

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

## THE COMMUNIST CRISIS

HUNGARY AND THE 'DAILY WORKER'

... page 3

THE GOMULKA ELECTION IN POLAND

... page 6

ANTI-SEMITISM IN POLAND & HUNGARY

... page 3

BUREAUCRACY AND DEMOCRATIZATION

... page 7

*A Road to Socialist Regroupment*

... page 2

JANUARY 28, 1957

FIVE CENTS

## Where's That New Bold Program the Dems Were Talking About?

By GORDON HASKELL

In a discussion of congressional reaction to the "Eisenhower Doctrine" on the Middle East, N. Y. Times correspondent William S. White wrote: "rarely have so few in Congress wholeheartedly welcomed a policy that will, in the end, be voted for by so many."

From the way things have been moving on the new Middle East policy, it appears that White is not far from wrong.

There is a lot of reluctance and questioning about the policy from both parties in Congress. There is Democratic frustration about the way in which the Republicans played down the Middle East crisis through the campaign, only to balloon it up into an immediate world peril as soon as the campaign was over. There are doubts about the idea of giving the president a blank check on the use of military force in the area, and even more serious doubts such as the stature of the times in Washington) about the idea of giving him as much money as he wants on an uncontrolled basis for economic projects in the area.

**There are doubts, misgivings and hesitations. But the one thing which appears to be totally absent is an alternative policy.**

It has not been forthcoming from the old isolationist wing of the Republican Party, and no one has announced it from any wing of the Democratic Party.

Here we come, it would seem, to the first test of the issue which was supposedly tearing the Democratic leadership apart a few weeks ago. Should they wait till the president presented his programs and then start counter-punching, or should they announce a bold program of their own and put the president and his party on the spot in comparison?

Since the Johnson-Rayburn Democratic congressional leadership had announced before this session of Congress started that they were going to play the caretaker role in Congress, it is easy to understand why they have not come forward with a program for the Middle East. But then on the other side were men like Stevenson and Humphrey, Douglas, Mennen Williams, and the like.

They were for the policy of bold new programs, and much of Stevenson's oratory in the late presidential campaign was spent on talking about imaginative programs and bold leadership. What have these men to offer as an alternative to this program which meets with so much hesitation and reluctance by so many leaders in Congress and in the country at large, not to speak of among America's allies and the peoples of the area themselves?

The answer is: they have absolutely nothing to offer. This program is a direct descendent of the whole line of military containment programs, alliances, economic aid and just plain bribery with which the weaker areas of the capitalist world have been pasted together, propped up and given a feeble semblance of auto-animation by the American colossus during the post-war period. While its predecessors have proved incapable of solving the problem of capitalist stabilization, and as often as not have been ruinous to the areas to which they were applied, they have served as stop-gaps of a sort.

That is all that the "bold approach" of the liberals amounts to in the realm of foreign policy, and that is why they are caught in a position in which they cannot hope to oppose Eisenhower on this issue.

He is actually proposing all the program they have, and is demanding the right to carry it out in his own way, which is more or less a function of his office.

In the months and years ahead, it is true, the present reluctant agreement will be replaced by conflict over the application of the program. The labor movement in this country will once again find out that the economic aid will do little to alleviate the position of the masses in the Middle East, and will thus leave the field of social struggle wide-open to the Communist-led and Russian-dominated movements in the area, as long as the U. S. remains lined up with imperialism.

The time to start hollering about that is now, and not later. The leadership of the Democratic Party is obviously incapable of doing it.

## Eisenhower Program Has Them Tied Up

By SAM TAYLOR

With the exception of the Economic Report of the President, all the major pronouncements of the beginning of Eisenhower's second term have now been made. They have been called the triumph of "modern Republicanism" as well as "a grab-bag of modest New-Dealism and moderate McKinleyism," and the inaugural address was called a "nice collection of beautiful words" that "offers no plan of action."

All of these are more or less descriptive of the State of the Union message, the Budget message and the Inaugural Address. Taken as a whole, and including the message on the Eisenhower doctrine, these reflect the thinking dominant in both political parties—firmly floundering somewhere around the middle of the road, repeating the old shibboleths of the "crackpot realists" on foreign policy and the warmed-over proposals for modest New Deal-type welfare legislation.

The general tone of President Eisenhower's messages was decidedly non-partisan toward the Democrats at home and the Stalinists abroad. A pall of unanimity has settled over Washington as politicians gaged over the platitudes or gritted their teeth in sullen acquiescence, as did Treasury Secretary George Humphrey and Senator Byrd of Virginia over the Budget message.

The proposals to deal with the major problems fall into three categories: too little (civil rights, education and housing), nothing (what to do about the mounting inflationary spiral), and worse than nothing (the Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East).

From the liberal side in Washington, there has been almost total silence. There

has been a squeak or two raised about the Eisenhower doctrine, but scarcely any real opposition on that or anything else.

Senator Hubert Humphrey—the spokesman of congressional liberalism, also—found the State of the Union message "constructive" although "a statement of general principles without any precise program or details." This differed little from the posture adapted by Senator Lyndon Johnson.

Aside from the "beautiful words" or the "constructive general principles," the real emphasis of the Eisenhower program is seen by the weight given to various items in the budget for the 1957-58 fiscal year. The proposal to spend \$71.8 billion is the largest amount for any peacetime year and is almost a \$3 billion increase over the last fiscal year. (See box on front page.)

However, Treasury Secretary Humphrey is unhappy over the budget. It is the unhappiness of a man who came to Washington to cut down on federal

(Turn to last page)

## WAR BUDGET AS USUAL

Once again the government presents a budget whose expenditures for past wars and preparations for future ones, big and small, make all "welfare" programs dwindle to virtually nothing. The guiding principle seems to be "billions for the military and pennies for welfare."

The military services get the biggest chunk—\$38 billion. But if you add to it the atomic-energy program as well as the foreign military and economic-aid programs, as the government does in its breakdown of expenditures by purpose, it totals up to \$45.3 billions or 63 per cent of the budget.

Now include the interest payments, the second largest item (\$7.4 billion), since most of the national debt was accumulated during the Second World War and the Korean War, and similarly the \$5 billion for various veteran programs, and it all totals up to at least 80 per cent of the budget as the result of military expenditures and payments for past wars.

Compared to this gigantic military expenditure, the \$3.5 billion being spent for labor and welfare, including education, public health and relief programs, and the \$400 million for housing, come to less than 6 per cent of the budget.

## Socialist Party-SDF Merger Goes Through

After a split that lasted more than 20 years, the Socialist Party and the Social Democratic Federation united into a single organization at a merger convention at New York's Hotel Biltmore on the January 18-20 weekend.

The only session open to the public was held on Saturday, but its deliberations were of a purely formal nature. In actuality, the business of the unification convention was transacted in executive session on Friday, and the Saturday meeting was devoted largely to public ratification of the decisions agreed upon the day before.

Each of the two groups at the convention was represented by 50 delegates, as agreed upon in the negotiations that preceded the merger. In accordance with

another agreement the new National Committee, of 22 members and the same number of alternates, was divided equally between representatives of the two groups, 11 from each.

After his nomination by Norman Thomas, Frank Zeidler, mayor of Milwaukee, who was not involved in the Cleveland convention of the Socialist Party in 1936 at which it split into two camps and was acceptable to both sides in the fusion, was chosen as national chairman of the organization. He is to be assisted by two vice-chairmen, Darlington Hoopes, former SP national chairman, and Louis P. Goldberg, former SDF national chairman.

Norman Thomas, the most prominent leader of the Socialist Party, did not

take any official post in the united organization. However, he actively supported the unification move and was the outstanding figure at the convention itself.

One of the results of the unification is now sure to be recognition of the group as the official American affiliate of the Socialist International which, prior to the unification, declined to accept either one of the two groups as against the other.

Hugh Gaitskell, head of the British Labor Party, who was to have addressed the convention at a banquet organized in his honor, left for Britain before the sessions because of the political situation created there by the Eden res-

(Turn to last page)

## AUTO WORKERS

# Fringe Benefits Don't Help When You're Laid Off

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Jan. 13

In a press conference following the nation-wide General Motors delegate conference held here last week, Leonard Woodcock, United Auto Workers vice president, announced that the main aim of the UAW in 1958 negotiations will be more money and fewer hours, with fringe benefits taking a secondary place. The goal of a Guaranteed Annual Wage has been, for all practical purposes, put on the shelf. As a propaganda slogan it was replaced a long time ago, with the more modest name of Supplementary Unemployment Benefits to identify the limited gain the UAW made in that direction.

Fundamentally, the shift in bargaining program that will reach a climax in the 1958 negotiations with General Motors, Ford and Chrysler, is a tacit recognition by the Reuther leadership that its perspective of reformism via winning fringe benefits is limited. Capitalism remained capitalism; the big auto companies continued their struggle against the workers on all fronts; the ravages of inflation, automation, and the changing sales and production patterns of the auto industry, made the claims of progress a hollow mockery to an increasing number of auto workers. From an average of 850,000 auto workers in 1953, there are now only 650,000, and by 1958 that will be cut around another 100,000.

Increasing unemployment, for whatever reason, makes a mockery of fringe benefits since the unemployed aren't eligible. We've described this time and again in LABOR ACTION. Let's take some fresh and new examples.

For many years Briggs Local 212 was a model for all UAW locals as a democratic, militant and successful union. When Chrysler bought it out, the union retained for a long while its working conditions. Recently, Chrysler moved its cushion and back work from Automotive Body (the old Briggs set-up) and over 1800 seniority employees were laid off. Since Briggs local, like most locals, had a seniority system that worked fine in periods of full employment, little thought had been given to changing it to meet recession or depression conditions.

## PENALIZE AGE

The 1800 workers had no place to go. Local 212 officials valiantly tried to improve the seniority system. They called meetings to get a vote to broaden their seniority set-up. These meetings were close to riots. All UAW representatives were booed. A secret referendum vote was taken, and the ranks voted to keep their antiquated set-up. The younger seniority persons who would have been laid-off to make room for an older seniority employee from cushion and backs refused to vote themselves out of a job.

Now the 1800 cushion and back employees join those unemployed from Hudson, Packard, Motor Products, Midland Steel, etc., to whom all fringe benefits won by the UAW simply don't mean a thing for they don't even have a job.

And to the ordinary difficulties of a man over 40 getting a job, in the auto industry, employers have an additional reason for

trying to hire only young people: the older persons carry a bigger weight on the pension program. Here the limitations of an individual corporation pension plan, rather than an industry-wide or a federal plan for all workers, catches up with the UAW.

On the SUB, the employers have certainly tried to keep its cost down by leveling off production somewhat, but this too has resulted in two new situations which don't make life easier for UAW officials.

