

"Of course, I'll be just as successful here as I was in Suez." A Cartoon by Vicky in the London Daily Mirror, September 1955

Glubb Goes: A Victory for Arab Nationalism . . . page 6

BRITAIN: Illusions About the 20th Congress . . . page 3

WESTINGHOUSE STRIKE: Union Fights On. . . . page 2

NEGRO FIGHT: Thumbs Down on Demo Party . . . page 3

CYPRUS: Imperialism Hangs On With Fang and Claw

By HAL DRAPER

Ending a period of attempted maneuvers designed to split the Cypriot nationalist movement, the British government has now admitted defeat by exiling Archbishop Makarios. With this, Britain declares war on the whole of the Greek population of Cyprus, and civil war on the island is exploding.

Now, after exiling the Cypriot national leader, the British (reports the papers) are searching his palace for "evidence" of his association with terrorism! This may be the prelude to manufacturing what is lacking.

The people of Cyprus answered, with a solid general strike, still continuing. It is important to understand that this move to resort to imperialist brass knuckles is the result of a defeat.

The British gauleiter Sir John Harding, backed up by envoys from London, has been trying to win away the "moderate" elements, who look to Makarios, as a counterweight to the more militant nationalists (heavily influenced by the Stalinists). The aim has been the usual one: to make an illusory deal with the moderates which would keep the situation quiet for a while while the imperialist dominator tried to consolidate the situation.

The expulsion of Makarios is, therefore, an act of desperation in reaction to his refusal, or inability, to play the British game.

It will inevitably remind the world of the equally desperate expedient employed by the French when, frantically trying to hold on to their profitable preserves in North Africa, they turned the Sultan of Morocco into exile.

As everyone knows, this only served to unite the whole Moroccan nation more solidly than ever behind the man whom they considered the national martyr. Even reactionary and mercenary elements like El Glaoui, the pasha of Mar-rakesh, were finally and reluctantly (Continued on page 7)

Natalia Trotsky Assails Illusory Hopes About Turn by 20th Russian CP Congress

"We cannot hope for anything from these people," said Natalia nosed, through the reforms which Sedova Trotsky, widow of the great revolutionary leader, discussing the recent 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, which had sent up a massive propaganda smoke-screen about its "return to Leninism."

Natalia Sedova made her views clear in an interview with the press

they promise.

Thus she made it quite clear that she was no party to the widespread illusions and delusions,

tion overstimulated by reading the bare news that Natalia had sent a telegram to Moscow, plus perhaps . the ignorant vaporings of Harrison Salisbury which were already appearing in the N. Y. Times. He told his radio audience that all this presaged a rapproachement "between the Communists and the Trotskyists," which no doubt "Communist" would increase strength no end....

which launched the news of the telegram and letter which she had sent to this same congress of the Russian bureaucracy. However, the general press (judging by the N. Y. Times and the New York press) printed only the general content of her telegram and nothing of her views.

In her telegram, dated February 22 and addressed to the presidium of the 20th Congress, she had put before them the challenge to make good their intimations about rectifying Stalin's falsifications of history, by rehabilitating Trotsky's name.

In her letter of February 15, addressed to Voroshilov as president of the Supreme Soviet, she had asked for news of the fate of her son Serge Sedov.

The interview with Natalia Sedova, as well as the texts of the messages, appeared in the Mexican newspaper Excelsior for February 28, in an article signed by Victor Alba, a wellknown Mexican socialist writer.

Comrade Natalia riddled the notion that the new rulers constituted a "collective leadership." In reality, she said, it is the "collective dictatorship of a small group," instead of a single man.

The heirs of Stalin do not "want to he subjected in the future to the worry of depending on the caprices, moods, and complexes of a single dictator."

"SOP TO DISCONTENT"

Nothing can be expected, she said, from these people who yesterday bowed before Stalin and were accomplices in all his crimes, and who today ask people to forget the "errors" of such magnitude that they were capable of making.

They are just trying to throw a sop to popular discontent, she diag-

about fundamental reform of the totalitarian dictatorship from the top down, which followed in the wake of the 20th Congress's demagogy.

Evidently the telegram had been sent with the idea of thus exposing the demagogic character of the Khrushchev "return to Leninism," by showing that, in spite of all the talk, Stalin's chief victim and the symbol of the Leninist opposition to him, Leon Trotsky, was not going to be "rehabilitated" in official Russian historiography.

CREATIVE IMAGINATION

It seemed, however, that misinterpretation. fantastic and otherwise, was rife in the speculations of the same sort of commentators who were already blithely reporting that the Russian rulers were going back to a great democracy. One radio commentator, for example, apparently had his imagina-

But Natalia Sedova was not looking optimistically to the political deliberations of the congress. This is clear from the sentiments she expressed in the Excelsior interview.

Here is the whole section of the Excelsior article which presents the interview with Natalia Sedova.

FROM TEXT OF INTERVIEW

... Making public the text of these documents [the telegram and letter], in the Coyoacan house where Leon Trotsky had lived and where he was assassinated, Natalia Sedova declared on the subject of (Turn to last page)

LABOR ACTION



Reject Gov't Scheme

By GERRY McDERMOTT

The Westinghouse Conference Board of the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE) has turned down a package settlement proposed by a panel of mediators. and, as this is written, still has the Westinghouse chain shut down tight.

As has been true ever since last summer, it is apparent that the rank and file, or at least the secondary leaders, are in a very militant. mood, despite months on the picket line. It was the pressure of two big locals which vetoed the mediators proposal. These locals were 601 in East Pittsburgh and 617 in Sharon.

The company accepted the mediators' proposal. In so doing, it backed down a long way from its unconditional-surrender policy, which it had maintained until that time.

The mediation proposal was for a fiveyear contract, but with a reopener every year and the right to strike every time the contract was reopened.

On time-study of day workers, the proposal called for any change in rates resulting from time-study to be arbitrated, which is what the union had asked all along.

The mediators also recommended that 60 of 92 strikers fired by the company be rehired, and the cases of the remainder arbitrated.

. In agreeing to this package, the company backed down considerably. However, the union conference board still objected to two features:

(1) They wanted all the fired strikers

reinstated. The union takes the position that anyone fired deserves the protection of the grievance machinery, whether they are on strike or not. The men fired, of course, have had no hearing and have not had the benefit of grievance procedure.

Furthermore, most of those fired are militant leaders singled out by the company for retaliation. The feeling among stewards and activists is very strongly in favor of fighting to retain the jobs of these men. It is felt that unless these men are reinstated, no steward will be safe from company retaliation.

(2) The company still has not agreed to forego wage cuts.

Before the strike, Westinghouse was switching piece-work employees over to day-work, and cutting their rate in the process. The union asked that whenever that happens, the worker be guaranteed at least his old average earned rate. The company has refused to give such a guarantee. Without such a guarantee, of course, the company could take back its wage increase many times over. When the union turned down the me-

diators' package, the company redoubled its efforts to get people to crash the picket lines, or at least to put pressure on the union leaders to settle. Foremen are again calling on workers' homes, urging them to return to work

However, the ranks are still solid in the five-month-old strike.

If this strike has proved nothing else, it has established that the industrial unions in the bigger corporations, at least, are virtually impregnable. That is one of the aspects of the present high-level economy-there aren't any strikebreakers, and it is virtually impossible to starve people out. As Ford and General Motors watch the present situation, they must congratulate themselves over and over again for settling with the UAW last year.



By BEN HALL

Whenever election time rolls around, we begin to imagine that democracy is the common, ordinary, to-be-expected state of affairs. But it only takes little incidents like the following, to remind us that democracy becomes real only when people are organized to make it so. In this country, the principal organized base of democracy is the union movement.

· The Southern Bell Telephone Company has threatened to fire seven employees, members of the Communications Workers of America in Kentucky, unless they withdraw their candidacies for local and state public office. It seems that the company frowns upon political activity by its workers. "We should make it clear," a company statement says, "to all our employees that we cannot permit the campaigning for or the holding of such office.'

The union first countered with a campaign to press the state legislature to adopt a law forbidding company interference with democratic rights but it was defeated in the state Senate. The House had passed the bill 82-3. Since the union does not feel strong enough to challenge the company outright, the seven workers have withdrawn.

• Last fall two CWA members in Louisiana, who had announced their intention of running for the state legislature, were warned by Bell that they had to give up their jobs or their politics. But the union went to court and on the basis of a state law illegalizing such company action succeeded in forcing Bell to retreat.

• In Wisconsin, the union faces an attack against political rights of a different kind. The president of CWA Local 5501, Stephen L. Kreznar, was fired by the Wisconsin Telephone Company when he was denied government security clearance. Kreznar, who works as an installer, was charged with being a member of the Socialist Workers Party, which he denies. The CWA filed a grievance on his behalf, only to be turned down by the company, and the international office of the union now must decide whether to press the case to arbitration or drop it.

CLASS STRUGGLE

Sixteen pickets were arrested at the gates of the Fairchild Airplane Company plant in Bay Shore, L. I. on March 6 at 7:30 in the morning. A-strike of the International Association of Machinists was only a few hours old. This was only two weeks after the opening of a strike at the Republic Aviation Corporation, also in Long Island . . . two weeks in which more than 20 pickets were injured and more than 50 arrested, culminating in a strict injunction against mass picketing.

And this is New York where labor and liberals are strong and influential.- It doesn't take long for the police and courts to clamp down these days.

Yet-

Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, was quite content with an AFL-CIO declaration setting up a Community Services Committee with himself as chairman. "This statement," he said. "is a departure from the traditional pattern of trade-unionism in many countries since it rejects the philosophy of isolationism and class struggle." (He feels no compulsion to examine the attitude of the Bell Telephone Company toward class struggle.)

fers it. Peace is wonderful but not at the price of progress."

And-

An editorial in the March issue of the Butcher Workman, published by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union, goes (one might say) whole hog, under the title "'Class Struggle' Rejected?"

"The principles announced by the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO, spelling out the responsibilities of trade-unionists in each community, make a clear-cut document.

"We cannot, however, believe that the Executive Council can concur in the statement of Vice President Joe Beirne, who is Chairman of the Community Services Committee of the AFL-CIO, when he said, "This statement in itself is a departure from the traditional pattern of trade unionism in many countries, since it rejects the philosophy of isolation and class struggle.'

