

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 10, 1952

FIVE CENTS

INDIA: The Socialist Party Merger
... page 6

LATIN AMERICA: A Basic Analysis
... page 7

GREAT BRITAIN: 'Bevanism' Minus Bevan?
... page 3

SCANDINAVIA: Left-Wing Forces Gird
... page 4

GREECE: Churchill Street in Athens
... page 4

Election Analyses — Next Week

As this issue goes to press on Wednesday, the day after the election, the news is the election of Eisenhower and probable, though not certain, control of Congress by the Republican administration. Next week's LABOR ACTION will be largely devoted to assessing and discussing the political meaning and consequences of this important change.



Fitzpatrick in The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Franco Government Announces the Big Deal: U.S. Dollars to Prop Shaky Fascist Regime

The Franco regime in Spain has announced that the Big Deal has been made with the United States. Armament dollars from Washington will give a shot of adrenalin to the shaky economic structure of Spanish fascism.

Washington has still made no statement on the news. It would represent the Democratic administration's last contribution to propping up world reaction in its search for allies against totalitarian Russia—preparatory to the taking over of the State Department by the Republicans, from whom more of the same can be expected, and perhaps worse.

The blow which is thus struck against the Spanish people by U. S. foreign policy is evident even from the dispatch by the N. Y. Times' correspondent Cianfarra, who is not unfriendly to the Falangist government:

"This major development in United States-Spanish relations, which is expected to consolidate the dictatorship of Generalissimo

Francisco Franco internally after many years of virtual diplomatic and political isolation was understood to have resulted from compromises on both sides," he cables. (Franco had plenty of room to compromise since his demands during the negotiations were characterized by U. S. officials as a flagrant holdup.)

The aim, as far as the U. S. is concerned, is to gain bases on Spanish land. According to the report, it gets three, and "the terms of the purported military agreement are being kept secret."

The meaning of the accord—which will give the biggest lift since the end of the war to Hitler's former ally in Madrid—is underlined by some of the reasons given by Cianfarra for Franco's willingness to "compromise," that is, scale down his stick-up to meet Washington's offer. He explains that "Spain was fighting a losing battle to stem the inflationary trend that started in the summer of 1950." The purchasing power

of the peseta has been dwindling. "The working classes are pressing for pay increases and the government is in urgent need to step up production to keep prices down."

This, as might be expected from Cianfarra, puts it as mildly as is humanly possible. With Spanish economy a shambles, and widespread misery, discontent and hatred among the people, Franco can now boast of new underpinning through the American dollar.

Both the AFL and CIO, as well as the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the widest sections of liberal and labor opinion at home and abroad, have denounced the government's Franco policy for what it is—a betrayal of the democratic forces in the only still existing regime which was a cog in the Nazi's axis.

During the past month the issue was raised of Franco Spain's admission into UNESCO. The CIO has made it known that trade-union initiative in the American

omy, except to peddle the worn-out notion that "business confidence" can do the job.

Danger in '53

The Democrats have feigned dismay at the thought that the Republicans have so little confidence in America as to claim that only the war economy keeps it prosperous. They claim that they have learned "new techniques" to maintain prosperity and to prevent the cyclical crises which capitalism has displayed since its birth, and the general crisis from

which we were lifted only by the war boom of 1941.

What are the actual prospects for the American economy, regardless of the outcome of the election? Perhaps we can arrive at a good short-run picture by quoting from the November 3 column of Sylvia Porter, economic analyst of the Fair-Dealish, Stevenson-supporting New York Post:

"We're swinging merrily through one of the finest eras of prosperity in all history. And with the best period of the year coming up, this prosperity is certain to continue into 1953.

"We're in this prosperity because the government is spending so many billions on plant expansion and builders are putting so many billions into new construction. And as a result of these immense stimulants, production is at a peak, employment is at an all-time high, incomes are at a record.

"None of this spending has anything to do with politics. All of these stimulants will be operating at top speed through the first months of 1953 at least. No matter who."

"Inflation is fast fading into history. Prices have leveled off and will continue leveling off.

"The cost of living is stabilizing and the cost of food—the key item in our budgets—is drifting lower.

"Inflation has cursed us through most of the last 10 years. But barring another

(Turn to last page)

(Continued on page 2)

NEW YORK

At a Liberal Party Rally

NEW YORK, Oct. 30—The Independent Citizens for the Election of George S. Counts, for U. S. senator from New York, rallied some 800 supporters on his behalf at a luncheon on October 29 at the Hotel New Yorker. Dr. Counts, who is a vice-chairman of the Liberal Party and a teacher at Columbia University, is running as the Liberal Party candidate against the incumbent Republican, Ives, and the Democratic machine hack, John Cashmore. The ISL has endorsed him as the independent Liberal Party candidate.

Although this is one of the few occasions when the Liberal Party has selected one of its party leaders as a candidate for a very important post, the Counts campaign has been a very disappointing one and completely subordinated to the Liberal Party's emphasis on the national candidates it is supporting. Stevenson and Sparkman. The campaign, if one can even call it that, has been quiet and innocuous. Most of the party's time, energy, and money has gone to the Stevenson-Sparkman campaign, with consequent neglect of the important Counts' candidacy.

The contrast between what the party was doing and what it ought to have been doing was brought home sharply at the luncheon of the Independent Citizens by the presence of Rudolph Halley, president of the New York City Council, elected to that post last year running on the Liberal Party ticket against the Democratic and Republican candidates. Halley, an "independent Democrat," won with some 660,000 votes as the result of a rousing and energetic campaign of the Liberal Party. Alongside this campaign, which resulted in the first electoral victory of the Liberal Party for an important post, the campaign for Counts is altogether inadequate.

UNDERPLAYING

Halley, speaking at the luncheon in support of Counts—with an eye no doubt to courting Liberal Party support for the next majority election—expressed the hope that the Liberals would also sweep Counts to office as had happened with him. Halley's election had fanned the rank-and-file sentiment within the Liberal Party for running independent candidates, and the Counts' candidacy afforded an excellent opportunity to make political hay on top of Halley's election.

But the Liberal Party leadership did not embark on the Counts' campaign in this spirit. They were "forced" to run Counts because they failed to swing their weight sufficiently to persuade the Democratic Party to run an acceptable liberal, in this case, Averell Harriman. Cashmore's nomination was a slap in their face—it was a brutal dismissal from the party bosses to peddle

their influence elsewhere. And so reluctantly they nominated Dr. Counts, and have run a token campaign, more or less.

Halley gave high praise to the Liberal Party as the only party of principle and conscience in New York and applauded its decision to run its own candidate against an incompetent hack like Cashmore. But when he asserted that while New York needed such a party of principle in the Democratic Party, his audience sat in stony silence.

HALLEY MISFIRES

Quite conspicuously, his accolades to the Democratic Party as the only party with the courage to change with the times, to root out the reactionaries within its own ranks, and to clean up their own house, fell on deaf ears. At several points, when he paused, expecting applause, the audience—consisting mainly of Liberal Party members and supporters—sat on their hands, in sharp contrast to their enthusiastic applause when he plumped for Counts and the Liberal Party. Apparently, there is growing sentiment that the Democratic Party does not "fill the bill on a national scale as the Liberal Party does on a local scale."

Liberal Party Chairman A. A. Berle, in his remarks at the luncheon, predicted another bang-

up victory, with 600,000 votes for Counts. He insisted that a vote for Counts would not be wasted, but would be a message to both parties that "we want good, liberal candidates" and that "we represent a significant force and our opinion must be respected."

REALIGNMENT DUE

In an interesting analysis of the heterogeneous forces within the two old parties, Berle predicted that this election would be the last election with the two parties as presently constituted and that the vast coalitions which they represented would be broken up. Realignments were long overdue, he said, and would give the voters the opportunity to know what they were really voting for. The Liberal Party, he stated, could play a large role in this process.

Dr. Counts, anxious no doubt to produce his credentials as a fighter against the Russian menace, pointed out that he had been a careful scholar of Russian developments for over 30 years. Devoting his speech to this subject, he gave extensive proof that he was familiar with the writings and speeches of Stalin—which he quoted at somewhat tedious length—but, alas, there was no evidence that he had any grasp of the real nature of Stalinism and the reasons for the ability of this reactionary despotism to appeal to the oppressed peoples of the world.

Notes on a National Tour

By GORDON HASKELL

I have just concluded a six-week tour of the branches of the Independent Socialist League throughout the country. Since my return to New York, I have been asked two questions by our comrades here: How does the election campaign look throughout the country, and how is the ISL getting along?

