

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 15, 1954

FIVE CENTS

A SPECIAL ISSUE ON INTERNATIONAL

Speeches by

THAKIN CHIT MAUNG
Burma's 'Declaration on Colonialism'

PURSHOTTAM TRIKAMDAS
Put Your Own House in Order!

MAX SHACHTMAN
America & the Imperialist-Chauvinist Mind

GEORGE HOUSER
Revolution Looms in South Africa

WALDO FRANK
The Stupidity of the Imperialists

A. J. MUSTE
The U.S. in Okinawa & Puerto Rico

American Voices Speak Out Against The Imperialism of Both War Camps

This special issue of LABOR ACTION has been turned over to a full report of the proceedings of International Freedom Day, the text of the speeches made at the rally in Community Church, New York City, on October 29.

We do this in the belief that it is of the greatest importance that American voices be heard that do not chime in with the monolithic American Party Line of imperialism—American voices that, at the same time, are not echoes of Moscow's rival brand of imperialism.

Under the aegis of International Freedom Day, there is an excellent opportunity for a gathering together of the widest possibly assemblage of anti-imperialist socialists, liberals and radicals to speak up, unitedly, against colonialism and foreign-policy reaction. We hope that the tradition, excellently established, will be continued.

This was the first International Freedom Day. Earlier this year, the Asian Socialist Conference issued an appeal for the setting aside of such an anti-colonial day during the month of October. To organize an American response to this call, a distinguished group of sponsors (listed elsewhere), acted to set up the rally. In their brief political declaration, which formed the motif of the rally, three basic points were stressed:

"They oppose the evils of 'colonialism, oppression, exploitation and political terror,' not only as practised by some nations, while abetting or condoning the same practices by others, but by whatever nation or whichever dominant military power bloc they may be practised.

"They hold that colonial and dependent peoples have the unconditional right to self-determination and freedom now, and not merely in theory and for some future date to be determined by others.

"They hold that Americans joining in the observance of an International Freedom Day have a clear obligation to register their protest not least against imperialist, oppressive and exploitive practices by the United States and American interests in Latin America and elsewhere in the world."

These three simple points, concisely and forcefully stated, have a dual character: They are obviously elementary prerequisites for anyone who wishes to call himself a genuine democrat or a sincere anti-imperialist; and yet, at the same time, they are sheer dynamite!

DEMOCRATIC TESTS

They are not only three ideas—they are three TESTS; elementary and ABC tests, but tests nevertheless. Only those who pass these tests can celebrate International Freedom Day without hypocrisy or mere lip-service.

There are too many "enemies" of colonialism and imperialism who furiously denounce imperialist oppression by the Western capitalist states, who tell the truth about it, who even do so courageously and sincerely—but who become mute and conscienceless when it is a question of the crimes of the rival imperialism of the Stalinist empire, of oppression of peoples by Moscow, of offenses by Mao's Peiping.



BOTTOM—The meeting at Community Church, Shachtman speaking. **TOP**—Left to right: George Houser of CORE and F.O.R.; Thakin Chit Maung of Burma; Purshottam Trikamdass of India; Max Shachtman, ISL; Waldo Frank, author and critic; & A. J. Muste, chairman.

True fighters for international freedom cannot confuse their own banners with such as these.

There are too many "enemies" of colonialism and imperialism whose hearts beat with mercy and good-will for all the peoples oppressed by their government; who are entirely in favor of "giving" these peoples their freedom some day; who even have only the best of intentions with regard to these victims of exploitation—but who somehow always have a reason why they cannot support freedom now, the immediate right to independence, the fight against imperialist domination that is going on. In all the imperialist states, including the U. S., there are also brands of "socialists" who find their "socialist" reasons for going along with imperialism just as the bulk of liberals find their "democratic" rationalizations.

True fighters for international freedom cannot confuse themselves with such as these.

There are too many "enemies" of colonialism and imperialism who are not only willing to speak out about the imperialism of the Stalinist war camp but are also willing to denounce the imperialism of their own country's allies in the cold war—but who somehow cannot see the resemblance between this "old-fashioned" imperialism and the role of the U. S., this country's role in Latin America, in Puerto Rico, in arm-twisting its noble allies in the UN and making them knuckle under to demands, in overthrowing a Guatemalan government by

force and violence, in substituting economic mastery for international aid.

True fighters for international freedom have earned the right to denounce imperialisms abroad only if they are first intransigent foes of their own government's transgressions.

Sad to say, there are not great masses in this country who can pass these three tests, elementary as they are, nor any mass movement which stands on the basis of a consistent and thoroughgoing democratic foreign policy in general. Indeed, from our Independent Socialist point of view, consistent and thoroughgoing adherence to a fully democratic foreign policy—if militantly carried through—inescapably leads toward revolutionary opposition to the capitalist status quo; and consistent anti-imperialism will lead to consistent socialist struggles.

But one of the features of the International Freedom Rally was indeed the fact that it brought together representatives of different viewpoints within the same framework. Labor Action's viewpoint, of course, was represented by Max Shachtman; and we print all the speeches here, not because we agree with all the ideas in all of them, but because International Freedom Day is an institution—must be made an institution—which will root itself in this country and which will help to rally people of varying political standpoints within the framework of anti-imperialist internationalism.

We dedicate this issue of LABOR ACTION to this endeavor.

SPONSORS

The following sponsored the International Freedom Day rally as individuals only; other information is for identification only.

- ROBERT ALEXANDER—Professor, Rutgers Univ.
- DAVID DELLINGER—Peacemakers.
- WALDO FRANK—Author and critic.
- ROBERT GILMORE—N. Y. American Friends Service Committee.
- IRVING HOWE—Author, editor Dissent.
- Rev. JOHN PAUL JONES.
- MURRAY KEMPTON—N. Y. Post columnist.
- CONRAD LYNN—Prominent civil-liberties lawyer.
- MAX MARTIN—National Chairman, Young Socialist League.
- C. WRIGHT MILLS—Prof., Columbia Univ.; author.
- A. J. MUSTE—Sec'y Emeritus, Fellowship of Reconciliation.
- JOAN PARNES—N. Y. Students for Democratic Action.
- A. PHILIP RANDOLPH—Pres., AFL Sleeping Car Porters.
- BAYARD RUSTIN—Staff, War Resisters League.
- MAX SHACHTMAN—National Chairman, Independent Socialist League.
- MEYER SCHAPIRO—Prof., Columbia Univ.
- GEORGE SHEPHERD—Sec'y, American Committee on Africa.
- ARLO TATUM—Exec. Sec'y, War Resisters League.
- ROWLAND WATTS—Sec'y, Workers Defense League.

THAKIN CHIT MAUNG

Member of the Executive, Socialist Party of Burma
Member of Burma's Delegation to the United Nations

BURMA'S 'DECLARATION ON COLONIALISM'

It is a privilege and an honor for me to join you this evening in your observance of this day to express your support of the right of self-determination by the colonial and dependent peoples. Since this is in answer to a call by the Asian Socialist Conference I am greatly heartened by this display of solidarity against colonialism, oppression and exploitation wherever it may occur. May I therefore thank the distinguished group of Americans for giving me this opportunity of addressing them on a subject which is very close to Burma's heart.

We were under colonial domination for one hundred years and we feel that we are fully qualified to speak on this subject. For this reason also we understand and sympathize fully with the many millions of peoples who are struggling to be free of this domination.

I will not try to tell you how colonialism came into Burma or elsewhere. I will only say that we in Burma, having gone through the mill ourselves, know that colonialism in all its forms, manifestations and brands is the absolute denial of all basic and fundamental human rights.

In other words, it simply means that because the peoples have lost their independence their future could and would be decided against their wishes. It also means that the country's resources would be exploited with cheap labor just for the benefit of the metropolitan powers. It further means the application of the doctrine of individual and national racial superiority, and the inevitable extension of spheres of interest.

It is therefore not surprising that colonialism has been the primary cause of two world wars and that it is still threatening a third.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is not an overstatement when the fate of many millions of Asians and Africans is involved. Apart from the underdeveloped conditions, it has never been sufficiently realized that these areas are danger spots for world peace.

We have evidence that peoples of these territories are showing more and still more impatience at the slowness of the rate at which they are being prepared to assume the responsibility of self-government. We have also seen these peoples becoming conscious of their political, economic and educational subjugation to a foreign power. In keeping with this consciousness their struggle for independence has grown more intense.

These are but indications that the world is getting restless, and unless early emancipation is granted by the colonial powers, the world may yet be faced with another crisis similar to that of Indochina.

New Colonial Dangers

This danger was foreseen by many powers and attempts were made to alleviate conditions at the end of the Second World War. These powers thought that their attempts would improve relations between the colonies and the metropolitan countries. We now see that this has been only a pious hope and mistaken thought.

We find instead that the new era has not materialized with the birth of new nations in Asia and Africa. We see further evidences that the colonial powers are trying to fasten on to the African colonies to make up for their losses elsewhere and in this process a new and even more dangerous form of colonialism has appeared on the scene.

This new form of colonialism is to establish small European communities, vest them with more political and economic rights and deprive the indigenous peoples of their land and reduce them to cheap laborers. We cannot help but deplore this tunnel, and to extend our sympathy and support to all those people who suffer under this indefensible system.

