

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 4, 1957

FIVE CENTS

Dictator Trujillo and the U.S.

A Study in American Imperialism's Role

... page 6

THE REVOLUTIONARY DEMOCRATIC OPPOSITION IN POLAND

... page 3

A HUNGARIAN FIGHTER ASSESSES THE TACTICS OF THE REVOLUTION

... page 5

Congress Dragging Feet On Civil Rights Pledges

By SAM TAYLOR

While most of the nation's attention has been fixed on the congressional maneuvering around President Eisenhower's Middle East Doctrine, the fight for civil-rights legislation has been slowly picking up steam.

Civil rights loomed as the big issue when the 85th Congress opened. Now, eight weeks later, the first hurdle of congressional committee hearings has not been cleared. The Senate subcommittee headed by Senator Hennings of Missouri has voted to conclude hearings by March 5, but even this is not certain.

Congressional leaders have approached this issue with all of the enthusiasm of a boy taking bitter medicine. But at the same time there is the awareness that they can avoid it no longer. Sooner or later Congress will have to act—but better later than sooner seems to be the feeling.

This puts a question-mark over the motivation of Senate Democrats in holding long committee hearings and then a leisurely "debate" on the Middle East Doctrine. Quite aside from the intrinsic importance of the foreign-policy discussion, such as it has been, it has served as a valuable time-consuming diversion from the important domestic issue.

The snail's pace in Congress has to be contrasted with the amazing speed with which the Southern states from Virginia to Louisiana, have moved with their program of "massive resistance" to desegregation. In one state after another legal roadblocks are being erected, to delay for years, it is hoped, the implementation of the Supreme Court's decision.

It is the intention of the racist leaders in the South, both in and out of the White Citizens Councils, to tie up desegregation in thousands of individual court actions which will take years to litigate, if this subterfuge is allowed to succeed. And, at the same time, in some

states like Mississippi and Georgia, election laws are being rewritten to make it even more difficult for Negroes to vote and to get on election lists.

Coupled with these legal actions, a campaign of violence and terror—bombings and shootings—has erupted in Montgomery, Alabama, in Tallahassee, Florida, in Clinton, Tennessee and elsewhere.

FOR MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Negro leaders in the South have called on President Eisenhower to "speak out to the South on the question of law and order" but the president has maintained a stoney silence.

At a two-day meeting of the Southern Negro Leaders Conference in mid-February, Rev. Martin Luther King called for a March on Washington to demand that the president "speak out."

In a telegram to the president he stated: "If you, our president, cannot come South to relieve our harassed people, we shall have to lead our people to you in the capital in order to call the nation's attention to the violence and organized terror directed toward men, women and children."

Eisenhower made a trip to the Southwest in January to visit drought areas and he has issued statements on crises all over the world, but he has steadfastly refused to utter a word on this political and moral blight in this country. And for that matter, neither has any leading Democrat; nor did the Democratic National Advisory Council at its West Coast meeting this month refer to this situation; and Adlai Stevenson would

(Continued on page 4)

Is Peace Nearer In the Middle East?

As we go to press, it appears that there has been a break in the long-drawn-out impasse over withdrawal of Israel's troops from the Gaza area and from the Egyptian territory it invaded in October. Under heavy pressure from Washington, Israel is reported ready to agree to withdrawal under conditions which are said to be satisfactory also to Egypt and the UN.

There is little doubt that the main concern in this situation, for most uninvolved peoples, has been the extrication of the belligerent states from the imbroglio with a minimum danger of war. The area is a tinderbox.

There are many important questions of justice and injustice involved, but it will do neither side any good to light the fuse of world antagonisms in what it conceives to be its own nationalist interests. This indeed was one reason why the original aggression by Israel, in collusion with France and Britain, deserved the condemnation of most of the world.

From this point of view—i.e., extrication—the solution of the immediate difficulty was a diplomatic task. But the problems will remain.

We are unreservedly for the demand that Israel must withdraw its forces from all territory not its own, and do so unconditionally; for its aggression gives it no rights, moral or political or otherwise, to maintain troops on land it invaded. We are not among those who, while they may reluctantly agree that the Ben-Gurion government cannot really be hailed for attacking Egypt, still justify in one way or another his obstinate refusal to bring his soldiers home from his foreign adventure and his effort to draw some profit from it.

But this viewpoint, which we believe to be vital for any democratic approach, must be accompanied by a couple of other opinions not less vital.

(1) We are not in favor of the enforcement of "justice" in the Middle East—even what we ourselves may consider to be justice—by the intervention of imperialist foreign forces to impose a settlement from the outside. We do not grant the U. S., or the UN, the right to police the world—a right that could be considered only for a genuine democratic world government, and that cannot be accorded governments, or any combination or alliance of governments, that have only their own imperialist axes to grind.

That goes whether the blackjack which is proposed for use in the Middle East is military or economic in nature (sanctions) and whether it is proposed for use directly through the U. S. or through the agency of the UN.

The labor and socialist movements of the world could have great influence in the Middle East, in particular on Arab and Israeli socialists and opinion, but only if they separated themselves entirely from the imperialist powers and developed their own line. Unfortunately this is still often far from true, but it is a road to pursue.

(2) The Israeli invasion served in some quarters to deflect attention from, but not to change the reactionary character of Egypt's own contributions to the locked-horns situation in the Middle East: in particular, Nasser's blockade of Israeli shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal.

We condemn these acts, now as before, and urge that no real settlement can be secured as long as the Egyptian dictator insists on belligerent rights which he does not accord to his enemy.

Above all, we call on the Arab socialists to use their influence to erase this *casus belli*, and not to rationalize it.

(3) We welcome any voluntary agreement whereby the Gaza area may be neutralized under the UN administration—not imposed, but accepted. Concentrated into Gaza is the very symbolization of the "conflict of wrongs" in Palestine, which is the other side of the conflict of rights and the conflict of antagonistic chauvinisms: the sins perpetrated against the Palestine Arab refugees on the one hand and by the Egyptian-sponsored fedayeen on the other.

But we believe that, in a disposition of Gaza, UN auspices should be used to lead to a free vote by the people of Gaza themselves in a plebiscite as to where they want to belong: to Israel, or Egypt, or continued UN administration. We think socialists should recommend the third, or internationalized, status as long as the present situation exists.

(4) Finally, we can only reiterate here that a longer-term solution lies not in any of the powers here mentioned but only in the development of a democratic and socialist movement in both Israel and the Arab states toward a Jewish-Arab rapprochement on a non-chauvinist basis, as we have spelled it out in the past. The events since October make it more urgent, not less.

The Heat Is on Hoffa and Beck

By JACK WILSON

The stench in the Teamsters Union will soon become noticeable with the opening of the hearings by the Senate committee on labor racketeering.

Advance reports on the Portland and Seattle phase of the hearings suggest that Dave Beck's empire may be about to crumble. For the Teamsters Union president personally built the West Coast machine in the Teamsters Union, and for years dominated it.

Naturally, many valuable union records have been lost or accidentally burned. In some Teamsters Joint Councils the financial officers are authorized to destroy the records yearly.

James Hoffa, Detroit Teamsters Union leader, repeatedly told a congressional committee a few years ago he couldn't talk about the financial records because

they were destroyed, and he showed the authorization for doing so from council minutes.

Hoffa, incidentally, apparently has changed his mind about testifying before the committee. He told Detroit reporters today that he is ready to talk to the committee if called, but he doesn't expect to be called. This seems incredible; any hearings that don't go over the ground covered by the congressional committee and examine to the end the financial manipulations of Hoffa and his associates would be strictly a whitewash or a sideshow on the problem of racketeering in the union movement.

It should be remembered that just when the examination of Hoffa became delicate and embarrassing, the whole thing was called off. The committee counsel resigned saying that pressure

from Washington had forced the ending of the hearing, and top officials of the Republican Party in Washington were implicated in the whitewash of Hoffa at that time.

Among the unresolved questions at that time were the story of the tieup between the attorney for the truckers' association and Hoffa in business deals; the use of a strike to force a trucker out of business, which then was bought in Mrs. Hoffa's name for a scant few thousand dollars, and which paid her enormous profits; the close and continued association of Hoffa with underworld figures; etc., etc.

It remains to be seen if Hoffa in the past two years has been able to make enough connections to get the heat off his back. He certainly seems confident that he will ride the storm out.

Observers at CP Convention Stress Open Fight Took Place

Eight of the observers, led by A. J. Muste, who attended the recent Communist Party convention have issued a statement stressing the genuineness of the ferment in the ranks of the CP as evidenced at the convention.

The statement was evoked by moves of the Eastland subcommittee of the Senate to open another inquisition, beginning with a summons to Eugene Dennis, and by statements made before the senate group by Carl Rachlin of the New York Civil Liberties Union, who was also one of the observers.

The eight observers declared that "the sessions of the convention were democratically conducted with vigorous discussion of all matters brought to the floor. There were many indications that no individual or group was in a position to control the convention." And: "Refusal to follow certain of the Duclos 'directives' was sustained by the convention by a two-thirds vote or better when matters of this kind came before it." Other indications were cited.

But while emphasizing this much, the statement also said:

"...it is specially valid in this case

to suspend judgment as to the extent to which the Communist Party has achieved independence and moved toward democratic socialism, and to let the actual behavior of the party and its members determine the verdict. We deplore the fact that the convention arrived at no clear condemnation of the military intervention in Hungary.

"However, in view of the upheavals in Poland and Hungary, the open airing in the *Daily Worker* in recent months of wide divergences among CP leaders and members, and the conduct of the recent convention as we observed it, to suppose as some apparently do that the ferment in the Communist movement here and abroad is merely an elaborate stage effect and that 'nothing is really happening,' seems to us to fly in the face of the evidence."

The signers in addition to Muste were: Dorothy Day, Bayard Rustin, Stringfellow Barr, Roy Finch, Lyle Tatum, Alfred Hassler, George Willoughby—all well-known pacifists associated with such groups as the War Resisters League, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Quakers, etc.

