

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**THIRD PHASE IN THE CP DISCUSSION:
Foster Attacks, Gates Group Retreats**

... page 3

**Gauging the Gomulka Regime:
The Polish Revolution and 'Polycentrism'**

... page 6

**Two Jewish Groups Speak Out:
'Bund' and 'Ichud' Rap Israel's Aggression**

... page 7

DECEMBER 10, 1956

FIVE CENTS

U.S. Is Picking Up the Pieces in Middle East

By GORDON HASKELL

This past week the U. S. government, having walked right up to the prospect of a break with its two major imperialist allies, turned right around and slid back in the old groove.

This was heralded on Nov. 27 when Eisenhower came out with a statement disclaiming any "weakening or disruption of the great bonds" that hold together the NATO war camp, and was made official in the ensuing week with the shipment of oil to Britain and France.

At the same time the United States has moved decisively to wield its power as overlord of the capitalist world for the purpose of liquidating the immediate crisis in Egypt.

By applying economic sanctions to France and Britain in the form of an oil boycott, Washington forced the governments in Paris and London to agree to an immediate withdrawal of their troops from Egyptian territory. Since these governments had already demonstrated their inability, in the face of powerful domestic and world hostility, to carry through the crude rape of Egypt which they had started, the final push given them by the United States oil boycott came as close to being an act of political mercy as one of outright hostility.

The desperate gamble of the British-French imperialists has virtually eliminated these countries from their traditional sphere of influence in the Middle East. It is inevitable that the United States will now seek to take over, under different conditions, the role of arbiter and policeman in the area.

THEY LEARNED NOTHING

For the moment, it appears that the American government hopes to ameliorate and control the clashing interests and rivalries in the area by dangling large bundles of economic aid before its rulers. But as it demonstrated in its oil boycott of its foremost world allies: where the carrot fails, the stick is not far behind.

While seeking to carry out the basic functions of political sanitation with regard to the imperialist mess the British-French adventure has left behind it in the Middle East, the United States makes it amply clear that it has no intention of breaking with its allies in Europe. Quite the contrary.

John Foster Dulles himself is being sent to attend the NATO council meeting which will seek to pick up the frayed strands of the alliance and weave them together as firmly as possible in the circumstances. All kinds of talk once more

issues from high places on the desirability of binding the NATO countries even closer together to prevent the kind of "misunderstandings" and "uncoordinated actions" that were involved in the Egyptian affair.

Thus, anybody's hope that the United States government might have learned something from the fiasco in the Middle East, or that the utter collapse of its previous policy there might have led it to adopt a "new basis" for its foreign affairs for the future—any such hope dies even faster than it was born.

In the Middle East, the American overlord sternly warns the weaker countries that any further fighting there will be viewed with the "gravest concern" by the United States, which is as close as one gets to a threat within the polite forms of diplomacy. And in Europe, the United States proposes to try to get even closer, if possible, to those very allies who have just reconvinced the rest of the world that they are just as imperialist as they ever were, and that the only limitation on their imperialist actions is the poor prospects of success.

These are the same governments, further, whose Egyptian adventure served to provide for the Russians a political cover for their brutal attack on the Hungarian people, and for the wobbling and tottering Communist Parties of the world an absolutely priceless, though temporary, political cement.

NO BRIGHT FUTURE FOR IMPERIALISM

This attempt to get back as close as possible to the status quo before Egypt, and to proceed from there beyond it, does not have too rosy prospects.

First of all, the British government might well fail to survive this experience. The Tories' only chance of continuing in power as a result of an early election would be to blame their Egyptian failure on the United States. A victory won on the basis of such a campaign would not promise the optimum for harmonious relations afterward. If the Labor Party were to win such an election, a brand-new turn in European political perspectives might well lie ahead.

In the Middle East, too, the future of an American era does not look bright. As is inevitable, the United States would seek to manipulate the countries of the area via their ruling classes, rather than by an appeal to the democratic aspirations of their masses.

Though for a country as rich and powerful as the United States such a game might give early appearances of success, its long-term prospects run against the mainstream of world history.

Sparks Fly as Shachtman Tilts with D.W. Editor

New York, Dec. 4

About 700, filling Community Church, were on hand last night as sparks flew in the unusual symposium on "Hungary and the Middle East" starring Max Shachtman, Independent Socialist chairman; John Gates, Daily Worker editor; Paul Sweezy, Monthly Review editor; and pacifists, John Swomley of F.O.R., and Dave Dellinger of Liberation; under the chairmanship of A. J. Muste.

It marked the first time in decades that a CP leader has been willing to meet Shachtman on the platform in political confrontation. The meeting was sponsored by the magazine Liberation.

All five speakers gave 10-minute presentations, followed by a period of round-table cross-questioning among the panelists; then they answered questions sent up from the floor, and ended with five-minute summaries.

First speaker was Paul Sweezy, who limited himself to the Eastern European side of the topic. For "historical perspective" he ascribed the distortion of "socialism" in Russia to "the problem of building a socialist society in a very backward country . . . extremely isolated in its first two decades. . . . The results were very grave costs, some perhaps not worth paying for the results achieved."

One result was that "an enormous bureaucracy and police apparatus was built and became entrenched . . . became in effect the ruling power in the country."

In contradiction with this "bureaucratic police state" was the development of education, creation of a large working class, etc. This contradiction had to be resolved somehow. After Stalin's death, the CPSU leaders "had an inkling" and began to move slowly, but the Khrushchev revelations precipitated an "avalanche," for example Poznan.

Sweezy then contrasted the development in Poland to the Hungarian course. In Poland, he said, there has been a "genuine revolution . . . beautifully controlled. . ." It was not clear, whether, in his opinion, a revolution had to be "beau-

tifully controlled" in order to receive his O.K. In any case, he went on to lament that the Hungarian development got "completely out of hand."

Referring to the Russian suppression, he said musingly: "I think, myself, that it would have been vastly preferable if it had been allowed to go to any end it was headed for; it probably would have been a very reactionary end, probably fascist. But if that's what the Hungarian people wanted after years of Soviet Communist rule, then they should be allowed to have it."

He thus combined acceptance of the

"fascist" calumny against the revolution with opposition to the suppression; but he went on to praise "the Polish example" again, and to call for "independent friendly criticism of things in East Europe."

John Swomley, Fellowship of Reconciliation national secretary, declared first of all that he was speaking for "Christianity and pacifism." He fired away particularly at "the futility of military alliances," ascribed the trouble in the Middle East to the Baghdad Pact, and stressed "the depolarization of power" that was taking place on both sides of the cold war.

Drawing his pacifist lessons from the Hungarian Revolution, he asserted that "much could have been saved if the people had chosen the non-violent form of resistance" and argued that "they turned to non-violence when they found they couldn't beat Russian tanks."

He aimed a salvo at "the Third Camp idea," which he identified entirely with the neutralist Nehru who has nothing in common with the Third Camp idea; took a shot at "the dogmas of extreme Marxism," singling out the slogan "Workers of the world, unite" as "obsolete"; and in conclusion urged that the U. S. disarm completely.

John Gates' presentation remained carefully within the bounds of the discipline and "legality" of the CP, where he is an

(Continued on page 3)

NEW YORK SPECIAL EVENT

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

SOCIALISM & DEMOCRACY: EAST AND WEST

A Panel Discussion, with speakers representing

I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY
I. F. Stone, moderator
MONTHLY REVIEW

MILITANT
Dan Roberts

LABOR ACTION
Hal Draper
AMERICAN SOCIALIST
Harry Braverman
LIBERATION
A. J. Muste

Discussion from floor . . .

. . . Contrib. \$1 (students 50¢)

COMMUNITY CHURCH, 40 East 35 Street, near Park Ave., N. Y. C.

McDonald Threatens to Expel Union Oppositionists

By EMIL MODIC

Pittsburgh, Dec. 3

David J. McDonald has finally taken notice of the rebel Dues Protest Committee in the United Steelworkers by threatening to expel them for dual-unionism. The rebels have dared him to carry out his threat.

McDonald's actions came after a meeting of the union's executive board and thus it may be presumed had the backing of a majority of the board. One of the main demands of the opposition has been that a special convention of the union be held to reconsider the dues increase voted at the recent convention.

Under the union's constitution, if one-fourth of the locals request such a special convention it must be held. But McDonald has now announced a "ruling" by the union's lawyer, Arthur Goldberg, that a special convention may be held only to consider "new business." Thus McDonald announced he would ignore the call for a special convention even if a fourth of the locals request it.

He also threatened to bring the rebel leaders to trial for dual-unionism if they continue to seek a special convention. He did not attack their right to run against him in the forthcoming elections, however.

Whatever else McDonald does, he is paying a great deal of attention to building the union (or at least to building his fences within the union). He has announced a series of regional meetings with local union presidents to discuss union problems.

He also told reporters recently that the Steel union "is more than a bread and butter union." This phrase, which implies that the union has a broad social program, is a favorite phrase of Reuther's. Pressure from the ranks has forced McDonald to talk this way.

McDonald has continued to charge that the opposition is influenced by "Trotsky-

ites." When pressed to name one, however, the only name he could come up with was that of a rebel leader who had once been a member of the Socialist Labor Party!

There has been speculation that McDonald was referring to the Cochranites in steel, but so far they are apparently sitting out the present struggle.

To date, the Dues Protest Committee continues to dominate most of the big basic steel locals in the Pittsburgh area. McDonald's home local, Local 1272 of J & L Southside works, officially endorsed Don Rarick for president recently. The Chicago area, on the other hand, is still well under McDonald's control.

The Dues Protest Committee continues on a fairly primitive level ideologically. It has an ambivalent character about it: on the one hand, it is a healthy tendency toward union democracy and rank-and-file control; on the other hand, there are overtones of anti-unionism about it. It is a sad indictment of the United Steelworkers as a whole that both factions are not on a higher level.

This week has also seen indications that there is a rift in the executive board. Ostensibly it is over moving the headquarters of the union to Washington.

McDonald and Vice-President Hague have long been in favor of this—perhaps in part because it would take them away from Pittsburgh where they are not overly popular and where people remember that Hague used to be a bill collector for a local jewelry chain before he became a "labor leader."

A majority of the board has vetoed the move, however, and have indicated that the union will keep its headquarters in Pittsburgh. News of this quarrel within the executive board was leaked to the press by someone within the executive board, by the way—further indication that there are tensions in that body.

SP Resolution on Mollet and Algeria

We are glad to be able to publish the text of the resolution on the Algerian issue which represents the stand of the Socialist Party of the U. S. It forthrightly condemns Guy Mollet, SP premier of France who is engaged in suppressing the Algerian people, and it comes out squarely for Algerian independence.

