

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**STEVENSON AND THE H-BOMB:
A Fast Grab at the 'Peace' Issue**

... page 2

**Stevenson and Foreign Policy:
Stale Phrases About 'Fresh Ideas'**

... page 2

British Labor Party's New Resolutions

... page 3

OCTOBER 29, 1956

FIVE CENTS

Polish and Hungarian Workers and Youth Shake Bases of World Stalinist Power In Stormy Mass Rallies and Open Revolt

By HAL DRAPER

The nationalist revolt of the Polish CP regime against Moscow, plus the gathering forces of social discontent with the Polish regime itself, make two sides of the biggest blowup registered so far against the system of Stalinist power.

The important thing is that there are evidently two fights going on in Poland, intertwined, not just one.

It is big—bigger than the East German July days or than the Yugoslav break of 1948—bigger than both of these combined, because the Polish events, which have gone in virtually a straight line from Poznan to Gomulka's cold coup, include both of these phenomena, wrapped into one fused bomb and set ticking. It is bigger in revolutionary potential, in a totalitarian system which has been rocking in convulsions since the death of its boss Stalin. After him, the deluge.

The two fronts in Poland are the nationalist (against Russia) and the social (internal). It is the combination that gives the Polish blowup its special character and dynamic, not yet seen in such massive form in any of the East European states, not excepting Yugoslavia or East Germany.

In addition, Poland is the heart of the East European empire of the Stalinists, where East Germany is on its Western marches and even Yugoslavia was relatively in the Balkan hinterland. It is the heart geographically; it is the heart industrially and economically; it is the heart also of the most advanced sections of the East European proletariat.

True, no prediction of imminent social-revolutionary explosion is involved necessarily in saying all this; we need set no time-coefficient for the unfolding of the process of disintegration of the Stalinist power, especially since, as this is written, it is not even known whether Russia will attempt to use force or other forms of involuntary pressure to make the Poles back down.

But then, after all, when the Titoist break of 1948 took place and its disinte-

grative potentialities on the Stalinist structure were evident, it would have been equally rash to predict that the galloping disease of Titoism would have broken the Moscow empire apart in any given number of years. In point of fact, the national-Stalinist dissidents in the other satellites were throttled back; the crumbling barrel was hooped up again with steel. But still it was the Belgrade-Moscow split of 1948 that pointed to the end of Stalinism.

But as we have said, the Polish events

There are a half dozen vital aspects of these great events that we have not touched on in this issue; they will be dealt with next week. That includes: the reaction of Washington circles and of the Vatican; the double role being played by Tito; the promises in Poland of "economic Titoism" and what they mean; the background of Gomulka and Nagy—who are they?

And above all: the impact of the Polish and Hungarian fight on the disintegration of the whole Russian empire in Europe.

are already bigger than the Yugoslav development. It is not just Titoism, but Titoism PLUS. The "plus" is even more important to us, as socialists. But let us first see something about the Titoism.

By Titoism, of course, we mean national-Stalinism—the drive behind the subdictators and satellite Stalinist leaders to themselves assume full power in their native bailiwicks; not as branch agents helping a foreign exploiter milk the country, but as the leader of a native ruling class that wants the full fruits of exploitations for itself.

It is the analogue (only an analogue) of the forces within the world of capitalist imperialism which push a colonial bourgeoisie to wish national independence so that it can develop the revenue, perquisites and power of any self-respecting capitalist class that feels properly resentful if some foreigner exploits "its" workers instead of letting it exploit its "own" workers itself.

It is not a question merely of phrases like "the Polish road to socialism," which can act as symbols of national strivings or can cover up suppression of these strivings. In the immediate post-war period when the self-styled "Popular

(Continued on page 6)

Hungary's 'Titoist' Uses Russian Guns to Save Regime

Hungary has now added a new lesson to the pattern of the two fronts of struggle which are going on both there and in Poland.

Imre Nagy—the "Titoist," the "Gomulka" of Hungary—in whose name the masses of Budapest have been demonstrating against Russian rule and the Stalinist regime—took over the premiership Tuesday night in the face of mass fighting, and the first thing he did was to call in Russian troops to shoot down the people. The Russians obliged.

As we go to press, Hungary is seeing the biggest and most heroic pitched battle against the dictatorship that has broken out anywhere under the Stalinist power. Russian planes, tanks and cannon had to be called in by Nagy evidently because the Hungarian armed forces could not be used against the people. According to one report from Washington, the Russians even had to bring in reinforcements from their Rumanian bases. Hundreds are reported killed, in the fighting which has spread from Budapest to the provinces. There is no knowledge of where the resistance fighters have gotten their arms, though indications are it was from the Hungarian army itself, nor of how organized these forces were in anticipation of such a struggle. The Moscow radio ascribes it to well-prepared underground movements.

As the ending of heavy fighting was announced, a N. Y. Times dispatch said: "In Budapest the last fighting was concentrated in the workers' district of Angyalfoeld, according to the Budapest radio."

A London Times-N. Y. Times dispatch said: "In the suburbs the rebels attacked factories and succeeded in capturing a few. Two of the biggest, the Ganz ma-

chine workers and the Caspel iron works were recaptured by government troops after a three-hour fight, the government said."

This government version probably means the workers took over these factories and used them as bases. The Moscow radio admitted: "In many industrial enterprises workers offered armed resistance."

PARALLEL

To see Hungary in perspective with Poland, put the following in parallel columns:

For Poland's Bierut, put Hungary's Rakosi. (Bierut died in Moscow of a disease which may or may not be known to medical science, at the time of the 20th Congress. Rakosi, still alive, has

been deposed from leadership of the CP.

For Poland's Ochab, who succeeded Bierut, put Hungary's Erno Gero. (Both are true-blue Stalinist hatchmen, collaborators of the men they succeeded, who were put in to quiet dissent but in the hope of changing nothing.)

For Poland's Gomulka, put Hungary's Imre Nagy. (Both are hard Stalinists who symbolize the Titoist aspirations in the CP plus stress on more relaxation.)

Just as in Poland the butt of the anti-Moscow movement of the people is Rokossovsky, so in Hungary the natural butt is Rakosi. In Warsaw the cry is "Rokossovsky back to Russia," since he is a citizen of the USSR and a Kremlin stooge. In Budapest, the cry is to put Rakosi on trial for his crimes.

Up to Tuesday, while in Poland Gomulka had already taken over the reins, in Hungary Gero was fighting back to the wall. But the stormy action of the mass demonstrations in the streets continued, and he had to throw in the reserves in the shape of Nagy, who became premier while Gero still remained at the head of the CP.

During Tuesday riotous demonstrations of hundreds of thousands had gone

(Continued on page 7)

N.Y. Meeting on the Stalinist Crisis
FRIDAY, Nov. 2—Hear MAX SHACHTMAN on
THE STALINIST CRISIS IN POLAND AND HUNGARY
8:30 p.m. at Adelphia Hall (Rm. 10-B), 74 Fifth Av. (nr. 14 St.), N.Y.C.

Stevenson and the H-Bomb: A Fast Grab at the 'Peace' Issue

By SAM TAYLOR

For these final weeks of the campaign, Stevenson had to have an issue; at any rate, he had to do *something*. He is running behind, according to indications.

At the same time, political observers have once more been documenting the power of the "peace" issue as a prime element in Eisenhower's popularity, especially in the Midwest. Stevenson proceeded to discover the "peace issue" and to concretize it in his H-bomb proposal and draft suggestion.

Stevenson originally made his proposal for banning H-bomb tests last April and spoke of considering an end to the draft at the American Legion convention in the beginning of September. But it appeared unlikely then that they would play any big role in the campaign.

Some of the "professionals" in the Stevenson braintrust are reported to have great doubts about these issues since they challenge Eisenhower's military judgment, and they felt that it would backfire. But they must have been silenced when asked "What alternative do you have?"

Now that the decision was made to go ahead, the H-bomb and draft proposals

are being presented as matters of great principle.

But if they are a question of principle, they are of recent vintage. Stevenson never insisted on nor tried to incorporate this "principle" into the Democratic Party's platform. In fact there is no hint of this "principle" in that document. In fact, precisely the opposite "principle" is to be found.

The heart of the Democratic plank on "national defense" repeats the same old bipartisan shibboleths on armed strength to deter wars: "We stand for strong defenses forces so clearly superior in modern weapons to those of any possible enemy that our armed strength will make an attack upon the free world unthinkable and thus be a major force for peace."

Thomas K. Finletter, secretary of the

Air Force under the Truman administration and one of the leading Stevenson backers in New York City, set forth his views on atomic weapons before the platform committee at the Democratic convention. He called upon the committee to adopt a plank stating that "our air-atomic power at all times and at whatever cost shall be clearly superior by a substantial margin to that of any other country in the world."

IS HE SERIOUS?

There is no record, on the other hand, that Stevenson put forth his proposals for consideration. Instead he raises it now, as the election seems to be slipping away, just as in 1952 Eisenhower sprang the one about going to Korea.

Stevenson has presented the banning of large-scale nuclear weapons tests from two angles: first, the danger of radioactive fallout, and second, seizing the initiative in making a disarmament proposal.

The only real service which Stevenson has performed in his entire campaign stems from the publicity which he thus gives to the fallout problem. His H-bomb proposal is couched primarily in terms of this danger.

But if Stevenson is serious in stating these dangers, present and potential, then he completely reverses himself when he adds in the next breath, as he always does, that in the event the Russians continue to test these large-scale weapons the U. S. should do the same and thereby continue to poison the atmosphere.

Either these bombs are threatening present and future generations from a medical, and not only a military, standpoint and they should be stopped, or else the proposal is doubletalk.

The Republicans, from Eisenhower on down, have met this modest disarmament proposal with a flood of vilification and slander. They know why the proposal was made and they are out to destroy its effectiveness.

Eisenhower called it a "pie in the sky" proposal, an "illusion," and Nixon found it to be "catastrophic nonsense" endangering the security of the nation.

But it remained for David Lawrence, the right-wing columnist writing in the October 19 N. Y. Herald Tribune, to show how the Republicans would really like to handle it: "Moscow does not need any Communist Party in the U. S. to espouse her cause on H-bomb tests . . . several Democratic leaders now are doing all the espousing necessary to mislead millions of voters." This is pure-and-simple McCarthyism.

However, aside from the Republican counter-punches, there is still the question of just what Stevenson is proposing.

