

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 14, 1955

FIVE CENTS

CLASS FORCES BEHIND PERON'S FALL

... page 6

THE ATTACK ON THE STUDENT CO-OPS

... page 5

FIEDLER: 'SOUR DREGS' OF LIBERALISM

... page 7

'LOOK' SQUINTS AT AFRICA

... page 3

DIRTY JOURNALISM AND THE SAAR—II

... page 8

Power-Politics Behind the Israel-Arab Crisis

Both Sides Offer Themselves as Pawns of the Rival Cold-War Blocs

RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM CHALLENGES WEST'S GRASP ON MID-EAST REGION

By AL FINDLEY

The current fighting on the Israeli-Egyptian border is of a different order from all previous forays and skirmishes.

Up to now, most of the actions were by individuals and small bands, some of them unofficial and some of them unofficial in the official sense only. Beginning with the Gaza retaliation by Israeli forces, the units involved have been getting larger and larger. On the Egyptian side there are the Fedayim (volunteer commando groups) and regular army units. On its side Israel may have committed as many as 3000 men in "incidents."

For the size of the states involved, these recent actions amount to more than "border incidents," almost verging on a "local war."

The spotlight, however, is held by another development in the region, the shipment of arms by the Stalinists to Egypt. There can be no doubt that Egypt under its ruler General Nasser is acting primarily to further its own aims and in response to the extreme nationalist currents now pulsating in the Arab world. However, the material supplied by Russia is one of the factors that is responsible for the large-scale fighting.

For a long time now, the West, primarily through England and France, has dominated the politics of the Middle East. After the end of World War II France was unceremoniously pushed out and the leadership in that area passed to the U. S. America's main object in recent years has been to organize a Middle East security alliance along the lines of NATO. For this reason it supplied arms both to Israel and the Arabs and advanced large sums for other purposes, primarily to Israel.

These services were offered both to the Israelis and the Arabs in the hope that both would submit to the broad line of American policy and subordinate their own and local interests to what the State Department considered the main issue. Of necessity therefore the State Department had to balance its favors to Israel with favors to the Arabs, to maintain some kind of balance of power in the area.

STALINIST LINE

With one contract the Russians have blown American policy sky-high. The mere announcement of the arms deal sent Washington into a tailspin. A special envoy was hurriedly dispatched by the powerful U. S. to weak Egypt. He pleaded and cajoled, but with no results.

In a succession of conflicting statements and reports emanating from the State Department, first Dulles offered to supply arms to Egypt instead of having Russia do so; then this cynical offer was hushed up in face of a storm of shocked criticism, then it was reported that the U. S. would arm Israel, that it would not, that it would... that it would help arm both... that it would consider an arms shipping list for Israel but only for defensive arms... and as this is set in type on Tuesday the headline is that Washington is ready to sell a "significant" quantity of arms to Israel.

The line of the dyed-in-the-wool Stalinists and their fellow travelers took its

typical course, as whenever there is a sharp change in line. The Stalinists and Stalinoids are the last ones to find out about it.

When the first press reports of the Russian-Egypt deal were printed, the Israeli Communist Party and the two pro-Russian Israeli parties, Mapam and Achdut Avodah, denounced the idea as ridiculous. Their indignation knew no bounds. It was a lie, an attempt to besmirch the honor of the peace-loving Soviet Union. Russia would never, never, no never, sell arms to

(Continued on page 4)

EGYPT THREATENS AGGRESSION, WHILE ISRAEL RELIES ON A PROVOCATIVE MILITARY APPROACH

By HAL DRAPER

The Middle East crisis over Israeli-Arab hostility illustrates on two separate levels the disastrous consequences of relying on military power-politics instead of a progressive political solution.

One is the regional level, where an aggressive array of Arab states under reactionary rulers faces a provocative Israeli regime operating on a Zionist-chauvinist policy. As Al Findley explains in his accompanying article, the Israelis, following David Ben-Gurion's lead, deliberately set out to raise the ante in the scale of border-fighting, with a policy of "massive retaliation" (scaled to the size of the states involved), implemented by the notorious Gaza raid.

