

LABOR ACTION

BLP Right Wing Wins Victory

... page 3

BOOKS AND IDEAS

The Roots of American Communism

... page 7

After the German Elections

... page 4

October 21, 1957



TEN CENTS

SPOTLIGHT

Court Blocks Hoffa

Jimmy Hoffa has been blocked from taking office as president of the Teamsters by a temporary restraining order issued by Federal District Judge F. Dickinson Letts in Washington, D. C. The order gives the union a week in which to show cause why the proceedings of its recent convention in Miami should not be voided on the grounds that delegates were elected in violation of the Teamsters constitution.

If Judge Letts' restraining order cannot be overturned by a higher court, and if he should eventually hand down a permanent injunction against Hoffa and the other officers elected at the convention, the court could appoint a master with veto powers over decisions of the union and control of its funds. If such action were sustained by higher courts, the only way in which the Teamsters could get out from under court control would be to hold another convention with legally elected delegates which would elect officers.

Judge Letts' restraining order was granted on the plea of attorneys for a rank and file committee of thirteen teamsters who had sought to prevent the convention from being held by court action. John Cunningham, a leader of the rank and file committee, has announced that the injunction was the "first move to return the Teamsters Union to the rank and file both on a local and national basis." He said the principal aim of the committee was to keep the Teamsters from being expelled by the AFL-CIO.

There is no way of knowing at this point whether the court action will run the full course outlined above. If it does, the American labor movement could be confronted with a new, and very dangerous situation: a major international union placed under the administrative control of a federal court. It is obvious that such a precedent could be used and abused to hamstring the labor movement in its struggles with the employers.

NOT CLEAR

At the moment, it is not altogether clear who is backing and advising the thirteen-man committee which has brought this action. But the fact remains that, dangerous as their action may turn out to be, it represents an understandable reaction to the high-handed violation of elementary democracy so widespread in the Teamsters Union. When rank and file elements seeking to control their own locals are confronted by trickery, violation of union rules and terrorism, and

Polish Joke

"The difference between capitalism and socialism is this: under capitalism we have the exploitation of man by man. Under socialism it is vice versa."

when no one with power and authority in the labor movement stands up to advise, aid and support them, it is easy to see why they feel driven to turn to the courts as a last resort.

Hoffa and his gang are facing attack from above and below. In Detroit it is reported that fifty-two members of Owen Bert Brennan's Local 337 have decided to quit the union in protest over the steamroller methods used to pick delegates to the convention. Insurgent members of 13 New Jersey locals have decided to affiliate with the rank-and-file committee in New York.

On the other side, the AFL-CIO Executive Council is planning to go ahead with its October 24 meeting where the Teamsters will be required to show cause why they should not be ousted from the AFL-CIO. In the convention call issued by Meany and Schnitzler for the second convention of the united labor movement to start in Atlantic City on December 5, the issue of cleaning the racketeers out of the labor movement is the first major problem listed as confronting the convention.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

The Hungarian Revolution started just one year ago. A whole nation rose up, broke the chains of Stalinist totalitarianism, and began to establish a democratic society. The revolutionary surge which had started in Poland a few weeks before rose to its high point in Budapest.

Within the short space of twelve days the old regime was overturned by a united people. Freedom of the press, of public assembly, the right of opposition parties to function freely, all were recognized. The peasants, who had been pressed into collective farms against their will, broke up the great majority of them and divided the land among themselves. Workers Councils were formed in most factories taking over their administration on a democratic basis.

This great upsurge of democratic socialism was put down by massed formations of the Russian army, starting their operations on November 4, 1956. The fighting which followed devastated the center of Budapest. For six weeks the workers maintained a general strike in the face of Russian military occupation. For three months strikes, demonstrations, meetings, delegations testified to the tenacity of the revolution in the face of the Russian army and the terror of the Kadar quisling regime.

A year has gone by since this first successful, even though momentary, overthrow of a Stalinist regime by a democratic revolution. During that year the Polish revolution, which never reached the height of the Hungarian one, has been gradually pushed back and whittled down. The "example" the Kremlin made of Hungary was not lost on the peoples of the rest of the Russian empire. In these countries, and in Russia herself, the anti-Stalinist revolution has been forced underground, where it smolders, with occasional outbursts such as the student demonstrations in Poland testifying to its continued presence.

As we look back on the Hungarian Revolution with the perspective of the year which has passed, we find its lustre in no way diminished. Not only was it one of the great chapters in the history of man's struggle for freedom, democracy and dignity, but it was a concrete manifestation and example of the real feelings and

(Turn to last page)

Sputnik's Message Decoded:

WHAT THIS COUNTRY NEEDS IS A NEW FOREIGN POLICY!

By SAM BOTTONE

The launching of the first space satellite by the Russians has launched an even greater political furor in the U.S. With one sweep the Sputnik has brought Russia to a position of technological superiority in the missile race with the U.S. But even more important, it has been a stunning political and psychological coup for the Russians.

While the military significance of the Sputnik is minor, it proves that the Stalinists have the capability to launch an Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile. The effect of this has to be to challenge the foundations of the entire Western political and military strategy in the cold war, based as it was on the assumption of overwhelming U. S. technological and military superiority.

Now this illusion, or assumption, has been shattered. The result has been virtual political panic after the shock of recognition wore off. Congressmen of both political parties have been demand-

ing a Congressional investigation, and even a special session of Congress to probe the reasons for the failure of the U. S. to win the race for the earth satellite.

The initial reaction of the Eisenhower administration, that Sputnik was just a "scientific" achievement has given way to the pressure for a crash program to win the "race for space," and an operational ICBM.

All that the excitement over Sputnik seems to have produced in the U. S. is the demand that more billions be spent to catch up with the Russians, and then surpass them. There seems to be no thought that the very assumption—the ability of the U. S. to maintain military and technological superiority—has been shattered. And that if the U. S. were to steal a march on the Russians tomorrow, the situation could be reversed the day after.

The launching of Sputnik, the threats by Russian leaders that all countries are vulnerable and subject to attacks by ballistic missiles, and the announcement last August that they have an ICBM shows the similarity in thinking between the "statesmen" on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Both have put their faith in superior and more destructive weapons.

A LOOK BACK

A look back at the arms race of the past decade shows the futility of achieving security and peace by the race for military hegemony instead of an anti-imperialist and democratic foreign policy. We do not have security from nuclear war, we do not have peace, but an armed truce, and now we do not have the lead in more destructive weapons. All that is happening is that the ante in this ghoulish game is being raised to the point where the armed truce is maintained only by the destructive capabilities of the weapons themselves.

After the end of the Second World War, the U. S. alone had the atom bomb. Then it was believed the U. S. and its allies had real security. Churchill said at that time, the only thing staying a Russian conquest of the world was the U. S. monopoly of the bomb. But this did not prevent a Stalinist victory in China.

Sole U. S. possession of the A-bomb lasted only till 1949 since the Russians embarked on their own crash program to catch up. This in turn led to a U. S. crash program to develop the H-bomb and in 1952 the age of thermonuclear weapons was inaugurated. Once more it was felt that the U. S. had "security." But this only lasted for less than a year when the Russian crash program caught up in August 1953.

A new stalemate was reached as both powers began the race to build the large-

(Continued on page 6)

The Duty of Every Decent Trade Unionist:

Give Hoffa the Bum's Rush

By JACK WILSON

The election of Jimmy Hoffa to the presidency of the Teamsters Union at its recent rigged convention was a blow to the entire labor movement, since it gave powerful ammunition to a growing anti-labor sentiment in this country. Nevertheless, there were many encouraging signs that the AFL-CIO campaign, utilizing the exposures made by the Senate rackets committee to clean house was making genuine headway. It remains to be seen if Hoffa's new cover will be sufficient to keep him and his cronies in the labor movement, and in the leadership of the Teamsters Union.

Most observers at the Teamsters' convention, carried away by the headlines and day to day events, missed completely the new situation in the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, one that is not to Hoffa's advantage. This was the first convention in at least 40 years where a contest for the presidency took place. The tight grip that the bureaucracy has had was shaken; it was so split by events that a real election was held. The vote against Hoffa exceeded previous expectations: his, and those of most followers of Teamster union events. A secret ballot at the convention would have increased the vote against Hoffa considerably, and he knows it. Furthermore, there is scarcely anyone in the Teamsters union, including Hoffa, who would care to predict that if a secret rank and file referendum of the ranks were held on his candidacy, Hoffa could have won. Quite the contrary.

PURE HYPOCRISY

Hoffa's protestations of a democratic election are pure hypocrisy. Just three months ago he bragged publicly that there hadn't been a contested election for 22 years in Michigan's Teamsters locals where he is absolute dictator. Hoffa makes no pretense of having been elected by the rank and file of his own local. Nor did any other delegates from Michigan go through that democratic procedure. It's a moot point whether or not the election at the convention will meet the minimum requirements set up by the federal court of appeals which now hears the case.

Election to the presidency gives Hoffa this personal break: he can utilize the vast finances and prestige of that office in his defensive legal battles and they have just begun. His cries of "persecution" are mere echoes of Dave Beck's last words in the labor movement.

The new president of the Teamsters Union faces another day before the Senate Committee where it is far more likely that he will have to take refuge in the Fifth Amendment to keep silent on his crimes against the labor movement, as well as because of his need for legal protection. On Oct. 15 his trial for using wire taps against his associates begins, as well as his indictment for perjury. (His boasts about losing his memory conveniently may well turn out to be his famous last words.)

Given the kind of public scrutiny that Hoffa faces from now on, his position will be even more defensive than we suggested in our last article. He doesn't dare start the jurisdictional war he has been threatening privately. If he cracks down on his opponents in the Teamsters Union he faces a split, and he may face one anyhow when the AFL-CIO expels the Teamsters, as appears likely.