Rather than be caught with high SUB costs, Chrysler for example, didn't call back 25 per cent of their employees who had seniority. Those who are called back work six and seven days a week. The bitterness of the younger seniority employees over the failure of the UAW to fight for a 40-hour week for everyone before overtime was allowed is quite understandable. Many local unions have been torn asunder by this issue, and the end result is not solidarity between employed and unemployed but rather cynicism over the union. Increasingly it becomes every man for himself, and too bad for the other guy.

At Ford and GM, the companies have instituted a crueler policy: GM and Ford hire new people, and just before their 90-day period of probation is up, and they establish seniority and are entitled to the fringe benefits and permanent job status, the companies lay them off. Here the union contracts get a heap of abuse from the ranks and the reputation of the UAW suffers, instead of the companies being blamed.

Each time a major company builds a new plant, and transfers production, as Chrysler will do with the opening of its Twinsburg, Ohio, plant, and its Neward, Delaware assembly plant, new thousands lose their jobs, their security, and their fringe benefits.

## SEAMY SIDE

It is not a very pleasant picture, but it is the real story of the auto industry based upon the facts of life, and not upon the glowing reports of progress so eloquently described by the able speakers of the

The UAW program was geared to high prosperity, and expanding economy that would be reflected in the auto industry, and it didn't work out that way. Instead layoffs and declining sales came.

(Even Harry Anderson, vice president of GM, said not long ago, that the annual improvement factor of the UAW contracts didn't cost the companies anything. "We make it up in production," he candidly declared. The fact that the UAW itself estimates that GM makes over \$2.93 an hour profits per autoworkers, testifies to the modesty of the gains the UAW has made.)

In this context, a fight for more money and less work—not just fewer hours—meets more adequately the conditions and times than decisive concentration on fringe benefits. And a public exposé of the fabulous profits of the auto industry, its ruthless attitude towards its employees in all its policies, gives the UAW a real opportunity to regain the confidence of the ranks, and do its job as the main bulwark of the working people in the auto industry, with greater success.

# ISL Chairman Gives Plan For Socialist Regrouping

New York, Jan. 18

A symposium on "Can the Left Unite?" drew about 400 to hear four speakers this evening discuss the subject of socialist regroupment, which has been arousing the liveliest interest in wide circles.

Max Shachtman, ISL chairman, presented a proposed basis for achieving socialist unity; Farrell Dobbs, SWP secretary, made a pitch to recruit a couple of members under the head of this subject; A. J. Muste outlined some thoughtful considerations for approaching the question; and John T. McManus, National Guardian manager, presented his opinions on where he thought his readers fitted into the picture.

Shachtman began his presentation by welcoming the "tremendous sentiment for the reunification, or regrouping, of the numerous socialist groups and organizations in the country":

"First, it is a recognition of the fact that there is no socialist movement in the U.S. today, that there exist only little sects without influence in the only solid foundation for an effective socialist movement, namely, the organized working class. Second, it shows that dissatisfaction with an isolated sectarian existence is not leading people to abandon the fight for socialism, but instead to consider afresh the possibilities that are opening up for a broad reassembling of socialist forces. In that there is great encouragement."

What is the basic reason for the fragmentation and isolation of the radical movement, he asked. It is "the Russian question," he answered; this is what split, and kept splitting, the socialist, Communist and Trotskyist movements for 40 years; and the bulk of these movements have been associated in the minds of American workers with defense of or apotheosis for the Stalinist regime in Russia.

If this Russia is "socialism," workers rightly say, then we don't want it; this is especially so since the events in Poland and Hungary. But also, these same events have brought about a new situation among radicals formerly hypnotized by Stalinism; this is giving new strength to the possibilities of a healthy regrouping.

Such a regrouping can't be achieved on the basis of the whole program of any one group. We have to assume for the time being, that theoretical positions are "frozen"; but it is possible to get political agreement "to an extent that would make fraternal and fruitful coexistence in some political organizations a realizable goal for the next period."

## OUTLINES PROPOSAL

"By political agreement," he said, "I mean a common declaration of firm and unambiguous adherence to the elementary principles and practices of democratic socialism—not only for the U.S. or Spain or Guatemala or Algeria, but precisely for the Stalinist countries. Everybody now declares himself for 'democratic socialism.' But the real test, in the light of past developments, is not how committed we are to it here or in Egypt, but how we are committed to it in Russia, China and their satellite countries.

"We are prepared to live in one political organization, and work in a comradely way to build a strong, popular socialist movement, with people who hold to the theory that Russia is some kind of 'socialist' regime, that it is some kind of 'workers state,' that it is 'state capitalism,' that it is 'bureaucratic collectivism,' or just a plain 'police state.' We are ready in one common organization to discuss this theoretical question at the right time and in the right way.

"But on one condition, and we state it frankly as a condition: that all of us are pledged unequivocally to the proposition that totalitarianism is not the road to socialism; that the road to socialism, not only in this country but everywhere in the world, lies through the ever-wider expansion of democracy and not in its extermination, and that we are committed without reservation to the support of every democratic working-class and so-

cialist struggle to establish the principles and practices of democracy in Russia and the other countries of the Stalinist type."

The corollary, he said, is that the movement must not take as its official position "the position that the present totalitarian regimes in Russia and the satellites represent a socialist or working-class state." Individuals or tendencies have the right to hold it inside, "but the movement itself cannot expect to represent a fruitful unity if it is committed to any such proposition." In this case it would be "doomed in advance to failure" in the American labor movement.

Shachtman explained that he did not want to deal here with any of the other important questions, including the so-called "American questions," that a regrouping would face, "in order to make it clear that so far as we are concerned, differences on such questions are not the cause of the split in the socialist movement and should not be allowed to divide socialists." They should be discussed freely inside the movement. But the condition is that the working class must not feel "that this regrouping is a defender or apologist for the totalitarian regime in Russia, or is committed to defending it and helping it to victory, including military victory, in any conflict it wages."

## DEMOCRATIC BASIS

He asked: "Who is in a position to unite with whom, and on what basis? Those that are committed in word and deed to the principles of socialist democracy" (which he spelled out here) "not only in the U.S. but in the rest of the world as well, Russia included; those that are committed to the idea that the controversial theoretical questions about Russia, historic or present-day, be placed on a level that permits healthy coexistence in one movement on the basis of practical political agreement for the next period; those that are committed to the idea that the united socialist movement must be free of all ties to the Stalinist regimes and pledged to support the struggle for democracy against totalitarianism; those that reject any proposition that the road to socialism lies through totalitarianism; those that are pledged to the fullest and most genuine internal democracy for all members and tendencies."

Finally, Shachtman brought forward, in this connection, the ISL's views on unity with the Socialist Party. The Independent Socialists consider this a vital feature of the perspective for a broad socialist regroupment. This is especially important since there is a tendency among the so-called "left" to think of regroupment in terms of unifying those who consider themselves "pro-Soviet."

Sticking out like a sore thumb through the evening was the nature of the SWP's participation, both in Dobbs' presentation and in speeches from the floor by leading SWPers. Dobbs devoted half his presentation to a virulent attack on the SP (which was not present), then on the ISL, and then on the Gates wing of the CP as capitulators to social-democracy, etc. Then he made it clear that he was all in favor of unity with anybody at all who agreed with him on everything. It was a sad exhibition of sectarianism rigidified into a total system.

Muste emphasized in his talk that the problem was not just to unify splinter groups but how to reach new elements of American labor and in language they can understand, dealing with "the new age and its new problems."

Labor Action FORUM • New York City

Next Thursday, Jan. 31

The Independent Socialist League and the YSL urge you to hear our guest speaker, one of America's leading authorities on the Mideast:

**Dr. Don Peretz**

**EIGHT YEARS OF THE ARAB-ISRAEL CONFLICT**  
An Assessment of the Forces Leading to the Recent War Crisis

Dr. Peretz, a disciple of Judah Magnes in his liberal approach to the subject, is the author of *Israel and the Arab Refugees* and of numerous articles in magazines and professional journals. He studied at Hebrew University in Jerusalem till 1948; during the Palestine war he was a correspondent for NBC. In 1949 he returned to Palestine as Quaker representative on the UN agency; later he became Middle East media evaluator for the Voice of America. In 1952 he studied Israel and the Middle East on a Ford Foundation grant, leading to his thesis. He is presently a Middle East specialist for the American Jewish Committee.

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

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

# The 'Daily Worker' and Hungary: Beating a Shamefaced Retreat

By H. W. BENSON

Where does the *Daily Worker* stand on Hungary?

If we followed its line only for the past month we would be totally unaware of the fact that a bitter dispute had raged in the Communist Party on this question and that the basic differences remained. There has been a shift from criticism of Russian policy toward a silent acquiescence to it.

Exactly what caused the change we cannot know in detail, but in general it is a symptom of a new balance of forces inside the party and an apparent decision of the *DW* board to retreat before the pounding of the Stalinist wing.

A distinct change was first noticeable toward the end of December. It was coincident with a meeting of the party's National Committee. Just what was decided and why we have no way of discovering, and also we cannot know the attitude of the *DW* board and its supporters. But it is obvious that a change of tone followed.

At the National Committee meeting, William Z. Foster summed up the two-month running discussion on Hungary in these words:

"At this stage, it can be said too that among the party national leadership there is practical agreement that the acute Hungarian situation developed primarily out of serious errors made by the Soviet and Hungarian Communists with American-paid emissaries and other reactionaries playing decisive roles as provocateurs of counter-revolutionary action. The remaining practical difference is as to whether or not the intervention of Soviet troops on November 4th was necessary and justified. But here also, I am sure the mass of our party membership has arrived at the conclusion shared by Communists all over the world that however deplorable the situation was in Hungary, it was imperative for the Soviet Union to take the action it did in order to prevent the development of a most dangerous fascist and war danger in Eastern Europe. Undoubtedly our convention will take a decisive stand along this correct general line with no large body of dissidents."

If there is now "agreement" that "reactionaries" played a decisive role of any kind, that is a new fact; but since Foster is customarily careless with facts, we have to reserve judgement. If the line-up in the party now corresponds with its description, then the Stalinist wing has won a victory without a struggle simply by manipulating its opponents into a step-by-step retreat.

## THE RECORD

For the record, here is a partial chronology of Foster's bloodless triumph:

November 5: As Russian tanks shot their way back into Budapest, the *Daily Worker* editorialized:

"The action of the Soviet troops in Hungary does not advance but retards the development of socialism because socialism cannot be imposed on a country by force..."

And: "The use of force by the Soviet troops in Hungary will bring no lasting solution to that country's problems. That is why we support the Hungarian masses who sought to solve their own problems as they were settled in Poland without violence, without foreign troop intervention and without allowing the supporters of the old fascist regime to remain in power."

