

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

LONDON: THREE PARTY CONFERENCES

... page 2

RIO: WILL THERE BE AN ARMY COUP?

... page 3

DUBLIN: IRISH LABOR ON THE SPOT

... page 3

In This Issue:

SPECIAL FOUR-PAGE EDITION OF

The Young Socialist CHALLENGE

OCTOBER 3, 1955

FIVE CENTS

Mass Rallies Roar Defiance To Lynch Jury

By PRISCILLA CADY

NEW YORK, Sept. 25 — Thousands of Negroes gathered this afternoon to attend the meeting at the Williams Institutional C.M.E. Church called by the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters (AFL) to protest the lynch murder of Emmett Till. They crowded the church, the sidewalks, and the streets; people clustered in the windows of buildings across the way and stood at vantage points on the roofs, to listen to the loudspeakers that broadcast the speeches. It was an impressive and heartening sight in this day and age of the reactionary climate in the U. S.

On the same day another rally also took place, called by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in the Bronx, with a crowd of a few hundred at a church.

Emmett Till, 14-year-old school-boy from Chicago, was kidnapped

(Turn to last page)

U.S. Goes Down the Line in UN In Open Support of Colonialism

By HAL DRAPER

In a series of UN votes and announcements, the United States has gone down the line three times in a week as the defender and supporter of colonialism and national oppression. This is a little more often than usual for any given number of days.

On Thursday, September 22, the U. S. delegation cast their votes in favor of France's position on the issue of Algeria.

The next day, the U. S. lined up with Britain to kill any discussion of self-determination for Cyprus.

On Monday, September 26, U. S. delegation head Henry Cabot Lodge announced that the U. S. would openly vote in favor of admitting Franco Spain to the UN.

On the Algerian question, the U. S. position was definitive proof that Washington was tied to the policy of going along with its imperialist military ally rather than with the aspirations of subject peoples.

There is, of course, no reason to believe that the U. S. is happy about this choice; far from it. Its own interests do not require that the French capitalists milk North Africa; and it also knows that resentment against French rule imperils its own war bases in the region. But the issue at the UN triggered the basic reaction of American reactionary foreign policy: "national security" lies in a war bloc armed to the teeth (which means: choose France) rather than in a foreign policy based on a democratic and progressive appeal to the minds of the people of the earth.

The French line in the UN was cyni-

cally founded on the juridical fiction that Algeria is an "integral" part of France and not a colony; hence UN action would be "internal" interference in the affairs of a sovereign power. Echoing the colonialists like a good ally was Lodge as he intoned that the proposal to discuss Algeria sought "the sanction of the General Assembly to a course of action intended to bring about fundamental changes in the composition of the French republic," and that it was the "considered conclusion" of the U. S. that this would violate the inviolable UN charter.

Yet, in this so-called "internal" affair, France was using French NATO troops which were supposed to be under international command and which were in fact under the formal command of an American general; in its mobilization of armed force to slaughter the "internal"

(Turn to last page)

Before the Vote

WASHINGTON, Aug. 21—The United States Government will probably confine its reaction to the clashes in North Africa to expressing hopes that both sides will resolve differences by conciliation United States officials said today.

Although the presence of United States air bases in Morocco makes United States interest more apparent than it was in Indochina, the officials believed United States attitudes were too conflicting to permit a firm policy supporting one side or the other.

On the one hand, they said, the State Department, in diplomatic language, "supports the presence of France" in North Africa and does not want to antagonize the United States' French allies. On the other hand, since the Indochina debacle and the Bandung conference of Asian and African powers, United States officials have come to realize more keenly than before the importance of not appearing to support colonialism.

From the New York Times

The State Department knows the importance of not "appearing" to support colonialism. The art of American diplomacy, it would seem, is not to let realities interfere with the appearance.

The Disarmament Farce

WASHINGTON AND MOSCOW TURN OUT THEIR BAG OF TRICKS ON HOW TO SAY YES-AND-NO

By A. STEIN

With the publication of Bulganin's reply to Eisenhower's Geneva inspection plan, the curtain falls on the first act of the new disarmament farce.

The Russians have accepted the American proposal. Not only that, they are even more magnanimous than Eisenhower. Why restrict aerial inspection to just the United States and Russia? Why not take in the whole world? That is, The American plan is being smothered to death in the kindly embrace of the Russian bear.

To be sure, it took Moscow two months to think up an answer that managed to say no while saying yes. But they finally succeeded in finding a formula appropriate to the new post-Geneva era, the era of "good will" and bad faith.

When President Eisenhower flashed his trump card at Geneva two months ago—his startling proposal for a complete exchange of military blueprints and mutual aerial inspection—he stunned the world . . . and the Russians. To some, Eisenhower's proposal to yield up the secrets of America's military establishments seemed the very height of magnanimity and statesmanship. A new era seemed to be dawning in which the morality of power was giving way to the power of morality.

As for the Russians, unable to frame

a suitable and equally blinding counter-proposal on the spot, they maintained an embarrassed silence that meant neither yes or no. They could hardly say that Eisenhower was not giving anything away or that this act of generous statesmanship meant the Americans were no longer interested in any plans to prohibit the production and use of nuclear weapons.

U.S. CALCULATIONS

For Bulganin to have rejected the Eisenhower proposal with a flat no would have put a mortal chill to the tender roots of that young plant, the "Geneva spirit," and brought negotiations to a flat halt. And this Bulganin & Co. were not ready to do.

The Eisenhower proposal was smart because while it appeared to promise a totally effective guard against the threat of a sudden attack with nuclear weapons by either side, it permitted the Americans

to pursue their military aims undisturbed. That is, while it promised everything, it gave nothing. And in addition, it contained certain benefits for American military intelligence.

More specifically, by concentrating attention on the problem of mutual inspection, it pushed into the improbable future the question of actual disarmament and therefore permitted the United States to continue maintaining its troops in Western Europe, above all, Western Germany, and to hold on to its 80 or more overseas bases which happen, by accident, to ring Russia.

At the same time, as the more astute military commentators have since pointed out, the United States would be able to break down the towering wall of secrecy which surrounds the location of Russian military establishments. While the location of most American military sites is no secret to the Russians, the reverse is not true, and in time of war such knowledge is of crucial importance. To gain such information during hostilities, the American Strategic Air Command would have to pay a heavy price in the loss of aircraft.

Leaving to one side all the problems raised by the social nature of the Russian regime which prohibits it from opening its skies to foreign observers—these skies, after all, cover not only military establishments but also the vast in-

dustrial and rail network, as well as the slave-labor camps—the Eisenhower proposal was unacceptable in Moscow both from the narrow viewpoint of military security and the broader perspective of foreign policy.

MOSCOW PARRIES

Returning home to Moscow, Bulganin, Khrushchev & Co. began concocting an answer to the Eisenhower proposal that would say no without closing any doors to continued discussion. Their first move was to announce the reduction in their armed forces of 640,000 men to take effect in December. The satellite countries immediately followed suit with similar declarations: What else could such a step prove except Moscow's "peaceful" intentions?

The second move, which has real elements of the comic, was the more recent announcement that Moscow is giving up its one base on "foreign soil," the Finnish naval base at Porkkala. With a straight face, the Moscow powers-that-be declared it would be an excellent idea if other great powers followed this example. Here was the ground for an equitable *quid pro quo!* Moscow renounces its one base on foreign soil and the United States ought to surrender its 80 odd airbases overseas.

The final scene in this act of the grim disarmament comedy has come with the

(Turn to last page)

LONDON LETTER

3 Conferences Mirror the British Scene

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, Sept. 22—Three political conferences have been in the news in Britain during the past week. Two of them have yet to come and the other took place last Saturday at the Shoreditch Town Hall in London. This latter conference was the one organized by the British Stalinists through the medium of their paper, the *Daily Worker*.

Allegedly a conference to discuss the future of British Labor, the gathering was in fact part of the current Stalinist line to woo the left elements of the Labor Party.

Top CP members like Frank Haxell, secretary of the Stalinist-dominated Electrical Trades Union, Arthur Horner, CP secretary of the National Union of Mineworkers, and R. Palme Dutt, vice-chairman of the British CP, peddled the "party line" good and fast for the benefit of the Labor Party members who had risked the wrath of the Labor Party chiefs and attended the meeting. For, as much as anything else, this was an attempt on the part of the Stalinists to cock a snoot at the leaders of the Labor Party and to demonstrate how many Laborites were prepared to incur the wrath of the party leadership at Transport House and consort with the Stalinists.

