

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

DECEMBER 3, 1956

FIVE CENTS

On the CP Discussion:

Foster vs. Hungary's Revolution . . . page 2
Those 'Fascists' in Hungary . . . page 3

Three Types of 'Deutscherism' . . . page 7
Interview with Hungarian Student Leader . . . page 5
Sidney Hook's 5th and the Real World . . . page 6

Crises in Middle East and Hungary Are Rocking NATO and U.S. Foreign Policy

The United States' foreign-policy structure based on the NATO alliance is being shaken from two ends in the most thoroughgoing crisis of the Western war camp that has been seen since the war. And this crisis is still intensifying, with no solution in sight, as the UN votes for and the U. S. supports the demand that the troops of all the invaders get out of Egypt before a settlement is taken up.

The other end from which the NATO policy is being shaken is the impact of the Polish and Hungarian struggle on the place of NATO in Central Europe.

The British-French-Israel attack on Egypt is shaping up, in its consequences, as an historic disaster for the Western war camp's position. Although the U. S. was itself not responsible for this move of frenzied desperation, it has no policy which can handle the effects.

"The bill for Egypt" (to use a phrase now popular in Britain) is becoming exorbitant for the Western capital's bank account.

- Russia has become a first-class power in the Middle East. The current exaggeration is that Syria is virtually a "satellite." It is not only a question of Moscow's credit with Cairo or Damascus, but also of its stock of sympathy among the Arab masses.
- Britain and France have not re-taken

the Suez Canal, in spite of huffing, puffing and parachute-jumping.

- Israel is now more isolated than ever before in world politics and regional relations.

- Nasser's prestige and position in Egypt has been strengthened, not weakened.

- The Western statesmen could not either morally or politically do anything about Russia's suppression of the Hungarian Revolution.

- The United States is in open opposition to its closest NATO allies, Britain and France.

- Britain and France, which once posed as among the great powers of the world, are revealed to be, like lesser luminaries in the UN, powerless as against the will of the Big Two colossi.

- The Suez Canal is not only not in British-French hands, but it is closed to traffic, cutting them off from their oil supplies.

- The Baghdad Pact may not be dead, as has been proclaimed by some in an excess of pessimism, but it is certainly wobbling and will never be the same.

- "Echoes of the Egyptian fiasco are bound to be heard in Cyprus, Hong Kong, Malta, Singapore and throughout Africa" (C. L. Sulzberger) and of course, most of all, in encouragement to the Algerian fighters for national freedom.

Of all of this, the basic shock is to the NATO underpinning of the Western war alliance. It is in a state of "panic and disarray"—to use a phrase made famous not in the West but over Stalin's bier in Moscow.

A N. Y. Times front-page story from Washington (Nov. 26), quoting "foreign diplomats here" on the UN vote, spoke of "a step toward something new in American foreign policy." The U. S. is "groping for a different approach" to

world affairs in cooperation with the Asian neutrals and through the UN."

[On the 27th, Eisenhower set himself against this wishful thinking with a statement disclaiming any "weakening or disruption of the great bonds" that tie the U. S. to its fellow imperialists in NATO.]

No doubt Washington is groping. Also, there is a "different approach" which beckons. But to grope all the way over to it will require dumping the NATO orientation and adopting a consistently

democratic and anti-imperialist policy throughout the world.

The new thing is not that this is any more possible for the State Department's mentality than it was yesterday. The new thing is that the old way is in shambles and everyone, even the tops, are groping.

LOVELY VISION

Life magazine is groping too. Here is what it writes in an editorial on November 5:

(Continued on page 4)

In Djilas' Defense

While the fate of Milovan Djilas, arrested by the Tito regime in Yugoslavia for publishing his article "The Storm in East Europe," remains dark, Vladimir Dedijer in Belgrade has courageously declared his solidarity with him.

Dedijer, Tito's biographer, on Thursday sent a statement to the foreign press (the Tito's totalitarian press will of course not print it) in which he openly warned Tito against trying to crush dissent by brutal force.

"If at this moment I had not listened to my conscience, I would renounce first of all the book [the biography] and I would renounce you," said his Open Letter to Tito.

He hailed the Hungarian revolution as a "magnificent struggle" against Stalinism, thus lining up on the main point with Djilas, as against the official Titoist (and Stalinist) line that the Hungarian revolution has been taken over by "fascists" and "reactionaries." But he said he had not himself seen the Djilas article.

He challenged the regime to let the Yugoslav public know what views Djilas was being punished for.

In New York the correspondent for Borba (Tito's main organ) defected and asked for asylum, because of Djilas' arrest. He said that "the promised liberation and democratization of my country have reached a dead-end street," and attacked Tito's approval of Russian intervention in Hungary and his conception of preserving "socialism" by denying democracy. If Djilas can be arrested, he said, "who will dare voice his opinions" in Yugoslavia?

Initiation to Freedom

On Wednesday, Nov. 21, the first plane-load of Hungarian refugees to be received in this country landed at Fort Dix, N. J. A group of welcoming notables headed by Army Secretary Brucker set forth to show them the American Way as soon as they set foot on our soil.

A platform had been erected for the VIPs. There were reports that the refugees had been deliberately kept waiting for 6 hours in a Newfoundland lay-over so that the reception could be done right.

For 10 minutes after the plane landed, preparations were being made for the refugees to disembark. "Let's get the show on the road," said the major in charge. "There's a lot of high-priced talent waiting."

He meant the politicians on the platform. The Army Secretary made a speech to his captive audience. "I want to initiate you," he said. "I want you to know what freedom is all about. First I want you to applaud the flag."

He meant the U. S. flag. The refugees were coming from a country where brave men were tearing a foreign symbol from their own flag. They dutifully applauded a foreign flag as ordered. It was the meaning of freedom.

(No one broke out a Hungarian flag, the red-white-green banner of the greatest fight for freedom in our day, in order to ask Army Secretary Brucker and his fellow notables to applaud it.)

The Army Secretary then assured the Hungarians: "Here, so long as we all conduct ourselves as good reliable people, you are safe and we will protect you."

Murray Kempton reports: "Here was no applause; it must have sounded, even in translation, a little too much like the words they used to hear from Matyas Rakosi in the compulsory assemblies in the country from which they had come driven."

Then the Army Secretary asked the Hungarians to applaud the men "responsible for the top-level handling of this great enterprise."

He meant the great enterprise of letting the refugees into this wealthy country which has such draconic laws on its books to bar the people of most countries of the world.

To make all clear, he introduced freedom fighter Scott McLeod, who has worked hard to bar even immigrants eligible for admission.

The refugees were ordered to applaud.

Then, after the speeches, to show them the further meaning of freedom, the refugees were put through security clearance, fingerprinting and photo mugging by the military authorities.

So now they know.

NEW YORK SPECIAL EVENT MON., DEC. 3—8 p.m. . . .

For the 1st time in decades, a CP leader meets Max Shachtman in discussion . . .

Meaning of Events in Hungary & Mideast

A. J. Muste, moderator

John W. Gates, Daily Worker editor

Max Shachtman, ISL

Paul Sweezy, Monthly Review

John Swomley, F.O.R.

Dave Dellinger, Liberation

COMMUNITY CHURCH, 40 E. 35 St., nr. Park Ave., N.Y.C. . . . Admission free . . . Auspices, Liberation

IN THE OLD GROOVE

W. Z. FOSTER VS. HUNGARY'S REVOLUTION

By H. W. BENSON

Nothing is awry in the world of William Z. Foster. Where the normal socialist-minded resident of this planet sees the empire of the Kremlin wracked by internal struggles with the masses of Eastern Europe fighting at different levels to free themselves from dictatorship and to establish socialist democracy, he notices no irregularities.

In the November 21 issue of the *Daily Worker*, for example, he discusses Hungary with this "optimistic" conclusion:

"The Hungarian tragedy has caused considerable uncertainty in the ranks of Communist Parties in various countries, the U. S. included. Temporarily, the prestige of the Soviet Union has been hurt among the masses. But all this does not signify, as some charge, a crisis in international Communism comparable to that of the Second International in 1914. The latter was the degeneration of Social Democracy; whereas this situation, for all its seriousness, is a 'crisis' of growth for world Communism."

This gem of analysis would be on a par with the thought that the French difficulties in North Africa and Egypt are only part of a "crisis" of growth for French imperialism, that independence for India came as part of a "crisis" of growth for the British Commonwealth. Anyone can add his own absurdities.

Ordinarily it would be a waste of time to examine Mr. Foster's effusions. This human duplicating machine reprints upon demand the handouts, canned phrases, and prefabricated facts that fit neatly into the latest line devised by the still-Stalinist rulers of the USSR.

Die-Hards vs. Events

Russia, he insists, represents "socialist" democracy; consequently he defends without qualification all its main moves. His art consists in an unwavering presentation of every oscillation. It would be more economical to follow the line of the Kremlin directly in the speeches of its UN delegates, its resolutions and articles, than to bother with English transmogrifications by Foster and his faction friends. But times are not normal.

Events are moving the Communist Party of the United States; there is now no doubt of it. Revolution, mass struggles, and the resurgence of socialist struggle in the Stalinist world are not without impact upon it. Whole sections of its membership and of its leadership are driven to break out of the trap of Stalinism and are groping for democratic socialism.

On the way, they come into head-on collision with the die-hard Foster. His views command attention now, not for their own sake, but because of the fight against them inside the CP.

In the November issue of *Political Affairs*, Steve Nelson, Pittsburgh CP leader, writes, "All friends of Socialism would do better if they pitched into the discussion, suggested changes in policy, program, and structure. This would do more good than to stand on the side and offer advice to us to dissolve."

