

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 18, 1957

FIVE CENTS

The Polish Revolution Nears a New Turning-Point

... page 6

A Report on the Middle East Cauldron: Arab Socialists and Arab Unity

... page 7

Who Cares About the Virgin Islands?

... page 4

CP Convention Dodges Key Issues but Foster's Purge Drive Is Given Setback

By H. W. BENSON

The long-awaited convention of the Communist Party ended four days of sessions in New York on February 12.

Three hundred delegates from 25 states claimed to represent a membership of 25,000. Actually they represent a probable 6-7000; the party has gone into rapid decline; members are leaving en masse.

In the last period the party has faced a crisis of decline and disintegration; political shocks have wracked the party from top to bottom: the Khrushchev revelations on Stalin; Poland; Hungary. For five months it has been plunged into a deep-going discussion of virtually everything, its first genuine discussion in decades. The debates have centered around a 62-page Draft Resolution prepared by the National Committee. At least three distinctive and opposing groups took shape among the leaders.

At the convention, in committees and at the sessions, they argued, debated, voted, and fought. But when they had finished, everything was essentially the same as before they convened, with one qualification which we will note.

For the convention resolved nothing politically. All the issues remain; the direction of the party is not set; new disputes are inevitable.

EVADED A STAND

One thing alone was settled: Foster's demand that the Gates group be cut to pieces was repudiated. The convention mandated the incoming National Committee to prepare a new party program; that alone guarantees new conflicts.

All debates could be summed up in one sentence: nothing, but nothing, came out clearly. Every question was wrapped in

the vague doubletalk and empty generalities so characteristic of Dennis and his slightly washed Stalinism.

How did the convention vote on Hungary? It did not! The only man who called for a clear statement was Foster, who of course demanded an unequivocal endorsement of Russian intervention.

But the convention did not vote to uphold the Kremlin's crushing of Hungarian democracy; it did not criticize it. It did not support the *Daily Worker*; it did not oppose it. It simply did not act in any way.

Not one responsible party leader, not one official reporter, took a stand one way or the other. Incredible? But there it was.

On Poland? Nothing. Greetings came from virtually every Communist Party in the world. But none from the Polish CP headed by Gomulka. And the convention had little to say about Poland. It did not support Gomulka's drive toward independence from Russia; but neither did it oppose it. In brief, nothing.

With this as a background, the nature of all resolutions becomes clear. They were abstractions, devoid of concrete content and divorced from the real struggles of our times.

But they accomplished one thing: Foster's demand for a statement of unquestioning subservience to the Kremlin line

as of old was rejected. But in its place there was little.

Two convention actions were touted as its declaration of "independence." But only the first feeble steps were taken.

One debate centered on the party's attitude toward Marxism-Leninism. The resolutions committee split. The majority insisted that the party "interprets" the principles of Marxism-Leninism. A minority insisted that the party "applied" the principles.

Thus the issue was joined in a disputation over "interpret" versus "apply." Did the party merely apply principles that were supplied by others, e.g., the Russian CP, or was it free and independent in deciding what the principles implied?

The committee voted 14-12 to remain "interpreters." The convention voted 2-1 to support the majority position. There was no minority report. Gates and Dennis voted for the majority. Foster's vote is unknown.

DENNIS' "NEW LOOK"

Another "highlight" came with the report on relation to other "Marxist" parties. The convention adopted the view that the party would respect the opinions of Communists in other countries but would determine its own policy itself.

In committee, a motion was made to reject the National Committee's November 4 resolution which repudiated Russian intervention in Hungary, but it was voted down and not brought to the floor. The convention was virtually unanimous. Gates, who was for the November 4 resolution, went along. Dennis, who opposed the November 4 resolution, voted along with him.

Everything was on the plane of abstraction. The party asserted its right to independence. But it did not exercise this independence on any important issue of world politics. It asserted its right to criticize. But it criticized nothing. It insisted that it had the right to "interpret" but it interpreted nothing that would be resented in the Kremlin.

Thus the Dennis policy was carried throughout, at every point. The party tried to get a "new look" but so far without success.

The prevailing mood was a desire for unity and harmony. "Independence, Unity CP Party Keynote" was the first *Daily Worker* headline. It was right.

But the quest for unity stemmed from

(Continued on page 2)

ISL Launches Fund Drive For \$10,000

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

The annual fund drive of the Independent Socialist League for 1957 began on February 15. This marks the 17th annual campaign of the ISL for funds to meet its operations and to cover the big deficits produced largely by maintaining LABOR ACTION, America's outstanding weekly socialist paper, and the *New Internationalist*, as a leading Marxist review. The goal is \$10,000.

In the past several years we have had something else added to the great burdens that any socialist organization has in maintaining itself in normal times, let alone a period of inflation such as we live under. We have our case against the Attorney General for listing the ISL and its successor organizations, the Workers Party and Socialist Youth League, on his list of so-called subversive organizations.

Readers of our press know how desperately long it has taken us to even get a hearing from the Attorney General. Well, that hearing has been completed. That is to say, the hearing itself, begun in 1955 and completed in 1956, is over. The government submitted a proposed set of findings to the Hearing Examiner to which the ISL has replied and countered with its own proposed findings.

As matters stand now, we are still awaiting a recommendation from the Hearing Examiner to the Attorney General, after which it is presumed we will have to wait until Brownell gets around to rendering a decision.

In the meantime, the case has been a very costly one to the Workers Defense

(Turn to last page)

Mideast Doctrine: Dulles and the Dems

By SAM TAYLOR

Congressional and public scrutiny of the Eisenhower Doctrine has been going on for close to two months. Both in Congress and in the press, it and its principal defender, John Foster Dulles, have been subjected to a varied assortment of criticisms and denunciations.

Secretary of State Dulles has in particular managed to stir the hostility of Senate Democrats to the point where there has been a demand for his resignation. His sanctimonious enunciation of high moral principles in response to questions about the meaning and application of the Middle East doctrine evoked from one senator the caustic comment that Dulles is a "card-carrying Christian."

Most, if not all, of the criticisms have come from liberals. Joint declarations and statements of opposition have been issued over the names of Senators Fulbright, Morse, Humphrey, Mansfield and Sparkman, calling for a new U. S.

policy toward the Middle East. The content of such a policy is never made quite clear and to the extent that it is clear it does not appear to differ significantly from the Dulles proposals.

From the liberal camp the Eisenhower Doctrine and the Dulles stewardship have been subjected to a bewildering array of attacks. The administration is charged with everything from bullying and weakening the Western allies to placing too much confidence in the United Nations; from asking for a "blank check" on how to conduct military and economic policy in

the Middle East, to the charge that Dulles is weakening the constitutional power of the president by asking for congressional approval for military action that the president already has the power to take.

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson said the doctrine goes too far in spelling out what the U. S. may do, while former Secretary of the Air Thomas Finletter charges that it does not go far enough. Former President Harry Truman says that the doctrine is just fine and that all senators ought to vote for it.

Walter Lippman repeats the accusation, although dissociating himself from it, that President Eisenhower is a "pacifist" as a result of the earlier declared policy of "non-involvement" in Middle East military actions; while some House Democrats charge that the new doctrine is "an open invitation to World War III." In addition, the accusation of "isolated internationalism" and "go it alone" are ascribed to the Eisenhower ad-

(Turn to last page)

Communist Party Convention

(Continued from page 1)

basic agreement, not from political uniformity but from hesitancy, uncertainty and disorientation.

The delegates, still under the stunning impact of unprecedented events, were not sure where to turn. They realized that the party could not go on as before; that changes were necessary. But what changes? They were not sure.

They were ready to legitimize the idea of change but not to endorse any particular radical change. They were ready to declare as a generality that the party had to be independent but not to exercise this independence in any decisive manner on any crucial question.

They wanted to hold together until a clearer settlement could come. Meanwhile, they wanted no purges; they wanted to maintain the present balance of power in the leadership; and they endorsed a greater measure of internal democracy.

It was a unity that took for granted not the wiping out of differences but their continuation; it was a momentary harmony based upon a temporary compromise of irreconcilable views.

But CP members must finally decide between moving clearly toward democratic socialism or being pushed back to Stalinism; such a deep-seated question cannot be settled in the end by inner-party diplomacy.

SHADOWLAND

One convention reporter, William Schneiderman, put it this way: We are striving to eliminate deep-seated dogmatism and doctrinarism but there is a current in the party that is fighting to revert to the old ways by opposing the basic content of the Draft Resolution.

As a generalization, it was true. But what exactly is dogmatism and doctrinarism and who precisely is fighting to revert to just what?

All was in a shadowland when the convention opened and nothing ever emerged into the clear light of day. Only the well-versed, highly sensitive, experienced party in-fighter could know what was really happening, but not the rank-and-file delegate.

As a political document, the Draft Resolution is ambiguous, incomplete, evasive and straddling on the key issues, above all on the key issues. It was supported by divergent tendencies for different reasons and thus slurred over real differences.

It fitted neatly into the mood of harmony and was endorsed, in basic line, by the convention majority.

In an atmosphere where everyone wanted to avoid new shocks, to prevent splits and hold together, National Secretary Eugene Dennis seemed to emerge as the prevailing single force. But was he? The delegates did not intentionally aim at endorsing his faction position.

Yet the results and actions of the convention could perhaps be fully satisfactory to him alone. It remains to be seen, in the inevitable disputes that will come tomorrow, what power he actually holds.

3-WAY DIVISION

To understand the significance of the convention, one must follow the three tendencies which emerged out of the party fight. For ready reference, we can use the following labels: (1) crude Stalinism; (2) concealed Stalinism; (3) anti-Stalinism.

Most observers found it difficult to follow the devious convention line-ups. What caused the confusion was this: that the anti-Stalinists (Gates) and the hidden Stalinists (Dennis) formed a common bloc against the crude Stalinists (Foster).

Foster and his close supporters, who had only a few votes on the old National Committee, are determined to turn back to the old line. They insist upon subservience to the Kremlin and want to clamp the lid back on.

Their "solution" to the party crisis is simple: root out Gates and his supporters and defenders, return to the authoritarian normality. They oppose the basic line of the Draft Resolution because it opens the door to fundamental criticism. At the convention, they centered their fire on one section of the resolution;

they too finally yielded to the spirit of harmony and permitted near-unanimous compromises to be effected without their open opposition.