In reality it demonstrated something else—the fact that in spite of the claims of the Stalinists they have not succeeded in attracting any large proportion of the Labor left to their standard. Most of the speakers were the same old faces which appear time after time at Stalinist meetings under a variety of guises.

For an instance, Nell Vyse, who received prominence in the *Daily Worker* as the representative of South London old-aged pensioners, is in fact an old Stalinist campaigner from the London borough of Southwark where she leads a group of old-aged pensioners who have become isolated from the main body of the Old Age Pensioners Association. Wal Hannington, given prominence as a London organizer of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, is another figure whose record in the Stalinist movement goes back for many years.

COUNTING STOOGES

There were, however, a few rank-and-file Laborites who swallowed the bait, and the Stalinists treated them with special reverence. H. Smart, of the Frome Labor Party, earned the applause of the Stalinists by making an attack on the Labor Party for its policy of excluding members of the CP from its ranks and meetings.

This particular client was naive enough to say that there were left-wing members of the Labor Party who could throw out the reactionary elements who had infiltrated into the party if it were given the right guidance by the right people. This could only be done, he suggested, if the ban on members of the CP were lifted.

The Stalinist organizers claim that the 497 people who attended this meeting came from 388 different organizations and represented 865,176 members. Even if these figures are accepted—which means stretching one's imagination to the utmost—they represent the merest drop in the ocean of the British Labor movement. The trades unions have some eight million members and the Labor Party has nearly a million individual members in addition to the five and a half million affiliated members through

the trade unions; viewed in this context the real relationship of the Stalinists (who incidentally included their own meager 33,000 members as being represented at the conference) to the Labor movement proper falls into perspective.

RACE FOR TREASURER

Next in the line-up of political gatherings is the annual conference of the Labor Party itself, which is due to begin in the Southeast coastal resort of Margate within the next few weeks. Recently the Transport House headquarters of the party released details of the final agenda and the report of the National Executive Committee. Big points of interest, as always, are the nominations for the NEC and for the post of party treasurer, which carries with it a seat on the Executive and in recent years has been the center of a left-versus-right conflict.

This year, as last, there are two names upon which interest is centered—in fact they are the only two—for the position of

treasurer. One is Aneurin Bevan and the other is Hugh Gaitskell, the bright boy of the right wing. This year Bevan has been nominated by 37 different organizations while Gaitskell can list 27 to his credit. But the cards are stacked in favor of Gaitskell, for among his backers are the two big unions of the right wing, the Transport and General Workers Union and the National Union of General and Municipal Workers; and in addition the Amalgamated Engineering Union and Bevan's own union, the National Union of Mineworkers, have placed their names against his nomination. This makes victory for Gaitskell certain.

TRADE-UNION LINE-UP

It is interesting to note that 33 of the nominations for Bevan come from local Labor Parties. They range from Glasgow in Scotland to his own Welsh constituency of Ebbw Vale; they include industrial areas such as Birmingham and quieter country towns such as Richmond in Surrey. Gaitskell, on the other hand, can only muster 19 constituency parties for his name, and four of those are local parties from his own area of Leeds. (There are actually five constituency parties in Leeds; the other has gone on record for Bevan!)

But, in the final analysis, it is the votes of the big trade unions which decide the treasurer. Thus Bevan is certain to be defeated—which means he will be absent from the NEC for at least another year—and Gaitskell will once again

ELECTRICAL WORKERS

IUE Strikers Teach Westinghouse a Lesson

By GERRY McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, Sept. 26—The CIO electrical union (IUE-CIO) has just completed its first strike against a nationwide corporation. The strike was against Westinghouse, one of the two arrogant giants of the electrical industry, and it was successful.

Furthermore, the strike began as a rank-and-file action in Local 601 in East Pittsburgh. Day workers in Local 601 began the strike; they were supported by the entire local; and finally, the local was backed up by the entire Westinghouse conference board, representing all Westinghouse locals in the IUE-CIO.

Westinghouse, like General Electric, has always had a "tough" labor-relations policy. They have always granted less than corporations in auto or steel, and have violated the contract over and over again when it suited them. They developed this attitude through years of dealing with the old Stalinist-dominated UE. The UE was, and is, a scavenger union which let the UAW, the Steelworkers and Rubber Workers win gains, after which UE settled for less, usually without a strike, and called it a victory. As a result of their experience with the Stalinists, the electrical industry came to believe that the more "militant" a union talked, the softer it actually was. They are beginning to find out differently.

In recent years, the corporations have also benefited from the division among the workers. Part are in IUE, part are in the AFL, and some remain in the UE. So the corporations have continued their tough policy.

FIGHTING BACK

During the first years of the existence of the IUE, the IUE was unsuccessful, by and large, in fighting back. Its leadership was new and inexperienced for the simple reason that the Stalinists never let anyone else get any posts of importance or any experience in running the union. Furthermore, the new IUE leaders were misguided by the red-baiting, flag-waving campaign against the UE dictated by Phil Murray and Carey. Instead of fighting the UE as bad unionists, which they were, the IUE fought (with certain exceptions, such as District Four) on an "anti-red" basis too often. This was no preparation for the ranks of the young IUE to fight the corporations; as a matter of fact, it attracted to leadership in the IUE many conservative elements who would ordinarily be company men.

But in the last few years, the IUE has developed a new secondary leadership in the battles to defend union standards in the plants. Especially is Local 601 such a leadership has been appearing. All of this

year, Local 601 has been fighting back. The strike of day workers in August was simply another chapter in the fight.

The strike began because the company began to time-study day workers (non-incentive workers) without first negotiating with the union, as the contract requires. The day workers struck, under the leadership of the local, and this soon closed down the plant. This in itself was a shock to the company and the local boss press, which thought of Local 601 as "right-wing." The local's demand was that the company negotiate before making time-studies, as the contract required.

When the company refused, the Westinghouse Conference Board, made up of all IUE Westinghouse locals, voted to strike if the corporation did not settle. The corporation remained defiant and shouted about its "right to manage." The bosses did not really believe the chain would go out. After all, it never had.

REAL VICTORY

However, other Westinghouse locals, smarting under the same hard treatment that 601 has received, began to go out even before the deadline. Local after local voted to strike. A big new local at Columbus, Ohio, which only last year threatened to withdraw from the IUE if a strike took place, this year voted to strike and did.

Just before the chain-wide strike began, IUE president Jim Carey entered the negotiations. A few hours before the strike deadline, he reached an agreement with the company. Local 601's Executive Board felt the settlement not an honest one on the company's part, and demanded a better agreement. The Conference Board backed them up and the strike began.

After four days, the Conference Board decided to accept the original agreement which it had once rejected. When that happened, Local 601 had no choice but to go back. After one more defiant day on strike, 601 returned to work.

In actuality, the settlement was a real victory for the union. The company got only a face-saving clause—the right to continue the time-study in the one department of one plant where the time-study began. But they agreed that no one would be laid off as a result of the study. On the other hand, the company agreed to negotiate on the time-study question, which is what the union had demanded all along. The company also agreed that it would not begin any more time-studies until it had negotiated with the union.

The union's victory was badly handled, however. This gave the company the chance to play off Carey against the local union. Carey, for his part, terminated the strike in a bureaucratic way

climb onto the NEC in spite of the fact that he cannot command a majority vote from the constituency parties themselves, as proved by his defeats when he attempted that practice in other years.

In the line-up for the seven Executive seats which are decided by the votes of the local parties alone—the trade unions not being able to vote in this particular section—there are 16 contenders. It is impossible to pick seven from this bunch on whom the right wing could rely—a clear indication that those who take their stand on the right fully realize that they have not the remotest chance of being elected if they place their fate in the hands of the local parties. The development of the left in the constituency parties has reached a point where the right wing are forced to rely almost entirely upon the right-wing trade-union leaders for support.