MORE DEFENSIVE

Hoffa's post-election speech telling the delegates that the Machinists and other unions survived by themselves and therefore so can the Teamsters misses a major point. The other unions split on arguable policy; there was no onus attached to their departure. In the case of the Teamsters, expulsion for failing to meet the minimum standards of the Code of Ethics of the AFL-CIO places the Teamsters in a very unfavorable position.

By now it is evident that the "brains" behind Hoffa is another one of the species that infect the American labor movement, the cynical ex-radical. In this case, Harold Gibbons who flirted with Stalinism, Trotskyism and socialism in the 1930's, and whose viewpoint was brilliantly exposed in a good profile in a recent issue of the *New Republic*, Gib-

bons is in the number two spot in the Teamsters and may well end up as the dominant figure if Hoffa's career catches up with him and he is put away for a few years.

It was Gibbons who cooked up that fabulous banquet for Hoffa in Michigan two years ago, and raised funds for an orphanage in Israel. It has been Gibbons who gave Hoffa that "union touch," which he used in his post-election speech at the convention.

MOST BACKWARD

We can only wonder if Gibbons, the ex-socialist, wrote or approved the article praising Hoffa, among other reasons because Hoffa didn't bother with world politics, social causes, civil rights or other nonsense that occupies Walter Reuther's attention. This shocking piece of campaign literature had all the prejudices and biases that one usually associated with either the most backward elements in the labor movement, or its reactionary enemies.

Hoffa, it should be remembered, also made a great contribution to democracy, and the fight for full rights in the South for Negroes, by his public statement during the memorable Montgomery, Alabama events that the trouble down South was caused by the NAACP. (The *Detroit Free Press* carried a full article on Hoffa at that time including this vicious viewpoint.)

Trying to dress up Hoffa in labor leader's clothes at this late date is going to take some doing, and we doubt if it will succeed. Nor should it. Only that fringe of self-isolated radicals who see no difference between Hoffa and Reuther ("Reuther is as corrupt as Hoffa because he believes in class collaboration") could want it otherwise. Incidentally, not since the Stalinists went into the fantasy known as the Third Period has the labor movement seen the like of the theory proclaimed weekly in the *Militant*. For an organization that once supported John L. Lewis against William Green (who were alike except in the vital matter of industrial unionism) this demonstrates only a life increasingly apart from the main stream of the American labor movement.

RATIONALIZATIONS

This is not to say that Hoffa won't have other defenders: The cesspool of Stalinism that has deeply corroded a whole generation of radicals and rebels is powerful enough, ideologically speaking, to provide rationalization and arguments to defend Hoffa as once Stalin and his crimes were defended in the name of "socialism." In this case the name will be "unionism." Here are a few samples.

Exposing the frame-ups of the Moscow trials was being "anti-socialist" because it "weakened the Soviet Union." "Exposing Hoffa weakens the labor movement." Russia is like a corrupt union. You defend it against the bourgeoisie. Converse: A corrupt union is like the Soviet Union, you defend it. Any other position makes you a strike breaker, either in regard to the Soviet Union or unionism.

Was blasting Stalin "anti-socialist" as the Stalinist said, until Khrushchev did? Nonsense. Blasting and running Hoffa out of the union movement is a duty for all decent unionists. His cover now of "unionism" is as fraudulent as Stalin's "socialism." Fortunately, this debate is just beginning. And out of the struggles of the labor movement to purge itself of racketeering and the fast buck boys, a new and higher stage of the development of the working class will be reached.

LABOR ACTION
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

LABOR SCOPE**McClellan Sleuths Dig For Anti-UAW Muck**

Investigators for the McClellan Committee are buzzing about in Sheboygan, Wisconsin, trying to dig up material on the Kohler strike. They are looking only for what they are looking for namely, some way to "prove" that the UAW is committing illegal acts of some kind in its long stoppage and boycott. At a Wisconsin CIO convention, Emil Mazey, UAW secretary-treasurer, reported, "Whenever anything derogatory is said against the Kohler Company, these investigators drop their pencils and don't write a word. But when anything comes up against the union, they write feverishly." Right-wing members of the Senate Committee would like to shift the emphasis of their investigations away from racketeering and toward the legitimate activities of unions.

So far, the big exposures have ruined labor officials who have been among the few supporters of the Republican Party, such as Dave Beck and lately James Hoffa. But the real target of the anti-union members of the Committee is Reuther and other union leaders whom they consider dangerous subversives. UAW leaders are ready to testify on the Kohler strike but they insist that company officials be called too. Mazey told the Sheboygan County AFI-CIO Council, "Walter Reuther and I... are prepared to answer any questions on political matters on the Kohler strike, on anything else before the McClellan Committee. But in relation to the Kohler situation, if we are to appear before this committee, we insist on the committee subpoenaing Mr. Kohler and Mr. Conger and having them testify so that the fair and objective senators can bring all of the facts to the attention of the American public..."

Masters, Mates Members Win Court Case

In 1952 and 1953 a group of unionists was expelled from New York Local 88, Masters, Mates and Pilots Union (then AFL). They had formed a caucus within the union called the American Mariners Association to run an opposition slate for officers in the local 1952 elections and to fight for inner union democracy generally. The group was under the influence of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists. They were quickly thrown out on false charges of "dual unionism," a handy trick for union bureaucrats annoyed by critics. For five years, the expelled members fought their case in the courts and finally they won. In ruling in their favor, the New York State Appellate Court declared, "A union does not have the power to expel members for dual unionism and distribution of so-called smear sheets against officials of a union, whose constitution and by-laws do not provide that such acts are offensive against the union or prescribe punishment therefore, since these members were but exercising the basic rights of free speech and assembly and their expulsion is an invasion of such rights." We can be glad that they won their case. But it is a sad fact that the labor movement, despite its latest code of democratic rights for union members, provides no place where victimized members can find recourse without resorting to the courts.

Shorter Hours? Unfair!

A recent issue of the McCarthyite *National Review* features a curious criticism of Walter Reuther... another article hails a protest movement among "conservatives" against the federal income tax among other "socialistic" devices. The author is outraged at the UAW demand for shorter hours which threatens to undermine our whole economy. Whether "the so-called 'Big Three' in the automobile industry could afford higher labor costs without raising prices" is "a matter that only the companies themselves are in a position to deter-

mine..." he writes. Naturally he does not suggest that we investigate any further for he has implicit confidence in the fairness of auto employers. But not in the union! "Why isn't it right for the auto industry to reduce hours below forty a week?" he asks and replies, "the answer is that to do so would be unfair to the general public." Does that mean we can never reduce hours anywhere. Not at all. "But unless hours of work can be shortened for everyone pretty much at the same time, by sharing gains in productivity wherever achieved, we won't be able to maintain a stable economy and avoid inflation."

It was our impression, up to now, that when workers fought for higher wages and shorter hours in one industry, they were preparing the way for their brothers in all industries. Then, too, we didn't think it any more unfair for auto workers to labor less than forty hours than it is, say for one man to busy himself with drifting magazine articles while another stoops over an assembly line. But there is no reason not to try out the *National Review* idea of fairness. As a beginning, let us suggest that everyone, including magazine editors and writers, spend at least 8 hours a day, 5 days a week on production... no less for that would be unfair to the public... and for no more than union pay. And let us all await together shorter hours and higher pay; no sooner for one than for all.

Whose Ox Is Gored

One matter that sometimes comes up for debate in the UAW is industry-wide bargaining. In its early period, the union demanded industry-wide bargaining but later decided that separate company negotiations were more to its advantage. Now, a spokesman for the American Motors Co. has decided that the UAW exercises a labor monopoly and calls for a united front of auto employers in industry-wide negotiations.

Bosses, Ike Turn Down UAW Price-Cut Demand

Here's what happened to the UAW demand for a cut in auto prices: The companies turned it down, insisting that price-fixing was their unilateral prerogative and was not a subject for collective bargaining. Eisenhower turned down the suggestion that he investigate, maintaining that the subject was properly the subject for collective bargaining and not government intervention.

NMU Calls for AFL-CIO To Reinstate ILA

At its convention this month, the National Maritime Union called for the reinstatement of the International Longshoremen's Association in the AFL-CIO. NMU President Joe Curran wants the backing of the ILA in his own fight with the Seafarers International Union of Paul Hall. On the eye of the last collective bargaining election on the New York waterfront, Curran publicly endorsed the ILA and helped swing the vote. In his own union, he has maintained that the union must not act against officials charged with corruption until they have been convicted in the regular courts, a position identical with that of Dave Beck. All this is perfectly consistent. What does not fit in is this: Curran is a member of the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee.

LABOR ACTION • 18th YEAR

October 21, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 35
Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—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: GORDON HASKELL
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON
Business Manager: Mel Stack

Editorial Board:
GORDON HASKELL
HERMAN BENSON
MAX MARTIN
SAM BOTTONE

LONDON LETTER

Labor Party Right Wing Wins Victory

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, October 11

Only a few days have passed since the British Labor Party conference ended at Brighton, insufficient time in which to make any detailed assessment of its influence on the course of British politics. But so sharply were the major issues posed that it is possible to outline clearly the important features which are now the subject of much debate and discussion in political circles.

The first fact to emerge from Brighton was that the Labor Party is one hundred per cent confident that it is going to sweep back into power when the next general election is held. This confidence is not restricted to any section of the Party, but is one of the few points which is commonly agreed from right to left.

From the outset it was apparent that the right wing was going to underline the coming sweep to power in order to make an appeal to the left for unity. The theme was introduced at the Party public rally held two days before conference opened by Hugh Gaitskell, the leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party. It was repeated with great force by the chairman of conference, Miss Peggy Herbison, in her opening address and the symphonic pattern was completed when ex-Bevanite Harold Wilson moved a resolution on behalf of the executive committee which attacked the Tory Government's economic policies and which he used to emphasize the feeling of confident power of the Labor Party and to give the overall impression that anyone who raised his voice too loudly in criticism during the week would be playing into the hands of the Tories and weakening the Party in the eyes of the voters.

