

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 4, 1957

FIVE CENTS

SOCIALIST UNITY: WITH WHOM?

... page 3

TITO & DJILAS: JENNIE LEE'S REPORT

... page 6

'LIMITS OF TITOISM': AN EXCHANGE

... page 7

THE CASE OF GEORGE LUKACS

... page 5

SLOW BOIL IN THE BAHAMAS

... page 8

What Happened at the U.S. Legation in Budapest?

A vivid sidelight on the relationship of U. S. policy to the Hungarian Revolution is offered in the current issue of the *Reporter* by Leslie B. Bain, who tells a firsthand name-naming story of the atmosphere in the American legation in Budapest when the revolution broke out. Broader political interpretations than Bain himself offers leap to the eye.

Bain is a Hungarian-speaking journalist who had enough live contact with Hungarians to realize early in October that an explosion was in the offing. He recounts how he could not induce the American legation officials to "taint" themselves by even meeting any of the dissident Communists socially; in fact, he himself merely became suspect.

He pictures the result: a legation-full of officials on October 23 who had a good deal less of an idea of what was happening around their bewildered ears than readers of the *N. Y. Times*. "Most of the officials of the U. S. Legation had never heard of the people who were leading the revolt. . . ."

Far from making any contact with Hungarians even after the outbreak, "Only those Hungarians were consulted whose views were 'acceptable,' and if any others showed up at the Legation the Marines nervously kept them outside the gates." As a matter of fact, even Americans sheltered on the first floor couldn't get to talk to anyone without running a red-tape gauntlet.

THEY WERE "SAFE"

John MacCormac of the *N. Y. Times* and Freidin of the *N. Y. Post* were denounced, within Bain's hearing, by one official as "anti-American" because of their questioning. He gives an incident "that went a long way toward explaining the American attitude toward Hungarian politics." This was during the press conference held by Cardinal Mindszenty at the legation:

"Henry Giniger of the *N. Y. Times* responded to the Cardinal's statement: 'There is no question about returning to the pre-war Hungarian system of government' with 'You mean the pre-war fascist regime?'"

"Nyerger [U. S. legation press officer], without translating the question, quickly told Giniger that there had been no fascism in Hungary then. Giniger rephrased his question: 'You mean pre-war feudalism?' Nyerger continued to give Giniger a quick lesson in Hungarian politics by insisting, without translating the question for the Cardinal or letting him answer it, that Hungary had not been a feudal state before the war. Giniger finally dropped the matter."

There are many other interesting footnotes on the American diplomatic mind in Bain's account, but it is notable that Bain does not simply limit himself to lamenting the incompetence of individuals. He concludes by showing why the U. S. officials in Budapest were this way. Only those could be taken on who were considered "safe" according to the security regulations. He applies this to

the personnel of Radio Free Europe as well as the State Department:

"The RFE, like the Department of State and other public and private organizations dealing with Hungarian affairs throughout the years, has been so occupied with the question of security that it has to consider as safe only those who proved 100 per cent anti-Communist with no dissenting opinion even murmured. Any newspaperman who has worked in Europe can testify to the fact that during the post-war years the tendency has been to look with jaundiced eye on European liberals, progressives, and socialists—all considered, if not Communists, at least near-Communists. It so

(Continued from page 1)

A Liberal's Scruples

The current to-do over how to greet visiting despots is one for the books.

The slave-trading king of Saudi Arabia gets the red-carpet-PLUS treatment from Eisenhower and the State Department; not only prescribed ceremonial laid down by protocol but also specially fulsome prostrations before this unsavory monarch.

This disgusting spectacle is certainly consistent for an administration that accepts the same king's anti-Jewish exclusion policy for U. S. personnel in that country.

The big grandstand protest comes from New York's Mayor Wagner. If cheers do not exactly make the welkin ring, it is because, by a filthy piece of ill luck, this noble mayor has just gotten through accepting an award from Hitler's only living ally, the fascist butcher of Spain, Franco.

Asked to explain the differentiation, Wagner said Franco is an ally of the U. S. and Spain is a "friendly nation." Or to put it colloquially, he may be a fascist but he's OUR fascist. . . .

Clean-Union Forces Light the Fuse:

Racketeer Problem Explodes in AFL-CIO

By JACK WILSON

The most exciting and important development in the labor movement since the merger of the AFL and CIO—and directly resulting from it—is the explosion shaking the union movement on the issues usually associated with the racketeering problem.

The pledges and speeches made by Walter P. Reuther and his CIO associates about carrying out a relentless struggle within the unified movement against the three Rs are taking on new meaning this week as the executive council of the AFL-CIO meets. Racketeering, racism and raiding are much on the agenda, with racketeering in the limelight at present.

What began a few weeks ago as a fishing expedition, by senators seeking to copy Kefauver's success with his crime hearings, lit the fuse over the social dynamite contained in the racketeering issue.

Another Pandora's Box has been opened which will not easily be closed; the implications of events in the past week will permeate every stratum of society, though it is the labor movement which faces this crisis in the first instance.

It will be no less difficult to confine the issues raised by the racketeer challenge than it was to curtail the impact of the Kefauver investigations. Then, the Democratic Party was shaken by the blows given it by the exposé of the connection between racketeers and big-city political machines. In the current case, the immediate political impact will affect the officials of the Teamsters Union and their Republican friends, but the exposé will go much deeper.

The statement of the Ethical Code

just issued by the IUE headed by James B. Carey, whatever else one may think about it, and the previous statement of the UAW and Walter Reuther, illustrate how quickly the union movement can respond to a challenge such as that made by the preliminary Senate investigation, whose first aim seemed to be to smear the union movement as a whole.

Apparently backed by George Meany, AFL-CIO president, the Carey-Reuther forces easily outmaneuvered not only the senators but also the Teamster officials like Dave Beck and James R. Hoffa, who clearly will be on the defensive both within the union movement and in the eyes of public opinion.

MANY ON THE SPOT

But the fascinating public maneuvers and factional intrigues should not blind one to the way basic issues are being raised which will affect and change the inner life of the union movement.

As an example of the obvious: Dave Beck's \$150,000 home in Seattle, purchased by the Teamsters Union from union funds, is a source of embarrassment, since it symbolizes the new status of the labor bureaucrats in America.

But what labor leader, living in a \$50-a-

(Turn to last page)

ISL Publishes Pamphlet on CP Crisis

The Independent Socialist League has just published a 40-page pamphlet for the discussion which has been going on for several months in the Communist Party. Entitled *The Communist Party at the Crossroads: Toward Democratic Socialism or Back to Stalinism?* the pamphlet is written by H. W. Benson not so much as a commentary on the struggle which is going on in the CP, but rather as a contribution to the discussion itself.

The Communist Party at the Crossroads starts out by discussing the crisis in which the CP in America now finds itself, and seeks to lay bare its basic cause. Benson points out that the isolation of the CP from the working class, the Negro struggle and from the population in general is to be attributed at bottom neither to some tactical errors it has made in the past, nor to the repressive measures which have been directed

against it, but to its slavish adherence to and defense of the Communist regime in Russia.

Once the Khrushchev "revelations" about the political regime which has prevailed in Russia for the past twenty years were made public, it became clear to a significant section of the CP membership that a movement based on a defense and apology for this regime would have to find a new road for itself or face irreparable bankruptcy.

The next section of the pamphlet is devoted to a detailed analysis of the course of the discussion in the CP, which aims at spotlighting the basic tendencies in the party and the central issues which divide them.

Benson points out that one section of the party leadership, headed by Foster, seeks to "resolve" the party crisis by minimizing it, diffusing the discussion

over a thousand fundamentally irrelevant issues, and hopes finally to return to the relatively comfortable though sterile existence of the party as a large Stalinist sect which looks to the Russian leadership to solve its problems rather than to a new road for the party.

The other tendency, led by John Gates and other members of the *Daily Worker* staff, has been growing increasingly aware of the real causes of the party crisis, and has been moving in the direction of the recognition that unless the party makes a real turn toward independence and democracy, in its internal structure, in its relations with and attitude toward the struggle for democracy in Russia and Eastern Europe, and in its approach to the radical movement in America, it is doomed.

Written at the height of the Hun-

(Continued on page 3)

Anna Kethly at Socialist Rally Tells of Hungary's Revolution

New York, Jan. 25

A socialist-sponsored meeting for Anna Kethly, Hungarian Social-Democratic leader who was a minister in the last Nagy government, took place tonight at the Community Church, under the sponsorship of the Socialist Party-SDF, League for Industrial Democracy, Workers Defense League and Post-War World Council. The Hungarian socialist addressed an audience of about 150 on "Hungary: The Revolution and the Aftermath."

Norman Thomas spoke briefly, paying tribute to her as a symbol of the heroic struggle of the Hungarian workers. He cogently stressed the irony that she had not yet succeeded in getting a hearing before the UN, while King Saud, who had just had slaves executed in the public square at home, was going to be listened to; however, she was to appear Monday before a UN subcommittee.

Anna Kethly, who read her speech in English, spoke forthrightly and clearly of the Hungarian Revolution and its democratic socialist aspirations. A new phase of the revolution was opening up, and she asserted that it was the duty of all who had escaped to do everything possible to keep the Hungarian Revolution alive. The United Nations hearings would give her the opportunity to attack the Kadar regime and expose its terror and complete subservience to the foreign oppressors.

Miss Kethly reminded the audience that Lenin had stated that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" must be based on the masses of the workers, but that the Kadar government had no support from the workers. The workers were organized through their revolutionary workers councils against the regime, and even though the councils have now been dissolved and their leaders killed or imprisoned, the demands they raised represented the wishes of the people.

She detailed the nine demands raised by the workers council, which included withdrawal of Russian forces from Budapest and Hungary, the end of the secret police, creation of a new workers militia, and free elections. She attacked the Kadar government as the tool of the Russian forces, carrying out their wishes and not the wishes of the people. The armored tanks lead, and Kadar follows. Under the one-party dictatorship for eight years, the Hungarian CP served as the façade for the Russian regime. Today Kadar plays that role.

The revolutionary coalition government of Nagy was justified, Miss Kethly stated, and she hoped to tell the world the truth about Russia's brutal intervention.