DISCUSSION ARTICLE

Independent Left Groups Pick Up in French Vote

By SAUL BERG

The January 13 by-election in Paris (briefly reported on in *LA* for Feb. 4) is worth a more thorough account because of its great symptomatic importance.

The election did not take place in a constituency that merely sends one deputy to the National Assembly, but in a district covering one-third of the city of Paris, sending some 15 deputies to the Assembly. This election of one deputy to fill a vacancy caused by death was therefore comparable in sweep to the election of a senator from one of our states.

The district involved has a population of one million, including about 600,000 old enough to vote. Over 50 per cent of the electorate turned out; this is unusual for a by-election in any country.

Competing were seven candidates of established major political groupings: Poujadists, Conservatives, Catholic MRP, Mendès-France Radicals, anti-Mendès radicals, Socialists, Communists. And there were also three minor left candidates: Claude Bourdet of the *Nouvelle Gauche* (New Left); Pierre Hervé, dissident Communist; and Pierre Frank, Trotskyist.

The election takes place in two rounds. On the first round, it takes over 50 per cent of the total vote to elect a candidate. If no one obtains this amount, a second election takes place; no one is eliminated, but customarily blocs are formed and, in any case, a simple plurality elects in the second round. Under these circumstances, people certainly can vote their favorite on the first round—there are no "wasted votes."

The Conservative candidate came in an easy first with over 30 per cent of the vote, all the other right-wing candidates running very poorly.

The "left" vote was much more divided. We include the Communists here because the mass of their voters can be considered truly a part of the "left" unlike the totalitarian party machine itself. In round figures the vote was:

Communist Party	60,000	20%
Socialist Party	30,000	10
Bourdet	13,000	4.1
Hervé	4,000	1.3
P. Frank	3,000	1

The only one of the above parties to suffer a decline was the CP, down from 26 per cent in last year's general election in this district.

THE "NEW LEFT"

What was phenomenally new was the fact that the vote of the "splinter groups" for the first time reached mass dimensions, totaling 20,000—one vote for every three votes received by the second strongest CP in Western Europe—two votes for every three received by the Socialist Party of the infamous Guy Mollet.

Further, this was not two-thirds of a very much shrunken SP vote; the SP was actually slightly larger than in the general election, evidently picking up more votes from the CP than it lost to the New Left.

In that general election there had been no minor left candidates. We may, however, compare this by-election with the 1952 general elections, when there were three minor left candidates in this district. At that time they polled the following percentages: Action Center of the Independent Left (a very loosely organized fore-runner of the New Left) 0.75 per cent; Trotskyists 0.5 per cent; dissident Communist (no relation to the 1957 dissident) 0.5 per cent.

The independent left, in short, went from 1.75 per cent in 1952 to 6.4 per cent in 1957. Even this jump can only be truly appreciated by one familiar with the tremendous stability (or should we say inertia) of the allegiances of the working-class electorate of Paris.

Since the best of the minor-party results was the New Left vote, it will be interesting to analyze their campaign.

Their platform emphasized three points: (1) Opposition to the "dirty war"

in Algeria; (2) opposition to the repression of the Hungarian people; and (3) the construction of a new socialist movement in France. Superficially this looks like a Third Camp platform, but when we investigate the New Left's views more thoroughly we find that it is still afflicted with many Stalinoid conceptions. In its analysis of the Russian bloc. However, let us leave aside the New Left's theoretical conceptions for another time.

The crucial consideration at this time is that it responded to the Hungarian events by complete solidarity with the Hungarian people, expressed by unambiguous support of the resistance of the freedom fighters and the workers' councils. It repudiated completely both stages of the Russian intervention; rejected the apologetics for the second intervention expressed by Tito and Gomulka; and endorsed the revolutionaries' demand for free elections.

CHANGING ORIENTATION

The Hungarian events also affected the New Left's attitude toward organization perspectives in France.

At its first national convention a crypto-Stalinist minority that wanted the organization to be a middle-class front for the CP was overwhelmingly defeated; but the majority, while favoring the building of a new party, conceived of it nevertheless as a marriage-broker to bring the CP and SP back to united-front action.

After Hungary this attitude was abandoned. The party's second convention, while continuing to endorse the idea of a united front with the SP and CP, set as its main aim the building of a mass party of socialism free from the taint of either Molletist colonialism or Stalinist totalitarianism.

Before Hungary, the New Left sought united fronts with local CP organizations on any and all problems. Since Hungary, united fronts are confined to local agreements for defense against attacks by Poujadist commandos.

Having noted the New Left's orientation in the campaign, let us see the scope of their effort. The organization raised 2 million francs (almost \$6000) in three weeks, for its effort. This is an unprecedented sum in France for a by-election campaign by an organization of modest size.

Thirty-five neighborhood public meetings were held, ranging in size from 30 to 300, plus a final central rally of 2000. Eighty thousand copies of an election edition of the party organ were distributed.

Finally, as to results in terms of membership: The New Left claims that this one month of intensive effort has produced in Paris 100 new members, four new party branches in factories, and the nuclei of six additional party branches in factories.

POSSIBILITIES?

Certainly then this campaign revealed significant possibilities for a new socialist movement in France.

Our own approach has been to emphasize the necessity for small left-socialist groups to participate in the mainstream of the mass socialist parties. However, this has been based on the general idea that this was the way to systematic participation over a long period of time in the experiences and struggles of the masses. If a group with a left-socialist and anti-totalitarian outlook actually does build a mass following under an independent banner, it should certainly get an encouragement.

In this connection, let us not be holier than the pope: The *Tribune*, organ of the Bevanites, who unlike ourselves are a mass left tendency in a mass Labor Party, sent a spokesman to give fraternal greetings to the recent convention of the New Left, and published an enthusiastic report on the organization by this spokesman.

Despite many political reservations on our part, this writer tends to echo his enthusiasm.

'THE LIBERAL IMMUNITY'

Following is Murray Kempton's column in the *N. Y. Post* on February 20.

By MURRAY KEMPTON

Last month, the City of New York announced that two longtime employees of its Borough of Manhattan resigned while under investigation for Communist associations. The announcement listed their names and addresses.

Now there was a delicate attention to which Herbert Brownell and the Republicans have never resorted. Richard Nixon plays a little loose with numbers, and gets called a fascist. Robert F. Wagner gives the *New York Times* the names of still-to-be-convicted security risks and gets endorsed by the ADA. Poor Dick Nixon, he's no liberal.

If he were, who can measure what he could do and still be endorsed by the Americans for Democratic Action?

He could be Averell Harriman or Robert Wagner and administer the the New York State Security Law, which was passed under Tom Dewey in 1951, to meet the emergency of the Korean War by protecting us from subversive civil servants whose continued employment "would endanger the security of defense of the nation and the state."

The Korean War is over, but the State Security Law is annually renewed and is any price you want to survive this session. By now, the State Civil Service Commission has widened its definition of sensitive positions to encompass the wild-

est reaches of its imagination and it covers geologists in the Department of Education, the probation officers of the Domestic Relations Court, and the employees in Department of Sanitation, this last "on the theory that disease might spread in the event the department did not perform its duty."

The Wagner administration has asserted its prerogatives out of this grab-bag with a passion of which its recent listing of the names of unconvicted suspects is only an extreme indication of general malignance. It went unsuccessfully to court to sustain the security-risk law discharge of a subway washroom attendant who had been expelled from the Communist Party in 1939.

Two years ago last July, the city fired Miriam Reif, a Bellevue stenographer, after she admitted membership in the Communist Party in 1942, but declined to name her associates in that dead time. Her lawyer has demanded that the Department of Hospitals show cause why Miss Reif's continued employment would endanger the city's safety; the department has refused for more than a year to give any answer.

When the State Security Law was extended last year, Gov. Harriman appointed a five-man committee headed by Whitelaw Reid Jr., to consider its revision. The Committee turned in a preliminary report which suggested that, at the very least, the Legislature amend the present law to confine its jurisdiction to (1) employees with access to material classified by federal officials as secret or top secret or (2) to persons with opportunities "substantially greater than those available to the general public" for sabotage.

The governor's response was to submit the report to the consideration of the Legislature. It was a typical piece of the passionless timidity for which liberal politicians are habitually forgiven. The governor's office has offered no bill to amend the present law; state and city legal officials remain committed to its enforcement; the Legislature is almost certain to extend it and the governor is almost certain to sign it again.

When these people do not neglect our individual freedoms, they abuse them. Last October, one Darwin Deen was caught painting his mothers-in-law's house on a Sunday; he was convicted by a local magistrate and the City of New York is throwing the full weight of its legal resources against his appeal. Just a few days ago, the License Commissioner's pursuit of smutty literature led to the summary arrest and hauling to the Tombs of six Staten Island storekeepers for stocking *Gent* magazine. The mayor who permits this kind of thing deserves the contempt of any sensitive citizen. Instead he gets the endorsement of our liberal guardians.

WHAT'S GOING ON?

For the only thorough account of the crisis in the American Communist movement, read the new booklet by

H. W. BENSON

The Communist Party At the Crossroads

25 cents.

Order from:

New International Pub. Co.
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

(15¢ each in bundles of 10 or more.)

NOTES AND VIGNETTES

The Revolutionary Democratic Opposition in Poland

By HAL DRAPER

In connection with the picture which we drew last week, and in previous articles, of the "triangle of forces" in the seething Polish Revolution, we want to present here some notes and vignettes on "our" corner of the triangle: namely, the revolutionary democratic opposition.

By this we mean in general the current, rooted in the working class and student population, which wants to push ahead ("prudently" or otherwise) to genuine democratization of the system and thorough independence of the Russian power, and which thus combines the socialist revolution and the nationalist revolution in its aspirations. In its most elementary form it is the "more' movement"—a good rough designation—that is, they want more than the regime is willing to give, although in their ranks are some of the most enthusiastic supporters of the Gomulka regime as against the Stalinists.

