

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**THE COMMUNIST PARTY
DISCUSSES DEMOCRACY...**

... page 3

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION:

Class Line-Up: Students and Workers

... page 2

Portrait of Poet with Machine-Pistol

... page 5

NASSER FORCING OUT EGYPT'S JEWS

... page 2

INDEX TO LABOR ACTION for 1956

... page 6

DECEMBER 31, 1956

FIVE CENTS

Rumblings of Unrest In Russia Are Mounting

Reports of unrest and dissent among students and workers in Russia, which have been mounting for weeks in Western capitals, now have been given semi-official credence by Washington authorities. The December 21 press carried the results of a briefing for newspapermen by "administration sources" on the subject, most fully reported by the N. Y. *Herald Tribune*.

The information given does not seem to justify the sensationalistic lead on this story, which said: "A wave of resistance is sweeping over not only the satellite states but also the heart of the Soviet Union..."

But the incidents reported, especially in the West Berlin press, do provide greater basis, if true, for the summary statement that: "Intellectuals and university students, and in some cases the workers themselves, have begun openly to question the Communist system and the leadership with unprecedented boldness. The students are daring to heckle their professors and the workers are reported to have actually gone on strike in some areas."

The West Berlin press has been telling of anti-Kremlin demonstrations in the Baltic provinces, demands for withdrawal of Russian troops and freedom for political prisoners, overt unrest among students in Russia, and "numerous" strikes in the Urals and in the Don River valley.

One West Berlin paper *Der Tag* on Dec. 20 reported that over 1000 Moscow University students had held a 6-hour meeting to criticize government policies, and were expelled. There have been previous accounts of similar stirrings among Leningrad students.

Though none of these stories can be called confirmed, the "administration sources" in Washington are quoted as being entirely positive about "the rebellion by the youths and intellectuals" in Moscow and Leningrad, and less certain as to whether it extends to other parts of Russia.

In Paris, "diplomatic sources" in that capital and in London are credited with "confirmed" reports of "strikes among factory workers in the Soviet Union." They also spoke of a Moscow student meeting where Khrushchev was "howled down" when he attempted to address it.

The Hungarian Revolution, and the role played in these events by the students as well as workers, is credited with having a tremendous impact not only on all the satellite states but also inside Russia.

Two thousand Spanish repatriates from Russia are source of another report. They had left Spain as children in

the 1937 civil war and have now returned as adults after living and working for 20 years like Russians in all respects. They have told in interviews of sharp economic discontent among the Russian people combined with "much mental turmoil and questioning" as a result of this year's events.

In a few cases partial confirmation has been provided by the official Russian press when it recently carried some attacks against "anti-Communist demagoguery" by students. The latest was a blast against such students in Sverdlovsk, printed by the newspaper *Soviet Russia*, organ of the main Russian republic.

The meeting of the party Central Committee, just concluded, has not so far made known any overt action that might tend to substantiate the picture that is being drawn. But there has been an important shake-up among the bureaucracy's leaders of the economy, substituting Pervukhin for Saburov at the head,

(Continued on page 6)

SPOTLIGHT

Looking Behind Gomulka

Some elementary good sense on interpreting what is happening in Poland appeared in a dispatch in the Dec. 23 N. Y. *Times* by M. S. Handler from Warsaw. Musing over Gomulka's rise to power, the correspondent takes a step away and tries to set down the larger picture. With a depth uncommon for *Times* correspondents, he finds himself writing about the Polish revolution which is seething below the Gomulka regime, as the explanation for the "Polonization" of the regime.

Here's a longish quote that's worthwhile:

"This major concession was granted when it became clear to the Soviet leaders that the pressure of the population in Poland's urban and industrial centers might get out of hand and result in violence. The struggle that soon developed could not be halted with one concession. Pressure from below only mounted. This resulted in a whole series of other concessions which, when taken together, radically changed Poland's relationship to the Soviet Union..."

"I would be incorrect to view recent Polish history in terms of personalities, as simple and attractive as this method

Bus Boycott Ends in Historic Victory for Negro Freedom Fight

By GORDON HASKELL

The courage, unity and solidarity of the Negro people of Montgomery, Alabama, have won a smashing victory against Jim Crow.

Following a year-long boycott of the buses in that city, Negroes began to ride them on a non-segregated basis on December 21. In the days following this historic event, the courageous fighters for equality nailed down their victory by showing the same qualities which had won it, despite organized attempts at provocation by members of Montgomery's White Citizens' Council.

On December 5, 1955 the bus boycott started when a Negro woman was arrested for refusing to give up her seat in a crowded bus. From that day till they won their victory, the overwhelming majority of Montgomery Negroes refused to ride the buses. They walked to work, organized car pools and special station-wagon services. In eleven months their boycott cost the bus company some \$750,000 in revenue.

Led by Martin Luther King Jr., a Baptist minister, and organized in the Montgomery Improvement Association, the Negroes of Montgomery showed qualities of solidarity, militancy and perseverance which stand as an example for people who would struggle for democracy and justice everywhere.

Shortly after the boycott was started, a suit was brought in the federal courts challenging the Montgomery bus-segregation laws. The Negroes of Montgomery began to ride the buses after the Supreme Court had ruled in their favor in this suit and declared the segregation laws unconstitutional.

The White Citizens' Council in Montgomery predicted that if the Negroes tried to ride the buses on a non-segregated basis, blood would flow in the streets. When the test came, they sought to make their prediction come true by organizing provocations against individual Negroes on buses, in the hope that this would lead to a general race riot.

In at least two instances, white women who had obviously been planted by the Councils started scenes in which they claimed Negroes had "muttered" at them, or "winked" at them, and sought to provoke their victims by physical attacks. In at least one case, after such a trick had failed in its objective, the woman involved got off the bus and into one of a number of cars filled with Council members, thus giving the game away.

The Montgomery Improvement Association had anticipated these tactics, and

may appear. This is not to underrate the importance of M. Gomulka and the role he has been playing. But the line of development makes it patently clear that he was liberated from prison and returned to power by pressure from within and outside the party.

"M. Gomulka served as an instrument and later as an interpreter rather than as a maker of the bloodless revolution that swept Poland in October and is still going on. If one takes this view, and it seems based on solid facts, then it must follow that the disaffected people in Poland were the principal actors in the drama and that it was their militant action that forced the concessions from the Soviet leaders."

"Faced with the possibility of an insurrectional movement in Poland, the Soviet leaders assumed it was safer to give ground. It was not a matter of being foxed by clever negotiators but a matter of brute facts."

That doesn't say it all, but it is good as far as it goes. Too bad *Times* correspondents in Poland, like Sidney Gruson and maybe Handler too, cannot be expected to keep this piece of elementary po-

(Turn to last page)

(Continued on page 6)

DOWN WITH THE OLD YEAR at the New York ISL and YSL's

GALA NEW YEAR'S EVE PARTY

MON., Dec. 31—at Labor Action Hall, 114 W. 14 St.—Dancing... Refreshments... Socializing... All invited



... from 9 p.m. on

AJC Sifts the Reports:

Nasser Gov't Forcing Jews Out in Mass Persecution

By HAL DRAPER

A sober and factual "Memorandum" by the American Jewish Committee makes clear, despite the uncertainties of reports and rumors, that the Nasser regime's large-scale expulsions of Egyptian Jews, which began in November after the imperialist attack on Egypt, were not temporary "excesses" but are part of a systematic campaign by the government to expropriate and pauperize the country's Jewish population and drive them out of the land.

Thus the reactionary Nasser dictatorship replies to the imperialist crime which was committed against it by the three allied aggressors, by organizing its own crime against the Jews of Egypt.

As the AJC explains: "The difficulty of separating in this situation solid fact from inevitable panic-born rumor and exaggeration, and of confronting the facts with face-saving explanations of the Egyptian government, is created in Egypt by the almost impenetrable iron curtain that surrounds the Jewish population in that country, and prevents objective observers from establishing the facts of the situation at their source."

But the AJC Memorandum's general picture will no doubt stand up.

While Cairo's crackdown has also been directed against British and French citizens in Egypt, the big bulk of the victims so far have been Jews, including Jews who are Egyptian citizens, as well as Jews of British, French or other citizenship, and Jews who are "stateless" because they have never been able to obtain Egyptian citizenship although born or brought up in the country.