While referring to the continued existence of what might be called 19th-century-style colonialism, we cannot of course shut our eyes to the emergence of a new style of imperialism since the end of World War II. And all I have had to say about colonialism extends to this new brand as well.

Among those that have come into being to save the world from a further war is the United Nations Organization. It has established the principle of international accountability of members of the United Nations for the administration of non-self-governing territories. This applies to all territories whether or not they are brought under the international trusteeship system.

The specific obligations are listed in Article 73 of the United Nations charter. These include, among several, the obligations to ensure the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the people with due

regard to their native cultures; just treatment; protection against abuses and to development of self-government. It requires members to submit information on these matters to the General Assembly.

This undertaking admittedly goes beyond any previous international agreement. It is more definite and wider in scope. Further, the goal is ultimate self-government for these territories. It therefore is an international charter of colonial administration.

Burma is a member of the committee which examines such information. We believe that the committee has done solid and useful work in the fields of its competence. Though we have generally given our support, we still feel that there are numerous shortcomings which I will discuss later.

Promise and Fulfillment

The United Nations charter also provides for the establishment of an international trusteeship system. The objectives are very much the same except that it places on the United Nations the definite obligation to establish such a system and expressly provides for both accountability and supervision. It has further provided machinery of international supervision. The administering authorities submit reports to the Trusteeship Council for its consideration. The council in turn submits an annual report to the General Assembly. I am telling you all this just to remind you what measures have been taken to improve and gradually eliminate colonialism.

Now, what progress have we achieved so far? Certainly not enough to satisfy people like you and me who fully appreciate the difficulties and agonies of these peoples.

We have learnt to differentiate between promise and fulfillment. We have realized through our own experience that the burden of dependency is always irksome. But when recommendations designed to bring the indigenous peoples to self-government are thwarted, we know how painful the feeling of frustration really is.

Nine years is a long time in which to make great strides. Yet I doubt if sufficient progress has been made. On the plea that certain matters fall within the domes-

tic jurisdiction, the colonial powers have managed to get away with many things. These only sought to retard rather than further the welfare of the indigenous peoples.

There is still lack of participation by these peoples in the legislative system of their territories. In many territories these indigenous peoples have not yet been appointed in responsible administrative posts.

Anti-Imperialist Center

Economic progress has been slow and in certain territories there has been little or no development and exploitation of the territory's economic resources. Preferential treatment is still given to the European planters and companies. In several instances administering authorities grant such concessions to the non-indigenous people that enable them to have the monopoly on finance and trade. The same applies to the acquisition of land and agricultural development.

Foreign capital has been invested in the colonies only where the rate of return is so high as to be considered exorbitant. The high rate of return from these investments has in turn resulted in the colonial powers becoming increasingly reluctant to set the exploited colonies free.

And so the cycle has gone on. The result of this colonial economy is to be seen today. Most of the newly independent countries, having seen that colonialism and capitalism have gone hand in hand, continue to be fearful of foreign capital.

On the educational and social conditions, I must say there is still much to do. The educational programs of some territories must be reorganized to broaden and adapt them to the particular needs of the inhabitants. On the social side, race relations continue to be a very serious problem. For so long as the doctrine of racial supremacy is maintained, cooperative unions can never be brought about between groups of inhabitants. The continued existence of separate public facilities segregating the white and the non-white will definitely prevent the social unity of the territory.

As I have stated earlier, we in Burma, India and Indonesia are familiar with all the phases of colonialism and we know how comforting is even a single word of sympathy, leave alone support from friends outside. But we also know that mere resolutions by friends, whose sincerity is never at doubt, do not carry one much forward.

We have therefore set up an Anti-Colonial Bureau as an integral part of the permanent machinery of the Asian Socialist Conference. This bureau consists of a Coordination Committee of eleven members of whom six represent the Freedom Movement Organization and five members are from the Socialist Parties of Asia. So we have in the committee representatives from Malaya, Indochina, Asia and Kenya, Rhodesia and Nigeria and the Gold Coast of Africa. It is the task of this bureau to organize all help and succor to the freedom movements in different colonies considered necessary and desirable at a particular moment.

The bureau, with headquarters in Rangoon, has organized this year, with the cooperation of the Socialist International and other anti-colonial movements, to observe the Dependent People's Freedom Day on October 30 of this year.

At the conference concluded recently in Burma, a Declaration on Colonialism was passed unanimously.

(Turn to last page)

Chairman A. J. Muste Opens the Rally "Why International Freedom Day?"

Last spring a conference under the auspices of the Asian Socialist Conference called for an International Freedom Day, to be held in this month of October. The call issued by this Asian conference appealed to all parties to celebrate this day in the spirit of solidarity with "all peoples who are struggling against colonialism oppression, exploitation and political terror in all parts of the world."

Furthermore, the call said, "the right of peoples to self-determination is a basic principle of the democratic system of society. This right of self-determination hitherto regarded by imperialist nations as their exclusive privilege must be exercised equally by colonial and dependent peoples and satellite countries."

Now, this meeting tonight is a non-political meeting—perhaps in the sense in which President Eisenhower's meetings these days are non-political meetings. To speak more accurately, this meeting is not held under the sponsorship of organizations; it is held under the sponsorship of a number of individuals.

But it seemed appropriate that, to this call issued by Asian socialist parties, there should be some response on the part of Americans—even at this time when the interest and time of a great many people are occupied in the election campaign, and when there are also people in this country who think that it is better just to stay away from meetings of all kinds.

It seemed appropriate that there should be some response to a call like the one that I have read, from Americans who in a broad sense are probably agreed on the proposition that they are opposed to exploitation and domination of one people by another, by whomever such exploitation or domination may be exercised; people who, speaking in terms of the present world situation, do not regard exploitation and domination as something democratic when it happens to be exercised by the

United States; but people who also do not regard exploitation and domination to be somehow progressive when it is exercised by the Soviet Union or other countries of the Communist bloc.

It seemed appropriate that there should be a response to this Asian call from Americans who believed in self-determination, and independence of peoples not in some "sweet by-and-by" but in the political present; and people who believe that, when one man is riding on the back of another man, it is not for the man who is doing the riding to determine when the other man is ready to carry the heavy burden of self-determination and independence, but that it should be the man who is being ridden who ought to determine whether he is able to carry the heavy burden of self-determination and independence rather than the burden which he happens to be carrying.

Similarly it seemed appropriate that there should be some response to the Asian call on the part of Americans who are probably basically agreed in being opposed to militarism, in being opposed to military preparation, in being opposed to atomic and super-atomic war, by whomever such military preparation may be carried on and by whomever such war might be waged; people who do not consider that an atomic weapon or an H-bomb somehow takes on a democratic and Christian content if it is produced in the United States, and who equally do not believe that an A-bomb or an H-bomb takes on a progressive or a truly revolutionary character if it happens to be produced in the Soviet Union.

At any rate, a number of us have participated in sponsoring a call to this meeting, in response to the call from Asia for the observance of an International Freedom Day.

We are glad to welcome you; we are glad to welcome the speakers this evening, and particularly to welcome the speakers who come to us from Burma and from India.

PURSHOTTAM TRIKAMDAS

Member of the Executive, Praja Socialist Party of India
Adviser to India's Delegation to the United Nations

PUT YOUR OWN HOUSE IN ORDER!

It gives me great pleasure to be with you here tonight, to meet people in the United States who are equally keen regarding the fight for freedom.

I'm not going to speak to you merely about the freedom which the colonial people lack, the exploitation from which they suffer. I am going to speak to you about the existing threats to freedom not merely to the colonial peoples but also to the peoples all throughout the world. And unless we realize that the world cannot be half free and half slave, in the memorable words of Abraham Lincoln, freedom will always be fighting a losing cause.

Among the threats to freedom—you will be very familiar with most of them, but I'll just enumerate them—is imperialism, which exists and did exist in various forms, and will continue to exist in various forms, unless the people who are threatened with being exploited and robbed will not tolerate any kind of imperialism so far as their countries are concerned.

There's the other threat which passes under the name of colonialism; according to some people it is a passing phase. To my mind it is very far from a passing phase.

And in this connection I might mention that there are two types of colonies. There is one type of colony where people of a foreign nation come in and dominate a large section of the native population in order to exploit that population. They do not intend to live there; they do not intend to make it their home. All that they want is to make a profit out of the misery of the natives of that country, who become helots, who become second-class citizens.

Types of Colonialism

In addition to this kind of colonialism, there's the other type of colonialism in which you actually colonize—colonize in the sense that you intend to settle. And the problems of countries in which the second type of colonization has taken place are much more difficult, because those who have colonized and settled have appropriated lands to themselves, have seen to it that the natives will work for them as slaves or semi-slaves; and the climate is suitable for them to settle, so they intend to make these territories their home.

I'll take an example from Africa, where the Britisher went merely for the purpose of exploitation and where he has indeed exploited for a few hundred years. Now, because the world is changing, he is willing to show that he has turned over a new leaf, and he is willing to leave, and leave the African people—say, in the Gold Coast or Nigeria—to go on themselves.

But few people are aware that in the Gold Coast or Nigeria no white man is permitted to stay for more than 18 months, because it is believed that if he stays for more than 18 months he's sure to die. Every man who goes there, whether he's a trader or a civil servant, is compelled to go on long leave at the end of 18 months. And therefore, so far as these territories are concerned, the British are rather magnanimous and are showing that they are taking the Gold Coast and Nigeria on the way to self-government.