But their line remains: a clear return to Stalinism. They oppose the Draft not so much for what it is as for what it can lead to.

John Gates and his group, centered around the Daily Worker and the New York State Committee, clearly look in the opposite direction. They understand not only that the party must move away from Stalinism but that radical and sweeping changes are essential. The crisis cannot be overcome, in their view, by any series of superficial changes or minor alterations in internal regime.

They propose to transfer the Communist Party into a Political Association and want a socialist regroupment in which Communists join not as the dominant element but as a contributing one. They propose not a mere change in form but a deep-going turn in basic line. While they still look upon Russia as "socialist" and sympathetic with the so-called "socialist" world camp, they want real independence and have criticized Russian policy openly and harshly.

THE DENNIS-GATES BLOC

Eugene Dennis and his supporters seem to be a "center" group. But actually, as a conscious tendency, this one is almost identical with Foster in a basic defense of a fundamentally Stalinist political line.

But unlike Foster, who is anxious to avoid any loosening of the iron hoops that once bound the party together, Dennis realizes that a "new look" is essential if the party is to survive. He is ready to accept superficial changes in policy and in internal regime which leave the basic line intact.

While Gates looks upon the Draft Resolution only as one step forward, Dennis sees it as the final product. It is a chance to devise tactical shifts and invent maneuvers to save the party. For Gates, a new fundamental line is necessary.

What impelled Gates and Dennis together at this convention was a common need to fend off Foster. Dennis does not want to chop off the Gates group and welcomes the Draft Resolution. Both are necessary to his "new look."

If the Foster group could be magically whisked away, the fight would inevitably erupt between Gates and Dennis, but under the pounding of Foster they are momentarily driven together. No one can say how long this alliance can last. World events can shatter their alliance. Or tendencies toward socialist regroupment outside the CP can have an impact upon them.

But at this stage Dennis can rally to his side not only those who are his clear and conscious political followers but a large section of the party who support him as a middle-of-the-roader who seems to stand for compromise. Not until the issues are clearly posed inside the CP—democratic socialism versus Stalinism—will his real role emerge in clear-cut fashion.

FOSTER'S TIRADE

Foster had no intention of hiding his views. Reporting as party chairman he launched a long tirade against Gates.

The Twentieth Congress? the Khrushchev revelations? the struggle in Poland? the revolution in Hungary? They have made no impression upon him. The main danger in the party, to him, is the Gates tendency; the way out of the party crisis, as he sees it, is to smash it and to reaffirm in every essential the old line which meant submission to Stalinism.

"One of the keys to the party's present difficulties," reported Foster, "and particularly to its leadership crisis, is the fact that during recent difficult months the party has been led especially in the National Board by a working combination of the Right and some comrades who, while not themselves Rights, nevertheless run a sort of political interference for the Right. The Right has its main strength in the New York State Committee and in the staff of the Daily Worker. It also acquires much help from the above described conciliationism. This is the main reason why in the Board the Right, although a minority in the party, has been able to write so much of its

line into policy and convention documents of the party. To eliminate such conciliation practices is one of the important changes needed by the party."

No conciliation! Break the power of Gates! (In Foster's peculiar terminology, the anti-Stalinist wing is the "right.") He demands that the national leadership be revised, calls for the introduction of more "mass workers" and the reduction of "our excessive numbers of full-timers," although it is necessary to "maintain a strong core of 'professional revolutionaries.'"

TYPICAL TACTIC

Translating this gobbledygook in the name of "proletarianization" and in the guise of a drive against "bureaucracy," Foster proposes to take the first steps toward crushing the trend toward party independence and democracy. It is the method typical of Stalinism: to stifle a working-class trend in the name of "proletarianization" and to wipe out democracy in the name of anti-bureaucracy.

In the same way, Foster accuses the Gatesites of bringing the party to the verge of a split! "The advocates of the Association which is the heart of the Right program have passed it upon the party with such vigor that the very life of the party became threatened with a factional split." In other words, you threaten a split because I may be forced to throw you out!

To sum up Foster's speech: He calls for an end of conciliating Gates and for rooting out its power in the party apparatus. He demands the "reaffirmation" of Marxism-Leninism, by which he means the Stalinist perversion of it. On Hungary: "We must revamp the National Committee position on Hungary recognizing that under the existing dangerous circumstances the military and political actions taken by the Soviet Union in helping to defend Hungarian Socialism against the acute threat of fascism and war was imperative."

DUCLOS RIDES AGAIN

The National Committee, we remind our readers, at first repudiated the Russian attack on Hungary and then retreated into the straddling position, neither criticizing nor supporting it. But this is not good enough for Foster who demands unwavering subservience to the Kremlin. Naturally, he demands an end to "pro-Titoism" in the name of "proletarian internationalism," a pseudonym for capitulation to the Kremlin.

He had help.

"This time," said William Z. Foster in December, "there will be no Duclos letter to bail us out of our folly." But he was wrong. A new Duclos letter arrived on January 21. It was the same Duclos whose notorious letter had put an end to the Browder regime, led to the latter's expulsion from the party, and lifted Foster into the saddle.

The fact that the Kremlin has the audacity to intervene now with a "letter" signed by the very same Duclos is a sign of the utter and complete capitulation that it is demanding in the American Communist Party. Duclos, as can be expected, denounced "revisionism" in an oblique attack on the Gates tendency and endorsed Foster's uncompromising defense of a Stalinist line.

Foster failed. And his failure is a sign that no one can get along successfully, even inside the CP, without at least a verbal call for independence from the USSR. The main positive achievement of this convention was the defeat of Foster.

DENNIS AVOIDS SPLIT

In his keynote address, Dennis repudiated Foster's split perspective and called for party harmony. But, while defending Gates against Foster, he was careful to issue a subtle threat to the Gates wing. He wanted them to realize that their position rested upon his tolerance.

He wasted no time on the critically important questions—Hungary, Poland, the Khrushchev revelations. Except to say: "when the facts of the Khrushchev speech on Stalin became known in this country, and again after the tragic events in Hungary, important sections of the party at all levels were temporarily disoriented and demobilized. Some tried to start a stampede. . . . Temporarily thrown off balance, the party began to

become enmeshed in a bitter and divisive internal struggle and was in danger of being torn apart."

"Temporarily"? Everything has been settled nicely for Dennis. He imagines, because the party now lives with itself without splits and without breaking from the Kremlin on decisive issues, that it has learned to live with the world of labor and liberal public opinion. But he is doomed to disappointment.

He does not want a split. Obviously if the Gates group were forced out now, it would be impossible for the party to convince anyone that it was making a turn. In a veiled thrust at Foster, he attributed the danger of a split to "some of the NC members who, at least until recently, clung to inflexible politics and pursued extreme political objectives. . . ."

He explained the role of his supporters on the Committee: "As distinct from the conciliators of either the 'Right' or the 'Left,' they began to intervene forcefully. The combined a resolute struggle to save the party, defend its Marxist-Leninist principles and make the necessary changes, with an all out effort to preserve its unity."

HE HASN'T CHANGED

Dennis is determined to defend "Marxism-Leninism." He means, of course, his own Stalinistic interpretation of it. But against whom will he defend it? The warning to Gates is clear enough.

In all the resolution, too, and in all the discussions, it was made clear by Dennis supporters that they were ready to fight against "right opportunism" when necessary. In their perverted Stalinistic terminology, "right opportunism" refers to all trends that would break more clearly away from the Kremlin.

Dennis was careful to suggest that the party must remain "independent," and in this connection uttered a mild rebuke to Duclos. But he saw little to repudiate in the past:

"We American Communists . . . have always constituted an independent American political party, have been unaffiliated with and organizationally independent of other Marxist parties for nearly 20 years."

Despite his new independent attitude, he saw nothing to criticize in Russia's role in Poland and Hungary, stressing his opposition to "hostility to the socialist countries and their Marxist parties."

Nothing in what Dennis said or did at the convention can change the analysis of his role that was so clearly formulated by two members of the Daily Worker staff in pre-convention discussion. Joe Clark, for example, wrote:

"Dennis evidently does not object to the Daily Worker criticizing anything said or done by Soviet Communists but only after the Soviet Communists have themselves made such criticism."

Max Gordon succinctly summarized the method characteristic of Dennis as a "process of blind apologetics," which "starts with the assumption that all Soviet action must be championed and then erects its own structure of 'fact' to accomplish that aim." Nothing has changed here.

"ASSOCIATION" DISPUTE

The balance of forces at the convention and the factional mechanics that were to dominate it were foreshadowed on the very first point on the agenda, the question of "name and form."

In the pre-convention period, Gates had proposed a change to a "Political Association." The National Committee had recommended that the party form continue but that the question be left open for continuing discussion.

Foster seized upon it to howl and denounce. He would not move an inch. He called for a clear-cut repudiation of the "association," an end to the discussion, and for a drive against Gates.

But a compromise was devised, a four-point resolution finally supported by all groups and virtually unanimously adopted by the delegates.

(1) It reaffirms the continuation of the CP and makes "our chief task to strengthen, rebuild and consolidate" it and "overcome its isolation."

(2) It rejects the political-association proposal.

(3) It opposes "endless debate" but al-

Dodges, Foster Is Set Back — —

lows the National Committee to reopen the question if it sees fit.

(4) It concedes that "revisionist" ideas have been advanced but rejects the notion that all proposals for change are "revisionist" per se.

PRIZES FOR ALL

For everyone there seemed to be some small consolation, and each group can perhaps claim a partial victory; but:

(1) To win this compromise, Gates has voted against his own point of view. However, in the meager five minutes he was allowed on the floor, he explained that he was supporting the resolution only in the name of unity and that he did not abandon his views.

(2) A previous recommendation of the National Committee would have automatically kept the discussion opened. Now, the committee may (but may not) reopen the question.

(3) Yesterday, by official decision of the NC, the Gates association plan was not—definitely not—"revisionist." But now it is cast in doubt. Foster can say yes; Gates can say no. But Dennis can decide when convenient.

The convention elected by secret ballot 20 members at large to the National Committee, which will total 60 after the remaining seats are filled by the state organizations. The top candidate, a young woman, unknown, got 210 votes. Dennis was sixth with 174; Foster seventh with 172; Gates sixteenth with 129 votes. George Charney, chairman of the New York State party (Gates stronghold), was lowest on the list with 115 votes.