WANTS NO WAR

In the short question period that followed, she rejected any military intervention by the United States government, feeling that it might lead to the third world war. When asked what chance there was that the Hungarian Social-Democrats could have gained control and held the government, she replied that the Nagy government was a coalition whose aim was to prevent the return of fascists and the Horthy days. The workers and peasants, she asserted, reject any return to the old days; they want a socialist order.

Leon Dennen, author and journalist, also spoke briefly; and Vera Rony, Workers Defense League secretary, appealed for support to the league's activities on behalf of Hungary. Harry W. Laidler of the LID chaired the meeting. William Kemsley of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, who was unable to speak as scheduled because of illness, had a letter read in which he detailed the work of the ICFTU in aid to Hungary.

ECHO OF THE REVOLUTION

Budapest to Mahoning Valley: CP Leader Steuben Breaks

By JACK WILSON

The American Communist party suffered another major defection with the announcement of John Steuben that he had broken with Stalinism. In an interview with A. H. Raskin, labor editor of the *New York Times*, Steuben gave cogent reasons for breaking with his past—35 years of completely devoted activity to the policies of the Communist Party.

Here was a man who was able to say that while he thought he was spending his life building for socialism, he was in reality destroying its chances of success. This is the implication of Steuben's statement. It is a terrible thought to have to live with; and Raskin's description of Steuben, who is critical ill, combines a picture of physical and moral suffering.

The straw that broke the camel's back, in this instance, was the decree of the Kadar puppet regime to execute strikers. Steuben said that any government that decreed death for strikers was morally bankrupt. It is not accidental that this was the breaking point for Steuben.

For Steuben remembered his early CIO days as a union organizer, a strike leader, and as the Communist *par excellence* in the Youngstown-Canton-Massillon steel area. He went through many steel workers' struggles: the violent defeat in 1935 in Canton; the Little Steel strike disaster in 1937.

HOME TO ROOST

How could any thinking individual of those days ever forget how the National Guard marched into the Mahoning Valley steel area, and broke the strike under orders of Governor Martin L. Davey?

Steuben knows from his own experiences what the steel workers of Budapest are

about. He knows what the Memorial Day massacre of Chicago meant in 1937. And now? To have worse, and in the name of "socialism?"

There is another interesting observation in Steuben's statement: "If the Soviet Union had been fortunate enough to have a Constitution which included a Fifth Amendment, many, many thousands of lives would have been saved."

Here the Moscow Trials have come home to roost. Steuben was an arrogant Stalinist in those days. He was a "fighter against fascism" in the days of the Spanish revolution. He sneered scornfully at the hair-splitters who questioned the "socialism" of Russia. They were counter-revolutionaries, at least in theory, these "enemies of the people" who were in the steel workers' union or active elsewhere in Ohio. For Steuben, the Moscow Trials proved they were class enemies and had to be run out of the unions. As a steel union organizer, he did his part to help purge "Trotskyist" elements, with a clear conscience, no doubt. Of course, later he was bounced by Phil Murray, too, but that is another story.

And now he knows. The Moscow Trials were frame-ups. And the people that he and his cohorts hounded, framed and persecuted in the American labor were right and he was wrong.

Unlike so many thousands of disillusioned radicals, who see in their own failure the failure of the world, Steuben hasn't given up the idea that a fight for socialism is worth-while as well as necessary. He urges his colleagues to "repudiate everything that smacks of Stalinism and chart a course on the basis of the true interests of the American workers and the American people as a whole."

The ISL Case Against the 'Subversive List' System

We continue here the excerpts from the "Proposed Findings" submitted by the Independent Socialist League's attorneys, Joseph L. Rauh Jr. and Isaac Groner, in the Department of Justice hearings on the "subversive list" designation of the ISL. Excerpts have previously been published in LA for Jan. 7 and Jan. 21.

11. The Government did not confine "Communist" or "seeking to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means" to the activities of the organizations. The Government had no real proof from within the organizations, although it has kept their activities under constant surveillance. The Government applied "Communist" and "seeking to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means" to definitions and conclusions which were expressed only by others, and which were never expressed, and some of which were even repudiated, by the organizations themselves.

A. There are more than 160 million people in the United States. From all these 160 million, the Government was able to produce not one witness who "gave flesh-and-blood reality to the mass of Communist literature read. . . ."

Altogether, the Government was able to find only two witnesses, both obtained at the eleventh hour, to offer any testimony against these organizations. One, Professor Robinson, was first visited by the Government in March, 1956, years after the organizations had been designated and re-designated and many months after the hearings had actually begun. And he "would have definitely preferred that others undertake it." Since they apparently would not, he did. He had never even heard of the organizations, let alone know anything about them. His testimony consisted exclusively of reading selections of his own from the works of Lenin. He made no assertions about the organizations themselves.

The other witness, James Burnham, agreed to testify almost one full year after this proceeding started. His direct contact with any of the organizations was limited to a few weeks' membership at their beginning in April-May, 1940. He had had no personal contacts with the organization in the past 16 years. A renegade from these organizations, he had run the political cycle, and now is a member of the McCarthy right wing of American politics. His motivations and hostilities toward anything on the left were obvious. Even so, he refused to make any categorical statements that the organizations advocated

the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, resorting instead to the doctrine that the end wills the means and there were no other means to achieve the society sought by the organizations.

These 2 out of 160,000,000 can hardly be representative or persuasive of the true facts.

B. The failure of the Government to produce live witnesses is all the more dramatic because of the Government surveillance of these organizations. The publications of the organizations were "Received through confidential mailbox N. Y. FBI." There were special markings on many of the organization publications produced by the Government, and the Government did not deny that the markings could well refer to "some informant. . . an agent's name," or that the organizations were kept under constant FBI surveillance.

C. The Government used "Communist" and "seeking to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means" as applicable to organizations which call themselves "Marxist," "Lenin-

ist," "Trotskyist," "Marxist-Leninist," or any variation of these general titles; or which hold certain doctrines which are described by other than the organizations to be "Marxist," "Leninist" or some similar other special adjective. The Proposed Findings provide examples. Proposed Findings I and II in effect only state that the organizations are devoted to and follow the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky. . . .

Here follow almost four solid lines of numbers and letters referring to sections and sub-sections of the government attorneys' "Proposed Findings."

These include the allegations central to the Government's case on force and violence. Many other Proposed Findings deal with what Lenin wrote and meant, according to Professor Robinson, an expert; and with what Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky wrote and meant, according to James Burnham, not an expert; and with what Burnham said flow from their writings according to his thinking.

D. The Government attempts to impute the views of the Socialist Workers Party and the Fourth International to these organizations. These have been expressly repudiated. See Proposed Findings 31 and 32 below.

12. The Government applied "Communist" and "seeking to alter the form of Government of the United States" to those who expressed views about historical or current events which were unorthodox or otherwise offensive to the Department of Justice.

A. The Government introduced published statements of the organizations criticizing, in strong language, the activities and policies of the United States in Guatemala and Okinawa. The relevance was defended, as showing the organizations "are anything but patriotic organizations." But the evidence was allowed, qualified, however, as "not being admitted for the purpose of establishing any unpatriotic attitude or anything of that nature." It must be that this evidence was considered relevant to the Government's theory of why the organizations were listed under one or both of the categories left in the case.

B. The attitudes of the organizations towards United States aims and programs in the Korean War, World War II, and a possible World War III, and internationalism in general, was treated by the Government as though criticism of American foreign policy was improper.

C. The fact that the organizations approved of the Russian Revolution, as an historical event in its own unique context, was considered damnable by the Government.

D. The Government equated criticism of capitalism as an economic system with doing something listable.

LABOR ACTION FORUM • N. Y. C.

Thursday, Jan. 31

OWEN LEGRAND

recently returned from a sojourn in France,

will speak on

FRENCH POLITICS TODAY

8:30 p.m. at Labor Action Hall

114 West 14 St., N. Y. C.

SOCIALIST UNITY: WITH WHOM?

By H. W. BENSON

In the discussions on socialist regroupment that herald the beginning of a new relationship among the various groups, not everyone is clear on everything. But there are some, at least, in the Socialist Workers Party who are crystal-clear on at least one thing. They are already willing, without condition and without qualification, to unite with themselves.

Consider the situation:

Under the impact of great world events, workers' demonstrations and revolution against dictatorship, Stalinism in the United States lies mortally stricken. Thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of socialist-minded people are at last shaken in their attachment to Russia; they look toward a new socialism.

But none of the socialist groups has yet emerged as a new center; none is about to. Everyone talks of the possibility of a renewed, broad socialist movement that would once again make socialism an influential, progressive and democratic force in the nation's political life and in its working class.

THE FIELD NARROWS

Yes, yes, we will talk of regroupment, says Farrell Dobbs, SWP National Secretary. Now, let us see. With whom?

• Perhaps the American Socialist Union (Bert Cochran) and the Socialist Unity Forum (Bartell)?—*Ridiculous, we just got through expelling them from the SWP!*

• Perhaps the Independent Socialist League?—*Of course not; why it opposes our slogan "defend the Soviet Union" and rejects what we consider so basic, that Russia is a Workers State.*

• The Socialist Party, maybe?—*Not those "State Department socialists!"*

• How about the Social Democratic Federation?—*What! After they allowed Hitler to take power in Germany only 24 years ago... impossible.*

• Well, then, let us look in quite a different direction. Naturally, we exclude William Z. Foster and his faction friends for they support the Democratic Party in order to help the Russian bureaucracy. But perhaps John Gates and his associates on the *Daily Worker* who are engaged in a bitter fight against Foster?—*Positively not! It is clear: they are moving straight into the arms of the bourgeoisie and support the Democratic Party just to help imperialism.*

• Let's face it; we will not delude ourselves: the only ones who deserve to be in this regroupment are we of the SWP, pure and undefiled. We and, of course, *Honest Workers everywhere; we stand ready to make every sacrifice to help them find a way to regroup themselves*

U.S. Legation--

(Continued on page 3)

happens that former war criminals, escaped Nazis, double and triple agents, and dubious characters of all sorts have been counted as allies in our crusade against Communism."