November 15: The counter-attack of the Stalinist wing begins, led off by James Allen. In the weeks that followed, Foster, Benjamin Davis and Eugene Dennis pour forth a typically Stalinist stream of abuse upon the Hungarian revolution. They sneer at "democracy"; they denounce the movement as "fascist"-dominated; they defend the puppet Kadar regime; they apologize for Russian intervention; they fabricate "facts" to suit their needs.

November 20: The *Daily Worker* announces a new National Committee statement on Hungary. It appears to com-

promise and straddle the key issues but actually encourages the Stalinist position. (There is no record of any opposition from the *Daily Worker* board, which had spoken up quite differently two weeks before.)

The new resolution said: "We do not seek to justify the use of Soviet troops in Hungary's internal crisis on Nov. 4. Neither do we join in the condemnation of these actions."

If the committee itself was not willing to justify Russian intervention, it strengthened those who did justify it. The resolution trotted out the bogey of an imminent danger of "fascist" rule in Hungary. But the *Daily Worker* itself, in particular its foreign editor Joe Clark, had helped to explode this claim as a fraud.

November 20—December 20: The *Daily Worker* treads on eggshells. It dutifully prints canned reports on Hungary from Moscow and from Kadar. But at the same time, it reports a wave of strikes, the formation of workers councils, demonstrations—all with a certain objectivity. Joe Clark on December 17 writes: "Perhaps the ultimate solution of the Hungarian crisis will depend on a recognition of the Workers Councils as the most vital force in that shattered land."

End of December: The National Committee meets. The *Daily Worker* begins to toe a new line. The struggles of the Hungarian masses disappear from its pages; now, only official and uncritical news.

## BACK TO THE DEPTHS

One of those who is relieved of an annoying strain as he reverts quickly to his old self is columnist George Morris; he wastes little time in churning out the standard stuff.

On January 11: "...the events in Hungary also proved that the socialist world isn't lulled and will not permit the re-entry of reaction in any form." He is

not at all disturbed over the fact that there is no democracy "in any form" in Hungary.

On January 18 he reaches not new depths but the usual depths of Stalinistic slander. His column is titled: "Hungarian Runaways Not So Popular in Unions."

He explains why unionists are not donating to Hungarian relief: "...the reports now breaking in the press of the anti-Semitism rife in the camps of the 'freedom fighters' are not likely to increase collections for Hungarian refugees." The Hungarians are just a bunch of anti-Semites, as Morris tells it, but that's not all; they are, he assures us, scabs as well:

"These are not the historic newcomers," he concludes, "who brought progress to America and built it. Many of the post-war crop (although by no means all) are reactionary refugees from socialism, some of whom served under Hitler, strongly poisoned by anti-Semitism and who see their future only in an anti-Soviet war. Employers have sought these elements as useful against unionism and as lickspittles. Some voices have been raised on their usefulness in armed operations against socialist countries. At least a sizable number of the Hungarian refugees are the latest reinforcement for this 'foreign legion' against Communism."

## ANTI-SEMITISM: 2 VIEWS

Morris drools whatever passes through his mind as long as it can denigrate the Hungarians. What does it matter that most of the refugees are youth; that they reached maturity under Stalinism; that in Hungary many were Communists? It doesn't matter. Morris has to find a way to do a job. Presto! They have become agents of Hitler!

The *Daily Worker* takes refuge in two different methods of handling anti-Semitism—one for Hungary and quite another for Czechoslovakia.

On January 13, the *Worker* reports from Czechoslovakia under the head "Old and New Exist Side by Side as Socialism Grows." Author George Lohr talks of "another friend, one of the most sincere and devoted Communists"; he is serious and good and he "fights against opportunists." Alas, he is not perfect for he has two weaknesses: "One of them,

he tries to rationalize—his unwillingness to let his wife go to work. The other is a latent anti-Semitism, arising strangely enough from a hatred of former bosses. He has never known a Jewish fellow worker but only Jewish employers, mostly the former owners of the textile mills in this city."

Here is a man who can be anti-Semitic and also a good Communist.

Thus, when anti-Semitism is discovered in Czechoslovakia the writer does not justify it but he tries to understand it.

But how different for Hungary! George Morris in his own crude way uses reports of anti-Semitic incidents to brand refugees from Stalinist-controlled Hungary as anti-union. It is not his personal quirk.

On January 11, the *Daily Worker* reprints reports of several anti-Semitic incidents in Hungarian refugee camps; "And in the midst of all the hullabaloo about the 'freedom fighters' and their escape to Austria, we find the anti-Semites carrying on their dirty work unabated."

On January 17 an editorial discussing anti-Semitism, entitled "Protect the Refugees," cautions against "the glorification of the Hungarian refugees en masse" and adds: "...we have never nurtured illusions about efforts of Hungarian reaction to make political capital out of the nation's crisis..."

## SELECTIVE STORIES

Any decent-minded person, not to mention any socialist, will protest against every manifestation of anti-Semitism from whatever source and will do what he can to end it. We notice, however, how differently the *Daily Worker* reacts to anti-Semitism for Hungary and for Czechoslovakia. The Stalinists demand that the Hungarian revolution be defamed. The *Daily Worker* gags at the job; but finds it necessary to print carefully selective stories on Hungary.

In Hungary, Regional Workers Councils have been illegalized; the Kadar government has executed leaders of the opposition and those whom it accuses of being revolutionary leaders, in drum-head courts; it has passed laws that make it possible to shoot strikers; it continues dictatorship; it refuses democratic rights to critics. But the *Daily Worker* has ceased to record such facts. In the old Stalinist days, it would have proudly trumpeted apologies for Russia; those days are gone. Now, it shamefully turns away from the grim facts of Stalinist dictatorship and edits the news with discretion. Is that the dessicated fruit of the great fight for independence? It will satisfy no one—in the Communist Party or outside.

## Anti-Semitism in Poland and Hungary Watch Out for Smears Against the Anti-Stalinist Revolution

By HAL DRAPER

All socialists and all democrats have recent reason to be concerned with the reports of rising anti-Semitism in Hungary and Poland, the two countries where the popular struggle against Stalinism has reached new heights. Is it true? From which direction does it come: from the Stalinist forces at bay, or from the revolutionary democratic opposition?

One of the main lines of Stalinist apologetics for the Hungarian massacre is the smear that the revolutionaries are shot through with anti-Semitism. It is used as part and parcel of the Stalinist smear that "fascists" carried out the great Hungarian Revolution. Reports from Poland are also being used in some quarters to smear the anti-Stalinist mass movement. If for no other reason, these claims and reports must therefore be approached with something less than credulity.

One of the strong points which these rumors start with, in advance of any investigation, is the sad fact that there is clear basis to believe they could be true. Everybody knows that anti-Semitism has historically and traditionally been strong in the Polish and Hungarian populations.

In addition, the victory of Stalinism introduced a special element in both these countries. Precisely in order to establish an alienated satellite bureaucracy which was most abjectly dependent on Russian guns rather than popular support, and counting precisely on anti-

Semitic currents, the Russians installed a large number of Stalinist hatchetmen of Jewish descent as their quislings in the East European satrapies. Typical was the role of Jakub Berman and Hilary Mine in Poland, and Rakosi and Gero in Hungary.

It is only an apparent paradox that it was the virulently anti-Semitic minds of Stalin and his henchmen that worked out this vicious scheme; they counted on evoking anti-Semitism to keep the creatures dependent on the outside masters. This extended also to the composition of the secret police cadres.

Certainly no one can rule out the incidence of anti-Semitic ideas here or there when a whole nation, with all of its variety, goes on the barricades against a foreign foe, as Hungary did. For that matter, no one has denied there could be a Horthyite here or there among the freedom fighters, or any other political animal. But it has been not too difficult to maintain perspective on this for Hun-

gary: a genuine revolution raises all sorts of scum from the depths as the waters churn, but the scum is not the revolution.

All that is general prologue. What evidence is there for any hard conclusions? Take Hungary first.

There have been several very strong attestations from Hungarian freedom fighters that the revolutionaries' fight was not tainted by anti-Semitic manifestations, in spite of whatever reasons one may have to expect it. (For one such, see *LA* Dec. 17, p. 5.)

## AUTHORITATIVE EVIDENCE

Very strong testimony was published in the London *Jewish Chronicle* (Dec. 7), one of Europe's most authoritative Jewish organs, by the well-known Hungarian Jewish writer George Mikes. He was himself in Hungary during the first days of the revolution and then interviewed hundreds of Hungarian refugees. He writes that he questioned and cross-questioned them thoroughly, and all of them, Jews and non-Jews, categorically denied that there had been any acts of anti-Semitism; they declared that even the word Jew was not heard during the Hungarian Revolution.

Mikes explains the absence of anti-Semitic manifestations (in view of our

(Continued on page 4)

# Anti-Semitism in Poland — —

(Continued from page 3)  
prologue) as follows:

(1) *Anti-Semitism is now thoroughly identified in Hungary and many satellite states with Russian Communism; and Hungarian revolutionists hate the Russian pattern so much they avoid it.*

(2) *The overriding feeling is that the one common enemy is the Russian power, nothing else.*

(3) *The present generation of Hungarian youth who are the leaders of the new revolution are of a much higher and more idealistic type than the men of the older generation, many of whom were carried away by the chauvinistic emotionalism of the "Awakening Magyars." The present generation seems to consist of "serious and intelligent young men, decent and keen on their studies. They do not even hate the Russians. They only want to get rid of them." (Summarized from Jewish Newsletter.)*

## A CAUTION

What got glaring headlines in the U. S. press, however, was not such a report as this, but rather the charges of one Zev Weiss, a Zionist organizer, of "virulent anti-Semitism" among the Hungarian refugees. We repeat that such charges cannot be dismissed out of hand, no matter where they come from; but one must at least understand the significance of the fact that this Zev Weiss was in Austria as a recruiter for the Youth Aliyah, of which he is a leader.

The Youth Aliyah is the Zionist arm which seeks to recruit Jewish youth to go to Israel as pioneers. The Zionist world is today blue in the face with rage at the fact that such an insignificant percentage of the Jewish Hungarian refugees are willing to go to Israel. (My own experience with Zionist propagandists, I will also admit, is that even when not blue with rage they are about as

reliable in transmitting truth as a Washington lobbyist.)

William Zukerman of the *Jewish Newsletter* rightly points out that the reports of anti-Semitism in the Hungarian Revolution "came from two sources: the Zionist and the Communist. The Zionist reports are based firstly on the general Zionist theory that anti-Semitism is potentially dormant in every country where Jews live and is bound to break out in time of revolutions and upheavals."