But come to the other side of Africa: There we have the classic example of South Africa, about which I understand a friend who is sitting here [George Houser] is going to speak to you. In South Africa a handful of white population is today exploiting and controlling millions and millions of the native population, who

have no rights, who are merely there in order to serve their masters; and yet we are told that this is a self-governing dominion—one of the frauds that has been perpetrated by the British in the colonial history of the world.

They are now trying to perpetrate the same fraud in Central Africa, where they have set up a federation in which, again, the dominating voice is the voice of a handful, a few thousand, of British settlers, while, so far as the natives and the colored populations are concerned, nominal rights are given but it is seen to, in effect, that those rights cannot be exercised.

Semi-Slaves

And in Kenya who has not heard of the Mau Mau? Now, trained as I am under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, I believe that non-violence can work miracles. But conditions differ, and I am not prepared therefore to say that under all circumstances and at all times and all regimes non-violence is the only remedy.

In East Africa today the position of the unfortunate native is such that he is treated, again if I may say so, as a semi-slave. He gets no education, no skilled job, no schools; what few schools he has put up have been all closed down. And all this because a handful of white settlers have gone there, robbed the African of his land. The country has a salubrious climate—I'm told the highlands are as good as England—and therefore the Englishman would not like to leave these countries.

That illustrates why the problem of colonies of this type is more difficult to settle. There is no question of anybody's belief in democracy or freedom or self-determination. This is the self-determination of the few whites who have come and settled there, and that's all that matters in this kind of colonial regime.

Along with colonialism comes racialism. (I'm merely enumerating this because I know there wouldn't be time to elaborate any of these things.) Racialism is rampant in Africa. You are also not unfamiliar with racialism here.

Enemies of Freedom

I'm glad and happy, however, that so far as this country is concerned, most of the people who claim to call themselves educated or civilized are ashamed to support racialism in any form or of any kind; and therefore while racial segregation does exist in this country, there is a great deal of hope that so far as the United States of America is concerned, the racial problem may be solved by the good will and understanding of the people today who consider themselves to be superior to their fellow beings and their fellow citizens who at one time may have been in the position of underdogs or slaves.

In addition to this, in certain of the so-called backward countries, we also have feudalism. That is also a denial of freedom to the large masses of people, and those of us who are freedom-loving and who believe in the freedom of mankind must set our hearts against helping the tottering feudal regimes in any way.

Billions of pounds or dollars may be poured into these areas in the hope that the feudal lords are going to be bulwarks of American democracy. Believe me when I say that the dollars are going down, the drain. Feudalism can never be a bulwark of democracy, however fondly you may imagine the feudal lords to be pro-democratic. They may be anti-Communist, but they are so utterly incapable of any kind of action, much less concerted action, because their own peoples are not with them, that they are at best a very weak stick to lean on in order to be ranged on the side of the so-called democratic nations.

In addition to all this there is also the other kind of danger which passes in the world today under the name of communism, totalitarian communism. Personally I have

no objection to the right type of communism. I hope I will not be served with a notice to quit this country because I say that personally I have no objection to the right type of communism.

And I shall explain at once what I mean by the right type of communism, the ideal communist society of equality, freedom, democracy—that's what the word communism used to convey to me, years ago, when I was in college, when I entered politics, and we used to be fired by the idea that communism and the communist society was a very ideal society.

The Stalinist Perversion

But the present perverted form of what passes under the name of communism is not communism at all—it may be some kind of giant state-capitalism, which brings totalitarianism and its police regime along with it, and converts its own people into slaves. I have told you about converting other people into your slaves, but this kind of danger exists today to even the so-called free peoples—free in the sense that they have no foreign domination over their heads—the danger of becoming slaves to a few individuals or a group of individuals who, in the name of proclaiming freedom, are doing nothing but enslaving their own fellow citizens. And this process is going on throughout the whole world where totalitarianism has triumphed.

But the pity of the whole business is that there are many people—intellectuals, the so-called intelligentsia—who, if anything comes from the totalitarian side, are so overwrought by the idea that unless they side with them they are not being "progressive," that they come forward as apologists for anything that the totalitarians might do. This is a great danger, because these people, if you ask them to examine their own beliefs and their own hearts, will tell you, "We believe in freedom, we believe in democracy, we are radicals, we are what-not," but they are so thoroughly confused, or are suffering so much from a kind of inferiority complex, that in order to prove that they are "progressive," they support something which they believe to be ideally progressive although it is in fact nothing but a theory of enslavement in the world today. And we therefore have got this kind of menace too.

Now in order to meet these dangers, what have you got to do? You have got to put your own house in order first, if I might say so.

When I say your own house, I do not mean America. I mean every one of us. We have got to put our houses in order.

And if there is any kind of exploitation which is going on in our respective homes, unless we cleanse our homes, our own countries, from that kind of exploitation, you cannot point the finger at somebody else: "Ah, he's not allowing his people to be free." The answer will be the usual retort: "What about you, my dear Mr. Uncle Sam? You've got a large number of people who are unemployed, underemployed, exploited."

You might tell the Russians, "Well, you've got so many people who are in prison camps." Well, their answer will be: "You also have a lot of people who are exploited, people who are segregated, and so on."

Our Own House

The same would be the case with every country. I'm not one of those people who merely wants to point his finger at other people.

In my own country we have the problem of the depressed classes. They were treated worse than animals. Their treatment was perhaps no better than the treatment given to the Negroes and the colored population in this country at the worst of American times of frenzy.

But my country also realized that these social injustices do not make for freedom, do not make for democracy, and with that realization my country, so far as the constitution is concerned, has banned that kind of segregation, that kind of separatism.

To be sure, it exists even today to a large extent in villages, because you may make a good law but it takes time to enforce that law and change the outlook of the people; but there is nobody in India today who will stand up and apologize for that system. And that again is in the right direction toward the freedom of the people.

And wherever there is this kind of exploitation or segregation, unless we put up a fight against it, unless we stand up and say we will not have it, we are not going to have freedom. Freedom, if we might say so, is indivisible in the world, which is growing smaller and smaller with the methods of communications that are coming up.

And if we are to believe the power blocs, we are today faced with two alternatives: one is slavery; the other is an atom bomb. The colossus is standing and bestriding

(Turn to last page)



LABOR ACTION

November 15, 1954
Vol. 18, No. 46

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: BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL

Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

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

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

MAX SHACHTMAN:

The United States and

We are happy to respond with enthusiastic solidarity to the call of the socialists of Asia to this International Freedom Day.

Those who sponsored this meeting signed their names to a compact and powerful statement of opinion and purpose that is printed at the bottom of the leaflet announcing this assembly. The heart of the statement is the declaration (I quote it): "Support self-determination and freedom for all peoples NOW."

I stress the word *now*. The declaration is of the most vital and world-wide importance, in this veritable volcano of turbulence and terrifying threats, of crises and conflicts, under which we all live today.

If it were not such an indelicate—not to say illicit—word to use in the United States now, I would go so far as to say that it is a revolutionary declaration. I don't say that. [Laughter.] It would not be inappropriate under other circumstances.

To subscribe to this declaration, to mean it seriously, to live by it, to act up to it in the realities of social and political life today—the man who does that alone has the full right to be regarded as a genuine democrat. The man who opposes it, or abjures it, or supports it in an abstract unobligating way, or who drowns it in sterilizing and frustrating reservations—he forfeits the right to be considered a democrat, and the word democracy on his lips is hollow and deceptive.

The importance of the idea expressed in the words I have quoted cannot be overstated. I know of none other in the realm of present political reality which equals this idea for its decisiveness as an infallible test of men and movements.

There Is a World Revolution

This holds true not less for the United States, but more here than almost anywhere else. We're supposed to be the outstandingly anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist country of all the big powers in the world. Compared to the other big ones, we have no colonies or practically no colonies—a source of great regret to some.

We hark back to the tradition of the great battle of the 13 American colonies for independence and the right of self-determination in the 18th century. And in the name of this tradition many people, including among them a prominent and eminent member of the Supreme Court of the United States, call upon the United States to take the leadership of the world revolution now going on. And there is indeed a world revolution today—not in the United States, I hope everyone understands [laughter]—everywhere except in the United States, there is a revolution going on. And one of its most important aspects is the rebellion of the old colonial, semi-colonial and dependent peoples, the hundreds of millions who make up the majority of mankind, and who have been deprived of national independence for generations, or who never even enjoyed it.

And reaction cannot understand this revolution. It cannot understand that the era of empires is at an end. And it cannot understand that these hundreds of millions of "backward" peoples—whom they consider doubly backward because they're not white but colored—will never allow the restoration of empires again.

We Suck In Poison

Now, to lead this revolution, of which so many in the United States talk, is a noble work; it brings man closer to human dignity and freedom. But before the United States, and anyone else, can even talk of leading such a revolution, we must first undergo a revolution here. (You understand that even now, even though I have accustomed you to the use of the word a little bit, I whisper it [laughter].)

