

# Fourth International Manifesto on Hungary

## Calls for Full Power To the Revolutionary Councils of Workers

(We publish herewith a Manifesto of the International Committee of the Fourth International (Trotskyist), on the Hungarian Revolution. It was issued for publication to the press by the world Trotskyist body at its recent meeting in Central Europe on Oct. 28. This was before the current attempt of the Kremlin to crush the revolution began. — Ed.)

Inspired by the events in Poland, the Hungarian people, arms in hand, have revolted against the native Stalinist bureaucracy and its Russian overlords. In the course of their heroic struggle, they have established workers' councils in several important industrial towns.

The International Committee, on behalf of the world Trotskyist movement, warmly salutes the workers' councils already operating in Miskolc, Gyor, and other places. By taking the leadership in the fight for their vital interests, the Hungarian working class nobly strives to fulfill its historical mission and establish genuine socialism in their country.

The whole world can now fully appreciate the real content of the so-called "Peoples' Democracies." Owing to the intervention of the Soviet bureaucracy through its local Stalinist puppets and the

### Open Letter to CP Members on Hungary

Page 3

presence of the Red Army, the Hungarian people were prevented from taking power in 1945 through the establishment of soviets and genuine organs of workers' democracy. Under the guise of holding back the counter-revolution the Stalinist apparatus subjected the Hungarian people to the cruelest persecution.

Once again, it has been made doubly clear that there is no bureaucratic substitute for the working class fulfilling its historical mission, which is to take the lead in the achievement of profound social changes.

Thanks to the policy of Sta-

linism and the action of the Stalinist bureaucracy, in Hungary, the forces of reaction have been reinforced, so that today, under conditions much more difficult than 1945, the working class of Hungary faces the enormously difficult task of maintaining and defending itself against both the forces of reaction and counter-revolution and the stranglehold of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

The formation of Workers' Councils in Miskolc, Gyor, etc. is a powerful demonstration that the Hungarian proletariat has decisively rejected social-democratic and counter-revolutionary bourgeois propaganda. The experiences and ideals of the Russian Revolution of October 1917 and of the Hungarian revolution of 1919 have remained alive in the consciousness of the Hungarian masses—much to the dismay of the world bourgeoisie and their social democratic agents.

To destroy Stalinist bureaucratic oppression and counter-revolution, the Hungarian workers' Council (or soviet) method of organization, which as in Russia in '17, forms the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat. By doing this they give the lie once again to the so-called theories of the "peaceful roads to socialism" which have now become the policies of the Stalinist parties outside Russia.

Social Democracy no less than Stalinism must shoulder a considerable portion of the blame for the events in Hungary. Whilst the

(Continued on page 4)

# THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XX - No. 46

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1956

Price 10 Cents

## Election Result Shows Need For Labor Party Says Dobbs

### Southern Mill Workers Picket NLRB



Southern textile workers picket National Labor Relations Board headquarters in Washington protesting board's failure to halt firings for union activity. The Textile Workers Union reports that some 200 men and women have been fired from jobs in Southern plants which have been the target of union organization drive.

## Points Road to Genuine Peace, Plenty and Equal Rights for All

NEW YORK, Nov. 7 — "Eisenhower's landslide victory is conclusive proof that the heads of the union movement in America have led labor into a political blind alley," today declared Farrell Dobbs, Socialist Workers Party candidate for President. "All the toil and treasure that the union movement poured into the Democratic Party campaign, at the behest of the labor bureaucrats, is now shown to have been wasted," said Dobbs. "Not only did the labor vote fail to defeat Eisenhower and the Cadillac cabinet, but where it did succeed — in the Congressional elections — the net result is to put control of Congress into the hands of dyed-in-the-wool labor haters and white supremacists — the Southern Bourbons."

"Had the same amount of energy and money been put into the building and running of a Labor Party in this election," Dobbs pointed out "even in defeat there would be something to show for it. Union men and women would have the basic structure of a party belonging to them. Moreover, there would certainly be a number of labor representatives in Congress."

"In other words there would be a promising political future for labor. As it is now, labor has nothing to show for its political efforts. In fact, there is the danger that some workers have become discouraged with labor's short-sighted political action. The election returns show that Eisenhower won a majority in city after city."

"The substantial decline in the Democratic vote in Negro districts demonstrates that the labor bureaucracy's policy of supporting the party of Eastland and Talmadge is losing labor the support of many of its best political allies. Similarly with the farm vote. It is an open secret that farmers' economic discontent was outweighed by their fear of war or 'police actions' under a Democratic administration. That the Republican Party

is as much a war party as the Democrats is not the point.

The point is that millions know that the Democratic Party is a war party. They mistakenly think that the Republicans may be less so. It is labor's duty to put into the field a true anti-war party that will expose the Democratic and Republican bi-partisan promotion of Wall Street's drive to war, and fight it."

Post-election comment from Democratic and Republican politicians, as well as that of newspaper writers, is almost unanimous in crediting the large size of Eisenhower's vote to the war danger that erupted in the last days of the campaign. His promise to keep the U.S. out of the Middle East "police action" apparently was taken as good coin by millions.

On the other hand Stevenson's attacks on the administration for the rift with "our allies," British and French imperialism, impressed many as a veiled call for U.S. military intervention against Egypt.

That Eisenhower's promises were mere campaign oratory is indicated in the fact that already the State Department's tone of moral indignation at the British-French invasion of Egypt has softened considerably.

Dobbs, who is National Chairman of the SWP in addition to being its Presidential candidate, urged that union members now begin the work of winning over the majority of their locals to the aim of building a labor party for participation in the 1960 elections.

Figures on the SWP vote are not yet available. However, it can be reported that the phones in the New York SWP campaign headquarters were ringing continuously from early morning election day till 9 P.M., when the polls closed. People were calling to inquire just how to write-in for the SWP candidates. Moreover, numerous voters called to report that in their polling places the voting machines did not have paper for write-ins, the write-in slot was sealed with celluloid, the metal shutter could not be lifted, etc.

## Hungarian Workers Fight to Bitter End

By George Lavan

Nov. 6 — Against the overwhelming military superiority of the Soviet army, Hungarian revolutionaries continue to fight on. Resistance remains strongest in urban and industrial areas: in Budapest; in Csepel Island, the most heavily industrialized area in the country; in Dunapentele (Stalinvaros), a factory town to the south where the national revolutionary council is still in control; and around the uranium mines of Pecs defended, according to the London Daily Telegraph (Nov. 5), by Hungarian soldiers and workers units.

Despite such bitter-end resistance it seems inevitable that very soon the Kremlin bureaucracy will succeed by brute force in crushing the first full-fledged national revolution to break out in its orbit. However, this is but the first chapter in the political revolution which, in all the East European countries and in the Soviet Union itself, is inexorably developing beneath the surface. When it bursts forth in all its fury, it will sweep away the Kremlin bureaucracy and all its servitors.

Out of this purification by fire the degenerated workers' state—the Soviet Union—and its deformed offspring—the East European countries—will emerge as democratic workers' states with freedom and self-rule for all nationalities. This will be the basis for a genuine, voluntary socialist federation.

Though it has re-imposed its military rule over Hungary, the Soviet bureaucracy has in fact been seriously undermined there and elsewhere. The Hungarian revolution reveals that in East Europe the Kremlin is unanimously hated by all sections of the population. Most important, the workingclass from the very first hours of the uprising proved itself the driving force of the national revolution, organizing local councils (soviets), militias and waging a general strike. All illusions that the Kremlin dictatorship had reformed, which it so assiduously sought to sow at home and abroad, have been dispelled by its repressions in Hungary.

The turn of events was very rapid. For over a week Hungary was a nation in the turmoil of revolution. Local councils and committees of workers, soldiers and students exercised the real power in much of the country. The political prisons were opened and everyone released was hailed for his suffering under the hated Stalinist regime.

Freedom of speech prevailed and all classes and individuals

exercised it to the full. Similarly with political parties. None existed save the official Communist Party, which the Kremlin, in an effort to ride the storm, had turned over to faction that a short time before had been imprisoned as Titoist. This party, in an attempt to divest itself of association with its hated past, changed its name and excluded adherents of the Rakosi-Gero wing, the most brazen political agents of the Kremlin.

In an effort to placate the masses' demand that the one-party system be ended, the Nagy regime hauled onto the political stage a few surviving leaders of long-dead workingclass and peasant parties. At the same time middle-class and clerical elements announced the formation of their parties. What would have emerged from the struggle of rebaptized, revived and newly-formed parties is now impossible to say. It is noteworthy, however, that the workingclass, the best organized and strategically placed element in the population, did not lag in its political claims.

For example, the national council of the trade unions, declaring its independence from all parties, announced that it would participate in the next elections to secure representation not only in the National Assembly but in all organs created by the revolution. (Reported in Nov. 5 issue of Le Monde.)

### ALL SEEM UNITED

As with national revolutions of the past, and as with the February Revolution of 1917 which overturned Czarism, the revolution was in its honeymoon stage. The whole people seemed united on one objective—to expel the Soviet Army and govern themselves. Anyone who had taken up arms to fight the hated political police and the Soviet tanks was considered brother-in-arms and had the right to express whatever political ideas he might wish or to announce the formation of a political party. Political and class differences that might develop later were held in abeyance while the work at hand—national freedom—was being pursued.

The generosity of such revolutions to all except the secret police and other hated figures of the overthrown regime was demonstrated in the period of truce with the Red Army. Without chauvinism, Hungarian workers, soldiers and students, who a few days earlier had been in combat with the occupying army, fraternized and propagandized the Red Army soldiers.