It goes without saying that this is no organized or formulated movement but a groundswell among the masses—think of what happened in Hungary for an analogous picture—and it has no sharp boundaries. These notes may help to make a little more concrete some of the disparate elements that enter into its effervescence.

1

'The Great Days'

One thing cannot be emphasized enough even if we wrote pages and pages on it: the fact that the "October Revolution" in Poland was a mass revolutionary upheaval from below, not a coup by Gomulka.

Anyone who does not grasp this may ascribe the revolutionary changes in Poland to Gomulka's bona-fides, rather than to the impact of the stormy upheaval and its threat; for as usual the hardest thing for bourgeois observers to see in such cases is the role of the masses. This is a terribly "abstract" idea for them, not to speak of being a subversive concept by very nature; they see Leaders delivering the people.

Some of the tang of the October days can be gotten from *Po Prostu*, the independent student organ which combines revolutionary-opposition currents with left-wing Gomulka-Communist elements, and which played such an important role in the events. Later the same month (Oct. 28) an interesting article in *Po Prostu* entitled "A Chronicle of the Great Days" gave a sense of how the freedom fighters felt themselves to be on the barricades. The emphasis on violence in the following passage is no doubt exaggerated but what's important is that the atmosphere comes through:

"Whenever I recall the atmosphere of those four days which shook Poland, it always occurs to me that all the high-flown remarks, such as 'the beautiful and noble act of restitution of our Republic' have something false about them. This is not so because the act was not beautiful or noble, but because this high-flown definition is in contrast to the violence used against lawlessness, deception and ignorance. The working class became confident of its own power and came to the conviction that it could commit this violence with justice on its side. The 8th Plenum was the first plenum of the Workers Party-[CP] in Poland which deliberated under the pressure of the people's masses and under the supervision of the working class keeping guard in their factories. This decided the course of the proceedings and the outcome of the Plenum; at the same time it enabled the Plenum to carry on its deliberations and guarded its physical safety....

"All this seems to justify the term 'revolution.' The revolutionary attitude of workers who, on the one hand, were perfectly calm and composed, and on the other hand ready—in case of emergency—to take the course of events into their own hands and use violence against the counter-revolutionary forces, such an attitude can be borne only in a revolution-

ary situation, when there arises a question of basic changes involving not only economic problems but also, and above all, political and moral problems; briefly, when there arises the problem of who should hold power... it became apparent that the indispensable condition for the overthrow of Stalinism is an active attitude of the working class and of society's main revolutionary forces, and, what is more, an active attitude in the sense of resorting to physical violence or, as took place in Poland, in the sense of manifesting the readiness to resort to such violence."

The vivid picture of the party leaders deliberating under the pressure of the revolution in the streets and factories says a good deal more about the Polish Revolution and the origins of the present Gomulka regime than many an article.

2

Worried Commissar

An appropriate vignette is contributed by Joseph C. Harsch, who covered the Polish election for the *Christian Science Monitor*. He was having lunch with "a Communist once very high in the party and still an important figure in Poland."

The Communist leader apologized for being late—he had had difficulty with a student delegation. Whereas in the "old times" (he said) he would have given them 10 minutes, he had spent three hours explaining why they should go along with the government's policies.

"'You know,' he went on in a tone of voice which assumed that we would understand and sympathize, 'this is a very serious problem we are having with the students. There are revolutionary tendencies among them. Almost anything could happen.'"

"There are 'revolutionary tendencies!' The phrase... reverberated through my mind.... Surely this was precisely the way an official of the czarist empire would have talked a hundred years ago about Polish students...." (Jan. 30.)

A few days later Harsch, with some astonishment visible, quoted "one of Poland's Communists" as saying to him: "The real choice all of us Communists have to face here now is whether we prefer to be hanged by Soviets or by Poles." (Feb. 5.) Harsch commented: "In Warsaw this sounded macabre, but not an overdramatization."

He is giving the sense that the party-Gomulkaists consciously feel themselves in the middle between hammer and anvil, between resurgent Stalinism and the revolution.

3

Behind Rehabilitation

A notable sidelight on the power of the revolutionary pressure on the regime can be gained from a revelation about the "rehabilitation" process that appeared in *Po Prostu*.

Everywhere in East Europe, "rehabilitations" of purges (dead or alive) have been used as an index to what is commonly called "de-Stalinization." Like everything else, rehabilitations in Poland have gone farther than in any of the satellites. The process began back in 1955, increasing greatly after the 8th plenum. Not only purged Communists but also ex-Socialist Party leaders, Peasant Party leaders, Home Army men, etc. have been decontaminated. It has been one of the prominent features of the "democratization" heralded in Poland.

Now we learn from a remarkably outspoken article in the student organ that these were not gains bestowed by a sympathetic new regime but extortions from

the Stalinist apparatus-men.

R. Zimand, a party member for 11 years, wrote as late as Dec. 9:

"Party Control Commissions are not capable of conducting rehabilitation, since they were formed with completely opposite goals in mind. I won't even mention their activities after the Plenum in 1949. However, after the Central Committee Plenum in 1955 the Control Commissions systematically wrecked party attempts to rehabilitate Communists released from prison. With few exceptions here and there, the Control Commissions represent the most extreme Stalinist faction within the party.... In my opinion, the [forthcoming] Third Party Congress will have to revise the matter of party control in a very radical manner. And those disgraced, who continue to defend the Stalinist Trinity to the last ditch, should depart and not judge anyone in the party, for they have no right to do so and no qualifications." (Italics added.)

4

'We Shall Fight...'

A feeling for the revolutionary climate of Poland appeared in a series of two articles to the London *Observer* by Lucjan Blit, a pre-war Polish Socialist Youth leader now a journalist in England, in a visit to his native country at about the turn of the year:

Commenting on the publishing thaw in Poland, highlighted by a weekly which is publishing extracts from Orwell's *1984*, Blit says:

"To be in Poland now is to breathe the air of revolution, directed not only against foreign domination but against the lies and the terror of the former regime...."

"Nowhere did I feel the atmosphere of the revolution so strongly as at a Congress of Revolutionary Youth, held here in Warsaw on December 6 and 7. This congress, which decided to dissolve the ZMP, the monopolistic state youth organization, and to replace it by three separate youth unions, had not even been called by the official leadership; all that happened was that the editors of a youth daily and of the famous students' weekly *Po Prostu* (Plain Speaking) published notices calling on young people everywhere to elect delegates.

"Two thousand came—representing young workers and groups of peasant youth, students' groups and members of the armed forces; some were Marxists, some were good Roman Catholics, but all were united in their will to defend the independence of Poland, to enlarge human freedom within its borders and to build a social system which they describe as 'humanistic socialism'...."

Blit himself seems quite favorable to Gomulka, but he winds up:

"Yet it is a healthy sign of the reawakened urge for mental independence that even Gomulka's most ardent political followers retain a critical reserve. At the youth congress a delegate of the Cracow students said, amidst stormy applause: 'We ought to support Comrade Gomulka, but only so long as the party continues on the way towards genuine socialist democracy. If they stop we shall fight against them.'" (Jan. 6.)

This is a direct threat. There, spoken out for a change, is the threat which lies just beneath the surface of the kind of "support" which haunts the Gomulka regime.

In his second article (Jan. 13) Blit mentions a couple of incidents which show the same spirit among the industrial workers:

"Even within the party, at recent membership meetings in Wola, a working-class district of Warsaw, and in Opole in Upper Silesia, representatives of the Central Committee would not get a hearing—not for any personal reasons, but simply because they represented 'authority.'"

That is, they represented the discredited authority of the party leadership. We can be sure that these same workers at

the very same time cheered the name of Gomulka to the rafters.

5

'The Poznan Stuff'

The revolutionary threat does not stay beneath the surface. No doubt it is not as important as the open warnings at the revolutionary youth congress, but here is a poem in the legal journal *Pravo i Zycie* of January. It is reported by the *New Republic's* Gilbert Harrison in a junket to Warsaw, and goes this way:

The bloody Communist sons of bitches!
We will plow these kolkhozes,
As far as the Ural mountains, so God help us!
Unless someone whom we trust should fail us, damn it,
Hell and damnation! What a row that would be!

But no, this is unlikely. And should we...
Again fall into that socialism of theirs?
Then, Marius, for this joking
They will have to drink the bitter stuff,

The Poznan stuff...

Among the other vignettes that Harrison contributes, on his superficial tourist-journalist level, is the following.

"I ask a Polish journalist what would happen to him were he to publish abroad a critical article such as that written by Djilas in Yugoslavia. Would he be jailed? 'No, no! No one is jailed. Not at this moment!'" (NR, Feb. 11.)

6

Fight On in the Youth

There have been indications of a continuing crisis in the youth organization, between those who want to stand pat on Gomulka's present line and those who want to press beyond.

We quoted above Lucjan Blit's account of how the new revolutionary youth organization was formed after the collapse of the discredited ZMP. (The ZMP collapsed in the October days simply because its youth left it flat.) For a while the former ZMP elements maintained themselves in a self-styled union of working youth.

At the same time there was also a separate youth organization set up alongside the shadow-Peasant Party and the shadow-Democratic Party, the two regime-controlled stooge parties. Just before the Jan. 20 election, Gomulka dissolved the Democratic Party youth league by police fiat, obviously because its political activities were getting out of the control of both its adult overseers and the regime.

The continued separate existence of the revolutionary youth and the regime's official youth obviously entailed embarrassment—for the latter. A merger back into one organization was brought about, the new league being called the ZMS Socialist Youth Union. Who would be dominant in it, the revolutionary oppositional youth or the regime's tried hacks?

On Jan. 26-27 in Warsaw the interim Central Committee of the new ZMS held its second plenum. We get only an echo of the tug-of-war within it from the discreet news reports of the Warsaw Radio for those dates.

"It appears from the report of the temporary secretary and speeches of the delegates that the organization is now passing through a critical stage. A number of unsolved factors have contributed to this, primarily the character of the organization and its ideological complexity.