"To reject isolationism is commendable, but to deny the 'class struggle' is another question. The great strikes of the workers igainst entrenched financial interests at Westinghouse Electric Company for the past six months, the Kohler Company in Wisconsin for the past two years, and the enslavement of organized labor in Southern states having phony 'right-to-work' laws, certainly is proof enough that this is not a classless nation, and that the class struggle is still with us.

"The great campaign of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Union at Miami Beach, Florida, against the owners of those seeming Taj Mahal hostelries stretching along miles and miles of sandy beaches, at thirty and forty dollars per day rates, can never be told that the class struggle is not still running rampant, particularly with the miserably low wages paid these hotel employees.

"The statement of Vice President Beirne bught to be clarified. Of course, there may be some distinction between the philosophy of the class struggle and the existence of the class struggle. The one point we desire to make, however, is that we may be sure that the class struggle will always be with us so long as selfish men assume the right to rule over the jobs and the lives of other men."



Bourbon Regime?

Scientists at Yale University have struck a major blow at America's prestige in the world.

Publishing the results of a survey on alcoholism, they have come up with statistics which seem to show (according to a columnist in the Pittsburgh Press)

(a) "World-wide statistics are bleary. But it looks like the U.S. has more alcoholics than any other nation.

Union Stands Firmly by Victimized Men

BY JOHN WILLIAMS

Newark, March 13 .The rejection of the federal mediation plan by the IUE Westinghouse workers shows that the latter are determined not to be blackjacked by the so-called "liberal" mediators.

The fact that the Westinghouse Corporation accepted the plan so readily was a tipoff in itself on which way the "compromise" was slanted.

What has annoyed the company, and the mediators, is the militancy of the Westinghouse workers in rejecting the loaded government proposal. When the union's Westinghouse Conference Board, consisting of all Westinghouse plants, woted, there was a confident and jubilant attitude, such as is manifested before a. struggle-not usually shown by workers after five months of picketline walking.

When one examines the reasons for the union rejection, and the way it has been reported that it took place, then truly the Westinghouse workers deserve admiration.

The unions main reasons centered around the discharge of its militants during the strike, for what the company called picketline "atrocities." The importance of the union's rejection can be readily understood by examining the approximately 36 people involved. They were all key militants and leaders of the various Westinghouse plants. To all intents and purposes the union would have been decapitated and left leaderless. Victor Riesel, the Hearst labor writer, reported that James Carey, IUE president, leaned in the direction of accepting the plan but was soon brought into line by the demand of the Conference Board delegates that all fired strikers get their jobs back. This would fall into the general picture that preceded the strike when it was the Pittsburgh plant workers who pushed Carey into a struggle against the company on the time-study issue.

The whole problem of union control of job classifications and work standards under automation was left unsettled. About the only real difference was that the company had moved somewhat away from its position of "no interference with its sole right to manage."

The fact that after five months of fierce battlingsthe company was forced to move away from its heretofore absolutely idamant position was a source of inspiration to the Westinghouse workers. They knew immediately that the company was being forced to take its new stand because of the fight they had put up. Their confidence was renewed in their own ability to win.

To anyone who has been impressed only by the company's strong attack on the union, and demoralized by all sorts of middle-class illusions, the attitude of the Westinghouse strikers was completely unaccountable.

It is interesting to note that the inde-pendent (Stalinist-led) UE, which is concurrently striking against Westinghouse, has been sticking it out and going along with IUE very closely. This is in line with the present CP tactic of backto-the-organized-labor-movement.

For quite some have been held in IUE' about permitting the UE to enter it. For some, UE entry into IUE would be a threat to their job on a local level.

However, it must be reported in all fairness that Carey has been militantly prosecuting the struggle and has earned the personal hatred of the Westinghouse officials.

On the work-standard issue, the company did make a "compromise" when it agreed at least to submit any disputed standard to arbitration. However, the union was far from satisfied as the plan was loaded with gimmicks that would result in downgradings, speedups and wage cuts.

However, it appears that the Stalinists are making headway in divesting themselves of their former strikebreaking taint. Previously, while IUE took strike votes, UE would settle with either Westinghouse or GE for less than the IUE was asking.

Following the union rejection of the federal mediators' proposal, the com-pany is continuing to fight. In broadcasts throughout the day over the radio, they mobilized their supporters to attend union meetings to vote against the Conference Board rejection. They singled out Conference Board leaders as the ones responsible that the workers are still out on strike.

But the union is holding solid: One of the very encouraging things about the Westinghouse strike is the thoroughness with which the rank-and-file strikers themselves understand the issues, and, in general, the support from below that has been won from the workers and the community.

But-

Joseph Keenan, international secretary of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, took a slightly more diffident attitude in a speech at the fourth annual Union-Management Conference at the University of Notre Dame last month. He saw a better tomorrow "when, if ever, there comes the day when management lays aside the implements of class warfare and accepts, with good grace, the right of working people to a full and effective voice in economic life through unions of their own choosing.

Nevertheless, he added, the union will use "every legitimate means at its disposal to defend and advance the interests of the working people of America—in cooperation with management where possible; but in opposition to management where that is the way management pre-

(b) "The District of Columbia, seat of our federal government, totters at the head of our drinking parade [among the states]. It has more male alcoholics than any other section of the Union and its women alcoholics are second only to the gals in Nevada. The D.C. rate for alcoholics is one out of every 13 adults, including one out of every eight men." These subversive statistics were pub-

lished in the current Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol.

There was no comment relating this news to Bulganin's recent remarks about Martinis and American foreign policy.

Free World News

Eugene Holman, chairman of the board of directors of Crusade for Freedom will take time out from his duties as chairman of the board of Standard Oil of New Jersey to campaign for funds for the Crusade. Standard Oil will contribute \$250,000. The Crusade lists Saudi Arabia where chattel slavery is widespread and where Standard Oil enjoys major oil concessions as part of the "free world."

-Reading Labor-Advocate

Illusions About 20th Congress Are Rife

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, March 9

In Britain, as elsewhere in the world, political circles have been much occupied in recent weeks in interpreting the significance of events at the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party. Newspapers and periodicals of every political color and tendency have been busy explaining to their readers what the latest movements in Moscow really mean.

The most pathetic exhibition has been, of course, that of the Stalinist press once again turning head over heels in an endeavor to justify policy changes which it had no part in developing. The Stalinist newssheet, the *Daily Worker*, has been quick to show that it intends to peddle the new line—even if it doesn't fully understand the necessity for its adoption.

On February 22 Allen Hutt, a wellestablished member of the Stalinist hierarchy and an editorial member of the *Daily Worker* staff, set the paec when reviewing the biography of the press baron, Lord Beaverbrook, written by the Bevanite member of the Labor Party executive committee, Tom Driberg.

Said Hutt of Driberg: "He has given us an extraordinarily illuminating study of what the cult of the individual, what purely personal leadership, means, in Big Business terms. He shows its end in frustration, uncertainty, lack of purpose." Hutt also said that Beaverbrook's lack of principle led him to swing from one position to another—from appeasement to campaigning for the Second Front and from backing the worst French reactionaries "to becoming more Stalinist than Stalin."

If the thirty thousand members of the British Communist Party were horrified that their late idol Stalin should be bracketed in such a fashion with a reactionary Tory press baron they were in for an even greater shock a week later when the Daily Warker devoted its editorial to the "lessons" of the 20th Congress. The capitalist press, it said, might report with glee the remarks made in Moscow concerning the cult of the individual, but where would the capitalist- press be without "the cult of Beaverbrook and Churchill"?

But, as if to excuse itself for suggesting afinity between Churchill and Stalin (and perhaps insure itself against any future turns in Russian policy), the *Daily Worker* hastened to add: "If Stalin was over-praised and the work of the party and the working class was minimized, nevertheless Stalin's contributions to Socialism were significant." The development of Marxism, it said, never ended, and what was happening was a development of "creative Marxism." "So Communists will hail the functioning of inner-party democracy in the Soviet Union."

In a few weeks time the British CP assembles in London for its 24th Congress and many interested eyes in the British Labor movement will be able to see how the Stalinists here interpret "inner-party democracy" and how far they are prepared to extend it to their own organization.

BEVANITE REACTION

The British Stalinists, however, are only very small fish in a big political ocean: more important from a real point of view is how the Left Laborites are going to react to the latest Moscow movements. A fair indication of this can be gained from the comments that have appeared in *Tribune*, the Bevanite weekly newspaper edited by Michael Foot. tion-will not forever be content to be excluded from political influence."

Aneurin Bevan himself, in today's issue of *Tribune*, harps upon the the role of the "professional and technical classes" who "occupy positions of decisive importance in the national economy." The present Russian rulers, he says, are faced with a situation in which a personal dictatorship has become an anachronism because of the succession of Five Year Plans that have "revolutionized the texture of Russian life." He then reiterates a statement he made five years ago when he said that industrialization was lifting large numbers of Russians to "economic enfranchisement" and that "political enfranchisement" must follow.

"Some people will argue," says Bevan, "that it is impossible for the Russian people to win the franchise for themselves against the power of a state machine in the control of one party. History does not confirm that view." And he then proceeds to recall the efforts of the British workers to secure parliamentary representation for themselves and asks why the same developments should not take place in Russia.

Bevan makes quite clear that he does not think that democracy within the Russian CP penetrates to the rank and file, and much less to the Russian people as a whole. "We will have to wait for that," he says, "but it will come beyond all doubt, either in the long or in the short run."

If the differences of opinion develop inside the Russian CP to a point where one or another group of leaders wished to extend the franchise and so gather greater support, says Bevan, "then the conditions for separate political parties would arise."

EXPOSING THE TURN

The same issue of *Tribune* contains another article, alongside Bevan's on the development in Russia. Written by Gerry **Healy**, the editor of *Socialist Outlook* which was banned by the Labor leadership eighteen months ago, it is captioned "Will they take back the lies about Trotsky?" and carries a large photograph of Leon Trotsky.

After recalling the purging of Trotsky and the old Bolsheviks and the transformation of the Bolshevik Party into a monolithic apparatus controlled by a bureaucracy of which Stalin was the personification, Healy states that the bureaucracy remains entrenched in the party and the state—even though Stalin is dead. Khrushchev and Co., he says, attempted at the 20th Congress to kill two birds with one stone; by attacking the Stalinist cult they hope to stave off growing criticism at home and at the same time impress Western socialists. "In other words, this is Khrushchev's method of defending the bureaucracy in the present world situation. Just as Stalin blamed Trotsky for every evil under the sun, so we can expect all short-comings to be explained away as by-products of the 'cult.'"