TORIES PONDER

The Tory party has also just released details of what it chooses to call an annual conference, but it is in fact hardly more than a semi-social gathering at which the Tory party leaders make pronouncements on what the Tory policy is to be for the future year—always providing, of course, that the economic gyrations of capitalism permits them to be followed. The practice in the Tory party is for certain of the "resolutions" submitted to be marked with a star; these are the only ones on which policy debates will take place. The "starring" of the resolutions is performed by the party leadership and thus gives an indication of what can be expected to come out of the conference; or, to be more precise,

(Continued on page 3)

which made it appear that he was abandoning Local 601. When the rest of the chain went back to work, it left Local 601 out on a limb. Carey was bitterly criticized and booed within the local for ending the strike in this way. He did not appear at the meeting of Local 601 which voted to return to work.

Local 601, on the other hand, had set their sights too high. They expected, apparently, to make the company back down 100 per cent. This is too much to hope for in any one strike. An experienced leadership is able to judge when it has won a maximum of its demands, is able to judge when it has won a maximum of its demands, and then settle. Local 601 misjudged.

Westinghouse put up a terrific fight all the way. They said that the union was featherbedding, and thus losing orders to other companies, which would force layoffs. They said that the leadership dictated the strike. They invited Local 601 to come back to work several times, and fought the strike votes in the chain across the country.

They were joined in this chorus by the organs of public opinion in Pittsburgh. Westinghouse owns the biggest radio station and the biggest TV station in town. And the Mellon interests own Westinghouse. The Mellon interests run Pittsburgh, so that all of the papers shrieked against the strikers. Westinghouse workers got a real lesson on the subject of who controls the daily press.

LOOKING AHEAD

A by-product of this strike will be the death of Stalinist influence in the local. The Stalinists have always called the local leadership "company men." Now the IUE has fought the company harder than the UE ever did. And by the way, where was the Philadelphia Essington local (a UE local) while the IUE was taking on the corporation? It was working, of course, and not a peep out of it!

What is the next step for Westinghouse workers? We would suggest the following:

(1) A real education program for the membership. Everyone saw what the newspapers tried to do to the strike. The only answer is a solidly organized, informed, and educated membership.

(2) Contract reopening negotiations are now going on with the corporation. These must be backed up 100 per cent.

(3) Westinghouse workers need unity. The IUE is proving itself the most militant union in the chain. On this basis, the IUE should try to win over the Independent Union of Westinghouse Salaried Employees and the remaining UE locals. Then it should press for joint action with the IBEW of the AFL, leading to eventual unity of the electrical unions inside a unified labor movement.



LABOR ACTION

October 3, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 40

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

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

BRAZIL

Threat of Military Coup Shadows Presidential Race

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Sept. 12—The political situation in Brazil has assumed heightened tension, following the declaration by General Pereira denouncing the "irresponsibility" of the politicians and looking toward an extralegal solution of the crisis.

The significance of this declaration was pointed up by the opponents of Getulism (the camp of the late Getulio Vargas, now headed by the presidential slate of Kubitschek and Goulart). They commented that it was a warning by the armed forces against any return to a Getulist government, a warning that if Kubitschek wins in the presidential election the armed forces can be expected to intervene directly in a new coup against Getulist "populism."

It is clear that the 25-year-old Getulist tradition in the government is still very strong, in spite of Vargas' own fate, and even after his death the spirit of Getulio Vargas haunts Brazilian politics and Brazilian politicians.

To be sure, the popular feeling of the masses is quite opposed to any coup d'état; it favors an electoral and parliamentary solution of the political crisis and the handing over of the power and office to the elected candidates, whoever they might be. The incumbent president of the republic Joao Café has declared that the elections will be carried out with all the safeguards of the law and that he will turn the government over to the candidate elected. Also, Minister of War Lott has reiterated that the army favors only a legal democratic solution and that its role is only to guarantee lawful and constitutional order.

But, on the other hand, the army's leaders have been alarmed anew by the support which the Communist Party has thrown to the Kubitschek-Goulart candidacy. The argument is heard that the Communist Party is illegal and that an alliance by a legal party with an illegal organization casts doubt on the legality of the Kubitschek candidacy.

The CP leader, Luiz Carlos Prestes, in a manifesto to the nation called for the support of the people to Kubitschek as the leader of the "anti-imperialist camp" and national emancipation, charging that General Juarez Tavora is the "candidate of Wall Street." The CP has set up a *Movimento Nacional Popular Trabalhista* (National People's Labor Movement), a sort of popular front composed of the Stalinists, Getulist "Laborites" and all other supporters of Kubitschek.

THE SINISTER FRONT

Though Kubitschek energetically denies any alliance between the Communists and his Getulist "Laborites," the police claim they have proof of it, records of secret conversations between representatives of the CP and the "Labor Party." At present the attorney general of the republic is seeking the outlawry of the MNPT before the electoral court, and the police will no doubt dissolve this movement as illegal.

But the Kubitschek-Goulart candidacy not only seems to have the support of the mass of voters but also the backing of two important political parties, the Getulist "Labor Party" (bequeathed by Vargas) and the so-called "Social-Democratic Party," which is neither democratic nor social-democratic; and in addition it also has the support of an important sector of the industrial bourgeoisie, of the *nouveau riche*, who are interested in an inflationary policy and state corruption, in access to governmental credit and a state-capitalist policy.

Thus Kubitschek is backed by "big money," and in the past money has won the elections in Brazil.

The general feeling of the "Laborites" is that their candidate will win a majority of the vote and that the present government will hand over the reins of power whether the generals want it or not—no coup d'état. To break up this feeling, Kubitschek's partisans are arming groups with government weapons. The police discovered that there was a "Getulio Vargas Legion" which possessed army weapons, delivered by army officers.

Naturally, this new evidence that the Getulists plan to implement a putative electoral majority with weapons in hand has sharpened political tension. Meanwhile there was activity also in

the democratic anti-Getulist camp, whose candidate is General Juarez Tavora, supported by the Socialist Party, the Christian-Democratic Party, the National Democratic Union (UDN), and Janio Quadros, who is head of the electoral campaign. They are mobilizing the opponents of Getulism among the middle class, among the workers and in conservative circles, under the banner of honest government, social and agrarian reform, defense of the country's oil resources, and for workers' profit-sharing in industry. Tavora is counting on support of the liberal democratic bourgeoisie that was opposed to Vargas, a part of the middle class and the army, and maybe a minority section of the working class.

But according to the information that reaches me, his only chance for a plurality is a split in the popular vote between Kubitschek and the third candidate, Adhemar de Barros.

Tavora's election would likely assure internal peace and continuation of the August revolution which ousted Vargas. Economic policy would be a liberal open door for foreign capital investment, and the internal regime would be a moderate democracy. In foreign trade: concessions to the U. S. in return for economic assistance and new loans for industrial investment. No adventurism.

IF KUBITSCHKEK WINS

It appears that we can exclude the possibility of a victory for Adhemar de Barros, the corruptionist *par excellence*, in spite of his great activity.

But what will happen in case of a Kubitschek victory? A coup d'état such as is threatened by the army, under the pretext that his election was illegal because it was backed by the illegal CP?

This probably depends on how sweeping Kubitschek's victory is in this case. If his electoral majority is large, if popular feeling in his favor is great, and if his organizations are clearly combative, then it is likely that the army will desist from any direct immediate intervention, that is, from a coup d'état, in spite of General Pereira's declaration. The generals would tolerate his assumption of governmental power and wait for another opportunity after his popularity has drained away.

Such a "peaceful" solution is indicated, in such case, by the political tradition of Brazil and by the tactics which the generals employed against Getulio Vargas. It should be understood that the Brazilian political regime is different from that of the other Hispanic republics; political passions are more moderate, and palace revolutions are neither so easy nor so popular as in Bolivia, Ecuador, Venezuela or Paraguay. Among the countries of Latin America, Brazil has a different past and a different tradition, national character and political dynamic.

The Brazilian army is not characteristically the instrument of adventurers and candidates for dictatorship. It is more like a state party of Brazilian capitalism, playing the role of a party which is not so much interested in running the government itself as in ensuring internal peace and order, which are indispensable for the economic development of the country. In the present juncture, the army is opposed to economic adventures, to inflationary policies, to corruption, and to economic "jacobinism" directed against the U. S.

If it should have to tolerate Kubitschek in power, it will wait for the first opportunity in a crisis to depose him and put a quietus to any subsequent danger of "Getulist restoration." In such a situation, the coup d'état would be organized not by generals but by younger colonels, and the neo-Getulist power would be replaced by a colonels' "social dictatorship," not by a liberal rightist administration.

