

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**THE SOCIALIST PARTY—SDF
FACES AN OPPORTUNITY**

... page 6

**THE TRAGEDY OF ISRAEL:
CHAUVINISM vs. PEACE**

... page 3

British Tories Take Another Beating

... page 2

Gag on John Gates at N. Y. City Colleges

... page 5

MARCH 18, 1957

FIVE CENTS

Chrysler Story Infuriates Rank and File of UAW

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, March 10

While top officials of the United Auto Workers union watched more local union leaders who support them fall by the wayside in the elections for convention delegates, another political bombshell was exploded last week that shook the UAW to the foundations in this area.

News that an anti-administration "Rank and File" slate had swept 19 out of 27 delegate election posts at the huge Dodge plant in Detroit seemed puny compared to the sensational stories that hit all Detroit papers on Thursday, March 7, and which created a veritable revolution in the Chrysler plants.

Obviously written with the intent of praising the new "responsible" attitude of the UAW, the top labor writer of Detroit, Jack Crellin of the Detroit Times, who is considered friendly to Walter Reuther, described in a background story how Chrysler was able to make a comeback this year. Crellin's front-page story was accompanied by a report from New York which said Chrysler was piling up profits at the rate of \$11½ million a month.

The New York story comprised excerpts from a speech by F. W. Misch, vice-president of Chrysler in charge of finances. Misch attributed the high earnings to new efficiency in operations, the elimination of 22,000 jobs, and new work standards.

"The leadership of the UAW had been informed of our plans," Misch said, "with

a full background of what was at stake." This was intended to be praise, but it turned out to be a kiss of death.

"GLOWING REPORT"

The big front-page story of the Detroit Times carried a picture of L. L. Colbert, president of Chrysler, and Norman Matthews, director of the UAW's Chrysler department, between a caption entitled "How Chrysler, UAW Teamed for Success." Underneath was Crellin's story, which other papers copied and added more information to.

Crellin's story begins: "There's a story behind the glowing report on Chrysler's financial position made in New York today by F. W. Misch, vice-president in charge of finance.

"It's a story of labor-management cooperation without parallel in the history of relations between the UAW and major auto manufacturers."

Just reading this far—and apparently

(Continued on page 2)

**Why Not Let the People
Decide, for a Change?**

Let Gaza's People Vote on Own Fate

The events of the past week in the Israel-Egyptian strife over the Gaza strip once more present the picture of two fire-eating chauvinists shaking their fists at each other, with a minimum of evidence that either is much interested in making concessions toward a peace settlement. But affairs took a step backward as Nasser replaced the beginnings of a UN administration in Gaza with an Egyptian civilian administration, though UN troops still will ensure the borders.

This is a setback, in our opinion, particularly for the possibility of that type of settlement in Gaza which can best assure the immediate interests of its people, granted that the only thing that can assure their interests permanently is a final Mideast peace agreement.

This would be to let the inhabitants of the Gaza area vote freely on what is to be their fate, and not have any rule imposed on them from the outside, whether from Cairo or Jerusalem.

What objections can there be to this course? What other democratic course is there?

Dominion over Gaza does not inhere in either Israel's or Egypt's rights. The

area is a part of that theoretical "Arab State of Palestine" which was set up by the same UN Partition Plan of 1947 as also established Israel, and which never came into being. Egyptian administration harks back to the armistice agreements of 1948. There is all kind of room for arguments about its juridical status, to be sure, but neither lawyers nor soldiers bear a solution that can bring the area one step nearer peace.

Why not let the people vote?

A free vote could be held only under UN administration, with both Israeli and Egyptian officials out.

A free vote would present at least three choices: Egypt, Israel, or continued UN administration. We are for the third ourselves, as the least undesirable makeshift arrangement in a bad mess.

We are still against the imposition of a solution by foreign troops or dictators, whether the foreigners are the Americans or are labeled UN. We look forward to the role that could be played by genuine socialists and democrats in both Israel and the Arab states if they break with their respective chauvinist national leaderships and move toward peace.

A TURNING-POINT IN THE POLISH REVOLUTION

Gomulka Begins Crackdown on Democratic Opposition

By HAL DRAPER

The Gomulka regime in Poland has taken a fateful turning, it appears from news first reported in N. Y. Times dispatches which we are now in a position to check and expand from other sources.

It is an open turn to crack down on the "democratizing" elements that have been cheering for Gomulka since October, and to lean on the more pro-Stalinist elements, in this push-and-pull of the seething Polish revolution—whose force is still far from expended though it has been in a quieter boil while awaiting Gomulka's next moves.

From the October revolutionary upheaval to just before the January 20 election, the Gomulka regime was trying to balance uneasily between the unleashed revolutionary democratic forces which pushed him to power and which he had to bridle, and the Stalinist forces which still dominate in the ruling party and which represent the pro-Russian line. In about the last week of the election campaign, Gomulka launched a virulent campaign against the vanguard "democratizer" elements, represented specifically by the student mass movement which demanded the crossing-out of those candidates most compromised by their old Stalinist record.

The real meaning of this election line of Gomulka's and its political consequences

were demonstrated immediately in the ensuing month. Contrary to the abundant predictions of virtually all newspaper dispatches and commentators—which were derived straight from the "inside dope" supplied by Gomulka press-agents in Warsaw—it was the democratic elements who ran into a series of battering setbacks, and it was the pro-Stalinists who went on the warpath, following through on the momentum set up by Gomulka's attacks.

Now, by the beginning of March, this trend was made "official" and given teeth by a series of open steps: (1) retention of the leading Stalinist Nowak as a deputy premier; (2) purging of the "democratizers" from the staffs of "Trybuna Ludu"

and other leading organs and their replacement with Stalinists; (3) open publication of articles by Gomulka brain-trusters declaring the change of line; (4) rehabilitation of Stalinists thrown out of favor by October.

Details on this turn come from the two Western dailies whose dispatches give Warsaw the most abundant coverage, the N. Y. Times and the Paris Le Monde. Both are represented in Warsaw by correspondents who are loudly and articu-

lately pro-Gomulka, respectively Sidney Gruson and Philippe Ben, and whose personal pain over the developments is clear (and written up in Ben's case). As we shall see, the picture is further filled out by the full text of a sensational article by Gomulka's penman Jerzy Putrament, which was mentioned in a Times dispatch of Feb. 23.

This turn by Gomulka is not the last word. The Polish revolution is still to be

(Continued from page 1)

Rally to Protest Gag on John Gates At the New York City Colleges!

Tuesday, March 19 at 3:15 p.m.

Speakers: JOHN GATES, editor Daily Worker; MIKE HARRINGTON, chairman of YSL; and a representative of N. Y. Civil Liberties Union.

The city college authorities have chosen Academic Freedom Week to make a new and shocking display of academic McCarthyism (see story on p. 5) by prohibiting the Daily Worker's editor from speaking. Socialist students who have no sympathy for the Communist Party are taking the lead in protesting. The DEBS SOCIETY of Columbia University is sponsoring a protest rally at Columbia's Harkness Academic Theater.

LONDON LETTER

Tories Get Another Beating

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, March 9

Britain's Tory government took another hammering this week at the hands of electors in two constituencies who went to the polls to cast their votes in by-elections for members of Parliament.

The most staggering shock for the Tories was at the constituency of Warwick and Leamington, where Sir Anthony Eden had a majority of 13,466 at the 1955 General Election. In place of Eden the Tories stood a John Hobson—who was the choice of some 5000 fewer electors than Eden. The Tory majority slid to a mere 2157 while the Labor vote shot up by more than 6000.

The most significant thing at this election was that almost as many people voted as at the General Election of 1955-77.8 per cent compared with 78.6 per cent. The Labor candidate received 47.7 per cent of the votes cast, compared with 35.5 per cent at the General Election.

This means that many thousands of Tory voters of 1955 switched sides this time—and in Eden's old constituency this is regarded by the Tories as a serious setback. So serious, indeed, that everyone in Britain realizes that although the Tories managed to hold the seat the voting trend made it a big victory for Labor.

On the same day as the electors at Leamington went to the polls the electors at West Bristol did likewise. Here the by-election was caused by the movement of Walter Monckton—who had held many senior Tory cabinet posts—to the House of Lords.

At Bristol the Tory vote dropped from 32,767 in the General Election to 24,585. The Labor vote, on a much reduced total poll, remained almost steady with the result that the Tory majority was slashed from 22,001 to 14,162.

Coming so soon after similar results at Lewisham, Wednesbury and Carmarthen, the Leamington and Bristol elections have piled up the pressure against the Tory government. This pressure comes from two sides; on the one hand within the Tory party itself, where "rebel" elements are trying to get their party bosses to ease up on its present policies, and on the other from the Labor Party, where the demand for an im-

mediate general election is growing.

Whispers have it that Harold MacMillan, the prime minister, did some blunt talking to his back-bench MPs at a meeting held on the same day as the Leamington and Bristol by-elections. Faced with the demand for an easing of economic policies he replied that the government intended to stick to its present course in the hopes that people will eventually realize the necessity for what he understated as an "unpopular line."

Meanwhile there are indications that the campaign of the Labor left for an immediate general election is bearing fruit. After the Bristol and Leamington results had been announced, the LP leader Hugh Gaitskell said: "It is obvious that the government has lost the confidence of the country. The sooner we have a general election, the better."

Coming from Gaitskell this is a big advance on some of his earlier statements. After previous by-elections he had only expressed the hopes that the government would take warning and withdraw its Rents Bill, which will allow landlords of private tenants to push up rents.

Like the earlier by-elections the Bristol and Leamington results have given a tremendous surge to the morale of the Labor Party—particularly its left wing. Everywhere in Labor circles there is a feeling of enthusiasm and confidence coupled with a growing impatience to get on the move in a big campaign against an already crippled government.

STRIKE THREATENS

In industry, too, the government has trouble on its hands. Having encouraged employers to resist workers' wage demands, the government is now confronted with angry workers who are prepared to go to any lengths in order to put a little extra in their pay packets to compensate for the rising cost of living.

At the moment the spearhead of this fight in industry is the men in the shipyards. Having spent many months pressuring employers for a ten per cent pay lift—only to be met each time with refusal—the 200,000 workers in shipyards

(Continued on next page)

ISL FUND DRIVE

\$1300 a Week Will Do the Job

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

This report covers a two-week period. Frankly, the reason why no report appeared last week is that the response did not warrant a story. In the last week, however, a real change took place for the first time since the drive began.

A ten-week drive requires contributions of \$1000 a week to be successful. It is obvious from the box score that we are far behind such a pace; have in fact been running 50 per cent of the weekly quota.

