

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MAY 6, 1957

FIVE CENTS

An Israeli Socialist Writes:  
DEAD END FOR 'PREVENTIVE WAR'

... page 6

Blasting Mollet's War on Algeria

... page 2

Ehrlich and Alter After 15 Years

... page 4

Youth Assembly Mobilizes for 'Pilgrimage'

... page 5

## The Crudest Clubbing Since the November Crimes Against Hungary and Suez \$10 Million Payoff, Fleet's Guns Back Up Jordan King in Monarchist Dictatorship

By GORDON HASKELL

"The question is whether Hussein can placate the Palestinians—for he cannot suppress the majority of his population indefinitely."—*New York Times*, April 28.

The real meaning of the Eisenhower Doctrine has been starkly revealed during the past week. The mighty U. S. Sixth Fleet has been rushed to the eastern Mediterranean to back up King Hussein's overthrow of the struggling young democratic government in his country. Ten million dollars have been granted Hussein for the purpose of "placating" or buying off the resistance of his own people against his *coup d'état*.

These are the circumstances, these the methods with which the United States seeks to firmly plant its control over the Middle East, to replace the power of British and French imperialism—which once ruled the area.

In choosing a pawn for its entering wedge in the politics of the Middle East, the American government has once again shown the unerring instinct with which it seeks out the most reactionary social forces in an underdeveloped country or area as the chosen instrument for its policy. In this case, it is King Hussein, whose sole support in Jordan comes from the Bedouin tribesmen, described by the *New York Times* as "relatively untouched by modern political ideas, and for years agents of British influence in the country."

Closest ally of Hussein in the area, as of this moment, appears to be King Saud, absolute ruler of the slave state of Saudi Arabia. Arrayed against him are all the popular, nationalist and democratic for-

ces in his own country and virtually throughout the Arab world.

What are the objectives of the American government in promoting and backing up Hussein's "Made in Washington," overthrow of the elected Nabulsi government?

In the broadest terms, they are to establish a base of American power for the "stabilization" of the Middle East against three "sources of instability" from the point of view of American imperialism's world interests there: the consolidation of a powerful and relatively independent Arab nationalist bloc; the danger of war between that bloc and Israel; the possibility of the spread of Russian influence in the area, either through economic and military aid, or through growth of native Communist movements, or through a combination of the two.

### ARM-TWISTING

Actually, the first and last "sources of instability" mentioned above can be understood only if they are viewed together. The establishment of a powerful and united Arab bloc would mean that the weight of all outside influences in the area, including that of the United States, would be reduced. To prevent this, the United States is seeking to play a "divide and conquer" game, as did the British and French in the past.

Since outright military conquest is not the method best suited to America's role of overlord in the capitalist sector of the world, and in any event would run the risk of starting World War III, this must be done by the application of a series of military-economic-political pressures on these countries to keep them divided, but

within the general confines of the American war camp.

The difficulty is that they have already achieved a level of independence and political consciousness which makes it infinitely more difficult for the United States to play this game successfully than it was for its imperialist predecessors in decades past.

Further, the rulers and the masses in these countries quite naturally seek aid and support in resisting American pressure from wherever they can get it. And in this case there is another world power which is glad to fish in troubled waters in general, and to bolster resistance to American pressure in its own long-term imperialist interests: Russia.

### ALSOP'S STORY

Thus, the American government tries to cover its own imperialist power-moves by claiming that it is "defending" the area from "international Communism."

And the Russian rulers, whose immediate interest in the area are far less pressing than are those of the capitalist world (Suez and oil), can gain support and influence by defending them, or helping them to defend themselves, from the threats and pressures of capitalist imperialism.

The danger of an Arab-Israel war, though far more immediate than that of Stalinism in the area, is also a factor which has to be taken into account.

Joseph Alsop, writing from Lebanon, reported right after the Sixth Fleet sailed for the eastern Mediterranean that this move was a by-product of an American guarantee to Hussein against a possible Israeli attack while he carried out his overthrow of the government.

Indignant denials by the Israeli government are hardly enough to counter Alsop's information, as well as the logic with which he has pieced it together.

It is hardly a secret that one of the

(Turn to last page)

### THE MARINES HAVE LANDED

## 'Free World' News

Supported by the guns of the U. S. Sixth Fleet, and with the cheers of all kinds of Americans from non-modern Republicans to ADA stalwarts like Hubert Humphrey, Jordan's boughten king imposed a monarchist dictatorship over his country, abolished political parties, and filled the jails.

Martial law was declared; headquarters of political parties were padlocked; a total curfew was declared in the principal cities; even the police were put under the control of the army; a system of military courts was set up to give summary trials to civilians and soldiers suspected of dangerous democratic thoughts, with power to hand down "extreme penalties," that is, death sentences.

"The United States government watched with quiet satisfaction today as King Hussein consolidated his control," reported Russell Baker from Washington (*Times*, Apr. 27) after this was done.

And as we go to press, the king ordered the dissolution of the trade unions, of which there are about 50 with a few thousand members.

That's how you defend the democratic world when you mean business.

### NO FINESSE

The king got his payoff promptly, practically on delivery, cash on the barrelhead—ten million clinking dollars.

Hussein, however, could not include in his delivery any permission for Eisen-

hower Doctrine ambassador James P. Richards, the payoff man, to set foot on Jordan's now-cleansed soil; and the ten million was announced as coming from a fund other than the now redolent \$200 million kitty of the Doctrine. Hussein said he would have nothing to do with the Eisenhower Doctrine; Washington made a wry face and then grinned.

Washington, however, went out of its way to make a formal and highly public announcement that the ten million was being paid for services rendered. A release by the official State Department press officer said it had been granted "in recognition of the steps taken by His Majesty King Hussein and the government and people of Jordan to maintain the integrity and independence of their nation." The American ambassador in Amman made a similar statement in handing over the loot.

But Hussein told newsmen in his capital that he knew no special reason why he asked for the money at this time. Just routine.

"Arab diplomats said the \$10,000,000 the U. S. granted Jordan today would prove a more than adequate substitute for British financial assistance." (*Times*, Apr. 30.)

### NO SUBMARINES

Also on the 30th, the Marines landed in a movement that used to be called

(Continued on page 3)

## Natalia Trotsky Denies Rumors

Natalia Sedova Trotsky, here in the United States for medical treatment, has denied the current rumors that she has been giving testimony to the Senate Internal Security subcommittee or any other congressional committee.

That report had been circulated in Robert S. Allen's political gossip column of April 18, who wrote of a "new sensation" and "secret testimony," linked it up with the committee's smear of the Canadian ambassador Herbert Norman who committed suicide, and said her willingness to testify was "a feather in the committee's cap."

A similar rumor was published in a Russian-language émigré paper. A N. Y. *Times* item on the subject, more cautiously worded, had been headed "Mrs. Trotsky Talks."

In a short letter to the N. Y. *Post*, which carries Allen's column in the city, Mrs. Trotsky wrote: "The article by Mr. Allen which appeared in your paper April 18 has no basis in fact. I have not been called to appear and have not appeared before any congressional committee."

# NORTH AFRICA **Lucien Weitz Blasts Mollet Government on Algeria**

By LUCIEN WEITZ

Paris, April 13

The Algerian tragedy has now lasted two years and a half. The insurrection of November 1, 1954, consisting of a few bombings and of the operations of partisan groups confined in the mountains, has since degenerated into a ruthless, full-scale war. A French army of 500,000 men fights against partisan groups numbering altogether about 100,000 men, and against a population which is entirely won over to the national cause, in spite—or because—of its sufferings.

Thus 130 years of colonialism have led to a terrible conflict which the socialist-led government in France has not had the courage to end.

After a brutal military conquest, and after many uprisings after the conquest, Algeria submitted to French colonization, which involved a systematic destruction of all native social structures. Since the end of the last century, an important European colony has become established. It now numbers one million people, but, at the same time, the Arab and Berber population has grown far more rapidly, and now amounts to 9 million people.

The basic characteristic of colonial Algeria, then, is the presence of a strong European minority. It is for the benefit of this minority that the slogan "Algeria is France" was proclaimed.

Among most Frenchmen, even among liberals and socialists, the basis of political thought about Algeria has always been the hope to assimilate the native Algerian population. At the same time, however, every timid move toward granting political rights to the native populations founded on the rigid opposition of the ruling group among the settlers, which has always had the administration at its beck and call. When universal suffrage was introduced, distorted as it was by the system of double and non-proportional representation, the administration proceeded to outrageously falsify the elections.

On the economic and social level, the main policy has always tended to satisfy the needs of the European community, behind a propaganda screen of grand modern achievements. While a narrow Arab and Berber élite derived a few meager advantages from this situation, the extreme poverty of the masses became more intense as a result of the rapid increase in population.

## BLOODY RIFT

It is true that in Algeria racial discrimination has never assumed the spectacular forms existing in the Union of South Africa. But it can be said that racial discrimination has inspired the whole political, economic and social system in Algeria, and that it has deeply permeated the customs of the European population.

Even so, the Algerian style of colonialism was subtle enough to trick the Arab and Berber population into believing for a long time in French democracy. This in turn produced an illusion among the rulers: The colonialists believed that Algeria would "always" remain French, and that the Algerian people would indefinitely accept, without a successful rebellion, a permanent state of material and psychological distress, of political and racial injustice, in short, that it would submit forever to collective contempt.

For these reasons, even after the insurrection of November 1, 1954, the French political leaders continued to advocate the old solutions which they had proved incapable of applying in the past. "Reforms" were proposed time and again to avoid granting the Algerian people its essential demand: the right to freely determine its own political fate, to administer its own affairs, in short, the right to independence.

The ruling political circles pretended to believe that granting such a right would amount to sacrificing the European minority, and the defense of this

minority served as a pretext for starting the war.

However, war and repression have only opened a bloody rift between the two communities.

Nobody—neither the Algerian nationalists nor the French anti-colonialists—questions the right of the European minority to exist. In fact, the nationalists value its presence as a token of its potential contribution to the construction of a future Algerian state. But the rights of the European minority cannot be equated with the arrogant privileges of a handful of large landowners and capitalists.

## REFORMS?

Finally, the presence of the French army has greatly embittered the struggle. In a climate of terror, the government continues to claim that it can crush the rebellion simply by putting into effect some administrative, social and economic reforms. At this point, we are no longer dealing with an illusion but with a swindle.

