

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Differs on What Was New at Convention

Editor, Daily Worker:

I wonder exactly what convention G. Dirba was talking about in his letter Monday entitled, "The Will of the Majority."

Dirba warns the paper, on pain paper "on pain of "the most serious consequences for the Party and for the Press campaign," that it must quickly adjust itself, not to the historic convention decision to really break with the left sectarianism which has hobbled us for years, but to a fight against errors "in the opposite direction"! He warns that the paper must quickly get in line, not with the long overdue affirmation of the right of friendly criticism of brother parties, but with the "framework" such criticism should be in!

This is indeed a sensational technique for turning the convention into their opposite. As if for all these years we were perfectly free of left sectarianism, and what the Convention did on this question was to assert the need to watch out for right opportunism. As if for all these years we have been freely and honestly and frankly exchanging criticism with the brother parties, and the convention examined this problem and voted overwhelmingly to put such criticism in its proper framework!

Using this technique, you can go right down the line into fantasy land. All these years, for instance, we've been telling Jacques Duclos we do our own interpreting of Marxism-Leninism in accordance with the requirements of the AMERICAN class struggle and democratic traditions, and what this convention did was to thank him warmly for his letter. (The answer did thank him, after all.)

It is no wonder that reader Dirba can thus see the convention decisions "badly violated" by the very title of a Joe Clark column "The Tito - Khrushchev Discussion." This heading, he actually writes, "is tendentious and smacks of the N.Y. Times."

Preserve us from a return to that nonsense, where every word is weighed and tasted for some hidden significance, and putting one person's name before another's becomes something sinister.

It is hard to disagree with Dirba when he says "the decisions of the CP convention are of the utmost importance for preserving the unity of the Party. . . ." Just let's stop standing things on their head. The unity of the party indeed depends on rallying to the big changes voted overwhelmingly at the conven-

tion, for a break with the old sectarianisms and for a sensible independent relationship for the first time with the other parties of socialism throughout the world.

I would say this sorely-needed good sense was evident in our editorials on the Middle East last, in which this paper disagreed with both the Soviet Union's position opposing free navigation of Aqaba to Israel, and the New York Post's refusal to call an invasion an invasion. We said we were for a basic settlement of the whole cold war, which is "why we opposed the invasion of Egypt but also supported the Israeli demand for free navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba . . . why we opposed the Western effort to seize the Suez Canal but also backed the demand for free navigation in the Suez without discrimination."

This is the kind of independent good sense which is the road back to real influence and respect in this country, to where we can again carry some weight and get an increasing hearing for our wonderful "product," a socialist U.S.A. free of the blight of discrimination, free forever from fears of depressions or wars.

-L

## Egypt and Israel

Editor, Daily Worker:

Benjamin Davis, in his letter of March 8, deals with relations between the Jewish and Negro people. In analyzing A. W. Berry's column and citing some merits in it, Davis finds a demerit in that the column, he says, leaves an impression of a neutralist position by the Negro people on the Israeli-Arab conflict. He takes issue with Berry's statement that "the Negroes are for the advance of both sides in the conflict."

I don't know how accurate is Berry's estimate of Negro sentiment, but to me it appears logical and plausible, because Ne-

groes, an oppressed people, are in sympathy with Egyptians who desire to throw off colonial domination, and with Jewish people who after so much suffering are trying to build their own state.

Davis' claims to wider observations by citing two Negro newspapers and finding a growth of Moslem influence in Negro communities are not very convincing. No doubt the Negro people oppose colonialism and recognize an identity with Egyptians on this score, as well as on the score of racism. Of course they are not neutral as regards colonial powers.

Davis believes Negroes "are mostly pro-Egyptian, and that they are right, in the sense that they are anti-colonial, not anti-Semitic."

It is true the government of Israel has a pro-West orientation, and it is a tool of imperialism. Iraq, Saudi Arabia and many other states receiving U. S. economic and military aid are also tools of imperialism, yet nobody questions their right to exist as independent states. But Egypt and other Arab countries deny such a right to Israel.

The invasion of Egypt by Britain, France and Israel was an act of aggression, justly condemned by the world. Since then the invaders complied with the UN decision and withdrew. Egypt has a right to complete independence, and sovereignty over Suez. But as of now Egypt doesn't pledge that it will stop raiding Israel, denies Israeli shipping freedom of navigation, and refuses to make peace with Israel.

It seems to me that proper relations between the Jewish and Negro peoples cannot be based on the attitude of being merely "pro - Egyptian." Rather they should be used on an anti-colonial policy, struggle for Negro rights, against anti-Semitism, and a recognition that the Arab world should be persuaded to conclude a peace settlement with Israel.—F.

## LABOR BRIEFS

A PROGRAM for American union members to study labor problems in Britain has been announced by the Institute of International Education, 1 E. 67th St., New York. Closing date for application is April 1, 1957.

Four full scholarships for the coming academic year (Oct. 1957-June 1958) are available: three at Ruskin College of Oxford University and one at Coleg Harlech in Wales.

Candidates should be actively participating in some phase of the labor movement. Each student is expected to return to active work in the trade union movement in the U.S.

The Ruskin College was founded primarily to afford a college education to British industrial workers who had not had such education. The curriculum is directed chiefly to social studies, especially history, economics, industrial relations and theory and practice of government.