The respected British publication, the Manchester Guardian

Weekly (Nov. 1), describes the situation as follows: "Hungary's revolution was unorganized. It has thrown up any number of local powers whose authority runs as far as their words and firearms can carry; but there is no central authority on any side. What picture we can piece together shows chaos in Budapest and in the provinces the calm of anarchy. The security police officially dissolved. . . the Hungarian army has no clear leadership. . . The Government lives on hope."

New York Times correspondent John MacCormack in Budapest reported (Nov. 1) a development that could have led to the unification of the councils and committees of the workers, soldiers and students throughout the nation into a central authority. He wrote: "Now that the Russians have left Budapest no one seems to know who rules Hungary. But everyone is certain it is not the Communists who rule. The Working People's (Communist) Party itself appears to be in a state of terror. 'The opinion that Budapest might be taken over by a revolutionary mob has not been justified. Order is being kept by the Hungarian army and by the police, helped out by workers' and students. . . Now that the revolution has been miraculously successful, it is looking for leaders and an organization and it is wholly uncertain whether it will find them."

"A pamphlet, issued by a revolutionary committee and signed by Jozsef Dudas, its president, has summoned all national revolutionary organizations to an assembly in the Budapest Sports palace. It said only such delegates should be sent who had never supported the Matyas Rakosi (Stalinist) faction of the Communist Party and who had not fought against freedom or progress or on the side of the oppressors."

In its attempt to ride the revolutionary whirlwind the Nagy regime was forced into repeated concessions. Even so, it was unable to control events or to re-establish state authority. Nagy took a Social Democrat and two peasant party leaders into his cabinet. He made speeches promising withdrawal of all Soviet troops, the possible ending of the Warsaw military alliance with the USSR and the neutralization of Hungary.

### THE MAIN DANGER

The complete inability of Nagy to control the revolution, the "chaos" and "anarchy," the revolutionary councils and commit-

tees, the propaganda directed at the Red Army soldiers, the ending of the one-party monopoly of politics—all this decided the Kremlin rulers that their "new look" had to be dropped and naked force employed.

The greatest danger to them was that the Hungarian working class would perfect a national system of councils (soviets), win the support of the peasantry and other layers of the population and thus establish a revolutionary proletarian government. Such a movement could spread throughout Eastern Europe (including Yugoslavia) and into the Soviet Union itself. The fate of Gero in Hungary left no doubt in the minds of Khrushchev and Co. as to their own fate at the hands of a workers' revolution in the USSR.

Another and a lesser danger, both in immediacy and scope, was that the Hungarian working class would be defeated by remnants of the old propertied classes who would prove strong enough to stage a counter-revolution restoring capitalism. While it is indisputable that restorationist elements in Hungary would join in the fighting against the Soviet occupation and that a party dominated by the Catholic Church would be hostile to socialized property forms (even though covertly as long as necessary), the pessimistic view that the workers would stand no chance against them is unwarranted.

In the honeymoon period of the national freedom fight any participant could have the floor for his ideas. This is far from saying that out of the welter of ideas, formation of political parties—the rebirth of political life—the restorationists had gained power or had become an immediate threat.

Naturally, the press of capitalist countries gives greatest prominence to, and places greatest hope in, potentially restorationist forces in Hungary. In this they have the aid of the Kremlin press which, as usual, tries to depict any movement against it as fascist, restorationist, inspired by paid agents of U.S. imperialism etc.

In this connection a number of significant facts must be taken into account. (1) The capitalist-landlord political exiles were given no encouragement to return to Hungary. (2) The capitalist press found not a single voice in Hungary calling for a return of industry to private ownership. (3) It is reported that in some areas peasants have left the collectives and divided up the land among themselves. This is elo-

quent testimony to how little benefit they derived from the collectives. But pre-World War II Hungary was outstandingly a country of huge landed estates. There is no report of any peasants proposing the return of the land to landlords. The re-division of the land of inefficient collectives into small holdings is not necessarily a restorationist movement.

### PROPERTY FORMS UPHELD

The key question is the nationalized industry and planning. No one in Hungary dared suggest its restoration to private ownership. Significantly the trade union federation of Hungary, in proclaiming its program (mentioned earlier in this article) simply assumes nationalization and planning to be beyond question and concerns itself with such points as these: defense of the workers; independence from the government and all parties; running candidates in the elections; the right to strike; condemnation of production norms; a new wage system.

By Nov. 4 the Soviet Army in Hungary had completed its redeployment and had received sufficient reinforcement from the USSR to carry out the Kremlin's orders to smash the Hungarian revolution. With a futile appeal to the UN, Nagy's shadow government fell. Deprived of sufficient time to organize itself and to develop a central leadership, the revolution fought back as an aggregate of local councils, militias and army units. The outside world heard the appeals of whatever individuals happened to be in radio or teletype stations not yet captured by the Soviet troops.

To replace the Nagy regime the Kremlin installed a puppet government headed by Nagy's colleague of the week before—Janos Kadar. One of his ministers Gyorgy Marosán—is a former Social Democrat and a number of cabinet posts have been left vacant so that "other parties" may designate representatives.

### A REVEALING PROGRAM

Since its program is bait to persuade the freedom fighters to lay down their arms, examination of that program provides valuable clues as to the overwhelming proletarian composition and aspirations of the fighters. Noteworthy among Kadar's 15 points are the following: absolute national independence, no persecution of workers who engaged in the fighting, improvement in the workers' standard of living, an end to bureaucracy, workers' ad-

(Continued on page 4)

## British Workers Stage Huge Protest Against Suez Attack

By Fred Halstead

The attempt of British and French imperialism to take the Suez Canal away from Egypt by armed force has bogged down as a result of stiff fighting by the Egyptian people and mass opposition from the British working class. At the same time, the present cease-fire arrangement leaves the imperialist armies with a beach-head in the canal zone, and opens up the possibility of imperialist control of the Suez Canal under some sort of United Nations cover.

Such control has been the object of United States, British and French policy since Egypt nationalized the canal July 26. Under Egyptian control, the canal operated at 100% efficiency from that day until the first British bombing of Egypt on Oct. 31, two days after the imperialist attack began with the invasion by Israel.

As the British bombers softened Egypt for the invasion, the Arab masses responded to the attack. The Arab Federation of Labor announced a general strike at all foreign oil plants, according to a Nov. 3 United Press dispatch. The Iraq Petroleum Company's pipeline in Syria was severed, according to

the Nov. 4 New York Times. British troops were called to Bahrain to put down demonstrations by oil workers. The Arabian-American Oil Company announced, Nov. 3, that its Arabian pipelines were reported stopped. In Egypt, thousands of volunteers joined the National Liberation Army and civilians were being armed, says the Nov. 6, New York World Telegram.

Meanwhile, a political crisis for Anthony Eden's Tory government developed in England. On Nov. 4, London's Trafalgar square was filled with British workers demonstrating against the imperialist attack on Egypt. Aneurin Bevan, leader of the Labor Party's left wing spoke. It "may have been the wildest political demonstration Britain has known since the uproar over unemployment in the Thirties. . . It was the largest popular demonstration against the Government and its policy that the Labor Party has yet organized," says the Nov. 5 N. Y. Times.

Under such conditions, prolonged fighting in Egypt could mean the fall of Eden's government. Nevertheless the next morning, Nov. 5, the invasion began. "I can state positively," N. Y. World Telegram cor-

respondent Fred Sparks wrote on Nov. 6 from the imperialist invasion headquarters on Cyprus, "that the primary idea was to give Egypt a sudden sharp slap in the belief that all her soldiers . . . would quickly drop their guns and quit the field entirely." From that point of view, says Sparks, the invasion "has utterly failed."

The roads from Cairo were clogged with volunteers on their way to fight the British. Egyptian civilians fought house to house in Port Said, and the British were not able to capture it completely. The invaders penetrated only one quarter of the way down the 103 mile canal against stiff opposition and with heavy losses, according to a Nov. 7 report from the imperialist command on Cyprus. Moscow radio Nov. 6 broadcast Egypt's appeal for volunteers to fight the invaders.

The Arab revolution for national independence proved to be no push-over, and the British and French announced a cease fire for midnight, Nov. 6, saying they would occupy their present positions until "relieved" by a United Nations police force which would "guarantee the use of the canal."



# Egypt Is in the Right, Says Dobbs

(Text of speech given by Farrell Dobbs, Socialist Workers Party candidate for President, over all major TV and radio networks, Nov. 3.)

I want to discuss with you today what attitude we, the American working people, should take toward the war in the Middle East — what side we ought to favor — how we can help to restore peace.

I believe that Egypt is in the right in the Middle Eastern conflict and that France and England are aggressors. Egypt is a nation long-oppressed by imperialism, fighting to secure its national independence. The French and British governments want to prevent the Egyptians from getting out of colonial bondage. The Israeli government is their stooge in this reactionary venture.

Operating behind the scenes, yet another government has designs on Egyptian independence. I refer to our government at Washington which, as run by both Republicans and Democrats, is really the government of American Big Business.

The immediate aim of the French and British forces is to regain control of the Suez Canal. But the Suez Canal is an Egyptian waterway, situated entirely on Egyptian soil. It is as much a part of Egypt as the Mississippi River is a part of the United States. For the British and the French to seize it, brands them as aggressors.

Egyptian nationalization of the Suez Canal last June symbolized the will of the Egyptian people to control their own economic resources. Such control is the key to industrializing the country and raising the standard of living which has been kept abysmally low by British economic domination.

Nor is it just Egyptian people that are embattled against imperialism. In a wide area stretching from Morocco to Iran, 60 million Arab people — workers and farmers in their great majority — are struggling to liberate themselves.