The "socialist" Resident-Minister Lacoste has given great publicity to a so-called agrarian reform. It should be remembered that nowhere in the world

could an agrarian reform be achieved by means other than revolutionary, and it will be understood that the measures of the French government are a mere propagandistic device.

A brief examination of the agrarian problem in Algeria will make this clear.

The best land is, naturally, in the hands of the European settlers, who are in a position to use modern techniques. Approximately 26,000 European settlers own over 2.7 million hectares of land, producing wine, citrus fruit, tobacco, vegetables and some wheat. On the other hand, 617,000 native peasants share 7.5 million hectares of poor and almost arid land, with a low yield of cereals, which make up the basic food of the Arab peasant. Moreover, these peasants are supposed to support 5-6 million people on this land.

The present "agrarian reform" aims to buy up 100,000 hectares of land from the large Colonial Companies, which only agree to the sale because they are sure to profit from the operation. Under the circumstances, it is easy to see why these measures are worse than useless.

## GREAT SWINDLE

We insist on this particular aspect of the Algerian problem to show how the French people have been misled. For over a year now, they have behaved as if they actually believed in the sincerity and the effectiveness of their present government. The press has stopped at nothing in order to consolidate the myth of "French Algeria" and to develop

## FRANCE

# Strike Wave Coming in France?

By LUCIEN WEITZ

Paris, Apr. 22

In the week before Easter a 48-hour strike of the Paris transportation system and of the national railways was fully successful. Unity of action had been achieved among the three major trade-union federations: "Force Ouvrière," in spite of its ties with the government, accepted the strike called by CGT and CFTC.

The strike was meant only as a warning, and the strikers resumed work although their demands had not been met by the government. The wage problem therefore remains unsolved.

The workers of the nationalized enterprises, where the wage freeze has been applied most rigidly, remain the most militant, but there is agitation in private industry as well. A general movement of the workers is not unlikely, although its timing is impossible to predict. (The strikes of 1953, which broke out in the middle of summer vacation, were just as unpredictable.)

The government is quite incapable of meeting the slightest wage demand. Every raise in the nationalized industries would increase the deficit in the budget, at a time when the government is forced to consider cuts totaling 250 billion francs—after eight days of secret discussions.

The military expenses were supposed to be cut originally by 100 billion francs, but the Minister of War, Bourges-Maunoury, a right-wing Radical firmly resisted any such move. The cuts in the investments earmarked for construction and public works were supposed to produce another 150 billion francs.

But since it is not certain that all these economies can actually be enforced, and since the deficit amounts to 400 billion francs, the government has announced new taxes. In order to prevent these taxes from being discussed before the parliament, the minister of Finance, Ramadier of the SP, is considering a

rise in postal and telephone rates and in the price of gasoline, that is, in services and goods not included in the 213 articles of the cost-of-living index.

(A law, passed by the SP when it was in the opposition, ties the wage scale to the cost-of-living index, which is based on very subtle calculations of the prices of 213 articles of current consumption. In order to avoid an automatic wage increase, as a result of the increase in the cost of living, the government is continuously manipulating this index.)

Other indirect taxes are also expected to increase. The government, which had promised a tax reform in the direction of social justice, is betraying its program in this respect as well.

## GAPING HOLE

But the growing deficit in the budget is not the only financial worry of the government. At the present rate, France will have exhausted her reserves in foreign currency by June. Every month the balance of foreign trade shows a deficit of about 40 billion francs.

Since Suez, foreign currency has to be wasted on keeping up the oil supply, but the main burden on the balance of trade and on French resources in foreign currency is the Algerian war. Mendès-France explained in parliament that the military purchases abroad represented in themselves 20 per cent of the increase in the foreign-currency deficit. Above all, the Algerian war has slowed down the volume of French exports. In 1956 the army absorbed 130 billion francs worth of industrial products which would have been exported otherwise. In 1957, the purchases of the army are expected to rise to 200 billion francs.

Hence the gaping hole in the budget. After having recently drawn \$60 million (about 24 billion francs) from its account in the International Monetary Fund, France has only \$102.5 million (40 billion francs) left in that institution. If France cannot find new sources

## New Correspondent

We welcome Lucien Weitz as LABOR ACTION'S new correspondent from France.

Comrade Weitz has long been the French correspondent for the London Tribune, the Bevanite weekly. It was as a result of his articles in Tribune, reporting the truth about the Algerian policy of the Guy Mollet government that he was expelled from the French Socialist Party by the Mollet leadership, whose hand is as autocratic inside the party as in Algeria. Comrade Weitz was one of the most prominent left-wing members of the French SP.

While Lucien Weitz's articles will cover French affairs specifically, our André Giacometti will continue to write for us as before, also.

In expelling Weitz the Guy Mollet brand of "socialist" imperialists has made him the very symbol of everything that is decent and healthy in French socialism. We are delighted to present him to our readers.—ED.

chauvinist reflexes. The inevitable economic consequences of the war—which costs the nation 1.5 billion francs daily—will perhaps impel the working class to resist actively.

The Communist Party has participated in the great swindle by its repeated votes for the Mollet government (full powers, confidence votes). It is not likely to change its course, busy as it is with re-establishing some cohesion in its ranks after the Hungarian crisis.

For the time being, it is mainly the left intellectuals and the socialist minority groups (within the SP, but mainly in the New Left with the courageous staff of *France-Observateur*) which have made known the terrible truth.

The UN session, which gave France a reprieve of six months, has been the

(Continued on page 3)

of credit, it will face a serious recession crisis.

It is impossible to develop the exports rapidly, especially since the government is about to reduce drastically certain imports which are indispensable to industrial development. But if industry is hamstrung in this way, unemployment is sure to follow. The level of exports can only be maintained at the price of cutting down on internal consumption; even so, inflation can hardly be avoided.

The government hopes, without doubt, to receive aid from the United States. If this aid should be forthcoming, it would mean that the United States is willing to foot the bill for the Algerian war, in the same way as it paid for the war in Indochina.

But times have changed. Vice-President Nixon declared on his return from Africa that the prestige of the United States depended on "the way in which we shall continue to make the [people of Africa] understand that we work for their independence alone." The U. S. might come forth with dollars, but it is easy to see what conditions it would require.

The government, set as it is on its self-defeating policy, might consider selling the Sahara in order to "keep" Algeria. Within the last few days a curious news item concerning oil deposits in the Sahara was given to the radio. The administration of the radio found it disturbing enough to hold the broadcast until it could get a confirmation.

These are the facts: Oil has been found at Edpelé (near the Tunisian border). Until now, plans were made to build a pipe-line either from Edpelé to the Gulf of Gabès in Tunisia (the shortest way to the sea) or to the Algerian coast. Now, the news has come that the government is thinking of building the pipe-line to the Libyan coast instead. Even if the information should not be confirmed, the fact that it exists at all gives an indication of the desperate expedients to which the French government has been driven.

# Weitz on Mollet — —

(Continued from page 2)

signal, on Algeria, for a fierce military terror. The state of siege in the cities, and especially in Algiers, has been tightened.

The Arab districts are surrounded by barbed wire; the military forces, particularly the paratroopers, which already "distinguished" themselves in IndoChina, have replaced the police; the judiciary practically no longer exercise any authority. The concentration camps are crowded with suspects. The populations of Kabylia have been sealed off from the rest of the country and are reduced to starvation. Most of the Moslem and European liberal lawyers have been interned, leaving the accused without legal defense. Summary executions in the streets are a frequent occurrence. Death sentences are passed on the basis of mere suspicions, and are executed daily.

## TORTURE!

The frightening accounts of returning French soldiers and officers describe the shelling of peaceful villages (which was already a known fact) but above all reveal that torture has become a current feature of the Algerian war. A book by P. H. Simon, entitled *Contre la Torture* (Against Torture) has exposed all these abominable facts.

The editor of *Le Monde* has commented: "As of now, Frenchmen must realize that they no longer have the same right to condemn, as strongly as they could ten years ago, the destruction of Oradour and the torturers of the Gestapo."

The first reaction of the government was to deny everything. Then the affair Boumendjel broke.

Ali Boumendjel, the brother of a political man close to Ferhat Abbas, who is also the lawyer of the FLN leaders imprisoned in Paris, was arrested by the paratroopers. Eight days later it was announced that he had tried to commit suicide. His brother warned the authorities: he knew that Boumendjel had been tortured and that he had become insane. Later, it became known that after having been released from the hospital, Boumendjel had been again handed over to his torturers. Finally, it was announced on March 23 that the prisoner had committed suicide by throwing himself from the sixth floor of a building.

Whether murder is involved here or not, the case in all its horror sheds some light on the illegality of methods, the arbitrary detentions, the absence of regular procedure.

At the time, a debate on Algeria was taking place in Parliament. Minister Lacoste was embarrassed, lied and covered the assassins.

A high tide of indignation shook the government. A former minister of De Gaulle's government, René Capitant, a professor in the Paris School of Law, resigned from his professorship: Ali Boumendjel had been his brilliant student in Algiers, during the years of the Resistance. The head of the lawyers' guild in Paris protested against the violation of judicial procedure. But, most significant and unexpected, General de Gaulle, who had commanded a military sector in Algeria, asked to be relieved of his command.

## SOCIALIST LEFT FORMS

After all this, the Mollet government still managed to win the support of a majority in Parliament. But now the margin has become very narrow. The parties of reaction give the government just enough votes to enable it to continue a job which they couldn't do without provoking the anger of the people.

The majority of the SP does not seem to realize even now that they are clearing the path for reaction, by acting against their principles and their doctrine. In Algeria, the government's men assassinate and torture; in France, they persecute journalists, seize newspapers (now again *France-Observateur*), punish university teachers and military men protesting against actions which current morality condemns.

Within the SP, a small minority is getting organized. A Committee for Peace in Algeria has been formed under the leadership of Robert Blum (the son of Léon Blum) and of socialist university teachers. About fifteen deputies have

joined this committee, among them Daniel Mayer, Alain Savary, Edouard Depreux, Robert Verdier.

But it seems that already the party machine is moving against this group, a machine which continues to grind away and to crush democracy within the party with the determination of a new Inquisition. After having expelled this writer for contributing to the *London Tribune*, the machine has brought heavy sanctions to bear against André Philip, Oreste Rosenfeld (the former editor of *Le Populaire*) and Marceau Pivert, the respected leader of the Seine Federation.

