

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

## REPORT AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRD-CAMP CONFERENCE

FOUR-PAGE SECTION, PAGES 3-6

### British Army Atrocities in Africa

... page 2

DECEMBER 14, 1953

FIVE CENTS

## Fellowship of Reconciliation Backs ISL Fight on List

Further support rallied to the case of the ISL versus the attorney general's "subversive list" when another important organization took an unqualified stand in support.

The National Council of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a leading religious pacifist organization, acting at its semi-annual meeting on December 4, adopted a statement on "The Attorney General's Subversive List and the Independent Socialist League" which vigorously condemned the attorney general's position and came out in support of the ISL's case for demanding removal from the list.

Besides communicating its stand to the Justice Department, it also authorized its staff members to bring the question of the ISL case up before the appropriate departments of church bodies.

The statement by the F.O.R. follows.

### THE SUBVERSIVE LIST AND THE ISL Statement by the National Council, F.O.R.

In line with previous actions in the field of civil liberties, the National Council of the Fellowship of Reconciliation declares its opposition to the principle of the attorney general's List. In addition to the serious inadequacy of procedures for determining inclusion on the List, it is essentially an attempt to proscribe and hamper organizations on the ground of political expressions and activities rather than overt subversive acts to be adjudicated under our judicial system. Our opposition to the List obtains despite the fact that we are in serious disagreement at important points with the views of the organizations involved

and our defense of their civil liberties does not imply approval of specific programs they may promote.

An outstanding current illustration of the danger to all minority groups presented by the Subversive List is furnished by the case of the Independent Socialist League (formerly Workers Party, U. S.) and its youth affiliate, Socialist Youth League. This group was formerly connected with the Trotskyist Fourth International but severed all connection some years ago. Throughout the whole of its existence in various forms since 1928 it has been anti-CP and anti-Stalinist. The indictment against the ISL in a letter from the attorney general's office at no point charges ISL with advocating, much less attempting, "overthrow of the government by force and violence." The ISL unequivocally declares that it seeks its objectives, foremost among which is a socialist society, by democratic and constitutional means only. It even advocates obedience to the draft law, e.g., where some pacifists would advocate civil disobedience on grounds of conscience or religion.

The essence of the charge against ISL and the reason for the exceptional gravity of the implications of this case is stated by the Workers Defense League, whose national chairman is Rev. Donald Harrington and most of whose board members are liberals adhering to the ADA position, and others about whose opposition to every kind of totalitarianism, loyalty to the U. S., and political discernment there is no question. "What the administration has done" in its listing of ISL, says WDL.

(Turn to last page)

### BIG THREE FIASCO—

## At Bermuda, The Mountain Labored...

### But the 'Big One' Sidesteps A-Bomb Issue at the UN

By HAL DRAPER

The news out of the Bermuda conference was the contrast between the flop performance staged by the Big Three in Bermuda and the show put on by the Big One at the UN.

Nothing came out of either place to suggest a real hope for ending the war crisis in the world, but that was hardly a revelation for anyone. In actuality, the main concrete result of the conference may be merely to exacerbate relations within the Western bloc. This was most clearly evident in the French reaction.

For while the heads of the U. S., British and French governments came together for what turned out to be merely a (more or less) friendly chat, it was the American president alone who took the spotlight at the UN to make a pro-

posal at which people could even prick up their ears.

There was no explanation of why the Eisenhower proposal for a pool of atomic materials could not have been (at least formally) presented as a conclusion of the Big Three conference, rather than as the unilateral proposal of Washington. It then would have been the only visible result of the conference. Instead the conference was allowed to pass into a pigeonhole of history as perhaps the emptiest and most futile high-level gathering in modern times.

We make this point, not as a complaint on our own part that the statesmen neglected to put a fake veneer over the essential hollowness of the Bermuda meeting, but as a comment on the relations among the so-called Big Three that it highlights.

### JUST A TOUR, IT SEEMS

There was a No. 1 at Bermuda, and no one had any doubt about who he was. This No. 1 was very polite to No. 2, having already made a great sacrifice in acceding to the latter's whim about having this talkfest in the first place. But politeness was enough. And as for No. 3—Laniel of France sat in the corner and was given to understand that minors should not take up too much of their elders' time.

The fact that the official communiqué from Bermuda merely said that a good

(Turn to last page)

## What the N. Y. Newspaper Strike Was About

As we go to press, the newspaper strike has been settled with the acceptance by the union of the publishers' terms, and all newspapers appeared on the stands for Wednesday morning.

### By A STRIKER

NEW YORK, Dec. 7—In a splendid demonstration of solidarity overcoming a century of organization along rigid craft lines, the New York City newspaper workers have succeeded in closing down six out of the seven major daily newspapers in that city.

The contracts of all crafts (except compositors) expired on November 1. For two months negotiations have dragged on. The unions asked for a package increase amounting to \$15 a week, but have been willing to settle for much less. The publishers, on the other hand, offered only a \$3.75 a week package deal, which included a pittance in the form of a raise, with the rest going to cover the cost of fringe benefits such as an extra holiday, welfare contributions, etc.

The photo-engravers union decided to strike the papers on Thanksgiving weekend in time for the busiest and most lucrative season for the publishers (Christmas advertising).

As soon as the photo-engravers began their picketing, all the other workers, reporters, pressmen, compositors and office workers, refused to cross the picket line, and the publishers were forced to suspend publication. Only one major newspaper, the Herald Tribune, was not affected, since it does not directly employ photo-engravers.

The publishers, of course, began to issue statements about "freedom of the press" and how wrong it is for other unions not to cross the picket lines. They especially attacked the typographical workers, who still have a contract running until January. But these editorials against the "monopoly" of the unions did not prevent the publishers from putting the squeeze on the Herald Tribune, forcing it to close down publication for a whole week.

### PUBLISHERS' SOLIDARITY

The result was that the Herald-Tribune became one huge featherbed. Large papers—64 pages—were set up, made up with news columns, ads and funnies—but only 100 copies were printed. Who paid for the Herald Tribunes which never reached the streets? It is evident that the publishers who scream against the unity of the workers have no objection to the unity of the employers' association!

Even after this notice of the intention of the bosses for a knock-down-drag-out fight, the solid front of the strike re-

mained intact. Against the advice of their international officers, the photo-engravers in New York refused to submit their demands to arbitration. They were heartily applauded by most of the workers in the other crafts.

The main cause of this unity is, of course, the simple fact that what the engravers win will set the pattern for the entire industry. The engravers are only the front ranks of this struggle.

There is, however, a more basic issue. The newspaper and printing industry is developing many substitute methods of production. These methods are not yet economical enough to use every day, but they do serve in case of a strike by one individual craft. None of the crafts striking individually has been able to close down a major newspaper. There are dozens of strikes going on now in the United States where workers of one newspaper craft union are crossing the picket line and scabbing on others. In such situations, all a craft union can do is pour out its treasury for years in a war of attrition, hoping that the accumulated extra costs of publishing, plus public opinion, will win the just demands for the workers.

### CRAFT UNIONS UNITE

From the workers' standpoint amalgamation into one newspaper union would of course be very effective. There are, however, many hurdles to overcome

before such an eventuality could take place. The second best thing for the unions and the workers would be cooperation among the trades, but even this is non-existent in most cities.

Fortunately, in New York it has worked out. It began a few years ago in a Typographical Union strike against the Journal of Commerce. Then, when the Newspaper Guild (CIO) struck for eleven weeks against the World Telegram, the rest of the crafts supported them. Just a year ago the heads of the New York unions made a formal agreement for united action, and the present big struggle is the result.

The pressmen's union had the greatest difficulty in overcoming self-imposed obstacles before it could cooperate. It has little local autonomy, and is bound by its international's policy of perpetual arbitration and a no-strike agreement.

But none of the cooperating unions has officially called on its members to support the engraver's strike. The men are simply refusing to cross the picket line.

The morale among the ranks is very high, and specially so in the CIO organization, the Newspaper Guild. For the Guild this strike has a special significance. It is a very young union, and this is its first large-scale strike in New York City. Some feared that its ranks would waver, but instead they have met the test and have become a model of action and enthusiasm for the others to follow.

# Reveal British Army Atrocities in Kenya And Other Strong-Arm Methods in Africa

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Dec. 2—Some horrifying revelations on the workings of the so-called Security Forces in Kenya have recently been made at the trial of Captain Griffiths, company commander of the 5th Battalion Kings African Rifles. Griffiths was accused of the murder in cold blood of two Kikuyu forestry workers.

The prosecution alleged that Company Sergeant Major Llewellyn of the 7th Battalion, on reporting for duty to Captain Griffiths, was told that "he could shoot anybody he liked so long as he was black." This order was given because Captain Griffiths' company was shortly going to Malaya, and the accused "wished to increase his score of kills to 50," it was alleged.

The prosecution said that three Kikuyu walking down the road in the Nyeri district were halted and told to wait for the company sergeant major. Captain Griffiths arrived in a car driven by Captain Joy, and asked three askaris why they had not killed the Kikuyu. Griffiths then examined their passes, which were in order, and told them to go ahead.

When they were ten yards away, Captain Griffiths—it was alleged—opened fire with a Bren gun, and shot them in the back. They screamed; and the captain was said to have commented, "Let them scream. My horse which they killed screamed more than that."

## Brownell vs. Brownell

From the "OIL WORKER,"  
organ of the CIO union:

### Our Justice

Said U. S. Attorney General Brownell recently:

"In contrast to the Soviet system of criminal justice, our system sets up elaborate safeguards to protect the innocent who have been charged with crime."

Brownell explained that our system gives an accused person the right to know the nature and cause of any accusation and to confront accusing witnesses.

### And Our Injustice

But three days later the White House announced that 1,456 government employees had been fired since May 27 under the Eisenhower security order which Brownell had helped frame.

The security order allows people to be branded as untrustworthy for the rest of their lives, often without being told the exact nature of the accusation against them and without a chance to confront their accusers.

Griffiths is alleged to have returned later to find one of the Kikuyu dead and the other dying. He ordered C. S. M. Llewellyn to "finish him off," but Llewellyn refused; so Griffiths drew a pistol and shot him through the head.