The Socialist Party's national convention last June passed the gist of this resolution, and the text below was drawn up at the last NEC meeting.

The Socialist Party is grieved to note the current situation in Algeria where relations between a government headed by Socialists and a colonial people have deteriorated to an extraordinary extent. On the inauguration of the Mollet administration we took occasion to praise the enlightened social program for Algeria advocated by the Socialists in the

French cabinet.

The emphasis has now shifted to predominantly military force in Algeria: This convention strongly condemns Mollet and those Socialists in the French cabinet who have supported him in this undemocratic and unsocialist handling of the Algerian crisis.

The Socialist Party supports the democratic aspirations of the Algerian movement, and particularly of Algerian Socialists, for an independent nation. Because we believe that the people of Algeria have the right of self-determination, we further suggest that the appropriate committee of the UN be asked to cooperate in finding a solution to the Algerian question, either through the Security Council or through a special session of the General Assembly. And we particularly demand that the United States reverse its former opposition to submission of the issue to the United States.

American Scandal: Red Tape for Refugees

The biggest current scandal in the country is the shabby treatment by the U. S. government of the plight of the Hungarian refugees who are crowded into Austria. By the end of November UN figures showed that the big, wealthy United States had so far taken fewer Hungarian refugees than any other nation aiding them except for Ireland. Red tape, security checks and investigations are keeping down the number entering this country, though now the administration has upped the U. S. quota from 5000 to 21,500.

Fifteen thousand of these, however, will be allowed in only as "parolees" without permanent status. The very term smacks of a cop's mentality, as does the whole procedure followed in "welcoming" the Hungarian refugees to "American freedom" via fingerprinting and mugging.

This means that the "parolees" must be on good behavior. There is always a club over their head in case somebody decides they're "subversive."

A note should also be made on the U. S.'s sifting method at the Vienna end. Under the reactionary McCarran Immigration Act, a refugee cannot be accepted if he has been a member of the Communist Party, unless he can show that he was not a member "voluntarily."

So if he joined the Hungarian CP as one of the opportunists who did so in order to get or keep a job, by licking the boots of the powers that be, he is adjudged good enough to pass the Statue of Liberty; but if he joined the CP because he once believed that it would bring a better world, and if he is one of those freedom fighters who were disillusioned, then he must be weeded out in order not to taint us.

Labor Editors Look At the CP Discussion

By BEN HALL

The *Labor Leader*, published by the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, comments on the fight inside the Communist Party in its November issue. It sees nothing particularly new, for "factionalism has long been associated with the development of the Communist Party in any country." If this fight is somewhat different it is only that for the first time "the orthodox position to which all must conform has yet to be defined."

This analysis, it should be noted, stems from a total failure to grasp the real depths of the crisis in the CP.

Take for example this: "Within the resolution [Convention Draft Resolution] itself, the key issue is the role of the party in the future. About the only thing that all three sides agree upon is that the party has a future."

But this is a simple misunderstanding of the basic lineup.

There are, as the *Labor Leader* indicates, the outlines of three groupings or tendencies:

(1) Foster, who proposes that the party go on exactly as before, no more no less, after making due deference and obeisance to Khrushchev.

(2) Dennis, who also would continue as before but who knows that the 20th Congress has made a "new look" necessary. But for him it is only a new look and not a new substance.

(3) John Gates and the *Daily Worker* staff: here it is a matter of another kind.

The Gates tendency, first of all, is beginning to understand one fundamental fact: no socialist movement can succeed in the United States if it functions as an apologist for Russia; it still looks upon Russia as a "socialist" community; but it has become critical of it and to that extent is moving in the direction of independence from it.

Foster and Dennis, then, tend to move toward one another and against Gates. The Gates group has a new view of the role of the Communist Party. And here the *Labor Leader* is dead wrong.

For Foster and Dennis the way out of the crisis is clear; the Communist Party must be strengthened so that it can emerge as the "vanguard" of the working class. But Gates rejects that perspective; in his opinion, the CP is not and probably will never be the "vanguard." It can, he maintains, make a "contribution" to the development of a new, broad socialist movement in the United States. But only if it makes fundamental changes in its policies.

With this compressed summary as a background, consider the *Labor Leader's* conclusion:

"In the final analysis it may not matter which side emerges triumphant, since the spoils of the victor will quite probably be merely the corpse of the party, its last gasps having been spent in contradicting itself."

But in our view it matters very much who wins out. And not only in our view, for the outcome of the fight in the CP is important to every trade-unionist, regardless of his point of view.

The Communist Party, in the course of its history, has gathered together thousands of union militants who were attracted to the party because they thought it represented the liberating ideals of socialism, democracy, justice, brotherhood. But in the party their ideals were twisted and distorted so that they became mere apologists of a totalitarian dictatorship. Now, with the fight in the CP, they are beginning to revert to the truly inspiring goals that first drew them to the movement. It is only the beginning; they have a long way to go, but they are on their way.

Whatever our views, and any other's, it is encouraging to see thousands breaking away from blind attachment to Russian dictatorship to take their place inside the labor movement on a platform of defending the interests of the working class. We may disagree, as doubtless the *Labor Leader* will, on how to promote the best interests of labor. However, when a group takes shape inside the Communist Party on that platform, and genuinely so, the labor movement, and

not bureaucratic dictatorship, is the gainer.

NO LONGER MONOLITHIC

This brings us to the November issue of the *Black Worker*, published by the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and edited by A. Philip Randolph. In an editorial entitled "Communists Woo Socialists," it comments:

"Since the movement of de-Stalinization initiated by Nikita Khrushchev . . . the Kremlin has begun another Trojan Horse derby. Efforts are now under way to seduce socialists to enter into an ideological marriage with Communists."

Since the 20th Congress, it is certainly true that the official Communist Parties throughout the world have sought a respectable cover from the devastating blows inflicted upon them by their de-Stalinization campaign. The Fosters and Dennis the world over would like a "united front" with socialists while they recover from the shock and continue on the old line of Russian apologetics. But that is not the full story.

In each country, especially in the United States, individuals, groups and tendencies are moving toward democracy. It is no longer enough to talk of the Communist Party as one monolithic piece; it is beginning to divide into antagonistic wings.

The labor movement should reject, utterly and without hesitation, what Foster and his friends would continue; but at the same time, it should not be indifferent to those in the Communist Party who are beginning to fight for democracy.

PURE STALINESE

It seems hard to believe, but a tragic example of utter stultification and total inability to break away from totalitarian dictatorship occurs among CP auto workers in Detroit.

At a conference held at the end of September a resolution was adopted proclaiming "That there can be no question as to the continued existence of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. as a political party, basing itself on Marxism-Leninism as applied to the American scene, and it be emphasized that our mistakes stem from a superficial understanding and application of these principles, rather than from a weakness in the principles themselves."

This is pure Stalinese (or Khrushchevese) for a continuation of the basic line with trivial modifications.

The road to democracy in Detroit is now via China: "We use the CP of China as an example in developing organizational measures to combat this [inner-party] bureaucracy and strengthening inner-party democracy." So far, they have learned only to substitute Chinese for Russian "democracy!"

But all is perhaps not lost. The conference took place in September. In October and November, the Hungarian revolution cracked world Stalinism. Let us hope it affected CP auto workers in Detroit.

NEW LINE ON REUTHER

In this context, we note that Sam Wellman of Detroit, whom we do not know, reported to the Michigan State Committee of the CP under the heading: "Eliminate Left Sectarianism in Ap-

(Turn to last page)

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

Third Phase in the CP Discussion:

Foster Attacks, Gates Group Retreats

By H. W. BENSON

The discussion in the Communist Party since the 20th Congress has already gone through three phases, each of which illuminates the nature of one of the conflicting tendencies.

First: there was the immediate aftermath of the Khrushchev revelations. This could be called the "Dennis period."

The CP was preoccupied with the vexing job of covering up its inner degradation. The "crimes of Stalin" were to be recognized quickly and superficially. The party was to go on as before after admitting a whole series of past "errors" which were to be replaced by brand-new correct tactics including an appeal for a "united front" of all progressives. This culminated in the "Draft Program" now under discussion.

It is clear now that the Dennis line and the Draft Program covered at least two hostile tendencies. The Dennis wing was ready to pass lightly over the Khrushchev line and was quickly satisfied with the pitiful "Marxist" explanation from the Kremlin because it intended no fundamental change in its subservience to Russia.

Second: came the Poznan uprising, the Warsaw crisis, and finally the Hungarian revolution. This could be called the "Daily Worker-Gates" period.

Under the impact of workers' revolution, a section of the party and its leadership which had presumably been united behind the Draft Program began to go further. The *Daily Worker* criticized Russian intervention in Hungary and sided with Gomulka in Poland. The discussion centered now, not around the draft program, but around the *Daily Worker's* attitude toward Russia and toward the Hungarian events.

The Gates tendency, it became clear, was beginning to shake itself loose from the tutelage of the Kremlin and was taking the first hesitant steps toward demo-

cratic socialism while, ironically enough, still calling Russia a "socialist" state.

Third: Russian troops and tanks entered Budapest for the second time, overthrew the Nagy regime and set up a simple puppet government headed by Kadar. This became the "Foster period" and continues to this day.

FOSTER HAMMERS AWAY

It was a clear case: which side of the barricades are you on? The Draft Program and the Dennis line had opened the floodlights of criticism; whole sections of the party were ranging themselves on the side of the Hungarian revolution and against Russian intervention. Foster demanded that the party draw back.

He pointed out that it was being undermined by the course of the discussion and insisted upon a return to "Marxism-Leninism" and to "proletarian internationalism" by which he meant subservience to Russia. Dennis and the whole cadre of old-line party officials hastened to rally around Foster and together with him heaped abuse and slander upon the Hungarian revolution, using every pre-fabricated lie supplied by the Kremlin.

It is under this pressure that the party discussion continues today and the effects of the hammering-away by the Foster neo-Stalinists is already evident.

Thus it came about that the discussion, which really pitted the spokesmen of bureaucratic dictatorship against those who want to break from it, was posed in

this false light: Dogmatism versus creative Marxism (as the Gates tendency puts it), or "Marxism-Leninism" versus "liquidationism" (as Foster puts it).

On December 2, the *Worker* editorializes on "America and Hungary" commenting:

"Of course, the issue isn't the same in those two countries. [Egypt and Hungary.] Foreign troops—British, French and Israeli—are in Egypt as a result of one of the most brazen acts of aggression in the long sordid history of imperialism. Foreign troops—those of the Soviet Union—are in Hungary by agreement between the two countries under the Warsaw Pact, counterpart of NATO, as well as under the Potsdam Agreement; Hungary was part of the fascist Axis."