## WHAT ARABS ARE FIGHTING FOR

They want to throw off the yoke of such foreign exploiters as the Standard Oil Company and numerous other American, French and English concerns. These international Big Business outfits pump out the wealth of the Arab countries and give the masses nothing in return. The Arab peoples also want to throw off the tyranny of kings and other politicians doing the bidding of the foreign plunderers and they want to end the gouging by the semi-feudal landowners, who are allied with imperialism.

What the Arab workers and farmers want is to get rid of all these parasites. They want to create governments that will meet their own needs, that will promote national freedom, industrialization and higher living standards.

The Arab people know that they have a difficult fight ahead of them. But like the Negro people in the United States — or any other oppressed people fighting for liberation — they are ready to make great sacrifices for victory. Just look at the heroic battle eight million Algerians have been waging for the last two years to win their national independence from France. The French imperialists are using 450,000 troops in Algeria — equipped by the United States government. And yet they cannot crush the poorly armed Algerian freedom fighters.

## ROAD TO SOCIALISM IN MIDDLE EAST

The same determination to get rid of imperialism is growing throughout the rest of the Arab world. Now with the invasion of Egypt, these workers and farmers will do all in their power to help Egypt beat back the French and British imperialists.

Israel started the war as a stooge of imperialism, and I want to deal now with that side of the question. For involved here is the fate of the Jewish people of Israel. Several hundred thousand of them are victims of Hitler's unspeakable persecutions. They fled the horrors of anti-Semitism in Europe in order to build, in Palestine, a country of their own. Their interests lie in finding a road to collaboration with the Arab working people. They will succeed only if they side with the Arabs in their national liberation struggles.

But Israel is ruled by a small minority of capitalists. Like capitalist rulers elsewhere in the world, this minority disregards the interests of its country's working people — in this case, the Jewish workers and farmers. For the sake of squeezing out a few more profits by enlarging Israel territory and filching an Egyptian oil well or two in the Sinai peninsula, the Israeli capitalists and their politicians joined the imperialist conspiracy against the Arab people. This can only embitter the Arab masses

further against Israel as a whole and sharpen feelings of revenge.

And yet that need not be. For Jewish workers and farmers and Arab workers and farmers could achieve their common interests within the framework of a socialist federation of the Middle East. The Arabs are already in motion towards socialism. Victory in their current struggle for national liberation can be secured only through the creation of workers, and farmers' governments.

The Jewish working people will have to repudiate their pro-imperialist capitalist rulers and link up with the Arab struggle, if they are also to strike out on the road to socialism.

Now what about the role of the American government in the Middle Eastern crisis? Can we keep Republicans or Democrats from plunging the country into the Egyptian war? I believe we can. But we should have no illusions to start with as to the real course both parties are pursuing in the conflict.

On the surface it might appear as if the Eisenhower Administration is at odds with the British and French over their military moves in Egypt. But take that surface appearance with a big grain of salt. A few days ago, James Reston, chief Washington correspondent of the New York Times, reported that the State Department thought war with Egypt over the Suez Canal too risky and "wanted to bring Nasser of Egypt down by the slow policy of economic pressure."

So Washington differs with London and Paris only on the tactics to be used against the Egyptian independence movement.

The truth is that American Big Business has a huge stake in the oil-rich Middle East, and it is desperately concerned with preserving it. Both Democrats and Republicans are faithfully committed to protecting this stake no matter what it may cost in American and Arab lives.

Even without direct military intervention the American government is already deeply committed to the anti-Egyptian police action. It is supplying arms to French and British imperialists. The equipment they are using also includes a great deal of material given previously under the military aid program.

## PROGRAM AGAINST WAR

It is here that we can intervene against the imperialist adventure and in support of the Egyptian people. We must demand that the United States government stop all further aid to France and Britain and repossess all equipment advanced under the military aid program.

You need have no fears that such a move would

anger the majority of the British or French people. Mass meetings, strikes, demonstrations are going on right now in these two countries against the imperialist war venture of the capitalist governments.

We should also demand that the U.S. Navy's Sixth Fleet be brought home from the Mediterranean Sea.

I think that we ought further to demand the withdrawal of all U.S. troops and fleets from abroad. They are being kept there for use against colonial and working class struggles as part of the U.S. Big Business policy of counter-revolution everywhere.

But these measures I propose are only first steps towards achieving world peace. Peace will be secured only when the cause of war is removed — and that cause is capitalism.

The struggle for national independence throughout the Middle East, Africa, Asia and Latin America, like the workers' struggles in Western Europe and Japan, are part of a world-wide movement for change to a socialist order.

The revolutionary struggle of the Hungarian and Polish workers and students against the Kremlin overlords is another part of the struggle for socialism. The Hungarian and Polish working people do not want a return to capitalism. Their aim is to clear away a parasitic bureaucratic caste that prevents the further advance of their country on the road to socialism.

The Hungarian and Polish uprisings will have strong repercussions inside the Soviet Union. They speed the day when the Soviet workers will go into action to restore the workers' democracy, they enjoyed in Lenin's day and will speed the forward march to socialism.

We, too, in this country, have to challenge our Big Business rulers and organize to place the power of government in the hands of the working people. For this we need our own mass political party — a labor party opposing the two political parties of Big Business.

Such a labor party can be started by the unions, the Negro organizations, and the organizations of the working farmers. It would rapidly become the majority party in the United States on a program of meeting the needs of the American people.

When elected, it would create a Workers and Farmers government that would cooperate with similar governments elsewhere in the world to disarm the imperialist war makers and to establish fraternal relations among all countries of the world.

That is the program that the Socialist Workers Party advances in the 1956 elections. That is the program I urge you to vote for next Tuesday.

# The SWP and SP On Suez, Hungary

Nov. 5, 1956

Editor:

On Saturday, Nov. 3, the Cleveland branch of the Socialist Workers Party was erroneously informed by Station WHK that there would be a broadcast by Farrell Dobbs on that station at 7:15 P.M. On the basis of that we contacted many of our friends and militant readers, and told them of the broadcast. When we tuned in, it turned out we were treated to a speech by Darlington Hoopes, the candidate of the Socialist Party. We certainly hope that no one who listened to this broadcast was confused into thinking that the speech, which was concentrated mostly on foreign policy, represented the views and program of the Socialist Workers Party.

The whole tone of the speech was one of scolding the Administration for using the wrong tactics in fighting communism, a tone which carries the implication that in a showdown the SP will gladly line up with U.S. imperialism to fight the "main enemy." Two important issues discussed in the speech hold the key to the enormous differences between the Revolutionary Socialism of the Socialist Workers Party and the housebroken reformism of the SP.

Hoopes called for the internationalization of the Suez canal under UN supervision, and referred to Nasser's "irresponsible nationalism." This kind of talk is a poisoned dart aimed at the colonial people. The Socialist Workers Party takes the opposite stand of defending the Egyptian people's fight to own a canal built with their own labor and existing within their own borders.

And we see Nasser, not as an irresponsible nationalist, but merely as the temporary spokesman in the present stage of the Egyptian revolution, ruling in behalf of the Egyptian capitalists. He will be overtaken at a

future stage by the working masses of Egypt, who will wrest control of their land and industries from all capitalists whether they be English, French, American, or Egyptian.

The second key issue discussed by Hoopes was the strife in Hungary. On this question he said a few words about freedom and liberty and then called for the intervention of the United Nations.

How could there be a worse betrayal of the workers' interests and of socialism? The UN is nothing but a committee controlled by the imperialist nations, dominated by the U.S., whose business is to camouflage the aims of the monopolies and finance capital to exploit the peoples of the world and crush their revolutionary resistance. UN (or more specifically, U.S.) intervention in Hungary would mean a restoration of capitalism in that country on the backs of the Hungarian workers, which would be a serious defeat for working people everywhere.

Our party fully recognizes the extent of the crimes of the Kremlin bureaucracy in Hungary as well as in the rest of Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union itself. But the expropriation of the giant landowners and capitalists in these lands has been an immense conquest for the working people, and their newly-won economic system must be defended from counter-revolution within and imperialist intervention without.

It is up to the Hungarian communist workers to settle accounts with the bureaucrats in their country. It is not up to the landowner-cleric Mindszenty, who ruled over two-thirds of the land of Hungary before he was expropriated. Nor is it up to Wall St., which would like to bring all of the workers states back into the orbit of capitalist exploitation.

Sincerely,  
Louise Cameron

# MORE RESPONSES TO SWP BROADCASTS

The following are some of the 2,000 letters received in response to the radio and TV election speeches of the Socialist Workers Party candidates. Most of the letters we publish herewith are in response to the Nov. 3 speech of Farrell Dobbs on the Middle East crisis. Some letters have also been received taking issue with the views presented by Dobbs and defending the action of the Israeli government. These will be published in a forthcoming issue where space will permit an adequate discussion of the important questions raised.

You will find enclosed \$3.00. May God's Blessing be upon you and your candidates.

M. D.  
San Francisco, Calif.

I would like very much to join the Socialist Workers Party and contribute my share in the Dobbs-Weiss campaign. As soon as I possibly can I will send a contribution. It may be small, but I will work to interest more people in the SWP and collect more funds. I have a friend who is also eager to join the party. Her name and address is enclosed.

W. W.  
Sioux City, Iowa

Heard you tonight on WLS out of Chicago and was glad to hear someone tell the truth about the British, French and American capitalist deal in Egypt.

I am on a farm near Daykin, Neb. Bought it and am trying to make enough to pay for it. It is lots of hard work, but wouldn't mind so much if we could get anything for what we have to sell. What we have to pay is plenty, though.

I am enclosing \$2.00 and would like to have your paper, the Militant.