The AJC concludes in summary:

(1) "Not 'limited' but large numbers of Jews, including leaders of the Cairo and Alexandria Jewish communities, all of the latter Egyptian citizens, have been jailed or interned and the bulk of the Jewish population has long been confined to their homes."

(2) "Thousands" of Jews in Egypt "were placed before the immediate choice between exile or internment."

(3) "The property of hundreds of the wealthiest Jews, representing the bulk of the economic substance of the Jewish population, has been seized by the government."

(4) "While no 'formal and general expulsion order' has been issued officially by the government, it is pursuing this 'objective of expelling large numbers of Jews while retaining their properties, by methods less obvious and politically much less consequential for Egypt."

And "Meanwhile, the misery and despair of the Jewish population is rapidly growing, the local Jewish communities are without means to alleviate the plight of the masses, and people whose property has been sequestered or who have been thrown out of employment, obviously will not, for any length of time, have any means to provide for the daily bread of their families."

CAUGHT IN THE GEARS

The summary warns of the "grave relief problem" and of a potential "catastrophic development" resulting from the planned "economic uprooting and destruction of the Jewish population."

In the past, and indeed even since the Arab-Israel war of 1948, the Jews of Egypt have fared very well despite increasing tension. The present events do not stem from a past of anti-Semitism and racism. The Jews of Egypt have been caught in the grinding gears of the Arab-Zionist conflict in the Middle East.

Most immediately, the assault on the Jews flows in part from an outburst of virulent chauvinism which overlays the legitimate nationalist aspirations of the Egyptian and Arab peoples; and in part from the calculated designs of the Nasser regime to grab the vast Jewish-owned wealth in Egypt as a form of "primitive accumulation."

Most of the world's indignation has properly been directed, not against Egypt's crackdown on citizens of the two European states which attacked it in order to grab the Suez Canal, nor on

any citizens of the third attacking state Israel (Israelis are not involved), but rather on the victimization of Jews as such under cover of the patriotic fervor against invading foreigners.

Thus Cairo uses the term "Zionists" coordinately with British and French, to describe the victims; but a large number of the victims have been non-Zionist or even anti-Zionist Jews; in any case there has been no or little attempt to define or delimit the application of "Zionist"; and, finally, there is no attempt necessarily to prove that any victim is indeed "Zionist" or to present evidence. This is in addition to the basic fact that "Zionist" is a wide-open political appellation which is undefined without connection to illegal acts.

While it is true that the official Zionist ideology of Israel and its leaders also openly looks on all Jews everywhere as co-nationals who would be traitors if they did not help Israel as against any other state, the relevance of this fact is only that Egyptian propaganda can make hay with this Israeli counterpart of the way in which Nasser confuses "Jewish," "Zionist" and "pro-Israel."

Indeed, in this way Nasser demonstrates the demagogic slyness of his anti-Israel propaganda; for up to yesterday, he was boasting of the loyalty of most Egyptian Jews and assuring them that he did not consider them fifth-columnists in spite of the speeches of their would-be leaders in Israel.

There has been no evidence adduced or claimed that any Egyptian Jews aided the Israeli assault on Egypt; any more than there was any evidence that the interned Japanese-Americans in the U. S. in 1941 were a danger to American security.

DANGEROUS FLIGHT

"Large numbers" of the Jews of Egypt, however, are now in Nasser's concentration camps and internment centers. Heads of Jewish families were taken hostage on a big scale in early November. Jewish employees of the government and of private firms have been fired or squeezed out. Heads of households have been given as little as 24 hours, or sometimes just a few days, to leave the country with their families, stripped of all they possess.

Persistent reports were and are that "the first detention, internments, sequestrations of property and deportation orders were aimed at the wealthiest Jewish families, both to wreck Jewish life in Egypt economically, and to make the results worthwhile from the point of view of the Egyptian treasury."

So far even the International Red Cross has been unable to ascertain and aid the plight of these Jews. This in spite of the fact that "there are many aged men and women among the detainees who could not be classified as dangerous to the security of the state on any grounds."

Energetic and unequivocal condemnation of the Nasser regime and its crime against the Jews of Egypt is especially incumbent on those anti-imperialists and socialists (like the British Laborites) who opposed the imperialist assault on Egypt as every genuine democrat had to do. The British-French-Israel assault does not justify Nasser's anti-Jewish drive, any more than the anti-Jewish drive by the reactionary dictator justifies the assault on the independence of Egypt. Egypt's rights and Nasser's wrongs are two different things.

Here in the U. S. it is especially important to advocate full U. S. aid to get Jewish refugees from Egypt to any other country they want to go, and particularly to open the doors of the U. S. to them.

CLASSES IN HUNGARY: Students and Workers In the Revolution

By PHILIP COBEN

There was one thing unanticipated about the class composition of the Hungarian Revolution's leading forces.

This revolution has been, and still is, a good deal more preponderantly working-class in leadership than even Marxist socialists could have predicted a day before it broke out.

This is an ironic fact in view of the many years in which Marxists have been abused as "dogmatic," "doctrinaire" and "obsolete" especially for their allegedly "nineteenth-century" views on the role of the working class in the modern world.

Among the many and various people who have been talking for some years about Re-evaluating Dogmas, we would like to see some dogma-revaluation on this point.

Nowadays the decisive role of the working class in the Hungarian Revolution does not need argumentation; indeed, as far as the second phase of the revolution was concerned, it was only the Workers Councils which remained as leaders of the struggle; and this is still true although they have been illegalized. It has even been wryly amusing to see the evident astonishment with which bourgeois writers sometimes note the resemblance between the real events and the Marxist stereotype.

For example, *Time* wrote for Nov. 5: "The streets of Budapest were like a favorite proletarian tableau come to frightening life — shouting students, muscular workers, flag-waving women raising fists on the barricades and braving death." We get a feeling that the bright pen-pusher who wrote this has memories of the Theater Union and "Sailors of Catarró" from the '30s...

So it may seem positively hoggish to point out that, in a couple of very important aspects, even this general impression is an inaccurate underestimation of the preponderant role of the working class in Hungary.

CLASS-SCREENED

The three social groups which are constantly, and correctly, referred to as the forces of the revolution are: the workers, the students, and the army. What is often overlooked is the working-class composition of the students and, to lesser degree, the army.

Yet it was well known, all along, that in every Stalinist state every effort was made by the regime for 10 years to "proletarianize" the student body of the universities and higher-education institutions. Applicants were sifted and screened and weeded to ensure a high percentage of sons and daughters of workers.

Since the beginning of November there have been a few, but very very few, incidental mentions of this important fact in the dispatches and articles on Hungary. One of the clearest, for example, was by the N. Y. *Times*' John MacCormac from Budapest on November 4:

"Although the demonstrators were mostly university students and admission to the university was restricted largely to the sons of workers and peasants, they demonstrated that theirs was not in any sense a Communist demonstration."

Even here MacCormac mentions it only parenthetically. No doubt, 99 out of a hundred American readers think of the Hungarian students as a social group distinct from the working-class sections of the population.

The fullest statement on this point appears in an article by a Hungarian youth, now a refugee in the West, writing in the December 23 N. Y. *Times* magazine section under the name of Janos Hollo, who was in the thick of the events in Budapest. The following passage is worth quoting entire.

"We young people comprised three main groups—students, workers and soldiers. It was of the utmost importance to our rulers that the political, cultural and economic leadership be taken over

by a reliable, Sovietophile new generation. The old, and for the time being indispensable, professional men were totally unreliable for the Communist system. With this in mind, the authorities modified the composition of the student bodies. In accordance with their dictatorship-of-the-proletariat ideology, they gave preference to children of industrial workers for college education, believing these people would be unconditionally true followers of the teachings of Marx and Lenin.

"Among college students you could find some children of poor peasants or kolkhoz (collective farm) workers. But they were not numerous because the Communist Government always lacked confidence in the peasantry, particularly in peasants cultivating their own land, among whom the sanctity of private property was a tradition inherited by son from father. Children of parents who were prosperous farmers or merchants or in intellectual occupations could very seldom get to college at all. I was lucky enough to have entered college fairly early in the Communist regime, before this rule had hardened."