In following this provocative and suicidal policy, the Israelis were attempting to solve by reactionary military means a problem which could be solved in a progressive way ONLY by a complete and

thorough transformation in their Arab policy.

To be sure, in following this policy, the Israelis were by no means seeking to provoke full-scale war; on the contrary they hoped to intimidate the Arabs into a peace settlement—that is, into a peace settlement on their own terms, unaccompanied by otherwise indicated concessions on the vexed problem of the Arab refugees and similar sore points.

Israel wants peace—of that there can be no doubt: but peace strictly on its own terms, which are far from being identical with the demands of justice and democratic politics.

On the other hand, when we turn our attention to the plague on the other house, it is an undebatable fact that the Arab rulers *officially* want war, that is, a second round of the Palestine war of 1948 in which they were defeated. (We underline *officially* because one has a right to believe it highly dubious that even Nasser is really very eager for a contest which will put his own power in extreme jeopardy, even if he thinks he is in a position to win eventually.)

In Egypt, Major Shawki, personal assistant to Nasser, declared recently: "Our aim is to fight to exterminate Zionism in the second round of the Palestine war." In Saudi Arabia the king, reigning by divine right of America's oil millions, has called for "surgical action" to eradicate Israel as a state. "We Arabs total about 50 million," he said. "Why don't we sacrifice ten million of our number and live in pride and self-respect?"

In Iraq, one of the hitching-posts of the Western-sponsored "Northern tier" alliance in the Middle East, Premier Nuri Pasha has explained to his people that it is all for the purpose of strengthening her militarily as against Zionism, "our main enemy." (Above quotes from London Tribune of Oct. 14.)

Here is the pattern of the crisis on the regional level, in the counterposition of these two chauvinist nationalisms. On neither side can socialists or genuine democrats support the politics which are pushing both sets of rulers into heightened conflict.

TOWARD AN OVERHAUL

However, we have always approached this question with the concept that a special responsibility in working toward a democratic solution falls on the Israeli working class, precisely because it considers itself politically and socially more advanced than the forces in the backward Arab societies. If an initiative has to be taken to break out of the vicious circle of antagonistic chauvinisms jacking themselves up mutually toward a blood-bath, then we have a right to make our demands on the Israelis first.

(Turn to last page)

Molotov Torpedoes Geneva And German Unity Hopes

By GORDON HASKELL

The Geneva Conference of foreign ministers was torpedoed by Molotov on his return from Moscow. Although there was practically no possibility, from the beginning, that the Stalinist and capitalist powers would be able to agree on the unification of Germany, the apparent hardening of Stalinist policy raises the question as to how mild and how durable the thaw in the cold war will be.

When Molotov left for Moscow, there was some hope in Western circles that he would come back with concessions on Germany which would make continued negotiations possible. He returned with a flat-footed, rock-bottomed rejection of free elections as the road to German unity, and a big propaganda blast which sought to counterpose the alleged existence of workers' rule in East Germany to the proposal for free elections in the whole country.

The "hard" stand taken by Molotov at this stage does not necessarily indicate strength and assurance on the part of the Stalinists. Quite the contrary; it can show that they have decided to make the most of a weak position by brazening it out. The bluster and noise on the Stalinist side can be expected to increase. This time, however, instead of the cheers of victorious battle, the noise is an attempt to cover defeat with bold front.

Although nothing concrete will be achieved at this conference, it can serve to drive home at least one important lesson: that when either side takes its stand on the basis of democratic rights it can crowd the other into a corner and achieve a notable political victory over it. In this instance, it has been the capitalist side which has taken its stand on the democratic right of the German people to be

united in freedom, and the Stalinists who, because they cannot and will not concede that right, have lost a political battle.