Of course, these are conjectures, and the real political development may escape the framework of our speculations.

DISPATCH FROM DUBLIN

Irish Laborites on the Griddle

By M. M.

DUBLIN, Sept. 6—Dubliners are facing a shutdown of the city's gas and transport services at the weekend when strike notices expire. The strike notices were handed in by "Larkin's union"—the Workers Union of Ireland (WUI)—for a wage boost of 15 per cent. The WUI has spearheaded what is known as the "fifth round" of wage increases, which takes its name from the number of increases conceded since the statutory restrictions on wages ended in 1947.

The Labor Court (an official conciliation court without legal powers) has become so discredited that even the most conservative union officers refuse to use it. In the circumstances, Industry and Commerce Minister Norton has been forced to convene a conference of both employers' and workers' organizations to attempt to shore up its falling prestige.

It is obvious that the government sees the impending economic storm and that Norton, the Labor handmaid of the government, has been given the dirty task of urging wage restraint on the unions. Clearly the "fifth round" may be the death knell of the government. The "Pull Down Prices" program of the Labor Party when it joined the government has proved to be an empty gimmick to justify fat jobs for the boys.

Further political storms are blowing

up. Last fall, world tea prices began to soar, and the government, under pressure from the Labor Party, gambled on a price fall within the year, and subsidized the existing price by \$4 million. But the price didn't fall, and if the capitalist minister of Finance has his way there will be a 20 per cent rise in the present price of 75 cents per pound. If this happens, a revolt in the ranks of the Labor Party seems certain.

Labor in the government is committed to the full implementation of De Valera's Social Health Act of 1953. This finds an echo in the fall of the last coalition in 1951. A united front of Catholic bishops and the Irish Medical Association (IMA) at that time killed a more progressive measure piloted by the petty-bourgeois radical Dr. Browne. The De Valera government that took office that year under pressure from Browne & Co. (who held the balance of power) resurrected the bill in a watered-down form; but again the bishops and the IMA succeeded in delaying portions of the act. The Labor Party is again committed to the "implementation in full of the 1953 Health Act."

It will be interesting to watch the Labor strategists maneuver to keep their lush jobs by avoiding an open break with the reactionary ministers in the cabinet on this issue.

Three Conferences — —

(Continued from page 2)

from the mouths of the party bosses.

Significant fact this year is that the debate on economic policy will take place on a resolution from Morpeth which pledges support for what it calls strictest economy and all measures designed to eliminate the dangers of inflation. This is an indication of the ideas which are floating around in the Tory mind and which will be applied if the economic situation in Britain gets tough in the coming months. As it probably will do if recent trends are followed.

SEEK RENT RISE

A further indication into the inner workings of the minds of the Tory leaders is contained in the fact that they have selected for debate a resolution which seeks to push up the rents on municipally owned houses.

At the moment most local councils charge tenants of municipally owned houses only a portion of the actual economic rent, the remainder being met by subsidy from taxes and central government funds. This has long irked the Tories and the resolution for debate at their conference seeks to wipe out part of this subsidy by charging rents according to the tenants' income. Only today the Tory minister of Housing and Local Government spoke of the "burden" which the subsidies constituted and urged local councils to push up rents until they were "more in line with the current levels of wages."

The irony of this situation is that nearly all local councils borrow the money for house building from the Public Works Loan Board and repay it with interest over a period of sixty years. The interest rate is governed by the bank rate and, because of Tory economic policy, the interest rates now payable are crippling many local councils. The posi-

tion has been reached where many authorities are in fact paying to the Public Works Loan Board more in interest than they are receiving in subsidies from the chancellor of the Exchequer. Which means that instead of the government subsidizing tenants of municipal houses the tenants are subsidizing the government!

Alongside these displays of Tory economics there are the annual indications of the Tory hatred for militant trade unions. Tame trade unions, led by "responsible men," can be tolerated by the Tories, but when it comes to fighting unions they want to clamp down. Hence demands for secret strike-ballot legislation, action against wildcat strikers and the prohibition of picketing for wildcat strikers.

Digging down deep, the Tories have actually found a shop steward in their midst and he will move a resolution which calls for cooperation between management and labor to remove the causes of industrial unrest. This shop steward, who is also a Tory member of a local council, must be a very unique specimen. For he actually comes from Birmingham, a Midlands industrial center which boasts a strong left-wing Labor organization, a militant trade union movement, and which has a record of fighting which stretches back into the dark regions of history.

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

Max Shachtman

A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!

\$1.00

Cloth \$2.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Who Said It?

In 1945 he said: "Nothing guides Russian policy so much as a desire for friendship with the U. S." In 1948 he said: "In the past relations of America and Russia there was no cause to regard the future with pessimism." In 1952 he said: "The lands and the millions made captive to the Kremlin are fresh evidence that dire peril stalks every free nation today. Tyranny must feed on new conquests or wither away." In 1953 he said: "The Soviet Government's goal is power superiority at all costs. Security was to be bought by denying it to others." In 1955 he said: "After talking to every member of the Russian delegation (at Geneva), he was profoundly convinced they all desired peace as sincerely as he did."

Who said all that? Why Ike, of course. Who else? P. R.

Letter in the New York Post
September 13, 1955

The definitive biography!
A masterly political portrait
of the totalitarian dictator

Leon Trotsky's
'STALIN'

This book is out of print, but we have copies available for \$6.00

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

U.S. Goes Down the Line — —

(Continued from page 1)

resisters on the other side of the Mediterranean, an American general had had to say yes. American-supplied helicopters had been turned over to the French in order to be used against the native population. American forces had trained French parachute-jumpers in Algeria to overawe the people.

And at the UN, the representative of the same United States which had already intervened against the Algerian people got up to support France on the ground that the UN must not intervene in an "internal" quarrel.

The New Zealand delegate was just a little outspoken. "Inclusion of the Algerian item on the Assembly agenda, he held, might put a premium on increased violence and terrorism by nationalist factions and set a precedent for 'any secessionist minority' within other states."

Or, as they put it outside UN speeches, if "we" let the Algerians gain their freedom, what colonial power will be safe?

ALGERIANS SPEAK

Four days after this shameful vote, the French-U.S. line of justifying colonialism received a resounding smack from inside Algeria. A majority of the Moslem (i.e., non-French) members of the elected Algerian Assembly repudiated French rule and asked for freedom.

The impact of this can be appreciated only if we note that these are supposed to be the "tame" Moslem leaders who are more trusted by the French, "who have long been closest to the French point of view" (as the *Times* dispatch put it), and who "are in no respect the friends, supporters or associates of the fellagha (outlaw) leaders in the hills"—nor, we may add, the real mirrors of the people's feelings. (Nine days before, a *Times* dispatch had written in so many words that everyone knew the French had "falsified" the elections to this Assembly!)

Even such as these proclaimed that the "immense majority of the population now supports the idea of an Algerian nation," and "spurned" the latest deal from Paris for something less than nationhood.

(The French thereupon cancelled the scheduled session of the Algerian Assembly, thus showing how "integrally" Algeria is a part of the French democracy.)

In Paris, the minister of the Interior denied any intention of dealing with the Algerian rebel bands, protesting that this would "dishonor the loyal Moslem population of Algeria." What population in Algeria is "loyal" to France?

In Paris, Premier Faure made a statement: "Without Algeria, he said, both the economy and world prestige of France would be compromised and she 'would be no more than the reflection, each day fainter, of her old grandeur.'" The words sounded like a plagiarism from Winston Churchill explaining that he would never-relinquish that jewel in the British crown named India.

And as these words about the economy and prestige of France were uttered, French planes and artillery launched a

drive to show the Algerian rebels in the Nemencha Mountains that they meant business—indeed, business.

(On the very same day, the little kingdom of Cambodia in Indochina formally declared her independence from France, by a stroke of a pen abolishing all mentions of the French Union in its constitution. The North African nationalists, who today are free from Stalinist ties as genuine fighters for national liberation, may well be led to ponder how the little Asian principality got the power to do this....)

ALARMED CRIES

On the Cyprus issue, the U. S. delegation to the UN had its other noble imperialist ally to consider, Britain. And of course Lodge did not neglect to remember that Cyprus is the major NATO base in the Eastern Mediterranean. What difference does it make, in the face of these convincing "democratic" considerations, that 80 per cent of the Cypriot people are Greek and that they certainly are not British?