To the first question I reply that if I were to judge solely by my first-hand contact with the electorate, there will be a socialist landslide . . . that is, I certainly talk to far more socialists than Republicans and Democrats! But joking aside, a person traveling around the country can judge chiefly by what he reads in the papers, which are largely Republican, and is really in no better position to expertize than the man at home.

The second question could not be answered so easily. Like all socialist organizations in the United States today, the ISL is under terrific political pressure. Rather than decreasing during the political campaign, this pressure has increased. The labor leadership has gone all-out for the Democrats in 1952, perhaps more so than in any other campaign. Any deviation from their propaganda to the world, and that an Eisenhower victory would mean depression and the crushing of the labor movement, was regarded as outright heresy or worse. It would be misleading to deny the fact that this made it difficult if not impossible for socialists to present their views in the shops or in union meetings.

To this difficulty was added the more long-range and more pervasive effect of the general witchhunt atmosphere which prevails in the country. This affects the size of attendance at the public meetings organized by the ISL branches and those sponsored by the Socialist Youth League and other anti-war student groups on the campuses. Although attendance at the former was about what had been expected by the local comrades (with the exception of Chicago, where it was much better), their expectations have been conditioned by the atmosphere in which they are compelled to operate. On the campuses the size of the meetings reflected the general lowering of the political level of college students, a condition which was described in a survey conducted by the New York Times early this year.

HOW TO RESIST THE PRESSURES

Despite these conditions, the ISL branches have been holding their own, by and large. A number of them have found fruitful arenas in which they can participate in the struggle for civil liberties and civil rights, and in which they can present the ideas of independent socialism to people who have not had access to them before. I have been strongly impressed by the fact that it is precisely those branches which have been able to involve themselves most successfully in this kind of work in their communities in which the internal ideological life is also the liveliest and in which the comrades have been able to resist the pressures of the witchhunt most vigorously.

It is a commonplace to point out that the health and strength of the socialist movement is directly related to the political consciousness and militancy of the labor movement as a whole. This is especially true of the ISL which, as a Marxist propaganda group—and unlike a socialist sect such as the Socialist Labor Party or even the Socialist Party—is overwhelmingly labor-oriented. I found that everywhere the comrades are primarily interested in the question: What is the long-range significance of labor's full commitment to the Democratic Party in this campaign? Does this mean that any real prospect of an independent political development for labor is put off indefinitely, or are we witnessing a development which may have far-reaching implications for a growing political maturity of the American working class? If so, how will socialists be able to play a positive role in the development of this maturity?

While the comrades are watching political developments in the labor movement, they are not neglecting the political opportunities which lie immediately at hand, relatively meager as these may be. This is the most important fact which bids well for the future of the Independent Socialist League.

Franco

(Continued from page 1)

had been delayed by a couple of weeks, the move might have been ascribed to the effect of Eisenhower's victory in the presidential election (which is in the headlines as we go to press) but as it is no illusions on this score can be entertained even by the gullible. Although the deal is a continuation of the switchover initiated by the Truman-Acheson foreign-policy-makers, there is no doubt that the GOP in power will continue and extend it along the same lines.

Get ALL your books

from
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.
We can supply you!

LABOR SCOPE

CIO and the Democratic Machine

THE CIO AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, by Fay Calkins.—University of Chicago Press, 162 pages, \$4.00.

By WALTER JASON

In the discussion inevitable after the current national election on the future of American labor politics, a very good prerequisite would be an understanding of what labor, or segments of it, actually has done in politics. In 1952, the CIO advanced further to the point where its own card-carriers comprised a majority of delegates, but Governor Williams handpicked his own slate and handed it down to a clearing committee of labor for approval, which was considered a mere formality.

Miss Calkins, who is listed as a research assistant for the National CIO-PAC, tries to bring out all the pertinent facts of five "case studies" of political-action participation by labor, that is, by unions. Two remain of major national importance: the ill-fated campaign to defeat Senator Taft in Ohio in 1950, and the UAW's virtual "capture" of the Democratic Party in Michigan since electing Governor G. Mennen Williams in 1948.

ABNER CASE

A third study is that of the Willoughby Abner campaign in Chicago in 1950. The other two are about recent Steubenville, Ohio and Rockford, Illinois elections.

In reviewing the Abner campaign, for example, Miss Calkins brings out enough facts of Realpolitik to indicate that any sober analysis of the whole adventure would have doomed it to failure in advance—the power of the regular Democratic machine; the role of a good section of the union bureaucracy; the traditions and practices of politics in Chicago, just to mention three important factors. It makes good refresher reading to review that campaign.

In the Ohio campaign, perhaps the most salient point to be remembered—and everything LABOR ACTION said of that campaign remains true—is that the union leadership exercised so little real influence over its ranks that it was afraid to buck the regular Democratic Party machine in the primaries, when there was a dispute over Joe Ferguson or Murray Lincoln as potential opponents to Taft. Lincoln told the CIO leaders that he didn't think they could muster 160,000 union votes in the primary for him, in a state where union membership registers well over a million and a quarter.

IN MICHIGAN

The CIO leaders agreed with that estimate and let the nonentity Ferguson take the nomination and the subsequent beating from Taft, in spite of a vigorous and unprecedented drive by all segments of organized labor to defeat Taft.

In Michigan, a skeleton Democratic Party obtained flesh, blood, money and life from a major decision of the Reuther leadership to work within it. By 1950, the state convention had 1,243 delegates, out of whom 486 were CIO members, and a coalition with "liberal forces" gave the joint team absolute control of the party machinery. And many CIO delegates didn't show up!

In 1952, the CIO advanced further to the point where its own card-carriers comprised a majority of delegates, but Governor Williams handpicked his own slate and handed it down to a clearing committee of labor for approval, which was considered a mere formality.

QUAGMIRE

Not very long ago, a top CIO leader complained that Governor Williams ignored the PAC in important decisions, but in fact the assertion of independence from the CIO is a major point in the Michigan campaign, with most active labor leaders agreeing with Williams that he must not be "too pro-labor"!

There is not one important CIO official in Michigan today who does not recognize that in any dispute between Williams and the CIO, Williams has built enough independent strength and support among labor's ranks so that such a dispute would be dangerous to the CIO leaders. Quite a change from the days when the CIO picked up the relatively obscure young lawyer in 1948 and ran him for governor. . . .

The kind of quagmire which the Democratic Party represents for labor in its work within it, be it in an organized caucus, as a pressure group, or as a semi-independent force, is well illustrated by these five case studies. The organizational aspects of the tortuous road to political influence and control in the Democratic Party are outlined in clear detail.

Yet, unless a turn of events takes place in the next period ahead, the likely road which the labor leaders will take in the next period is within that framework and under the general concept of political realignment. The five case studies demonstrate that this path—already in use by labor's most active political section, the CIO—is booby-trapped all the way.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.
specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

LONDON LETTER

'Bevanism' Minus Bevan?

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Oct. 29—Despite brave attempts by the Tory press to fan the flames within the Labor Party, a noticeable change of mood has been observed throughout the length and breadth of the movement. Gallant efforts are being made by the saner elements on both the Attlee-Morrison side and the Bevan side to cut through the personal issues to the political issues.

The fact that Arthur Greenwood is now chairman of the National Executive Committee of the Labor Party makes the chances of another slugging match rather remote. He himself has always been identified with the center of the party rather than the right wing, and his new position will give him ample scope for reconciling the very strong personal differences between the two groups (which do most unfortunately obscure many genuine political differences).

Again, Morgan Phillips, the secretary of the party, has made it quite clear that he is not prepared to join Hugh Gaitskell's witchhunt against the Bevanites. This week he repudiated Gaitskell's wild charges about "Communist" influence inside the Labor Party by pointedly referring to the fact that "there has never been a time in our party's history when Communists' influence has been so weak. Reports from all our regions confirm this view, and the Communists themselves know it to be true."

And then there is James Griffiths, the former colonial secretary, who is universally accepted by both the Attlee and Bevan MPs in the House of Commons. He too is trying his hardest to heal the breach on the basis of the policy decisions at Morecambe. Although the Bevan group will be disbanding, this in no way reduces the rate at which the party as a whole is moving toward Bevanism. Even Emanuel Shinwell, one of the first anti-Bevanites, has come over a good way to the Bevanite position.

