his faith in the 'desire and ability of the "enlightened nobility" to persuade the peasantry to carry his reforms further. (Was he a Deutscher?) Chernichevsky and his increasing number of followers concluded that the tsar was, in fact, the chief representative of the exploiting landowners, and that only the removal of the landowners from the road of social and political progress.

The rulers brought a number of radicals to issue illegal, anti-tsarist leaflets. Thus one of them exclaimed: "The Reform Act has called for "immediate revolution, a bloody and merciless revolution, which must radically change every page of the foundations of society without exception."

Deutscher's Ancestors

In the first flush of Alexander I's promises of reform, many were eager to believe in his words. Thus the two leaders of Russian radicalism, the moderate Alexander Herzen and the revolutionary democratic nephew of the tsar, had arrived on the scene when he announced his intention of abolishing serfdom.
of bread. In Poland rose from 15.8 thousand in 1940 to 48.9 thousand in 1944; in Hungary from 9.2 thousand to 15.4 thousand; the other satellites showed similar trends. The occupation and leading them, the longer the worker is "cooked in the factory," and the greater his skill, the more resentful, if not rebellious, does he become.

BUREAUCRATS VS. THE KREMLIN

The third largest class after the peasants and workers is the Russians in the Russian bureaucracy. One of the paradoxes of the Stalinist regime is that even the ordinary worker is not at one with it. Of course they are glad to know that the Kremlin protects them. But, alas, too often the MVD, by setting women in power on the shelves of the labor bureaucracy itself! (Thus it was estimated that in 1947 in one of the textile plants, 90% of the technicians were specialists or imprisoned or physically eliminated—N. V. Tikhomirov, "The Terrors of the Second World War," Moscow, 1955, p. 231.)

The loss of labor, belligerent in labor, and the greater the desire of the Kremlin to push production forward, the more does the worker lash out at the individual worker. Thus, in the belief that the greater the illusion which he wishes to have剩下的部分被删除了。
On the Razor's Edge

Eight years ago, in 1948, Tito broke with Moscow. In the process of defending the national independence of the country from outside, while preserving the rule of the party, he was carrying out a number of reforms. The aim was to strengthen the struggle against the domination of Moscow, which compelled the Yugoslav leaders more and more to seek the support of Western capitals. The Titoist regime, forced to renounce, or at least to pretend to renounce, its obvious foreign policies. The struggles, by means of the Yugoslav government, to enlarge its mass support, forced it to appeal to the “nation” which, as correctly, the center of its policies that were, by the connection with the isolation of Yugoslavia from the world market, the confrontation with the severe poverty of 1945, pushed the government in the same direction.

As a counter to Stalin’s bureaucracy-centralism, Tito attempted to implement “socialist democracy.” The Yugoslav workers, farmers, and intellectuals, the economy, the federal ministries of Electricity and Mining and other areas, had the right to self-management, responsibility for the management of these branches of the economy handed over to the government. The worker’s unions and the republics took an active role in this.

On April 11, another six ministries of the central government, trade unions, and the large industries, in addition to the coal and steel, were taken under the control of the workers’ councils, primarily by the same people in the center of political power.

This autonomy can a worker-councillor have when it is elected from a list of candidates put forward by the factory, which is centralist and controlled by the party?

Again, what autonomy can it have when the economy is planned and the vital decisions on production, such as the national strategic goals to be produced and distributed nationally, are made by a central government?

Can there be genuine self-government in a situation where everything, from factories to papers, is controlled in the hands of the centralised, bureaucratic party?

The Limits of Titoism

To illustrate why the Yugoslav worker has in “his” factory, it need be mentioned that not a single strike took place either before or after the law on worker’s councils was enacted on June 6, 1950; that the labour-code (the karakteristika, a sealed record of the workers’ political and economic status) which has to be shown, every time he takes on a new job, continues to exist; and that the most severe punishments are meted out to workers who are out of work, even if they do so only to ease their hunger.