Is he calling for an end to the testing of the super-H-bombs of the 10- to 20-megaton variety or all H-bombs? Or

(Turn to last page)

It's the Same Stale Phrases About 'Fresh Ideas'

By GORDON HASKELL

Last week LABOR ACTION pointed out that "Nobody's Talking About Foreign Policy." The Reporter currently features an article justly entitled "Peace—The Forgotten Issue." But a few days ago Stevenson made a speech at Cincinnati described by the hostile New York Times as one of the most effective of the campaign, and its subject was . . . foreign policy.

And, says the Times, the response to this speech was so sensational that "Stevenson Maps Sweeping Attack on Foreign Policy" as the big issue for the closing weeks of the campaign.

Stevenson needs a big issue for the closing weeks, as he has had none during the opening months of the campaign. It may be that he has decided the closest he can come to it is in the very important issue of H-Bomb tests, on which LA comments elsewhere in this issue.

His Cincinnati speech was vigorous and aggressive and full of all kinds of excellent preachments, warnings, adjurations and resolutions. Surely neither Stevenson nor his supporters in the liberal-labor wing of the Democratic Party will have any objection if we look at it closely for the purpose of finding out what policies Stevenson is proposing for adoption in place of those of the Republicans.

To begin with, Stevenson painted a pretty dark picture of the present state of affairs as far as America's position in the world is concerned. In fact, one would not exaggerate things much if one were to say that Stevenson claims America, in its foreign affairs at least, is going to hell in a basket and fast:

Korea and Indochina remain divided, and America is paying the bill. Communism and neutralism are gaining in Ceylon, Burma and Indonesia. In India, there have been too many ambassadors during the past few years. NATO is declining in influence, and "France has withdrawn most of her NATO forces to North Africa," for reasons Stevenson did not bother to mention. As far as he "can discover, we have been of no help whatsoever in settling" the "dispute" in Cyprus. Iceland wants American troops to go home, and to cap it all "America's relations with its oldest and strongest allies, Britain and France, are more fragile than they have been in a generation or more."

Well, that covers quite a bit of the field. Things are bad, one must admit, and get worse as we read on and find

that instead of a victory at Suez, what has been going on is that Russia has "gained welcome to the Near and Middle East."

Now, before we discuss the "positive" part of candidate Stevenson's speech, it should be noted that he does not even blame the Republicans particularly for all the things that have gone wrong with American foreign policy. He just lists some of the most glaring weaknesses of the American position in the world, and lets it go at that.

The only point at which he gets close to being specific is his charge with regard to the shuttling of ambassadors to New Delhi, and another passage in which he says that "I cannot remember any other series of diplomatic strokes so erratic, naive and clumsy as the events of the past few years through which Russia gained welcome to the Near and Middle East."

Actually, in this portion of the speech, Stevenson is not protesting any specific aspect of Republican foreign policy so much as the attempt of Eisenhower to claim that things are going well in this field as part of his campaign for reelection.

SAMPLE OF PROSE

Stevenson is quite right to denounce Republican attempts to cover up the disintegration of capitalist imperialism and of America's position of overlord in it. The only question is: with what policies are the past ones to be replaced?

That is where we get down to the kernel of the speech: "We need to be called to labor, not lulled with rosy and misleading assurances that all is well." We need "Fresh ideas and creative thinking," not old methods, old thinking, and old slogans." There must be "honest criticism" of the mistakes of the past, but with it goes "a clear responsibility to state a constructive alternative." Stevenson in all modesty continues to say that he has "no slick formula, no patent medicine, to cure our problems."

Well, all that sounds fine. I for one will always go with the man with fresh

ideas and creative thinking, and I also favor responsibility for critics. Further, there is no doubt that the world presents many knotty problems, most of which are impervious to slick formulas or patent medicines.

From statesmen and leaders worth their salt one can expect, however, if not a slick formula, then a rough outline or a hint of what should be done in critical areas of foreign affairs.

What one might expect is not a finished program, in the sense of its being worked out to the last billion dollars and the last bureau in the table of organization, but just a series of concrete proposals as to the general method by which America should start moving in new directions in her foreign policy.

Is that what Stevenson offered at Cincinnati? Well, not quite. As a matter of fact, he was rather far from it.

To tell the truth, he sounded a bit more like the Eisenhower of 1952 than the man with fresh ideas and creative thinking.

PETERING OUT

He proposed what one might, for lack of a better term, call a six-point program, and in all honesty we reproduce it condensed but not stripped of a single fresh or creative idea, or even a concrete proposal along the lines of an old one.

"First, our entire military establishment must be re-examined. . . . There is much evidence that we don't have the military establishment we need now . . . a restudy of the Selective Service system to find, if possible, some better way of meeting our manpower requirements. . . ."

Sounds a bit like the good old Eisenhower idea of "studying" every problem instead of proposing a program to solve it, does it not?

Second came a restatement of his H-bomb proposal which is discussed elsewhere.

Third came a proposal that "we act, and act fast, to meet the challenge of the underdeveloped countries." Here, at last, it would seem, is a proposal for action, even for fast action, rather than for re-examination and study. What action?

"We must do better than we have been doing." I'll buy that any day. "And the way to begin is to understand the hopes and fears of these peoples and to work out with them new relationships based on cooperation and trust and mutual respect. . . ."

That one sort of petered out, didn't it? The fast action, it appears, lies in quickly beginning to understand the fears and hopes of other nations.

Point four doesn't start quite as fast, but it ends just as vaguely: "We must breathe new life into the Atlantic community . . . let us recognize clearly that cooperation in defense implies and demands cooperation in political and economic affairs as well. And in the neglect of these matters lies the explanation of the declining vigor of the alliance."

That one should be put side by side with the high tariff plank in the Democratic Party program.

FRESH AS METHUSELAH

Point five: "I propose a fresh approach to the problems of the world economics." (Here we go again.)

"This new approach must take account of the almost universal desire for economic development and must rest solidly on the principle of mutual advantage. I am more interested in practical measures than in global plans for solving all the world's problems by some master stroke. I am impressed, for example, by the possibilities of a world food bank as a means of aiding economic development and putting our agricultural surpluses to work."

The "principle of mutual advantage" is about as "fresh" and "new" in world economics as it is in the domestic variety. And, however much you or I may be "impressed" by one or another scheme for working off the agricultural surpluses, as voters we might like to know whether a man who seeks the presidency is for it or against it, especially after we have found out that he is for boldness and leadership as against timidity and abdication of leadership.

Point six is a bit more positive. It proposes "that the American government deal openly, frankly, honestly with the American people." To that we can only say "amen," and, perhaps add "and concretely."

Well, that is Stevenson's big opening contribution on foreign policy. From all reports, it had the assembled Democrats in Cincinnati standing on their chairs with enthusiasm.

Surely it is enough to convince one that, however much Stevenson may talk about foreign policy, it is quite true that the central questions of America's foreign policy are the "forgotten issue" and are not being discussed in this campaign by anyone.

LONDON LETTER

Resolutions Out of Blackpool

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Oct. 18

When the delegates to the Labor Party annual conference ended their week of debate, discussion and verbal fisticuffs earlier this month, they had covered a very wide range of subjects. Domestic policy, foreign and colonial affairs and party organization all received consideration in some form or another.

In order to present a concise and objective report the most convenient method is to group the conference proceedings under main headings.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS:

The Suez situation figured prominently in debates on foreign affairs and, with only one delegate registering a vote in opposition, a resolution was adopted which condemned the British government's policy and expressed the view that British policy must keep in line with the United Nations Charter and have as its object a peaceful settlement by negotiation.

Delegate John Haynes won applause when, seconding the resolution, he said: "Even if the United Nations sanction the use of force as well as economic sanctions the Labor Party must do everything in its power to oppose such actions. Our slogan must be peace, and not war."

A resolution calling for fresh efforts by the "four powers" to settle the German problem on the basis of reunification, free elections and the withdrawal of both NATO and Russian forces was passed by the delegates; as was another resolution calling for reductions in arms expenditure and the size of the armed forces. An amendment which stated that the "spread of the social revolution is wrongly identified with Russian aggression and that the danger of war comes from the forces of capitalism which are fighting it" was defeated.

Another resolution, moved by the Labor member of Parliament Konni Zilliacus, who was recently readmitted to the party after being expelled for his pro-Stalinist policies, was also defeated. This resolution stated that the challenge of Communism was social and not military and it urged the Labor Party to discuss questions "relating to peace and international cooperation" with the Stalinist parties of Russia and its satellites.

Replying to Zilliacus the spokesman for the Party Executive, Sam Watson, asked the conference delegates to reject the resolution because the recent changes in Russia were not fundamental but stemmed from the weaknesses in Russia's political constitution.

"One need only consider the Poznan rising to realize that no deep or solid changes in the social system have occurred in Eastern Europe," said the Executive speaker.

Suggestions that the Labor Party hold

official discussions with the Communist parties of Eastern Europe were "woolly thinking" and would mean a united front with the British Communist Party by a backdoor method, he said.

The conference also passed a resolution calling for the abolition of all nuclear bomb tests and pledging the Labor Party to work for the abolition of all atomic weapons.

It rejected, by 5,217,000 votes to 1,580,000 a resolution demanding the immediate abolition of compulsory military service but supported a demand for a reduction in the period of national armed service and gave general support to the Parliamentary Labor Party's demand that conscription should end in 1958.

ON NATIONAL FREEDOM

COLONIAL POLICY:

The conference adopted a policy document which pledged the next Labor government to direct all colonial governments to remove all administrative and statutory racial discriminations except those expressly designed to protect underprivileged racial groups. Colonial education authorities, it said, must accept the principle that education at all levels should be multi-racial. Politically there must be parity of franchise and representation, with the ultimate aim of common electoral rolls, universal adult franchise on the principle of One Person, One Vote.

"Europeans and Asians," it said, "must be prepared to ultimately accept unqualified African equality as the only permanent basis for democracy."

On the situation in Cyprus the conference accepted a resolution condemning the Tory government's actions and calling upon the Parliamentary Labor Party to press for a solution to the Cyprus problem founded upon "self-determination for the Cypriots."

A resolution demanding equality of justice in Kenya, and demanding the im-

mediate appointment of a commission to inquire into the severe and brutal punishments inflicted upon non-Europeans, was also passed. Moving the resolution, delegate J. Papworth declared that "if we want to keep Russian influence out of Africa, we must stop practising tyranny."