This is far from settling the matter, but it is a caution.

## STALINISTS WERE EXPOSED

When we turn to Poland, there is one thing at least that is entirely clear: there has been an anti-Semitic flare-up indeed, and its primary source is beyond doubt; it is from the unreconstructed Stalinist elements dubbed the "Natolin group," who form the pro-Russian opposition to the Gomulka line.

This was already well known in Poland before the October upheaval. One of the leading characteristics of the pro-democratic ferment among the students, workers and intellectuals that preceded and heralded the October days was precisely their courageous and frank blasts against anti-Semitism in the upper echelons of the party and government and in the bureaucracy at large, among exactly the same bureaucrats who up to today, though largely retained by Gomulka, are the main targets for the attacks of the democratic opposition.

Before October, one of the leading voices exposing anti-Semitism in the bureaucracy was the student organ *Po Prostu* (see *LA* Oct. 29, p. 7). The issue of anti-anti-Semitism was a lively one in the whole movement which led to the ousting of the "Natolin" regime.

If therefore, today, one hears so much about forces in Poland pushing anti-Sem-

itism, it would seem there need be no mystery as to where it comes from. The whole dynamic of the revolutionary upsurge leads the revolutionary democratic elements against anti-Semitism; the whole dynamic of the pro-Russian faction impels them to the most sinister use of it, to fan it among the less conscious.

## GRUSON'S AMALGAMS

But here we come up against a most vicious phenomenon.

The Gomulka regime is faced not only with the machinations of the pro-Russians, but, on its other flank, with the seething revolutionary aspirations of the people for "more"—for social freedom and not only national freedom—which is also a danger to its own brand of totalitarianism. *The Gomulka regime and its spokesmen have been busy at work trying to scotch both (opposite-type) oppositions by the standard Stalinist device of creating an "amalgam" between them.*

The prototype of the Stalinist "amalgam," of course, was the Moscow Trial pattern of equating Trotskyism with fascism, or, more generally, of equating the opponent on the left with the foe on the right. Thus the Gomulka regime's fulminations against elements that want to push ahead for "more" is full of blanket smears that such people are "reactionaries," etc.

This would not be so bad except that the *Times* Warsaw correspondent Sidney Gruson has obviously accepted the traditional Walter Duranty role of acting as the journalistic agent to transmit what is pumped into him by the Gomulka regime's briefings. A number of Gruson dispatches on the subject of anti-Semitism in Poland have been written in this spirit.

In garbled and sometimes almost unintelligible juxtapositions, Gruson has been giving the impression that the flare-up of anti-Semitism which he reports is somehow tied up with all critics of Gomulka of whatever sort, in particular with the "nationalist" elements who are "embarrassing" Gomulka's realistic relations with Russia. There are passages in which Gruson makes the crude amalgam explicitly.

## FREIDIN ACCUSES

There is some good testimony that this is a falsification.

(1) Seymour Freidin, N. Y. *Post* foreign correspondent writing from Warsaw (Jan. 21) on "Poland's Jews," says in just about so many words that whereas the anti-Semitic drive comes from the pro-Russian elements who still infest the bureaucratic apparatus, the Gomulka regime tries to shunt it off on the revolutionaries.

After citing experiences showing the prevalence of anti-Semitism especially in government circles themselves, Freidin writes:

"Then, as soon as Soviet policy began to use anti-Semitism as a political weapon, its supporters—still powerful here—began to turn it against Gomulka and his wing.

"Rarely are anti-Jewish remarks by party members noted in the press. Usually, when published, they are virtually all attributed to 'nationalist' and 'reactionary' demonstrations."

But he concludes, it is the old-line Communists (i.e., the "Natolinists") who use the Jews as scapegoats.

The terms "nationalist" and "reactionary" are the regular, standard terms used in the Gomulka press to label every manifestation of what we call the revolutionary democratic opposition. The current code-word for Natolinist-Stalinist is "conservative," meaning the old-line party elements who don't want to change over from the old bad ways. (to the new bad ways).

## 'PO PROSTU' EXPLAINS

(2) More important, *Po Prostu* with all of its authority spoke out on this question of the source of the new anti-Semitism in its first issue this month, in an article by three collaborators entitled "Are Old Ghosts Rising Again?" Its answer was crystal-clear and straight: it not only pointed the finger at the "conservative" elements, and them only, but in excellent discussion underlined and scored their motives in terms which are unmistakable.

"There can be no doubt as to whose interests are served... by the unleashing

## Austrian Nails a Liar

Among the many exposures of the Stalinists' fantastic claims that "fascists" infiltrated Hungary from Austria, thus launching the Hungarian Revolution as a "fascist plot," is one contributed by Chancellor Raab of Austria. The Austrian head of government thought it rich enough to give in one of his bi-weekly radio broadcasts (Dec. 9).

Reminding his hearers that the stories about arms deliveries from Austria have been revealed as fabrications before, he gave a "concrete example" of "how such reports are concocted":

"Even the Soviet foreign minister, in his speech in the UN on Nov. 21, referred to an eyewitness report of the two Soviet journalists, Skobolev and Makoyev. These two journalists declared that they had inspected in Hungary an arms depot taken away from the counter-revolutionaries and had seen Austrian 'Gasser' weapons. It appears that the weapons in question had been pistols."

"It is interesting to note that an Austrian firm by the name of Gasser did in fact produce 8-mm. pistols, but only up to 1917. In that year, production was discontinued and was never resumed. I have consulted an expert in this field. He said that in Austria Gasser pistols can be found only in museums and possibly among arms collections. Otherwise, there are none in existence...."

"The former Gasser firm was subsequently turned into the Rast and Gasser Sewing Machine Co. Have the bad Austrians fired upon the good Hungarian Communists with sewing machines?"

This example of Russian inefficiency in concocting plots is reminiscent of the "Hotel Bristol" blooper in the Moscow Trials of the '30s. The hotel was named in vital testimony as the scene of one of Trotsky's plots; but it turned out that this hotel had been torn down long before the alleged date, and that no such place existed.

of anti-Semitism as a political argument. The conservative forces use it as a smokescreen in order to prevent the people from correctly recognizing where the front line of this struggle lies." (And several other passages like this.)

The *Po Prostu* writers explain acutely how both the Jewish and non-Jewish Natolinists use anti-Semitism as a cover:

"The thesis about the collective responsibility of Jews obscured the other, correct thesis about individual responsibility of people for their actions. The thesis about the collective responsibility of Jews allows petty dictators and local tyrants of 'Aryan' origin to shed their guilt and give themselves full absolution. By contrast, the petty dictator and local tyrant of Jewish origin who is attacked for his activities is given a weapon which makes it possible for him to describe the justified attack against him as anti-Semitic persecution. In this way he not only is in a position to evade responsibility, but also to assume a martyr's robe of an innocent victim of nationalistic persecution. [To be echoed by the Gomulka press and Gruson—H. D.] These are not by any means hypotheses. The past few months have shown that both these methods find extensive application in practice, and unfortunately all too frequently bring the desired results." (As broadcast by Warsaw Radio, Jan. 6.)

The "petty dictators and local tyrants" of whom this speaks as the fountainhead of the new anti-Semitic flare-up are precisely the bureaucratic holdovers from pre-October whose purging is one of the leading and continual demands of the mass movement everywhere in Poland, day in and day out.

Those who go around muttering that the Polish revolution against Stalinism is "anti-Semitic" are doing the Stalinists' work for them, and echoing Kadar-type slanders.

## LABOR ACTION • 17<sup>th</sup> YEAR

January 28, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 4

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

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

## Shachtman Nails a Liar

To the Editor:

A comrade has drawn my attention to the *Militant* of January 21, which is devoted largely to articles on the SP-SDF merger, on the attitude of the ISL toward it, and the corresponding attitude of the SWP.

The position of the SWP on socialist unity in general is known. It is prepared without prejudice to unite with anyone at all who adopts its program; who is won over by patient discussion to share its views on Marxism, Leninism, Trot-

skyism, Bolshevism, Stalinism, Titoism, Menshevism, the Bolshevik Revolution, the Stalinist Counter-Revolution, the Trotskyist Political Revolution, the Chinese Revolution and the Bloc of Four Classes, the Spanish Revolution and the Popular Front, the Anglo-Russian Trade-Union Unity Committee, the Permanent Revolution, the Rise and Fall of the IWW (American approach), and Cochranism; and who is ready to submit to discipline, or simply to submit. I mention this position not because I think it omits a number of unsettled but vital questions, but because this is an opportunity to say that any member of the SWP has a right to this view. The heart fills with sadness to say it, but you have to be firm in such matters: a right is a right.

By the same simple logic, a lie is a lie. On page 2 of the same paper I read that the left wing of the SP had been denouncing the terms of the SP-SDF merger "as capitulation to Dulles and American imperialism." The article continues: "The ISL, instead of supporting the SP left wing in this struggle, urged them to accept these terms wholeheartedly and did everything in its power to facilitate the capitulation of the left wing leadership."

I quote these thirty-six words only because they are a rare case of the flawless lie, unmarred at a single point by the truth. If the *Militant* writer alludes to no fact to support her assertion, it is because none exists, and she knows it. The entire story about what the ISL did or did not support, urged or did not urge, did or did not use its power for, did or did not facilitate, is pure invention, and she knows it. It is a lie read forward or read backward or started in between and read in either direction.

When I say it is a flawless lie, I don't mean that it is a fancy, artistic, hand-painted, chrome-plated lie. It is a mighty poor specimen of barefoot, barerump, barecheek lying, as untouched by ingenuity, skill or subtlety as it is by truth. Her friends, it seems to me, owe it to her to hint, without hurting her craft pride, that she ought to try something else—her talent is not for this.

MAX SHACHTMAN

## Inter-Socialist Panel Planned for Philly

Plans are being made in Philadelphia to hold a symposium on "What's Ahead for the American Left?" on March 1, a Friday.

Brought together by the Third Camp Contact Committee, agreement to participate in the meeting has come from the Independent Socialist League, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Socialist Workers Party, and Communist Party. The Socialist Party has shown interest but did not attend the planning session; likewise readers of the *National Guardian*. The Socialist Labor Party is also being asked to participate.

This meeting will be the first of its kind in the city and is sure to arouse much interest in all political and radical circles.

## SUBSCRIBERS — ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

21-4

If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW!

## The Trend Is to Narrow-Gauge Education

More public attention has been paid to education in the last few years. In the main, this has been the consequence of the politics of the politics of the Cold War, i.e., the sudden knowledge that Russia is training a greater number of technicians than America.

Last week, another impetus was given to this discussion by the announcement of significant tuition increases in a series of private colleges.