PARTY UNITY

Pleas for Party unity were not confined to the right, they also came from Nye Bevan himself in circumstances—and accompanied by other events—which now have the whole Party speculating on the future of the Bevanite tendency. Bevan's attitude was indicated at a rally held by the weekly left wing periodical Tribune and at which he was accompanied on the platform by editor Michael Foot and French socialist Claude Bourdet. Perhaps judgment on Bevan's speech can best come by quoting Forward, a middle-of-the-road weekly Labor journal.

"One of the big talking points at conference," said Forward, "has been Nye Bevan's explanation to a rather startled Tribune rally audience that he is no longer a Bevanite. Internal quarrels can lose the next election, he declared, but the election must be won to save our economy at home and peace abroad. Nye was in a subdued mood. It was not the sort of speech which many of his supporters expected. It contrasted strangely with a rip-roaring rebel blast from Michael Foot." Claude Bourdet himself, writing in Tribune, commented that Bevan spoke "Much more like a statesman than a polemicist"—probably Bourdet was not told that in British politics to call a left-wing socialist a "statesman" is almost as bad as doubting the validity of his birth certificate.

"STATESMANSHIP"

The real depth of Bevan's "statesmanship" became apparent later in the week when the conference debated nuclear weapons and Bevan, as member of the national executive and the spokesman on foreign affairs in the Parliamentary La-

bor Party, put forward the leadership's attitude on the subject. Before the delegates were a number of resolutions including one calling for unilateral action by Britain to stop manufacturing or testing nuclear weapons around which the left forces had rallied. This, too, was the viewpoint advanced by Tribune in frequent articles in the months of pre-conference debates in its columns.

From the platform Bevan asked conference to reject this left-wing resolution. It would, he said, send a future Labor foreign secretary "naked into the conference chamber"; it meant that all international commitments and arrangements "with our friends and allies" (sic!) must be scrapped; it was not "statesmanship" but an "emotional spasm" and, claimed Bevan, the resolution (if acted on) would do more to precipitate incidents that could easily lead to a third world war.

As can be imagined, left-wing delegates at conference did not like this speech one little bit. And they showed their annoyance by maintaining a barrage of heckling at Bevan. Commented Tribune, when writing on the debate, for five minutes there was "practically a dialogue between floor and platform" and it spoke of Bevan's words being lost in "shouts of disagreement."

STAGGERING VICTORY

When the votes were counted up at the end of the debate (and Bevan's speech wound up the debate) the result was a staggering victory for the Bevan right-wing axis. Supporters of the "scrap Britain's H-bomb" mustered only 781,000 votes against 5,836,000 in opposition—the Labor Party is thus stuck with a policy of reaching international agreement to ban nuclear weapons and which pledges future Labor Government to a policy of "cessation of H-bomb tests"—but here Bevan insisted that the word "cessation" was to mean "suspension."

This outspoken defense of right-wing policies on the H-bomb astonished not a few newspaper correspondents and caused gloom amongst a number of Bevan's supporters. But the fact remains that it is only a small step forward along the path he has been treading for several years and which has been sketched out in many earlier "London Letters" in Labor Action. The important thing now is how the other leading Bevanites will react, and first signs are encouraging.

In the current issue of Tribune Michael Foot takes a whole page to examine Bevan's arguments on the H-bomb and to explain why he (Foot) and Tribune still favor unilateral action by Britain in ending nuclear weapon manufacture. On another page a feature examines the peculiar role of Stalinist led (or influenced) trade unions which supported Bevan at the Brighton conference and thus voted against the left-wing. The same article notes how the Daily Worker hailed Bevan's speech "and toned down its reporting of the attacks on him." On yet another page there are columns of letters on the H-bomb issue—with nearly every one attacking the line put forward by Bevan.

All of this seems to indicate that, in spite of Bevan, Tribune is going to continue its fight against the H-bomb.

To revert to the conference itself, in addition to the H-bomb there was posed a second major issue—that of the extension of public ownership in Britain. The scene for this debate was set by a policy document issued by the National Executive Committee under the title Industry and Society. This advocates the re-nationalization of steel and road transport and the acquisition of shares in large companies by the Government out of public funds (but with no interference in the management); nationalization is con-

sidered only as a kind of penalty for industries which "let the nation down" by being inefficient.

As may be imagined, this document has been greeted with hostility by the left-wing who see it as a retreat from Labor's previous general principle of direct ownership and control through nationalization of industry. The pre-conference debate in the columns of the movement's press was a little complicated by the fact that a number of leading Bevanites sat on the committee which drafted this policy document and who were alleged to have voted in favor of it at the National Executive meeting where it was adopted. Indeed, several Bevanites at first seemed to support the document with little qualification and only switched their line when, they complained, the right-wing started interpreting the document in a way they had not anticipated. (In fact, the right wing was able to do this because the document is so vague in its terms—indication of the way in which the Party leadership is trying to build up the atmosphere of unity in readiness for power, as mentioned at the start of this article.)

ISSUE NOT SETTLED

However, by the time conference arrived the lines were drawn out clearly with the left-wing ranged against the executive policy document. An exception was Bevan—who had carefully refrained from making a single comment on the document despite the fact that his wife, Jennie Lee, and many others had hit out in public speeches and in newspaper articles. At the conference the left wing urged the Party not to retreat but to press forward. In reply the executive, through the mouth of Hugh Gaitskell, said that the policy was one of pressing forward and was constructed to be acceptable to the electorate (which, it appears, might be a little frightened of nationalization). At the end of Gaitskell's speech came Bevan's first public reaction—he almost swung his arms off in an enthusiastic bout of applause which contrasted with the immobility of several other Bevanite members of the executive who were also sitting on the platform. The result was a crashing victory for the right, 5,309,000 votes against 1,276,000.

Again, the important thing is what the reaction of the Bevanites (if one can

still use that term) will be, and again Tribune gives the clue. Under a streamer front-page headline reading "We'll Keep The Red Flag Flying Here!" it promises to continue the fight for a speedier advance to Socialism and it says that Gaitskell's defense of the policy document was "evasive and unconvincing." In another article Jennie Lee writes that the fight for more nationalization can still be won, that the vote at Brighton did not settle the issue, and that she hopes Tribune will give "pride of place" to arguments in favor of more nationalization in the coming months.

Just what all of this means is not yet clear. The spot assessment of the Tory press has been that Bevan has promised Gaitskell and the right-wing his silence in return for the promise from them of the job of Foreign Secretary in the next Labor Government. This is a very crude assumption—more likely is the idea in Bevan's mind that he must act with the maximum of "responsibility" now that he is back from the wilderness and must do nothing to upset the chances of a Labor victory at the polls in the near future. This ties in much closer with Bevan's character of seeing himself as a pivot point around which the fate of the Labor Party revolves than does the more vulgar idea that Bevan is prepared to sell out for a portfolio in the next Labor Cabinet.

SORTING OUT IDEAS

But, whatever Bevan's motives (and so far they are known only to himself) there is little doubt about the situation which his latest shift has created. First, the right wing is now much stronger, and more confident than it has been for many years (particularly happy that, for the time being at least, Bevan will either keep silent or lend his vocabulary of left wing phrases to defeating left wing policies). Second, the left wing is confronted with the need for sorting out its ideas, for the conference revealed a dangerous tendency of left speakers to rely on emotional pleas pitched at a low political level rather than reasoned argument based on consistent political thought. Third, the left (particularly the Bevanites) must now think seriously about developing new voices as leadership within the Movement. All these are but preliminary estimates made soon after the event, other tasks will undoubtedly arise in the course of the great debate which is now beginning in Labor organizations all over Britain as delegates to the Brighton Conference report back on what will undoubtedly prove to be the most important conference British Labor has held for many a year.

Djilas and the Daily Worker

Twenty-seven prominent Americans have written Tito asking that he help release Milovan Djilas from prison. Djilas has just been given an extended sentence for having smuggled into the United States and published his book *The New Class*.

The *Daily Worker* for October 3, 1957 carries an article by Simon W. Gerson entitled "The Djilas Case and the Smith Act Trials."

Gerson calls to task most signers of the Djilas letter for their failure to ask President Eisenhower to free Gilbert Greene, Henry Winston and Irving Potash from their Smith Act sentences. Gerson then goes on to smear Djilas in a manner which is typical of the Stalinist slander machine which we all remember from the good old days. His book "has become an ideological platform for the 'liberationists.' In brief, it has become a manual for the cold war . . ." the cold warriors whose fundamental outlook is that of 'liberating' the socialist countries by atomic war and restoring capitalism . . . have clasped Djilas to their bosom . . ."

The *Daily Worker*, Gerson continues, opposes the Djilas trials because they "unfortunately play into the hands of the worst enemies of both the American and Yugoslav people. For it gives them the argument—a specious one, indeed, on the lips of men who hail the Smith Act!—that in socialist countries men are imprisoned for writing articles and not for overt criminal acts." The Yugoslav government is, in his opinion, strong enough to be able to combat Djilas by ideological rather than police methods. Then comes a paragraph which can only be described, even in these days of diplomatic par-

lance, as a slimy little offal right out of Stalin's own Moscow Trial meat-grinder:

"If Djilas is guilty of illegal relations with enemy agents diplomatic or otherwise, and has therefore violated the laws of his country then we have a different question. But then the indictment, trial and evidence must be of a different nature. This type of illegal activity cannot be excluded if we realize the nature of the real world and the frantic activity of the various government agencies, particularly the Central Intelligence Agency, to exploit all problems in the Socialist countries."

Does the *Daily Worker* charge Djilas with espionage? Not quite. It only hints broadly. Tito's regime didn't charge him with that, or even hint at it. Even to Tito that must smell too reminiscently of Stalin's handiwork. Enough for them was that Djilas did violate the "laws of his country," just as, incidentally, Green, Winston and Potash "violated" a law of theirs.