"It is pointed out that the way to eliminate this state is a decisive break with the remnants of the practices of the Stalinist period, which still appear both in the central and regional branches of the organization here and there. Groups and committees of ZMS adopt administrative methods and there is the phenomenon of a mass invasion of routine workers from the ZMP—former Union of Polish Youth—in the ZMS apparatus."

That was the Jan. 26 broadcast, after the first day of the plenum. Two days later a summary report said:

"The second plenum of the ZMS interim committee which has ended in Warsaw has become a turning-point in the life of the young generation. A statement on the subject by... the secretary of the interim committee said that at the second plenum those accusing the

(Turn to last page)

PRO and CON: DISCUSSION

On Socialist Unity

To the Editor:

Comrade H. W. Benson in his article "Socialist Unity: With Whom?" [LA, Feb. 4] has tried to substitute a snide attitude for a serious political argument. This does not help contribute to a comradely discussion of regroupment. However there are some points that are worth an answer.

(1) Comrade Benson hints broadly that whoever does not wholeheartedly support the recent SP-SDF-sponsored Kethly rally has the "twisted mentality of the determined sectarian." He forgets to mention, however, that Kethly demanded before a committee of the UN "that a United Nations police force go into Hungary until free elections can be held." (N. Y. Times, Jan. 29, 1957, p. 8). I had somehow gathered the impression that LABOR ACTION would strenuously oppose such a demand, reasoning that such a "police force" would be a cover for Western imperialist intervention. Perhaps I have been mistaken. Does LABOR ACTION approve of sending UN troops into Hungary? Or Egypt? Or anywhere? If not, why does it support the supporters of American imperialism and call for unity with them?

Benson assumes that anyone who supports the Hungarian revolution should also support, without question, the Kethly meeting. On the contrary, in order to support the Hungarian workers in their opposition to both Stalinist and capitalist imperialism, one must oppose vigorously not only the Soviet intervention, already accomplished, but also the proposed UN (i.e., American imperialist) intervention.

(2) Benson asks the SWP whether it might favor unity with the Socialist Party. He answers his own question, putting into the SWP's mouth the words: "Not those 'State Department socialists!'" After all, this dialogue seems to say, isn't it silly for the SWP even to call the SP "State Department socialists," to say nothing of rejecting unity with it on that trifling account? This type of treatment may seem humorous to some people. But what does it say? The only meaning I can glean from it is that Comrade Benson does not consider the SP to be State Department Socialists; or, if he does, he considers this to be unimportant. How else can his remarks be interpreted? I would indeed be happy if I could be shown that the author did not mean what he seemed to mean, for it was in the pages of LABOR ACTION itself, not so long ago, that I first saw the term "State Department Socialist" and read very convincing arguments why the social-democracy in general, and the SP in particular, could never be entrusted with the task of building a socialist movement in this country.

(3) Comrade Benson indignantly denies that the ISL, by seeking unity with the SP-SDF, has "capitulated to American imperialism." After all, is it not obvious to "every informed socialist" that the ISL looks for the defense of socialism "to the struggles of the world's peoples against capitalism and Stalinism?" It "rejects in any form support to the totalitarian regime in Russia." Fine. But does it also reject in any form support to the capitalist imperialist regimes in the West? Judge for yourself: it seeks unity with the SP-SDF which, in Benson's own words, "maintains that the interests of democracy and socialism require critical support to the allied bloc [Western imperialism—M. W.] as against Russia."

Benson maintains that a lasting co-existence in one movement between the ISL and the SP-SDF is "possible," "desirable," and "urgent." If this is actually true, I can only wonder how the ISL has been able to resist this compelling necessity for the past sixteen years.

Benson does make one correct point in his article: it is the crisis in world Stalinism which has brought about the widespread interest in radical regroupment. The disoriented ranks of the Stalinist movement contain many honest workers who have been deluded by their party's loyalty to the Soviet bureaucracy. It is these workers who can be won over to revolutionary socialism; who can form the basis for a radical regroupment. One

of their few healthy attributes is their disgust with capitalist politics. They will never be won to the banner of the SP-SDF with its "critical support to the allied bloc," to use Benson's euphemism. The only kind of opposition to Stalinism that they will ever accept is a revolutionary opposition—not a capitalist opposition.

Unity, yes, not to the right, but to the left! May we for once be permitted to quote Trotsky without being called sectarian: "The revolutionary struggle does not suffer interruption. The conditions for it may not be favorable today; but a revolutionary who cannot swim against the current is not a revolutionary."

MARTHA WOHLFORTH

New York, Feb. 4

Reply

I confess, at the outset, that I find it impossible to take the *Militant's* outbursts on "regroupment" seriously. All the groups are talking about regroupment, which implies the possibility of new relations among the organized tendencies. In the face of this, which is new, the *Militant* calls for "regroupment" of workers into the SWP on the basis of its own program, succinctly formulated.

But that is not new. The SWP has been vainly seeking such a "regroupment" since its foundation, as has everyone else. But thus far, it has "regrouped" more workers from within the SWP to the outside than it has in the opposite direction. It is not alone in that either.

Now, thousands of socialist-minded people spurred by the crisis in world Stalinism are looking for a new movement, not for refuge in a minor sect, however perfect its program may appear to those who agree with it already.

It is hard to believe, too, that in the light of this new situation the *Militant* line can find unanimous acceptance among those members of the SWP whose long experience and training in the socialist movement have taught them that hard language and harsh characterizations are a poor substitute for politics. Of some SWP comrades self-proclaimed attachment to Lenin, we can say:

"The way he used to hawk and spit
They carefully copy it;
But his genius and his mind,
That's of quite another kind."

Now to take the question-objections in order:

(1) It is not a question of "wholeheartedly" supporting the SP-SDF rally. The point is that Weiss attacked the SP-SDF for daring to hold such a rally in support of the Hungarian revolution at all. She intimated that such a meeting was somehow illegitimate unless first a meeting to protest "U. S. imperialism's war plans in the Mid-East" were called. It is this, a failure to recognize that other socialists are moving in the right direction under the impact of workers' revolution, that I called "the twisted mentality, etc."

But Comrade Wohlforth looks askance at the meeting for another reason. Anna Kethly, she indicates, has called for a UN police force. This "cover for Western imperialist intervention" she cannot forgive.

Her hearty denunciations pursue that chain of reasoning which some *Militant* writers find quite convenient in avoiding any analysis of the real world of politics. In this case, the full treatment would go something like this: "Anna Kethly wants a UN police force; everyone knows the UN is dominated by U. S. imperialism; capitalist imperialism wants the restoration of capitalism and reaction and dictatorship in Hungary. It is obvious therefore that Kethly stands for world imperialist intervention and the restoration of capitalism. And anyone who supports her in any way is nothing but a capitalist agent too." Since Comrade Wohlforth is a novice at this sort of thing, she doesn't quite give us the full treatment.

In vain, Kethly might repeat and insist that she is against the intervention of U. S. troops; that she is against the restoration of capitalism in Hungary; that she recognized the power of the Workers' Councils and wants the end of Stalinism and its replacement by socialism and democracy. She cannot escape

the *Militant's* tirades because... the UN etc.

We are not for imperialist intervention and we are not for unleashing a new world war; and we oppose calling for a UN police force because it opens up the danger of both. That of course will do us no good either because... what about your support to the Kethly meeting—Kethly who is said to be for the UN force, which is for imperialism, which is for capitalism etc, etc.?

The UN (and this is only an example of the type of reasoning we are dealing with)—the UN is not identical with American imperialism although the U. S. government dominates it by and large; but not utterly and not completely. And because the UN affords a limited room for maneuver to colonies and oppressed peoples, they use it as a forum to publicize their struggles and to arouse world opinion. Precisely because it provides such a restricted arena, the UN gives rise, too, to illusions among people who genuinely want to fight for freedom.

The Hungarian revolutionaries, for instance, had illusions over the ability of the UN to support their fight for freedom. We do not share these illusions but we understand how they arise among democratic and socialist movements. We want to try to overcome illusions by comradely discussions; at the same time, we support all socialist and genuinely democratic movements in the fight for freedom, despite differences on such questions.

A chasm separates Anna Kethly from the Stalinist executioners of the workingclass. We are with her, as the representative of the revolutionary workers, and against the Stalinists. Anyone who puts on the same plane of hostility her reported appeal to the UN and the Stalinist terror against the workers... is living in the rarefied world of the anointed sect.

(2) If writers for the *Militant* like to titillate themselves by referring to "State Department socialists" they have the right to that private pleasure. I prefer to be accurate in my political definitions and I point out that the SP-SDF is generally for "critical support to the allied bloc as against Russia."

Is that an important question? Of course not! But it is not now decisive in connection with the unity question; and we propose to unite with the Socialist

(Turn to last page)

Congress and Civil Rights — —

(Continued from page 1)

not be caught dealing with civil rights in any way but the most lofty and abstract generalizations.

The civil-rights program coming up in Congress is widely regarded as a "minimum" one. By and large there is agreement that if anything is passed it will be similar to that one proposed by the Eisenhower administration before the 1956 election and reintroduced this year.

The key points in this "minimum" program are the proposals to protect the right to vote through federal authority to use court injunctions to prevent voting violations, and to establish a civil-rights division in the Department of Justice empowered to seek injunctions on behalf of persons denied civil rights and to bring suits against conspiracies to violate these rights.

The theory behind the right-to-vote emphasis is that once this is achieved all the other rights will come in time. While the right to vote is an important and vital right, it is not a cure-all.

This protection will be determined to great extent by how the federal government backs it up. And the vigor with which both the Republican and Democratic administrations have moved to protect this right in the past does not inspire confidence in their future actions.

For example, in the past election the Attorney General's office announced that the FBI was "investigating" wholesale purges of Negroes from voter registrations. Thus far Attorney General Brownell has refused to release the FBI report or to announce any action against those who have violated the existing law.

The vigor with which Brownell or a future Tom Clark would move to prevent future violations is open to great doubt.