SHIFTING GROUND

In a letter to the Daily Herald, the Labor Party newspaper, on Monday, he wrote among other things that "the National Executive, the Morecambe conference and the members of the Parliamentary Labor Party are all agreed that in addition to existing nationalization we must proceed further in this direction. A national water supply, the transfer of the sugar and cement monopolies to the state, an examination of the engineering [metal-working] and other industries to see how and when they can be brought under public ownership . . . all this nobody in the party can object to."

Later in the same letter he writes that "there must be further study on the preparation of the necessary blueprints, for as I said at the recent party conference there are important aspects of nationalization—for example, how to inject workers' cooperation into administration—which call for examination."

And on the subject of arms he writes: "The Conference agreed that the whole subject should be reviewed, and clearly every member of the party would wish to reduce the cost."

Shinwell has certainly shifted his ground! He is now the peace-maker along with many other Old Guard members of the party. The impression we have of the situation inside the Labor Party is that the party will unite on a left program despite the disbandment of the Bevan group. In other words, the Labor Party is becoming Bevanite without Bevan. Or to be more precise, the party leader-

ship is bending toward Bevanism without acknowledging Bevan himself.

Meanwhile, while the peace moves were being made, Aneurin Bevan himself was addressing an Eastern Regional Labor Party rally at Cambridge. Among the topics he dwelt on was the colonial revolution. He said:

"At Morecambe we decided that we would adopt a rather saner attitude to foreign policy than some people have been talking. We decided that when people in Africa were raising their heads above the soil and looking at the heavens now and again, it was not necessarily a Kremlin plot. What we are witnessing in China, Indonesia and Africa is what happened in the days of the Chartists."

Whether or not Nye Bevan is slyly digging at the Tory government's Kenya policy is difficult to say. The tragedy is that the Labor Party's front bench is up to the neck in the soup as far as Kenya is concerned. The Labor government's own policy in Kenya was only slightly different from that of the Tories (a brief glance at John Dugdale's article on the Mau Mau is last week's Tribune is convincing enough as far as this is concerned.)

BEVAN AND MINERS

There is yet another bone of contention—the Miners' wage claim. The Labor Party has—as yet—not expressed an opinion one way or the other on what looks like becoming a first-class industrial dispute. The demand for 30 shillings a week more by the National Union of Mineworkers on behalf of 700,000 miners has been turned down by the National Executive Tribunal. It had been expected that the miners, like the railwaymen and the engineers, would be offered another 7s. 6d. or 8s. a week. They are offered nothing.

This situation is delicate, to say the very least. Sir William Lawther, the president of the NUM, who only recently devoted some little time to slanging Bevan on the other side of the Atlantic, is in quite a fix. He may be forced despite himself to press the wage claim and so open himself to the charge of being a "Communist" or a "Bevanite."

However, the irreconcilable struggle between the two classes proceeds apace—notwithstanding Sir William Lawther's personal feelings. We may yet witness the spectacle of a fire-eating Lawther denouncing the Tory government in no uncertain terms.

The question is: Will the Bevanites take up the miners' case? Will they shift the main line of attack on the right-wing leadership from its hesitancy on the nationalization issue to its possible fence-sitting on the miners' wage demands?

One thing we can be sure about: Bevan is flexible enough to realize when to shift the line of attack. Quite correctly, he transferred his attack from the arms issue to the nationalization issue when he saw at Margate that the miners, with their decisive bloc vote, were adamant in defending the orthodox case on arms, while militant and radical on the issue of the extension of social ownership to new sectors of the economy.

As far as the London Tribune (the Bevanite organ) is concerned, there is plenty of healthy and alert criticism of a constructive kind from Labor Party members. There is a general feeling that

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 W. 14 Street, N. Y. C.
specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

Laski on the U.S. Dilemma

A new book by Harold Laski, on which he was working at the time of his death in 1950, has just been published in England, under the title of *The Dilemma of Our Times*. The following comment on America, quoted from it by the London Tribune, is topical.

"What is disturbing in this picture is that despite its immense wealth, its technological superiority, its massive productive power, the rulers of America are afraid. They are afraid in the same sense as Pagan Rome feared Christian Rome, as the landowners of the 16th century feared the rising middle class.

"The order of things has got out of focus for them. They feel as though they cannot see clearly ahead, and they are afraid of the obscurity. They repeat with passion the old formulae, and instead of hearing over most of the world the echo of their words, they catch fragments of new formulae which they find uncomfortable, challenging, disturbing. . . .

"They have an unhappy sense that a new idea is abroad in the world to the implication of which they cannot accommodate themselves. They are afraid to discuss the idea lest by argument in the marketplaces of the world they find that it is more persuasive than the old.

"They point to their faith in education, their confidence in science, their desire to solve their problems, internal and external, by the light of reason. Yet with all their protests, they are still afraid, and they communicate their fears to others.

"They have an inner sense that bourgeois democracy has reached a grave turning point in its development. They suspect that, if it is to keep its bourgeois character, it cannot remain democratic; yet they suspect also that if it remains democratic, it cannot keep its bourgeois character. . . ."

The existence of Nkrumah's People's Convention Party in the Gold Coast, of the Pan-Malayan Labor Party, the Jamaican Labor Party, of Dr. Azikiwe's Action Group in Nigeria, all indicate the absolute importance of the withdrawal of troops from these areas. The very fact that the trade unions, cooperative movements and

Tribune and the Labor Party as a whole will have to take action on this burning issue. For, as Bevan put it last weekend: "We decided that when people in Africa were raising their heads above the soil and looking at the heavens now and again, it was not necessarily a Kremlin plot."

Polish One-Party Election Farce Prelude to Changes at the Top

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Oct. 25—The elections to the new Polish Parliament (the Sejm) will take place tomorrow, October 26. In accordance with the new Stalinist constitution adopted by the regime, about which we have already written, the new election law is entirely "Russian" in character and represents an absolute break with the Polish democratic tradition, though we can add that Polish democracy was very weak and shaky at its best.

The first constitution of the independent Polish republic was a very radical and democratic one, protecting the rights of political and national minorities to their own representation. It was a bourgeois-democratic constitution which was voted in under the pressure of the powerful working-class movement of 1921. Now the working class of Poland has been defeated by the Stalinist autocracy, which has no need to preserve the "bourgeois prejudices" of democracy.

"ESCAPISM"

In the new electoral law there is only the single state of candidates, after the Russian pattern. The old opposition parties have simply disappeared. Only the official party, the "United Workers Party," together with organizations which it controls, has the right to present candidates for the parliament. In this simple, bureaucratic-autocratic way, every opposition was eliminated. This is the true face of Stalinist "democracy."

As we wrote about the last plenary session of the Stalinist party, it is known that the popularity of the ruling "Workers' Party is very low among the

workers and peasants and very high among the state officials of the reactionary bureaucracy. It calls itself a "true workers' party" but without the living support of the workers, especially those of heavy industry.

The opposition against the Stalinist regime is very strong among the workers and peasants, and finds its expression in the decline of production and in absenteeism and "escapism" (that is, flight from the job), especially among the new workers from the villages. Production in the textile industry is lower than in pre-war times, because of the very bad food and wages situation. Flight from the job in the mining and building industries is very high and affects from 30 to 50 per cent of the workers. The young peasants who are mobilized by the government for factory work often "escape," because of hunger and low wages.

Therefore the workers try to have nothing to do with the Stalinist "Workers Party" and fight it with every means available. Therefore also, the ruling bureaucracy calls for "self-criticism" methods as against the methods of bureaucratic "command," in order to try to bring the party closer to the masses, etc.—Stalinist slogans which are very well known.

TWO ZEROS

The Polish people know these methods but they have no legal way to express themselves; political opposition is excluded from the election, and though every citizen must vote, what this means for citizens that they must vote for the Stalinist one-party list. Only the Stalinist party and its party-controlled organizations can run candidates.

The political discontent that exists can scarcely express itself in the conflicts and disputes among the elements of the ruling bureaucracy. The Kremlin's totalitarian offensive against the Polish workers and peasants is searching for new scapegoats. Once the stage of the so-called "people's democracy" is finished with, the political role of Premier Cyrankiewicz will be over. He will probably be replaced after the elections by A. Zawadzki or Ochab.

The former is an ex-official of very limited mentality, simply stupid in fact, who has the great "merit" of enjoying the confidence of the Russian because he belongs to the "Russian school," was a Russian general and then a political commissar in the "Polish army" of General Berling. Zawadzki—whom I know personally from prison days in Poland—is absolutely nothing, a complete nonentity, and therefore very convenient for the Russian masters. He used to be a vice-premier and a governor of Upper Silesia.

