Shachtman Tilts with D.W. Editor —

By H. W. BENSON

The discussion in the Communist Party since the 20th Congress has already gone through three phases, each of which illuminates the nature of the coexisting tendencies.

First: there was the immediate aftermath of the Khurshchev revelations. This could be called the "Dennis period." This was the veering job of covering up its inner degradation. The "crimes of Stalin" were to be recognized. Dennis, however, was to go on as before after admitting a whole series of past "errors" which were to be replaced by an appeal for a "united front" of all progressives. This culminated in the "Draft Program" now under discussion. It is clear now that the Dennis line and the Draft Program have at least two hostile tendencies. The Dennis wing was ready to pass lightly over the Stalin line and was quickly satisfied with the phoney "Marxist" explanation from the Kremiln because it involved no fundamental change of observation in the East.

Second: came the Poznan uprising, the Warsaw crisis, and finally the Hungarian revolution. This culminated in the "Daily Worker-Gates" period.

Under the impact of workers' revolution in Poznan, the Kremiln policy of keeping Stalinist structure and aided with Gomulka in Poland. The discussion centered now, not over the "New Daily Worker" attitude toward Russian and to the Gates tendency, it became clear, was the question of the tug of the Kremiln and was taking the first hesitant steps toward democ-

ratic socialism while, ironically, enough, the actual situation of Russia as a whole was getting closer. Third: Russian troops and tanks en-

tered Hungary, and the Kremiln threw the Nazy regime and set up a sim-

ple puppet regime headed by Kadar. This became the "Foster period" and continues to this day.

FOSTER HAMMERS AWAY

It was a clear case: which side of the barricades are you on? The Draft Pro-

gram and the Dennis line opened the floodgates of criticism; whole sections of the party were ranging themselves on the side of the Hungarian revolution and against Russian intervention. Foster de-

fended the party's line with ardor.

He pointed out that it was being used as a convenient expedient to cover up and insisted upon a return to "Marxist-Leninism" and to "proletarian interna-
tionalism," by which he meant subservience to Russia. Dennis and the whole line of the party were seen in Hungary as trying to rally around Foster and together with the Russian occupation to save the Hungarian revolution, using every pre-

fabricated" he supplied by the Kremiln.

It is under this pressure that the party discussion continues today and the effects of the personal animosity on the Foster wing are already evident.

Thus it came about that the discussion was a long, bitter affair, for the opposition was the precipitous dictatorial against those who want to break from it, was posed in this false light: Dogmatic versus crea-

tive Marxism (as the Gates line is put in; "Marxism-Leninism" versus "Modern Revisionism" (as Foster put it).

On December 2, the Worker editorialist on "America and Hungary" com-

mented:

"Of course, the issue isn't the same in these two countries. [Belgium, Ger-

many, Egypt] Foreign troops—British, French, Italian, American—are in Egypt as well as in one of the most abject of acts of aggression in the long sad ritual of imperialism. But if you are going to join these two—those of the second type—those of the first type—are in Hungary by agreement be-

tween the two countries under the War-

saw Pact, counterpart of NATO, as well as in Egypt. These Potsdam-24, Hun-

gary was part of the fascist Axis."

We skip discussion of the inner content of this monstrosity; it suffices here to point out that this editorial represents an explicit attempt by Foster to put the pressure of Foster and his allies.

D.W. YIELDS

This editorial is a direct repudiation of that adopted by the Moscow Com-

mittee on November 4 under the impact of the Poznan crisis, the Tulsa crisis, and the Hungarian crisis. This is what the Daily Worker printed.

An appeal of the Soviet authori-
ties to the request for armed interven-

tion cannot be justified by anything.

If there is an argument for it, it is that they had the legal right to do it. As for Polish troops, they can and should be made to fight a matter of formal rights. It violated the essence of the Leninist concept of nation-

al self-determination because the call for the troops was not in accord with the wishes of the Hungarian people.

In one month, the Daily Worker swung from repudiation of the "Warsaw Pact" to full support of it.

Behind it all is the preparation by the Fosterites to cut thethroats of those who want to break from it, was posed in this false light: Dogmatic versus crea-

tive Marxism (as the Gates line is put in; "Marxism-Leninism" versus "Modern Revisionism" (as Foster put it).

The political content of his remarks is of little independent significance. We realize that Foster is eager to pro-

ceed to finality with the Gates line. We know all we have to know about his personal animosity and it is significant as an acid test of the hostile overtures. The "Central issue in our own party," says Foster, "will either be or not we shall continue to build the Communist Party. Comrade Gates raises this basic question sharply in the November issue of Polit-

ika (a Party paper) and we can find no transfor-
mation of the Communist Party into a so-called political-action organization..."

The proposed new organization is a threat against the life of the Communist Party itself.

Foster goes on to speak of "this reck-

less manner in which he had made his ex-

tremist pronouncements, to a point which vastly amazes this reporter, who has not heard him speak for a long time. He often seems to be trying to sound like a "crazy" politician. He is "utterly absurd" on the Soviet Union and New England twang and put out with a fulsome vocabulary, it did not quite sit right with me, but I suppose that this is the way who specializes in the more abstract methods of expression and writing.

At any rate, his reply to the question went like this: "I don't know the answers to these questions?" (apologies from a num-

ber of other folksy-type intellectuals in the audience), . . . "Things are quite so simple. . . . We ought to try to under-

stand, not denounce or demand. . . . Con-

sider how complex problems are. . . . You know, things aren't so simple..."

"WILL OF THE PEOPLE" IN HIS OWN WAY

He was against the imposition of socialism by Russia on another country, but in Russia, "Communist power not imposed by force. He then proceeded to describe how the "people' controlled the Russian revolution and "Marxist popular character" of the Russian revolution. Shachtman castigated this line and made the point that we are no longer living in the age of the "will of the people" and that it is time to cease with this illusion which we "People of the people" under the Stalinist system where the old Tsarist institutions of political de-

ocracy..." Свэйси answered in what was becoming his usual manner for the evening: "This question has been discussed by the Congress;" while Rousseau and we won't see it to-
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