WHAT'S THE LINE-UP?

Since no hardened and organized faction lines were drawn, and elections were by secret ballot, the delegates were free to express their uninhibited feelings. As a result, apparently, the majority of those elected at large are indeterminate or uncommitted in a strict faction sense.

The real line-up will not be clear until the full 60 seats are filled in by the state organizations in the coming months. A hint of Foster's strength among the delegates came when he made a procedural motion to add another member to the National Committee. It lost 140-80.

To avoid opening up the faction sores, the convention by-passed the election of national officers. The party will be ruled by a secretariat of eleven until a permanent committee is chosen when the final composition of the National Committee is decided.

At another juncture, the convention voted to transfer party headquarters to Chicago, an innocent-appearing decision. But Foster, in the name of "democracy," had demanded that more "workers" be added to the National Committee in order to free it from the influence of the "opportunists." The move to Chicago is aimed at removing the party from the influence of its strongest pro-Gates section, New York. But, ironically, George Charney, New York chairman and a leading Gatesite, seconded and supported the motion. All were for harmony.

So the secretariat replaces the party officers; Foster becomes a secretariat member along with Dennis and Gates; but he is eased out as chairman. The party has declared for independence. Illusions mount; perhaps the party crisis has been overcome. But disappointment must come.

"SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY"

The vain hopes instilled in the party by Dennis are best illustrated by the resolution on "Social-Democracy" adopted without opposition.

The CP now seeks a rapprochement with "Social-Democracy," and Dennis is ready to vote for words, words, words. For the first time, to this writer's recollection, the theory of "social-fascism," in fashion during the thirties, is specifically and officially rejected as incorrect. It calls for cooperation with "social-democracy" despite ideological differences and emphasizes that the party really, truly and honestly does want to cooperate. "We should look upon the Social-Democratic organizations, including their leaders, as workers' organizations. We must deal with these organizations, fraternally, and not as enemies. We strive for their cooperation, not liquidation."

There is no mass social-democratic movement in the U. S., in the strict sense of the term. The resolution makes clear that it intends to apply to the labor, liberal, reformist, Negro movements which it broadly lumps together under the heading "social-democratic." It refers, then, to the unions, the ADA, the Liberal Party, the NAACP.

For Dennis, this is the tactic *par excellence*, and its success or failure will be life-and-death for the party. What, after all, is the aim of declaring one's independence and promising that a few days has dawned in the life of the CP? What if not to gain access to the mass progressive movements and win acceptance and respectability?

IF THEY'RE SERIOUS . . .

But it is all in vain. For no one will believe it. And rightly so.

Dennis and his friends have yet to learn that it is not "left sectarianism" or "right opportunism" or any tactic or maneuver singly or in combination that has ruined the reputation of the party. What stands in its way is the realization, not by backward workers but by experienced and educated union militants and progressives everywhere, that every tactical line has been dominated not by the interests of the working class but by the needs of Russian policy. Duclos, in his letter, admits it frankly. Dennis would deny it. Now consider the resolution on Social Democracy.

The CP in the United States with its 7000 members solemnly pledges that it does not propose to liquidate (say) Walter Reuther's 1,250,000 followers in the United Auto Workers. But it hardly has much choice!

The party wants to cooperate with Social-Democracy and not destroy it. But where? In the United States the party is a tiny minority. The fact that it proposes to cooperate with the mighty mass movement of the workers and of the Negroes is not exactly spectacular news!

But no one can take it seriously. Where does the CP of the United States stand on cooperation with Social-Democracy where Communists are in power? Everyone knows that it is not simply a question of "cooperation" there.

Is the CP for the freeing of all Social-Democrats and other democrats from prison where they have been jailed by Communists in Russia, in China, in Eastern Europe? Are they or are they not for the right of Social-Democrats to free and political existence, to the right to organize, where Communists are in power? That is the test.

Who will believe that you are for real cooperation in the United States, where you are under fire, if you do not raise your voice for their rights where your comrades are in power?

PRESSURE ON GATES

The resolution, then, is a typical product of the Dennis school.

Whatever the motives of the Gatesites in going along with it, they know that more than verbal trickery is necessary. That was why, before an audience of socialists and liberals at Community Church on Dec. 3, Gates himself, asked if he was in favor of democratic rights to all parties in countries under Communist control, felt compelled to reply "Yes."

Not only was nothing settled at the convention; in fact, the key issues were never even posed. The Gates group did not fight for their views on any question but were content to go along with Dennis' generalities. The penalty they pay will become evident soon.

They did not make their position clear and they did not begin to rally their own supporters and potential supporters for what they realize is so vital: a radical change in policy. They did not press their position on Hungary; they did not propose to endorse the line of the *Daily Worker*; they did not even suggest support to Gomulka; they did not fight for the Political Association. If you did not know that the Gates tendency existed before the convention, you would not have realized it at the convention.

If the decision to abstain from a fight cannot be endorsed, it can be understood. The Gatesites were under great pressures. Foster was calling for their heads. A new Duclos letter arrived to bolster the fight against Gates. From the state

organizations came resolutions rejecting the Gates position on the Political Association. The Gates group felt impelled to stall for time, to retreat and wait, to wait for more favorable circumstances.

SPLIT—WHERE?

But this time it will not be enough to put the lid back on. Say what one will about the actions of the conventions: disappointing as the tactics of the Gates group may have been, the fact remains that the Foster line was defeated and that his efforts to wipe out the Gates wing proved utterly futile. It was shown that the CP cannot be simply purged and ordered back into line; an atmosphere was established for the right to discuss tomorrow, and this is an important achievement for the CP that it never had before.

Until the party can give such a clear reply to such a simple question, all its resolutions for "united front" and for collaboration with all progressives will be in vain. If the membership hasn't learned that yet, it will have to go through another period of bitter disillusionment.

There are some who may insist that the Gatesites should have been ready without hesitation to split from this party which finds it impossible to break cleanly from Stalinism. But split to what? That is undoubtedly the question that arises in their minds.

They look toward a broad mass socialist movement for tomorrow. But are they to end up as a sect today? They dread to end their fight as a mere sect and such fears are understandable.

In the face of an organized working class of 18 million, of a Negro movement which involves hundreds of thousands, it

is necessary not to found a new sect but to find a way out of sectarian existence. If current trends are permanent, the days of the sects are coming to an end.

THE IMPASSE

The dilemma of Gates and his friends is not easy to resolve. If they remain in the party without opening up a prospect of winning drastic changes, their own supporters will crumble away, leave the party, and probably end their political careers. If they had split from the party, they ran the risk of ending as another sect still without influence on the mass movement and consequently unable to give their own supporters what they want: a way to bring socialism to the people.

It can be argued that the Gates group might have pressed their point of view nonetheless and done their best to educate and arouse the party membership even if they were defeated in the end. But they feared a split. Above all they did not want to end up outside the party now.

Gates' dilemma is not his own. It is a problem for all socialists and it is one which must be solved by all. If he is impelled toward compromise and quiescence, the socialist movement shares responsibility.

There is no easy road, no quick answer. Yet it is the duty of all the existing socialist groups, tendencies, publications and committees to find a way to create a new rallying center for democratic socialists of all shades. Above all, there is the lack of a powerful, crusading, militant Socialist Party to offer a practical alternative to Stalinism.

The impasse at the Communist Party convention should drive that home to all.

DISPATCH FROM DUBLIN

Notes on Labor Politics in Ireland

By M. M.

Dublin, Jan. 24

One of the significant events of 1956 in this country was the public demonstration of solidarity of the Dublin workers with the embattled workers of Budapest during the last phase of the heroic general strike there. Sponsored by the Dublin councils of the two trade-union centers, the parade and mass meeting was a gratifying experience of united working-class action to defend the basic principle of working-class freedom.

Freaney, the president of the Dublin Trades Council, proposing the resolution of sympathy, said that "while Stalin the tyrant had been superseded, tyranny nevertheless remained the weapon of the frightened men in the Kremlin."

Needless to remark, the Hungarian events bewildered the local Stalinists, and this writer had the unique experience of witnessing Stalinist delegates supporting a "Third Camp" amendment to a sectarian Catholic resolution at the November meeting of the Dublin Trades Council, though they did subsequently boycott the demonstration on Hungary.

On the heels of the October days in Hungary came the pre-Christmas guerrilla raids by the so-called Irish Resistance movement (IRA?) on cross-border police, military and strategic civil installations—BBC transmitters, power plants, etc. The precise and well-planned character of the raids threw the Belfast authorities into panic.

All but a few cross-border roads have been blocked, mined and demolished, to prevent attacks and withdrawals from and to the Republican area. Further units of British army and air-force personnel have been drafted into North Ireland.

Acting no doubt under pressure from London and under the threat of an incipient coup d'état from the well-armed and militant direct-actionists, the Dublin government launched a police-military action, first to head off proposed further cross-border assaults, and secondly, to take police action under the repressive Offences Against the State Act to disperse and harass the leadership of the illegal force within the Republic.

A wave of public sympathy for the direct-actionists was sparked off by the

death of two young fighters in a battle with North Ireland police; and to stop growing mass subversion of the authority of the Republic's government, Premier Costello was forced to broadcast appeals and threats to the sympathetic elements and to the direct-actionists themselves, to cease their activities.

The active leadership of the direct-actionist movement is essentially petty-bourgeois, non-socialist and reactionary in social and political outlook. Some elements are frankly fascist in their utterances and attitudes. Their conception of democracy and minority rights in a united Ireland would approximate the "freedom" and "unity" offered to the Saar by Hitler.

Mounting unemployment (90,000 persons registered at the moment and the figure growing daily) is rocking the government-coalition boat. Trade-union leaders are demanding government action or else the withdrawal of the Labor ministers from the coalition. The United Trade Union Organization convened special conferences at the year's end to deal with the problem.

A document "Planning for Full Employment" was submitted to the Dublin conference in December. The conclusions drawn were substantially a mishmash of social-democratic, Keynesian and "enlightened capitalist" solutions to the problem of a decadent and abortive attempt to organize an impoverished country along classical capitalist lines.

The unemployed are demonstrating once again, and a mass protest meeting is scheduled for next Sunday in Dublin's leading thoroughfare. Socialists are apprehensive that if the Unemployed Association becomes an embarrassing element to the government its leaders may be intimidated by the operation of the special police powers under the Offences Against the State Act which is at present being applied against the leadership of the direct-actionists. This Act was used against the pre-war unemployed leaders.

