LETTER TO READERS
Dear Reader,
We bow the old year out by changing our format, our size and the range of articles offered you. Also, alas, our price. We have been encouraged to do so by the tragic events of the last month, events that have done much to shake the complacency of the British working class and reawaken an interest in the views of the independent left wing of the Labour Movement. We have been helped by the generosity of our comrades in the fight for Socialism—the Independent Socialist League—in the United States. They have placed some of their facilities at our disposal. We shall be able to continue in this form only if you, readers, do the utmost to help us—

push the paper hard;

—join contributions into our gaping deficit;

sell, sell, sell at branches, wards and public meetings.

P.S. One aspect of the old Socialist Review has not changed however, namely, the responsibility of our contributors for the views expressed in their signed articles. Only unsigned articles express the opinion of the editorial board of the Socialist Review.
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SUEZ

The deject of Tory imperialist Policy was clearly illustrated by the number of excuses dragged up to justify the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt.

First it was said that the invasion was intended to protect British national-

als and property threatened by the Egyptian war.

Then it was aimed to keep the Suez Canal open. (On the day Britain

and France issued their ultimatum to Egypt, the Canal was working without

a hitch; since then it has been completely blocked).

When this excuse proved hollow, a new one was invented: the invasion

was a "police action" directed to separate the Israeli and Egyptian troops—despite the fact that the in-

vasion took place a hundred miles inge-

siany territory and Israel de-

clared that she would stop 10 miles from the Canal, and did so.

The final excuse was that the inva-

sion was a preventive measure directed

to save the Middle East from Soviet

aggression. One is reminded of Hitler's declaration on the invasion of Norway:

that it was carried out to protect the

independence of Norway from British

occupation.

The true cause of the invasion is the fear of a situation that British and French

capitalism have in the Middle East.

First the Canal itself,

The Economies of Suez

Carved through the heart of the Middle

East the canal serves as the main route for the tankers plying between the oilfields of the area and Western Europe. Nearly half of all the oil used in Britain and Western Europe—some 67 million tons—finds its way through the Suez Canal. Of all the oil used in Britain 85 per cent. arrives via the canal.

The Suez Company is also important for another reason—it is very profitable. The total original investment in the building of the canal by Britain and France was less than £10 million, but now the business is growing. Last year the Company had a gross revenue of £34 million. Of this, £104

million was paid out in dividends, £55

millions went to reserves and £9

millions went on operating costs. The Egyptian Government received only £1 million.

The imperialists oppose the nationalisation of the canal, not only because of its great value, but also because it augurs ill for other imperialist countries in Egypt. It has been estimated that French investments in Egypt amount to some £600 million, and American investments amount to some £200 million. Between 40 and 50 per cent. of all Egypt's wealth, including land, is owned by foreign capitalists. If this is excluded the figure is 75-80 per cent.

The nationalisation of the Suez Company could be the first step on the path of nationalising all this foreign capital which now dominates the Egyptian economy. Large amounts of foreign capital are also involved in the oil fields all over Middle East. If Nasser gets his way in the Suez, the other countries may follow suit and decide to keep the profits of the oil fields to themselves. This fear which dominates the thoughts of British and French capitalists is steadily driving them to insist on hard measures.

As a result of imperialist rule which relies on an alliance with the native land-

lords, the conditions of the Egyptian people are down trodden in the extreme. The expectation of life is very low, being, before the war, 31 years for males, and 36 for females. In the United King-

dom the expectation of life at that time was 66 years for a male and 64 for a female. Those who lived through the war speak. Ninety per cent. of Egypt's population suffers from tuberculos, 50 per cent. from malaria, 50 per cent. from ankylostoma.

[continued on back page]

HUNGARIAN "FASCISTS" This cartoon appeared in the Communist Journal For a Lasting Peace. For a People's Democracy on July 20th, 1951. It shows "Two, the Fascist."

Today, Hungarian workers and peasants are called Fascists. Does "Fascist" in Russian mean anyone—socialist or otherwise—who opposes oppression by Moscow?

HUNGARY

The initial spark to the Hungarian Revolution was a big but peaceful demonstration on October 23rd, which was joined by some 200,000 workers. The demonstrators, gathered outside the Budapest radio station and re-

quested that their programme be broad-

cast. The programme demanded:

(1) That the Russian forces leave Hun-

gary; (2) that free general elections be

held; (3) that strikes be permitted; (4)

that freedom of speech, literature and political beliefs be permitted; (5)

that factories be directed by workers and technicians; wages, norms, etc., be revised; (6) that peasants be given their freedom; membership of collec-

tive farms be voluntary; and com-

pulsory agricultural deliveries to the State be abolished.