And he adds, "It is hoped that this discussion will not bypass them and that there will be Socialists who will enter this discussion constructively."

Nelson leaves us unclear on where this kind of discussion is to take place; our view of the discussion from week to week will be found in the pages of LABOR ACTION.

The Smear Pattern

Foster's reconstruction of the Hungarian events, which needless to say is virtually point

for point and date for date a repetition of what he has heard from his Kremlin mentors, could be summarized in these main points:

(1) Under the old Rakosi-Stalin regime, errors and blunders were committed leading to a rise of resentment among the Hungarian people.

(2) Khrushchev and the 20th Congress changed everything. The way was now opened for reforms that would reverse the grievous errors of the past.

(3) Regrettably, the regime in Hungary delayed. When it failed to make a turn, the masses with their justified grievances demonstrated for a change.

(4) But "fascists" took advantage of the legitimate demands of the people and turned their demonstrations into a counter-revolutionary, anti-socialist uprising, Nagy capitulated to the "fascists."

(5) To prevent Hungary from falling into the hands of reactionaries, Russian troops were compelled to intervene and save "socialism." Russia was not merely justified; it fulfilled a duty to "proletarian internationalism."

We might ask: what kind of regime was the CP in its decade of rule, a regime so barbaric and oppressive that the masses were ready to permit what you call "fascism" to take over, so long as they could get rid of it?

But we need not ask that question, for Foster's apologetics hang upon one gigantic fraud and lie. It is nothing new; the whole history of Stalinism as defended and explained by Foster in years past was filled with just such lies and frame-ups. When an opponent could not be refuted, he was called a "fascist"; if possible, executed; or, second best, murdered. Foster merely continues in old-fashioned style; it is another piece of evidence that for him nothing has changed.

In an article on page 3, we call attention to the flimsy factual basis for this newest frame-up of a whole revolution. There we learn that "60,000 fascists" crossed not the Hungarian border but the editor's desk at the London *Daily Worker*.

The prosecutors will doubtless busy themselves as the months go by with fabricating "evidence." Thus far they have dredged up nothing but vociferous slanders and outright falsification.

No License from Foster?

Let us look at the CP-Rakosi regime as Foster himself describes it:

It (1) "lowered living and working standards for the masses"; (2) was guilty of "bureaucratic blunders and tyranny"; (3) "excesses and brutalities"; (4) "great-Russian chauvinism"; indeed "the national independence of the Hungarian people was virtually liquidated"; (5) "they were stripped of their civil liberties and subordinated to the vicious domination of the secret police"; (6) brought "needlessly severe economic strains"; (7) "the several political parties . . . were either emasculated or liquidated"; (8) "these harsh and unjust measures alien to the principles of Socialism could not be justified. . . ."

It was against this that the peoples revolted, against this and for socialist democracy. And such a revolution against such an oppression we hail as a vindication of the great role of the working class in the fight for democracy.

The workers did not wait to be generously "liberated" from above by new CP dictators or by bourgeois imperialists; they took their fate into their own hands and for a time were

victorious. Even in defeat they have given an enormous impulse to the world struggle for democracy and socialism.

But they had to do this without Mr. Foster's kind permission. In his view, they should have awaited reforms from above through the ruling CP. Meanwhile, he gives them a permit to have "justified grievances" and he is even willing to put an official stamp of approval upon their first peaceful demonstrations for reform. The party in Hungary, he tells us, regrettably was dilatory and the "explosion" derived from its failure to act soon enough. Presumably, the people should have waited patiently.

In Poland, Foster feels, things worked out far more felicitously:

"Fortunately, however, the shift from the old to the new situation was finally accomplished [in Poland] without a serious rupture, and Comrade Gomulka emerged as the leader of a new regime with a policy of rapidly developing Polish Democracy and of establishing friendly relations with the Soviet Union. . . ."

Definition of "Fascism"

One cannot help but wonder what Foster's reaction would have been had Russian troops deposed Gomulka. Doubtless, he would have discovered that Gomulka too had been a tool of fascism.

Mr. Foster's office, you see, issues permits which are carefully circumscribed; the people are permitted to press for and demand what is tolerable to the Russian bureaucracy. They must stolidly await dispensations from above; they must be satisfied to remain under the rule of the Communist Party, reworked and refashioned as it sees fit in its good time.

They may, in sum, go as far as Poland but no farther; for so it is written by Khrushchev and so it must be. Anything more is "fascism."

For the sake of argument, let this be, just for a moment. In Poland there now exists a government which is "socialist" by permission of Mr. Foster. So far, its actions have the official stamp. But Russian troops are still stationed there. Have the Polish masses the right to demand their removal? Should the government insist upon their leaving Polish soil? At any rate, if the people do not want Russian armies on their territory, have they the right to demonstrate and to fight for their departure?

Foster doesn't say directly but it is clear that such actions are beyond what his "socialist" patent allows.

They Fought for Freedom

But let us leave Russian troops in Poland. Mr. Foster frowns upon the Rakosi regime which outlawed other political parties. So far, there is no indication that the Gomulka government will permit really free elections. It has not permitted the reconstruction of free political parties; and we refer not to parties which are manufactured to support the government but genuinely free parties, free to oppose it.

Have the Polish people the right to demonstrate for free elections and for free political parties? And if the government refuses to grant such demands, have they the right to overthrow it?

Mr. Foster doesn't bother with such matters because his license doesn't cover such grants. That, in his view, is nothing short of "fascism."

The world-shaking significance of the Hungarian events lies in this: the socialist working class did not wait for permission from Mr. Foster and his ilk in Hungary or in Russia. They wanted freedom and they fought for it. Their surge for freedom could not be contained within the framework of bureaucratic dictatorship and it therefore had to be smashed by anti-socialist dictators.

That is what happened in the Hungarian Revolution. Socialist-minded workers rejected the promises of their oppressive rulers; they did not trust the promises of dictators and they sought to take power into their own hands. This socialist revolution was crushed only by the power of Russian arms.

All the lies and frame-ups are calculated to hide this basic truth, but they will not succeed.

FRAME-UP OF A REVOLUTION

What About Those 'Fascists' in Hungary?

The Daily Worker Is Puzzled

By H. W. BENSON

On November 19 the National Committee of the Communist Party dodged a critical aspect of the Hungarian Revolution and left itself floating above the struggle.

"We do not seek to justify the use of Soviet troops in Hungary's internal crisis on November 4," reads the NC "Open Letter to CP Members." "Neither do we join the condemnation of these actions. Was there no alternative? Was it a grim necessity? There are no ready answers and we are in no position to give final judgment on the Soviet actions."

The Daily Worker and the Communist Party are now in the pitiful position of those who presumably welcome a struggle for democracy in Hungary but are not ready to condemn those who shoot down revolutionary democrats. It is a fine thing to fight for democracy! But it appears tolerable, too, to murder democrats.

The NC is well advised to address this "analysis" to members of the CP and not to the public opinion of the working class where it would be received with the mockery and scorn it deserves.

How does the NC get into such a contorted position?

On November 4, just before Russian troops set up the puppet Kadar government, the NC adopted a statement on Poland and Hungary which said among other things:

"Their [the CP government] calling upon the Soviet troops stationed in Hungary to put down the popular demonstrations was a tragic error." (Let us overlook the peculiar terminology which calls such an anti-socialist crime an "error.") And it added: "The response of the Soviet authorities to the request for armed intervention also cannot be justified by the argument that they had the legal right to do so under the Warsaw Pact. This was not a matter of formal rights. It violated the essence of the Leninist concept of national self-determination because the call for the troops was not in accord with the wishes of the Hungarian people."

Here too the authors place an undue strain upon the English language. It was wrong to massacre the Hungarian people because that was "not in accord with what the people wanted." The tone better befits a discussion of a Roper public-opinion poll than a brutally suppressed fight for democracy.

IMPRESSED BY WHAT?

But even that is a big step forward for the Daily Worker; it is frankly critical of the Russian action, critical in a gingerly sort of way, but still critical.

Two weeks later, the CP National Committee retreats into a puzzled neutrality. And why? It has been impressed by Kremlin-created "facts" that manufacture, in typical Stalinist fashion, a fascist and imperialist plot in Hungary.

This is from the Open Letter:

"The role and influence of the reactionary elements within Hungary were bolstered by an influx of exiled fascists, interventionists, and agents of Project X across the Austrian border. The Nagy government, retreating before reactionary pressures, lost its capacity to govern and was unable to halt the lynchings, anti-Semitic outbreaks and reign of terror against Communists and progres-

sives. From these facts it appears that the Soviet Union decided on the large-scale use of troops on November 4 to head off the White terror and what is considered to be the danger of the formation of an anti-Soviet, Horthy-like regime on its borders which would threaten not only the security of the USSR and other socialist countries but world peace as well."

We don't intend to wade too deeply into this muck of apologia. But we ask: where did you learn of the mass influx of fascists, etc? And when?

The Kremlin has not yet had time to manufacture forged documents or to create real corpses with mythical political histories. So far, there has not been one reference anywhere to any "fascist" or group of fascists by name and address, dead or alive, found fighting in Hungary. They are the pure invention of the Kremlin.

What devious inner-party motives guide the authors of the Open Letter, we cannot know in detail. We do know, however, that they are aware of the fraudulent nature of the charges of "fascist counter-revolution" directed against the Hungarian people.