"At entrance examinations grades were less important than a student's origin and political reliability. Therefore, many young persons had to falsify their personal data in order to be accepted. For instance, my cousin was disqualified from taking his last examination at the Agricultural University because it was discovered that his father had owned a tractor some time ago. One of my friends was excluded, for another example, because his father owned a tavern. Altogether, 80 to 90 per cent of Hungarian college and university students were children of laborers and landless peasants."

ARMY AND PEASANTRY

The students who took the bold initiative in the launching of the great struggle were, then, largely working-class students.

In the first few days of the revolution, when students were most prominently among the leadership of the mass actions, there was one report (we do not have the clipping available) that they raised the demand for the abolition of the Stalinist screening system for students, in favor of merit, etc. In this they were quite right, even though in a sense they themselves were the beneficiaries of the system.

But it was not only the student body that was proletarianized by the regime. This was also true of the army (not the police).

Janos Hollo writes: "The nucleus of the Hungarian Army was formed from the children of workers and peasants, because, again, the government dared to arm only those it believed could be trusted. Young people whose origin was unreliable were assigned to labor battalions, without arms, separated from the regular army."

But there was certainly a much greater admixture of peasants and peasants' sons in the army than among the students (no figures available). Here too we should recall a background fact: the tendency of the Stalinist states was to proletarianize, or try to proletarianize, particularly the officer cadres of the army. And in this connection one remembers that reports from Budapest on the revolution often indicated that it was the officers who took the initiative in going over to the revolt, while sections of the rank-and-file soldiers merely melted away from the units.

There is no doubt that the peasantry as a whole supported and still support the revolution; this is unquestionable. But there have been many indications that peasant support was far less active, much more passive, than that of the workers. Even Marxist socialists, who are often accused of derogating the social role of peasants, would have anticipated far more dramatic and even violent actions on the countryside than anything reported. But on this aspect the evidence has perhaps still to come in.

TWO PROBLEMS IN THE CP DISCUSSION

THE COMMUNIST PARTY DISCUSSES DEMOCRACY...

By H. W. BENSON

The whole Communist Party is in arms against bureaucracy. Everyone repents the past and pledges to protect inner-party democracy in the future; gone are the days when the most elementary rights of rank-and-file members were passed off with a shrug.

So universal are democratic professions that the matter seems raised above dispute. Yet it would be foolhardy if the party members trusted to simple expression of good intentions.

The future of democracy in the CP depends not on the good will of leaders, not even exclusively upon the alertness of its membership, but upon the political means chosen to solve the party crisis. Foster's road leads ultimately back to bureaucracy; not necessarily because he is a willful man but because he wants to overcome the party crisis in a certain manner.

What has caused the crisis and what is the way out? The answers to these questions will in the end determine the fate of internal democracy.

Consider the approach of John Gates, Steve Nelson and their supporters: For them, the party dilemma is rooted basically in a failure of party policy in a fundamental sense to meet the needs of our times. *The party and its policies must be changed radically* if it is to make its essential contribution to socialism in the United States.

Once this view is carried out consistently, democracy becomes more than a mere preference; it becomes an indispensable instrument.

SEEING DEEPER

In the first place, it would be impossible to make the essential turn now and tomorrow without the most thoroughgoing participation of the membership in action, in decisions and in debate.

But this is the minor key. For there are others who would agree: *So far, so good. But so far, and no farther!* For them, the question of democracy is posed as though it were a code of etiquette to guide the family in the private relations among its members.

But those in the party who move toward democratic socialism view democracy as something more than mere traffic rules and see it in its deeper significance. It is not enough to grant each other the dispensations of democracy; they must convince trade unionists, Negroes, all peoples fighting for democracy, that they are actively turning away from dictatorial methods, away from independence upon any authoritarian regime and toward democracy.

Party democracy becomes a life-and-death matter for them, not only for private purposes but because without it Communists are doomed before working-class opinion.

Some socialists, who regrettably have not followed the Communist Party discussion with the attention it deserves, demur. "You claim there is a democratic socialist tendency in the CP, even among some of its leaders," they object, "But look at their past; see how they still refer to Russia as a socialist state and shy away from a full and frank criticism of its role in Hungary. Do you imagine that they can be sincere in this turn?"

But it is not a question of "sincerity" as some disembodied spirit. Look upon the past in a new light; insist upon a change in a given direction; and you are led willy-nilly toward a new view of party democracy, flowing from a whole political outlook. Such a leaning or tendency arises in the party; we can only hope that

it continues consistently along the road which it has charted for itself.

To understand their outlook, contrast their views with Foster's.

For him life is quite simple. The only crisis that he notices is the annoying fact that others in the party persist in talking of a crisis! What is fundamentally wrong, he thinks, is that there are too many comrades who insist that there is something fundamentally wrong.

FOSTER "SETTLES" THINGS

The 20th Congress? The Khrushchev report? Events in Eastern Europe? Isolation from the mass movement? No problem for Foster: just don't think too much about them.

Pages flutter from his pen like butterflies around a flower garden. Thirty pages "On the Party Situation" (*Political Affairs*, October); nineteen more on "Marxism-Leninism in a Changing World" (*Political Affairs*, September and December). The world changes but not Foster. He flits lightly across the big questions in passing.

Why bother, in any case? The basic difficulties have been handily settled for us, now and forever, just as in the past. "Now, however, upon the initiative of the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Stalin undemocratic cult is being liquidated root and branch." (*Political Affairs*, September.) What more do you want; let us go on to "constructive" work and leave such things to our highest "leaders."

Everything could have easily been straightened out by Foster, given a little time to think up a good apology and to acquire a prefabricated Marxist explanation. As he puts it (*Political Affairs*, October): "Although the situation created by the Stalin revelations presented certain problems no doubt the party could have overcome them without great difficulty, absorbing the immediate lessons from the Stalin exposure and studying the long-range implications of this important matter."

"Just a bit of a problem, nothing different from what he juggled successfully many times before. But alas, it was not to be because there were Gates and the others."

To quote from Foster (*Political Affairs*, October): "This Right tendency is now menacing the Marxist-Leninist foundations of the party." And "If it were desired to liquidate our party no more effective means could be used to this end than the current discrediting of the party and its leadership by ascribing to them endless 'errors,' many of which never happened." And "These wrong views included bitter attacks upon the Soviet Union, upon our party, and upon its whole leadership."

There is no doubt in Foster's mind where the crisis originates; the cause can be pinpointed exactly: it is the rise of the Gates-Daily Worker tendency.

KEEPER OF THE SEAL

The solution? It follows inexorably, from Foster's bizarre conception of what is happening in the world and in the party, that the way out of the crisis, for him, is the defeat of the Gates tendency and the return to "normality."

Remember that we are dealing with the keeper of the seal, the man who will countenance no deviation from "Demo-

cratic Centralism" and who longs for the "monolithic unity" of the party—whatever it means to anyone else, we know what it means to him. For Foster this discussion can be nothing but an annoying, unavoidable overhead.

What follows from his line and from his whole conception of the nature and solution of the party crisis is that the Gates group must be smashed and the buds of party democracy cut off.

"This time," says Foster (*Discussion Bulletin* No. 2), "there will be no Duclos article to bail us out of our folly." A thought scented with nostalgia for the good old days when everything could be decided by a nod from above, or a letter.

Not only that, things have gone far enough; that is: too far. "Such an exaggeration of mistakes as we have had in our party during recent months would not be tolerated in the Communist Parties of the USSR, Peoples China, Italy, etc.," he warns. Why then tolerate them in your party, Foster? Doubtless he asks the same question of himself and has an answer ready for the proper time.

Everyone pays lip service to inner-party democracy. In keeping with the spirit of things, all kinds of constitutional changes, organizational devices and structural novelties are advanced to safeguard the rights of members. But the real test will come in the fate of the opposing tendencies.

Can democracy win out in the party, can the party advance if Foster and allies take it in a stultifying grip? The most ornate constitution devised by the human imagination could hardly maintain democracy if the Gates-Daily Worker tendency comes under his heavy hand. If they are penalized in any way for their views, or removed from posts of responsibility, or their right to speak bridled, what will be the fate of the party then?

Nelson, Gates and the others take on nothing less than the task of defending democracy in the party and its reputation outside. Before they can face the working-class public, they must face their own party.