Actually, French socialism will undoubtedly be one of the major victims of the Algerian adventure. The minorities can only try to save its honor and to contribute to a just solution.

It is certainly not enough to be indignant against excesses, tortures and all the horrors of war. A class war, compounded with a race war, cannot be humanized. What is needed is to end the war and to open peace negotiations.

## Government Persecutes Every Critical Voice

Paris, Apr. 22

Ever since the truth has been told about the revolting methods used by certain elements of the army and the police in the "pacification" of Algeria, the government continues to persecute those who have broken the silence. Every day the government becomes more responsive to the pressure of the extreme Right in Algeria, the arrogance of which is now without limit.

The European students in Algiers demand the dismissal of the dean of the law schools, Prof. Peyrega. In a letter to the minister of War, Prof. Peyrega had described a summary execution to which he had been a witness, and had expressed his indignation about the executions by the army and the police.

The Radical Party (Mendès-France tendency) had decided to send an investigation commission to Algeria, and a violent campaign was organized to prevent it from accomplishing its task. All the government authorities declared that they would not even receive the members of the Commission, and that they would oppose any inquiry the commission might undertake.

Lacoste notified the Radical Party in a telegram that, considering the "emotion" of the European population, he would be unable to guarantee the safety of the members of the commission. In other words: "If you come, you will face a riot and don't count on me to oppose it!" The commission, which had intended to leave that evening, gave up and stayed in Paris.

This is the way in which the colonialist, fascist and racist leaders in Algiers lay down the law to a government that has conceded all power to them.

The methods of arbitrary rule continue to spread to France. Without any specific motivation, the government has seized and forbidden the sale of last week's issue of *France-Observateur*.

Commenting on the seizure this week, Claude Bourdet analyzed the evolution toward fascism which is taking place in France under the present government. He concludes: "There is not much courage and not much energy needed to stop this process now, by organizing immediately and by fighting with all those who are willing to fight."

Will Bourdet's appeal be heard? The credit of the Mollet government is, without doubt, rather low. After Boumendjel's "suicide," much wider segments of public opinion begin to question government policy.

But we do not yet have a movement of mass resistance. Perhaps this mass resistance will crystallize when the economic and social consequences of the Algerian war become apparent in their full force.

Get All Your Books from  
**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

# LABOR SCOPE

## Racketeering Problems Before Labor

By JACK WILSON

The report by the Senate committee investigating racketeering within the union movement, that four key witnesses who wanted to testify in regard to the affairs of Dave Beck and the Teamster union officialdom have disappeared, is a good illustration of the kind of difficulties facing labor in any campaign to clean its own house.

In the case of Dave Beck, who is due for a hearing at the Ethical Practices Committee of the AFL-CIO on May 6, top union officials have no power to make him appear, or if he does, to talk. If he hadn't blabbered before a national TV audience, there simply wouldn't be any evidence against him at all.

Time and again Teamsters' union officials have defended business agents under indictment for extortion, etc. with the plea that a man is innocent until proven guilty. This is true, of course. After the business agent is found guilty, he goes to jail, and upon finishing his sentence, gets his job back in the union. "He's paid his penalty to society for his mistake, why punish him more?"

How deeply capitalist thinking has permeated the union movement is shown by the fact that even some radicals defend Dave Beck and the Teamsters officials by saying they aren't doing anything different from businessmen.

As a code for the conduct of AFL-CIO officials the recent statement of the AFL-CIO Executive Council does, of course, offer a different moral basis for judging the actions of all active union people. The weight of this moral judgment, backed by an aroused rank and file, able to control its own union affairs through democratic procedures is, in the long run, the only effective force that can clean up the union movement. But there are many ifs in that fundamental proposition.

## 'Free World' News — —

(Continued from page 1)

gunboat diplomacy in a more naive era before H-bombs and guided missiles, the U. S. fleet was rushed over to brandish its cannon and jet planes over the Middle East, just to show how concerned we were to prevent any interference by foreigners in other people's affairs.

With straight face, the press announced that not a single Russian submarine was encountered to stop this mission.

Half a battalion of Marines landed at Beirut, Lebanon. "But this was no assault landing. The Marines were dressed not in combat fatigues but in their proud dress blues. Their pockets bulged not with grenades but with money. For this first shore leave, amounting in effect to 'showing the flag' on Arab territory, was neatly but accidentally arranged to coincide with pay day." (Richardson, dispatch to N. Y. Post, Apr. 30.)

## FROM DEMOCRATS

Hubert Humphrey, an intermittently liberal senator and a leader of ADA, applauded. In Cairo on a trip through the Middle East, he told the press, with regard to the fleet's move: "It was the only way to underscore Eisenhower's statement that Jordan's independence is vital to the United States."

The Democratic Party's foreign-policy elder statesman, Dean Acheson, had an article in the current *Reporter*, as it happened, on Eisenhower's Middle East program.

He vigorously attacked the president... For "moralism"...

Whereas he, Acheson, on the contrary, does "not believe that the purpose of American policy is to carry out a 'crusade' or 'mission' to bring about equal justice or to 'vindicate' international law," he said. American policy, he lectured Eisenhower, ought to be devoted to protecting vital American interests, and not blink if this may require unequal treatment of other nations.

In September, the Teamsters Union will hold its convention. From all signs, the bulk of the Teamsters rank and file want to reform their union. They want to stay in the union movement. What chance will they have of expressing themselves at this convention? None, or next to none.

The last time in our memory that any decent opposition to the Teamsters' bureaucracy spoke and functioned was when the Minneapolis teamsters union leaders, who were well known as Trotskyists, took on the Dan Tobin leadership on a few issues. The first time they did, the local lost its charter, back in 1934. Hoods and thugs from Chicago came up and worked over many prominent union men.

In 1940, in an effort to break the hold of those decent union leaders, Tobin went to President Roosevelt and an indictment against the Socialist Workers Party was obtained; and once the Minneapolis leaders were convicted under the Smith Act, the bureaucracy of the Teamsters Union obtained a firm stronghold on the union. The cynicism of this action was so apparent that the story broke out in the *New York Times* at the time, although it was later denied. For the record it should also be remembered that the Stalinists hailed the conviction of the Trotskyists under the Smith Act.

Now in the Teamsters Union there are no strong incorruptible forces, although there are thousands of solid decent members who want a good union. How can one start a rank-and-file faction on a nation-wide scale against Beck, Brewster and Hoffa? If Walter Reuther tries it, he'll be accused of "interfering with the affairs of another union," of violating union independence and international autonomy.

We raise these points to illustrate some of the problems raised within the union movement now.

He didn't say what was so terrible about Russia taking exactly the same attitude.

## FROM ROTTEN ROW

Columnist Max Lerner kept at it, of course, as probably the most rabid shouter for a strong imperialist fist in the Middle East that one can find in the whole press.

In his April 26 column he chortled over the fact that Washington was now doing exactly what it had objected to when the British and French (cheered by Lerner) tried to use the "club" (Lerner's word) against Nasser.

Eisenhower and Dulles, he complained, "jumped out of their skins to dash the club from the hands of our Allies." This was a crime, he thinks. "And now the club is in our own hands." This is good, but it shows how stupid the State Department was when its Allies wanted to beat Egypt's brains out in time.

This incarnation of everything that is vile and rotten in American liberalism, grates out the news that Egypt and Syria are in actuality "controlled by international communism." He abuses Dulles for saying otherwise at the time when the Eisenhower Doctrine was being adopted, when Dulles was trying to reassure Congress as to its possible consequences.

At that time, it is good to remember, Dulles was forced into a clear reply to the question whether any Middle East government was "under the domination of international communism at the present time." He said, "None." Since then Syria, if anything, has moved right, as a result of the unsuccessful but state-mated coup against the nationalists.

In fact, the whole juridical basis for Washington's blatant intervention in Jordan is approximately as strong as that of Russia in its intervention against the Hungarian Revolution.

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### Denies Swaback Quote

To the Editor:

The article in Labor Action of March 25, "In L. A., Shachtman debates SWP-er," contains a number of false and slanderous accusations against the Left-Wing Caucus of the YSL which we must answer in the most public and straightforward manner.

(1) Comrade Enright quotes Comrade Swaback of the SWP as saying "that it was no wonder that there were many comrades in the ISL youth now studying Marxism under the tutelage of the SWP." Even if this statement is quoted accurately, it is entirely false. First of all, the YSL is not the "ISL youth," but an independent militant socialist youth organization, unaffiliated to any "adult" socialist group. Secondly, the YSL Left-Wing Caucus contains comrades with differing points of view on many questions, and in no way declares political solidarity with the SWP as against the ISL. Those members of the Left-Wing Caucus who consider themselves in general political agreement with the SWP have arrived at this position by their own independent political analysis, and in no sense "under the tutelage of the SWP."

(2) Enright paraphrases Shachtman as referring to "the discontented youth of the ISL." The highest bodies of the ISL and YSL ought to repudiate this statement by the National Chairman of the ISL implying that the declared independence and broad character of the YSL is a fraudulent pretense behind which the ISL controls the YSL as its youth group.

(3) Again according to Enright, Shachtman charged "that the SWP was presently engaged in a split maneuver in the YSL." This is an absolutely impermissible intervention by the national leader of a fraternally related organization in the discussion on socialist regroupment now under way in the YSL. The Left-Wing Caucus of the YSL is not engaged in a "split maneuver" with the SWP or any other organization. We are entirely opposed to any split in the YSL. We do not want the YSL to affiliate to the SWP in any manner whatsoever. We want to build the YSL as the center for a broad regroupment of socialist youth in America on a minimally decent socialist political basis, not on the basis of the anti-socialist politics of the SP-SDF. We wish to unite with all socialist youth, including young members of the SWP, ISL, SP-SDF and other groups, but we want the YSL to be fully independent of all "adult" socialist groups.

The only "split maneuver" now taking place in the YSL is the effort by Comrade Shachtman's co-thinkers, the YSL Right Wing, to split the YSL and enter the SP-SDF. The purpose of the

Left-Wing Caucus is to oppose this split, to preserve and build the YSL.

LEFT-WING CAUCUS OF THE YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

April 5.

While this letter deals in the main with YSL affairs, the following comments by Labor Action are necessary.