The second "leader," Ochab, is a high official of the secret police (the Bezpieka) and therefore has the absolute confidence of the Russian MVD. These are the political figures who are destined to come to the top in the Free, Democratic and Strong Poland of the Kremlin tyrants.

The farce of the Polish elections corresponds with the needs of the bureaucracy for a show of popular confirmation of its right to govern, as also is true for the Stalinist party congress in Russia. The difference lies in the fact that none of the problems of Poland can be solved in Warsaw; for they will all be decided in Moscow.

The ISL Program in Brief

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 totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting 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 war 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!

INTERESTED? Get Acquainted

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY ZONE
STATE TEL.

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:
 Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

NEW RENEWAL
 Bill me. Payment enclosed.

NAME
ADDRESS APT.
CITY
ZONE STATE

YOU and SCIENCE

ILLUSIONS BY AN INDIAN SCIENTIST

By JACK STUART

Last Saturday in New Delhi Dr. S. S. Bhatnagar, a high official of the Indian government, offered the world some words of advice on how the United States and Russia could better their relations.

Dr. Bhatnagar has just returned from a visit to both countries, where as secretary of India's Education Ministry and Ministry of National Planning and Resources, he had discussed Indian development projects, and he feels better relations can be achieved by interchanges of scientific and technical personnel between the United States and Russia. He further feels that while such a program would be likely to "be a long-term proposition" it would further understanding between the two countries at a very small risk on the part of the U. S.

Dr. Bhatnagar feels that the risk to capitalist America would be small because he says "I am certain that the Russian people don't want war. Another war would be too disastrous to their development plans. . . ."

How this Indian scientist can seriously and realistically propose the interchange of scientific and technical personnel at this time is difficult to understand unless he fails to comprehend the nature of the conflict between Stalinism and capitalism.

Even supposing the American ruling class were willing to supply the scientific and technical assistance to enable their imperialist rival to equal or better them industrially, for the Stalinist ruling class of Russia to permit the

free entry of such trained personnel is difficult to believe. For the Stalinists, in order to maintain absolute control over their populations, must resort to isolating them more and more from the non-Stalinist states—free exchange of highly trained personnel would break this isolation and open to the view of the world the horrible picture of Stalin's Russia.

BLIND SPOT

Finally even if the ruling classes of both countries would permit such an interchange, what American scientist would go to Russia and how would Russia get its people back? A recent article in LABOR ACTION pointed out how the Stalinists have forced upon several sciences absolute dictation of their ideas and goals. No scientist in his right mind would willingly enter such a system.

In one way Dr. Bhatnagar was not entirely blind, for from his visit to Russia he noted that "there seemed to have grown up a favored class of Communists who are better dressed than the average Russian on the street."

In general, however, Dr. Bhatnagar, like many of India's intellectual and political leaders, refuses to understand the nature of the conflict between the U. S. and Russia. They fail to realize that India cannot appease both Russia and the U. S. but that her place of world leadership can be assumed only by leading the peoples and other nations of the world into a third camp which is programmatic ally opposed to both Russian Stalinism and U. S. capitalism.

'Det Gaerer' in Scandinavian Socialism as 'Bevanism' Mounts

By ERIC BOURNE

Natl. Assn. of Labor Student Organizations (London)

COPENHAGEN—On October 21, the Danish newspapers picked up a report from *Verdens Gang*, an independent daily in Oslo, that Norwegian "Bevanites" will next month launch their own paper, *Orientering*.

The editor of the new weekly will be *Stortingsmann* (Member of Parliament) Jakob Friis, leader within the governing Labor Party of the anti-Atlantic Pact minority.

Background for this development, according to *Verdens Gang*, is the feeling that the growing dissatisfaction inside the party with the government's foreign policy does not find adequate and free expression in the party press. *Arbeiderbladet*, the party's big daily in Oslo, and the smaller labor dailies throughout Norway firmly support the policies of Socialist Foreign Minister Halvard Lange—once, ironically, a leading pacifist in the International Fellowship of Reconciliation—who personally and not very scrupulously torpedoed the strong efforts in 1948-1949 to form a neutral Scandinavian bloc. Lange was determined that Norway should en-

ter the Atlantic Alliance, and he flew to Washington to beg for admission at the time when the Pentagon was originally cold to the idea of including Scandinavia.

ANTI-PACT

This writer can recall the statement in 1951 of Dr. Karl Evang, Norway's Surgeon-General and a very active "Bevanite" within the Labor Party, when he addressed the University of Oslo's Summer School for American Students. He told us that he felt a daily necessity to read the newspapers from "neutralist" Sweden plus the *New York Times*, because he could not obtain an objective and comprehensive picture of the news from Norwegian newspapers.

The press reports state that the Norwegian Bevanites expect to cooperate with similarly minded socialists in Sweden, Denmark and

perhaps Finland. Already an anti-Atlantic Pact group in Denmark publishes the semi-monthly *International Perspectives*—primarily translations and reprints of articles from papers and magazines abroad carrying news and viewpoints which do not find their way into the Danish press.

Coincidentally, on the same day the Danish press carried an item on Bevanism here in Denmark. Fru Bodil Koch, who served in the Danish Social-Democratic cabinet at the time that Denmark joined the Atlantic Pact, announced that she will vote in Parliament against the establishment of American bases in Jutland. One provincial socialist daily, the *Silkeborg Social-Demokrat*, had already shocked the bureaucratic party leaders by opposing the proposal for American bases.

Ekstra-Bladet, a non-political afternoon paper in Copenhagen, indulged in a bit of musing in its news columns. At the end of its factual reporting on October 21 of these new Bevanite crystallizations in Scandinavia, it added the following two words and three dots: "Det gaerer . . ." (literally, "it ferments," or, as we would say, "things are brewing" . . .).

WORLD POLITICS

CHURCHILL STREET IN ATHENS MIRRORS LIFE IN GREECE

(From the London Tribune, Oct. 17)

Churchill Street is one of the biggest and busiest streets in central Athens. It runs from the crowded and plebeian Omnia Square to the tree-lined and fashionable Constitution Square, with many commercial buildings occupied by leading American corporations and airline companies.

Churchill Street is the main artery of the Greek capital's financial and political system. Here the various American missions to Greece have their offices. It seemed to me a symbol of Greek life today.

Although Greece has been receiving American economic aid now for some years, I saw little evidence on a recent visit that the money is being used to improve the living standards of the Greek people. Rarely did I see housing projects, schools or hospitals being built. On the other hand I noticed the amount of speculative building in offices and luxury hotels.

WORKERS' LOT
Together we frequented the working-class districts of Peristeri and Kallithea. We visited factories and pits. I made drawings of workers and their families, and the thousand and one craftsmen who live and work in the narrow winding streets. I began to understand what it meant to be a Greek worker.

I was appalled by the contrast between the living conditions in the working-class districts and the luxurious extravagance of the fashionable hotels and night-clubs of Constitution Square.

In Peristeri, which is a lightening centre, miners and their families live in hovels which match those described in Mayhew's records of the Victorian poor. Four, five and seven persons sleep, cook and live in one room. There is one "lavatory" between twenty families, one water-tap between fifty.

In the Agora itself, hundreds of men, women and children beg, others sell everything from ikons to comic strips. Hordes of small boys, bare-footed themselves, shine shoes to provide food for their families.

I had been in Athens for almost a fortnight when the Ambatielos trial started. This was actually a

military court-martial, a re-trial of the case in which Ambatielos and ten other officials of the Greek Federation of Maritime Unions were condemned to death, and others were given long sentences. The re-trial was a result of a world-wide protest.

SPANISH MODEL
Proceedings were rushed through in a small court-room packed to suffocation point with the relatives and the friends of the defendants. There were only brief recessions. The five presiding judges—four of whom were prominent supporters of Marshal Papagos, the leader of the Fascist Greek Rally—continually heckled the defendants and their witnesses. The trial was nothing but a sham.

Day after day in the intense heat, from eight in the morning until eleven at night, the large audience of relatives, seamen and dockers stood in silent sympathy. The encouragement they gave by simply being there was no small factor in the tenacity of the fight which the defendants made. Ambatielos himself was in excellent spirits. In spite of four years of imprisonment, his sense of humor and his grasp of the case was remarkable.

This trial seemed to me to symbolize another sinister aspect of Greek life today. Looking back on my four weeks in Greece, I involuntarily compare the country's appearance with that of Franco Spain, which I visited three years ago. I saw the same degree of poverty amidst outrageous plenty, the same brutal suppression of civil liberties and democratic opinion.

In fact the same kind of people are in power—the military leaders who think that peace is a time in which to prepare for war.

