

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Praise for 'A Season of Fear'

Editor, Daily Worker:

A book has been published by Cameron Associates that all readers of the DW will want to have in their homes. It is "A Season of Fear" by Abraham Polonsky, and it is one of the finest books of the year and by far the most outstanding achievement by a writer of the Left this year or last. It is the story of the effect the signing of a loyalty oath produces upon a basically conformist American.

Polonsky is to be congratulated for the deftness with which he has attacked a national disgrace, and also for the extraordinary talent he demonstrates as a writer of real stature in "A Season of Fear."—H. B.

Psychiatry Question

Editor, Daily Worker:

Here is a problem which progressives have faced and which they have had to work on alone. As we know, people have problems, not only with making a living, being active in the movement, but also in their personal lives. Many good, very active people have problems with their wives or husbands, or lack of either of these necessities. Social and sex problems can destroy peace of mind and ability to lead campaigns for the improvement of our lot in this country.

What do ordinary people do if they have the means? They go to psychiatrists. They say, in effect, "Look, I have held on to this problem so long it is killing me. Maybe you can help me?" And they get lots of help.

But in the movement, this has been for a long time taboo. Horrors! A psychiatrist may be a Freudian or an Alderian. A Communist should not deal with such! What should he do? Take his problems up with the Section leadership. He could take them up once, twice, three times. But they persist. He is ashamed to discuss his private life—all the time with the Section. Nor do they have the time to spend on him. How can each Section meeting have an item called: Why Mary doesn't get married?

Mary, or Louis, is depressed. Mary goes to meetings four nights a week, but comes Saturday night, no boy friend, no husband. Louis is married, but is unhappy with his wife. Both know that people who go to psy-

chiatrists get help with their troubles.

Sometimes they can find a psychiatrist who is progressive, sometimes not. What happens? Often they go for help anyway, and their resentment at the Section, which loves mankind in the mass so much it has no time for the individual, freezes into dislike, distaste. Very often they leave activity altogether.

I am aware that fear of giving information has stopped many progressives. I am aware also that many have helped the movement by being able to help themselves better after psychiatric treatment. We must have some pity for those who suffer and help them find the right psychiatric help. We must stop just shoving them away. We need them too much.

—A Good Friend of the D. W.

Organizers as Well as Observers

CHICAGO.

Editor, Daily Worker:

Recently, the Chicago Daily News carried a story by its foreign correspondent, William Stoneman, which we believe demands the attention of the Daily Worker and the National Committee of the Communist Party.

Stoneman reports, on the basis of intelligence "experts" in Vienna, that a new explosion is in the making in Poland. This, he says, is timed for the January elections and if it breaks will be "worse than the Hungarian blood bath."

It is regarded by these experts as particularly important because they expect it will be accompanied by a similar movement in East Germany. Under such circumstances, these gentlemen believe it would be unthinkable for the West German army not to march into East Germany. Czechoslovakia would not be much help to the socialist countries, in that event, because Slovakia, center of the old Hlinka fascists, would not be reliable.

And, then, the punch line: **"the West and the United States would not be able to sit idly by as they did in the case of Hungary!"**

A number of commentators have made observations similar to Stoneman's, including the idea that if such events developed, NATO would have to act as a supply center for the "guerrillas" active in central Europe.

It is obvious that the "experts" are organizers as well as observers of this movement. It is obvious that there are people who hope through Poland to achieve in January what they failed to achieve in Hungary in November: **the restoration of capitalism and landlordism, even if it means a third World War.**

Gomulka and the Polish Party have made important advances on the road to greater democracy and towards economic reforms. In doing so, they have served the best interests of the Polish people and of socialism. But this has only made more desperate the old capitalists, landlords and foreign corporations who had big holdings there. For them, it is now or never. They are ready to sacrifice tens of thousands of Polish, German, Czech—and American lives, if need be—to get back their right to live off the backs of the Polish workers and farmers.