J. L.  
Nebraska

I heard the radio speech of Mr. Farrell Dobbs tonight and was very interested in it. I liked Mr. Dobbs' ideas, and I would like to learn more about him and the Socialist Workers Party. I really appreciate what your party is trying to do.

A. F.  
Manhasset, N. Y.

In the midst of the most depressing news about the rotten and depraved condition our so-called civilization has brought about in this world of ours, I was fortunate enough to hear your radio broadcast about the aims and aspirations of the Socialist Workers Party. I am very much interested in your program, remarks and ideals. Do you have translations of your literature in foreign languages? Spanish, Italian, Portuguese?

T. M.  
Washington, D. C.

I am sixteen years old and a junior in high school. I firmly believe that this nation to survive, needs a third party and I

wish you gentlemen great success.

M. A.  
Vancouver, Wash.

Enclosed are \$3.00. One of these are for a three-month subscription to the Militant. The remainder may be applied to your party fund. Although it is too late for the campaign, I am sure that it can be used in some way to defray expenses. If my financial condition were better I would contribute more, and I will do so in the future.

I would appreciate any information on the Socialist Workers Party that you can send me. I want Socialism, and I am willing to work to achieve it. From my reading of the Militant I have found that the methods you ad-

vocate are very congenial to my way of thinking. I have also recently come in contact with the writings of Leon Trotsky, and I consider him one of the greatest social thinkers of our time.

Any information on party organization within my own locale would also be appreciated. In particular, I would like to know what party members I can contact. I know that personal discussion would clear me up on many points that written information could not.

J. S.

Seattle, Wash.

Heard your address over T.V. on Saturday and would like to learn more about your Socialist plan as it impressed me a lot.

S. M.

Hagerstown, Md.

Just heard a broadcast by a member of the Socialist Workers Party. I am an old Debs man and a former Wobblay lumberjack. You do seem to have the correct approach to world problems except your ideas on Russia. I would like a copy of your paper, the Militant.

T. S.

Eureka, Calif.

May I request the Militant copies you mentioned in your radio broadcast of Nov. 4. There is a great sympathy among the University students of my acquaintances for a strong workers political party in our country.

J. R.

Dallas, Texas

Dear Joyce Cowley, I suppose this could be called a fan letter. I read in the Militant your discourse over WABD on Sunday, Oct. 14. I think you did very well. You sure gave those would-be sharpshooters some food for thought.

I'm sort of newly interested in socialism and I am learning more as I go along. I can say that I'm convinced the SWP is on the right track.

H. H.

Portland, Ore.

I would be pleased to receive a copy of your paper. Yours was the best socialist speech ever. I'll send you a subscription.

E. H.

Stockton, N. J.

## 'Arab Nation Will Appreciate Stand'

I am extremely interested in acquiring the most extensive information about your party. I have listened to your program attentively and it has brought a great comfort to my heart. It expressed my aspirations. The principles of truth and justice are the only salvation for mankind. I want to mention that I am one of those people who have been victimized in the Palestine dispute in which we became homeless. The reaction of it has brought a great calamity to my people, the Arab-Palestinians. So keep struggling for humanity. It is the greatest thing you can give. God will bless all of you as the entire Arab nation will deeply appreciate your struggle.

S. E.  
Milford, Conn.

I heard your program today and would like to have a copy of the Militant. Incidentally, I heard quite a few people around here in loud tones crying "Get that Red Commie off the air!" There are, unfortunately, many sincere, but capitalist-society imbued people who know of no difference between democratic socialism and totalitarian communism. There is a crying need for education and propagation of ideas. I wish your ideas could be more widely known and understood.

J. C.

Albuquerque, N. M.

Please send newspaper and all other literature on your wonderful work. Thanks for a little light.

R. T.

Martinsville, Va.

Listened to your candidate, Mr. Farrell Dobbs, this evening and enjoyed his common sense talk. Kindly send me literature relative to your party plans.

M. C. S.

Westmont, N. J.

You have given the true picture of the peoples of the Middle East, North Africa, and Hungary. These peoples fight for freedom against feudalism and imperialism which suck the blood of poor nations. I would appreciate it if you would send me a copy or two of your article. I will look forward to hearing more and more of such true speeches, and thank you very much.

K. M.

Fort Wayne, Ind.

Please send me more information on your ideas and general platform.

C. B. (Age 15)  
New Jersey

I heard your program on T.V. Saturday. You can believe that I am for the Socialist Workers Party 100 per cent. In fact I have felt the same way for quite a few years and didn't know there was a party such as yours. Please send me all the information you can about the party.

R. W.

Salisbury, Md.

Would you please send me a copy of the party's paper, the Militant. I think Farrell Dobbs' speech on Television was very good and the best of any candidate for president.

W. V.

Little Falls, N. J.

Tonight my husband and I heard a representative of your party on the radio and we enjoyed it very much. And speaking for myself, I have never registered in either of the old parties, Democrat or Republican. I see nothing which I could vote for, being poor and expecting to remain that way unless there is a social change for the working class.

We are not allowed a third party—or second party, as this writer believes that the old parties use two party names but operate as one. We are not permitted a progressive or socialist party in West Virginia. As I understand it, they have been outlawed. So, in view of this, I shall be grateful if you could supply me with some information concerning the basic policies of your party.

At this writing we have been listening to the general Assembly of the UN debate the Egyptian situation and it is a very grave one. However heartening to learn that 64 nations voted for a cease fire plan, it is sad to learn that two great powers would do such a trick. Yet the things the Socialist Workers Party speaker said were so true it makes my husband and I glad we heard it.

There are few people here who ever discuss anything other than their personal problems, so we have so few to talk to. I shall

look forward to hearing from you. And, please send me the paper you mentioned on the air, the Militant.

Yours for peace and justice for all men.

Mrs. M. B.  
West Virginia

In response to Mr. Dobbs address a few evenings ago over WOR please send me his full name as candidate for president and the full name of the candidate for vice-president, at this coming election.

C. A. S.

Peekskill, N. Y.

I heard your speech Saturday night and I was very much impressed with it. They were real facts. I feel your remarks were absolutely right and I am voting for you on election day. Please send me a copy of your speech.

J. C.

Patterson, N. J.

There is a small group of students here at this mid-west university who wish to become more acquainted with your party and program. Some of us are very eager to work for the socialist cause in this and subsequent elections. Thus, if you can send us information about your program, organization in Indiana and the Midwest, and campaign material, we will appreciate it greatly.

G. R.

Indiana

I have been listening to Mr. Farrell Dobbs on T.V. He makes sense to me. Please send me literature and advise if you have a Miami chapter or office.

G. T. B.

Hialeah, Fla.

## America's Road to Socialism

by JAMES P. CANNON

80 pages 35 cents

Order from

Pioneer Publishers  
116 University Place  
New York 3, N. Y.

## NEGROES ON THE MARCH

A Frenchman's Report on the American Negro Struggle

By Daniel Guerin

192 pages \$1.50

Order from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS  
116 University Place  
New York 3, N. Y.

## SWP On TV and Radio

Sun., Nov. 11

WABD - Channel 5

12:00 - 12:30

Hear

JOYCE COWLEY

on

"Between the Lines"

## A Three-Month Subscription To THE MILITANT

Only 50 Cents

116 University Pl. N. Y. 3, N. Y.



# An Open Letter to Members Of the Communist Party

By the Editors

Dear Comrades:

Communist workers are bewildered and confused by the contradictory reports that come from the whirlpool of revolution and counter-revolution in Hungary. They hope that a victory for workers, democracy and an advance for socialism was implied in the Hungarian uprising. But they fear that the crowing of the imperialist press might have been for good cause, that capitalist and fascist counter-revolution might actually have won the day, and that, consequently, the suppression of the movement in Hungary by the Soviet Army was necessary.

What is important in this crucial time is that we examine the basic criteria for an approach to these momentous developments.

Our criteria are the interests of the world socialist revolution which coincides fully with the interests of the defense of the Soviet Union. This is not the criteria the leaders of your party and the editors of the *Daily Worker* use. Unfortunately they have demonstrated that the basic Stalinist criteria — the interests of the Soviet bureaucratic caste — remains the guiding line of their policy.

## BUREAUCRATS' PRINCIPLES

Stalinism is the politics of the parasitic, privileged bureaucracy which holds the reins of political power in the Soviet Union. The Soviet bureaucracy, like every labor bureaucracy in the world, lives by two fundamental principles:

(1) They defend with ferocity their special, privileged, aristocratic interests — in the name of defense of the interests of the workers' state. (In the U.S. Meany, Reuther and McDonald identify the interests of the army of fat-salaried labor functionaries they head with the interests of unionism.)

(2) In practice, they are mortally hostile to any conception that the working class is the great moving force in modern history, that the working class must organize itself, raise its consciousness, rally the oppressed masses around themselves and through their own creative revolutionary activity overcome the old exploitative society and build socialism.

In actual fact the Soviet bureaucracy is the weakest link in the chain of defense of the Soviet Union. By their suppression of the workers democracy, by their criminal resurrection of the oppression of national minorities (including anti-Semitism), by their numerous betrayals of the revolutionary interests of the workers internationally to the narrow national and conservative interests of the Soviet bureaucrats, they have weakened immeasurably the defense of the Soviet Union and provided capitalism with its strongest propaganda weapons against socialism.

But the world tide of revolution against imperialism has proved stronger than capitalist reaction or bureaucratic betrayal and this has provided a world political climate that is favorable to the movement for the political revolution against the bureaucratic caste regimes throughout the Soviet orbit.

The big question before the revolutionary workers is: which side are we on in the struggle between the revolutionary workers and the bureaucracy. Life has demonstrated that it will be a stern and bitter struggle. Obviously, the bureaucracy will not simply change its organic reactionary character through inner reflection. It must be overthrown, and this must be done by the socialist masses and not by the imperialists who want to reintroduce the old capitalist slavery.