FOR A SOCIALIST EDUCATION

Get it EVERY week!

A subscription to LABOR ACTION is only \$2.00 for a year

Youth and Student Corner

The 'Freeman' Magazine Squints Through Alice's Looking Glass

By DON HARRIS

Any students and teachers who have been under the impression that an atmosphere of deadening conservatism lies over the college campus may henceforth be reassured that such is not the case. Rather the truth is that The Left is militantly and ruthlessly propagating its views to a student body which listens eagerly and absorbs the current prejudices in favor of collectivism, while political and cultural conservatives are practically driven into a state of helpless and defenseless silence.

Such is the weird picture of the American college today as it is described in the second anniversary issue of the *Freeman*, the magazine which has set for itself the task of becoming the "organ of militant conservatism."

The editors and writers for the *Freeman* represent a curious combination of ex-radicals with died-in-the-wool conservatives of the more extreme type generally associated with the Taft wing of the Republican Party. Indeed, the *Freeman* was the only magazine with serious intellectual pretensions which has consistently championed the political fortunes of Ohio's senior senator.

A glance at any typical table of contents for the *Freeman* will show the stripe of its contributors. Joseph Zack, ex-Stalinist, ex-Trotskyist and currently a professional informer at government trials, appears on the same title page as Friedrich Hayek, the author of a work designed to show that governmental intervention in the economy inevitably leads to the loss of political freedom. John Chamberlain stands next to William Buckley Jr.

What unites such figures around a more or less common political program is presumably agreement on the need to defend the rights of the individual from encroachments by the state. Under the banner of defending the traditional values of laissez-faire liberalism, the *Freeman* attempts to lend intellectual respectability to doctrines long outdated from the point of view of both major classes, and under cover of its "conservatism" manages to defend every reactionary and anti-labor measure as a defense of "freedom" against collectivism and Stalinism.

The disability under which it suffers, however, is such as to preclude the possibility of its ever becoming an organ of influence except among those who already agree with its prehistoric viewpoint. Its "liberalism-is-collectivism-is-Stalinism-is-tyranny" point-of-view forces it into the type of absurd position briefly described in our first paragraph.

As Reaction Sees It

American education, according to the article, is dominated by a minority of articulate and intolerant liberals. They persecute honest professors who disagree with them; they have greater tenure and job security than conservatives, and in general they dominate the proceedings of the professional academic associations. And while doing all this they build up in the public mind the myth that it is they who are persecuted while the colleges are dominated by conservatives.

"The public-address system of the Left" ranges from the educational columns of the *New York Times* to the "ukases of the Civil Liberties Union," we are told, and it is through such instruments that tremendous shrieks are raised whenever an incompetent professor of radical views is fired, making the position of a radical much more secure than that of a conservative professor of equal professional competency.

In their positions of prominence, the liberals have managed to inculcate a whole generation of college students with the prejudices of The Left. The current college generation believes "that capitalism is 'immoral' and socialism is 'moral'; that America is always secretly 'imperialistic,' and Soviet Russia always (quite secretly) an emancipator. . . ."

This description may come as quite a surprise to "anyone who knows this college generation" and has found it to be, in its overwhelming majority, career-oriented, hostile to any idea or movement which attacks the status quo from any fundamental point of view, and above all, thoroughly anti-Stalinist and patriotic. If it is apathetic and cynical about political ideas in general, this cannot be attributed to any sympathies with radicalism. It is rather a vague distrust of the values it has been taught, but cannot really come to accept with enthusiasm. But except for the minority of passive liberals, American students today are, to describe them accurately, passive conservatives.

And what about the militant and dominant professors? Since the only individual mentioned by name in this category is Johns Hopkins' professor Lattimore, we must fall back on our own experience, which includes a long series of fruitless attempts to secure faculty sponsorship for "radical" student organizations, faculty representation on

programs and debates, or even faculty interest in radical political writings.

Far from being the firm and staunch defenders of their viewpoint, most of the liberals that we have known tend to shy away from any public association which might tend to identify them with "leftist" causes. Exceptions, of course, there always are, and they retain an honorable place in this period of the academic witchhunt.

This Side of Wonderland

But there are also the long lists of supposed liberals who will never sponsor a student socialist club "because they can't afford to take the chance." There is the case of one of America's prominent sociologists who always excuses himself from speaking before radical groups with the explanation that since he is Jewish, he is afraid that his appearance before a radical group might promote anti-Semitism. And not even counting the cases of Stalinists fired in the last period, no one even knows the number of cases of lower instructors "released" because of their suspected political sympathies.

But how many other cases are there similar to that of the philosophy instructor at the University of Colorado who was quietly dropped from the staff (and without a word in the columns of the ACLU bulletin) for defending the head of his department against charges of having once been a Stalinist? There is political discrimination and persecution in American colleges and universities, but it is not directed by the forces of the militant left.

What are the views which are supposed to characterize this Left, the views which it propounds with such vigor in and out of the classroom? To the *Freeman's* author, himself a professor of English, its worst crime would seem to be praise of the "slick, sterile wasp-poetry of Ezra Pound" and the patronizing of the "fruitful, timeless American poetry of Robert Frost." The domination of the Left is also demonstrated by the fact that Dr. William Carlos Williams was invited this year to address the Indiana Association of College Teachers of English. Dr. Williams, it seems, in addition to having "a long record of fronts," is also "a known disintegrator of art and life." Thus do liberals corrupt even the simple country schoolteachers in places like Indiana. . . .

\$Academic \$Freedom

More serious, however, are the political crimes of the Left, crimes both of omission and commission. Thus, we are told, the prejudices of faculty members are revealed by their unreasoning and biased opinion of Senator McCarthy. They believe that he is an assassin of character who deals in "smeared" and "lies" and without even toying to examine the evidence. Yet they do not bother to refute the lies and smeared of a Joliet-Curie on germ-warfare!

The simple explanation for such a situation seems to escape the author, who prefers to leave the impression that college professors "secretly" believe and endorse the ridiculous findings of Stalinist scientists. Again, in the professor's eyes it is a disservice to American values to praise (at "how many? too many!") college chapels the British system of free medical and dental care while ignoring the economic Puritanism which is, again presumably, the fruit of British collectivism.

The real heart of the *Freeman's* article comes in its proposal with regard to the question of academic freedom. Naturally, it is not proposed that the conservative viewpoint shall dominate exclusively. That would be too much like the liberals. The function of education, however, being to conserve and transmit the values of society, it behooves the parent who believes in the values of American society (i.e., its conservative values) to insist that his tax funds and tuition be used for teaching what he thinks should be taught. If other parents believe in other things, why their children can be taught what they believe, but every conservative parent has the right to insist that his children shall not be infected with what he considers to be the opposite of truth.

This is what we meant by saying that the *Freeman* is driven to impossible extremes in its attempt to be militantly conservative. For its practical proposal is essentially to reform education along lines of social distinction and social viewpoint. Insofar as conservatism has intellectual force, it is in terms of an appeal to social unity and for social cohesion. And insofar as modern education functions as the great instigator of social conformity, it is precisely by emphasizing the aspect of social unity over internal divisions which rest on social class. The *Freeman's* position is not a genuine defense of conservatism, but an attack on it from the vantage-point of crackpot reaction.

INDIA What Is Happening to Asia's Largest SP?

The Indian Socialist Party's Merger

By PHILIP COBEN

The Socialist Party of India has now ratified its announced merger with the party of J. B. Kripalani, which polled third highest in the national elections, and the fusion of the two organizations is going forward to the accompaniment of political developments within the Socialist Party which raise serious questions about the future of the movement.

Organizationally, the merger seems to mean an important advance in numbers, influence and strength in parliament. Politically, the merger marks an appreciable rightward turn by the Socialist Party, though how far the latter goes is not yet clear.

Kripalani's movement, called the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party (KMPP), is an offshoot from the dominant Congress Party led by Prime Minister Nehru (as is the Socialist Party itself, for that matter). It is thoroughly Gandhian in its general philosophy, though to the left of the Congress Party in social demands.

"The Socialist Party and the KMPP," writes Asoka Mehta, general secretary of the SP, "are the second and third parties in India [this refers to their popular votes in the national election]. Their merger creates an organization backed by 17,360,000 voters. The combined representatives of the merged party in the state legislatures will be 205, that is, second only to that of the Congress."

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, who has now become the leading ideologist of the Socialist Party, writes further in the party organ *Janata*: "When the merger of the SP and the KMPP is completed, the party will become the largest Socialist Party of the world. It will be able to claim a total vote exceeding 17 millions and will surpass even the British Labor Party, which is now the largest, by a round 4 million votes."