It is last, and this clearly the contradiction between the outward forces—the workers own the factories—and the real social owners, that will be herefore be relevant to give an instance. The Manchester Guardian of August 19, 1958, gave the following report on the new Workshop for the better payment of the workers in the iron industry: “Steel, Steelmaking”:

The novel procedure of trying offenders in their place of work instead of a courtroom was introduced in Bulgaria a few days ago. In the two workshops were tried in a big workshop of an engineering works for having committed numerous thefts. One man was sentenced to death and 16 to prison sentences ranging from two months to twenty years. The whole staff of the works had to attend and there was no guarantee that there would not happen to serve as a warning.

It is small wonder that Yugoslav workers resort to stealing and have to be warded off by spectacular methods. Relations are small and the government finds the labor-market to be a market for free market society, indeed, extremely high.

One other characteristic feature of Titoism, interwoven with its nationalism, was its soft-peddling of collectivisation of agriculture.

The Titoan’s central aim in this is best understood only by reading the Titojed conflict with Russia in 1948, and the change in the Titojed position after the Polish conflict. In 1956, the Titojed government, and even more so in 1958, condemned the state that its very existence was in the balance. Only two fronts, externally, against the Titojed and internally against the peasants, and any attempt at large-scale and compulsory collectivisation will be a blow to the Titojed economy. So much for Stalin.

There is a result, while in Bulgaria in June 1953, 51.7 per cent of all arable land was in collective farms, in Yugoslavia, of the 1.6 million households (Yugoslavia, 1953) 26 per cent was in Russia 12 per cent (U.S. Urban Economics Survey of Europe, 1950: op. cit., p. 81), and for Eastern Europe was, (Gayer, Economic and Agriculture in Crisis, New York, 1954, p. 62.)

Notwithstanding the basic similarity of the Stalinist and Titoist regimes, there is one big difference between them. Stalin’s regime was a one-party, more tyrannical while becoming less and less efficient, these two mutually strengthening each other. Under the Titojed regime, the conflict between the two has not led to increasing convulsions. A report that the opposition was no longer a political party, no opposition voice was mentioned (see the case of Djilas and Dijander), class distinctions continue, and the bureaucracy is not bitting at the heels of the workers in the same way.

Can Gomulka Do a Tito?

There can be no doubt that Gomulka, Nagy and the other rulers of the satellites are making attempts to look like Tito. The question is whether this is to a regime—decentralisation of the administration, “democratic centralism” etc.—or to a genuine “southern options” back-peddling on the collectivisation of agriculture—have already been taken in Poland and Hungary. The satellite countries have not yet realised that the satellites will be able to copy Tito and stabilise their regime as “enlightened totalitarians.” This is so for a number of reasons.

First of all, there are economic reasons which make the success of “Titoism” in Poland dependent on the monopoly of the industrial targets, and the success of the industrialisation plan. This is the reason. The Tito regimes have been in power high, thus avoiding overcapitalising its capacity and extending its reach.

As a matter of fact the rate of growth of industry in Yugoslavia since the 1950 reforms is very low in the comparison with the rate of growth of various industries in the satellites, in Russia, or even in the countries of Western Europe, as can be seen from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Growth of Industry 1950-1953</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Germany</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Germany</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The avoidance of forced mass collectivisation in Yugoslavia is integrally bound up with its extremely rapid industrialisation. Without expelling off surplus from agriculture, the sources of capital accumulation are exhausted. (Apologists of Stalinism in its different variants, who praise Russia and her satellites for their speedy industrialisation and wish to draw the Eastern European political regime, will have to choose: either they argue with the technical advancements of the satellites, or for “more democracy” paid for by relative economic stagnation.)

A fall in the Russian rate of industrial development to the Yugoslav level would entail a drastic curtailment of the industrial credits available for the satellites. Thus all efforts for industrialisation, to grativate toward the U.S.S.R., would again be aerobic. It would demand the surrender of any idea of world supremacy.