Can they tolerate an appeasement of Foster's Stalinist conceptions? There is the first hurdle.

MALICE IN A FOG

As the discussion goes on in the Communist Party, everyone assures everyone else that a "peaceful road to socialism" is possible in the United States; no one protests. By a process of natural selection the question should disappear.

Yet it does not. Debate continues; more accurately, two debates: the real debate and the fake one.

Knowing Foster's methods, we expect him to steer the discussion up a blind alley. We are not disappointed.

As far back as the first Smith Act trials, he posed the possibility of "achieving socialism" in the United States by peaceful means if democracy prevailed at home and world capitalism continued to decline. He, at least, should have little objection when others speak of the same possibility. But we are dealing with a Foster. Where there is no real difference, he is ready with a false substitute.

True, he admits, a peaceful development is possible. But you, you compromisers, he cries to the dissidents, insist that the peaceful road is inevitable? That's the difference: is it merely possible or is it inevitable? And there follows from him and his imitations an interminable flow of disquisitions, complete with digressions, on overestimation of capitalism, revisionism, class-collaboration, etc.—all of which is presumably

contained, tightly compressed, in this simple original difference.

It is all arrant nonsense; it is an argument concocted out of nothing but sheer malice. And if fog settles in a shadowland, if everyone gropes about blindly, so much the better! That is the ground on which he prefers to fight.

His task is made easier by those on the other side; for they are not quite clear on what they are driving at, or they are not able to say.

In the December issue of *Party Voice*, Norman Schrank contributes an article entitled "Strengthen the Draft Resolution." By title alone we locate him in the political spectrum. He is for the party's Draft Resolution as a beginning but he sees the need for a deeper analysis and more extensive changes in party policies.

"SERIOUS OMISSION"

"Sometimes I feel," he writes, "the stand-pat dead-center comrades are still too much hypnotized by the international movement. They wait for distant winds to blow." And he concludes: "the charge that we move to extremes is being used today by those who hold the stand-pat position who want no change and by those who want to return to old policies. Under today's conditions, this criticism which was once sound becomes harmful. It becomes a pernicious thesis against change!"

All this is simple truth. What is even more significant is this: "I believe," he says, "there is a serious omission in the resolution's failure to describe the socialism we seek as democratic socialism."

Democratic socialism! If this phrase is conceived in all its depth and not as a catchword, it summarizes the whole crisis in the Communist movement and points the way out. The crisis derived from a failure to come forward truly as a democratic socialist movement, and the solution lies in moving toward it.

It seems to us that when the Gates-Daily Worker tendency speaks of the peaceful road to socialism it is already reaching toward an even deeper concept: the democratic nature of socialism, in general. Perhaps that is what really irritates Foster.

Notice how Schrank returns to the point in the same piece: "Given the democratic, peaceful and constitutional path to socialism in America, what is wrong in characterizing the socialism we seek as democratic socialism? Is the socialism we seek undemocratic?" (His emphasis.)

In his mind, then, the peaceful, constitutional road is virtually synonymous with the democratic road to socialism.

THE DEMOCRATIC ROAD

It is true that the peaceful road to socialism is possible and desirable in the United States. As humanitarians and champions of civilized methods in every respect, socialists will do everything to make this possibility a reality. There are countries ruled by dictatorships where a "peaceful road" is barred, not only the peaceful road to socialism but the peaceful road to almost anything else of importance to the people! But even where the peaceful road is blocked, socialists hold to the democratic road; that is the only road to socialism. For the democratic way to socialism is not necessarily dependent upon parliaments and constitutions where these do not exist.

In November 1917 when the Bolshevik Revolution took place in Russia there was literally no constitution in existence. Yet the revolution became a triumph of democracy; it was based upon the support of the masses of soldiers, workers, and farmers, and was not imposed upon them. In 1933 Hitler came to power in Germany under the forms of the old Weimar Constitution. Yet this "constitutional" method was the road of totalitarian dictatorship.

Socialism remains democratic under all conditions and under all constitutions. The road to socialism in the United States, with its democratic institutions, will be vastly different from that in Spain where a dictatorship suppresses every democratic right. But in both countries, as in all, socialism must come with the support of the majority of the people. Without such support, it will not come; or what will come will not be socialism!

Socialism always and everywhere insists upon the rights of democracy. And more: it seeks its objective not against the will of the people, not over them, but with their support. That is why any authentic socialism is democratic socialism.

PRO & CON: DISCUSSION

'Critical Support' to the Gomulka Regime?

To the Editor:

In his excellent and brilliant article about the "nationalist revolt of the Polish CP regime against Moscow" [October 29 issue], Hal Draper arrived at conclusions which I cannot support, and I am impelled to communicate my doubts to LA readers.

First, on the half-truth about Polish nationalism as the background of Gomulka's coup: "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." (LA, Oct. 29.)

Rosa Luxemburg fought the "sick Polish nationalism" and Draper exalts it as a political advantage. For myself, the first driving force of Gomulka's coup was not so much Polish nationalism as the spontaneous social and economic fight of the Polish working class, which is more internationalist than Draper thinks. What was decisive was not the Wroclaw riots of the middle class but the workers' upsurge of Poznan born from the strike.

It is also a commonplace and a half-truth to affirm that Polish nationalism, "one of the most stiff-necked and intransigent in all Europe," was a "constant" and a reserve of Gomulka's coup. The Poznan upsurge is the proof that it was the class war against the Russian and Polish oppressors.

As proof for his affirmation, taken from the N. Y. Times' "wishful thinking," Hal takes the Wroclaw meetings and riots, which passed out of the party's control and acquired a nationalist, anti-Russian character. But from the revolutionary Marxist standpoint, both the Wroclaw and Bydgoszcz nationalist riots must be condemned as the efforts of Polish reactionary nationalism to throw off the control of the working class and to impress on the workers' class war against Stalinism the purely nationalist character of a Polish-Russian war.

I think that the Warsaw meeting of 400,000 people, the student meeting in the Polytechnic, the workers' meeting at Zerzan, were more typical than the nationalist riots in Silesia and Bydgoszcz. It is true that the people at the Warsaw meeting were dissatisfied with Gomulka's call to order and discipline, but they obeyed him, because they understood that any imprudence could signify the defeat of the revolution and massacre by Russian troops.

I think that, thanks only to the control by the working class over the nationalism of the middle class and the old intelligentsia, Poland avoided a defeat of the revolution and an inevitable massacre in the Hungarian style. The merit for this belongs entirely to the spontaneous discipline and political maturity of the working class and not to the political capacity of the Polish "Titoists." For the success of Gomulka and his friends is only the expression of the political moment and of the objective development in Poland.

What was typical was not the Stalinist declaration of the Zerzan party secretary, "We were anxious that the workers should not act like the Poznan workers," but that the Zerzan workers backed their Poznan class brothers against the party. What was typical was not Wroclaw or Bydgoszcz but the Poznan upsurge and the Warsaw meetings. Gomulka's victory is the consequence of the Poznan uprising and not of the "constant" of Polish nationalism. The Russians could calmly massacre any nationalist uprising in Poland but they feared to challenge the entire Polish proletariat backed (in this Draper is right) by the entire Polish nation.

It also seems it is not correct to identify Gomulka with Cyrankiewicz to speak of the Cyrankiewicz-Ochab-Gomulka regime. The legend of Cyrankiewicz's "liberalism" was created by the badly informed U. S. bourgeois press. He was only an opportunist and servant to all of the Moscow politburo's lords in Warsaw. He is not an independent politician, just an obedient bureaucrat, a *Mädchen für alles*. He went over to Gomulka in order to save himself from his guilt for

the crimes committed by his government.

Ochab is a different case—an old member of the Polish Communist Party. He was always a Stalinist, and was designated as general secretary by Khrushchev. Probably under the influence of friends of his youth, who belong to the party Left, and after the Poznan events, he understood that the Stalinist cause in Poland was lost. He delivered over to Gomulka first the Ministry of Justice, then the Security forces, and finally the whole party. Thus Ochab played a very important role in Gomulka's cold coup in spite of his former declarations against the Poznan workers and against the intellectuals.