Still on the organizational aspect, not only does the KMPP have a mass following but geographically its support also complements that of the SP, since in many cases one is weak in areas where the other is stronger.

From this point of view the merger is undoubtedly a coup for the party, which henceforth will be known as the Praja Socialist Party of India. The politics of the merger, however, are another matter.

Post-Election 'Confusion'

Actually the rightward turn which it marks is not merely the direct result of the agreement with the KMPP, though the latter seems to have intensified it. Its background is to be seen in the results of the national election, or rather in the impact of those results on the SP. This was detailed in LABOR ACTION for October 20 ("The Socialist Party of India After the General Elections").

This impact, to put it briefly, was to throw the party, including its leadership, into a crisis.

Objectively, the reasons for this might be considered mysterious if one recalls that the relatively young Socialist Party polled the second highest number of votes, even though it was the Communist Party (due to its concentration of forces in limited areas where it was very strong) which won more seats in parliament.

Actually, the reaction of the party was mainly due to deep disappointment after inflated expectations of emerging from the election as the rallying center of all or almost all anti-Congress opposition forces.

This is important to keep in mind in understanding the course of the SP in its unity with the KMPP.

It is quite clear that the perspective of the SP leadership, no doubt transferred to the party militants, has not been merely that of fighting as a socialist opposition for the patient conquest of the allegiance of the masses, but has been to set themselves up as THE electoral power to take over office from Nehru with the least delay. Having been disillusioned about such a quick road by the results of the election (even though big gains were registered), the action that arises is whether the party leadership has come to the conclusion that the socialist character of the party must be watered down to achieve the same aim.

Because of the "confusion" in the SP ranks which followed the elections, a special conference of the party

History—Year by Year!

The BOUND VOLUMES of LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves.

1945 to 1950 \$3 a volume
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

was held in May at Pachmarhi. (Our October 20 article dealt with the organizational discussion at this gathering.) At this conference the leadership, led by Dr. Lohia and J. Narayan, proposed a new political and ideological orientation which already indicated which way their thinking was going.

An amendment to the program, hotly discussed but finally adopted, pretty much ruled out all but "peaceful" methods of struggle, in the context of much talk about integrating Gandhism with socialism. Although the party and its leadership has heretofore considered itself generally Marxist, the conference was also marked by what may be fairly called an "offensive" against the Marxist character of the movement.

The content of the latter discussion, judging by the conference report which was published, did not consist of anything even purporting to be an examination of Marxist ideas but rather of reiterated declarations from the leading figures which simply sought to put Marxism on the shelf. Objections from delegates representing the Marxist sectors of the membership were for the most part met with declamations against "dogmatism" and narrowmindedness, etc.

Lohia's Theory

Instead, from the positive angle, Dr. Lohia, in the name of the leadership, officially put forward for approval his conception of a road to economic development (and socialism) for India based on the use of "small machines" rather than big industry, decentralization based upon village economy, etc. Lohia himself was more or less representative of the approach of the party leadership when he declared that he was not concerned with Marxism one way or the other, for or against, but was putting forward his program as an "Indian" road to socialism, which would also be the best guarantee against the evils of bureaucratism and other concomitants of industrial civilization.

In fact, very heavily overlaying his presentation was the counterposition of this "Indian" non-Marxist concept of socialism not only to capitalism but more basically to modern industrial civilization itself, of which capitalism, Communism and (by clear implication) "Western-type" socialism were presented as different forms.

This conception, of course, deserves discussion if only because it has been given the stamp of approval by Asia's largest socialist party, even though other socialists may be rightly inclined to look at it askance; but little in Dr. Lohia's explanation of this approach, or in other leaders' defense of it at the Pachmarhi conference, would impress a Western socialist with meeting the obvious objections which arise to it—objections to it based not primarily on its aim of decentralization but on its unhistorical and utopian approach to the economic problems of underdeveloped countries today, even assuming that the suitable "small machines" of which Lohia speaks do get invented some time as he hopes.

Short of discussing this conception from the theoretical angle, it can yet be said with little fear of mistake that, at Pachmarhi in May, the SP leadership took advantage of the "state of confusion," which the delegates spoke of and felt, to turn the party's helm in a political direction which facilitated rapprochement with elements further to the Gandhian right, of which the KMPP was the leading example.

A few days after the May conference the SP leaders initiated discussions on unity with the KMPP. In June the two parties concluded an agreement for a united bloc of deputies in parliament. During July and August's discussions on merger, an agreement on organic unity was reached at the top. And on September 24-25, at a meeting of the SP's General Council in Bombay, the merger was ratified.

Democratic Decision?

While the politics of the merger are of course most important, a word is obviously required about the procedure by which this important decision was reached. Judging by the five issues of *Janata* dealing with the merger which we have so far received (Aug. 31-Sept. 28) at no point has the membership of the Socialist Party had an opportunity to pass upon the step, with its very important organizational and political concomitants, from a change in the name of the party to the naming of a new leading committee to new commitments in political program.

This is not to say that the membership of the party would have declined to back up the leaders' move—from this distance at any rate we can assume for the sake of argument that they would have done so—but that does not gainsay the peculiarity of the whole procedure for a party which, above all, prides itself on its emphasis on democratic views.

The decisions, rather, were taken by the National Executive Committee of the party, and in Bombay were ratified by a General Council of leading militants called together. A letter of protest to *Janata* objects to such "sanction . . . of appointed representatives at the proposed joint Bombay meeting," and nowhere in the explanations of Asoka Mehta is there any indication that this is not true.

It appears, then, that the move has been made without endorsement, formally at any rate, either by a delegated convention or referendum or other means of ascertaining the exact will of the membership.

In two separate issues of the SP organ, J. Narayan and Asoka Mehta both defend the character of this procedure, and in both cases the basis for their defense is the fact that, at Pachmarhi in May (i.e., before the unity discussions with the KMPP were even broached), the conference there assembled passed a resolution on political perspective which spoke generally of the need to "draw closer and work in cooperation" with certain other groups "in the hope that" the opportunity would come of "achieving a consolidated party of radicalism and socialism." The KMPP was not specifically mentioned here, though possibility of unity with it was mentioned at the conference at another point.

This was obviously ample authority to initiate discussions on unity with the KMPP, but it is rather surprising to find this resolution used as the authority of the party leadership to carry through all the new decisions without further endorsement by the ranks. This even apart from the fact that (as explained in more detail in our Oct. 20 article) the Pachmarhi conference was itself not composed of delegates newly elected from the branches but was an emergency conference made up of delegates of the 1950 convention plus others invited by the national committee.

It is clear from *Janata* that there were substantial complaints on this score from the membership, as indicated by Narayan's front-page article (Sept. 7) answering "complaints from party members about the undemocratic behavior of the Executive." But in the next issue, an article by Asoka Mehta, defending the procedure, is subtitled "Baffled Reds Start a Campaign of Slander," and ascribes the raising of the question to "the Communists" (who no doubt made what they could of it, to be sure).

It may well be that the peculiarity of this procedure—for a socialist leadership which so insistently counterposes the democratic traditions of Indian thought and culture to the bureaucratism and materialism of the West—is more the result of immature party life than of ill-will, and we are willing to believe this, but there is no doubt that it would be hard to think of an established socialist organization which would have tolerated it. It is, at any rate, no very useful part of the Indian comrades' attempted contributions to socialist thought.

Right Turn

The outstanding fact about the political side of the merger, as presented in the aforesaid five issues of *Janata* up to and including the ratification by the General Council, is the degree to which it did NOT enter into the negotiations and agreements.

The emphasis on Gandhian non-violence is reinforced, as might be expected. (As an example, though not a new one, the first issue of *Janata* announcing the merger, also carries a first-page article giving "Shri Vinoba Bhave's Advice to Peasants." It begins: "Don't give up your land, stick on firmly to your plots. If you are beaten up, you should suffer silently. To suffer silently is also a great power. Remember, that those who beat ultimately get exhausted. . . . Obviously the newly strengthened insistence on "peaceful" revolution is not simply counterposed to Stalinist putschism or to violent overthrow of constitutional governments.)

Already at the Pachmarhi conference, suspicious delegates had raised questions about whether the leadership was drifting away from class-struggle methods. In the agreement with the KMPP, the formulation is for "non-violent class struggles" as "a necessary method of democratic action" but "to be used when other available methods have been exhausted."