It emerges purely as a by-product of this account (Bain doesn't make the point) that it was precisely this deep-dyed reactionary character of U. S. policy which hermetically insulated U. S. representatives from any contact with the Hungarian Revolution, let alone any role in it. It would be hard to imagine a greater gap between the reality and the Stalinists' slanderous ranting about the sinister operation of "Project X."

into the SWP. This we have already been doing for decades with a degree of success known to all.

THE WORLD THEY SEE

And Dobbs will tolerate no unity, no other regroupment. If you dare, he will visit upon you the ultimate punishment: a special issue of the *Militant* just to denounce you.

When the Socialist Party united with a section of the Social Democratic Federation, *Militant* writers Myra Tanner Weiss and Harry Ring activated their typewriters to campaign up and down among their own membership against it. They instantaneously recognized the unification for what it was: a devious plot by bourgeois agents in the ranks of the working class to prevent the mass of socialist workers from streaming toward "revolutionary socialism." And they can modestly give you the latter's address; by chance it corresponds with their own. They can hardly understand the implications of what they are saying.

In the world, a massive socialist workers' upsurge... East Berlin; Poznan; Poland tearing itself loose from the Kremlin's grasp under the pressure of working masses; Hungary in open revolution, its nation in arms represented by revolutionary workers councils. It is a crushing reaffirmation of the power of the proletariat against all its oppressors. One would expect that in the face of this assertion of workers' strength and class solidarity every political tendency in the working class would be shaken out of its lethargy and would look, once again, back toward the class which gives socialism its strength.

But they will not see it. They see only this: capitulation to imperialism by one and all; a further and faster drift to the right among all groups; instead of workers' revolution exerting a magnetic pull to the left among all socialists, they see all others driven away from socialism, leaving their own SWP stark and lone as the only self-admitted genuine and guaranteed representative of socialism now and forever.

TWISTED VIEW

Everything here is topsy-turvy. As the workers rise against totalitarianism, every socialist grouping begins to look less toward the power of capitalist imperialism or Stalinist imperialism and toward the working class. That explains the rise of the Gates wing in the CP. That will impel the SP-SDF forward. That was the theme of every speaker at the SP-SDF rally on January 25, from Anna Kethly and Norman Thomas through the list. Only the case-hardened Stalinist wing of the Communist Party and its sympathizers remain unmoved; they defame the Hungarian Revolution but they expose and isolate themselves.

At every point, Weiss and Ring display the twisted mentality of the determined sectarian. They will not even remain silent when the SP-SDF dares to call a rally to hear Anna Kethly in support of the Hungarian Revolution.

Why does the united SP-SDF call such a rally? A normally perceptive person would understand that the Hungarian Revolution is one of the finest chapters in the struggle for socialism; that the representative of a Hungarian Socialist Party is here in New York, and that the SP-SDF is stirred to express its solidarity with a socialist revolution and impelled to revive its own hitherto lagging supporters into renewed activity.

But Myra Tanner Weiss sees through

it instantly: "The role that the SP-SDF will play in the labor movement is expressed in its first official public action," she reveals in the *Militant* January 28. "On January 25, it is sponsoring a meeting in New York City not to protest U. S. imperialism's war plans in the Mid-East but to hear Anna Kethly, Norman Thomas and others speak on Hungary."

Let there be no mistake about it: If anyone is to support the Hungarian Revolution, she will not legitimize it unless her diagrams and maps are followed without deviation. She and her co-thinkers, after all, have issued themselves a monopoly on revolution and no one will engage in that type of enterprise without a license from them. Their job-sheet calls for every operation to be performed in prescribed order: turned, milled, drilled, and finished in exactly their way and no other.

Thus it comes about that they spit venom upon the united SP-SDF and work themselves into a veritable rage against the ISL which proposes to unite with the new group.

PATENTS AND PERMITS

Since Weiss, Ring and Dobbs want no one else in their private regroupment, they of course want the SP-SDF even less. For their own convenience, they momentarily forget that the SWP has already given a permit, signed and sealed, for its allies in Europe to join parties whose political line is no different from the SP-SDF. In fact, it is quite ready to urge its friends to join open Stalinist parties in other countries.

But in the United States, Weiss, Ring et al. claim exclusive patent rights. They are distraught not because they cannot accept the political line of the SP-SDF but because their absurd claims to hegemony over U. S. socialism are dismissed by everyone with a shrug.

They declaim against SP-SDF foreign policy and pronounce to the world, too, that the Independent Socialist League proposes, through the SP-SDF, to capitulate to American imperialism. But that should not come as a surprise to their attentive readers; they announced no less than 16 years ago that the ISL had finally capitulated to imperialism. They find it necessary, too, to report from time to time that the ISL has finally capitulated once more.

Their intermittent announcements always prove somewhat inaccurate and they must try again and again. For, as every informed socialist knows, the ISL stands on the platform of the *Third Camp*; it rejects in any form support to the totalitarian regime in Russia, whether it be in the name of "workers state" or "defense of the Soviet Union," two SWP shibboleths. It rejects, too, all confidence in the foreign policy of any bourgeois government in this country. For the defense of socialism, democracy and peace it looks to the struggles of the world's peoples against capitalism and Stalinism.

The SP-SDF remains in unqualified opposition to the Stalinist bloc; but, unlike the ISL, maintains that the interests of democracy and socialism require critical support to the allied bloc as against Russia.

SOCIALIST COEXISTENCE?

The SWP must answer this simple question: is it possible and desirable for two such tendencies to unite today, to coexist and to proceed unitedly and in comradely fashion to rebuild a powerful, broad socialist movement in the United States?

Our answer is unhesitating: Yes, it is not only possible; it is not only desirable; it is urgent.

The possibility of reconstructing the socialist movement is before us; the imperative interests of socialism require that all democratic socialist tendencies like the ISL and SP-SDF despite divergencies on many questions join hands to bring socialism to the American working class and to win a new generation to socialism.

Those in the SWP who delude themselves that they alone bear aloft an untarnished socialist banner must at some point face the grim facts of life. You persist in calling for "defense of the Soviet Union" (whatever that means to you today); you insist that Russia is some kind of "Workers State" which takes its place in the world socialist camp. By that, you make it more difficult to defend the good name of socialism. The Socialist Party, with its attitude toward the allied bloc against Russia, has never dreamed of calling capitalist imperialism a "socialist society" or a "workers state."

At any rate, what has helped to ruin socialism in the United States was its identification with a totalitarian regime in Russia by a majority of those who profess to be for socialism.

A PROPOSAL

We propose to join with the SP-SDF for a new beginning. If this still seems fantastic to our irate SWP friends, we must plead guilty to a thought which they consider even more fantastic:

In a broad socialist regroupment which makes absolutely clear in its platform that Russia is not socialist and which calls for democracy everywhere, we hope that even the SWP, with its views, can find a place as one tendency among others in building a reinvigorated socialist movement.

But now it has embarked on a wild, all-out drive against unity with virtually anyone—but above all with "perfidious Social-Democracy," to quote Weiss. It will convince no one—that is not new. But it will close the door to the future for itself as a tendency and remove its membership from the task which they have the duty to pursue: to build the renescent socialist movement.

For every socialist who isolates himself from it, there is a personal tragedy. For the movement, there is a loss.

NEW ISSUE OF N.I. IS NOW OUT

The latest issue of *The New Internationalist* is just off the press. The feature article of this issue is the pamphlet "The Communist Party at the Crossroads," reviewed elsewhere in this issue. The full text of the pamphlet is reprinted in this issue of the *NI* in order to make it immediately available to all the readers of the magazine, especially those in its large foreign readership.

In addition, the issue contains a major article analyzing the character and significance of the Hungarian revolution, by Max Martin and Julius Falk. "Hungary—the Wave of the Future" is a significant contribution to the analysis of the Hungarian revolution. In addition, Michael Harrington's "A Chronicle of Revolution" gives valuable factual summary of the Hungarian struggle.

This issue of *The New Internationalist* also has a brief discussion of the 1956 presidential election by Gordon Haskell.

Pamphlet --

(Continued from page 1)

garian revolution, the pamphlet discusses the attitude of the two groupings in the CP toward that great historic event as a touchstone of their real character and the direction in which they have been moving.

The Communist Party at the Crossroads ends with a brief discussion of the problems and prospects of socialist regroupment in America today, from the standpoint of its bearing on the crisis in the CP. It stresses that the possibility of a new, revitalized socialist movement looms on the horizon. But this movement can only fulfill its possibilities if it is firmly dedicated to socialist democracy both in the capitalist world and in the countries ruled by Communist parties.

The pamphlet sells for 25 cents.

YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of *Labor Action*. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

DISCUSSION

Some Lessons of the Hungarian Battle

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The Hungarian revolution, militarily defeated by Russia's superior force, remains politically victorious, as the highest conquest of the working class in its historic fight for socialism, as an example for imitation and the road to take in the next victorious revolutionary battle.

It is a truism today to repeat that for the Kremlin the Hungarian occupation together with the military action is a political disaster which can never be repaired, because the breach opened by the Hungarian proletariat in the monolithic, totalitarian structure of the Stalinist empire can never be closed.

The working class has politically triumphed because it did overcome the stage of Stalinism not only ideologically but in a practical way, in experience, and it proved to be capable of defeating the Stalinist state and its political machine, for all the latter's power, in an open revolutionary struggle. In a few days the Hungarian Stalinist state and party were destroyed by the revolutionary proletariat and replaced by the spontaneous power of the armed people.

Only the Russian occupier and its military intervention could save the Stalinist counter-revolution in Hungary; but in this way the Kremlin showed the whole world, showed the entire international proletariat, that it is a counter-revolutionary power, covered only with a "Leninist" mask. For Hungary is a great stage on which a historic drama of revolution and counter-revolution is being played out, and the actors are playing without masks.

None of the pygmies in the Kremlin in all probability knows the historical consequences of their criminal policy in Hungary, of their stupidity and brutality, but it seems they did not have any other road if they were to save the monolithic bloc of the Stalinist empire. It is possible that the Russian people will pay for this criminal policy for the next 30 years.