ELUSIVE 60,000

Here is where they got their "facts," as explained in the Daily Worker on November 23 when the editors answer indignant Fosterites who claim that the D.W. had suppressed the "facts" of "fascist" intervention:

"On Nov. 8, the Daily Worker ran a story culled from the London Daily Worker by foreign editor Joe Clark, which reported that since last April when the Austrian-Hungarian border was opened to tourist traffic an estimated 60,000 counter-revolutionaries had entered Hungary. As far as we've been able to discover, no other English-language daily paper published this news item. Yet, several people have demanded to know why we've 'suppressed' it."

Is that clear enough? The CP National Committee's sole unverified source of the fable is none other than the London Daily Worker. But that is not all to be noted:

(1) The traffic in fascists was supposed to have started in April. Yet no one thought it fitting to mention it until the Hungarian events of November. A suspicious person would conclude that the whole story is a Stalinist invention.

(2) The Worker doesn't explain how counter-revolutionaries were identified nor does it mention a single name. Did they cross the border with swastika flags flying?

(3) Where did the figure "60,000" come from? Was there a special turnstile, complete with counting device, through which border-crossing "fascists" passed?

(4) Where and how did the 60,000 spend their time in Hungary awaiting the Budapest events of November? Did they ride the subways? Did they infiltrate government buildings, dozing with feet on desks pretending to be Communist Party bureaucrats?

But away with annoying details! In days of old, thousands were shot as "fascists" in Russia on even flimsier evidence. The Kremlin demands that the Hungarian revolution be defamed. So be it.

By HAL DRAPER

As H. W. Benson points out to the left, the New York Daily Worker found out about the "fascists" who infiltrated Hungary from its colleagues of the London Daily Worker. But where did the latter get this scoop?

It is possible to trace the manufacturing process of this Stalinist slander against the Hungarian Revolution, from the now-available compilation of Monitored Broadcast Reports for East Europe.

The Daily Worker today concedes that the first stage of the Hungarian Revolution was led by honest socialist-minded workers and students who were revolting against the "mistakes" of the Stalinist regime. But Foster claims, while the CP's National Committee is dubious, that in the second stage (namely, to justify the Russians' second intervention in force) the "fascists" took over.

But the claim comes from the same kind of people who, from the very beginning of the uprising in Budapest, threw out the smear "fascists" in order to defame the revolution.

Erno Gero himself made a tentative stab in this direction on that fateful October 23 in Budapest, in the speech of his which further inflamed the people when they heard it. He ranted against "enemies of the people" who want to bring the bourgeoisie back [from where, by the way? from their graves?] and he denounced them thus:

"They heap slanders on the Soviet Union; they assert that we are trading with the Soviet Union on an unequal footing, that our relations with the Soviet Union allegedly are not of equality and that our independence must be defended allegedly not against the imperialists but against the Soviet Union. All this is impudent untruth, hostile propaganda..." etc.

But it is now virtually official Stalinist doctrine that these "slanders" are all true, due to "excesses" and "mistakes" committed by Gero and Rakosi. So Gero was lying. Why should any Daily Worker reader believe the other ravings about "enemies of the people?"

THE FIRST DAY

With the deposition of Gero, for the most part the Budapest radio did not dare to call the freedom fighters "fascists." The standard term used in all broadcasts was "the counter-revolutionaries," and this was used in blanket fashion for anyone fighting against the government, whether they were "misled elements" or "provocateurs." It was not used to distinguish between "good" and "bad" elements among the fighters.

There were a couple of exceptions. On October 23 at 11:37 a.m., a short flash addressed to women referred in passing to "fascist looters." At the same time, all along, the government broadcasts called the fighters "hooligans," "irresponsible," sometimes "anti-democratic," usually "counter-revolutionary," but it was not until nearly 5 p.m. that there was another incidental use of the term "fascist provocation," not from the authorities but in the text of one of those "factory resolution" that were read off to quell the struggle.

On the 24th, Kadar's speech made no mention of "fascists," and only vaguely referred to "those who intend to restore capitalism—even if they carry out the attack under different pleasing slogans."

But if, as we are now told, the government knew that hordes of organized fascists had crossed the border in advance, how come that even Kadar did not use this information to bring the "misled elements" to their senses? Obviously, because this story was invented later.

TASS DISCOVERY

In fact, from this point on and until the start of the Russian massacre at the end of November 3, the Budapest radio never tied the revolution up with any "fascists." On the contrary, the Nagy-Kadar regime later began to describe the fighters as good patriots and socialists who had won out and ought to stop fighting.

The epithet "fascist" came mainly not from Budapest, where presumably Kadar

might know, but from—Moscow.

On the evening of the 24th Radio Moscow broadcast a TASS dispatch in which "fascist thugs" were described as looting shops in Budapest.

The same evening, over the East Berlin radio Gerhart Eisler told his listeners that the Hungarian fight was exploited by people who wanted "the establishment of a fascist reactionary dictatorship."

Neither TASS nor Eisler, of course, bothered to reveal how they had discovered all this. According to the line now, they were lying then. Why should they be believed ever?

HOW TO EXPLAIN

Now look at what was said that same evening of the 24th over the broadcasts which are beamed at Italy from Prague, by the Italian CP commentator Alberto Clerici. He also had discovered there were "fascists" in Budapest. But he was talking to a country on this side of the Iron Curtain. Here's how he put it:

"The Budapest fascists only wanted to destroy and kill. I have used the term 'fascists' and I would like to explain it." But what followed was merely a wandering reference to the fact that in the last 10 years "land was taken from big landowners, factories from their owners, and trade from speculators." Presumably the listeners were left to infer that these were the people doing the fighting. This is how he "explained" it. At least he knew there was something to explain away.

Later on, there were many confessions that any references to "fascists" were lies. For example, the Warsaw Radio on the 28th broadcast a report from Budapest by its correspondent Marian Bielicki. The experiences he related made it very clear who was leading the fighting, but in addition he made it explicit:

"The uprising, despite the fact that here and there hostile elements had joined in, was not directed against the socialist system; it was not a struggle for the return of the capitalist system... the truth must not be camouflaged about these events."

Of course, the official Stalinist line now is that, while this may have been true at first, later the "fascists" took over. But why should the Stalinists be believed, when it is clear that their first effort was in any case to smear the revolt as "fascist" without any justification, that this is their pattern, their system?

A SMEAR IS BORN

But how about the story of the "Horthyite fascists" who were streaming across the Austrian frontier into Hungary? Where did this come from?

It was first published on November 1 in the Austrian CP organ Volkstimme, nowhere else. The evidence given was the testimony of "observers," in other words it was concocted in the staff room.

It was retailed over the Moscow radio on a November 3 evening broadcast, as follows:

"The newspaper Oesterreichische Volkstimme reports the appearance in Vienna of leaflets calling for volunteers to go to Hungary. Dispatches from the Austrian-Hungarian frontier, the newspaper reports, state that a restaurant in the town of Nickelsdorf resembles a transshipping point where people from West Germany, speaking Hungarian and wearing U.S. military uniforms, are arriving. Their passports were issued in West Germany. Each of them is equipped with a field kit."

To understand the full fantasy of this report, one must remember that Austria is neutralized by treaty with Russia, and that its government is anxious to give Moscow no occasion to denounce this

(Turn to last page)

FRIDAY, DEC. 14 . . . 8 p.m. . . . Bill of Rights anniversary

Socialism and Democracy: East and West

A Panel Discussion, with speakers representing

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Monthly Review
Militant

Labor Action
American Socialist
Liberation

I. F. Stone (moderator) . . . Contrib. \$1 (students 50¢)
COMMUNITY CHURCH, 40 East 35 Street, near Park Ave., N. Y. C.

Victory Out of Defeat

By A. RUDZIENSKI

If defeat can sometimes be politically more fruitful than victory, then the defeat of the Hungarian Revolution by Russian tanks and heavy artillery will have incalculable consequences and aftermaths for the Stalinist empire.

For the Hungarian uprising was not a nationalist or reactionary movement against the "mistakes of socialist power" but an authentic workers', peasant and middle-class revolution; a social revolution against the Stalinist totalitarian tyranny.

Of course, a reactionary wing of the Hungarian nation, represented by Cardinal Mindszenty, also intervened. But, in the first place, in the course of every real revolution all social classes rise against the old oppressing power. And in the second place, it is the Stalinist power that is responsible for the fact that reactionary elements like Mindszenty could acquire so much glory as martyrs for the nationalist cause, thereby getting identified with the democratic and social rights of the Hungarian people.

To be sure, the Hungarian Revolution was nationalist, for it fought for the national freedom and national independence which had been trampled on by the Stalinist regime and the Russian invaders.

It was also a democratic revolution, demanding rights for all the persecuted and oppressed, including the "anti-Soviet" parties of the peasants and middle class, demanding a multi-party system, democratic elections, and the abolition of the Stalinist dictatorship. But I think every socialist revolution will demand democracy for all working people and greater democratic rights than exist under the capitalist regime.

The peculiarity of the Bolshevik dictatorship in Russia is only proof of its "Jacobin" petty-bourgeois character, as Rosa Luxemburg rightly said, and of the fact that it did not entirely overcome the bourgeois character of the Russian revolution. The strongly marked democratic character of the Hungarian uprising is also a justified result of the Stalinist dictatorship.

But after all, the main tendency of the Hungarian upsurge was the working-class rebellion against the Stalinist tyranny, the working-class fight under the socialist banner in the "spirit of Bela Kun," with workers' councils as the political organs of the revolution, with an armed popular rising against the old power, and finally with a general strike which in its long duration has no precedent in the history of the working-class movement.