To be critical of Djilas' book is one thing. To oppose it ideologically is one thing. But what would one think of people who, while saying that they themselves favor the freeing of Green et al from prison on Smith Act charges, went on to add that, of course, if they had been accused of espionage, the question would be different, and then added: "This type of illegal activity cannot be excluded if we realize the nature of the real world and the frantic activity of the various Russian government agencies, particularly its intelligence service, to exploit all problems in the capitalist countries?" Well, that is what we think of Gerson.

New Perspectives for American Socialism

The Case for Unity

Introduction by

Max Shachtman

ten cents

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE
114 West 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

PRO & CON: DISCUSSION

Growing War Danger Seen

After the German Elections

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Two events have decided the course of the political development of the world for the next few years: the Russian intervention in Hungary and the defeat of the East European revolution there; and the victory of Adenauer in Germany.

Even if the defeated Hungarian revolution has a great and fruitful significance for the future of the working class movement, at the present moment the Russian counter-revolutionary intervention has saved the Stalinist empire from the growing revolution in the satellite countries. This demonstrates the relative resistance and "solidity" of the post-revolutionary Russian empire. With the defeat of the Hungarian uprising, the Polish revolution was destined to congeal. The East German revolution had been stopped previously, and the revolutionary development in other satellite countries as well as in Russia itself, was dominated.

ADENAUER'S VICTORY

It is in this sense that the victory of Adenauer in West Germany was a consequence of the Russian butchery in Hungary. No one wanted Adenauer's victory more than Khrushchev and his friends in the Kremlin, despite the bluff of "support" to the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD). The success of the alter Fuchs (old fox) was desired by all reactionary forces and expected by all, and thus surprised nobody. It was desired not only by the government of the United States, by the German and European bourgeoisies, by the Russian bureaucracy, but it was desired also by the German opposition, that is, by the SPD, which fought against Adenauer without impact or enthusiasm, because it desired its own defeat. The world now has the desired victory of reaction in Germany and enjoys it, because its defeat could have meant a catastrophe for the present organization of Europe, for world equilibrium, and for the "coexistence" policy.

I will not say that a victorious SPD could and would have initiated a different foreign and economic policy than Adenauer, because the Russians don't want a change in Europe and the unification of Germany. But they could have attempted a policy of European integration, of the creation of a neutral zone between the two imperialist powers, of the withdrawal of foreign troops from Europe. Now, after Adenauer's victory, all that kind of policy is at dead center.

Thus, all supporters of an independent, socialist policy directed against the two imperialist blocs were defeated by the German pro-Adenauer voters. Defeated also was the hope for a new revolutionary uprising in the satellite countries, and for a growing revolutionary pressure in Russia. It is perhaps for this reason that the American and European bourgeoisies are so overjoyed with Adenauer's success, while the Kremlin's press discreetly hides its satisfaction. For in Germany world reaction won against the progressive socialist camp; the war camp gained against the peace supporters, and Russian totalitarianism against the young, growing anti-Stalinist revolution.

REALPOLITIK

The German middle class (petit bourgeoisie) voted for the division of their own country, for the national captivity of 18 millions of Germans in the Russian totalitarian prison, for the division of the world. They were lured by the capitalist boom ("may it only continue") without thinking of the consequence of their votes for their country, their children, or even themselves. It is not the first time that the German bourgeoisie and middle class push the world and their own country toward a catastrophe by their political blindness. This time, it was to the applause of the whole of world reaction, from Washington to the Kremlin. It was a real victory of Realpolitik over the policy of the future.

For the future of Germany and Europe, after the Adenauer victory, will be very dark. The capitalist boom and prosperity which seduced the German petit

bourgeoisie cannot last, for the growing world antagonism and division was strengthened and deepened by the German reactionary voters. The German working class which fought under its own banner to the "bitter end," voting against Adenauer, against the division of the country, that is against the war policy and against capitalism, will get its justice. But the defeat of the German proletariat explains in our time the whole tragedy of socialism and all the disasters of our world.

Of course, Adenauer's victory also has other important aspects. It is the answer of the Germans to Russian threats and in part the repudiation of Russian "socialism" which brings slavery, poverty, police terror and exploitation. For in the German elections the "benefits" of the Stalinist regime in East Germany, the Russian policy against Germany, the "conquests" of Stalinist "socialism" in East Europe and the Russian intervention in Hungary were also on trial.

GERMANY VITAL

Even if Germany is no longer a world power, it is the most important country of the European continent, and thus a necessary partner in world policy. Thus, if the Germans support American imperialist policy, they must be prepared to carry the full weight of Russian power policy, including the danger of war on German territory. The only way to avoid war was the neutralization of Germany and the withdrawal from Europe of foreign troops, and possibly in this way the achievement of German reunification. Now, after the Adenauer victory there remains for the Germans only the road of force, of a power policy against the Russians. And Russia is now stronger than Germany. It dominates a part of Germany, while the Americans remain on the other side of the Atlantic. American military help can play for the Germans only the same role as the British "guarantee" could for Poland against Hitler's invasion in 1939.

The development of world power policy does not provide any happy prospects for revolutionary socialists. After the victory of the Polish uprising it appeared that the satellite countries could free themselves from the Stalinist yoke; that the pressure against the bureaucracy was growing in Russia; that the eventual victory of the SPD in Germany and of the Labor Party in Great Britain could free the world from the war danger and unleash a working class offensive against the reaction in both the West and the East.

But after the Russian intervention in Hungary, accepted by the power policy of the United States, the bureaucracy consolidated its precarious positions in Russia and the satellite countries. And after the German elections, the American government has consolidated their power policy in Europe. What remains now as a solution? Only the growing war danger with the perspective of a new catastrophe.

THEORETICAL POSSIBILITY

Of course, a theoretical possibility of a new revolution in Russia remains. But the growth of this revolution can take a long time, for the Bolshevik revolution attained the aims of the October revolution, destroying the old regime, and building a new industrial order. Therefore the Russian working class suffers the domination of the bureaucracy, in spite of all abuses, because it is for the industrial development of the country. Therefore also the ripening of the new Russian revolution can take longer than we would like, so that the bureaucracy has the possibility of temporarily solving

the crisis by a faction fight, or by a military dictatorship as a last resort.

But as long as the Russian proletariat is neither determined nor capable of assaulting the power of the bureaucracy, the anti-Stalinist revolution in Poland and the other satellite countries is doomed to defeat by Russian military intervention. The German elections have further lengthened the time of the "pereklyshka" (break) for the bureaucracy, thus broadening the possibilities for its reactionary power policy.

On the other side, the working class of the West, that is of the United States, Britain and Germany have adopted, correctly, a policy directed against the Kremlin's totalitarianism. (The French and Italian workers, where the Stalinist Party retains a majority, are condemned to political sterility, for the division of the world.) It is inevitable that the policy of the Western proletariat benefits Western capitalism, thus contributing to the deeper division of the world.

The contradictions of our world can be solved only by socialist revolution or by war (in the latter case, in a reactionary way). Only a new revolutionary wave, a new Hungary or Poland, backed by the Russian revolution can save the world from the catastrophe of war. Only an independent, class and revolutionary policy of the Western (American, British and European) proletariat can accelerate and widen the possibility of the true socialist revolution in Russia and East Europe.

COMMENT

View Too Gloomy

The victory of Adenauer in West Germany seems to have put Comrade Rud-

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Critical Support To Gomulka

To the Editor:

I would like to offer some observations on a most perplexing section of the ISL resolution on Stalinism (Labor Action, July 15), namely, that portion dealing with the question of critical support to the Gomulka regime in Poland.

The ISL, it appears at first glance, takes the prudent position that socialists from afar should not presume to legislate anti-Stalinist tactics to the Polish workers and their allies.

And yet, in practically the same breath, the resolution takes a most definitive stand against any motion for critical political support for Gomulka and the "Gomulka way"—with the exception of a sort of hazy, vague, and ill-defined "military support" against any attempt at national subjugation by Russian troops and Natolinist quislings.

The first impression I get from this approach is that it most certainly does contain judgments on Polish revolutionary tactics. It does so in a negative fashion, by its specific clear-cut rejection of the very course of action, that has been manifestly chosen by most of the Polish people. Should not the ISL, by its own supposed strictures, remain neutral on this point? Or, at the very least, should not the ISL remove such a contradictory stricture from the resolution, and so remove the impression of an attempt at a disclaimer of political and intellectual responsibility?

Secondly, I am really baffled by the resolution's most artificial compartmentalization, in raising the question of military support for Polish national sovereignty, apart from the swarm of interdependent political, economic, and geographical considerations that face the Polish masses, in their choice of anti-Stalinist tactics.

Indeed, because of the intrinsically close relationship between all these factors in Poland today, such military support to Gomulka—in any meaningful sense—necessarily implies political support, albeit critical political support. For,

ziensky in a gloomy mood. He sees the trend of events leading to the "growing war danger with the perspective of a new catastrophe." His negative prognosis is modified only by an allusion to a "theoretical possibility of a new revolution in Russia," but he warns the patient against pinning too many hopes on this theoretical possibility by reminding him that "the ripening of the new Russian revolution can take longer than we would like."

It not only can, it already has. But the fact remains that while up to four years ago the prospect of the revolution against Stalinism was purely theoretical, during the past four years during which we have seen the East German revolt, the revolts in Poland and Hungary, and the distinct weakening of the monolithic and total character of Stalinist control, the revolution against Stalinism has become much more concrete and immediate.

Naturally, the defeat of the SPD in Germany, and the big victory of the right wing of the British Labor Party indicate a further consolidation of conservatism in the capitalist world, and within the labor movement in it. It is not what third camp socialists would like to see. But it also does not signify the crushing of the labor movement, or even a major, historic defeat. The economic boom, and relative stabilization of the world has its usual, predictable results, however bad that may be for the long-range interests of the working class and humanity as a whole.