But, as an article in the current *Nation* by Arnold Rogow points out, this is really only the surface of the problem. In reality, there are two questions which must be faced: the familiar one of whether society will make education available to all by increasing the investment in teacher's salaries, plant expansion, and the like; the hidden one of what educational use will be made of new facilities.

And the information which Rogow cites gives cause for a pessimism which goes beyond the paltry sum appropriated for education in America.

In secondary education, Rogow notes, "the prevailing stress . . . seems to be on adjustment to contemporary social norms and attitudes, on 'getting along' with schoolmates, parents and community, and on the acquisition of narrow-gauge skills."

In part, this seems to be a function of several elements, not the least of which is the type who is attracted to teaching in secondary schools. In *The Organization Man*, William H. Whyte Jr., quotes figures showing that education majors in graduate school had the lowest aptitude for education of any group.

Or, as Rogow puts it, "the future farmers demonstrated a greater aptitude for education than the future teachers. . . ."

And this, in turn, is related to the much-

discussed "crisis" in technical education.

Among the college graduates of 1954-55, 20 per cent were business majors, 12 per cent took engineering, a little over 8 per cent education, nearly 4 per cent agriculture—and the physical, biological and social sciences, the liberal arts and mathematics combined accounted for 26 per cent. In other words, the greatest single component in America's college population is the business major, followed by the engineering student. The theoretical sciences, the social sciences and the humanities lag far behind.

Here is how Rogow sums up the social impact of the American college: "We are, in short, graduating business administrators and technicians rather than men of broad knowledge and understanding; and again, we are doing this because the community prefers specialists to generalists and narrow skill to comprehensive learning."

One addition should be made to this comment.

As *Challenge* noted in an article last year, business is moving into the educational sphere to push these trends with all its financial might. Corporations are involved in competitive bidding for engineering graduates, and they seek to curry favor with the schools by setting up various endowed chairs, giving scholarships in the fields where business needs men, etc.

Yet all of this is hardly surprising. It merely means that the American educational community is becoming more and more dominated by the values of this prosperous Cold War society. In part, this is a simple matter of reflection, more or less automatic; in part, it is being consciously fostered by those elements in the society who stand to gain from the trend.

### KEEP A WARY EYE

But how does this effect the current discussion about the "crisis" in American education?

In almost every case, the crisis is described in quantitative terms, i.e., the Stalinists are turning out more Cold War technicians than the United States. There is, of course, little or no serious consideration of turning to an educational system which would provide some political basis for opposition to Stalinism.

That would mean breaking much too sharply with the present situation. It is rather a case of deepening the trends which Rogow has documented, of emphasizing the narrow (Cold War) skill at the expense of all else.

And this means that we must be very careful in considering the various plans for government aid to education. In the main, many of them are simply efforts to have society shoulder the cost of paying for the cadre of the business and military institutions of contemporary America. As such, they have little to do with education.

Yet, as *Challenge* has pointed out in the past, America has already demonstrated that the country is capable of vastly extending educational opportunity, of democratizing it without necessarily guiding it into narrow, utilitarian channels. That was the impact of the post-World War II GI Bill.

Under that law, the broad trend toward business education continued. Thirty-three per cent of the veterans re-

### Hopes to Be of Use . . .

"The old concept of the ivory tower is dead. Today a modern university, such as UCLA, is the bridge between education and the community. We profit from the presence of mature, devoted students on our campus, and we hope that our academic disciplines and our risk-capital of ideas are of use to business and industry."

RAYMOND B. ALLEN  
CHANCELLOR OF UCLA

ceived their training in that sphere. But the GI Bill also produced 238,000 teachers, 180,000 doctors, and 113,000 scientists. For the Korean War, Congress passed a modified version of the GI Bill, one which had the effect of favoring the student who went to a state college (by making the grant a flat sum, out of which the student paid tuition, thus favoring those with lower tuition rates).

### THE BIGGER DANGER

As we mentioned, many of the long-range factors which are a problem today were at work in the GI Bill; it was hardly a panacea. And yet it was such a step forward, in the sense of giving education a democratic scope, that its potential effect may well have worked against these trends.

For it was basing education on the ability to learn, not the ability to pay, and it did not—as the business investors in education do—try to form the curriculum to suit certain narrow needs.

But the chances for such a program today, for everybody, veteran or not, are slim. Instead, we may well be confronted with a government plan which will emphasize the most destructive and narrowing trends in American education.

Perhaps the best summation of all this is a statement from a speaker at the American Association for the Advancement of Science, quoted by Rogow:

"The shortage of scientists and engineers is bad enough, but with some efforts these immediate shortages can be corrected. . . . What is more serious and dangerous in the long run is that the mass of our population . . . remains in ignorance of the foundations on which [our] society is based."

### BARCELONA STUDENTS IN THE VAN

As we go to press, we have just received sketchy information on the transportation boycott in Barcelona. The American press has mentioned demonstrations and riots, but the role of the students was not specifically spelled out. Now the Foreign Delegation of the National Federation of Catalan Students has added a little to our information on the subject.

The Barcelona boycott was a popular movement of the entire city in protest against the fare increase which was announced on January 9. The boycott itself began on the 14th of January, and it was led by students. On the first day of the demonstration, there were skirmishes between the students and the police.

On one occasion, an inspector and two armed guards were wounded. In the afternoon of the 14th of January, the boycott was extended from the street cars to cover the busses and the trains of the city.

The radio and the press, both officially controlled, have not made any mention of the boycott, although some news of it has appeared outside of Spain.

## B'klyn College Moves to Evade Court Verdict in Slochower Case

The ritual of academic self-purification is continuing at Brooklyn College. The possibility that the students of that school might be contaminated by association with Dr. Harry Slochower continues to loom as a terrible menace in the minds of the administration.

Slochower was dismissed from his post on October 3, 1952. The charge against him was that he had refused to tell a Senate subcommittee whether or not he had been a member of the Communist Party in 1940-41. The firing itself was on the basis of the infamous Section 903 of the City Charter of New York which provides for the automatic dismissal of any city employee who refuses to answer questions before an official body with respect to his official conduct.

The Supreme Court took the case on appeal and ruled in favor of Slochower. It held that he must be reinstated, given back pay, court costs and interest (a sum which totaled \$40,000), and it enunciated some excellent principles about the significance of silence at a congressional hearing.

Hardly had the news appeared in the *Times* than Brooklyn's indefatigable president, Harry D. Gideonse, charged into print with the assertion that he was going to rehire Slochower—and fire him just as quickly on a new charge. And that was the upshot of this week's news.

The formal approach has been to suspend Slochower pending the settlement of new charges which have been brought against him. This time it is alleged that

Slochower lied under oath on various occasions about Communist activities in the schools of New York State. (It is as yet unclear whether or not the Rapp-Coudert investigation figures in all of this.)

Or rather, the charge seems to be that of making false statements under oath. For the *Times* story gives that version, and then, in the same piece, quotes the allegation that Slochower "willfully and intentionally refused to make full and fair disclosure of all of the facts within his knowledge" and refused to "cooperate fully and to answer all proper questions."

If the second statement in the *Times* describes the situation accurately, then Slochower is being held on the very same grounds which figured in the Supreme Court case, that is, for refusal to testify. And this would mean that Gideonse is bringing up the same old charge, that he is only tactically amending the language, that he is trying to accomplish in a new form what the Supreme Court declared to be substantially illegal.

At any rate, the case is clear enough for any civil-libertarian. There is no question of defending Slochower's politics (from his books and articles, *Challenge* would not), but rather of affirming his fundamental rights.

So far, all of this has been off in the abstract. No real connection has been demonstrated between Slochower's alleged misdeeds and his academic competence. For all an outsider would know, he could well be an excellent member of the faculty. In other words, Gideonse and Brooklyn have made the crucial question irrelevant.

Here, there is no academic trial nor jury of peers; here there is not even an academic investigation into the question of Communism, à la Hook's "Heresy, Yes—Conspiracy, No."

Instead, an apparent attempt to circumvent a ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States—so that Brooklyn can remain pure.

### THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

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

## 'The Mark of an Old, Detested Style'

# THE GOMULKA ELECTION IN POLAND

By PHILIP COBEN

On Sunday, Jan. 20 the election rigged up by the Gomulka regime in Poland was carried off with results hailed by the government as a victory.

The official returns are that over 94 per cent of the eligibles voted, and that 98.4 per cent of the vote cast was for the single ticket. The latter figure, however, is not clear, since there is no report on how much crossing-out was done; the N. Y. *Herald Tribune* dispatch said "little more than 10 per cent" according to indications. In any case, the percentages claimed by the regime are well up there with the best in the Stalinist world.

This balloting marks the end of one period, and the beginning of another, in the attempt to resolve the seething revolutionary crisis in Poland. The events especially of the last week before the vote threw a hot spotlight on the oppositional ferment among the masses. And now that the voting is over, and Gomulka has gotten his formal OK, the tension will rise again as the people wait for delivery on expectations from a popular leader who heads a detested bureaucracy and party—and who is going in the opposite direction of delivering on hopes for more freedom.

There can now be no question about the rigged character of the election. In addition to what we have explained about the formal setup (*LA*, Dec. 24), it turns out now that the regime resorted widely to two persuasive practices on election day itself that deserve notice.

One was the common practice of forcing voters to show publicly whether or not they were voting the "clean ballot" demanded by Gomulka or whether they were following the dissidents' course of crossing-out candidates' names. Thus it was usually not even a secret ballot on the main point.

The other was the frequently open mobilization of the Catholic clergy to keep the electorate in line, adding immense pressure from the church to the already extreme arm-twisting from the secular authorities of the regime.

All this was on the background of the one deviation conceded from the classic formula of the one-party totalitarian election, a concession made in the hope that it would quiet the mass demands for real democratization. More candidates were listed than there were posts to fill, thus giving the voter a choice between individuals all of whom were pre-selected by the ruling apparatus. Thus as usual no one could be elected unless approved by the regime in advance.

But the leeway permitted did make possible a peaceful political demonstration at the polls. Such a demonstration had been courageously proposed, indeed, at a revolutionary students' mass meeting in Warsaw on Dec. 18.

## 'WE WANT TO ELECT'

There speaker after speaker protested the hand-picked nature of the imposed candidates. A "roar of support" greeted one speaker who said that "the election preparations hardly varied from those during the last 10 years." See *LA* Dec. 24 for more details from the N. Y. *Times*.

Because of the importance of this Dec. 18 meeting, we now add more details given by *Le Monde* (Paris), in the dispatch from Warsaw of its outstanding correspondent Philippe Ben, whose accounts checks with the *Times* in every way. The student speakers, he writes, said—

"...The candidate lists were established in secret, and now they are presented to the voters as a *fait accompli*," they declared. And the slogans on the posters announcing the meetings already

said: 'We want to elect, not only vote.'