A revolution here is required to purge ourselves of poisons that devour us and make us today the most suspected and even disliked nation and people in the world. This is an ugly fact which nobody even attempts any longer to deny, and about which returned travelers speak with great mystification in the interviews which they give to the American press upon their arrival back.

That poison is our chauvinistic imperialist mentality. It is in all of us to one degree or another, because we suck it in, or rather it is injected into us, from school days onward.

Someone has said that fascism will come to the United States in the name or under the banner of anti-fascism. That I don't know. But I do know this: that imperialism is the essence of American foreign policy, and the essence of the thinking of 99 per cent of us, *in the name of anti-imperialism*. Anti-imperialism in the United States today—on the lips of everybody, especially politicians, especially demagogues—means one thing primarily, if not exclusively: it means opposition to *Russian* imperialism, opposition to Stalinist imperialism.

Now that's very cheap in the United States; that's very easy; that's very convenient; and in some circles that's very essential. It is the bread of political life for many; for some it is even the bread of life. But that's not anti-imperialism at all.

Cheap Anti-Stalinism

In the days prior to the Second World War and even after it broke out, Japanese imperialism, one of the most depraved and predatory in the world, was fiercely anti-British-imperialism in India. They "could not understand" how the Indians tolerated the imperialist rule of the British, and as far as they, the Japanese, were concerned they would do everything in their power to help the British be pushed out of India. Not the Japanese out of Korea—the British out of India! They were opposed to British imperialism, yet very few people were deceived about their own imperialist nature.

Hitler, I remember, and Goebels used to rant about the British in India, and what they're doing to the Indian people, the "Aryan" Indian people; and they were for everybody getting out of India except the Indians themselves—but not for Germans getting out of Poland, first because the Poles are not "Aryans" and because they were not human but pigs, and they were being taken care of by German swineherds.

Now we, for our part, are opposed to Russian and Stalinist imperialism — unreservedly unhesitatingly, and through and through. We're for the freedom of those peoples and nations who are dominated and ruled over, militarily, politically and economically and socially and every other way, by the Kremlin. We're for the national freedom and independence of the long-suffering Polish people, of the Czechs, Hungarians, Bulgarians, the Latvians, Lithuanians and Estonians—all those many ancient and honorable peoples who've been deprived of their national independence by the Russian ruling class.

That's excellent. That's necessary. Whoever is not for it, loses title to being a democrat.

The Overlords of Civilization

But what about British imperialism? What about their rule of Kenya in general and their hounding of the Mau Maus and Kikuyus in particular?

The English gentlemen at home ride to hounds against the Fox; that distinguishes them from the common cockney; that shows the breeding of the English gentlemen at home. In Africa he rides the Kikuyus. And for anyone killed with a rifle—or better yet with a pistol, because that brings you nearer—there is a bounty. That's what's called bringing "Judeo-Christian civilization," which we are defending in the cold war, to the heathen Kikuyu.

In Malaya the British hold a whole community, a whole village, collectively responsible for what are considered the misdeeds of a native who lies in ambush against a British trooper—who, as you know, is bringing "order" to Malaya, as he has for I-don't-know-how-many generations.

In Hong Kong, the British are still there to this hour; they say they want to give it up, they're dying to give it up, but how can you give it up if the ones who will take over will be the Stalinists? And it isn't that we want to be in Hong Kong, it isn't that we want to control Hong Kong, we want to save it, to spare it from the ignominy and suffering that it would have under the Chinese Stalinists. Every child knows that—at least every English child is taught that; every

"THERE ARE TWO AMERICAS"

the Imperialist-Chauvinist Mind

American child is taught that; every American adult believes that, pretty near.

And French imperialism, our other great ally, in North Africa—it will not leave. There are efforts made—not altogether of a non-violent kind, I regret to say—to induce it to leave; but it will not leave.

Who Are Our Allies?

The natives of the North African colonies come to the United Nations and ask that their case be heard. The United States is deaf. We cannot antagonize an ally. Which ally? The North Africans? No. They're not our allies. Who then? The French. That is, it's not that we're not for the freedom of the North Africans—of course we're for their freedom—but can we afford, in the interest of freedom for backward people, to lose a great (and I should add, a powerful) ally like France, a nation capable of standing up for itself in a fight with anybody, be it the Germans or the Indochinese or anybody else?

We're for the North Africans—even Eisenhower admits it in an indirect way; Dulles has been known to whisper it to his immediate family—but we can't say that publicly because we'd lose a white ally, and gain whom? Berber tribesmen or natives, picturesque people whom we see in Hollywood movies with bur-nooses and ancient rifles, not modern war equipment as the French have from the stores given them by the United States.

And above all we can't lose Moroccan air bases which we now enjoy, can we? We must have these air bases, because how else will we be able to bomb the Russian people into nothing? From Idlewild? Too far!

We need the Moroccan air bases, and every idiot knows, every idiot realizes, the importance of wiping out the Russian people as quickly and efficiently as possible, if and when this deplorable war comes. In fact *only* idiots realize the importance of that!

We Humanitarians

We have Okinawa now. Is it because we want to rule the Okinawans? Of course not. We oppose imperialism, we're against colonies, we have a great tradition, 1776—but we need Okinawa for a base. It is not our fault if God, or someone else, placed a lot of Okinawans on Okinawa, instead of leaving it there just as a base so we wouldn't have to offend the people whose island we occupy.

Take atom-bomb tests: Every intelligent idiot knows that you have to have atom-bomb tests otherwise you wouldn't know which is bigger and bigger and bigger—

Well, where will you hold them? The indicated place is Eniwetok, the Pacific islands. They're convenient isles, they're just about the right size—for the time being.

We drop a bomb—excuse me (I forgot), we humanitarians take the people (heathens, by the way) off their island and we transfer them to a safe place, another island. Their lives have been spent on their own island but the other island, so far as *we* can see, is just the same as this island; they can't lose anything by the shift. And then we drop the bomb—the island disappears—and that's one for us, because no Russian island has yet been made to disappear.

Why Not Cape Cod?

Now why is it taken for granted by all of us—While its unpleasant of course, but interesting, to wipe out an island in the Pacific in order to have the atom-bomb test, why don't we have an atom-bomb test in the Atlantic? Say, Cape Cod? Why not?—Everybody laughs. Why not?

That is, first you take the people of Cape Cod off, and bring them to the rest of Massachusetts safely. Because we're humanitarians. Besides, these aren't pagans or heathens, they are "Judaeo-Christians." We bring them to Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont; and then bomb the islands off the coast of the Atlantic. Why not?

Why not? People here—people there; island here—*island there*; ocean here—*ocean there*; I don't see why not. The possible explanation is that—as we say to the Asian people, above all the Moslems, that they should join us in the fight for Judaeo-Christian civili-

zation (a thing that the Moslems are panting to do)—we are bringing Judaeo-Christian bombs to the Pacific islands, while it's not necessary to bring them to Cape Cod, inhabited exclusively by Puritans.

We think like imperialists!

It's a joke that we should drop the bombs in or near Cape Cod, isn't it? But we take it for granted: Drop it in the Pacific! Normal! And when the Japanese, or the peoples of those islands, complain to the United Nations: "*What have you done?*"—we don't understand it. If someone was hurt by accident, we offer him (or his family, his heirs) absolutely genuine American money. We don't see what in hell they're complaining about; they're getting paid for this.

We act like imperialists; we allow the government to act like imperialists, this one, the one that came before it, and the one that hopes to replace it.

The Scandal Is Silence

Isn't Guatemala and what we did there a scandal? What's the biggest scandal? Our silence; the silence of the liberals, their miserable silence; the silence of the labor leaders, their miserable silence!

And what did they actually say? They didn't say in so many words in public that which they said stammering among one another: "True, we intervened—disgraceful—but the Russians intervened before us. . . ." Where? No Russians there!—Oh, Stalinists, Communists—same thing.—Well, *are* they Communists?—Doesn't matter, more or less the same thing—besides Latin America is our private preserve.

This statement deepens the passion which all people of Latin America have for what they call the *Norteamericanos*, for us, since we consider it our private preserve—to go in, to go out, to drive in, to drive out, at any time we please, as we see fit.

I say to you: Opposition to Stalinism is worthless, worthless and worse than worthless, necessary though it is, unless it is accompanied by and inseparably connected with equally firm opposition to imperialism everywhere, including that of our allies, and including that of the support that we give to our allies who are imperialist.

We are for the revolution of all the oppressed and disfranchised peoples of all the nations. Are we for violence, because they are violent, rather? No, we ourselves are against violence. We have been preaching pacifism for generations and decades, we socialists, to the imperialists. We have said: "Stop using violence; if you want to gain your ends, do it pacifically." We are still busily engaged in preaching pacifism to the imperialists: "Do not employ violence against the peoples; do not prohibit them from gaining their legitimate aims." Watch for the reaction of the people to such preachments!

The U.S. Is Not United

But pacifists or not—whether you're a pacifist from our point of view, that of socialism, or from another—I say as solemnly as I can on this International Freedom Day:

Let us let no opportunity go by without showing the colonial and oppressed peoples that the United States is NOT united, that there are TWO United States, that of the equivocators and supporters and apologists of imperialism and colonialism—and that of true democrats, true socialists, people who meaningfully and purposefully subscribe to the statement of the sponsors which I quoted at the beginning of my remarks; whose hearts are warm at the sight of an enslaved people anywere and everywhere resisting the imperialist yoke and throwing it off their necks; whose arms are stretched out in unhesitating comradely support for such people.