A resolution proposed by the Stalinist-controlled Electrical Trades Union, calling for the immediate withdrawal of all armed forces from colonial territories, was defeated.

Jenny Lee, wife of Aneurin Bevan, proposed a resolution which demanded a considerable increase in the amount of money allocated by the British government to the colonies and to the United Nations for helping the "underdeveloped countries."

"It is an appalling stain on Britain's reputation," she said, "that we are spending 600 times more on armaments and defense than we are on the specialized agencies of the United Nations." Britain was spending eight times as much on sending troops to Cyprus, she said, than it was giving to these specialized agencies of the United Nations.

Delegates agreed with her and passed the resolution.

South Africa, while not a colonial territory, was debated during the discussions on the colonies. A resolution asking the next Labor government to expel South Africa from the Commonwealth was defeated in favor of a resolution which, while condemning the racial policies of the South African government, favored its continuation within the Commonwealth framework in the hopes that its policies could be influenced and altered.

DOMESTIC PROGRAM

HOME AFFAIRS:

Prominent place in the debates on domestic policies was occupied by the policy document "Homes of the Future," a statement on the housing program drawn up by the National Executive Committee. This document, which was accepted by the conference, proposes that the next Labor government should take into public ownership some six million houses now owned by private landlords and let out to tenants.

The take-over from the private landlords would be made by the local councils, which would then operate them in the

same way as they do the houses which they at present build and let out to tenants.

The policy document also promises loans of 100 per cent through the local councils to people who wish to build their own houses, providing that their housing needs are justified. Moving this document on behalf of the National Executive Committee, Tony Greenwood described it as "the biggest socialization project ever attempted in the democratic world."

Leader of the building workers' unions, Sir Richard Coppock, agreed but reminded the conference that "if you socialize housing you must socialize the building of housing." His organization, the National Federation of Building Trade Operatives, has recently published a plan for the public ownership of building construction, building materials and the land, and is campaigning for its inclusion in the Labor Party's program.

On the question of automation in Britain's factories, a resolution was adopted by the delegates—after initial opposition from the National Executive Committee—which demanded that a policy statement on the subject should be produced within the next six months. This statement, said the resolution, should provide for "socialist planning" and control of automation; for consultation with the unions before automatic machinery was installed; for adequate compensation for redundancy (lay offs); and for an adequate program of technical education to enable workers to man the new plants.

A second resolution, proposing that automated industries should be nationalized, was defeated on the grounds that public ownership of industry must rest upon other considerations too and not purely whether the industry is automated or not.

A policy document entitled "Towards Equality" was adopted by the conference. This document proposes that a future Labor government would levy a capital-gains tax; tighten up on tax dodging by businessmen at present carried out under the guise of "business expenses and pension schemes"; state acquisition of property shares in lieu of estate duty; the financing of new capital expenditure in nationalized industries out of their own surpluses or the government's budget surplus in order to avoid "a mounting volume of interest payments to private lenders"; and the closing up of loopholes whereby the payment of death duties is being avoided at present.

Another policy document, "Personal Freedom," was also adopted. This deals with the rights of the individual in relation to the state, and promises that an advisory board be set up to consider "security" charges against workers on arms contracts in private industry; a review of the home secretary's power to deport aliens; and an extension of the free legal-aid service brought into operation by the last Labor government.

PARTY ORGANIZATION:

Most of the resolutions under this heading were crowded out due to lack of time. One resolution passed increases the contributions of local Labor Parties and national trade unions to the central Labor Party Funds by 50 per cent.

A number of proposals to increase the power of local Labor Parties at the annual conference, and whittle down the power of the trade unions, were defeated; as were proposals that the local party organizations should hold an additional conference each year apart from the one attended by the trade unions.

This is but a very brief review of some of the more important aspects of the 1956 conference of the Labor Party and is by no means exhaustive.

Declaration on Colonialism

Following is the "Declaration on Colonialism" proposed for Dependent Peoples Freedom Day by the Socialist International and the IUSY. For comment, see article in the Challenge on page 5.

DECLARATION ON COLONIALISM

(1) The Universal Declaration of Human Rights to be respected by all peoples in the world, recognizes the dignity of man and his inalienable right to choose his own way of life provided that he does not infringe this right for his fellowmen.

(2) The right of peoples to self-determination, again provided that it does not infringe the same right for other peoples, and that it does not prejudice their freedom or the peace of the world, is a basic principle of the democratic system of society. The Charter of the United Nations recognizes this right.

(3) Self-determination, hitherto regarded by imperialist nations as a privilege, must be exercised as a right by colonial and dependent peoples and satellite countries.

(4) Colonial and dependent peoples aim towards the realization of this right to self-determination and of their own dignity.

(5) The colonial rulers and imperialist powers still cling to their "sacred mission," whether in its old or new interpretations, only to justify their self-interest and for safeguarding their domination as long as possible.

(6) As long as there are colonial powers and dependent peoples there will always be a continuous and persistent

struggle for freedom and against economic enslavement.

(7) The struggle against colonial rule is in essence the human protest against poverty, misery, degradation and indignity, which any form of imperialism necessarily entails for the peoples under it.

(8) But national freedom is only a means to human freedom. The struggle against colonialism should aim at the emancipation from any form of exploitation of man by man and at social and economic equality of the suffering masses and the establishment of a democratic Socialist society.

(9) The continuation of colonialism and imperialism, besides economic disequilibrium and the politics of spheres of influence, is one of the main sources of international unrest and serves as a constant threat to the peace of the world.

(10) All genuine democrats fully share with these fighters their passionate desire for human rights and freedom, and therefore associate themselves with the struggle against colonial and any other form of oppression and for a world order free from slavery, hunger, political terror and war.

(11) We solemnly resolve that all nations and peoples of the world shall be free and dedicate ourselves to that endeavor with all the strength that we command.

(12) The Asian Socialist Conference and the Socialist International appeal to the socialist parties all over the world to observe Dependent Peoples Freedom Day in the spirit of this declaration.

World Premiere: A NEW SKIT

by the Marxoid Mummies
"The Three Dollar Force"
an amazingly unanalytical view
of the election campaign

The New York Independent
Socialist League and
Young Socialist League
sinisterly invite you to hunt
witches at our

Halloween Hassle

which is scheduled for the dark
of the moon at 9 on

Saturday, Oct. 27

There will be thaumaturgical refreshments, necromantic dancing, folk-dancing and other hocus-pocus, as well as cabalistic conviviality and, of course, demonic drinking. We're on! Witch sighed, "Are you on?" If so, on to

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

NEW YORK

LABOR ACTION FORUM

Thursday, Nov. 1

The Minority Parties and the Election

The Socialist Groups discussed by
GORDON HASKELL

The Stalinoid Groups discussed by
DON HARRIS

Labor Action Hall

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

PRO and CON: DISCUSSION

Dissent—1

To the Editor:

Regarding the election statement by the ISL (LA, Oct. 8); the concluding paragraphs, recommending a vote for the Socialist Party and not for the Socialist Workers Party, is a tissue of rationalizations and half-truths.

To begin with, the statement is glaringly deficient in detailing its criticisms of the SP (an essential part of critical support). "The Socialist Party," says the ISL ever so delicately, "maintains positions on a number of vital questions of the day, including its attitude toward the war question, which in our opinion are incorrect policies for the socialist movement." What are these "incorrect policies"? The plain fact, only indirectly suggested in the statement, is that the SP supports American imperialism in the cold war. It also supported the hot war in Korea, as well as the counter-revolution in Guatemala. I fail to see how a support which omits these important criticisms of the SP carries out the ISL's expressed wish "to encourage revolutionary socialist positions on the vital issues of the day."

Compare the polite treatment of the SP with the forthright criticism of the SWP. The SWP, says the statement, is in "rapid movement in the direction of political capitulation to Stalinism and political solidarity with Stalinism in the looming world war." This is one reason why the ISL refuses to recommend a vote for the SWP. With whom, then, will the Socialist Party be "in political solidarity in the looming world war"? I can only assume that in the opinion of the ISL it is less criminal to support American imperialism than to "move in the direction of political solidarity with Stalinism."

The truth is that the SWP maintains an attitude much more independent of and antagonistic to Stalinism than does the SP toward American imperialism. Compare, for example, the complete solidarity expressed by the SWP with the Poznan strikers on the one hand with the support given by the SP to the U. S.-instigated counter-revolution in Guatemala. These are unpalatable truths which are omitted in the ISL statement.

An SWP vote, says the statement, will be interpreted as a pro-Stalinist protest vote, because "this year sees the SWP putting itself forward before the voters as, in effect, the *ersatz* electoral instrument of pro-Stalinism in the absence of any candidates put forward by an outright Stalinist or Stalinist-run party." There is a measure of truth in this statement; but a similar interpretation would be given the vote of any tendency opposed to American imperialism, in the absence of an outright Stalinist or Stalinist-run party. This year the SWP has gotten the support of such Stalinist collaborators as Vincent Hallinan, Progressive Party candidate for president in 1962. Indubitably, the more successful the SWP is in getting such support the more its vote will be interpreted as a pro-Stalinist vote. But this would be completely incorrect.

The SWP campaign is a double blow against Stalinism, such as the SP campaign cannot be. First of all, a vote by a Stalinist for the SWP is a vote against popular-frontism, which has been the official line of Stalinism since 1934, and the unofficial consequence of its material and theoretical base, before that. Secondly, a Stalinist vote for the SWP is a sharp break with Stalinism precisely on the Russian question. To vote for the SWP, or even to consider the question, is a recognition that Trotskyism, the most intransigent enemy of Stalinism, is not only not counter-revolutionary but a legitimate part of the revolutionary movement. It is an admission in practice that it is legitimate to work for the overthrow of the ruling bureaucracy in the Soviet Union. Such an admission, needless to say, is a thousand times more significant than the purely formal and unimplemented recognition of the right to criticize made by the Communist Party. I do not see how the conclusion can be escaped that the SWP campaign is a significant blow against Stalinism.

The same cannot be said of the So-

cialist Party campaign. A Stalinist voting for the SP does not make nearly the same decisive break with Stalinism as one voting for the SWP. Such a vote (for the SP) could easily be a reflection of the CP popular-front line. Furthermore Stalinist prejudices against the Socialist Party are not nearly so strong as against the SWP; the SP is regarded quite rightly as a much less serious enemy of Stalinism than the SWP. Consider, for example, the anxiety of the CP to "debate" with the SP and its refusal to have anything to do with the SWP. Moreover, a Stalinist vote for the SP is more likely to mean a step in the direction of reformism than toward revolutionary socialism.