The present corrected figures show that the over-all income is still short of \$2000. The calculation is easy: in the remaining six weeks of the drive we will need to average over \$1300 a week to finish on top. This is the first warning to all areas to speed up their local campaigns.

As of the time of this writing, St. Louis is at the top of the list, having completed its quota. A surprise in this early part of the campaign is Seattle, which has almost completed its quota and is in second place.

Almost every area is now in the percentage column except five. We have no doubt about these five coming through as they always have, but we are surprised that Los Angeles is among them.

Both Chicago and New York are really lagging. Chicago has always been a pacesetter in fund drives and New York has always done better than appears from its standing. Because they have the largest quotas, much depends on them. This is a challenge to the cities with the largest quotas.

Newark, Bay Area and Detroit have started out well. They are close to the half-way mark in the campaign, which is exactly the place where all cities should be.

The next couple of weeks are crucial weeks. They will indicate just how easy or tough the closing period of the drive will be.

GIVE
to the Fund Drive!

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

City	Quota	Paid	%
	\$10,000	\$1973.50	19.7
St. Louis	25	25	100
Seattle	100	89.50	89.5
Buffalo	100	65	65
Nat'l Office	1,250	500	40
Newark	450	176	39.1
Bay Area	400	130	32.9
Detroit	400	120	30
Chicago	2,000	400	20
Philadelphia	200	32	16
Pittsburgh	200	30	15
New York	3,900	400	10.2
Cleveland	150	15	10
Los Angeles	650	0	0
Reading	75	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
Mass.	25	0	0
Streator	25	0	0

CONTRIBUTE TO
THE ISL FUND DRIVE

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the ISL's Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

(Make checks out to Albert Gates)

Infuriates Rank and File of the UAW — —

(Continued from page 1)

that is all many rank-and-filers in the shop did—caused tempers to reach a boiling point; and soon stewards, committeemen and local officers were being told off in blunt, plain language.

SUSPICIONS

Crellin's story told of a secret meeting between Colbert and Reuther last summer, and then a meeting of local union presidents, Norman Matthews and the labor-relations directors of the Chrysler plants. After those meetings, which have just now come to the knowledge of the ranks, Chrysler put out a letter to all employees which said:

"We have developed new work standards. These standards are comparable to those of the same jobs at Ford and General Motors and they are fair in themselves.

"Meeting these new work standards means only that each of us will do on his own job as much work as the employee doing the same job at Ford and GM."

As employees were called back last fall from layoffs due to model changeover they were taken into offices and given this same line. Naturally there was much suspicion in the ranks about what was going on. Disputes on work standards have been very prevalent; nine Chrysler plants have had strike votes, but everything was kept under control.

The plain fact of the matter was, and remains, that in many cases Chrysler workers had won higher—that is, better—work standards than those which exist at Ford or GM; and the loss of that "gravy" (as some union officials call it) has been a source of widespread discontent. (This being reflected in convention elections as reported last week.)

The plain fact also is that the UAW was worried lest Chrysler go the way of

Hudson and others in this area, and leaned over backwards not to give Chrysler trouble in this comeback year. The UAW had done this at Studebaker, and the plant did remain in operation even though the local union was divided on the issue of doing more work and giving up some of the "gravy."

The trouble with Crellin's story was that it implied a cold deal between the UAW and Chrysler, although he doesn't say so. And the stupid bragging of Misch about the high profits of Chrysler, coming together with an "understanding of the union," added to the suspicions.

DAMAGE DONE

The fury in the shop was so great that on Friday Walter Reuther called an emergency meeting of top Chrysler local union officials, and vigorously attacked Chrysler, as did Matthews. The UAW has repeatedly put out denials of any deal, and has been blasting Chrysler.

But the damage was done. The vote of confidence won by Matthews and Reuther at the meeting is by no means shared by the ranks in the shops. Interestingly enough, neither the company nor the UAW has denied the facts in the Crellin story.

If there were elections now in the Chrysler plants, a wave of protest would sweep out most if not all incumbents. The ranks are just sore as hell, and they just don't trust the union officials. This development has been a real damaging blow to the prestige of the Reuther regime.

Of course, the UAW leaders are now giving a go-ahead signal to the locals to fight harder on work-standards issues. As a matter of fact, Chrysler made the blunder of the year with its bragging about profits based on new work standards. Plant-level union officials will now be outdoing themselves in militancy. It's

a case of running harder to catch up with the masses.

Fundamentally, the dilemma of the UAW comes not from the problems in Chrysler but from the inability of the UAW to lower the high speed of work at Ford and GM. Either this comes down or Chrysler workers go up to its level. Thus far it is mainly the Chrysler workers who are taking the beating.

In a press release blasting Chrysler, the UAW pointed out that there were more strike votes at Chrysler plants now than in the rest of the industry. That's just what is wrong. The fight belongs primarily at Ford and GM.

Since this whole development took place in a city with 92,000 unemployed, it may well be understood how the indignation of the unemployed Chrysler workers has carried into the plants.

DIDN'T UNDERSTAND

The UAW was caught by surprise on another aspect of this situation.

Since most Chrysler plants have worked much overtime, even with thousands unemployed, it was assumed that at least the workers with big pay checks would be satisfied and vote for the incumbents who ran on a full-pay-check, steady-work slogan. It just didn't work. There is too much unionism in the tradition of Detroit for anyone not to feel guilty about working overtime when a union brother is unemployed.

Besides, the overtime work dragged on and on, so that many workers who aren't speeded up still feel tired, and feel "they are working too hard."

The UAW leadership missed the boat completely in understanding how the ranks felt, and the crisis they had this past week testifies to this point.

In the context of this suspicion and hostility on the part of a vast number of rank-and-filers, the dues question

takes on a different value than a mere money question—which is how the UAW leaders view it, and why they are therefore very impatient with any criticism of their financial program.

The international executive board of the UAW met this past week, and its pre-occupation with organizational features of the coming April convention and its adoption of more measures for organizational control are hardly assurances that the UAW leaders either grasp or are ready to admit the crisis in the Detroit area, which after all is the heart and soul of the UAW.

ON THE WARPATH

Unless a new and unforeseeable change in attitude takes place, many good secondary leaders in the UAW will have their heads roll in the sand in the May local union elections; for the ranks are on the warpath, and the closest victims are the shop committeemen and local union officials.

How the destruction of these cadres will strengthen the union, even if it does get more money, is simply beyond our comprehension. The top leaders of the UAW have failed to put on an intelligent and effective campaign in this area on the dues increase. They allowed Chrysler to outmaneuver them in the present sensational news. They are in far deeper trouble with the rank and file here than they care to admit. It is not exactly a pleasant situation.

One thing that has come out of this mess is the resurgence of a fighting spirit, albeit a bitter one, among some of the ranks in the shop. No one will be surprised if a series of wildcat sweep Chrysler.

As for its efficiency program, it's finished now. The men and women in the shops are on the muscle, as shown in the first wildcat that took place at one large Chrysler plant Saturday.

An outspoken article by the leader of the Jewish Labor Bund in Israel, reprinted from the Bund's *Unser Tsait*.

THE TRAGEDY OF ISRAEL: CHAUVINISM vs. PEACE

By J. ARTUSKY

After England and France unwillingly submitted to the UN decisions and withdrew from Suez, the Israeli government was placed in a dilemma. It could not proceed to completely ignore the judgment of the UN; it could not let the gains of its military victory slip out of its hands. It therefore decided on a wide-scale political struggle to save what was possible from the Sinai campaign.

At the January 5 session of the Central Committee of Mapai [the ruling governing party], Ben-Gurion explained the theory of combining the two forms of fighting—the political and the military: "It was clear to us that, especially after the victory, we would be faced with an unprecedented political fight." The political fight has as its aim to consolidate the results of the military victory.

In *Davar* of Dec. 20, 1956 we read on the same subject: "Our aims meet against the resistance of the strongest world powers, who want to limit and shrink the fruits of our victory as much as possible. . . . Of course we will not get all we want but the amount we finally achieve depends on the outcome of the political struggle that the government is now conducting on the international arena."

Despite the political struggle, the Israel government was forced—after two months' delay—to withdraw from almost all of the Sinai peninsula and thereby give up the greatest part of "the fruits of victory."

The situation became very tense when it came to the problem of giving up the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza strip. The Israel government decided to make a strong stand and not submit to the UN decision. An intensive national campaign via radio, press and meetings was carried on—and is still being carried on—against the return of these two areas even if economic and political sanctions be imposed on Israel.

The Aqaba Gulf was immediately, in the first days of the Sinai action, incorporated into Israel under the name of *Mifratz Shlomo*. By holding the Gulf of Aqaba it is intended to secure free navigation to and from Elath. An Israeli administration was established in the Gaza area. In this case the argument used was

though he didn't perhaps realize it, that plater was aptly summarizing the feelings of the majority of Britain's workers, that Gaza never was Egyptian territory but rather a part of Palestine, and that the return of Gaza would give Egypt the possibility of re-establishing the *fedayeen* bands.

At the aforementioned session of the Mapai Central Committee, Ben-Gurion declared: "The three objectives we placed before ourselves (in the action against Egypt) were: destroy the offensive bases of the Egyptian dictator; expel the occupiers of the Gaza strip and insure free navigation to the port of Elath. We agreed to the return of the Egyptian territory. We will not however agree to withdraw to the previous armistice lines."

Those who thought that the State of Israel did not have territorial ambitions—in the Sinai action—have had enough opportunities to convince themselves. It is worthwhile remembering that only a few weeks previously, Ben-Gurion did not consider the Sinai peninsula itself to be Egyptian territory.

Later, under the pressure of the UN, a more elastic formula on the two areas was put forward. The Israel government now agreed that a UN army occupy Aqaba, that it should be a permanent UN force that would actually guarantee free navigation for Israeli ships. The Israel government also agreed to turn over the Gaza strip to the UN on the condition that the area remain under a permanent Israeli police and administrative organization.

This latest proposal had the added advantage that it relieves Israel of a problem that caused some uneasiness among Israeli leaders immediately after the conquest of the Gaza strip: the problem of the 300,000 Arabs. The new proposal is better for Israel because it would allow Israel to rule the police and the administration but would be free from the burden of providing for the refugees and from the fear that the Arab minority in Israel would be increased to a half million people.

As we write these lines, the outcome of the political struggle by Israel is not known.

DO THEY WANT PEACE?

Come what may, it is ridiculous to believe that these proposals—or even the retention of these areas—will strengthen the security of Israel. As long as there is no peace with the Arab world, as long as the Israel-Arab tension survives, these "security" measures are not worth anything.