Onward toward the national independence, national sovereignty and freedom of choice of all people, the old ones and the new ones, the advanced and the so-called backward ones, toward national independence and freedom of choice without reservations of any kind and without delay of any kind—there lies the path on which we can march to the ideal of the brotherhood of man, not only as a passionate aspiration of millions tormented and anguished by the alien yoke, but as a common lot of equal peoples all over the world.

Speaking of H-Bomb Tests . . .

CHICAGO, Nov. 1 (AP) — James R. Arnold, assistant professor at the University of Chicago Institute for Nuclear Studies, suggests any more U. S. tests held in this country—where any casualties would be American citizens.

Referring to radiation casualties among Japanese fishermen and Marshall islanders from an H-bomb explosion last March 1, Arnold said the tests should be conducted within the nation's boundaries because it is not fair to expect others to incur attendant risks.

"A nation which feels itself in danger has some right to ask certain of its citizens to run special risks in behalf of all," Arnold said. "This is the principle behind compulsory military service."

He did not suggest a specific American site.

Arnold said he does not expect the government to accept his recommendation on hydrogen bomb tests.

He made it, he said, "in an effort to arouse the American conscience."

In his article, he criticized the U. S. government for what he called lack of honesty in not admitting the seriousness of injuries to Japanese fishermen and about 200 Marshall Islanders.

One of the fishermen dusted by atomic ash died of what Japanese doctors called radiation sickness.

—N. Y. Post

Have You Read Labor Action's Pamphlet-Issues?

- No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism.
 - No. 2—Independent Socialism and War.
 - No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis.
 - No. 4—Socialism and Democracy.
 - No. 5—What Is Stalinism?
- 10 cents each

EVERY WEEK —

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

appears as a section in all regular issues of Labor Action.

Published, and independently edited, by the Young Socialist League.

it is the only socialist youth weekly in the country.

Don't miss it!

AMERICA'S LEADING MARXIST REVIEW

The New International

In the current issue:

- Max Shachtman: Two Revolutions—A Review of Isaac Deutscher (II)
 - Albert Gates: The Crisis of American Socialism
 - A. Stein: France and American Foreign Policy
 - T. N. Vance: The Counterfeit Concept of Countervailing Power
- \$2 a year 35¢ a copy

NEW INTERNATIONAL
114 West 14 Street, New York City

GEORGE HOUSER

National Projects Sec'y, Fellowship of Reconciliation
Chairman, Committee of Racial Equality

REVOLUTION LOOMS IN SOUTH AFRICA

Although I spent the last two months visiting colonial areas in Africa where the British and the Belgians and the Portuguese and the French hold sway, I think it is logical tonight to speak directly to the South African situation. I think it is logical for two reasons.

The first is that if one is to characterize the meaning of the struggle which is taking place in South Africa today, it must be understood in terms of a national struggle. That is, it has more similarity with the kind of struggle which took place for freedom in India, or the struggle which is taking place in the Gold Coast for freedom from the British, than it would have with certain other revolutions, such as (say) the Russian or the French Revolution. And I say this in spite of the fact that the struggle taking place in South Africa is within one country, where the white people who are living there are as much at home—most of them—as the Africans themselves.

One cannot understand the struggle in South Africa without understanding that the masses of people, the Africans who live there, approximately 9 million of them, other non-whites amounting to say a million and a half, are brought together as a group—a self-conscious, racial, national group—because of the exploitation of them by the minority, some 2½ to 3 million whites who are living there as permanent settlers and who think of themselves as only citizens of South Africa and not citizens of some other country in the world.

I think this was revealed in many things which I saw. One incident which brought it quite vividly to my attention: a discussion which I had with a rather well-to-do African doctor living in the Sophiatown area, one of the Western Areas of the city of Johannesburg.

This town of Sophiatown is one of the very few areas in the Union of South Africa where it is possible for an African person to own land. Traditionally Africans have been able to own land since the early 1900s in Sophiatown. And this rather well-to-do doctor, who is well-to-do enough to have African servants of his own, owns this piece of land.

But quite recently the government has proclaimed that Sophiatown and a couple of other towns in the Western Areas of Johannesburg are to be a white area. One of the reasons why this was done under the Native Resettlement Act was, of course, to take the property-holding rights away from the African people who own property only in this area. And therefore it has been stated that within a 6-months period—whether it will be done within this period or not is another question—but within a six months period, all of the African people, amounting to some 70,000 of them, who live in these Western Areas of Johannesburg, must move.

At an Advanced Stage

And this well-to-do doctor—with a home which I imagine at least upper-middle-class Americans would be very proud to live in—a large home—will also have to move. I talked with this doctor, and he said: "If I am to move out of my place here, it will be because I am carried out."

Therefore one cannot characterize this kind of a struggle as a class struggle, because it is not at this point essentially a class struggle. The people are not thinking in terms of a basic change in the economic order at the present time. They want equality of wages, they want equality of working conditions, they want decent opportunity for jobs, they want decent housing, they want equality within the political structure, but they are not asking for an economic revolution understood in a class sense at the present time.

And therefore whether a person is working at 3 shillings a day in the mines on the outskirts of Johannesburg, or whether he has an income of several thousands dollars a year as a doctor or a dentist or a teacher or some other professional person, the fact is that because of their race and therefore because of their nationalism, non-whites are drawn together in a group. We are discussing the problem tonight of the struggle of dependent peoples for freedom, and therefore it is logical to spend some time discussing the problem in South Africa.

Now there is a second reason why it seems to me it is very logical to discuss South Africa in particular in this setting. And this is the fact that the struggle in South Africa of the people for freedom has advanced to a further stage than in any other multi-racial area on the continent of Africa.

It was like a breath of cool wind on a very hot summer afternoon to go into South Africa after having been in the colonial areas of French rule, but even more

specifically of Portuguese and Belgian rule in Africa; because all of a sudden one was thrown into a world and into a community in which there were all kinds of organizations: the African National Congress, the South African Indian Congress, the Congress of Democrats, the Institute of Race Relations, the Non-European Unity Council, the All-African Convention, the Liberal Party, and many other groups that could be mentioned. Any one of us who has been connected with cause organizations fighting for social justice here in the United States would feel right at home if we found ourselves in South Africa. Except that we would find that the struggle is more tense there at the present time than we have found it here, at least within our lifetime; that is, the possibility of the struggle coming to a head in the very near future is upon the people of South Africa in a sense that we have not experienced here recently in the United States.

One saw this sense of struggle, this sense of cause-consciousness, and felt it immediately upon arriving in South Africa. A very simple incident: an African was crossing a street in downtown Johannesburg, and a white man driving his car went rather too rapidly around the corner without looking, almost hit the African; the African jumped back; and then—the thing which could not have happened anywhere else, at least that I experienced in Africa—the white man stopped his car momentarily, and the African went up to him and leaned in the window and shook his hand at him and told him that he ought to watch out how he was driving the car. And that just wouldn't happen in most places, and it was something which had almost revolutionary meaning to it, to me, as I saw this incident take place.

Revolutionary Forces

I went into the office of one of the vaguely liberal organizations on the South African scene, and there I talked with an African employee of the organization, a man whose job depended on not going too far out on the limb of radicalism. And yet when the Defiance Campaign came along in 1952, led by the African National Congress and the South African Indian Congress and the South African Colored People's Organization, this particular African employee of this vaguely liberal organization, who stood not only to lose his job but also to be put in prison for a period of time if he participated in the Campaign, volunteered his services to the committee that was planning the projects of non-cooperation with the unjust laws because he felt that the place for him was by his fellow men who were struggling against the injustices that exist in South Africa.

This too was something which one would not find in the same sense in other countries at the present time in this way, but one found it certainly in the South African situation.

Driving down a road past the mines in Johannesburg, on a wall there were the words written in red letters: "Defy unjust laws!" And I received a letter just today from a friend of mine in South Africa who said that apparently some new organization, at least an organization that is working not quite openly at this point, is putting out similar signs to this, painting them in all parts of Johannesburg—this again an indication that things are in motion in South Africa in a way that one did not find in other parts of the continent.

Now there are many other things of this kind which could be mentioned, that indicate the extent to which the people are in motion. The people realize that the struggle is taking place, they realize that they are in the vanguard of those who, some time, will bring a new national democratic regime to South Africa.

I want to go on to say now that while I was in South Africa my basic analysis of the situation there did not greatly change. When I went to South Africa I felt that the situation was one in which a national revolution was at least potential, and I came away with the same feeling, because the forces which exist in South Africa today are inevitably making for some kind of national revolution. The psychology of the situation is revolutionary in itself.

I met, while I was in French Equatorial Africa, a month or two before I arrived in South Africa, a South African white businessman, in the timber business. We were in the same small community together where there were not too many people who spoke English, so we had quite a time to talk with one another, and he told me some of his feelings about the situation in South Africa. Here was a successful businessman with a five-year-old son, who said, "There is no future for the white person in South Africa. I therefore am trying to make a way so that my five-year-old son will be able to go to Canada or some similar place where there will be some security in the future."