Explaining the political agreement with the KMPP, Asoka Mehta speaks of weaving together Marxism and Gandhism, and says that "our next task, the new face of democratic socialism, is, to no small extent, as J. Narayan has aptly called it, 'Agrarian Socialism.'" He adds: "The new party will still be a socialist party, it will only not be a doctrinaire party."

This may or may not be reassuring, in view of the fact that the KMPP has not hitherto been for socialism at all. Mehta states that the KMPP has been "moving forward to socialization" at the same time that the SP has been moving toward "economic decentralization," but nowhere does *Janata* declare that the KMPP people have accepted an explicit socialist platform.

New Mixture

In fact the only political platform quoted by *Janata* as a unity basis is that which was adopted jointly as the basis for the original parliamentary bloc. This speaks of "an equalitarian social order free from political and economic exploitation and wedded to personal freedom" decentralization of economy, the "small-machine" technology, and nationalization in "key industries, foreign trade, and such sectors of economy where capital tends to accumulate and power concentrate." That may or may not add up.

Likewise, with regard to foreign policy, there is only the following formulation: "In foreign policy, the [united] party favors a policy of neutrality and non-involvement and cooperation with like-minded forces in other countries." This is some distance from the vigorous third-camp line which the SP has been following.

The merger has also, it seems, given an impetus to *Janata* to feature rather virulent attacks on Marxism, (Turn to last page)

LATIN AMERICA Theses by a Group of Uruguayan Marxists

Socialist Tasks in Latin America

This "thesis" on the situation in Latin America, which is presented for the information and discussion of our readers, was published by a group of students in the University Federation of Uruguay. This organization—unlike its similars in the U. S.—plays an important political and social role in its country, and is one of the most advanced in Latin America.

The "thesis" attempts to summarize succinctly, in a series of statements, a Marxist analysis of the basic phenomena which are behind political and social developments on the continent. U. S. socialists, above all others outside the Latin American countries themselves, have the most need to acquaint themselves with the thinking of the Marxist movement in the lands which fight against "Yankee" imperialism.—Ed.

these two social strata already has no basic practical significance.

At the same time there developed a numerous, combative and dynamic proletariat, whose growing weight made itself felt particularly in Argentina and in the countries with a good deal of mining, Bolivia, Chile and Mexico.

Nevertheless the development of capitalism is still inadequate in these countries, even in the most advanced of them; and this means that the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie (small businessmen, white-collar employees, artisans, intellectuals) make up the social mass which predominates numerically and which plays a front-rank role in the political life of these countries.

Character and Tasks of the Revolution

From the semi-colonial character and structure of the Latin American countries flows the historical nature of the revolution which is to be carried through in these countries, as well as the combined character of the tasks of this revolution.

In no section has the bourgeois-democratic phase been completed; and the bourgeois-democratic tasks—namely, above all anti-imperialist liberation and agrarian reform—continue to be on the order of the day for solution, to different degrees, in all the Latin American countries.

The native bourgeoisie is incapable of completing this bourgeois-democratic phase of the revolution in the epoch of imperialism. This has been demonstrated by all the experience of this century, not only in Latin America but also on a world scale and particularly in the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the world.

Only the proletarian revolution will achieve this phase, and will tie it up organically with the socialist stage, properly so-called, and with the solution of the socialist tasks.

Class Struggle and the Motive Forces of Revolution

The structure of the classes, the relative importance of their social layers, their mutual relations and their dynamism vary a good deal from country to country in Latin America.

Within the ruling class in most of the Latin American countries one can distinguish a big sector of large landowners side by side with more or less important groupings of a commercial and industrial bourgeoisie.

There is no hard and fast line of demarcation or distinction between these social strata, but rather there is an interpenetration which is marked in the more developed countries.

Furthermore, the relations of these groups with imperialism vary, and depend especially on the importance of the industrial bourgeoisie.

In the countries where conditions favored a specially serious development of industry, as in Argentina, Brazil and Mexico, it is above all the industrial-bourgeois sector which pushes toward inconsistent efforts of independence from tight control by imperialism, and even touches or resists to it.

In contrast, in the countries where this stratum is almost nonexistent, the impotent native ruling groups play a role which is even more directly and entirely one of "compradors" in the service of imperialism.

In countries like Bolivia, Peru, Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador and Guatemala, the anti-imperialist struggle of the masses expresses itself through the movements formed particularly by the masses of the peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie and led by the spokesmen and parties of the radical urban petty bourgeoisie and the "intelligentsia."

In the countries where the bourgeoisie has already been sufficiently developed and has been stirred to resist imperialism, either by the masses pushing behind it, or in its own interests and for itself (Cardenas, Peron), or where it tries to make the masses believe that it wants

to resist imperialism (Vargas), it has gotten the support of the peasant masses and the urban petty bourgeoisie as well as of the workers.

This support is in fact necessary to the bourgeoisie in order to put up some resistance to imperialism, and this explains its interest in gaining bases of support among the masses, including the proletarian masses, and including their class organizations, the trade unions.

II

But, on the other hand, since it rests on a very limited national base of its own, and since it is by its very nature incapable of giving real satisfaction to the numerous economic, democratic, cultural, national and anti-imperialist demands of the super-exploited masses of its own countries, the bourgeoisie is compelled to hold the masses in subjection as firmly as possible by means of a powerful military-political and bureaucratic machine.

This machine, which is disproportionately strong in all the Latin American countries, often has the tendency to play an autonomous role, and to place itself at the service, either of one ruling stratum against the others and against imperialism, or of an imperialism which is allied with one or another native social group or allied with the whole ruling class against the masses. (The latter depends on the relationship of forces which exists among the classes within each country, among the strata of the ruling class, and between these internal forces and imperialism.)

Hence the varying forms of Bonapartist power in the countries of Latin America and the preponderant role of the army and of coups d'etat.

Neither the bourgeoisie nor the petty bourgeoisie is capable of carrying through the bourgeois-democratic revolution: this has been demonstrated by all experience with the resistance which the bourgeoisie (supported by the masses) has tried to put up against imperialism—as in the case of Cardenas and Peron—and with the radical petty-bourgeois anti-imperialist movements of Betancourt in Venezuela, of the APRA in Peru, of Grau San Martin in Cuba, of Villaroel and the MNR in Bolivia.

That role belongs to the young Latin American proletariat which will be able to join in unity with all other social forces in the struggle against imperialism and the bourgeoisie and for the proletarian revolution, thanks to a combined program which adequately answers the economic, democratic, national and anti-imperialist demands of the mass of peasants, urban petty-bourgeoisie and the backward pueblos and communities.

The Present Situation and the Tasks of the Working Class

The economic rise of the Latin American countries during the last war, through their role as suppliers of raw materials and agricultural products to "democratic" imperialism, began to come to an end with the termination of the war and the reconversion of world economy to a peace economy.

But because of the scarcities in raw materials and agricultural products which continued to exist particularly in Europe, the prosperity of the Latin American countries did not end sharply at the close of 1944, but rather was prolonged, thanks to the continued demand for and high prices of their products up to about the end of 1948.

It is above all from that date on that the re-establishment of agricultural production in the other countries to pre-war levels, and the restoration of the markets of the belligerents, liquidated the upward movement in Latin America and cast the shadow of the crisis on these countries.

Prices of native products began to fall in foreign markets while the prices of imported industrial products did not stop climbing. Inflation gained in the Latin American countries; their trade balance was seriously hurt, and a real crisis began to develop, aggravated by (among other reasons) the conditions of monoculture (one-crop specialization) which is the basis of agricultural production in several of these countries.

However, before this process reached a culminating point it was changed again as a result of the outbreak of the war in Korea in 1950 and the new reconversion of capitalist economy into a war economy.

The big capitalist countries, the United States before all the rest, began a frantic hunt for raw materials, in order to pile up big reserves and control their ownership and distribution, thus bringing about a new increase in their price. All the producing countries profited from this, and naturally the Latin American countries also.

But, far from benefiting all social strata in these countries, this boom, by stimulating a parallel rise of inflation, brought it about that the peasant masses, the petty bourgeoisie of the towns and the working masses see a daily worsening of their living conditions, at the same time that fabulous fortunes are amassed by the big native producers, exporters and industrialists.

Hence there has been a sharpening of the class struggle in all of Latin America, expressed both in the resistance of the masses and in the offensives launched by the reactionary ruling strata, especially those which serve

(Turn to last page)

Economics Will Be Decisive — —

(Continued from page 1)
global flareup, the worst is definitely behind us. Today we have the ideal—prosperity-without-inflation.