Company Sergeant Major Llewellyn during cross-examination said that he was not prepared to say that there was competition among the Kings African Rifles to see who could get the highest score of kills, but there was tremendous rivalry. A Nairobi advocate asked him if it was the usual practice for company commanders to offer 5 or 10 shillings a head. He replied that he had not heard of it in his unit but he had in others.

In evidence, Captain Griffiths denied that he wanted to kill black men only, and asserted that he had shot these two men after ordering them to halt. A Kikuyu chief, in defense, said that the two men were known to have taken the Mau Mau oath, and it was hoped that they would lead the "Security Forces" to the Mau Mau hideouts.

Captain Joy appeared for the prosecution. He agreed that Griffiths may have told the men to go forward and sit down, but he couldn't understand why they should have been walking if they were trying to escape. Also, he said, as operations were being carried out in a prohibited area, he thought that the armed forces had the right to shoot any African found there.

### REWARDS FOR MURDER

Griffiths admitted in evidence that, the day before, he had told C. S. M. Llewellyn that "he could shoot anybody from the forest, even if they were P. W. D." (Public Works Department, issued with special passes). He maintained, however, that that was a figure of speech.

He said that he told Llewellyn that he had shot "two Mau Mau who were trying to get away." When he (Griffiths) returned with Joy 20 minutes later, one of the Africans was moaning and the other breathing. As the one moaning was in great pain, he had shot him out of mercy. He denied telling Joy not to tell anybody.

Later in the day, Griffiths gave evidence that the attitude of his battalion commander with regard to Mau Mau kills was the same as that of the others. There was a lot of competition, and his commanding officer had told him that their battalion had to beat the record of the 23rd. Griffiths had personally given Askaris 5 shillings reward for each "terrorist" killed; some company commanders gave 10 shillings. This practice was known to his commanding officer and approved by him. They even had a barometer scoreboard of kills. He admitted that it was possible that he had told his company that they had to get a half-century of kills before going to Malaya.

Summing up, the prosecutor said that they had to decide firstly if the men were trying to escape, and secondly if Captain Griffiths thought they were. If the first was true, then that was the end of the case; if not, then it was cold-blooded murder.

The judge advocate said that the Kikuyu had been killed under the

Queen's peace. If they were satisfied that the revolver shot killed the African at whom it was aimed, and that the man was Ndegwa, it would be their duty to find him guilty.

### Captain Griffiths was found not guilty.

It would be contempt of court for me to comment on the trial. Nevertheless the following facts are clear:

(1) Certain officers have offered financial reward for the killing of Kikuyu, not stipulating whether terrorists or not.

(2) It is enough for a Kikuyu in the forbidden areas to walk fast, as if trying to "escape," to render him liable to be shot.

(3) There is rivalry among some branches of the "Security Forces" to see who can kill the most Africans.

(4) Five-hundred and thousand-pound bombs are now being dropped on Kikuyu in the Aberdare Mountains and other prohibited regions.

(5) Although the shooting took place on June 11, no inquiry into it was instigated until August.

(6) Many thousands of Kikuyu are still being kept in prison, many without trial, on suspicion of being Mau Mau supporters.

On hearing the revelations in this trial, Labor Party leader Attlee arose in Parliament to ask for a government statement. Tory Minister of War Head said that he had sent for the documents of the case as a matter of urgency, and would make a further statement about its implications as soon as he received them. He reminded Parliament of General Erskine's order strongly disapproving of any violence toward the "inhabitants of the country because they are the inhabitants . . . which makes our task of settling Mau Mau much more difficult."

Fenner Brockway and Wedgwood Benn tried to adjourn Parliament to discuss the matter, but the minister would not be drawn until receipt of the relevant documents. Brockway wanted a public inquiry "so that all might know the evidence brought forward."

### STRONG-ARM METHODS

On the same day as Griffiths' acquittal was announced, Colonial Secretary Oliver Lyttelton made a statement about the deposition by the Colonial Office of Mutesa II, kabaka of Buganda.

Buganda represents about a quarter of the total area of Uganda, one of the richest East African territories. It came under British "protection" in 1890 through the Imperial British East Africa Company. In exchange for trading concessions, Britain guaranteed the kabaka. Uganda is an almost entirely agricultural country producing cotton, with a population of 5.2 million, of whom only 3500 are white.

In August, the kabaka sent a letter to the governor-general of Uganda, Sir Andrew Cohen, opposing the idea of an East African Federation. He requested that Buganda should be transferred from Colonial Office control to Foreign Office control. The kabaka had also recommended the same policy to his advisory council, the Lukiko.

The governor-general tried to talk the kabaka out of this attitude, and met with him several times. The kabaka now publicly opposed any suggestion of federation, although in March he had accepted Buganda's unity with Uganda. Not only that but he also refused to nominate any members of the new legislative council. This body, consisting largely of government-nominated Africans, thus lost much of its authority.

In consultation with the Colonial Office, Sir Andrew Cohen deposed the kabaka, declared that his presence in Buganda would constitute a threat to security, and flew him into exile to England. Martial law was proclaimed as a "precautionary measure."

It was not long ago that Colonial Secretary Lyttelton had assured the kabaka that Buganda would not be forced into an East African Federation without the people's consent. But the Bugandans did not trust this assurance very much in view of the Central African Federation forced on the peoples of Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, in face of the unanimous opposition of every African organization in these territories.

It is not only opposition to Central African Federation which is worrying the Colonial Office. Two of the biggest

towns in Uganda, Kamfala and Entebbe, are in the territory of Buganda. These towns trade in cotton and coffee, the country's two main products, and in the view of the minister "it would be impossible to look forward to a prosperous Uganda if Buganda was separated."

Jim Griffiths, former colonial secretary under the preceding Labor government, asked if Lyttelton would see the kabaka who had flown to London. Lyttelton replied that he certainly would if the kabaka wanted to see him, but that his decision to depose him was irrevocable. Labor MP Wade wanted to know why his presence in his own territory, though deposed, would make the kabaka "a threat to peace." Lyttelton thought it might lead to bloodshed. Labor is trying to force a debate in Parliament on the deposition of Mutesa.

### BLOW IN SUDAN

On top of all their other headaches, the Tories have suffered a severe blow in the Sudan.

It will be remembered that last year Britain thought that it could foil Egypt's designs on the Sudan by offering the latter independence. An Anglo-Egyptian agreement to hold elections was signed against the wishes of many die-hard Tories. Immediately after its signature, Britain and Egypt exchanged bitter words about whether the independence offer would allow the Sudan to join the Commonwealth.

No sooner was the ink dry, than Naguib and Lyttelton started a propaganda war to persuade the Sudanese to support the parties they respectively sponsored. Britain supporter the Umma Party headed by Sir Abdeh Rahman el Mahdi; the Egyptians plumped for the National Unionist Party.

On the whole, North Sudan is Arab, supports the Khatmia sect, and is pro-Egyptian. The South is more like Ethiopia, is of the Ansar sect, and supports the British. The Socialist Republican Party originally favored independence. Now that it holds the balance between the pro-British and the pro-Egyptian, it has sided with the latter.

In the vote, the National Unionists, backed by Sir Ali Mirghani, won 43 seats; the Umma 20; Independents 13; Southern Party 9; and the Socialist Republicans 5. Out of 92 seats, pro-Egyptians will have 48. Naguib has definitely won this round. His minister of Sudanese affairs, Major Salar Salem, got most of the credit for this victory.

The Tories were taken by surprise and utterly humiliated. In private some have suggested British military intervention, and a further quarrel within the Tory party is expected very soon.

The extreme right-wing Daily Telegraph gave the news very little prominence, while the middling News Chronicle headlined "Sudan Snaps British Link."

Churchill has been outplayed in the Sudan game by General Naguib, who is half Sudanese himself. Although there will be a British governor-general for the next three years, it is expected that Ismail el Azhari, president of the National Unionists, will form the government.

The New York ISL invites you to its

## NEW YEAR'S EVE PARTY

Dancing, Food and Drink

and a Gay, Gala Time for All

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 31 at 9 p.m.

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street

Contribution \$1.00



## LABOR ACTION

December 14, 1953 Vol. 17, No. 50

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

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

# THIRD CAMP CONFERENCE

## Report on Proceedings and Resolutions New York City, November 27-29

The Third Camp Conference, held in New York City on November 27-29, brought together a number of radical anti-war organizations to seek ways and means of joint cooperation.

The basis and main objectives of the Conference were clearly indicated in the call which was signed by the following organizations: the Independent Socialist League; Libertarian Socialist Committee (Chicago); Peacemakers; Socialist Youth League; West Coast Young Peoples Socialist League (Socialist Party); and Young Peoples Socialist League (not a part of the Socialist Party).

The call stated, in part:

**"The primary purpose of this Conference is to bring together representatives of organizations, and individuals, who oppose and reject both the capitalist and Stalinist social systems; who refuse to give support—critical or otherwise—to the war preparations of either side in the cold war; or to those aspects of their foreign policies which are a part of such war preparation; who believe unequivocally in the right of all peoples to independence from foreign control, whether military, political, economic or cultural; who stand on a program of democracy in its fullest sense both at home and abroad; and who are dedicated to the defense of civil liberties, including those of Communist Party members in the United States.**

"The organizations listed below believe that whatever their differences of approach may be, there is a wide area of collaboration open to them on questions on which they are in agreement. . . ."

### Planning Committee Formed

The initiative toward the Conference began in October 1953 when the radical pacifist, or Gandhian, group known as Peacemakers held a "Seminar-Conference on the Outlook for a Third Camp" in Chicago. Though this was essentially a Peacemaker event, it was made

known that young socialists and others who were seriously interested in the subject, though not necessarily adhering to non-violence as a principle, would be welcome. A few such persons did attend the Chicago seminar-conference and were convinced that the Peacemakers' "Declaration on a Third Camp," adopted at Chicago, constituted a good starting point for further discussion and a provisional basis for another conference which would bring together organizations prepared to consider actual collaboration in Third Camp activities. (A limited number of copies of this Peacemaker Declaration are still available: write to Peacemakers, care of Charles Walker, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.)

The upshot was the formation of a Planning Committee consisting of representatives of the sponsoring organizations plus a number of individuals representing tendencies in the movement (Michael Harrington, Bayard Rustin, Arlo Tatum, A. J. Muste chairman, and Charles Walker secretary). This Planning Committee issued the call for the Conference.