I talked with tens of people, the three weeks I was in South Africa, and I didn't talk with one person, whether he was a supporter of the Nationalist Party, whether he was a supporter of the Liberal Party, or whether he was just a rather vague person who was wandering around in a political vacuum of some sort or other, or whether I was talking with a non-white person, who did not say at some point in the discussion that there will be bloodshed in South Africa, and soon. There was a sense of gloom which settled in upon everyone, no matter what his own political convictions on the situation in South Africa and the solution or the resolution of the problem might be.

"Freedom Must Come"

And yet the response to it, on the part of various of these people, was different. There were some liberals, for instance, who, as in the case of this businessman I spoke of, were planning to get out of South Africa before everything broke loose. There were some Africans also who were thinking of trying to get out of the country if they could. But then there were others with whom I talked who, although they were tempted to get out of what is going to be a very horrible situation without any question, said: "No, our place is here in order to struggle for the freedom which must come."

And these were the people who, also, were not talking in terms of violence breaking out because they believed in violence, or who thought that violence should take place, but because they believed that it would only be as they and others like them stayed in the situation that it would be possible for non-violence and for the struggle to be carried on at least in the maximum degree in the spirit of Gandhian non-violence.

If the psychology of the situation was, then, one of everyone seeming to recognize that terrific changes were going to take place, it also must be pointed out that politically and economically, within the situation in South Africa, there is no way in which it is possible, within the constitution of the country or with legal methods, for the African to achieve any kind of justice and any kind of equality for himself. He is entirely enclosed within a set of laws, within a set of social customs, which make it impossible for him to achieve that which he must achieve.

And this is precisely why the situation is revolutionary. And one, I think, should not hesitate to use the word revolutionary in connection with a discussion of what exists in South Africa today.

From a political point of view, the non-white people have virtually no voting rights. There are a handful of the so-called Colored People—those of mixed ancestry—in the Cape province, one of the four provinces of South Africa, who have voting rights, but outside of them there are no non-white people of the nine or ten million non-whites in South Africa who have any voting rights; with the exception of a few Africans, in the Cape province again, who can vote for three white people to represent them in the lower house of Parliament in Capetown.

As far as the economic situation is concerned, the philosophy of the whites there is that the Africans were put in South Africa to serve them. There is this complicated system of pass laws—some 11 or 12 different passes which Africans are supposed to carry on their person in order to allow them to move rather freely around South Africa. The philosophy of it is that the city area, the urban area, is the white man's domain. This is the result of European civilization. The Europeans built the cities, and therefore the African should be allowed to come to the city, not as a right, but only as a privilege when jobs will be offered to him there.

In 1952 there were something over 200,000 Africans who were arrested for violating the pass laws. Every day in the city of Capetown there are between 60 and 70 Africans who are arrested for violating the pass laws.

Under an Iron Heel

I visited one of the so-called native courts in the urban area of Langa just outside Capetown, where a good many of the Africans in the Capetown area live. And I saw one case after another come before the person who is called the magistrate but who really was the Commissioner of Native Affairs in the Capetown area. All of them involved pass violations.

A woman, for instance, who had been living in the Capetown area with her husband for five years was told that she had to be out of the Capetown area by the end of October—this was about the middle of September—although she had been there five years and although her husband had a job, because she did not have a pass and she herself did not have a job, and therefore it was necessary for her to go back to the Native Reserve Areas. She was given until the end of October to get out; otherwise she would spend 60 days in jail and pay a fine of ten pounds.

One case after another of this type came up. Again the idea is that there is something back in the Native Reserves for these people to go to; but when you have some 9 million people who have about 12½ per cent of the land surface in South Africa set aside for them as the Reserve Areas, one sees how impossible it is for this large majority of the people to eke out a living in the small amount of land which is granted to them.

The idea that there is something for these people to go back to is, of course, a fiction. And this too makes the situation definitely a revolutionary one.

Under the Group Areas Act—as I briefly outlined in the case of the Western Areas in the city of Johannesburg—in the urban areas, there will be designated areas for white people, for African people, for Colored people, for Indian people; and of course, the decision as to whether an area will be white or Colored or African or Indian is left to the white people who are in the city government to decide. And naturally, as areas are declared white or Colored or Indian or African, the white

(Turn to last page)

WALDO FRANK

Noted Author and Critic
Authority on Latin America

THE STUPIDITY OF THE IMPERIALISTS

[Waldo Frank writes us that he is unable at this time to revise the transcript of his address for immediate publication in this special issue. With his permission, following is a fairly complete report of the leading points of his address.—Ed.]

Waldo Frank began his talk with an analogy for his place on the speaking program: We have had a feast of eloquence and wisdom, he said, and "what is there left that I can give?" A demitasse, he answered—a demitasse of black coffee.

After the excellent words that have been spoken about the oppressed billions of the earth, he suggested, "let us end by thinking of ourselves. . . . What's going to happen to us?" And he made clear that he was raising the question of the place of the minority white nations in a world where it was inevitable that political and economic independence is coming for all the colonial peoples.

While their independence is inevitable, "that doesn't mean we shouldn't fight for it, that doesn't mean we mustn't do everything we can now." But it is inevitable and that has got to be understood. The only reason they

are not independent now is because of the fact that the Western peoples of Europe (and the U. S.) happen to enjoy a certain priority—priority in the use of the machine—"But one of the dangerous illusions that we of the Western world have, is that this priority means or ever meant superiority."

Identification of priority with superiority would be a very foolish and dangerous thing for Westerners, who would come out of a comparison "rather badly" when it came to matching "the basic values of our civilization, of our culture [which], come from religion and from aesthetic creations," for in these spheres the West does not enjoy priority.

OUR FUTURE AS A MINORITY

"We can be pretty sure it's going to come. Asia is going to be for the Asians indeed. There will be great powerful federations and coalitions of power among the Asian people with enormous resources, with enormous populations, and, of course, with all the inward resources of the great culture that China and India and Japan and the other Asian countries have produced in the last millennia." The same will be true in Latin America, of such a great country as Brazil, for example. "And Africa, which will be the latest, will come too."

"Well, now, what will this mean for us?" he asked.

Let us remember, to begin with, that the Western Hemisphere is a minority hemisphere, when one compares it with the great land-masses (and man-masses) of the Eastern Hemisphere continents.

It is true, he added, that many of these countries, including the Western Hemisphere countries to the south and north of us, have not solved numerous complex problems that they face; and that some of these problems are more complex than ours because of "their immense ethnic riches." But in some fields they have solved their problems much better than we have—in the field of racial democracy, for example. "And racial democracy is just about as important as circulation of the blood"; in fact, the United States is partly crippled and numb today because of its lack of racial democracy.

These countries, with all their profound capacities, are going to create powerful communities—"communities, incidentally, which will survive even in the case of an atomic war. There is very little likelihood that anyone will waste atom bombs on Patagonia or on the forests of Brazil."

IF THIS GOES ON . . .

And so, when this time comes, we, the United States, will be "a minority nation in a minority hemisphere." Therefore the question: what are we going to do about it? "There's no reason to be frightened because we're going to be a minority nation, outnumbered, out-resourced, in our own little minority hemisphere." Athens as well as Judaea was in a similar position. "Maybe the whole history of the world has been the history of minority nations. Maybe the history of the culture of a nation is the history of the minority men and women within it."

But if we continue to antagonize the majority peoples, for example the Asians, to earn their distrust and hatred, "if we continue to consider as our own preserve these great potential peoples of Latin America, to earn their distrust and possibly their hatred," then our situation will not be a happy one. "It's something for us to think about from the standpoint of enlightened egoism, if you wish."

On the background of this thought, he warned against continuing the type of policies the U. S. is pursuing now: in refusing to recognize the government of China while continuing "the farce of recognizing the pseudo-government hanging on by its nails—or rather, by our nails—on the island of Formosa"; in flouting the advice and help of the leaders of India; or in behaving as in Guatemala.

The truth about Guatemala, he said, has been obscured by all the noise about it, just as a man can be blinded by a glare of light or deafened by a babel of voices. "But this I can assure you, that, even granted the premise that there was a danger of a Communist putsch in Guatemala—even granted that—what we did was incredibly stupid. And a minority people in a minority hemisphere mustn't be stupid."

"Let us assume that Toriello and Arbenz, who are not Communists, were naive like the liberals of Czechoslovakia; and let us assume that the same thing could have happened in Guatemala as happened in Czechoslovakia, that is, an infiltration and a gradual assumption of power and then at a certain moment, *poof!* Suppose this had happened in Guatemala, and suppose that while it was happening we had taken the position of helping the people of Guatemala, of backing up what was good in the program of Arbenz and Toriello—and most of it was good; suppose we had taken the side of the Guatemalan people's fight instead of the fight of the United Fruit Company, and had made clear to them that we were on their side, on the side of every true democrat, that we were on the side of the nationalization of the land, on the side of education, on the side of the people; and suppose that, having taken this position and having made it evident and obvious, there still had been a putsch by the Communists—what would the result have been?"

"Every Latin American, from Mexico to Argentina, would have said: 'The Americans were right; they've been warning us against the Communists, and look! We're on their side, because the Americans have proved their wisdom.' That would have been intelligent—even granted the premises of the State Department, which are dubious."