But the world is not, at the moment, rushing toward war at breakneck speed. Even if the launching of the Russian ICBM and Sputnik gives another spurt to the arms race, the danger of a catastrophic war is still some time off. This means that large possibilities are still open for the development of "class and revolutionary" policy on both sides of the iron curtain, and while they may not be immediate, they are also not, in our opinion, as abstract and uncertain, as "theoretical" as they were ten or even five years ago.

—Editor

is it not the case that a more revolutionary course of action, as opposed to the "Gomulka way" at the present time, immediately raises "military" considerations, Red Army "military" considerations? How politically realistic and meaningful, in such a context, is a discussion of military support to the Gomulka regime completely divorced from questions of critical political support?

I suppose that some socialists could offer a think-piece or two with some excruciating distinctions on this matter—indeed some such excursions have already been made. Their fascinating intellectual game reminds me of the very apt, severely critical evaluation—by a prominent ISLer—toward somewhat similar efforts in another area of discussion: "The logic is perfect; the politics—zero!"

Fortunately, as we have already intimated, most evidence leads to the conclusion that the Polish masses have been politically perspicacious enough to forego such fine distinctions. Concern for their national sovereignty and independence has led them to legislate unto themselves, however, grudgingly, the critical political support for the "Gomulka way" that is such anathema to some of the more sophisticated and theoretically inclined revolutionaries.

That most Poles support Gomulka in matters more than the purely military as long as he resists Moscow's pressures and intimidations, that they see no realistic alternative to his leadership and his "way" at the present time—this has been recognized by numerous anti-Stalinist and anti-Titoist Polish Socialists, including our own A. Rudzienski, but it appears to have completely escaped the political consciousness of the ISL.

—Paul Germain

August 30, 1957

COMMENT

As will be seen from the date on Comrade Germain's letter, it was submitted almost two months ago. He is entirely blameless for the lapse of time between its writing and publication.

(Turn to last page)

Central High Students Point to The Genuine Integration of the Future

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

The frantic, provocative and irresponsible conduct of the Governor of Arkansas led to a near-tragic situation in Little Rock. For some weeks now school has continued only because of the presence of Federal troops. In one sense, the situation seems to be a tremendous step backward; the integration which has been achieved a false thing maintained only by force of arms.

But that isn't the whole picture. For there is a tremendously hopeful process taking place in Little Rock. It involves the students.

Many observers have already pointed out that the fanatic resistance to integration in Little Rock is the work of a minority. The racist mother's organization which has supported Faubus has proved to be the organ of a small group. But more positively, there is the reaction of the overwhelming majority of the student body of Central High. There is no evidence to demonstrate that they are for integration as a group. But there is plenty of documentation coming in to show that they stand against the segregationists.

Several attempts have been made to organize a student boycott. In the main, they would seem to be the work of students who have been egged on by rabid parents. And they have all failed. Central High has 2000 students. The lowest attendance figure since the crisis began is 1400. But that does not mean that the other 600 are in the racist camp. Far from it. The October 3rd strike in favor of segregation attracted fewer than 60 students. And ever since the rock-bottom of 1400 was reached, attendance has been climbing. This week, it was up to 1800. That means that 90 per cent of the students are going to an integrated school.

Indeed, it is estimated that only 150 students have been involved in the die-hard resistance to integration. They have been in the news: standing outside the

school yelling and jeering. But what is overlooked is that they are such a tiny minority. The 90 per cent who have stayed in Central are not as photographically dramatic as the 7 or 8 per cent who hang around to yell racist slogans but they are much more important.

MAVERICK SECTION

Or take another seemingly insignificant fact. Not a single member of Central's football squad (which has won its last 26 games), nor a single student leader has joined the boycott. According to Homer Bigart in the New York Times, this has meant that the focus of school loyalty has been for accepting the integration of the school. The racists who are advocating a prolonged campaign of resistance are thus cut off from the recognized student leaders and from the student body itself. They apparently represent a maverick section of the school population with little real influence upon their fellow students.

Inside the school, there have been a few incidents. One Negro student was kicked and hit. But so far that has been the exception. The majority of the students have apparently adopted an attitude of accepting the situation. And a minority have actually made overtures to the nine Negroes. And of course, it is extremely important that not one of the nine has asked for a transfer out of Central. Like the other Negro students who have braved mobs in the South during the past few years, they have demonstrated a bravery and tenacity which contrasts magnificently with the gang tactics of the "white supremacy" advocates.

Another important factor in Central is the Tiger, the school newspaper. The evidence would indicate that it reflects the opinion of the majority of the students—not so much pro-integration as anti-the-forces-of-segregation. In a page one article in its last issue the Tiger even defended the troops who are enforcing the peace at Central. Opposing the taunts which some of the students were making, the article said, "They're somebody's husband, somebody's son, somebody's boy friend, and they want to be friendly with the students of Central High. . . . They were sent here to do a job with a minimum of force and as quickly as possible."

And finally, the Tiger urged a "sensible, peaceful neutrality," and called upon the students to "accept the situation without demonstration."

This, obviously, isn't enough. It is not a position in favor of integration, but only one against disturbance. And yet it is an auspicious beginning. Considerable forces have ranged themselves on the side of disrupting the situation at Central. Governor Faubus, acting in the worst tradition of Southern demagoguery, lying and extremism, has tried to incite action against the very peace which he always claims he is trying to defend. He made up a series of stories about the FBI; he concocted some fanciful tales about the soldiers and the girls' locker room; he has provoked violence in the fraudulent process of deploring it. But the students, fortunately, have not listened to the governor of their state. They have taken their stand in favor of accepting the situation.

This present development opens the way to a real emergence of genuine integration in the future. For the decisive wall has been shattered: the students are seeing each other each day, they are sitting next to each other in class, playing together on the athletic fields. A certain healthy adolescent rationality—in this case quite superior to some of the adult "thought" in the area—finds it difficult to accept the traditions and prejudices of the past. If the nine Negro students are at first only tolerated, the way is open for their acceptance in the future.

This, apparently, is what has already happened in some of the schools which faced integration crises last year, in 1956. At Clinton, Tennessee, for example, it took the state troopers, the FBI, the United States attorney and all the forces of law and order to even begin integration. This year, integration was accepted. There was no problem at Clinton, the students were able to enter. If the wild

and vicious antics of the governor of Arkansas can be stopped, if the troops can be removed and the local, Little Rock majority be allowed to assert itself in defense of integration, it may well be that next year, integration will continue at Central High without any particular fuss.

NEED FOR ACTION

All of this comes back to the need for hard, decisive action. Little Rock almost became a defeat for integration because a Republican president played golf and the Democratic Party, true to its political schizophrenia, was either engaged in calling for insurrection or making moderate statements about how this wouldn't have happened under the Democrats. In a sense, all the forces conspired to put the students of Central in the worst possible situation: with a clownish governor courting riots, with troops ringing the school, with television dramatically presenting the minority of 7 or 8 per cent as if it represented the real sentiment of the student body.

Despite all these tremendous forces militating against integration, Central High has made its choice. The students, the overwhelming majority of them, have not been gulled by racist nonsense. And that is a marvelously hopeful sign in a situation which could have become tragic.

Polish Students Continue Fight for Press Freedom

The students who played such a crucial role in the events of last October, have come out into the streets again.

This time the occasion was the banning of *Po Prostu*, the youth paper which was one of the political leaders of the people. The Government recently announced that "For many months, *Po Prostu* has conducted agitation against the achievements of Socialist Poland." The paper was accused of "barren negation," and "party and organization" sanctions were announced against its editors and writers. Translated into straight talk all this means that the critics of the regime will be fired from their jobs and expelled from the Party.

STUDENTS REACT

The students reacted immediately. On October 3, students met in the Polytechnic and then went on to demonstrate in the streets. The action was broken up by police who used tear gas and beat the students with rubber truncheons. On October 4th, the protest broadened. It became a general campaign against police brutality and the suppression of free speech. On that day, 3000 students met in the Polytechnic and adopted resolutions calling for the reinstatement of *Po Prostu* and attacking the police for having broken up the meeting of the night before. Before this meeting, the government had attempted to stop it from taking place. An appeal had been broadcast from all of Warsaw's colleges asking the students to maintain order. The radio also announced that demonstrations would not be permitted.

This did not halt the student meeting. The 3000 gathered and listened to Professor Jerzy Bukowski. Bukowski had been one of the leaders in the October uprising last year, and had been elected to Parliament as a non-party candidate from Gomulka's district. He ran second only to Gomulka. Bukowski evidently tried to calm the students, arguing that *Po Prostu's* fate was still being discussed by the Communist Party. But he was

cheered wildly when he said "I will never approve of the way the militia behaved toward the students last night."

Bukowski then suggested that the students negotiate a "safe conduct" with the police. This was done. But when the meeting broke up and the participants streamed out of the Polytechnic, tear gas bombs began to explode and the police started to flail away with rubber hoses. Student cries of "Gestapo" were heard, and it apparently took two hours to clear the square at Polytechnic of demonstrators. Even then, small groups of students formed in other places and continued the protest.

The next night, the protest still went on. Steel-helmeted Mobile Guardsmen moved in and took over from the regular police. But their troubles increased. It was necessary to block off whole sections of downtown Warsaw, and Constitution Square was cordoned off for nearly two hours. At one point, the crowds on Marszalkowska became so big that a call went out for more Mobile Guards. There were 1000 of them who responded, and they finally succeeded in achieving some semblance of order. The demonstration of October 5th, according to the New York Times, was not exclusively the work of the students, but included others who had been drawn into the struggle. Moreover, on the 5th, the government effectively scotched any hope of *Po Prostu's* revival. The paper was denounced for having taken an "anti-party" line, and that, of course, signaled the beginning of the end.