The State Security Police—AVH—opened fire and killed a number of unarmed men, women and children. Russian troops were called in by the Hungarian Government dominated by Erno Gerb.
HUNGARY—continued

On November 3rd the Russians expressed their readiness to negotiate with the Nagy Government for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the country. But when the Hungarian Minister of Defence and the Chief of Staff came to this meeting they were arrested.

That the Russian rulers were preparing for a military and political showdown, is obvious from the fact that they continued to pour troops into Hungary while promising to withdraw altogether from the country, if the latter was restored to its prewar frontiers. On this basis the Hungarian press and radio did not make any mention of the decision in favour of a military showdown.

The Hungarian press also failed to mention that the Russian rulers had issued an ultimatum to the Soviet government to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact, to get rid of the occupation forces, and to declare that the country's neutrality in foreign affairs.

Where the mass support lies

The small Hungarian nation could not of course stand up against the weight of Russian armies.

If the Moscow-inspired regime were not isolated in the country, the demonstrations, strikes, and other forms of popular resistance would not have been possible.

After all, look at the official support for the government: in the last election, for instance, the majority of the candidates got 95.6 per cent of the total vote (Daily Worker, November 14). If only 4 out of 10 Hungarians voted, could a general strike and mass people's uprising take place?

All Communist organizations were very passive. In May, 1954, it was stated that in the Party alone, there were 65,000 members of the Hungarian Communist Party, and in the Union of Hungarian Democratic Workers, 50,000. (For a Living Peace, For a People's Democracy! May 28, 1954).

These two millions by themselves constitute a fifth of the population of Hungary, and if children are excluded, nearly half.

How could a mass movement develop under these circumstances?

And again, factory and office workers made up 94.1 per cent of the employed population of Hungary. In 1954 and practically all of them are members of trade unions (HID). How could a general strike be carried out against their will?

To add to the forces of the Communist government one should mention the army and police.

The 12 or 12 Hungarian army divisions were built since the war under the leadership of the Communist Party. The police was made up practically only of Communist Party officials.

In sum, every one of the above factors—armed forces, police, army, police, army—can be brought to bear against the people of Hungary.

The Daily Worker's Jumps

For the first two days of the Hungarian revolt, the Daily Worker pretended that it did not know what was happening to the country, and treated it as a capitalist counter-revolution by murder gangs resistively supported by the workers. The misfortune was the title of its streamer heading across eight columns: "Armed Groups Demand flights to End Communist Tyranny. Worker, October 25." The leading article announced that the Hungarian workers "are not going to be held in the dark about events at home." The leitmotif of the whole article was that the Hungarians had smashed this attempt to put the clock back to a period of peace and prosperity. And in order to accomplish this, it was explained, because the armed troops joined their Hungarian comrades-in-arms and shed their blood in the struggle to save the country and people from reaction.

On the third day the Daily Worker's leading article stated that Soviet troops were "assisting the Hungarian people to retain their freedom and liberty, and make their country free from Moscow domination."

The Crisis in the British Communist Party

By an ex-member

There has been a heavy post in King Street recently. Many of the envelopes contained small pink cards which only recently had been treated by their owners. Many of them came from life-long radicals on the Party line—early members of the Nazi-Soviet split—whom the Party followed the 20th Congress. Why did these dedicated Communists decide that they could remain no longer in the Party? It did not happen overnight, but the pressure was kept up until the moment finally arrived when they decided to break off with the Party. This happened in the leadership of the Party. To all appearances, and as if nothing had happened before.

In the beginning there was the Khrushchev Report. The fatuous explanation of the horrors revealed in the report, by the secretaries of the various Ministries, gave them a chance to denounce the Party's "errors" and to declare the necessity of new policies.

On November 1, the Daily Worker stated that the "Soviet Government has decided to command Soviet Union from Budapest as soon as the Hungarian Government has declared its neutrality."

And on November 26, the Daily Worker declared: "Soviet Union had taken control of the mass movement, and the intervention of Soviet troops is necessary to quell the fascist uprising."

Revolution or Dollars

All the emphasis was on the famous 100 billion dollar loan, on the declaration of neutrality, and on subversion in Eastern Europe. As the total population of Eastern Europe is nearly a billion, one can see that the US-imperialists are not going to lend a little more than a dollar a head.

This is brought forward to explain a mass uprising.

The Daily Worker cannot even pretend that there are any Hungarian troops, or workers, peasants and students, supporting the Russian troops against the fascist uprising.