It is evident that the chances for some

kind of "minimum" civil-rights program are better than at any time in recent political history. It is also evident that this turn of events is not due to a change in heart on the part of the political leaders of both parties. It is a cold and calculating decision. There is less concern for civil rights and justice toward the Negro people than for the trend of the election returns.

RACISTS'S TACTIC

Southern Democratic leaders in Congress realize the present situation: The votes for a civil-rights program are there any time the Republicans decide to move; and Eisenhower is determined to attempt to solidify the Republican gains won among the Negro people last fall.

Senator Lyndon Johnson has assured Northern liberals that he will not stand in the way of bringing up the "minimum" program. But not so for a group of about 20 Southern Democrats—and for Senator Eastland, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Their tactic is to delay civil-rights legislation from reaching the floor of the Senate till as late in the session as possible, and thereby increase the possibilities for a successful filibuster; or to force a compromise to water down the program to meaningless verbiage capable of being tied up in the courts for years.

Another piece of civil-rights legislation to come up at this session is the desegregation amendment to the school construction bill which is certain to be reintroduced again this year by Rep. Adam Powell. Up till now Congressional leaders on both sides of the aisle have been trying to avoid the Powell amendment like the plague while at the same time trying to avoid the appearance of not voting for segregated schools.

The latest strategy is reported by

Washington columnist Dorris Fleson on Feb. 26:

"The leaders' strategy is to keep the school bill a safe distance behind the civil-rights measures in both House and Senate. The civil-rights legislations, they figure, will enable members for and against to make their positions absolutely plain to their constituencies.

"The leaders argued next that, with everyone firmly on the record, there will be no need whatever to refight the segregation battle on the school bill. House Democrats from big city districts are not at all sure this is so, but they are listening.

"Senate liberals [no doubt Sen. Humphrey], on the other hand, have given assurances that they will put the need for school construction ahead of segregation considerations if and when the bill reaches them."

As if in answer to this cynical maneuver, Clarence Mitchell, director of the NAACP's Washington bureau, testifying before the House Education Committee on federal aid for segregated school construction, asked:

"By what logic does our powerful and rich nation say to its colored citizens: Even though you have won in a fair contest we shall continue to give your adversaries money with which to build illegal schools?"

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

March 4, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 9
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, 1879.—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

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

March 4, 1957

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

A Hungarian Fighter Assesses The Tactics of the Revolution

News continue to come from Hungary indicating that the youth and students who played such a crucial role in the events of last October have not yet been vanquished; that the work of the revolution has gone underground, but that it continues.

The current issue of *La Nouvelle Gauche* from Paris reports that the students have taken to clandestine organization. Returning to their universities, they were met by a brutal repression, and leaders were arrested as "counter-revolutionaries."

But these charges themselves were something of a guarantee of continued action on the part of the Hungarian youth. They were, of course, greeted by universal disbelief and, according to *Nouvelle Gauche*, secret papers are today being circulated among the students.

This may or may not be related to the persistent reports that another uprising is scheduled for the spring. But, at any rate, it is a fact of tremendous importance, one that indicates that the Hungarian Revolution is far from over.

MAJOR CRITICISM

Even more important is another document, printed in *France-Observateur*. This is a summary of an article being circulated in Hungary by a writer who uses the pseudonym of Hungaricus.

It attempts to subject the events of last October and November to a careful critique, from the point of view of a Communist Party member who participated in the rising, and to draw conclusions from this analysis for future ac-

tion. In part, it is addressed to the youth and intellectuals, in part to the older militants of the Communist Party "opposition."

The first major criticism of the work of the opposition within the Communist Party is that it did not organize itself into a faction:

"It [the opposition] discussed whether or not it should constitute itself a faction. But it did nothing to contact the people, in particular to establish positions of strength within the working class. It failed to establish relations with the bourgeois parties. Even on the very eve of the revolution, the Communist opposition in Hungary limited itself to drawing up petitions and making prophecies, à la Cassandra—courageous actions, to be sure, but not enough."

Hungaricus then goes on to make a sharp criticism of the role of the militants of the opposition, and of the youth and intellectuals in particular. They continued to argue and discuss, he writes, instead of concerning themselves with obtaining weapons:

"Even among those who constituted the massive base of the movement, the students of the university, there were far fewer combatants in the first days of the insurrection than one would think. ... The statistics published by the hospi-

tal indicate that 80 to 90 per cent of the wounded were workers. These facts underscore the notion that the principle error of the opposition was one of not organizing itself within the working class."

Another interesting comment is Hungaricus' attack on those who believed that Kadar had actually come over to the revolution. There was no evidence to assume this, he argues, not a single real act of Kadar's which would indicate that he had really joined the opposition. And now, clearly, he must be classed with Rakosi and Gero as a traitor to the Hungarian people.

But, he continues, even the present Kadarist party is rife with opposition. At the very first shot of a rising, it would melt away. For Hungaricus, it is obvious that Kadar's "Hungarian road to socialism" is "the direction of the Presidium under the direction of Rakosi-Geros and guided by telephone calls from the Russian ambassador Adropov and the commandant General Lashchenko."

THE REVOLUTION LEARNS

Finally, Hungaricus proposes a program of action for the older militants from the Communist Party and the youth and students:

"The socialists ... and the partisans of Hungarian freedom must separate themselves from all that is practiced in Hungary today under the name of 'socialism.' They must become independent. At the same time, however, they must unite their efforts and cooperate with all democratic bourgeois elements who do not seek a restoration of the old order, but a genuine development of the new."

And the very first task of this movement, Hungaricus contends, is to develop a new theory for socialism in Hungary. In this regard, he is critical of, but drawn toward, Tito, the pole of attraction apparently being the slogans of "decentralization" and "worker's councils" which emanate from Yugoslavia.

Thus the revolution teaches itself. The Communist opposition and the students are continuing their work, preparing for a new rising, but on a much higher level of consciousness.

The errors of October and November are being subjected to criticism; the necessity for organization, independent socialist organization, within the framework of a broad, national movement for democracy, is being recognized.

In this sense, it is once more clear that the Hungarian Revolution is far from over, that it is preparing itself for a new surge forward.

A MATTER OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

A recent decision of a Supreme Court judge in New York (where the Supreme Court is the lowest state-wide court) provides a legal prop for a particularly obnoxious piece of American political religiosity: the insertion of the phrase "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

This, the judge found, did not contradict any of the constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion and prohibitions against the establishment of religion. It was all very simple to him. During the recitation of the Pledge, an atheist or agnostic student could simply not say the words "under God" (and presumably take his hand from his heart at that point?).

In other words, one more freedom has received a temporary setback. For this is a retrogression from the principles announced in the Jehovah Witnesses cases; it is a new imposition of official piety on the public.

One hopes that the judge's solution—silence during the Pledge when the words come into it—will receive the treatment it deserves from the Appeals Court in the State of New York, and eventually from the U. S. Supreme Court. But it is hard to be optimistic. In these times of official piety and a "religious revival," the rights of atheists and agnostics are being progressively weakened.

Acting Out 'The Crucible'

By M. OPPENHEIMER

A most extraordinary theory on the social role of drama was advanced last Thursday by the adult director of the University of Pennsylvania theatre. This view, involving at once disapproval of a controversy for any drama group, disapproval of plays critical of our system of government, and above all disapproval of Arthur Miller, personally and "all he stands for," was so extraordinary that even the normally even-tempered and conservative *Daily Pennsylvanian*, undergraduate men's newspaper, came out of its equanimity editorial-wise.

Kathleen C. Quinn, director of the Pennsylvania Players and ultimate censor of what the Players present, closed (as far as she was concerned) a running debate concerning Miller's *Crucible* by stating she would never vote to have it openly produced at the university. It is scheduled for a closed workshop production, on the basis of which successful productions usually tread public boards afterwards.

"I do not think any dramatic organization, if it is going to live, should become involved in anything controversial," she said, "and Arthur Miller is quite controversial."

Thus even if a faculty advisory board recommended its production, Miss Quinn has censored the play from public performance in advance. Disapproval of Miller and what he stands for were given as the official reasons.

Asked about Miller further, the director stated that "He writes in a derogatory way. In his play 'All My Sons' he indicts a whole system of government—the American system."

This, apparently, is in contradiction to Miss Quinn's policy which is, she stated, to select plays "in order to show that those who have complained about the system are wrong." She stated further that "Students often do not have the maturity and ability to interpret a difficult role which may be beyond their experience."

The *Daily Pennsylvanian*, in a refreshing outburst, promptly charged Miss Quinn with "intellectual aridity," and went on to say that "Unless she is shorn of her dictatorial power the university campus can settle down to watch a succession of foam and froth devoid of creative thought." The *DP* opined that Miller's citation for contempt of Congress did not detract from his ability as a playwright.

The crux of the matter seems to be in the censorship powers one person exercises over the entire campus to prevent "controversial" and heretical thoughts from being presented.

It may be interesting to know that the very play which Penn's director is most upset about, "All My Sons," was produced as a long, successful run by the United States Seventh Army Symphony and Soldier Shows, stationed in Germany last year. The Seventh Army is not noted for harboring notions indicting our system of government.

It is undoubtedly true that most University of Pennsylvania students did not up till now have the experience to interpret some of the "difficult" roles of *The Crucible*. It is to the credit of the Penn Players' director that she has now created a local crucible to give them the experience they heretofore lacked.

EVERY WEEK—
Young Socialist CHALLENGE
appears as a section in all regular issues of Labor Action. Published, and independently edited, by the Young Socialist League,
it is the only socialist youth weekly in the country.
Don't miss it!

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 ACQUAINTED!

Young Socialist League
114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

- I want more information about the Young Socialist League and its ideas.
- I want to join the Young Socialist League.

NAME.....
ADDRESS.....
CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....
SCHOOL (IF ANY).....TEL.....

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM'S ROLE IN ABETTING THE DOMINICAN DESPOT . . .