Gomulka, finally, is an old prisoner of Stalin's who learned something, and so he could succeed in giving expression to the need of the hour. Nobody in Poland speaks of the Gomulka-Ochab-Cyrankiewicz regime; they speak, rightly, only about Gomulka, because they expect important changes after the elections in the government and probably also in the party leadership.

While the spontaneity of the Polish upsurge played the most important role, one should not underestimate the political experience, discipline and organizational capacity of the working class, which threw off the control of the party and the state and imposed its class instincts and its policy on the Politburo. Under its pressure the unity of the Politburo and government cracked, and the adherents of the "Natolin faction" were eliminated. Gomulka was able to take power, like Joshua overthrowing the walls of Jericho only with his trumpet. He grew from being the saved to being the savior.

But, it is true, he was a martyr, he

was stubborn, and he proved to have character. Is he Poland's Tito, or "Tito-plus," as Hal says? I do not think so. He arose not by the grace of the bureaucracy but out of the Poznan upsurge. For without Poznan, Gomulka was only a poor bureaucrat in disgrace, like Rajk or Slansky. But now he is the expression of the political moment in Poland; he is backed by the majority of the people; and in this sense he is *more* a Kerensky of a declining 'ancient regime' than a Tito or Tito-plus.

HOW TO HELP

For, as I once wrote, the picture of the Stalinist counter-revolution is going inside-out, and the earth is trembling from the Elbe to Vladivostok. How can one now help the coming revolution?

I well understand Draper's sympathy for the Polish "more" movement," because I also have the same sympathy. But the old Polish reactionary nationalism is dangerous not only to Gomulka-Kerensky but to the Polish socialist revolution. The Wroclaw and Bydgoszcz riots could be used by the Kremlin as grounds for military intervention and the massacre of the revolutionary proletariat. It is not Polish nationalism but the Polish social revolution that is the terror of the Kremlin; not the Catholic Church and the old underground but the new industrial proletariat and the rebellion of the majority of the party against the Kremlin. For, if the spontaneous movement of the working class is the real victor and savior of the Polish nation, then the spontaneous Left of the party organization is the architect of this victory. For the first time in history the Russians have been defeated in occupied Poland (not counting the battle

at the Vistula in 1920, because that was in a Polish-Russian war), thanks to the discipline and political capacity of the Polish workers, who know how to control Polish nationalism. It was not Gomulka who controlled the social revolution; it was the camp of social revolution that controlled the old nationalism and subordinated it to general national liberation in the socialist sense. Thanks to this role of the Polish proletariat, the Polish revolution was not defeated as it was in Hungary, and the Polish nation was saved from massacre this time. But the Polish revolution was not accomplished and, conserving its explosive energy, it is like a charged rifle. It can explode at any moment.

How can we help the Polish revolution? Should we be sorry that there has not been a massacre in Poland as in Hungary, together with the U. S. bourgeois press; or shall we give our critical support to Gomulka-Kerensky, while the masses are giving him their support?

Lenin gave his support to the Soviet, against the Russian right, when the Soviet had a majority of SRs and Mensheviks. But our good friend Hal is so much under the influence of the N. Y. Times that he will fire the Gomulka regime before we have a revolutionary substitute for it. Easy, Comrade Hal, because in this way we could do a great service for the U. S. bourgeoisie and for the Kremlin at the same time. And we two—you and I—will help the socialist revolution in Poland, in Hungary, in Russia and everywhere. We can do it if we analyze the situation according to the reality and not according to the wishful thinking of the N. Y. Times.

As for me, I prefer the Gomulka regime to nationalist hegemony in Poland and to the inevitable Russian massacre and Stalinist counter-revolution. And so do the big majority of the Polish people and the majority of the workers in the world. I think you prefer the same solution, and we both prefer the coming socialist revolution to the Gomulka regime.

A. RUDZIENSKI

REPLY

No, We Must Support the Revolutionary Democratic Opposition...

It is good, for purposes of discussion, to have Comrade Rudzienski set down concretely views which have been implied in his recent writing.

His point of view, evidently, includes political support to the Gomulka regime not only as against the Russians but also as against the internal democratic opposition, which he indicates "must be condemned" as "reactionary nationalism."

It is "reactionary nationalism," he asserts, when mass demonstrations (such as those in Wroclaw and Bydgoszcz—and, since he wrote, in Szczecin) demand such things as a greater measure of democracy and the ousting of Russian troops, demands which the Gomulka regime is unwilling to grant.

He condemns the "nationalist, anti-Russian character" of this movement and suggests not the slightest criticism of the "savior" Gomulka (although he latterly speaks of "critical support to Gomulka-Kerensky").

He puts a wall between the "nationalist, anti-Russian" fight in Poland and the "social and economic fight of the Polish working class." This is proper for him because he condemns the former. But it is not proper for him to misrepresent my own article, which he criticizes, as doing the same thing.

Basic to this discussion is precisely the two-sided view of the Polish revolution which we stressed right from the first day of the October events, namely, the intertwining of the nationalist and social struggles in Poland.

Although he quotes only the phrase about the "nationalist revolt," the article in question began right off as follows;—italics and boldface in the original and not by hindsight:

"The nationalist revolt of the Polish CP regime against Moscow, plus the gathering forces of social discontent with the Polish regime itself makes 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...."

"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...."

Then after a short passage about the "Titoist" (nationalist) aspect of the events as the background "constant," the bulk of the article was devoted to explaining the social-revolutionary dynamic.

This must be stressed because what Rudzienski lacks is precisely the view of the Polish events as an all-sided revolutionary struggle in which the "nationalist" (anti-Russian) element is not separate and counterposed to the "social" but an integral contribution to it.

"REACTIONARY"?

It is simply amazing that Rudzienski can equate the "nationalist, anti-Russian character" of the mass action with "reactionary nationalism." What is "reactionary" about the demand, going beyond Gomulka's wishes, to oust the Russian troops from the country? Is it reactionary because Gomulka is against it?

Is it reactionary when it is raised by the Hungarian revolution? Is not Rudzienski condemning the Hungarian battle also as largely based on a "reactionary nationalism"?

"Rosa Luxemburg fought the 'sick Polish nationalism' and Draper exalts it..." writes Rudzienski, not very aptly. Is Rudzienski appealing to Luxemburg's old mistake on the national question? It would be news to find that anyone shares it today to the extent of refusing to recognize the power of the demand for independence as a motivation of mass struggle, in this world. Yet Rudzienski gets himself into this absurd situation by his anachronistic reference. It is not a question of "exalting" the aspiration for national independence, but (1) supporting it as part of a revolutionary struggle, and (2) recognizing its importance as a motivation for events that have actually happened.

Does Rudzienski support the demand for Polish independence from Russian domination, the demand that was concretized by the "oust Russian troops" movement? He must. Then how on earth can he smear it as "reactionary nationalism" in order to condemn the

revolutionary demonstrations and support Gomulka against them?

The other outstanding demand of the revolutionary ferment in Poland, which Gomulka is seeking to repress, is that for a genuine democratization. The masses understand the connection of this aim with the need to get the Russians out of the country. Is this demand also "reactionary" in Rudzienski's opinion?

In line with this smear of "reactionary," Rudzienski asserts that the "nationalist, anti-Russian" demand is typical of "the middle class and the old intelligentsia," whereas "the working class" stands by the Gomulka position. This is not in conformity with any facts, and that can be said on the basis of detailed acquaintance with the daily Monitored Broadcasts in and from Poland. On the contrary, events especially since Rudzienski wrote, as well as before, underline the sad mistake he is making in trying to cram the facts into his political position.

No doubt Rudzienski would have wanted to "condemn" the Szczecin (Stettin) demonstrations also; but then this movement was climaxed when the Poznan steel workers, speaking for the whole Poznan working class they said, put themselves at the head of it and threatened strike. To the demand against the Russian troops and for genuine democracy was added also: aid to the Hungarian revolution.

On the "good" side Rudzienski cites the "student meeting in the Polytechnic"—but since then, unfortunately for his thesis, another mass city-wide student meeting in the Polytechnic took the lead of the nation in exposing Gomulka's rigged election and calling for an electoral demonstration against it.

This quite apart from the fact that Rudzienski has absolutely no evidence to ascribe the Wroclaw and Bydgoszcz "riots" to bourgeois and "old nationalist" elements, as distinct from the working class and the students. He does this only, solely and exclusively because he has to cram the picture into the false frame of his political support to Gomulka. It is not true, and Rudzienski is finding it out now.