Where are the 2 million members of the Hungarian Communist Party in the Y.C.C. and youth organisation? Where are the 2 million trade unionists? Where is the Hungarian army? Where are the police? Can some thousands of US spies—if there are any—possibly maintain the education of youth through 12 years of a Communist regime, and turn them into fascists?

There is no fascist lobby, no mass workers' strikes, control the trade unions, mass Communist Party and Young Communist League? And if now really believes that these masses preferred fascists to Communists, after their horrible experiences of the German regime, what illusions must they have suffered during the last 12 years.

The Daily Worker was the priest of King Street, who slavishly followed Stalin—Stalin who has now been exposed by Khrushchev as a blood-thirsty, popular—foreign—authoritarian, the present masters of the Kremlin.

At the time of writing (November 15th), the Daily Worker's line is not yet ended, but the armed forces of the Hungarian Revolution are, it seems, overwhelmed and crushed. But the main battle is to be fought at the feet of your Majesty!—so wrote the Daily Worker General Padilla, the day after Russian troops put down the Kosuth uprising in 1949. Similar words are probably being said now by the present Russian Commander of Hungary.

But this is not the final page of history, the collapse of Hungary and Hungary will for ever be celebrated as the beginning of a new society, a revolutionary, democratic social—economic order. It will be pillared by fraternal workers.
By TONY CLIFF

Author of "Stoilov Russia: A Marxist Analysis" and "Russia from Stalin to Khrushchev"

The Future of the Russian Empire:
REFORM OR REVOLUTION?

In 1855 Tsar Alexander II succeeded to the throne of Russia on the death of his father, Nicholas I. One of his first pronouncements was a declaration of his intention to abolish serfdom, which in 1861 he duly carried out.

Two main factors had led to the emancipation of the serfs, at least in the north. The first was the growth of the trade in slave labor; by the end of the century, a few years before emancipation, the average annual yield of four principal crops (wheat, rye, barley and oats) was 60 million cwt.; after that, in the seventies, it was 320 million cwt. The great Marxist historian, Kropotkine, stated that “free labor did prove far more productive than forced labor.” (Brief History of Russia, London, 1932, Vol. 3, p. 116.)

The second main cause for the emancipation was a steady rise in the number of outbreaks of localised but violent peasant revolts. There were 400 in the ten years 1845-55 and 404 in the five years 1855-60. Fearful of the outcome, the tsar, at a meeting of Moscow nobility, uttered his startling and famous phrase: “It is better to abolish serfs from above than to wait until the serfs begin to liberate themselves from below.”

However, the emancipation of the serfs was carried out half-heartedly, and it did not turn the peasants into really free wage-workers, but in fact left the peasants with less land and a heavier economic burden to bear. Following the emancipation of the serfs, Alexander implemented some other reforms:

- Creation of local government to the provinces and districts of European Russia.
- On November 30, 1864 he referred the judicial institutions to a jury was introduced for all criminal cases and court proceedings were made public. (And there is no doubt that freedom of expression from the court-room and the publicity given to trials held greatly in the formation of democratic anti-tsarist public opinion.)
- April 6, 1862 saw the partial abolition of preeminent covenant, or, (one of the results of this was the legal publication in Russia a few years later of Marx’s Capital).

That all these democratic reforms were very restricted was soon made quite clear. Thus, for instance, while the press was freed from preeminent censorship, it was not allowed to publish accounts of any meetings of societies and clubs with special permission: from the Provincial Government; the Ministry of the Interior was empowered to inform editors of papers what subjects were forbidden, and the State newspapers were in “State significance.”

The peasant riot soon showed its iron hand. Many a rural community in the provinces in July 1863-64 was put down, and Putilov was arrested and condemned to prison and eventually exiled for life to Siberia. He remained there until 1862, and was not allowed to return to his home town Saratov until 1868, where he died a few months later.

DEUTSCHER'S ANCESTORS

In the first flush of Alexander II’s promises of reform, many were eager to believe in his words. Thus the two leaders of Russian radicalism, the one after Alexander Herzen and the revolutionary democratic novelist, Chernyshevsky. But this was to grow out of control when, in 1862, Alexander announced his intention of abolishing serfdom.

For the American Political Scene

With the words: “Long live the social and democratic Republic of Russia!” (Polevsky, page 178.)

But the tsar “Liberator” showed himself most vicious in his attitude towards the Jews.

Tsar Nikolai’s brutality, his method of governing by means of the tsar, the arrest of the Pole, the arrest of the Pole. His son, who was not a fool, realised this and started his rules popular public opinion. He militated and the rule over Poland, and curtained somewhat the powers of the tsarist vicegerent in Russia. He even became a new “liberal” or a new “fascist”.