We skip discussion of the inner content of this monstrosity; it suffices here to point out that this editorial represents a further capitulation by the *Daily Worker* to the pressure of Foster and his allies.

D. W. YIELDS

This editorial is a direct repudiation of the line adopted by the National Committee on November 4 under the impact not of Foster but of the rising workers of Budapest. This is what the *Daily Worker* printed then:

"The response of the Soviet authorities to the request for armed intervention also cannot be justified by the argument that they had the legal right to do so under the Warsaw Pact. This was not a matter of formal rights. It violated the essence of the Leninist concept of national self-determination because the call for the troops was not in accord with the wishes of the Hungarian people."

In one month, the *Daily Worker* swung from repudiation of the "Warsaw Pact" argument to apology for it.

Behind it all is the preparation by the Fosterites to cut the throats of their

critics, figuratively speaking of course. In a speech on November 11, probably at an inner-party discussion meeting, Foster set the tone for the opening of a bitter campaign against the Gates tendency.

The political content of his remarks is of little independent consequence; once we realize that Foster is eager to proceed without making any basic changes we know all we have to know about his fundamental line. What is significant are the hostile overtones.

"The central issue in our own party," says Foster, "is whether or not we shall continue to build the Communist Party. Comrade Gates raises this basic question sharply in the November issue of *Political Affairs* by calling for the transformation of the Communist Party into a so-called political-action organization. . . . The proposed new organization is a threat against the life of the Communist Party. . . ."

Foster goes on to speak of "this reckless campaign of wildly exaggerating the party's errors." He warns: "One of the main manifestations of this trend is the development in the recent period of definitely anti-Soviet trends in their ranks."

He goes on to characterize the Gatesites further as a "strong right tendency," and accuses it later of "persistent sniping at the USSR and its leaders, which went so far in the Hungarian crisis as to denounce the latter as enemies of Socialism, both within and without the Soviet Union." This tendency, he concludes, "is now threatening the life of our party."

Foster, then, is ready for a fight. The *Daily Worker* yields before his attack.

Gates and his friends have raised the banner of independence from the Kremlin, so far in mild but unmistakable fashion. Independence is no abstraction. In the concrete conditions of the fight inside the CP, independence means the rejection of every hint of capitulation to Foster.

Shachtman Tilts with D.W. Editor — —

(Continued from page 1)

opponent under heavy fire from Foster and Dennis, and he often seemed to be picking his way carefully in order not to give ammunition to his inner-party opponents, while at the same time he stressed that side of the CP's views which was most congenial to him.

An example of this occurred at the very beginning of his presentation, which started by quoting the Nov. 4 *Daily Worker* editorial on Hungary. This was the one, written before the second intervention, in which the use of Russian troops was clearly criticized. He then added, "That is what I believe."

However, he did not mention that after the second intervention and with his support, a new statement adopted refrained from taking a position on the Russians' role and put much stress on the talk about "fascists" in Hungary. He thus left the impression that the Nov. 4 editorial still represented the CP position on the current situation.

He continued: "Others in the Communist Party do not fully share my views. There is disagreement on whether the fascist danger was serious enough to justify the second intervention; and this is now being discussed. While there are differences on this one aspect, we agree on . . ." and from this point on, he proceeded to give his version of the party line. He did not again mention the "fascist danger" in Hungary, nor did he ever give the now-official view on it.

The three things "we agree on" were: (1) The "tragic clash" was the "result of serious mistakes by the Soviet Union and the former Hungarian leaders." (2) Powerful reactionary forces in the U. S. and Hungary tried to "use" the occasion for their own ends. (3) A program for "a way out." Under the head of this "program" he sloganized for "a new summit conference" to end the cold war; simultaneous withdrawal of troops by both West and East from foreign countries; dissolution of all military blocs,

including both NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

This, he said, "will facilitate the democratization of the socialist countries, which is the irreversible process now under way."

THIRD CAMP AND DEMOCRACY

Max Shachtman's close-packed 10 minutes covered both the Middle East and the upsurge against Stalinism in East Europe, presenting a Third Camp position of opposition to both imperialist aggressions. The "brutal and chauvinistic assault" on Egypt, he said, has failed because the former colonial subjects of imperialism cannot be dominated by force any more. "We Independent Socialists are unreservedly on the side of Egypt's resistance" to this attack.

But the brutal assault on Hungary, he stressed, is "conducted by a foreign imperialist regime which perpetrates its infamy in the name of socialism," and this makes the Russians' massacre especially odious and disastrous. Those who justify it as "necessary" only "reveal how their ideas about socialism have been warped, deformed and corroded. . . ." The supreme infamy indeed is that the Stalinist assassins slander the Hungarian martyrs as fighting to restore "fascism."

"All the talk of 'different roads to socialism' means nothing," he said, "unless it is commonly agreed that the road to socialism leads through democracy and an ever-greater expansion of democracy. . . . Socialism and democracy are not two different entities which can be added or separated as you feel like doing it. . . ."

American workers, he said, rightly despise Stalinism and the Russian system, and will have nothing to do with those who defend them. "There is much talk nowadays about reconstituting and reuniting the American socialist movement on sounder and stronger foundations. I am emphatically for it." But no socialist movement can get anywhere unless it clearly comes out against any

notion that the road to socialism leads through any system of political suppression of opposition, and for the view that proclaims democratic rights for all, in this country and Russia both.

The battle in Hungary, he concluded, poses the question: Which side are you on?

Dave Dellinger, second pacifist on the panel, emphasized that "the lesson of Hungary" is that "the spirit of man demands total freedom." The revolutions of our time are "at dead end," both the Russian Revolution and "the American Revolution with its ideals in the Declaration of Independence." We all must re-examine our assumptions, he reiterated (but did not indicate just how he was "re-examining" his own pacifist assumptions).

This was followed by something of a blast at American trade unions which "now have become a second set of bosses over the American people."

He could describe his own prison experience as a C.O. either as a "horror story" or a "country club idyll," he said; similar approaches can also be taken to Russia and the Communist system; the truth includes both: this was his last if somewhat inconclusive point.

CHALLENGE ON RUSSIA

This ended the presentations. Around the table, the panelists directed questions at each other. First of all, Swomley challenged Shachtman on pacifism, and Shachtman explained the socialist attitude on violence and non-violence.

Chipping into this discussion, Gates took occasion to veer off into how grateful we should all be to the Soviet Union for helping to defeat Hitler. "So we must consider this when we ask why a socialist country did what it did in Hungary. It was wrong . . . a setback to socialism" but they are not just devils; they thought they were acting in the best interests of socialism, though they were mistaken. . . .

Shachtman launched a question at Gates and Sweezy: How do you explain

the social reasons for this Russian policy of imposing its "socialism" by force?

Sweezy, replying first, intensified the manner in which he had also made his extemporaneous presentation, to a point which rather amazed this reporter, who has not heard him on the platform before. He often seemed to be trying to sound like a cracker-barrel Will Rogers suspicious of the fast-talking city-slickers. Although he was aided by a natural New England twang and pieced it out with a folksy vocabulary, it did not quite sit right on this ex-Harvard professor who specializes in the more abstruse reaches of Marxist economics.

At any rate, his reply to the question went: "I don't know the answers to all these questions" (applause from a number of other folksy-type intellectuals in the audience). . . . "Things aren't quite so simple. . . . We ought to try to understand, not denounce or demand. . . . Consider how complex problems are. . . . You know, things aren't so simple. . . ." but he did refer back to his explanation about the backwardness of Russia.

"WILL OF THE PEOPLE"

Gates tackled the question in his own way: He was against the imposition of socialism by Russia on another country, but in Russia, he asserted, socialism was not imposed by force. He then proceeded to substitute the question of the "genuine popular character" of the Russian Revolution of 1917.

Shachtman caught this up and drove the question home again; picking up a reference to the "will of people," he wanted to know (from Gates and Sweezy) how they proposed to determine the "will of the people" under the Stalinist system where there are no institutions of political democracy.

Sweezy answered in what was becoming his characteristic know-nothing vein for the evening: "This question has been discussed by political scientists since Rousseau and we won't solve it to-

(Turn to last page)

LONDON LETTER

Peter Fryer Case Shakes CP

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Nov. 29

The crisis in the ranks of the British Communist Party as a consequence of the ruthless Russian intervention in Hungary continues to develop. Everywhere intellectuals and workers, sickened with the latest Stalinist crime, are rebelling against the British CP leadership which, in complete conformity to Moscow, has dubbed the Hungarian revolutionaries "fascists."

Large numbers of the British CP "rebels" are quitting the party entirely in protest against the line on Hungary; others, while expressing complete opposition to the line, have publicly declared that they are staying in the CP only in order to fight the leadership and its policy on Hungary.

Hard-hit by the rebellion has been the *Daily Worker*, the Stalinist news sheet which has been subjected to a constant barrage of criticism since Khrushchev's revelations at the 20th Congress. So far five members of the *Daily Worker* editorial staff have walked out because of disagreement with the Stalinist crimes in Hungary.

First to go was "Gabriel," twenty years a member of the CP and for years

the cartoonist on the *Worker* staff. He was followed by Malcolm MacEwen, the features editor; Patrick Golding, the film critic; and Llew Gardner, a reporter.

The biggest blow to Stalinist prestige, however, came when Peter Fryer, *Daily Worker* parliamentary correspondent, walked out. Having been sent to Hungary as a special correspondent, Fryer quit because he was horrified at what he saw there and because the *Daily Worker* failed to publish his dispatches from Budapest.

When Fryer's resignation became public knowledge the *Daily Worker* published his letter of resignation. It is a letter worth quoting at length because it provides some interesting background material on what happened in Hungary.

Fryer first complained that out of three dispatches he filed from Budapest, two had not been used and the third had been severely cut. He said that the editor of the *Daily Worker* would not even let the remainder of the staff read the dispatch he filed on arrival in Vienna after leaving Hungary.

Saying that for nine years he had been proud to represent the *Daily Worker*, Fryer said he was quitting because no

journalist could cover major foreign assignments for a power which then refused to publish what he wrote. He continued as follows:

"This was my fourth visit to Hungary since 1949. I spent over a fortnight there, and I am convinced that Soviet intervention was both criminal and unnecessary.

"The danger of counter-revolution did exist. Austrian Communists told me that before November 4 some 2000 émigrés, trained and armed by the Americans, had crossed into Hungary to fight and agitate.