We have seen how every time the workers launch an independent, anti-capitalist socialist struggle against the bureaucracy, the Kremlin charges that the movement is led and inspired by imperialist spies, provocateurs, fascists and capitalist restorationists. Since the East German uprising in June 1953, we have consistently exposed these charges as lies. We have never closed our eyes, however, to the fact that capitalism sought to take advantage of these uprisings. We placed ourselves firmly on the side of the revolutionary workers against Stalinism. And we were convinced that the revolutionary workers are the only force that can destroy the schemes of capitalist elements who seek to take advantage of the revolutionary crisis to grind their own axe.

To drown the workers uprising in blood, as the bureaucracy did in East Germany, Poland and Hungary, is not to combat the capitalist restoration threat but to crush the only class force capable of defeating it. Placing the iron lid of bureaucratic

military repressions can lead only to demoralization of the peasants and to the more backward layers of the working class becoming more receptive to anti-Soviet propaganda.

All the evidence from East Germany to Hungary shows that the workers approached the Soviet troops as revolutionary socialists — appealing to them to side with their just cause. It was only when the Kremlin's army shot down the working people that the ground was prepared for world-wide capitalist propaganda against "communism," and for the Hungarian capitalist elements to raise their heads. Even then the Hungarian workers, who had already formed their councils (soviets), showed every tendency to push their revolution forward on a completely socialist basis. These workers would have routed the feeble capitalist restorationist clique. The Hungarian workers and peasants have had their bitter experience with capitalism and landlordism and want no part of a return to the old slavery. They want a new and free life under a workers' state they genuinely control.

Now, trace the line of the *Daily Worker* on the recent events in Eastern Europe and you will see that at each point the editors followed step by step the policy of a segment of the bureaucratic caste, namely, the Polish and Hungarian bureaucracies in distinction to that of the Kremlin. There is, of course, within the party leadership a wing that gives outright support to the Kremlin headquarters of the bureaucracy. Although the distinction is important, what is more important is that both wings are bound by the same Stalinist formula — support of the bureaucracy.

## SLANDER AND RETRACTION

When the Poznan workers rose and voiced the demand for bread and freedom, the *Daily Worker* echoed the slanders of the Kremlin and the Polish regime, to the effect that the Poznan workers were being led by spies and provocateurs.

When the Poznan uprising spread, in effect, throughout Poland, the bureaucracy had to desperately offer concessions to the masses and get rid of the outright Kremlin agents in the government. At the same time the Polish regime was forced to retract its slanders against Poznan. The *Daily Worker* echoed this retraction, but failed to explain why it voiced them in the first place.

When the Gomulka regime refused to accept the ultimatum of the Kremlin the *Daily Worker* defended Gomulka, who is a representative of the Polish bureaucrats. But they wouldn't support the Polish workers against the Polish bureaucrats.

When the Hungarian masses rose against the Gero regime, the *Daily Worker* voiced the slander of the Kremlin, Gero and Nagy that the uprising was an imperialist-fascist inspired movement. After Nagy retracted these slanders and was even forced to denounce Pravda for carrying them, the *Daily Worker* retracted their slanders along with Nagy.

## STICK WITH BUREAUCRATS

When Nagy stood up to the Kremlin, under the pressure of the revolutionary masses in Hungary, and demanded the withdrawal of the Soviet army, the *Daily Worker* sided with Nagy. And when the Kremlin, after a fake withdrawal, again sent the Soviet Army into Budapest, arrested the Nagy regime, and installed the puppet government of Kadar, the *Daily Worker* shifted over to support of the Kadar government and began to offer rationalizations for the counter-revolutionary role of the Kremlin.

What underlies these astonishing zig-zags and gyrations? It is the CP leadership's adherence to the Stalinist bureaucracy or a wing thereof, and not to the independently organized revolutionary workers. At the same time the inclination of the *Daily Worker* to associate itself with the bureaucracies of the East European regimes when they are in conflict with the Kremlin stems from its general tendency to capitulate to the pressure of American imperialism.

In contrast, those who stand with the Polish and Hungarian workers against the Kremlin and native bureaucrats are at the same time the uncompromising opponents of capitalism in the U.S.

Comrades, the only road out of the crisis in the Communist movement is to make a fundamental break with Stalinism. Only such a break can align a worker-revolutionist with the progressive socialist current in the world and with the class struggle for socialism within the U.S.

# Comments on Hallinan Letter

BY GEORGE BREITMAN

In the Oct. 22 issue of the *Militant* we published a letter from Vincent Hallinan commenting on the attitude of the Socialist Workers Party and the Militant toward other radical organizations. At the time we invited our readers to state their views about the points raised in Hallinan's letter. George Breitman, whose letter we publish herewith, is a former editor of the *Militant* and a leading member of the SWP. Space in this issue did not permit us to publish another letter we have received. It will be published in a forthcoming issue, as will any other comments from our readers. — Ed.]

Editorial Staff,

The Militant:

The 20th Congress in the Soviet Union, the Khrushchev revelations, etc., shook up the radical movement in this country, especially the Communist Party and those who had collaborated with it politically in one way or another. Following this shakeup, the election campaign produced or at least revealed a general division in the radical movement: on one side, those who wanted to go back into the Democratic Party, that is, continue class-collaboration politics (the CP leadership, and elements of the former Progressive Party leadership like C. B. Baldwin); on the other, those who refused to support the Democrats.

Among the latter should be included W.E.B. DuBois. You may think his call for boycott or abstention in the election was wrong, but at the same time it signified on his part a refusal to accept the arguments of the CP leaders, Baldwin, etc., that progress is possible through the Democratic Party. The direction of his action was therefore progressive on the whole.

Other former PP leaders, like Vincent Hallinan and Clifford McAvoy, also refused to accept the pro-Democratic line. But instead of stopping there, they saw and seized an opportunity to take an affirmative stand in favor of socialist politics by endorsing the presidential candidate of the organization whose platform came closest to expressing their own program.

In addition, they conceived of their endorsement of the Socialist Workers Party candidate, Farrell Dobbs, as a means of contributing concretely, during the campaign, to the process of left or socialist regroupment, about which many radical groups have been talking in general and even vague terms.

Their honest and principled action rendered a genuine service to the socialist movement. They are people who deserve to be listened to, listened to, not only when they endorse Dobbs, but also when they express criticisms of the SWP, as Hallinan did in his letter to the *Militant* (Oct. 22 issue). I urge that his letter be read and considered objectively, as I have tried to do.

Fundamentally, Hallinan says, the conflict now dividing the world is "one between the public and private ownership of the means and instruments of production and distribution" (socialism or capitalism). "The champions of private ownership" are "the elements against which the struggle should be waged." On this point we are in agreement with Hallinan.

## HALLINAN'S CRITICISM

The SWP, he continues, was correct in seeking to win support in the election campaign from individual members of parties and groups not running any candidates, such as the PP and CP. But he thinks the way in which this was done was not logical or consistent and tended to defeat its own purpose.

For example, he points to the SWP's letter to the national election conference of the CP in September, requesting the CP's endorsement of the SWP ticket. In this letter, to quote his summary, the CP "is 'fraternally' advised that (1) it is in effect endorsing the policy of top labor officialdom in keeping the working class tied to the Democratic Big Business Party in violation of basic socialist principles and that such support renounces the struggle for socialism; (2) that crossing class lines in politics leads to the betrayal of the interest of the working class; and (3) that party coalition is a betrayal of the socialist aspirations of numerous radical workers, including Communist Party members, and of the interests of the American working class as a whole."

Hallinan thinks it is unwise and self-defeating to say such things to the CP in a letter appealing for support. He doesn't say whether he thinks these things are correct; his letter leaves that question open. He doesn't argue that its ideas were poorly or tactlessly expressed and should have been presented in a different and better fashion; if that was his criticism, I'm sure we could reach agreement in short order on the best way of expressing them. His point seems to be rather that these things are products of past "hatreds between two parties" and should be "forgotten for the purposes of the coming election."

In support of his view, he notes



VINCENT HALLINAN

that the SWP welcomed his support as "principled" even while acknowledging its political differences with him. Why, he asks in effect, doesn't it adopt a similar attitude toward the CP? After all, he says, the CP advocates socialism, opposes war, racial discrimination, colonialism, pressure on Egypt, and so on. "Are there not, among the foregoing, areas upon which these parties can cooperate?"

Yes, there are. But Hallinan overlooks some vital differences between the Hallinan-McAvoy position and the position taken by the CP leadership — differences that determine our attitudes toward them.

Hallinan says the main issue in the world is socialism or capitalism; we do too; but the CP doesn't. Hallinan says "there is no substantial difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties"; we do too; but again the CP doesn't. Because of our agreement on these questions, Hallinan is able to cooperate with us in the election and we with him. But how is it possible to cooperate in the election with a party that denies the issue is socialism or capitalism and bends all its energies to persuading its followers and the public generally that the Democrats should be supported and elected?

Hallinan, like the SWP, wanted to help get a big vote for socialism in the election. But how can you get such a vote by ignoring, forgetting or failing to combat the pro-Democratic campaign by a party that still has considerable influence among radical workers?

Yes, the main enemy is capitalism in our own country, and it is capitalism on which the SWP should and does "concentrate its assault." But if the capitalists were the only enemy, if it was only their direct influence that had to be fought, the job would be relatively easy.

Unfortunately capitalism retains its power, in part, because of the support it receives from within the labor and radical movement and the confusion and demoralization resulting therefrom.