Milovan Djilas compared the Hungarian Revolution with the French and Russian. There is no doubt that it begins a new historic period: the twilight of the Stalinist totalitarian counter-revolution and the dawn of the new social revolution.

The Hungarian experience showed that the revolution against Stalinism can be achieved only by the working class and under its leadership, that is, it must be a workers' socialist revolution. This was proved not only by the ideological programs but by the revolutionary methods and, especially, by the new organizational forms created by the revolutionary movement. The Hungarian proletariat has proved that it does not want any capitalist restoration; that it is capable of leading the whole nation on the road to socialist democracy, for it won the indisputable revolutionary leadership of the nation as the only revolutionary force capable of defeating the Stalinist power.

SPONTANEITY

But the most important thing, it seems to me, was the spontaneous collective action of the working class as a whole against the Stalinist power.

There was no revolutionary party, because the Stalinists destroyed any revolutionary organization. There was no revolutionary press, no leadership, no

conspiratorial revolutionary party, no central committee; and the revolution triumphed. More, it broke up the Stalinist party; it paralyzed and destroyed it in a few days; likewise the police and the state apparatus; and it won over the soldiers of the Stalinist army for the cause of the revolutionary upsurge.

It was the youth and the workers of the Stalinist party who led the revolution, the intellectuals and literary men, people educated by the regime and appointed to defend it. But in a few days the Stalinist power machine was destroyed, the Stalinist leaders isolated, from the nation and abandoned by all, backed only by Russian bayonets.

It was the entire working class, backed by the whole people, that made the revolution, not the party or the Central Committee. It was the spontaneous popular upsurge that destroyed the Stalinist power and won power for the people. Not a party but the class operated in this revolution, in this historical experience overcoming the old Bolshevik forms and theories of revolutionary organization, the myth of the omnipotent Central Committee and the "only" revolutionary party.

Right after the victory of the armed uprising there were spontaneously created the organs of the new popular power, the revolutionary committees, the workers' councils, the factory committees, the new free unions, etc. It was the spontaneous initiative of the masses and of the working class, and not the leadership of the party, which organized the revolutionary uprising and achieved victory over the old power, creating in the process of revolution new forces of revolutionary power and of revolutionary organs.

This spontaneous creation of the masses is a new hope for us socialists and for all mankind, because it showed that totalitarianism, for all of its military and technical power, can be beaten in the revolutionary struggle, if the masses are determined to fight and to die. Thus was confirmed Trotsky's remark that correct ideas themselves seek out the means for their own realization.

Now, after the Hungarian Revolution, the way is open to the socialist revolution, in spite of all the power of the modern Stalinist state. The Hungarian workers opened it up for all the workers of the world.

That is the second lesson of the Hungarian Revolution. The revolution will come and will win out against any modern power, if the masses are ripe for it and are determined to fight and to die for it, as the Hungarian workers are. There is no power in the world capable of defeating a social revolution if it is ripe.

PREMATURE

Now we come to the third important question of the Hungarian Revolution: From the standpoint of revolutionary strategy the Hungarian uprising was premature or untimely, because it was isolated from the other "Popular Democracies" and not backed up by the Russian workers' movement. So it was defeated by the Russian military superiority, the people were massacred, and the revolutionary victory was lost.

If a revolutionary party or leadership could have prepared and led the Hungarian revolution, it probably could have avoided this prematureness, controlled the masses, and led them—let me say—

along the "Polish way" and to the "Polish solution." I would personally have rather spared the blood of the Hungarian workers and conserved their revolutionary energy for a better opportunity, when the revolution was stronger and the Russian butchers weaker and the probability of victory greater.

The "Bolsheviks" could say, "There was a lack of revolutionary leadership." But the masses don't act that way; they act instinctively, without any cold calculation, generously offering their blood for mankind. The Paris Commune too was politically untimely, but it was very fruitful historically, more fruitful than thousands of politically correct resolutions of a Central Committee. Though the Hungarian Revolution was untimely, the spontaneous uprising and revolutionary struggle of the masses will be politically and historically more fruitful than an organized and victorious political operation under the leadership of a revolutionary party.

Because the spontaneous "mistaken" action of the Hungarian masses has uncovered to the whole world the naked truth about and the true face of Stalinism. The generous and heroic sacrifice of the Hungarian revolutionaries has given the proletariat a new social and political experience, has created new forms of struggle, and has opened the way to the victory over Stalinism, opened the door to its definitive defeat.

EMPIRE-WIDE REVOLUTION

The third lesson of the Hungarian Revolution is that a socialist workers' revolution cannot win in one country, especially against the modern superior power of the Russian counter-revolution; it can win only in a group of countries or in the whole Stalinist bloc.

The Hungarian revolution was defeated not by the power of the Hungarian state or army; it was defeated by the Russian counter-revolution, by the Russian occupation. I think that no one of

FILMS AND IDEAS

Hollywood Parable on Jim Crow

By MEL BECKER

The Negro struggle in the South has had some ramifications. Thus in Hollywood a class-B Western blossoms with obvious symbolism of that struggle. The film *Reprisal*, moreover, clearly supports the fighters for democracy in the South.

Set in the West a generation after the Indians have been reduced to the squalor and starvation of the reservations, the movie is an indictment of the oppression and segregation that the white settlers inflicted on them.

Guy Madison plays the role of a half-breed who passes himself off to the white community as a white settler. He craves land, and as he points out to his Indian grandfather, only the white man can own land. He asks his grandfather: "They took our land and make us starve, do you want me to go back to that? No, this way at least I can have my own farm."

The consequences of passing as a white man are then well-drawn: Madison must stay clear of the struggle; he can never defend the oppressed Indians. Whenever an Indian is beaten up or lynched, he repeats the agonized words: "Leave me alone, all I want is to farm my land and raise my cattle."

Yet the struggle for the Indian people's basic human rights will not leave Madison alone. His racial background keeps him continuously disquieted and repeatedly tends to draw him into the struggle.

Incidents showing prejudice, culminating in a Jim Crow remark by the liberal white girl whom Madison loves, push him even further toward the Indians' side. Finally the barbarism of the white-supremacists, who kill his grandfather, force him to take up the battle for the Indians' rights to be treated like human beings.

Only one aspect of the real Negro struggle is missing in *Reprisal*: The role of the Indian people in collectively rising up and fighting for their own rights does

the popular "democracies" can win out against the Kremlin without the solidarity of the other satellite countries and especially of the Russian proletariat. For the center of Stalinist power is Russia, and only the Russian revolution can defeat and destroy it. Against the revolutionary uprising of the Russian proletariat, Zhukov's tanks will be ineffective.

In this respect too the Hungarian experience shows the way: the coming socialist revolution must embrace the whole Stalinist empire, from the Elbe to Vladivostok. The Russian revolution must be fought by the Russian workers, not by the Polish, Hungarian or German workers. Without the revolutionary uprising of the Russian workers, any revolutionary action in Poland, Hungary or Germany will be partial or defeated. But the Hungarian Revolution touched not only Russian soldiers but also Russian students and workers, as we heard from the news reports.

While the military defeat of the Hungarian uprising could hold back the growth of revolution in Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria, it may and probably will accelerate the maturing of the revolutionary movement in the USSR. While the pacification of Hungary could stabilize, for a brief while, the Stalinist empire and Russian hegemony in East Europe, the Kremlin's political disaster must bring about and accelerate the growth and ripening of revolution in the whole empire, through the demoralization and decomposition of the Russian Stalinist political machine. After such a shorter or longer period of ripening, the revolutionary process will embrace the whole Stalinist empire, the "Popular Democracies" and the USSR.

In this sense, the Hungarian Revolution can be compared with the 1905 Revolution before the great October Revolution in Russia.

Some of the questions dealt with in the above discussion article by Comrade Rudzinski, such as the role of party organization in the anti-Stalinist revolution, will be taken up in subsequent discussion columns in LA.—ED.

De Madariaga Circular Appeals for Spanish Refugees

Dear Everybody:

I am writing this letter to whomsoever it may concern, i.e., you. The Spanish Civil War ended 18 years ago. There are still between 150 and 200 thousand exiles who will not go back. Franco has solemnly promised to amnesty all those who would come back. Why amnesty them when they had committed no crime? Those who have come back—a handful—have sometimes found that Franco's promises are not to be trusted—Lieutenant Colonel Beneyto, for instance, who was shot on November 19, 1956.

Most of the exiles have made good. They have acquired an independent posi-

tion sometimes in difficult circumstances; and in some cases—in Mexico, for instance—they have powerfully contributed to the culture and prosperity of their adoptive abode.

But the handicapped ones—by language, trade, age, illness, or other circumstances—have been and are living a hard life.

The Spanish Refugee Aid, Inc. (80 East 11 Street, N. Y. 3) founded four years ago, is taking care of them. The Committee needs your help. This concerns you for you are a free citizen of a free country. Help.

SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA

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 • 17" YEAR

February 4, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 5

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

Intellectuals in the Hungarian Revolution: THE CASE OF GEORGE LUKACS

By EDWARD HILL

One of the leading intellectual figures in the ferment that preceded the Hungarian Revolution was the famous Stalinist and Marxist, George Lukacs. Several weeks ago, *Challenge* described the background of the developing revolutionary consciousness in the Petofi Circle. Now it is possible to add a little to our information about Lukacs, and through that, to understand more of the dynamics of the last fateful year in Hungary.

In the current issue of the *Reporter*, Leslie B. Bain, in an article attacking the State Department and Radio Free Europe, writes:

"Typical of the situation was the treatment of George Lukacs, a recently rehabilitated professor of Marxist ethics. In June, I had told the first secretary and Nyerges [U. S. Legation press officer in Budapest] that Lukacs was the intellectual leader of the ferment and that he was attacking Marxism and Leninism with telling effect. Both warned me against Lukacs, who, although jailed and then rehabilitated by the Reds, was still on the black list of the Legation. When the revolution broke out, students and intellectuals flocked to Lukacs begging him to take a part in Imre Nagy's new government."

Lukacs did, of course, take part in the Nagy government—he was minister of Culture. He was one of the leaders who took refuge in the Yugoslav embassy, and is now presumably in exile with Nagy. More than this, the East German philosopher who was recently arrested as the Stalinists moved to quell the ferment there has been reported as a protégé of Nagy.