(1) The comrades of the "Left Wing Caucus" express their resentment at statements which imply a relationship between them and the SWP. This resentment, it appears to us, should not be addressed to LABOR ACTION or Shachtman but to those who have made such "slanderous accusations." That's not us.

(2) This comment also refers to Swaback's labeling the YSL the "ISL youth." As our news article indicated, Shachtman's reference was to such statements by the SWP spokesman. But this "Left Wing Caucus," or at least its letter, utilizes this slander by Swaback to call on "the highest bodies of the ISL and YSL" to repudiate Shachtman's reference. Have they called on the SWP to repudiate Swaback, who happens to be the slanderer in the case, as they do not deny?

The YSL is an independent organization, unaffiliated to any adult group, although it enjoys the closest fraternal relations with the ISL and regards itself as constituting with the ISL a single tendency in the socialist movement. No other inference can be drawn from Shachtman's remarks.

(3) Most peculiar of all: For revealing the SWP's maneuvers and claims, Shachtman is denounced for "absolutely impermissible intervention" in the YSL discussion. This is remarkable enough, but it becomes doubly so when we remember that this same "Left Wing Caucus," in the bulletin which it has published, freely attacks, denounces and vilifies the ISL's views. We do not mind this "intervention" of theirs. What is instructive is the righteous indignation of these "Left Wing Caucus" letter-writers when Shachtman criticizes—not even the "Left Wing Caucus" itself but the SWP claims of a certain relationship with them!

(4) Finally the letter accuses the "YSL Right Wing" of an "effort . . . to split the YSL and enter the SP-SDF." This is based on the fact that the YSL, like the ISL, has proposed unity with the SP-SDF.

The letter's reference to "split" is very interesting. Is the "Left Wing Caucus" announcing in this way that it will refuse to go along with the unification if and when it takes place?—i.e., that it will split? This, of course, is the only sense that it makes. If so, then the comrades who wrote the above "Left Wing Caucus" letter have been badly tutored, no matter by whom.—Ed.

# Ehrlich and Alter After 15 Years

Translated from the Jan.-Feb. issue of Lebensfragen, organ of the Jewish Labor Bund in Israel. Condensed.

By I. EICHEN

Strictly speaking, we do not know the exact date of the 15th anniversary of the death of Heinrich Ehrlich and Victor Alter, just as we do not know where they lie buried. Secretly, like bandits in ambush, the Russian rulers murdered these two leaders of the Jewish labor movement of Poland. They did not dare hold a public trial and for a long time indeed they kept all knowledge of the murder from the world.

The first official notice of their death was given in February 1943 through Maxim Litvinov, then Russian ambassador in the U. S. In a letter to President William Green of the AFL, Litvinov wrote that "People's Commissar Molotov gave me instructions" to say that in December 1942 Ehrlich and Alter were "condemned to death by a military collegium" and that "the death sentence was carried out."

Two months later, the same Litvinov in a second letter to Green "explained" that he had made a mistake: the "trial" and execution had taken place in December 1941, not 1942. On the basis of this "date," with no exact pinpointing of the day, the Jewish Labor Bund groups of the world observed the 15th anniversary of the death of Ehrlich and Alter.

### THE BIG LIE

The official announcement of the Russian government came in response to a wave of world protest against the arrest of Ehrlich and Alter. It was at the time of the Russian-Allied war alliance against Hitler Germany.

The Russian leaders could no longer ignore the numerous protests and appeals and inquiries of the labor and liberal leaders of the democratic world, spearheaded by Albert Einstein. They no longer could maintain silence about the assassination, so they attempted to justify it with base and vulgar lies.

Eichen's article takes up the first Russian charge against the two Jewish labor leaders: collaborating with Polish army units against Russia. This was admitted to be a lie in September 1941 when they were freed and the "error" acknowledged. Beria even showed his confidence by appointing them to head the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee. On December 3, they were rearrested and sentenced to death, this time for allegedly calling on Russian soldiers to stop the bloodshed and "make immediate peace with Germany." It was typical of the Stalinist criminals that they should not only murder their victims but also blacken their name, with the absurd charge that two men who had devoted their whole lives to Jewish labor and the fight against Hitler fascism should in any way reconcile themselves with the Nazi regime. Yet at the time there were blind

pro-Communist dupes who parroted the charges.]

Finally there came a time after Stalin's death when the Russian leaders themselves revealed to the whole world the terror regime that had existed in Russia. . . . There began a period of rehabilitation of those innocents who had been convicted and murdered. . . .

Recently one of the Polish papers of widest circulation, Zycie Warszawy, published an article by an eminent Polish journalist, Stephan Arski, who is a close friend of Premier Cyrankiewicz. Arski demands in his article that the names of Ehrlich and Alter be rehabilitated.

He vigorously rejects the accusations against them. He writes that there is no ground for believing that "these two people, who were leaders of the Jewish workers in Poland for decades, would have turned to attempts to end the war against the Nazis while the latter were busily engaged in murdering millions of Jews and when the Red Army was the only hope of mankind in its struggle against the Nazi beast."

Furthermore, wrote Arski, "It is no wonder that the Soviet terror did not skip Ehrlich and Alter. It was a time when many Polish Communist leaders were murdered by the Soviets." He calls for restoring the honor and clearing the name of Ehrlich and Alter.

Whoever knows the relationships that exist in the People's Democracy of Poland knows that such an article could not have appeared in public without the knowledge of the government leaders. That proves that the Communist leaders in Poland no longer believe in the base Soviet accusations against the two Bund leaders.

### REHABILITATION?

When the process of "rehabilitating" began in Russia and in the People's Democracies, there arose a question in socialist and Bundist ranks. Should a campaign be waged to force the Russian government to rehabilitate the names of Ehrlich and Alter?

The majority of the Bundist organizations of the world, and the World Coordinating Committee, came out against the proposal. The reason was clear and simple. We do not need the "rehabilitation" on the part of the Russian hangmen. There is no need to give the murderers the opportunity to wash their hands of the deed done. . . .

Despite this we can only hail Stephan Arski's article. We salute him for his courage in raising this question in a "People's Democracy." Maybe it will help correct the polluted air that originated from the Russian Communist leaders, and help liberate the people from blind belief in Russian "justice."

Ehrlich and Alter need no "rehabilitation." What is needed is that those people who were blinded by the Russian regime be able to see better and clearer the true criminal face of the "socialist" Soviet Union.

[NOTE: At the time the Arski article appeared in Zycie Warszawy, the intellectual organs of the Polish press were pretty much wide open, still under the impress of the October Revolution and not under the thumb of the government as in the other satellites. Around the beginning of March, along with other left-wing editors, editor Korotynski of Zycie Warszawy was fired by the Gomulka regime.—Ed.]

### ISL FUND DRIVE

## Two Weeks Added to Make Goal

By ALBERT GATES  
Fund Drive Director

There was a real spurt in this week's campaign when total contributions reached the high point of \$1499, bringing the national percentage up to 84.8 or just about 15 per cent to go in order to successfully complete our 17th annual drive.

The big contributors were New York, Los Angeles, Detroit and Bay Area, and the standings altered quite a bit. Bay Area is now at the top of the list with 125%, and it will take some pushing to beat it out of winning the drive, since we have been advised by our friends that they aren't through yet. Detroit too has come through surprisingly with 107% of its quota fulfilled which puts it in a position to challenge Bay Area.

The effect of the pickup in the drive in the last three weeks is to make everything look promising. Only Philadelphia, Streator, Reading and Massachusetts are below the fifty per cent mark, all other areas being now within striking distance of finishing at their quotas or above them.

At the request of several areas, one on the West Coast and one on the East Coast particularly, the Political Committee of the ISL has extended the fund drive to May 15, in order to give an extra two weeks to cities to complete their local campaigns. This isn't exactly cricket, but it has been done before.

We hope now that this doesn't mean a letup in the next days but produces a real charge among our friends so that we may even before the time is up report to our members, friends and readers that we have gone over the quota top.

If we can get the middle layer of cities to make a real effort the job can be easily done. We are exactly \$1513 short of the \$10,000 goal. That means we have to average \$756.50 for the next two weeks and we will have done it. We are counting on every city in our list to make this possible.

### FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

City	Quota	Paid	%
	\$10,000	\$8487	84.8
Bay Area	400	500	125
St. Louis	25	30	120
Seattle	100	115	115
Detroit	400	428	107
Oregon	50	50	100
Chicago	2,000	1855	92.7
Nat'l Office	1,250	1148	91.3
Buffalo	100	85	85
Los Angeles	650	535	82.5
Newark	450	362	80.4
New York	3,900	3043	78
Pittsburgh	200	150	75
Cleveland	150	100	66.6
Philadelphia	200	110	55
Streator	25	10	40
Reading	75	0	0
Mass.	25	0	0

GIVE  
to the Fund Drive!

### We Need Your \$\$\$

The facts of life for LABOR ACTION readers are: The maintenance of LA depends entirely on your contributions to the Fund Drive. We have no angel. Make out checks to Albert Gates and send them in.

### LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

MAY 6, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 18

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 24 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER. Business Mgr: L. G. SMITH. Associate Editors: GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

## Youth Assembly Mobilizes for 'Pilgrimage' to Capital

New York, Apr. 16

One of the broadest assemblies of youth leaders to take place in this city met last week to map plans for support of the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom.

The meeting was under the chairmanship of Joe Brown, president of the Manhattan Youth Council of the NAACP. A half-dozen local NAACP chapters from colleges and neighborhoods were present, as were representatives and observers from the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Students for Democratic Action, the Columbia University In Friendship Committee, the American Friends Service Committee, the Hunter College Civil Liberties Union, the Mid-Harlem Community Parish and many other groups.

The youth leaders sketched out a program for their participation in the Pilgrimage. They agreed to organize informal ad-hoc committees on every campus and in every neighborhood in the city. These groups would take over the job of leaflet and poster distribution, hold meetings, arrange to get students and youth to go down to Washington.

They will be centers of mass support for the Pilgrimage which is developing in New York and throughout the nation. The youth and students are joining with trade-unionists, church and community groups, with a wide range of organizations, both Negro, white, and interracial.

The aim of the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom is to bring some 50,000 Negroes and whites together at Lincoln Memorial on May 17, the third anniversary of the

Supreme Court decision ending segregation in the public schools. This huge assembly will hear Martin Luther King, leader of the militant struggle in Montgomery, Roy Wilkins, national secretary of the NAACP, and A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and leader of the March on Washington movement of the forties.