(Continued on page 7)

Hungarian Portrait: Poet with Machine Pistol

Another story, similar to those which came out of Poland last summer and fall, has revealed the mechanism through which youth breaks with Stalinism. This case involves Tamas Aczel, a young Hungarian writer who won the Kossuth Prize in 1949.

At the end of the war, Aczel was 24 years old, a veteran of the Nazi concentration camp at Mauthausen. He joined the Communist Party because he believed that it offered the best defense against a resurgence of fascism.

The decision to join, he stresses, was not a forced one. It was on the basis of political convictions. As he now tells it, "I hoped and believed that this was the way to build a new Hungary. I was a true believer. In the service of the party I did what was expected of me as a writer. I wrote lots of attacks on 'American imperialism.'"

Aczel's career as a party writer went well. In 1949 he won the Kossuth Prize for a collection of poems which he had published. And in 1952 he was awarded the Stalin Prize for his first novel, *In the Shadow of Liberty*. The money which he received from this went, in part, toward buying a car, the one which he eventually used to escape.

Until 1949 Aczel did not doubt his initial decision to join the party. This, of course, was the period when the precarious "Popular Front" government set up after the war was being destroyed by Rakosi's famous "salami tactic."

The incident which set off the process of disillusion was the trial and execution of Laszlo Rajk in 1949 as a Titoist.

"SUDDENLY"

"Suddenly," Aczel recounts, "I became aware that Hungary was a country gripped by terror. I saw something of the cruelty of the AVH (the secret police) against the peasants who were resisting collectivization and against workers in the towns. I was believer enough to send a memorandum of protest to the Central Committee. Of course, there was not a word of reply. I realized by now that something was wrong but I did not see that the regime itself was bad. When Imre Nagy became premier and outlined his inner 'new course' after the death of Stalin we rallied around him. There was the hope that the wrongs would be put right.

"But Rakosi got rid of Nagy and tried to turn back the clock. That was when the writers' struggle started. So it was that a poet found himself in the battle for Budapest with a machine pistol in his hands."

And, he concluded, "The process lasted for years and brought on a deep personal crisis. It meant turning against myself, my own work, my own writing."

Aczel's development symbolizes the disillusionment of a generation. It is evidently a process which has taken place in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, and now with Molotov cracking the whip over the students, perhaps in Moscow itself.

Challenge has already commented on some aspects of this phenomenon. For one thing, this generation of satellite youth was brought up on a version of Marxism—a perverted, Stalinized Marxism, to be sure, but nevertheless they were exposed to the ideas and the values of Marx himself.

It is interesting that Aczel continues to regard himself as a socialist. At the same time he apparently rejects Marxism but the context of his remarks makes it plain that he is speaking of the Stalinist version:

"I used to think that Marxism-Leninism was a good theory. But I have seen its evil results and I, for one, can't stop at blaming Stalin and Stalinism." Skippy as this published quote is, it would seem to indicate that Aczel's rejection is of the phony "Marxist" explanations of the "cult of the personality."

To him, this means a denial of Marxism, but to us, it is a testimony to the strength of Marxist method.

DANGEROUS IDEALISM

But a second question is raised by Aczel's defection from Stalinism, and one with considerable theoretical implications.

Aczel was not only a Stalinist youth, he was a privileged young intellectual, a prize-winning writer who could buy his own car. In one sense, it might be argued that this gave him a stake in the regime, that we would naturally expect him to defend it. But this leaves his obvious political idealism out of the picture, and it does not deal with the fact that his motivation in joining the Communist Party was not fear or careerism but sincere adherence to what he mistakenly considered to be the best anti-fascism.

That is the other side of the picture, and it is present in Poland and in all of the satellites. It underscores the other thought: that it is dangerous to tap the idealism and political convictions of the youth in a totalitarian state. For that may well lead, as it did on Poland and Hungary, to the youth playing a crucial role in resistance to the tyrannical state.

There are different factors at work in Russia. There Stalinism is less shaky than in the satellites. There a historic process has taken place in which every vestige of political independence and idealism has been carefully smothered. And yet the fragmentary reports which we now receive indicate the very real possibility of a striking development among the Russian youth, indeed, among the university youth, a privileged section of the society.

It happened in Poland, it happened in Hungary. Russia, let us hope is next, and perhaps we shall hear from there:

"So it was that a poet found himself in the battle... with a machine pistol in his hands."

Int'l Stalinist Youth Line Gets Ready for the Turn

For some time now, *Challenge* has been reporting on the new Popular Front turn in the international Stalinist youth line, first in Asia, then in Europe. The process is now proceeding apace, and will be crowned by the "Sixth World Festival of Youth and Students for Peace and Friendship" in Moscow, July 28 to August 11, 1957.

This meeting is, of course, a lineal descendant of the congresses at Prague in 1947, Budapest in 1949, East Berlin in 1951, Bucharest in 1953, and Warsaw in 1955. But the important, and somewhat unique, thing about it is that it will formalize the new 20th Party Congress line in the international youth field.

Here, for example, is the call to the meeting:

"The festival is open to all youth, irrespective of its convictions, race, religious beliefs or nationality. No political, ideological or other tendencies will prevail at the festival. It will be held in the spirit of mutual respect and understanding, in the spirit of the friendship of the youth of all countries. Its program... reflects the hopes and interests of various groups and strata of youth."

This is, of course, a fairly standard Popular Front type call. On the face of it, it invites every single political tendency, there is to be no discrimination, etc., but the meeting is to be held in Moscow and will be under the control of the state apparatus.

But more than that, this approach is symptomatic of how deeply the new turn has gone in the Stalinist youth movement. As *Challenge* reported recently, the European Stalinists were organizing one meeting in such a broad fashion that invitations were sent to a Falangist youth group in Spain.

TWO FRONTS

The Moscow conference will pivot around the two main international Stalinist youth organizations, the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY) and the International Union of Students (IUS). The WFDY is the largest of the Stalinist groups, claiming a membership in 1955 of 80 million. This includes all kinds of "official" youth groups in Russia, China, and the satellites, and undoubtedly numbers a Hungarian section which only recently was in the streets fighting Russian tanks.

The IUS is a union of student organizations, and is smaller than the World Federation. It claimed this year that it had 3 million members in 36 countries.

How subservient these groups are to the Stalinist line was made plain (if that were necessary) in 1950. At that time, the IUS Executive expelled the Yugoslavian youth who had become... "fascists." The British section of the IUS called for the semblance of a fair hearing, and they were, of course, accused of disruption. The British leader, Stanley Jenkins, was accused by *Mlada Fronta*, the Czech youth paper, of trying "to smuggle into the congress a defense of Tito-fascist bestialities."

Paradoxically, the Yugoslavs are now,

of course, "socialists" once more, and the Czech union which had toed the line of orthodoxy in 1950 was one of the centers of anti-Stalinist student disaffection in the Czech events of this spring.

A NEW FEATURE

All of which raises an important question. There is a ferment taking place in the Communist and pro-Communist youth movement today. It is no longer possible to analyze these people as before. Many of them are sincerely confused, honestly trying to deal with the ideological wreckage of their pre-20th Party Congress programs.

Toward them, socialists must maintain their principled opposition to Stalinism and combat new illusions about Khrushchev, realizing at the same time that the possibility of a dialogue is now present, that some communication is possible. Thus it is that the YSL has engaged in debate and discussion with the Labor Youth League in this country.

That is one thing. An "official" Stalinist congress in Moscow is another. Let no one be mistaken about the purpose of this gathering: it is to push the new line, and the symbolism of the Moscow site should not escape us.

We still hope, of course, that the irresistible ferment which has broken out in Stalinist youth organization after youth organization will be present in Moscow. But we know that the state direction of the meeting will be doing everything possible to block this.

We anticipate the usual dreary affirmations of the usual resolutions. That is what is intended. We hope that it will be different, that the youth of the world, even the youth of the Stalinist organizations, will give another surprise to the tyrants in the Kremlin.

THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

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

anvil

Winter 1957 Issue Just Out

Articles on politics, literature, music, student affairs... Single copy 25 cents... Subscription: five issues for \$1.00.