The last thrust of the demonstration took place the next night. Again the students were not as much in evidence as on the first two occasions. Appeals were being made to Gomulka, and Stefan Cardinal Wyszyński, the cardinal primate of Poland, had entered into the dispute more or less on the government side. Wyszyński said, "I well understand your fight for freedom of speech and thought, but respect what you have. You must remember that our country is in a difficult situation." This action is, of course, in line with the role which the cardinal played in the elections earlier this year. On that occasion, he had placed the pow-

(Turn to last page)

CHANGED MINDS

After a two-hour discussion in Little Rock the other day, two of the most anti-integration students began to change their minds.

The panel was sponsored by Mrs. Jrunn Ricketts, a Norwegian woman living in Mississippi who has been reporting on the Central High situation to newspapers in Norway. The discussion was among four white students and three Negroes. After it was all over:

Sammie Dean Parker, 16, one of the leading opponents of integration and the girl who was photographed both embracing Governor Faubus to thank him for action and weeping in front of the school after the boycott in which she participated failed, said: "I didn't think they want to go to school with us any more than we want to go to school with them. If you really talk to them, you can understand why they are in Central High. I think they're there because the NAACP is paying them to go." This is hardly a decent position, of course, and yet it marks a significant change. The girl herself recognized it, saying that she had changed "in a way" but "not altogether."

And another anti-integration activist, Kaye Bacon, said, "I just hope all this works out for the best. . . . I mean it, after today I've changed my mind.

"I feel Sammie and I have both changed our minds completely. We both came down with minds set."

Sputnik and Foreign Policy — —

(Continued from page 1)

est stockpile of H-bombs and to develop the means of delivering them. The initial emphasis was on the supersonic jet bombers but in the background the race was on to develop the ballistic missile.

"Peace" was maintained through this balance of terror. This was informally formalized at the Geneva conference of 1955 where, while no agreement could be reached for the settlement of political problems, both sides recognized that an armed truce had to be reached in the threatening situation in Indochina—they divided the country in half.

But neither the U. S. nor Russia is content with a balance of terror. Each pushes on to try to achieve a superiority in the means of terror in the hope that it then can impose its own "political" solution on its rival camp.

The U. S. establishes a ring of air bases, staffed with jet bombers and H-bombs around Russia, and the Stalinists embark upon a crash program to solve the scientific and technological problems of the ICBM. All of this feverish activity goes on while their diplomatic representatives dutifully attend disarmament conferences and offer proposals for control and abolition of armaments.

ICBM LAUNCHED

In August of this year, the Russians announced that they have successfully launched an ICBM. This was greeted with widespread skepticism in the U. S. Then came Sputnik and the realization that the Stalinists have achieved a breakthrough on at least part of the ballistic missile problem. And the Sputnik, circling the earth every 96 minutes, is a steady reminder of this achievement.

The initial reaction of the Democrats, or at least those who have spoken out thus far has been to blame the Eisenhower administration for complacency and failure to give full support to scientific research. The statement of the Democratic National Advisory Council called for "an all-out effort to regain our position in the armaments field and to lead the world in the drive for peace."

Democratic senators, led by Symington and Jackson, have attacked the recent cut-backs in military expenditures and called for a Congressional investigation and they have the support of some Republicans.

But Republicans for the most part have been wringing their hands out of public view. Only Senator Wiley publicly came to the defense of the administration's policy, but this was a lone voice.

MORE FOR SCHOOLS

From some liberal journals there came additional reasons. First was the accusation that this calamity had occurred because of the failure to encourage scientific research through the failure to expand the educational system. This is usually accompanied by the warning that Russia in a few years will have more scientists and engineers than the United States. Therefore the lesson of Sputnik is federal aid to education.

Another reason is to be found in the period of the reign of McCarthyism in Washington which drove many scientists out of government work. But this accusation, whatever its relevance to the ICBM, is one that can be leveled against both

Republicans and Democrats since the "loyalty" program and the witchhunt were initiated under Truman's administration.

In turn the Republicans have been saying that if you want to investigate, then let's go back to the Truman administration and find what delayed rocket development since 1948.

Some hardy journalists, assisted by Senator Knowland, have threatened to raise the charge that the reason for the Russian advance has been due to a degree never specified, but inferred to be decisive, to Russian espionage.

U. S. News and World Report carried an article "Did Russia Steal Satellite Secret From U. S.?" and they strain hard to reintroduce the Rosenbergs case. They refer to testimony by David Green-

other are sabotaging and delaying the U. S. missile effort under all kinds of seemingly logical excuses."

While there can be no doubt that the Russians have spy rings operating in the U. S., just as the U. S. has in other parts of the world, this "explanation" will need a little more than a Gouzenko's "opinion." At any rate even if Russian spies did get the "secret" of the satellite from the U. S. (something which the U. S. doesn't admit to having anyway), they must have stolen the only available copy.

More substantial reasons are probably to be found in a certain amount of bureaucratic bungling and rivalry among the army, air force and navy missile research centers. Army missile experts claim that they could have sent up test

Foster Takes Off into Wild Blue Yonder

William Z. Foster takes out all the stops in hailing the Russian "moon" in the October 9 issue of the Daily Worker. "The launching of the man-made satellite by the USSR is, by common agreement, an event of stupendous scientific importance. . . . It is also a splendid demonstration of the superiority, technically and otherwise, of the Socialist system over that of capitalism."

After listing Russia's achievements in re-building a shattered economy after the revolution and civil war, and of advancing the industrialization of the country and winning World War II, Foster continues:

"The Soviet Union made an impossible swift recovery from the gigantic damage done its economy by World War II. This was soon followed by the 'impossible' breaking of the atom-bomb monopoly, the halting of the warlike drive of American imperialism for world conquest, the achievement of the first intercontinental ballistic missile, and now comes the launching of the new moon. All of which constitutes a chain of accomplishments such as have never been achieved by any other nation, grace to the Socialist system of the USSR."

Comment: No one questions the great scientific and engineering feat involved in the ICBM and Sputnik. But to claim that any scientific or technical advance "demonstrates the superiority" of a social system is demagoguery.

glass on interest in a "sky platform" sometime in 1947 while reporting that the present satellite program did not get started in the U. S. till 1955. That the Rosenbergs were executed in 1953 does not stand in the way of this "explanation."

A more up-to-date opinion came from Igor Gouzenko, a former code clerk in the Russian Embassy in Canada who exposed the Stalinist spy ring in Canada. In a letter to Eisenhower he stated that "In my opinion, it [the Russian satellite] indicates the work of well-organized Soviet spy rings in the U. S. missile production system. These rings on the one hand are pumping out of the U. S. valuable scientific information and on the

satellites two years ago, but were prevented from doing so (for reasons unspecified) when the task was assigned to the navy.

There is another major "explanation" of the relative positions of the U. S. and Russia in space satellite development. This school sees the Sputnik as a consequence of differences in social systems. In turn there are two subdivisions of the "sociological" approach. First there are those who see Sputnik as the result of the fact that Russia is a totalitarian dictatorship which can direct the economy and national effort in any way the ruling bureaucracy decides.

This school concludes that the setbacks and weaknesses of the U. S. in the

technological race are a result of the fact that there is democracy in the U. S. "The U. S. is limited by the nature of its democracy" and "democracy is on the defensive" because it has to answer to public opinion. Hence a sneaking admiration of Russia where "things get done."

The second half of the "sociological" school is to be found among the Stalinists and their friends who view this Russian advance as a demonstration of the superiority of "socialism" (i.e., Stalinism), and also to those socialists and radicals who refer to the "non-capitalist, non-profit Soviet economy" and draw similar conclusions.

LOGIC OF APPROACH

By the logic of this approach, the Nazi development of the V-1 and V-2 rockets during World War II was a result of the superiority of the Nazi economy; or the U. S. development of the atom and hydrogen bombs proved the superiority of capitalism. This is an endless game since each major scientific or industrial advance can be considered an indication of the superiority of any given social system.

The superiority of a society is not demonstrated by its ability to produce the most effective weapons of mass destruction. It has to be demonstrated on its ability to provide the basis for democracy and freedom for the people—freedom from want, freedom from war, freedom from personal and political insecurity, and freedom for the unhindered development of each individual. It would be demonstrated by the ability to point the way to a solution of the present danger of war and nuclear holocaust while at the same time expanding freedom, democracy, and the people's standard of living. It is not demonstrated by the ability to win any given lap in the race for military superiority.

But the fact that neither capitalism nor Stalinism can provide the way out of the madness of nuclear armaments and ICBMs is a demonstration of the reactionary character of both of these societies.

The launching of the space satellite should have been the occasion for a re-examination of the basis on which U. S. foreign policy rests. Even granting the military superiority orientation which is the common denominator for most political thought in this country, a serious disaster has occurred. To try to reglue that hollow shell is an impossible task.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF LABOR ACTION, published bi-weekly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1957.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Editor, Gordon Haskell; Managing Editor, None; Business Manager, Mel Stack, all of 114 West 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

2. The owner is: Labor Action Publishing Co., Max Shachtman, Gordon Haskell, Herman Benson, all of 114 West 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was 2043.

MEL STACK
Sworn to and subscribed before me this 26th day of September, 1957.

JACOB P. KAUFMAN, Notary Public, State of New York No. 31-2008800. (My commission expires March 30, 1959.)

The New Class

"An Analysis of the Communist System"

By Milovan Djilas

List \$3.95

our price \$3.50

The Roots of American Communism

By Theodore Draper

List \$6.75

our price \$5.75

History of the Russian Revolution

By Leon Trotsky

Trotsky's great classic, now available for the first time in years
New Edition—Three Volumes in One

List \$12.50

our price \$10.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14th Street, N. Y. C. 11, N. Y.