The *fedayeen* bands have enough borders, without Gaza, through which to enter Israel. And a glance at the map is enough to see that navigation to Elath is possible only either with the consent of Egypt and Saudi Arabia or through a constant military protection of the ships against the two states. Without peace with the Arabs, shipping to the port of Elath is in danger of continual military conflicts that carry the threat of war.

We don't want to reopen the discussion on whether the Sinai action was necessary or useful. The question now stands on a broad principled plane: What is the aim of the Israeli political struggle? Do the Israeli leaders think that this is the way to a breakthrough to a peace with the Arab world or are they concerned with the acquisition of new strategic positions in preparation

for new wars?

The question may appear wild to those who are afraid to look at reality with open eyes or to those who are naturally inclined to yell "enemy of Israel" at any opponent of the Israeli policies. The truth is, however, that the Israeli leaders did not believe and do not believe in the possibility of a peace with the Arab world. The result of this **DISbelief** in peace was the Sinai campaign. Now, after the Sinai action, the prospects for peace are still worse.

For those who still delude themselves that the Sinai war broke out only because "we were at 5 minutes to twelve," it would be worthwhile to read the speech that Ben-Gurion gave at the above-mentioned session of the Mapai C.C., printed in *Davar* January 11. The speech makes it clear that as early as June 1956 the Israel government had already allied itself with France and was preparing for war.

WHO WILL BELIEVE HIM?

"Toward the end of June," declared Ben-Gurion, "and in the beginning of July there occurred one of the greatest events we experienced since the [1948] war of independence."

What was this "great event" but that France began to supply arms. The ships arrived and were unloaded in the dead of night.

"That was the real decisive point not only as it affected our [security] condition but also in our fate. Ships loaded with arms continuously arrived in Israel and in the course of months the relationship of forces in the Middle East was radically changed. Not only our security position was changed. It was a great political change, the greatest political development since Truman recognized Israel."

We see that it was not the striving for peace that dominated the mood of Ben-Gurion in this period but preparation for war. And the war against Egypt, it is now clear, started not when Israel was faced with a direct danger but only when "the relationship of forces in the Middle East was radically changed" in Israel's favor.

We have not seen Ben-Gurion fight a vigorous political battle for peace in the UN, in the world, as he is now doing to consolidate politically the conquests of the military victory.

Here is another thing that Ben-Gurion declared: "When it was possible for me to make public in the Knesset the receipt of arms, I summarized it as follows: It is possible that we are on the eve of fateful events. That was October 15. That gave a hint about this fateful event"—that is, the coming Sinai action.

Let us remember that it was on the same October 15, in the same Knesset speech, that Ben-Gurion came out so sharply against the advice of Beigin [right-wing Herut leader] to initiate a war and characterized it as "criminal advice." In the very same speech Ben-Gurion made a fiery promise that we would under no condition initiate a war but only "we will defend ourselves when we are attacked." What "ingenious" Machiavellian strategy. . . .

Ben-Gurion was preparing for war for months and he deliberately hoodwinked the people and the world with his pretended attacks on Beigin. Yes, he also fooled the enemy—and was able to attack him unawares. Truly a "clever strategy." But how many times can one fool the enemy with such "strategies"? And after this who, in the Jewish and non-Jewish world, could believe in ANY words of Ben-Gurion?

A FIG FOR ASIA

But more important—what about the future?

In his speech Ben-Gurion talked about the Asian peoples among whom Israel is ordained to live and who "all, as one man, opposed us." He explains it by the fact that these peoples are "foreign to

the traditions of the Bible" and he felt it necessary to proclaim that "our teachers and prophets are greater than theirs."

In the end we have Ben-Gurion's political philosophy in regard to these nations. "From the point of view of our existence and security in this period," declared Ben-Gurion in his speech, "the friendship that we arrived at with one European country from July till today is more important than the sentiment that prevails now among the Asian peoples?"

"Nations in our times," he further declared, "have respect for a people that has a good army and it is difficult to overestimate the role that the wonderful heroism of the Israeli army in the Sinai fighting has played in raising the esteem for Israel among the nations."

Are these the words of a head of government that is striving for peace? The armament-friendship of France is more important than the whole Asian world? Incidentally, in his whole speech there is not a mention of the word "peace." . . . Yes, as regards militaristic braggadocio, Ben-Gurion yields second place to none of the militarists of "all nations."

After such a speech it is difficult to doubt that the decisive Israeli leadership, just like the Arab leaders, do not want to go down the road of real peace. In the best of cases, it is a question of imposing on the Arab peoples a capitulation-peace by force of military power. But are the Arabs in such a position that they can be forced to accept a capitulation-peace under the threat of military power?

It is the tragedy of Israel that on the one hand she is surrounded by countries whose nationalist leaders want to destroy her and on the other hand she herself is dominated by leaders who are intoxicated by chauvinistic and militaristic insanity.

NO IMPOSED PEACE

On December 19 we read the following in an editorial in *Davar*: "an imposed peace is not a peace but a ladder to war."

These are "wonderful words." They were, however, written in connection with plans by Israel to impose an Israel-Arab peace on the basis of compromises.

Al Hämishmar [organ of the Mapai party] of Dec. 20, writing on the same subject, said: "An 'imposed peace,' as it is understood in Washington, means nothing more than a new attempt to force Israel to make far-reaching capitulations . . . the 'imposition of peace' by no matter whom can only worsen the situation and lead to the opposite results."

The Israeli leaders are opposed to forcing on Israel a peace based on concessions. They are, however, strong advocates that such a peace should be imposed on the Arab countries. Do not the same "wonderful words" apply to the Arab states, namely, that "an imposed peace is not a peace but a ladder to war?"

We too do not believe in the value of an imposed peace. We, however, believe that it applies equally to Israel and to the Arab states.

For a peace that will not be an imposed peace but a freely given peace, it is necessary to create the psychological and political atmosphere for such a peace. We know that this is not an easy matter. It is difficult to break down the wall of hatred against Israel that exists among the Arab people. We also know that there is no other way out. No matter how difficult this road may be, it is the only one that can solve the tragic Israel-Arab problem.

[In conclusion, Artusky calls on the U.S. to "do a lot" to solve this problem, and calls on Israel to accede to the UN decisions without further obstinacy. He quotes Ben-Gurion as saying that "One of the important results of the Sinai action is that we have assured ourselves a few years of military cease-fire." If this is true, then Israel should have no reason not to carry out the UN decisions loyally. But, if this is true, why the whole political struggle to retain the "fruits of our victory?" Guarantees cannot take the place of peace. Finally, the fundamental question is whether the government "is taking the road of seeking peace with the Arab world . . . or is it taking the road of preparing for new wars supported by the temporary and ephemeral friendship of one or a few of the colonial powers?"]

Tories Beaten — —

(Continued from page 2)

throughout Britain have decided to down tools one week from today.

This is the first time in 30 years that Britain's shipyard bosses have been faced with a complete stoppage of work, and there is little doubt that if the employers don't pay up the stoppage will take place.

From top to bottom the men in the shipyards are united in their determination to have a showdown. When executive committee members of the 40 unions which organize shipyard workers met to consider the strike proposal, not a single hand was raised against strike action when the vote was called. And considering that several members of the TUC General Council were present, this indeed represents a welcome sign of determination. As *Labor's Daily Herald* was moved to comment: "Seldom have they been more determined and united."

In the yards themselves the men are solidly behind the strike proposal. Last night television news cameras visited a shipyard to quiz the men—and it could not find one to oppose strike action; this in spite of the slanted questions by the television newsmen, such as: "Will you support the strike even if it means a loss to Britain's export trade and a gain for foreign competitors?"

One grimy plater, on being asked this question, replied: "That's the old, old story and we are just about fed up with it. This time we mean business and we aren't going to be talked out of it." Al-

PRO and CON: DISCUSSION

GOMULKA AND THE SITUATION IN POLAND

To the Editor:

In answer to Hal Draper's reply to our letter (LA January 28) we would like to make the following observations:

It is our opinion that a close scrutiny of recent Polish events will reveal the existence and activity of three distinct socio-political elements within what has been generally and indiscriminately described as the "opposition."

First, we have those workers, students, and intellectuals desirous of more freedom and independence than has been projected by Gomulka's more conservative and prudent course of democratization. Draper refers to them as the "revolutionary internal democratic opposition," or "more group."

It is evident that the Polish electoral results offer abundant proof that this grouping is cognizant of the need to carry on its critique within the context of critical support for the Gomulka regime in the present period.

Draper's description of the elections will be dealt with further on.

The other oppositional groupings are quite something else again. They have not been very reticent over the utilization of racist anti-Semitism and reactionary-nationalist denigration and social oppression of national minority groups in their anti-Gomulkaist campaign.

The role and motivations of the Natolin-Stalinist faction and their allies within the Polish United Workers Party (UWP) are fairly well known, and have been reported at some length in the press. However, when consideration is taken of the fact that the Natolinists still wield tremendous control over the party apparatus—especially in the provinces—and that their oppositional tactics have not been limited to internal party factional polemics, but have been demagogically conducted on a mass scale in the countryside and provincial urban centers, then the picture takes on a clearer and wider focus.

In this picture we see the alarming extent of anti-Semitic riots, brawls, and other incidents throughout the length and breadth of Poland—in Warsaw, in the provincial urban centers, in the countryside, in the school system, etc. We see a mass emigration of terrorized Jews—25,000 of the surviving 75,000 in the nation in just a few months according to the London Times correspondent on the scene.

In view of these indisputable facts, we fail to see any "slander of the democratic opposition" in maintaining, at the very least, that the numerically small but strategically located Natolinists, and their allies, have helped to open up the sluice gates for the entrance and extensive influence on the political-oppositional scene of the reactionary-nationalist and racist dregs of Polish society.

As far as the Polish elections are concerned, Comrade Draper sneers most vehemently at them, considers them a typically Stalinist farce, and, we presume, would not give too much weight to the contention that they prove the majority of the workers, students, intellectuals, and peasants to be in support of Gomulka, however critically.

Draper also sneers at N. Y. Times correspondent Gruson's reports on the election, and indulges in quite a disturbing display of intemperate name-calling. All this despite the fact that Gruson's reportage has been voluminously reiterated and confirmed by Freidin in the N. Y. Post, McGurn in the N. Y. Herald-Tribune, by Polish Socialist Adam Ciolkosz in the New Leader, and by the New Republic, New Statesman and Nation, Manchester Guardian, London Daily Telegraph, London Times, and the London Economist—to name those publications that we've checked to date.