"The real test will come," he says, "when the Soviet workers begin to participate publicly in the policy-making decisions in the Soviets, factories and the press."

He concludes by saying that the reestablishment of democratic rights in Russia, as in Communist Parties all over the world, "will be accomplished as a result of a successful struggle against the bureaucrats."

٠

DIVERSITY A PROBLEM

In contrast to Healy's attitude the New Statesman and Nation, in its issue of March 3, carried an article by Kingsley Martin which sees the Moscow movements as a "restatement of Communist philosophy" presenting a "new challenge to the western world." Martin asked if the "basic revision" of Marx—as interpreted by Lenin—announced in Moscow now lets in "the 'reformist' heresy of Social-democrats"? The fact that the Russian Communists, he said, now recognize that there are "many roads to Socialism" is the most important of all changes in the "Communist doctrine."

Expressing the hope that Western socialists will now be able to think out their own policy without "the constant preoccupation with a struggle against Communist Parties," Martin said that when Bulganin and Khrushchev visit Britain in the spring they should be subjected to severe cross-examination which, he hopes, will mark the fact that "Western socialists" can once again engage Communists in "dialectical discussion."

It is fairly obvious that with such a diversity of views being expressed on the left wing of the Labor Party, and with a fairly large section eager to see the Russian developments as what Bevan calls "a belated constitutional adaption to the changes that have occurred in the structure of Russian society," the Third Camp socialists within the party are going to have to work hard to make their point. Future months will undoubtedly see some extremely interesting discussions developing in the local Labor organizations as the anatomy of Russia is examined on the basis of the 20th Congress.

Fight for Rights Pushes Negroes Away from Demos

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, March 11 The increasing difficulty of maintaining the status quo in American politics has been amply demonstrated by recent events surrounding the magnificent efforts of the Negro people to win for themselves the full rights to which all human beings are entitled. CIO white members are in the Citizen's Council. Here, clearly, is a crucial area for the labor movement.

Threats of secession, obvious dissatisfaction and sharp antagonism between the white and Negro members of the labor movement—these are some aspects of the problem facing the labor movement.

Comm. Demands Picketing Rights At UN Building

On the eve of the trial of two Puerto Rican nationalists arrested Feb. 22 for attempting to picket the United Nations, 16 organizations issued today a public statement protesting the UN's antipicketing regulations.

The arrests occurred only a week after a conference between a deputation of the Committee to Secure Picketing Rights at the United Nations and David B. Vaughan, director of the Office of General Services at the UN.

At this conference. Vaughan refused to negotiate any change in the regulations which ban picketing on the sidewalk directly in front of the UN (on the *east* side of First Avenue). At present such picketing is limited to a small section on the opposite (west) side of First Avenue out of sight of the Assembly Building entrance.

Today's statement, issued by Rowland. Watts, civil liberties attorney and secretary of the Committee, concludes: "To deny the right to picket on this sidewalk seems to us an infringement of liberty. inconsistent with the United Nations Charter. We therefore find Mr. Vaughan's adamant position unjustified. It leaves open no further avenues of negotiation, with the only recourse a direct challenge which may result in a legal test of the present picketing regulations."

Among the 16 organizations making up the committee are: Workers Defense -League, American Civil Liberties Union, New York Civil Liberties Union, Young -Socialist League, American Committee on Africa, War Resisters League, Post-War World Council, and several organizations representing democratic Latin American émigrés.

PROTEST TO UN

The full statement of the Committee follows:

"Since last October the Committee to Secure Picketing Rights at the UN has been striving to secure the right to picket on the sidewalk directly in front of the United Nations (on the east side of First Avenue).

On November 10 a 6-man delegation representing the 16 organizations constituting the committee met with Frank M. Begley, chief of building management service for the UN. At his suggestion the committee thereupon communicated with Albert F. Bender Jr., chief legal officer of the U.S. mission to the UN. Upon Mr. Bender's advice, the issue was then raised with David B. Vaughan, director of the office of general services for the UN.

"On February 15 the same 6-man committee which had met with Mr. Begley, conferred with Mr. Vaughan, who asserted that there would be no change in prevailing regulations under which picketing is limited to a small section on the opposite side of First Avenue (the west side of the avenue).

"That section-a small park between 42nd and 43rd Streets-is actually out of sight of the main entrance to the Assembly building and is so distant from the entrance to the office building that picket signs cannot be read by those entering. In short, picketing at such a distance cannot ac complish its aim expression and is therefore inadequate. 'Furthermore, the sidewalk directly in front of the UN buildings, although it may be UN territory, IS a public sidewalk, open 24 hours a day-as differentiated from the enclosed area where the buildings are located. To deny the right to picket on this sidewalk seems to us an infringement of liberty inconsistent with the UN Charter.

On February 24, Tribune dealt with the 20th Congress in a front-page lead story which, as it was unsigned, must be assumed to represent editorial comment. "The change," it said, "is a real change, ... It would be absurd to see Khrushchev as a sudden convert to liberal ideas. It is equally absurd to discount the significance of the change and dismiss it as a trivial maneuver."

The dismantling of a dictatorship from within, continued the article, is something never previously attempted in history and would take many years to perform. There will be obstacles, setbacks, diversions, counter-moves and stumblings in the dark.

"But the motive power for change is still strong and rooted in practical necessities. Khrushchev is first and last an organizer, interested in efficiency and production." *Tribune* then commented that as the movement proceeds wider, questions will follow because: "The growing army of Soviet technicians—like the French middle class in the RevoluAnd the hopes of many politicians, including labor leaders, that the 1956 campaign could be confined to a rehash of old issues and standard disputes took a bearish turn with the intrusion of the Negro question into the forefront of acute domestic issues. Nor is there any indication that the burning character of this decisive battleground will diminish.

In the South, the AFL-CIO found many of its local leaders members of the natorious White Citizens Councils. In the North, the labor leaders found a deep hostility to the Democratic Party developing. The net result is a new and different kind of political situation than was expected. And the problems call for new answers, for the old no longer meet the test of events.

Down in Montgomery, Alabama, Jack Brock, president of the Typographical Union, publishes a race-baiting sheet called the Alabama Labor News. A member of George Meany's union, business agent Webster Bozeman, is a member of the executive board of the Montgomery White Citizen's Council. A CIO official down there says that at least half the Likewise, the problem of organizing the South, a major objective of the AFL-CIO, faces not only the long-standing jurisdictional disputes but also the everpresent and now sharp question of "How do you organize?" Jim Crow Locals or bona-fide unions? It appears that the time for temporizing and compromising on this issue is past.

Nor will these issues die down. For soon comes the fight of the Negroes to register and vote.

The top labor leaders thus far have stood firmly on the traditional views of the progressive section of the union movement. George Meany sent a letter to the Montgomery locals informing them that the AFL-CIO wasn't retreating on that ground. It was a good start, but a long hard fight is ahead.

In the North, the defection of a large number of Negro unionists from the political program of the labor movement (vote Democrat) is clearly in evidence. At the recent civil-rights conference in Washington, the debate between Paul Butler, Democratic national chairman, [Continued on page 4] "We therefore find Mr. Vaughan's adamant position unjustified. It leaves open no further avenues of negotiation, with the only recourse a direct challenge which may result in a legal test of the present picketing regulations."

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street, New York City, specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply bocks of all publishers. Send for our free book list.

LABOR ACTION

Page Four

Anti-Stalinist Encyclopedia

THE SOVIET REGIME—COMMUNISM IN PRACTICE, by W. W. Kulski.—Syracuse Univ. Press, 1954, 807 pages: \$8.00.

By HAL DRAPER

In January, in reviewing T. Cliff's book Stalinist Russia, I mentioned that it does a great job in its first couple of chapters in assembling a documented mass of material on the conditions of the people under the Stalinist regime; that it was in fact "the best accomplishment of this task to date, *for its size.*" The reason for the italicized qualification was the existence of Kulski's book, which is truly unique and which has no close competitors."

Kulski's The Soviet Regime is in every sense a one-volume encyclopedia precisely on the subject of documenting the conditions of the Stalinist regime "out of their own mouths,' most particularly out of their own laws and official documents. Do not confuse this job with that performed or even attempted by any other among the scads and slews of books on Russia that come out of the publishers' assembly line. Fainsod's bulky How Russia Is Ruled, for example, also has an encyclopedic (or at least textbookish) air about it but does not really compare.

Kulski does not pretend to be making any political or socialogical analysis as he goes along, except perhaps incidentally in comments; he is interesting solely in presenting the factual material itself; and this is an advantage, from this reviewer's standpoint, because it means the book has a minimum of mere anti-Communist agitation in it. It is solid-packed with facts and quotations, intelligently marshaled, organized and presented to document the whole picture. Since this goes on from page 1 to page 807. If can be imagined what a bursting storehouse of such information this book is.

I do not mean by this that the tone of the book is "objective." Professor Kulski, on the contrary, writes and presents his material as an indictment of the regime.

The book is divided into four parts— Cultural Isolation and Conformity; State and Party; Worker and Social Stratification; Peasant and Collective Farming —with a fifth part on the post-Stalin era up to 1954. It would be useless to try to list all the subjects covered in the chapters under these heads, because they cover practically everything.

The first part on "Culture" also includes the various aspects of the drive for ideological conformity in art, history writing, science, sports, linguistics, nationalism (in re the non-Russian nationalities of the country), etc. Under "State and Party" Kulski cov-

Under "State and Party" Kulski covers not only all the obvious subjects like elections, governmental structure, nature of the party and its control of all other institutions, all individual freedoms and rights, but also criminal law, the courts, family and marriage problems, youth, and political aspects of non-Russian nationality questions.

The third part, of course, goes into all the ramifications of labor's lot—from wages and working conditions to bureaucratic fatcory management, housing, labor control, women's work, social security, and class stratification.

The fourth part is similarly extensive on the exploitation of the peasants and the organization of the collective farm system.