Smith Act Victims Freed

The Supreme Court has reversed the convictions of Irving Scales and Claude Lightfoot, two Communist Party leaders, under the membership clause of the Smith Act. This clause makes mere membership in an organization which teaches or advocates the overthrow of the government by violence a crime. The Supreme Court did not rule on the constitutionality of this clause, but based the reversal on the Jencks case in which it had ruled that when oral FBI testimony is used against a defendant in a trial, he must have access to the FBI reports on which the oral testimony is based.

Thus the constitutionality of the Smith Act still awaits consideration and decision by the Warren court.

The Roots of American Communism

An Account Lifted Out of History

By H. W. BENSON

Both Norman Thomas and James P. Cannon have high praise for Theodore Draper's new book. That alone is a remarkable achievement for a work entitled *The Roots of American Communism*. Every serious commentator has commended the author for an invaluable contribution to the study of the Communist movement and justifiedly. To reconstruct the early days for contemporary readers, Draper consults old faction periodicals and handbills; he digs through the press of the foreign language sections which played so decisive a role in the first days; he presents biographical sketches of the original leaders.

LIVELY INTEREST

To speak of "painstaking scholarly research" might give the wrong impression; for here is no heavy-handed account of musty events. Draper knows the early Communist movement and he knows how to awaken a lively interest in its spirited internal life. When he gives an account of a faction fight, the reader knows who was quarreling over what, and why. And that is not easy, as you will discover when you read the book. The author explains in Chapter 21, "If the reader has not been slightly confused by all this, he cannot be sure that he has fully recaptured the Communist atmosphere in this peculiar period."

For twenty years, the Communist Party dominated radical politics in the United States and in that time it almost succeeded in wiping out the influence of every genuine socialist current. Now, Mr. Draper presents the first detailed factual account of its origins, beginning with its start within the Socialist Party, through the splits and faction fights of the "underground," ending his story in 1923 when it turned toward open existence as a legal party. In all this, the book is unique. The story of the CP's steady rise and finally of its spectacular decline belongs to a later period.

The early Communist movement took form under the impact of the Bolshevik Revolution and looked to it for inspiration . . . but in primitive and mechanical fashion. This becomes the subject of an enlightening chapter entitled, "Reflected Glory." If left-wing socialists were an insignificant minority in the working class, spurned and isolated, it mattered little . . . Wasn't Lenin virtually unknown the very day before rising to the heights of power? The recipe for rising out of obscurity was plain; it lay in repeating a few crude and infantile slogans that American left-wingers thought constituted the essence of Bolshevism. It was necessary only to be intransigent, to denounce, to remain firm and uncompromising, not to deviate . . . this was Lenin, so they thought, and so they too would come to power and not with too great a delay.

BEGINNING OF END

In those days, the Communists made a fetish and a principle out of "illegality"; they denounced existing trade unions from stem to stern, refusing to recognize them as workers' organizations; they called literarily for revolutionary unions; they thundered against the formation of any Labor Party as an obstacle to revolution and a deception of the workers. No one listened except their own dwindling membership.

And, as his account ends, the Communist International, intervening in the

(Two Appreciations)

THE ROOTS OF AMERICAN COMMUNISM, by Theodore Draper. Viking Press, 498 pp. \$6.75.

affairs of the U. S. party, sets it straight on all these questions. The authority and prestige of the International is rising; the party relies more and more upon its intervention and it becomes the arbiter of all disputes. The beginning of the end is in sight.

Let there be no mistake about it. You must read it all for yourself. But a few words of caution. It is impossible to write "pure" history as a mere assemblage of facts; and Draper makes no such vain attempt. Where does his account fit in to the larger historical picture? Here, he misses some of the basic factors that shaped the course of American Communism.

The key to his thinking lies in the introduction where he writes: "The historical problem is not merely to establish what position the American Communists have held at any particular time but to seek out the dynamic forces that drove them from one position to another—and back again. The Communists have held so many different and conflicting positions that at first glance the total effect may be one of incredible inconsistency and confusion. . . . But when the reasons for the changes are looked into, when the conditions that made them necessary are analyzed, a number of basic problems and forces appear—a pattern emerges. This pattern began to emerge at a very early stage. Once the Communist movement matured it became the prisoner of its own development. . . . The deepest, the most important secrets are hidden in the formative period. Once something happened, it was easy to repeat it."

NOTHING SO IMPORTANT

And he ends the volume as follows: ". . . something crucially important did happen to this movement in its infancy. It was transformed from a new expression of American radicalism to the American appendage of a Russian revolutionary power. Nothing else so important ever happened to it again."

If Draper were simply saying that the turns and twists of CP policy can be explained only by reference to its role as an instrument of Russian policy, we could find nothing wrong. But he means something more. He seeks out the congenial defect in the new-born movement; from it, in inexorable development he traces all the tragic conclusions to come. He is compelled, by this view, to lift the whole account out of history and treat it as an automatic process with a built-in future. This book is to be followed by other volumes bringing the story up to date. Apparently, it is in his analysis of these years past that Draper imagines he has discovered the secret of all to come later. Fortunately, this shortcoming of interpretation does not mar the factual accuracy of the work. But he can discuss what happened inside the Communist movement with great skill, yet with hardly any reference to the world outside, except for its relations with Russia. We know that the CP was transformed into a Russian appendage. From Draper we learn how it happened. But why?

The problem for socialists is to trace the causes of Stalinism's rise and decline as a guide to the reconstruction of the socialist movement. Stalinism has its origins in the socialist movement; but before large sections of socialist-minded workers would submit to it, a series of

giant historical events was necessary which undermined and destroyed the self-confidence of the workers' movement. That came in the World War I period. In Germany the military was reestablished; in central Europe, military dictatorships; in Russia, Stalin rose; later in Italy, in Germany, in Austria, in Spain fascist regimes took over. And finally, the destruction of the working class organizations in the second world war. Surely, all this had as profound an effect as the first causes of 1923.

SOCIALISM PUSHED BACK

Socialism everywhere was pushed back. In the U.S. there were special difficulties. Communism arose as a left-wing socialist movement (before it was transformed into an anti-socialist trend); socialism however was not the working class movement but a minority within it. From its early days, American Communism can be viewed as a movement torn between two alternative pulls: Russia and the American working class. But this working class was backward, divided and unorganized. Only its minority was organized and that was non-socialist. It was a force that might be discounted, so to speak, by those who saw an impending revolution.

A Classic of American Radical History

By JACK WILSON

Until the publication this year of Theodore Draper's brilliant study of the origins of the Communist movement in the United States, few events in contemporary history were as obscured, misrepresented and politically distorted as that period from 1917 through 1921.

Draper's achievement is remarkable in two respects; (1) he has accomplished the hard task of setting right the role of persons and factions in the context of the turbulent repercussions to the October revolution, and (2) he has created a model, a little classic of American radical history. His work will stand for a long time as a challenge to future historians of the story of the Left, and its appearance itself is a devastating criticism of a vast array of nonsense and biased writing that previously passed for the record of the birth of the Communist movement.

If this book had perchance been published in the radical 30's, its impact on the radical movement would have been tremendous, but this was not possible. Draper himself, and many like him, were busy pounding out the party line for the *New Masses*. Nor were men like Earl Browder, Bertram Wolfe and James Cannon in a mood or position to provide the reflections and mature judgments which they contributed to Draper. Each was too busy as a factional leader to be as objective then as the span of 20 years has enabled them to become.

MANY LESSONS

Even today, many of the lessons of that period have great validity. This is not Draper's purpose, of course. But the material is there, for study. It goes without saying that the McCarthyite notion, spread by many ex-radicals of the 1930's, that the Communist Party was born a conspiracy is demolished by the most competent, factual, and authoritative study possible. As a matter of fact, one of the curious anomalies of that early Communist movement was that in its understandable if regrettable imitation of the Russian party, it failed to listen to the wisdom of Lenin and Trotsky. These giants of October were so far to the right of their American followers that only their world prestige saved them from the kind of factional vituperation which marked the debates on policy of that period. Heresies like working in the AFL, being for a Labor Party, having a legal party, and other sound advises were shunted aside at a time when each leader and faction was trying to prove himself a better "Marxist" than the next man.

Cursed by a combination of ultra-leftism and utopianism, the early American movement needed more than advice to grow up. It needed time and events,

The great strike wave of 1919, proportionately vaster in scope than anything before or since, was the first massive struggle to unionize the modern industrial workers, that is, to organize them as a class. The Communists, in the expectation of imminent revolution as in Russia, saw not the possibility of the birth of a new labor movement but only the certain death of capitalism; they debated whether to advise strikers of the necessity of armed insurrection. The strikes were defeated; unionism set back; the class disorganized as before. It is this weakness of American labor that made it possible for the early Communists to invent their political absurdities with abandon. The real labor movement was not able to make its mark upon them.

But that has changed. In thirty years of class struggle, the American workers have organized. The depth of the present crisis in the American Communist movement stems not from the fact that it meets a witchhunt but because it was forced by the Kremlin line to come into conflict with an already organized and active working class. This inner crisis was forced into the open by the 20th Congress and the Hungarian Revolution which finally broke the back of the American Communist Party.

Instead, it soon became unwittingly a part of that vast historical struggle epitomized in the personalities of Trotsky and Stalin. It became a caricature of the mass European parties of the left and its leaders mere secondary figures or pawns in the world factional struggle.

For trade unionists, the arguments on policy of those early days give food for thought to working out sound socialist policies in the current complex period. For factionalists who take themselves too seriously, the Draper book serves as a good shock treatment. Something that many of the remnants of the left ought to undergo. It should be an excellent antidote for the ignorance that passes itself off as Marxism in so many circles today.

In every respect this is a fascinating book. Its defect is one of understandable limitation. Yet its notes and references are so thorough and copious that any serious student can easily fill in the gaps and get the full story. As a case in point, just when one begins to get a little disturbed by the brief summary form of Lenin's views of "revolutionary defeatism," Draper adds a footnote and some references, including the excellent study that Hal Draper did a few years ago in the *New Internationalist*.