There are many auto workers who would be ready to vote for an independent labor party or even socialist this year but who are restrained from doing so by the influence of Walter Reuther, who tells them the Democrats are their party. Reuther is able to do in this case what Stevenson can't.

Similarly, there are many radicals who know quite well what Stevenson is, but who are voting Democratic this year because the CP tells them it is a lesser evil. (And one reason the CP succeeds at this is that it has the reputation of standing for socialism, opposing war and Jim Crow, etc.)

That's why a socialist campaign cannot be directed against the capitalist class alone; it must simultaneously combat the pernicious notions spread by the labor bureaucrats and radical groups advocating support of capitalist candidates. Hallinan agrees the SWP should seek to win over individual members of the CP. But how can that be done without opposing the ideas of the CP leadership? Can it be achieved by stressing the "areas of agreement" — common advocacy of socialism at some time, common opposition to war and colonialism? Or is it necessary to demonstrate to them that the CP's election policy contradicted, conflicted with, violated and — if you'll pardon the expression, which is used here in an objective and scientific sense, rather

than as a term of insult — betrayed the socialist aspirations of the CP members?

(Not that I think it is a betrayal of socialist principle to write an article or letter that doesn't use the word "betrayal." What I am concerned with here is the political content and not any special term for designating it.)

## DUTY TO DEFEND VIEWS

Hallinan, I think, mixes up things a little when he introduces the point that "the right to differ in opinion is a fundamental one." That's not what is involved here at all. Of course the CP has the right to defend its policies, Hallinan his, and ours. (Like Hallinan, the SWP has throughout the witch hunt defended the CP's right to do this without restriction or persecution.)

But along with the right to differ we also have the political obligation to defend our respective positions against those with which we differ. Hallinan says he has no quarrel with the CP, admires and respects it, has had cordial relations with it and recognizes its right to differ with him.

Good. But while he may have no quarrel with the CP leaders, he found himself on the other side from them in this election campaign: he advocated voting for the socialist Dobbs, while they opposed his arguments (whether or not through a "hatchet job" I can't say since I missed the *Worker* article by Alan Max) and they advocated voting for the capitalist Stevenson.

At this point, I think, it was Hallinan's obligation to answer the *Worker* — in whatever tone he thought would be most effective, but to answer them politically, rather than merely concede their right to differ from him. Had he done that, he would have made a bigger contribution to his objective in the campaign — getting the maximum vote for socialism. (Also he might perhaps have taught the SWP and the *Militant* by example something useful on how to express their ideas.)

The election campaign will be over by the time this is printed. But Hallinan's letter obviously was not intended to apply only to the election. It raises questions for thought and discussion by all who are interested in the prospects for left regroupment. I'd like to hear more of what Hallinan and others like him who are interested in regroupment have to say on a number of questions.

Is it seriously contended that the "continued division of the Left" is due mainly to "folly," "hatreds" and fanaticism? Or is it due mainly to deep-going political differences? Why wasn't it possible to get more united action in the election campaign — because the SWP's tone was bad, or because the CP's politics, despite its avowals of socialism as a future goal, are anti-socialist in 1956?

If the answer is that the main cause of continued division is political differences, how can these political differences be resolved? Is there any answer other than: by discussing them? Discussing them objectively and if possible in a friendly manner, but discussing them.

## WE FAVOR DISCUSSION

The possibilities for such discussion are better now than they have been for many years. The SWP strongly favors such discussion and wants to participate in it fully. We want the CP to participate in it too. And we hope that pressure from the CP ranks and from other groups will compel the CP leaders to recognize our right to participate. (In Detroit recently the CP declined an invitation to participate in a Fellowship of Reconciliation symposium to which Farrell Dobbs had also been invited.)

To what extent can or should we "ignore or waive, for the time being, the areas of difference"? I don't think they can be ignored at all, but have to be discussed, in suitable times and places. But recognizing the political differences, and discussing them, does not and need not prevent joint action by the various radical groups.

"Areas of cooperation" have become much wider during the last year. We certainly can do more and work more effectively together in such fields as the de-

fense of civil liberties and civil rights.

And not in those fields alone. Let's consider the question of "peaceful coexistence." Some groups and people (perhaps including Hallinan, I'm not sure) think it's possible to achieve "peaceful coexistence" on a more or less permanent basis. The SWP, on the other hand, holds that war is inevitable as long as imperialism exists and remains a constant danger until capitalism is abolished. This is no small difference, it cannot be ignored, it must be discussed.

But time and experience will show which side is right, and meanwhile the difference over it need not be an obstacle to cooperation of all anti-war forces in concrete actions against the war danger, such as protest meetings and demonstrations around Suez, etc.

In the sense that such cooperation is possible and desirable, the difference over "peaceful coexistence" can be "waived," provided all sides are free to express their own ideas and to seek to convince others of their correctness. (Common action, in my opinion, is also a form of discussion and highly educational to all who participate in it.)

In the fusion of common action and discussion that is needed if the consistently socialist forces in this country are to be united, to what extent are we to discuss the experiences of the past?

## MUST EXAMINE PAST

I agree completely with Hallinan that no political party can afford the luxury of "crowing, rubbing salt in wounds, or saying, 'I told you so.'" Even the appearance of such an attitude should be guarded against by responsible parties and papers. But agreeing on that does not mean, I hope, that any ban, self-imposed or otherwise, will be placed on discussion of past experiences and evaluation of previous actions and proposals.

We can learn from our own past; in fact, it is impossible to learn without examining what we did in the past, both right and wrong. I am not advocating "confessions" of mistakes along the lines of Stalinist "self-criticism," which is quite barren anyhow. What I am saying is that we cannot discuss what to do in the future without knowing the lessons we can learn from the past. Not in order to crow, "I told you so," but to be able to avoid the repetition of mistakes. Hallinan was a leader of the Progressive Party which was, in its own way, an attempt at an earlier regroupment. In that position he must have drawn certain conclusions about the life and death of the PP, which prob-

ably influence his present views on regroupment. I'd like to know what they are, when he is ready to express them.

The PP is dead, but does he think that its revival, with a different name and a smaller initial membership, can be a vehicle for the next regroupment?

Does he think that another kind of party is necessary — one that advocates socialism, as he does now (which the PP never did)?

Should a new regroupment be based on the "waiving" of important political and theoretical differences, as the PP was, or should the procedure be first to hammer out a correct political program and then to build an organization on the basis of adherence to that program?

## WHY PP DIED

Why did the PP collapse? Hallinan barely begins to touch on the question when he says the PP "invited its political death by permitting him (Henry Wallace) to walk out of it" (after Wallace demanded it support the Korean war).

I agree that it was to the PP's credit that it refused to support the Korean war. But it didn't die because it let Wallace walk out. It would have died just as fast and much more shamefully if it had capitulated to his demand and supported the Korean war. In other words, it would have died either way once it was confronted with the Korean test.

The cause of its death must be sought in an earlier period — in its origins, I believe, and in its conception that it could prosper as an "all-inclusive" anti-war party, where basic differences were submerged for the time being — a conception that inevitably produced demoralization when the differences could no longer be suppressed.

And finally, what is Hallinan's estimate of the role played by the CP in the PP, which, as he knows, had not a little to do with the death of the PP? Why, in his opinion, did the CP, in recent years, want to get the PP out of the way? What conclusions can be drawn from the CP's role in the PP about the role it can be expected to play in a new regroupment (assuming that the CP will want any regroupment outside of the Democratic Party)?

This letter is written in the belief that it will be possible in the coming period to assemble within a single organization all the forces who want to fight now for a socialist America. I hope it will be read in that spirit.

George Breitman  
Detroit, Mich.  
Nov. 2, 1956

## BY A SEATTLE READER

Editor:

In the Oct. 22 issue of the *Militant* there appeared an article by Vincent Hallinan with which I find many points of agreement, likewise many points of disagreement.

When he says "there is no substantial difference between the Republican and Democratic parties," he has certainly hit the jackpot. And, again, when he says that "the Left forces in the United States should use the national elections as a platform to educate the American people to turn to a Socialist solution of the crises which are rapidly developing," he has stated a profound political truth.

But when Mr. Hallinan states that the "Left in this country has allowed itself to become torn and divided" over such questions as support to the Democratic Party, to the labor bureaucracy, to the Soviet bureaucracy, etc., then he is in effect advocating an uncritical alliance of the left merely for vote-getting purposes. Such an alliance would not educate the American people for Socialism but would only heighten the existing confusion.

If we are to use elections to teach the American working class socialist ideology, then we must preach a socialist program, not class-collaborationist policies. To raise the general level of socialist consciousness is far more important than getting the maximum of votes.

I must agree with Mr. Hallinan that a realignment of the American left should be the next thing on the agenda for all honest and sincere Socialists. But this realignment can only

occur around sound working class principles.

I wish to state frankly that I admire the forthright stand that Mr. Hallinan has taken in regard to supporting SWP candidates and his courageous manner of stating his views. I do believe that the entire left movement will profit by some of the criticism he has made of the SWP and other left groups.

We have all been a bit too dogmatic and sectarian in our approach to each other and to the working class in general. I sincerely hope that Mr. Hallinan will accept my help in the very worthy cause of uniting the American left — uniting it around proven socialist principles. He should accept me very critically, and I shall accept him in the same manner — critically.

J. B.

Seattle

## NEW YORK Militant Forum

"Why Eisenhower Won"

An analysis of the 1956 elections and the future of the Democratic-Labor alliance

Speaker:

George Lavan  
Staff Writer, The Militant

FRIDAY, NOV. 16, 8 PM

116 University Pl., N.Y.

Subscription \$5 per year.  
\$1.50 for 6 months. Foreign:  
\$4.00 per year; \$2.50 for 6 months. Canadian: \$3.50 per year; \$1.75 for 6 months.  
Single Copies: 5¢ or more copies to each in U.S. To each in foreign countries.