"This work," says Professor Kulski in his introduction, "is intended to provide a ref-

erence book which will give indirect access to Soviet sources. To avoid the reproach of intending to make propaganda of any sort. I have limited myself to Soviet sources only, refraining from the use of foreign commentaries and second-hand accounts. I wanted the reader to hear Soviet legislators, politicians, and authors speak directly. This method fails to provide only one important kind of information, that concerning the actual conditions of inmates of the Soviet correctional labor camps. But the official reasons and the judicial and administrative procedures for confinement to the camps are fully discussed, because the Soviet State makes no secret of them."

This well describes the unique character of this work and is a guide to what one can and cannot expect from its contents.

It is not the sort of book that one reads through, and I confess that I have not done so. I have been dipping into it for its sections on various separate subjects, as one usually does with a reference book. As one might expect from the author's background (Polish Govern-ment in Exile) some of its political judgments made in passing are of the standard bourgeois type, but it is not worthwhile criticizing this further in this space; political enlightenment is not its forte. But if (say) you want to document the draconic Russian law penalizing workers for coming late to their jobs, or any other such concrete fact, this book is what you need."

Negroes and Dem Party — —

(Continued from page 3)

and Hugh Scott, Republican spokesman, had this impact on many Negro delegates: There isn't any Senator Eastland in the Republican Party. Ike did more for the Negroes in three years in Washington than the Democrats did in 25 years.

In Detroit last week, a political rally of over 1,000 Negroes, ostensibly called by Democratic Party leaders to gain support, turned into a rally of violent criticism of the Democratic Party and the expression of much sentiment that "Ike's our man."

When you consider that in 1953, Democratic Governor Williams was reelected by the slim margin of 8218 votes, a shift in the Negro vote would be disastrous to the political plans of Walter Reuther and Williams.

FED UP

- Last night, in a city with 95,000 unemployed, and with every Negro citizen watching closely, Adlai Stevenson spoke again of moderation, made his brilliant witticisms, and counseled patience to a well-fed crowd of 2500 Democrats. It is so easy for the politicians to preach patience. But every indication here is that the Negroes are fed up with precisely that approach.

Nor is this issue confined to the political front. Within the unions, both AFL-CIO there is a growing awareness and tension about the civil rights of Negroes. Anti-Negro sentiment is not a special local disease of Alabama and the South. There exists in many unions a big gap between the sound civil-rights approach of the labor movement and the backward rank and file. For labor to exert its social role more effectively, much more has to be done than a repetition of old methods of education; otherwise a growing schism may be the result in the unions on this issue.

ABOUT BLUSHING

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

To the Editor:

Much as I admire Comrade Coben's knowledge of Marxism and his attempts to understand Gandhism and Indian Socialism, I must say that his present knowledge of what he calls "Gandhianism" would put an Indian child to blush!

Gandhism has never taken the absolutist pacifist position that Coben speaks of. In LABOR ACTION, Feb. 8, 1954, I had attempted to show that Gandhi was not the kind of pacifist that several pacifist organizations make him to be. Nowhere does he say that only pacifist means should be employed to overcome tyranny and injustice. He does say that the nonviolent means are best (and this a Marxist won't deny) but he most emphatically adds that it is better to resist violently than not to resist at all.

However, what bothers me is Philip Coben's statement that Lohia's party represents the drift away from Gan-dhianism (i.e., pacifism). Will Comrade Coben please permit me to say that neither the Praja Socialist Party nor the members of the new Socialist Party of India have ever accepted absolute pacifist position to be the hallmark of Indian socialism? If Comrade Coben were to insist that the Socialist Party in India has been a pacifist organization ever, that would be the gravest distortion of Indian history. Under such circumstances the statement that Lohia's group has rejected pacifism becomes meaningless; it never possessed it in the first instance. If I may make a generalization about Indian socialism, I would say that it has always rejected the concept of "organized violence" for achieving its ends, and in this respect Lohia's group is much more Gandhian than any other Indian socialist group has ever been.

As I have suggested elsewhere, what differentiates the new SP from the old PSP is in no case Gandhianism (both in its economic and political aspects), it is the question of attitude toward the Nehru government, and whether or not struggle against the Nehru government should be relaxed. The preoccupation of Comrade Coben in analyzing the spit in terms of class struggle, and/or Gandhianism, has made his articles a little bit unreal. No doubt L.must hasten to say that his analysis of the split in terms of attitudes toward the Nehru government is factually correct and is to be commended.

I do not wish to comment on his aside at Peacemakers, the WRL and the FOR. would, however, like to say that in all these groups there are definitely two tendencies, one representing Christian pacifism (an absolutist position) and another representing Gandhian civil-disobedience. The former will have nothing to do with any violence, big or slight; the latter would co-operate with other groups who may not share their enthusiasm in nonviolence, but who also would have no truck with organized violence. This is what makes A. J. Muste a revolutionary, and Sid Lens and Michael Harrington such good advocates of Gandhian nonviolence.

BRIJEN K. GUPTA

(1) Comrade Gupta says "Gandhism has never taken the absolutist pacifist position that Coben speaks of."

In spite of his vast erudition, which puts my humble ignorance to shame, I'm honor and which distinguished him from the Christian-pacifism of "turn the other cheek," does not in anyway contradict the view, which he often put forward as his position, that one must not resist violently.

To make it clearer to Gupta, perhaps: I, as a benighted Marxist, think that it is better to resist *pacifistically* than not to resist at all. This obviously does not contradict my very dim view of the pacifist delusion.

(4) Gupta has got himself to the point of explaining away everything that distinguishes Gandhianism from the standard aversion to the use of violence that characterizes all kinds of socialists and others. This, I think, is why he has adopted the opinion that everybody else (including "several pacifist organizations") falls short of his own notable fund of knowledge about what Gandhi never did.

Gandhi, like other men who made a great impact on different kinds of people, has become all things to all menthat is, to all men who have some reason to conjure with his image. He is equally a hero for the Christian-pacifist who insists we must love Hitler, and for the government that has shot down more unarmed demonstrators than any other in our time (to take two extremes). Gupta was far more careful in discussing Gandhism in his Feb. 8, 1954 letter, to which he refers.

(5) As for analyzing the Indian split "in terms of class struggle and/or Gandhianism": Both questions, among others, emerged from the factual material and quotations I was summarizing out of the left-wingers' publication. Their frequent emphasis on class struggle rather surprised me too, pleasantly. Apparently Gupta doesn't believe it. I have a suspicion he is not quite in step with the upsurge that has taken place in the party while he has been away.

PHILIP COBEN

DISCONTENT IN RUSSIA

To the Editor:

I read with great interest Gordon Haskell's article "It's Stalin's Turn at the Guillotine" in the Feb. 27 issue of itagon ACTION. It gives two possible reasons for this change in internal policy: (1) a faction fight within the bureaucracy; (2) Khrushchev has become dictator.

I don't disagree with these possibilities but it seems to me Haskell misses the main point. There is a lot of resistance (though not organized) in the Soviet Union today. There is dissatisfaction with low wages, high prices, too many restrictions. Perhaps not to such an extent as to have the Western press take much notice but enough to cause the leaders to promise certain concessions. I, for one, doubt, if they will be more than promises, but the mere fact that concessions had to be promised proves to me that the opposition is something to be reckoned with.

HENRY BLACK

WEEK by WEEK ...

LABOR ACTION screens and analyses the week's news, discusses the corrent problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you con't find anywhere elso.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

By VICTOR HOWARD

Not only Harpers [see LA last week] but also the Atlantic is exposing Washington's raid on the Indian reservations.

"Uprooting the Indians," is the title of a scorching attack on the relocation program, written by Ruth M. Harmer, in the March issue of Atlantic.

Mrs. Harmer reveals how the government lures Indians from their rural homes with rosy promises of modern living in nice homes with TV sets. Upon reaching the city they are sent, by government agents, to the filthiest slums lacking the simplest conveniences, where they must pay out most of their earnings simply to keep a shabby roof over their heads.

Most Indians are unprepared for this new life by reason of education, language, and upbringing. They soon long for their old environment, where they had status and personal security, and were never lonely. The author appeals for a slow-up in the mad government pressure for relocation. One thing is certain. There isn't the slightest inclination on the part of Negro union activists and the ranks to accept merely the status quo of the past. Both in local union elections and in the national political campaign, the Negroes are determined to exercise their rights and influence. This is indeed a fresh wind blowing on the stale scene of American politics.

YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, ropardless of views. Keep them to 500 words. afraid that Gupta is quite wrong. Gandhi (let alone Gandhism) often put forward this absolutist view.

A quick look into the new Gandhi Reader just put out by Homer Jack: On page 345 we read Gandhi advising the British people to let Hitler and Mussolini take over England rather than resort to violence to stop them, "because war is bad in essence." (The important thing, he advises, is not to let Hitler take over their souls.)

On page 138, Gandhi is explaining the doctrine of "Ahimsa." Here is a sample: "If we return blow for blow we depart from the doctrine of Ahimsa. But I go further. If we resent a friend's action or the so-called enemy's action, we still fall short of the doctrine."

(2) I have an advantage over Gupta: he thinks Gandhi was a consistent thinker, whether on the subject of pacifism or anything else, I do not.

(3) The "evidence" which Gupta offers in his second paragraph is an evident misinterpretation, visible to the untrained eye. In the famous quotation to which he refers, Gandhi is saying that it is better to resist violently than not to resist at all. This opinion, which did him



Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.— Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as secondclass matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874. - Subscriptions: S2 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 stransmets.

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



March 19, 1956

YSL FUND DRIVE

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

Launch Fund Drive for \$1475

By MAX MARTIN

The Young Socialist League's 1956 Fund Drive opened on March 15. This year it is the YSL's aim to raise \$1475 during the three month period ending on June 15. The separate quotas for YSL units and groups is as follows;

~	Presidente al anticipation of the second sec	
2	Albany	75
	Antioch	25
	At Lorge & N. O.	100
	Berkeley	75
	Chicago	350
	Cleveland Area	25
	Los Angeles	150
	New York	600
	Pittsburgh	50
	Son Francisco	25

\$1475 TOTAL While several scattered sums have already arrived in the national office, a few even before the opening of the drive, it is too early to report them. The first results of the YSL financial campaign will appear in a forthcoming issue of Challenge.

Although the YSL did not succeed in reaching 100 per cent of its goal in its first two drives, there is good reason to believe that we shall do so this year, indeed, that we shall surpass the national quota. The quotas of the various branches are based on realistic estimates of what can be raised. In addition, we are informed that intense preparations are being made by all branches to make the drive a success.