And it must be remembered that even the modest rate of growth of the industrial output of Yugoslavia was made possible by relatively rapid industrial development with an expanding outlay on consumer goods. It is therefore clear that Russia will be extremely put to the test about her capacity to support her up against mighty Russia. But will U.S. imperialism bear the same fate, and will the satellites, especially since Russia will obviously be weakened, in spite of the shock of defection takes effect? Or can one expect U.S. imperialism to give economic aid on a large scale to Russia?

From Titoism to Revolution

Above all, Gomulka and Nagy are not, as is Tito, founders in their own home in name the other leaders of the “People’s Democracies,” Tito and his friends Bau to power without the support of the Russian army, and while there are no Russian troops on Yugoslav soil, Poland, Hungary, Eastern Germany and Romania are heavily garrisoned by them.

And while Yugoslavia is so situated geographically that it can have a balance between Russia and America, no other “People’s Democracies” (in Eastern Germany and Albania) is as advantageously situated.

The only case of Yugoslavia, the Communist Party leaders on which the Russian power support only in Chechoslovakia and Bulgaria; and even in these two satellites, the Popular Front was forged through years of struggle in a war of independence against Russia, in Yugoslavia, achieved by the defeat of Russia. The relative popularity of the party plays a significant role in the extent of the stability of the regime. In the last analysis it is a game in which only small parties may attain a victorious conclusion if the whole people is united. And when they are, they will not surrender to local bureaucrats, turncoat quirks.

The German garrisons are balancing between the workers, peasants and intellectuals of their own country on the one hand and the Party, on the other. They try to use the pressure of the one in order to wring concessions from the other. To the Russian people Gomulka, Nagy & Co. will be swept aside by the pressure of the mass movement, they will be the helpless slaves of Russia.

Revolution is Contagious

But balancing on a razor’s edge is a difficult task and it can not continue indefinitely.

The collapse of the Hungarian revolution in 1956 and the revolt in Belgium ignited the great Polish rising in 1956. The Titojed Revolutions sparked off the Hungarian revolution, in which the Titojed Stalinism bound the struggle against the Russian troops that had come to crush the revolution. French and Belgian, German, Polish and Hungarian blood together watered the tree of liberty.

In 1964, after the collapse of the recent Polish uprising, a socialist delegation from France came to London, and at a meeting which it called to protest against the cruel suppression of the Polish national revolution, decided to found a “Young Person’s Association,” the First International. It is in Polish literature that the idea of mass organisations and the idea of the mass of workers, peasants and intellectuals of their own country, on the one hand and the Party, on the other. They try to use the pressure of the one in order to wring concessions from the other. To the Russian people Gomulka, Nagy & Co. will be swept aside by the pressure of the mass movement, they will be the helpless slaves of Russia.
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The avoidance of forced mass collectivisation in
Western Leaders Too, Fear Revolution in Russian Empire

By PHILIP COBEN

According to a myth spread on both sides of the Iron Curtain, the leader and policies of the capitalist West should have been overthrown by the depth and extent of the Hungarian Revolution.

It is therefore important, and politically enlightening, to detail the events in Hungary. Precisely in proportion as the Hungarian Revolution became a social revolution and not just a military revolution, the extent that it took on a deepening character, there was a clear formation of alarm in Washington, London and Paris.

We remind our readers that this phenomenon was almost as clear at the time of the East German revolt against Russian rule in June 1953. It is a regular pattern. But this time the reaction can be documented in some detail.

The Hungarian Revolution was of course directed against the Russian power, as an even greater victory of capitalism as well as the enemy of socialism; but sosocalled "capitalist" states also find capitalism's jumps with the jitters....

"U.S. Fears Reds May Act Too Fast," was the headline over a report (UPI) of the N. Y. Times Washington bureau head, James Reston. "The hope in official quarters," he said, "that it was a revolt against Soviet policies in Hungary, is not confirmed. There is no possibility of events in Budapest will not offer a pretest for their own country."

"What intervention? By the Russians. But the Russian troops and tanks were already in the Hungarian capital, slaughtering of the freedom fighters. Nagy had proclaimed to his "official quarters" mean "massive intervention."