At the first formal session of the Planning Committee, the Industrial Workers of the World were also invited to join the sponsoring groups. They sent an observer to the Conference in New York but at this date have not indicated whether they will move to join the Third Camp Contact Committee which was provided for by the Conference. The Fellowship of Reconciliation U.S.A. voted to participate in the Conference as observers.

### Our Objectives

At the Conference on November 27-29, a total of nearly 100 members of the participating organizations and other persons attended one or more of the sessions.

At the opening session, A. J. Muste of the Peacemakers, as chairman of the Planning Committee, sketched the events leading to the Conference. "The objectives," he said, "of the organizations participating are of two kinds. We wish to conduct some exploration

### THIS FOUR-PAGE SECTION

of LABOR ACTION has been turned over to the Third Camp Contact Committee established by the Conference, at its request, for the publication of its full report on the Conference proceedings and documents.

of our respective political philosophies and programs. Secondly, we wish to consider possibilities of joint actions in specific, limited fields. It would have been possible to have a conference devoted to one to the exclusion of the other. In a conference attempting to combine the theoretical and the practical, we might deal with the first at such length and in such a spirit of controversy as to leave no time to consider joint activity and possibly generate so strong a sense of differences as to make joint endeavors seem hopeless or even politically dangerous.

"On the other hand, it would be possible to be impatient with theoretical discussion or to feel that we must above all be polite and that being polite rules out straightforward acknowledgment of differences. In that case we might come up, on paper, with some good-looking ideas for action but in the absence of any real theoretical agreement and some concord of spirit, this could only end in frustration within a few weeks after the conference.

"We shall, therefore, try to combine both. The Planning Committee has a programmatic statement to lay before you. It seeks to state agreement at important points; it frankly recognizes that there are also differences. But we are sensible that in this era of war and reaction, we should act and that action and discussion may illumine and fructify each other."

### Discussion on Draft Statement

The Draft Statement on the Third Camp was then read by Arlo Tatum, executive secretary of the War Resisters League. (The Statement, with minor editorial changes by the Third Camp Contact Committee, is printed in full on the inside pages.) Some of the ensuing discussion on procedure had to do with a small group, the Libertarian Socialist League, with headquarters in New York, which asked to be considered a sponsoring organization. Later in the conference the Steering Committee voted to ask LSL to participate on the same basis as other organizations. However, in the course of the discussion at the final session the LSL members walked out on the stated ground that they could not go along with a paragraph in the Draft Statement relating to "defense of the nation." They took this action despite the fact that they were assured that the Statement when issued would contain a note to the effect that LSL rejected this particular section. Except for this incident, no friction marked the conference, though discussion was often lively.

At the evening session on Friday, representatives of the sponsoring organizations addressed the conference—Max Shachtman for the ISL and SYL; A. J. Muste and David Dellinger for the Peacemakers; Dick Frederickson for the Libertarian Socialist Committee; and Bogdan Denitch for the YPSL. (Brief summaries and excerpts from these speeches are given elsewhere in these pages.)

On Saturday morning, Chairman Muste read a number of greetings to the Conference which had been received from organizations and individuals, especially from abroad, even though there had been little time to send out notice of the meeting. Some of these are also summarized elsewhere in these pages.

### Work of the Panels

Following this, the delegates and visitors broke up into three panels to discuss respectively (1) anti-war and anti-imperialist work; (2) civil liberties; and (3) the struggle against racial and religious discrimination. The objective was to discuss the kind of work in these fields now being done by the participating organizations and to seek ways to expand this work and cooperate in it.

The Anti-War and Anti-Imperialist panel discussed the possibility of demonstrative actions in connection with such specific issues as Japanese rearmament, the Puerto Rican struggle for independence and on other issues as they would arise. It also gave special attention to the setting up of organizational machinery through

(Continued on page 6)

## GREETINGS FROM U.S. AND ABROAD

**MOSABURO SUZUKI, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Japan:**

"On behalf of the Socialist Party of Japan which represents most peace-loving people in Japan, I feel the greatest pleasure in sending a comradely message to you. . . ."

"Japanese socialists, who are most anxious to secure peace in Asia and in the world, and to resume friendly relationships with all peoples of the world, have advocated from the beginning: (1) an independent policy for a neutral Japan in any power conflict; (2) the formation of the Third Force.

"I firmly believe that by the neutralization of Japan dangers around Japan can be diminished and that by the third force the conflict between the two camps can be settled. . . ."

"I hope your Conference can attain a big result and success which will encourage also all peace-loving people in the world.

"Long live democracy and peace in the world.

"Long live the Third Camp."

**FENNER BROCKWAY, MP (Great Britain), secretary of the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism:**

"I am delighted and encouraged to know that a Third Camp Conference is to be held in America. There are many of us in this country who take the view that peace-makers and Socialists should turn their efforts in this constructive direction. The group of nations in the United Nations led by India are giving us an example of the way to peace, and all of us should be urging that our respective governments should join them in this endeavor. In Europe and in Britain the movement is growing for this purpose. . . . Our task is not easy but it is a real stimulation to us to know that in your more difficult circumstances there are people who have the courage to advocate the same view. I would like particularly to say to the younger members of the Conference that they should regard this Movement as a great crusade for human welfare and peace and that history abounds with many triumphs which have been achieved by brave persistence even when the opposing forces have been more formidable. . . ."

**MICHEL CROZIER, editorial board, Tribune des Peuples (Paris):**

"I can tell you on my own behalf that your enterprise by itself and the mere fact that it can gather many participants now in America is most comforting for me and that the many friends I am going to talk to about it will be most comforted too. I believe that your approach is fundamentally right. I may object to your Gandhian outlook but I agree it can't be brushed aside without discussion. I belong to the editorial board of a new international review *La Tribune des Peuples* that is without definite commitment because of day-to-day political entanglements but fundamentally and wholeheartedly for the *Third Camp* you are advocating. And we are not alone in that position in France. . . ."

**DICK BEECH, editor, Chemical Worker, organ of the Chemical Workers Union (Great Britain):**

"Many thanks for your interesting letter with details of the 'Third Camp Conference.' Shall be pleased to receive a report of the conference and will give a mention in the January issue of a trade-union journal I edit.

"I should like to wish your conference every success as there is a growing need today for a clear-cut socialist policy, not only in the USA, but throughout the socialist movement of the world.

"Here in Britain there are a few of us who have been stressing the need for a Third Socialist Force as the only way of dealing with the many and varied world problems so we shall be more than glad to hear the views of your conference. . . ."

"Some time early next year we are aiming at trying to organize, in Africa, an all-African Congress attended by representatives of all the African peoples. There are, as you will understand, many difficulties to be overcome, but we are hoping that we will succeed in our objective."

**DR. LEON SZUR, leader in Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism (England):**

"I am sure that my pleasure and feeling of solidarity would be shared by countless people in the Labor movement in this country, in Europe, and in the national

(Continued on page 6)

# Statement on the Third Camp:

The second half of the twentieth century finds the world in the midst of a profound crisis.

In this atomic age, men live under the shadow of war and economic insecurity, and in danger of social disintegration.

Armaments increase, cleavages deepen, wars which cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of men are fought under the guise of "police action." Despite surface changes in the international scene, each day seems to bring us closer to an appalling Third World War fought with weapons more barbaric than poison gas, more destructive than atomic bombs.

In the economically less developed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, peasants and workers who have been oppressed by poverty, disease and tyranny, both domestic and foreign, for thousands of years are striking out for freedom and decent material conditions. Multitudes are in revolt also against the doctrine and practices of white, or Anglo-Saxon, supremacy.

These popular revolutions have tremendous repercussions in Western nations. British, Dutch and French imperialism is discredited and is in retreat where it has not already been overthrown.

This generation has, moreover, witnessed the emergence of various forms of totalitarianism, which, along with World Wars, have resulted in indescribable brutalities and misery, on a scale never before reached by men in their efforts to exercise domination over their fellows.

The means of transportation and communication are such that the upheavals to which we have referred take place under conditions where the shock which occurs in any part of the world communicates itself to all the rest. The whole planet is involved in the power struggle between the two dominant armed nation-states, Russia and the United States.

War tends to become total and permanent. In a situation which obviously calls for world order and a world society, there is chaos.

Both the power blocks which divide the world into two armed camps—American and Russian, the capitalist and the Stalinist social systems—are incapable of providing the solution of the crises by leading in the achievement of a global democratic society. They are cause and embodiment of the crisis, not its solution.

Neither provides the road by which mankind may reach the goal of a fraternal and peaceful order of life: both are huge blocks in the road which must be removed if catastrophe is to be avoided and the goal reached.

## The Power Conflict

In the military-political field the two great power-states, Russia and the United States, engaged in a fantastic race to develop weapons of mass destruction, exist essentially in order to wage the power struggle against each other.

The psychology of the dominant elements in each is a war psychology. A state of hysteria, fluctuating up and down occasionally, is the prevailing mood. This is the basic objective fact, despite the subjective horror of atomic war and wish for peace which are also found.

The economies of the two modern leviathans are war economies. The national budgets are war budgets.

In Russia to an extreme degree, in the United States increasingly, the liberties of the people are sacrificed to the exigencies of the garrison state.

For these power-states to overcome or liquidate the power struggle, and to devote themselves to the achievement of world peace, would require and reflect a revolutionary change in attitudes and in the socio-economic systems of these countries.

All "peace" activities which do not proceed on this assumption are based on illusion and, no matter how much those who take part in them may wish otherwise, will serve as a screen behind which war preparations go on. Because of this, discussions of disarmament go on endlessly and the armaments race concurrently becomes more intense.

Some of the functional organizations of the United Nations are useful to a degree. But except occasionally where small nations are involved which can be directly or indirectly coerced by big powers, the UN is helpless to keep the peace. Its "police action," as in Korea, represents war of the most devastating and brutal kind, an episode in the global power struggle which is in no wise altered by having a UN label pinned on it.

## NO ILLUSIONS

Pinning the hope for world peace, as many do—including the Stalinists for propaganda purposes—on the "coexistence" of the two power states and their socio-economic systems is likewise to trust in an illusion. This is not to say that tension may not temporarily relax and relations be relatively stabilized for a time, or to suggest that we would prefer overt war to such relaxation. But such developments occur after every war, if only because nations must have a breathing space in which to prepare for the next war.