Their general consensus is that, despite isolated manifestations of coercion at the polls—some possibly premeditated, others obviously not—the elections allowed a genuine if limited range of choice within the plebiscitary limits set by the regime. Also, they agree that these limitations did not choke off the population's opportunity to register approval or disapproval of the Gomulkaist approach at this time . . . the Telegraph

reports that this was generally agreed to by the 100 foreign journalists on the scene at the time.

We believe the conclusions drawn by the Economist (January 26) are very much to the point:

"The elections can be regarded as an experiment in democratization [which] . . . does not mean democracy, but merely a process which seems, or is intended, to lead to democracy in some sense. . . . The absence of intimidation in Sunday's election was . . . an achievement of a few years' evolution [in the growth of democratization in many areas of Polish society]. The same freedom equally manifested itself during the election campaign."

Finally, some comments on what we consider the most salient and important feature in Comrade Draper's rather detailed discussion of the Gomulkaists' debureaucratization problems.

When we take account all that has been said and written over the years, in our movement, about the inextricable fusion of politics and economics in a bureaucratic-collectivist or National Communist state, then Comrade Draper's excruciating attempt to completely differentiate economic debureaucratization of the Polish state apparatus from political debureaucratization becomes utterly incomprehensible. Gomulka is opposed to a political cleansing of the bureaucracy, says Draper, despite any "sincere lip-service" that the regime pays to the economic necessity of reducing the size, unwieldiness, and exorbitant waste of the bureaucratic state apparatus.

The fallacies inherent in such an artificially compartmentalized line of reasoning are self-evident when one takes a look at the immediate political consequences of Gomulka's economic course, i.e., the common cause made between the disfranchised Bierut-regime bureaucrats and the Natolinists. They, at least, recognize the political ramifications of Gomulka's economic policy; they acknowledge the threat posed by the Gomulkaist economic course against their former positions of power and privilege; and they've acted accordingly, in a profoundly political manner. . . .

Gomulka and economic braintrusters Jedrychowski and Oscar Lange—among others—have spoken of the crying need for non-coercion, voluntarism, and genuine cooperative forms in town and country, i.e., democratic participation from below as a basic economic necessity. This has a political logic of its own. They recognize the special urgency of this course in a period of economic, political, and social flux, when an attempt is made at the organic economic and political overhauling of the state apparatus and its personnel. This is their only defense against the possibility of a counter-attack by the Natolinists and Co., and/or Russian troops.

The Gomulkaists have indicated the direction they want and need to travel. Whether or not they will ultimately succeed in their total plans, whether or not Gomulka will wind up a turncoat when the chips are down, we obviously cannot prophesy.

But to smugly and abruptly dismiss their efforts at more far-reaching and extensive changes as mere lip service, even "sincere" lip service—this is an attitude we feel no serious student of Polish affairs can accept in this most uncertain transitional period.

PAUL GERMAIN

COMMENT

In view of the past month's open turn by Gomulka, detailed in this issue, even Comrade Germain may have to ask himself one of these days what exactly is the point of these letters he insists on publishing; but be that as it may, four remarks to help him:

(1) I'm glad to see that Germain agrees that it is the Natolin-Stalinists who are behind the excitation of anti-Semitism. This is what we have maintained against those, like Gruson, who have transmitted the slanders that the revolutionary democratic elements go in for anti-Semitism too. What Comrade

Germain is getting at, if anything, I don't know.

(2) The entire world press of every variety was full of those phrases about the "democratic experiment" in Poland. Germain's quotations could be expanded to fill a book. This applies to virtually everybody from the tabloids to the Times, to the State Department's bulletin, to Radio Free Europe, and points right and left—very much like the near-unanimity in the general press on Titoist "democracy" at one time. That's why we analyzed it. Germain says nothing (not a word) about our detailed and documented analysis of the facts, but quotes these hapless journalists, from whom he is seeking to learn revolutionary politics. This is crushing.

If Germain tries to understand the revolution that is boiling, he should give thought to this: was this Polish election an "experiment in democratization" by Gomulka, or is it rather to be understood in the context of the revolutionary pressure against Gomulka? You really can't get to first base in understanding a social revolution through the eyes of bourgeois pundits. You have to independently analyze the facts they and others report and independently evaluate also their interpretations.

(3) I take it Germain now understands the difference we explained between (a) the political cleansing of the Stalinists out of the bureaucracy, which Gomulka has refused to do even though

it is a main demand of the people, and (b) the efforts being made to cut down on the size and economic burdensomeness of the inflated bureaucratic structure and reduce its personal. Abstract references to the "fusion of politics and economics" are silly if used to confuse these two things.

In fact, now Gomulka is not only not cleansing the Stalinists out, but rehabilitating some of them that were dumped by the revolution.

So Germain falls back on the rejoinder that the second process, which embitters dismissed bureaucrats, helps the Stalinists. This is indeed "profound," as he says, and we duly reported it in LA for all it was worth. So . . . ?

(4) Let us not smugly dismiss "their efforts" at big changes, lectures Germain. Sure: whose efforts? There's a revolution going on.

One of these days Germain will have to decide whether he has a political view on these things, or whether he just collects clippings from the press. Is he for "critical support to Gomulka"? Does he agree with Rudziński that one should "condemn" the revolutionary opposition element as "reactionary nationalists"? Or what idea of the matter does he have, if any?

So far, Germain won't be caught telling anybody that; after all, if he commits himself to a serious political analysis, events might make a fool of him. And one must avoid over-exposure—to use the mountain-climber's term for the kind of embarrassing situation where you're hanging by a piton over sheer empty space without a foothold to look forward to.

HAL DRAPER

YOU and SCIENCE

THREE VIEWS ON SCIENCE AND PEACE ISSUES

By CARL DARTON

Recently the Philadelphia Third Camp Contact Committee sponsored a symposium on "Science and International Peace." Representing various science organizations were a chemistry professor from the Federation of American Scientists, an industrial engineer from the Society for Social Responsibility in Science, and a university psychologist representing the Journal of Conflict Resolution.

All in all, it was a good educational evening during which scientists, pacifists and socialists were able to exchange their views about science's impact on war and peace.

The FAS position was well presented with a review of recent scientific events, particularly the availability of atomic energy, which have stirred physical scientists into social awareness and their descent from the proverbial ivory tower.

The FAS was founded about ten years ago by atomic scientists to educate the public and "policy-makers" in the implications of the use of atomic weapons. Its general position has been one of opposing war, favoring disarmament and control or elimination of nuclear weapons. One member of the audience commented that the ambiguous position manifested on the one hand by their scientific efforts resulting in the availability of such weapons, and on the other hand their public agitation to restrict their use, is one of the many neurotic manifestations of our times. The FAS has been "apolitical," their members being of all shades from right to left.

According to the speaker the main accomplishment of the FAS in the United States has been the maintenance of atomic energy under civilian rather than military control. To some of the audience, however, the effects of this have been more theoretical than practical.

The organization generally has fought for freedom of travel for scientists, international exchange of information, and against anti-intellectualism in all spheres of American life. Since many members of the FAS also belong to the much larger American Association for the Advancement of Science its greatest task has been making scientists everywhere more socially conscious.

The Society for Social Responsibility in Science, as explained by its speaker, is made up of a few thousand individual sci-

entists, mostly pacifists, who refused to participate in any scientific work directed toward destructive ends. Since the end use of scientific efforts is often difficult to predict, the SSRS does not attempt to define the limits of participation but leaves it to the individual scientist's conscience to decide where the "line should be drawn."

Many of the SSRS policies are similar to those of the FAS, but in addition to contributing to strengthening the moral fiber of American society, the SSRS offers aid to individual scientists who have difficulty in finding jobs because of their views. Also they are currently sponsoring the procurement of facilities, particularly small tools, for people in undeveloped countries who are unwilling to follow the American or Russian paths to industrialization.

PROF AT WORK

Provocative of much discussion were the views of the psychologist representing the Journal of Conflict Resolution and the Research Exchange in the Prevention of War. As one might surmise from these titles, the position of these groups is very academic: namely, if enough "scientific" data is collected on why people "go to war" means will be available to prevent armed conflict.

In presenting this learned but not entirely new thesis, the professor almost entirely neglected to consider the obvious cause of war as a conflict of interests between nations and classes. It was pointed out in the discussion period that even if all the causes of war were properly diagnosed scientifically, the question of who had the power to put the solution into effect was the paramount one. A socialist in the audience pointed out that in a capitalist society the power holders are not interested in the solution of social problems but the continuation of their own privileged interests.

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

March 16, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 11

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

YSL for Socialist Unity

At the recent meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist League, a resolution was adopted favoring the creation of a broad, Debsian socialist party in America, and advocating the unity of the YSL, the ISL and the SP-SDF as a step in that direction.

The Committee based its action on its perspective for socialism in America, primarily on the fact that a decisive common task faces all democratic socialists today—building a broad democratic socialist movement and helping to build a labor party. Given this fundamental starting-point, it was felt that democratic socialists who differ on a series of questions can, and must, join together to work to re-establish the influence of socialism in the labor movement. The differences between various points of view would, of course, continue to be debated, but they would no longer divide the socialist movement and keep it from uniting.

The SP-SDF, it was felt, has the opportunity to become the framework of a general socialist regroupment. A series of reasons account for this. The SP-SDF is regarded as the voice of general socialism in the United States; it is not identified with a hard-and-fast theoretical position on a series of questions which separate the other sects; it is itself a heterogeneous party containing Marxists, non-Marxists, pacifists, non-pacifists, etc. These factors, the Committee felt give the SP-SDF the potentiality of becoming the focus of democratic socialist regroupment in America.

The unity of the YSL, ISL and SP-SDF was seen as a step in the direction of the regroupment of the entire socialist movement, of the creation of a single, broad Debsian party of socialism in America. The NEC resolution pointed out that there were a series of questions on which there was considerable difference between the YSL and the SP-SDF, but that these are not now decisive as

far as unity is concerned, that they should be allowed expression within a single party in fraternal and democratic debate, that they should not interfere with the imperative common task, that of working for a labor party in America today.

The National Executive Committee is the highest body of the YSL between conventions. Its perspective on socialist regroupment will be submitted to the forthcoming convention of the YSL.

At the NEC meeting, a minority of the comrades present opposed the resolution on unity. They maintained that the majority were advocating in reality that the YSL be dissolved and that its members will be subordinated to loyally promoting what they characterize as the pro-imperialist politics and organization of the SP-SDF. They counterposed to this a unity on the basis of programmatic agreement on the basis of socialist concepts of opposition to American imperialism, to Stalinist oppression, and to the support of imperialist politics and parties.