It is our responsibility here in the United States to help curb and bridle those forces in our own country who egg these elements on. Millions of Americans, who desire peace, do not approve of the activities of Radio Free Europe, of the foreign embassies and their "experts," of the Leo Chermes, of the Free Trade Union Committee, of the Lovestones and Browns, and others who are sowing civil war, counter-revolution and possible world war in Central Europe.

Fortunately, there are other forces, even among the American capitalists and in public life who recoil from this perspective which Stoneman reveals. This split was reflected by another correspondent of the Chicago Daily News, Ed Lahey.

The latter states from Warsaw that Poland can be a bridge between Russia and the United States. He urges that we send Poland the things she needs: grain, fats, machinery for the coal industry, etc. But, he says, this must be done "by treating the Poles as people rather than an important pawn in the global game of limiting Soviet influence."

As far as we Communists are concerned, important as our debate about Hungary is, it is far more important that we unite to help curb the war plots revealed by the "experts" for January in Central Europe. It is important, both for the cause of

socialism and of peace, that all Americans struggle for the Lahey line against the Stoneman line.—Emanuel Blum.

The Cardinal and Movie Criticism

Editor, Daily Worker:

Setting the tone for his column of Baby Doll, David Platt states that history will record Cardinal Spellman . . . rose from his pulpit midway through solemn mass to denounce Baby Doll. This, while humanity was engaged in a titanic struggle with life and death questions, says Platt.

Unfortunately there is nothing here to be sarcastic about. I recall Mao Tse Tung delivered lectures on art in the midst of the Chinese civil war.

Platt states that the Cardinal went far beyond the question of Baby Doll, attacking the producers of the film and challenging the revised and relaxed movie code which now permits the discussion of formerly forbidden subjects. Is this automatically wrong?

Marxist writers have frequently attacked producers. As for the revised codes. I would not be too surprised if they really do represent a step down on the moral ladder.

Platt states further that Spellman has set himself up as a critic of the arts. I see nothing wrong in this. It is the privilege of every man, even Cardinals. Marxists do it all the time.

If Spellman denounced The Miracle, that is his right. We and many Catholics may disagree with him and that is our right. Of course, Spellman is in a powerful position. But as long as Catholics subscribe to censors within their ranks, their authorized censors have the right to express their views publicly and to take action as a pressure group.

The method and goal of this action is another story and one which concerns us. If the producers succumb to such a group, and if the group is always wrong, then we should also criticize the producers. If the pressure group is right on occasion, we should support them with such qualifications as we think necessary.—R.B.

Contrasts Poland With Hungary

Editor, Daily Worker:

On the basis of available in-

formation I believe that the SU made a bad error in Hungary which compromised itself and the world socialist movement.

Those who disagree with this, claim that: S. U. had no other choice, that the other alternative was fascism or at least capitalism in Hungary, that there was a possibility of imperialist armies entering and acting as a spearhead of reaction in the socialist camp of countries, that all of this would endanger the world peace.

I think there was other choice. The S. U. should have spoken out and not with tanks! S. U. should have made a declaration that it would not tolerate a fascist state in Hungary nor any other army entering there. A "Monroe Doctrine" of its own! (And is it not obvious that there is such an understanding between governments? How else does an isolated socialist country like Albania remain unmolested?) Furthermore they could have brought in the Red Army not into Budapest but to the western Hungarian border. Thus by word and action there would be a convincing argument for "keeping pigs snouts out of the socialist garden." At the same time that would demoralize the local fascist gangs. With some little help to the Hungarian workers the fascist scum could have been put in their place in a short time.

In recent notes to leading capitalist governments S. U. claimed that it is strong enough to take over the rest of Europe without using atomic bombs. This is obviously true since Gen. Eisenhower said the same in 1945. This being so it is nonsense to say that events in Hungary could have altered the military balance of power etc.

I think had the S. U. acted wisely they would have achieved same results as in Poland. But that is just the crux of the matter! Results in Poland were achieved in spite of Soviet Government. They were opposed to the seemingly necessary changes there too!