And if no such revolutionary change takes place as we have indicated and the two regimes remain essentially what they now are, the stabilization will simply register the power relationships. It will represent, in other words, a temporary demarcation of "spheres of influence" and bargaining at the cost of less powerful States, à la Munich, Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam.

The accompanying Statement is not in any sense a final programmatic declaration on which a Third Camp is to be based. As the Statement itself points out, "the Third Camp cannot at present be conceived as a united world-wide organization or movement with a single ideology, strategy and goal." Under the circumstances "it would be ridiculous for the small socialist, pacifist and other groups which have come together in this conference to attempt to lay down an ideology or a detailed program for the Third Camp." The Statement furthermore clearly indicates that there is divergence among the groups participating in the conference on certain basic issues. In joining in the present provisional Statement, the groups do not abandon or dilute their respective convictions on such matters.

If men do not keep this in mind, the "peace" activities of today will end in World War III as surely as the "peace" activities following World War I ended in the horrors of World War II.

## The U. S. Economy

As for the American capitalist economy built on exceptionally great natural resources and linked with a revolutionary technology, it has created a situation where nearly half the wealth of the world is concentrated in the United States. This regime has been able to provide a privileged position, both as compared with their own past and in comparison with other peoples, for American workers, farmers, and professionals and intellectuals as well.

The result is that the class conflict has been mitigated, if not almost abandoned. The political Left has suffered temporary disaster. Despite uneasiness and misgivings, the masses have backed the state in its "bipartisan" foreign policy and its wars. They have submitted to military conscription, to the curbing of the power of unions, and to a considerable degree of thought control.

But this regime which has achieved, so far as modern times go, an unprecedented measure of "social peace" at home, is the source of tension and irritation, the provoker of wars abroad—in short, one of the two great and dangerous "aggressors" in the contemporary world. There are various respects in which this is an accurate statement of the case.

In the first place, the mere fact that Americans are well fed, clothed, housed, and have dollars to spend in a world where austerity and poverty is still the lot of the majority, is a source of profound irritation. The vicinity of every base where American "occupying" or "defending" forces are stationed furnishes any number of illustrations every day.

In the second place, even apart from considerations of "defense," Western European nations and many raw-material-producing countries are economically dependent upon the U. S.

A small decline in U. S. production may mean a serious or even catastrophic slump for these countries. Because of the economic weight it can throw around, the U. S. can pressure these countries to espouse "free enterprise," take down tariff walls if they "want to be prosperous like the Americans." At the same time, their access to the vast American market is drastically limited and there is no likelihood of any substantial change in this provoking situation. Other nations have to engage in the game of competition with nearly all the cards in the hands of one of the players who can, therefore, always make up a winning combination.

## U. S. BULWARK OF STATUS QUO

In the third place, American capitalism operates on a national basis and is backed by the state. The wealth of this country, and its relatively aristocratic standard of living, are based on the one hand on the productivity of highly mechanized American industry, and on the other on the decay of European capitalism and the extreme vulnerability of the economies of the underdeveloped, raw-material-producing countries of the world.

While America has put the rest of the capitalist world on rations—just enough to maintain political stability—all this is done in the "national interest," primarily that is, in the interest of the economic royalists of this country. Access to raw materials and markets is dominated by American capital.

To maintain this privileged economic position, which on any moral basis is unjust and which evokes the resentment and hatred of the peoples of the world, force is required. And it requires increasing force as Stalinism takes advantage of world-wide social discontent to spread its totalitarian rule and thus removes additional portions of the planet from access to capitalist trade, investment and occupation. Hence the need for a vast military establishment and the deployment and constant use, in direct and indirect ways, of American armed forces in all quarters of the globe.

A fourth, and perhaps most important, reason why American capitalism cannot bring peace is that it blocks the road to social change both in the decaying capitalist countries of Europe, and in the underdeveloped countries of the rest of the world.

In the face of widespread social discontent in the former, and a sweeping nationalist, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution in the latter, America stands as the bulwark of the status quo. It can nowhere rally the masses to its cause, because its cause is reactionary. Hence it must rely on and supports the most re-

actionary elements such as Syngman Rhee, Bao Dai, Franco, Adenauer, and a handful of Latin American dictators.

It is commonly recognized among liberals that military measures are not enough to contain and overcome Stalinism. They seek an auxiliary program in such measures as Point IV. But as conducted by a capitalist government, Point IV tends to entrench rather than remove or overthrow the capitalist and feudal exploiting classes in the backward countries. And in the heat of the cold war it becomes either an instrument of American bribery or coercion of the receiving governments, or it is reduced to a petty-cash item by the voraciously expanding military budget.

## NO HOPE FROM U. S. WAR CAMP

American capitalism, or capitalism of any kind, is incapable of bringing bread and freedom to the peasant and worker masses of the underdeveloped countries. To the extent that it has developed the resources and productive capacities of these countries, Western capitalism has done so in a distorted manner which meets its own needs, rather than those of the countries involved. In the main, however, it has kept them in their backwardness, and has even to some extent destroyed the productive apparatus and methods these countries had before they were subjected to capitalist pressures.

The peoples of these countries are engaged in a world-wide drive for emancipation from imperialist control and native exploitation. They can hope for nothing from the American government and its cold-war allies. They must, and in large measure do, look to the working people of America and Western Europe for political support and fraternal help in their struggle. If these fail them, they have nowhere to look but to the Stalinists, who offer to help them to liberate themselves from old evils only to subject them to new and more terrible ones.

And to the extent that the masses of the people in America and Europe, and this includes their labor and socialist movements, give support to the capitalist socio-economic systems and the imperialist policies of their governments, they too cannot establish a positive, dynamic movement of their own as an alternative to both capitalism and Stalinism. To the extent that they have come to rely on their own privileged position based on the exploitation of the masses in the rest of the world, they are bound to one of the war camps, and can give neither serious aid nor real leadership to the masses in the rest of the world.

## Stalinism

Stalinism derives its opportunity, its appeal and its strength in the world largely from the decay of capitalism in Europe, and the situation in the underdeveloped countries which we have described. The Stalinist war camp is bolstered and strengthened by the reactionary and imperialist policy of the United States, just as the capitalist war camp is bolstered by the totalitarian and imperialist nature and policies of Stalinism.

Far from offering the peoples of the world a free society and the hope of peace, Stalinism offers only a new totalitarian barbarism and war in perpetuity.

It imposes on the peoples in its camp a rigid state collectivism which has no resemblance to democratic socialism. In all countries where it has achieved power, it has developed a bureaucratic class which holds all power in its hands, and exploits and oppresses the mass of the people in its own interest. This class regiments the masses into huge war machines and vast slave camps. It deprives them of all political rights and liberties, for it recognizes that any degree of democracy, any permission of voluntaristic individual or group action, could lead to its speedy overthrow. As it seeks to duplicate the high industrialization of the West at great speed so as to equal its military potential, it is driven to resort to the most ruthless exploitation, the most extreme terrorism of modern times.

The development of totalitarian Stalinism out of the high hopes of the Russian Revolution has disoriented and demoralized a whole generation. The fact that it arose out of a struggle led by socialists, and still uses the terminology of socialism and democracy, has deceived millions into believing it is a force for emancipation, and has convinced other millions that if this is a "socialism," they would rather endure those evils than make any new attempt of their own.

Both Stalinist and capitalist propaganda serves to perpetuate this state of confusion and demoralization, in which support of one or other of the imperialist war camps appears as the only alternative open to mankind.

## Need for a Third Camp

If hope and revolutionary determination are to be reborn, a Third Camp must come into being.

This cannot be merely a Third Force of power-states alongside of the two power-blocs which now dominate and divide the world. There is no room in the world for another power-bloc, whose social and economic system is in no way to be distinguished from that of one of the existing ones.

To offer genuine hope to mankind, the social and political movements which make up the Third Camp must be opposed to the social orders of both war camps, and hence to the military and diplomatic cold war which they are waging.

But they cannot be a merely negative or passive force. They must be animated by a positive principle, the goal of a new, free, human, and democratic order which is superior in all ways to what the two war camps have to offer, and which, therefore, the peoples in Stalinist and

# Conference Resolution on War

capitalist countries will recognize as the goal in which they also will find freedom and peace.

Although it would be ridiculous for the small socialist, pacifist, and other groups which have come together in this Conference to attempt to lay down an ideology or a detailed program for the Third Camp forces in many countries which exist today, or which must come into existence if the world is to be saved from social disintegration and the ultimate horror of atomic war, it will perhaps be useful for us to outline those ideas we hold in common, as a possible rallying ground for other Third Camp elements in America, and as a means of conveying our thoughts to adherents of the Third Camp in other countries.

**(1) We reject and oppose the war policies, war preparations and war aims of both Stalinism and capitalism. As Americans, this means that it is our primary duty to oppose such policies, preparations and aims of our own government, while in no way yielding in our opposition to those of the Stalinists.**

## "DEFENSE OF THE NATION"?

(2) We reject the suggestion that the present government's military program is designed to defend the national independence of this or any other nation, or in any way organized to "defend freedom" throughout the world. To support the war preparations of the American camp as a method of defending the national independence of our people is to support one of the imperialist camps, since the people are not the ones who will decide how and why our ruling class will use its military power. The ruling elements of both camps continually and deliberately identify "the nation" with the needs and interests of their own rule, and hence "defense of the nation" with defense of their social systems.

To talk, today, of the "national defense" of either of the two colossi is to ignore the fact that it is they who threaten the national independence of other peoples. For us who live in the United States, the defense of our nation and of freedom elsewhere can take on real meaning only when the mass of the people have established a society which is truly democratic in all its aspects, and which can therefore defend its own democracy and that of other peoples by such means, military or non-violent, as the people may freely choose.

(3) Those of us who are pacifists, or adherents of Gandhian non-violence, believe that in the present circumstances no war, no military preparations, can issue in a progressive solution to the problems of any nation or of the people in any nation. Those of us who do not accept personal pacifism, or the Gandhian techniques of non-violent resistance as generally applicable methods of struggle; cannot accept such an absolute rejection of war as a means of defending the nation or of liberating it from foreign or domestic oppression under any and all circumstances.