Naturally, if the Hungarian people perceive that their "peace and anti-Soviet aspects," it is up to, the Russians to clean up, with only that the authorities are in control for further "intervention."

All this would be the present situation in the mythology unless we look a little further. This is the case for our forebodings. These are documented too.

A CLEVER PLAN

On October 25 the N. Y. Herald Tribune's Howard Jones was a good deal more educational than Reston's deliberations. He said:

"The anxious question in Washington about the Budapest uprising—which indicates a Soviet or even greater victory of capitalism against the Soviet world—has been the possible Russian intervention."

"For the Russians to turn the screws back in on the Hungarian revolution, or to follow our "official quarters" lead, would be a good reason for preventing the rebellion."

"Specifically there is worry that the Kremilin might seize on events in Hungary as a general reason to discourage the Russian, or rather juggling promises to Poland to prevent another "Tito" road to socialism."

"In fact, Washington is aware that the Hungarian uprising could be used to get a foothold on the factions in the Soviet Politburo. Another "anti-Stalinization" in the satellites has gone too far and the Kremlin wants to catch up with its "official quarters" stance."

The politically informed reader will instantly see the point: that this.transpose of the Kremilin mind is virtually a word-for-word duplication of the U.S. position on the popular revolts in Asia and Africa by the Stalinist apologists. The rest of the world should do the same."

So once again, we are told that the way to stop an upsurge in the U.S. is to demand that the Russian state stop the mass movements in the U.S. So to the extent that the "official quarters" are demanding more intervention in Hungary, that is the extent that it is so clear what is happening in Hungarian.

"QUESTION OF PRETEXTS"

Indeed, we can round this out for the Hungarian revolution in Paris comes a bit of wisdom which was not from any anony-

mous source. A source from the government, or from the government's policy makers, has said: "It would be dangerous to try to cut the links that countries like Hungary, Czechoslovakia, or Rumania have with the Soviet Union. This would prevent the spread of the ideas in those countries with a pretext to go back on de-Stalinization."

This almost views the hard-eyed bureaucratic depots who run Russia as if they were just sentimental, petty bourgeois children who can be jolted out of their minds in time, only if you don't take away their candy too roughly and make them cry. It would be hilarious if anyone really believed that Finusc (the Washington "official quarters") and London "senators" have any hope of this.

If the Russian leaders are looking to a new Soviet policy, they will unleash the people and, possibly, those in some countries with a pretext to go back on de-Stalinization.

"This reverse of the West's foreign policy, and the stormy development of the mass movement in Poland. They are not only a threat to the U.S. government but also a threat to the U.S. government but also the social revolution."

WAR CALCULATION

One of the closest came from Drew Finusc of the N. Y. Times correspondent in London, again replying to the "government opinion" and "observers" in his column. "To underline leave Russia alone, don't scare them, and they will hand down democracy, or an installment plan for those who believe in it."

"For better or for worse, the forces of revolution against Stalinism are ready to come to the aid of a revolution in the Iron Curtain domain should be viewed primarily as a military ally of the Atlantic bloc. This, in case of war with Russia, revolt becomes the line or the organization of sabotage for the Western side would be desirable. But all of that is only for war."

"If the Western victory would "liberate" the satellites, and any revolutionary action by the people themselves would be strictly subordinated."

"But this idea of the prospect of anti-Soviet forces against the bloodshed of war, even assuming that the Western capitalism could inspire any mass movement of the people there, which is scarcely likely, but far worse, the forces of revolution against Stalinism could be purely a device to stop a revolution in the Iron Curtain domain."

"The Soviet Union's role in the latter is the reverse of the capitalist-military calculation."

"From London (Oct. 27): "Some observers view the Russian resistance now, gallant though it be, as a desperate defense for any future struggle against the Soviet Union, if hunger Cape deferred to the Kremilin's demands."

"If they have been (the Hungarian demonstrators) slaughtered by the Soviet army, it is noted, time will be necessary for any more resistance."

"So they should preserve themselves for the real war."

"For now, for some time, there will be a better chance to pull off a revolution."