Since the drive will be on for thirteen weeks, all of the comrades and friends of the YSL will have ample time in which to raise the required money.

Unit Fund Drive Directors should, however, make every effort to start collections and remissions early, as a tendency to wait until later on can hurt our efforts. An average weekly receipt of \$115 will be needed to complete the drive successfully and on time.

As everybody knows, these are difficult times for the organized socialist movement. All the more need then to keep organized socialist effort going; to educate and struggle for the ideas of socialism.

The socialist struggle today requires, in the first place, devoted and courageous people who do not let themselves become cynical or fainthearted as a result of the setbacks of our time. But it requires also the financial support of all of those to whom socialism is more than a "word." To support our press, to be able to conduct tours, to publish pamphlets, to perform the regular work of the organisation-money is needed.

This year the need is greater than ever. We know that all of our members, our sympathizers, and our friends will make an extra effort and an extra sacrifice this year.

Readers of Challenge can also do their bit. Make your checks payable to Max Martin and send them to YSL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City.

THE NEW 'SOFT' LINE HAS ITS LIMITS: Stalinist Youth Welch on Agreement to Debate YSL

By CHARLES WALKER

Berkeley, March 5 An overflow crowd of about 180 persons filled Stiles Hall near the University of California to hear the California chairman of the Communist Party speak on "Civil Liberties" under Labor Youth League auspices. The meeting was a mixed blessing for the Stalinists because of the sharp questions and criticisms which were posed. About three-fourths of the audience was hostile to the speaker.

It was not too auspicious an emergence of the LYL into public activities following the new and more flexible CP line internationally.

Schneiderman spoke on three questions: (1) Did the Communist Party advocate overthrow of the government by force and violence? (2) Were Stalinists foreign agents? and (3) Were Stalinists a legitimate part of American political life?

Replying to his own questions Schneiderman said:

(1). Supreme Court Justices Douglas and Black had dissented from the Smith Act conviction, and such dissentions had often become majorities later.

(2) Stalinists' political lines were so close to Russia's politics because both were based upon the science of Marxism, and the atomic conference at Geneva last year showed how mathematically similar answers could be obtained despite insulation of the scientists.

And (3) Stalinists had been active in organizing unemployed and unorganized workers during the thirties, and Stalinist ideas couldn't be eliminated by being banned, since they represent ideas held by one third of the world and attractive in other parts of the world. Such ideas were also an aid to progress.

Schneiderman also spoke for a united front between Stalinists and social-democrats as in Italy.

NOT SO FLEXIBLE

The general impression was that he was a smooth and tough customer. This was confirmed during the lengthy one and one half hour question period that followed, during which Schneiderman gave the impression of trying to meet questions with intellectual, although hedging or distorting, replies.

Questioned on the CP's support of the Smith Act against Trotskyists, Schneiderman was not as flexible as anticipated, in that he defended the CP and didn't admit it was "mistaken."

He said that Trotskyists were against the war effort, and when reminded that this took place during the Hitler-Stalin pact when he opposed the war effort, he said that only when the issue had reached the Supreme Court did the CP notict it! And by then a war was on. This is obviously false. It also has an interesting bearing on the CP in World War III, which they "probably" won't support on the U.S. side! No civil liberties for CPers? After admitting that civil liberties weren't possible in Russia because people wanted to overthrow the government, Schneiderman was blasted by the SCLU president for having one reason after another for denving civil liberties. How, he asked, could anyone rely upon the CP for defense of his liberties?

what scientific principle of the various CPs and the Labor Youth League called for the use of Russian tanks against millions of German workers in June 1953. He replied that they weren't Russian tanks (a lie) and that CIA money was going into Germany (how could this cause a social revolution?). Anyway facts were difficult to get (a lie).

FIVE CENTS

SHE SAID YES

Russian invasion of Finland? Finland was a Nazi base. But during the Hitler-Stalin pact? It was secretly a base of Hitler's since 1917!

The difference between socialism and-Communism; socialism was more conservative, but had the same goals. Therefore the CP wants a united front.

Forced labor in Russia? Mostly Nazi prisoners or regular criminals given useful work.

So much for the flavor of his talk, When Schneiderman and the LYL were challenged (from the floor) to a debate on the subject "Is Russia a Socialist Community?" Schneiderman said that a Stalinist had debated that question with a socialist (nameless) in Pennsylvania recently. He was later publicly reminded by the YSL organizer that this debate with Max Shachtman at Swarthmore College was on foreign policy, and asked if he had any principled objection to debating the question of Russia's social character.

The LYL chairman (a quiet girl) was then asked to publicly commit her organization to a debate on this subject with an independent socialist within one and a half months, details to be jointly arranged. For several minutes she stood frozen and finally gave in to the audience's pressure, with a weak yes!

The YSL had greeted this LYL meeting with a lampoon leaflet called "Campus Nonsense" published by the "Laborious Youth League" and needling the Stalinist change of line in Moscow. The YSL also distributed a leaflet at the meeting called "Socialism versus Communism" and this was reported in the Daily Californian's coverage of the meeting.

CHICKENING OUT

On Monday, however, after the YSL organizer had submitted a letter to the Daily Californian (the same day the Daily Cal carried an account of the meeting and the public commitment by the LYL to debate this subject), in order to get this debate held on campus, since opposing views were on the same platform, meeting a Rule 17 requirement-the LYL reneged on its promise.-How could they be held to this, they said, in reversing themselves, since they were a democratic organization and the chairman was only one person? They had been "forced" into this debate. They wouldn't get an impartial hearing on this loaded subject. The times weren't propitious, etc. As this is posted the YSL chairman has just prepared a blistering letter to appear on the Daily Cal, attacking the political cowardice of the LYL and again inviting them to debate. There is a possibility that an open chair "debate" will be held, featuring a presenta-tion against Russia's claims to be socialist and then questions from the audience -a representative from the LYL being allowed to fill the chair if he has the courage to do so.

U. OF CALIF. . BERKELEY **Petition Drive Forces Reversal** On Lucy Case by Student Gov't

By CHARLES WALKER

Berkeley, March 8 student-government leadership The has had to reverse itself, under pressure, on the Lucy case.

As previously reported [Challenge, March 5], the Executive Committee of the Associated Students of U. C. had voted to refrain from sending a letter to the University of Alabama on the case. After a surprisingly successful petition campaign indicated that the student body opposed this decision, the action was reversed by a 9-6 vote of the Executive Committee at a meeting yesterday afternoon.

The letter will be addressed to the student executive committee at Alabama. It commends "a substantial portion" of the Alabama student body for its pledge that peace will be maintained.

statement to the student body at the University of Alabama-

'(a) affirming our conviction that racial segregation in higher education should speedily be put to an end, and

"(b) that all efforts to this end be supported at the University of Alabama.

"We further petition Executive Committee to recognize its responsibility to act for the student body in speaking out against segregation where it may exist on university campuses."

This petition, supported by the Young Democrats, Student Civil Liberties Union, and one of the girls' co-ops, obtained 2835 signatures in 6 days of circulation on and off campus. One "independent" representative on Ex Com said this petition "received more votes than any member of Ex Com had received before entering office. He added that the number fell only 400 votes short of the number of

"At our university," the letter states, "we, too, have our integration problems, but we realize that the elimination of racial barriers contributes to fuller education and growth as democratic citizens.

The message concludes by urging the Alabama committee to support "at your university, those efforts which would put an end to racial segregation in higher education."

The idea of circulating a petition against the Ex Committee's stand appears to have been launched at Westminster House (Presbyterians), the place from which a telegram had been sent to Alabama earlier, and whose action brought the issue up at an ASUC meeting.

The essential provision of the petition read: "Whereas the Executive Committee, being requested to make a statement to the student body at the University of Alabama supporting the right of Miss Autherine Lucy to enroll at that university, felt that it could not speak for the student body on this issue, we, the undersigned, duly registered stu-dents of the Associated Students of the University of California, respectfully petition Executive Committee to issue a

in the last election." students

IMPRESSIVE RESPONSE

An interesting factor in this petition is that prior to last fall there was no universal suffrage because of the requirement for a \$17 athletic and student body ASUC card. But, following a raw and uninhibited campaign to get more money to build a new student center directed from above, a split ASUC card became available as a result (separating athletics from ASUC membership) for only \$3. Everybody can now vote. Naturally, this aids the co-op and independent vote primarily.

A second petition, in support of Ex Com's inactivity, was circulated by two Ex Com members for 3 days and it received 550 votes. Although it claimed to be against segregation, there is ground for reasonable doubt as to the motive in the eyes of some signers. One of its provisions said that "we refuse to interfere with men of good will in solving their own problems," this good will presumably referred to the rioting Alabama U. students and White Citizens Councils.

As important as the Lucy case was and is, the response of the students to a petition campaign as such has been esSchneiderman also hedged when asked

pecially impressive after years of intimidation and apathy. As an editorial put it: "Petitions are back. And it's about time. For years the room reserved for ASUC Executive Committee has overflowed with nothing but ASUC Executive Committee."

It seems that civil rights for minorities-as opposed to civil liberties for dissenting opinions-is the strongest political issue that can enlist liberal support these days.

In the meantime the LYL's debut back into open meetings has resulted in a political defeat for the Stalinists.

Read the NEW INTERNATIONAL America's leading Marxist review.

THE INTERLOCKING CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Glubb Goes: A Victory For Arab Nationalism

By AL FINDLEY

The world was startled by the sudden and abrupt dismissal of General John Bagot Glubb on March 1 by King Hussein of Jordan. By this act, says the N. Y. *Times*, Jordan has been launched "into the mainstream of the Arab nationalist movement."

The reports differ as to the immediate reason for the dismissal of the British general who has led Jordan's Arab Legion for a quarter

century even while maintaining his connections with Britain. (Glubb became a converted Moslem, hence "Glubb Pasha.")

Some report that the king was angered by articles in the foreign press picturing Glubb as the virtual ruler of Jordan. Others say it was forced by the group of "Free Officers" in the army, possibly more than one competing group of officers. The intrigues of Egypt's Nasser and Saudi Arabia to remove English influence are also mentioned.

However, there can be little doubt as to the fundamental cause for the removal of Glubb. The desire of the Jordanian Arabs to get rid of foreign control has been growing by leaps and bounds.