(4) We agree in not placing sole dependence upon parliamentary methods at all times and in all countries for overcoming injustice, removing the exploiting forces in the control of the present order, and laying the foundations for a truly democratic society. We believe in the mobilization of the workers, farmers, and "little people" for direct action in strikes, against segregation or invasion of civil liberties, and the like. To these some of us would add individual and group resistance to conscription and other acts of civil disobedience as among the means of peaceful struggle which they advocate and practice, as occasion offers.

## DEMOCRACY AND POWER

**(5) We are for the democratic ownership, control and administration of the basic resources and industries in all countries. This means that we reject private ownership and monopoly control of these resources and industries on the one hand, and bureaucratically controlled state ownership on the other.**

What must be aimed at is the widest direct participation of the mass of producers and consumers in all phases of the direction, administration, planning and work in production, transportation and distribution of goods. Only in this way can society approach the humanization of machine technology and subordinate it to man rather than man to the machine.

(6) We are agreed that the revolutionary movement must adhere firmly to democracy, both within its own ranks and for society at large. Its aim must be to organize the people's will for the broadest and most democratic political and social struggle, not to seek an "easy" way to power by the action of a narrow elite.

Although the final aim of any serious revolutionary movement must be to achieve power, it is not a matter of indifference to us *how* this power is achieved. We recognize that proclaiming the most noble and ideal ends and justifying any means in order to achieve these ends, is characteristic of both the power blocs and both the regimes which in our view are responsible for the desperate state of mankind today. We do not wish to copy this pattern and we are sensible of the moral and political restraints which always need to be placed on power. We are, therefore, for the employment of those democratic means which enlist the participation of the widest strata of the population in the struggle, and thus prepare them to take the administration of the new society into their own hands when their efforts have been crowned with success. We reject such means of struggle as tend to create a dominating bureaucracy over the movement of the people, thus removing them from the exercise of real power.

**(7) As citizens of a country in which all strata of the population benefit from the impoverishment and degradation of the peoples of the rest of the world, we take it as our first task to oppose all forms of economic and**

**political imperialism, no matter how difficult and unpopular such a course may be, and regardless of its implications for our own standard of living.**

## Third Camp Beginnings

The Third Camp cannot at present be conceived as a united world-wide organization or movement with a single ideology, strategy and goal. There is no single movement in any country of the world today which has been able to achieve such a degree of authority and prestige as to win the allegiance of masses everywhere, and thus to put its unique ideological stamp on the Third Camp movement.

Rather, the Third Camp is and must be made up of a wide variety of movements and organizations throughout the world, each of which has developed out of its own specific historical and social conditions, but which are drawn together by concrete opposition to the present war camps, and by a broad common aspiration for a democratic society.

**The Third Camp consists of all those movements and organizations in the colonial world which are struggling for their emancipation from foreign domination and social and economic exploitation, but which have not fallen into the trap of Stalinism.**

It consists of those groups and individuals in the great social-democratic and labor movements of Europe who genuinely resist Stalinism; and at the same time oppose the increasing subordination of their movements to the capitalist camp and its war aims; who fight for a domestic and foreign policy free from capitalist exploitation, military and political regimentation, and national privilege at the expense of their brothers in the underdeveloped part of the world. It includes elements which are waging the struggle against rearmament in various countries and those Gandhians in India and other countries who are committed to rejection of the present power camps and the non-violent struggle for a free world. It consists of those masses who, even under the shackles of Stalinism, fight as best they can against their totalitarian masters, without becoming tools in the hands of capitalist imperialism.

## APPEAL TO THE WORLD

Although the broad Third Camp forces already exert a considerable *retarding* influence on both war camps, they are neither sufficiently powerful and well organized nor have they clarified their ideology to a point at which they can present a mass, positive appeal to the peoples of the world. But the hope of humanity for peace and for a better society can rest only on their growth, cohesion, and ideological clarification.

In this respect, we appeal specially to the labor and socialist movements, and to individuals, in Britain, France, Holland, Belgium and Germany.

It is inexcusable, and in the long run, suicidal for us of the industrialized capitalist world to adhere to a

nationalist economic and political outlook. Neither a Labor Britain nor a socialist movement in power in any single European country can hope to achieve its goal, or even to endure, unless it is willing to assume the risk and hence open the perspectives offered by the political and economic collaboration and eventual unification of Western Europe.

**And even this will not lead to a world of freedom and plenty unless the socialist and labor movements of Europe individually, and all of them collectively, are willing to stand unreservedly as the foremost champions of the complete freedom and self-determination economically, politically and culturally of the underdeveloped countries of the world. Only when that freedom has been achieved will it be possible for the peoples of the world to unite in a new way, as brothers and comrades, and to achieve that fruitful economic collaboration which will be to the true benefit of all.**

To the Third Camp movements and groups in Asia, the Near East, Africa and Latin America we say this:

*Our forces are small, and our influence in our own country is far weaker than is the case with many of the movements in the rest of the world. Nevertheless, to the utmost of our ability, we will do what we can to support your struggles for complete national emancipation and revolutionary social and economic change. Your struggles help us to arouse the conscience and consciousness of the American people to the role their government and ruling class compels them to play in the world.*

## Our Aims

Concretely, in view of our forces and the types of activities to which these limit us at the present time, we will seek to do the following:

(a) Organize public meetings and demonstrations to protest imperialist activities of the American or its allied governments when dramatic events will make them most fruitful. Similar activities to protest acts of Stalinist imperialism will be undertaken when appropriate.

(b) Participate in every way at our disposal in the struggle against racial or religious discrimination or segregation in all its phases in this country.

(c) Seek ways and means to dramatize the struggle against McCarthyism and for civil and political liberties. In particular we declare that we oppose the abrogation of the civil liberties of Stalinists in this country, although we do not find it feasible to engage in organizational collaboration with Stalinists in this or other fields.

(d) We will defend the political and civil liberties of pacifists and others who choose the method of civil disobedience.

(e) We will seek by all means at our disposal to bring to wider circles the revolutionary Third Camp ideas presented in this resolution.

# Resolution on Civil Liberties

We recognize that among the greatest and most pressing evils with which we have to deal are the numerous invasions of civil liberties which take place in our time.

**Our responsibility is the greater in the situation since in the final analysis civil liberties cannot be preserved in the context of imperialism, cold war and preparation for total war. A nation involved in the madness of total war will not preserve its own sanity and freedom.**

We recognize it as a shortcoming that this Conference has not succeeded in working out a joint program against McCarthyism on a national scale which might serve as a new rallying point for many elements in the civil-liberties struggle and dramatize the crucial importance of the Third Camp for such a struggle.

**(1) We urge the Third Camp Contact Committee to try at an early date (a) to prepare a leaflet on McCarthyism and related matters which could be used by all Third Camp groups; (b) to be alert to the possibility of developing some form of demonstrative national action in which Third-Campers and others might take part.**

(2) Attention has been called to the fact that in a number of local communities spontaneous protests against attacks on the schools and other violations of civil liberties are taking place.

**We urge participation in these community movements, among other reasons because this offers an opportunity to educate people not otherwise reached on the basic nature of the present attacks on freedom, the forces behind them and the means of truly effective struggle against them.**

(3) The Taft-Hartley Law represents an attack on the working class and its organizations. Third-Campers are urged to be alert for opportunities to take part in struggles against these evils.

**(4) We oppose the principle of the attorney general's "subversive list" and will do all in our power to combat this development.**

In particular, we support the Independent Socialist League in its challenge of the subversive list and call attention to the Workers Defense League and

its efforts in this and related fields, and urge support of these efforts by all Third Camp groups.

**(5) Our attention has been called to a movement for non-cooperation with congressional investigating committees of the Velde-Jenner-McCarthy type, initiated by the Ohio Peacemakers group.**

The non-cooperation pledge has been presented in two forms. The first reads as follows:

"Desiring to preserve for myself and all others the inner integrity and sanctity of the human personality, I resolve to oppose all intrusion by the government or any unofficial group into this citadel of democracy. Regarding such opposition as a duty as well as a fundamental right, I will speak freely, associate as I see fit, publish and otherwise teach or advocate any ideas or political or economic changes which I deem advisable and oppose freely whatever I deem wrong in the actions of my government. I shall, therefore, if summoned, refuse to appear before the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities or any similar official or unofficial body. I intend to offer total non-cooperation to such attempts at abridgement of liberty."

The second suggested form reads as follows:

"Desiring to preserve for myself and others the inner integrity and sanctity of the human personality, I am resolved to oppose all intrusion by the government or any unofficial group into this citadel of democracy. Regarding such opposition as a duty as well as a fundamental right, I will speak freely, associate as I see fit, publish and otherwise teach or advocate any ideas or political or economic changes which I deem advisable and oppose freely whatever I deem wrong in the actions of my government. And I shall resist, wherever necessary, any effort to interfere with my right under the First Amendment of the Constitution, to hold any social, political or religious opinions that correspond with my concept of truth—a right of which no inquisitorial committee of Congress is legally empowered to deprive me. I intend to offer non-cooperation to all such attempts at the abridgement of liberty."

The Conference suggests that all groups give information about these actions, and pledges support to Peacemakers and others who may be attacked for participation in them.

# Conference Proceedings — —

(Continued from page 3)

which the participating groups could exchange information and arrange for cooperation.

One of the panel's recommendations dealt with the possible issuance of a newsletter by a continuation set-up, to include information on anti-imperialist movements throughout the world and their publications, so that all of the organizations could better inform themselves on the views and activities of such movements.

The Civil Liberties panel, with a heavy agenda for discussion, was marked by a very large area of agreement between the pacifists and socialists present. It was generally agreed that it was essential in the struggle against the current witchhunt to expose the tie between the growing garrison state and the attacks on the freedom of the American people.

There was agreement on working closely with the Workers Defense League in defense of the victims of "security screening" and the anti-fascist victims of the McCarran Act who were facing deportation to Franco Spain. It was also agreed that it was not possible or desirable to work with Stalinist front organizations, like the Civil Rights Congress. Out of the panel came suggestions for the resolution on civil liberties which was adopted by the Conference (see inside pages for the text), and for the issuance of a joint leaflet on this subject.

The panel on Racial and Religious Discrimination found that none of the organizations at the conference are at present engaged in specific projects in this important field in their own name. All the organizations have participated in anti-discrimination campaigns in the past, and the panel briefly discussed some of their experiences. It was found that Peacemakers generally work through the Committee on Racial Equality as individuals, while in some localities members of the ISL have been supporting the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, also as individuals.