A summary of the views of this minority grouping, prepared by it, will appear in an early issue of *Challenge*, along with a statement of the majority position of the YSL as adopted by the NEC meeting. In the meantime, those interested in more particulars on this question may obtain the current *Young Socialist Review* (which presents several articles on the unity resolution) from the YSL, 3rd floor, 114 West 14 Street. The price is 10 cents. The minority of the NEC has also published a fuller statement of its views in its own organ *Left-Wing Bulletin*. This may be obtained from Wohlforth, 305 East 21 Street, N. Y. C.

The YSL is currently engaged in discussing the questions raised by the resolution on unity in all of its units in preparation for the convention which will take place sometime this summer.

Campus Notes from Philadelphia Area

Philadelphia, March 8

Following a unanimous vote of the Pennsylvania Players Advisory Board, newly reorganized, the adult director of the Players abruptly reversed her decision to veto Arthur Miller's "Crucible" for public presentation. It will be shown March 16. [See *Challenge* March 4.]

Kathleen Quinn, the director, had said earlier that regardless of recommendations, she would not permit a public showing of Miller's play because it was controversial, because his plays tended to undermine the American system of government, and because she did not like him or anything he stood for. Apparently the unanimous vote of the Advisory Board, which followed the usual critique of the Players' private workshop production, changed her mind, and Miss Quinn went along.

The players, the Board, the *Daily Pennsylvanian*, and friends of the university were elated at the victory. The DP had previously severely condemned Miss Quinn's action as dictatorial, and deserves much of the credit for this reversal.

Meanwhile, liberal and socialist students are regarding with noticeable lack of enthusiasm organization of a new student magazine, *Campus*. Originally intended to present varying points of view with a generally liberal orientation, reins have now been gathered into the hands of a young alumnus whose game is

as yet uncertain. At any rate, his frank attitude is that he will be the sole decision-maker as to articles and content, and that there will be no say for the staff, which is voluntary.

The magazine will also be printed without a union label. Leadership, in addition to the alumnus editor, is in the hands of a small group of Daily Pennsylvanian staff members, but how much they have to do with the policy-making is uncertain.

One of these staff members had just resigned from the U. of P.'s *Jester* magazine because of charges of "bureaucracy" made by him. Students are awaiting the first issue, due in April, to see just what the score will be by then.

At Temple University, the first foot in the door against the Temple News' policy of not accepting advertisements from "subversive" groups has been achieved. The News has agreed to accept an advertisement concerning a symposium on "What's Ahead for the American Left?" scheduled for March 15.

The symposium is being sponsored by a committee of the participants, which include to date members of the Independent Socialist League, Socialist Workers Party, Communist Party of Eastern Pennsylvania, and Fellowship of Reconciliation. The chairman will be an official of the American Friends Service Committee. A member of the Socialist Party-SDF is also expected to participate.

Gag on Gates Is New Gain For Academic McCarthyism

Academic Freedom Week is currently being celebrated in the five municipal colleges of New York City; meetings and forums are being held at which the principles and problems of democratic rights for students and teachers are expounded and discussed, and voices raised for the defense of democracy on the campus. The Academic Freedom Week programs testify to an awareness by both students and faculty of the importance of civil liberties in the academic community, and a concern over its repeated denial.

But as if he did not believe that student consciousness over academic freedom was great enough, Provost Thomas V. Garvey of Queens College—one of the five—provided students at that school with a brand new violation of academic freedom to be concerned with. And ironically enough, the latest manifestation of the witchhunt in New York City's schools has taken place in connection with Academic Freedom Week itself.

Garvey's contribution to Academic Freedom Week activities consisted of banning "Daily Worker" editor John Gates from speaking to a student group which had invited him to address them as part of the Week's program. In so doing, Provost Garvey overruled the decision of the Faculty Committee on Student Activities and Services which had cleared Gates' appearance.

Gates had been invited by the Marxist Discussion Club, a student group. This invitation to Gates and one to folk-singer Pete Seeger were protested to the Faculty Committee, which voted "full clearance" to both. Garvey then announced that he was overriding the committee, but was submitting his decision to the Board of Higher Education for review.

The gimmick here lies in the fact that the board has no intention of meeting until March 18, by which time Academic Freedom Week will be over at the college. And the Board's Bureau of Information Services indicated that as far as it is concerned, Provost Garvey's ban remains in effect until then.

In explaining his decision, Garvey announced that Communists are barred from teaching at the college, and that in speaking to a group Gates would be acting as a "teacher" for the period of his address. Thus the anti-civil-libertarian

THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

Get the Challenge

every week — by subscribing to
Labor Action. A student sub is
only \$1 a year!

Now CCNY Too

As we go to press, John Gates has been banned as speaker not only at Queens College but also at the City College of N. Y. This decision was taken at a meeting of the presidents of the five municipal colleges in New York, where they adopted a ruling that prevents Gates from speaking at any of these schools.

The college presidents gave as their reason for banning Gates his conviction under the Smith Act, reviving thereby in a new form this hoary rationalization for preventing students who might wish to listen to Communist speakers from doing so.

Originally, in 1950, the city colleges had barred as speakers persons under indictment. That ruling did not apply to persons who had been convicted and had served their sentences. Hence the need for this new ruling.

All students must make known their opposition to this latest wrinkle in the witchhunt on the campus.

denial of rights to Communist teachers has received a new fantastic and outrageous interpretation and extension.

The reaction of students at Queens College and at the other city campuses was immediate and progressive.

The Cabinet of the Students Association of Queens College and the regional executive committee of the New York region of the National Students Association both protested the banning of Gates from the campus.

After an emergency session, the Cabinet accused Garvey of "yielding to public pressure groups," and stated that Gates should be allowed to speak "to insure an atmosphere of free inquiry." It also rebutted the Provost's arguments that Gates would be acting as a "teacher" if allowed to address the club which had invited him.

The Student Senate at Queens issued a petition on the matter which stated that: "We, the undersigned Queens College undergraduates, although we do not agree with or condone the political theories espoused by John Gates, affirm the right of the students on this campus to hear Mr. Gates speak." Within a few hours of its being issued, the petition had been signed by several hundred students.

Nor has the reaction of students against the ban on Gates at Queens been limited to that school. The Student Government Public Affairs Forum at City College announced that it was inviting Gates to speak at a meeting it was holding on Academic Freedom during the celebration of the Week on this campus. This invitation, which had not previously been scheduled, was issued in response to the action at Queens.

In addition to the students, various individuals in public life have spoken out in opposition to the action by the Queens College Provost. Norman Thomas called upon the Board of Higher Education to override Garvey's ban. Osmond K. Fraenkel, counsel to the American Civil Liberties Union, characterized Garvey's action as "wholly indefensible" during the course of an address which he was delivering at Queens College to open the Academic Freedom Week program.

This reaction by students and others to the latest violation of Academic Freedom is a heartening sign of the increased opposition to repression which is to be found among students. It deserves the applause and support of all who believe in civil liberties and academic freedom.

PROSPECTS FOR UNITY AND REGROUPMENT

The Socialist Party—SDF Faces an Opportunity

By H. W. BENSON

When the Socialist Party united with the Social Democracy Federation, the merger succeeded in creating only a mild ripple of interest in the radical public, and since the unity convention its activities have not yet aroused any strong surge of enthusiasm. Its first big public venture, a mass rally in New York for Anna Kethly and the Hungarian revolution, attracted an audience that was disappointingly small. Yet it would be a serious mistake to underestimate the potentialities of the new organization.

For the merger instantly takes on meaning when considered together with the new possibilities that have already opened up for the reconstruction of a strong and vigorous democratic socialist movement in the United States.

An unmistakable sign of an upturn after decades of decline is the wide-ranging discussion on socialist regroupment among virtually all groups that profess socialist principles.

If what was at stake were merely a shifting of relationships among small groups, the discussions would be of interest but hardly of decisive significance. A simple addition or combination of tiny elements could hardly create a new movement. What is needed is more than a simple reshuffling of the groups as they are.

But discussions take place on a background of momentous events in world politics, events that have shattered the old sympathies and allegiances of tens of thousands of socialist-minded people in this country. Once they imagined that Stalinism was socialism. The need of the hour is to win them to a new conception of socialism, to democratic socialism, and to make a dramatic new beginning for it in the United States; that is: to restore the movement for socialism.

It is that possibility which gives meaning to all discussions; it is that responsibility and obligation which faces us as democratic socialists; it is that which turns our attention to the SP-SDF; and it is that urgent task, finally, which serves as a measuring rod to evaluate the SP-SDF convention and its most recent activities.

For while every group has an obligation to facilitate the rebuilding of the movement, the SP-SDF has a unique responsibility. If it faces up to what it should do, it can perform an historic service toward restoring a once proud and influential movement. If, however, it turns its eyes away from the pressing job at hand, it will squander advantages and possibilities that are not often granted twice in one political lifetime.

This is not a moment for sitting on one's charter; it is time for a giant step forward. For our part, we propose to do everything possible and necessary to make that step forward; and toward that aim, as is known, we propose unity between the ISL and SP-SDF.

LET US SEIZE IT!

Everyone is looking for a new socialist road. Yet the SP-SDF disdains to notice the political turbulence and remains aloof from it.

We emphasize this fact starkly, strongly, and sharply, and not because we enjoy criticism for its own sake. The SP-SDF, now, is small and weak; only when we understand what it can accomplish and what it must try to achieve can we judge its significance to American socialism.

For perhaps 25 years, socialists have been awaiting the opportunity that at last offers itself. It is here; let us seize it!

In all that time, the great traditions of socialism in the United States had been stolen and perverted by Stalinism. For decades the overwhelming majority of those who rejected capitalism and sympathized with socialism looked toward Russia and toward the Communist Party. All genuinely socialist groups

went into decline, ending up as a number of small fragmented sects with tiny resources and dwindling memberships. The underlying causes of this tragic decline of socialism are not hard to find.

For a quarter of a century, the world working class and socialist movement was brutally beaten back in an almost unending series of defeats and setbacks. Mussolini in Italy; Hitler in Germany; Franco in Spain—all culminating in the outbreak of a new world war which ended in the spread of dictatorial Stalinism.

It was a time of disappointment, of demoralization; the power of the socialist working class seemed broken; tens of thousands in the United States and millions in the world once looked toward the power of stalinist Russia for consolation and support in warding off fascism.

Those, on the other hand, who were repelled by Communism looked in the United States not toward democratic socialism but toward the New Deal and liberal capitalism—first to stop fascism, then to hold off Stalinism. Between these two forces, Stalinism and New-Dealism, at a time of working class defeat, the socialist movement in the United States was battered to pieces and Stalinism won pre-eminent influence among socialist-minded people.