Legally, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan has had full sovereignty since 1940. In fact, however (as was explained in LA of Jan. 9), it had remained a protectorate with all key posts in British hands, and the main part of the budget, which went for the army, was paid for by Britain. This payment went directly to the Arab Legion, which was the only modern armed force in the Arab world as a result of British nurture; and as far as the Legion was concerned, the king did not even have the figleaf of a semblance of control.

It did not help matters much that General Glubb became Glubb Pasha, a Moslem. Along with its freedom of religion, the pious West also has the freedom to use religion as a tool. The Jordanian people still thought of Glubb as a British agent, and quite correctly so.

THREE DAYS OF JOY

The sudden conversion of the king of Jordan to the "Arabization" of the Legion has to be considered against the mass demonstrations and riots that took place last December and January, and which we discussed in these columns January 9. The Jordanian people, spearheaded by the Arabs from former Palestine who had been taken over by Jordan and were now a large proportion of its population, showed their hatred for the West's Baghdad Pact and their desire Once again then, we see, an imperialist creation has turned into an instrument of destruction for imperialism. Jordan was created by Britain to play the latter's game. Even during the last war, in the floodtide of Arab nationalism, Britain still was trying to build up Jordan.

The Foreign Office had hoped to use the Russian-Egyptian arms deal as a tool in its own game. Having been pushed out of Suez by the Egyptians, with the connivance of U. S. oil interests, the British hoped that, with the new relation of military power in the region, they could force Israel to give up the Southern Negev and thus create a land bridge for British troops to Egypt and the Suez. (With its present frontiers as fixed by the armistice, the southeast corner of Israel extends to the Gulf of Akaba, separating Egypt from Jordan.) The British also had been hoping that

The British also had been hoping that their creation and support of the Arab Legion in general, and their furtherance of the Hashemite king's plans for a Greater Syria or a united "Fertile Crescent" kingdom, would enable them to maintain their position in the Middle East.

NO GRATITUDE

Until the present the Hashemite plans had been thwarted by Ibn Saud, who expelled Husseini from Arabia. Now, a new contender for leadership has emerged in the Arab world. This is Colonel Nasser, dictator of Egypt, who has cast himstlf in the role of the Kemal Ataturk of the Arab world.

The army officers' revolt that replaced King Farouk of Egypt with a military dictatorship, headed first by Naguib and then by Nasser, was organized with the help of U.S. State Department elements. They had hoped for more gratitude. But in relations between nations, as in love or war, everything is fair. The force that America helped to create got out of hand and turned against its benefactor.

This is one reason for the consternation of Washington's leaders at Nasser's deal for Russian arms.

Nasser went further and created an Arab bloc of Syria, Saudi Arabia and Egypt for the sake of nationalist action against the historic big powers of the Middle East and against Israel. The measure of success which he has had seems to have led him further toward plans to realize the old Hashemite dream of a united Arab state or confederation under his leadership., British subsidy with an Arab subsidy. This was turned down by Hussein. It would have meant the complete ascendancy of Nasser and Ibn Saud over the Hashemites.

Instead, a suggestion was proposed for a meeting of all Arab rulers, a meeting that would include the other Hashemite kingdom, Iraq, and also half-Christian Lebanon, which is afraid of being swallowed up by its Moslem sister-states in the Arab world.

A statement by the Iraqi premier, Nuri as-Said, increased the prospects of further strengthening this Arab bloc, which is maneuvering between the powerful Western and Stalinist camps. The Iraqi leader said that "important events within not more than 10 days" will make the Arabs forget their differences and close ranks. This may mean either an anti-Israel action or withdrawol of Iraq from the Baghdad pact.

The continued growth of Arab nationalism and the increase in violence in North Africa in the fight against French imperialism have again raised the question of how long the French can hang on in this part of the world. The British and the U.S. have systematically pushed France out of the Arab world—first Lebanon, then Syria. France has complained—with truth—that her position in the Middle East and her advice have been ignored.

The recent events seem to have changed the British attitude. Reports of an agreement between England and France seem to indicate some kind of united front between the two powers to maintain British influence in the Levant and French influence in North Africa.

Like other such efforts in this era, this agreement is likely to end up very soon in the ashcan of history.

PORTENT FOR ISRAEL

Arab nationalism's quick victories, and the ease with which it uses hatred of Israel as the magnet to draw the Arab states together, should not blind it to the fact that continued enmity to a fellow Middle Eastern state will lay the groundwork for a resurgence of the power of imperialism. By threatening to wipe out Israel, they not only prevent the regional economic development which is needed, but may also push Israel to become dependent on, and therefore an agent of, some outside power, against its own wishes and to the detriment of itself and others.

For Israel the latest developments have tended to underscore the growing critical

died in Israel. Premier Ben-Gurion has said that Israel will not start a war; and he has not retaliated against the barbaric action of the Syrians in killing four Israeli policemen when they went to retrieve a disabled fishing boat from Israeli waters on Lake Kinneret, after having first notified the UN Mixed Commission of their intentions. Against the wishes of Achdut Avodah, which is part of his governing coalition, the premier delayed work on the Jordan River water project.

The "activist" policy has proved itself to be completely bankrupt. While Israel's policy has always been one of attempting to secure its present territory, the means it used during the "activist" period worked against the country's interests.

The decline continues in Israel's position with respect to the military balance of power. The Arabs get huge quantities of materiel from the Russian bloc and small amounts from England, Canada, the U.S., and even Sweden, while all these countries refuse to sell Israel even defensive arms like anti-aircraft guns, fighter planes, and the like.

Little wonder then that the Israelis are bitter about Dulles' preachments. Here is a man who builds his policy on "brinks of war," "massive retaliation," et al. suddenly donning an ecclesiastical w garb and urging little Israel to rely on means other than armaments. Coming from him, this is simply hypocrisy. Coming from him it can mean only the relative weakening of Israel to the point where she will be forced to give up comparatively large areas to satisfy the honor and prestige of the Arab rulers.

Events have now come full circle. Until last year the Israelis were demanding that the U.S. enforce a peace settlement. Under the given relationships of power, a peace settlement then would have been favorable to Israel. That was the "diplomatic" policy advocated by Foreign Minister Sharett in opposition to the "activist" policy of Ben-Gurion.

That policy too has failed, and reliance on the big powers has again proved illusory. Now Israel faces the prospect of an enforced peace, but one that is to Israel's disadvantage.

QUOTING SCRIPTURE

Like an enforced peace on the Arabs, an enforced peace on Israel may mean peace formally but it will not bring tranquillity to the area.

Coming from Dulles, the preachment to rely on non-military action is a fraud and a deception. The fact of the matter, however, is that the devil can quote scripture, and in this case he does.

Both the "activist" policy of Ben-Gurion and the "diplomatic" policy of Sharett have not secured peace for Israel. A radical change in Israel's policy is essential—toward a political offensive in the Middle East to make contact with the increasingly rebellious Arab masses, to direct their anti-imperialist and anti-statusquo sentiment against their own, rulers and away from a fratricidal war in the region.

Hal Draper discussed such program in the March 5 issue of LA ["How to Break the Vicious Spiral"]. Time is running out and a drastic action by Israel is necessary now to change the course of developments,

I believe that a declaration by Israel, that it would permit all refugees to return to their homes "as a matter of right rather than sufferance" (I borrow the phrase from the Zionists as they used it with respect to Jewish immigration), while late, could take a big step toward changing the hostility between Israel and the Arab states and open the possibility for a further political offensive to ensure peace and prosperity for both the Jews of Israel and the Arabs.

for full sovereignty.

The new development on Glubb is one more act in this process. The delirious and almost hysterical three days of rejoicing in the narrow dusty streets of Amman show genuine enthusiasm for the move and the depth of feeling among the people.

The British were alarmed, expecting to be thrown out of Jordan completely. Eden announced that other British senior officers of the Legion would be withdrawn, and that war was nearer. The opposition in Britain demanded that the subsidy to Jordan come to an end. The military men began drawing new plans to base British strength in the Middle-East on Iran and the puppet sheikdoms of Arabia.

The rulers of Jordan, however, are apparently not ready to follow their people in moving so rapidly. Having satisfied the nationalist desires temporarily, they have announced that the dismissal of Glubb was directed against him and not against Britain, that the traditional friendship (etc., etc.) will continue, et seq. While no one really believes these statements, the British imperialists grabbed at them as a drowing man grabs at a straw. The dismissal of Glubb Pasha was followed by a renewed offer to Jordan, by the new Arab bloc, to replace its

SHACHTMAN TOUR

SAN FRANCISCO & EAST BAY

Max Shachtman

will speak in Berkeley

The Russian Congress And the Cold War WED., MARCH 21 at 8 p.m. FINNISH BROTHERHOOD HALL 1970 Chestnut Street Berkeley position of that small country. Until now it had some assurance in the disunity of the Arab states and in its military superiority. The military superiority is fast being diminished. In fact, Israel is already at a disadvantage in the air.

In addition, Israel faces a new, and almost united, front of its Arab neighbors.

The worsening of Israel's position has been recognized even by the Herut Par ty, who are the advocates of a preventive war. Introducing a motion of noconfidence in the Israel government, they criticized the government for not declaring war. The Herut spokesmen said that the possibility of a one-front war no longer existed.

He nevertheless urged an immediate war before the Arabs get too strong. The motion was decisively defeated.

Israel officials blame the dismissal of Glubb on the "myopic" policy of Great Britain in trying to force Jordan into the Baghdad pact. At first the Israel government hoped the event might shock the U.S. into favorable action on its request for arms. But the statements of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles have dashed these hopes. The urge toward a preventive war has



Comrade Al Findley calls my attention to the fact that, in the program suggested in my article "How to Break the Vicious Spiral" (March 5), points 7 and 8 are ambiguously worded. I see this is quite true.

Re point 7: The proposal for the admission of 100,000 refugees is suggested as the *immediate* first step, and definitely not counterposed to recognizing the, rights of all the refugees.

Point 8 speaks of accepting "the principle of repatriation or compensation" for the refugees. This too-short formula has been commonly used to refer to the principle that all the refugees are entitled to repatriation or, if they refuse repatriation, to compensation for their property.

HAL DRA PER

March 19, 1956

Cyprus: With Fang & Claw – –

(Continued from page 1)

pushed over into the nationalist camp out of simple self-interest.