## THE MILITANT

Published Weekly in the Interests of the Working People  
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION  
116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: AL 5-7468  
Editor: DANIEL ROBERTS  
Business Manager: ANNE CHESTER

Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent The Militant's policies. These are expressed in its editorials.

\*Entered as second class matter March 1, 1944 at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.



## The Negro Struggle

By Jean Blake

In the delightful musical comedy, "Finian's Rainbow," Senator Billboard Rawkins of Mississippi, who bears a remarkable resemblance to Senator Eastland of Mississippi, undergoes an amazing transformation. The arch white supremacist, with an assist from Irish leprechaun magic, turns black.

This creates all sort of difficulties for him, for his white hirlings, for the sheriff and sundry other persons, but everything ends happily. Senator Billboard Rawkins' transformation is complete: His character also changes; he loses his bigotry.

The real, live Senator Eastland has not been struck by leprechaun magic. He did release a statement recently calling for free elections. But it was Poland he was talking about, not Mississippi.

Eastland had the brass to propose that the United Nations press for free elections in Poland. The statement would have made headlines in the American press — as a "man bites dog" story, if nothing else — except for the fact that the Democrats and Republicans were so busy singing hymns to the "democratic process" that all discordant notes had to be drowned out.

One such unpleasant note was a telegram from Roy Wilkins, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, advising Eastland to ask for free elections in Mississippi.

Mr. Wilkins pointed out that a "half-million potential Negro voters" are prevented from voting in Mississippi by "fraud, trickery and terror."

He told the Senator, "We are convinced that you can do far more than urge free elections in your home state. You can use your influence as a United States Senator to open the polls. . . The need for action in Mississippi is even more urgent than in Poland."

Unfortunately, life in Mississippi is no musical comedy, any more than it is in Poland. No miracles will change the Senator Eastlands, nor the Stalinist bureaucrats. The Polish workers will have to win genuine democratic control for themselves. The American workers can help them — but only by preventing intervention of the class represented by Senator Eastland.

The workers of Mississippi, Negro and white, will also have to win their freedom without depending on miracles, or help from those with antagonistic class interests.

Those who wish to help win free elections in Mississippi, and the rest of the country as well, should join the struggle to unite and organize all working people economically and politically. Only through their own organizations, not through the capitalist parties, can they demand and enforce free elections.

## Tribute to Bertold Brecht -- A Revolutionary Artist

By Trent Hutter

For some time now, The Three Penny Opera by Bert Brecht and Kurt Weill, that superb satire on bourgeois morals, is one of the biggest hits of the New York stage. Brilliantly performed at the Theatre de Lys in Greenwich Village, it is the most successful off-Broadway production ever; and Mack the Knife's ballad from the play has become a top song hit in America twenty-eight years after it was composed in Germany by Kurt Weill!

The Three Penny Opera's first night in Berlin, in 1928, was a very big theatrical event indeed; and even liberal bourgeois critics understood its importance. Brecht and Weill had become famous, and above all, a new dramatic style had been born (despite the inspiration from the 18th century "Beggars' Opera"). As long as they lived, Weill the composer and Brecht the poet were to create various masterpieces, although their association was only temporary.

### 'LENINIST OF STAGE'

Brecht died in East Berlin, in August, 1956. Certainly it is not too late to say a few words about his career and his achievements. . . . Bertold Brecht, who came from a bourgeois family, was born in Augsburg, Germany, in 1898. He was sixteen at the outbreak of World War I. He did not share any patriotic illusions and was deeply impressed by the misery of the masses and the uselessness of it all. "I came to the cities in times of disorder, when hunger dominated," he tells us later in one of his ballads.

The Russian Revolution determined his political and intellectual orientation. He wanted to be "a Leninist of the stage," and that is what he undoubtedly was: A militant poet and dramatist, a sharp fighter for the oppressed and the exploited. "We who wanted to prepare the soil for friendliness, could not be friendly ourselves," he remarks in his poem "To Those Who Will be Born Later."

Among his numerous plays — apart from The Three Penny Opera — The Good Woman of Setzuan, The Caucasian Chalk Circle, The Private Life of the Gallies, Mother Courage, and others are particularly famous and have become international classics, although they are rarely staged in the U.S. They are splendid revolutionary plays, not simply political propaganda, draped in the drama's mantle.

Brecht knew that a play can produce an ideological effect only if it is a good play in the first place. And in any case he was too much of a poet to write plays that were not alive and profoundly human. Thus, his dramatic "parables" never become pale allegories. They are full of unforgettable characters and situations. Like Schiller, the great German dramatist of the late 18th century (1759-1805), he considered the theatre a "moral institution."

Brecht's plays do not end with the solution to the problems they deal with. They rather make us think about the problems, make us find a way toward their solution ourselves, make us feel intense emotions about moral points. Brecht also was an outstanding stage director. After World War II his East Berlin theatre became one of the world's best. His actress wife Helene Weigel was one of its "stars" and a big help to him.

Just as Brecht's revolutionary plays are much more than dramatized propaganda, his revolutionary poems are much more than political slogans put into verse. They are genuine works of art — if we except some that he wrote on special occasions to please the East German bureaucrats. Brecht had, of course, left Germany when Hitler seized power in 1933. After staying in several countries, including the United States, he finally went to East Germany. He thought that in the "Cold War" he could not remain neutral and even less support the imperialists; and in this he was right.

Yet he committed the big error of mistaking support to the Soviet government and its Eastern European satellites for support

to the cause of Socialist revolution, and defense of the Soviet Union. Brecht was a "Leninist of the stage" — an honest revolutionist. But like so many honest revolutionists of the last thirty years he was taken in by the Stalinist hoax. He was not enough of a Marxist-Leninist to understand and apply Leninist principles outside the stage.

He misunderstood the notion of revolutionary discipline, a misunderstanding that may have been facilitated in his case by a typically German tradition of strongly emphasizing the importance of "order." Brecht thought that the government of the workers' state had to be obeyed under any circumstances, even if it was "unfriendly" and obviously wrong, since in the long run these wrongs would be rightened with the world victory of Socialism.

Brecht did not sufficiently understand that the victory of Socialism cannot be brought about without a real workers' democracy and that the workers' state is not strengthened but weakened and corrupted by the totalitarian intolerance and betrayals of a bureaucratic dictatorship, that an effective struggle against capitalist imperialism is impossible without a struggle against the privileged parasitic bureaucracy too, whose counter-revolutionary nature he failed to see.

This grave error does not mean that Brecht was a totalitarian type. He definitely was not. But it was tragic that this rebel who basically felt like a rebel all his life and who hated oppression, accepted the Stalinist dictatorship as a necessary temporary evil because of his misunderstanding of Bolshevik discipline and because he did not realize how important workers' democracy is for the march toward Socialism.

Yet, at the end of his life Bert Brecht seems to have turned away from the Stalinist regime. He decided that after his death the Stalinist bureaucracy should not be associated in any way with his funeral; he did not wish an official state funeral; and indeed, the bureaucracy ignored the burial of the literary genius and revolutionist.

Bert Brecht had died at a moment when he was reassessing his political outlook. The rebel's longing for freedom and human dignity finally proved to be stronger than his belief in Stalinist "discipline." The general crisis of Stalinism and the Khrushchev speech against the Stalin cult may have helped to open his eyes and may have encouraged his old hatred against tyranny.

We do not know the whole story; but we do know that Bert Brecht never actually belonged to those vulgar counter-revolutionists, the arrogant bureaucrats to whom he mistakenly submitted for a while. His life-work always belonged and always will belong to the revolutionary movement and to the toilers of the world whose interests always were his supreme law.

BOOKS - PAMPHLETS  
On Socialism  
and the Labor  
Movement

Order Free Catalog from:  
PIONEER PUBLISHER  
116 University Place  
New York 3, N. Y.

## Clash in Japan Over U. S. Base



Over 250 persons were injured as Japanese police club Sunakawa peasants, last month, protested use of their land for a U.S. Air Base. A report to the Militant said, "Today all Socialist members of Parliament rushed to Sunakawa. The defense fight is now a big national issue led by the Socialists."

## Jack Brust

The Twin Cities Branch of the Socialist Workers Party suffered the loss of a beloved comrade in the sudden death of Jack Brust on Tuesday, Oct. 30.

Jack had first joined the party as a high school youth. He was influenced by his respect for the working class leaders of the Minneapolis trade union struggles and by respect for his brother who had found the revolutionary path out of the Stalinist ranks.

For an intervening period, he was not in the active movement, but he never lost his sympathy with Marxist ideas. The growth of the witch hunt instead of driving him into passivity made him feel his personal responsibility to revolutionary socialism. He rejoined the Party at the Trotsky Memorial meeting in 1955, and this last year of his life showed him as a serious and mature political comrade.

Leon Trotsky's words — "to understand the causal sequence of events and to find within that sequence one's own place" — might have been Jack's guiding motivation. He helped to organize classes; he utilized his home for party socials and contact work; he took leadership in the University of Minnesota in speaking out for Trotskyist ideas and against revisionism.

The initiative he took in the Dobbs-Weiss election campaign resulted in SWP candidates being presented on the campus for the first time in years. He and his wife, Esther, attended the West Coast Vacation School this summer, where he spoke for the Twin Cities at the closing banquet.

All this political work, Jack carried on despite the handicap of a serious heart condition since childhood. In 1954, faced with a rapid heart degeneration, he underwent major heart surgery. For a year this arrested further deterioration and gave rise to hope of a lengthened life span. However, the technique which was an experimental one, was not successful, and the former condition reasserted itself resulting in his death at the age of 29.