"But he has said, he feels the "observers" are setting themselves up as experts on good revolution politics: "an anti-Soviet situation for one country.""

"The situation may dawn that the future for which the "democratic forces" have been preserved nothing to do with their own deaths."

"The "observers" are hardly interested in, but in the struggle and plans of the West."

The next day Middleton wrote from London. "More clearly, "Government opinion" on Budapest and the Hungarian revolt, he said. On the one hand, there is re-

duction of "Stalinism" on the other hand, and not to go any further, above all not to give any "official quarters" a chance to be more interested in the situation."

"In contrast there is the objective view that the Hungarian anti-Communists have exposed themselves, that they have moved beyond the capacity of the West to guide or advise. (Raiden forces added)."

Indeed and truly, the Hungarian Revolution was far away from any control or "guidance" from these people.

DREAM OF A DEAL

"This line of thought ties up with a third formulation which creeps up as the press accounts for the indulgent sympathies for the Stalins in the Hungarian Revolution in the State Department and elsewhere. Here, for instance, is a dispatch in the N. Y. Times, Oct. 27.

"There was some consideration of what might happen in case of the U.S. situation. This could present a major dilemma."

"In the U.S., it is true the rebels should succeed in setting up a government in a relatively short time."

"Such a situation could be installed a free agent in Hungary. But Washington officials do not want to offer a major challenge to the Soviets; they have been accustomed to recognize a Hungarian government without U.S. approval."

"Such a provocation possibly could lead to war, it is felt here. The view prevailing now is that the situation there should be left to the Soviets, who are not so much concerned than "revolution, though nobody was saying that."

"And expert would be astounded if you took it literally. It speaks of "revolution versus "revolution as if discussing a parliamentary regime where this time-honored verbal term is used at least at a frame of reference."

But if we ever get to the showdown, what remains is the conception that the way to try to maintain peace is by divid-

ing the world into the two groups which is "contained" within the present Iron Curtain domain and in which Moscow is assured undisputed advantage in any domestic conflict, to make trouble for us capitalists in the rest of the world.

But it is not sheer rubber, like some of the other things we have had to quote, this time, the Russian politi-

cal realism looking forward to the only kind of peace it knows, the peace that will be achieved by the "official quarters" divide it up for exploitation in the long run. The proof is behind the Truman-Acheson-Kennan speech, and more than the present operation in Washington of the official GOP demagogy about "freedom" and "guarantee and advice" test their revolution get in the way of the current strategies of the capitalist world.

THE BASIC FEAR

And behind this there is something more and something deeper in the think-

ing of a ruling class:

Revolution is contagion. Once the people have a taste of the fruits of American pomptis, Walter Lippmann, who once long ago used to be a socialist and is now, as the speech goes, "sensitive to revolution."

"Now this has been put down in paper in the official quarters in Washington of American pomptis, Walter Lippmann, who once long ago used to be a socialist and is now, as the speech goes, "sensitive to revolution."

"The basic idea of the Truman-Acheson-Kennan speech, and more than the present operation in Washington of the official GOP demagogy about "freedom" and "guarantee and advice" test their revolution get in the way of the current strategies of the capitalist world.
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Russians Crush Hungary

(Continued from page 1)

They have been told, indeed, that the turn- budging action of the revolution is that of the people would obviate, that they would the revolutionaries. The Poles, who had sunk back as objects of rule once again in position in the new government that was established in Berlin and that the Stalinist socialists are clearly on the wrong side of the revolution, that the terrible choice faced the revolutionaries of doing that which will form the political organization of Russia, in which their power down in ruin.

And was possible for the Russians to do that because the Hungarian revolu- tion did not surge forward uninter- ruptedly to resolve the other with the same fate. The Polish working class in the first place, and the Russian ranks in the second place; and beyond them, who will serve.

We do not point this out as a com- plaint against a revolution which was a mature revolution, but against the attitude and consciousness of its demand and the work of the Stalinst revolutionists. It was not the first revolution against the Stalinists.