I think a revolutionary socialist must recommend a vote for the SWP.

There is one other less important but significant omission in the election statement of the ISL. "In this election," it says, "unlike previous years, the Socialist Party will appear on the ballot in few states." With its previously noted decorousness, the statement does not attempt to say why the SP is on the ballot in so few states. As the ISL well knows, the explanation does not lie simply in the weakness of the SP; it was the policy of the SP not to try to get on the ballot, but to run only a token campaign. The SP wants to do as little damage as it can to the Stevenson campaign and to its ties with the imperialistic liberals.

I believe that the ISL statement, by its omissions, superficiality, and rationalizations, constitutes a capitulation to the capitulators to imperialism.

One final word. I hold the "Orthodox Trotskyist" view that the Russian state is a degenerated workers state; at the same time I have been a supporter of the ISL. It might be said that my support for the SWP candidate follows from my position. This is probably true. But I do not think that support for the SP candidate necessarily follows from the ISL "Third Camp" position. I think a case could easily be made that the contrary is true. I believe the election line of the ISL is symptomatic of the political direction it is taking.

S. R.

Los Angeles, Oct. 14

Dissent—2

To The Editor:

I was interested in your reply to Comrade Howard's letter on the elections. The basic question he raised—how one can call for writing in Hoopes and Friedman in states where either the SLP or the SWP is on the ballot—remains, in my opinion, unanswered.

No matter how important the SP's "name and tradition" are, and I think you greatly exaggerate it, to ask someone to actually bother to write in Hoopes and Friedman (assuming they could remember to spell them correctly) is another question.

Hoopes and Friedman are virtually unknown to the American public and stand as much for socialism in the people's minds as Marlen and Weisbord. A write-in vote for Hoopes and Friedman in a state where another socialist party is on the ballot is equivalent to abstentionism and will decrease the size of the socialist protest vote.

Such a position can only be justified in two ways. The first was mentioned by Comrade Howard and properly called "opportunistic." The ISL should justify its support for the SP not on the internal desires of the ISL for unity but on the objective needs of the working-class movement in the country. To do otherwise is opportunism.

The second justification is based on the proposition that independent socialists are politically closer to the SP than, say, the SWP. This point of view must be argued either on the basis that support of American imperialism is a lesser evil than support of Stalinist imperialism or on the basis that the SP does not really and consistently support American imperialism. Anyone who makes the first argument is no longer a third-camp socialist. The second argument can only be made on the basis of ignorance, or worse, a deliberate attempt to whitewash the SP.

The SP's stand in support of every

important imperialist policy of America from the Marshall Plan through NATO and the Korean War make it absolutely clear that there is no political basis for support of the SP alone in this election.

Hand in hand with the ISL's support of the SP goes its Stalinophobic denunciation of the SWP. As everybody in the third-camp movement knows, the SWP's position on the defense of Russia prevents it from clearcut opposition to Stalinism. But to jump from recognition of this to the accusation of "continued capitulation to Stalinism" and "ersatz pro-Stalinism" is to lose one's sense of perspective.

The SWP has carried out a consistent campaign in support of the Poznan workers, correctly pointing to the revolutionary impact of their uprising; it has consistently fought the Stalinist's peaceful coexistence line; the continued capitulation of the American CP to the Kremlin's foreign policy needs; and has supported the working class and the colonial peoples in every one of their struggles. Would that the SP had as good a record towards its own ruling class as does the SWP towards the Russian bureaucracy.

In my opinion it would make better sense for revolutionary socialists to support the SWP in this campaign than the SP. But since the real meaning of a socialist vote in this election will be its protest nature, the most sensible advice we third-camp socialists can give the radical public is to vote for any of the socialist candidates on the ballot and in that way express your opposition to capitalism and the blind alley of capitalist politics.

TIM WOHLFORTH

In Reply

(1) Our two critics, whose letters are printed above, are wrong in linking electoral support with *programmatically* support of any one of the socialist sects which is running candidates in this election.

Programmatically we Independent Socialists have essential disagreements with all three (SP, SLP, SWP) and could not support any of them if the selection is to be made on a programmatic basis. This is the point of the programmatic criticism of all three which is made in the ISL statement. This is also what is wrong with our two critics' approach.

Our recommendation to vote for the SP candidates was specifically motivated in the first instance as follows: "We select the SP . . . because we believe that a vote for the SP candidates will be most easily and widely interpreted as a socialist protest vote in its general sense and not because we wish to indicate any endorsement of the SP's program or policies as a whole" . . . and so on.

This refers to our opinion that workers who don't want to vote for either Stevenson or Eisenhower can be explained—propagandistically, if you please—the positive alternative of a socialist protest vote most easily if it is concretized in terms of the SP. (That's where the SP's "name and tradition" are relevant. Not its program.)

We note that S.R. does not refer to this, our motivation, at all; he is solely concerned with arguing whether he agrees programmatically with the SWP more than the SP. We note that Comrade Wohlforth does not mention it either, though he includes the otherwise inexplicable reference to the SP's "name and tradition," only in connection with the question of "bother."

This motivation, which they decline to discuss, seems to us a valid basis for concretizing an electoral recommendation without programmatic agreement.

(2) Comrade S.R. is not really discussing electoral policy at all, as he seems to realize at the end of his letter, when he more or less concedes that he wants to support the SWP candidates because he too holds the "Orthodox Trotskyist" view on Russia. One can therefore understand his leaning, if not agree with it, but it is not a possible mode of approach for socialists who have nothing in common with the SWP-type of pro-Stalinism.

To balance his concession, S.R. merely argues that he doesn't think "support for

the SP candidate necessarily follows from the ISL "Third Camp" position." He is right; it doesn't. It follows only from the motivations stated in the ISL statement on the question.

We think S.R. is making a political mistake when he tries to derive an electoral recommendation from either his own "orthodox Trotskyist" view, from our Third Camp views, or any other programmatic affinity.

As for his last sentence, we must remind Comrade S.R.: Over two years before S.R. quit the SWP and moved toward us, we of the ISL had already endorsed the SP candidates as our electoral recommendation in 1952. If we repeat that general recommendation in 1956, it is hardly in order for him to speak ominously of some new "political direction." Our "political direction" in opposition to all forms of pro-Stalinism, including the "Orthodox Trotskyist" variety, was accomplished quite a while ago.

(3) Comrade Wohlforth also seems to link electoral recommendation to programmatic agreement: "The second justification [for supporting SP] is based on the proposition that independent socialists are politically closer to the SP than, say, the SWP."

Since this has no resemblance to anything in our statement of views, we take it that our critic means that he thinks this would be a justification if it were true. If this is the meaning intended, we beg to disagree. That is, we disagree with the type of approach which tries to determine electoral recommendation by asking: "To whom are we politically closer?"

In fact, this approach might well be considered "opportunistic" by those who like to use the epithet, since in one way or another it involves subordinating our programmatic differences to the exigencies of an electoral recommendation, whether for the SWP or SP or any other.

The ISL statement touched on a matter of political "closeness" not with reference to the SP as such but with reference to those revolutionary socialist sentiments in the socialist movement which we wish to encourage. If Comrade S.R. (or Wohlforth) can dig up any Third Camp elements in the SWP, any at all, we would be glad to say the same. If they cannot, then this fact is not without interest for our problem.

As for the proposal for socialist unity which was made in the SP by Third Camp comrades there, and which is mentioned in the ISL statement, we did not present that as the ruling motivation for our electoral recommendation. Comrade Wohlforth should please remind himself that we made the same general recommendation in 1952 when no unity proposal had been made by anybody.

If S.R. thinks our criticisms of the SP were "polite," that's fine. He complains that we didn't dissect the SP line on Guatemala or Korea; but then, we didn't say anything about the SWP's embracement of the Titoist dictatorship, its hosannas for Mao's totalitarianism in China, or even its position in defense of Russia's invasions and imperialism; in fact, we didn't even mention its views that Stalinism is a legitimate working-class movement, etc. In other words, we did not write essays on these parties, but it is the SWP which relatively got off scot-free in our statement, evidently.

We mainly pointed out that the SWP

(Turn to last page)



LABOR ACTION

October 29, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 44

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 24 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

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

Youth in the Van in Anti-Stalinist Revolt

By MAX MARTIN

Students and young people in general have been playing an important and active role in the sensational and turbulent events which have been sweeping Poland during the past few days, as they have been doing in every momentous upsurge that has taken place in Eastern Europe in the last few years. And developments in Hungary show that students and youth are a key factor in that country also.

In Poland student organizations and circles of young intellectuals have been the focal point of strength for independent tendencies in and around the Communist Party in the months between the Twentieth Congress of the Russian CP and the current meeting of the Central Committee of the Polish Stalinist party. Student organizations and student newspapers played an important part in the agitation for "liberalization" of Polish Stalinist society and the breakthrough from domination by the Kremlin.

And during the hectic twenty-four hours which followed the rejection by the Polish CP of Khrushchev's ultimatum, the Polish students rallied to the defense of Poland as against Moscow and demonstrated their intentions of fighting against both Russian military aggression and any coup by pro-Russian Polish Stalinist forces. (See other stories in this issue of LABOR ACTION for more on the role of the Polish youth.)

Meanwhile the Hungarian students were being heard from. The student body of the Budapest Technical College submitted a list of demands to the government whose fulfillment they called for in a two-week period. They informed the authorities that they would begin holding street demonstrations if their demands are not granted.

Their program included the following: Freedom of the press, abolition of the

death penalty, freedom of travel, access to Western literature, abolition of compulsory indoctrination courses, better living standards, restoration of the independence of the universities.

Moreover, they demanded that these changes be accorded not merely for themselves but for the entire country, demonstrating that their aim was freedom for the Hungarian people, not merely better conditions for themselves alone.

In addition they called for a public trial of Mihaly Farkas, former minister of Defense who had played a key role in the execution of Laszlo Rajk for Titoism. As a result of the "de-Stalinization" taking place in Hungary since the Russian CP's Twentieth Congress, Farkas has been under arrest, but faces a secret trial by a military tribunal. Demands for a public trial for him have been widespread in Hungary.

STUDENT OPPOSITION

On the day before these developments, the student body of Szeged University resigned as a group from the Stalinist youth organization DISZ, and issued a statement explaining that it was inadequate to represent the interests of university youth. They then proceeded to organize an independent student organization under their own control. Some three thousand students took part in this event.