In a keynote speech to the assembled youth representatives, Bayard Rustin, one of the organizers of the national office of the Pilgrimage, stressed the dual nature of the movement.

The religious element, he told his audience, was an essential part of the struggle for civil rights. In Montgomery, in Tallahassee, throughout the South and in the North, the Negro churches have become the rallying points of a gigantic mass movement. This, Rustin noted, is a function of the fact that the church is the one representative institution which is universal to the Negro community, South and North. As a result, it is of the greatest importance that this mobilization center around a theme of prayer.

### BROAD ISSUE

And yet, Rustin went on, the May 17 meeting is not going to pray and wait for the heavens to open up in answer to supplication. For the prayer meeting itself is of tremendous political significance. It will confront a Congress which is do-nothing in the area of civil rights with a mighty and dramatic statement of the determination of the people to win through to human dignity. It will be, he said, an event of international importance, one of the most crucial developments in the struggle for civil rights.

Rustin then went on to point out that one cannot even say that the issue is confined to civil rights. For, he argued, every political question in America today concerned with domestic policy—schools, health, labor—is becoming inextricably tied up with the issue of emancipation posed by the developments in the South. This one burning question has become a key issue, ramifying through both political parties, challenging fixed institutions and established values.

The Pilgrimage, he concluded, will not simply concern itself with civil rights for a given minority; ultimately it touches upon the fate of almost every citizen in the United States.

The youth leaders received Rustin's speech and his proposals for action enthusiastically. As a result, the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom will have a broader youth support than any demonstration in years. It will bring together the political students, the religious clubs, the service organizations, and it will unite them on a basic program for civil rights.

This, in the context of recent student awakenings in the field of civil liberties, is a development of major importance. It could well play a role in the re-emergence of a healthy and political student movement in the United States.

In a statement on the Pilgrimage made to Challenge, Michael Harrington, national chairman of the Young Socialist League, pledged all the resources of the YSL to the new movement.

"Our aim," he said, "is to participate in the broadest possible student mobilization of support for the Prayer Pilgrimage. We are particularly happy to join

(Continued on page 7)

## BC Editors Back, Faculty Rule Stays

By TOM KAHN

Two of the three editors who had been suspended from the Brooklyn College newspaper *Kingsman* two weeks ago (*Challenge*, Apr. 22) were reinstated on Thursday by the Faculty-Student Committee on Publications. The conditions of the reinstatement, however, continue to enforce the administration's tight grip on the newspaper and promise virtually to eviscerate the editorial powers of the staff.

In restoring Editor-in-Chief Anatole Levkoff and Associate Editor Phyllis De Sena to their positions, FSCP demanded that: "Because of the situation presently existing, said editors agree to a temporary rule that they exhibit to the *Kingsman* faculty-advisor any pre-publication copy they may be requested to exhibit to him."

It was precisely because the three editors had refused to recognize the right of the faculty advisor to read editorials in advance of publication—and, indeed, had printed the April 12 issue with no editorial at all in order to avoid the same ruling by the dean—that they had been suspended.

In setting its terms for the reinstatement, FSCP in effect served notice that it would yield not one iota of its peremptory control and that all of the protestations and demands for campus democracy were just so much head-knocking against a brick wall.

The suspended editors were faced with a very simple choice: either to give in to the administration or to lose their jobs. And more was involved than a question of personal conviction. As Levkoff wrote in a statement to *Kingsman*:

"My action was a concession, to be sure; it was a giving in on our previous stand, for which I was suspended; but it is an action that was taken solely in the interests of the newspaper. Had the paper fallen into certain hands, I feel that *Kingsman* would have become the gentle, peaceful little sheet that it was several years ago, when I was literally ashamed of its editorials."

### APATHY IS THE ENEMY

To Associate Editor Ronald Meyers, no choice was given. On the most incredibly flimsy grounds—namely, that he had made a phone call to the acting editor-in-chief to ascertain whether the latter had changed his position regarding the faculty-advisor's right to read copy—FSCP refused to reinstate Meyers. Of course, this is understandable. If all the suspended editors had been restored to their posts a bad example would have been set. Someone had to be the scapegoat.

The recent history of academic freedom at B.C. is replete with incidents such as this one: efforts for student rights which peter out. The real problem resides in the background of widespread student apathy against which these efforts by a few individuals take place. To those engaged in political activity on campus—the major effort now is being made for the "Prayer Pilgrimage" to Washington—the job of initiating movement in the student body is a difficult one.

But there are encouraging signs that students may be becoming less fretful about the old "little red schoolhouse" reputation and more concerned about not lying in a charnel house of ideas.

## YSL Weekend Camp Rings the Bell

New York Apr. 29

Over 40 members and friends of the Young Socialist League from New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania attended and enjoyed the weekend encampment sponsored by the New York Unit of the YSL on April 27 and 28. It was held at Mountain Spring Camp, near Washington, New Jersey.

The weekend selected for this gathering proved to be an absolutely perfect one: it had the warmest weather yet seen in the area this year. The camp had been advertised as a celebration of the inauguration of spring, but actually the temperature and the day-long sunshine all weekend were summer-like. As a result, bathing suits were the rage, many of the campers went swimming, and nearly all acquired sun-tans.

The featured educational consisted of a talk by YSL national chairman Michael Harrington on "The Ideas of George Lukacs." Harrington analyzed the views of Lukacs on society, philosophy and art, as expressed in such works as *History and Class-Consciousness*, noting the positive contributions to Marxist theory developed in them, and pointing out, on the other hand, those defects in his ideas which led to his becoming a Stalinist. A lively discussion period followed Comrade Harrington's talk.

A second educational planned for the weekend was canceled by an overwhelming vote of those present at the camp so that all could enjoy the unusual weather which prevailed. Socialist education, however, was carried on throughout the weekend in the form of many bull-sessions and informal discussions on a variety of political subjects, in addition to the formal educational held.

All of those attending the camp agreed that it was one of the most pleasant and fruitful ventures of this kind held by the New York YSL.

## Debate on Russian 'Workers State'

New York, Apr. 25

Approximately forty-five young people attended a debate between representatives of the Young Socialist League and the American Youth for Socialism in this city on April 23. The subject under discussion was "Socialist Attitudes Toward Russia: The Class Nature of the Russian State," with Sam Taylor speaking for the YSL and Bert Deck for the AYS.

Taylor analyzed the various viewpoints which had developed on Russia in the socialist movement as its degeneration became evident to socialists and radicals, and discussed the different conceptions held by Trotsky at different times. He subjected the "orthodox-Trotskyist" analysis, that Russia is a "degenerated workers' state which must be defended against capitalist attack," to a penetrating criticism.

He inquired how it was possible to regard a totalitarian state, in which the workers had no political rights, let alone any political power, as a workers' state. How, he asked repeatedly, can the workers rule socially when they do not rule politically? Democracy, he explained, is of the essence of working-class rule and for socialism. He ended by pointing to the many pro-Stalinist policies which this false view of Russia has led its proponents to adopt.

Deck, speaking for the AYS, stressed that his anti-Stalinism has nothing in common with the anti-Stalinism of "the Social-Democrats," which he labeled "a phony." He stated that there were two alternatives on the Russian question: either the bureaucracy in Russia was a "caste," representing a temporary re-

lapse in the transition from capitalism to socialism, in which case the socialist program for society was valid, or else the bureaucracy constituted a new ruling class which had arisen as a product of that transition, in which event the struggle for socialism was utopian.

He then proceeded to defend the "degenerated workers state" theory, stating that "nationalized property forms" were sufficient to characterize Russia as a workers state, and to argue for the defense of Russia and its "Red" Army in a struggle against capitalism or capitalist countries. He did not answer the questions posed to him by Taylor on the relation of democracy to workers' rule.

A protracted and lively discussion period, during which various aspects of the viewpoints under discussion were debated by the audience, followed the presentations. Summaries and rebuttals by Taylor and Deck concluded the debate.

## Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the *Challenge* or the YSL.

In Israel, the Bankruptcy of Policy  
Is Still Obscured by False Claims . . .

# DEAD END FOR 'PREVENTIVE WAR'

By AMNON ZICHRONY

At the public meetings arranged by the various political parties after the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Gaza Strip and Gulf of Aqaba, the withdrawal was generally criticized by the different political tendencies, though in different tones and colors. Herut speakers saw the withdrawal as "treachery"; the General Zionists saw it as a "cowardly act"; and spokesmen of Achdut Avodah characterized it as an unjustified capitulation.

The case was different for the leaders of Mapai. The majority party's meetings tried to prove that the victories of the Israeli army did not evaporate with the withdrawal but that on the contrary "Our military victory has brought us political gains," as the Mapai minister of Finance summed it up at a mass meeting in Tel Aviv.

Which of these interpretations is most realistic and meets the test of facts? To a degree, there is an element of truth in all, though to a very limited extent. None of them, however, stands up under consideration of the full meaning of the facts.

It is ridiculous, of course, to accuse the heads of Mapai of "abandoning the Zionist ideal or treachery to it."

For months before the Sinai operation, Mapai representatives had attacked the idea of "preventive war," while Herut spokesmen had toiled to convince us that time is against us and might bring our enemies an "opportune moment" to resume the war in a "second round." Herut argued: In the rivalry between them and us, we are fated ultimately to collide with their larger numbers; we must improve our security and political position, change our borders, which are not easy to defend, stop the *fedayeen* plague, defeat the Arab nationalist movement which is engulfing the Arab world like a tidal wave and is to a great extent directed against us; the only way is by strengthening our military forces and annexing specified territories.

The invasion of Sinai can be understood as an acceptance of the Herut line. The withdrawal signifies an abandonment of this line or "treachery" to it; in this limited context it is possible to accuse the Mapai of "treachery."

## IT WASN'T PROPITIOUS

The General Zionists viewed the withdrawal as a "cowardly act." Was it?

Months before the actual withdrawal, after the military victory and the end of the first phase of the Sinai action, it was clear that Israel would be obliged to give up the areas conquered by it.

The invasion of Sinai was undertaken at an "opportune moment" not only for Herut and Mapai but also for Britain and France. With the ferment in East Europe, it appeared that Russia had been weakened. This weakness gave ground to the assumption that Russia would not dare at that moment to gamble with the danger of a third world war if Britain and France decided to act against the demands of Asian and African countries for independence and national freedom.