This time, of course, there could be no pretense that Cyprus was a "part" of Britain and therefore an internal affair. All that was proposed was that its people be given the right to decide their own affiliation. In fact, all that was proposed in the UN was that this question be put on the UN agenda.

The U. S. shifted its line from last year, when it had abstained. This time it came out openly against considering self-determination.

A *Times* dispatch from Athens by Sulzberger (Sept. 24) weeps. The U. S. "thanks to maladroit public diplomacy" is losing favor. "Neutralism, inspired by disgust with Britain and Turkey and despair with the U. S., is sweeping public opinion." Some influential and conservative Greek leaders are openly hinting at willingness to play footsie with the Russians. There is "imminent crisis," including a slipping economy. (It is typical and hilarious that after painting such a picture, Sulzberger has a remedy: "some distinguished American official [ought] to call in at Athens and pay our respects—adroitly." End of story.)

The same paper's UN correspondent writes a front-page alarm about Russia's wooing of the Asian and African nationalist movements. It turns out, on careful reading, that the alarm is being rung because of Moscow's demagogic vigor in pretending to be a friend of the Algerian and Cypriots, by voting their way in the UN. Cheap courtship! What prevents the American-type demagogues from pitching some of this woo? Nothing—except their foreign policy of building a war bloc around the colonialist oppressors.

Correspondent Drew Middleton, in this busy week of viewing-with-alarm, writes a Sunday think-piece that is really remarkable in what it admits. (And incidentally, this Middleton is one of the most hard-bitten apologists for Washington's foreign policy in the *Times* stable; no softy he.)

Writing from London, he makes some sensational statements about the contemporary sweep of "neutralist" sentiments

in Western Europe; and to him "neutralism" means virtually anything which squints at NATO. It is the "attitude that Continental powers, great and small" are adopting now. They would not be "neutral" if the 1950 intensity of the cold war returned, "but even in those conditions, it is doubtful if the alliance that confronted Moscow three years ago could be reconstructed to its old strength." Why? Because "intelligent men in European governments understand" that, without nuclear weapons, they could do nothing to affect the outcome. "Consequently... the Atlantic alliance is losing both popular and governmental backing."

He even confesses, gingerly, that the press had falsified and distorted the real sentiments of the European people back then when the cold war was sizzling:

Mass Rallies — —

(Continued from page 1)

from his uncle's home in Sumner, Miss., while there on a visit, by Bryant and Milam, and his body was later found, beaten and shot. The two men were arrested for murder. Their defense was that the boy had whistled at Milam's wife and so they went after him. (They claimed they turned him loose unharmed.)

The official defense at the trial was that the body was too badly decomposed (it had been in the water 'some time') for identification and that probably the boy's mother and the NAACP had planted the body to frame the two white men. This outrageous defense could only have been made in the South—and only in the South could the two murderers have been acquitted.

After their acquittal they were arrested on a kidnapping charge; the indictment will take place before a LeFlore grand jury. This county is more urban than the Tallahatchie County in which the murder trial took place, and it is considered "tougher." The indictment handed down could be a lesser kidnapping charge, with a maximum penalty of ten years, or a greater one, with the penalty 30 years up to the death penalty. It is possible that, in view of outraged world opinion, the two men will be gotten on the lesser charge—it is not probable that anyone will attempt to try them on the greater.

Outraged opinion was clearly manifested on Sunday at the great protest rally in Harlem.

"NOT YET A REALITY"

After the amenities of the Star Spangled Banner and invocation, A. Philip Randolph of the Sleeping Car Porters spoke. He protested the fact that freedom and democracy for all is not yet a reality in this country, and said that if soldiers could be sent to Korea to defend freedom abroad, they could be used to defend it at home. If freedom is to be a vital force to defeat Communism at home and abroad, it has to be a reality, he declared.

David Licorish, assistant minister of the Abyssinian Baptist Church, spoke next. He was an impassioned and impressive speaker. The fight would take more than words, he said; it would take money, work, blood, sweat and tears. Everyone must fight on and stand for no nonsense—"Farewell, Jim Crow." The audience was at all times responsive, and particularly when he called for a march on Dixie.

Earl Brown, Democratic city councilman, asked where the Department of Justice was in these affairs, the Lee murder, the Smith murder and the Till murder. He pointed out that there was obvious jurisdiction, in the first two cases by virtue of the Federal Civil Rights Statute, and in the second because of the Lindbergh Kidnap Law. He said that the FBI was quick enough to step in in such cases as the Greenleaf kidnapping. He called for a committee for refugees from Mississippi, and said

"Although it was unfashionable to say so at the time, these [neutralist] elements had extensive popular backing."

But if "the Atlantic alliance is losing both popular and governmental backing," why then, this would mean nothing less than a total crash of the whole edifice of U. S. foreign policy!

Perhaps Middleton is anticipating, in his panic. But surely it is clear that America's reactionary course is alienating the people of the world. The "neutralist" sentiment that appalls him is used by the Stalinists where they can, fanned by the Stalinists where they can, but it is created more by the U. S.; and it reflects the ardent aspirations of the people to tear loose from dependence and domination by either of the threatening war blocs in the world, not to tie up with the Russian totalitarians.

that if the Negroes left the South its economy would fall apart.

When Roy Wilkins, secretary of the NAACP, told of a letter from Yazoo, Miss., describing what had happened to the Negroes who paid their poll tax ("that means you want to vote")—everyone fired from jobs, storekeepers unable to obtain produce from wholesalers, a disabled veteran unable to cash his government check—the audience was moved to a new pitch of indignation. His answer to the problem was that everyone should get smart, not emotional and register, vote, see their precinct captains, see to it that civil-rights bills got passed, and support the NAACP.

MOTHER'S STORY

There were a number of other speakers, notable among them Emmett Till's mother, Mamie Bradley, who gave an articulate and moving account of the news of her son's disappearance and the later finding of his body. She said that they were able to get possession of the body and have it shipped to Chicago only when her cousin swore that the box would never be opened. It was opened, of course, for the world to see—the viewing after the funeral took two days. She described the trial as a terrible farce, and said that they had not expected anything but an acquittal. She wasn't too impressed by the prosecutor, Robert Smith, who laughed at fears for her safety, telling her that she was as safe as he was. "He had a gun in his pocket," she said.

Two songs were sung by the church choir, the Battle Hymn of the Republic and the Negro Anthem; both were very moving and expressed the feelings that had brought these people there to stand for two hours on a Sunday afternoon—the sorrow, the courage and the determination.

The speakers were all at great pains to point out that just the fact that these people had come to the meeting was "worthless," unless followed up by such positive action as voting or supporting the NAACP. They were exaggerating. A meeting of protest, of outrage at a wrong against someone else—today that is something very important indeed.

The Negroes in attendance were expressing solidarity with a vital struggle, with the Mississippi sharecroppers who live in fear and poverty and ignorance, and they want to do something about these conditions. They weren't cynical because it wasn't their son who was killed, that it wasn't their lookout. It is their lookout and they know it. The white workers and all workers can learn a lot from them.

Disarmament — —

(Continued from page 1)

White House release of Bulganin's answer to Eisenhower's proposal. To no one's surprise, Moscow rejected the inspection plan, but not with a flat no. It suggested that the plan be widened in two ways: to include all states, and to include all of America's world bases.

From a technical viewpoint, Bulganin's suggestion to widen the inspection plan creates a staggering and impossible problem. It would take years to set up an adequate organization for American-Russian inspection. To do this on a world-wide scale would postpone its practicability into an even more distant future.

THE REAL BUSINESS

By including America's overseas bases, the Russians have handed the Eisenhower regime a political headache of the first magnitude. While the Russians no doubt know almost everything there is to know about America's continental military establishment, they do not presumably have the same information about the bases on foreign soil. Furthermore, the protests from the America First choir in Congress would rise from the present whisper to a heart-rending howl. And would America's allies readily

consent to having their sovereignty breached? Would Franco, for instance, that great defender of civilization, permit Russia aerial inspection over Spain?