DICTATOR TRUJILLO AND THE UNITED STATES

By JEAN ANDERSON

Recent publicity on the sinister operations in the United States of the Trujillo dictatorship has helped to focus attention on the unsavory regime in the Dominican Republic.

There was the murder and kidnaping of Jesus de Galindez in New York City, for example, and the widespread feeling that the American authorities have been remarkably inactive or ineffective in solving the case. Most recently there has been the German Ornes case, in which an enemy of Trujillo was kept out of the U. S. for a long time for no good reason except apparently the influence of the Caribbean dictator.

In both cases the question arises of the relations between this two-by-four tyrant and the U. S. government.

The terrible economic, social and political conditions under which the Dominican people live—to Trujillo's profit—have been aired in the U. S. press from time to time. In this article we shall be concerned, however, only with the degree of responsibility borne by Washington and the State Department for the Trujillo tyranny.

Came the Marines

The Dominican Republic occupies two-thirds of the island of Santo Domingo, in the Caribbean. Haiti, to the west, comprises the rest of the island. The population of the Dominican Republic is of mixed race, with many Negroes; however, the Negroes are not the dominating element as they are in Haiti. The cultural inheritance of the Dominican Republic is largely Spanish and Catholic.

The Dominican Republic is important to the United States because of its strategic position in the Caribbean. The United States wants a stable and friendly regime in the Dominican Republic so that it can better protect shipping and trade and the Panama Canal, and for use in naval operations and military defense.

The United States has intervened in the political affairs of the Dominican Republic ever since it was founded—once through actual invasion, and later more subtly, through economic control such as government loans, control of customs, and generally through the conventional forms of diplomacy. The extent to which the United States will go to maintain a stable neighboring regime is illustrated by its relations with Trujillo.

The Dominican Republic became independent from Haiti in 1844, and since then has had a long history of dictatorships and "strong" presidencies. But in the pre-Trujillo era, these regimes did not provide sufficient "stability" to satisfy the United States.

In 1905 and 1907, the United States arranged with the Dominican government for the collection of customs by American officers—operating under the rationale of the Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, which stated that the United States would intervene in an unstable situation to collect the foreign debts of a Latin American nation for European powers as well as for the U. S. itself—ostensibly so that no European nation would have an excuse to get a military foothold in the Caribbean.

In 1916 even the device of customs collection was not enough to guarantee the safety of foreign investments. The Dominican Republic was in the throes of rebellion and virtually without a government.

A STOOLIE MAKES GOOD

In order to put the situation under control and protect foreign property, the American Marines landed on Santo Domingo, completely suppressed the native government, disarmed the people, some of whom resisted, and set up a military government under the U. S. Navy Department. A constabulary or National Police was created, and the United States assumed complete financial control. (The U. S. intervened to a less dramatic extent in Haiti and Nicaragua at about the same time.)

The occupation lasted until 1924, at which time the Marines were withdrawn. In the meantime, the United States had conducted a considerable program of road building and public education—and also, in 1922, floated a loan which doubled the bonded debt of the Republic.

It was not until this period of military occupation that the American sugar corporations confidently established themselves in the Dominican Republic. It was also during the occupation that the Marines gave Rafael Leonidas Trujillo his start.

This start was certainly an ignoble one, according to Albert Hicks, who says that Trujillo entered the Marine Intelligence Service in 1918 and made his living by informing on his countrymen. Trujillo soon made friends among Marine officers, and this stood him in good stead when, in late 1923 or early 1924, they recommended and obtained the promotion of Captain Trujillo of the National Police to the post of commander of San Luis fortress in Santiago and hence second in line for the command of the National Police.

When the Marines withdrew, a provisional government was set up and free elections were held. However, customs remained under American administration until 1941.

Vasquez, who was elected president in 1924, named Trujillo a year later to the office of Chief of the National Police. In 1927 his title was changed by the Dominican Congress to General of the Dominican Army.

REBELLION FLARES

The situation which led to Trujillo's coup in 1930 has been explained in various ways.

Carleton Beals says that the attempt to clean up the army, resulting from the investigations of the Dawes Commission, caused intolerable friction within the higher circles of the republic. The American Commission was invited to Santo Domingo by the president in 1929 "in an effort to put the country's financial condition in order and to lay the basis for a new American loan. An attempt was made to force an army clean-up because of the exaggerated military expenditures due to increasing costs and rampant graft under Trujillo's administration. Though the direct charges do not appear in the commission's final report, the great economy urged was precisely the reduction of military expenditures."

The Report of the Dawes Commission, consisting of a study and recommendations, stated that the Dominican Republic must prove itself financially sound before it could enjoy unimpaired sovereignty; therefore, control of customs must last until the government debt was paid. And it did, in fact, recommend the removal of the National Army to a new Department of War and Marine.

Albert Hicks, explaining the internal political situation of the time, states that the coup d'état was possible because Vas-

quez tried to cling to his power by having the Constitution amended to extend his term another two years. This created a split in his own party, and caused men such as Estrella Urena, who was apparently honest but not too clever, to think of revolt.

The former American minister to the Republic was quoted in the New York Times at that point as saying that Vasquez' closeness to the United States was part of the cause of popular dissatisfaction with him. And Dexter Perkins ascribes the rise of the dictator Trujillo to the difficult social and political situation resulting from the depression.

It was most likely a combination of these factors that caused Estrella Urena to lead a rebellion against Vasquez in 1930 when the latter was seriously ill.

Estrella Urena, seeking the support of the army, conspired with General Trujillo. Trujillo complied by refusing to defend the Vasquez government, but later out-manuevered Estrella Urena and himself usurped political power.

AMBASSADOR'S ROLE

The American ambassador, Charles Curtis, played a very interesting and active role in the settlement of the rebellion, as reported by Dr. Jesus de Galindez in *The Era of Trujillo*.

The ambassador's aide, Cabot, interviewed Estrella Urena before the rebellion, and returned to the capital convinced that the situation was not very serious. Upon news of the uprising, Vasquez, his wife, and the vice-president took refuge in the American legation. There, Curtis was reassured by Trujillo of his fidelity to the government. When the rebellion was obviously advancing, Trujillo said that the government troops had been forced to capitulate. The rebel army entered the capital without a fight.

Curtis advised Vasquez to name Estrella Urena secretary of the Interior, so that Estrella Urena could constitutionally succeed to the presidency, from which Vasquez was to resign. Elections were to be held, with no restrictions upon candidates; however, Estrella Urena asked that the United States should not recognize a government headed by Trujillo and Curtis agreed.

The attitude in the United States was not one of alarm at the revolt. It was apparently bloodless, and American lives and property did not appear to be endangered. The United States apparently thought that the cause of the revolt was anxiety about Vasquez' clinging to power, and the Dominican people seemed to be on the side of Estrella Urena.

The secretary of State said after the revolt had occurred: "The Dominican Republic is going to hold an election, which presumably will be a fair and good one, and under such circumstances the person elected president will be recognized by the United States." [Italics added.]

But by March 18, 1930 the U. S. State Department knew that Trujillo was keeping the preparations for the elections from being fair. When Trujillo ran for president and was using soldiers to murder opposition leaders, Estrella Urena invoked the agreement that the United States would not recognize a Trujillo government. The State Department

REFERENCES

- The sources referred to in the course of this study are as follows:
- Dexter Perkins: *The United States and the Caribbean.*
 - Albert Hicks: *Blood in the Streets.*
 - Jesus de Galindez: *The Era of Trujillo.*
 - John Gunther: *Inside Latin America.*
 - Carleton Beals, in *Current History* for Jan. 1938.
 - Another book not directly quoted here is:
 - Paul Blanshard: *Democracy and Empire in the Caribbean.*

refused to give any clear reply.

Curtis feared that there would be a revolution on either side, but the State Department only told him to be expedient. He was to urge Trujillo to give up his aspirations to be president, but not offend him in case he won—in which case, the State Department showed itself ready to recognize the Trujillo government.

This reneging on the part of the United States served to encourage Trujillo to run for president and to continue his bloody campaign.

On May 18, election day, the polls were relatively quiet. The New York Times of that day reported: "No reports of election violence have been received, although a couple of heads were smashed this morning as a result of post-election hilarity." Trujillo had, in fact, murdered and imprisoned the opposition, or caused them to flee the country.

Curtis objected to the U. S. State Department that the elections were rigged; there were more votes for Trujillo than there were voters. Nevertheless, the United States recognized the Trujillo government in the same year.

Hicks reports that from the summer of 1930 to October 1931, "at least one thousand Dominicans who were on the Trujillo black list were killed. Thousands of others were imprisoned and tortured."

Trujillo had only begun to fulfill his pre-election portents of a bloody reign.

2

The Bonds Were Safe

In 1931 the Partido Dominicano came into existence under Trujillo's auspices. It was for many years the only political party in the country. Eighty per cent of the electorate joined within the year—it was a matter of "join or starve." Government employees were required to give 10 per cent of their salaries to the Partido Dominicano.

Trujillo took other measures besides the institution of a single party in order to consolidate his hold on the country. In April 1933 he passed a law penalizing persons who in their "writing, letters, speeches, or in any other way spread information of a subversive character."

The army was assiduously developed. In 1931 it was allocated 11.5 per cent of the nation's budget. In 1936 it took 16.1 per cent, while two of Trujillo's Marine cronies, Major Thomas E. Watson and Lieutenant Gregor A. Williams, were ordered to train the Dominican army, at Trujillo's request.

Aside from the helpfulness of the American navy, in 1934 State Department officials praised the Dominican Republic for a new agreement whereby \$16,000,000 of her bonds in the United States were refinanced. The acting secretary of State said that the effort that the Dominican Republic was making to meet its obligations had "set an example worthy of emulation."

Members of the Roosevelt administration said at that time that the bond extension was safe because the Trujillo regime could be considered stable, giving the following reasons:

"1. The loan problem is now solved. 2. The leading local business leaders are cooperating in Trujillo's reinauguration. 3. United States business interests have shown their support as evidenced by the attendance at the reinauguration of . . . the president of the American-Dominican Chamber of Commerce." (N. Y. Times, Aug. 16, 1934.)