ZHUKOV'S "GLORY"

This working-class and socialist character of the revolution explains the violence and cannibalistic cruelty of the Russian intervention against the entire Hungarian people and especially against the Hungarian workers, who are in the vanguard of the revolt against the invaders.

After the victory of the popular upsurge and the constitution of the Nagy government, it seems that panic seized the Kremlin. Nagy's categorical demand for neutrality—liberation from Russian "protection" and the Russian war policy—and his repudiation of the Warsaw Pact enraged the Kremlin lords and strengthened the position of the "hard" Stalinist wing in Moscow (which is backed by Marshal Zhukov) against the "thaw" policy. And so they decided on a war of extermination against the entire Hungarian people, in accordance with the classic Hitlerite principle: "If you don't want to be my friend, then I'll break your head."

The rest is well known to the whole world: the "victorious offensive" of 5000 tanks and 20 divisions against the Hungarian people, after cautious preparation under cover of evacuation of Russian troops, and the destruction of Budapest and other industrial cities.

It was the personal glory of General Zhukov, the hope of the Kremlin—this war against the kids and women and the "pogrom" against the heroic city of Budapest. He can now deservedly add to his titles, "Great Marshall and Conqueror of Budapest." Of course, the in-

This article was submitted by Comrade Rudzinski as a discussion piece. But obviously its estimate of the Hungarian Revolution is entirely in accord with our own. The "discussion" rubric would apply only to Comrade Rudzinski's interpolated remarks about the "petty-bourgeois" character of the Bolshevik regime (we do not know any more about his views on this theory) and, of course, to his personal speculations about the line-up inside the Kremlin.—What is important, however, is the analysis of the Hungarian Revolution. On this we are particularly glad to note Comrade Rudzinski's counterposition of the "Polish way" (Gomulka's regime), which would satisfy the Kremlin's needs in the satellites, as against the "Hungarian way," which shakes the whole Russian empire.—ED.

ternational conspiracy against the Hungarian Revolution, and especially the attack by British and French troops on the Suez Canal, gave the Russian cannibals liberty to slaughter the defenseless Hungarian peoples:

After 21 days of heroic and unequal fighting, the Great Marshall and Conqueror of Berlin defeated the Hungarian resistance against the invaders, but he did not win the victory. The working class answered with its last weapon, the general strike against the invaders, paralyzing completely the life of the conquered country. The puppet regime of Janos Kadar is absolutely isolated and no one except the Stalinists is willing to collaborate with him.

The defeated revolution rises politically and morally victorious over its conqueror.

POLISH OR HUNGARIAN WAY?

The powerful Kremlin despotism, which menaces the whole world with war and presents ultimatums to Britain and France, stands forth as politically and morally weak and inferior before the defenseless Hungarian people, before the defeated Hungarian Revolution. It is a question of the political and historical superiority of the proletarian socialist revolution over Stalinism.

The consequences of this political defeat for the Kremlin will be really incalculable. The whole structure of Russian domination over the satellite states is obsolete now, after the Hungarian Revolution, and must be changed.

The Kremlin would be satisfied if the "Polish solution" would be sufficient to take care of the satellite problem. The isolated Kadar regime now holds out the offer of the multi-party system and new elections to the workers and peasants, but it invites the "traitor" Nagy into the new government. In Gomulka's coming visit to Moscow he will discuss the rebuilding of Russian-satellite relations and the Warsaw Pact. The "Hungarian Way" could find imitators in East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Rumania.

The defeated Hungarian Revolution is indeed a powerful factor in the political revolution of all of East Europe.

Its influence will be very decisive for Russia itself. It seems to me that after the initial war enthusiasm, a process of political demoralization began in the Kremlin. It should weaken the "hard wing" and shake the position of the "future Napoleon," the Great Marshal Zhukov, not to speak of being a political defeat for Molotov, Kaganovich and Suslov.

The demoralization of the hard Stalinist wing will accelerate the growth of the revolutionary process in the USSR. Without an upsurge of the Russian workers against the Stalinist lords, there can be no durable progress of the socialist revolution in the satellite countries. The position of Khrushchev will also be shaken, because he endorsed the Hungarian massacre. We can expect important changes in the upper strata of the Russian dictatorship.

In Western Europe and America, the Russian suppression of the Hungarian Revolution must provoke political splits in the Stalinist parties, as has been shown by the strong reactions of Pietro Nenni, Jean-Paul Sartre, and of Stalinists in Austria, Britain, and, I hope, the

(Turn to last page)

Rocking NATO — —

(Continued from page 1)

"...the military necessity for NATO may be thought to decline with the decline of the Red Army's prestige [because of the Hungarian events]; but its potential political and economic importance becomes all the greater. Its European members are now challenged on this score. Why should not NATO be a peaceful magnet in which ex-satellites are eligible for membership? But first NATO must become something more coherent and dynamic, something to join."

The idea has been floating around for some time now, of course: from NATO to a beginning of supra-national federalism on the political and economic side. "NATO must become something..." What and how? *Life* has no more idea than NATO. It is a lovely vision, and it is hauled out again because something is needed to fill a vacuum.

In this case we see, however, that the immediate response is being made to the Hungarian Revolution. For this is the other side from which NATO is being rocked. Its impact is less obvious in this country than the impact of the Middle East crisis.

We explained why in our Nov. 5 issue ("The Hungarian Revolution Versus NATO and War"). Subsequent events have been pointing it up.

Thus a month ago it was Gomulka who was pointing to NATO and American troops in Germany as the reason why Russia's troops had to stay in Poland—and therefore why the Polish people had to softpedal their own fight against the Stalinist power.

This was not merely a futile propaganda effort on his part. It strikes home. *Po Prostu*, the vanguard student organ which played a big role in the events leading up to the October upsurge, has been won over to it.

"We are opposed both to the Anglo-French aggression against Egypt and to the intervention, for the second time, of Russian troops in Hungary," it says, but adds:

"However, America is allied to Western Germany, American divisions are stationed there, the Western Powers have refused to guarantee our Oder-Neisse frontiers, and therefore there are Polish reasons of state which make us accept Russian divisions in Poland." (Quoted by Claude Bourdet in the *Nation*, Nov. 24.)

The Adenauer regime in West Germany is doing Moscow's work for it when it makes not the slightest gesture toward the Polish people to indicate that a democratic united Germany would be willing to negotiate outstanding antagonisms with a free Poland.

MOSCOW USES NATO

Instead, in Bonn the leadership of Adenauer's party, the Christian-Democrats, have just released a stubborn glorification of the policy of "military preparedness and close alliance with the West"—i.e., the policy which is the only weapon the Polish national-Stalinists have for consolidating their regime and keeping the Russians in the country.

"It [the C-D statement] asserted that the tragic story of Hungary had confirmed the rightness of Dr. Adenauer's policy of 'strength...'." (*Times*, Nov. 25.)

Confirmed? because Russia will hurl an attack on West Germany through the burning ground of Poland and East Germany? No, Moscow needs every American GI that there is in Germany in order simply to hold on to Poland.

It is in a nice calculation on Washington's political inertness that Khrushchev from the Kremlin has been able to launch the taunting proposition: *We will withdraw our troops from East Europe if you withdraw yours from Germany and West Europe.*

It is a challenge, a grandstand play before the Polish people and all of East Europe. It is a bluff. It can be said almost with scientific precision that the Russian heel will not be withdrawn from the necks of the East European people if the bluff is called.

But it is an effective challenge. Moscow is counting on the inability of Western policy to expose it. It is its means of using NATO to hold Poland. NATO can do that for Russia, even though NATO can-

not hold Algeria or Suez for its own imperialists.

The groping goes on. In an editorial Nov. 5 on the East European revolution, even the *New Leader* came out for steps toward a withdrawal of "all foreign troops from the Continent," in order to bring about "entirely new political possibilities [which] would emerge if Soviet troops went home."

Maybe there was something to the London *Observer* report that Eisenhower himself has been toying with the withdrawal-of-troops idea. Not only the *New Leader* but the N. Y. *Herald Tribune's* Washington correspondent Marguerite Higgins has come out for a version of the proposition. Her Nov. 26 column starts off like a manifesto: "There is a way of helping Hungary... This involves a dynamic move by the U. S... to offer boldly to withdraw American forces west of the Rhine in Europe on condition that Russia withdraw forthwith from Eastern Europe and give Germany its freedom..."

This would help the anti-Stalinist revolution in East Germany and Poland even more. Higgins is even willing to consider accepting a neutralized united Germany.

"CHANCE WAS MISSED"

In the current *New Republic*, Richard Lowenthal discusses "Hungary—Were We Helpless?" He too comes over to the idea, "in a situation where Soviet Communist control of Eastern Europe was actually crumbling." Such an American offer "would have transformed the situation." (Neither he nor Higgins let out that in point of fact, as mentioned, the Russians were already making the offer.)

"It was the only chance of influencing" the Russians' actions, and "this chance was missed," says Lowenthal.

Yesterday when socialists proposed withdrawal of troops we were told that U. S. soldiers were the only defense against the Stalinist hordes. We replied that the real defense was the awakening of the revolution against Moscow. It was worth a smirk, a blank stare, or remarks about dogmatists who haven't learned anything since Marx. Now Republican journalists and State Department hangers-on are talking nostalgically about what should have been done and the chances that were missed...

But who expects that, even with life educating them, our Washington leaders can become practitioners of revolutionary political warfare?

Now that we have seen how the Hungarian people have fought, try to imagine a Western world which has given up its military-base encirclement of Russia in order to permit the revolution to encircle Russia; which has aligned itself with the colonial peoples of Asia and Africa in order to spotlight the colonialism of Moscow; in other words, a Western world which is following a consistently democratic and anti-imperialist foreign policy: What a tremendous impulsion would be given to the revolutionary volcanic forces which are battering the inner vitals of the Russian empire!