Order ALL your books from Labor Action Book Service, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

AMERICAN COLONIALISM

Who Cares About the Virgin Islands?

In the course of time LABOR ACTION has covered an exposé of conditions in most of the United States' colonial possessions—Puerto Rico, Okinawa, Guam, Samoa and some other Pacific islands. Another that has demanded attention has been the Virgin Islands.

A good summary of the state of affairs in that Caribbean colony appeared in the Nation for Jan. 12, in the second part of an article by Russell W. Howe on "The American Caribbean."

Incidentally, the first part of this article, dealing with Puerto Rico, gives a picture of the Muñoz regime which appears to us far too uncritical; but this at least indicates that foreign correspondent Howe's approach to American colonial rule is not simply "agin'." In any case, he describes the Virgin Islands as in sharp contrast with the progress he sees in Puerto Rico. The Virgin Islands "are purely and simply a colony," he makes clear, with "almost none of the advantages so generously meted out to Puerto Rico."

This would seem to raise the question why Washington has been so "generous" to one and so callous to the other. Could it be precisely because of the long and bitter nationalist struggles fought by Puerto Rico movements against U. S. callousness?—in which case it is not a question of imperialist generosity but of concessions extracted to quiet rebellious aspirations.

Following is a summary of Mr. Howe's picture of the Virgin Islands.—Ed.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

"Defensive"?

To the Editor:

In his rejection of Al Findley's contention that the Israeli position in the Middle East is inherently defensive Hal Draper again fails to come to grips with the heart of a central issue.

That there are expansionist moods and ambitions among Israeli politicians and populace is undeniable. (Incidentally, these moods grow and wane depending upon the intensity of the sense of desperation, isolation and abandonment by the advanced nations of the world.)

However, to put the relatively petty border expansionism of Israeli nationalism on the same level with the virtually unanimous crusade of Arab nationalism to totally destroy and eradicate the state of Israel seems unfair. It is like comparing the pre-World War II expansionism of the Polish nationalist movement with the Nazi or Stalinist efforts to destroy Polish independence and statehood root and branch.

Compare if you will the expansionism of the extremist wings of Israeli nationalism with Egyptian nationalism's designs on Libya or Syrian designs on Jordan but don't talk as if the Pilsudskis' of Israel have the objective of destroying the independence of the Arab world as Nasser claims.

Arab irredentism towards Palestine is a life and death matter for the state of Israel and possibly even for its Jewish population. The opposite is not true. Despite reactionary excrescences and occasional, publicly condemned atrocities Israeli nationalism is not a life and death threat to any part of the Arab world.

The difference in the real dangers which each of these two opposing nationalisms present to the other is a crucial one. Draper seems either to underestimate it or treat it too lightly.

A. SOPKON

Correspondent Sopkon apparently thinks the "central issue" is whether the Israeli regime's offenses are "on the same level" with the Arab regimes' offenses, or whether one can "compare" this government's crimes with that government's, etc. There are, I think, few ways of approaching the Middle East tangle that are more fruitless.

The Virgin Islands include three islands plus a few other inhabited islets, acquired by the U. S. in 1917 for \$25 million from Denmark. The big islands are St. Thomas (pop. 16,000), Ste. Croix (13,100) and St. John (800). Ninety per cent of the population is Negro and creole.

Economic conditions: Per-capita income is \$480, "infinitely less if one discounts the high incomes of the 'continentals' cashing in on the tourist boom." The high living of the tourists who swarm over the islands only points up the general poverty of most of the people, who live in battered shacks.

"Unfortunately, very little of this tourist boom trickles down to the natives. Most of the flourishing stores, hotels and restaurants offer only menial employment to the islanders. When local girls refused to take sleeping-out chambermaid jobs for \$15 a week—half the New York unemployment pay—in an economy where the cost of living is 35 per cent higher than in New York City, the hotels got permission to bring in girls from the British Virgins, where living conditions are even poorer and where the offer of a permanent U. S. immigration visa—in return for a one-year contract on St. Thomas—was a certain lure."

Industries are not lured with inducements equal to Puerto Rico's; they get only a 75 per cent tax cut for 10 years, and taxes that are levied are at the federal rate.

"Minimum salary in this high-cost territory is 40 cents an hour, but domestics earn as little as \$5 a month. The tourist boom has rocketed land values 100 per cent in the past two years and rents have risen proportionately. The

rents of the clapboard cabins in Charlotte Amalie, capital of the islands, have risen as much as 1,000 per cent in 10 years, according to Ottley [editor of leading native newspaper]."

But the AFL-CIO trade unions are growing in strength.

Political rights: The simple colonial status of the islands is concretized in the following facts.

- The governor is appointed by Washington and can veto the legislature's acts. The islanders have no Resident Commissioner in Congress and have no voice, let alone vote.

- "No taxation without representation" doesn't apply. Islanders pay full federal tax.

- "The local legislature, comprising 11 senators, can sit for 60 days each year."

BOOKS AND IDEAS

A Frenchman on Jim Crow

NEGROES ON THE MARCH, by Daniel Guérin. Translated by Duncan Ferguson.—New Park Pub., London, 192 pages, \$1.50.

By FRANK HARPER

Daniel Guérin's booklet, subtitled "A Frenchman's Report on the American Negro Struggle," is an easily readable work which summarizes the history of the Negro people and its struggle for integration into the stream of American life. For those who haven't the time or lack the interest to read a great deal on the subject, this book is strongly recommended. But even those who are widely read will find Guérin's approach and emphasis stimulating.

For example, Guérin challenges Gunnar Myrdal:

"If there had been a desire for further clarity, it would have been necessary to view this mental sickness [race prejudice] as an end result, the final product of a whole chain of material and historical causes. But for Myrdal, on the contrary, it is a starting point. He is disturbed by it. He bewails the fact that it produces attitudes among the white population in America that are in contradiction with another magical phenomena, namely, their attachment to the 'American Creed' of Democracy. And then, entangled in this 'dilemma,' he can propose no other solution than the transformation of their consciousness: by education, moral reform, and the passage of time."

Guérin gathered his material during a visit to the United States in 1947 and 1948 and by careful and wide reading on the subject. One cannot but note that in a few short months a Frenchman saw and understood a lot more about our racial problems than most native Americans. Guérin's perception comes from his socialist approach.

Worldwide racial discrimination is tied to economic and political subjugation of the colonial world by the Western European nations and the United States. In addition, in the U. S. discrimination and prejudice derives from a history of slavery:

"The economic exploitation on which the slave system was based gave birth to race prejudice. It was possible to treat the Negro like an animal if one refused to consider him human. For how could Christians enslave their fellow men? To be able to look on Negroes as a piece of merchandise, sell them at auction in the public square, wrench child from mother and husband from wife, it was essential to insist that the Negro was not really a human being. This necessity produced the entire racist attitude."

NEGRO AND LABOR

In the chapter "Negroes and the Labor Movement," Guérin sketches the historical attitudes of American labor toward the colored worker and describes the post-World War II organizational drives in the South. While unions yielded to Southern white pressures, the industrialization of the South and the unionization of white and colored workers strengthen tendencies toward a racially integrated America.

He says, "the positive features out-

weigh the negative. The CIO, even if it sometimes believed that it had to compromise with Southern reaction, nevertheless gave the latter a real setback. And the senile AFL, even if its methods were sometimes out of date, inadequate, or actually abhorrent, nevertheless in the final analysis did contribute to the cause of Negro Emancipation and unity of the workers regardless of color.

"... the Southern liberals, animated by the best of intentions but scattered and timid, have never been able to come together into a sufficiently coherent force to lift the region out of its dark ages... the message which the CIO has brought has a greater possibility—greater than the message of any political, racial, cultural, or religious organization—of reaching the disinherited masses of the South, restoring their self-confidence, welding together the two sections of the working class, Negro and white, that are separated from and set against each other by the color barrier."

Guérin states: "Most Negro authors who favor the integration of Negroes into the trade unions desire the creation, inside the labor movement, of a liaison organization among colored workers. They think that only such an instrument would allow the Negro workers to coordinate their action and secure a hearing when specifically racial problems arise... I personally was struck during my travels by the lack of liaison among Negro trade-union officials."

In many local unions such intra-union organizations actually exist. On a national basis perhaps an organization similar to the Jewish Labor Committee could play a progressive role. The Labor Committees of local NAACP branches could perform a liaison role in a given locality.

Negroes are indeed on the march in America. Their progress today is more rapid than that of their white brothers, but only because they start farther back along the road. The important parts of their forward progress must be made side by side with the white workers in the labor movement.

Because he is insecure by virtue of the color of his skin, the Negro is even more reluctant than the white to face the dangers of loss of employment and harassment by the government because of unorthodox political activity. This does not mean that he lacks courage or political perspective. The Negro alone will not change society in America just because he is the most downtrodden, but neither will he be a bystander to a new world in the making.

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

February 15, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 7

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, 1874.—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 WASKELL, BEN HALL

GI Wins Honorable Discharge From Army Witchhunters

Philadelphia, Feb. 5

A young socialist won an important victory against the army loyalty-security program when, after a delay of over one and one-half years he received an honorable separation last week.

The ex-soldier had served two years, including 15 months overseas, with character ratings of excellent, but had been released from active service with a character of service "pending completion of investigation." Two months after his release he received the army's Letter of Allegations, and, two months after that, a hearing before an Army Field Board of Inquiry at Fort Dix, N. J. After a silence of over a year, during which time he remained ineligible for mustering-out pay and other benefits, he received, without any further explanation, his honorable separation.

The soldier had been inducted before signing his loyalty form, a procedure that has now been amended. He was interrogated while overseas and made a frank, open statement about his political connections, refusing, however, to name persons he had known during such connections.

He stated that he had been a member of Temple University's Students for Wallace in 1948, of the university's Socialist Club, and of the Libertarian Socialist League, now defunct. He also stated that he had attended open meetings of the Independent Socialist League, an organization listed by the attorney general as subversive and now in process of a hearing. All of his statements became the basis of allegations upon which he was to receive a sub-standard discharge from the army as a security risk.

