

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Israel in Bad Company

Editor, Daily Worker:

The British and the French, not satisfied with the blood-letting they have been perpetrating in Kenya, Cyprus, Indochina, Algeria, have now jointly embarked on a full scale armed assault against Egypt with the too obviously eager cooperation of Israel. The latter is bound to find herself still more implacably hated by the Arabs than she is already. Her participation in the Anglo-French sanguinary assault on Egypt puts the stigma of war-maker upon her as inescapably as is that of murderer on the individual who assassinates another or others.

As for Americans it is a matter for shame to see that the three governments involved in the armed assault have received enormous amounts of money and military equipment supposedly to enable them remain solvent, safe and peaceful. But what a mockery they are making of every principle of law-abiding members of the international community! They are showing contemptuous disrespect for the United Nations!

—World Affairs Student.

Who Are Aggressors In the Middle East?

Editor, Daily Worker:

Your editorial, "Stop the Middle East War," in your Oct. 31 issue, represents in my opinion an opportunist yielding to what I can only call Jewish nationalism.

(1) "We think the government of Israel harmed its own good cause by ordering armed forces into Egypt." The cause of Israel is no more "good" than is that of Egypt. Israel is a state which began as an experiment in social fellowship and equality of opportunity and has been turned by its government into an imperialist pawn. Egypt is a semi-feudal state which has recently thrown off the bands of imperialism and is now itself showing imperialist tendencies.

(2) "There is good evidence that Arab forces have been making raids again and again into Israeli territory." There is equal evidence of Israeli raids into Egyptian territory. Israel has suffered no more "provocations" than it has itself delivered.

(3) "But the present Israeli action appears to be more than a reprisal raid." It is aggression and needs to be branded as such.

(4) President Eisenhower "sent a message only to the Israelis warning against aggression, without sending a similar message to the Arab states." But Egypt is not an aggressor. Nor are the other Arab states. The Arab states have made raids along with Israel. This evens them up. But Israel has invaded Egyptian territory in depth and in force. This is not the same thing.

(5) There is "the threat that the British and French colonial powers will use the Israeli action as a pretext for . . . seizing the canal." This was clearly the Israeli intention. It is not a "threat" arising as a kind of by-product. Ben Gurion's government is shedding the blood of Israeli youth in a dirty imperialist game — the subjugation of Egyptian by British and French imperialism. And when the people of Israel understand this they will throw this government out of office.

What, finally, of American imperialism? There is no mention of this in the editorial. But it is clear that the United States could have prevented the present situation from arising if it had put on full pressure.

The State Department wants to see Nasser overthrown and is not too unhappy that Britain

and France are going to try to do the job; but it does not want the American people to realize this. On the other hand it does not want Britain and France to assume full control of the Suez Canal or to turn Egypt into a colony (with a monopoly on Egyptian trade).

The object, as President Eisenhower has stated, is to localize the war—letting it go just long enough to break the will of the Egyptian people—and then jump in for the division of the spoils. Thus the United States government is caught between two conflicting desires.

This plot, however, and the aggression of Israel, Britain and France will fail. The world today is not the world of yesterday. The aroused Arab nations will fight to the end before allowing the imperialist chains to be bound around it again. And the voice of the peace forces of the world (inside Britain and France also) will rise to break the backs of the aggressors.

What must the American peace forces do? We must take advantage of the dual position of the American government in order to rouse the whole American people to assert the sovereignty of the United Nations over the aggressors and force the withdrawal of British, French and Israeli forces from Egypt.

Above all we must stand on firm Marxist-Leninist principles.

—Carleton Howells.

Dogmatism in Communist Party

Editor, Daily Worker:

For the past week or so there have been more and more letters denouncing the democratic positions the Daily Worker has taken since the Krushchev report.

I'm glad that you're printing these letters, for they give us some idea of the extent to which many party members are crippled by dogmatism . . . dogmatism that has become so deeply ingrained over the years.

T. F., in the Nov. 1 issue, stated that "the Daily Worker no longer speaks for the American Communists"; that the paper's "pseudo-theory and half-truths" are "the crudest and the oldest form of renegeacy." Further, the present policy of the paper is called "a vicious sell-out."

It is one of the tragedies of our past that party doctrinaires, often in leadership, habitually substituted invective and clichés for facts. This error, along with so many others recently publicized, has brought the C. P. to the brink of catastrophe.