This capitalist-imperialist West cannot do that; but its leaders grope. Its people can also speed the revolution in the east by fighting for socialism not in Budapest or Warsaw but in our own countries.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

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

A sub is only \$2 a year!

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

December 3, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 49

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

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

Interview with Hungarian Student Leader

The following report was made available to *Challenge* by people who had the opportunity to talk several hours with Istvan Laszlo, a student leader of the Hungarian revolution now in this country.

Laszlo is 21 years old. His family background was intelligentsia. At the outbreak of the revolution he was studying forestry at the University of Sopron in western Hungary near the Austrian border.

Obviously quite intelligent, poised, and a good speaker, he was elected mayor of Sopron by the Revolutionary Council in that city and was also made military commander of rebel troops in the area, numbering 5000. He led other students in arresting first the secret police and then local Communist Party functionaries. As military commander, he negotiated a cease-fire with the local Russian garrison, a cease-fire which was broken by the Russians after Laszlo had left the area.

Although slight of stature and boyish-looking, his carriage and bearing are those of a leader and of a young man intensely proud of speaking for the Hungarian people and the Hungarian Revolution.

Following is the gist of questions addressed to him, and his replies.

Q.—What was the program of the revolution?

A.—Free elections and political democracy.

Q.—What social system did you believe the rebels desired?

A.—That is hard to say—we had little opportunity for political discussion.

Q.—Do you believe that state ownership of industry should continue?

A.—Even before the Communists took over, much industry was state-owned. Large enterprises should be kept that way. Small enterprises should be returned to their rightful owners.

Q.—Do you think most of the people believed that way?

A.—The question is very dark. It is very hard to say.

Q.—What was the attitude of the Russian troops?

A.—When they found we were not fascists, they would not fire. [This refers to the early days of the revolt.]

Q.—Was there any socialist underground in Sopron before the revolt?

A.—No, but there were social-democratic leaders in prison, and any Hungarian who had been imprisoned by the Russians was popular with the people when they were released by the revolution.

Q.—Do you believe that the Russians will some day turn against their rulers?

A.—That is very hard to say, because I had very little contact with the Russians, but there were some signs to indicate this.

Q.—What was the attitude of the Hungarian workers toward the Hungarian Communist Party?

A.—It was completely hated by the entire working class. In 1948 there were workers who believed the promises of the Communists, but this is no longer true.

WHOLE PEOPLE ROSE

Q.—What attitude did the Communists in your city take toward the revolution?

A.—The rank-and-file members joined; the leaders did not.

Q.—Do you believe that Nagy is still popular with the Hungarian people?

A.—Yes. He was not popular at first, but as he moved toward independence for Hungary, he became very popular.

Q.—What social groups led the revolution?

A.—Students, workers, soldiers, peasants and city dwellers.

Q.—But that is the entire population.

A.—Exactly.

Q.—Who were the leaders?

A.—The revolution was so popular that all were leaders.

Q.—Did the faculty of your university join in?

A.—Naturally.

Q.—Before the revolution, did your teachers speak out against the regime?

A.—No, it was not permitted.

Q.—Before the revolution, did you have any contact with the Russians in Hungary?

A.—No, the Russian soldiers were care-

fully prevented from fraternizing with the people. They were stationed in isolated camps outside of the main cities. The only Russians we saw in Sopron were the wives of Russian officers, who came to shop.

Q.—When you negotiated for a cease-fire with the Russians, did the Russian soldiers speak any Hungarian?

A.—Only one, and he was from a part of the Soviet Union which once belonged to Hungary and was taken from her and incorporated in the Soviet Union after the war.

LIES

Q.—What were you told about the United States before the revolution?

A.—That the United States was trying to stir up revolution, that it committed espionage and sabotage, and that all Americans chew gum. We were told about the bad treatment of the Negroes and how they are segregated in the schools. The newspapers published many pictures of riots against Negroes in America.

Q.—What were you told about West Germany?

A.—That it is the most reactionary country in the world, and was completely under American control. That all were Nazis.

Q.—Didn't you know that there was a large Social-Democratic Party in West Germany?

A.—We were told that they were really Nazis.

Q.—If an election were held in Hungary, a free election, what party would win?

A.—The Peasant Party, the Small-holders Party, and the Social Democrats. Everyone but the Communists.

Q.—Did you ever listen to American broadcasts?

A.—No, they were always jammed. We sometimes listened to British broadcasts.

Q.—Did you expect American armed aid?

A.—No. Most Hungarians did not expect any.

Q.—What do you feel about the Suez situation?

A.—It was a terrible mistake and was done at the worst possible time.

Q.—Do you feel that the Suez situation made it easier for the Russians to crush you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do the Hungarian people feel this way, also?

A.—Definitely.

Q.—Did many Hungarian students go to Russia to study?

A.—No. Students resisted going to Russia, although there were many scholarships offered, and there was much official pressure to go. When I was in

high school, I was pressured to go very heavily, but I did not.

Q.—Why?

A.—There were three reasons. (1) I would not accept anything from a country which was oppressing Hungary. (2) I did not believe I would get a good education in a completely Communist country. (3) Those who went were invariably persuaded to become informers when they returned.

Q.—Were you familiar with the program of the Budapest students?

A.—Of course. The twelve-point program was famous throughout Hungary and was the program of the revolution. [For this program, see *LA* Nov. 5.]

Q.—What are your plans?

A.—When I have finished my speaking tour, I will return to Hungary and re-enter the country as a guerrilla.

THE MOTIF

Here is one report on the over-all impression given by Laszlo:

"There were many questions that he had not thought through; in many ways, he was not a 'political' person, although it was clear that he had learned a lot in a very short time and was still learning fast. Talking to him, you got a clearer idea of what it was like to grow up in a totalitarian country. On many questions, he knew what he himself thought but not what others thought.

"But this was not a major problem to him. He was dominated by one idea—get rid of the foreign occupiers. He now knew that all the rest of the people felt that way too. That was the motif of the revolution, and Laszlo was unshakably optimistic that it would eventually triumph. Having seen him and talked to him, so am I."

Oslo Students Picket for Hungary

Last week's LABOR ACTION carried an account from Norway of the speech given by Isaac Deutscher on the events in Poland and Hungary at a meeting of the Oslo University Student Society on October 27. Before an overflow audience of some 300 students, Deutscher expounded his usual apologies for the Kremlin leadership. Following is a summary of the rest of that Oslo dispatch by correspondent Leif Eiriksson.

After his speech, the Oslo student group, which is a non-partisan student organization embracing all political tendencies, considered various resolutions on the Hungarian events and adopted two of them. These were:

(1) A resolution expressing sympathy with the Polish and Hungarian people "in the struggle for national independence and political freedom" and expressing admiration for the struggle of the Hungarian students.

(2) A resolution condemning the Russian military actions and declaring that only the Hungarian people have the right to decide who shall govern their country.

A student then proposed that all those present at the meeting gather in front of the Russian Embassy to demonstrate and to give their resolutions to Russian Embassy officials. A socialist student leader then declared that if there was to be a demonstration before the Russian embassy, there should also be one in front of the embassies of England and France to protest their actions in their colonies. (This was before the invasion of Egypt.)

At this point, Isaac Deutscher remarked that he did not want his lecture to lead to any demonstration, and that furthermore, he had not been connected with any political movement for over twenty years.

After a short period of chaos, the overwhelming majority of those present adjourned to the Russian Embassy, where they arrayed themselves in two groups: a large group of 700-800 students, intent on demonstrating against Stalinist oppression in Hungary, and a smaller group of some 60 students under socialist leadership who planned to also demonstrate against British and French imperialism later that night.

However, a contingent of police stationed themselves in front of the demonstrators and informed the students that it was illegal to present notes to an embassy at this late hour. (It was a little after midnight at this point.) The police suggested that the students disband, which they did peacefully. As a result of the break-up of this gathering, the planned demonstration before the British and French embassies also did not come off.

At the next meeting of the Oslo University Student Society, on Nov. 3, a panel of speakers discussed the Anglo-French-Israeli attack on Egypt, after which the Society adopted a resolution criticizing England and France's "military intervention, without United Nations sanction, in the conflict between Egypt and Israel." A stronger resolution, offered by socialist students, was defeated by a slender margin.

Meanwhile, in regard to the Hungarian

events, the students have organized a "Give A Day's Pay for Hungary" campaign. About 1200 students took a job for a day, contributing their pay, which amounted to \$6,000 to the Red Cross for help to Hungary.

The executive committee of the Norwegian Social Democratic Youth on November 2 sent the International Union of Socialist Youth a telegram on the revolt of the Hungarian people, expressing its solidarity with the uprising. The Norwegian youth organization's executive committee also adopted a position expressing its shock at the Anglo-French action and calling upon Norway to leave the Suez Canal User's Association if Britain and France try to utilize it for their aggressive policies.

MONTGOMERY ANNIVERSARY CONCERT

Sponsored by "In Friendship" to give financial help to the Montgomery bus boycotters and to victims of economic boycotts in the civil-rights struggle in the South, there will be a benefit concert on Wednesday, December 5, at Manhattan Center in New York.

Featured performers will be Harry Belafonte; Soprano Mrs. Martin Luther King, who has sung with the Boston Symphony; Tallulah Bankhead, and others. Tickets run from \$1 to \$5.