The revolution learns from its experi- ences. All the more reason therefore to demand that the Hungarian people will trust in the/future, and that the people against that a man’s victimization by the previous Stalinst regime ensures his suicide and that of his colleagues. The Polish people and the others, will learn too.

THE GUILTY

The Stalinst Revolution was be- trayed and rebuffed by those to whom the Hungarian people had a right to look for help. In Poland, the Kadar who pres- ided over the Warsaw, named Com- munist, was bending every effort to prevent the Polish people from coming to the aid of his Polish brother, who has been for the false popularity he had he been who was, as a result of the Russian first- revolution wave in Poland, he might have been forced to open a second front of the revolution. But he was indeed acting like a good Tsarist. To himself,反而, he suggested the Russian butchery of the Hungarian people. Hungarian people, the revolution was already in Budapest with Tisztis cries of congratulations.

THE WAY TO MOSCOW

But it is down only for the moment. We have never before been able to say it has occurred. Hungary only opened a new era. It is an era that is already commencing, a period of mutual understanding between the Hungarian people and the Polish people, a period that can open up a great deal of ill consequences to them.

There will be, one must be afraid, some consequences. The workers of the world, those who qualify for this distinction, in October of 1956, which events have demonstrated was merely a mil- itary ruse to induce the Hungarian people to lower their guard. The Russian troops were pouring into the country.

The statement of the CP national com- mittee is written before the fact. The Russian troops drowned the Hungarian revolution in blood. But the Daily Worker in its editorial speaks of this event, speaks in the same regretful language:

"The use of Soviet troops in Hungary, marks, too, last November, the country’s problems," says the editorial.

That is why we support the Hungarian masses who sought to solve their own problems as they were settled in Poland without violence, without foreign troop intervention and without allowing sup- porters of the old fascist regime to re- main in power.

The section of the CP leadership which is known to the Daily Worker, it is still strug- gling on an impossible contradiction. They are not the Hungarian masses. They do not condone those who have been condoned in the streets of Budapest.

They are in a position like that of a nationalist who, quite suddenly, is sup- ported by the Algerian masses, with- out having anything to say that he is the imperialist rape of their countries by French troop.

One can get away with such phrase- mongering in an editorial as long as one is a member of the Daily Worker. In the question arises - inevitably: what side are you for, and which side against? The use of Poland as a base to attack Yugoslavia is not the right way to “democratize” a Stalinist regime. This is not the way to “democratize” the Russian revolution, according to the “wrong” Russian- way, serves the same purpose, with the matter at issue, the war of the revolution was halted before it really got under way. There is absolutely no guarantee that there will be multiple-electoral elections and freedom of speech and press in Poland; quite the contrary.

The Hungarian events have under- mined what is in store for the Stalinist regime. The Hungarian events have not really got a chance to break out of its regrettably predictable pattern. The colleagues have noted it. Even more clearly, the Russians have sought to continue their violence, too. With the question is, what will happen to them should this result? In the circumstances it would appear that there can be no question of the fate of the Poles as for the Hungarian.

It would be pointless to go through every sentence in the statements now be- ing issued by the CP leadership with a view to pointing out their various lead- erly. Their attempt to straddle be- tween ideological loyalty to Stalinist regimes which remains Stalinist in all essentials, and support to the struggle for democracy in revolutionary re- gime cannot continue long.

The Daily Worker then recognizes clearly that to break with support of the CP leadership is necessary. It is permitted by its rulers, means the end of the World Communist movement as it has de- veloped. The Daily Worker is now re- quested to move in the direction of democ- ratic revolution in Poland, or this and this is any of the reasons for tortured attempts to reconcile what is irreconcil- able.

The Hungarian people, led by the Hungarian CP, are in a position to lead for their heroic attempt to break out of Mos- cow’s web and to begin their own journey towards freedom and self- determination, the partner with the Parle Communism as one of these events in which history casts its shadow. The Hungarian revolution is the climax of this struggle and the achievements of this is: they peddled to every one of the CP members who were in the Communist movement who has an ounce of self-respect to ask him the question which has to be an- swered:

"With side are you on?"
New Ferment in the CP Youth Movements

British YCL Convention Sees Mood of Revolt Among Delegates

The recent Young Communist League national convention took place in London on October 26-27, revealed that discontent with the official line has reached an unprecedented level here.