Both great powers continue talking about disarmament and simultaneously pursue the real business of converting and gearing their armed forces to fight a nuclear-air war. One of the by-products of this expensive process of preparing for H-bomb war is the need to cut the cost of conventional arms and armies. And this has pushed both the United States and Russia to cut their standing armies. This is "disarmament" with a vengeance.

Meanwhile, Moscow and London continue testing thermonuclear devices; the Americans push the arming of Germany and are planning a rapid build-up of the air force, which has been outstripped in certain particulars by the Russians. Both sides woo "neutral" countries with the offer of arms. Moscow has offered to install plants for the production of MIGs in Yugoslavia in order to oust the Americans. And Egypt, recently wooed with an offer of arms by Russia, has just received a similar offer from Washington.

Thus imperialist disarmament marches on.

Labor Action FORUM New York

Thursday at 8:45 p.m.

Oct. 6—Hal Draper

**SCHUMPETER'S THEORY
OF IMPERIALISM**

Oct. 13—Sam Taylor

**THE ECONOMIC BASIS
OF AMERICAN PROSPERITY**

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

The New Young Socialist Movement: For a Socialist World—Against Both Capitalism and Stalinism

By GEORGE RAWLINGS

The Young Socialist League is the only nation-wide socialist youth organization in the United States, dedicated to advancing the cause of Third Camp socialism among students and young workers, its two main arenas of activity.

It attempts to organize into a single-socialist youth organization all youth on the basis of a general commitment to democratic socialism.

It welcomes to its ranks those who, while not necessarily in complete agreement with its programmatic views on all subjects, are in general agreement with its aims and who are willing to engage in democratic discussion and socialist education concerning major political questions.

While it is a completely independent youth organization, with no organic relationship with any adult organization, the Young Socialist League maintains a close fraternal relationship with the Independent Socialist League on the basis of their common program of Third Camp socialism. However, membership in the Young Socialist League in no way demands agreement with or conformity to the traditions and politics of the Independent Socialist League, membership being open to youth members of other existing adult socialist organizations who join the Young Socialist League in good faith on the basis of general concurrence with its program. As a youth movement in this particular historical period, the bulk of the members of the Young Socialist League belong to no adult socialist movement.

The Young Socialist League was founded in February 1954 as the result of the merger of two existing socialist youth organizations: the Socialist Youth League, at the time the youth affiliate of the Independent Socialist League, and the Young Peoples Socialist League, which had been, until the severance of its connection in 1953, the youth affiliate of the Socialist Party. This united, for the first time since 1937, the two major socialist youth organizations in the United States.

BUILDING FROM UNITY

The unity was made possible by the movement of YPSL away from the politics of the right-wing leadership of the Socialist Party and toward the position of independent Third Camp socialism. Furthermore, in the years before the unity convention, the members of both had learned that they could work together in campus and other situations fruitfully and for the same ends.

At the time of unity and increasingly since then, the organization which was formed as a result of this merger, the Young Socialist League, has attracted a considerable number who had either previously dropped membership in one of the several socialist tendencies or who had had no previous affiliation with the socialist movement. A reactivation of the membership of the socialist youth organizations and a resurgence of general activity, which has led to numerical growth, have been the healthy results of the creation of the Young Socialist League a year and a half ago.

The experience of the Young Socialist League has indicated that the merger has been successful, that a new organization has come into existence, which, while drawing upon the traditions of both the former Socialist Youth League and Young Peoples Socialist League, nevertheless has achieved an organizational distinctiveness and maturity of its own. Michael Harrington, the newly elected national chairman of the Young Socialist League, who had been one of the leaders of the YPSL, well summed up the spirit of the new organization when he declared at the recent meeting of the National Executive Committee of the YPSL: "Differences in the organiza-

tion based on being part of a 'YPSL faction' or an 'SYL faction' are something of the past and have become only a footnote to the history of the socialist movement in the United States."

It is not an empty platitude to declare that while building upon the experience of the past, the direction and mood of the Young Socialist League is toward the future.

SOCIALIST AIM

The aim of the Young Socialist League is to aid in the basic transformation of our present society into one "where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed." In this task, we look toward the working class as the class capable of successfully leading the struggle for socialism.

In common with all democratic socialists, we reject the "elitist" concept of social change held in common by "American line" liberals, fascists, and Stalinists. Socialism cannot be handed down from above, as the social-democratic bureaucracy and various shades of Stalinists believe, but can only be brought into being by the working class, struggling in its own behalf. The nationalization of industry is not necessarily socialism or "socialistic," for the crucial question always remains: who controls the state which is the nationalizing instrument? Is it controlled by

the majority or by a minority class in power?

The Young Socialist League and all revolutionary democratic socialists do not make the mistake of confusing nationalization of industry under the conditions of exploitive class rule, as in Stalinist Russia, with democratic socialism. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels recognized this in 1848 when they wrote, "The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority."

IN THE STRUGGLE

The Young Socialist League, at the present stage of the class struggle in the United States, directs its energies toward breaking the organized labor movement away from the Democratic Party, a party devoted to the preservation of capitalism, and toward moving it to the creation of an independent labor party. Although we do not believe that the labor party can be anything more than a first step on the road to socialism, nevertheless, at the present stage of development it is the necessary precondition for raising the level of the masses to a stage of socialist consciousness.

We orient our members toward continual participation in the political and economic struggles of the day, and do not retreat to a mystical contemplation of the ideal of socialism, nor abstain from the politics of contemporary society. Therefore YSLers are active in the struggles of their trade unions, in the fight for civil liberties and civil rights, in all movements that represent progressive development toward the creation of independent labor politics in the United States.

Although the Young Socialist League

realizes that many of the students who join its ranks can best make their contribution to the socialist cause in other ways, it attempts to encourage as many of its members as possible to enter industry, where they can participate as active rank-and-file militant leaders in the trade-union movement.

On the campus the League participates militantly in the struggle against the witchhunt and Jim Crow. YSLers work in defense of academic freedom on campus, and of civil liberties in government and industry. Wherever possible they function in local adjuncts of the Workers Defense League, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, with the aim of increasing the effectiveness and militancy of these organizations.

FOR THE THIRD CAMP

The Young Socialist League is an heir to the tradition of internationalist socialism. Loyal to its basic aim of opposing man's exploitation of man, and understanding that one of modern capitalism's major supports comes from imperialist exploitation, the League struggles against imperialism and its concomitant in the 20th century, brutal white chauvinism and racism, wherever they are to be found.

The YSL supports with all the strength it can muster the struggles of the Puerto Ricans against American imperialism, and of Africans and Asians against French, British, South African and other oppressors. It recognizes that the colonial revolution is one of the major hallmarks of our era and that socialists must be the leaders of these struggles. American socialists must in particular struggle against the attempts of American imperialism to bolster up or supersede the European colonial powers.

But more than this, we recognize that a dual fight must be waged: against both capitalism and Stalinism. The YSL raises the slogan of the Third Camp: Neither Moscow nor Washington! It understands that both capitalism and Stalinism are reactionary forces which must be defeated. It fights against Stalinism from the left in all its arenas, and attempts to convince those among the youth who have mistakenly identified their own radicalism with Stalinism, of the perfidious role of Stalinism in the class struggle and in the fight against fascism and imperialism.

In the major document adopted at its recent Second Convention, the League declared that it "is unalterably opposed to the war plans, war drives and war aims of both imperialist camps. It calls for the Third Camp struggle of the international proletariat and colonial peoples against both Washington and Moscow. Only such a struggle opens up

(Continued on page 4-C)

Challenge to the Campus

As an immediate program for the campus, the Young Socialist League advocates:

(1) *The right of students* to organize freely for political discussion, to hear speakers of their choice, and to organize for political activity without interference from the school administration. We especially oppose the requirement that full membership lists must be submitted to the school authorities.

(2) *Opposition to the militarization of the campus;* to compulsory ROTC; to UMT in all its disguises, including the present Reserve program; to student loyalty oaths; and to government use of student activity as proof of "subversion," as in the Army Discharge Program.

(3) *The right of faculty members* to be hired and fired on the basis of academic competence.

(4) *Student government*—the right of students to participate fully in the decisions affecting the academic community and to be free from arbitrary administrative rule; the right of students to strike.

(5) *Increased federal aid to education* to make a free college education available to all American youth; government aid to students for tuition and living expenses to combat the increased cost of higher education, and to counter discrimination against youth from low income groups.