The strategies of the two sides have been clear for several months. The Stalinists have sought to exploit the longing of the peoples of the world for peace by proposing an international ban on nuclear weapons and withdrawal of all troops to their national boundaries. They have linked their disarmament proposals to this plan. Since it would involve a withdrawal of American power from Europe, as well as the dismantling of American air bases all over the world, the Stalinists have felt that they could push it safely with no danger that the Americans would take them up on their proposal.

At the same time, they have felt that they could continue to hold up the rearmament of Germany, and to push at the weak spots of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization by leaving in a state of suspended animation any discussion of German unity. If forced to discuss it, they have stood on their old position of demanding that "steps toward unification" must first be taken by the governments of the two Germanies which would give their East German puppets a veto power over every decision, and hence the puppet-masters an infinite

(Continued on page 6)

Russian Imperialism — —

(Continued from page 11)

aggressive Egypt and its military dictator Nasser.

Then came the official confirmation of the deal. The tide of indignation, however, rose still higher. The CP became indignant that anyone could possibly find fault with such a deal, despite the fact that only a few days previously they had done this very thing.

Achdut Avodah and Mapam maintained their hostile attitude toward the deal. As Zionists they were opposed to the Stalinists' supplying arms to Egypt, and for the first few days they indignantly denounced not Russia, not Czechoslovakia, but the Israeli Communist Party for justifying the deal.

Mapam continued its double policy of denouncing the deal and finding excuses for Russia. Only a little while ago, despite the fact that their own lives were at stake, they persisted in saying that Russia was entitled to use all its efforts to block the creation of an anti-Soviet alliance; unfortunately it was sacrificing Israel along this road—a mistake....

MOSCOW'S AIMS

For a while it did seem as though the Stalinist aim in the Middle East was merely a negative one, i.e., frustrating American plans for the area. However, as the story unfolds there appears to be much more to the Russians' moves.

The Egyptians who had led the opposition to U. S. military plans in the Middle East had not shopped around for the arms. The Russians came to them with a fully worked-out deal. While the armaments came from Czech factories it was the Russians who acted as the "merchants of death" in this instance. The price of the materiel is reported to be ridiculously low, according to some reports as low as one-tenth of the marked price. In addition it is all on credit, and the credit is payable not in cash but by barter of cotton and other goods that the Eastern bloc does not normally import in large quantities. The size, amount, and quality of the arms involved is of relatively high order, including jets and submarines.

One of the most ominous signs was the speed with which the deal was consummated. Less than a few weeks after the signing of the agreement, Russian ships were already unloading their tools of death in the ports of Egypt. No such haste and no such terms were needed to keep Nasser and others out of the Middle East alliance. Russia has more than negative interests in this cauldron.

Historically Russia has always looked to the Middle East for expansion. While the Bolshevik regime renounced the imperialist plans of old Russia, the Stalinists reinstated the old tsarist ambitions in this area with a vengeance. Before the war, Stalin demanded that the British give him a warm-water port in Iran. After the war, Russia marched into Iran and seized some territory. Pushed out of Iran by its Western imperialist rivals, it tried to make a deal giving it control of much of Iranian oil. Here too it was frustrated.

At the wartime and post-war conferences, Russia demanded that the then Italian colony of Libya, which is now a nominally independent state on Egypt's western border, be placed under Russian control. Russia has never made a secret of its desires to control the Dardanelles. It has been hot and cold in its demand for acquisition of two Turkish provinces near Istanbul.

There can be little doubt that the Russians are playing for more than the immediate diplomatic stakes. They are now involved in a long-term rivalry with

opponents for imperialist influence in the Middle East.

As is usually the case with the Russians, the new line is put into effect in a totalitarian, or total, manner. During the early days of the late "Geneva spirit," the satellite countries freed some Zionists from prison. Now Zionists or suspected Zionists are once again being imprisoned in Russia.

If and when a new Israeli-Arab war does break out, another great power will have smeared its hands in blood again. The situation was difficult enough when the Arabs and Israelis were left to themselves. The actions of both power blocs have and will continue to act as a disturbing influence on the Middle East.