"Several speakers attacked especially unpopular candidates in Warsaw, notably two members of the CP central committee: Mme. Jaworska, president of the Polish Youth Organization... and M. Albrecht, one of the party secretaries, a top-flight figure. Another much-criticized candidacy was that of the famous writer Iwaszkiewicz, president of the Polish Peace Committee; he was attacked for his ardor for the regime in the worst Stalinist period."

Ben tells of another student action: "Another demonstration against the candidate slates took place Saturday in Lodz, where the students demonstrated for several hours in the main street and stormed into the CP headquarters, demanding inclusion on the slate of their favorite, the dean of the political-economy department. The police force did not intervene; the students themselves kept order."

Ben notes that at the Warsaw student meeting, the name of Gomulka was never mentioned once, sign that even his personal popularity was strained.

What the students called for was that voters assert themselves by crossing out the names of those candidates they had no confidence in, and, by not voting for a full slate, perhaps make a follow-up election necessary for those unpopular candidates who failed to get 50 per cent. Obviously, this would make no difference in the effective political composition of the parliament; it was a peaceful demonstration of dissatisfaction with the failure of the regime to cleanse out the old Stalinist cadres.

Not one report said that the students called for the crossing-out of Communist candidates as against the candidates who nominally represented the two controlled shadow parties. Their fire was directed against those whom they considered the worst examples of the unreconstructed Stalinists retained by the regime.

It was this danger of a peaceful political demonstration at the ballot box by the revolutionary democratic opposition elements that the Gomulka regime set out to smash with whatever weapons it dared to use at this time, when the Polish revolution is still bubbling from the October days.

## PLEBISCITARY TACTIC

The Gomulka regime had some legitimate trumps at its disposal. There was the leader's personal popularity, immense according to all accounts, which was tied up with the image of him standing up to the Russians on behalf of Polish independence. There were the steps taken in decollectivization of agriculture and ease-up on the peasants.

There were a couple of other trumps not quite so legitimate but which did not necessitate any new overtly anti-democratic moves by the regimes. They were just there. One was the example of Hungary. The government dinned into the ear of the people the cry that there but for the grace of Gomulka goes Poland. They did not threaten the people with massacre if Gomulka didn't get his way; no—they simply kept pointing to Hungary with not very veiled reminders that "adventurism" had horrible consequences.

Pointing up these reminders was the presence of thousands of Russian troops in this country that was going to the polls. Barrett McGurn (*N. Y. Herald*

*Tribune*, Jan. 20) quotes the following "delicate" remarks from government sources:

"It is customary that troops be confined to barracks when they are not participating in an election. Since the Russian troops are not participating in this election, that would apply to them." —Very subtle.

Right off, the regime tried to turn the election into a plebiscite, in accordance with traditional authoritarian strategy. This was openly put by the two top leaders of the regime. As early as Dec. 21 Premier Cyrankiewicz told a rally that the vote would be "for or against the path chosen by our party and our nation at the 8th plenum," the one which put Gomulka in. On Jan. 14, Gomulka said in a speech "that Sunday's election would have the effect of a plebiscite on his leadership" (*N. Y. Times*, Jan. 15.)

As election day neared the most sympathetic correspondents began to transmit the fears of the regime that the people were against it, dissatisfied with its inadequate measures toward the revolution they aspired to. The *Times*' Handler cabled from Warsaw that the regime "is acutely aware of the almost total cleavage between the people on the one hand and the party and government on the other... [and that] this constitutes the classic pattern of a pre-revolutionary situation." (Jan. 6.)

In another week, just one week before the election, the government put aside its pretenses of standing by democratically even at this rigged election, and openly swung into action with the blackjacks. This virtually coincided with the arrival in Warsaw of Chou En-lai as traveling rep of the Chinese Stalinists. Though observers do not ascribe Gomulka's final-week intimidation campaign to Chou's presence, the negotiations with Chou at least formed a proper backdrop for the steps which may have been motivated only by fear of an effective anti-Stalinist ballot demonstration.

## CHOU IN WARSAW

The public result of Chou's few days in Warsaw was a notable swing of the Gomulka regime back toward overt Stalinist positions. It may indeed be wondered whether this development flowered suddenly under Chinese smiles. Gruson's dispatch to the *Times* Jan. 12 pointed to a *Trybuna Ludu* editorial which "had made what appeared to many observers here like an offer of surrender even before Mr. Chou's arrival." It promised basic rapprochement with the Chinese and for the first time since the October days swung into the typical Stalinist litany in reviling the West.

Chou on his part made it clear that he was pressuring the Polish regime to recognize Moscow as boss, "head of the socialist world." He stressed this formula twice at the airport on arriving, again while speechifying through the country, and again on leaving. He won, to all intents.

In the final Joint Declaration, Gomulka accepted the code-word "proletarian internationalism"—which is "a current Communist euphemism for Soviet leadership in matters affecting the Communist world," admits Gruson, who had been poohpoohing the extent of Gomulka's concessions. Indeed, the AP (but not the *Times*) quoted Gomulka himself as finally referring on Jan. 14 to "the socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union."

## CAPITULATE ON HUNGARY

Chou's other great victory was on support of the quisling Kadar regime in Hungary.

In one of his first speeches in Warsaw, where the great bulk of the workers sympathize vividly with the Hungarian Revolution, he had provocatively denounced it as a "crazy subversive movement." But Gomulka was very reluctant to go along; to line up with Kadar would be to disillusion masses in Poland. As late as Jan. 15 Gruson, as often parroting his briefing by Polish officials, specifically denied that the Poles would revise their views on the Hungarian uprising. (This whole dispatch, dishonestly minimizing the new turn with Chou, should be read as a particularly crass example of the role of a *Times* correspondent in passing out what had been pumped into him by the propaganda services of a totalitarian regime.)

But two days later the Joint Declaration revealed that Gomulka had capitulated completely on Hungary, supporting the Kadar government and "the program announced lately by that government," i.e., the new strong-arm program to finish the massacre of the revolution.

One may well wonder whether this capitulation on Hungary was merely a concession to pressure, or whether it also played a role in underlining one of the regime's prime threats to keep the voters in line: the threat of a Hungarian-type bloodbath. Now the regime that was pointing to Hungary was one that itself endorsed Kadar.

## CRACKDOWN STARTS

The first step in the new tough election drive put on by the regime was signalized by a purge of the slate.

On Jan. 12 it was announced that "certain candidates" would be removed from the single list because of "lack of responsibility" in behavior, "weak character," "demagogic promises" and other "disloyal tricks." The statement further said that "Certain candidates, fearing for their misconstrued popularity, evade opposing hostile and even provocative opinions."

It was clear, then, that this blast was directed against those candidates who were "yielding" to popular demands, i.e., to the moods of the democratic opposition.

There has been no clarification of how it was legally possible for candidates to be wiped off the slate by the say-so of Gomulka as CP head plus the puppet-heads of the other two regime "parties." It is sufficient commentary on the wonderfully "democratic" way in which the composition of the single list was established, as the student rallies had maintained.

*Trybuna Ludu* even announced the expulsion of a "few" party members for slandering party candidates. The "slanders" against party leaders which the regime has been complaining about are those directed against the suspect Stalinist records of the "bad candidates."

When the name of one withdrawn candidate was made known, it turned out to be Osubka-Morawski, post-war premier, who was charged with saying that "Gomulka was a good man but he is now selling out to the Russians" and "What guarantees do we have that a Polish Gero will not be found to invite Soviet tanks into Warsaw?"

This writer would not flatly guarantee that this is the whole story behind the hatcheting of Osubka-Morawski, but, at any rate, again the sharp edge of the sword was directed against the revolutionary aspirations of the masses for "more."

The picture was confused, as often, by the increasingly tendentious dispatches of Gruson in the *Times*, who was systematically cabling crude "amalgams" between the pro-Russian opponents of Gomulka and the democratic opposition elements. In a Jan. 13 dispatch, for example, Gruson linked what he surprisingly called the "Kadarization of Poland" by the pro-Russian forces, to the reasons for the candidate-purge.

## POLICE RIDE AGAIN

On Jan. 13, Gomulka announced the "total mobilization" of the apparatus to ensure suitable results in the election. Although one of the big promises of democratization had been to keep the police out of the election, now "Gomulka said it

(Turn to last page)

PRO &amp; CON DISCUSSION

## Some Sidelights on Gomulka's Poland

## Bureaucracy, the Economy, &amp; Democratization

By HAL DRAPER

Comrade Germain cites two newspaper dispatches as supporting Rudzinski's claims about the character of the democratic opposition in Poland. Let us remember, to begin with, that we are talking about those elements (unorganized and amorphous under the circumstances) who want more than Gomulka allows toward freedom from Russia and toward internal freedom; as distinct from the pro-Stalinist opposition to Gomulka on the other side.

Rudzinski's claim was that these opposition elements represent "the efforts of Polish reactionary nationalism to throw off the control of the working class," that this "old Polish reactionary nationalism is dangerous... to the Polish socialist revolution"; and he (Rudzinski, not Germain) concluded that we ought to "condemn" them and, as against them, give critical support to the Gomulka regime.

It is a question, then, of the class character and political aims of the elements that want to push toward more freedom and independence than Gomulka is willing to allow. There has been an abundance of evidence showing that these aspirations and movements of protest, despite Gomulka's well-known personal popularity, come from the ranks of the Polish workers and students, i.e., the most active revolutionary elements. This evidence has been cited in *LA* in detail from all available reports; it was capped when the Poznan working class, acting virtually as a unit through steel-worker spokesmen, put their weight behind the demands of the democratic opposition and even threatened strike; and when the very Warsaw students in whose name Rudzinski had "condemned" the opposition held a mass meeting to denounce the rigging of the election and to call for a ballot demonstration. We have gone through all of that.

Germain does not comment on any of these things, but presents two passages from the press. Unfortunately neither one, as any reader can see, has anything whatsoever to do with such a claim as Rudzinski made about the democratic opposition elements.

## WHO WERE THEY?

(1) *Stettin (Szczecin)*: This report appeared in the whole press, not only the *London Times*, for the simple reason that it appeared in the official story of the Szczecin "riot" that was put out by the government. Now, I see no reason to doubt that there were at least squads of Communist shipyard workers in that port city which the regime could mobilize to defend itself in a pinch; and students too. For that matter, even before this event, in Warsaw itself the regime had been forming "worker militia" groups of those whom, no doubt, it considered "reliable" stalwarts. The implication has been right along that these are groups, or picked squads, of those workers, students or other elements whom the regime thinks will defend it against opponents, whether Stalinist or democratic.