But it was obvious, even in the early days of his reign, that Alexander II intended to curb his “refounding zeal” even more strenuously in Poland than in Russia, but the tsar was not able to stop the development.

And immediately the Cossack’s consul and general played their usual part. Already in February and March 1863 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 Polish did not possess a regular army and the majority of the population consisted of serfs, or the serfdom of the Russian empire.

But even more serious for the fate of the insurrection was the fact that only a minority of Poles supported the national insurrection; the latter was quite indifferent to a movement led by the nobility. Out of a population of some five million persons, only ten thousand had risen against the Polish government.

The rebels managed to hold on for eighteen months in a guerrilla war. This was purely due to the lack of enthusiasm that many of the Russian garrisons 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 in the Devaen, the border of Poland. In March 1864 insurrection spread to Lithuania, and the same year saw an insipient rising in Russia, near the Volga—but this was crushed.

Alarmed, the government made some concessions. It granted the serfs in the so-called Northern Province—
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The Post-Stalin Reforms

Stalin’s method of approach to each new failure or difficulty was to increase pressure and terrorism. But this rigid method became not only more and more ineffective, but also more and more inhuman. Each new attack of the whip increased the stubborn, even if moose, resistance of the people.

Where serfdom under Tsar Nikolai hampered the development of industry, rigid Stalinism oppressed a became a brake on all modern agricultural and industrial production.

Two and a half decades after the inauguration of the forced collectivisation, it became clear that Russian agriculture was in a worse state than ever.

Nothing could highlight this crisis better than Khruschev’s report to the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union delivered on September 3, 1956. He painted the atrocity that had been committed.

He stated that while in 1910 there were 28.8 million metric tons, in 1951 there were only 24.5 million. At the time of the tear there were six persons for every one cow, and 28,000 tons in 1952.

Vegetable farming, another intensive branch of agriculture, showed the same trend.

Agriculture in the United States faced no better. The cause is not to be sought in a lack of agriculture machinery or fertilisers.

Indeed, the mechanisation of agriculture and supply of fertilisers was sharply stepped up. Thus the number

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

The Polish national revolution ended in defeat. But the Polish of Poland was few in years. Two years after the defeat of the insurrection of April 4, 1863, the first revolutionary attempt on the life of the tsar was made, by the Russian student Rasputin. He failed and was executed, but his was the first act in a revolutionary movement that was to make its overthrow the overthrow of tsarism, half a century later.

Even this brief historical outline shows quite clearly that all anti-serfdom reforms from above merely tended to weaken revolution from below.

Action is coming under the almighty pressure: autocracy from democracy in a number of small steps. (Of course the Tsarism does not want to make such crossing.)

Any concession from the top, instead of more revolution from below, kindles the flame of liberty; and Russian final analysis armed autocracy has to face the armed insurgent people.

The similarity between the first years of rule of the “Tsar Liberators” Alexander II and those of the First Secretary “Democratizers” Khruschev is indeed great. And one can learn a number of important lessons from a comparison of the two.

Their autocracy, however, must not be pushed too far:

- Russia of the horse age moved far more slowly than the Russian of the iron age.
- Poland of the nobility was a weakness compared to the mighty Polish masses’ 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 Poland is quite different from that of the sixteenth century.
- The mighty working class of all the nationalities oppressed by the Russian autocracy, is not the Russian working class: in a waging giant which is consolidating the chains of social and national oppression.
of tractors in Poland rose from 15.5 thousand in 1940 to 48.3 thousand in 1944; in Hungary from 9.2 thou-
sands in 1940 to 158 in 1944; in Czechoslovakia—31.1 thousand in 1940 and 51.0 thousand in 1942; and so on. (Ibid., p. 272.)

In spite of the better supply of machines and fertiliz-
ers the yield of the Russian grain crop failed to rise, for the
bean sativa has not risen, and has declined since the begin-
ing of collectivisation.

The very low productivity in Russian agriculture was es-
timated that in April 1946 not less than 5.6 percent of the
area's land was idle. This was reported to the National Environ-
ment USSR. Russian, Moscow, 1946, page 1), nearly all—i.e., practically the total popu-
lation of the country. To sum it all up, the key point was that the people were not used to work for
themselves and not for the state, and the state managed to provide sufficient food for itself.

As against this, in the United States only 13 per cent of
the population was engaged in agriculture and it supplies enough food not only for the whole of the
American people, whose level of consumption is much
higher than that of the Russians, but also for exports. In Britain the farming population makes up only 5 per cent of the population, and it supplies half the food
consumed in the country.

