Moscow Intervenes in CP Fight With Smear Attack on Clark

Virtually on the eve of the national convention of the Communist Party which will take up the conflict between the Gomulka-Gagauz and Stalinist Foster group over the future of the party, the not unexpected intervention came from the Red Press in the shape of a blast in the magazine Soviet Union against a leader of the dissident tendency.

Stung out for attack was Daily Worker foreign editor Joseph Clark, who has been among the most vigorous critics of the old habits and approaches of the Communist movement. The Russian press assigned to the job of denunciating Clark called him “right wing,” “national-communist,” and hinted at connections with Dulles and “bourgeois nationalism.”

In a preliminary comment and rejoinder. Clark wrote that “As several Polish and Yugoslav Communists have pointed out, Soviet publications often attack something they do not quote, or if they quote, it will often be out of context. Thus, I find it difficult to discern what I wrote in the accounts quoted from Sowietzka Prawda.

Most of his reply is taken up with arguing that it is good Marxism and Leninism to admit some of the ideas of the great socialist leaders to the national conditions of the U.S.

“Whenever the editor of Sowietzka Prawda, C. R. Clark, also remarks, “without giving him an enlarged view of my importance.” However, most political observers commented that the Russian attack on Clark was designed to intimidate other CP dissident elements as an assurance of success for the Foster-Dennis leadership.

An editorial in the Daily Worker assured its readers that the attack in the Russian organ will not be taken as instructions by “American Communists,” who, it said, will make up their own minds at the convention. This assertion of political independence has been generally taken as a reflection of the Gates group’s views.

On Monday (in the same issue which reported the Russian blast), the Daily Worker’s letter column printed an intervention by Jack Bigsby, who asked Clark to give evidence for his assertion that the Stalinists in the Polish CP were anti-Semitism against the Gemella leadership. In reply Clark cites a number of items, including the Pac Protsa statement quoted in LA Jan. 28. His first citation, however, was from a Canadian Communist leader, J. B. Saliberg, saying that the CP was up with Khrushchev.

“Comrades, recently returned from Poland, have confirmed the following facts. First, that Comrade Khrushchev on his arrival in Warsaw while the Polish Central Committee was meeting said that he would never allow Poland to fall into the hands of the ‘impersonators and Zionists.’ Surely, this is the language of interference. In addition it has an anti-Jewish bias, otherwise why add the word ‘Zionist’ to the word ‘impersonators?’

The Communist party convention opens February 9.
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AFL-CIO Is Pushing To a Show-Down on Clean-Union Issue

By BEN HALL

A showdown is coming at last, and quickly, in the fight against racketeers and gangsters in the labor movement and against their allies, apologists and defenders. That alone would be a great vindication of the AFL-CIO merger, which has led to this important move.

Fair unions were found guilty of corrupt practices in violation of the AFL-CIO constitution by the Ethical Practices Committee; and the Executive Council now meeting in Miami is taking action against them. They are small unions, total membership about 170,000; but by beginning with them, the federation gives warning to more powerful affiliates, like the Teamsters, and prepares the precedents.

The Executive Council has already adopted three sets of codes, laws that will govern the federation and that can be enforced to eliminate the stamp out racketeering, both in its obvious forms and in itsrespectably decorated manifestations. The three codes are:

1) A code of rules governing the operation of welfare funds to outlaw practices harmful to the Code for the advantage of corrupt officials, through phony “salaries” and “commissions.”

2) Provisions to prevent a ties between union officials and employers by outlawing “investments” by labor officials under conditions that clearly deme- nstrate collusion with management. (The Council seems to feel that such provisions are so unneeded that it is constrained to reiterate its belief in capital enterprise.)

3) A code of laws to be known to racketeers and Communists from union leadership. In addition, the adoption of this code prepares the way for action against racketeers. Most union officials enforce provisions against Communists, what is now is the adoption of a code to be enforced against racketeers. This is all to the good.

DEMOCRATIC ISSUE

Nevertheless, the code, while aimed primarily against crooks, continues to reflect and reinforces an attitude that undermines union democracy. One thing to outlaw racketeers. It is some- thing else to outlaw the whole Communists for their political views or affili- ations.

Regardless of how we may detect the opinions or program of Communists, all their democratic rights must be defend- ed inside and outside the unions; not because we want to defend their policies but because we want to protect democracy. At some point, the labor movement will have to make a choice.

THE EISENHOWER DOCTRINE: Is It ‘Go-It-Alone?’

By SAM TAYLOR

The Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East cleared its first hurdle when the House of Representatives passed it by the overwhelming vote of 360-36. And the Senate will give it a similar majority later this month.

In Washington, as elsewhere in the country, the major emphasis was in an effort to find out exactly what the doctrine proposed to do in concrete circumstances. It is a vaguely worded statement which constitutes a blank check for the administration to do anything it wishes to and including Korean-type “police actions” and Guatamalan-type revolutions.

A pall of confusion settled over Washington as congressmen struggled to find out what was the policy of the Middle East, other than being against Communism.

There is a general rumor that one is in the making, but no one is quite certain what it is.

The Eisenhower administration, after touring the country that everything was fine in the Middle East as well as elsewhere during the election campaign, enveloped its proposals in a cry of urgency and the threat that the country would be in mortal danger if it was not adopted. This was enough to stampede the vast majority in Congress into voting approval.

But it has not been enough to stampede popular reaction into grateifying this “undeclared decla- ration of war.” The mail to senators on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committee holding hearings on the Middle East plan has been running 6 to 1 against it, according to a survey made by the N.Y. Times.

The Eisenhower Doctrine is the beginning of a policy toward the Middle East. The Times’ foreign correspondent C. L. Sulzberger quotes one of Dulles’ closest advisors as stating that “the secretary had absolutely no policy in the Middle East prior to the Suez in-vasion.” It is more of a stop-gap measure designed to “seal off the area” from “Communist military action, economic pressure, internal subversion” and to fill the “power vacuum.
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