Now that this is established for us both, what exactly is the point of citing the dispatch? It does not tell us whether the whole Szczecin working class supports squads which help the cops and soldiers against demonstrators. It is only a question of whether the "more" demands come from workers and students and reflect a mass aspiration, or whether this movement is to be condemned as the "reactionary nationalism" of the "middle class and old intelligentsia."

Comrade Germain will have to admit that he knows of no evidence to sanction these derogatory appellations of Rudzinski's, which is the matter at issue.

The thing reminds me of the outcry after the Czech coup of 1948, which was made formally through "workers councils of action" organized by the Stalinists. We never bothered to deny that these "workers councils" contained workers, Stalinist workers. We only maintained—what everybody knows now—that these Stalinist goon squads did not act for the working class. For over a decade now in East Europe the Stalinist regimes have been announcing, on every appropriate occasion, that any

## A READER REQUESTS A CLARIFICATION

To the Editor:

In *LABOR ACTION*'s issue of December 31, Hal Draper berates Comrade A. Rudzinski for maintaining that the most recent outbreak of riots in Poland were, for the most part, spearheaded by conservative-nationalist elements, as distinct from the majority of Polish workers who support Gomulka's prudent course at the present time.

Comrade Draper insists that Rudzinski slanders the "revolutionary internal democratic opposition" with a characterization that is completely unsubstantiated by all the available facts.

However, in a *London Times* dispatch from Warsaw—one of a number of reports at our disposal that strongly buttress these and many other points in Rudzinski's discussion article—we are informed that as far as the Stettin riots were concerned, they were stopped by the local CP committee after it had summoned workers from the Stettin shipyard, who with students and soldiers of the local military unit "dispersed the hooligans."

Another dispatch that gives even more support to Rudzinski's characterization of this internal opposition is forthcoming from New York *Times* correspondent Gruson, who also casts serious doubt on *LABOR ACTION*'s contention of a rapprochement between the Gomulka forces and the Natolin Stalinist group:

"The ruling United Workers (Communist) party has decided on a drastic slimming down on the party's huge bureaucratic apparatus. The scrapping (of all but 4 of 19 party bureaus that until quite recently wielded control and rule of the nation) is in line with the party's proclaimed new policy of guiding rather than governing the country's affairs.

movement of dissent or protest is put down not simply by gendarmes' truncheons but by the spontaneous and indignant action of honest proletarians who defend the regime against hooligans, because of their glowing love for the new life they have been given.

## "AMALGAM" METHOD

(2) The fact that Germain thinks it relevant to cite the Gruson dispatch about the slimming down of the bureaucracy is more disturbing. Before I give more details about this process, let's just take at face value the information as Comrade Germain presents it via Gruson:

There is a Natolin (pro-Russian) group in the CP who are biding their time to knife Gomulka; this is the pro-Stalinist opposition. The bureaucratic apparatus is being reduced in size; bureaucratic posts are therefore fewer;

## The Bureaucracy's Need to 'Debureaucratize'

Now, apart from replying to Comrade Germain on the above point, it is worthwhile (since the question has been raised) to explain what has been going on in Poland about the "slimming down" of the bureaucracy. Germain has a couple of things mixed up.

One thing is that Gomulka has vigorously opposed any purge of the old elements in the bureaucracy with a bad Stalinist record, as long as they now pledge allegiance to him. This is what I wrote about in *LA* (Dec. 17). Germain's reference to this is inaccurate. Also, it is not easy to see why the Gruson dispatch is supposed to "cast serious doubt" on the copious quotations which I gave them from Gomulka and his supporters.

In any case, this concerns Gomulka's opposition to a political cleansing in the bureaucracy and government of those who, in the people's eyes, are Stalinists.

The attempted reduction in the size and unwieldiness of the bureaucratic apparatus itself is an entirely different matter. It is pretty much a duplication of much that was done, and had to be done, by the Tito regime in Yugoslavia after its break

Thousands of party members are losing their jobs as a result... they are not taking kindly to the idea (and) are forming a stubborn opposition (to the Gomulka regime)....

"(Their essentially non-ideological struggle against Gomulka, in order to regain their past privileges and power) has led them to make common cause with the 'Natolin group'.... (The latter) are using old speeches of M. Gomulka's supporters to cast doubt on (his) professions of support for democratization... these speeches, some of them attacking concepts that are now party policy, follow... the Stalinist line. By this measure every official of the party was Stalinist.

"The important question... is that of who has changed position. The Natolin group... has not altered its attitude that the new Soviet-Polish relationship achieved by M. Gomulka was wrong, injurious to Poland, and inherently dangerous for the future of the party here."

Gruson's reports have been confirmed and reiterated in the *New York Times* by his colleague Handler, and by *New York Post* correspondent Freidin.

In addition, some recently published articles that support the bulk of Rudzinski's total picture of Polish events can be found in the following sources: Adam Ciolkosz's penetrating articles in the *New Leader* of December 3 and the December number of the *Socialist Call*, and Harold Hurwitz in the *New Leader* of December 24-31.

Clarification by the editors on these and the conflicting reports and interpretations listed above would be most appreciated.

*New York, Jan. 6* PAUL GERMAIN

office-holders are losing jobs and resent it; they tend to coalesce their disgruntlement with that of the Stalinist opposition....

And what exactly has this to do with either the class character or the political character of the masses in Poland who are demanding "more" democracy, "more" freedom from the old Stalinist remnants, "more" independence from Russia...?

Of course, it is the line of the Gomulka regime, as it is of every Stalinist regime, that any opponent of any sort is equally an enemy of humanity. The Stalinist-type "amalgam" of opponents is one of the best-known standard operating procedures in the manual. Yet, after all these years, it is great carelessness to give an uncritical ear to such amalgams.

As for the other articles cited at the end of our correspondent's letter, there is no evidence in them for the thesis at issue.

with Moscow, and apparently for much the same reason. The first thing to understand is that it does not involve a political purge. But since it is interesting in itself, I give some details.

One of the big background facts is the impossible state of the Polish economy in the present situation, about which Gomulka has made several very detailed speeches. He has said in virtually so many words that Poland is economically "bankrupt." The revolutionary excitement that has gripped the country, and which is unresolved, has not been good for production, either. The country has been milked dry by Russia. At the same time, Poland cannot hope to maintain a really independent status unless it becomes more economically independent of Russia, as well as politically....

To make a long story short, one must first get a sense of the desperate economic straits in which Poland finds itself at a crucial time. This is not Gomulka's fault, naturally; he inherits the crisis. But if he is not to fall back simply on Russian charity, he must scrimp and squeeze.

One of the biggest overhead, and un-

productive, economic burdens in all the Stalinist states is the crushing wasteful burden of the overinflated parasitic bureaucratic apparatus itself. One of Gomulka's hopes is that, given a regime that has popular support, a big percentage of this bureaucratic overhead will be rendered unnecessary; this could mean an enormous saving. (In a sense, it is part of the economic solution that would be undertaken also by a democratic socialist government, except that it would be possible for such a government, and it is impossible in the long run for Gomulka without a complete break from the whole Stalinist past.)

It is the old effort, inherent in every one of the Stalinist totalitarianisms and well known in Russia, to combat the foundering of the regime in its own bureaucracy. It has taken many forms in Russia itself. In Poland it is taking the same form as in Tito-Yugoslavia: trying to capitalize on the new popular support gained from the nationalist credit of the new regime in order to debureaucratize.

## THE HYDRA-HEADS

This is the essential drive behind it, arising from the very heart of the laws of motion of bureaucratic-collectivism. An important form it takes, as before, is the campaign to cut down on unnecessary bureaucratic posts; machinery, committees, departments, activities, etc.

For example, on Dec. 13 the organ *Zycie Warszawy* discussed in this light the effort to merge and reorganize the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of State Farms, a not illogical move. A commission had been set up to do this. It produced a draft project which was adopted by both ministries.

Alas, this project "does lead to savings in personnel expenditures but does not take into account the necessity of doing away with functionalism and such excessive centralization that almost every single agricultural expert and every single hectare of land and tractor is organized from Warsaw." Besides the project gave the merged ministry "a number of central administrations" not connected with agriculture, with results that are "bound to lead to a tremendous amount of administrative work." Etc.

So personnel was cut down indeed, but the problem of bureaucratism not solved. (Only socialist democracy can solve it in a collectivized economy.)

On Nov. 27 the central organ *Trybuna Ludu* carried an article "showing that a survey carried out in 13 ministries has shown that, despite the personnel cuts in state administration, expenditures in ministries have not fallen but have gone up. It seems that the reason for this is that the ministries and their deputies show little interest in the budgets of their ministries.... A report on this matter has been sent to the premier." (Warsaw Radio.)

## CHOICE OF EVILS

However, it is not the "snafu" angle I want to emphasize now (that's a much bigger question), but rather only the aims behind this development.

The regime, of course, was perfectly conscious of the pitfalls. It was a choice of intolerable evils, as always in the case of regimes beset by social crisis.

As early as Nov. 15 *Zycie Warszawy* was explaining that the "problem of the dismissal of administrative workers" was tough. It would involve over 10,000 employees in Warsaw alone! (That begins to give an idea of the tremendous incubus of the inflated bureaucracy.) But, it added, "the majority of employees dismissed are women." It raised the question of the pace of the change, and of the need to immediately retrain and re-employ the dismissed workers in some way. But even so, there was still a problem: "one has to remember that these people will earn less when they take up new employment." (Again, this adds to the picture of the drain which the parasitic bureaucracy imposed on the economy.) So there should be a special bonus to tide them over, it recommended....

If there were space it would also be interesting to go into the discussions going on by economic specialists who very rightly project proposals for simplifying and decentralizing the whole planning setup. One of the ideas is to try to eliminate planning of details. The usual lip-service (quite sincere, no doubt) is given to the indispensable idea that this is possible only insofar as "initiative from below and democratic control

(Turn to last page)

# Socialist Party-SDF Merger — —

(Continued from page 11)

ignation. He had been expected to bring also the greetings of the Socialist International.

His place was taken by Alsin Andersen, who spoke to the convention in behalf of the Danish Social Democratic Party and of the Executive of the International. He announced that at the coming Vienna meeting of the Executive, the united organization would undoubtedly be given official delegate status for the first time.

There is no question of the completeness of the support which the membership of the Socialist Party will give to the fusion. The support which the former members of the SDF will give to it is another matter.