For Israel, a Jewish island in an Arab sea, the situation is deteriorating and shows little promise of change for the better as things are going now. As a result of both the power politics of the big states and of its own policies, Israel is being forced willy-nilly to depend on outside powers for its very survival.

BEN-GURION'S ROLE

No matter who is to blame for the new Israeli-Arab bloodshed, no matter who will supply the guns, it is Ben-Gurion who has supplied the Arab leaders with their slogans and atrocity material.

"Remember Kibya!" is playing and will continue to play a big propagandistic role for the Egyptians. Ben-Gurion, too, is responsible for deliberately substituting large-scale fighting in place of the small brush fighting that was the rule for the last eight years.

At the beginning of 1955, Ben-Gurion proposed a large-scale retaliatory attack on the Egyptians in Gaza. He carried his point in the councils of the Israeli government but had to assume personal responsibility by emerging from retirement and becoming defense minister. His rationale was that a show of force, a defeat for Nasser, would stop the border fighting by frightening the Arabs, and it might even bring a peace settlement.

We in LABOR ACTION pointed out at that time that this policy would not bring peace nor stop the border fighting, but that it would lead to mutual retaliation on a heightened plane. The events of the past year have proved that Ben-Gurion's policy of swashbuckling chauvinism is the worst poison for Israel. One of the reasons why Nasser quickly accepted the Russian offer was the defeat suffered by Egyptian forces in Ben-Gurion's Gaza raid early this year, and the consequent demonstration of Israel's military superiority over Egypt. No military dictator can long endure such a situation if he hopes to maintain his position.

The hope of the Israeli moderates like Sharett, who went along with Ben-Gurion in the belief that by headlining the border troubles they could get the benevolent intervention of the great powers, has also proved to be an illusion. The road to peace in the Middle East does not lie via Washington or Moscow or London, but in the Middle East itself.

Whatever the immediate outcome of the present border fighting will be, it seems to have put a damper on the Johnson plan for sharing the waters of the Jordan among Israel, Jordan and Lebanon. Should this prove to be the permanent quietus on the plan, it would indeed be unfortunate. Despite its suspect authorship in the U. S., it has been the only regional plan proposed up till now that would make some contribution to the development of the area and to the prospects for peace.

Egypt Threatens — —

(Continued from page 1)

Advance toward a political solution of the crisis cannot get very far without a bottom-up overhauling of Israel's whole Arab policy. This is where to start.

This can be done by the type of program advocated in Israel by such groups as Ichud (the group founded by the late Judah Magnes), the Jewish Bund, and the Democratic Club. The Ichud, for example, proposes:

"(1) Israel must change radically the ideological position underlying her present foreign policy, namely, that physical, political and military force can bring peace between herself and her neighbors.

(2) Israel must acknowledge the principle of repatriation, and admit a considerable number of Arab refugees to their old homes. It is possible that many will not want to return. But Israel must make a magnanimous offer. Those refugees who will not want to come back should receive just compensation for their land and property. (3) The Arab minority living in Israel now should also be given complete equality with Israelis." (Quoted from *Jewish Newsletter*, Nov. 7.)

IT CAN'T GO ON

All these proposals and the reasons for their importance have been spelled out in our own columns on many occasions. Their importance does not consist in the fact that, if applied by Israel, the Arab rulers will love Israel instead of hating it. Their importance lies in that a program consistently pushed along these lines will work to eliminate the legitimate grievances and powerful issues used by these rulers to whip up their people to a chauvinist frenzy, and indeed which understandably infuriate the Arab people even without demagoguery from the leaders.

Steps on the immediate sore points should only be a beginning: the only long-term solution for the region is a much more extensive integration of Israeli-Arab interests looking toward regional federation. But this, politically practical though it is, is a pipedream as long as Israel is obsessed with the Zionist politics of making this small state the racial homeland for the "Ingathering of the Exiles" of all world Jewry.