As in Poland, the dissident Hungarian Stalinists have enjoyed wide popularity in Hungarian student groups. For Imre

Nagy, Hungary's counterpart to Poland's Wladyslaw Gomulka, who like the latter was purged from the CP, and who like the latter escaped the fate of Rajk or Bulgaria's Kostov or Czechoslovakia's Slansky, the groups of students and young people have been a strong supporting base. A Budapest student mass meeting demanded that Nagy be made premier.

Last July witnessed a stormy meeting in Budapest of the Petofi Youth Club, a meeting attended by over 1000 young people and intellectuals and listened to by an additional 5000 over loudspeakers from outside the cafe in which the meeting was held. At this gathering, speakers attacked Matyas Rakosi and other Hungarian Stalinist leaders, demanded their removal, and called for the readmission of Nagy to the CP.

This was the meeting of the youth club, subsequently condemned by the Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party as a gathering place of "reactionary elements," which heard Tibor Deri, a well-known Hungarian writer and a member of the Communist Party, declare: "It is high time that an end be made to this present regime of gendarmes and bureaucrats."

Before the meeting of the Petofi Youth Club there had occurred another meeting in Budapest at which 2000 "old-time Communists, and former partisan and underground workers" had criticized the Hungarian Stalinist regime. At this gathering, where Rajk's widow spoke, many student leaders were in attendance.

Nor have these been the only manifestations of revolt by young people in Iron Curtain countries. Young workers played a prominent part in the Poznan uprising. Students in Czechoslovakia held demonstrations last May in which they expressed their hostility to Stalinism. And in the

heroic 1953 German uprising, young workers also took part on a large scale.

The activities of these students and youth are not difficult to understand.

Tens and tens of thousands of young people in Eastern Europe joined the Communist Parties out of mistaken idealistic conviction, out of belief that Stalinism would build a better life for their countries. They rejected completely the society of the past; capitalism and feudal remnants could have and did have no appeal for them. They embraced Stalinism because they mistakenly believed that it would create socialist freedom in Eastern Europe.

FOR SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY

During the last few years disillusionment and disgust have been rife among them, as they have been among the workers. Since the Twentieth Congress it has become more possible to express their feelings, and expressed they have been all over Eastern Europe, especially in Poland and Hungary.

These young people have rallied to the support of these sections of the Stalinist leaderships which were jailed and purged for "Titoism." They have done so for several reasons.

In the first place, their sympathy has been drawn to the Gomulkas and Nagys as victims of the hated regime. But more important, they enthusiastically welcome developments away from Russia in their country; they regard the Kremlin's imperialist domination of their lands with hate, and support those who wish, or are supposed to wish, to fight for independence like Yugoslavia's.

Thus it was that demonstrations occurred in Polish universities rallying the students behind Gomulka's regime and urging him not to back down; thus it was that student delegations visited Gomulka to inform him of their readiness to fight, if it came to that.

But the students of Hungary and Poland have left no doubt that they want much more than independent national-Stalinist states. They want genuine democracy, genuine socialist freedom.

The demands of the students of Budapest Technical College show this clearly. The emphasis of these students on "democratization" show this clearly. A banner hung over Warsaw University read: "The army is with the people; the people are with the army in defense of democratization."

The Polish and Hungarian students today may possibly entertain many illusions about the democracy they can expect from Gomulka and Nagy; but if they support these men it is precisely because they do think that the "Titoist" national-Stalinists stand for a course which leads toward freedom.

In so doing, they demonstrate their devotion to liberty, and their desire for socialist democracy. They demonstrate the irrepressibility of the struggle for human emancipation, even under the despotism of Stalinist totalitarianism.

Socialist Youth Int'l Declares Anti-Colonialism Day

In a circular dated October 9, the International Union of Socialist Youth (IUSY) has urged socialists throughout the world to join in observing and celebrating Dependent Peoples Freedom Day on October 30.

The Asian Socialist Conference selected this date three years ago as a day for international socialist dedication annually to the support of all subjugated peoples struggling against imperialism and colonialism. It has been marked by anti-imperialist meetings, rallies and demonstrations throughout the world, including the United States, since then.

This year, the Day has been preceded by the agreement of the Asian Socialist Conference and the Socialist International, in consultation with the IUSY, on a joint Declaration on Colonialism, as well as by an agreement on the purposes of the Day and a program for its observation.

Among the purposes of Dependent Peoples Freedom Day the IUSY circular lists the following:

"To inspire dependent peoples all over the world not to lose heart in the struggle against exploitation of man by man and by colonial powers, economic disequilibrium and politics of spheres of influence;

"To cement bonds of comradeship between fighters for freedom in all parts of the world, in the countries behind the Iron Curtain as well as in the territories still under the heel of imperialism."

The IUSY calls upon socialist organizations in all countries to organize activities for Dependent Peoples Freedom Day, including meetings, rallies, demon-

strations and parades.

It urges that socialist publications should, immediately prior to the Day, "be devoted to the struggle for full freedom in colonial countries." In a spirit of "socialist solidarity with all peoples fighting for freedom," it asks IUSY affiliates to send greetings to socialist organizations and freedom movements in colonial countries and to collect funds for "the purposes of colonial liberation."

The Young Socialist League welcomes these sentiments and is pleased to join in the observance of Dependent Peoples Freedom Day.

For the purpose of helping to mark this Day, and in order to help circulate the position and activities of the IUSY, we print below a resolution on "The Struggle For Independence" adopted by the IUSY Executive Committee at its meeting in Tampere, Finland, this past July. Published also in this issue of LABOR ACTION is the Declaration on Colonialism of the Asian Socialist Conference and the Socialist International, which the IUSY endorses. We are certain that Challenge readers will find them of interest.

The IUSY resolution, a strong statement on the whole, suffers, in our opinion, from the absence of the specification of Algeria among the colonial countries listed in the final sentence, precisely because that country is among those, and perhaps the most important of those, in which a concrete struggle for freedom is now taking place.

The joint Declaration on Colonialism, while condemning imperialism strongly

in the abstract, deplorably fails to address itself to concrete struggles at all, and moreover, in its second section contains formulations which can be used by the imperialists to justify their imperialist policies in specific cases. Nevertheless one can be certain that it represents the views of the Asian Socialist Conference on the whole, rather than those of the sections of the Socialist International which are pursuing imperialist policies, the French Socialist Party in the first place.

STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE

The Executive Committee of IUSY supports fully the struggle for independence of all peoples fighting against colonial oppression and imperialistic exploitation.

It calls upon the youth of the world to give all possible help in the struggle according to the best principle of international solidarity. It demands that an end be put to any further action against the interests of nations which are fighting and working for their full liberation.

It calls upon every man and woman of good will to raise their voice against the rule of terror and bloodshed where it exists and against the denial of civil and economic rights in the territories which still do not enjoy full political independence. It especially draws the attention of youth and asks for support in the condemnation of oppression and makes known before the whole world its grave disapproval of events in Cyprus, Malaya, Nigeria, and many other lands under colonial rule.

YSL-LYL Discussion:

WHAT HAS CHANGED?

Two viewpoints on the Effects of the Russian 80th Congress

MICHAEL HARRINGTON
National Chairman, YSL

WILLIAM H. JENNINGS Jr.
Acting Illinois Chairman, LYL

TUESDAY, Oct. 30 at 8 p.m.

University of Chicago
Rosenwald Hall, Room 2

Polish and Hungarian Workers & Youth

(Continued from page 1)

Democracies" were new and cautious, exactly such phrases were the regular stock of the Stalinists as they moved toward full power. These phrases were in vogue until the Tito upheaval. The reality behind such phrases is far more important.

ECONOMIC DRIVE

In Poland the reality behind the nationalist striving, from the point of view of the tops, can be spelled in dollars and cents, or rather zlotys. Russian demands have been draining Poland of its coal, of its manufactured products, at artificially low prices imposed by fiat, while the standard of living of the people has been sinking and the conditions of labor worsened.

This economic pressure on Poland is one reason why one of the first steps of the new Gomulka regime has been to put out feelers for economic aid from the United States, as the existing alternative to increasing economic dependence on Russia.

No doubt, the economic drive is not the only one, though the main one. It would be useless to play down the significance of the historical bases of hatred of Russian domination in this country most of whose existence has been under the heel of Russian tyrants and their allies. No other nation has such reserves of anti-Russian antagonism, with the possible exception or close competition of the Ukrainians.

Therefore: "Even among non-Communists of whatever age . . . there seemed to be a feeling of solidarity with the government and of national pride at the way the Polish leaders had thus far stood up to the long-hated next-door neighbor." (N. Y. Times, Oct. 21.)

No doubt; and this solidarity is a good thing to keep in mind, too, when we discuss the interplay of national-Stalinist sentiments and social-revolutionary aspirations. Tito had the advantage, in his break, of a purely national armed force which had fought independently to liberate their country and which owed little to the Russians; but the Poles have a different advantage: roots of anti-Russianism that go down to national bedrock and unite every section of the Polish people with no visible exceptions worth mentioning.

But Polish nationalism, which has traditionally been one of the most stiff-necked and intransigent in all Europe, for excellent reasons of history, only provides a background for the national-Stalinist drives; it is a constant. What has been mounting in intensity has been the economic pressure.

THE LINK WITH POZNAN

There is another reason for spotlighting the economic drive as the dynamically operative one. It is by its very nature the transmission belt between the two sides of the present struggle, the nationalist and the social. It is what provides the continuity between Poznan and the Gomulka coup.

The immediate impulsion behind the Poznan mass action was economic—wages, working conditions, demands of labor. But it is characteristic precisely of the bureaucratic-collectivist structure that such demands tend to go right over into political demands, for it is also the all-powerful state which is both economic and political master. So it was in East Germany. So it was in Poznan. (This fact is one of the "secret" weapons of the socialist revolution against Stalinism.)

In a twinkling, a peaceful demonstration for workers' economic demands became an assault on the secret police's fortress in Poznan—and it does not matter who fired the first shot there.

So the political power is menaced unless economic concessions can be made. But the Polish subfuehrers were hamstrung in this direction. They could not both appease the masses and satisfy their Russian masters. They were squeezed.

Only yesterday, perhaps, the Cyrankiewicz regime would not have stopped with using armed force against the workers only in Poznan. But view it, for the sake of oversimplification, as a problem in physics: there is pressure from Moscow, there is pressure from below—what gives?