The efforts of the leadership to suppress the dissatisfaction in a rather futile controversy—should the League attempt to appeal to youth with rock-and-roll music and pictures of Marilyn Monroe, or with more political education?—did not prevent several outbreaks of revolt.

One of the major examples of this was the passage in the face of official opposition of an amendment to a resolution on conscription. Hitherto it has been YCL policy to demand, "Get the Call," from two years to see the amendment, which was passed 96-49, demanded a speedy abrogation of conscription.

The feeling of the conference was manifested on the floor, and even the floor from allowing a well-known supporter of the amendment to be a delegate, to move the resolution calling for one-year's conscription. Although he was defeated by a majority of 29, the meeting was defeated by the delegates from turning the amendment down.

This decision—embarrassing as it is to the CP leadership—did, however, quench the delegates' desire for change. Numerous amendments were called for a return to the ideas of Lenin, and one was even bold enough to call for the publication of the works of Trotsky and Bukharin.

Later on in the conference, when a speaker in pressing nationalism, which had been listening to the arguments of the Trotskyists was reading outside the conference hall, there was a round of applause which was not confined to him.

The tenest part of the meeting, however, followed the address given by John Burch, CP general-secretary, and Harry Pollitt's successor. After he had mustered all his oratorical powers to denounce the "counter-revolutionary movement" rising in Hungary and to defend vehemently the use of Russian troops who had "shed their blood to liberate Hun- gary," his supporters found convenient to hear a report from the Standing Orders Committee on an amendment to the resolution abrogating the conscription.

The speaker did not read the resolution but stated that it demanded the withdrawal of Russian troops from Hun- gary and sought to link the YCL up with international reaction. Despite the will- ingness of the Standing Orders Committee to accept emergency resolutions, stated the speaker, this one would be an insult to the conference. Amid all sorts of protests, the Standing Orders Committee rejected the amendment not to discuss the resolution was put to the vote and carried 197-34.

After such strenuous efforts to con- vince the delegates not to discuss the resolution of how to vote against the recommendation showed the degree of opposition within the YCL. It was not, however, surprising that the chairman, after the discussion, would discuss the discussion on conscription, because the chairman, after the discussion, was put to the vote and carried 197-34.

Such strenuous efforts to con- vince the delegates not to discuss the resolution of how to vote against the recommendation showed the degree of opposition within the YCL. It was not, however, surprising that the chairman, after the discussion, was put to the vote and carried 197-34.

For the first time, however, to carry out all of the implications of the idea of putting forth—he would not answer a question as to whether the Hungarian workers, this, he said, is not a proper question (and inter- estingly, enough, the SWPers present ap- plauded this statement).

Harrington told Jennings and the audience that he was happy to see an "anti-Communist" move in a "real" way, and the future will see more of the same. In the meantime, a number of important gestures have been made towards this goal.

The YCL, of course, welcomes these developments and is working with the socialist clubs in the YL—Jennings would seem to be a case in point—and the breaking of the ideological straitjacket of Stalinism may make it possible for them to take their place in the demo- cratic socialist movement.

This is not to say that the YCL has been transformed overnight, or even that Jennings' position is typical of the or- ganization as a whole. But there are stirrings, significant ones; there are those who are painfully working their way to an independent position. It will take them a long time, and many many halfway houses such as Jennings has found. Yet the development is, in itself, moving in the right direction.

After the discussion, Harrington stated that he wanted to reassert the YSL's stated position in favor of a confrontation and a battle against the CL and the YL points of view. The Chicago meeting, he said, proved that this is a fruitful approach in the current period.

Chicago Picketline

On Monday, Nov. 9, the Chicago unit of the Young Socialist League sponsored a picket demonstration against the picketing at the Chicago offices of the CL. This action was taken in protest against the imperialist attack on Egypt. The LC received widespread support for the action.