TWO-SIDED

Who is this man who played such a role among the Hungarian students? And what were his attacks on "Marxism and Leninism" reported by the *Reporter's* Mr. Bain?

Lukacs is without a doubt one of the most brilliant Marxist theoreticians of the twentieth century, particularly in the field of the an-

alysis of ideology and culture. Now well into his seventies, he had been a faithful and loyal Stalinist for approximately 30 years prior to the Hungarian Revolution. During that period, he had followed the party line and paid the terrible price of orthodoxy. In his writings, which fairly breathe a violent hostility to vulgar Marxism, he paid his debts to Stalin's "theoretical work" on socialist realism. Only a few years ago, he wrote a fulsome essay praising Stalin's pamphlet on linguistics.

And yet Lukacs was no simple party-liner. Side by side with the obscene intellectual capitulations to Stalinism, he wrote subtle, brilliant analyses of ideology and culture. And this at a time when his most seminal work, *History and Class Consciousness*, was officially prescribed by the party.

But some time after the war, Lukacs' independence finally got him into serious trouble. There were charges that he did not concern himself with current Russian literature. And one remark of his—that Marxism is a Himalaya of the intellect but that doesn't make any small animal which plays on its slopes a giant—was regarded as having dangerous overtones.

TO WIDEN BOUNDARIES

Apparently during the first Nagy regime in 1953, Lukacs was rehabilitated and restored to his teaching position in Budapest. It was from this vantage point that he exerted an influence upon the intellectual ferment which preceded the revolution itself.

According to Leslie Bain in the *Reporter*, Lukacs was attacking "Marxism and Leninism with telling effect." Mr. Bain was on the spot; I wasn't. But I doubt his story.

First on general grounds: It is almost inconceivable that this 76-year-old giant of Marxism would have expressed his anti-Stalinism in such a way.

But more interesting is one piece of concrete information. It is an article by Lukacs which appeared in Hungary after the Twentieth Party Congress and was then translated, before the revolution, into the East German magazine *Aufbau*. (Given the fate of Lukacs' German protégé, this is, in itself, an interesting fact.)

Lukacs' piece is entitled, "The Struggle Between Progress and Reaction in Contemporary Culture." Contrary to Bain's report, it is an attempt to widen the boundaries of intellectual freedom under Stalinism through an appeal to the authority of Marx and Lenin. It has many echoes of previous articles by Lukacs during the Popular Front period of the thirties.

Lukacs begins, almost inevitably, with a quotation from Lenin's *Left-Wing Communism*, one which distinguishes between the "world-historical" obsolescence of parliamentarism and the necessity for parliamentary activity in the short run. But the point which he emphasizes from this is that the world is not di-

vided between two, and only two, camps; that there are all kinds of elements in-between. And quoting Engels, Lukacs goes on to polemicize against the sharp division of the world into two classes, two camps, two absolutely opposing points of view. He criticizes Stalin for the theory of social-fascism and points to the period of the thirties as an example of the cooperation between party and non-party people.

Lukacs then goes on to use the current line on "coexistence" as a further prop for his position. With Stalin's death, he argues, a period came to an end, one predicated on the increasing sharpness of the struggle between Moscow and Washington. And now, with Khrushchev and with the Twentieth Party Congress, new possibilities open up—for cooperation among all kinds of elements in the fight for peace, in the struggle for coexistence.

LUKACS' APPROACH

Thus far, all of this bears the appearance of post-Twentieth Congress orthodoxy. But once having laid this foundation on the party line, Lukacs proceeds to use it as a basis for arguing in favor of the extension of intellectual freedom.

If, he says, we are going to have this cooperation in the political sphere around the slogan of coexistence, what then about the intellectual sphere? Doesn't it hold that the Communists should enter into a dialogue with all kinds of bourgeois intellectuals, that the old sectarian approach should be abandoned? And here we encounter a significant fact.

In the previous article on the Petofi Circle, *Challenge* pointed out that the development of revolutionary political slogans grew out of a discussion about freedom for the artist. At the very end, even the Hungarian regime recognized them and regarded attacks on the theory of "socialist realism" as being directed against the state power itself. Lukacs' article is in line with this general kind of a process—and that's why the *Reporter's* assertion is doubtful.

The attack on Stalinism before the Petofi Circle did not take the guise of opposition to Marxism and Leninism. Lukacs, and the playwright Gyula Hay and the others involved, argued rather from within the framework of an apparent agreement with the party line. But the very dynamic of the ideas, of the forces released by the Twentieth Party Congress, carried the discussion on to the formulation of revolutionary political slogans.

PLEA FOR FREEDOM

Thus, Lukacs begins his plea for greater intellectual freedom at a curious point: by calling for a dialogue between the Communists and the Protestants and Catholics. He speaks of the role of Karl Barth and Martin Niemoller in opposing the Adenauer government. (Niemoller is well known; Barth is a "theological neutralist" on the basis of a Neo-Orthodox point of view.) He talks of the Catholic experiment with the worker-priests in France. And he refers to a famous incident last year when a Catholic priest lectured on Marxism and Thomism in Moscow, and talked with Mikoyan. (Recently, the Vatican was reported to have forbidden further exchanges of this type.)

But it doesn't stop there. Lukacs moves on from his plea for a dialogue between Communists and Christians to an advocacy of conversations and interchange with various anti-Stalinist intel-

lectuals, such as Albert Camus. He even quotes, with approval, a remark of Sartre's that Marxism (in the context, Stalinism) has not met the modern, scientific world in frank and free discussion.

And finally, Lukacs argues in favor of a less dogmatic, more tolerant approach to "decadent literature," for a realization of the contradictions which it expresses, and the possibilities which it opens up.

If it were ever possible to say that an intellectual argument expressed the motion of the class struggle, this is a case in point. Behind Lukacs' scholarly formulations, his appeals to Marx and to Lenin, his use of party orthodoxy to break the bonds of party rule, there lies the struggle of forces in Hungary which preceded the revolution.

Prior to the massive changes in the Stalinist empire and in that country, such articles and speeches by Lukacs, a phenomenon like the Petofi Circle, would have been impossible. But once that opening was made, and the one clear crack in the monolithic structure of the state appeared, in this case a debate over artistic freedom, a dynamic process had begun, and Lukacs and those with him went from the single issue of artistic freedom to the program for a revolution.

IDEOLOGY AND CLASSES

The intellectual ferment was an expression of the mood of the masses, and once the masses had won this tiny victory for a few, the few were able to articulate that mood into broader and broader terms.

For these reasons, I would doubt the *Reporter's* assertion that the discussion took the form of an attack on Marxism and Leninism. Rather, I would think that it expressed itself within a framework like that of Lukacs' article: that is, from an apparent agreement with the basic premises of the state power which concealed a profound and revolutionary opposition to that state power.

This detail is not unimportant, for it concerns the way in which it is possible for a revolutionary opposition to develop in the very midst of a Stalinist country.

More, given the kind of analysis which the Lukacs article requires, we can place the role of the students and the intellectuals into some kind of perspective. The pre-revolutionary role of this grouping is of tremendous significance, and we should scan every report of intellectual unrest which comes out of the Stalinist empire.

For, as the Hungarian Revolution makes clear, the debate and discussion—even on esthetics—is but the symptom of a far deeper conflict. Today, the life of the students and intellectuals in the Stalinist world, the sphere of ideology, may well express the struggle of contending social classes with a directness and immediacy unknown in other periods of history.

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the *Challenge* or the YSL.

THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

Jennie Lee Went to Yugoslavia to Find Out . . .

What Was Djilas' Crime?

By JENNIE LEE

It must be clearly understood that Djilas is in gaol primarily because he reacted to the Hungarian situation spontaneously, caring nothing for personal consequences.

Stephanie, his wife, gave me an intimate domestic account of the sequence of events.

When the Polish news came through Djilas was interested and sympathetic. . . .

But when on top of that came the news of the Hungarian uprising he was too excited and involved to be able to eat or sleep.

All through the night he paced his lonely Belgrade flat. For about two years he had been a virtual prisoner in that flat. Technically he was free to go about wherever he wished, but actually the secret police dogged his footsteps inside and outside his home.

Since to be known as a friend and visitor of Djilas has meant well-nigh certain economic victimization, he was a very lonely man.

From the outset he appreciated the true significance of the Hungarian Revolution and denounced the Soviet view that it was merely the work of a handful of counter-revolutionaries.

Why, he demanded, had his country's representative at the United Nations Council refrained from voting on the question of Soviet intervention?

This, he alleged, was a betrayal of Yugoslav principles. They had fought for their own freedom from Soviet domination, but were now prepared to sacrifice Hungary.

Tito was putting "narrow ideological and bureaucratic class interests" before everything else.

It is not necessary to take sides in this argument in order to appreciate that Djilas was advancing a serious point of view which deserved a serious answer.

Instead, under article 118, paragraph 1 of the Yugoslav penal code, Djilas was arrested. It is a criminal offence for a Yugoslav citizen to publicize views on international affairs in conflict with official government policy.

On the day of the trial journalists from all over the world crowded into the courtroom. But the Council of the Belgrade Circuit Court ordered them to leave, once the indictment against Djilas had been made public.

The Yugoslav leaders say they would like to have more cordial relations with the Labour and Socialist movements of Asia and the West. I can think of no way of damaging good feeling between us more effectively than by the contemptible act of accusing a man in public and then refusing to allow us to hear what he has to say in his defence.

This violates every principle of fair play, and shows either an ignorance of Western values or a cynical contempt for our point of view.

TITO'S CONFINES

The heart of the matter is that Marshal Tito is determined that at all costs Yugoslavia shall remain a rigid monolithic Communist state. His ideal world is one in which Soviet satellite countries win their independence, but remain strictly and exclusively Communist. This is the background to the ideological controversy now taking place between him and the Russian leaders.

Tito is contemptuous of the Hungarian Communist leaders because they have not been able to hold the situation there within these narrow confines; and he is passionately resentful when Djilas argues that he cannot play King Canute indefinitely, that the same winds of freedom now sweeping over Poland and Hungary will one day reach Belgrade.