"But power was in the hands of the armed people, and they were fully aware of the danger of counter-revolution and were themselves fully capable of smashing it.

"The great mass of the Hungarian people have no desire to return to capitalism, and want to retain all the positive social achievements of the past 12 years.

"Nor did the Soviet troops who entered Budapest on November 4 fight fascists; they fought workers, soldiers and students; and they could find no Hungarians to fight alongside them."

"These are the conclusions I reached after hundreds of interviews. I hope soon to publish the detailed facts on which they are based.

"No honest Communist can now ignore the truth about Hungary. The Hungarian people were the victims of tyranny and oppression masquerading as socialism."

"A corrupted Communist Party, swollen by an influx of careerists; a highly paid secret police (officers received ten times the national average wage, men three times) which jailed, tortured and murdered dissenters. A state machine warped by bureaucracy; these were the means by which the worst features of Soviet society were imposed on Hungary.

"Yet the whole police dictatorship was so rotten and so universally detested that it collapsed like a house of cards the instant the people rose on their feet.

"Most of the revolutionaries—Communists and non-Communists—hoped to win an independent, democratic and genuinely socialist Hungary. But their hopes were crushed by Soviet intervention."

MAKE KNOWN THE TRUTH

After saying that he had turned down \$2800 from an American newspaper chain to write on Hungary as a renegade, Fryer said that he was staying in the CP to fight it out with those responsible for Hungary and similar situations.

"Sooner or later," he concluded, "the Hungarian revolution, tragic though its immediate outcome has been, must lead to a renaissance and redemption throughout the world Communist movement, which for so long has been tainted with the vilest features of the capitalist system which it seeks to end. The first step is that the truth about Hungary should be made known."

Faced with this strong blast from Fryer, the editor of the *Daily Worker* took action to try to prove that Fryer's dispatches were inaccurate. This he did by quoting at some length dispatches by Sefton Delmer from Hungary. Unfortunately, for the Stalinists, Delmer works for the Tory Lord Beaverbrook and his dispatches were published in the pro-capitalist *Daily Express*!

Sitting snug in his London office of the *Daily Worker*, far removed from the blood and smoke of Budapest, the Stalinist editor had the audacity to write:

"We did not publish Peter Fryer's first report because it was an unbalanced estimate of the past 11 years and not an objective account of what he saw and heard. His interpretation of what he saw and heard was even more unbalanced."

One would think, since the editor of the *Daily Worker* is blessed by second sight which enables him to know what his correspondent in Budapest is seeing and hearing, that it was a complete waste of time to send Fryer to Hungary in the first place. All the editor of the *Worker* had to do was make himself nice

More from Peter Fryer on Hungary

More details on the case of Peter Fryer, former correspondent in Hungary for the London *Daily Worker*, are provided in the Dec. issue of the *National Guardian*. Fryer, who resigned his job with the CP organ after seeing the Hungarian revolution with his own eyes, was interviewed by a London correspondent for the *Guardian*.

What he has to report shatters the Kremlin slander and all its lies about the "fascist" nature of the workers' revolution.

"It is suicide for the party to try to conceal the truth," he told the *Guardian* reporter. "I was holier than the Pope on Stalin in the past, but I cannot go against the evidence of my own eyes and ears. The party can be wrong, but I believe in it and shall stay and fight with many other comrades to make it right."

He called the Russian action "no less brutal than, say, British rule in Kenya," and said it could not be defended while "deploring British aggression in Egypt."

As example, Fryer mentioned the Babolna state farm which he visited on October 29-30, after most of the fighting

had stopped but before the Russians struck the second time. There, he said—

"A brutal director had been appointed—an iron worker with no knowledge of farming—who had recently beaten up one of the shepherds. When the rising started, the shepherd's two sons beat up the director, and workers searching the Party safe found stoolpigeon dossiers on the 'reliability' of every man and woman on the farm, which they burned.

MICROCOSM OF REVOLUTION

"I watched them electing a revolutionary committee, a council and a new director by secret ballot—a slow process because, as they explained, this was the first experience they ever had of a democratic election. At the meeting they discussed at length the question of maintaining order, of keeping food supplies moving to Budapest, and of the local CP whose liquidation one worker demanded. Communist farm workers spoke frankly of their past mistakes, and it was decided that the CP should be allowed to function as freely as any other party.

"Everything I saw confirmed that this was a microcosm of the revolution that took place throughout Hungary. Fascist elements, of course, were trying to take advantage of the situation, but nothing indicated that they had any chance of gaining ascendancy.

"I can't say categorically that there was no white terror anywhere, but I do say that the power was overwhelmingly in the hands of revolutionary committees such as the one at Babolna. Such was the situation at Csepel, a real proletarian center which put up a heroic fight against the Germans and fascists in past years and which resisted Soviet troops to the end.

"The same with the miners at Tata-banya—a pampered group if any one was in Hungary—who rose to a man against the AVH secret police. AVH men were being strung up by the infuriated people as soon as they were caught, but Bruce Renton is correct when he writes in the *New Statesman & Nation* that there was no mass lynching party and Communists continued to walk about freely.

"The fact is that leading positions in the Hungarian CP were filled with careerists—some of them ex-fascists—who were in the party merely to feather their own nests, and who simply crumbled up after the uprising. The other party people—perhaps half of them, but of course I don't know the exact proportion—joined the uprising and fought the Russians.

"The *Worker* is being absolutely shabby when it says that it would have been inhuman for Soviet troops not to intervene. It was a question of whether or not to have confidence in the people."

Readers Take the Floor

A British friend who is active in supporting the Labor left-wingers who put out the *Socialist Review* in London writes us about the new possibilities that have opened up in England in winning over Communist Party members to a revolutionary socialist position. Then, referring to the *Socialist Review*, he writes:

Our progress here in the last months has been quite exceptional. More people have been jolted into political thought during this period than in any comparable time for a very long while. The benefit we reap from it is only limited by the meagerness of our manpower and financial resources. We have been practically cleaned out of all our literature and are trying desperately to hurry out reprints of Cliff's book [*Stalinist Russia, A Marxist Analysis*] and Kidron's pamphlet [*Automation*] . . .

I think I should mention, by the way, that LABOR ACTION has been very, very useful to us in our work. We have found that it makes a very good impression even on people who are not yet ready to accept fully our ideas. Time and time again we've had newcomers to whom we have shown it say: this is the sort of paper we need here. They are impressed by its seriousness, the simplicity and straightforwardness of its language, the meatiness of its articles. Our only regret is that we can't use it organizationally on a larger scale because, naturally, it is very much an American paper.

Clark Reveals Truth on Those '60,000 Fascists'

In the *Daily Worker* for Dec. 4 there is a postscript on the Stalinist claim that "60,000 fascists infiltrated Hungary via the Austrian border." The *DW* had previously confessed it had garnered this little statistic from the London *Daily Worker* (see last week's *LA*).

Now Foreign Editor Joe Clark, in the course of a vigorous polemic against Eugene Dennis, tells more about this "fact."

"Now, the story of the 60,000 appeared in the *DW* via my typewriter and it was picked up from the London *Daily Worker*. The dispatch in question did not come from Hungary because at that time the Budapest correspondent of the London *Daily Worker* [Peter Fryer] couldn't get his on-the-spot reports into his paper. It was based on dispatches from Prague, which mentioned 60,000 as the total number of persons who crossed the Austrian-Hungarian border over a period of months. These included all tourists, delegations and persons whose politics ranged from Communist to Fascist. [Italics added.]

"To cite this as evidence that the 800,000 members of the Hungarian Communist Part and the millions of organized Hungarian workers and the Hungarian army of 250,000 could not prevent fascism is to deny facts and the class struggle."

Note that this is an open accusation that the editors of the London *Daily Worker* had forged the news item in their own staffroom, since Clark now states that the Prague news item said something different.

This gives a final blow to the 60,000-fascist question, and simultaneously rips the lid off on what in the whole past has been standard operating procedure for all Stalinist sheets.

Nehru's Motive

Apropos of our comments on "Nehru's Infamy" (Nov. 19):

"Members of Mr. Nehru's party... said what might seem to be backing-and-filling abroad was really in line with Mr. Nehru's policy of trying to keep on the best possible terms with both sides. Mr. Nehru himself said in his speech: 'We have become a link between peoples who do not have such links. It is a service we can perform...' (N. Y. Times, New Delhi dispatch, Nov. 21.)

It documents our contention that Nehru turned his back on the Hungarian people because of the policy of neutralism (the 1½ Camp), which makes it impossible for him to fight consistently against the two imperialist camps he wants to reconcile.

and cozy in London, and then use his occult powers to write first hand accounts of what was happening in Hungary.

The editor of the *Worker* overlooked the fact—when accusing Fryer of sending dispatches—that only a couple of weeks before he had been praising Fryer to the skies. When he was making an appeal for funds to send Fryer to Hungary, he then wrote:

"*Daily Worker* readers know Fryer's reputation as an experienced and skilled reporter. No one is better qualified for such an assignment."

The tragic rape of Hungary has therefore, once again, demonstrated to the workers here the ability of the British Stalinists to turn double somersaults in order to excuse the tyranny of their bosses in the Kremlin.

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

December 10, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 50

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

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

Order ALL your books from Labor Action Book Service, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE MONTGOMERY BUS BOYCOTT—

Launch 'Enroll for Freedom' Campaign

By EDWARD HILL

On Wednesday, December 5, at a concert in New York on the first anniversary of the Montgomery bus boycott, a nation-wide student campaign for civil rights was announced.

The campaign will be under the sponsorship of an ad hoc student committee in New York which developed out of the youth mobilization for the Montgomery Anniversary Concert. The honorary chairman of "Enroll for Freedom" is the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., the leader of the Montgomery Improvement Association. The campaign will be under the auspices of "In Friendship," a new organization set up to provide economic relief for victims of the racist terror in the South. ("In Friendship" also sponsored the December 5 concert.)

On campuses throughout the nation, ad hoc working committees will be formed. The aim of the campaign is to obtain signatures for a petition which will be presented to President Eisenhower on Lincoln's Birthday. Each signer will pay 25 cents, which will be given over to "In Friendship" for its work in the South.

The Enroll for Freedom campaign is particularly oriented toward the role of students in the struggle for civil rights. The petition begins with a reference to the expulsion of students and professors

from the State College at Orangeburg, South Carolina, and it emphasizes throughout that the question of integrating schools is one which demands the support of every student in the United States.