(6) *Student support to the unionization* of campus employees, academic and non-academic.

(7) *Complete racial integration* of all American schools; an end to all discriminatory practices, such as the quota system.

(8) *Student cooperation* with groups like the Workers Defense League, the ACLU, the NAACP, and especially with the progressive sections of the labor movement, in the struggle for peace, civil liberties and economic democracy.

THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

SOCIALIST CRITICISM OF A HALF-WAY HOUSE

What Does Liberalism Offer Youth?

By EDWARD HILL

During the past year, American liberals on the campus and in the nation at large have come face to face with the ambiguities of their position.

At best, the liberal delegation in Congress has offered token resistance to coattail-riding Lyndon Johnson's policy of capitulating to the Republicans on almost every issue. At worst, they have continued their retreat on a score of basic (liberal) issues: civil rights, civil liberties, foreign policy.

As a result, the national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action has been forced to verbally reassert ADA's independence and to warn the Democrats that they must fight to retain liberal support. And yet everyone knows that ADA and American liberalism, given their present politics, are in a blind alley. There is no place to go for the liberals, and on election day they will be voting for those same leaders whom they criticize so sharply in an off-year.

The impasse of adult liberalism is doubled on the campus. Among the political students there is usually a more militant and independent attitude than among the ADAers. Yet those sincere, democratic youth who have been attracted to liberalism are saddled with all the compromises and Realpolitik of their elders—without receiving the bureaucrats' jobs and patronage which still go to ADA. Within the limits of American liberalism, it is difficult, if not impossible, for liberal students to offer a militant program to the campus. Yet here too is the same problem as ADA faces: where shall they go?

It is not too difficult to realize that these are the facts. They are often admitted publicly by liberal spokesmen, as in ADA's criticism of the Democratic Party. But even more important is an understanding of why this is the situation, of how a movement which feels itself dedicated to all kinds of decent social values—to unionism, to civil liberties, to democracy in foreign affairs—is pushed into an impasse where the only alternatives seem to be support to conservatism and even reaction or to admit that liberal organizations have become politically irrelevant.

The first and most crucial point in understanding this development is to grasp the intellectual bankruptcy of liberalism today and the reasons for it.

In the thirties, in a period of social movement, American liberals united behind Roosevelt on a program of reforming capitalism. The seven years of the New Deal failed to accomplish the most minimal goals of this reform and in 1939 almost ten million were still unemployed. World War II did provide a solution to the social crisis, although the cost was reckoned in lives. Thus, the American liberals entered the post-war world with a domestic program of questionable value, that of Keynesian reform, and of little else in terms of concrete proposals.

FATAL FLAWS

The Truman victory in 1948 demonstrated that the liberal-labor coalition was still politically viable in terms of winning elections; but the aftermath of that triumph proved that it could not provide real political leadership to the nation. Four successive Fair Deal programs failed. The liberals were unable to cope with either the functioning or the mood of a war-economy prosperity.

Their limited analysis of society and their well-advertised empiricism (which they contrasted to the "dogmatism" of socialists) turned out to be fatal flaws. For this was a period when foreign policy was determinant and in this area the liberals had nothing much to offer other than support to the Democratic Party.

At the same time as the struggle between the United States and Russia for world domination became the political focus of American life, a related, parallel phenomenon developed: the witch-

In foreign affairs, America viewed the success of mass Stalinist movements in Asia and Europe as the results of a "conspiracy." China, according to this attitude, was lost in the offices of the Institute for Pacific Relations. On the home front, Stalinist organizations, and almost all radical groups, were regarded in the same way, as conspiracies. But the police power was not used against them only when the Stalinists were, or might have been, acting conspiratorially. It was invoked in order to suppress the exercise of ordinary democratic rights.

The liberals had no political basis on which to dissent from this trend even though many of them instinctively understood its evil, undemocratic content. Formed as they were by the limited reform ideology of the thirties, they had no particular understanding of the historic nature of the colonial revolution or of the roots of Stalinism in the European labor movement. Korea, Indochina, Formosa, these were problems to be handled empirically by men of good will.

Given this point of view, American liberalism could differentiate itself from the conservative leadership of the Democratic Party only in terms of emphasis, of a claim of better administrative ability—but not on the basis of a principled disagreement.

More or less the same situation prevailed with regard to civil liberties. The liberals responded to the repression with an immediate disgust and opposition. Yet when Hubert Humphrey pushed his logical development of the conspiracy doctrine in his Communist Control Act, ADA could momentarily demur only to agree at its convention that Stalinism was, after all, not a political movement but a conspiracy pure and simple.

Here, as in the case of foreign policy, liberals were caught in a world which they did not make and which their reform orientation of the thirties did not prepare them for. There were the occa-

sional objections, the outcries against what was happening, but these could only be part of an emotional reaction. Politically, liberalism's intellectual bankruptcy made their coattail-riding more or less inevitable.

Some within the liberal movement have made a virtue out of this necessity. Like Hubert Humphrey in his advocacy of the Communist Control Act, they have abandoned even the emotional sense of the wrongness of American foreign policy and the tragedy of the witchhunt. But for others—and for the majority of students—there still remained the instinctive sympathy with democracy even though this was contained within a political bankruptcy of thought that often forced the liberal movement to support undemocratic policies.

It is to these liberals that the Young Socialist League addresses itself.

CHALLENGE TO LIBERALS

The first and most obvious thing we must say follows immediately from our analysis of liberalism: that anyone in the 20th century who wants to fight for democracy must understand the revolutionary crisis of our times, the struggle of workers and Asian peasants against capitalism and imperialism, their constant betrayal by the reactionary anti-capitalism of Stalinism.

This, we say, is a situation which requires some kind of coherent ("dogmatic") consciousness. It is also a situation which requires the taking of sides—for the workers and peasants—against imperialism whether it be Stalinist or capitalist.

We believe that such an understanding is only possible on a socialist basis, indeed, that this consciousness is precisely the precious heritage of the so-

cialist movement. Therefore we believe that ultimately liberals must be brought to this point of view and abandon their liberalism.

And yet there are many American liberals today—the overwhelming majority of them—who refuse to make this transition. Have we nothing to say to them, or do we simply doom them to their blind alley?

To those liberals who cannot see this necessity for a socialist point of view and who are sincere democrats, we say: Fight for your belief in democracy within the liberal movement; fight against the Humphreys and the witchhunt, against the support to Chiang and Franco and Bao Dai and the suppression in North Africa. And in all fairness, we must add that we do not believe that such a fight can be won within the bounds of liberal ideology. Yet we feel that such a struggle must be made by liberals, not only for the partial realizations which it may achieve, but more, for the education which it will give.

We are confident that one result of such a fight within the liberal movement, honestly carried on by liberals and not by socialists, will be to bring the sincere, liberal democrat closer to socialism.

Finally, it must be emphasized that we view the struggle within the liberal movement as only one phase in a larger development. In the crisis of our times, with its threat of atomic holocaust and its vast Asian revolution, we believe that only a socialist program can provide a real solution. This is the final point of view which we put forward on the campus to the liberal students. But even with those who are unable to accept this full program, if they are democratic liberals, we believe that we can work fruitfully on the basis of our common devotion to freedom.

UMT Smuggled In in Disguise

By SAM TAYLOR

The road to the militarization of society does not take place at one swoop. It proceeds by bits and stages, and while it is going on almost all can see it happening.

When Congress passed the Ready Reserve bill at the close of the first session of the 84th Congress, a giant step was taken on the road toward this militarization. As one college after another adopts an ROTC program, or even worse, a compulsory ROTC, further steps are taken along this road to disaster.

Perhaps very few who support the Ready Reserve program or ROTC are aware of the consequence. It is becoming more and more a part of the "American Way of Life." Along with baseball, television, the movie and a car, the intervention of the military into daily life becomes accepted and commonplace. And to the extent that it leads to complacency, the greater the danger.

The intrusion of the military into the life of American youth has not been one smooth, easy path. There has been resistance and it will continue. Therefore the most consistent and vociferous initiators of UMT and ROTC have been forced to take piecemeal victories.

If they can't get a complete and universal military training bill through Congress—not because most senators and representatives don't support the idea but because the people have refused to go along with it—then a Ready Reserve program will be pushed. Or first they introduce a voluntary ROTC and follow with a compulsory program.