The political and personal loss of such a comrade as Jack Brust, with his courage, his selflessness, his revolutionary integrity, is impossible to measure. Our deepest sympathy is extended to his wife, Esther, and his small daughters, Mary and Diane.

## Six Leaders of Canadian CP Quit; Declare Party Bankrupt

By Harry Ring

The ideological crisis which now grips the Communist parties throughout the world has caused a major defection from the Canadian Labor Progressive (Communist) Party. The LPP announced Oct. 19 the resignation of "six leading full-time members of our party; four of them members of the National Committee."

The LPP paper, Tribune, published Oct. 26 a letter from Gui Caron, party leader in Quebec, explaining why he quit the LPP. Caron writes, "My decision this week to leave the party coincides with the conviction . . . that a sound moral and political basis for the continuation of the struggle for socialism in Canada cannot be reconstructed within the framework of the LPP."

To resolve the crisis of the LPP, Caron contends that it must "put an end to the conception of a monolithic Communist world movement, a conception which in practice meant blind allegiance to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."

He also declares the need to "repudiate the alien conception of democracy with which we have come to be associated in the eyes of the Canadian people." It is necessary, he argues, for the LPP "to explicitly disassociate itself from the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat," and, what he mistakenly considers its corollary, "one party rule." The LPP, Caron declares, must "associate (itself) with the idea of a socialist democracy based on Canadian parliamentary traditions." However, he adds, "The experience of the past eight months . . . have led me to conclude that the LPP cannot be transformed into a genuinely Canadian and genuinely democratic socialist party."

Caron charges that the main obstacle to a free discussion in the LPP has been the party's leader, Tim Buck. He charges that Buck has opposed efforts to end dependence on policies of the Soviet CP. Buck also told a meeting of the LPP national committee that he had not seen the "secret" Khrushchev report at a time when he had a copy of the report in his possession. "From that time on," Caron says, "Comrade Buck has continued to minimize and push aside the question of what happened in the Soviet Union and why it happened."

"The resistance to change is very deep in the party," he continues. "We have had discussions concerning the cult of the individual in the Soviet Union and in other countries, but we have not faced up to the cult of the national leader in our own party. I had hoped that Tim (Buck) would come to realize there is no conspiracy in the party, but profound questioning of where we are going and why and how . . . I had hoped that the majority of the NEC would at some point surmount the six-month stalemate between those who wish to question and those who don't, and go over to the actual, critical, fundamental reexamination of ourselves, our past and our future. This has not occurred."

### WANTS TO RE-STUDY

"I have been disturbed," Caron adds, "by the undertones of suspicion which have attended the unfolding of this discussion in the party and which have been expressed by Comrade Buck, in references to 'rotten elements.'" To the question, "What are we to do?", Caron replies, "I cannot answer that question. Personally, I wish to spend a period of time re-studying the basic ideas which I accepted many years ago. I have been confronted

## Election Boards Deprive Puerto Ricans of Right To Vote in New York

By Della Rossa

It is a well-known fact that in many parts of the South, Negroes are deprived of their right to vote. Less well-known is the fact that in New York City, thousands of American citizens belonging to the Puerto Rican community are similarly deprived of their right to vote.

El Diario, a Spanish-language New York daily, exposed the discrimination against Puerto Ricans in a series of articles published Oct. 11, 12 and 14, by Jose Lumen Roman.

New York State demands proof of ability to read and write the English language as a condition for registration. This is invoked against many Puerto Ricans, who speak, read and write Spanish. A number of election officials go so far as to forbid the speaking of Spanish at the registration centers. "It is known that Spanish-speaking people use the vernacular whenever necessary among themselves," says Jose Lumen. "It is illogical to ask them not to do so at the polling places."

HARRYING TACTICS  
According to Lumen's personal estimate, 10,000 Puerto Ricans were prevented from registering this year. Some were challenged on grounds of English-language literacy, and this blocked others in the line, who were kept waiting for such a long time that they finally gave up in disgust.

Lumen cites the case of a 65-year-old woman who was refused the right to register because she spoke Spanish. The woman, Mrs. Maria Velez, insisted that she had voted on five previous occasions and demanded that the officials look up her record. Tony Mendez, a Democratic Party politician, supported her demand; but the cop on duty at the registration center stepped in to settle the dispute — by arresting Mendez on a charge of "disorderly conduct." Mrs. Velez never did get to register for the 1956 election.

The same day, in the same district, El Diario noted, another Puerto Rican woman was denied registration because she spoke Spanish. At another East Harlem center, an official was called in a Puerto Rican registration dispute and arrived an hour late, hoping to settle the question by means of dilatory tactics.

It is significant that the New York English-language literacy test requirement for registration was enacted in 1922, in the wake of the anti-Communist hysteria of the infamous Palmer Raids, when thousands of foreign-born were arrested without warrant and herded together under horrible conditions, charged with being "subversive" and "dangerous aliens." Plainly, the requirement was designed to prevent political expression by many foreign-born who had succeeded in becoming naturalized.

The Puerto Rican organizations in New York urge Puerto Ricans to learn English as quickly as possible. This advice is correct as a practical matter. But it doesn't solve the question of their right to register and vote. Their problem is peculiar.

They are citizens of the United States by virtue of birth and residence in Puerto Rico itself, where the official language is Spanish. One year's residence in New York State, after reaching the legal age, should entitle them to the right to vote on a par with all other residents of the state without having extra demands made on them. In New Mexico, which is officially bilingual, ballots are printed in both Spanish and English. A similar provision should be enacted in New York State to guarantee the rights of Puerto Rican citizens.

Actually, the English-literacy requirement serves the purpose of depriving a minority of its civil rights. Since the majority of Puerto Ricans in New York are wage workers, it also deprives a section of the working class from expressing itself politically.

## ... 4th Int'l Manifesto

(Continued from page 1)

"statement" of Social Democracy shed crocodile tears for the people of Hungary, they condone the foulest torture and murders committed by the imperialists, as for example, in Algeria.

By renouncing the fight for socialism in the West in favor of class collaboration with the native bourgeoisie, they have prevented the revolutionary proletariat from proceeding earlier to a reckoning with the Stalinist bureaucracy.

They must bear the guilt for the counter-revolutionary forces which are being mobilized against the proletariat of Hungary. The International Committee calls upon all Social Democratic workers to intensify the struggle against their opportunist leaders and force them to give full assistance in every way possible to the revolutionary people of Hungary.

We address ourselves especially to the membership of the Communist Parties who are undoubtedly very disturbed at the treacherous role of their leaders who long ago chose the Stalinist road instead of the genuine communist goal of Lenin and Trotsky. Comrades, strike a blow now for Leninist democracy. Clear out the guilty men from Stalinism — the Thorez, Duclos, Togliatti, Politt, etc. Demand that the armed forces of the imperialists as well as the Soviet Union's be immediately withdrawn from Europe.

REVOLUTION WILL SPREAD  
To all members of the Soviet Armed Forces, we say — Remember the revolutionary traditions of the Red Army founded by Leon Trotsky. Solidarize yourselves immediately with the gallant Hungarian fighters for socialist freedom organized in their soviets.

Hungary is a call to action not only for the working class of Eastern Europe but of the entire world. Together with Poland it forms the starting point of the political revolution which is inspiring the workers and peasants to overthrow Stalinism. It must eventually spread not only to all countries in the Soviet bloc but to the Soviet Union itself.

Long live the democratic Soviet Republic of the workers and poor peasants of Hungary and Eastern Europe.

Long live the resurgence of Soviet democracy in Russia, All power to the workers and

peasants soviets of Hungary. For a united front of all Social Democratic and Communist Party workers to force their leaderships to give full assistance to the Hungarian people. Stop the threat of imperialist intervention.

Long live the proletarian internationalism of Lenin and Trotsky!

Long live the Fourth International which has never ceased to organize and lead the fight against imperialism no less than the Stalinist bureaucracy!

## ... Bitter End Fight

(Continued from page 1)

ministration in all factories, democratic elections of local authorities and revolutionary councils, reduction in delivery quotas of peasants and end to illegalities in the collectives, negotiations with the USSR about the stationing of Soviet troops in Hungary — after the fighting has stopped.

The manifesto of the Kadar government concludes with frenzied exhortations for workers to "go back to work immediately in all enterprises," "to restore order, to resume production."

The Hungarian masses tolerated the Nagy regime as it tried to keep afloat on the revolutionary tide. Kadar's regime, however, is detested by all freedom fighters. For despite its similarity in composition and program to the Nagy regime, it is a counter-revolutionary puppet of the Kremlin. Protected by the tanks of the invading Soviet Army, it sits not in Budapest, the capital, but some 65 miles away.

## Chicago

THANKSGIVING  
SOCIAL

Food — Refreshments  
Entertainment  
Turkey Raffle!  
20 lbs. of Delicious  
Oven-Ready Turkey

Sat., Nov. 17 - 9 PM

777 W. Adams St.

## The I. W. W. The Great Anticipation

By James P. Cannon

"The bold design of the IWW was drawn by Bill Haywood, who presided at the Founding Convention. . . In his opening remarks, calling the convention to order, he said: . . . We are here to confederate the workers of this country into a working class movement that shall have for its purpose the emancipation of the working class from the slave bondage of capitalism."

Cannon tells how the IWW struggled to realize the "bold design," how much has been achieved since, and what further forms the working class struggle must take to bring it about.

44 pages

25 cents

Order from:

Pioneer Publishers

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.



The Militant  
116 University Place  
New York 3, N. Y.

Name .....  
Street ..... Zone .....  
City ..... State .....