Britain will leave Cyprus too. It is only a question of how long it can hang on now.

THAT 'RUSSIAN' FEELING

"The Cypriot capital looked today like a sullen Russian-occupied town in Eastern Europe," said a front-page dispatch from Nicosia in the Times (March 12, Homer Bigart).

Exactly.

"Grim-faced British soldiers, their guns at the ready, moved in open trucks through streets lined with silent, expectant crowds. Around the ramshackle palace of the exiled Archbishop Makarios, troops with fixed bayonets stood behind barricades of barbed wire."

Already back in December, Times correspondent A. C. Sedgwick had reported the "sullen Russian-occupied" feel of Cyprus under the democratic heel of British imperialism:

"When Field Marshal Sir John Harding, governor and commander-in-chief in Cyprus, visits his far-flung units, he does so in a helicopter accompanied by his staff members or travels at high speed in an automobile with an escort of armored cars and trucks.

"When he attends divine service . . . armed men must first investigate the place. The altar Bible, from which he may read the lessons, the pews, chancel and vestibule, are inspected. Outside are the armored cars and their menacing cannon and armed men dotted over the adjoining lawns. . . .

"If one walks down the main thoroughfare of the town of Ledra, street squads of soldiers, with quick-firing rifles ready for action, stand guard while British women do their Christmas shopping.

"Another common sight is that of a British woman pushing her baby in a perambulator while her husband walks beside it with his finger on the trigger of an automatic weapon" (Dec. 25.)

CYPRIOT RIGHTS

Four-fifths of the population of this island is ethnically Greek and virtually unanimously demands union with Greece (Enosis). The remainder of the population, which is mainly Turkish, has been promised full national-minority rights.

The question is not whether Greece has a right to take Cyprus: the demand is for *self-determination* by the Cypriot people themselves. But no one has any doubt that the people would vote overwhelmingly for union with Greece—incidentally, for integral union, not for mere attachment to the mother country as a "possession."

Certainly, whoever has a right to Cyprus, the British have NO right, except that of imperialist domination and oppression. The Turks can put some face on their claim, especially since the island is off their coast and quite distant from the Greek mainland, though they will not convince the Cypriot Greeks that this geographical argument has any weight; but what moral claim can be made by the occupying army from England?

Besides, many believe that Turkey's recently fervent concern for the island has mainly been stimulated and cooked up by the British as a cover.

A British MP, Lena Jeger, who represents a London constituency with a rel-

the so-called "ethnarch," who is elected as both religious and national leader.

The Stalinist organization is AKEL, (initials of the Cyprus Progressive Peoples Party) which is also influential in the trade-union movement. AKEL's general secretary Ezekiel Papaioannou was arrested and sent to a concentration camp a few miles from the capital Nicosia. (Yes, the democratic British have them here too. These concentration camps have gotten plentiful use. They were also used for the herding of would-be Jewish immigrants to Palestine who were taken off illegal ships before reaching their destination, in the years before the end-ing of the British Mandate and the setting up of the state of Israel. Cyprus was the British "Siberia" for the remnant of Nazism's victims who were fleeing Europe's burning ground.)

Harding also arrested 135 leading CPers, including leading trade-unionists, in the attempt to remove their influence and leave the "moderates" free to make the kind of settlement they wanted.

It was quite obvious at the time that the Stalinists were not being proscribed because of their pro-Russianism, or for any of their own variety of crimes against the working-class, but solely and simply because their line was then militantly for Enosis and their strength prevented a deal to the likings of the imperialists. (A few years before, the CP line had been for independence rather than union with Greece, but that had been switched.)

The London Times admitted :-

"The reasons which prompted the governor, with the full consent of the British Government, to proscribe AKEL are that it has become obvious that the party is doing its utmost to prevent the possibility of an agreement being negotiated between Britain and Greece on the future of Cyprus. It has consistently denounced Archbishop Makarios for reports that he was about to come to an agreement with Britain, and has demanded that he should refuse to negotiate on any basis other than that of immediate self-determination on terms which would exclude the use of Cyprus as a base."

BACK TO THE WALL

The Stalinists, of course, were simply interested, as always, in holding up Russia's end of the cold war, in this case fighting against the role of Cyprus in the NATO military structure in the Mediterranean. Makarios and the nationality majority, on the other hand, have fervently promised Britain that they had no intention of changing Cyprus' role in that regard. This gives the Stalinists an excellent handle against the right-wingers, for their own demagogic aims.

Also, the British realize naturally that with the removal of their own occupation troops, the Cypriots' opposition to any NATO involvement would be bound to grow. Although Greece is a full member of the Atlantic Pact and would be in control in Cyprus, it is now riddled with anti-Western-camp feeling and, besides, might not be effective in actually keeping Cyprus happy as a non-floating air base for attacks on Russia. In case of a war, the Cypriot population would be a doomed people if Cyprus was being used simply as a very large and fixed aircraft carrier.

To date, \$84 million has been poured into military installations on Cyprus. Four thousand troops are permanently maintained there, in addition to 8000 sent to Now, in reaction to Britain's bloodand-iron policy in Cyprus, Washington seems to be publicly splitting with London on the question. The U.S. ambassador in London extended American "sympathy" to Greece, infuriating Whitehalf. Then Washington backwatered, claiming that it was only offering its "good offices" for a settlement, as an honest broker.

The upshot will likely be: (a) the British will feel they have been kicked in the teeth (as one London paper has put it already); (b) the Greeks and Cypriots will not be grateful because the U.S. is not doing anything for them; (c) and the U.S. will wind up supporting Britain after all when the chips are down in the UN.

ARE THEY BERSERK?

But though England is hanging on twice as hard precisely because it was pushed out of two other nearby areas, the preceding cases of Egypt and Palestine are luminous lessons for Cyprus.

For example, a former British teacher on Cyprus wrote last year in a London pacifist weekly:

"I remember how, when I was in Cyprus in 1947, the Greek Cypriots despised the Egyptians and the Jews [of Palestine] for using violent methods and were confident that they would achieve their own liberation just by making the people of Britain understand the justice of their cause.

cause. "Britain has, however, left Palestine and Egypt following the use of force, while she has refused to discuss the question of Enosis with the Cypriots.

"The inevitable conclusion has been drawn, and, since we have refused to listen to polite requests, we now have to listen to bombs." (Peace News.)

One likely interpretation to this latest desperate measure by the British, in kidnaping and exiling Makrios, is that "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad." But there are a couple of possibilities of method in this modness.

In the first place, although the new move will only spur the Cypriots to greater struggle, there is still the question of what better alternative was before the British (outside of getting out). The whole situation is pretty hopeless for continued British rule, no matter what they do.

Secondly, the forlorn hope may be that, by removing Makarios and, infurating the whole people more than ever, it will be the Stalinists that will take over the nationalist movement, thus exposing it to draconic suppression by bloody violence under circumstances that may get the approval of "world public opinion." Americans, including American liberals, have shown themselves susceptible to approval of such murderous suppressions. provided that they can be convinced that it is all really in the interests of suppressing "Communism," as in the U.S.inspired and organized suppression of the Arbenz regime in Guatemala.

Thirdly, the Eden government, which is under fire for many things, may reason that, even if all plans fail, it will have shown that it was ready to stand staunchly by British interests and not yield "supinely." If Eden were to withdraw from Cyprus simply out of enlightened self-interest right now, he would no doubt be attacked from the right as a liquidator of the empire and, at the same time, be denied credit from the left since it was "too late." That was a pretty frank statement of the "enlightened" approach to preserving whatever could be salvaged of British imperialist control.

Page Seven

Be reasonable, said Creech-Jones: "Need we press claims which we know are completely unacceptable when, in the long run, we may be obliged, unless we find a solution, to end in abject, retreat before anarchy and violence?"

Labor Party leader Jim Griffiths (since then elected over Aneurin Bevan as deputy leader of the party) made a similar appeal though more circumspectly: "... is it not better from every standpoint for us to have in Cyprus a people which is contented and which will work with us rather than a people which is bitter and hostile?"

He too warned against eliminating Makarios from the picture: "I have not had the privilege of visit-

"I have not had the privilege of visiting Cyprus, but I believe that all those who have been there will agree that in putting forward the proposals to which I have referred [for a compromise] Archbishop Makarios took very great risks. He departed from his first slogan and his first position. He is being attacked for putting forward these proposals, and has risked his position as a leader by doing so. If no settlement takes place, and Archbishop Makarios is discredited because of his proposals, with whom shall we discuss the matter? What will then take place?"

Griffiths asked the House to think of the consequences in terms of previous attempts to keep peoples suppressed by force and violence:

"In that case [if the conflict in Cyprus goes on unsettled], who knows when the conflict will end, or where? Who, in 1948, would have thought that the Kenya emergency would have lasted for three years? Once a situation like this is allowed to drift it becomes a running sore, and we pour out money afterwards. . ." One thing is sure: with the present British provocation in Cyprus, the situation is not drifting, it is exploding.

MINIMUM STAND

Creech-Jones also attempted to scare the assembled solons of the empire with the thought that, unless settled, the trouble will spread:

"The House should remember that we may be faced with problems similar to this one in the near future. Something will have to be settled about Singapore and Hong Kong, and there are other vulnerable dependencies of some importance in any strategic plans where some agreement with the people concerned will have to be reached."

Another point made by Creech-Jones should be mentioned; his reply to the Tory idea of buying off Cypriot discontent by allocating more money for investment there. He said:

"Now, in the midst of all this trouble, we offer the Cypriots a contribution from our colonial development and welfare moneys for the purpose of a social and economic program. Surely it should be known that the Cypriots are completely disinterested in material improvement. The emotional claim for selfgovernment is fundamental. The Cypriots cannot be bribed into facing some of the problems of development and welfare in their country until political satisfaction is given to them."

That is quite right, and should be a reply to other oppressors who counterpose economic benefits to political freedom.

atively large Cypriot population, went to the island to find out why her London electors were so anxious to become "foreigners." She reported (*The Spectator*, Dec. 31):

"In Cyprus this year I honestly tried, as a trained reporter, to find the anti-Enosis element in the [Greek] population... The governor is sure he will find some cooperative Cypriots; if so they are very elusive now...."

are very elusive now. . . " Archbishop Makarios refused to be "cooperative," i.e., to sell out the nationalist aim, though he was prepared to make concessions for a gradual change.