Frankly, it's a question today among party members whether or not the party can survive. The sins and errors of the past are so grave and numerous—the bad taste left by years of harsh, blind bureaucracy — may well have compromised the party in the minds of its members and friends, present and past. Confidence in the party leadership has been severely shaken and possibly destroyed.

The non-Communist American left, which once turned to the party for moral and political leadership, now looks at the party with various degrees of scorn, debilitated by its own inadequacies, whose continued existence is a stumbling block to the emergence of a new party of socialism.

I count myself among those, within and without the party, who hope that the C. P. can regenerate itself. But, while wishing the party success, and pledging whatever personal assistance I can give, I have no illusions: I cannot mechanically assert that the C. P. will be automatically revived by recognizing and analyzing its mistakes, correcting them where possible, and taking the neces-

sary organizational and theoretical steps necessary to prevent their recurrence. That is too much like whistling in the dark, one of the very types of self-deception that got us into the mess we're in now.

It is evident, from Foster's position, and the subsequent letters attacking the DW, that a schism is developing in the party between the Old Guard bureaucrats and those who feel that the party will disintegrate unless it breaks sharply with its undemocratic past.

The issue is simple: those members of the party who cannot give up the self-comforts of dogmatism—whose thoughts and actions, by habit and inclination, are so bureaucratic and high-handed that they cannot understand that democracy and socialism must walk hand-in-hand—these people will succeed in wrecking the party if their attitudes and policies prevail.

Fortunately, the paper supports the "reform" group, and probably represents the sentiment of most of what is left of the rank and file. But nonetheless, the party is still plagued and threatened by the diehards. Their course appears set, and there's every reason to expect that their hysterical attacks and diatribes will continue to increase as the National Convention grows nearer.

If there is any chance left for the C. P. to take part in the American movement toward socialism, it must first prove to its membership, other socialists, and eventually to the American people that it believes in and practices ideas and activities that will lead to an independent, democratic, socialist America. The party must do much more than honestly regret its past violations of inner-party democracy and its theoretical and political fiascos.

—DAVID SOLOMON

Backs Editorial Policy on Poland

BUFFALO

Editor, Daily Worker:

We want to express our full agreement with your editorial of Oct. 22, regarding the recent events in Poland. We believe, with you, that the struggle of the Polish people and the Polish Party for greater democracy and independence can result only in the strengthening of the socialist movement all over the world.

We strongly urge the National Committee of the Communist Party to issue the same kind of forthright statement as did the Daily Worker.

A CP Section Committee, Erie County.

Assails Support For Nagy Policies

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have been patiently waiting the return of sanity in the editorials of the Daily Worker. With the editorial on Hungary one week ago, I saw the disappearance of a Marxist approach to history. The struggle in Hungary is pointing out clearly the need for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. So clearly, that it must be kind of hard even for the former Marxists of the Daily Worker to escape.

There can be no doubt that the writings of (pardon the use of) J. Stalin on the National and Colonial questions were not carried into practice either in the Soviet Union nor the other Socialist countries but does that justify the overthrow of socialism? It is the most backward step to allow the redevelopment of capitalism in Hungary.

As much as we American detest force and violence as a method to bring socialism to any land, its overthrow must be understood by you, editors, so that your editorials reflect some historic clarity to your readers. Rather than this progressive hogwash devoid of Marxist his-

CP Statement Hits Mid-East Aggression

Branding the British, French and Israeli aggression against Egypt as "the most serious threat to peace since the Korean war," the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, by majority vote

in a statement issued yesterday, urged an immediate cease-fire and close cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union to implement the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly.

The statement issued over the weekend also asserts that "the attack on Egypt is directed at the independence of all the Middle Eastern nations, including Israel, and at the anti-colonial liberation movements of Asia and Africa." It declares that "Israel's partnership in this aggression can only bring disaster to the hard-pressed people of that country."

The statement follows:

The brutal British and French aggression against Egypt has shocked and alarmed the world. In flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, London and Paris have moved to seize the Suez Canal, overthrow the Nasser government and subject Egypt to their domination under a quisling ruler of their choice. The bombs falling on Cairo and other Egyptian cities are the most serious threat to peace since the Korean war.

An immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Egyptian soil, as requested in the resolution voted overwhelmingly by the General Assembly of the United Nations, is the urgent need of the hour. This should be followed by determined international efforts to resolve the Suez Canal problem and the Arab-Israel conflict on a basis that serves the interests of all nations and safeguards world peace.