Here enters another big difference from the 1948-Tito case. The pressure from Moscow was not the same any more. The Russian heartland of Stalinism was in a convulsion too—racked by factional conflict over the problems of "relaxation" in a totalitarian framework, with no all-mighty Vozhd like Stalin who concentrated the reins of power in one hand, rent with its own uncertainties. The pressure from Moscow was weaker, and the pressure from below expanded.

From a simple demand in a factory for a few zlotys, to an international crisis of Stalinism—all in one practically continuous sweep of three months—this is the sort of phenomenon that is possible only in a totalitarian collectivism where economics and politics are FUSED in one rigid structure, so that a shock at one end travels right through. This is Stalinism, the system which has scared so many radicals into believing that it is so invulnerable to revolt from below that only capitalist-imperialist armies can be relied on to get rid of it for "us" . . .

THE BIG DIFFERENCE

This leads us right to another difference with the Yugoslav Titoist break of 1948, and this is the biggest difference of all.

The Yugoslav break was a "cold" split purely on top, bureaucratically managed from A to Z. The Yugoslav people, who naturally hailed the resistance shown by Tito to Russian imperialism, played only the role of cheering squads, choruses of admiration, and sounding-boards for speeches from on high. There was no movement from below accompanying it. There was no mass participation.

Not so now in Poland. It is not only a question of Poznan. That was three months ago. Right now, as we write, to the dismay of the Gomulka and Cyrankiewicz and Ochabs who are supposed to be leading this movement, the Polish people are in the streets.

True, they are in the streets in acclamation of the anti-Russian moves; what they are doing is under cover of this "legality." But they are in the streets yelling for more. Moreover, the Gomulkas do not want them in the streets under their own power (in "unauthorized meetings") even if they only yell "Hail Gomulka!" They are not under control.

"PERMANENT REVOLUTION"

One of the first problems of the new national-Stalinist combine will be to get the people under control. At this point, all we want to point out is that there was no such problem, not even for a day, in Tito's Yugoslavia when he broke with the Cominform.

This fact is the transition to the "second front" which is opening up in Poland, simultaneously with (and under the umbrella of) the all-Polish welling-up of revolt against the Russian masters—side by side with the latter, intermingled with the latter. This is the front of social and political struggle against the Polish masters, the Polish "Titoists" themselves.

We see the open beginnings of this. Open beginnings—for, after all, it is not actually only beginning now; from a cold class struggle of slowdown and sabotage to outbreaks of strikes and demonstrations, the Polish workers and peasants have been simmering. And it is only the open beginnings, for we are not promising any social revolution for a delivery date.

But, that said, it is still the open beginnings of that struggle for socialist freedom which must go from ousting the Russian Stalinists to ousting the Polish Stalinists themselves, which must end up with (though it does not begin with) an open fight against the same leaders who are now being hailed as the heroes who told off Khrushchev.

(In Yugoslavia, this "second front" was opened—very late and very gingerly—only in the fashion of Djilas and Djedjer; and it was slammed shut by Tito with no visible social convulsion resulting. But this is Poland.)

SIMULACRUM

There will of course be the illusions among the Polish people that the same people who stand up for them (and for themselves) against the Russians will

also give them the social demands which they want, and which presumably only the Russians are holding back. This illusion is inevitable. De-Russianization and de-Stalinization are identified; nationalism and "liberalization" are identified; "democratization" becomes a demagogic slogan behind which hides only so much relaxation of the totalitarian rigor as is needed to get the new leaders through their first period.

But as long as the people are in motion they will soon find out different, and this motion is the great danger now to the Gomulka regime.

"Democratization" will be shown up as a counter-word whose distinctive visage has been worn off with use, or rather abuse. For example, the N. Y. Times reports: "The military historical department of the General Staff and the Army's Technical School both passed resolutions demanding the democratization [sic] of the army, a phrase unmistakably aimed at the present army leadership." (Oct. 23.)

Exactly; it is not aimed at democracy for the ranks. "Democratization" is a phrase which in Titoist doublespeak means, "Let us 'democratize' our enemies out of power and ourselves in." Do they really mean democratize the army? Not for a moment. It is only dupes who parrot their vocabulary.

To be sure, and this is important, there is a simulacrum of "democratization" set up in any situation where the controlling power is no longer stable and assured, but rather in convulsions and uncertain of itself, or rocked by factional conflict. This indeed has been one of the bases for the illusion of "democratization" in Russia itself. Things are allowed because they cannot yet be punished. This is going on all over Poland and Hungary.

WHAT THEY WANT

In this connection a precious remark from Hungary was cited in the press. The Hungarian writer Hay is presently a leading voice calling for expansion of liberties:

"He told an inquirer who wondered why Hungarian newspapers were expressing different opinions about the culpability of Mr. Rakosi that this was because the Hungarian press, although still directed, was ineptly directed." (N. Y. Times, Oct. 23.)

Of course, simple ineptness or incompetence or confusion is only one form in which this "ghost" of democratization appears in times of convulsion, but it is an hypothesis which should not be forgotten in the midst of our usual preoccupation with finding "deep" reasons for political phenomena (just as in America the ditherings of Dulles are not always to be ascribed to the "needs of American imperialism" but sometimes merely to lamentably subjective factors like stupidity).

In its own way and with its own vocabulary, *Trybuna Ludu*, the Polish CP organ, took occasion of a reply to Eisenhower to make clear that "democratization" has its own special semantics: "If anyone thinks* democratization of our internal life and reforms mean abandoning of socialism [which is the code word for Stalinism] and the weakening of solidarity with other socialist [i.e., Stalinist] countries he is equally mistaken." It went on to stress its "ideological unity" with the Russians.

What the Gomulkas and Cyrankiewicz want is one thing; but Poland is not Yugoslavia. Poland is a politically and socially advanced and industrialized country with a mature working class that has had centuries of revolutionary experience and a great background of socialist experience and education. This fact has something to do with what is happening now, as with what happened in Poznan.

"NOT LIKE POZNAN"

On October 21 the N. Y. Times correspondent in Warsaw found a CP organizer holding vigil in the Zeran auto plant; he was Secretary Zuzankiewicz of the party cell in the plant. He explains why he has been up for two nights running:

"We were anxious that the workers should not act like the Poznan workers," he said, "because that was not the way to fight for democratization."

The anxiety was understandable. No doubt the Warsaw industrial workers

number among the cream of the revolutionary proletariat of the country; so did the East German steel workers who marched down Stalinallee. On the very day when his party leaders were overjoying the Polish people by defying the Russians, why should cell secretary Zuzankiewicz fear that his sterling proletarians might "act like the Poznan workers?"

The Gomulkas are not only afraid of mass action against themselves; they are almost equally afraid of mass action behind themselves.

THE OPEN DOOR

They did not fight very hard when, following the Poznan action, the Russians transferred three new divisions into Poland. We now discover that one of the Soviet divisions which started toward Warsaw Thursday morning was stationed at Poznan. On his visit to Warsaw in July, Bulganin had publicly blamed the Poznan episode on "imperialist agents" and, it was reported, called for a stern crack-down.

But insofar as the Cyrankiewicz regime turned its police power against Poznan, i.e., against the people, to that same extent it could be only a servile creature of the Russians, doomed to squeeze the people ever harder for the foreign masters and to club them ever harder in order to keep them in line, till they themselves were cast aside as squeezed lemons by the masters when they were no longer able to keep up with this ratrace.

To go easy on Poznan, however, i.e., to ease up on the people, was to run athwart the Russians on the one hand, and on the other, to run the risk of unleashing forces that could not be controlled.

Which should it be? Which way? The classic result is the split-up of the leadership into the "hards" and "softs," and it seems that terms like these have been used (as reported by the *Le Monde* correspondent in Warsaw, Philippe Ben) to describe the factional line-up in the Polish politburo.

The "Natolin group," the so-called pro-Russians, were therefore not pro-Russian simply because they liked Russians better than Poles, or even simply because they are characterless rat-souled creatures, but also because there is an unsolved problem here which the national-Stalinists do not get rid of by getting rid of Russian controls.

The relatively light sentences conferred upon the Poznan prisoners in the dock was the Cyrankiewicz line; so also was the latitude allowed the defendants for blowing off steam. But every concession opens the door a little more, and every millimeter that the door opens, more dissent pours through; the door has to be opened a little more . . . or slammed shut.

LOST CONTROL

In the end, the alternative is a crack-down or a crack-up. We have had the crack-up. But now the problem still remains; it is even worse. How to shut that door against the newly invigorated and encouraged forces that are trying to fling it wide open to the light . . .

So one of the first results of the new upheaval is the reversal of even the light sentences imposed on the Poznan defendants, which will be "reviewed," dismissal of cases against those not yet brought to trial, etc. It is another concession, this time to open force.

The *Times* correspondent reports an unpublished resolution of the Polish Central Committee; in it they "made a startlingly frank admission . . . that the party had 'lost its leading role in the country' during the last three months of economic chaos and unrest." (N. Y. Times, Oct. 23.)

Exactly the trouble: the regime has lost control of the masses, it fears. It must either run on and head them back, or shoot now. It is trying to do the former.

LESSON IN WROCLAW

This was acted out in the city of Wroclaw which on Monday saw a "tremendous demonstration" in the streets, as "the city's inhabitants acclaimed the marchers," who apparently were the student population of the town. It was a tempestuous mass outpouring, unorganized by party shepherds. To underline the point, the Stalinist press the next day actually

Shake the Bases of World Stalinism — —

denounced it, and warned against such actions.

The Wroclaw mass action, however, was only the stormiest example of what was happening all over the country, according to observers.

Yet these people were not "acting like the Poznan workers," they were not rioting against the regime, they were not shaking fists against the Warsaw Titoists. Why should the latter warn against them?

They were supporting the Gomulka coup, it is true, but they were demanding. To begin with, it doesn't even matter what they were demanding. This is a totalitarian regime. You do not allow an uncontrolled rally of massed thousands to demand anything. You cannot shoot them down, but you know what direction you must start turning the helm...

(As for what the demands were, we will come back to that.)

SUPPRESSED PROGRAM

The Polish students and youth have been in the open vanguard in formulating the demands that go beyond the Gomulka program, just as the Polish workers have been in the vanguard in open combat.

Student rallies have been assuring Gomulka of their support against the Russians and, to this support, have been adding their own program for real freedom.