As projected by the New York committee, Enroll for Freedom will be a broad campaign. Special attention will be given to the work of contacting various religious youth organizations on campuses, and also to involving as many Negro colleges as possible in the joint effort.

SEEK BROAD MOVEMENT

The various local committees of Enroll for Freedom will be working bodies, agreeing only on the campaign itself, and composed of the widest possible student representation. Leaders from NAACP youth chapters, liberal student organizations, pacifist and socialist groups have already been brought into the work of the campaign. As it proceeds, it is hoped that this base can be broadened, and that Enroll for Freedom can become a mass student movement.

Because of the nature of the campaign, the committees will not be representational (composed of representatives of student organizations on a proportional basis). They are, as noted before, ad hoc groupings. But the endorsement of

various youth groups is being sought.

The National Action Committee of the Young Socialist League has announced its wholehearted support of Enroll for Freedom, and has alerted all members and friends of YSL throughout the country to do as much as they possibly can for the campaign.

It has been a long time since the American campus has seen a truly national campaign. Several years back, *Challenge* reported on the "Green Feather" movement, a spontaneous anti-McCarthy grouping which began in the Midwest and spread throughout the United States. But the Green Feather campaign had little or no orientation; it was more a matter of civil-libertarian, anti-McCarthy sentiment.

Although Enroll for Freedom is a broad campaign, it aims at having a specific content: its main demand is for steady, democratic implementation of the Supreme Court decision by the federal government, and it will be directed to the president.

At this stage, the main emphasis is on organizing Enroll for Freedom committees. All interested students should write to: Enroll for Freedom, c/o In Friendship, 122 East 57 Street, New York City.

If the campaign is successful, it is possible that a series of meetings can be held throughout the nation on Lincoln's Birthday, or even that some kind of National Student Conference on Civil Rights may be held on that date. At any rate, the problem now is to organize the campaign. All democrats should give it their support.

TEXT OF PETITION

Lincoln's Birthday, 1956

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:

We enroll for freedom. We affirm that civil rights is the responsibility of the whole nation, of democracy itself.

At Orangeburg, South Carolina, students and teachers at the State College have been expelled for standing up for civil rights. As students of different colors, religious and political convictions, we say: We stand with them, and with the Negroes of Montgomery, of Tallahassee, of the thousands of cities and towns in which this struggle goes on day by day.

As students, we take particular pride in supporting the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in public education. We call for the steady, democratic implementation of this decision by the federal government.

As a token of our conviction, each of us is contributing 25 cents. This money will be used by In Friendship, an organization which aids anyone who suffers in the struggle for Civil Rights, regardless of color, as part of their general fund.

Mr. President, we enroll for freedom. To us, civil rights is basic to the challenge of democracy itself, it is the responsibility of every one of us. In this, we do not seek to "help" our Negro fellow-students and fellow-men, but rather to join with them in our common cause of freedom.

Budapest to Madrid: Revolution Is Contagious

The following important dispatch appeared in the Los Angeles Mirror-News, Nov. 27, its Madrid correspondent, Richard Mowrer.

By RICHARD MOWRER

MADRID, Nov. 27—Here as elsewhere the Hungarian revolt against Communist oppression has excited admiration and respect. But within the Franco regime itself these very genuine sentiments are tinged with uneasiness. For the convulsions in Eastern Europe have had the effect of firing Spanish students and intellectuals with a stronger determination to press for less authoritarianism and more liberty in their own country.

"They're making us look like a bunch of cowards!" a student of Madrid University exclaimed during a discussion with this writer of the Hungarians' fight for freedom. "We, too, want democratization of our regime. But what have we done to bring this about? So far very little. And we Spaniards don't even have a foreign intruder to contend with."

That these views are shared by a good many Spaniards, particularly among the youth, was confirmed a few days later by the backwash of Soviet military repression in Hungary. Throughout the free world indignation and revulsion over Russian interference and brutality took the form of large-scale and sometimes violent street demonstrations. In Spain similar sentiments sought expression.

But if public manifestations of anger were less explosive here than in other countries it was not because Madrid has no Communist Party headquarters to smash or Communist embassies to stone.

It was because the Franco regime, correctly evaluating the rebellious mood of the students took extraordinary police precautions to prevent any but officially sanctioned demonstrations from building up. The authorities were and are determined not to allow a repetition of last winter's street clashes between liberal-minded students and regime-supporting Falangists. Nor did they want to be confronted with demonstrations starting out anti-Communist and winding up pro-democracy.

As it turned out one meeting called in favor of Hungary degenerated into a denunciation of the police. Members of the Catholic Action youth organization had gathered in a private hall, made speeches, and then poured out into the street shouting, "Down With the Russians!" The police, zealously following standing orders to break up all demonstrations, charged with swinging truncheons. As the scuffle developed the Russians were forgotten and shouts were taken up of "Down with the police!" Later it was admitted that the police had been precipitate.

As Franco Spain has repeatedly proclaimed its hostility to Communism an outright ban on all demonstrations in support of Hungary was out of the question. So an officially approved parade consisting of several hundred youths waving Spanish and Hungarian flags was allowed to march through downtown Madrid flanked by the gray-coated Policia Armada. At the headquarters building of the Falange a large Hungarian banner was flown at half-mast and the assembled crowd chanted, "Viva Hungaria!"

The following day Madrid papers made much of the fact that the youths

had demonstrated "in a correct manner." They all carried an oddly identical word-for-word account of the event which said, in part:

"It is to be noted that the students began their march after classes so as not to affect in the slightest their work at the university. . . . The demonstrators dispersed in the most correct manner, giving by their conduct an exemplary impression of enthusiasm, order, and work which has profoundly impressed the people of Madrid."

AGAINST KADAR-FRANCO

But in Barcelona students were demonstrating in a not so correct manner. Under cover of manifestations of solidarity with Hungary they took sideswipes at the Franco regime by parading banners which carried these slogans in large letters: "WE STUDENTS DEMAND LIBERTY! WE ARE AGAINST DICTATORSHIP!" and under these appeals, in words so small as to be barely discernible, was added the afterthought: "For Hungary!" The authorities' reaction was to close the University of Barcelona.

Nothing of this has been reported in the government-controlled press. Neither have the endeavors by students of Madrid University to stage similar demonstrations. Massive mobilization of police supported by fire trucks armed with batteries of high-pressure hoses effectively scattered concentrations of youths in the University City district on the capital's outskirts before they could get near enough to town to be heard.

Meanwhile, clandestine leaflets are being circulated addressed to Spain's university youth and calling on them to show "active solidarity with the heroic

students of Hungary who are fighting for liberty." The leaflets say:

"The heroic rebellion of the Hungarian people in defense of man's essential liberties is being suppressed in rivers of blood by a tyrannical power assisted by foreign troops. All the countries of the civilized world have condemned this aggression. By showing their solidarity with the Hungarians they have reasserted those freedoms which are the heritage of honor: freedom of religion according to one's own conscience, freedom of association, freedom of expression, free labor unions."

"The Hungarians have won the respect and support of the Spanish people who have also experienced tyranny, the horrors of civil war, hunger, and the suppression of liberty. Students of Spain! Support the Hungarian students who are giving their lives in the name of those very ideals for which we are struggling. In the East and in the West there resounds today a unanimous call to liberty. Long live the fight of the Hungarian people! Down with tyranny! Down with police states based on terror and the rule of silence! Down forever with all dictatorships which debase religion and culture, which falsify the law and falsify the truth with their controlled press! Down with Soviet tyranny! Down with all tyrannies!"

[In conclusion, Mowrer points out that in Spain, as in Hungary, students have been in the lead of anti-Franco dissent.]

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION—
\$1 a year for Student Subs

**'THE NEEDLE ON THE METER'
GAUGES THE GOMULKA REGIME**

The Polish Revolution And 'Polycentrism'

By HAL DRAPER

During the period after the 20th Congress when he was still raising questions about the Khrushchev revelations, Italian CP leader Togliatti tossed on the table a phrase about a new "polycentrism" for the world Communist movement: Henceforth there should not be one center of Stalinism (Moscow) but more than one, to which Stalinists should look for example, guidance, etc.

At this time, no doubt, Togliatti was referring to Yugoslavia as one of the "centers." At the same time there were questioning elements in lesser CPs, such as the American, which began to look to Togliatti himself as an alternative "center"—i.e., a rallying point for asserting a certain measure of autonomy from Moscow.

Since then, of course, Togliatti and his party leadership have shifted over toward a return to the old-line Muscovite monocentrism to which they are accustomed; but our present story is not about Togliatti; so we leave him and follow the course of the Stalinist "polycentrism" to which he gave a name.

The idea ought to be disentangled from its associated elements of democratization, liberalization, de-Stalinization, etc.

The first thing that "polycentrism" demands is that the CP in each country (with or without its own Stalinist state) should not be slavishly bound by every decree or whim of the Moscow leadership. It is an elementary aspect of any attempt to create a national-Stalinism. Tito was forced to work out his national-Stalinism without any alternative "polycenter" (to invent a useful solecism). But for the shaken Communist Party tendencies of today, at least those that are trying to wipe off some of the taint of the Russian blood-bath in Hungary, there is a question of finding a suitable replacement for the Moscow cynosure.

What new polycenter shall questioning Communists orient themselves toward? This points to an important element in the present ferment of thought in and around the Communist movement.

TUG-OF-WAR OVER TITO

The first obvious candidate, as for Togliatti, was Tito's Yugoslavia. As a matter of fact, Moscow itself officially okayed the role of Belgrade as an alternative polycenter when Khrushchev & Co., after their dramatic reconciliation with Tito, put the Kremlin stamp of approval on the "Yugoslav road to socialism" as an alternative road to Stalinism. The catalog now read:

Socialism, road to, Yugoslav—limited use authorized in tight spots.

Officially, this catalog item is still in stock, but in practice its most enthusiastic users have been not the CP party-liners but the would-be dissidents—in the U. S., for instance, not the Fosterites but the Gatesites. It is a blurred line, however, for especially since Tito's speech at Pula, the former has been quoting Tito against those who would defend the Hungarian revolution and who would question the tale of the "fascists" who took over the freedom fight. (See for example the letter in the Dec. 4 *Daily Worker* by party hack Phil Bart.)

While the hacks try to club the dissidents with these excerpts from the new Yugoslav gospel, the dissidents are understandably sympathetic to Tito's vigorous criticism of the "mistakes" of Russian policy which he is willing to oppose (essentially "mistakes" on how to repress freedom in Hungary, but that's another matter).