Individual students and student clubs who wish to sell *Anvil* on campus can obtain bundles of 5 or more copies at 20 cents per copy.

ANVIL, 36 East 10 Street
New York 3, N. Y.

INDEX TO LABOR ACTION 1956

ACADEMIC FREEDOM—2 liberals & dem 2-20.4. Tex stud ed vs censors *2-27.5. CCNY clubs quit campus *2-27.5. Young Repubs demand free speech *3-5.5. Bklyn Coll SCD case *3-12.5. Chi teachers vs Broyles oath 4-9.3. Challenge Hookism at AAUP *4-9.5; AAUP takes firm stand *6-4.5. Wayne witchhunts soc club *4-9.5. UC Rule 17 paradox *6-11.5. Stoolie system for teachers? *8-20.8. Random curiosity *9-10.5. Witchhunt in post-McCarthy climate *10-8.2C. Bklyn Coll suspends critic *10-15.5. Calif witchhunters attack FOR *10-15.5. Caltech lesson *10-22.5. ACLU lists stud rights *11-26.5.

AFL-CIO MERGER—See Labor Problems.

AFRICA—See also indiv countries—Portugals slaves 2-13.6. New labor movemnt 8-13.7.

ALGERIA—Where do you stand? 5-7.1. Mollet does the dirty work 5-7-2. Bloodhound in Algeria: Under generals' thumb; Imperialist solidarity; 'Only Social-Dems'; Algerian socialists 5-7.3. Will Amer SP speak up? 5-28.4; SP resolution 12-10.2. Alger liberation movemnt: (1) Origins 6-4.7; (2) The fight inside 6-11.7; (3) Revol Left 6-18.4. C. Gerard inside Alger camp 7-9.3; Alger Lib Army as I saw it; Introd C. Gerard 8-6.6; correc 8-13.7. New labor movemnt in Alger & N Afr 8-13.7. Weygand on Mollet's role 8-27.6. BLP resolutions 10-29.3. YSL-YPSL protest *11-26.5.

AMER COMM FOR CUL FREEDOM—Arthur Miller & the posse 3-5.3. Farrell letter to Chi Trib 7-16.4; Resigns from ACCF 9-10.2.

AMER FOR DEM ACTION—See also SDA—Back both Negroes & Dems? 5-7.1. ADA & civ rights 5-21.6.

AMER LABOR PARTY (NY)—How ALP cracks down 5-28.6.

ANTI-SEMITISM—Anti-sem & Arab propaganda 4-9.6; Anatomy of a smear 4-16.6. Stalinist anti-sem not yet over 4-30.1; correc (L) 5-7.4. Nasser govt forces Jews out 12-31.2.

ARABS—See also Middle East, Israel, Suez—Anti-sem. & Arab propaganda 4-9.6; 4-16.6.

ARGENTINA—Permanent crisis 1-2.7. Students vs Peron *1-30.5. SP meets 9-24.4.

ATOMIC BOMB & ENERGY—'Red plot' 2-13.1. Gen Gavin on death toll 7-16.4. Poisoning the atmosphere; Scientists admit peril 7-30.1. Can A-plants go out of control? Lagoon beach plant 8-13.4; UAW joins protest 9-17.4. Honest John's war 8-27.2. AEC's soothing syrup 9-17.4. Stevenson's H-bomb issue 10-22.2; 10-29.2.

AUTOMATION—See Econ Conditions.

AUTO WORKERS—See also Elections, Econ Cond—Hoffa vs UAW 2-20.3; 3-12.2; 4-9.2. Reuther, the unfrustrated 4-9.2. Labor notes on Detroit 4-23.2. Educ conf: 'vanguard' with a whisper 4-30.6. GAW won't help them 5-21.4. Pressure for short work-wk 5-28.2. Hint to UAW 6-11.3. Rank & file control 8-6.2. Help Kohler strikers 8-13.2; 10-22.2. Inventories, speed-up, squeeze 9-10.2. UAW protests A-peril 9-17.4. Does textile show future? 10-8.2. Chrysler poses dilemma 11-5.2. UAW on Hung'y. & Egypt 11-26.1.

BAHAMAS—Editor asks help (L) 1-23.4.

BEVAN—See Britain.

BOLIVIA—Dictatorship & state capitalism 1-2.7. Regime turns right 2-6.3. Rigs a plebiscite 7-2.3.

BOOK REVIEWS—Burns: Lion & the Fox 8-20.7. Cliff: Stalinist Russia 1-16.4. Edwards: First 10 Million Sponsors 9-17.2. Fund for Repub: Bibliog on Comm Prob in US 3-12.4. Ginsberg: Negro Potential 8-13.6. Hill & Greenberg: Cit's Guide to Desegreg 5-21.6. Josephson: Union House Union: Bar 11-5.7. Kidron: Automation 10-22.4. Kornhauser et al.: When Labor Votes 9-17.2. Kulski: Soviet Regime 3-19.4. Levinson: Labor on March 8-6.7. Mills: Power Elite 7-30.7. Nelson: Mine Workers Dist-50 7-30.7. Shannon: SP of Amer 1-9.4. Stavis: Man Who Never Died 4-30.4. Thompson: IWW. First 50 Yrs 4-30.4. Trotsky: Ecrits 2-13.4.

BRAZIL—Permanent crisis 1-2.7. Kubitschek's faces 1-30.3. 'Practical' socialism's

reward 4-16.4.

BRECHT, BERTOLT—Poet of the GPU 10-1.4.

BRITAIN—See also its colonies, Suez, Cyprus, Nigeria, &c.; Cole—Bevanites to expand activities 1-2.3. Brit journalism 1-9.2. Struggles ahead 1-16.3. Labor acting tough 1-23.7. Aylwin-Gibson girls 2-6.3. Bevan's vote at peak 2-13.3. Bevan on offensive 2-20.4. Another turn of screw 2-27.6. TUC chides, prepares; strikes 3-5.2. Illusions on 20th Cong rife 3-19.3. Malenkóv flirts, Pollitt sweats 4-16.3. BLP battle looms 4-30.3. Khrushchev snarls at BLP hecklers 5-7.4. Anti-draft sentiment in BLP 6-4.2. First automation strike 6-18.2. Tory defeat, mid-cl frustration 7-2.3. Auto unempl rises, labor threatens 7-9.3. End of H of Lords? 7-23.3. BMC strike 7-30.3; Class lines tense 8-6.4. TUC faces wage issue 9-10.3. TGWU's new militancy 9-17.3. Nehru & Bevan 9-24.4. Labor vs Eden's camel corps 9-24.6. Faction organ in CP 9-24.8; CP crisis 10-22.3; YCL conv mood of revolt *11-12.8; CP disintegrating 11-19.3; Peter Fryer revelations 12-10.4. Eden cabinet split 10-1.1. Tories grumble at Eden 10-8.2. BLP shifts left, Bevan wins 10-15.1. Brit & Eur unity 11-5.8. Demonstr vs Suez assault 11-19.2. Soc left sparks fight 11-19.3. Left-wing progress (L) 12-10.4. People pay bill for Egypt 12-17.1.

BRITISH GUIANA—L. F. Burnham dissects London plan 9-17.8.

CANADA—CCF & trade unions 10-15.3. Ques of climate 10-22.1.

CATHOLICS—Attack on Jim Crow 3-5.4.

CHIANG KAI-SHEK—See Formosa.

CHILE—Polit line-up 9-24.4.

CHINA—See also Formosa—US kept Mao from split 6-11.1. US bars newsmen's trip 8-13.1.

CIO—See AFL-CIO, Labor Problems, indiv occupations.

CIVIL DEFENSE—See Atomic Bomb.

CIVIL LIBERTIES—See also Academic Freedom, Supreme Court—Use of secret informers 1-9.2. McCarran concentr camps 1-9.2. Picket rights at UN 3-19.3. Govt raids CP 4-2.1; Official hoodlum 4-9.1. Thomas et al defend CPers; Witchhunter Tompkins 4-9.8. Prosecute Jefferson 6-18.1. Smith act trial in NY 6-25.1; 8-13.3. Thomas-Buckley debate Smith act 7-2.2. WDL on security progr report 7-16.7. Cain's language 7-30.1. Petrillo, patriot 7-30.2. Housing oath washed out 8-13.1. Persecute CP Thompson 8-13.1. Sen liberals & Smith act 8-13.3. Big brother 9-24.7. Penna stoolie scandal 10-8.1; Case thickens 11-19.2. Post-McC witchhunt climate *10-8.2C. Fund for Repub contest 10-15.4. Calif witchhunters vs FOR *10-15.5. Ques of climate 10-22.1. Hook's 5th & real world 12-3.6.