## VICIOUS CAMPAIGN

The Jewish Socialist Verband, which actually constituted the backbone and bulk of the Federation, not only voted overwhelmingly against the merger at its recent convention in Philadelphia, but has since carried on an intensive and furious campaign both against those of the Federation, like its former chairman Louis P. Goldberg, who have worked for the merger, and also against the Socialist Party.

In New York, the only locality where the Federation had a fairly substantial group of its own besides the Verband membership, a meeting was held prior to the unity convention denouncing the proposal for merger and repudiating the efforts of Goldberg. In addition to the leaders of the Verband—who, like the *Jewish Daily Forward* which often speaks for it, represent the extreme right wing of American socialism—the one who led the fight in the New York Federation against the merger was James Glaser, a former editor of the *Daily Worker*.

The fierceness of the Verband's opposition to the unity is positively extraordinary. Its denunciations of the Socialist Party in general and of Norman Thomas in particular have been only little less savage than those it usually reserves for the Communist Party. The *Forward*

has not hesitated to print the most grotesque and patent falsehoods about the Socialist Party.

The Verband spokesmen are apparently not impressed by the fact that, in the negotiations, the representatives of the Socialist Party went to exceptional lengths to make concessions to the representatives of the Federation.

The resolutions agreed upon between the two, one on foreign policy and the other on policy in the United States, made most extensive concessions to the point of the view and in general to the outlook of the Federation; so much so that a good deal of opposition to the resolutions was voiced and voted in the ranks of the Socialist Party, despite their general support for unity. The numerically smaller Federation was guaranteed equal representation in the leadership of the united organization.

These formalities, for all their importance, did not abate the hostility of the Verband leaders to the unity, in which they see a menace to their narrow control and their conservative political position.

## CONVENTION DECISION

It appears that not all the members of the Verband will refuse to go along with the unity. Some have already signified their defiance of the Verband decision; still others probably will. At the unity convention, Louis Goldberg struck back at the assaults of the Verband. Strong efforts will undoubtedly be made by the merged group to break through the violent pressure being directed at it by the Verband leadership.

Meantime, it was noted that as a compromise proposal, the convention decided to call the new group by the names of both former groups, namely, Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation. The hyphenation is obviously aimed in part at preventing the anti-unity elements at the extreme right from continuing under the old Federation name. In any case, the question of the name of the organization is to be reconsidered at the next convention, scheduled for a year from now.

The delegates voted unanimously to

reject any proposal for united fronts with the Communists. They also voted in favor of a statement which invites "all democratic socialist groups and individuals to join with us in helping to make real the concept of human fellowship in freedom."

This was supplemented by numerous declarations by speakers emphasizing that the convention unity was but a first step, as former SP national secretary Singer said, "toward developing a new and vital socialist movement in the United States." What this means concretely for the next period was not spelled out or even indicated save in the most general way.

What is most likely, as the next step in unification, is the merger of the American branch of the Jewish Bund into the SP, although in this regard there is more than one problem to settle in view of the singular position the Bund has always occupied in the international socialist movement. With regard to other groups, no specific indications were given as to the attitude of the new organization.

Preoccupation with the merger between the two groups involved seems to have given the delegates, or most of them, no room for considering the much larger and much more important aspect of a reunited socialist movement in the United States. The fact that the virtual monopoly which the Stalinist movement exercised in the past two decades over the radical and socialist-minded public in this country has now been violently

shattered, leaving thousands and even tens of thousands of earnest and devoted socialists throughout the country unaffiliated, unprepared to join any sect or any movement with a narrow and sectarian or exclusive attitude, but ready to move toward a broad organization which is firmly committed to democratic socialism both in its policies and its inner life—this fact received no attention at the convention, except perhaps in the closing address by Norman Thomas.

## BUNDIST CAUTIONS

In an eloquent speech on the meaning and power of democratic socialism, he took note of the disillusionment of great numbers who had been hypnotized in the past by the ideas and the movement of Stalinist totalitarianism. But he neither drew nor indicated any conclusions as to the attitude of the united organization toward them.

Among the greetings read or orally delivered to the convention, one of the most interesting was that delivered by Dr. Emanuel Scherer, head of the fraternal delegation from the Jewish Bund. He not only emphasized that this unification was only the first step toward a powerful American socialism, but that unity, in his words, should not mean "uniformity"; that a democratic socialist movement could not be monolithic, one in which only one standpoint is tolerated and diversity of tendency and opinion is looked at askance, or with the hostility that distinguishes the Stalinist movement.

He called for the unity of all who are devoted to democratic socialism, and indicated that its principles are represented in the basic resolution of the Socialist International.

# Gomulka Election —

(Continued from page 6)

was the party's duty to see that the police and workers militia were used against attempts to produce an illegal opposition and to protect polling booths on election day." (*Times*-Jan. 14.)

The next day he boldly stated that the regime "will never surrender power"—to reaction, etc.

(In this same dispatch, after everything that had already happened, Gruson had the monstrous effrontery to cable that the regime leaders "are determined to hold elections that are totally free within the limited choice presented to the voters." It was getting clearer every day that the *Times* correspondent was doing the traditional Walther Duranty act for the benefit of a totalitarian regime to which the State Department was not unfriendly.)

On the 17th Gomulka crossed another line. One of the youth organizations that had sprung up out of the October ferment was suppressed by police action—on the eve of an election!—by this democratizer. This was the youth organization of the "Democratic Party," one of the two puppet-parties of the regime, which had however disowned it.

This writer does not know anything more about this youth organization or its political character than what appeared in the press dispatches, where it was described as Catholic anti-Communist. But there seems to be no doubt that the suppression was simply a totalitarian police act.

The group was not charged with any illegal activities. Even Gruson made it clear that this intervention of the "secret police authorities" "left a particularly bad taste reminiscent of the Stalinist days of repression."

Two days before the election, the regime's drive was reaching a shrill crescendo. "Party activists" launched house-to-house combing to impress on people that they had to hand in a "clean ballot." The church machinery went into high gear to support it.

Then Gomulka made his election-eve speech in which he threatened that "to cross out Communist candidates is to cross out Poland from the map of European states." He was admitting that the signed pact of equality with his Russian friends and their pledges about using troops were nothing but worthless pieces of paper. He was saying that not even a peaceful ballot demonstration which could not possibly affect parliament was impossible in this "democratized" Poland.

Although a to-do had been made about

the great advance toward "free elections" marked by the right to cross out candidates' names, now Gomulka thundered that anyone who proposed to use this right was not merely mistaken—no, it was the "criminal persuasions of the reactionaries." It was "tantamount to calling for the liquidation of socialist Poland," which of course is a crime.

Gruson was sad: "Belated though the effort was, there no longer appeared to be any doubt about its success. There was a price, however. The manner of the party's 'total mobilization' during this week left the mark of an old, detested style." (Jan. 20.)

## PAYOFF

We have already mentioned the new features disclosed on election day itself. The widely used gimmick was that those voters who cast the "clean ballot" did so openly, without going behind the curtain.

Those who insisted on crossing-out had to advertise this by using the curtain (except that some of the "younger people in Warsaw . . . in deliberate displays of bravado, scratched out a name or two in the open"). In one reporters' survey, only 2-12% used their alleged right to a secret ballot; in another, in Warsaw 50% did. Barrett McGurn (*Herald Tribune*) found only one polling place in Warsaw and vicinity where most voters used the voting booth.

Even in the one exception, it seemed, some of the voters were still "clearly visible." In other cases there were "strong lights that showed their actions through the curtain"—no doubt accidentally.

The Catholic Church machinery paid off handsomely for the regime's concessions to religious education (which went way beyond separation of church and state) and to church autonomy. Church head Cardinal Wyszyński had long made clear that the church completely backed the regime and favored the "clean ballot" for it.

In early voting priests led parishioners to the polling places after mass, en masse. The Church officially had instructed the devout not to boycott the vote. Priests electioneered for the "clean" totalitarian ballot from the pulpits. On election eve the bishop of Siedlce publicly instructed his flock to vote down the line for the regime. In another place, Powsan, "voters went in a group from mass to the polls, where they voted beneath a crucifix." Gomulka had truly mobilized heaven and earth.

This was "democratization" under the Gomulka regime.

# Eisenhower Program — —

(Continued from page 11)

spending and reduce taxes. When the budget was released, Humphrey held a news conference in which he expressed his unhappiness and virtually issued a call for Congress to pare it down.

But Humphrey is in a dilemma, and he knows it, when he "urges Congress to reduce the president's budget" despite the fact that it is "apparently the best we can do at the present time." How much cutting can he do when 80 per cent of the budget is tied up in past and future military spending?

He is also concerned about the developing inflationary spiral, but given the military-oriented foreign policy there is nothing he can do but wring his hands. He explained the problem to the newsmen as reported in the *Christian Science Monitor* of January 17:

# Bureaucracy — —

(Continued from page 7)

of the masses" is a factor in economic life. This priceless ingredient would indeed permit an enormous cut-down in overhead. But the regime cannot solve its economic crisis along the lines that a socialist democracy could.

But the projects are being made, and the personnel is being cut down in the hope it will work and under the pressure of need, despite the dangers. On Jan. 2 planning commissioner Jedrychowski mentioned over the radio that the planning commission itself was cutting its staff from 1800 to 900-1000. He was also worrying over the air about what to do with the surplus workers.

Indeed this is a very interesting subject, but not because it has anything to do with the deplorable demigration of the democratic opposition elements, who look to the road that can solve the crisis—consistent democratic socialism.

Comparing the cost of defense hardware and outlay with the total gross national product of the U. S., he figured that one of every eight employed persons in the nation is engaged in the production of military equipment or in some phase of defense—none of which contributes to the supply of peacetime goods. Billions of dollars are being spent on defense, but nothing pours from the factories to absorb the purchasing power. And here—too much money chasing too few goods—lies the powerful cause for inflation.

This is about as candid a statement of the cause of the basic inflationary tendency in the economy today as you will find—but it took George Humphrey four years as secretary of the Treasury to find it out.

About inflation Humphrey says: cut spending. Some say: limit consumer installment credit. The *N. Y. Post* suggests the "reimposition of drastic price and wage controls." The president proposes a commission to study inflation and the banking system.

But the inflationary pressure is really a political problem, that is, it is a consequence of the United States' military-orientated policy of dealing with Stalinism.

"The immediate question in Democratic circles now is: 'Where does the Democratic Party now turn?'" reports Doris Fleeson in the *N. Y. Post* of January 22. "The president has staked out an almost invulnerable political position. If his programs are enacted, he will get credit for what works well, and the Democratic Congress is a natural scapegoat for what doesn't. And if the Congress does nothing, it can be blamed for all that goes wrong."

This analysis is absolutely correct as long as there is broad agreement over the foreign policy which necessitates the gigantic military budget, and limits any real welfare legislation.