So there is a sort of rivalry for the image of Tito, which is itself a reflection of the Tito-ward polycentric tendency in the CP. For the party liners it is a defensive maneuver: the aim is to show that Tito after all bolsters the Moscow line. It is only the dissidents who try to set up Tito as a real polycenter, i.e., as representing something different from Moscow.

Thus in the same Dec. 4 *Daily Worker*, foreign editor Joe Clark (who is reputedly Gates' brain-trust) tears into Eugene Dennis to show that Dennis approves any criticism of Russia only after the Russians themselves have made such criticism. He gives three examples; the second concerns Yugoslavia. In effect he is saying that he, Clark, really likes Tito, whereas Dennis only pretends to on orders from Moscow. Tito is mine, Clark insists, clasping him to his bosom.

There is a real need being gratified there. The need is for an alternative polycenter if one is going to go in for polycentrism.

MAO IS NOT AVAILABLE

There is another possible polycenter which might seem to be available for the catalog: Mao's China, which has certainly been functioning as a national-Stalinism rather than a mere puppet.

For a moment, indeed, it even seemed as if Peiping was going to speak out independently on the East European upsurge, but the moment was soon over. Peiping

joined the chorus reviling the Hungarian people. It does not seem to be concerned with offering itself as a polycenter—for the Occidental Stalinist movement.

(That is because it is interested in being the regional boss of the Oriental sector of the Stalinist world, and does not want to jeopardize its efforts in this direction by muscling in on Moscow's territory; just as, according to credible reports, Tito promised to hold up Moscow's hand in Poland, Czechoslovakia and East Germany in exchange for regional hegemony in the Balkans.)

So Stalinist China is not a very useful candidate for polycenter as far as our corner of the world is concerned. Indeed, therefore, it is party-liners who can use it in this pseudo-role, to bolster Moscow with Mao's authority, thereby utilizing the desire for a Chinese polycenter to cram Communists' questioning back into the Moscow mold.

Thus, see the Detroit CP resolution (quoted by Ben Hall on page 2) which says in so many words: "We use the CP of China as an example in developing organizational measures..." etc. It is the hacks who write this resolution. For them "the example of the CP of China" is a sugar-coated way of standing pat on "the example" of the Russian Stalinists.

The sugar in this coating is, however, the fact that an apparent polycenter is being used as a surrogate for the Russians, whose odor even in CP nostrils is not quite as sweet as it used to be.

But even as far as genuine dissidents are concerned, China as Stalinist polycenter cannot be entirely written off with confidence. Tito went through this whole process with Mao, too, beginning 1948. Rejected by Moscow, he launched an ardent courtship to win Peiping. He never got anywhere, and the sheep's-eyes he cast eastward met a stony stare. Yet, as far as I know, even the Yugoslavs have not given up hope, even though the real possibilities probably depend on Russian-Chinese relations in areas that will not be affected by Occidental Stalinist aspirations.

WARSAW TO THE FORE

In any case, Belgrade or Peiping as polycenters might have been made-do after the 20th Congress, but for many CP dissidents they are no longer entirely adequate for the era launched by the Hungarian Revolution.

For one thing, as we have mentioned, both Yugoslavia and China have endorsed the "necessity" of the brutal Russian massacre in Hungary; though Tito continues to chide the Russians for having made this "necessity" necessary.

Perhaps more important, however: the notion of polycentrism, which we have been considering in its disentangled form, has usually in actual fact been entangled with illusions or pretensions or hopes of genuine democratization. And these illusions, etc. have suffered cruel blows as far as Tito and Mao are concerned. Replacement is needed.

Just as it was hoped that Tito's national-Stalinism was really not a Stalinism at all but a step on the road of introducing genuine socialist democracy from above, and just as this hope accumulated a host of myths around it for eight years, so also the new polycentric tendency is inevitably associated with hopes and desires for democratization by the Stalinist regimes.

The fact that these hopes and desires exist is, in part, a healthy thing. They are part of the notable stirrings in the Communist ranks. They will become even healthier when they break out of the limitations of the Stalinist framework. Meanwhile we note the outstanding result, at this time, of the tendency we are considering:

It is the elevation of Gomulka's Warsaw to leading candidate for polycenter among Communists who are leaning toward independence from Moscow.

THE "POLISH WAY"

"The Polish way" of Stalinism has become a last stand for two kinds of CPers who are by no means identical:

(1) Stalinist hacks who find it clever to put the spotlight on "the Polish way" of that Stalinist regime which is at present least compromised and least tainted by the discreditment of the movement and its system.

One of the hallmarks of this breed is that the "Polish way" is counterposed to, and used in association with the vicious slandering of, the "Hungarian way" of revolution for socialist freedom against Stalinism.

(2) Disturbed and questioning Communist Party followers who are, however, not yet ready to hail the Hungarian Revolution unreservedly, and who are willing to be convinced that Gomulka is going the same way except more wisely, more cleverly, and in a manner which the Russians do not or cannot object to; and that he is in the "irreversible" process of getting peacefully from the Russians what the Hungarian people are fighting for.

This is also a common thesis in Stalinoid circles, and it trickles down to quarters that are influenced by Stalinoid rationalizations, like the Bevanites. (At the De-

cember 3 symposium reported on in this issue, q.v., it was nearly the only thing Paul Sweezy had to say.)

The most remarkable thing about this thesis is the degree of sheer stupidity it ascribes to the Russians—who will presumably stand by, fuming helplessly, while Gomulka so-cleverly leads Poland to socialist freedom and independence. Or else, as often, it assumes that the Russians themselves are willing, indeed anxious, to bring these blessings to Poland and were reluctantly dissuaded from following this beneficent course in Hungary too only because the Hungarians wanted to go too fast and because those 60,000 "fascists" took over singing The Star-Spangled Banner.

But we leave a discussion of the thesis itself in order to continue to follow the subject of the new Polish focus of polycentrism, namely, the manufacture of the new myths about the "Polish way."

GIGANTIC DIFFERENCE

Thus in the *Daily Worker* a typical letter by William Mandel counterposes Poland to Hungary and tries to start a new myth:

"Poland, not Hungary, should be the center of attention for all socialist-minded people at present... the events in Hungary will win no one to socialism... The events in Poland will win people to socialism. Here, for the first time in history, in a country that has socialized its industries, but conducts its Parliament, its newspapers, its courts of justice, in the manner that Western peoples consider democratic."

Now this claim is not true, of course; it is the sort of myth about democratic achievements which was so often made about Tito-Yugoslavia every time a new story was handed out; and the coming Polish election is being rigged as a Stalinist-controlled election.

But with respect to this attempt to counterpose the "Polish way" to the "Hungarian way" in order to set up Gomulka-Poland as the new polycenter, we have to put the spotlight not on the essential social identity of Gomulka's Stalinist regime and Tito's Stalinist regime, but rather on a big difference.

The difference is simple, and gigantic:

Gomulka's "Titoism" is trying to ride out and bridle a revolution. Tito did not have that problem, and the impact of his break with Moscow was not decisively determined by any such fact.

In its time (1948 and after) Tito's falling-out with Russia was tremendously important for the anti-Stalinist perspective. Nobody was ahead of us in hailing its disintegrative effect on Stalinism at the same time that no one so painstakingly explained why Titoism remained within the framework of Stalinism, national-Stalinism.

Today, having exhausted its objectively disintegrative function, Titoism offers a half-way house for Stalinoids, dubious Stalinists, Deutscherites and others of the ilk who want to hang on to every essential of Stalinism while at the same time they dissociate themselves from, or draw a pace away from, the open brutality and imperialism of Moscow.

But Gomulka-1956 does not and cannot play the role that Tito-1948 played in a different era.

The perspective for Poland today, and the meaning of the Gomulka "Titoist" regime, cannot be mechanically read off in terms of the Yugoslav development.

The minor, but still important, reason is that Poland is still under the hammer of Russian troops quartered over the land, and as long as it is thus occupied, however "voluntarily," the possibilities are differently conditioned.

THE FLAMES BELOW

The major and all-important reason, however, is that Gomulka comes to power as an interim stage of a massive, stormy revolutionary upsurge from below, whereas the Tito break came solely from above, on the initiative of Moscow, with no relation to mass-motion below. In Yugoslavia the role of the masses was only to applaud and yell "Hero-Tito!"

But since Gomulka is riding and bridling a revolution, the perspective for Poland is determined by this—that is, determined not by the "Titoists" on top but by the revolution which they are riding and bridling.

This is the heart of the "Polish way," which is not a "way" at all but rather a state of dynamic equilibrium—between the revolution which is trying to find its path, and the Stalinist masters who work to keep their own rule intact while at the same time using the threat from below to exact concessions from the Moscow overlords for the national-Stalinist bureaucracy, concessions which at the same time help to keep the revolution from boiling over.

Behind the uneasy balance of the present equilibrium in Poland, what is bubbling and heaving and churning is—the "Hungarian Way."

It churns to the surface here and there like a steam blow-hole in Yellowstone:

"A quarrel over pushing in a movie queue in Bydgoszcz this week, for example, quickly became a street demonstration of several hundred young people shouting anti-Soviet slogans. They burned a radio station that had been used for jamming but was being put into operation for local programs. The demonstrators roamed the streets for many hours unchecked by local security forces. Troops had to be brought into the town to restore order."—*N. Y. Times*, Nov. 25, from Warsaw.

This was not presented as a sensational report out of Poland; it was on page 42 at the top-end of an article headlined "Poles May Free Church Schools."

You catch a glimpse of the "Hungarian Way," still breathing fire down the neck of the Gomulka regime, the same fire that flared out in Poznan, and that flamed forth in October in the mass street actions and demonstrations from Warsaw to Wroclaw.

(Turn to last page)

Two Jewish Groups Speak Out Against Attack on Egypt

Jewish Bund Raps Israel's Path

The international committee heading the Jewish Labor Bund, meeting in New York this past month, adopted two resolutions on the crises in the Middle East and in Eastern Europe which commend themselves to the attention of all socialists.

The first resolution, on the Middle East, is particularly significant as a condemnation of Israel's invasion of Egypt (as well as that of Britain and France) by a Jewish socialist movement which approaches the question from the point of view of the real interests of the Jewish people as well as of world peace and socialist principle.

In the second resolution the Bund hails the Hungarian Revolution and makes no concessions to illusions about the new national-Stalinist regime in Poland under Gomulka.

We are glad to publish both resolutions on this page.—ED.

On Middle East

(1) In the Middle East the vital interests of many nations and countries are at stake. The Suez Canal is one of the main international waterways. The oil fields of the Arab countries are the chief source of fuel for the Western European economy. To the Jewish people this part of the world is of particular importance for one more reason: It is there that the State of Israel is located, with its over one and a half million Jews whose lives, security and future are a matter of concern and anxiety to all of us.