A VICTORY

The importance of his honorable separation at this point is that it is one of the first issued to an avowed socialist believing in a fundamental reconstruction of society, whose defense consisted largely, before the Fort Dix Hearing Board, of an explanation of socialist views. He fully agreed to most of the allegations and based his defense largely on constitutional grounds.

It is also one of the few cases in which an honorable separation has been given to a man who refused to cooperate with investigating authorities to the extent of refusing to become an "informer." The basis of this refusal took up a large part of his defense, since it was this issue which seemed to be the crucial one determining the army's reluctance to regard the GI as "loyal."

The ex-soldier, who is now studying at an eastern university, and is active in socialist circles, released this statement following his receipt of the army's letter

informing him of his honorable separation:

"I am very happy that we have won, after long delay, this victory against the loyalty-security system. I wish first of all to thank those of my friends who stuck by me after my initial separation and helped me, regardless of their own political affiliations and regardless of the fact that they were assuming some personal risk in so doing. I am grateful to them and honor them.

"I wish also to thank my counsel for his help, and Rowland Watts, then of the Workers Defense League, and the Fund for the Republic, for publicizing some of the worst aspects of the army loyalty-security program. Without the help of such real civil-libertarians my fight would have been impossible.

"At the same time I wish to caution civil-libertarians everywhere against the notion, so prevalent now, that this is any kind of a big victory or that things are getting better generally. Individual victories are important, of course, but the over-all effect has been not to do away with the loyalty-security program and its effect of creating a conformist America; it has on the contrary been to make this program simply more palatable to liberals, less vulnerable to charges of McCarthyism, less gross and unjust."

"But the basic framework remains to be fought, and the fight will be harder now that the program is taking on the tinges of judicial 'safeguards.' The loyalty-security program is invading ever greater areas of American life: private industry, entertainment media, and above all the labor movement, at the same time that it continues in government in politer forms.

"I call upon all civil-libertarians, and I pledge myself, to continue the fight against all aspects of the loyalty-security program, until the climate of democracy and freedom of expression is again secured—a climate which cannot be secured until democracy is extended to all phases of human life in general. Personally I feel that this extension is impossible without a fundamental reconstruction of our society along democratic socialist lines. As I have stated before, under more unpleasant circumstances, the fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable."

THREE YEARS OF THE YSL

Three years ago this week, in February 1954, the Young Socialist League was formed at a convention in New York.

This period of three years has not been one of growing student politicalization. Liberal organizations, such as Students for Democratic Action, have experienced a considerable decline, and the events of the past year have all but destroyed the Labor Youth League.

Within this context, the YSL has not become a large, mass student organization; yet it has maintained itself, won new recruits to the cause of socialism, expanded its influence on various campuses, and, unlike any other youth organization in the country, has actually been able to grow slowly.

Today YSLers throughout the United States are active in a dozen different spheres of political activity.

Last fall, the Chicago YSL took a leading role in organizing anti-imperialist demonstrations against the Russians in Hungary and the attack on Egypt. The

'Enroll for Freedom' Campaign to Go On

New York, Feb. 12

The recently organized nation-wide student civil rights campaign, "Enroll for Freedom," has received such an encouraging response from around the country's campuses, that the committee in charge of the drive has announced plans to extend the time limit for at least another month.

Originating out of a New York City committee which worked in close cooperation with In Friendship for the anniversary concert of the Montgomery bus boycott, which helped raise funds to fight against segregation in the South, Enroll for Freedom has appealed to students in all sections of the country to help the struggle against Jim Crow.

Honorary chairman of the group is the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., the leader of the Montgomery Improvement Association, which has sparked the bus boycott.

Launched in late December, Enroll for Freedom has aimed at obtaining signatures on a petition which affirms student support for civil rights and endorses the Supreme Court decision on integration of the schools. Each signer of the petition is asked to contribute 25 cents as his share in aiding economically victims in the fight for basic democratic rights in the South for all. A button, inscribed with the words "ENROLL FOR FREEDOM," is given to each petition signer who donates his quarter.

MOVEMENT GROWING

The money collected during the petition campaign is to be turned over to In Friendship, an organization which has the support of civic, labor and religious leaders in both the white and Negro communities. Its co-chairmen are Msgr. Cornelius J. Drew, Rabbi Edward E. Klein and Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick. Enroll for Freedom's funds will be specifically earmarked for assistance to those who have particularly suffered in school communities because of their courageous work on behalf of civil rights, regardless of their race or religion.

The Enroll for Freedom Committee called upon all students at the outset of the campaign to appeal for the broadest possible support on their campuses. This

would include youth of all varieties and shades of political, social and religious opinions to help the petition drive. From reports received by the committee, the campaign has very definitely gained wide support on many campuses.

At Columbia University, the NAACP, the Young Democrats, the Young Republicans, Hillel, SDA, and the Debs Club have all endorsed Enroll for Freedom. The City College of New York Student Council gave its support and directed a very successful petition campaign. The National Student Association, NAACP and Socialist Discussion Club joined forces to work toward a combined triumph at Antioch College in Yellow Springs.

Many other colleges and universities are in the midst of preparations for the Enroll for Freedom drive, including UCLA, University of Chicago, University of Pittsburgh, Millersville State Teachers College in Lancaster, Pa., Brooklyn College, Sarah Lawrence and the University of Michigan. At all these schools, groups of students have either formed ad hoc committees for the campaign or are working through specific organizations already on the campus.

APPEAL FOR AID

According to Bill Lusk, a Columbia University student and member of the committee, Enroll for Freedom needs even larger support than it has already received because of its exceedingly important role as the American student contribution to the fight for civil rights.

"While the campaign has appealed to many groups of students who have given it their wholehearted and active help," he said, "Enroll for Freedom has a tremendous job ahead. We must all put extra effort into the urgent need for publicizing the plight of those who live under Jim Crow every hour of their day and who need all the moral and economic support we can give. When students across the nation state unequivocally their support for those who are fighting for their very lives to enlarge the cause of civil rights, they are contributing much more than the monetary value of their quarter donations. Let's help put the American students on record for another step in the fight for greater democracy."

We of the Young Socialist League, too, call upon students and youth everywhere to solidarize with the Negro struggle in the South and support Enroll for Freedom to the greatest extent possible. Our friends on various campuses have helped to organize broad groups to work for a successful campaign and their participation has contributed much to the success of this student civil rights drive.

We particularly hope that Challenge readers will aid the campaign on their own campuses and give it the boost of active support so rightfully deserved. For additional information, write to ENROLL FOR FREEDOM, c/o In Friendship, 122 E. 57 Street, New York 22, N. Y.

Get the Challenge

every week — by subscribing to
Labor Action. A student sub is
only \$1 a year!

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

THE POST-ELECTION STRUGGLE TAKES SHAPE

The Polish Revolution Nears a New Turning-Point

By HAL DRAPER

Practically everybody hailed Gomulka's election victory on January 20, either in advance or after the event, as a welcome thing for his own side, whatever the side was. This includes Moscow's *Pravda*, the State Department, Tito, Radio Free Europe, the Sweezyites, Cieslaw Milosz, the French Stalinists, the German Social-Democrats, Walter Lippmann, *Le Monde*, the Bevanites, and the *N. Y. Times*.

Somebody must be wrong . . . maybe even more than one.

A second elementary conclusion from this world united front is that the Gomulka election was no decisive answer to the "Whither Poland?" question.

On the Western bourgeois right, there was little vagueness about the motives for the all-hails. We have dealt in considerable detail, in previous *LA* articles, with the prevailing views in Western capitals and political circles which hold that a real anti-Stalinist revolution in Poland (as in Hungary) would or could be a disaster for the West. There has been more of the same in the last few weeks.

On the Polish election day, an editorial in the *N. Y. Herald Tribune* nervously averred that "It is essential that NATO be prepared for any eventuality, whether it comes tomorrow, over Poland, or next week or next year. The first necessity is military preparedness, lest a struggle against Communism in some satellite spill over into Western Europe." Then it specified that the spill-over peril lay in Germany.

Four days before, a Washington dispatch in this favorite newspaper of Eisenhower's had quoted (as often before) administration spokesmen as "concerned" over the possibility that an "anti-Red" vote in Poland might touch off revolt in Poland, then (worse still) in East Germany; and (worst of all) in West Germany, whose people might insist on coming to the others' aid. However (exhale) it was fortunately believed by "some sources" in the capital that Gomulka had so rigged the voting that the election couldn't get out of control.

TRANQUILIZED

From Bonn (Jan. 19) a *N. Y. Times* dispatch reported that both Adenauer and the Social-Democrats were worried lest a revolutionary explosion against Stalinism take place in Poland. They wanted to do what they could to "tranquillize" the Polish people; for a revolution in Poland would stir up the East Germans, which would prejudice the Russians against making a deal for German unity. Thus the revolution is always getting in the way of good burghers' plans; it's a nuisance; put the Poles on Milton.

After the election the most vivid report of the reaction in the State Department came from *Le Monde's* Washington man. "Relief in Washington," was the headline (Jan. 22).

According to a *Times* Warsaw dispatch (Jan. 17), Radio Free Europe's broadcasts to Poland were sufficiently close to the State Department line to satisfy the Warsaw regime, at least until January 7 when a blast against RFE appeared in the Polish press for saying something (not reported) out of line:

Detail

For the sake of completeness, add the following small detail to our account (Jan. 28) of the Gomulka election rig-up. From the *Christian Science Monitor's* Joseph Harsch, Warsaw, Jan. 19:

"Mr. Gomulka has a number of cards up his sleeve. One is a special election-law feature which permits a voter who has 'business' out of his own district on election day to vote in any other district. Such a device would make gerrymandering unnecessary. It is only necessary to move voters from a solid district to a marginal district."

"The Communist paper said the broadcasts had suddenly changed the support they had given M. Gomulka after the political crisis with Moscow in October."

Before this, the French correspondent Philippe Ben had noted with surprise in *Le Monde* that "one of the most representative journalists of the regime" had praised the Free Europe broadcasts to him.

It should also be remembered, outside of Free Europe's role as an unofficial State Department agency, that RFE had gone through a rough period of accusation that it had overstimulated the Hungarian Revolution with its exhortations; it made doubly sure no doubt to toe the State Department line on Gomulka.