Armed forces: Grossman case 1-16.8. Watts dissects new rules 5-21.1.

Industry: CWA stands up 8-6.2.

Kutcher Cases: Third case, pension sus-

pending 1-2.1; Hearing 1-9.3; VA backs down 1-16.1. NY rally 2-13.2. Wins job case 4-30.1; Govt yields 7-2.1.

Subversive List: (See also ISL) Sen Hennings blasts list 1-30.8. Excerpt from Anvil *5-7.5.

CIVIL RIGHTS—See Jim-Crowism.

COCHRANITES—Split? (L) 7-23.4; 8-6.7.

COLD WAR—See Introd Note—Eisenhrw Bulganin thrust & parry 2-6.1. Editors say US losing 4-30.1. Talking Eur unity 10-15.1; Brit & Eur unity 11-5.8.

COLE, G. D. H.—New popular-frontism 6-4.6. Mind of a fellow traveler 9-3.6.

COLONIALISM—See also indiv countries—Soc Int'l declaration 10-29.3; Anti-colonialism day *10-29.5.

COMMUNIST PARTY (U.S.)—see also Civil Liberties, Amer Labor Party, Labor Youth League—Shachtman debates CPER at Swarthmore *1-2.5. CP rocks & rolls 3-26.3. Uncle Miltly at Jeff school 4-2.8. CP leader breast-beats 4-16.2. To CP, on soc. dem & Stalin 4-23.1. CP disc continues; Schneiderman in S.F. 4-23.3. New line woos Negroes 5-21.2. ISL challenge 5-21.4. Confessions of CP 5-21.7. Ques for Dennis 5-28.1. Carnegie Hall symp 6-4.2. Selling old goods 8-27.2. Crisis grows deeper 9-10.7. Basic ques raised 9-24.8. CP-Stalinoid debate 10-15.4. Chi symp 10-22.3; correc (L) 12-3.8. Which side are you on? 11-12.1. Disc on soc regroupmt 11-26.3. Foster vs Hungar rev 12-3.2. 'Fascists' in Hung'y 12-3.3. Shachtman tilts w DW ed 12-10.1; DW ed said yes 12-17.4. Labor eds look at CP disc 12-10.2. Foster attacks 12-10.3. Detroit: Shachtman & Winter in symp 12-24.2. Socialist, Communist debate at CCNY *12-24.5. CP discusses democracy 12-31.3.

COMMUNIST PARTIES (Int'l. Gen.)—For indiv CPs, see country; see also Cole—Fund bibliog (BR) 3-12.4. On vocabulary, 'Stalinism' (L) 4-30.4. CP crisis opens way for Eur socialism 7-2.1. CPs won't break with Moscow 7-23.1. Cracking under Russ guns 11-19.3. Stalinist stud int'l new line *11-19.5. Int'l youth line ready for turn *12-31.5.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS—See Militarism.

CYPRUS—Imperialism hangs on 3-19.1. Enosis or independence? 4-9.3. Bination-alism? (L) 7-16.4.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA—Hunger strikes & purges 3-12.6. Oren on Gestapo methods 5-28.8. Fable by J. Marek 6-11.4. Student demands *6-11.5; govt clamps down *7-23.5.

DE GALINDEZ CASE—Picket FDR Jr, Trujillo agent 4-16.4. Picket in NYC 4-23.2; 4-30.2.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY—See also Elections, Liberalism—Dems & natrl-gas sell-out 2-13.1; Scene in Senate 2-20.7. After Dred Scott case 2-20.7. Two memos on Demos 3-12.2. Labor & Dems 5-14.3. Ft-note to Sen liberalism 8-13.2.

(Continued on page 7)

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

To avoid repetitive cross-references, here is a list of the headings under which you will find entries dealing with the general subject of

WAR
FOREIGN POLICY
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
EISENHWR ADMN, FOREIGN POLICY for government acts and policy.
FOREIGN POLICY, U. S. for other discussion of foreign policy.
SUEZ, HUNGARY, CHINA, and other foreign geog heads for U. S. policy toward, and relations with, other countries and its colonies.
WAR POLICY for discussion of socialist policy.
COLD WAR for U. S.-Russian diplomatic struggle, etc.
 See also **UNITED NATIONS; NORTH ATL TREATY ORG; ATOMIC BOMB; MILITARISM.**

HOW TO USE THIS INDEX

The number following each entry gives the date and page number of the issue. Thus:
 10-8, 6=Oct. 8, page 6.
 *Entries marked with an asterisk are from the *Young Socialist Challenge* section (for which, see below). The fullest listing is by SUBJECT. Names and personalities mentioned in articles are usually not listed separately.
 Entries relating to foreign countries or places are always listed under the foreign geog headings, and not necessarily under any other subject heading.
 Trade-union articles are listed under the name of the occupation, e.g., Auto Workers, and under Labor Problems.
 Entries are separated by periods; but successive related entries are separated by semi-colons. In some cases, related entries are grouped under boldface subheadings.

ABBREVIATIONS

L—Letter to the editor.
 BR—Book review.
 Disc—Discussion.

INDEX TO "CHALLENGE"

*Articles in the *Young Socialist Challenge* section are included in the general index; but they are distinguished by an asterisk.
 Note that when the *Challenge* consists of 4 pages, its pages are numbered 1C, 2C, etc.
 The bulk of *Challenge* articles will be found under the following subject headings: **ACADEMIC FREEDOM; EDUCATION; MILITARISM; SOCIALIST YOUTH (INT'L); STUDENT MOVEMENT; YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE; YOUTH PROBLEMS.**
 General political articles will be found under subject headings, foreign geog heads, etc.

Bus Boycott in Historic Victory — —

(Continued from page 1)

urged Negroes neither to let themselves be provoked, nor to come to the aid of any individual who was being attacked in this type of a situation. This followed in line with the tactics of the boycott which, from the beginning, stressed the peaceful, non-violent character of the resistance. Martin Luther King and other leaders of the Association have laid heavy emphasis on the philosophy and tactics of Gandhi in this struggle.

The first three days of non-segregated bus service in Montgomery demonstrated once more an aspect of the struggle for equal rights for Negroes which is of the utmost importance. That is: in the face of determined resistance, Jim Crow can only be enforced by organized terror backed by government authorities.

The vast majority of white citizens in Montgomery showed no reluctance to ride in buses on a non-segregated basis. Once the hands of the police and other city authorities had been tied by the Supreme Court decision, the only hope of maintaining segregation lay in the attempt of a handful of fanatics to institute a reign of terror or to provoke a riot.

That they are determined to do their

dirty work despite the apathy of the majority of Montgomery whites was shown by the fact that a shotgun was fired into Martin Luther King's home by a shoot-and-run coward during the night of December 23.

The inspiring example of the Montgomery Negroes has caught on. Negroes in Tallahassee, Fla., who have been boycotting the buses for seven months, announced that they will start riding on a non-segregated basis. A similar announcement has been made by Negroes in Birmingham, Alabama. There can be no doubt that other attempts will follow.

The victors in the Montgomery struggle

have no intention of sitting on their laurels. King has announced that they will now proceed to fight for desegregation of the schools and recreational areas.

Obviously, to break down Jim Crow in these fields will be no simple task, especially as the economic pressure which could be brought to bear by the bus boycott cannot be easily applied to schools and playgrounds. But the solidarity and morale of the Negroes of Montgomery have been such that, having won their first struggle, there is every prospect that they can forge ahead.

Unrest in Russia — —

(Continued from page 1)

together with a cutback in the size of capital investments, which indicates serious economic trouble.

This may be due to a desire to increase consumers goods, in order to allay discontent, though no such announcement has yet been made; or it may be due to the economic setbacks delivered to the economy by the crises in Poland and Hungary and rumblings in the other satellites.

Something is astir in the heartland of Stalinism itself.

There's No Angel Around to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime, and dollars, of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—Subscribe now!

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