Israel's partnership in this aggression can only bring disaster to the hard-pressed people of that country. It is true that for years Israel has been the target of border raids, war threats and economic blockade by Egypt and other Arab states. We Communists have condemned and continue to condemn these acts and policies, which have taken a heavy toll of life and inflicted great damage not only on Israel but on the Arab peoples themselves.

At the same time, these provocations cannot justify a war of aggression in which Israel acts as the tool of the former oppressors of Palestine and the present oppressors of Cyprus and Africa. That the Israeli operation is designed to eliminate Egyptian fedayeen bases is shown to be a pretext by the course of the invasion itself, which is directed toward the Suez Canal, far from the fedayeen bases. Clearly this action was prearranged and coordinated with the Anglo-French move to seize the canal.

What has Egypt done that in the eyes of the imperialists justi-

fies their barbarous assault? Egypt did what Mexico did in 1938 when it took over and nationalized the British and U.S.-owned oil industry; what the British Labor government did when it nationalized the steel, coal and other industries; what the post-war French government did when it nationalized banks, coal mines and the Renault auto company. The Cairo government, acting in accordance with Egyptian and international law, last July ousted the British and French owners of the Suez Canal Company and assumed responsibility for this great public utility built with Egyptian labor on its own territory. And despite the efforts of London, Paris and Washington to disrupt operation of the canal, the Egyptian government continued to run it in accordance with the international convention of 1888 until Anglo-French aggression forced it to halt.

The nationalization of the Suez Canal is part of the valiant struggle the Egyptian people have been waging to free their country of British and other foreign domination. Egypt has also encouraged, as it had every right to do, its Arab brothers in the Middle East and Northern Africa to fight for their freedom too. And it has refused John Foster Dulles' demand to join the reactionary Baghdad military alliance and instead has pursued a neutralist course in international affairs. Egypt has also joined with the massive millions of Asia and Africa in the great Bandung movement for liberation and peace.

The attack on Egypt is thus directed at the independence of all the Middle Eastern nations, including Israel, and at the anti-colonial liberation movements of Asia and Africa. In showing Israel into this conflict as their catspaw, the British and French imperialists are no more interested in Israel's welfare than in Egypt's. Their sole interest is in the profits of the British and French investors in the Suez Canal Company and in crushing the revolting peoples of the Middle East and North Africa.

It is tragic that Israel's government joined this plot against its neighbors—and its own—freedom. We share with millions of Americans a deep concern for the safety of this small nation which won its independence in heroic struggle only a few years ago. The people of Israel want peace and to be allowed to build an independent life in freedom. That is why in recent months support for a neutralist course in relations with the great powers has been gathering impressive strength within Israel, as against the policy of the Ben-Gurion government of playing ball

(Continued on Page 5)

torical understanding, that you have been publishing daily in The Worker.

Stop trying so hard to get back into the mainstream that you get out of the Marxist stream. If you want to get close to the American people, the answer does not lie in undressing publicly and showing everyone where on your body you committed a sin. But for the first time in years, go out among the people like every other party and try your program on for size with the people, set-up election district captains, district clubs, service the people, rent controls, school problems, development of grocery coops to try to beat the spiraling cost of living. Try being a people's party, maybe then your draft and counter-draft resolutions can have meaning.

Similarly, your approach to the Hungarian problem would start to reflect some saneness.

Do you doubt that a counter-revolution is not in progress in Hungary? Do you think that Nagy is not in effect selling out socialism in Hungary and the eastern bloc by his (and his cronies) actions. How short are the memories of those whose brothers died freeing those same Nationalists in Hungary from Horthy and the Nazis? Can the Soviet Union afford to let their blood be shed in vain from their own national interest?

JOE CAMPIN

Daily Worker

Published daily except Saturday and Sunday by the Publishers New Press, Inc., 35 E. 12th St., New York 3, N. Y. Telephone ALgonquin 4-7864.

Registered as second class matter Oct. 22, 1942, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

3 mos. \$3.00 1 year \$12.00 Daily Worker only \$4.00 \$7.00 \$12.00

SUBSCRIPTION RATES (Except Foreign)

Daily Worker & Worker 4.75 8.00 13.00 The Worker 2.00 3.50 6.00