Right after the outbreak of the Hungarian revolution and before the resistance of the Russians sharpened came the Israeli attack. One day before the attack began, we were informed that Israel would not start any military action. The next day the British ambassador came to Ben-Gurion and engaged in a lengthy conversation, after which the Israeli attack followed.

Britain and France believed that the moment was propitious for them too. But the analysis was wrong. Russia took decisive steps while America did nothing.

In his first letter to Ben-Gurion, Eisenhower had already hinted that there was a danger of a new world war if Israel did not relinquish the areas she had conquered. Bulganin's letter following threatened a war not only against Israel but also Britain and France, and spoke

Tel Aviv

of the possibility of guided missiles. Eisenhower did not take this threat lightly. He observed that the situation was really even more serious than the newspapers pictured it. One should not be amazed by this. Were the Sinai operation, with all its implications to succeed, it would have weakened Russia to an extraordinary degree, extended the area of Western influence to a great extent, and damaged the prestige of Russia as a great world power. Such a possible development the latter could not accept.

When Russia showed that it was still powerful, it became apparent that trumping its cards in the penetration of the Middle East could not be done militarily but by winning the friendship of the Asian and African nations. It was therefore clear that Israel would be obliged to relinquish the areas she had conquered. Restitution, and winning the friendship of the Asian and African nations, are two sides of the same coin.

## DOUBTER?

Not a few commentators see the root of evil in Eden's doubts. Eden should have completed the invasion without retreating and thus presented the world with a *fait accompli*; once he retreated the picture was spoiled. In point of fact, however, Eden did not stop the attack because he had doubts. If he were a doubter he would not have gotten into the invasion of Suez.

The cause of the retreat is the Russian pressure combined with the acceptance of the American thesis that the friendship of the African and Asian peoples could not be won by arms. Domination of one of them might turn out to be the thread leading to world war or to a more limited war, and would aid Russian penetration of our region.

Other commentators argue that had we invaded Sinai alone, and had not tied up with the British and French, the political background would have been entirely different. World public opinion would have viewed our operation not as an aggression but as a defense of our existence. In such a context we would not have been caught in the web of relations between the two rival blocs and it is possible that they would have held back from forcing us to withdraw.

However, the choice of withdrawal in any case would not have rested only with us. The U. S. would not have permitted Israel to interfere with its attempts to win the friendship of the Arabs. It is almost a certainty that even in such a case they would have forced us to withdraw.

Lastly, there was thrown into our political arena the argument that we withdraw because the Mapai leaders feared for the Histadrut enterprises. These enterprises would have suffered seriously if economic aid from abroad had ended. This argument too is without foundation.

It is almost certain that if the economic assistance that is given us from abroad were to be stopped, our weak economic structure would collapse, especially if other economic sanctions were added. The truth is that Ben-Gurion knew that if more stringent sanctions were imposed, the people would not stand for it. In truth it is not easy to change the habits of a public pampered all through the years of the state's existence by unproductive and willful squandering of money without cause.

Assuming we could have withstood sanctions, would the U. S. have accepted the thwarting of its program for the Middle East just because we were eating austerely. Only a few days ago, a

writer in *Letzte Naies* [the liberal Yiddish daily of Israel] apologized to his readers for slanting the news in the past few months to aid the publishers in giving the impression that we were strong internally. In fact, he wrote, great pressure was put on us that would have extended and grown even to military sanctions if we had not withdrawn.

## MYTH OF "GAINS"

Despite our withdrawal, the spokesmen of the government repeatedly make statements about the many important gains achieved by the Sinai action: (1) The Egyptians will not return to Gaza. (2) Israeli ships will enjoy freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba. (3) Our right to use paragraph 51 of the UN charter for self-defense is recognized. (4) The rift among the Arabs was widened and the Nasser myth dimmed. (5) We smashed the Egyptian army and upset its preparations to attack us the coming summer. (6) World public opinion is more awake to what is happening in our region than ever before and as a result there is greater possibilities for peace.

Are these commentators justified in their analysis?

(1) We have seen that an Egyptian civil administration has returned to Gaza, while any new attempt by Israel to reconquer the strip will be interpreted by other governments as an attack on the organs of the UN. Furthermore, even if we went to war again and succeeded, it would all end again as it did before—with a withdrawal.

(2) Will our ships have freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba? A positive answer is difficult. Egypt has hinted its willingness to bring the dispute to the World Court for adjudication. We could have requested a World Court decision before the Sinai operation. Also it has been stated that even if Egypt agreed to our right of free navigation, Saudi Arabia would oppose it.

(3) As to our right to use Article 51 of the UN Charter: we could have exercised this right before the Sinai action! Did we have to wait for the "right moment" to achieve this?

## WON'T HELP ISRAEL

(4) What truth is there about the intra-Arab rift? We read in the press about the failure of the Arab rulers' meeting to discuss the Eisenhower doctrine or to mention in their joint communiqué; from this and other indications, the conclusion is reached that divisions among the Arabs have widened.

First, the communiqué says that the Arabs must rely on themselves only for defense, and it immediately adds that the Arabs will not adhere to either of the two blocs. This means they decided to reject the Eisenhower Doctrine while not mentioning it by name in the text.

Even were we to grant that the inner rifts among the Arabs have grown: will that help Israel? It seems to me that the divisions among the Arabs that we talk of bode no good for us. This consideration will increase Russian-American competition to try to aid the Arabs in order to win their friendship. How does Arab disagreement help Israel if, on the one hand, Iraq receives military aid from the U. S. because it is a member of the Baghdad Pact, while Egypt on the other receives aid from Russia because she is not a member of that alliance?

Has the "Nasser myth" been weakened? On the contrary. Two world powers tried to get rid of him and did not succeed. Can this diminish his prestige in the Arab world to any extent?

(5) An important gain is seen in the smashing of the Egyptian army. Was it really smashed. In the Sinai action, about 3000 Egyptian soldiers were killed and 5000 were captured. Could this accomplish the destruction of an army that numbers tens of thousands? The truth is that the defeat in Sinai increased the

Amnon Zichrony is secretary of the "Third Force" group of Israel, which is dedicated to Jewish-Arab peace and justice to the Arab minority. Some of our readers may remember the "Zichrony case" in Israel some years ago: a principled pacifist, Zichrony went on a hunger strike to force recognition of his right to conscientious objection—from a government of "socialists" some of whom used to be pacifists themselves. Massive protest mounted in the country as he neared death, and the government finally yielded. We look forward to further articles by him on Israeli affairs.

military awareness of Egypt. Russian arms are streaming to Egypt in enormous quantities. Russia has no difficulty getting replacements for the warships and the few dozen tanks and cannon destroyed by Israel's forces.

There has been talk about how quantities of military equipment were found, this proving that Egypt was preparing to attack us next summer. This is a bit strange. Did the foolishness of the Egyptians go so far as to maintain sizable armories and reserves of equipment in the forward sectors or in their Sinai desert bases?

After the Egyptian dictator was able to withstand an attack of two world powers and turn military defeat into political gain by the mere fact that he had forced stronger forces to defer to him, his stock naturally rose in Arab eyes. Together with this, Arab hatred of Israel increased, since we were revealed in the eyes of our neighbors as allies of the West in its opposition to the Arab front. We hastened their unity—at least, their unity in hatred of us.

## CHAUVINIST BLINDNESS

However, there are other "gains" that came on the heels of the action.

Previously Israel had opposed the enlargement of the powers of the UN armistice observers as an infringement on its sovereignty. Now an international force has been introduced into our region. True, at present it is stationed in the Gaza Strip, though it has been proposed to place it on both sides of the border.

Previously the rulers of Israel talked of a period of 20 years without peace, not because they did not want peace but because they were not prepared for real compromises to achieve it. Now they have pushed talk of a final settlement that will naturally be made at our expense. An indication: Selwyn Lloyd has revived Eden's proposal to reduce our present borders as a means of achieving peace.

Also, the Sinai operation impelled the promulgation of the Eisenhower Doctrine. There is nothing good for us in the doctrine. The greater flexibility of action which this gives the American government is not in our favor. If Israel were to inaugurate a new war, the U. S. could send battleships to our ports to prevent a supposed threat of Communist domination in our region.

In truth, the Israeli foreign ministry was correct when it summed up our gains by saying that "What existed before will not exist again," because our political position has deteriorated. Unfortunately, the gravity of the situation is not grasped by the public here, who are over-raptured about gaining France as a friend rather than about the worsening of Israel's perspectives in Africa and Asia as well as other consequences of the action.

The Israeli public does not yet understand that if anybody gained from the Sinai operation it is first and foremost Russia, whose entry into our region was recognized very clearly; secondly, it is the U. S., whose replacement of Britain in the region is finally recognized; and thirdly, it is the Arab states, who have learned how valuable they are to the contending blocs, and have gained experience in their stand against Britain and France.

The Sinai defeat can bring advantages if the people of Israel understand that the action proved the bankruptcy of the "preventive war" policy. A defeat can open blind eyes, and destroy the causes that lead some people to the false assurance of chauvinist obscurantism.

It can bring home the correctness of the viewpoint held by some small circles in Israel today: that without significant concessions by Israel, without a reasonable settlement of the Arab refugee problem, no real peace is possible with our neighbors.

## DISCUSSION

# Now They Will Fight Gomulka

By A. RUDZIENSKI

There was no political liberty allowed in the Polish election (of January 20); there was only a choice between Russian intervention or acceptance of the Gomulka regime. To be sure, the Polish people preferred Gomulka to the Russian occupation or the "Kadarization of Poland." In this way the October upsurge was frozen at the present Gomulka stage.

In this sense the Polish plebiscite was a defeat for Kremlin policy, in spite of the optimistic declarations of Khrushchev, who put the best face on a bad thing, thus covering up his own policy against his adversaries in the Kremlin. The Polish people, in voting for Gomulka, voted for the conquests of the October revolution, for freedom and democracy, against the Kremlin.

Now we will watch the development of the Polish situation, to see whether this policy was right or wrong, whether it is possible to preserve what there is of Polish autonomy as against the Kremlin's growing totalitarian pressure.