Within Poland itself, regime spokesmen rubbed in the moral to give pause to revolutionary pressure from the people:

"Numerous comments on the election from Western newspapers were being reprinted here, particularly on the theme that M. Gomulka and the program of renovation that he symbolized were Poland's only hope of avoiding a return of 'Stalinism' or even Soviet intervention." (*N. Y. Times*, Jan. 19.)

In the text of a Warsaw radio broadcast we find the punchline that caps this. The commentator (Dec. 17) is explaining that "all thinking U.S. politicians and publicists" are moving away from the "liberation" line; quotes a British Tory paper to the same effect; and adds: "If some hothead should think that they could count on Western help, they would soon see their own lack of prudence."

TWO LINES

So it is clear enough why these Western sources welcomed Gomulka's victory: what was set back, they felt, was the "danger" of revolution. But this is also what explains the world united front from its various viewpoints. For the revolution is not popular among any of the powers that be, or their publicists.

This was indeed how the issue was posed in Poland on January 20. Not that anyone was getting set for a revolution that particular Sunday, of course! But everybody knew that the real contest was between the Gomulka line of the "clean ballot"—uncritical endorsement of the regime—or the line publicly launched at a student mass rally in Warsaw.

The revolutionary students' line called for crossing out (as a political demonstration) those candidates who were most closely identified with the preceding Stalinist regime but who were now formally supporting Gomulka and made up a good part of the single-list ticket. The political demonstration proposed would be a mass announcement that the people wanted more progress toward socialist democratization, more independence from Russian power—in short, simply "more" than Gomulka was willing to give.

It was against this "more" line of the revolutionary students that Gomulka directed the growing drum-fire of the last week of his campaign against crossing-out (*LA*, Jan. 28).

In its typical fashion, the Gomulka regime and press howled unceasingly that the "reaction" wanted to cross out all Communists, and by implication all candidates who stood for "Polish socialism." There no doubt were such people, just as no doubt there were Horthyites somewhere about on the streets of Budapest in the revolution.

A KIND OF "SUPPORT"

But the fact is that the line which the revolutionary democratic students had taken the initiative in announcing publicly was one to support the "Gomulka

Communists" and their allies against the *Natolin-Stalinist-Communists*—against the will of Gomulka himself! And such "support" of Gomulka was the very symbol of the revolution which Gomulka had set his face against.

As we indicated in our first sentence, there are all kinds of ways of supporting Gomulka. This was the kind of "support" to himself that Gomulka condemned as the main enemy in the election.

The Stalinist wing of the party, still the big majority of its apparatus, backed the Gomulka "clean ballot" drive right down the line. There is not the least indication of any sabotage of the "clean ballot" from this side; nor is there any real reason to believe that there would be, given the fact that the composition of the upper part of the ticket (those slated for election) was designed to maintain unity with the "former" *Natolinists* whose purge from the party Gomulka was opposing.

On their own, many of the bureaucrats of the Stalinist wing would have been voted down by a landslide, even under the rigged conditions of the election. They were riding back on Gomulka's say-so and prestige, and there was no conceivable reason for them to throw a monkey-wrench into that process until the election was safely over.

THE TEN PER CENT

There still have been no official figures announced (as far as we know) on how much crossing-out took place at the polls; the figure 10 per cent has been mentioned in a couple of places as an estimate—that is, 10 per cent of the voters did some crossing-out. These voters, who resisted Gomulka's appeals, were the ones who struck the only electoral blows at the Stalinist wing.

The low marks in the vote were polled by those well-known party leaders who had been most compromised under the pre-Gomulka Stalinist regime.

As against Gomulka's personal 99.4 per cent vote and the high percentage of 98.4 scored by *Po Prostu* editor Eligiusz Lasota, a low mark of 91.4 went to the party Central Committee's secretary Jerzy Albrecht, a poor 86.7 to the discredited Helena Jaworska who had headed the former Stalinist youth league, and an extreme low of 79.5 (to take another example) to a Lodz candidate named Mrs. Patarkownu who had made the mistake of giving a glowing welcome to Bulganin after the Poznan rising. So it went.

The *Christian Science Monitor's* excellent foreign correspondent Joseph C. Harsch, in Warsaw, reported: "Invariably independents, peasants, democrats and Roman Catholics ran ahead of anyone regarded as a Stalinist. . . . That is, even these, for the very highest voting percentages went to those Communists who were clearly untainted Gomulkaists."

POLITICAL DEMONSTRATION

Harsch speaks of "conclusive evidence that as far as possible they [the voters] showed their contempt for Stalinists and their preference for those who had hoped to bring off the October half-revolution. . . . Officially and organizationally, there still is only a single party in Poland. But the voters have distinguished between three branches of this party—Stalinists, Gomulka supporters, and socialists." But of course this refers as far as overt action is concerned only to the 10 per cent or so who crossed-out, that is, who followed the revolutionary students' line and not Gomulka's.

If this overt action was taken as a political demonstration against an accommodation with Stalinism by only 10 per cent, then the overwhelming majority of the others yielded to the "clean ballot" only under the various and overwhelming pressures which we detailed in our Jan. 28 issue—pressures which ranged from the implied threats of a Hungarian-type massacre to the ballot-box arrangement at the polls which usually made impossible a secret ballot as

far as crossing-out was concerned.

The revolutionary students' line, therefore, did not achieve the victory in the election that the speakers at that Polytechnic rally had hoped—for example, to throw the election of some of the worst Stalinists into a second ballot; but what has to be kept clear, in view of the regime's misleading propaganda, which was widely parroted in press dispatches, is the nature of that line itself.

For example, Gomulka, in that noted January 19 speech of his in which he threatened that crossing out candidates meant crossing out Poland, had also thundered: "Reject the criminal whisperings of the reaction, as well as the stupid voices calling for the deletion of PZPR [the CP] candidates."

STALINISTS RAISE HEADS

The distinction here between "the reaction" and the merely "stupid voices" is not a fine point. Regularly and systematically the Gomulkaists use variants on "stupid" to denounce those democratic oppositionist elements whom even they dare not smear as "reactionary." In this case the reference was absolutely clear to the sensational and public stand of the Warsaw students, of which everybody naturally knew.

But the Warsaw student rally or any of the speakers at its never called for deletion of the PZPR candidates. The policy they proposed and spelled out was to delete the names of those candidates whom, they said, you "do not have confidence in," that is, the Stalinists and compromised bureaucrats whom no one trusted but who were being kept afloat as part of Gomulka's line of accommodation with the Russians and their stooges.

(As we see, Gomulka's touted self-reform has not yet gotten to the point where he dispenses with the old Stalinist tricks he was brought up on.)

So Harsch's sweeping statements about what the voters did are not really quite accurate; they do serve to highlight the fact that the anti-Stalinist blow was struck only by the 10 per cent who rejected Gomulka's line.

This was not enough. The peculiar world united front of hollers was able to point to the election results as a setback to the revolution they feared. Actually it was not that either; it was merely indecisive; though a bigger vote for the revolutionary students' line could have meant a positive spur to the further development of self-confidence on the part of the most advanced elements. This Gomulka succeeded in stopping.

The victory was not only Gomulka's, though indeed everyone knew that it had been brought about only by the weight he had swung with the people (including in that also his alliance with the church). To the extent that the "clean ballot" went through, to that same extent the Stalinist-wing candidates were able to raise their heads again, now that this trial-by-ballot was over. It was only their fates that had been in question right along, not the others'.

A PUSH BEGINS

On the momentum of Gomulka's drive to "tranquillize" the revolutionary opposition, and with the election result hailed as a victory for the "clean ballot" against the plan to delete the Stalinists, it was the Stalinist wing that launched the cry that the election results meant a vote of confidence in THEM, the party-apparatus men.

This very important fact, which is also a key to what is beginning to happen in the present period, was laid on the record by an unimpeachable authority, the organ *Sztandar Mlodych* on January 31. We have to explain that this is the official organ of the Communist youth league, and thereby hangs the reason for its special authority.

Since the October upheaval, the Communist youth organization has gone through two changes. In November the independent student organ *Po Prostu* (revolutionary democratic plus Gomulka-Communist) called a youth congress which proceeded to set up a new national youth league outside of the official one. In December, however, this was merged back with the official league under a new name; but the upshot is that the youth organization is still in deep ferment, with revolutionary elements of the "more" movement seeding it all the way to the top, not at all under Gomulka's mechanical control—indeed, perhaps as far from him in the revolutionary direction as the adult party apparatus is from

(Turn to last page)

A REPORT ON THE MIDDLE EAST CAULDRON

Arab Socialists And Arab Unity

It is the Arab socialists of the Al-Baath Socialist Party that are the vanguard of the movement in the Arab world toward Arab unity, reported Brijen K. Gupta in a series of press articles following a tour of the region.

The Baath Socialists center in Syria, but also have considerable strength, in Jordan, and large influence in the other Arab states.

Following is the picture Gupta draws of the role of the Baath Socialists, their ideas and their leadership.

"The greatest impetus to Arab unity comes not from Egypt, as is wrongly reported from Cairo's Semiramis Hotel by the European reporters, but from Syria," he writes. Egyptian-Syrian unity is a first objective. "Arab unity is not in the cards of the near future but the groundwork for it is being laid day by day," in the form of customs-union arrangements, passport regulations, proposals for common currency, military agreements, and the drafting (now completed) of a proposed constitution for an Arab Federation.

The Suez nationalization gave impetus to the pro-unity feeling, but even before it the Syrian parliament unanimously approved immediate negotiations with Egypt for union. This was moved by Salah Bitar, the foreign minister who is a leader of the Baath Socialists.

The Baathists see in Arab unity a road to solving the problems of imperialist domination, domestic reform and the Israel issue, and not merely an end in itself.

The two outstanding leaders of the Baath Socialists in Syria are Akram Hourani, "trade-union boss" and effective political leader of the movement, and Michel Afflak, who is the leading intellectual spokesman and "theoretician" of the movement.

Hourani has been a powerful force in the setting up and elimination of successive governments in the country. Secretary General Afflak "commands the allegiance of the intelligentsia and the students and is a very frequent lecturer at the Syrian University in Damascus."

They believe that Arab unity would help to weaken the role of outside imperialism in embroiling the region and thereby make it easier for the Arabs and Israel to come to terms with each other. This is the outcome toward which they look.

"We shall ask Israel," Afflak told Gupta, "to join us, and to agree to lose as much sovereignty as any Arab state would lose. And in addition we would promise to world Jewry a spiritual symbol in Jerusalem, such as the Vatican promises to Catholics the world over." But he also said that this does not mean "unrestricted immigration of Jews" to the Middle East.