For example, on Friday the Polytechnic students in Warsaw at a mass meeting adopted a resolution and elected their own committee to present it to the CP. The resolution indicated they were restraining themselves at the moment: they were aware, they wrote, that "provocation might play into the hands of the Stalinists"; they pledged their support "in defense of socialist democracy." And they called for "the principle of openness in political life, workers' self-government and other steps leading to the removal of Stalinism from the economic and political life of our country."

But the resolution was not simply one of those things that get handed to the Leader. The student committee set about printing it on leaflets for mass distribution Saturday morning.

The leaflets were seized by the regime—these same leaflets "supporting" them. "However, typewritten copies found their way to school bulletin boards. Large groups of students in the courtyard of Warsaw University crowded around their board to copy the text into notebooks." (N. Y. Times, Oct. 21.)

What were they copying? Rah-rah all-hails to Gomulka? No, they were copying a political PROGRAM that had been suppressed—by the regime that it "supported." The point of this suppressed program was not directed against the Russians; it was directed against Gomulka-Cyrankiewicz-Ochab, our Polish "patriots" themselves.

A STORY

It is not necessary to conjure up an organized underground movement directing and achieving all this, but on the other hand, there is even evidence that something like this exists, at least on the student field.

One evidence for this is the rather sensational statement (Oct. 21) by a Times correspondent, Jack Raymond (now in the U. S.) that 10 months ago when he was in Warsaw he was contacted by such a group: "And now it can and should be told that within two hours of the reporter's arrival in the Polish capital he was approached by a representative of an underground group in the University of Warsaw and smuggled into a youth hostel for a one-hour interview with its leaders."

According to Raymond's remarkably scant account of this interview, "the

youths said they hated Russia more than communism, but held no brief for that philosophy." Were they for a socialist philosophy? Nothing is told; but on the other hand one fairly unanimous judgment of observers is that there is no appreciable sentiment, among all the Polish people who hate what their leaders call "communism," to go back to the old regime, to capitalism, or to de-nationalize the economy.

"PO PROSTU"

However, the picture does not depend on Raymond's story, interesting as it is. It happens that there is absolutely public knowledge (that is, in Poland, not in the U. S.) of a group of student leaders who have recently been functioning in the open on the basis of a program for socialist democracy.

This is the group around the remarkable and entirely unofficial periodical *Po Prostu*, which has been far and away the clearest democratic voice in the country. By "group" in this case, however, we do not mean an organization but a publishing group and staff.

"*Po Prostu*" used to be only one among many campus periodicals. As late as a year ago, it was published in only 30,000 copies. Today it sells 100,000 and every copy is snapped up. It is by no means only a "student organ." It is the main organ of the Polish youth.

According to a report in *France-Observateur*, the score of students who put it out include members of the CP as well as "youth of various opinions." It has been sharpest and most hard-hitting in its attacks on individual bureaucrats, on methods of work, on scandals, and in demands for new freedom. It has criticized Stalinist phenomena not simply as "mistakes" but as consequences of "the gap between the social character of production and the excessively centralized and bureaucratic system of leadership in the Soviet economy."

It has poured fire on the anti-Semitic trends in the bureaucracy. For example, it revealed that the manager of one state factory told the party secretary in the plant, who is Jewish: "With a face like yours, comrade, you must not be in any prominent post now." Opposition to these anti-Semitic trends hit not only the "Natonin group" of pro-Russians but also men like Ochab, who have been going along with anti-Semitism.

Ochab had even said in a speech that the Jewish problem must be "settled," a euphemism that was adequately understood. Ochab, of course, has now gone along with Gomulka, and this hard-bitten Stalinist hack and experienced assassin is now a "Titoist" along with the rest.

"GOING TOO FAR"

The *Po Prostu* group recently began to take on the air of a semi-organization when, in addition to getting out the journal, they also organized exhibitions of modern painting, showings of movies including previously banned Western movies, and even the production of a play, Jean Anouilh's *Alouette*, in which discreet allusions were seen.

It is to be expected that, as in the case of the Wroclaw demonstration, "*Po Prostu*" will have to be curbed. In fact, already one month ago, when the above-mentioned report in "*France-Observateur*" appeared in a dispatch from Warsaw, the correspondent wrote:

"However, certain Communists are beginning to find that *Po Prostu* is going too far. This organ's action, its campaigns, have certainly been useful during these last months, but it is necessary to finish with the phase of criticism. It is no longer enough to demolish certain idols; it is necessary to propose to the masses new constructive ideas in the perspective of Leninism."

Instead of this Stalinoid's advice being in order, it turned out that "the phase of criticism" was just getting started.

"MORE"

But we do not want to give the impression that we know the stirrings in Poland are primarily or largely the reflection of conscious organization. It is safer to assume, in the absence of knowledge, that the mass activity that has been unleashed is the natural reaction of an oppressed population which

sees a door opening and hurls itself forward. This, indeed, highlights the basic political problem of the Polish national-Stalinists, not the police problem of uncovering an underground general staff.

Most immediately, the demands raised spontaneously from among the mass demonstrators center around more drastic action against the Russians, in the first place against Rokossovsky, Moscow's general at the head of the Polish army. Slogans are raised to oust the Russian army forces in the country. A factory bulletin board blossoms with a workers' resolution to refuse passage to Russian troops on their way to East Germany; let them go by sea.

This is the first point in the "more" that the demonstrators are demanding. But the Gomulka regime does not want this. The new combine wants a compromise with the Russian power.

GOMULKA AND RUSSIA

Its motives are simple and easy to understand. In fact, it is perhaps enough to remember that in 1948, after the kick in the teeth from Moscow, Tito continued to "hail Stalin" and plead for understanding from the Kremlin until it became more than clear that every sob of anguish coming from Belgrade was only grist to Stalin's mill. It took months before the Titoists were even willing to admit publicly that Stalin was the man responsible for it all.

The Gomulka-Cyrankiewicz-Ochab leadership has even better reasons for preferring to convince Moscow that a friendly arrangement should be made on the new and altered basis, and certainly not to exacerbate Moscow by themselves pushing the split harder. Besides the political and economic reasons which obtained for Tito, there is also the factor of the former German territories on the west which Poland now holds by the grace of the Kremlin and no one else.

Besides, the very existence of this mass-in-motion from below is itself one of the best reasons for an accommodation with Moscow, in the eyes of a regime which has no intention of driving through to the goals demanded by the vanguard democratic elements. A complete break with the Russian power leaves Gomulka so much the more under the pressure from the revolutionary ranks in the country. They must balance out for a while, and then curb this internal danger as soon as "things quiet down."

TOWARD A NEW STAGE

But, as this is written on Wednesday, the mass action from below against the Russian alliance is still mounting in Poland (and reaching rebellious heights in Hungary).

"Communist officials in Warsaw conceded that a 'nasty' situation had developed in the countryside...."

"Soviet war memorials in several parts of the country were damaged during the night and anti-Soviet leaflets run off on clandestine printing machines appeared in Warsaw...."

"...The workers in Lodz... offered to strike till the Russian tanks near the city were withdrawn."

The Gomulka regime may be forced to withdraw all Russian officers now sown through the Polish army or make other minor concessions. But, also as this is written, the report is that Khrushchev has given in to the Gomulka program and has made up. This reinforces the expectation that, if the people's anti-Moscow push continues to surge forward, Gomulka will be impelled to take open action against it, impelled by Moscow and impelled by self-preservation. Then new levels in the "second front" in Poland can be reached.

It Seems the Main Enemy Is at Home

"Tonight leading officials [of the Gomulka regime] considered the anti-Soviet mood of the people their greatest problem, not the presence of Soviet tanks, troops and warships. All party efforts were being directed to damping the anti-Soviet feeling that has flared openly in all parts of the country during the last few days."—Dispatch from Warsaw, N. Y. Times, Oct. 24.

[As we go to press, Gomulka has told the country that the Russian troops will stay in Poland, though they will end their "maneuvers"; he pointed to NATO troops in Germany to justify this.]

Thus Poland heads for its next stage in this stormy development. Anyone who expects the Polish Stalinist leaders to introduce that "democracy" from above which Isaac Deutscher writes of dreamily will be disappointed, just as they should, by this time, be quite disillusioned with the bureaucratically imposed "democratic" transformation which Stalin's heirs in Moscow were supposed to be planning in all their benevolence. Socialist democracy has to be won in a revolutionary struggle against these despots.

Hungary's Titoist — —

(Continued from page 1)

on in the Hungarian capital. "Communist youths and even soldiers had been marching through the streets throughout the afternoon." The slogans were: oust the Russians; trial for Rakosi, and even "Down with Gero!"

REVOLUTIONARY DEMANDS

The firing came from the political police. But the soldiers solidarized themselves with the people. Officers and soldiers were prominent in the wild demonstrations.

To demolish a monumental statue of Stalin, "Young workers, who had marched in the afternoon demonstration in oil-stained overalls, brought trucks with mounted winches."

But sparking the movement, as in Poland, were the Hungarian students and youth. The whole demonstration seems to have begun with student meetings which turned first into peaceful demonstrations and then into the massing before the radio building, where a student delegation had gone to demand the broadcasting of a program of demands. It was when the delegation failed to return that things flared up.

At the Budapest rallies, resolutions were distributed with the suppressed program for socialist democracy. (Who printed them? Press reports do not say, outside of the indication that it was done by student groups.)

Outstanding in the list of democratic demands is "A secret general election with more than one party." This is a fundamental demand, which goes beyond the mere demand for free "criticism" to the demand for the right to political opposition and organization.

The rest of the program lists: oust Russian troops; put Nagy in and try Rakosi; lower norms; right to strike; concessions to farmers on forced collections and on collectivization; Hungarianize the army.

Placards read: "Do not stop half-way: Away with Stalinism"; "Independence and freedom."

In this connection, one of the most important developments in Hungary, not yet heard from in Poland, was the organization of an independent student organization in a breakaway from the official-controlled youth league DISZ. This is an analogue of the demand for opposition parties, but in action. The Budapest radio said that the new student movement was sending delegations to the factories to work out a common program of demands with the "young workers."

Press reports are referring to "rebel leaders" who negotiated a surrender with Nagy in the face of Russian and Hungarian troops mobilized by the man whose name they had been chanting. Nagy is promising draconic revenge against the "counter-revolutionary elements" who do not surrender. He is using the language of Stalinist terror.