SIDNEY HOOK'S 5th AND THE REAL WORLD

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

In a series of four articles recently published in the *New Leader* (October 1, 8, 15, 22) Sidney Hook has considered the Fifth Amendment at great length. In doing so, he has delivered himself of judgments upon the inferences that may be drawn from the exercise of the Privilege, the rights of teachers, the new immunity statute, and a host of other issues.

Hook has a widespread influence in the intellectual world—it is no exaggeration to say that his book *Heresy, Yes—Conspiracy, No* won a considerable portion of the academic community to his views on the rights of teachers, the Smith Act and the witchhunt in general; and so his new analysis deserves careful attention.

Perhaps the most striking thing about the Hook series is its abstract character. The argument takes place, for the most part, in a world untroubled by the realities of the witchhunt.

The argument is directed toward the judicial calm of a courtroom with all of its procedural safeguards; it is largely predicated upon examples drawn from "normal" criminal law—kidnapping, embezzlement, and so on. The failure to take the real situation into account results in a serious methodological flaw, and it keeps Hook, in most cases, from facing up to the real problem.

This is quite surprising, since one would expect from a man as talented and brilliant as Hook a sophisticated conception of the relationship of law to political and social reality. But it just isn't there in his *New Leader* series, and the result is that he once more comes up on the side of the repression of civil liberties.

OUT OF CONTEXT

At the very beginning of the first article, Hook does state the reality in terms of "two sets of facts":

"The first is that the overwhelming majority of those who have invoked the self-incriminatory provision of the Fifth Amendment have done so in answer to questions concerning their involvement in the Communist movement. The second is that these questions have been put by congressional committees whose purposes or personnel are extremely controversial."

Right. Except that one would underline Hook's second fact about congressional committees: the shift of the focus of civil liberties from the courtroom to the committee and the quasi-judicial administrative board is of crucial importance within the last decade.

But then Hook immediately goes on to separate his argument from the actual reality:

"Whoever permits himself to consider the relevant clause of the Fifth Amendment only in relation to the phenomena of Communist conspiracy and/or cultural vigilantism is not likely to reach sound conclusions on the subject. The privilege against self-incrimination was invoked long before the Communists appeared on the scene; it will be invoked by others when and if the Communist challenge to the free society recedes."

In other words, Hook is consciously considering his problem out of context; he is not talking about the Fifth Amendment today, but of the Fifth Amendment, a generalized rule of law which must be taken

in terms of all possible situations past and present.

LAW AND REALITY

Now the relationship of judicial process to social reality is not a case of a simple one-to-one correspondence. Abstract formulations, rules of law in and of themselves, take on a certain autonomous existence, especially in the thought and practice of the courts. Yet basically, these rules are a response (often delayed because of the built-in lag of an unrepresentative, lifetime institution like the federal judiciary) to political and social conditions. It is no exaggeration to say that the Supreme Court sits in constant Constitutional Convention; that we have had, not one, but many Constitutions. And in approaching any legal formula, it is of the utmost importance that we see it in its over-all context.

Suppose, for example, that a writer at the beginning of this century had considered the law of contract. He acknowledges at the outset that there are facts to be considered—say, the influence of Herbert Spencer on the Supreme Court and the relation between the abstract law of contract and the development of unions in the society. But then he goes on to announce that anyone who considers the question primarily from the point of view of the yellow-dog contract (the reality) "is not likely to reach sound conclusions on the subject. The law of contract was invoked before the rise of unions; it will be invoked by others when and if the question of workers' organization is settled."

We would say to such an argument that it is mystified by verbal formulations, that it is unconscious of the play of social forces involved in every debate over legal formulas.

Yet this abstract approach is at the very center of Hook's series. One need only look at the obvious assumptions which he invokes.

WHAT RULES?

In arguing with Dean Griswold on torture and the Fifth Amendment, "even if he [the invoker] is safeguarded not only from torture but by watchful counsel and judge from bullying and intimidation"; in another place "should we abandon all the rules of evidence." (Emphasis added.) In most of Hook's examples, these are the controlling notions—that we are dealing with court, counsel, rules of evidence, cases like kidnapping, fraud, murder, etc.

But that, of course, is not the real problem. The real tangle of the Fifth Amendment arises out of the social phenomenon of congressional committees, often engaged in fishing expeditions, committees which do not have procedural rules, committees before which a man's counsel may not speak, etc.

But Hook, in certain places, does take this into account. The result is the gentlest conception of these committees uttered by a liberal in a long time:

"Indeed, anyone who takes the unusual course of actually reading extensively the give-and-take between congressional committees and witnesses will make the startling discovery that members of those committees are more often abused by unfriendly witnesses who do not invoke the Fifth Amendment especially witnesses concerning whom evidence exists that they are or were members of the Communist Party, than vice versa."

There is, obviously, a certain truth here. In some cases, people of the type

described by Hook shouted, kicked, screamed and abused their inquisitors (read, for example, the "Hollywood Ten" hearings). But my concern for the committee members is somewhat mitigated when I also read that they engage in systematic attempts to trap witnesses into waiving the privilege, assume that opposition to the Smith Act is *per se* evidence of Stalinist convictions, issue summary statements to the press about what has been "proved" by the invocation of the Fifth Amendment, and so on.

It is incredible that Hook singles out the bad manners of various Stalinists as a central point to cite on the question of the Fifth Amendment.

Here, clearly, is a case or rather a whole series of cases, in which understanding is predicated upon a realization of the actual situation when the Fifth Amendment is invoked.

THE WAIVER PROBLEM

But Hook's abstract methodology leads to an even more obvious error, one in which he ignores a type of situation which, because of circumstances and not legal formulas, escapes almost every logical point which he makes.

In his first article, Hook makes the following reference:

"The Supreme Court has extended the doctrine of waiver to witnesses before congressional committees (Rogers v. United States, 340 U. S. 367). If a witness answers a question without fear of incriminating himself in a certain field—say, as to whether he ever joined the Communist Party many years ago—he cannot therefore invoke the privilege with respect to whether he joined recently because his answer to the first question opened up the field of inquiry."

Now suppose that a witness had been, for six months, a member of the party. He is willing to testify about that, but he does not want to name the names of those who were with him. Assume further that this witness had no connection with espionage and has no knowledge of espionage. If he answers any one question on the subject, he is presumed to have waived his right of refusing to answer on any other question with regard to that subject.

Thus he must say, "Fifth Amendment" to the question, "Did you steal plans for the atomic bomb?" in order to keep his privilege for the question, "Did you recruit your good friend John Doe into the Party?"

The Rogers rule is no abstraction. Reading the testimony of actual hearings, one will make the startling discovery that there are a number of witnesses who, pretty obviously, are ex-members who would like to say so, but who cannot because of the waiver rule. (On one committee there is a congressman whose favorite sport, it would seem, is trying to trick witnesses into waiving.)

But what does this reality do to Hook's basic contention? His thesis is that "its [the Fifth Amendment's] invocation establishes a presumption of guilt or unfitness with respect to the issue in question which is relevant to inferences made in a non-legal or moral context." (Hook's emphasis.) But the Rogers rule excludes even such a presumption in a whole series of cases.

For we know—through experience, through common sense—that the waiver situation may force a witness to invoke the amendment in answer to questions concerning which he is willing to speak. And there is nothing in the process itself which tells us whether we are confronted with an invocation out of fear of waiver and in anticipation of some other question, or with a "genuine" invocation.

HOOK VS. DOUGLAS

But let us follow Professor Hook one more step in his dealings with the real world. Most of the time, as I mentioned before, he is indulging in abstract argumentation. But at some points he takes

the actualities into account, as when he demonstrates his sympathy for the abuse which committees must take from unfriendly witnesses. A further example is revealing.

Justice Douglas had written: "The disclosure that a person is a Communist practically excommunicates him from society... He will be able to find no employment in our society except at the lowest level, if at all."

This is, rather clearly, an exaggeration. But Hook counters it with an interesting emphasis of his own:

"Despite what Justice Douglas says, Communists can be and are lawyers, physicians, dentists, nurses, lay analysts, small businessmen, to mention just a few vocations which known Communists are currently and prosperously pursuing... Injudicious and unbridled exaggeration of fact is characteristic of Justice Douglas's opinions wherever the issue of Communism is involved..."

Am I unfair in finding an implication in Hook's statement that practically no bad consequences follow from exposure, that the truth is really the opposite of what Douglas says it is. If Douglas goes a little over-board (some exposed Stalinists have kept up their employment at a high level), Hook is, in turn, guilty of "injudicious and unbridled exaggeration" by giving his part-truth the air of a description of the total situation.

It is clear that exposure as a Stalinist will have grave consequences for people in almost every walk of American life. Workers have been hounded out of shops by their fellow workers, by unions, by management; writers have lost jobs; teachers have been fired, etc.

ROBUST EVASION

Here is another Hook formulation on the same subject: "What prevents witnesses today from taking greater advantage of the unjustifiable latitude extended to them by recent judicial decisions... is not fear of judicial punishment but fear of condemnation by the robust common sense of public opinion." One would think that New York University is located on the far side of the moon, not at Washington Square.

In my book, "robust common sense of public opinion" is a non-derogatory, indeed a complimentary characterization. And in the last five years it must include in its range of reference the whole hysterical, witchhunting, McCarthyite attitude toward the invocation of the Fifth Amendment, i.e., phrases such as "Fifth Amendment Communists" and the like.

The witnesses, faced by the complexities of the waiver rule, have not been afraid of the chairman of the NYU philosophy department, but of a mass, anti-libertarian sentiment which developed in this country in recent times. And it is an interesting phenomenon that Hook can refer to this as demonstrating some "robust common sense of public opinion."