What should penetrate even Zionist skulls in Israel today is the fact that the country simply cannot go on living this way, no matter how the present acute crisis is temporarily settled, if it is settled. Its leaders must come to realize that they must come to an accommodation with their Arab neighbors, instead of following their present arrogant and insolent policy toward the Arabs, in reaction to the latter's aggressive threats and skirmishes.

WAY OF SUICIDE

The Israeli government's response to the danger which is now upon its head is a typical extension of the same policy which has led into its cul-de-sac. It demands as the answer: counteract the Russian-Czech shipment of arms to Egypt with a Western shipment of arms to Israel; and counteract the new Russian-Egypt relations with a U. S.-Israel pact.

This is the way of suicide for Israel. No one in his right mind can believe that the Middle East explosion can be damped by jacking up armaments on both sides. Least of all can this be a far-seeing way out for the little state of Israel. It is fantastic that, for any length of time, one state with 1,800,000 people can demand from world opinion the "right" to military parity with a whole region of the world with over 40 million people.

Likewise no one with an elementary understanding of world politics can believe that the Middle East crisis can be solved by splitting it down the middle along the lines of the international cold war, by institutionalizing and freezing the line-up of different sections of this area with different camps of the world-wide imperialist struggle for the world.

In their demand for a "security pact" with the U. S., the Israelis think to purchase a precarious safety by tucking themselves under the wing of the big world overlord, the U. S., and, from this "secure" perch, thumbing their nose at the local hoodlums—"Just dare to touch me, and I'll call my Big Brother on you..."

Thus the Israelis only turn themselves into another pawn in the big game going on, without even the slightest insurance that at some propitious moment they will not be traded off with complete cynicism for some castle or king.

themselves to one camp as its base in the Middle East, the Egyptian people are being given to understand that, by making the deal with the Russians, Cairo is showing its independence of the blocs. It is doubtful whether Americans understand this aspect of the Egyptian arms deal, from the point of view of its impact on the Egyptian people, because the U. S. press, with its voluntary kind of monolithism, cries to the heavens that Russia is taking Egypt over and in its panicky way even implies that the arms deal makes Egypt a kind of Russian "satellite."

Now, to be sure, this "independence" of the Egyptians does evidence independence from the Western bloc, and this is a good thing, but it is rife with illusions about independence from Russian influence, once the latter's foot is in the door. The aims of Russian imperialism, as it fishes for a maximum of prizes in these troubled waters, are well analyzed by Al Findley's accompanying article. It is a sorry but characteristic commentary on such efforts at independence in the world of blocs that it can be achieved by these states mainly by playing off one bloc against the other. It is no recommendation of the Egyptian move that it counters the pull of the Western camp by leaning back into the arms of the Stalinist camp.

PARTY-LINE CYNICISM

But quite another thing is the kind of abuse against the Egyptians that has been raging in the U. S. press. It is not without reason that the Egyptians angrily and correctly reply that they have as much right to buy arms from one nation as from another.

The U. S. party-line reaction is all the more sickeningly hypocritical, in its moral and political pretensions, in view of some absolutely public facts. Soon after the disclosure of the Egyptian arms deal with Russia, Dulles openly proposed that Egypt buy its arms from the U. S. instead: everything would be all right, presumably, if the arms to kill Israelis came from good democratic sources rather than bad totalitarian factories. After this little inconsistency was fixed up, some people remembered that Israel not too many years ago had bought shipments of arms from the very same Czechoslovakia which was now sup-

plying Egypt. In this connection, too, it is worth noting that, formally, Russia has covered itself by claiming willingness to sell arms to Israel—whether on the same easy terms may be another matter—but Israel now spurns the tainted weapons: at least while it still hopes for the security pact with the U. S.

But there is something more to this question of Egypt's "right" to buy arms where it will—an undoubted right as long as U. S. propaganda puts the question on this superficial level. This "something more" is also more sinister.