In another connection, Gupta quotes Afflak as expressing special distrust of Ben-Gurion, as the Israeli champion of the "massive-retaliation" policy, and preferring Sharett.

SOCIALIST STRENGTH

The great strength of the Baath Socialist Party in Syria has been obscured in Western newspapers, Gupta indicates, by the exaggerated outcry about "Communist infiltration" in that country.

"It is perhaps the only party in the [Arab] Middle East that has a political program with ideological foundations, with the result that the younger generation in all the Arab countries is with it," he reports.

In the present Syrian cabinet, two Socialists hold portfolios, in foreign affairs and economic affairs. Hourani, besides his strong trade-union base, also has a good deal of influence among the army officers. But the army, Gupta says,

is controlled by the cabinet, and not vice-versa as is bruited by Western correspondents.

Col. Sarraj, head of the army's internal security, has often been represented in Western papers as almost the behind-the-scenes military dictator with crypto-Communist connections. As Gupta reports it, this is a baseless myth. In the first place, Sarraj has no significant independent political role, say the Baathists, and in the second place he is a friend of Hourani, and not of the Communist Party.

The Syrian Communist Party, which has only one deputy in the parliament, would indeed like to have some kind of alliance with the strong Baathists, but such an alliance does not exist and is highly improbable. "This was one reason why the Baath refused an electoral alliance, or even an electoral adjustment, with the Communists in the recent Jordanian elections."

The leftward movement in Syria and Jordan, he says, has been toward the non-Communist left, as far as the internal politics are concerned.

IN JORDAN

In Jordan, the Baath Socialist leaders Abdullah Rimawi and Abdullah Nawas have a large electoral following among the Jordanians east of the Jordan River, and hope to become the second largest party. They have an electoral agreement with the other socialist group, the right-wing National Socialist Party led by Suleiman Nabulsi. The two are united on Arab unity; "they have their disagreements on the future of King Hussein."

In the national elections held toward the end of last year, the Baath Socialists of Jordan won only two seats but secured about 30 per cent of the popular vote, and in many places lost by less than 1000 votes.

In Jordan, as in Syria, the foreign minister is a Baathist, Abdullah Rimawi.

"This means that the Jordanian and Syrian foreign policies are being coordinated to the utmost extent, in fact they are almost identical. A move is growing in Jordan for a Syrio-Jordanian reunification."

SPLIT IN LEBANON

In the other Arab states Baath supporters are either unorganized or weak as such, but reports Gupta, often exercise considerable influence on politics. In Egypt, for example, it is said that Baathists are among his advisers, with varying effects as Nasser threads his political way among the courses urged on him from different sides.

In Lebanon, however, where there is a strong socialist movement in the Progressive Socialist Party led by Kemal Djumblatt, the Baathist tendency runs a poor second. In 1956 two leaders of the PSP broke with Djumblatt to form a socialist rebel group which supports their Arab unity program. These were Gibran Mejdalany, until then the foreign-affairs head of the party, and Clovis Maksoud, a member of the party Executive who studied in England under G. D. H. Cole. (Maksoud may be remembered by LA readers for his 1954 articles here on socialism and politics in the Arab world.)

Djumblatt, a very popular figure in

Lebanon, has an outlook quite different from the Baathists.

He "thinks that Arab unity at this stage would only lead to an 'aggressive nationalism' and this nationalism is likely to be directed against the West and Israel, instead of towards some creative ends. 'Egypt, in such a case, will become the Prussia of the Middle East, and might cause war.' Furthermore, he thinks, the diversity of the economic and political standards of the Arab peoples do not give any hope for unity being achieved in the near future."

This whole question in Lebanon is conditioned by the delicate religious problem in the country: the almost equal balance of Christians and Moslems. This also has a bearing on the issue of Arab unity, for Djumblatt "feels that an Arab Union would be predominantly Islamic in character and he has fears that national minorities in such a union might well be relegated to second-class citizenship."

But policy on Arab unity in Lebanon does not split on communal lines. Mejdalany and Maksoud, the dissidents, are also Christians; and, points out Gupta, so also were the Lebanese representatives who worked on the drafting commission for the constitution. So too is Michel Afflak, though his Syrian party is 95 per cent Moslem.

However, "It can hardly be denied that Djumblatt's criticism has some merit and some sting. A large section of the Orthodox Christians of Lebanon have similar doubts."

UNITY AND REFORM

Djumblatt's doubts about the consequences of Arab unity also raise fundamental issues. Here is the other side:

"According to Mejdalany and Maksoud, Arab unity would do precisely the opposite of what Djumblatt thinks.

"It would be only through Arab unity, they argue, that social and economic reforms inside Egypt could be carried out smoothly, and they think it is conceivable that the Baath socialists may well ask the normalization of political life inside Egypt as the price for Syrio-Egyptian unity."

"They claim that it would be only when the idea of the Arab Union has made sufficient progress that the pressure of the liberals and the radicals on the autocratic regimes of countries like Saudi Arabia and Yemen would make any headway.

"To them the Suez dispute is evidence enough to prove that the Arabs have to be united to resist the threat of Western military aggression.

"They are convinced that the economic development projects of the Middle East would have to be locally financed, and such financing would not take place until the economies of the rich and the poor countries are combined together."

Another sidelight is thrown on this debate when it is further reported (though apparently not confirmed) that Djumblatt leans toward support of pro-Western foreign policies for Lebanon, as represented for example by Charles Malik, while the Baathists and the Mejdalany-Maksoud group tend to be neutralist in foreign policy, though anti-Communist in politics.

OBSTACLE IN IRAQ

The picture is further complicated by the fact that in countries like Syria and Jordan, the lines between right and left tend to merge into (or you will, blur into) the lines between pro-Iraqi and pro-Egyptian sentiments respectively. In this disjunction, the former is equated with pro-imperialism and the latter with anti-imperialism.

The focus of pro-imperialist influence in

Last week we published a discussion of Nasserism and Arab nationalism by Brijen K. Gupta, an Indian socialist now studying in the U. S. who last summer toured the Middle East talking and discussing with prominent socialists and other leaders in the Arab world and Israel. His reports appeared in the Indian & British press, particularly the London Peace News (October through December) and the Times of India.

We here present a summary of some of the material which appeared in Comrade Gupta's reports as published in Peace News, the summarization being ours. This is a valuable informational supplement to last week's article, most particularly on the relation between Arab socialism and nationalism.

Of course none of the various Arab views described in this informational summary is necessarily held by Gupta, whose own opinions on some of these subjects were given last week. The same goes for LABOR ACTION.

But Gupta's knowledgeable reports fill an important gap in the knowledge of socialists on the issues in the Middle East. The big thing that emerges, we think, is the vastness of the common error of discussing the Arab world as if it were one monolithic reactionary bloc run by kings, effendis and military dictators with a single policy. It becomes obvious that socialist policy must take account of the great and fateful progressive stirrings that are boiling up in the Arab social movements, and on no account must fall into the Western propaganda cliché of thinking of the Arab world as presenting only dangerous threats to peace, democracy and other countries.—Ed.

the Arab world is the Iraqi regime of Nuri es Said, and it is thereby also the biggest obstacle to Arab unity. Gupta stresses that the Nuri es Said government is a completely anti-popular dictatorship at home, and that the pro-Iraqi underground in countries like Syria "is essentially semi-fascist in character."

Since August 1954, when Nuri took office and dissolved the just-elected parliament because it has acquired too large an opposition bloc, "Iraq has been a large prison house run... with the help of the secret police and British 'advisers.'" (Yet in the Western press, Iraq is often represented as the "good" Arab regime as against the bad Nasser regime.)

A new parliament was packed in a farcical election; the National Democratic Party boycotted it and was dissolved. The first act of the new parliament was to dissolve also the existing political parties, the sport clubs and student unions. A reign of terror against all freedoms began. In November 1954 over 300 periodicals were closed down. The government gave itself the right to deprive a person of his citizenship, and 15 leading Iraqi nationalists were victimized.

But there still are voices of protest against the Nuri line raised in the country; there have been protest demonstrations and organized petitions, some speeches in parliament against the Baghdad pact, etc. On June 28, 1955 the offices of the Baath Socialist Party were raided, and 100 Baath members arrested; 1500 people were arrested in all on that day.

Under these difficult conditions, the Baath's ideological influence is strong, as far as Arab unity is concerned, in the National Democratic Congress, which is a recent amalgamation of the former organization of the same name led by Kamil Chederjey and Hussain Jamil with Istiqlal Party of Faik Sammarly and Sadik Shanshal.

The sense in which the Baath Socialists are pro-Nasser must be seen, therefore, in the terms of this polarization of the Arab world, by imperialism, between an Iraq which acts as a base for the old colonialists and an Egypt which impresses them as militantly fighting the outside foe.

It would follow from Gupta's picture that the elimination of Western imperialism and its stooges like Nuri from the Middle Eastern scene would lay the groundwork for the development of the natural social and political antagonisms against Nasser-type dictators from the significant socialist and democratic stirrings in the Arab world.

Dulles and the Democrats — —

(Continued from page 1)

ministration by "internationalist" commentators.

In part, the bitterness of these attacks are a carry-over from the presidential campaign. At that time the Republicans insisted that our prestige in the world was never higher, that relations with Britain and France were good, and that the outlook in the Middle East was hopeful. And now Dulles, without batting an eyelash, reports that the Middle East situation is more serious than anything in the past ten years.

STATE DEPT. TACK

The key toward understanding the differences between the liberal Democrats and the Eisenhower administration is their differing estimations of the role which the United States' allies, Britain and France, can play in the Middle East.

The State Department has come to the conclusion that Britain and France are through in the Middle East, and that this area cannot be kept inside the Western camp on the basis of a policy in which these two hated imperialist powers play a leading role. It recognizes that Arab nationalism is anti-Western-imperialist.

The liberal Democrats, on the whole, do not agree with this view. Or if they do, they believe that acting in accordance with it will weaken the NATO alliance, that the net affect will be negative. For them support to the NATO allies is the first consideration. Therefore they are generally for a tougher line in the Middle East, although they do not quite spell it out.