Egypt is ruled by a dictatorial regime. As democratic socialists, we abhor the dictatorship of Nasser no less than a dictatorship of any other brand. But democratic socialism emphatically rejects the policy of military invasions, interventions and aggressions with regard not only to the democratic countries but to the countries with other political systems as well.

At present, when a local war can set off a world-wide nuclear holocaust, every policy of military aggression is more dangerous than ever.

For Jews who suffered so grievously from wars and who lost six million people during the last world war, the maintenance of world peace is a matter of life preservation.

The Bund, moved by grave concern over the fate of all the nations and of the Jewish people joins the protests of those other democratic and socialist forces of the world which are denouncing the recent military attacks on Egypt.

These acts of violence are bound to fan the feelings of hatred toward the West among hundreds of millions of people in Asia and Africa which constitute the major part of the human race.

The events in the Middle East are grist for the mill of the hypocritical Communist policy and propaganda. The camp of Soviet imperialism has gained a new weapon.

(2) Nations which have freed themselves from colonialist oppression, or which are now in process of freeing themselves, should not become oppressors in turn. It is their duty to protect the natural rights of minorities in their countries and to respect the vital international interests and agreements. These principles apply to Algeria, Cyprus and to other countries. They also apply to the Suez Canal.

The nationalization of the Suez Canal by Egypt should not jeopardize the right of free passage for the ships of all countries without exception and should not invalidate the international character of this waterway.

The Israeli-Arab relations constitute a long chain of bloody border clashes, of attacks and counter-attacks. The State of Israel has been recently in a difficult situation because of the menacing attitude of Egypt, infiltration of the fedayeen and Soviet arms deliveries to the Arab countries. But no matter how strong may have been her sense of provocation, Israel should not have permitted herself to be pushed into the tragic error of military aggression.

We declare our opposition to such a path which the Israeli government had allowed itself to follow, in contradiction to the principles of United Nations to which Israel owes to a great extent her creation.

(3) A just and durable peace is an indispensable condition for survival of the Israel community. The British and the

French will leave Egypt before long. Britain once withdrew from the Suez Canal and she will withdraw again. But the Jews of Israel will remain where they are. The live, and they will have to live, among the Arab nations.

Neither the Israeli victory in the first round nor the victory in the present second round but only the end of all attacks from either side and the recognition of the State of Israel by the Arab states can bring about the indispensable peace. In order to achieve this purpose, both parties, Arabs as well as Israel, must be prepared to compromise, particularly in the issue of the Arab refugees.

In this spirit we support the demand of the United Nations for a cease-fire on the part of Britain, France, Israel and Egypt, and for withdrawal of foreign troops from the Egyptian territory.

We salute the British Labor Party for the stand it has taken in this tragic situation. By their courageous campaign against the government of their own country, our British comrades have set an example of devotion to the interests of their own nation, of respect for the rights of other nations and of socialist determination to combat the dangers of wars.

On East Europe

The peoples in the satellite countries are aroused and determined to shake off the yoke of Soviet slavery. The recent events in Poland and to a greater degree in Hungary show the extent of their craving for liberty and independence. "Bread and Freedom"—the slogan of the workers and the youth there—underlines the economic and the moral bankruptcy of the Communist dictatorial regimes.

(1) The new leadership of Poland, led by Gomulka, succeeded in arresting temporarily the struggle for freedom by means of some democratic and liberal reforms. But Poland's fight for real democracy and freedom will not end as long as the government of Poland is usurped by Communists, as long as there exists a one-party rule which is the cornerstone of dictatorship.

The end of dictatorship even in its mildest disguise, the victory of democratic socialism will increase the standard of living, insure personal liberty and uproot anti-Semitic tendencies among the Poles. Only in a Poland free of Soviet army divisions could the government become a true exponent of its peoples will to build a new way of life based on liberty and independence, on truly democratic and socialist foundations.

(2) We express our admiration for the people of Hungary which fights heroically for freedom and independence. The mass demonstrations against the Soviet army in Hungary and their domestic Communist hirelings, the heroic armed resistance waged by the Hungarian workers and toilers, and supported by the Hungarian army who embraced the cause of the people, are proofs of the unrelenting hatred toward Communist dictatorship and Communist occupation.

The long weeks of the general strike against the Soviet panzer divisions has demonstrated the unshaken will of the Hungarian workers to live as free men. The tens of thousands of victims from the Soviet army bullets emphasize the horror and the brutality of the Communist usurpers. We pay homage to the heroic warriors and martyrs who fell in the fight for freedom.

Together with socialists and democrats the world over we demand that the Soviet armies should stop the murderous deportations of Hungarian youth, return the already deported to their homes and should immediately leave Hungary and other satellite countries.

(3) The revolt of national-Communists in Poland against foreign interference, the armed uprising of the Hungarian population, the endeavors of the Communist Parties in the free world to escape Moscow's chaperonage and other similar manifestations—are signs of the ideological bankruptcy of the Communist movement. The Soviet colonial empire, which is based on terror, slavery and merciful exploitation of the subjugated people, is disintegrating.

Labor plays a most vital part in the expanding fight for freedom waged by all classes of the population. General strikes were the nucleus and the base of the mass struggle against Communist dictatorship in East Berlin, Poznan, Budapest and in scores of other industrial centers behind the Iron Curtain. They emphasized the anti-labor sub-

stance of Communist totalitarianism.

The severest of anti-Communist uprisings—the Hungarian revolution—has revealed the innate weakness of the Communist murder-regime and the immense powers of a population which has decided to break the chains of slavery and to fight for its freedom.

(4) After the holocaust of World War II, only small remnants of the once thriving Jewish communities remained in Poland and in Hungary. Fascists and anti-Semites as well as Stalinist elements in both countries endeavor to shunt the wrath of the population against the small number of Jews which survived Hitler's gas chambers and Stalin's slave-labor camps. It is an old trick to drown peoples wrath against their rulers in the blood of the Jews. But human freedom and human happiness cannot be gained by means of oppressing or destroying co-citizens of a national minority.

We express our belief and our hope that the workers and toilers who wage the struggle for freedom and justice will resist the endeavors of their oppressors to mislead them on a false and tragic path.

Ichud Combats Expansionism

Outside of the two socialist anti-Zionist groups in Israel (the Israeli organization of the Jewish Labor Bund, and the "Third Force" group), there is only one group in Israel which has taken a consistently democratic stand for the rights of the Israeli Arab minority within the country and for Jewish-Arab rapprochement in external relations. This is the *Ichud*.

The *Ichud* [Unity] Association is the organization that was founded by Judah L. Magnes to uphold, within the framework of the Zionist movement, the ideal of justice toward the Arab people. Although there has always been much lip-service to this ideal in the Zionist movement, the *Ichud* is the only wing that sticks by it. It is true that the *Ichud* is not a power in the life of Israel, being a small group primarily of intellectuals not involved in politics, and it is therefore often derided by cynics as "visionaries," but the voice of these visionaries is a genuinely liberal and democratic one. We Independent Socialists would put many things differently—for instance, *Ichud's* hopes for the UN—but most important is that there is another honest voice out of Israel.

Following is the bulk of the resolution adopted by the Council of *Ichud*, in Jerusalem, Nov. 15, "A Peace Program for Israel."

The [*Ichud*] Council met at a time of great tension both at home and on the international scene, brought about by the hostilities between Israel and Egypt on the one hand and England and France on the other. The Council marked with sorrow and distress the sad fact that Israel had involved itself in action with powers bent on the exploitation of backward peoples and had thereby laid itself open to being called a tool in the hands of these powers.

England and France will leave the Near East sooner or later, either voluntarily or under duress, but we live in the midst of it and all our hopes are here. Reckless and adventure-seeking action is bound to bring upon us untold trouble for generations to come.

Israel's only way out of its present position is to obey world opinion as expressed by the resolutions of the United Nations and to cooperate wholeheartedly and willingly with the efforts of the UN and its representatives to end the war "without victors and vanquished." This is the first step toward the clearance of the many and difficult obstacles from the road to peace in our region. It is regrettable that Israel only then declared, that it did not intend to keep the conquered territories, when pressure was brought on her by the U. S. and Russia.

The Council expresses the hope that the International Force of the UN, which now will separate the armies of Israel and Egypt, will firmly establish itself as the Army of Peace in a troubled and unbalanced world hastening toward utter destruction. If this Force had been established in 1948 and had come to the Near East to implement the resolutions of the UN it could have saved the lives of many thousands who fell victim to the war of the Arab States against the young State of Israel and it could have prevented the outbreak of hatred of these peoples against the Jews.

The Government of Israel must turn the policy which was forced upon it into

one accepted by it of its own free will and fulfil the destiny which its position in this region and the status of our people in the world impose upon it—to be the pillar of peace and justice in the Near East and the world. It is the sacred duty of all Israeli citizens and Jews the world over to encourage the government to travel this road.

It is not sufficient to fulfil the decrees of the UN, but we and especially our government must stop using such irredentist expressions as "liberation and redemption" with respect to all those parts of Eretz Israel which are beyond the frontiers of the State of Israel. On the contrary, the government must declare unequivocally that she has no expansionist intentions now or in future.

The government should propose to the UN that the political status of the Gaza Strip should be decided by the free will of its inhabitants, as expressed in a "plebiscite" to be held under the auspices of the UN. The attitude of the State of Israel toward its Arab citizens will strongly affect the outcome of such a plebiscite.

The Council marks with satisfaction that, in spite of the hostilities and the tension, nothing was heard of clashes or trouble between Jews and Arabs in the daily life in Israel or in the Arab States. It is this fact which strengthens our hope that Jews and Arabs will at some time find a way to rapprochement and peace for the good of the region and its inhabitants.

YOU'RE INVITED

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

Poland and 'Polycentrism' — —

(Continued from page 6)

It is the bridled Polish revolution that is pushing the Gomulka regime to maneuvers and concessions in order to hang on.

In this connection we would like to repeat and underline an analogy which we made in *LA* last April, in connection with the then new-blooming expectations aroused by Khrushchev's anti-Stalin revelations, and the "rehabilitations" that were then going on.

"The limits of the Khrushchev reforms are the limits of the Stalinist system as a system," we wrote in "Stalinism Without Stalin" (April 2), but "these limits are not rigid, any more than under capitalism."

There followed some examples of how capitalist regimes bend and make apparently vital concessions under the im-

pulsion of radicalization or discontent from below. For the rest of the analogy, change Russia to Poland:

"We have here a jury-rigged meter to register and measure the elusive social category called internal revolutionary strain.

