

World Socialism

KINGS AND REVOLUTIONISTS

By HERBERT ZAM

"WHEN the devil is sick, the devil a saint would be." We are not sure whether the "Daily Worker" is sick, but it certainly is trying to attire itself in the pure-white toga of a saint. And this is a little difficult for a paper with its reputation—particularly in the subjects it chooses. For example, it has been making constant demands for an apology from the Socialist CALL for mentioning the appearance of the Greek Communists before King George with a pledge of allegiance. This, they insist, is a slander of the Greek Communists. Every one who reads the CALL knows that it is always anxious to correct any errors which may creep into its columns, and we are glad to accept the Daily Worker's explanation of what happened in Greece. Had the Daily Worker merely asked for a correction, this would have closed the case. However, the Daily Worker accompanied this demand with a vicious attack on the Socialist CALL, trying to give the impression that we had deliberately used this story knowing all the time that it was false. For this reason we must say a few more words about the case.

The Greek Communists

The Greek Communists first appeared before King George on Jan. 7. This information was contained in the capitalist press. Nevertheless the CALL ignored it. We were reluctant to accept an unconfirmed capitalist report on a matter as important as this. It was not until February 15 that this column made mention of the Greek case. Why this delay? Because by then we had received the European Communist press which confirmed the report. Here, for example, is the report as it appeared in *Humanité*, French Communist daily, Jan. 8th:

"A Communist delegation appeared at the royal palace. It made a declaration stating that its party would operate within the framework of the present regime, considering King George II as a guarantee against fascism and against any 'dictatorial regime'."

And *Humanité* carried this report without any comment or editorial doubt. Even worse than what appeared in *Humanité*, is an

"explanation" which was printed in the French Communist "New Press":

"King George understood that if he wants to maintain himself in the country he must depend upon the broadest democracy. Therefore, already on the first day of his return there appeared sharp differences between him and the fascist general Kondylis.

"The King declared an amnesty which Kondylis did not want to permit, and Kondylis had to retreat. The amnesty benefited all the democratic forces in the country and many revolutionary workers. Now there will take place new elections.

"Against these democratic forces there is being carried on an underground fascist attack. And the Communist Party has declared itself ready in the present struggle to support democracy against fascism. This is the fact in the Communist appearance before the King. The Communists are not monarchists—such a thought is in general an absurdity—but they want to cooperate with all democratic forces to destroy fascism."

This explanation, it is obvious, is far more dangerous than any statement, for it gives direct and objective support to monarchism, and further generates the illusion that such support will preserve democracy. Now we want to ask any impartial reader whether, with these facts before us, we were not justified in making the few comments we did make on the Greek situation. And while we are at it, we might ask the Daily Worker to answer a few questions. Why did they have to wait until after February 16 to come to the defense of the Greek Communists, when this news was carried in most cases on January 8. If the Havas report was so unbelievable why did they not question it editorially? Is it because they had a suspicion that it was true? And if they thought the report to be true, why did they not criticize the Greek Communists for seeming having committed such a blunder?