Djilas now prefers to be called a Socialist rather than a Communist. His insistence that there should be two parties in Yugoslavia, not one, may or may not be premature, but there can be no denying that it is the friends of Yugoslavia, not its enemies, who have most cause to be worried by much that is happening.

Drastic action of some kind will have to be taken if present discontents are not to degenerate into something worse.

We publish here the bulk of an important article on Tito and Djilas by Jennie Lee which appeared in the Dec. 21 issue of the London Tribune, the British Bevanite weekly. A few words of preface are needed to appreciate it.

Jennie Lee (Mrs. Aneurin Bevan) is one of the editors of Tribune; and moreover (this is not usual in Tribune) writes the article in such a way as to speak for the Bevanite group. She stresses that, on the news of Djilas' arrest, the Tribune decided to send her to Belgrade "as a member of our editorial board"—i.e., not simply as an individual.

This was important precisely because of the sympathetically pro-Titoist standpoint that Tribune and the Bevanites had taken consistently since 1948. Indeed, when Djilas was first purged three years ago, Tribune largely refrained from blasting the regime, in spite of the Bevans' personal friendship with Djilas, sympathy with his democratic views, and (we understand) non-public protests to Belgrade against the treatment he was receiving.

At that time, and still today, one thing that was at stake was the Titoists' energetic attempts to woo the European social-democracies and the Socialist International. Three years ago, this was successful at least to the point where most of the socialist and social-democratic parties shamefully turned their backs on Djilas' persecution, at least as far as public expressions were concerned, though here too there were reports of private chiding. This is what is behind the last four paragraphs of Jennie Lee's article.

Lastly, we would like to direct special attention to her disillusioned report on the state of democratization in Titoland, particularly her remarks on the "workers councils" in theory and practice. This also bears on the discussion elsewhere in this issue between Comrades Libertini and Cliff.

Jennie Lee's article is entitled "What Was the Real Crime of Djilas?" with the deck "A firsthand report on the situation in Yugoslavia." It begins with a vigorous defense of Djilas's right to express his anti-regime criticisms and explains why she went to Yugoslavia.—ED.

In 1955 1,700,000 tons of wheat and 400,000 tons of maize had to be imported. No one who knows the facts will claim that the only reason for this was the bad harvest.

The peasants, who make up 56 per cent of the population, are producing for their own needs, but as little more than that was possible. To put it mildly, they are showing no enthusiasm for Marshal Tito's brand of socialism.

DEMOCRATIZATION?

In the industrial centers the grumbling is more open. What is all this about workers' councils being the true road to democracy? Many workers are now asking that question.

The ideal behind the councils they still admire and uphold. But they become increasingly resentful because of the wide gaps between theory and practice.

In theory the councils are all-powerful. In practice they are permitted to dispose of less than a shilling in the pound of the profits of their industries. The central government takes charge of the rest. Promises have recently had to be made by the Yugoslav leaders that they will be given wider scope.

The average wage for an industrial

worker is the equivalent in dinars of what £3 [\$8.40] a week would buy in Britain at present prices.

This means, that in order to live, most workers after they finish their eight-hour shift in their normal job have to search for spare-time work to supplement their earnings.

This they have to do, not to buy luxuries, but in order to be able to afford the barest necessities.

The mood of Yugoslavia today is very different from that of the earlier heroic times, when they were fighting for their freedom from Russian bondage. But no nation can remain in an exalted mood indefinitely, and it would be most unfair to expect it.

It is natural and wise that men and women who have been through so much should be allowed to relax. But relaxation and stagnation are not the same thing.

Yugoslavia is a desperately poor country. It will take long and patient effort to build up living standards, especially when about 20 per cent of the national income has to be spent on defence.

But do men and women work with lighter hearts and more willing hands in a social climate where it is a criminal offence

to think independently about international affairs?

Can people exercise sound, critical judgement in economic matters and remain morons when it comes to wider political and social issues?

Are the present restrictions on freedom of thought in Yugoslavia having a stupefying effect, inimical to industrial effort?

Is it really necessary to ban the writings of Djilas? Why was it impossible for the Dedijer letter of protest to be published in a single Yugoslav paper?

What lay behind the reporting of the November 20th speech by Mr. Nehru to the Indian Parliament, with the passage in which he defended himself by saying he had been largely guided by Marshal Tito in his first appraisal of the Hungarian situation carefully deleted?

Milovan Djilas is not by any means the only Socialist in Yugoslavia who is asking these questions. . . .

"CRY FREEDOM"

But the really important thing that concerns all true friends of Yugoslavia is the formidable ammunition that Tito, not Djilas, has given to the enemies of Yugoslavia.

You cannot condemn an old comrade to three years solitary confinement because he disagrees with you instead of answering his criticisms without losing stature in the eyes of all free men and women.

You cannot add to the offence by the outrage of condemning a man in public and then denying him the right to defend himself in public without further loss of prestige.

It is no answer to say, as was said to me again and again, that Djilas is only a little man of no importance—so why bother about him.

If Djilas is so unimportant, the lengths Yugoslav leaders have gone to silence and discredit him are all the more distasteful. It gives the impression that they are very uncertain of themselves. . . .

At this grim moment in world affairs Yugoslavia and the Labour and Socialist movements of the world should be moving into a closer and more cordial understanding in a common effort to ease international tensions.

But Marshal Tito can know very little about us if he thinks that by gaoing Djilas, who has paid us the compliment of saying he agrees with much of our democratic socialist faith, he is doing other than lengthening the distance between Belgrade and the West.

Tito likes to see himself as a bridge between the Kremlin and the West. But this is not how bridges are built. This is a one-sided surrender to Soviet prejudice and an alarming sign of the rigidity of the Marshal's own outlook.

But even for Marshal Tito the world will not stand still. "Cry freedom" is in the air. This is 1956, not 1946 or even 1948.

'The Russians Must Get Out of Hungary'

The Communist Party of New England publishes a party discussion organ called Opinion, in which CP members have their say on the problems facing the CP in its present crisis. The current (January) issue contains a contribution signed "A. E." entitled "Lessons of Hungary" which is noteworthy for the vigor and political sweep of its defense of the Hungarian Revolution against the Russians. We reproduce here for the interest of our readers.—ED.

By A. E.

At the present crossroads of history in our organization all questions concerning Party organization and outlook invariably return to Hungary as a test.

When Josef Revai spoke to the Party leaders of the Hungarian Workers Party in March of 1949, he said two interesting things among others. One, that the workers' state should not overlook its coercive and repressive powers as secondary, and two, that the state had no need to fear civil war specifically, since "the Soviet Army is always here to support us."

Revai was a leading figure and had the authority of the Kremlin. This method of government could lead to only one result. The people of Hungary eventually protested.

That protest was met by tanks. A small group of men, without even a shadow of popular support, who were the heads of the Communist Party of Hungary, carried on a civil war against all of Hungary with the use of foreign troops.

The song and dance of "fascists" was raised. But this was used so often before. During the trials of Rajk, Kostov, Slansky and Gomulka, such words as "mad dogs," "Fascists," murderers, "assassins," were commonplace.

The fact remained that the Hungarian people followed only one government, that of the Workers Councils. Even now, after seven weeks of terror and bloodletting, the Workers Councils are still the only agency commanding respect from the Hungarian people. The Kadar shadow group has no other purpose now except to front for the orders that come from the Soviet Union. It is a horrifying spectacle and has nothing in common with socialism or socialist democracy.

The Russians have got to get out of Hungary. It will be not at all difficult if the government is turned over to the Workers' Councils as it should have been long ago, if the Red Army turns over military equipment to the Councils, promises to repay the damage they committed during their invasion and help

restore the destroyed industries. On that basis the Red Army could leave any day of the week. And it could leave as a friend of the Hungarian people.

What sort of government would this bring? The actual form no one can foretell. But during this whole terrible time there has never even been a hint that the land would be returned to the big landlords or the industries to the capitalists. This was not a counter-revolution, but a revolution to establish socialism in content in Hungary.

What about the small group of men who are now sitting on a ruin and who call themselves the Communist Party? Will they still be able to dictate every phase of Hungarian life under penalty of the secret police? This small group, who had been the heads of the Communist Party of Hungary had long been deserted by the Party. The membership, the real Party, has been with the rest of the Hungarian people. The Communist Party of Hungary has nothing in common with Kadar and his cohorts. The Communists will play a part in Hungarian life, but Kadar's role is all over as soon as the foreign tanks leave Hungarian soil.

There is reason to have every confidence in the Hungarian people. No

(Continued on next page)

PRO & CON DISCUSSION

'Limits of Titoism': An Exchange of Views

Industrial Progress and Democracy in Yugoslavia

By LUCIO LIBERTINI

I read in LABOR ACTION [last Nov. 12] an interesting article by Tony Cliff entitled "The Future of the Russian Empire—Reform or Revolution?" I don't want to engage here in a general discussion on the article as a whole, which contains positions that I agree with and others which I accept only in part or not at all. Instead, I want to raise a specific question which seems particularly important to me.

In the article there is a paragraph entitled "The Limits of Titoism" which contains, in my opinion, a series of mistaken judgments based on false data.

I agree that what is generally called Titoism, that is the Yugoslav regime, has its limitations and cannot be equated with a fully socialist system. But it seems to me that in his article Tony Cliff is fighting windmills, due to wrong information, and consequently that this estimate is not only mistaken but incapable of leading to a concrete socialist perspective.

I shall divide my observations in two main parts:

INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS

(1) Misinformation.

To demonstrate the contrast existing between the propagandistic slogan "the factories to the workers" and the Yugoslav reality, Cliff quotes at length a dispatch to the *Manchester Guardian*, dated August 19, 1950, concerning a Yugoslav factory. Aside from the fact that a bourgeois newspaper does not offer sufficient guarantees in this matter, it is important to note that the system of workers' councils and of self-management was introduced in the Yugoslav factories only after August 1950. The *Manchester Guardian's* report is therefore not relevant to this problem.