CRISIS ON THE LAND

The low productivity of agriculture alarms the Kremlin specialists. First, it impairs the productivity of industry thereby bringing about its economic collapse. Second, it makes imposible to supply livestock with food, thereby
in turn reducing the agricultural productivity still further. Third, it delays the process of industrialisation, the Second World War makes such upheavals particu-
larly dangerous.

Thirdly, the low productivity combined with the slow growth of the population and the distance of the rural population, a corollary influence which is liable to spread throughout the Industrialised countries. In these countries the crisis in agriculture came to a head just after the post-war rehabilitation of the Soviet Union.

TENSION IN THE SATELLITES

In the satellite countries during the later years of Stalin's rule, the tension became even more acute than in Russia itself, and it led to a certain degree of opposition to the Stalinist regime. The first, national opposition was added to social. The country was faced with the spectacle of the exploitation of the satellite
by the Russian states.

Thus, for instance, the Polish-Russian agreement
of August 8, 1950, by which the following terms were
law of Poland was to deliver to the USSR at a special
price on the following terms: for 1946—8 million
tons; from 1947 to 1950—13 million tons each year; and
from 1951 to 1955—16 million tons of coal. The occupation of Germany continued. This real was to be paid for not by Russian products but by reparations furnished to be transferred to the FRG, other satellite countries, and the non-Russian
land.

According to Professor W. J. Rose, the price agreed
on was said to be $2 per ton. (Poland, Old and New,
London, 1949, page 101) It is not known, Poland did not get anything on this account.

Anh, 12-13 million tons of coal at $2 a ton was expected to be sold to Poland by the time of the running of the
Lisso-Russian agreement, Denmark and Sweden were offered additional 6 cents per ton, subsequently to be raised to $16 per ton.

The rubber of Poland, by the same agreement, amounted over $100 million. (To get some idea of this amount, it is worth mentioning that Brit-
ish Government's estimates of its capital export in 1947 and 1949, for instance, indicate a total of $179 million
of their investments in India.)

In 1949 Russia signed a deal for Polish coal to 7 million tons a year; even so, this is a heavy commit-

The presence of Russian garrisons in the satellite area could only be explained by a desire of Moscow
Moreover, some of the satellite states at least had high-
siderable strings attached to them, and probably were not
about to give up such a policy, notably with the anti-"Titoist" purges.

CRISS IN THE FACTORIES

The industrial workers in Russia and her satellites do not enjoy the same position as the peasantry. The best proof is the fact that the peasant outlives the worker by far behind the technical level of its equipment.

Russian industry, being quite new and built in very large
factors, is in a far better position than the peasant economy. The best proof is the fact that the peasant outlives the worker by far behind the technical level of its equipment.

Despite this, the productivity of industrial Russia is just as low as that of the other countries. It is not by

In the industrial factories, in great efforts have been made to improve the skill of the workers through better technical education. But the more tur-

However, the reticence, anxiety and new work-
ners at the beginning of his role, some of the Eastern
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they must quickly disappear under its rule. Indeed, such illusions can scarcely be spread at all, as Gomulka has a past. The Poles and the Eastern European peoples, especially the Polish people with their centuries of struggle against foreign invasions, are not inclined to be hoodwinked.

When Gomulka lost power in 1949, Poland was already a member of the Council of Europe, and the Polish Communist Party had played an important role in bringing this about.

Gomulka did not protest at, and actually benefited from, the purges of the leadership of the Communist Party of Poland carried out by Stalin. As Poland lay on the border of the Soviet Union, the Polish Communist Party was illegal, the most important leaders of the party were usually in the USSR, and were thus involved in the purges. Many of them had been executed, exiled, or persecuted in forced-labour camps—Dumski, Sudecki, Krier, Jankowski, Kaszuba, Lipiński, Pożoga, Lubelski, Sznajderman, Plutański, Prochoszak, Huberman (brother of the violinist), Winarski, Sochacki, Leski, Rzaki, Marszulski, and Jankowski.

As thoroughly as the Purged Polish Communist Party could, the party was not necessarily destroyed by the December party (1929), using as its martyrs of the Polish Communist Party members of the Socialists and agents in the party. It was this purge which opened the doors to the Gomulka (an obscure trade-union official who was to emerge as its main leader), forested it to the Central Commissaries (The killing of the Nazis at the Babi Yar in Ukraine was ordered by the Gomulka from the German Concentration Camp in Poland). The Gomulka and his associates, a number of them of the Gomulka’s associates, were already thoroughly purged by the initiative of Stalin himself. So, it is quite understandable why Stalin could trust it so completely, especially when one considers the geographical situation, that it can get military aid from the West and in so much balance between Russia and America, no other “people’s delegate” to the Soviet Union could have been as advantageously situated.