CIA THREAT

This is the implied threats from the U. S. that a government which buys arms from Stalinist states against the wishes of the Washington overlord is a government which must be treated like—Guatemala.

This note was struck in the press right after the disclosure of the arms deal, when inspired stories from Washington commented that the deal put in doubt the "stability" of Nasser's regime.

But this was only a subtle hint compared with the crude menace contained in a pronouncement by Allen W. Dulles, the head of the same Central Intelligence Agency which reportedly took care of the "stability" of the Arbenz regime in Guatemala, when that government made the "mistake" of buying arms from the wrong side.

This was contained in a speech appropriately made by this Dulles to the International Association of Chiefs of Police, as published in that organ of the cops, the *New Leader*.

Dulles swings into a discussion of "a somewhat recent development in their [the Communists'] program of sowing international discord"—their use of stocks of obsolete war equipment to tempt countries that want to build up their military establishments. He leaves little to the imagination:

"... we now hear of advanced negotiations with several countries of the Middle East. I would not be at all surprised if we soon heard that countries in this hemisphere were being approached.

"A premature start with this program was made over a year ago. You will remember that it was a shipload of obsolete arms sent by Czechoslovakia to Guatemala which aroused the Guatemalan peo-

ple to realization of the Communist plans for a take-over of that country. Once again, Czechoslovakia looms up as the front for the delivery of Communist arms—this time in the Middle East."

He could not more clearly have put the case of Guatemala and of Egypt in the same bag. Of course, the affair may be more difficult in practice for the CIA's spies and provocateurs to operate, and it is not a question here of predicting that Washington is realistically looking for a Castillo Armas in the Middle East. What is involved in this disgraceful pronouncement by the U. S.'s cloak-and-dagger head is obvious enough without that.

CONFESSION

Lastly, on this level of the international cold war, we come back around to the same point with which we began on the regional level: the fatal substitution of military lineups for political program.

We have seen how this characterized Israeli policy. The same is true, writ larger, of U. S. policy in the Middle East. In fact, this failure is now semi-officially confessed.

In a *Times* dispatch from Washington on Nov. 7, James Reston communicates the officially unofficial views of the State Department on how U. S. policy must now be changed in the area. In the course of this account of State Department thinking, it is admitted that the U. S. policy-makers have been relying on the "Northern Tier" military pact of Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and Britain, and that this is a weak reed, for—

"Finally, the defense alliance of the 'northern tier' of Middle Eastern states has not 'contained' the Communists. The pact has apparently provoked the Russians to action, and led them to the decision to vault right over the 'northern tier' into Egypt."

Reston points out that some in the State Department counterposed "economic solutions" to the provocative military solution of the pact, and it is such "economic solutions" that he apparently counterposes to the military. One supposes that the economic solutions referred to boil down to more handouts of foreign aid, which is no solution in itself, but which could be integrated into a consistent political program for a democratic foreign policy. The American powers-that-be, however, have no conception of such a political front in the war against Stalinism, which they know how to wage only in their own imperialist way.

Dirty Journalism and the Saar:—Left at the Post

By BERNARD CRAMER

As we noted in a short item in last week's *LA*, the *N. Y. Post* was not behind the general ruck-and-muck of American newspapers in its chauvinistic treatment of the Saar vote. In the case of the *Post*, indeed, ordinary American chauvinism (liberal variety) is complicated by the additive of a virulently poisonous anti-German chauvinism of the type which tends to cast the responsibility on the whole German people of the Nazi crimes against the Jews.

The *Post* editorial on the Saar vote not only painted the whole situation in terms of "a Nazi offensive," but also gratuitously added a smear against the Saar Socialists. This writer picked up the latter point for a "Dear Editor" missive to the *Post* which gave rise to the following exchange. Unfortunately the *Post's* letter column is of the tabloid variety, usually printing only telegraphic-style short squibs, so that one cannot say much. My letter as published was a long one for this paper:

"Your Oct. 25 editorial on the Saar vote said, 'The Socialists in the Saar were dreary echoes of Dr. Schneider,' whom you describe as an 'unreconstructed Nazi rabble-rouser' whose campaign had 'all the ugly overtones of a Nazi offensive.'