Soviet leaders who are responsible for Hungarian invasion and Polish affairs are a bunch of bunglers (who act like supermen, still!)

There is no excuse for an open warfare by a socialist government against a working class of a country.

Mr. Khrushchev we are not the ones who are getting lost in an open field.

—ALEX, East Queens.

A SOUND REAPPRAISAL?

THE NEW YORK POST last week interviewed several liberals and leading Democrats on the election results and on "Where do we go from here?" One of those interviewed was Alex Rose of the Liberal Party who is quoted as saying:

"In the Congressional races the American people once again endorsed Roosevelt and the New Deal. But in the Presidential campaign they again voted against Truman and his foreign policy."

This is a shrewd observation and well put. You might expect Rose to conclude that the Democratic Party needs to break with the Cold War policy inaugurated under Truman. But it seems that Rose does not mean what his words seem to say. He makes this clear as he continues:

"The people remain liberal in

domestic affairs, but they are being taken in by a new mood of non-involvement, of selfishness, almost of isolationism in foreign policy."

According to Rose, then, the people remain liberal in domestic affairs but they are deceived into being conservative or even reactionary on foreign affairs. There is nothing wrong with the Truman foreign policy but there is something very wrong with the voters. According to this way of looking at matters, there is no need for the Democratic Party to address itself to drastic changes in its foreign policy. But as to just what the Democratic Party does have to do about it, Rose admits he has no idea.

"If I was the man who had the answers, I'd be a miracle man," he says gloomily.

I HOPE ROSE keeps on looking for the answers. But he won't find them, I believe, in such Post writers as Max Lerner, for example, who spells out in detail the views on foreign policy at which Rose only hints. It is the kind of foreign policy

outlook which, instead of winning support away from Eisenhower, would spell defeat for the Democratic Party or for anyone else for as many elections ahead as one can imagine.

Lerner has got himself into a box where, while he is sharply critical of the Eisenhower foreign policy, it is from the wrong direction.

He is indignant over the Administration's attitude toward both the Middle East and toward Hungary. But he is angry because Washington did intervene to the extent that it did in the Egyptian crisis. And he is even more angry because Washington did not intervene more than it did in Hungary.

On the Middle East, Lerner writes:

"We could afford the luxury of using the UN against Britain, France and Israel because they depended on us and we knew they would not start a nuclear war."

On Hungary, he writes:

"In the case of Hungary the fear that haunts us is the fear that Russia will fight over it. Given the present distribution of

nuclear weapons, the UN can be used only against the weak, not the strong."

Lerner's understandable feeling for Israel unfortunately blinds him to the realities of the British-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt. His intense anti-Soviet attitude blinds him to the situation in Europe.

IT HAPPENS that discussions are going on right now within Administration circles over possible courses in Europe. One proposal—so far only a trial balloon launched by Harold Stassen and by no means a set policy—would look to reducing all foreign troops on European soil.

Why doesn't Lerner urge the Administration to adopt the Stassen proposal and even to go further and agree to eliminate all foreign troops from Europe and elsewhere? The Soviet Union has said it is for such a proposition—why shouldn't we be too?

But instead Lerner writes:

"The real decision that Eisenhower and the leaders of Western Europe will probably have to make is whether they are so

By ALAN MAX

scared of Russian military action that they will undertake to freeze the present division of European power by a general European security pact."

Actually, it is difficult to think of anything better for the people of France, Germany, Hungary, Israel and everywhere else, including the United States of America and the Soviet Union, than what Lerner fears—a general European security pact. Such a pact would vastly reduce the dangers of war and would hack away at the enormous arms budgets. It would be greeted with whoops of joy, I am sure, by the American voters.

Now, the Eisenhower Administration's foreign policy is far from a liberal one. It yields from its Cold War attitudes only under various pressures. But Lerner's attacks on the Administration only make the Administration look good by comparison. He certainly does not have here the answer for the Democratic Party. This can only be found, I am convinced, in a program in the direction of ending the Cold War altogether.