TIGHT LITTLE DICTATORSHIP

The unholy amity between the State Department and Trujillo was already making its repercussions felt within the United States when, in 1936, a "March of Time" film was shown in New York which called the Trujillo regime "the tightest little dictatorship in the Caribbean." Secretary of State Cordell Hull expressed his regrets to the Dominican minister, saying that he could not censor the film because of freedom of the press in the United States, but that the government would regret "any such occurrences that might reflect on the cordial ties of friendship that unite the people of our countries."

Freedom of the press or no, the theater which was showing the film immediately censored it.

Except for this incident, Trujillo was quietly building his "tight little dictatorship" from 1930 until 1937 without too much unfavorable notice on the part of

From Protege of the Marines to Protege of the State Dep't . . .

the American press. Then, in October 1937, he perpetrated a terrible massacre which not only branded him permanently for what he was, but aroused such hostility within the borders of his protector, the United States, that he learned a lesson he has never forgotten.

Haiti, Trujillo's next-door neighbor, is a heavily overpopulated country. Hence, it was the custom of many thousands of Haitians to cross the border to find work during the day in the Dominican Republic, and to return to their homes in Haiti in the evening. Trujillo, for no apparent reason except an argument with the Haitian government, ordered his soldiers to attack the Haitian civilians living or working in the Dominican Republic near the border.

The estimate of the number of Haitians murdered runs from 15,000 to 20,000.

The story did not break in the United States until a month later, when it caused such outrage that even Congressman Hamilton Fish demanded that the United States withdraw its recognition of the Dominican Republic. (He was later invited to the Dominican Republic as Trujillo's guest, in behalf of better understanding, and subsequently became Trujillo's paid agent.)

For some reason, the president of Haiti remained silent all this time, and the affair was settled by a committee of the United States, Mexico, and Cuba. Damages of \$750,000 were awarded to Haiti, and Trujillo paid a third of it at once.

But Trujillo was so alarmed at the "bad publicity" he had received in the U. S. that he spent thousands of dollars, not on reparations but on lobbying and advertising in the United States, a technique he has used ever since.

Also, as a result of the bad publicity, Trujillo had a stooge run in his place in the next election, had three laudatory biographies published in English, and put forward an offer to take in refugees from the Spanish Civil War. This latter offer did not prevent him from recognizing the Franco regime in Spain "following similar action by the United States."

3

The Yankee Dollar

Trujillo, who had always known on what side his bread was buttered, now realized most sharply that he was a political embarrassment and must be especially attentive to every maneuver of American foreign policy. With World War II impending, he offered the harbor and other facilities of the Dominican Republic to the U. S. for naval defense. He announced a declaration of war on Germany and Japan in December 1941, although he was not then the president. His was one of the first Latin American countries to join the United Nations. Apparently he felt that his future was more secure "on the side of the democracies."

Nevertheless, he was suspected of cooperation with the Nazis, and it is thought that he received so much in lend-lease from the U. S. in order to keep him friendly.

Hicks says: "Many of his army officers were trained by the U.S. at bases in Puerto Rico, and arms and ammunition were shipped him in large quantities . . . large funds were sent him under lend-lease so that he might increase his shipment of meats. . . ." President Roosevelt congratulated him on his reinauguration in 1942, saying that the "magnificent support rendered by the Dominican Government and people in the present war effort is deeply appreciated."

Trujillo responded happily to this praise by urging all non-belligerent Latin American states to support the allied war effort. He also offered to take in 100,000 war refugees, and pointed to "Nazi propaganda" against the Dominican Republic, saying, "We are at war alongside the United States in defense of democracy and civilization." There were no Nazis in the Dominican Republic, he commented, "because of our watchful spirit."

DEFENDING DEMOCRACY

Along about 1945, of course, it was no longer the Nazis but the Communists against whom Trujillo was defending democracy and civilization alongside the United States. From 1945 on there were a series of incidents which appeared to

be attempted invasions of the Dominican Republic by exile groups, which Trujillo immediately branded a "Communist plot."

Actually, in 1945, when the Cayo Confites incident took place, the new Venezuelan regime, together with Dominican exiles and with the approval of the Cuban government, had projected an invasion of the Dominican Republic, where the ousted Venezuelan regime was under Trujillo's protection. The United States helped sabotage the invasion plans by confiscating a war-surplus landing craft which had been bought by the Cubans. Then the Cuban government changed its mind and broke up the expedition.

In 1947 there were more invasion rumors. Cuba seized on her territory four planes evidently intended for the invasion of the Dominican Republic, and later it was reported that there were more surplus planes and camps of men training in Cuba, which Cuba this time ignored. But the second attempt to invade the Dominican Republic was also a fiasco.

Trujillo was naturally indignant at the attempts, and publicly conjured up a vision of a "Caribbean Legion" directed against him by the Communists. Carleton Beals called the Caribbean Legion "largely a figment of a newspaperman's imagination," and said that it had a maximum strength of about 300 men, mostly exiles and adventurers.

BANKERS' BOY

Trujillo's economic dependence upon American and Canadian banks has been quite clear. At the outbreak of World War II, the Dominican Republic's exports of sugar to Great Britain collapsed, and the economy of the dictatorship was seriously threatened. At this point the U. S. Export-Import Bank lent the Dominican Republic \$3,000,000.

Dominican imports are chiefly from the United States, but the Republic cannot sell sugar to the United States because Cuban and Puerto Rican sugar is favored by this country. In a 1950 interview with a *Newsweek* reporter, Trujillo complained that he wanted to even up this balance by getting more purchases by the United States from the Dominican Republic. He complained of the United States preference for Cuban sugar, and asked for Point Four aid and American investments.

Trujillo has encouraged investment by the example of his cooperation with the American and Canadian owners of great sugar cane and some banana and cacao plantations in Santo Domingo. Corporate taxes are high, but labor is cheap, and there is a mutual "live and let live" policy established between the owners and the government.

In 1951, Trujillo got his wish regarding Point Four aid. He obtained technical assistance "in developing economic resources, educational programs and increasing productive capacity." The fact that much of the profits of this increased productive capacity would go into the personal treasury of the dictator seemed not to disturb the Point Four planners. Trujillo is personally one of the largest foreign clients of the National City Bank of New York.

According to John Gunther, American rights (and the Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine) continue to be safeguarded, as the United States retains "a lien on all Dominican revenues, not just customs, for gradual debt repayment, ending in 1969."

THE "ANTI-COMMUNIST"

Internally, and with an eye to opinion in America, Trujillo has adopted many "democratic" trappings. In 1945 he encouraged the formation of pocket "opposition" parties. In 1946 he coaxed out the few Communists by promising them political legality—and then smashed them. In 1947 he paraded the spectacle of a "Labor Party," with hand-picked candidates. In 1951 he modestly declined to run for the next election, and his brother Hector was nominated by the Partido Dominicano.

Before the United Nations in 1953, Trujillo took the opportunity to avow his anti-Communism. He charged that "Communists were organizing a Caribbean Legion with the help of the Red-tainted Guatemalan Government" and offered asylum to 25,000 non-Communist Jewish refugees from behind the Iron

Curtain. (He appears to welcome all immigrants, except Haitians.)

Meanwhile, the United States has found a useful instrument for dealing with flare-ups in the Caribbean in the Organization of American States, founded in 1948 by Secretary of State George Marshall. In the case of the Dominican Republic, it is U. S. policy expressed through the OAS that keeps the Dominican Republic from Haiti's throat.

(An aggressive incident on the part of Trujillo took place in 1950. Haiti complained to the OAS. Trujillo brought counter-charges against Haiti, Guatemala, Costa Rica, and Venezuela. An OAS Commission placed the blame on the Dominican Republic, Cuba and Guatemala, and threatened sanctions. Later, the OAS Council placed a greater share of the blame on the Dominican Republic "for allowing the domestic situation that created exiles to exist.")

4

A Trail of Blood

One of the unsavory, though minor, aspects of Trujillo's terrorism which has aroused more indignation in the United States is the audacious murder of his opponents on American soil. Actually, this is an old story for Trujillo.

In 1935 a man named Bencosme, secretary to Angel Morales, a leader of the Dominican exiles, was shoot and killed in New York City. He was believed to have been mistaken for Morales.

Currently, the De Galindez case has yet to be solved. A. A. Berle said recently that the United States' failure to act "is ascribed throughout Latin America (perhaps unjustly) to the extensive lobby and 'public relations' machine maintained by Trujillo in Washington." The federal government refuses to intervene, in spite of the fact that it has a right to enter such kidnapping cases.

Even more recently, a man who had testified on behalf of Nicholas Silfa, head of the Dominican Revolutionary Party, was attacked in New York by an unknown assailant.

Actually worse, since the State Department was an open accomplice, was the case of German Ornes, formerly editor of Trujillo's newspaper, who broke with him and left the Dominican Republic for the United States. Ornes later went to Cuba for a press conference in order to clear his name of Trujillo's accusations, and then was not permitted to return to this country; he had been warned by the State Department before he left that he might not be allowed to return. For a while his enforced stay in Havana made him a sitting-duck for Trujillo's assassins, but finally, after considerable publicity over the case, Washington yielded.

TERROR OPERATIONS

More items in this bloody record are listed in a recent article by Prof. Robert J. Alexander (*New Leader*, Feb. 11):

"A few years ago Andres Requena, a Dominican-born U. S. citizen who edited an anti-Trujillo periodical in New York City, was murdered gangster-style while leaving his home. In 1950, an anti-Trujillo labor leader, Mauricio Baez, then living in exile in Havana, Cuba, mysteriously disappeared without a trace. About a year and a half ago, another important anti-Trujillo exile was murdered in Havana, causing a tremendous sensation in the Cuban capital."

Alexander also recounts some recent Trujillo persecutions. The liberal anti-Franco magazine *Iberica*, edited by Victoria Kent, reprinted sections of De Galindez's book; soon afterward the government started an investigation into Miss Kent's status in this country, even though she has resided here for over six years as a representative of the Spanish Republican government in exile and her status has never been questioned before.