"The next major challenge to us, in fact, will be deflation.

"A slide after government and business spending reaches a top is not just a tortuous fear of tortured minds.

"Its timing, duration and severity are being debated with utmost seriousness by the leading industrialists and economists in the country and 1953-55 is considered the "danger" period.

"But blueprints are being drawn even now to minimize or avert it. Never has there been so much advance anti-slump planning as now; never before has industry shown such interest in long-range planning — which is deeply significant in itself."

What Blueprints?

So—blueprints are being drawn, and the industrialists are interested in long-range planning. . . . That may be deeply significant, but of what we are not sure.

All the billions which have been poured into plant expansion and new construction have been tied to the armament budget. There is no getting around that fact,

although Miss Porter somehow manages not to mention it. The whole point is that once armament production has ceased to increase, even if it continues on a very high level, the capitalist economy will be in trouble.

The most dangerous aspect of the situation is that the U. S. has been able to maintain full employment only on the basis of a constant expansion of basic industrial plant, while consumer-goods industries, both in soft goods and durables, have been able to supply current demand even on its present high level. Materials shortages have not kept supplies below the level of effective demand, as they did during the war.

Only Cushions

When the new plants have been finished and are ready for production on a high technological level, what will they produce, and for whom? If the actual production of armaments does not continue to increase after the middle of next year, where will the capital and the manpower which has been building up the war industries be invested? In the consumer-goods industries which are already able to supply the current demand?

It is true that as long as the government keeps pour-

ing money into armaments at the rate of fifty or sixty billion dollars a year, the economy cannot skid to the level of the '30s. It is true, also, that the unemployment compensation and social-security measures passed during the heyday of the New Deal present a cushion for the economy, and that this cushion can be inflated somewhat by expanding credit and lowering taxes for the common people.

Investments

But even at that, an economy such as that of the U. S. can skid dangerously if it must rely on a gun on one side and a cushion on the other for its major supports.

Perhaps the blueprinters are looking to foreign investment and markets for an additional prop? There have been stories recently to the effect that private investors have been investing up to a billion dollars a year abroad, and that these investments during the past two years have not been confined to the lucrative fields of oil and other extractive industries. But a continuation or major expansion of this investment depends on the economic health of the rest of the world, and that means primarily, of Europe. How do things stand with them in this respect?

We are compelled to report that they do not stand well. The Tory government in Britain is faced with a decrease of ten per cent in national production this year, instead of the three per cent increase which they had "planned" in their budget. Their export program has not been going well, despite war prosperity in the United States.

Europe's Angle

For Europe as a whole, the dollar gap remains as serious a problem as it ever has been. And even though the economies of most European countries have been operating on a fairly high level, this has been made possible primarily by the joint action of prosperity here and the international pump-priming of the American government.

Any faltering of the American economy would apply a double pressure to the economies of the countries of Europe. On the one hand it would squeeze their export programs to the bone, and on the other it would make continued large-scale economic aid abroad politically far less palatable than it has been in the past. In this respect it can be said that a Republican administration might well deepen the crisis

more rapidly than a Democratic one as the former might yield more easily to the pressure to cut foreign expenditures.

Pregnant Facts

But regardless of which party is in power, a contraction of the European economy would not invite expanded capital investment from private sources in this country. This is true even if we don't take into account the political repercussions which would follow such a contraction in Europe. The most optimistic "planners" in Washington can hardly fail to take this into account.

The major economic facts of life are not primarily dependent on which party is in power in Washington. Even Herbert Hoover would have had to work at it real hard to engineer a depression on the basis of an expanding war economy. But can either party prevent one if that basis is absent? There is nothing in their record to show it.

There is an old story about a young lady who informed a friend, with great relief, that the doctor had told her she was "just a little pregnant." In the unstable world economy of 1953, "just a little depression" may prove a very serious thing.

Theses on Latin America — —

(Continued from page 7)

Yankee imperialism in controlling and exploiting these countries.

Toward the end of the war, the radicalized masses mobilized a series of movements which expressed their anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist aspirations, in spite of their petty-bourgeois and sometimes even bourgeois leadership. The power of these movements was enough to achieve important victories in the economic field as well as in the field of democratic liberties.

But the reactionary ruling social strata, most often backed up by Yankee imperialism, taking advantage of the weakness of the petty-bourgeois leadership of the masses, the impotence and opportunism of Stalinism and the lack of a real proletarian party, rapidly reassumed the offensive; and between 1947 and 1950 dictatorial military-political regimes were established in virtually all sections.

However, the resistance of the masses did not stop for all that. On the contrary, stimulated by the world crisis of imperialism, by the victories of the anti-imperialist movements of Asia, and by the inflation process general in all the Latin American countries, they once more demonstrated their resistance in several of the countries, under

various forms: the recent big strikes in Chile, in Argentina and in Uruguay; the civil war in Bolivia and in Colombia; the electoral victories in Bolivia and Brazil which had a democratic and anti-imperialist meaning for the masses.

This resistance will tend to rise in the whole present period, which is dominated by the stepped-up preparations which imperialism is making for the war.

The Latin American countries will face growing difficulties which will not be solvable by either imperialism or by the native social groups. On the contrary.

THE PERSPECTIVES

Yankee imperialism, which dominates practically all these countries, with the exception of Argentina which still resists its domination, will make every effort to win an exclusive monopoly over all Latin American production, as it has been doing up to now, in order to get prices more advantageous to itself: that is, to lower prices and to shape production in accordance with its own needs. This will mean that it will deliberately sacrifice the whole industrial development of these countries, as well as all prospect of a more harmonious and balanced economy, and will fix their dependence on itself, through financial means and through its industrial production.

Every time that this tendency of Yankee imperialism shows itself and intensifies—as has already been the case in all the Pan-American conferences and international bodies set up since the beginning of the Korean war—it provokes the resistance of the national bourgeoisies ever more vigorously (as in Argentina, Brazil, Mexico). The latter demand for themselves a bigger share in the exploitation of their countries and aspire to build themselves a broader base through independent industrial development.

But, on the other hand, these bourgeoisies are incapable of holding back the inflation which is on the way, and, in the present international situation, of accumulating capital in any way other than a super-exploitation of the native masses.

Hence arises the perspective of a constant lowering of the living standards of the masses, who along with the rest of the world will have to suffer the disastrous consequences of the new war, which will be especially serious for countries with a semi-colonial structure.

Hence also arises the perspective of growing resistance by the Latin American masses, a resistance whose forms and extent will depend on the character of the class which will be able to take the leadership in the future: the petty bourgeoisie or the proletariat.

The Indian Socialist Merger — —

(Continued from page 6)

often in featured letters from readers—"Marxism Stands for Civil War," etc.—an attack joined in by Lohia in the issue of September 14, ascribing the degeneration of the German Social-Democracy to its "Marxism"!

It would seem, in fact, that the merger is being carried through prior to any agreement on fundamental lines of program. The party chairman, Narendra Deva, "expressed the hope that once the political consolidation had taken place a way will be opened for ideological clarification."

Disquieting

There was, naturally, a great deal of ideological heterogeneity within the Socialist Party as it stood up to now; with the KMPP merger as it has been put through, this situation will be aggravated to an extent hard to foresee. It is clear that the Indian SP leaders, while quite in favor of ideological clarity, do not worry themselves about its lack and its future half so much as about the failure of the party to quickly become the main power bloc in Indian politics.

There are even indications that the party leaders look on the KMPP merger as only one step in this direction. Party chairman Deva writes, for example: "For the process of democracy, it is necessary to have as few parties as possible. . . . The process will continue until we are in a position to have one consolidated Opposition party consisting of all non-communal and non-Communist groups having similar aims, policies and principles."

If this is truly their perspective, and not merely something written down in an enthusiastic moment, there is reason to wonder how far the party's socialist ideas can be watered down before the aim will be realized. It is not without reason, evidently, that a Bombay member wrote in, apropos of the merger: "What is the current reason for existence of the Socialist Party of India? Is it merely to create an anti-Congress front or is it to introduce a socialist state in our country?"

Such, at any rate, are the questions which are raised by the presentation of the merger as given in the party's own account in *Janata*. Conclusions about what is happening or will happen to the Socialist Party of India could be premature, but left-wing socialists are bound to be disquieted.

Read about Independent Socialism

in the special pamphlet-issues published by LABOR ACTION

THE PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM OF INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

THE FAIR DEAL: A SOCIALIST CRITICISM

10 cents each

Order from: Labor Action, 114 West 14 Street, New York City