In basic methodology, then, Hook's approach is to abstract the question of the Fifth Amendment, and the judicial interpretation of it, from the actual social and political context.

There is much citation of Wigmore and Bentham and old cases concerning the privilege. But when the actual living-breathing reality of the witchhunt enters, it is usually mentioned only to be played down; committees are abused; exposed Stalinists have no hard row to hoe as far as jobs are concerned; there is a "robust common sense" which is the real thing which the witness fears.

The explanation for this extraordinary procedure lies, I think, in the fact that Hook is reacting to "ritualistic liberals," as he calls them. (And this, as *Heresy, Yes* makes clear, is not unrelated to his advocacy of the side of American imperialism in the cold war.)

Often enough, as in the case of Justice Douglas, Hook does have an exaggeration to point out. But he deals with this by the technique of counter-exaggeration; he is, to use the patois of the actual reality, soft on the witchhunt. And this also buttresses his position on academic freedom, an area in which his views have been particularly pervasive and particularly harmful.

The Fifth Amendment is, to be sure, no easy question. Neither is the relationship of the universal formulas of the law to the particularities of actual situations of conflict. But Sidney Hook, in his *New Leader* articles, has dodged the real issue, the issue in context. The result is freedom's loss.

NEW YORK
LABOR ACTION FORUM

Thursday—Dec. 6—8:30 p.m.

STAN GREY

Highlights of the
Communist Party Crisis

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

THREE TYPES OF 'DEUTSCHERISM'

By PHILIP COBEN

Last week we had a note on Isaac Deutscher's emergence into print (in the *Reporter*, Nov. 15) to slander the Hungarian Revolution in accordance with his theory that the Kremlin is engaged in "democratization" from above. We also pointed out that Deutscher has degenerated from a man with a theory to a man who is engaged in outright falsification in order to prop up his now incredible theory.

Here is an especially ironic example of the latter, from different pages of his article in the *Reporter*, both dealing with what happened when Khrushchev & Co. arrived in Warsaw to put the arm on Gomulka.

On page 15 Deutscher asserts:

"When Khrushchev arrived in Warsaw on Oct. 19, he was not in fact motivated by any special hostility toward Gomulka—it was indeed far easier for him to come to terms with Gomulka than it had been to make apologies to Tito. What brought Khrushchev and his colleagues to Warsaw was, it seems, the fear that anti-Communist forces might gain the upper hand in the upheaval and that Gomulka, playing unwittingly the part of a 'Kerensky in reverse,' might pave the way for a counter-revolution."

That is a right neighborly view of Khrushchev's flying trip; and though it has not the slightest resemblance to anything reported by anyone else from Warsaw, still it came straight from Deutscher's ouija board.

However, on the next page and a few hundred words later, we get another version of what happened "in fact" when Khrushchev came to Warsaw together with the leaders of the other Kremlin factions:

"Khrushchev's first inclination was to side with the die-hards [Molotov and Kaganovich] and to use force or at least to threaten it. Only when the threat failed and it turned out that the Polish upheaval did not after all imperil the Communist regime did Khrushchev reconcile himself to the new situation."

It is a good example of Deutscher's authoritative reports via ESP on what any given person in the Kremlin felt like on any given day.

The *Reporter* article from which we quote was also published in Claude Bourdet's Paris weekly *France-Observateur* for Nov. 8, but in a curtailed form. This leads to a very interesting observation.

The section that is left out entirely is the whole-long first section which (in the longer *Reporter* version) purports to give a detailed picture of how the Hungarian Revolution was taken over by reaction, as we noted last week. There is not a word of this despicable thesis left in the *France-Observateur* version. (Bourdet's weekly has been treating the Hungarian fight very well, indeed.)

The contrast is ironic:

A leading American liberal magazine gives Deutscher free rein and apparently unrestricted space to hold forth with his clearly falsified and Moscow-whitewashing version of the Hungarian Revolution; but a Paris weekly which has long been heavily influenced by Stalinoid ideas (together with independent socialist ideas) has evidently drawn the line.

The Neutralist Appeal

This leads to a question which we touched upon glancingly once before. It is the question of the relation between the Deutscherite thesis and certain currents of opinion among Western anti-Communists who are very far from wishing to whitewash the Kremlin.

That is a more general way of putting a question which more than one person is asking about Max Ascoli's *Reporter*: How come this

magazine has made itself the U.S. organ for Deutscher's theory and views? For example, the above-discussed Deutscher atrocity on Hungary is the *Reporter's* main article on the Hungarian events so far. This comes close to being incredible at first blush. What is the attraction of Deutscherism for these circles?

It can hardly be understood if one thinks of Deutscherism solely in its capacity as today's most highly sophisticated mode of justifying Stalinism and its historical role. To be sure, it is in this capacity that it has been taken up by Sweezy's *Monthly Review* and by other Stalinoids, but it also has an appeal for certain anti-Stalinists.

It is easiest to see its appeal to the neutralist sympathies of such tendencies as the Bevanites in England. *LA* has explained this before. It is virtually made explicit by some Bevanites, in the first place Bevan himself, whose theoretics on the Russian question seem entirely derived from Deutscher's writings.

The neutralist perspective depends upon, and becomes nonsensical unless one believes in, the interpretation of the Russian power as essentially peaceful and progressive if only left alone. If a "coexistence" deal is to be negotiated with Moscow to ensure peace to the world, then on no account can one have such a pessimistic view of Moscow's politics as to make this deal merely a matter of appeasing a totalitarian despot.

The Don't-Scare-'Em Thesis

In short, neutralism enforces all kinds of illusions about the nature of the Stalinist power, as it also does about the nature of capitalist imperialism. If the two war camps are to be reconciled in understanding and amity, then one can hardly hold a Third Camp view that it is unavoidably necessary to fight both imperialisms to the end.

Deutscherism provides such neutralists with a handy theory which makes it possible to envision "peaceful coexistence."

If the Kremlin leaders are anxious to hand down democracy from above to a people who ought to be grateful for any tendencies in this direction, then it is obviously wrong to scare them out of it in any way.

One way to scare the would-be benevolent masters is to act bellicose in foreign affairs—Dulles' brinkmanship, for example; and so on. Hence: neutralism.

Another way to scare them is to make revolutions under their iron heels, as in Hungary, or to threaten to do so, as in Poland for a while. Hence the Hungarian Revolution must be deprecated (if not condemned or slandered, à la Deutscher himself), and the Poles must be warned against doing anything to make the Russians mad at them (à la Bevan in the *Tribune*).

This is one important connection between various forms of neutralism and some of the infamous reactions we have seen toward the great Polish and Hungarian events—including Nehru's.

State Department Version

Now it is important to understand that, in a diluted form, this ideology also has its influence on the State Department and the foreign offices of the West.

No, it is not a question of "subversive" infiltration here, or any other conspiratorial nonsense. State Department circles *must* think in the direction of how to make a "peace" deal with the Russian rival, in terms of their own ideology of "containment," which is still the ruling notion in spite of all GOP demagoguery about "liberation."

For some documentation on this, as it pertains to the Hungarian Revolution's reception

in the West, we refer to *LA* for Nov. 12, "Western Leaders, Too, Fear Revolution in Russian Empire." But it has been a fairly obvious fact for a long time.

Hence the nursing of illusions about the Kremlin's course in Washington too: illusions and hopes. Or rather: hopes, therefore illusions.

In terms of bourgeois foreign policy, there is not really any genuine alternative to some form of the "peaceful coexistence" illusion, no matter how the suspect term is reviled by U.S. troglodytes. In the last analysis, the Stalinoids are absolutely correct (within the framework of bourgeois policy) in arguing that the only alternative to "peaceful coexistence" is—war or no existence.

Alternative to Deutscherism

Hence, the attractiveness of Deutscher's analyses for all kinds of people. What they look for to him is (what seems to be) an informed and politically sophisticated explanation by a man who is clearly no crude apologist, of the forces at work inside the Kremlin which might give life and color to the desired end of "containment"—namely, a peace settlement with reformed Russians. What else can they hope for, after all?

This is, I would venture to say, the reason for Deutscher's apparently strange hold on the pages of the *Reporter*, for, as everyone knows, publisher Ascoli views his magazine most fondly as a brain-trust organ for the "thinking" circles who make policy, not least of all in the various bureaus of the State Department.

Thus one gets the phenomena not only of Stalinoid Deutscherism but also of neutralist Deutscherism and even bourgeois Deutscherism, in the above-mentioned diluted (and bourgeoisified) forms.

For after all the only consistent alternative to any kind of "Deutscherism" is a revolutionary perspective for the world, the Russian empire included. It is not easy to maintain such a perspective firmly, as everyone knows. But when the phrase "revolutionary perspective" takes flesh-and-blood, as it does in Hungary, then a Deutscher takes his place as its enemy and defamer. And the diluted-Deutscherites take their place as cool friends of the revolution while, say, they warn the Poles not to make any trouble for Gomulka, i.e., not to come to the aid of the Hungarian Revolution.

It Is Not Dead

Let no one think—as we have heard it said—that the Hungarian Revolution and the Polish events have given a death-blow to the Deutscherite thesis that the Kremlin masters are seeking to democratize their regime in Russia and elsewhere, and would like to or intend to hand some kind of real political democracy down to the lower echelons of their society.

To be sure, it now takes very strong-willed people to believe this stuff. One must have an iron determination to believe that the same butchers who are ready to drown a whole nation in one of history's most brutal bloodbaths are yet somehow on the road to importing-from-above some of the same rights which the Hungarian people are demanding.