All that is coming to an end.

WHERE DO THEY GO?

It is not democratic socialism that is in retreat but Stalinism which is beaten back under the impact of workers' revolution. The socialist working class reasserts itself in the democratic anti-Stalinist revolution in Eastern Europe. Above all, the Hungarian Revolution points to the only realistic, practical, and progressive alternative to Stalinism—democratic socialism.

In the United States, where Stalinism once enjoyed the support of hundreds of thousands, where it was able to pervert and distort and destroy socialism, it is now itself utterly and completely discredited and isolated.

It is possible now, right now, to restore socialism, to rebuild and reinvigorate it. Thousands, tens of thousands, have already broken from Stalinism or are in the process of breaking from it. Many of them, if not most, are looking for a new meaning in socialism and are turning, in their own way, toward some kind of democratic socialism. They reject Stalinism but where do they go? So far, nowhere.

The task of democratic socialism today is to conduct a political battle for the minds of these tens of thousands. It is with this in mind that we judge the recent SP-SDF merger convention and its most recent activities.

The convention did not reject this task. Neither did it endorse it. Worst of all, it simply ignored it!

This is a fact hard to believe and harder to accept, but as the SP and SDF joined together they devoted hardly a second's thought to the most urgent task of all. In some ways, it is incredible.

Here is a group of socialists who have always emphasized the democratic character of socialism. Whatever one may think of their views on all kinds of questions, now and in the past, one thing cannot be denied: at a time when thousands were acclaiming the totalitarian regime in Russia as socialist or as some kind of

Workers' State, they emphasized the inseparability of socialism and democracy; the number of those who defended democratic socialism was small, but they remained among them.

And now, when tens of thousands are shaken from Stalinism and are just beginning to understand the quintessential importance of democracy to socialism, as many of us learned anew in the political discussions of two decades—in sum, now when the world of socialist opinion is striving to find its way to democratic socialism, the newly merged SP-SDF seems content to cultivate its own private garden, oblivious to it all.

The convention met just as democratic socialism was receiving its historic vindication at the hands of millions who supported the struggles in Eastern Europe. Later, the "Socialist Call" published a special SP-SDF Unity Convention issue. Many things were discussed; articles written; memorandums and resolutions adopted. But on the decisive question—how do we make an impact upon the thousands who are looking for a way to democratic socialism—almost nothing!

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE

Take for example, the convention resolution on "Toward Socialist Organization," which begins:

"This Unity Convention marks a first step in the rejuvenation of the socialist movement in the United States. But while socialist unity is vital, unless this historic meeting is followed by an intensive campaign to gather together all democratic Socialists into our organization, our present enthusiasm may be wasted."

But this, a promising introduction to what might follow, peters out into nothing much. The resolution proceeds to outline a course of action for a routine membership drive, for increasing the paid staff, a circulation drive, organizers. But this is exactly the type of activity that all socialist groups have relied on for decades.

The question is how to organize, whom to try to organize, and on the basis of what political issues. Where are democratic socialists now and where can others come from? It is not simply a question of stimulating new organizational zeal but of a proper political perspective; and with the latter, the former will come quickly!

From the long-range standpoint of fundamental class relations, the strength of socialism depends upon those two great social movements: the labor movement and the Negro movement. The industrial working class is at last organized and the Negroes are on the march. But it will take a whole new period of struggles and political experiences before the organized power of the working class is directed toward independent political action and finally toward socialist politics. Meanwhile, democratic socialists have an immediate, unpostponable duty: to begin the battle for the minds of those thousands who already reject capitalism.

There are already hundreds of convinced militant democratic socialists, men who have always opposed Stalinism but who remain unaffiliated to any group. They have never joined any organized socialist group because they are not interested in socialist activity as a secluded form of private or semi-private dedication. They are found in all the labor and liberal movements of our time.

FOR A NEW BANNER

Hundreds have been disappointed by the defeats of the past, discouraged, pessimistic. But now, new hopes arise. Stalinism is on the defensive. If democratic socialism comes forward now, militant, crusading, confidently challenging Stalinism in all its varieties, and fighting to emerge as the movement of renewed socialism—under such conditions we are certain that such people will soon join along with it. We are just as certain that a union

of the ISL and the SP-SDF, a merger of two different currents of democratic socialism, will be a sign to them that the long-awaited resurgence is under way.

If we expect people to have confidence in democratic socialism today, we must have confidence in it ourselves, confidence in its appeal, in its ability to win thousands back to socialism and away from Stalinism!

Among the tens of thousands who are breaking from Stalinism and who have already done so, there undoubtedly are many—too many—whose conception of "socialism" has been so corrupted by its Stalinist perversion that they are hopelessly destroyed for any progressive movement; and there are others who have become so cynical that their experience has led them to lose all faith in the working class and in the possibilities of socialism itself. This is the tragic result of the undermining of socialist consciousness by Stalinism.

But there are others, thousands—some even still inside the Communist Party under the illusion that they can transform it as a whole into a genuinely socialist movement—thousands who can be won by a resurgent Socialist Party.

It is not a question of "appeasing" Stalinism; it is not a question of collaborating with it in any way or through any intermediary; it is a question of rooting it up politically and wiping out its last vestiges of influence.

Can democratic socialists pretend that nothing is going on? If we turn our backs and take a purely negative attitude, the problem will not simply disappear but will keep returning in one form or another.

If those who have begun to move toward democratic socialism are not given a new banner and a new socialism, they will inevitably tend to trap themselves into some new form of semi-Stalinism or near-Stalinism. For them, it would be another disappointing impasse, doomed to get nowhere, and only another disillusioning obstacle in the path of democratic socialism. If we permit everything to end in such a blind alley, it is an opportunity dissipated.

THE UNITY TERMS

Among the documents submitted for a referendum of the membership of the SP and SDF as a basis for unity was a "Memorandum on Foreign Policy." It was published along with other material in the Reading Labor Advocate on January 25 without national attention. Whether the convention voted on it or not was not reported. But the special post-convention issue of the Socialist Call did not reprint it; it did not explain it or analyze it.

In fact, the Call did not refer to it even by so much as one word! And advisedly. By the time of the convention, if not before, the memo had been quickly by-passed by events. Those who agreed with it, as well as those who did not, treat it as though it no longer applied to what was actually taking place in the world now.

Big concessions had been proffered in the Memorandum to the extreme right wing of the old SDF, in particular the Verband, in order to win its approval for the merger. The Verband finally refused to go along; its spokesmen heaped abuse on the new organization, hurling epithets—Communist, Trotskyist, Leninist, Titoist—as these cropped up in their heads. But the Memorandum which reflected their leanings remained for the merged SP-SDF which they denounced.

In substance, the Memorandum was framed to put forward the familiar policy of critical support to the Allied bloc against Russia. Such a policy—and in this it resembles the attitude of extreme liberals and left-wing laborites—combines two clashing and contradictory aims, aims which are in fact incompatible. On the one hand, it calls for a democratic foreign policy, the end of imperialism, aid to backward peoples. On the other hand, it expresses confidence in the ability of capitalist governments which are themselves imperialist to advance such policies. Thus, they are eternally disappointed and dismayed to discover that in real life the bourgeois governments line up with reactionaries, fascists, colonialists above all, with anti-socialists.

In examining the concrete expression of any such policy, then, it is essential to see to what extent it is critical of the bourgeois policy and to what extent it expresses confidence in bourgeois foreign policy.

And because the Memorandum repre-

The Task of Democratic Socialists Is to Reach New Thousands . . .

sents an overture to the extreme right, which finally did not go along, it expresses its support of the struggle against imperialism poorly and weakly, and it puts its call for support to the Allied camp coarsely and rigidly. In this respect, it was a step backward from recent resolutions adopted by the SP before the merger. Most strikingly, it gives a measure of approval to current United States policy that goes far beyond anything even suggested by the statement of principles of the Socialist International entitled "Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism."

EXAMPLES

A few examples:

(1) "We realize that until universal and enforceable disarmament can be achieved, the free world and its democratically established military agencies must be constantly on guard against the military drive of Communist dictators, lest the gains made by the socialist movement . . . be lost in an enslaved world."

Here the phrase, "democratically established military agencies" covers a multitude of evils and gives a blessing to agencies, treaties, agreements, that are hardly famous for their "democratic" nature.

(2) "The Marshall Plan and the Point Four proposal under President Truman's administration, the proposal of a pool of atomic energy for peaceful purposes under the present administration, are expressions of the American spirit at its best. We must do all we can to infuse that spirit into more of our fellow Americans, to implement it and to give it a more socialist underpinning and direction."

There have been statements from the UAW, deriving in no way from socialist principles; that are far more critical of American policy. The implication that socialists must make present U. S. policy "more" socialist can only be dismissed as an utter absurdity.

At the same time, the Memorandum can declare: "We Socialists believe that the struggle against the factors that lead to war—the battle against exploitation, against imperialism, and against the newer and more terrible forms of imperialism, totalitarianism—must be continued and intensified."

But then, the call for a struggle against imperialism is put only in general fashion. In France, the government of Guy Mollet carries on military warfare against those who struggle for national freedom in North Africa; he besmirches the name of democratic socialism. The Socialist Party repudiated the war against Algeria; the Memorandum ignores it.

NO BARRIERS

What drives socialists toward a policy of critical support to bourgeois powers is the fear of world Stalinism. Faced by the power of Russia and its allies, they seek refuge and a point of support in the military might of imperialist capitalist powers, even while they call for an end of imperialism.

In contradistinction to the Memorandum, the ISL stands upon the platform of the Third Camp, a position which it shares in general with certain other left socialist currents. For many years, we have insisted that capitalist and Stalinist imperialism feed upon one another. Those who have been exploited and oppressed by capitalism have been driven

into the arms of Stalinism; others, who shrink in revulsion against Stalinism, fall into the arms of capitalism. There will be no escape from this endless circle of disillusionment without the rise of a Third Camp of world socialism, democracy and peace against all imperialisms. It is to this Third Camp that we look; it is upon it that we base our hopes, without confidence in any degree in capitalism or Stalinism and without political or moral support to either.

We do not pretend for a moment that the differences between these two points of view are trivial, or unimportant. They have been debated and discussed in the socialist movement for decades and they will be discussed again. But they are not decisive barriers to unity.

The common tasks of democratic socialism now transcend these differences; and all such questions can be discussed in such an atmosphere and in such a way as makes unity lasting, effective, and healthy while the fight to rebuild the democratic socialist movement goes on.

Above all, more than logic and words are in the scales. If the Memorandum has one main defect, it is this: it takes no notice of the great events of our time. It is not stirred or influenced by the disruption of the Stalinist empire and by the rise of the democratic and revolutionary socialist working class within it and against it.