In the case of the Gomulka, the Communist Party leaders coming to power had must support both in Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria; and even then the Gomulka and his associates might have been forced through years of heroic struggle in a war of defense that perhaps not even in the Soviet Union. The Gomulka and his associates might have been forced through years of heroic struggle in a war of defense that perhaps not even in the Soviet Union could have been able to balance the efforts of the West and in so much balance between Russia and America, no other “people’s delegate” to the Soviet Union could have been as advantageously situated.
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By PHILIP COHEN

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

It is therefore important, and potentially misleading, to ask whether our capitalists jump with the Jittes...

1. "U.S. Fears Rebels May Act Too Fast," was the headline over a report (Nov. 2) in the New York Times, Washington bureau head, James Reston. "The hope in official circles," he said, "is that the events in Budapest will not offer a prentch.

2. What intervention? By the Russians. But Russia, already intervening with merciless slaughter of the freedom fighters! Nagy had fled to the West, although the U.S. "official quarters" massivc resistance and intervention.

3. Naturally, if the Hungarian people pulled back on their "pace and abi- Despite the Soviet "official quarters" to clean up with only the troops that are in the country, a further "intervention" move against Hungarian politics would be to th...""

A CLEVER PLAN

On October 25 the N. Y. Herald Tribune's Margaret Higgins was a great deal more eloquent than Reston; it "deter- nize reference of the same date:

Specifically there is worry that the Krellin might seize on events in Hun- nary as an excuse for going back on its re- itment. However, the Krellin would permit it to go its own "Titoist" road to socialization.

It is feared in Washington that the Hungarian uprising could give assimi- hibitions to the East and that the public hurs who have been arguing that "demo- critics who are planning to rise up--- more, and the threat of greater armed forces to put an end to the satellites."

The politically informed reader will be interested in the "view" that prior to the transformation of the Washington state of mind it is virtually a word-for-word duplica- of the notorious thesis laid down by the Stalinist apologists in the West. The East German "June days." They should not have made

trouble for the Russians, he explained them; "democratization" and "liberalization" under ti- good things are going on in space in the Krellin, I have no doubts, I am not alone, don't scare them, and they will join us."

"We see, DeStecher, of course, this insurrection as a 'Titoist' one, which is to say a 'subversive movement'," said the Hungarian official, "the leaders of it, to people who behave themselves.

Now, for DeStecher, of course, this revolution is a "Titoist" one, which no one who is informed about the events in Budapest will not offer a prentch.

The "intervention" move is to withdraw the troops that are in the country, a further "intervention" move against Hungarian politics would be to th...""

Indeed, we can round this out for the Hungarian "official quarters." From Paris came a bit of wisdom which suggests that "official sources" or flying sources, but from Soviet circles, that "official circles" were the" mysterious" center of the Hungarian revolution, Minister Christian Pinnau.

"The hope in official circles," he said, "is that the events in Budapest will not offer a prentch. They are all the more "Titoist" the "official quarters" are in the country, a further "intervention" move against Hungarian politics would be to th..."

Thus, to stop the revolution, the "official quarters" are sunk in the blackest despair, and to get no further, "above all not to allow a "Titoist" source to set in the first place is so clever that it is hard to understand how the "official" circles could be more "Titoist." This prescription for preserving "official quarters" in the bud, as it were, is not the same as...""

So once again, we are told that the way to stop the revolution is by "official quarters" which has a game of "official quarters" and London "sources."" This, some sources fear, is what is hap- pening.

And there is good reason for it. For when for some reason the revolution is stopped, there will be a better chance to pull off some deal, capital war was avoided. But he does not indicate that the "observers" are acting, that...a very doubtful move in all that, in which the "official quarters" are massing in the blackest despair, and to get no further, "above all not to allow a "Titoist" source to set..."

Indeed and truly, the Hungarian Revolu- tion 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 sets up the pre-assents for the indispensable symp- toms of alarm caused by the Hungarian Revolution in the State Department and Foreign Office. Here is a Washington Times (Nov. 27): "There was some consideration of what might conform the U.S. in case the rebels, whether they were "freedom fighters" or not, were..."
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Indeed and truly, the Hungarian Revolu- Revolution was far away from any control or "guidance" from these people.
How to Fight the Tories’ Housing Bill

By Owen Roberts

Duncan Sandsy, Minister of Housing and Local Government, received a storm of applause at the Tory Party Conference in October when he announced that a new Housing Bill would be introduced in the House of Commons this session. With the details of the Bill now published, the newspaper headlines of the landlords and the Tory Party have joined in the cheering.