So at the present moment it's a little difficult, under the burning heat of the Hungarian Revolution, but tomorrow some of the same people will pluck up the heart to restart the same tune. Far fewer people, we believe, but still some of the same.

Once again we may hear and read speculations about democratizing intentions in the Kremlin, every time Mikoyan sneezes, or Khrushchev chucks a diplomat under the chin, alcoholically or non-alcoholically, or indeed when some real concession is made to discontented slaves or sub-bureaucrats or to the fear of revolt.

There will be such people, for the political drive behind the impulse to Deutscherism will still be there. But they will be people who will have to forget the lesson of Hungary, of Poznan, of the East German revolt, who will have to turn their backs on it.

Steelworker Opposition Names Its Slate

By EMIL MODIC

The Dues Protest Committee, opposition group within the United Steelworkers, has announced a slate of rank-and-filers for the three top offices in the organization and are now working to get this slate on the ballot.

Named for president was Donald C. Rarick, a grievance-committeeman from Local 2227 of the Irvin Works of U. S. Steel in the Pittsburgh area. Rarick has been the leader of the rebels from the start.

Nominated for vice-president was Edward Revak, Local 1256, Duquesne works of U. S. Steel in the Pittsburgh area. William A. Klug of Milwaukee will run for secretary-treasurer. Candidates are also being named for district director in some of the districts.

In a sense, this slate represents a setback for the Dues Protest Committee. They had hoped to persuade some of the district directors to make the fight, specifically some of the district directors who unsuccessfully backed Joseph Moloney in a special election for vice president last year.

So far, the district directors involved—Bill Hart and Moloney—have resisted efforts to draft them. Undoubtedly one of the reasons for their reluctance to enter the fight is that they were in favor of the dues increase which gave them and their staff people a raise.

This is one indication of the weakness of the opposition faction. They have made opposition to the dues increase almost their only plank, although union democracy is an issue in a secondary sense, since the rebels claim that the dues increase

was put through in an undemocratic manner.

Basically, the strength of the Dues Protest Committee to date has been not its own program, but the unpopularity of McDonald.

The Dues Protest Committee has continued to gain strength, although to date the indication is that it will not be strong enough to win. At any rate, it has become strong enough to scare McDonald into launching a counter-attack.

This will probably consist in part of bureaucratic attempts to keep the rebels off the ballot on technicalities. (To get on the ballot, a candidate must be nominated by 40 locals before December 14 of this year.) There are also indications that the administration forces will charge the opposition with being Communist-influenced.

Finally, McDonald plans to run on his record of not inconsiderable concessions from the company, and on what will probably be a fairly sound trade-union program: organize the unorganized, combat discrimination, handle automation, and so on.

The rebels had better come up with such a program in a hurry if they are serious. If they do, and the issues are debated, it will be a good thing for the steel workers, no matter who wins.

Another note on the steel workers has to do with the recently concluded national election. There were wide reports before the election that many steel workers would vote for Ike simply to spite McDonald. The extent to which this happened is hard to say, but it is noteworthy that the Democrats failed to carry Allegheny County for the first time since 1932.

Labor and Students Hold Hungary Rally

By GERRY McDERMOTT

Pittsburgh, Nov. 24

One thousand Pittsburghers turned out on a cold and rainy night November 20 to protest the actions of the Kremlin in surpressing the Hungarian revolution.

The protest meeting was called by the Pittsburgh Citizens Committee for Hungarian Freedom, an organization formed specifically to hold the rally.

The committee was made up of representatives of local student organizations, of faculty members from the five colleges and universities in town, of trade-union officials, and of representatives of Hungarian-American organizations. The idea behind the composition of the committee was that it should be composed of the American equivalents of the groups that led the Hungarian revolution—students, intellectuals, and workers.

The movement was endorsed by the student governments of the five local colleges and was publicized by them and by student newspapers. Public relations in the community at large was handled by the United Steelworkers. Other detail work was handled by faculty people and the leaders of Hungarian fraternal organizations.

Principal speaker at the rally was Istvan Laszlo, a leader of the Hungarian Revolution who escaped to Austria and is now in this country. Laszlo declared that he believed the Hungarian revolution would yet triumph, and said that Russian troops showed great reluctance to fire on the Hungarians.

Short speeches were also given by spokesmen delegated by the student governments of the five Pittsburgh colleges, in honor of Hungarian students, and by Maurice Schulte, an assistant to Steelworker president David J. McDonald, in honor of Hungarian workers. Professor Robert Neuman read a memorial to Hungarian intellectuals.

Co-chairman of the Citizens Committee were Dr. Geza Grosschmid of the economics department of Duquesne University, and Hugh Cleland of the history department of the University of Pittsburgh. Chairman of the actual protest meeting was Judge Lois McBride.

The meeting adopted a resolution which was released to the press. It said in part, after denouncing the Russian intervention as "naked imperialism":

"With hearts filled with anguish, but also with admiration, we salute the heroic students, workers, soldiers and citizens of Hungary who have written a magnificent and imperishable chapter in the long struggle for human freedom. We vow finally to vindicate their courage by striving to insure that Hungary yet may be free.

"This meeting calls on all friends of human dignity and freedom to rally to the support of the Hungarian people and to demand, with us, the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary, the immediate end of deportations, and the immediate return to Hungarian soil of those already deported."

Readers Take the Floor

To the Editor:

A sentence in my report on the recent "left" forum in Chicago [Oct.22] was rephrased in such a way as to be inaccurate. The sentence reads: "what it [the Cochran line] proposes is rebuilding the Stalinist movement in America, not a socialist movement." This is not correct. Organizational and politically the Cochranites have moved far away from their Cannonite origin. They are for an all-inclusive socialist educational society, within which they would advocate their Stalinoid ideas. Their own role would be no better, but no worse either, than that of the large numbers of Stalinoids within the Bevanite tendency in Britain. Illusions about the future evolution of Russia and definitions of its present class character are not enough to define a movement as Stalinist.

-SAUL BERG

Chicago, Oct. 23

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2. 6 months at \$1.
 - Payment enclosed. Bill me.
 - New sub. Renewal.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

'Fascists' in Hungary — —

(Continued from page 3)

neutrality. If the *Volkstimme* report were one-quarter true, then it would be incomprehensible if Russia failed to take formal steps to protest and stop Austria's breach. It has not done so.

The *Volkstimme* report, therefore, in addition to being a smear of the Hungarian Revolution is a provocation against the Austrian government. On November 3 the state prosecutor was instructed to bring charges of high treason against the CP organ. If it comes to trial (i.e., if it is not quashed out of deference to Russian relations), then the Hungarian Revolution's Stalinist slanderers will be on trial too.

That is all quite aside from the fact that somehow only the *Volkstimme's* "observers" saw this mass activity going on in Nickelsdorf, though it was obviously on such a scale that any tourist would know about it.

This is the origin of the slander against the Hungarian people. Later versions simply embroidered on it.

Prince Eszterhazy, the reactionary ex-landowner, was "seen" in Budapest. Ferenc Nagy, the right-wing ex-premier in exile, was listed as passing over into Hungary, though it is a matter of record that he was expelled from Austria by the government. The Rumanian Radio tied up things neatly with the scoop that "At the Austrian-Hungarian border the

real general headquarters of the Hungarian fascists has been set up under the direct leadership of the Free Europe American broadcasting station."

"MORE OR LESS OPENLY"

The Moscow Radio (Nov. 5) actually said that "Every Hungarian worker, peasant and office worker saw with his own eyes" that the "counter-revolution" was trying to return the factories to the capitalists. It was "revealed" that the planes flying in from Austria with medical supplies "really" carried "bands of fascists" (or band-aids of fascists? were they made up to resemble Horthyite big sulfa shots?).

On November 4, right after the Russian tanks fell in full fury on Budapest, the Prague Radio informed its listeners that "Cardinal Mindszenty more or less openly demanded the restoration of fascism... Such well-known persons as Cardinal Mindszenty, Count Eszterhazy, or the agrarian Bela Kovacs [who joined the Nagy cabinet] did not conceal their anti-people pro-fascist aims." If Kovacs was open about it, and "did not conceal" this, then why the need to concoct frame-ups about restaurants in Nickelsdorf? why not just quote his "more or less open" pro-fascist declarations as a member of the Nagy government?

Of course, no one can deny that with the outbreak of the Hungarian Revolution many émigrés may have returned clandestinely from Austria. The question is only whether they are all "fascists" and who says so, whether they went back as American agents, and, even if the foregoing is assumed, whether they then "took over" a revolution that was being fought by a united nation.

But somehow not a single live fascist or Horthyite has been produced in Budapest as a leader of the revolution, nor as one of those who were flown in disguised as band-aids. This frame-up has not been produced with the leisure that was possible for the Moscow Trials. It was invented extemporaneously, and only those will give it the slightest credence who still believe that every member of Lenin's Central Committee except Stalin was an agent of Hitler.

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Out of Defeat — —

(Continued from page 4)

U. S. The Hungarian suppression will also add to the isolation of the Stalinist parties from the Social-democracy and the trade-union movement, and thus weaken the Russian position in the West.

Also, the Asian bloc under Nehru's leadership is very displeased with Russian policy in Hungary, in spite of the isolated declaration by China. In this way Russian successes in the East can be limited.

But the most important consequence will be the growth of the socialist revolution in the entire Russian empire, not only in East Europe but also in Russia and China. In this sense it can be said that with their death the massacred Hungarian revolutionists have dug the grave of the Stalinist counter-revolution.