"In the next period, use this meter on the Russian regime, where (unlike the capitalist cases cited above) we cannot look into the 'works' but can mainly keep our eye, from the outside, on the 'needle' as it registers....

"Let us put it as sharply as possible: let them rehabilitate Trotsky, let them raise a monument to the victims of the Moscow Trials, let them promise or write or pass any number of new laws or constitutions or scraps of paper about democratic rights, let them even repeal some

of the more horrible and hair-raising provisions of the Russian penal code and factory legislation, etc.—and it will mean only that they are shaking before the specter of the coming Russian Revolution, i.e., that the needle on the meter is in the red zone, unless and until such maneuvers to appease discontent are accompanied by revolutionary steps to democratize the whole socio-political structure: which means, to begin with, steps to permit open and organized political opposition."

In Poland the needle is in the red zone.

We do not know of course which way it will go from there, but we do know that the specter which haunts the Polish "polycenter" is the "Hungarian Way." This is the beginning of all analysis of Poland today.

Labor and CP Discussion — —

(Continued from page 2)

proach to Auto Workers." Wellman functions under the handicap of his own illusions.

He thinks that the answer to his problem lies in some minor tactical shift inside the UAW; but the CP has been defeated, for good, because UAW militants recognize that in all its twists and turns one guiding line dominated: the interests of Russian policy as applied to the U. S. scene.

This fundamental fact has yet to penetrate the wall of Wellman's mind even slightly.

As he puts it, the recent line of "left-sectarianism" maintained that "The main enemy was Reuther and Reutherism, and we called for his isolation and defeat. Objectively, this line obscured who was and how to meet the main enemy of the peace and democratic forces—namely, auto monopoly. Ford, GM, Chrysler."

But now he sees it clearly! Not Reuther but the auto companies is the main enemy of auto workers! To reach this brilliant conclusion which everyone, except the deluded members of the CP, always took for granted, Wellman must have spent the last four years in a post-graduate course on labor problems. Or perhaps he merely attended a brief lecture on Post-Khrushchevism.

At any rate, he is cured: "The last remnants of our left-sectarian approach to the UAW leadership must now be eliminated. The Reuther policy has gradually changed from 1953 to date in the direction of a more consistent middle-road progressive course." And now, the "objective of the Left in the UAW" must be "placed in the context of a united UAW cooperating from top to bottom to solve these questions in the course of struggle against the companies and extreme reaction."

But what about the CP line during the war, before Reuther became UAW president? That too comes in for "re-consideration." Fourteen years after, Wellman lets out what everyone realized at the time:

"We impermissibly supported piece-work, while ignoring war-profiteering; neglected the united front of struggle on shop grievances by methods short of strike action; and were satisfied in merely tailing behind FDR and Phil Murray."

And what was the basis for these "mistakes"? It is simple: "Our correct win-the-war line was executed in a wrong way, due to the rightist policies of Browder." Poor Mr. Browder!

We cite these reports from Detroit as examples of old-line Stalinist breast-beating upon command from above. While the CP is plunged into a crisis of fundamentals, while the relation between it and the Kremlin dictatorship is re-examined, Wellman is busy with new tactical devices. It will do him no good!

It is not a matter of "left-sectarianism"; it is not a question of "Browderism"; what is at stake is the underlying motive of any and every policy. CP auto workers must reject the basic line of supporting Kremlin dictatorship. That will be the start of a genuinely new period.

in Moscow today! How differently Russia could deal with its rebellious satellites and protect its legitimate interests if they saw in Moscow new faces they could trust!"

UNITED FRONT

While the Stalinists were doing their best to spread the slander that "fascists" had taken over the Hungarian Revolution, therefore impelling Russian intervention, in New York City the genuinely fascist wing of the Hungarian emigration raised its head.

A meeting on Nov. 24 was sponsored by an "Emergency Committee on Arms to Hungary," supported by (1) "the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Hungarian Section," and (2) the magazine *Contemporary Issues*.

The ABN is notoriously pro-fascist. The magazine is something else again.

Shachtman Tilts with D.W. Editor — —

(Continued from page 3)

day. . . . After again playing the record about Poland and Hungary, he wound up: "How do you determine the will of the Soviet people? I don't know. I hope they will evolve in a direction where there can be institutional devices. . . ."

Gates followed two tacks for his reply:

(1) Do elections really reflect will of the people here in the U. S. . . . "It's not so simple," he echoed.

(2) How is the will of the people shown in Russia? They expressed their will through the revolution . . . through defeating the interventionist armies . . . through industrializing the country . . . through developing its military strength . . . and so on in this vein. "Can the Russian people express themselves fully? No, they cannot." "The next great advance" will be to "build democratic institutions to correspond to their industrial base."

In the course of giving the above series of acts showing the "will of the people," Gates included: "when the CPSU through full discussion over a period of several years disagreed with Trotsky's policies, defeated him, and he was removed from power."

At this whopper, Shachtman interjected: "not only removed from power, but removed from the power to breathe!" Gates paused and replied: "That is a conjecture. Shachtman knows as much about that as I do, and he has no proof." Gates made no other reference to, let alone any attack on, Trotsky or Trotskyism or Trotskyists.

Chairman Muste then turned the floor back to Shachtman, who sewed up the point about democracy and Stalinism: You have an answer for Spain (referring to Sweezy's know-nothing pose), you have an answer for Egypt, for every

other country under dictatorship, where you advocate the overthrow of the dictator and the establishment of democratic institution—but not for the Stalinist dictatorships.

He concretized the evaded question: In Russia do you favor the right to issue a publication condemning Foster's line, or Khrushchev's? the right to hold a meeting in Moscow where you could make the same speech you made here? . . . etc. You can't determine the "will of the people" where the people don't even have as much rights as in "this miserable bourgeois democracy of the U. S."

THOSE FASCISTS AGAIN

As the chairman began presenting the panel with written questions from the floor, the first question, addressed to Sweezy, elicited another plain-Joe performance.

The question asked, "Has U. S. foreign policy been responsible for crimes and excesses of Stalinism . . .?" and obviously invited discussion of the relation between the two. Sweezy snapped the one word "Certainly" in ostentatious taciturnity, and sat back. This reporter began to suspect that he'd have been happier if he'd stood in bed.

A question challenged Shachtman on his "underestimation" of the "counter-revolutionary element in Hungary." The reply covered some of the material on that point that *LA* readers are familiar with, and the ISL chairman stressed: "Who makes the charge about 'fascists' in Hungary? The same people who said Tito was a fascist . . . the same people who said Hitler was their comrade when they signed the Hitler-Stalin pact. . . . We have a right to be skeptical."

Another question asked Sweezy to cite his evidence that Hungary might have

gone fascist, as he claimed to believe. In part Sweezy began to sound like W. Z. Foster: "Plenty of evidence . . . Mindszenty back in triumph. . . . The church was the only organized force [no mention of the Workers Councils! . . .] but then he reverted to the Will Rogers pose: "I don't know . . . I just read the New York Times like Shachtman. . . ."

"Anyway," he wound up, very revealingly, "it was natural enough, considering Hungary's past of the fascist regime. Why wouldn't it go there [to fascism], especially since the Communist regime did such a lousy job on Hungary?"

There was the unspoken assumption that it was "natural," no less, for people who hated the Stalinist tyranny to accept a fascist tyranny to replace it because the Stalinists "did such a lousy job." It speaks volumes on Sweezy's notions about the masses of people.

The last question, addressed to Gates, was: "Would you favor free elections in Communist countries, including freedom for capitalist parties?" He gave a one-word answer: "Yes." [We propose to discuss this interesting reply further in our next issue.—Ed.]

In the brief summaries, Shachtman re-emphasized the view that the much-to-be-hoped-for socialist reconstitution in the U. S. must be based on a fully democratic conception of socialism.

Gates, in his summary, for the first time showed a bit of an old-fashioned snarling tone in referring to opponents of Communism who are not so much concerned for Hungary as intent on "destroying the Soviet Union, which is the program of imperialism."

Chairman Muste closed with some salutary remarks on the general discussion.

The only unanimous view was that it was a lively evening.

Notes: What They Say About Hungary

MESSALI'S STAND

Among the political movements that have vigorously and forthrightly denounced both the imperialist attack on Egypt and the bloody massacre of the Hungarian people is, we are glad to note, the Algerian revolutionary nationalist movement led by Messali, the MNA.

Its resolution, whose first four points condemn first the one and then the other, continues with a fervent salute to the defense of both Egyptian and Hungarian national sovereignty against foreign assault and a demand for UN action to bring about the withdrawal of the foreign troops from both countries.

It is noteworthy that the resolution deliberately treats the two together, instead of separating the cases in the manner which is now popular among Nehru-type neutralists.

FIVE-POINT PROGRAM

In a declaration on the Hungarian fight, the Social-Democratic Party of Hungary in exile raised the following five demands for Hungary:

"(a) An amnesty for all those who have taken part in the revolutionary rising. (b) Every effort to effect the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary. (c) An assurance to the Hungarian nation of its right to self-determination as laid down in the Peace Treaties. (d) Restitution to the Hungarian people of the freedoms laid down in the UN Charter. . . . (e) Restoration of the right of democratic parties and trade unions to function and, subsequently, free and unfettered elections."

CLASS STRUGGLE

A news item from Los Angeles: "Members of Local 887, United Auto Workers, picketed installations of North American Aviation today—but not in a labor-management dispute.

"They were asking for contributions to the AFL-CIO's fund to assist embattled workers of Hungary in their fight for freedom. The picketing device was resorted to when NAA declined use of company premises for implant meetings to take contributions."

—*Mirror-News*, Nov. 27

STONE'S CONCLUSIONS

We call our readers' attention to I. F. Stone's notable reaction (in his *I. F. Stone's Weekly*) to the Hungarian Revolution. His Oct. 29 piece started as follows:

"For those of us who have all our lives regarded socialism as our ideal, it is humbling to see that the leading role in the convulsions sweeping Eastern Europe is being taken by the working class, and by the factory workers in particular. Those to whom socialism in the nineteenth century most appealed, the workers, the idealist students, the intellectuals with a conscience, these are the elements at the head of the risings in Poland and Hungary today, as they may be tomorrow in Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. . . ."

And it ends as follows: "In Moscow alone there is no Tito, no Gomulka, no Nagy, to symbolize a real break with the past; there alone Stalin's collaborators survive in power. What if Trotsky had never been exiled and murdered, what if Bukharin had never been liquidated! What a different picture there might be