The panel proposed that when particular problems arise, the members of Third Camp organizations should seek to stimulate existing organizations in the field to action, or (together with them if possible or under their own auspices where necessary) seek to set up the widest possible ad hoc committee to conduct a struggle against discrimination. It recommended that the continuations body should also be alert to situations or projects in

which it could seek to involve all the organizations in joint activity.

## Set Up Contact Committee

On Saturday evening (while an Open-House Social for delegates and visitors was held at Labor Action Hall) the steering committee of the conference met to discuss the progress of the Conference's work, and to lay plans for continued cooperation among the organizations involved. It was decided to set up a Third Camp Contact Committee made up of representatives of the organizations which had been able to collaborate fruitfully in planning and conducting the Conference. It was decided that individuals who represent Third Camp tendencies in organizations which have not sponsored the conference could be added to the committee, but they would participate on invitation of the organizations and at their tolerance.

It was further decided that if united action among the various groups is to go forward, all decisions made by the committee will be based on substantial agreement between the radical pacifists and radical socialists, the two main currents in the committee. Thus there will be no question of a coalition of groups outvoting other groups in the committee.

A report along the above lines was submitted to the conference as a whole on Sunday morning. At that time also the resolution on civil liberties aforementioned was adopted.

It was decided that the Third Camp Contact Committee would prepare a brief statement along the lines of

the Statement on the Third Camp adopted by the conference, and seek to obtain the signatures of prominent individuals and organizations which adhere to the Third Camp idea both here and abroad. Such a statement could do much to give a feeling of solidarity to the Third Camp adherents throughout the world.

## Machinery for Collaboration

It was also decided that the Third Camp Contact Committee would publish a modest bulletin from time to time, to keep the interested organizations and individuals in this country informed of its work, and to direct them to sources of information on Third Camp struggles in other countries.

The conference closed with brief remarks by Gordon Haskell of the ISL and by Chairman A. J. Muste. Both emphasized the basic harmony which had prevailed throughout the conference among the various tendencies represented, and pointed out that the value of the Third Camp Contact Committee would depend on the degree of actual work and cooperation in which the memberships of the organizations would engage in each locality.

Muste stressed the difficulty of the times in which we operate, and pointed out that the important thing is not the present size and influence of the groups which maintain a Third Camp point of view in this country, but their determination not to lower their banners; not to give up their resistance to capitalism and Stalinism; their determination to do the most they can do in their struggle for peace and a decent society.

# SUMMARY OF SPEECHES

At the evening session on Friday, November 27, representatives of the various sponsoring organizations addressed the Conference and were followed by speakers from the floor.

## MAX SHACHTMAN

Independent Socialist League

Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, spoke on behalf of that organization and the Socialist Youth League.

Shachtman emphasized the resistance of the peoples of the world to both war camps as a prime factor in deterring them from plunging the world into a holocaust.

He stated that Marxian socialists give primary importance to the working class movements in all countries as a key to social change. After discussing briefly the difference in approach between radical pacifists and socialists, he added:

"We see the highest moral values in the triumph of the classless socialist society and all that contributes to that triumph. We socialists, who are not pacifists but militants, feel an infinitely stronger bond with the anti-war pacifists, specially those who support the ideas of the Third Camp, than we do with 'militants' who support the warmongers."

## A. J. MUSTE

Peacemakers

A. J. Muste of Peacemakers pointed out that it is natural that here as in other countries adherents of radical, anti-Stalinist socialism and of radical or Gandhian pacifism should be considering whether they have substantial ideological agreement and possibilities of joint action.

Those who are agreed in rejecting both power blocs and both the capitalist and Stalinist social regimes already have much in common and are inevitably drawn closer together. The Gandhians, to use a term in some ways inadequate, are concerned with the problem of making non-violence relevant and effective in the actual struggle against dictatorship, militarism and war. Socialists need to take account of what recent decades have taught about the methods of struggle and may, therefore, be willing to examine the claims of non-violence.

"One of the problems we might fruitfully discuss," Muste continued, "at some future gathering has to do with the attitude of contemporary Marxists toward war. What wars are in their view justified? Are any such wars now in progress? . . ."

"Another useful theme for discussion would be exploring the meaning of what seem to me very radical statements about the necessity of placing moral and political restraints on power; and the rejection of the pattern of dictatorship, the pattern of proclaiming ideal ends and justifying any means to achieve them. Certainly the presence of these basically democratic ideas in our programmatic statement opens the way for collaboration on the basis of frankness and integrity."

## DAVID DELLINGER

Peacemakers

David Dellinger, also speaking for Peacemakers, said he wanted to devote his time to "clearing away some possible misunderstandings as to the type of pacifism represented by Peacemakers." He stressed:

(1) "Peacemakers are not soft or submissive" but it was formed because of "the need for a more aggressive, uncompromising attack on the evils of war and exploitation than the existing pacifist organizations were willing to make." (2) They "are not sentimental, church-centered pacifists" and "do not share the illusions of some religious pacifists that 'good will' alone

is enough to combat the very real powers of totalitarianism and entrenched privilege." (3) "Peacemakers are not bourgeois" and "attack the fallacy that you can renounce war and accept the society that produces war." (4) They have "a special 'grass-roots' emphasis" and believe in "living the new life now." (5) Their "emphasis has always been on doing instead of talking."

In conclusion Dellinger briefly discussed Gandhi, ending with the thought that "we feel more unity and more hope in the possibilities of working with those whose understanding of society leads them to be revolutionary and not pacifist than with those who reject violence but can swallow the rest of the evil, false, destructive and violent society that surrounds us."

## DICK FREDERICKSON

Libertarian Socialist Committee

Dick Frederickson, speaking on behalf of the Libertarian Socialist Committee, laid special stress on the inclusion of anarchists and syndicalists in the Third Camp movement. He emphasized the importance of implementing the draft statement's concern with economic democracy, and of the Third Camp movement sinking roots in the working class.

"For this purpose, activities centering around the achievements of economic democracy — trade union work, participation in strike activity, development of the spirit of workers' solidarity and of shop democracy, building of the cooperative movement—are needed."

Frederickson also stated that he hoped this Conference would result in a Third Camp federation, or at any rate that arrangements would be made "conducive to a maximum of joint activities and membership interaction at the grass-roots level."

## BOGDAN DENITCH

Young Peoples Socialist League

Bogdan Denitch, representing the Young Peoples Socialist League, urged the Conference to concentrate its attention on limited and achievable objectives rather than on a discussion of theoretical, abstract, or historical questions.

"Let us first get used to working together," he said, "and then we can discuss plans for 'federation.' Many of you may not fully realize how much of an achievement it is for us to be holding a conference of this type." Denitch went on to urge that special attention be given to student work as a field for cooperation. "The sponsors have already all endorsed *Anvil*, the publication of pacifists, socialists and other anti-war elements on the campus. In our campus clubs are represented all of the elements present at this conference. In our campus work our disagreements (particularly those over non-violence as a principle) are minimized since no one has yet showed us how a campus club can function differently. This is the area where fewest problems in cooperation exist and the area therefore calling for our special attention."

## FOR MORE INFORMATION

about the Third Camp Conference and the Third Camp contact committee, write to its secretary: Charles Walker, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

For extra copies of this four-page Report on the Third Camp Conference, write to: the Business Manager of *Labor Action*, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

# Greetings From U.S. and Abroad — —

(Continued from page 3)

Democratic movements in the colonies, if they knew of the conference. There is no doubt that Third Camp 'feelings' are gaining ever greater support in the British Labor movement, in spite of the policies of the official Labor Party leadership. These feelings are still inchoate and lack a clearly thought-out program and organizational basis, but there does nevertheless exist an ever-growing rejection of both the Western capitalist and the Russian Stalinist camps, and a belief in the necessity for a third solution along libertarian democratic socialist lines. . . ."

**CHARLES CURTISS, for Los Angeles Local Socialist Party, U. S. A.:**

"By motion of Local Los Angeles, Socialist Party U.S.A., we wish to extend our fraternal greetings to your conference.

"As a component part of the Socialist Party, U.S.A., we are urging our national organization to send a representative to your conference to further its work. [The S.P., U.S.A. was invited to do so but declined.—Ed.] However, as a component part of our national organization we are bound by its decision.

"We would like to continue to receive communications regarding the conference.

"Due to the great distance it is impossible for us to have even an observer, but we send this to you to acquaint you with our sentiments."

**FRITZ LAMM, German socialist:**

"I am happy and thankful that you have written—and that we in this way have come in contact with you. A little circle of comrades, who mostly are organized in the SPD, who on the ground of Marxist thoughts stand up for a renewal of the German and international socialist movement, put out a small periodical, *Sparks*. This has a circulation of 1,500 copies, appears once a month, and has only a small range. . . . We are therefore very much interested in a contact with you—and I beg you please not to neglect to send us the report of your conference. . . ."

Additional greetings were received from Allan Vaughan, London writer on labor and political topics; Harris Wofford, Jr., author of *India Afire*; and Charles Brainerd, on behalf of the Haverford College Peace Fellowship.

# YOU *and* SCIENCE

# WORLD POLITICS

## F.A.S. Denounces McCarthyism at Ft. Monmouth

By CARL DARTON

On November 29, the Council of the Federation of American Scientists, meeting in Chicago, went on record opposing the widespread "security risk" suspensions which have recently taken place at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey army Signal Corps laboratories. The FAS said that the suspensions and the investigations at Fort Monmouth by Senator Joseph McCarthy could "result in a net gain for those who work against the interest of the United States."

In early October McCarthy claimed that "top secret army papers" had disappeared at Fort Monmouth; that there were "radar thefts," and "top defense secrets were stolen." Following that, some 40 employees were suspended or stripped of access to classified documents. After the closed hearings held by McCarthy in early November the FAS' Scientists' Committee on Loyalty and Security (SCLS), members of which had visited Ft. Monmouth to study the situation at first hand, made the following comment in a widely quoted press statement released by its chairman, Ernest C. Pollard of Yale:

"The announcement yesterday by Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens that no evidence of present espionage has been uncovered at the Army Signal Corps Engineering Laboratories at Ft. Monmouth, N. J., is a long-awaited but scarcely adequate clarification of a situation about which, we believe, the public has been insufficiently informed. The impression has arisen in recent weeks, from press reports of the McCarthy subcommittee investigation, that Ft. Monmouth is a center of continuing espionage and subversive activity. The Ft. Monmouth laboratories, which include the main army radar research center, are an essential factor in the development of the continental radar defense network which is being established by the government for the air defense of this country.