One thing the British have refused to dò is make any definite pledge of selfdetermination for a reasonable date. If Makarios had accepted the British proposals, he would simply have ceased to be accepted as leader by the Cypriots, who were already giving unaccustomed and portentous support to the CP (one third of the population, according to some).

Toward the end of last year the British initiated a crackdown on the CP movement with the hope of driving a wedge between it and the genuine nationalists. When Makarios was showing some signs of wavering on accepting the London deal, the Stalinist party turned their attack on

beat down the population.

Now that England has been pushed out of Suez and out of Palestine, abandonment of Cyprus would mean virtually the end of all British standing in the region.

This is especially true since the ouster of Gen. Glubb by Jordan imperils British influence in still another part of the Levant.

Back against the wall, the military rulers have been treating the discontented Cypriots like an occupied enemy. All assemblies, including strikes, are banned; schools have been closed (the youth, and even children, have been in the forefront of the day-to-day struggles); collective punishments are freely employed against villages; there is in effect no right to trial for suspects; etc.

The U.S. has adopted the same position as in the case of French North Africa: it would like to see Cyprus attain self-determination, since its own imperialist power is not at stake, under circumstances which would retain the people voluntarily within the NATO framework; but as long as its ally in London is hanging on, Washington stands "loyally" by its fellow imperialist. When the question of Cyprus came up in UN, the U.S. voted against discussion. The bloody drama may therefore have to be acted out to the end, as in North Africa

THE 'ENLIGHTENED' KIND

But the Labor Party has a freer hand, being out of office, unlike the years when under Attlee it was this party's leadership which stood in the breach for the defense of British imperialism, with a policy on Cyprus as infamous as Eden's now.

So when Parliament had a full-dress debate"on Cyprus last December, the Labor Party colonialists came out for moves toward self-determination. Arthur Creech-Jones, Labor's former colonial secretary, lamented that the "anarchy and violence" on Cyprus was a danger to other British interests.

Unless a deal is made, he urged, "there is a very real danger that the moderate elements in Cyprus will be swept aside, that the archbishop will lose his authority, such as it is at present, that much further delay will make reconciliation of the interests virtually impossible, and that we shall have the greatest difficulty in controlling both the Right and the Left wings of the Enosis movement." But the Laborites have not clearly supported the Cypriot program of self-determination, even now. In contrast, a definite stand was taken by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions which, on colonial matters, has often been ahead of any of the European social-democracies.

Meeting in December, the Executive Board of the ICFTU reiterated the demand of the 4th World Congress of the movement "that prompt action should be taken in favor of the implementation of self-determination in Cyprus. . . The Board urges that the people of Cyprus be immediately granted self-government on a democratic basis and that the mettropolitan government /Lon /Britain/ should forthwith accept the principle of self-determination and declare its readiness to negotiate with a government so formed about a reasonable period, at the end of which the people of Cyprus should have the right to determine freely the future status of their country."

This is surely the rock-bottom minimum that any genuine democrat, let alone socialist, can stand for, without being a bootlicker of those imperialisms which have the advantage of being non-Russian.

March 19, 1956

Natalia Trotsky

(Continued from page 1)

the recent congress of the Russian **Communist Party:**

"Since it was stated at the Congress, by those who rule in the USSR, that the history of the Bolshevik Party was falsified by Stalin and that during his regime many people were unjustly accused, it is logical that, as a practical consequence of this, they should review the trials of those unjustly accused and rehabilitate their memories, although it is not possible to return to life those who were assassinated under calumnies and falsehoods."

She added that the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party accentuated the turn to the right initiated in the 19th Congress by Stalin himself.

"They are not talking now about socialism," said Natalia Sedova, but of peace and welfare, probably because the present leadership of the USSR is worried because the mass of people are restless, discontented and a-stir, and they are trying to calm them with easy-tounderstand phrases. In a way, it's a matter of throwing a bone to popular discontent.

"Furthermore, it is logical that the bureaucratic ruling caste does not want to be subjected in the future to the worry of depending on the caprices, moods and complexes of a single dictator. Hence the insistence on the so-called collective leadership—in reality, the

collective dictatorship of a small group — and the repeated announcements about easing political conditions, and hence the attacks on Stalin.

"But we cannot hope for anything from these people who were in agreement with Stalin, who never protested not only against his theories but also against his horrible deeds. Now, these post-Stalinists, who previously were fervent and faithful Stalinists (for, if not, they would have been purged), who capitulated before Stalin-now they confess they committed a grave error with him. and ask to be reproved and pardoned by the masses and by the rank-and-file of the party. But people who were capable of an er-

TELEGRAM

"PRESIDIUM, 20TH CONGRESS COMMU-NIST PARTY SOVIET UNION, MOSCOW:

"Noting the declarations Congress affirming falsifications in history of the Revolution and Party, and condemnation leaders of the Revolution and Party unjustly accused as enemies of people, among them my husband, the deceased Leon: Trotsky, called enemy of the people number one, and my son Leon Sedov, I ask, as practical consequence of these declarations, review of trial with a view to rehabilitation of memory of victims before international opinion.

"NATALIA SEDOVA TROTSKY."

LETTER

"K. E. VOROSHILOV, PRESIDENT OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE USSR, KREM-LIN, MOSCOW:

"The press has widely announced the

ror of this magnitude, what confidence can they inspire as rulers in the Russian people?

"To be sure, the declarations of the 20th Congress encourage the still live opposition that exists in the Soviet Union; for they do no more than prove it right, and acknowledge the strict truth of what the Opposition said 30, 20, 10 years, at a time when its members were sent to Siberia or murdered for saying so."

Natalia Sedova, surrounded by the books with which Trotsky had worked, wrote the text of the telegram and the letter on the same machine that had been used by the secretaries of the old Bolshevik leader to typewrite his books and articles.

liberation of certain prisoners from Soviet jails and concentration camps. Some of them have received permission to return to their own countries.

"In this connection, I ask to be informed of the fate of my son Serge Sedov, who formerly lived in the Kremlin. Twenty years have gone by since I learned that Serge had been arrested. During this whole time, I have found no news about his whereabouts or his fate; only indirect indications that Serge had been deported to Novosibirsk, then to Vorkuta, from there taken to Moscow; since then, I have heard nothing more.

"I address this letter to you in the very feeble hope that my son is still alive and perhaps is among those who have been freed after reconsideration of their cases

"I hope that this information will be given me.

"NATALIA SEDOVA TROTSKY."



The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianisma new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unreleating enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism-which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These, two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both wor blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now--such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

s	Get Acquainted!
	Independent Socialist League 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.
pre- Jus-	i I want more information about the ideas of Independent Social- ism and the ISL.
k for.	□ I want to join the ISL.
s we	NAME (please print)
i our s put been ggle;	ADDRESS
thout drive is to	CITY
tand-	ZONE STATE

Attorney General to Resume Hearing on ISL 'Listing': Fund Drive Needs Steam!

By ALBERT GATES **Fund** Drive Director

ISL FUND DRIVE

It is going to be hard to find an explanation for the lowest return of any week in the drive. But that is exactly what happened this past week. Contributions were received from only four areas: New York, Newark, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. Nothing from the Middle West! Nothing from the West Coast!

This is rather astounding and we hope that the only explanation for it is that weekly contributions are on their way and that we will be able to report next week that payments made up for the above lapse.

York carried the whole country this week.

What makes this whole matter so disconcerting is that this week, too, we received word from Washington that, at long last, the Attorney General's Hearing Officer is ready to resume the hearings on the listing of the ISL and SYL that were begun in August 1955! Every reader, friend and sympathizer knows what this means. It means that we need assistance in seeing our case through to a finish.

We are, unfortunately, unable to raise funds from those quarters which presumably dedicate themselves to aid cases such as the Shachtman passport case and the hearing of the ISL, which is the very first ever granted by the Attorney General's office since the founding of his infamous list. In the Shachtman passport case which we won and which has made legal history, serving as the precedent for so many other successful cases that followed, we had to go it virtually unaided financially. We made it primarily because of the wonderful services of our counsel, Joseph L. Rauh, the enormous assistance of the Workers Defense League, and our own grit. The forthcoming hearing is even more important than the passport case. It is the first opportunity to

challenge the list within th cincts of the Department o tice, and lays the groundwo a legal test of the method practices of that office.

have never before: Get behind 1956 Fund Drive and help it over the top. Our press ha the main weapon in our str it needs to be maintained w question. A successful fund does just that and permits carry on.

Let us get way beyond the ings in the acompanying box.

We therefore urge you,

We received a total of \$440 and if you note the standings, you will see that most of this came from New York City. In a word, New

FUND DR	IVE	вох	sco	RE
City	Quota	Pe	rid	%
	\$10,000	\$2,5	290.50	22.9
Oregon	50	1	50	100
Chicago	2,000	1.	035	51.7
Newark	400		181	45.2
Streator	25		10	40
New-York		1	051	27.6
Bay Area			100	25
Philadelphia	200	n (45	22.5
Los Angeles	. 650	1	140	21.5
Pittsburgh	200		43	21.5
Cleveland	150		25	16.6
Seattle	150		20	13.3
Natl. Office	1,250		25	2
Detroit	350		0	0
Buffalo	150		0	0
Indiana	100		0	0
Akron	25		0	0
Reading	50		0	0
St. Louis	25		0	0

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

	HANDY W
CONTRIBUTE TO	
THE ISL FUND DRIVE	LAB
Independent Socialist League	Independ
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.	114 New 1
Enclosed is \$as my	the second second
contribution to the ISL's Fund	Please ent
Drive.	6 mont
in a second s	Paymen
NAME	31.00
Nome .	NAME (pl
ADDRESS	-
	ADDRESS
CITY STATE	CITY
(Make checks out to Albert Gates)	a fair and a start
(make checks out to Albert Gales)	ZONE

5	HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE	
	LABOR ACTION	
	Independent Socialist Weekly 114 West 14 Street New York 11, New York	
	Please enter my subscription:	
31	🖸 -1 year at \$2. 🔲 New	
w	. 6 months at \$1.	
	🗇 Payment enclosed. 📋 Bill me.	1
	NAME (please print)	
1	ADDRESS	
i.	CITY	4
11120	ZONE STATE	1