Behind Khrushchev's wooing smiles, the Kremlin press harshly attacks the Polish papers for their criticism of Stalinism and "socialist realism," for their Western orientation, and especially for publishing Camus, Koestler and Orwell in translation. The critical audacity of the Polish writers is very dangerous to the Russian autocrats, because in Russia, the Ukraine, and Byelorussia, as well as in Lithuania and the Baltic countries, there are some millions of people of Polish extraction who read the Polish press. So the Polish press is the bearer of criticism, of fresh air and of revolutionary ferment in the whole Stalinist empire.

Hence the pressure on the Gomulka government to "discipline" the Polish press, whose political course is absolutely incompatible with the interests of the Russian bureaucracy. In addition to the direct Russian pressure, the press and parties of the satellite countries (especially the Politburos in Prague, East Berlin, Sophia, Budapest and Bucharest) attack the "Polish road to socialism" of Gomulka and attack "Polish national-Communism" as a variety of "national-socialism" (as Kadar says).

Finally the Russians also have at their disposal in Poland the old party leadership which was deposed by October, and which now, inspired by their Russian bosses, has renewed its attacks against Gomulka and his group, winning some success for themselves in spite of the electoral disaster of the Stalinists.

In their fight the Stalinist faction profits from the bad situation of the workers, promising them wage raises, inspiring nationalism and anti-Semitism, accusing

## GOMULKA SAYS NO

Add a sequel to our account (LA, April 1) of the Workers Councils in the Polish revolution. At that time we already indicated that the Gomulka regime was moving toward open rejection of the aims of the Workers Council movement, after a period of non-committal fence-sitting.

An AP dispatch from Warsaw in the N. Y. Times reported April 16:

"The Communist leadership today dashed hopes that newly formed workers' councils could take full control of Poland's industries.

"A 5000-word editorial in the party organ *Trybuna Ludu* said the national economy must stay under a central administration. It rejected demands that the councils be free to organize production without interference.

"The councils were formed last year with the aim of giving workers a voice in management. Council members demanded the right to fix their own prices and wages and arrange for their own materials and supplies.

"The editorial said that to yield to such demands would disrupt the national economy."

This formalization of the Gomulka regime's opposition to the Workers' Council system marks another step in the cold counter-revolution in Poland taking place under Gomulka's wing.

Gomulka of betrayal and capitulation before the kulaks, and other crimes. In this way the Stalinists have won control of the Warsaw organization, which played the decisive role in the October days. The secretary of the Warsaw party organization, Staszewski, who was one of the organizers of the October upsurge, was fired from his post, charged with Jewish and petty-bourgeois origin.

In the same way Matwin, a member of the secretariat and editor of the party organ *Trybuna Ludu*, was dismissed, as was the popular editor of *Zycie Warszawy*, Krotynski. The Stalinists also won the secretariat of Warsaw County and the leadership of the Rzeszow district.

The offensive of the Polish Stalinists is, of course, backed by the Kremlin, by the Russian press, and the satellite press and parties, so Gomulka was probably obliged to make compromises and concessions, such as the appointment of Zenon Nowak as deputy premier, R. Nowak to the State Council, etc.

The Polish émigré press reported a new movement of Russian troops in Silesia at the same time as Gomulka declared his support to Kadar's policy and "acknowledged the counter-revolutionary character of the Hungarian uprising."

Gomulka is trying to make a deal with the Stalinists as the only way to save his regime, but this policy is leading him to capitulation before his own and Poland's hangmen, as in the case of Hungary. He is trying at all costs to preserve the "unity" of the Stalinist party in Poland as the only way to save the bureaucratic dictatorship, but in reality the "monolithic" party is divided in three: the Stalinist Right, the Gomulkaist Center and the "revisionist" Left.

## AGAINST THE LEFT

In a confidential circular, the party secretariat attacked both tendencies, comparing the Left of the party to the old revisionists and liquidators of socialism, because the Left attacks Russia as a reactionary regime and demands liberty of criticism and discussion. The Left does not have any important bureaucratic position in the Politburo and government, but it controls the most important press organs and has the support of the students, workers and honest party militants.

Gomulka's compromise with the Stalinist faction is, of course, directed against the Left, against the free press, and thus against the deepening of the revolutionary process. On the other hand, Gomulka cannot capitulate to the Stalinists and the Kremlin under the penalty of new internal commotion. For the workers are organizing their self-government in the factories, abolishing the bureaucratic dictatorship there; the peasants have dissolved 85 per cent of the Kolkhozes, organizing their own cooperatives free from bureaucratic control. The Polish press describes the spontaneous impulse of the peasants toward different kinds of buying, selling, credit and producing cooperatives in the traditional pre-war, democratic peasant way. The Polish masses are in every field consolidating their activity and gains of October, through the toleration of the government or against it.

To counter the Kremlin's and Polish Stalinists' pressure, Gomulka is seeking help in France, Britain and the U. S., asking for credits and loans, but so far without great success. He is also seeking support by Western Stalinist parties, as is shown by the joint declaration of the British and Polish parties against Kremlin intervention. He is seeking help and financial assistance from Poles abroad, in the U. S. and Britain, and the top committees of the British and American Poles have responded favorably, in spite of their political antagonism to Gomulka.

The economic situation in Poland is very difficult, in spite of the apparent success of industrialization, because the Polish people daily get poorer and poorer, working harder and harder, thanks to the imperialist policy of Russia. The Russian policy was very simple: they sent raw materials to Poland at high prices and got back Polish-made commodities at artificially low prices. So the Polish

economy was milked, in spite of industrialization.

Now Gomulka has put an end to this economic dependence. But for how long? Without American financial help, it will be impossible for Gomulka to solve his economic difficulties, to raise wages and the peasants' living standards, and resist the pressure of Russia, for whom Polish economic emancipation could create serious problems.

Therefore the question is, how long Gomulka can resist the Russian and internal pressure. The Polish upsurge of October was probably the greatest mass movement since the time of the Russian Revolution, but it was stopped by the Russian intervention in Hungary, without having solved the fundamental problems of the economy and politics.

## TO A BOLDER POLICY

The upsurge elevated Gomulka to power against the Kremlin and the internal Stalinist opposition, as a transitional regime, backed by the majority of the Polish masses against the Kremlin. But the political struggle is going forward in Poland, and under its pressure the unitary ruling party divides into the three tendencies.

The support by the people was conditioned on the realization of the revolutionary program. Now the masses demand their program—the workers, peasants and "intelligentsia." The left wing of the party, backed by the revolutionary press, demands more liberty, more democracy, more bread, better wages, a higher standard of living.

Can Gomulka do it? He is between two fires, the pressure of the masses and the offensive by the Kremlin, its satellites and Polish agents. He is trying to appease the Stalinists, firing his own supporters on the left, and delivering high bureaucratic positions over to the Stalinists. He is trying to appease the Kremlin, capitulating on the Hungarian question.

This policy cannot gain him the support of the masses, the backing of the intellectuals and the independent press. The answer of the workers to Gomulka's pro-Stalinist appeasement was the strike at Bydgoszoz and the meeting at the Cegielski factory in Poznan (where the upsurge began), as proof that the Polish working class is overcoming the stage of Gomulkaism; and that if Gomulka does not change his policy, then it will come to an open fight between his regime and the masses. For the support of the masses to Gomulka was politically and temporarily conditioned on the realization of the Polish October.

The working class supported Gomulka against the Kremlin and against the old nationalist Right, but it will fight Gomulka if he does not realize the demands of the masses and the program of October as well as the realization of national and social emancipation.

In this situation the Polish spontaneous Left, from the students and workers to the independent press and the left wing in the party, will go over to a bold-

er policy, will attack Gomulka's concessions to the Stalinists and to the Kremlin, in this way winning the support of the masses and overcoming the popularity of Gomulka. It will be supported in this policy by the whole international working-class movement and especially by the independent Marxist Left.

March 28, 1957

## A Note

Comrade Rudzienski's article, we are glad to see, makes a transition from his previous views (of critical support of Gomulka) to a new one of opposition. This advance, spelled out in his last few paragraphs, is so welcome that it may be ungracious to demur at all, but on one factual point I think a correction is important.

In his seventh paragraph Rudzienski seems to say that the Stalinist faction, by its demagogic appeals to the workers, succeeded in winning control of the Warsaw (city) organization, whereupon the left-wing secretary Staszewski was fired. This is not true. Staszewski was not fired because the Stalinists won over the workers; nor did the Stalinists win over the Warsaw workers! Staszewski was fired from above by the Gomulka leadership, as part of the decisive turn taken by the regime to crack down on the revolutionary democratic Left and move over toward the Stalinists. (Details are in LA for March 18.)

Staszewski, Matwin and left-wing editors were fired because they stood in the way of what is increasingly being referred to as the "cold Kadarization" of Poland under Gomulka—a process which, fortunately, is not only far from completed but which can be rolled back if there is an effective crystallization on the Left of the sort that Rudzienski is now in favor of, and which has been delayed by unwarranted illusions about the national Communist Gomulka.

HAL DRAPER

## CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 51)

in behind the leadership of Martin King, Roy Wilkins and A. Philip Randolph, and we are delighted that the youth groups of the NAACP are playing a central role in the work. We want to work with every youth and student organization in the United States which is committed to civil rights. And we call upon all our units and members and friends to do everything they can to aid this important interracial movement."

From New York City, there will be a Freedom Train on May 17, with a round-trip fare of \$9.50. Buses are available at \$5.50 round-trip. Car pools and caravans are being organized. Further information can be obtained from the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom, 217 West 125 Street, New York City.

## HAVE YOU SIGNED YOUR FREEDOM PLEDGE?

I want to do my share for freedom.

- I will go to Washington, D. C., May 17, on the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom.
- I will bring two friends with me.
- I will drive my car.

PRINT YOUR NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

PHONE No. ....

(Mail this coupon to the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom, 20 West 40 Street, N. Y. C., immediately.)

## BOOKS AND IDEAS

# An Antidote to Some Colonialist Myths

By SAM TAYLOR

A short and useful survey into the background of the Middle East events is offered in the recent Penguin paperback, *The Middle East Crisis*, by Guy Wint and Peter Calvocoressi, a British historian and a journalist respectively. It carries its narrative and analysis up to the first months of this year and the introduction of the Eisenhower Doctrine.

In view of the present crisis in Jordan and the frenetic outpourings of official and unofficial propagandists about "international communism" taking over the Middle East, this book is a healthy antidote. It places Russian influence and power into its actual place and perspective.