The Financial Times, for instance, says Sandsy’s Bill “deserves a welcome as a second step in the direction of the complete abolition of rent restriction.” The Economist says “Mr. Sandsy strikes a sensible and fairly bold blow at the futilities and waste of the present system of rent restriction.” The only criticism of Sandsy’s Bill to be voiced by the Press is that it does not go far enough fast enough.

This, however, is only a minor criticism. Most Tories, particularly those who have studied the Bill, recognise that it is but the first move towards the complete abolition of rent restriction. Indeed, the Bill contains provisions for further attacks to be made by the means of a simple majority order. A fact which the Economist considers significant is that Mr. Sandsy means business.

There is no doubt that Sandsy does mean business. According to a statement issued by the Ministry of Housing and Local Government, the “broad objects” of the Bill are to provide for “the progressive abolition of rent restriction” and to “fix revised rent limits.” The Bill itself contains the following clauses:

- As soon as the Rent Bill becomes law regular inspections will be made, applying to some 34,000 million houses which at present are over-rented. No means of the owners can, if they wish, escape inspection. One of the house to private tenants at any rent they can get to, and with no security of tenure for five years.
- Also removed from rent control will be houses with rates of value of over £40 in London and the Metropolitan Police District to be exact and £30 elsewhere in England and Wales. This will effect some 800,000 houses of rent restraint.

The Tory Smoke-Screen

In all cases where rents are going to be raised under the new limits the landlord must give tenants three months’ notice. It is not possible to predict with much accuracy how many rents will rise, but general opinion sets it at around ten shillings a week. The Tory Government has, however, endeavoured to cover up its tracks by a letter inserting a clause in the Bill which says that increases must be made in accordance with the prices in 1936 for the first six months of their application.

Commenting on this clause the Financial Times says that amongst the self-middle class tenants who will have to pay higher rents as a “reward” for having supported the Tory Party at the last general election.

The Next Steps

The final provision for the complete abolition of rent control at the present stage concerns any houses which at any time after the passing of the Bill have had vacant property on their hands, which were previously rent controlled, he can raise the rent sky-high for new tenants. This clause will, of course, provide an incentive to money-grubbing landlords, but it is a clear case of the clear out existing tenants so that they can push the rents up. If they have found out rent controls for certain houses, the Bill turns its attention to some 45 million houses which will be subjected 100,000 to a real rent rate on their rents. For all of these higher rents are on the way.

As soon as the Rent Bill becomes law regular inspections will be made, applying to some 34,000 million houses which at present are over-rented. No means of the owners can, if they wish, escape inspection. One of the house to private tenants at any rent they can get to, and with no security of tenure for five years.

CANN THE UN DO ANYTHING?

By Stan Newens

Much of the Labour Party criticism of Tory action in Egypt has been directed against Eden’s complete headlessness for the United Nations. Many socialists have focused their hopes for international peace and co-operation on the United Nations and feel that by flouting its authority, the British and French Governments have struck a blow against world peace.

This point of view is based upon the idea that war arose from ill-educated bickering between the war parties. War, however, is never an accident, but is a result of the force of power within a definite interest or group of interests. Only the occasion of its outbreak is accidental.

Causes of War

In the 1914-18 war, the clash was between two empires which had divided the continent of South East Europe and Africa between them. In the 1939-45 war, the clash was between two empires which the Nazis tried to achieve what they had failed to realise in 1914. Colonial, spheres of markets and opportunities to make profit were at stake. On both sides the same forces were at work among the peoples in the fight with slogans that they refused to put into effect where they would.

It will be seen, therefore, that when the Rent Bill becomes law tens of landlords all over the country will be involved in bitter argument over the “necessary” repairs. And, as usual, the advantage will be on the side of the landlords with their lawyers and technical experts to squeeze the most out of tenants while giving as little as possible in return.

Fight on Two Fronts

An immediate practical task for local Labour Parties is to redress this balance by providing medical advice and other facilities necessary to fight the landlords. If every active Party member goes out of his way to get tenants involved in action to bring down the rents, and reduces the burdens of the landlords and their Tory friends can rake in from the tenants for months in a mass of technicalities.

Local authorities, too, must be brought into the arena. In addition to Labour Party advice centres, the local authorities must be prepared to give tenants as much assistance as possible. In particular they must be prompt in issuing certificates of disrepair.