"The Scientists' Committee on Loyalty and Security is concerned since it is evident that this vital defense work has been

seriously disrupted by the suspension of a number of key scientists and by the atmosphere of suspicion and distrust which exists throughout the laboratories. While all possible precautions must be taken to prevent espionage and security leaks, the statement by Secretary Stevens renews confidence in the well-established army security program, and raises the question of whether the results achieved in sensational investigations are not more than offset by the very real and immediate damage to the defense program."

As background for its statement, the Scientists' Committee on Loyalty and Security noted that:

"1. No charges of actual espionage or real subversive activity have been made against any of the approximately 30 scientists suspended or the 10 scientists who have been transferred to unclassified work.

"2. The majority of the charges so far presented to those suspended have been: slight acquaintance with known or suspected communists, casual attendance at meetings or social functions, and organizational affiliations of relatives and friends. Many of the charges have been based only on hearsay.

"3. Some of those now suspended had previously been suspended but contested their case at considerable personal expense, and were ultimately cleared by an army review board. It is likely that some of these scientists will resign, even if cleared for the second time.

"4. The suspensions at Monmouth have hit hardest among the more highly skilled scientists in the upper civil service grades. Approximately one-fourth of the section chiefs in one of the three main laboratories have been suspended. Reports indicate that morale among the professional staff is very poor and that a high percentage of the scientists not implicated in the present investigation are now planning to seek employment elsewhere."

The action by the FAS' Council adopted in essentials the report of the Loyalty and Clearance Committee.

## New Cochran Group Puts Out Its Line

NEW YORK, Dec. 6—The Stalinoid faction recently expelled from the Socialist Workers Party, led by Bert Cochran, presented its views on December 4 to its first public meeting, attended by about 80 people.

Cochran, whose new outfit calls itself the Socialist Union of America, gave his speech in two strictly divided sections. The first was his own ritual version of the well-worn record, patented by J. P. Cannon, entitled "The Great and Thrilling Revolutionary Past of the American Proletariat."

In the second part, explaining the new Stalinoid group's perspectives and views, the main point that emerged was: Nothing much will change in America politically speaking until the catastrophe of war hits the country and the world; economic decline is taking shape but the multi-billionaires will never permit this to turn into an old-type depression; instead they will immediately plunge the country into the third world war; and this war will open the road to revolution.

This theory of revolution-through-the-catastrophe-of-war, as held by Cochran

and his co-thinkers abroad, is based on the ideas of Pablo (secretary of the now defunct Fourth International) that Stalinism is a revolutionary force. Once the war comes, the Stalinist bureaucracy will have to summon the workers to revolutionary struggle against capitalism; it will have to repeat on a world scale the "revolution" it made in East Europe after the last war; but this time it will have to proclaim international civil war as soon as war begins; etc.

However, while this bright prospect gleams ahead, in the U. S. between the present moment and the outbreak of war lies a bleak period during which the adherents of the group must not feel depressed; they must wait for the war and its blessings to follow.

More immediately, Cochran advised his supporters in New York to concentrate their activities on the Stalinist milieu, the CP and ALP, while elsewhere they should work within the main body of the labor movement. He did not mention the Pablo line of entering the CP in countries like France and Italy.

Among the audience were apparently quite a few out-and-out pro-Stalinists. The main burden of the comments from the floor was the "progressive and socialist" nature of Russia and its rulers. Indeed, the first person to take the floor, after praising "Professor" Cochran for his brilliant exposition of "Marxist thinking," urged him to be "more generous" in his attitude toward the Soviet Union and its leaders.

## BOLIVIA: THE RIGHTIST OPPOSITION IS GAINING

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Dec. 2—It has been hardly a few weeks since the abortive coup d'etat of the Falange Socialista Boliviana, the pro-fascist organization, which was supported by the whole bourgeois opposition, especially by the expropriated mine owners. The rightist "revolution" failed politically because the working-class and peasant masses are backing the Nationalist regime, in the belief that they are defending agrarian reform and mine nationalization.

It was the spontaneous intervention of the workers and peasants which saved the situation in the Cochabamba district, where young Falangists arrested Minister Lechin as the representative of the "Left" in the regime. In the capital La Paz, the house of President Paz Estenssoro was surrounded by the conspirators but he was not there. The coup could not win because the workers' and peasants' masses are opposed to the Falange, and the bourgeois opposition cannot win without the support of the masses.

But this opposition is growing together with the rise of inflation, the cost of living and the deep economic crisis of the country. The government will defeat the bourgeois opposition by itself turning to the right, and also with the help of the U. S., which has promised and sent a little food and provisions. This financial assistance from the U. S. is accompanied by a low price for the country's tin, and this is the primary reason for the economic crisis in Bolivia.

The Nationalist regime's policy — of heading off the rightist opposition by its own right-wing and pro-capitalist policy — might succeed under conditions of economic prosperity, but under present conditions this policy pushes the working masses into opposition, into their own opposition to the government, not into the rightist opposition. The effect of this will be a change in the position of the Bolivian "Left," of the Trotskyist section as well as the Stalinist.

In 1946 the defeat of the Villaroel government was made possible by the alliance between the rightist "liberal and democratic" camp and the Stalinist "left." Now the strength of the Paz government lies in the "Left's" support of the Nationalist party.

As we have explained before, the Bolivian Left never has been able to achieve an independent policy of its own; it has backed either the "democratic" camp or the Nationalist camp. This is probably a reflection of the political (especially ideological) backwardness of the Bolivian working class, which is now supporting the Nationalists out of disappointment with the sterility of the "Left." To a great extent this situation is due to the mistakes of the "Left," especially of the Stalinist PIR, especially the latter's capitulation (at the end of the war, on

orders from Moscow) to the "defense of democracy" line, and later its submissiveness before the bourgeoisie after the 1946 revolution.

The return of the Nationalist to power was made possible by the Stalinists' inability to achieve any of the promised social reforms, particularly agrarian reforms, in the years 1946-52. Thus Bolivian Stalinism relinquished any independent role of its own. This may also have been one of the reasons for the growth of the Trotskyist party, the POR.

But the mistake of the POR is the mistake of the Stalinists, in inverted form. While the Stalinists backed the rightist "democratic" camp, the Trotskyist POR supports the rightist Nationalist wing of the workers' and peasants' movement. Just as the Stalinists were unable to carry out their reform policy against the rightist camp, so also the POR is unable to carry out its own independent policy against the Nationalists. Because of the unconditional support which the "Left" gives to the Nationalists, it is now possible for the Paz regime to begin its turn to the right, after disarming the masses.

Now we can look for a turn in policy on the part of the bourgeois opposition. Given the bankruptcy of the pro-Franco Falange, the right-wing politicians may seek rapprochement with the Stalinists. On its side, the right turn on the part of the Nationalists will also push the Stalinists into opposition. A new alliance between the rightist opposition and the Stalinist "Left" seems to be the only way in which a defeat of the Nationalist regime will come about.

In this whole process, an accelerating role will be played by the U. S. State Department. Through the help which it does out to the Paz regime, accompanied by demands for the suppression of the Left, U. S. policy will speed up the defeat of the Nationalists and the victory of the right opposition.

Thus, as things are going on, the Trotskyist POR representatives have been suppressed in the trade-union federation, the Central Obrera Boliviana; and the POR paper *Lucha Obrera* was not published last week. Bolivia's foreign minister, Guevara, has made the declaration in New York that the Nationalist regime is "anti-Communist." The labor minister in the present cabinet is not a representative of the labor unions but a representative of the rightist "Catholic Action," who is used against the unions by the president.

People are talking now about a new devaluation of the currency, a step which would hit the workers and the peasants most of all. The Nationalist regime is frankly turning to the right, and the "Left" is passively waiting for a savior. The Trotskyist POR will probably pay for its pro-Nationalist policy in the same way that the Stalinists did—with its disintegration and disappearance from the political scene.

### The Handy Way to Subscribe!

## LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

- 1 year at \$2.  New  
 6 months at \$1.  Renewal  
 Payment enclosed.  Bill me.

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....

### A Basic Pamphlet—

## SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY

by  
Max Shachtman

Read it! 10 cents

Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

## Holiday Book Sale

The books on this list are either rare, or offered at reduced price for holiday clearance. Many items are in limited supply, and are offered on a first-come first-served basis. All orders must be accompanied by payment in full. Refunds will be made promptly if the item ordered is no longer in stock.

ANTI-DUHRING, by Engels (German) .....	\$2.50
THE BENDING CROSS, by Ginger (biography of Debs) .....	1.00
THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV, by Victor Serge .....	1.00
THE CASE OF LEON TROTSKY (Dewey Commission) .....	5.00
DECLINE OF AMERICAN CAPITALISM, by Corey .....	3.75
FONTAMARA, by Silone (hard covers) .....	2.50
HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION, by Trotsky (three vols., illus.) .....	20.00
THE IRON HEEL, by London .....	1.00
MOSCOU SOUS LENINE, by Rosmer (French) .....	2.50
ONE STEP FORWARD, TWO STEPS BACKWARD, by Lenin (paper) .....	1.00
THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION, by Trotsky (1st ed., paper) .....	5.00
MALENKOV, by Frazier (paper covers) .....	.16
THE REAL SITUATION in RUSSIA, by Trotsky (rare) .....	5.00
THE RED FRAUD, by Fred Beal (paper) .....	.50
RUSSIA TWENTY YEARS AFTER, by Serge (rare) .....	3.00
STALIN, by Trotsky (U. S. edition) .....	4.00
THE UAW AND WALTER REUTHER, by Howe and Widick (out of print) .....	3.50

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

# Bermuda Conference —

(Continued from page 1)

time had been had by all in this vacationers' paradise is not in itself evidence that nothing happened. Official communiqués are notoriously arid. But the army of press correspondents who surrounded the barbed wire that surrounded the conference have made clear that *this* time the official report was as complete as truth and honesty demanded.