"If this smear against the Saar Socialists is made in good faith, then surely it requires some evidence. Otherwise, it sounds like a particularly despicable McCarthy-type slander.

"It is possible you 'merely' meant to say that the Socialists also favored reunion with the Saarlanders' own country, which happens to be Germany—a view you label 'reactionary German nationalism.' It is a pity you don't discuss your undoubtedly very liberal reasons for believing that the Saarlanders should be deprived of the right to self-determination. Is it perhaps for the same reason that Max Lerner argued the Moroccans are such backward people that they have no right to freedom? It is a pity you do not mention the right to self-determination at all, in the

course of whipping yourself liberally to a chauvinist frenzy."

In an appended editorial reply, editor James Wechsler dodged the little matter of self-determination and tried to shift the ball while running:

"We'd welcome any evidence from Mr. Cramer," wrote Wechsler, "that the Saar Socialists repudiated and condemned Dr. Schneider's performance. Dispatches from the Saar reported that Socialists there shared campaign platforms with the Schneider forces."

That was all from him. This invitation encouraged me to send in the following reply which, though necessarily still telegraphically concise in the *Post* letter style, probably covers the main points:

"Re your editorial defense of your smear against the Saar Socialists:

"(1) I see you decline to defend your charge that 'The Socialists in the Saar were dreary echoes of Dr. Schneider,' whom you described as a Nazi. Instead you replied with a new and different charge (see point 2). I take it, then, you admit your original statement was an invented falsehood.

"(2) The new charge you shift to is that Saar Socialists 'shared campaign platforms with the Schneider forces.' This charge is based exclusively on a *Times* photo caption depicting a joint campaign rally of ALL Saar parties advocating a no vote. Your words convey the misleading impression that the Socialists carried on their campaign jointly with Schneider.

"True, I would have been for an entirely independent Socialist campaign—but for reasons you'd consider 'doctrinaire,' I have opinions on this score not shared by American liberals who cohabit in the same party with Southern lynchers, while they write editorials smearing Socialists.

"(3) You ask me for evidence that the Socialists 'repudiated and condemned Dr. Schneider's performance.' With this demagogic request you try to shift the obvious burden of proof; still I comply. It is well known that the German Socialists are the only consistent enemies of the neo-Nazi rehabilitation carried on by

Adenauer, Washington's pet German. In the Saar campaign, the Socialists (as well as other parties) specifically disavowed mob tactics against Hoffman meetings such as flared for a few days (*Times* 8-21). It was the Socialist paper which fingered the use of stench bombs against Hoffman meetings (*Times* 8-19). After Aug. 21 there was NO violence or disorder reported in the Saar campaign (*Times* 10-20, 10-25). It is plain from copious *Times* dispatches that Schneider at no time permitted himself to express any Nazi ideas but posed as reformed. Other than what I have covered, what is the "performance" that requires repudiation?

"(4) Above all, you carefully avoided replying on the one and only main issue: democratic self-determination of the Saar. Harold Callender's dispatches in the *Times* blew to pieces the hypocritical farce about 'Europeanization,' which was an empty mask for French control of Saar coal. The French had grabbed the Saar in exactly the same way that Bismarck and Hitler grabbed Lorraine; or that the Russian despots grabbed East Europe. The Saarlanders voted their wish to reunite with their own country. If Nazis can take advantage of this legitimate aspiration toward national integrity, if they are handed that issue free then the crime belongs to French imperialism, which is supported by liberal chauvinists among others."

As this goes to press, over a week and a half later, Editor Wechsler still has the above letter on his desk (according to his office) without publishing it or rejecting it, in spite of his invitation. Perhaps he is finally trying to find out what happened in the Saar election.

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

While the Israelis openly offer to sell