IMPORTANT PEOPLE

In these pages pass almost all the important political, literary and cultural figures of the 1920's, from Walter Lippman to Jay Lovestone, from Carl Sandburg to Senator Paul Douglas. Never was the parade of those who marched through the Left so thoroughly roll-called. Since much of this material is contained in the superb notes and references, a great deal of the value of this book is missed unless read properly. But for the thorough reader, the reward is rich.

Bertram Wolfe recently wrote that the publication of the Draper book was exciting not because a classic was created but because a new historian was born. This is an accurate judgment. Fortunately, the Fund for the Republic has placed in Draper's capable hands the project of completing the study of the CP until 1945. If the results match the performance of the first work, then we are lucky. For this should enable the socialist movement to see itself and its chief antagonist, the Communist movement, in proper perspective. For it seems unlikely that until a fresh generation sees and draws some of the lessons of the rise, life and suicide of a whole generation of radicals mainly in the octopus clutch of the phenomenon we call Stalinism in all its varieties, will a cure be found to stop the disintegration of the American Left.

It is not an accidental irony of our times that one of the important contributions of major worth in re-evaluating the past and restoring a real life view of American radicalism should come from the pen of a man who has changed his basic views, but who is not lost in the mire of cynicism which has submerged thousands of Ex's. All the more credit to him.

HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION — —

(Continued from page 1)

aspirations of the masses under Stalinism, of the ideology and organizational forms which are specific to the anti-Stalinist revolution. Before the Hungarian Revolution we could only speculate about and construct abstract schema of the revolution against Stalinism. Now we knew what it looks like in reality, and therefore we know better what to do to contribute to its eventual triumph.

For the darkest aspect of the Hungarian Revolution is not that it was crushed by the Russian Stalinist juggernaut. That, after all, was to be expected by everyone who has an elementary understanding of the nature of Stalinism. It was also not the failure of the United States or other capitalist governments or groupings, whether or not they had previously given lip-service to their utmost determination to "liberate" the satellites from the Stalinist yoke, for there, too, socialists know from long experience that an un-

controlled popular revolution is regarded as an expression of "anarchy" or "chaos" by these gentlemen.

The darkest aspect, and it looks no better from a year's perspective, was the failure of the labor and socialist movements in the rest of the world to give any effective aid to the Hungarian Revolution.

In Germany, where they could have done the most, the Social Democrats did little or nothing. Their feeble reaction to this great event presaged their flabby effort in the campaign against Adenauer. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions issued statements of support to the Revolution, and raised funds to help its refugees and exiles.

But to really help the revolution against Stalinism what is necessary, in the first place, is an attitude of independence from and opposition to the policies and aims of the capitalist governments which stand ranged against the Stalinist

world in the cold war. Only workers movements which oppose all forms of oppression and discrimination in and by their own countries can reach clean hands across the iron curtain to help the struggles of the peoples there for freedom. To the extent that the ICFTU and its affiliates remain tied to the policies and interests of the capitalist world, every effort on their part to aid the revolution against Stalinism is doomed to sterility at best, and to backfire at worst.

The considerations of immediate practical politics which led to the decision of a decisive section of the Russian ruling clique to suppress the Hungarian Revolution with arms appears to have paid off: the revolution in Poland was bridled; the revolutionary forces in the other satellites intimidated; the discontent and unrest inside Russia driven further underground. Even though the top Russian leadership itself was split, as evidenced by the Malenkov-Molotov purge, the regime appears to have consolidated its power over the bodies of the Hungarian revolutionaries.

For the moment, it may have done so. But we are as firmly convinced today as we were when we wrote it ten months ago: "The Russian leadership sealed the doom of Stalinism as a world system by attacking the Hungarian Revolution with a massive army of troops and tanks." From that day on, however it may be obscured by the drum-beating of the Stalinist propaganda machine and the passage of time, one fact has been deeply impressed into the consciousness of mankind: in Hungary, at least, Stalinism rules not because it is a social system accepted and supported by the people but because Russia is a bigger, and stronger, and better-armed country than Hungary.

It is a year since the heroic Hungarian Revolution electrified and revitalized the political atmosphere of the world. Though its immediate repercussions have died down and receded, it stands and will continue to stand as one of the great leaps forward in man's struggle to wrest the control of human society from the hands of the few, to end the exploitation of man by man—in a word, to establish socialism.

READERS TAKE THE FLOOR

(Continued from page 4)

But while his letter was stewing in the editorial hopper, events have moved along. Gomulka has been compelled to suppress strikes with troops; Po Prostu has been banned, and the student demonstrations in Warsaw have been so persistent and massive that tear gas and rifle-shots have been used to disperse them. Comrade Rudzienski has been writing about the need for a "new Polish left" "to break up Stalinism, overthrowing Gomulka's transitional administration in the process." (LABOR ACTION, September 23.)

The general analysis of the revolution against Stalinism endorsed by the recent convention of the Independent Socialist League, including its section on Poland, could not, by its nature, be considered as a tactical guide to socialists in Poland. I venture to suggest that to disclaim responsibility (or even ability) to give tactical guidance to socialists in other countries is not the same thing as disclaiming "political and intellectual responsibility" for a general analysis of the nature and tendency of important social and political developments internationally. That is all we could hope to achieve in a convention document.

If "most of the Polish people" supported the Gomulka regime for a while, that did not make them right or their course a justifiable one from the long-range point of view. If most of them "saw no realistic alternative to his leadership and his 'way' at the present time," does it follow that the ISL was debarred from pointing out that in the long run (and better sooner than later) if the revolution did not develop beyond the stage of "Gomulkism" it was doomed (and the Polish people with it) to frustration and an eventual disastrous defeat?

Could revolutionary socialists in Poland have prepared political alternatives six or eight months ago which had a chance of gaining mass support (in other words, "realistic" ones)? Only an intimate knowledge of the forces, groupings, currents in the October Left could answer that question. Lacking the detailed information and "feel" required for tactical proposals, we made none (we did not propose "slogans" or a "program" for instance).

We would not claim that all formulations in the ISL analysis of the anti-Stalinist revolution are perfect. But if Comrade Germain's letter, plus recent events in Poland stimulate readers of LABOR ACTION to go back to our July 15 issue and re-read the resolution, we believe they will find it not the least illuminating approach to developments in Russia and Eastern Europe.

—Gordon Haskell

YOUNG Socialist CHALLENGE

Polish Students — —

(Continued from page 5)

er of the Polish Church behind the Gomulka line in the election.

It would be foolish and irresponsible for American socialists to attempt to estimate the strategic situation in Warsaw and to "advise" on tactics. Apparently the majority of the people in Warsaw were not ready for a major push against the Gomulka regime's vacillating policy. Such a decision can, of course, only be made on the spot. But some other generalizations are in order.

REGIME BALANCED

The Gomulka regime has balanced for a year now between a revolutionary left which fights for real freedom and a Stalinist right which seeks to wipe out the gains of the October uprising of last year. (Even while the students were demonstrating against Gomulka's line on Po Prostu, he was being attacked from the right for seeking "capitalist restoration.") The result has been a policy of vacillation — and of demoralization. Trapped geographically, entirely surrounded by Russian military power, the majority of the Polish people have fairly clearly rejected the policy of a show-down fight at the present time. Some reports indicate that this has taken a terrible toll of the revolutionary morale of the masses on the left.

And yet, the student demonstrations are proof that the incomplete revolution of last October is still a tremendous factor in Polish politics. The students recognized the closing of Po Prostu as a tremendous step back from the gains of that uprising. And they became vocal, their protest moving in the inevitable direction of demanding ever more freedom. They were put down—for the time being. But they have made it clear that the support which the Gomulka regime does enjoy, at least from important elements on the left, is provisional, a matter of tactics, of necessity, and not of real endorsement. They have made it clear that the ultimate historical direction of the anti-Stalinist revolution is toward real freedom, not toward the precarious half-way house of Gomulka.

Meanwhile, the United States sits idly by. The agony of the people's struggle in Eastern Europe has not really penetrated the thinking of a single major American politician. For our part, we can only repeat a crucial immediate demand:

the United States should call the Kremlin bluff and offer to remove all American troops from Europe with the Russians doing the same. But of course such a program shakes that house of cards known as NATO. It runs counter to all of the lines of Cold War imperialism which have dominated American thought for over a decade. And the Polish students, the Polish people, along with all the people who suffer under Communist totalitarianism, are paying a terrible price for American inaction.

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

BOOK BAZAAR

Books of all kinds, specially political

Records, Prints
Bargains Galore

Friday, October 25, 8:30 P.M.

LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14th St., 3rd Floor

New York City

JUST OUT

New International

A New Stage in The Russian Crisis, By Max Shachtman • *What Is Orthodox Marxism?* By G. Lukacs • *Unions, Racketeers and Senators*, By H. W. Benson • *An Amalgam of Marx and Keynes*, By T. N. Vance.

50 cents

114 W. 14th Street, New York 11, N.Y.

A PUBLIC RALLY TO COMMEMORATE THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

speakers:

PAUL JONAS

chairman of the Budapest Peto Circle, Oct-Nov. 1956

MEYER SHAPIRO

Professor, Columbia University, Dissent Editorial Board

MAX SHACHTMAN

national chairman, Independent Socialist League

AND OTHERS

Friday, November 1 8:00 P.M. Admission 50c, Students 25c

Central Plaza
(111 2nd Ave., near 7th St.)

sponsored by

ANVIL a student socialist magazine

NEW YORK LABOR ACTION FORUM

Thursday, October 24

**SOCIALISTS AND
THE LABOR MOVEMENT**
Speaker: Ben Hall

Thursday, November 7

LIBERALISM AFTER WORLD WAR I
Speaker: Julius Falk

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