Nagy is doing the job for which he was put in by the all-night session of the CP Central Committee. No doubt he will then try to follow up by a policy of concessions to quiet things down, à la Gomulka, in particular to quiet the demands against Moscow.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

Stevenson and the H-Bomb — —

(Continued from page 2)

does he go along with the proposal of the leading congressional Democrat on atomic affairs, Senator Clinton Anderson, that testing be limited to bombs of 1 megaton or less?

That is, is he a "moderate" on the amount of strontium-90 with which he is willing to continue poisoning the human race?

BOTH SIDES OF THE MOUTH

Stevenson's statements on the H-bomb and military defense show that he is talking on all sides of the question.

First he states that he is for stopping H-bomb tests because of the danger of radioactive fall-out; then he states that under certain circumstances he is for continuing the tests.

He attacks the Republicans for cutting down on military expenditures because they are concerned about budgetary considerations; then he points to the \$100 billion the world is spending on war as an indication that the Republicans have not brought peace.

He speaks out against the doctrine of massive retaliation and reliance on atomic and nuclear weapons, and then makes a proposal for ending the draft which has as its justification the view that today's armies need only a professional caste to handle the atomic weapons.

This same kind of foot-in-both-camps approach was climaxed on Stevenson's October 15 nationwide TV broadcast. Accompanying him on the program were two senators, the two leading Democrats on matters of military and atomic policy

—Senator Clinton Anderson of Arizona and Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri. Their job was to assure the TV audience that Stevenson's proposal in no way curtailed the military posture of the United States.

These two senators were not chosen at random. Senator Anderson is chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. But Senator Anderson does not support Stevenson's proposal if it is taken to mean the ending of all H-bomb tests, since he is on record for favoring the continuance of 1-megaton-bomb tests. In addition, last spring when Stevenson first made his proposal, Anderson opposed the ending of any tests.

Senator Symington, the other expert witness, is the most vocal military jingoist in the Senate. He has taken the lead in calling for more expenditures for the Air Force; he is the leading exponent of a large fleet of long-range bombers and for the development of the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile.

The time he spent on TV was devoted entirely to an attack on the Eisenhower administration for not expanding the strategic air force as fast as he would like.

Just where does Stevenson stand in the midst of such company? We can imagine the caustic remarks he would have directed and has directed ("Who's in charge here?") against the multiplicity of views expressed by the Eisenhower administration at the same time and on the same subject.

It's as if Stevenson were to broadcast

a speech all in favor of civil rights and human dignity, while flanked by Eastland and Herman Talmadge, who would proceed to explain that only a victory for the Democratic Party can preserve Southern institutions from the Supreme Court.

The appearance of Symington on a program to push a proposal for reducing the dangers of nuclear warfare was a cynical deception in view of his position on the ICBM. Its "value" is related to its use in conjunction with a nuclear-bomb warhead.

How much sense or meaning is there in a proposal to end H-bomb tests when this monstrous weapon is already nearing the final stages of development? A few nuclear-ICBMs, against which there is no known defense, could destroy a city the size of New York in a matter of minutes. It is, therefore, easy to see why Symington could come out in support of Stevenson's proposal and not in any way contradict his military-jingoist position.

"PEACE" GIMMICK

According to Marquis Childs' column, Stevenson at the beginning of the campaign received information that the ICBM is to be ready for testing in a short time, months ahead of schedule. This fact, Childs claims is the background for the other "peace" proposal Stevenson has made—about the draft.

Now Stevenson has not quite called for ending of the draft. All he proposes is that "consideration" be given to it, or as Eisenhower likes to say, "Let us study the question." But aside from all the escape-clauses he has inserted into his

proposals, it is a proposal for the building a professional army based on long-term enlistment with sufficient inducements to encourage military careers.

His reasoning, aside from all the reactionary implications of building an army of pure professionals, proceeds from the ICBM and atomic-weapons position:

"Many military thinkers believe that the armies of the future now upon us, will employ mobile, technically trained and highly professional units equipped with tactical atomic weapons." Therefore he proposes a "highly skilled force capable of using our new weapons with maximum effectiveness."

At Stevenson's news conference on October 1, he was asked how his statement on the draft ties in with the widely known position held by the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford. Radford holds that because of modern weapons, the size of the army can be cut down. It is a position which places the major military reliance on nuclear weapons, and it aroused the opposition of congressional Democrats who are advocates of large armies as well as large air forces equipped with nuclear weapons.

Stevenson with the candor which typifies most of his other positions on important questions, ducked the question by stating that he knew nothing of the Radford proposal other than rumors.

Although Stevenson has stated opposition to the Dulles doctrine of "massive retaliation," it is clear that his two "peace" proposals move him close to this position with all its reactionary consequences.

It once again demonstrates how narrow is the gap between Stevenson and Eisenhower in matters other than temperament and wit. It is also a demonstration of the futility of "peace" gimmicks, most particularly within the framework of the present foreign policy.

Chicago ACLU Hears Shachtman on ISL Case

Chicago, Oct. 18

Max Shachtman, chairman of the ISL, on a lecture visit here, was invited to speak before the Chicago Executive Board of the ACLU at its regular business meeting Thursday noon. Following reports from several committees concerning various cases the ACLU has under investigation at this time, Shachtman gave a 20-minute report on the history and development of the ISL's eight-year struggle with the Attorney General in an attempt to secure a hearing on its listing in the "Subversive List."

With the exception of one or two of the lawyers who have defended individuals in various administrative cases in army and government jobs, the board members were hearing for the first time the extent of the "abominations" heaped upon the ISL by the attorney general, his prosecuting attorneys and his hearing officer.

Shachtman introduced his remarks with the statement that in his 40 years in the radical movement in America he knew of no other time where organizations and individuals "have been so persecuted and hounded without being accused of any illegal activity and without any recourse to law to prevent such harassments."

Shachtman ended with an appeal to the Chicago board to take an active interest in these cases here where the FBI has been harassing individual members and friends of the ISL; particularly those cases where FBI men have been taking surprise pictures by jumping out from behind trees, or knocking on doors and snapping a picture of the occupant as soon as he opens the door. (The Chicago ACLU has already directed an inquiry to the FBI concerning this, and received an extremely vague and elusive reply neither admitting nor denying the occurrences.)

In spite of the fact that court convenes at 2 p.m. in Chicago, the entire board stayed until Shachtman concluded at 1.55, at which point about half of the members had to make hurried exits. Most of those who remained came and thanked Shachtman personally for his remarks and asked further questions concerning the case.

Following the meeting Mr. Douty, the executive secretary, requested that he be sent affidavits from those individuals who were being harassed by the FBI and promised the fullest support of the Chicago ACLU in these cases.

LABOR SCOPE

AFL LONGSHOREMEN BUCKED INSUPERABLE ODDS

When the independent International Longshoremen's Association won the October 19 NLRB elections by 11,827 to 7,428 votes, the drive to free the New York waterfront of racket-dominated unionism was stalemated.

The outcome was not surprising. The AFL union, the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen, was on its own. Two years ago it was reduced to a mere skeleton when the AFL withdrew financial support. Top AFL-CIO officials opposed its decision to demand another election. Up to the last minute, the IBL itself was undecided.

Meanwhile, it was undermined by strong AFL groups in New York that want it to disintegrate. Powerful Teamster officials are allied with the ILA. The day before the vote, Joe Curran, for the National Maritime Union, came out publicly against the AFL union and called for readmission of the ILA to the federation.

With this combination of indifference and hostility it is a minor miracle that 40 per cent of New York's longshoremen stood fast for clean unionism.

It is easy to understand, too, why so many still hold on to the ILA. The ILA officialdom convinced the majority that their jobs and security were in danger if the new union won, warning that they would be replaced by unemployed seamen from Paul Hall's Seafarers International Union.

Hall was a prominent figure in the AFL drive; a man less likely to quiet the uneasiness of dock workers and to convince them that the AFL stands for clean democratic unionism would be hard to find.

Meantime, the AFL-CIO puts everything aside to help elect Stevenson and Kefauver. Perhaps it fears to stir up "scandals" until the elections are over.

Yet it still has to show workers victimized by crooked union officials that it means business in the fight against racketeering, and above all it has yet to encourage that mood of revolt from below that can rouse unionists to rid their own unions of dictators, not only the dock workers but everywhere.

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-54.....\$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

VOTE SOCIALIST! Write in Darlington Hoopes and Samuel H. Friedman for Pres. and Vice-Pres.

In Illinois, for governor and lieutenant-governor, write in the names of Kellam Foster and Donald R. Anderson.

In New York State, write in Joseph G. Glass for Senator.

To cast a socialist protest vote, Labor Action recommends a vote for these candidates of the Socialist Party.

Pro & Con — —

(Continued from page 4)

presents itself in this election as the electoral vehicle to vote pro-Stalinist.

S.R. concedes there is "a measure of truth" in this, but goes on to show he doesn't get the point. It is not a question of some interpretation someone is giving to the SWP campaign. This is how the SWP presents itself to the voters, in its paper, in programs on the air, etc. It is currently directing the main brunt of its appeal on an explicitly Stalinoid basis in order to capitalize on its Stalinoid support.

And when we say this, Comrade Wohlforth (without discussing the point with one word), calls it "Stalinophobic"! Now we're quite used to this sort of epithet from those who think any criticism of Stalinism is "red-baiting," but this kind of appellation is usually a reflection of political ideas in the head of the appeller, ideas which are not made explicit. When they are made explicit, we will not be discussing electoral policy, but rather the issue of Stalinism. The electoral question is here a surrogate issue, a stand-in.

This is particularly clear in the case of S.R.'s fantastic description of the SWP's Trotskyism as "the most intransigent enemy of Stalinism," in view of the record, and the rest of his semi-defense of the SWP's pro-Stalinism. Wohlforth does something like that too, even objecting to referring to this group's "continued capitulation to Stalinism," which we have documented in many articles in LA; and it is the documentation which Comrade Wohlforth ought to discuss sometime if he wishes to pursue his thoughts.

In view of all this, we doubt whether the amount of "bother" in writing in candidates is any controlling consideration; we can hardly discuss it in that technical light in an election where both the SLP and SWP will be on the ballot in unprecedentedly few states.

The point about the SP which Comrade S.R. tries to make in this connection is simply untrue: at its Chicago convention, that group in the SP which did not want to buck the Democrats was the group which voted against running any candidates at all, as LA reported. The convention majority which voted for the write-in did so because of the weakness of the SP's forces.

HAL DRAPER