The *New York Times'* columnist Anne O'Hare McCormick perked up a bit at the thought that the conference had brought the participants together "in the closest intimacy," but otherwise she noted that "it is significant that there was no suggestion from any quarter that it be repeated." She hands on "the general comment that the mountain had labored to bring forth a mouse."

The *Times* editorially said: Shucks, "the Bermuda conference was never intended for anything but a personal get-together and tour of the horizon by the Big Three statesmen."

Though the *N. Y. Herald Tribune* correspondent also called the affair "sterile," it is true that the three tourists utilized the occasion to accept the Russian bid for a meeting of the Big Four foreign ministers, a decision that had already been arrived at through the usual diplomatic channels before the tour of the horizon began.

Churchill apparently did not even raise his proposal for a meeting of the Big Four heads of state (rather than the foreign ministers). The knotty question of attitude toward China, on which the participants differ, was also apparently not even brought up. The problem of EDC and line on Germany came in for some small talk. France came away with nothing, except extremely hurt feelings.

## "POSITIVE" DECISION

Very unofficial communiqués from Bermuda reported that the best summary of the results was that "they shoulda stood in bed." More symbolically minded commentators mentioned that a member of the French delegation, who distrusted foreign food, had made the mistake of bringing canned tripe to Bermuda.

One of the "positive" elements ascribed to the talks is revealing in a negative way. We are told that the three statesmen agreed that the projected Big Four foreign ministers' meeting was not going to be allowed to become a propaganda forum for the Russians; they would walk out first, it was implied. But how is it that the Russians can threaten to make a "propaganda forum" out of the affair, while the "dynamic" Western semi-democracies cannot?

If the latter had anything to make "propaganda" about, they would not be loath to do so. The "dynamism" does not

seem to be on their side. There is nothing wrong with making "propaganda" at such a meeting—that is, utilizing the occasion to make clear to the world where the responsibilities for the world impasse lie. While it is true that the propaganda of the Russian totalitarians is a deception and a matter of demagoguery, the sad truth is that the Western capitalisms have no program for peace to offer, no inspiring examples or proposals for the extension of world democracy and security, and a justified lack of confidence in their own ability to pretend to these laudable qualities.

If the Stalinist system of terror and exploitation weigh more heavily than the Russians' demagogic words, so also on the other side the platitudes about freedom that come from the West are somewhat obscured by the U. S.-Fascist deal with Franco Spain, the crude imperialist suppressions by France, and the current terrorism of the British in Africa.

## END OF ANOTHER ILLUSION

The upshot of the Bermuda Conference, therefore, was that it dramatized and acted out the fact that the leading statesmen of the West have nothing to offer the world in the "crusade" which they proclaim. As long as the meeting had not yet taken place, people with illusions could hope that "something could be done" if they did get together; such well-intentioned people could even raise this demand as a "program" for peace.

That much is over with, then. From this point of view, the Bermuda fiasco was something of a disaster for the participants.

The bad taste in the mouth that this may have left behind, for the world, was only partially washed out by the Listerine gargle performed by Eisenhower before the UN, in his solo capacity as the Big One.

Formally, the aim of the speech was to present something new — the plan whereby all the atomic powers (including Russia) would contribute something to a stockpile of fissionable material to be held under the aegis of the UN and used by internationally associated scientists for developing peaceful uses for atomic power.

That would be very good, no doubt, if possible. Eisenhower scores a point just by bringing the matter up on a highly placed platform.

If, however, it has not been brought up before, that is not because no one had ever thought along these lines, but because the questions which it leaves unsolved make even this proposal a utopian one. That is, it becomes simply a "propaganda" proposal at the best—to use the term which the Big Three in Bermuda viewed with distaste.

Although, as one correspondent put it

truly, it was an attempt to "sidestep" the real problem in the world, it cannot effectively even sidestep. It will have to be demonstrated more cogently than Eisenhower did that international cooperation for the peaceful development of the atom is at all possible as long as atomic power exists in a world divided between two threatening war camps.

## THE DIFFICULTIES

The most obvious question that comes up to illustrate this is the simple one that Eisenhower himself raised in passing: where this atomic stockpile would be kept safe from seizure by one or the other war camp in case of the expected holocaust. It is unfortunate that this place must be on either one or the other side of the Iron Curtain. In a curious passage, the president hinted that this could be solved by some scientific gimmick. To tell the truth, we have read about such proposals in science-fiction (which has anticipated the idea) but unfortunately the solutions proposed in this field are not exactly practicable today.

A second difficulty is the question of control. Eisenhower suggested the UN; but the Russians have scornfully countered any proposals for atomic control by the UN with the truth that that agency is dominated by its enemies. This truth is used by the Kremlin to justify its own rejection of international control measures, but it is no solution to pretend that the UN is anything but what it is.

It is understandable that, the day after the speech, the representatives of more than one country allowed themselves to be quoted as having "grave doubts" about whether anything can come of it.

With sufficient pressure all around, a simulacrum of such a program can no doubt be patched up, with a few micrograms of uranium and a few scientists. And that would no doubt be good in itself, provided it does not persuade too many impressionable people that something real had been achieved on the road to peace.

## MISLEADING

It is interesting to note in this connection that at least two New York newspapers, in headlining the content of Eisenhower's proposal, summarized it in a way which was not what Eisenhower was proposing at all. Thus the *N. Y. Daily News* headlined, "Ike Asks World to Put All Its Atoms in One Basket." The president did nothing of the sort; he was not asking that the UN agency take over all atomic materials. He was modestly suggesting that the various countries contribute an atom or two (or an electron or two) to a world fund.

The *N. Y. Herald Tribune* was equally misleading with: "Eisenhower Bids World Bar Atom War by Depositing Key Materials with UN." This might give the impression that the idea was similar to the custom (which exists at least in cowboy movies) whereby the gunoters deposit their six-shooters at the door before entering the dancehall. But this is not the case either. The editors were trying to "make something" out of the proposal.

At the most, the hope which Eisenhower permitted to be expressed was the hope that through cooperation on the UN project the war camps might learn to "live together." And no doubt the co-operating scientists, if any, might learn to live together. But as a sentimental road to peace, we're afraid that it reminds one too forcibly of the hopes, sometimes expressed, that peace would flow if only enough students were interchanged between universities, or if only enough people learned the fairy tales or folk dances of another nation, or if only Esperanto became an international language, etc.

Aside from the formally new proposal in the speech, the propaganda aim of the speech was also to convince the suspicious peoples of Europe and Asia that these Americans are willing to talk to the Russians and negotiate, and not merely brandish atomic bombs.

Not since Roosevelt's days, perhaps, has an important American speech been so filled with the platitudes and generalities of international cooperation. Eisenhower did, in fact, what Adlai Stevenson had more or less suggested: make a play to persuade doubters that the U. S. was not closing the door on making a deal with the Kremlin.

## BID FOR A DEAL?

The U. S. "wants agreements," Eisenhower stressed; he reminded the UN of Washington's proposals for various negotiated deals with Moscow.

He even included, as possible bait, a

## 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!

## Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

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

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....

carefully worded passage which might be interpreted to mean that he was willing to include in such a deal a guarantee of Moscow's empire: "We never have, we never will, propose or suggest that the Soviet Union surrender what is rightfully theirs." He did not say what Russia had (what countries, what subject peoples) that was "rightfully theirs."

Behind all this talk, he did not, however, neglect to speak also "the language of atomic warfare." The one new thing the world learned was that the U. S. possessed H-bombs with the power of millions of tons of TNT; that it possesses atomic weapons ("increasing daily") which exceed "by many times" the explosive equivalent of everything which went off in all of Second World War; and he modestly mentioned that the U. S. would use these to "lay waste" an enemy's land (an "aggressor's," of course).

In the face of this threat, neither the Bermuda conference nor the Big One's UN speech had any answer that could bring peace to the world as long as it is divided between the two warmaking systems of capitalism and Stalinism.

# F.O.R. Backs ISL Case —

(Continued from page 1)

"Is to equate capitalism and democracy. It is the first time to our knowledge that an official government document has done this." The WDL statement in full reads:

"The Workers Defense League has taken the case of the Independent Socialist League as a means of challenging the whole procedure of the attorney general in setting up his list of subversive organizations."

"The list was drawn in the most undemocratic manner. No organization ever received notice that it was under consideration by the attorney general. None was even notified directly that it had been placed on a list. Thus these organizations never had an opportunity to examine any evidence against them, or to cross-examine witnesses who presumably gave allegedly damaging evidence to the attorney general.

"We are challenging the validity of the list itself, procedurally and politically. The WDL does not believe that the ISL is subversive and it should not have been added to the list under the Executive Order.

"After having seen the Interrogatories of the attorney general submitted to the ISL, this is even more apparent than before. What the administration has done is to equate capitalism and democracy. It is the first time to our knowledge that an official government document has done this."

Another proof of the concern felt about the issues here raised is the fact that the well-known Washington attorney, Joseph L. Rauh, member of the National Executive Committee of ADA, has undertaken to represent ISL in dealings with the Department of Justice and in the courts.

Additional evidence is the following statement by Norman M. Thomas in a letter to the attorney general:

"I understand that on your list of subversive organizations, the Workers Party (now the Independent Socialist League) has a place.

"Between that organization and myself and the Socialist Party U.S.A. there is at many points a sharp conflict. Nevertheless I want to protest the inclusion of the Workers Party in your list. . . .

"Now to my knowledge, the Independent Socialist League in its present form, and in its older form, the Workers Party, was a sharp critic of Stalinist totalitarianism and Stalin's methods. It was engaged in promulgating its own ideas without resort to conspiracy and deceit. I believe this fact can be established in a fair hearing, as I earnestly hope that the Workers Party, like some others, may be removed from your list."

(Full details about the case may be obtained from *Labor Action*, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, New York.)

(1) The National Council votes to communicate its concern about the principle and procedure of the Subversive List to the attorney general and, as occasion offers, to other government officials; and to inform the attorney general that it joins with WDL, Mr. Rauh, Norman M. Thomas and others in urging ISL be removed from the List.

(2) It calls the attention of our members to its action and urges them to act in line with it as opportunity presents itself.

(3) It authorizes the Staff, as time may permit, to call attention of other bodies such as the Social Action departments of Churches, etc., to this action.