Although it does not make a country-by-country study of the internal line-up of forces, nowhere is there the charge that any one of the Middle East countries is dominated or on the brink of domination by the forces of "international communism." Rather the dominant force is Arab nationalism, in which Stalinism tries to play a role and supports for its own reactionary reasons.

Far from providing a justification for the Suez adventure, or for the muscle-flexing over Jordan because of alleged Stalinist influence or domination of the nationalist movements, it makes clear that it is Western imperialism which is throwing the Arab nationalists into closer cooperation with Russia.

Arab nationalists, even Nasser, it is pointed out, "while trying to extract every ounce of profit out of the Cold War [are] aware of the length of spoon needed to sup with the Russians. Only if forced by the West will an Arab leader ally himself with the Communists, and even then reluctantly. The Anglo-French attack went a long way to forging this very dangerous alliance."

"The Russian interests in the Middle East are: to fend off and, if possible, drive out the Americans, the British, and any other enemies who may establish influence or bases in the area; and to substitute Russian influence for that of any other major power."

But the substitution of Russian influence is still in nascence. Its growth will

**MIDDLE EAST CRISIS**, by Guy Wint and Peter Calvocoressi.—Penguin Books, 141 pages, 50 cents.

not result from Russian guile or subversion but as a result of the continuation, in one form or another, of British and/or American imperialism in that area.

The two authors see the crisis in the Middle East in terms of the crisis of British colonialism, and only secondarily do they deal with U. S. policy. This is as it should be since the dominant power in the Middle East since the collapse of the Ottoman Empire has been the British, and the U. S. is only today entering into the history of that part of the world as a result of the weakening of British power.

## INGREDIENTS

Arab nationalism and oil are the basic ingredients in Middle East politics. While these two are of sufficient power by themselves to produce an explosive situation, the presence of another factor, Israel, which the Arabs look upon as the creation of Western imperialism, compounds the difficulties.

The failure and inability of British capitalism to come to terms with Arab nationalism, that is, to end British political domination, is at bottom of the crisis. In the opinion of the authors, in time and with the general collapse of imperial power Britain might have given up its system of "client states." But it was prevented by one special circumstance—oil.

Oil became the vital lubricant in the West European economy as well as an extremely profitable commercial enterprise. This factor determined the basic British attitude: the maintenance, in one

form or another, of the system of "client" or satellite states in the Middle East.

Therefore "from time to time Britain was ready to revise its treaties with its client states to make the relationship more equal, at least in appearance. But its hope of Arab consent was bound to be disappointed because nationalism would not be satisfied with anything less than genuine independence, and nationalism spread inevitably.

"The perennial mistake of British policy in the Middle East was to underrate the force of Arab nationalism, and to fail to grasp its main sentiment, which is a passionate longing for the assertion of full sovereignty and equality. Britain protests constantly that it has learned the lessons about nationalism, and realizes that there is no safety except in coming to terms with it; but its record in the Middle East belies the claim."

## THROUGH EGYPT'S EYES

British policy toward Egypt and the Suez Canal is reviewed not only because it illustrates this point but because it is central to the present situation. The treaty of 1936 which limited British troops to a small area of Egypt around the Suez Canal appeared to be a major concession to Egyptian nationalism, and yet it was bitterly resented.

On paper it was a means to safeguard the canal. "But by degrees the purpose came to be thought of as the securing of a base by whose means Britain might maintain its military power throughout the Middle East."

With the development of the cold war, the Suez base became a strategic focal point for the protection of the oil supplies and to prevent possible Russian penetration into the area.

This is how Western imperialism looked at the situation. For the Egyptians it was something else. "The trouble about this strategic plan was that it left Egyptian nationalism out of account. On the Egyptian side the guiding aim was that no British soldier should remain on Egyptian soil. The treaty might state that the presence of British troops did not infringe Egyptian sovereignty, but no Egyptian saw it like that. No Egyptian government would regard the treaty of 1936 as anything but a half-way house to the realization of Egypt's aim—which was the disappearance of all British troops."

Even the withdrawal of British troops in 1954 became a half-way house to a further aim—the ending of all foreign control over the Suez Canal.

## EXPOSING PRETEXTS

The political conclusion the authors draw is that the prime prerequisite for the start of any Western policy toward the Arab nations based on real friendship and cooperation and not on the old system of "client states" is the complete withdrawal of Western troops and military bases from the Middle East.

How the authors reconcile this basically progressive point with their support of the Eisenhower Doctrine is one of the major mysteries of this otherwise perspicacious book. One wonders how they would look upon the recent U. S. actions in the Jordanian crisis.

Another interesting and useful part of the book is its treatment of the events around the Suez invasion by the Israelis, British and French. There is a cataloguing and incisive dissection of the shifting justifications given by the British government for its Suez adventure.

It starts with the deception offered at the time of the attack that British and French intervention was necessary to separate the Israelis and Egyptians. On this flimsiest of justifications the authors wryly comment: "The Anglo-French action could hardly be said to separate the combatants except in the sense that the annihilation of one of them must leave the other side alone, and so separate."

Then they proceed to demolish one after another all the tales concocted about alleged possible Russian control and about how Nasser was or is in process of becoming a Russian satellite. Then why, they ask, did London and Paris conceal their motives and plans for the attack from Washington?

"The U. S., it was said, was so blind to the Russian menace that a heroic act

of self-immolation by Britain and France was needed to awake in Washington a proper awareness of the situation and to get the Americans to do something about it." This sounds remarkably akin to the arguments and reasoning of Stevenson and leading Democrats during the 1956 election.

But the authors continue: "Yet it might have been worth testing this assumption first by presenting the Anglo-French case to the Americans instead of keeping them in the dark, for the notion that the Americans discount threats from Russia is grotesque. It has been commoner hitherto to charge the Americans with a pathological propensity for seeing Russians everywhere."

There is also an attempt to give a proper perspective to Nasser's dictatorial regime. To those such as Max Lerner, the Zionist propagandist of the N. Y. Post, who try to make of Nasser a Hitler, they say: "His little book, *Egypt's Liberation*, is engaging, though naive. The comparison between it and *Mein Kampf* could only be made by someone who had read one of these works at the most."

## QUESTION OF MEANS

The strength of the book is its analysis of the crisis and understanding of the driving forces of Arab nationalism. Its weakness is support of the Eisenhower doctrine and a search for other means to accomplish what Britain failed to do by its use of military means in November 1956. Although it is never quite explicit, there is a tendency to support the U. S. approach toward the Middle East. By this they mean a greater caution and sensitivity toward the nationalist sentiment, and a reluctance to become enmeshed in Arab politics.

But this has come to an end with the Eisenhower Doctrine, which (in fairness to the authors) was only introduced at about the time the book went to press. They were writing at the time the U. S. had clearly dissociated itself from the Suez fiasco. This action by the U. S. they regarded as saving the entire Western position in the Middle East.

But what do they counterpose to the military action at Suez? They were not for the Anglo-French intervention, but they have no harsh words for the Israeli aggression. Although not saying so explicitly, they were for aid to the Israelis, whom they felt could have finished off Nasser by themselves.

In the longer run they counsel that Nasser should have been brought to his knees by an economic boycott or other non-military pressure, as the British and Americans did in the Iranian oil dispute. And regretfully it is added: "How melancholy that the same means were not later to be used in the case of Colonel Nasser."

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

## NEWARK

Friday, May 10—8:30 p.m.

### American Socialism and the Future

Speakers:

**MAX SHACHTMAN**

Independent Socialist League

**MARTHA STONE**

N. J. Communist Party

**DAN ROBERTS**

Editor, *The Militant*

**DAVID DELLINGER**

*Liberation* magazine

**HARRY BRAVERMAN**

*American Socialist*

Tunis Mansion  
939 Bergen Street  
Newark, N. J.

# Payoff in Jordan — —

(Continued from page 1)

Israeli government's long-term goals is to seize that part of Jordan which is west of the Jordan river and a part of historical Palestine. Since internal turmoil in the country might lead to a general grab for pieces of its territory by its neighbors, Israel, flushed with military victory in Egypt, could hardly be expected to stand idly by if such a golden opportunity were to present itself. In fact, since its government's willingness to engage in "preventive war" has been demonstrated so recently, it would not be exercising too much imagination to suspect the possibility that Israel might find some pretext to start the grab.

From the point of view of the consolidation of American control in the area, however, such a possibility must be prevented at all cost. Whatever shreds of moral credit the United States may seek to preserve among the peoples of the Arab world after the monarchist rape of democracy in Jordan would be irretrievably lost if one consequence of this action were to open up Jordanian territory to Israeli seizure.

## U. S. PAYS THE BILL

In short, the role of the Sixth Fleet is not to prevent Russia from marching into the Middle East, but to guarantee "peace" while Hussein strangles democracy in his country.

The American coup in Jordan may succeed. The example of Jordan may have telling effect on some of the Middle Eastern rulers who have been playing with Russian support as part of their attempt to find some way of maintaining themselves and furthering their own interests in the context of the world struggle between Russia and the United States. But if it is permitted to go unchallenged

in this country, its major long-term effect can only be to strengthen either the most reactionary manifestations of Arab nationalism, or Russian Communism, or both.

Throughout the Arab world there are many democratic elements who have looked hopefully to the United States for support in ridding themselves of their old imperialist masters. Their hopes were, alas, based on illusions about the nature of American democracy, just as the hopes of others who have looked to Russia and the world Communist movement as a source of support have been based on illusions about the nature of Stalinism.

The application of the Eisenhower Doctrine will, to be sure, help to dissipate the illusions about American democracy in the Middle East, but only at the cost of strengthening the illusions about Communism. This remains an effect of most American ventures in foreign policy, especially in the less developed areas of the world.

And the effect is heightened, to the degree that the power moves of the American government encounter no serious, determined opposition in this country. Here is another opportunity for everyone in America who has a shred of real democratic feeling in him to raise his voice in protest.

Confusing and complicated as the pattern of Middle East politics is to most Americans, one thing is absolutely incontrovertible in this situation. In a small, undeveloped country the first burgeonings of democracy are being crushed under the muzzles of an American fleet, while the bill for the suppression is being paid out of the American treasury.

To remain silent in this situation would be to betray the cause of democracy, and of socialism, all over the world.