KING CANUTE AND UNCLE SAM

"But what we did was just the opposite. . . . With the most unbelievable arrogance and stupidity, we committed our ambassador down there not only to arrange this miserable revolution but positively to boast about it. And having refused arms to the government down there, we protested in horror because they were getting arms from Poland. . . . And what is the result? Every Latin American, whether he hates the Communists or not, distrusts us and hates what we did and is horrified. And now, no doubt, we're going to devote a hundred million dollars to propagandize for democracy in Latin America. . . ."

If the U. S. continues to behave like this, it will make King Canute seem like a very intelligent man.

But even keeping hands off is not enough, he went on to stress. We must develop the real resources we have—the rich and deep resource of our democratic traditions. Up to now in history, nations have depended on economic and military force. This age is now challenged. The alternatives are like seeds waiting to germinate. Statecraft and politics must achieve other values, for the sake of survival. "It is only through a truly, deeply revolutionary modulation of our values that we can survive."

He said he agreed with Shachtman that we have an imperialistic psychology, and mentioned that Shachtman's point (about using Cape Cod for H-bomb tests—was particularly good for him since he lived on Cape Cod—at which there was much laughter from the audience. But it doesn't make sense to denounce colonialism, he stressed, so long as the social organism "secretly imperialism and stupidity and stupid leaders. It's the organic system that must be changed."

A. J. MUSTE — Closing Remarks: The U.S. in Okinawa & Puerto Rico

[The following is an extension of the remarks made by A. J. Muste in his closing address at the meeting. For lack of time he spoke more briefly. We thank Mr. Muste for writing the fuller account here presented.—Ed.]

Though something has already been said about exploitation and domination by the United States, which not so long ago was widely regarded as the enemy of all colonialism, I wish to speak to this subject again. A meeting against all forms of colonialism, satellitism, etc., conducted by Americans may properly devote considerable attention to repenting of American sins rather than indulging in the pleasant pastime of indicting the sins of the British, French and Russians.

I want to touch on the situation in two islands which are in the U. S. orbit. The first is Okinawa in the Pacific.

To begin with, the Ryukyu Islands were not turned over to UN trusteeship after the war simply and admittedly because the U. S. regime—then a Democratic one—wished to use these islands for its own military—"security" purposes.

Ostensibly, the people of Okinawa are under a civil administration—U.S.C.A.R.—controlled by the U. S. army. They elect representatives to a legislature. There are even political parties. The chief of these is the Democratic, which is pro-U. S. and pro the civil (military) administration. Both the other parties want the islands back in Japanese hands.

But the real situation is indicated by the fact that when some one suggested that, with several parties in the field and two of them opposed to the status quo of U. S. control, the situation might become unstable, the Chief Executive appointed by the U. S. army replied: "The situation cannot become unstable because U.S.C.A.R. holds absolute power."

Let me mention just one more aspect of the Okinawan situation, and here our authority is eminently respectable, an American Methodist missionary stationed on Okinawa and writing some time ago in the *Christian Century*.

Naturally, the U. S. army needs land on Okinawa. When an Okinawan's land is appraised, this is done for him by an American committee. According to the "civil administration" itself, the army has taken 200,000 parcels from 76,000 owners, and all but 2 per cent of these refuse to negotiate on the present basis because they regard it as grossly unfair. The army says they get this way because of Communist agitation, which would indicate, if true, that in eight years of U. S. occupation a lot of Communists have been made.

Entirely apart from the question how the army obtains the land is the stark fact that the population density of Okinawa, if the land were all available to the inhabitants, is 1300 per square mile. Subtract the land

the army has taken and the Okinawans are crowded 1700 to the square mile.

They live, of course, on a U. S. base and are likely to be obliterated in any war in the Pacific in which the U. S. becomes involved. They have never had a vote on this fairly important matter involving their own welfare.

Finally, a word about an island much nearer New York: namely, Puerto Rico.

This is a controversial subject and I do not want to go into it at the close of a long meeting. But I do have two things to say. One is that, like Okinawa, Puerto Rico is an important U. S. military base. Furthermore, its youth are drafted into the U. S. army under a law on which no Puerto Rican voted, since they have not a single voting representative in the U. S. Congress which determines such matters. Puerto Rico will also be terribly punished in any war in the Western Hemisphere in which the U. S. becomes involved.

Secondly, a few days ago, thirteen members of the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party were convicted, and have now been sentenced to six years each, the maximum penalty, for conspiracy to overthrow the U. S. government by force and violence. I do not make any defense of the methods employed by the Nationalist Party. Leaving all other questions aside, I do say that these people were entitled to adequate legal defense and that important civil-liberties issues were at stake in this trial. Under the circumstances, I deem it a tragedy and a shame that the one lawyer, Conrad Lynn, who stepped forward to defend the majority of the defendants in this case, has not even been reimbursed for the expenses he has incurred in the course of long weeks of work.

Let me conclude on another note. A former president of Colombia, speaking the other day at Columbia University's bicentennial conference on Latin America, contended that there was no point in Latin Americans arming in the atomic age.

The *New York Times* reported on October 28: "The plea that this country stop arming Latin America was made by Dr. Eudardo Santos, former president of Colombia. . . ."

"Dr. Santos received the only standing ovation of the conference so far. . . ."

"Dr. Santos asserted that Latin America wished to defend its liberties against communism. But if existing political and economic factors tended to 'take away our liberties now,' he added, 'we will have nothing to defend.'"

"Dr. Santos said there was no real reason for Latin Americans to arm. He said their countries could play no real role in an international conflict in the atomic age, and that by continuing to provide armament to the Good Neighbor lands, the United States was, in effect, 'shifting' their destiny."

He concluded by saying that he "looked forward to a truly united—but unarmed—America." Let us conclude by looking forward to, and resolving to help achieve, a united—but unarmed—world.

Houser: South Africa — —

(Continued from page 6)

people will take the best areas for themselves.

We drove home one night with an 82-year-old Indian man in the city of Durban, and as he was getting out of the car he said, "I have lived in this house for 40 years but this area has been declared a white area under the Group Areas Act and I will have to move." This is the kind of situation which exists in South Africa today, which again makes it a revolutionary situation.

African unions are not recognized under the Industrial Conciliation Act. Every union has to be a registered union, and Africans can be only in non-registered unions. They don't even have the right to strike recognized. Therefore any action which an African union takes—since they do not have the right of collective bargaining either—must, by its very nature, be a revolutionary act.

There is nothing else which they can do. They cannot sit down with an employer to discuss working conditions, because under the law their union doesn't exist. Therefore they must strike, if they wish to make their power felt in any way, and this is illegal also, and therefore it becomes a kind of revolutionary unconstitutional action in itself.

Under the Suppression of Communism Act, all the leaders—the majority of leaders at least—of the African National Congress, some 40 of them, have been banned, which means that they are not supposed to attend any "gatherings." There is no precise definition of what a gathering really is; but I got some indication of the confusion which exists about the meaning of the term "gathering" when I was on a ride with two banned Africans near the city of Port Elizabeth one Sunday evening a few weeks ago.

We found that we were tailed by two police cars. We were about five miles out in the country, and we were stopped, and the police got out of the car—plainclothesmen—and they said to the two banned Africans: "We suspect that you are in a gathering. You'll have to come down to police headquarters." So the three of us went down to police headquarters to find out if we had been in a gathering and if therefore they were in violation of their ban under the Suppression of Communism Act.

One could mention many other factors, but in the final analysis, in South Africa it is as if the people, the non-white people, had had their hands bound together with some kind of thread and then were told that they should eat. But if they move their hands the thread will break. These people are bound by laws, and then they are told that they are supposed to live as men and as beings making a living within this society and within this community, but to do so they must violate the laws. And that is why I say that one cannot understand the situation in South Africa without understanding it to be a revolutionary situation.

Now I want to close by just saying a couple of things about whether this revolution is going to come about soon, or what some of the difficulties are that are facing those that attempt to bring this revolution into being.

I came out with the feeling that this revolution was not very near. Many people with whom I talked said rather glibly: "We'll give the white man ten to 25 years in South Africa"—those were the two figures usually chosen. Perhaps they're correct but at the present time it is quite obvious that the Nationalists are in complete control in South Africa.

In the recent provincial elections the Nationalists for the first time got a majority of the vote. They have complete control of three of the four provincial legislatures in South Africa and they have a large majority in the national parliament of South Africa. Politically they cannot be touched, and because they have a political program, which is a definite program of *Apartheid*, a definite program of putting the squeeze on the non-white people on the supposition that this is the only way by which they can maintain their control there—and they may be correct, with the ends which they have in view—because they have a definite policy, because the white people are scared, because they think bloodshed will come, because they do not see that there is a possibility of non-violence changing the pattern over a period of time, these people are scared, the white people are increasingly gathering behind the banner of the Nationalists; and the United Party—which has been the opposition party, which doesn't put the squeeze on in the same way but has relatively the same program as the Nationalists do—the United Party is definitely losing out.

Interim Strategy

And then added to this would be my observation that the non-white people in South Africa are not quite ready for a final showdown in any revolutionary sense. There are many indications of this: the fact that the Defiance Campaign was called off early in 1953, simply because the Criminal Laws Amendment Act was passed, which meant that any person who participated in an act of defiance of the government would spend five years in prison and might be lashed fifteen strokes and might have to pay a fine of a few hundred pounds—I'm not saying this lightly, but if a person is ready for a final showdown, then he will be willing to suffer the consequences in a campaign to challenge the right of a government to pass such laws.