To prove that Tito's "enlightened totalitarianism" is tied to the stagnation of industrialization, Cliff quotes the data from the "Economic Survey of Europe" showing that the increase of heavy industrial production in Yugoslavia amounted to 6 per cent between 1950 and 1953, that is, less than in any other European country. On the other hand, the official Yugoslav statistics (which may be questionable but nonetheless remain the only direct source) show an increase of 11 per cent for the same period.

But, aside from this, I would like to point out that the years chosen by Cliff are hardly indicative of what he wants to prove. In the first place, Yugoslavia was exposed to a terrible economic siege during this period, and was compelled to build up its military forces; secondly, the establishment of workers' councils slowed up production below the expectations of the plan. Finally, the production index does not show the effort accomplished in building those factories which started producing after 1953.

In fact, if Cliff had moved on to consider the year 1954, he would have found that the index of industrial production rose from 183 to 208 between 1953 and 1954. The inhibiting effect of certain criteria of planning on the indexes becomes even clearer if one considers the indexes showing the production of means of production. If 1939 is taken as base (100), we have: 121 for 1946, 510 for 1950; 757 for 1953; 789 for 1954.

Also the absorption of inexperienced labor of peasant origin into the new

Lucio Libertini, a leader of the Independent Social Union (USI) of Italy and editor of its weekly *Risorgimento Socialista*, is also LABOR ACTION's Rome correspondent. Tony Cliff, author of *Stalinist Russia*, is associated with the *London Socialist Review*, and has frequently contributed to LA. In question here is his longer study "The Future of the Russian Empire: Reform or Revolution?" which appeared in LA last Nov. 12.

As a matter of fact, the exchange of views on this page took four countries to organize it, speaking geographically. Our Paris correspondent André Giacometti invited Comrade Libertini to express his views on Titoism in our columns, since in general the USI has always been considerably more sympathetic to the Tito regime. Comrade Libertini wrote from Rome, Comrade Cliff commented from London, and our job is to publish it in New York. The discussion is still open, of course.—Ed.

factories caused a drop in the average productivity; only in 1956 did productivity rise in a greater proportion than the number of workers entering production.

In short, a more careful examination of the real data shows that Yugoslav industry has made considerable progress and that, most important, the basis now exists for a rapid development, notwithstanding the difficulties deriving from the conflict with Russia.

It is true that the speed of accumulation has remained inferior to the countries under Russian occupation; but isn't the tempo of accumulation in these countries precisely a symptom of the oppression that caused the popular insurrection in Hungary?

WHAT COURSE?

(2) Lack of a concrete socialist perspective.

Cliff criticizes the Russian bureaucratic-collectivist regime, the imposition of agrarian collectivization by police methods, an excessively high rate of accumulation and the emphasis placed each year on heavy industry. I agree with him.

But then he proceeds (also on the basis of erroneous data) to show that a more "liberal" system tends to inhibit industrial development and to arrest agrarian collectivization; consequently the reader remains under the impression that he is opposed to such a "liberal" course. Cliff being a socialist, we know that he is opposed to a system based on private property and on a free market economy. So the question arises: what does he want?

It is easy and always possible to criticize, but what is necessary is to propose a concrete and effective perspective, other than on a propagandistic level. One may be in favor of a high or low rate of goods, of compulsory or voluntary collectivization of the land, but one cannot be against both at the same time without objectively falling into defeatism pure and simple.

Therefore I want to know whether Cliff supports workers' councils or not, provided they actually function as such; secondly, if he believes that all is solved if they do, or if the choices listed above remain, as well as many other practical difficulties.

NEED CONCRETE SOLUTION

(3) The position on Yugoslavia.

I do not believe that the Yugoslav system is good for my own country; moreover, I believe that it shows a number of defects even in Yugoslavia. The laws on the workers' councils, the decentralization of administration, the dismantling of the bureaucratic apparatus are positive facts, while the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of "crimes" of opinion.

But a judgment on Yugoslavia which explains everything by the conflict between the national bureaucratic caste and the Russian bureaucratic caste is dogmatic and abstract. By so doing, the perspective of socialism is removed to an enchanted land where the state has already withered away, where there are no international problems, where the mountains are of butter and the rivers of milk and wine. It seems to me that this is the worst service one can render the cause of socialism.

I have no objection to sharp criticism of Yugoslavia, by Cliff or anyone else, but he should indicate at each point a different concrete solution to the problems at hand.

Political Preconditions For Socialist Progress

By TONY CLIFF

(1) Comrade Libertini writes: "it is important to note that the system of workers' councils and of self-management was introduced in the Yugoslav factories only after August 1950. The *Manchester Guardian's* report is therefore not relevant to this problem."

Actually, already at the beginning of 1950 this system was introduced into 215 factories. By June 26, 1950, when the Federal Parliament of Yugoslavia promulgated the "Basic Law on Workers' Collective Management of State Economic Enterprises and Higher Economic Organization," a thousand enterprises had established the system. Immediately after the promulgation of the law, the system was introduced throughout the country. (For more particulars, see Chen Yung-wen, "Yugoslavia's 'System of Workers' Own Management,'" *Pekin Daily Worker [Kung Jen Jih Pao]*, November 29, 1956.)

(2) Whatever years we choose show that Yugoslavia's general industrial output rose very slowly since Belgrade's break with Moscow.

An increase of 6 per cent in industrial output between 1950 and 1953 is quoted by official Yugoslav sources. (See, for instance, *Statisticki Godisnjak FNRJ 1956*, Belgrade, 1956, p. 150.) Things have improved considerably since the lifting of the Stalinist blockade of Yugoslavia (with its accompanying easing of the military budget). Thus, in the years 1953-55, industrial output increased by 32.2 per cent. (See *ibid.*)

Of particular note is the virtual stagnation of consumer-goods industries supplying the needs of the people. Thus, for instance, if the output of Yugoslavia's textile industry in 1948 was 100, then in 1950 it was 97.4; 1953, 75; 1955, 105.8. The corresponding figures for the leather and footwear industries are: 107.4, 65.4, and 87.7; for the tobacco industry: 93.0, 69.6 and 103.2; for food industries: 82.1, 99.1, and 110.1. (*Ibid.*)

(3) One result of this, together with the existence of an exploiting bureaucracy, is the harsh material conditions of Yugoslav workers.

Thus, for instance, Vice-Premier Svetozar Vukmanovich stated in the Yugoslav parliament on November 26, 1956: "the wages of skilled workers have remained below their pre-war level." (*Politika*, November 27, 1956.)

"WORKERS' MANAGEMENT"?

(4) Libertini writes that "on the basis of erroneous data" Cliff proceeds "to show that a more 'liberal' system tends to arrest agrarian collectivization." He does not, however, point out what is wrong with the figures I used in my article. And it is certainly the case that in Yugoslavia, to which the term "liberal" probably applies, collectivization of agriculture lags far behind Moscow's European satellites, as is clear from the official figures. Thus in 1953, cooperative farms made up only 9.5 per cent of all the agricultural area of Yugoslavia. (*Statisticki Godisnjak FNRJ 1955*, Belgrade, 1955, pp. 111, 131.)

(5) One should not idealize "workers' management" in Yugoslavia. Shortly after the promulgation of the Yugoslav law on workers' management the following was written:

"The Yugoslav leaders do not try to explain how decentralization of the administration can be compatible with the existence of a monolithic, highly centralized, one-party system, managed by the

Political Bureau; nor how workers' management of an enterprise can be compatible with a central economic plan determined by the same nine people in the center of political power. What autonomy can a workers' council have that is elected from a list of candidates put forward by the trade union, which is centralistic and controlled by the party? Again, what autonomy can it have when the economy is planned and the vital decisions of production, such as real wages (the amount of consumers' goods to be produced and distributed nationally) are made by a central government independent of the people? How can there be genuine local self-government in a situation where everything, from factories to papers, from people to machines, is in the hands of the centralized, bureaucratic state?" (*Y. Gluckstein, Stalin's Satellites in Europe, 1952, p. 276.*)

In fact, the actual power of the councils is very small. Thus, for instance, the amount of profits available for wage-bonuses out of the factories' profits averages only 0.6 per cent of the costs of production. (Paul Johnson in *New Statesman and Nation*, October 27, 1956.)

NEED DEMOCRACY

(6) Libertini says: "I want to know whether Cliff supports workers' councils or not, provided they actually function as such..." The answer is yes.

However, for the working of such a system of workers' councils, some basic pre-requisites are necessary, primarily the existence of workers' political democracy, but also some other objective factors.

The death of workers' democracy in Russia was not an accident. It resulted from the economic backwardness of the country and its siege by world capitalism. Under such conditions the productive forces cannot advance speedily along a socialist groove, and a class of bureaucrats rises to "reach the light with knout in hand."

This basically applies as much to economically backward Yugoslavia as to Russia.

A socialist revolution in one country is possible, even if the country is very backward. An advance in the direction of socialism is also possible for a certain period of time, but the more backward the country and the greater the outside pressure on it the shorter is the period, and the greater the danger of bureaucratic degeneration. "Socialism in one country"—and especially a backward country—is absolutely impossible.

Russians - -

(Continued from page 6)

people will give up what they have in the way of progress, material progress. The Hungarians merely want to throw off the repression.

There are people who think that this repression is a necessary part of socialism, and that whoever resists repression strikes at the roots of socialist life. That thinking comes as much from Moscow as from the Kadars in Budapest. That thinking is false and has nothing in common with socialism. That sort of repression could only be to maintain a small clique in authority, and could have a final result like the one in Tirana, when the Albanians in 1950 voted "to erect a statue of Stalin, the deity."

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by Max Shachtman

A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!

\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

SUBSCRIBERS—ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

21-5

If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW!

THE CARIBBEAN

Slow Boil in the Bahamas

A New Mass Struggle Is Rising Against British Colonialism

By BOB BONE

As Walter Rauschenbusch once remarked, "Free men organize." And if free men organize, it follows that to keep them unorganized, you must render them unfree.

Nowhere is this better illustrated than by the political economy of the Bahama Islands, a British crown colony which is rapidly becoming a suburb of Florida.

There in recent years the colonial status quo has been challenged by the democratic aspirations of the islanders. About five years ago, the Bahamas Federation of Labor was founded by a handful of dedicated men. More recently the Progressive Labor Party was formed, which in its first election (1956) captured six seats out of 29 in the House of Assembly, or almost 20 per cent of the popular vote.