Such activities, however, bring only temporary and partial relief to tenants. If Labour is to fight this new Rent Bill more positively action will be necessary. First the tenants must be mobilised behind the Labour Party for a POLITICAL campaign against the Tory Government. Public meetings, lobbying of M.P.’s and all the other tactics of mass agitation must be employed.

Tenants must be led by Labour because only in this way will it be possible to channel their immediate housing campaign against the Tory Government. Labour must lead the tenants because only in this way will it be possible to act as a form of the slogan of public ownership of all rented properties and demonstrate to the tenants that the war to come can remove the curse of private landlords.

With a double-barrelled campaign of exploiting the present housing crises and a widespread agitation against private landlordism, the Labour Party can frustrate the Tory Rent Bill.
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As we go to print, the news of the "Killing of the 30 Weeks old official strike at Norton Motors, Birmingham, is still fresh. We hope it will stay fresh in the minds of mili-
tant workers throughout the coun-
try: a fresh indictment of the AEU's inefficiency which pledges support for
caves in to management at the earliest
opportunity; a fresh exposure of a leaders'
paralysis even after backing the strike
officially refused to put teeth into it and
then went on to call for a blacking of
Norton goods and refused to support the
work of the Leyland strikers. The whole
show who actually boycotted the
Norton stand.
There is only one attitude that the
organized workers can adopt: solidarity
with the strikers must be united in condemning
the AEU's Executive's recommendation to
resume work on management's terms. It
was a shameful betrayal of the strikers by their
leadership.

SUEZ--Continued from front page
Poverty is inevitably accompanied by ignorance, which in Egypt reaches fearful
proportions. Some idea of its extent is
gained from the very succinct remark of
El Masr, when it discussed the results of
the census for August (24, 1950). Out of
30,000,000 holders of a population as
large as 18 million who know neither how to
read nor write.
Riches, pleasures and idle long of some
thousands of foreign capitalists and
Egyptian landlords and capitalists on the
one hand, and hunger, disease and igno-
rance of the millions on the other--this is
the picture of Egypt.
Without any way legalizing Nasser,
the military dictator, oppressor of the
workers and peasants, defender of Egyptian
capitalists and landlords, is it clear that
he is not the business of the British Labour
movement to remove Nasser. That is the
job of the Egyptian workers and peasants.
British and French bombs do not kill
Nasser, but the common people--men,
women, and children. Britain's threats on
Nasser increase his popularity at home and undermine the anti-British fronts in his
country. This cannot be Cauchy in 10 Downing
Street.

Who stopped the war.
After murdering thousands of Egyptians,
the British and French overthrew Nasser
and, at the time of writing, to call a halt to
the war. A number of factors have brought
about the end of the war. First the unwillingness
of the United States to use its influence
in Britain and the increasing threats of
industrial action cooled the Tory hotheads.
A second factor was the burning out of the
tanks in Syria and Saudi Arabia's stoppage of the
oil of British refineries in Bahrain, and
slowly cleared that even a brave triumph
over Egypt could be a Pyrrhic victory. Thirdly, the deep anguish, with the war in
India, Pakistan, Ceylon and other "Com-
monwealth" countries, made it clear that
Eden's diplomacy can lead to a complete
shrinkage of his Britannia. Fourthly, the
United States was not ready to support
either Mollet militarily or financially. Last,
but not least, the threat of Russian inter-
vention was not enough to keep Nasser
beholden by British and French imperialists.

In Britain there has developed the biggest
labor movement in the country. The toilers
were not tired and could not be
noticed put to end to the war. The
giant organised labour movement had
hardly raised itself to its feet before the Tory rulers qued with fear.

However, the anti-war demonstrations were not translated into mass industrial action,
notwithstanding the many trade union
resolutions supporting such a line of action.
As a result many in this country, and
even more abroad, underestimated the
importance of the anti-war march to
the stoppage of the war on Egypt. This
has made it possible for Eisenhower to
move in the middle of the struggle and
undermine with his new tanks from the
other hand Bulgars and Kurshumluk
defenders with the new tanks, with their
hands, washed with blood of the Himmels
from the Canaan.
It was a tremendously stop forward since
Gainskell's speech in the House of Com-
mons on August 2nd, in which he pro-
duced for intervention against Egypt, to
the extent the Labour
movement took more recently in the campaign
against the war on Egypt. But this was far from enough.

The lesson is clear: the answer to
militarism on the stock exchange, demonstrations, industrial action and any
other suitable means able to stop the war, with-
draw the troops and withdraw the conscripts.