The fact that the leaders of the movement at the present time are accepting the banning upon themselves—they are not attending gatherings, they are trying to find out what a gathering is so that they can be sure not to attend one—is another indication that they aren't quite ready. The fact that with the act passed called the Bantu Education Act, by which the educational system is going to be taken out of the hands of the Department of Education and put under the Department of Native Affairs, there is yet no campaign amongst the non-white people to refuse cooperation with the school system as it exists under this system of *Apartheid*, is again an indication that the people are not ready for a final showdown at the present time.

And even the fact that there isn't a wholehearted campaign which has been organized yet, and which has been planned carefully, for resisting this Western Areas removal project which I mentioned before, and the fact it is only a few people who have had a few scattered meetings to discuss what the strategy might be to resist the action of the government in moving these people out of the Western Areas of Johannesburg, is again an indication, it seems to me, that we are not faced with a period in which there will be a final showdown, a power struggle within the confines of South Africa, but rather that we are in an interim period.

And I think that what is now the dominant strategy of the African and the Indian and the Colored Peoples Congresses in South Africa—a move which is called the Congress of the People—again indicates that we are in an interim period.

I do not make this analysis with any sense of scorn for the people of South Africa, because they are waging a fight with the strength and the resources which they have at the moment, and when one compares what is happening in South Africa with what is happening in other parts of Africa, again one can see the real motion, the real progress, which is taking place in the movement of the people. It is a difficult task which they have before them.

I would like to read in closing, though, just a few words from the Call which is being sent out for this Congress of the People, which happens to be this interim strategy of the joint congresses of the African, Indian and Colored People of South Africa, because I think it is rather beautifully written in catching the spirit of what the struggle is all about in South Africa.

WE CALL THE PEOPLE

[Following is the complete text of the Call, only part of which was read by Mr. Houser as the conclusion of his address.]

WE CALL THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH AFRICA, BLACK AND WHITE—LET US SPEAK TOGETHER OF FREEDOM!

WE CALL THE FARMS OF THE RESERVES AND THE TRUST LANDS. *Let us speak of the wide land, and the narrow strips on which we toil. Let us speak of brothers without land, and of children without schooling. Let us speak of taxes and of cattle, and of famine.*

LET US SPEAK OF FREEDOM.

WE CALL THE MINERS OF COAL, GOLD AND DIAMONDS. *Let us speak of the dark shafts, and the cold compounds far from our families. Let us speak of heavy labor and long hours, and of men sent home to die. Let us speak of rich masters and poor wages.*

LET US SPEAK OF FREEDOM.

WE CALL THE WORKERS OF FARMS AND FORESTS. *Let us speak of the rich foods we grow, and the laws that keep us poor. Let us speak of harsh treatment and of children and women forced to work. Let us speak of private prisons, and beatings, and of passes.*

LET US SPEAK OF FREEDOM.

WE CALL THE WORKERS OF FACTORIES AND SHOPS. *Let us speak of the good things we make, and the bad conditions of our work. Let us speak of the many passes and the few jobs. Let us speak of foremen and of transport and of trade unions; of holidays and houses.*

LET US SPEAK OF FREEDOM.

WE CALL THE TEACHERS, STUDENTS AND PREACHERS. *Let us speak of the light that comes with learning, and the ways we are kept in darkness. Let us speak of great services we can render, and of the narrow ways that are open to us. Let us speak of laws, and government, and rights.*

LET US SPEAK OF FREEDOM.

WE CALL THE HOUSEWIVES AND THE MOTHERS. *Let us speak of the fine children that we bear, and of their stunted lives. Let us speak of the many illnesses and deaths, and of the few clinics and schools. Let us speak of high prices and of shanty towns.*

LET US SPEAK OF FREEDOM.

LET US SPEAK TOGETHER, ALL OF US TOGETHER—African and European, Indian and Colored. Voter and voteless. Privileged and rightless. The happy and the homeless. All the people of South Africa; of the towns and of the countryside.

LET US SPEAK TOGETHER OF FREEDOM. *And of the happiness that can come to men and women if they live in a land that is free.*

LET US SPEAK TOGETHER OF FREEDOM. *And of how to get it for ourselves and for our children.*

LET THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE BE HEARD. AND LET THE DEMANDS OF ALL THE PEOPLE FOR THE THINGS THAT WILL MAKE US FREE BE RECORDED. LET THE DEMANDS BE GATHERED TOGETHER IN A GREAT CHARTER OF FREEDOM. WE CALL ON ALL GOOD MEN AND TRUE, to speak now of freedom, and to write their own demands into the Charter of Freedom.

WE CALL ALL WHO LOVE LIBERTY to pledge their lives from here on to win the Freedom set out in the Charter. WE CALL ALL THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH AFRICA TO PREPARE FOR:

THE CONGRESS OF THE PEOPLE—Where representatives of the people, everywhere in the land, will meet together in a great assembly, to discuss and adopt the Charter of Freedom.

Let us speak together of Freedom.
Let us work together for the Freedom Charter.
Let us organize together for the Congress of the People.

LET US GO FORWARD TOGETHER TO FREEDOM!

Trikamdas — —

(Continued from page 3)

the world, and the only two alternatives that it seems to offer to the world is: Either you become my slaves or I destroy you with this atom bomb. Now that is the danger with which we have got to contend.

And if we want to fight that danger and want to win, it will require all of our resources, and not resources by way of a counter-answer in arms, but resources which come from within the human heart, the aspirations of human beings, a feeling that "I'm not born a slave, I'm not going to become a slave," the feeling which one man in India created in the 350 million of us who used to cringe and crawl before the lowest policeman under the British rule.

"Stand Up and Fight!"

One man came to India in 1915 and he said, "I bow to nobody, I bow to"—he used to believe in God and he said, "I bow only to God," he said, "I bow to no authority in the world which is unjust; I'll render unto Caesar what is due to him, but I will not render unto Caesar what is not due to him." And therefore he set in motion something which became contagious; and thousands and millions of people within the short scope of ten-fifteen years became human beings; and men stood up against oppression, stood up against brutal lathi charges—lathis are big staves with which the police used to be armed—stood up against shooting, stood up against massacres.

It didn't get us down because, once we realized that it doesn't matter, that freedom must be paid for in our blood, that we must fight for it, we fought under the great leadership of that man, and the one thing that he taught us was "Stand up like men and fight."

And I submit that is the one thing which we must realize if we are going to preserve freedom.

There's one thing more which I want to add: that if we want freedom as free men, we must also counter the modern tendency—it doesn't matter how it has been created—of thinking in slogans. Because freedom must be realized not merely in your heart but also in your head. And one of the things which is enslaving the modern world is this thinking in slogans.

Somebody invents a nice little slogan, keeps on repeating it twenty or thirty or fifty times, and everybody who is too lazy mentally to think, picks up the slogan—the slogan grows into an army, an army into an army of fanatics, and the fanatics ultimately overrun the free world. And wherever we come across this kind of tendency, of controlling thought by it-doesn't-matter-what means, we must also stand up and say: "Not only will I not be controlled in other matter, but my thought will also not be controlled by anybody or deprived of the right to question, and I shall only agree with and submit to anything which does not enslave me either mentally or physically."

These are some of the things which we have got to bear in mind if we are to preserve freedom throughout the world.

I thank you once again, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity that you have given me on this day, International Freedom Day, to meet so many freedom-loving Americans, and my brothers and sisters, in this hall.

Chit Maung —

(Continued from page 2)

With your permission I shall read the following Declaration:

"The Universal Declaration of Human Rights to be respected by all peoples in the world recognizes the dignity of the human being and his inalienable right to choose his own way of life.

"The right of peoples to self-determination is a basic principle of the democratic system of society. The Charter of the United Nations recognizes this right.

"This right of self-determination, hitherto regarded by imperialist nations as their exclusive privilege, must be exercised equally by colonial and dependent peoples and satellite countries.

"Colonial and dependent peoples aim toward the realization of this right to self-determination and for their own dignity.

"The colonial rulers and imperialist powers still cling to their 'Sacred Mission,' whether in its old or new interpretation, only to justify their self-interest and for safeguarding their dominations as long as possible.

"As long as there are colonial powers and colonial peoples there will always be a continuous and persistent struggle for freedom and against economic enslavement.

"The struggle against colonial rule is in essence the human protest against poverty, misery, degradation and indignity, which this system necessarily entails for the peoples suffering under it.

"National freedom shall mean also social emancipation and economic equality of the suffering masses and the establishment of a democratic socialist society.

"The continuation of colonialism, besides economic disequilibrium and the politics of spheres of influence, is one of the main sources of international unrest and instability and serves as a constant threat to the peace of the world.

"All genuine democrats fully share with these fighters their passionate desire for human rights and freedom, and therefore associate themselves with the struggle against colonial oppression and for a world order free from slavery, hunger, political terror and war.

"We solemnly resolve that all nations and peoples of the world shall be free and dedicate ourselves to that endeavor with all the strength that we command."

The Declaration is self-explanatory and I would urge all of you to share this declaration and join us in presenting a united front against colonialism with all its complications. I thank you.