A NEW ERA

And now, with the Hungarian Revolution, the socialist working class has made a thunderous reappearance on the stage of history as a decisive class. It changes everything and points to a new road. We see now the real alternative to Stalinism and to capitalist imperialism, and we

base our hopes more firmly than ever upon it. And so, we strongly believe, will all socialists.

In the *Socialist Call* (November), Aaron Levenstein writes on "After Egypt and Hungary—What? A new historical era begins." He starts this way: "The basic fact that emerges from the Eastern European crisis and the Middle East explosion is the destruction of the pattern that has prevailed through the post-war period."

And he ends: "Yet, despite the horrors now being enacted in the Middle East and in Eastern Europe, there is one glimmer of light in the new turn of events. The world is no longer confronted with rigid line-ups. A situation that has been frozen for a decade has showed some signs of melting. The log-jam may conceivably be broken, and as the new currents begin to flow we may find ourselves heading toward a new age. But that will require real flexibility in our thinking, sufficient to match the new fluidity in world affairs."

Yes, a new era has begun. Will the governments of capitalist countries demonstrate their readiness and ability to play a progressive role in this period of the rise of anti-Stalinist revolutions?

Or will the democratic and socialist movements on both sides of the crumbling Iron Curtain find it necessary to join together in a common opposition to both Stalinism and capitalism?

We will soon have not merely old arguments but new evidence in the living political experiences of peoples. We are ready to submit our Third Camp principles to the test of events in the new era. Meanwhile, while time tests all views, we propose to proceed to the rebuilding of a united movement of democratic socialism.

Poland: Gomulka Begins Crackdown — —

(Continued on page 7)

heard from. Further twists and turns by the Gomulka regime are very far from excluded. But this article is devoted to reporting the picture as it has developed up to now, tracing the pattern since the election.

"FEEL SUBMERGED"

First, a citation which dates back anticipatorily to even before the election, included here because it is an outstanding example of perceptive reportage. It comes from Claude Bourdet's *France-Observateur*, in the Warsaw dispatch of its correspondent Frédéric Barraud who believes with all his heart in Gomulka's democratic bona-fides and says so. In his dispatch dated January 8 from the Polish capital, he already reported, almost two weeks before the election barrage, the decisive change in the climate.

"If Gomulka's desire to maintain the party's structures intact at all costs, while little by little renovating the state and parliamentary organs, was shared by the 'October Communists' [the democratic wing], the latter are beginning to feel submerged by a wave of distrust which threatens them with paralysis. For some time it has been the fashion in the leading party circles to denounce the intellectualism, lack of proportion, and anarchy of the youth—that same youth who by their determination took Gomulka and his friends out of jail.

"The censorship over the press is becoming plaguing, and the party 'activists'—the men who were carried into responsible posts by the October revolution—feel they are more and more isolated inside the bureaucratic machine which the old maneuverers know well and easily control. . . . Paralyzed today is the great ideological work undertaken by these ardent, sincere Communists who matured through a decade of Stalinist police operations and Stalinist lies. . . .

"This erosion in the party translates itself into a growing absenteeism at meetings, giving up of cards, flight of the 'slyest opportunists.' 'We must recreate our study circles, carry on underground agitation,' declared a young Communist intellectual, 'or else go and cultivate our garden.' In reality, nobody in Poland can dream of going and cultivating his garden. The election excitement mounts from day to day. . . ."

The election excitement mounted, as mentioned, to the point where Gomulka had to take to the radio in a final appeal to counter the movement awakened behind the revolutionary students' line.

GOMULKA SLAMS THE DOOR

With regard to the same time, Alexander Werth (surely no willing critic of Gomulka but a friend, with a long fellow-traveling experience) reports from Warsaw in the *Nation* of March 2 that "Even before the elections, Gomulka had some stormy sessions with the editorial board of *Po Prostu*, which with its half-million readers is by far the most influential Polish weekly. . . . His [editor Lasota's] and his co-workers' reaction against Russia and in favor of Polish independence is so violent that, on one occasion, Gomulka argued with them through the night until four in the morning. Finally the Premier [sic] slammed the door, shouting that if the staff imagined he was going to restore bourgeois democracy in Poland it was very much mistaken."

Writing late in February, Werth read the signals aright, as the events soon showed:

"To appease the Russians, Gomulka may have to fight not only *Po Prostu*, but *Przegląd Kulturalny* and *Nowa Kultura*, two other weeklies of overwhelming importance in the country. He will certainly refuse Lasota's demand that government press censorship be abolished. The censorship may, if anything, get tougher, for up till now it has certainly given these papers extraordinary latitude."

That Werth even underestimated is shown by the fact that the most brutal attack turned out to be on "Trybuna Ludu" itself, the party's daily central organ, which of course had not gone near as far as the organs mentioned.

PURGE IS PREPARED

But to return to the morrow of the election: It was immediately given out that a purge was in the offing. Whose? The *Times*' Gruson, (Jan. 22) cabled that Gomulka was out to "house-clean" the Stalinists out of the party apparatus, in "a showdown struggle for control" with them. He knew this because it had been "reliably reported" to him by his pro-Gomulka friends. Gomulka had said, "Now we are going to work on the party."

Le Monde's crack correspondent Philippe Ben, more than two weeks' later (Feb. 7), had the same news—from the same reliable sources. Gomulka was preparing "to precipitate the final settlement" with the "Natolinists" (the Stalinist wing). More than that: "The purge of the Stalinist elements from the state administration is going to extend to the diplomatic corps. Several high functionaries, including some ambassadors, will be dismissed. Others, known for their liberal tendencies, will be promoted."

What these Western news outlets were reporting was not news but the wishful dreams or bum steers of their Polish friends. Within a week there was a hard piece of information, which already didn't quite fit the predictions. Gomulka's Politburo had addressed a letter to all party organizations to "declare war on the two opposed tendencies which had long been tearing the party apart: on the one hand conservatives, that is, the Stalinists; on the other, the 'revisionists,' that is, the liberals." (*Le Monde*, Feb. 13.)

At the same time the Central Control Commission sent instructions to all locals to expel the members of these two tendencies from the party. (Ibid.) Observers whose heads were not stuffed with Gomulkaist illusions would have been alerted; for as long ago as December a writer in "Po Prostu" had already revealed that "the Control Commission represent the most extreme Stalinist faction within the party," which still retained its grip on the apparatus (See LA March 4). The Stalinist apparatus-men were going to do the purging.

In the very same column with this report (*Le Monde*, Feb. 13), an Agence France-Presse bulletin reported the dismissal of anti-Stalinists Matwin and Staszewski, of which more below.

MOSCOW TURNS THE HEAT ON

Behind this development lay the forces which we explained in LA in two articles, "The Polish Revolution Nears a New Turning-Point" (Feb. 18) and "The Triangle of Forces in the Polish Revolution" (Feb. 25), dealing with the political offensive which the Polish and Russian Stalinists started right after the election, whose results they took as their springboard.

What was happening was that the Stalinist wing, backed up by their Russian masters, started putting the heat on Gomulka—to follow through on the momentum already built up by the drive against the "democratizers."

Observers who thought this was a move of "desperation," or that all it could do was alienate Gomulka, did not understand the ABCs of this politics. Being serious political gangsters, and not journalistic pundits filled up to the ears with Gomulkaist fairy-tales, the Natolinists did not waste any political ammunition giving thanks to Gomulka for having tided them through a critical period.

Gomulka, already off-balance in his tight-rope act between Stalinism and the revolution, was hit with a 1-2-3 by the Stalinists, just as soon as Khrushchev got through praising him in a personal telephone call of congratulations on the election results.

THE OCHAB WING

First, the Polish Stalinists launched an open attack on the regime's peasant policy, which had led to the catastrophic collapse of the whole system of collectivization. (See the LA Feb. 25 article for some detail.) Above all, this was calculated to light a fire under the Stalinist wing of the Gomulka forces, led by Edward Ochab, the party secretary who had preceded Gomulka, had gone over to him and been replaced by him, and who was now minister of Agriculture.

For it is absolutely crucial to the picture to remember that, besides the unreconstructed and more-or-less overtly pro-Russian Stalinists who are popularly called the Natolin group, the majority of the old Stalinist apparatus and its cadres went over to support Gomulka in the October upheaval, led by Ochab.

It can be said with political exactitude, leaving personalities out, that Ochab is an Erno Gero who did not make Gero's mistake of trying to meet the democratic revolution head-on and cutting it down with immediate brute force. Ochab and his old, experienced cadres are still there in control of the party machine, with one hand (eyes averted) clasping the Natolinists and with the other hand on their hearts swearing allegiance to Gomulka, to October, to the "8th Plen-

(Turn to last page)

Poland: Gomulka Begins Crackdown — —

(Continued from page 7)

um," and to all good things known in heaven or earth.

The pressure brought to bear by the Russians and their pawns was designed in the first place to put the screws on THESE decisive elements, who sought to make Gomulka their political prisoner, while at the same time Gomulka sought to achieve autonomy by balancing them against the counter-pressure of the revolution.

THE BARRAGE

It was not only a matter of peasant policy. Moscow exerted economic pressure, hinting at withdrawal of trade that could disrupt Poland's shipyard and textile industry; trouble was made on the repatriation of Poles from Russia as had been promised (*Times*, Feb. 5). In Russia, Polish students started meeting persecution (*Le Monde*, Feb. 6).

A barrage of attacks was launched in *Pravda* and its kept press in the satellites. Decollectivization is for rich peasants, shrilled *Pravda*. "Democratization" is counter-revolutionary, piped the Bulgarians. "National Communism" is like Hitler's national-socialism, barked Kadar from Hungary. The Poles are abandoning "Marxism-Leninism," yapped Ulbricht. The Czechs referred ironically to the "equality and sovereignty" that the Poles liked to talk about so much.

The Poles' "isolation" from their dear brothers of the rest of the "socialist world" had already been pointedly emphasized when Gomulka failed to be invited to a conference of the bloc held in Budapest, to the consternation of some of them who suddenly saw that it was hard to live with one foot in the Russian camp and one foot out.

The Gomulka press did not react to the attacks. Then on February 7 the youth organ *Sztandar Mlodych*, more outspoken, wrote that it thought Poland ought to hit back (*Times*, Feb. 9). Two days later, *Zycie Warszawy* did speak up with a complaint against the barrage, noting that it called up "the danger of a return to all that was wrong and the worst in the past [Stalinist] period."