In general, the Eisenhower administration is attempting to ride along with the wave of Arab nationalism in its attempt to establish an American sphere of influence in the traditional imperialist sense. This is done by not being too friendly to Israel, by trying to act as an honest broker in the disputes between the Arabs and British and French imperialism, and by supporting Egypt and the Arab-Asian bloc in the UN against the NATO allies on the Suez invasion, and by agreeing to ship arms to Saudi Arabia.

Senator William Fulbright, a spokesman of much of the opposition to Dulles, stated the basis of his approach in a statement on January 24:

"I regard the course of action which has been followed as harmful to our interests, as being calculated to weaken the influence of the free world in the Middle East, as disastrous to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and as damaging to our friendship with Great Britain and

France, two of our oldest and strongest allies."

Fulbright has demanded an investigation, which he got, into U. S. Middle East policy since 1946. He would probably argue that the reason Great Britain and France are finished as Middle East powers, if he is willing to admit it at all, is that the U. S., specifically during the Eisenhower Administration, has failed to back its allies. He was for backing up the British in the Suez aggression, and ultimately he would have to be for Western rule by naked force. In this case, Dulles is the formal "liberal" in that he is looking to do it through other means.

EXPLAINING TO KEFAUVER

In his testimony before the Senate committee, Dulles spelled out his motivation for the pattern of U. S. policy which antedates even the Suez crisis, in an exchange with Senator Kefauver.

Senator Kefauver: "Mr. Dulles, what worries me about this program is that we are undertaking unilaterally, by ourselves, a program which is primarily—anyway, of course, largely—for the benefit of Western Europe, without their being part of it, for the protection of the sovereignty of the nations of the Middle East without having discussed the matter with their foreign ministers or prime ministers..."

Secretary Dulles: "Well, Senator, let me say first, you say we are undertaking this for the benefit of Western Europe. That is in a sense true, but only in a sense—we are really undertaking it for the benefit of the United States, because our interest in this respect coincides with that of Western Europe.

"Let me also say that if Europe—Western Europe—were, as you put it, part of this plan, then I can say to you it would be absolutely doomed to failure from the beginning, because a plan for the Middle East of which certain of the most interested Western European nations are a part will not succeed, and I think they would be the first to recognize that fact; indeed are the first to recognize that.

"Recent events have made it such that a plan of which they are a part, or which they appear to be the partial sponsors of, just would not succeed.

"I happened to be looking last night at the scrapbook of my wife's about my first trip to Cairo in May 1953, nearly four years ago, and the whole burden of that rather unfriendly reception that I got from the press there was that we were there in the interests of the British and the French. And there was a cartoon, for instance, of Churchill putting a mask over my face and saying, 'Can't you go out there and fool the Egyptians into thinking that you are independent?' And I was presented as their stooge..."

Senator Kefauver: "But was there any discussion about getting them [the British and French] to revitalize their interest in the Tripartite Agreement [of 1950], and to include in it 'as against aggression by international Communism'?"

Secretary Dulles: "There was no consideration of that because I cannot think of anything which would more surely turn the area over to international Communism than for us now to try to go in there hand-in-hand with the British and French."

Virgin Is. — —

(Continued from page 4)

the salaries paid to locals employed by the government. Some high school teachers get as little as \$220 a month (remember the cost of living). But a Washington appointee, Comptroller Krabach, recently spent over \$5000 of public funds moving furniture from the mainland. The senate boiled over, but the "guyva maan" vetoed a bill to limit such moving expenses to \$2000.

"Most island development projects—new schools, slum clearance projects, etc.—are held up for lack of funds. If taxes collected from persons in the hotel and tourist business were returned to the island, this would not be so."

Above all, what the Virgin Islands need is self-government.

It is true that Washington has had no past policy in the Middle East in the sense that a policy is usually referred to—a military pact and some economic aid. And it still doesn't. But it is clear that the Eisenhower administration has had an attitude: to dissociate its policies, such as they may be, from close entanglement with the British and French.

DISENTANGLEMENT

True to form, Washington bungled along until a first-class crisis—Suez—gave it the opportunity. And then Vice-President Nixon announced, "For the first time in history we have shown our independence of Anglo-French policies toward Asia and Africa which seem to us to reflect the colonial tradition. That declaration of independence has had an electrifying effect throughout the world." (N. Y. Times, Nov. 4.)

It also explains why after encouraging the British to set up the Baghdad Pact with Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Pakistan, the U. S. resolutely refuses to join it.

This is one time when the conservative politicians in Washington are more sensitive than the liberals to the nationalist and revolutionary forces abroad, although they both come up with solutions which add up to the U. S. replacing Britain and France as imperialist overlord of the Middle East.

The decline of the old imperialism in this area is one part of the picture. The other is the role played by the oil interests. While the influence and importance of the U. S.'s interest in Middle East oil cannot be underestimated, and the interest it has in undermining British control—as it did in Iran—its influence has to be subordinated to the more general strategic and military considerations, and to the economic needs of Western Europe.

While the American oil companies would like to push out completely British and French oil interests and open the entire area to their own domination, this cannot be the goal of U. S. foreign policy. To beggar Western Europe means to put it on the dole, and thus to weaken it politically and militantly as well as economically. This the U. S. cannot do. It moves in that direction from time to time, but it has to pull back at crucial junctures.

NOT HAPPY

What has happened in the Middle East is not that the U. S. has calculated to weaken the NATO allies, but that Dulles was at least perspicacious enough to realize that, given the existing hostility toward British and French imperialism, it would be impossible to maintain Western domination with them as equal partners. A new basis must be found—and the Eisenhower Doctrine is an attempt to take the first step in its evolution.

Naturally the British and French are not happy about this development. However, "officially" they have welcomed the Eisenhower Doctrine and are quietly making plans for their reappearance on the stage.

It is not a question of their being completely excluded from Western plans for the area. It is simply that they are slated to be the "junior partners" in an area where they formerly ran the entire show.

It is not that the British, in particular, agree with U. S. policy. But now that the die is cast, what choice do they have?

"London expected no direct consultation in framing the new 'Eisenhower Doctrine'—a British hand in the formulation would have tainted the doctrine in the Arab world as of now," writes William Stringer, chief Washington correspondent of the *Christian Science Monitor* from London on January 4.

"What the British see—and they understand why they must 'lie low' at the moment—is Washington making policy which may totally determine the terms and policies governing the Suez Canal in the years ahead..."

Read and subscribe to
THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
The Marxist review for serious
students of social issues.
50 cents \$2 a year

"However Whitehall experts see Britain's influence being slowly, quietly reintroduced into the Middle East—over a period of more than a year. Britain will be espousing United Nations solutions to the Arab-Israeli feud and the problems of the Suez Canal and the safety of the pipeline."

The problem that Dulles has faced is getting his doctrine across without shouting out his assumptions from the roof-tops. Consequently U. S. foreign policy has been playing all sides of the street—for example, in regard to the UN.

At one point he announced that U. S. policy will be closely-tied to the UN, and then turned around and announced a doctrine based upon the intention of the U. S. to militarily intervene in the Middle East without the UN.

Dulles has no more illusions about the UN than the British or Russians. He uses it as everyone does—to get a certain policy carried out. The U. S. joined with the Arab-Asian and Stalinist blocs in forcing the British and French out of Egypt. To have done less would have completely isolated the U. S. and made it almost impossible to carry out any sort of policy.

Now, as this is written, the State Department has come up with a proposed compromise solution on the Aqaba dispute which apparently by-passed the UN. It involves an undertaking by the U. S. itself to support free passage through Aqaba for Israel if that country yields on the withdrawal of its troops. Thus the U. S. appears more than ever as the overlord of the region.

Poland — —

(Continued from page 6)

him in the Stalinist direction. As far as we know, "safe" regime elements have the majority in its leadership, to be sure, but what we are explaining is why its official organ *Sztandar Mlodych* gets to publish things that would not see print in *Trybuna Ludu*, and yet are entirely authoritative.

The January 31 article in *Sztandar Mlodych* was entitled "A Few Post-Election Reflections." Its outspoken section put the finger on the Stalinists without mincing words, for the use of the code-word "conservative" for Stalinist-Natolinist is now so standard as not to be "minced" any more.

"... one hears, from different quarters, voices saying with satisfaction, 'We have won. It is to us that support was given. It is in us that they have confidence!' This is being said by people who represent well-defined circles, people who had been criticized for their conservative obstinacy, for conservative tendencies, which were heard before and after October."

"One feels like asking the question: Are there not too many claiming this post-election credit, too many who have no right to it? This credit has been given by the nation on strictly defined conditions, conditions of the further renaissance of political and economic life, of increasing the rights of the widest number of the popular masses, of consistently uprooting everything that was bad in the past.

"We cannot remain indifferent to the question of who will be responsible to the nation for spending our election capital..."

"All those who hypocritically say they are for, but in fact acted against, workers' democracy... who wanted to bring in an order à la Stalin, should be reminded that the powerful Yes spoken by millions of electors also contained a condemnation of them and their methods."

Well, of course it did; and of course the attempt of the Stalinist wing to ride up on the swell of the election is bare-faced cheek, otherwise known as standard cynical demagoguery; but the point of the matter is not who is right in the logical debate.

The point is that this has happened, and that *Sztandar Mlodych* has to remind its readers who it was that was supposed to have won.

This is what leads into the motivations for the Stalinist push against the Gomulka men which seems to be getting under way, with the launching of an outcry against Gomulka's peasant policy.

Next week:
The Triangle of Forces in the
Polish Revolution.

Fund Drive — —

(Continued from page 1)

League, which is sponsoring the case, and, of course, to the ISL which has had to cover so much of the costs involved.

There is more to come. But everyone should remember that this is the first and only test of the list in its almost ten years of existence and it must not be hindered by lack of such an onerous commodity as money.

We don't want our press jeopardized and neither do we want our case made more difficult by lack of funds. We are therefore asking all our readers, friends and sympathizers to get behind our 1957 fund drive and assist us with financial contributions.

We know the branches of the ISL will do their job; we want everyone else to assist them. Below are the area quotas:

National Office	\$1250
Los Angeles	650
Bay Area	400
Seattle	100
St. Louis	25
Chicago	2000
Detroit	400
Cleveland	150
Pittsburgh	200
Buffalo	100
Reading	75
Philadelphia	200
Oregon	50
Massachusetts	25
Newark	450
New York	3900
Streator	25