

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Changes in Poland Called Socialist Setback

Editor, Daily Worker:

After the D.W.'s change of line following Mr. Khrushchev's secret speech one could have forecast its reaction to the grave events which began in Poland last week-end. These serious developments are hailed with childish glee as a triumph of democracy, when they in fact constitute a serious socialist setback.

That the regular newspapers also hail democracy is understandable, since to call it a setback for socialism would be undiplomatic and give the show away. But that the D.W. should in so short a time have retreated to this immature analysis is a measure of the degeneration of scientific thinking among those who speak for the Communist Party in the United States.

When great capitalist states such as U. S. or Great Britain utilize their capital gains to invest their wealth in foreign countries, whether through cartels, banks or a Marshall Plan, it is proper for all honest democrats who believe in the independence of nations to be on the alert against political interference to defend the sovereignty of the beneficiary state, and to prevent the spread of imperialism and colonialism.

But the rise of socialist states creates a qualitative change in the relation of state to state, be one as big and stable as Soviet Russia and the other as small and insecure as Poland. If it be a law of capitalism—apart from the preference of capitalists—to export capital for economic and political exploitation, it is not a law of socialism, which has no need and in fact cannot advance as socialism through such exploitation.

The path of socialist states must be one of economic co-operation out of which necessarily flows political collaboration. It is that relationship which has heretofore existed between Soviet Russia and Poland, in fact among all European socialist countries, until Yugoslavia took the path of non-cooperation. . . .

Only a sound internal economic policy correlated with a policy of co-operation among all socialist states, through a common, general economic plan for the benefit of each, could insure that socialism would be as firmly established in Yugoslavia—and Poland—as it had been in Russia, and at far less cost and travail.

But such a policy of socialist collaboration entailed a solemn responsibility upon the leaders of the new socialist states. Instead of going their own way, to failure, they were, one may say, obligated to take the right way, however difficult, to achieve success. Plainly Tito was not prepared to live up to his obligations, and now it is clear that the Polish leaders are equally unwilling. Perhaps this explains why, of all the astern democracies, Yugoslavia's economic recovery should be the slowest,

and I am afraid that Poland will experience the same economic downgrade.

Undoubtedly friction existed among the socialist partners through the years, but friction is a natural aspect of relations between states. What matters is how the conflicts are resolved; in this instance they have been resolved by the termination of relations as socialist collaborators. What will take its place is a new relation, no different than that between the United States and Israel or between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, a relationship of a wholly different and lesser quality.

I have no doubt that the socialist collaboration between the Soviet Union and Poland placed severe burdens upon the Polish leaders. They were called upon to fulfill quota tasks in which they failed; their failure surely resulted in suffering among the people which prompted complaints against the immature government. It is not unlikely that sharp conflicts developed within the government, not over Democracy vs. foreign dictation but over the government's failures. The Pros and Cons had it out, and those who favored an end to socialist collaboration have won out, for the present.

They would make it appear that their victory was a triumph for Democracy, but as one reads Mr. Gomulka's speech (N. Y. Times, Oct. 21) the opening sentences tell us plainly that what transpired was a weakening of socialist economic collaboration. That is the heart of the week-end's events, and it is no wonder that all anti-socialists rejoice.

To prattle, as does the D.W., about Democracy in this context is to make the word meaningless. There is not the slightest evidence of Russian interference with Polish sovereignty; and the non-exploiting collaboration of the two states, one big and powerful, the other small and weak, has been a true example of Democracy, democracy of a higher quality than we have unknown in past history, heretofore impossible because of the limitations of a capitalist society. Failing to understand this the D.W. writes as if it were dealing with the U.S. and Guatemala or England and Kenya or France and Indo-China.

Further evidence of this primitive concept of Democracy appears in your reference to the right of the Polish press to criticize the Soviet press and vice versa. No one denies the right; no one has tried to stop the Polish papers; but the real issue is how the right is exercised. If Poland's action is a retreat from socialism then the Soviet press' condemnation is warranted and the Polish press' retort should be criticized. That's Democracy! Democracy does not mean the freedom to utter falsehood with impunity, to deny scientific truth, to conceal the real cause and effect of events.

I am afraid that the rate of European socialist's progress,

which was first affected by Yugoslavia's defection, will be further retarded by Poland's action. This episode also makes clearer why the Cominform and Stalin were so gravely and presciently disturbed by the conduct of Tito and the Yugoslavian Communist Party eight years ago in giving birth to "Titoism."

—A. UNGER

Suggests Articles On 'Moscow's Path'

Editor, Daily Worker:

What with all the rhubarb going on between the USSR and Poland, the USSR and Yugoslavia, the USSR and Hungary, etc., etc. on the various approaches to socialism, it would be a real service if Joe Clark could have a series on just how Moscow's path (tried, tested and found wanting) differs from, let's say Tito's path.

Just to comment on this, whatever else may or may not be true about Soviet interference in Poland the unsolicited presence of Khrushchev and the others smacks of the most rank attempt to intimidate a sovereign state.

Imagine the hue and cry if Ike and Dulles flew to Paris (uninvited) to "help along" in a governmental crisis there. Not a true analogy—some may say, we are capitalist and the USSR is socialist (just a little friendly socialist prodding).

We are all the more capitalist (imperialist) the more we interfere in the affairs of other nations and the USSR is all the less socialist the more it does.

Congratulations on an excellent editorial stand on the Polish situation.

—E.K.

Colo. Demo Hits Smears

DENVER.—Supporters of former Rep. John A. Carroll, Democratic nominee for Senator from Colorado, have reacted vehemently to the revival of the "smear" of the 1954 campaign. At that time material put out in leaflet form by "The Rev." Kenneth Goff of Englewood, hate merchant of the G. L. K. Smith type, was reproduced as full-page newspaper ads in the campaign of the Sen. Allott (R). The ads attacked Carroll's vote against the McCarran Act in 1950.

Carroll answered with a defense of his vote. In February of this year, when he urged a Congressional investigation of bribe charges in connection with the natural gas bill, he returned to the subject. Carroll then asserted in the 1954 campaign, oil and gas millionaires sent nearly \$100,000 into the state to defeat him. This money financed the ads based on the Goff leaflets.

The same leaflets, called the "pink slip", have appeared in the present campaign, and State Democratic chairman Fred Betz has charged a hidden connection between Goff and the GOP.

(the states the right to prosecute