As for Silfa, says Alexander, two attempts to frame him have been made in the last year. In one case, incriminating evidence was placed in his car; fortunately he discovered it accidentally and turned it over to the police immediately. Then his home was suddenly raided by six policemen without warrants, and "evidence" against him found, for a case now pending in the New York courts.

Clearly the Trujillo dictatorship needs

good will in the U. S. It buys and pays for it, in order to keep public pressure from exercising too much influence on the complaisant attitudes of the U. S. authorities.

An important step was taken in stepping up Trujillo propaganda here when it was announced in February of last year that Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. had been hired as legal representative of the Dominican Republic. Alexander says that Trujillo has spent "many hundreds of thousands of dollars" on advertising his virtues to the American public: full-page newspaper ads, outdoor billboard displays, etc.

New York City's leading Spanish-language daily *El Diario de Nueva York* has been taken over by Stanley Ross, long-time editor of the Ciudad Trujillo daily *El Caribe*, who was refused credentials last October at the Inter-American Press conference in Havana on the ground that he was a Trujillo agent. Under its new management, *El Diario* has been attacking democratic critics of Trujillo in Latin America.

A series of "Dominican Friendship Societies" and "Anti-Communist Associations" have been cropping up all over the U. S. as well as Latin America; in New York there is the "Pan-American Anti-Communist Association of New York, Inc." These outfits eulogize Trujillo and smear his opponents.

Prof. Alexander adds: "The Dominican Government has also spent sizable sums in Washington on lavish entertainment of U. S. public officials who it feels might be useful. These expenditures have borne fruit in the form of eulogistic statements by some U. S. congressmen concerning the Dominican dictatorship."

The government does not seem to be exactly zealous in investigating to see whether the Foreign Agents Registration Law applies to some of these enterprises and their promoters, in spite of the exaggerated concern which it has shown on the other hand about the open activities of Trujillo opponents like Victoria Kent and Silfa.

The man who began as a protégé of the Marines is still a protégé.

WHAT THE U. S. PREFERS

If the invasion of Santo Domingo by the U. S. Marines in 1916 was a blatant example of an imperialist adventure, the "Good Neighbor Policy" which was encouraged in the Caribbean after the Marines had withdrawn was only a subtler way of conducting the State Department's policy of interference and influence in countries to the South, most often to the complete disadvantage of any development of political freedom in those countries. The Dominican Republic is clearly a case in point.

Albert Hicks states that "the policy of the State Department in the past, and especially during the war [World War II], when perhaps there was no other choice, helped considerably to write the sanguinary history of Santo Domingo under President Trujillo. For it cannot be denied that the United States Marines lifted their protégé, Rafael, to power, and that the State Department helped keep him there."

A. A. Berle makes the same point in characteristically milder form, in the *New York Times* magazine for July 15, 1956, when he says, in connection with the case of Peron:

"The exaggerated diplomatic detachment of the United States raised the question whether, in reality, the United States does not prefer ruthless dictatorship which will go along with American foreign policy to less manageable but real democratic evolution."

The case of the State Department and Trujillo seems to be one answer to the question which Berle raises.

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 Opposition in Poland — —

(Continued from page 3)

ZMS activists of betrayal of the movement had suffered a defeat. A similar defeat was inflicted on the theories that the revolutionary spirit must be expressed by shouting, by negation.

"The sound tendencies were victorious—the tendencies favoring the positive program of the participation of the organization in the renaissance of political life, the Polish model of socialism based on humanism, and the struggle for the interests of youth.

"The draft of the ideological-program declaration speaks clearly of the ZMS standing on the basis of the community of aims with the Party of the working class and helping actively in the building of socialism. The draft also states that the ZMS should be an independent organ and have an independent administration, while its ideology will be worked out by its members."

From this it is not altogether certain which tendency is dominant in the leadership, but it is clear that there is an open fight on, as could be expected from the vanguard youth.

7

Reprieve on Credit

As was characteristic of Hungary, the indications of revolutionary dissatisfaction in workers' circles do not tend to take such literary or volatile forms as attracts journalistic attention like those of the students, cultural spokesmen or street demonstrators. But every turbulence here is far more dangerous.

One indication is such a reference as we find, for example, in the Paris *France-Observateur* of Dec. 20 in an article by Frédéric Barraud which is quite sympathetic to Gomulka, but which makes

clear that: "workers' meetings are multiplying that are often tumultuous. They take place sometimes simultaneously in several cities and more and more have a tendency to make demands and to protest that the new regime has changed nothing in their situation."

The most dangerous swell of working-class rebellion that threatened to get out of Gomulka's hands was, of course, the threat of the Poznan workers to strike, especially since Poznan is a magic word and the Poznan proletariat tend to feel, not without justice, that they play a role like that of the Kronstadt sailors in the 1917 revolution.

Philippe Ben, *Le Monde's* excellent correspondent in Warsaw, reported Dec. 15:

"It is easy to imagine the effect that the Poznan workers' ultimatum had among the leaders in Warsaw. Several members of the Central Committee, it is said, yesterday hide themselves to Poznan to persuade the workers to withdraw their threat, which furthermore had no chance of frightening the Soviet leaders. The efforts of persuasion were crowned with success. Finally the workers decided not to start a strike for the moment, but they demanded that their resolution be brought to Gomulka's attention."

This time it was a reprieve, bought with Gomulka's limited supply of political credit among the revolutionary masses. But the threat still hangs high: "If they stop, we shall fight against them."

PRO & CON

(Continued from page 4)

Party-SDF where this and other important questions can be discussed in a comradely fashion, where in fact such questions have been and are being discussed.

(3) Aha! then you are for support to "capitalist imperialist regimes!" If comrade Wohlforth puts it in the form of a question, it is only out of self-restraint. The chain of reasoning is implied: you are for unity with the SP-SDF; which is for critical support, etc; which means support to imperialism; which means pro-capitalism. Thus, she feels it necessary to admonish us against supporting capitalism! Come, come now, Comrade Wohlforth!

She has learned to swim against the current. But it is a poor swimmer who can travel only in one direction. The currents of political life are changing; that is what is new. It is now and not 16 years ago that the possibility of a new beginning for socialism arises. It is now that the Socialist Party, if it rises to the occasion, can serve, better than any other group, to rally thousands away from Stalinism toward democratic socialism. At any rate, a resurgent movement is possible, not a slightly enlarged sect but a renewed broad movement. Those in the SWP who are content simply to cry out wildly against it are tragically cutting themselves off from it and placing themselves in imminent danger of ending up as a hardened, sterile sect.

H. W. BENSON

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

Max Shachtman

will speak in

BERKELEY, CAL.

on

Regroupment:

REBUILDING THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

March 8

Fri. eve., at 8 p.m.

Finnish Brotherhood Hall
1970 Chestnut Street

Sponsored by ISL & YSL

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now, such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Please enter my subscription:

- 1 year at \$2. 6 months at \$1.
- Payment enclosed. Bill me.
- New sub. Renewal.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

ISL FUND DRIVE

Starting Pace Is Too Slow

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

By this time all of our readers know that the 1957 Fund Drive of the ISL has started. The drive begins this year not only after completing the first important stage of our fight on the Attorney General's list, but what is more important, at a time when the problem of socialist regroupment has become a primary question for all socialist organizations in this country.

All groups have addressed themselves to the problem, but none in such clear and precise terms as the ISL. More than any other section of the socialist movement the ISL has understood how indispensable is socialist regroupment for the future development of a broad democratic socialist organization in the United States based on the broad labor movement.

Because it understands that basic need the ISL has made public its position in favor of unity with the Socialist Party-SDF in response to queries made of it in that organization. The ISL considers that the SP-SDF can become a rallying center for socialist regroupment on the basis of democratic socialism. Such a rallying center for all democratic socialists is imperative in preparation for the future.

The ferment in the CP is one vital element of the changing currents in the political movements in the working class. Here too our readers know how quickly we responded to the struggle there. We have tried to influence dissident elements in the CP to make a clean break and to come out in behalf of democratic socialism. One of our instructive contributions in that struggle is the pamphlet by H. W. Benson, *The Communist Party at the Crossroads*.

These developments make it imperative that **LABOR ACTION** and *The New Internationalist* be secure for the coming year. The only way to secure these periodicals and to ensure the voice of the ISL in this period is to put the fund over the top.

It is yet too early to establish any trend in the drive, but in all candor we must tell you that contributions are coming in too slowly for comfort or satisfaction. We have to step up the pace of the drive and do it quickly.

This is a call to the branches of the ISL. It is also an appeal to all readers of **LABOR ACTION**, to our friends and sympathizers. Get behind our fund drive. Contribute as much as you can, making

your payments to: Albert Gates, 114 West 14 Street, New York, N. Y.

Note to the branches of the ISL: Those of you that are still in the zero column, make the change in your standings in this coming week. We want no zeros in our next report.

Fund Drive Box Score

City	Quota	Paid	%
	\$10,000	\$757	7
Buffalo	100	65	65
Detroit	400	170	42.5
Newark	450	88	19.5
Chicago	2,000	200	10
Cleveland	150	15	10
Philadelphia ...	200	12	6
New York	3,900	200	5
Nat'l Office	1,250	0	0
Los Angeles ..	650	0	0
Bay Area	400	0	0
Pittsburgh	200	0	0
Seattle	100	0	0
Reading	75	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
St. Louis	25	0	0
Mass.	25	0	0
Streator	25	0	0

CONTRIBUTE TO THE ISL FUND DRIVE

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the ISL's Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

(Make checks out to Albert Gates)

Labor Action FORUM • New York City

Thursday, March 7

ANNE RUSSELL discusses
the current drive by the AFL-CIO:

RACKETEERING IN THE UNIONS

8:30 p.m. at LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

SAT. EVE., March 9—Come to the joint ISL-YSL Spring Social,
9 p.m. at Labor Action Hall.