"REMARKABLE CHANGE"

But the barrage had its victory. Writing the same day as the opening of the new parliament (Sejm), the *Times*' Gruson reported that "Within the last few days Poland's Communist leaders have received assurances from the Soviet Union that the anti-Polish campaign in the Soviet-led press will be called off." Khrushchev had "flashed the signal publicly" the day before in a Kremlin speech in which he said that the Polish party under Gomulka was successfully "repelling the reactionary conspiracy," etc. "This was a remarkable change of tone toward Poland's leaders." (*Times*, Feb. 21.)

Several things had happened "within

the last few days" to account for this "remarkable change." Gomulka had started taking concrete steps to implement his turn.

It turned out that the projected purge was not to be directed against the Stalinists; not against "the two opposite tendencies"; but solely against the "democratizers," against the anti-Stalinists, against the democratic and socialist revolution.

NOWAK STAYS

The reason why the opening of the newly elected Sejm represented a deadline in the Stalinist drive had to do with the composition of the new government (cabinet) to be set up there.

Since the election one of the big question-marks in all speculation had been this: Would Deputy Premier Zenon Nowak, the most highly placed Natolinist-Stalinist of all, be renamed as a deputy premier when the new cabinet was placed before the Sejm?

It was going to be the test of whether the regime would go on to more, though still "prudent," democratization and de-Stalinization. For the Stalinists, on the other hand, it would be the test of how they stood. The decisiveness of the Nowak issue in everyone's mind is beyond dispute, so it is only because of their special piquancy that we note the following facts:

On Feb. 20 as the Sejm convened, Philippe Ben cabled his paper that Nowak was out; it was in the bag. The blooper was not his own fault, as a curious incident showed. The Gomulkaist illusionists made an even more embarrassing boner in Poland itself. On February 25, the very eve of the presentation of the list, the government news agency PAP put out a press release naming the ministers who would not be re-appointed; Nowak's name was among them.

The next day Nowak was renamed deputy premier in the slate presented, and the just-"democratized" Sejm voted for him unanimously, without even a maverick nay-vote such as was cast against Cyrankiewicz himself.

"GOMULKA WAS PITILESS"

Behind this lay a bitter argument. It was Gomulka himself who had insisted on Nowak. Opposition to the Nowak appointment ran high in the party (we would remark here: no doubt, not only from sincere "democratizers" but also from those who thought it was tactically unwise to offend popular sentiment so crassly).

Philippe Ben writes (Feb. 28) that "several members of the Politburo" were against it; the argument lasted for "several days." Apparently the PAP blooper had resulted from a mistake about how this dispute was going, in the party caucuses.

Le Monde's dispatch (March 1) related:

"Deputies like the eminent economist Oscar Lange, the young editor of the weekly *Po Prostu* Lasota, and representatives of the Warsaw workers rose one after the other to disapprove of this nomination. The old socialist leader Dr. Drobner declared that six years ago the deputies were compelled to vote against their own consciences to lift the parliamentary immunity of M. Gomulka, who had already been arrested by the Stalinists. He begged M. Gomulka not to force him now to vote for M. Nowak. But M. Gomulka was pitiless: taking the floor three times and visibly more and more exasperated, he repeated that the important thing was

not what M. Nowak represented in the past but the fact that since October he had followed the party line and deserved to stay in the government."

(Sidelight: The speech opening the Sejm had been made by the same 74-year-old Dr. Drobner, as dean of the deputies, an ex-socialist who had gone along with the merger of the SP into the Stalinist party. In this speech Drobner had said with heart-felt intensity: "Our Sejm should no longer remain mute. This Sejm must not be a parliamentary fiction. It must become a source of renovation. It must and shall be a furnace in which we will be forging iron and steel as long as our October remains hot.")

Outside of these corridors, "Reports from Cracow said university students met there during the day [when Nowak was elected] in protest and adopted a resolution against Nowak." (*Times*, Feb. 28.)

STALINIST EDITOR RETURNS

"Increasingly," cabled Gruson in the same dispatch, "he [Gomulka] is disassociating himself from those who fought hard for his return to power and who paved the way for Poland's 'October Revolution.'"

And: "There no longer is any doubt among this faction—the revisionist—that hard times lie ahead. The 'fight on two fronts' recently ordered by the Politburo seems to them to be turning out as a one-front campaign, with the 'conservatives,' as the Stalinists are now described, being left in peace."

This is elicited not just by the Nowak issue, but more by the apparatus measures taken against the "democratizing" spokesmen of the press. Wladyslaw Matwin, editor of the party organ *Trybuna Ludu*, had in the midst of all this been cashiered, exiled to a provincial party post in Wroclaw, and his place taken by Leon Kasman, the same man who had edited the paper in the Stalinist years when Gomulka was in jail. The same night that Nowak was elected, the paper's editorial board had been put on the carpet before Gomulka and "criticized sharply" for "revisionism."

Philippe Ben gives details on this "tumultuous meeting" where "M. Gomulka severely criticized the whole of the Communist press, declaring that most Polish journalists and writers had broken with socialism and had become mouthpieces of 'petty-bourgeois' ideology. He depicted revisionism as the greatest danger and attacked *Trybuna Ludu* for having done nothing to combat it while on the contrary it had itself lately published several 'revisionist' articles."

While Matwin had been "one of the first supporters inside the Communist central committee of M. Gomulka's return to power, and a member of its secretariat," his replacement Kasman had been editor of the party organ all through from 1948 to 1954, the depths of the Stalinist-Bierut days.

ATTACK ON THE PRESS

More: The editor of another important Warsaw daily *Zycie Warszawy*, Korotynski, is also to be replaced, recounts Ben. And: "several Warsaw weeklies whose role in the preparation of the October revolution was primary are having more or less big difficulties with the censorship, and numerous articles are banned every week. A weekly of the socialist youth of the University of Warsaw could not come out for two weeks. A monthly magazine *Theoretical Review* [Zeszyty Teoretyczne], which specializes in the republishing of important texts, has been withdrawn from sale because it reprinted Jean-Paul Sartre's article on Hungary."

Next day, Ben reported that the editor of the last-named magazine, Orlanski, had been fired. The same day, eight of *Trybuna Ludu's* editorial staff ("all the important editors," says Ben), including the secretary of the party organization on the paper, submitted their resignation in protest against Matwin's ouster and also against his banishment from the capital.

Outside of the press, another prominent victim was Stefan Staszewski, first secretary of the Warsaw Committee of the party, one of the strongholds of the democratic Communists and the Zeran workers. He was bounced from this important post.

On the other side of the ledger, THE man who is a symbol, precisely in the eyes of the organized workers, of both the old Stalinist regime and the present Natolin wing—Wiktor Klosiewicz, head of the trade-unions up to the October upheaval, which heaved him out—is to be brought back into the government for the first time since his fall.

"ABSORBING OCTOBER"

Philippe Ben, reporting all this, does not conceal his regret and bewilderment over the turn, which is equally opposed to his hopes and predictions. But he reports:

Like Gruson, he says strongly that the announced "fight on two fronts" has turned out to be "on a single front: against the liberal intellectuals, who were the most faithful supporters of M. Gomulka and who by their unremitting criticism of Stalinism brought him to power." (March 1.)

He reports that "Great disarray reigns in intellectual circles in Warsaw, after Gomulka's latest measures, which seem to combine indulgence toward his Stalinist enemies together with severity toward his old liberal friends. In these latter circles, they feel extreme pessimism and even talk about the 'Kadarization' of Poland." (March 2.)

Ben quotes a noted "liberal" as telling him:

"Our Polish Stalinist and their Moscow masters were beaten in October; at that time they failed in the operation that Moscow, through the medium of Janos Kadar, put through successfully in Budapest several days later. But what is happening now in Warsaw is the triumph of the Stalinists and of Moscow by peaceful means. They are simply absorbing the Polish October little by little. M. Gomulka himself does not resist, and on the contrary he seems to take delight in his new role." (Ibid.)

Next day, reporting the Klosiewicz item, Ben adds that the same circles "will see in it confirmation of the fears they had on the subject of a turn by M. Gomulka. They believe that M. Gomulka, forced to choose, prefers the Stalinist bureaucrats to the liberal intellectuals, whom he despises with all his heart." (March 3-4.)

"SMART WAY"?

This from a correspondent who makes it clear that he himself still has faith in Gomulka. In fact his March 2 dispatch is largely an essay in explaining why it is wrong to think such harsh things about Gomulka—the very thought plainly horrifies him. His essay is not important, since he goes at it only in generalities about Gomulka's desire to avoid Russian intervention; but we mention it to indicate that when he reports the opinions of the democratic Communists, he is not biased in the direction of their interpretation.

Of course, fear of Russian intervention is a trump-card of the re-Stalinizers, and it doesn't matter how sincerely it may be held in the mind of any individual (even Gomulka, even if Gomulka does not "take delight in his role"), and everybody knows it is also a real danger and a real problem, including the revolutionary democrats, who have no more longing for a Russian massacre than the next man and a lot less. The problem is how the Polish revolution can defeat the Russian threat, but certainly one answer to this is not to re-Stalinize Poland without resistance:

Yesterday "the Gomulka Way" was being hailed as the "smart" way to get the most concessions out of the Russians without a fight; but it should now be clear that it was the heat of the October "furnace" that got those concessions, and that they will be retained, as Drobner said, only "as long as our October remains hot."

For an insight into the thinking behind the Gomulka turn, we must turn to a recent sensational article by one of the leading brain-trusters of the party leadership, Jerzy Putrament, in which this is expounded. We expect we will have the space to do this next week; and as soon as possible after that, a sketch of the main issue in which the Polish working class as such is directly involved with the fate of the Polish revolution—namely, the present struggle over the Workers Council system, which parallels inside the factories the story we have recounted in this article.

NEW YORK LABOR ACTION FORUM

Thursday, March 21

HAL DRAPER
Editor, *Labor Action*

on

Social Forces in The Polish Revolution

On Thursday, March 28, Sam Taylor, will speak on "Eisenhower's Dilemma: the Mideast Crisis."

8:30 p.m. at L. A. Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

SYMPOSIUM IN CHICAGO

SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY

Mulford Sibley

Socialist Party leader; professor at U. of Minn., assoc. ed. of "Liberation."

Max Shachtman

National Chairman of Independent Socialist League.

Max Weiss

National Staff of the Communist Party.

Chairman:

Lawrence Scott

Amer. Friends Serv. Comm. Director, Peace Education

Wednesday, MARCH 27 at 8 p.m.

MANDEL HALL, Univ. of Chicago, 57th & University

Auspices: U. of Chi. Socialist Club & Young Socialist League

Gen. adm. \$1 . . . students 75¢ . . . reserved seats \$2.