In response to this challenge, the colonial government has reached for every anti-democratic weapon in its well-stocked arsenal.

Ninety per cent of the population is "native." (Colored inhabitants are called "natives"; the whites are called "Bahamians.") The labor movement is thus overwhelmingly colored, and its aspirations are those of the colored population as a whole.

Racial segregation, however, is far less apparent than in southern United States, for the color line and the class line are virtually identical. Until 1951, for example, the colored group had no representation in the legislature, among other reasons because members serve without pay, on the assumption that they possess an independent income.

Similarly, Negroes have been excluded from the private preparatory schools by the simple expedient of a high tuition. (There are no public high schools in the islands.) One of these schools, Queen's College, now admits qualified Negroes, but the other, St. Andrews, remains Jim Crow, although it is partly supported by public funds.

There are two branches of the legislature: a lower house, the House of Assembly, which is elective, and an upper house, the Legislative Council, which is appoint-

ive. The latter, which corresponds roughly to the House of Lords, holds a veto power over the elective body. The governor-general, appointed by the crown, also has a veto, and in fact can run the government for six months without the legislature under special "emergency" powers.

The House of Assembly, already bound hand-and-foot by a double veto, is further hampered as a sounding-board for public opinion by a restricted suffrage. Women do not vote at all, and men must meet a property qualification (about \$17) before going to the polls. Furthermore, corporations vote in the general elections as an additional safeguard against majority rule.

THE OLD SQUEEZE

In the courts, the colored population is playing against the same stacked deck. There is only one court of appeal; unsatisfied with its decision, the victim must appeal to the Privy Council in England, a procedure which costs upwards of \$2000. On important cases, "special" (i.e., all-white) juries are appointed to guarantee the integrity of Anglo-Saxon civilization.

In the recent elections, for example, one of the old political machines was caught red-handed at bribery at the polls. The indictment was dismissed by a special jury.

The economic advantages of this system should be apparent. Wages for common laborers are about 30 cents an hour for a nine-hour day. Semi-skilled workers (e.g., truck drivers) earn anywhere from 42 cents to 70 cent an hour. The highest wage for the most skilled worker does not exceed \$1 an hour. Domestic work pays women about \$1.50 for a full day.

Prices, meanwhile, on basic items like food and clothing, are comparable to or even higher than in the States. Milk is 40 cents a quart; work clothes are two or three times their price in the States. (All manufactured products imported from the United States are higher because of tariff barriers designed to protect the sterling bloc.)

The islander is thus caught in the imperialist squeeze, as he suffers all the hardships of industrial society without any of its advantages.

It is this wage-price squeeze which has provided the recent impetus toward labor organization and progressive politics.

In 1955 a law was passed making trade-union organization among agricultural and domestic workers illegal—that is, among three-fourths of the labor force. It was largely resentment at this law which carried the Labor Party members into the House of Assembly during the recent elections. There they introduced legislation aimed at securing labor's elementary right to organize.

The House majority responded by simply voting to adjourn for seven months, hoping thus to ride out the wave of popular resentment aroused during the election campaign. In this they will be disappointed, for labor struggles have since emerged which will provide a solid basis for labor politics for some time to come.

Like their neighbors in Puerto Rico, the islanders face an invasion of runaway industry from the United States. Bethlehem Steel, Remington Rand and other American firms are licking their chops at the thought of low wages, free land (99-year-lease variety), low taxes and tariff concessions offered by the Bahamian government. Already a large shipyard is being installed on Grand Bahama by Wallace Groves, a Caribbean shipping magnate.

LABOR ON THE MARCH

Both the AFL-CIO and the British TUC are alarmed by this development, and have corresponded with the Bahamas Labor Federation, urging an organizational drive, to prevent British and American shipyard workers from losing tonnage to the unorganized workers of the Bahamas.

The young federation has responded aggressively, and has succeeded in organizing the majority of the harbor and dock workers who are dredging the harbor and installing transportation facilities for the new shipyard.

Early in December a successful ten-day strike was called, whose brief history reveals exactly whom the representative government of the Bahamas represents. Although a law provides that foreign capital must employ native labor when "willing and available," it seems that striking workers are not regarded by the government as reliable. On petition to the governor-general, the company was granted permission to import Costa Rican, Okinawan, and Japanese laborers at two shillings an hour (about 28 cents, or one-half the going Bahamian wage).

But despite the strikebreaking tactics of their own government, the workers held firm and won their demand for union recognition.

In future struggles of this sort, the British colonial government (which after all is trying to attract American industry with the promise of cheap labor) can be counted on to intervene in behalf of foreign capital and against its own people. For this reason, every struggle for a higher standard of living will of necessity become transformed into a struggle for democratic government in the Bahamas.

And the democratic process, once begun, is irreversible. A political consciousness such as the present regime is forcing upon its people will in time destroy it. Democracy Limited is a nineteenth-century formula which has no lasting place in the modern world.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

Racketeer Problem - -

(Continued from page 1)

day hotel room in Miami Beach while attending the executive council sessions can speak seriously on the charge that union officials like Beck are living too high? Is the crime of Beck living too high, or bragging about it?

Welfare and insurance funds? When the Senate investigators finish with Hoffa his name should be mud in the labor movement. Will the business interests in the trucking industry who helped him also have their day of exposé before the court of public opinion? The Carey-Reuther forces will try hard to bring this about.

Will there be a look into the transfer of a few million dollars—not an inconsequential sum—from the insurance and sick-benefit funds of the UAW members to the office workers' fund by General Motors? After all, ostensibly the UAW members gave up a wage increase to get this fringe benefit. Now the UAW didn't collaborate with GM on this financial manipulation. It was powerless to stop it. Will it demand a look into that phase of this problem?

Will the public get the full facts—known to everyone privately in Michigan—how the investigation of Jimmy Hoffa was called off and how he later supported Senator Ferguson for re-election as well as Dwight Eisenhower? This isn't exactly small potatoes.

Many labor leaders are on the spot because of the issues raised by the forthcoming hearings into labor racketeering. Their personal lives will be scrutinized, and the luxury of their status, especially in the old AFL unions, will be given publicity which they wish they could stop. Perhaps this will be a brake on higher salaries and big expense accounts. Here too there is social dynamite, for after all labor leaders are only imitating their business counterparts. America's millionaires live all year in Miami Beach in the way that labor leaders live only four times a year.

For the record, only Walter Reuther spoke against the AFL custom of living the good life in Florida via quarterly meetings of the council, but he was told to adjust himself to his new status in the unified labor movement.

QUESTIONS COMING UP

The shocking practice of many Teamsters locals and joint councils of burning all records each fiscal year may come in for notice. Also, the dictatorial provisions of this union's constitution, and the bureaucratic practices of most top union leaders.

It may even become public knowledge that only when the Teamsters Union had devoted, loyal and radical union leaders like the Dunne brothers and Farrell Dobbs in Minneapolis did it make real progress and at the same time maintain democratic and clean unionism.

The current issue of Reporter magazine brings some of this important labor history to light. In the days of social idealism and union conviction—rather than business unionism—the racketeers were isolated and kept in their place. The disappearance of a conscience—an active integrated socialist movement—within the labor movement facilitated the development of the "fast buck" boys. The Minneapolis frame-up of the Trotskyist leaders left the fast-growing Teamsters Union to the mercy of the Hoffas and their associates. For this the Roosevelt administration as well as Dave Beck bear responsibility.

The more one thinks about the developments, the more it becomes clear that a new stage in the history of the union movement is before us. To the fore comes every vital question, from democratic unionism to the kind of union leaders, the role of labor in society, and the responsibility of its leaders.

Unquestionably, even the enemies of labor will have a field day for a while at the exposures about to take place. But as certain seems to be the fact that the overwhelming bulk of labor will rally around the efforts of the clean-union forces.

Paris By-Election Inconclusive For Trend of French Politics

By OWEN LEGRAND

The special election held January 13 in the Left Bank district of Paris was awaited by observers as a guide to the reaction of French voters to the recent events in Hungary and Suez and to the utter failure of the French government to have any success against the Algerian revolution. The results were inconclusive.

The N. Y. Times correspondent claimed it was a victory for the Right. The Rightist parties gained in percentage; they did not gain absolutely in votes. Their vote remained stable, while that of the others declined—mainly due to abstention. There was little or no shift in votes to the right.

The Times correspondent also claimed a defeat for the Mendès-France people in the great loss of votes suffered by the Radical candidate. This loss is deceptive. The Radical vote was inflated in the last election (January 2, 1956) by the tremendous personal popularity of their candidates. This time the Radical candidate was an unknown, who had the reputation of being opposed to Mendès in the Radical party. Mendès-France, due to his lack of a positive policy in Algeria, may very well have lost influence in France, but it cannot be proved from this election.

The Communist Party, according to the Times, lost the election. True, the Communists lost a fifth of their voting strength, but it was not a debacle for them. They received 20 per cent of the votes in the district (not a working-class district, incidentally).

Even after the butchery of the Hungarian revolution, after the betrayal of the working-class and youth struggle to end the "dirty war" in Algeria which swept France last spring, still the Communists are able to keep a large section of the French working-class vote, due to the absence of any alternative that attracts them.

Also running in this election as an independent leftist candidate was Claude Bourdet, an editor of France-Observateur and a leader of the Nouvelle Gauche. This is an assembly of various tendencies outside of both SP and CP and including independent socialist elements as well as neutralist and Stalinoid ones. Bourdet ran on a program advocating peace in Algeria, neutralism in foreign policy, and a general regroupment of the French left.

But Bourdet did not succeed in attracting the votes of those who were no longer voting CP. Most of the former Communist voters disgusted with their party took refuge in abstention.

In the Jan. 17 issue of his weekly, Bourdet takes an optimistic view of the election results and of his share in it. But although the independent left vote increased, it was still only some 3.8 per cent of the total. It is another indication of the fact that outside the SP and CP, there are still only sects. There are some indications, however, that independent elements are doing better in the factories, where CP influence among the workers is still weakening.