The tactics of the military and the political leaders of both the Democratic and Republican Parties has been to avoid a head-on assault or any all-or-nothing gamble. Instead they will take out what they can get today and come back tomorrow to take another bite out of our liberties.

Such was the approach in the proposal for UMT. The administration would have liked to pass a UMT at this last session of Congress, but the opposition to it was too strong. Congressmen after congressmen said that he agreed with UMT in principle but begged off voting for it by pointing out that their constituents back home were against it. However, they were open to a proposal that would incorporate many UMT features in it, and that was

the genesis of the active Ready Reserve. **Thus they could at one and the same time vote their convictions and tell the people that they did not vote for UMT.**

However, while the administration was unhappy about the bill and openly proclaimed it to be unworkable, it was better than nothing at all. At least it opened the door.

The bill that was passed was in form an extension of the draft—but with an addition: the strengthening of the active Reserve program. Formerly a draftee, when released from active service, did not have to participate in active drills in a Reserve unit although they are carried on the rolls of the Ready Reserve (subject to recall to active military service without an act of Congress). The new law provides that all two-year draftees from now on will have to participate actively in a Reserve unit for three years after release from active military service.

It has also set up a "pilot" program whereby enlistments will be accepted for 6 months on active duty to be followed by 7½ years on the active Ready Reserve. The other innovation is that the Reserve Program is backed up by penalties (presumably, recall to active duty) for those not regularly attending Reserve drills and a summer encampment.

FLIMSY EXCUSES

Although the military regard this program as inefficient, it does give them hopes of a broader program later on. What they did like about it is that it gives them control over draftees for five years of active training, in one form or another, and starts a program where they will have control for 9 years.

The reasons for the extension of the draft and the introduction of the new program were about the flimsiest ever offered. And the only real reason offered was to create an active Ready Reserve in which youth, according to the original proposal, would be subjected to active military training of one kind or another for 10 years. Although it is now tied to the draft, the ideal would be to have all youth, including large numbers of women, included in a program.

It cannot be claimed that the weekly drill does much, if anything, toward the actual training of a soldier. Much if not most of it consists of drilling and inculcating military discipline and unques-

tioning obedience. It has the same purpose as ROTC, as it expanded from specialized schools such as engineering to liberal arts.

In ROTC, the pretense of purposeful military training is thin; the real motivation is the inculcation of military discipline. The consequence has not been to train soldiers but to allow the military to take a part in the educational process where they exert a reactionary and anti-democratic influence.

In practice, the draft's Ready Reserve program will work out to be more discriminatory than in the past. In the past year the average age of draftees in many states rose to about 25 years due to the large number of draftees coming of age as against the smaller number called up for service. The effect was to hinder potential draftees in getting decent jobs because many employers were hesitant to hire them when they were liable to be called at any time. Now Selective Service has announced that it will lower the age at which it will make the call to service. Either this will mean fewer deferments for students and the possibility of being drafted out of school, or else, once a deferment is made, those who are able to afford to go to college will stand a better chance of not being called up at all.

The military are using this fact of built-in discrimination as another argument for UMT: in order to be "fair," they want to take everyone into the armed forces. And the Ready Reserve program is the foot in the door for this.

The pattern of militarization as it affects youth goes beyond actual call to military service. Compulsory ROTC, for example, is a form of conscription—a UMT for students. It means that in order to get a college education, one must train to be a soldier at the same time. And with these inroads has come the loyalty oath for those who have to take ROTC in order to go to college.

Whatever the inroads to date, it must be kept in mind that they have not gone further because of the opposition of students and the people. Where opposition was organized and vociferous, as at the University of California, this process is slowed up. Militarization, however, depends on apathy to be put into effect; apathy by the people and activity by the military is the formula for its success.

STAND UP AGAINST THE WITCHHUNT

How to Stop the Erosion of Civil Liberties on Campus

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

For over five years there has been a steady erosion of civil liberties on the campus.

At a mid-western university, a girl informs on her date and his friends; in California, students who refuse to sign an ROTC loyalty oath are subjected to tremendous pressures; in New York, City College (like other schools throughout the nation) requires a full membership list of all student organizations — and this within the context of administration cooperation with the FBI. The insane climax of the entire process comes in Detroit where a conservative, anti-Communist professor is charged with Communist leanings, on the basis of having gone to an American Youth for Democracy meeting in order to break it up!

These events are not confined to the students alone. A little over a year ago, the *Harvard Crimson* conducted a survey on academic freedom. In several dozen cases, taken from colleges and universities throughout the nation, it was found that professors had been fired because of their present or past political associations.

Usually, the pretext for discharge was the invocation of the Fifth Amendment by a faculty member. When Edwin Berry Burgum of the New York University faculty was dismissed for refusal to answer the questions of an investigating committee, he was given his walking-papers as he left the hearing room.

The low level of student political life is both a cause and an effect of this anti-libertarian trend. Clearly it is an effect: the repression of college administrations has made it far more difficult for a campus to organize.

But even more importantly, the political apathy of the American college student is a cause of this situation. There has been little or no real resistance to the suppression of civil liberties on the campus. Where students have organized to protest—as for example in the Student Civil Liberties Union on the University of California campus at Berkeley—they have achieved results.

In another case, that of the Green Feather movement—a protest against McCarthyism which spread from the Indiana campus after a legislator in that state had proposed to ban Robin Hood as subversive—large numbers of students became involved in a campaign for civil liberties. Yet this movement was part of the times. It was ephemeral, almost non-political, built as it was around the single and undifferentiated slogan of opposition to McCarthy. It failed to develop any kind of program on how to oppose the witchhunt. And as a result the Green Feather movement vanished almost as suddenly as it came.

LARGER CONTEXT

This failure is of particular significance, for it relates the civil-liberties struggle on the campus to the world outside. It focuses upon the fact that the college youth must understand their problem in a larger context, that of the whole anti-libertarian trend in the United States. And it is a clear indication that unless this is done, unless the opposition to repression on the campus broadens to a political opposition to repression throughout the country, the campus movements will fail.

To be specific: What should the student attitude have been when an Edwin Berry Burgum was fired at New York University? He was associated with the Jefferson School in New York, an organization which had been denounced from all sides as being Communist. He wrote articles sympathetic to Russia and published in pro-Communist magazines. And to cap it all, he had invoked the Fifth Amendment when he was brought up before a congressional investigating committee.

Should students oppose his firing? And, more to the point, if they should do so, how?

Involved in such a case is the whole complex question of job rights, guilt by association, academic freedom. Throughout the United States, more and more positions are being made to require political tests—and positions far removed from any government secrets. Moreover, these tests almost always operate on a principle of drawing wide inferences from associations; of assuming, for example, that to use the Fifth Amendment is to confess a crime or at least a criminal intent. If this trend is understood—and opposed

—then the case of a man like Burgum is put into perspective.

The conclusion of such an analysis is to oppose the firing of Burgum, or any other real or alleged Communist, for his views, and to put forward the standard of competence as controlling in academic hiring and firing. And here, once again, larger issues are raised.

For the argument of those who would fire a man on the grounds of party membership, especially the "liberal" argument put forth by Sidney Hook, is that such membership involves a man in a "conspiracy," that it is not simply a political association, and so on. In dealing with this kind of opposition, it is essential that a movement for academic freedom have some idea of the nature of the Stalinist movement, the American Communist Party, and the characteristics of

the entire repression in the United States based on the "conspiracy" doctrine.

DEMOCRACY FOR ALL

These apparently theoretical problems have immediate practical significance. In defending a man accused of Communist membership, how does one react on the subject of Stalinism in general? Is it a good thing for a civil-liberties group to put itself on record as opposed to Stalinism—or is that a red herring?

The answer to this question depends on two basic considerations: first, an understanding of the anti-libertarian, totalitarian nature of Stalinism and Stalinist parties; secondly, a determination to defend civil liberties for ALL, specifically including Stalinists and fascists.

In practical terms, this means that an academic-freedom campaign should base itself upon a democratic defense of civil liberties, and in most cases, should clearly dissociate itself from Stalinist totalitarianism even while defending the rights of individual Stalinists.

Such a democratic defense of civil liberties demands a careful analysis of problems which go far beyond the campus: It means, once again, that the student movement must become conscious of

itself as participating in a national struggle, of fighting on particular campus issues which are related to larger over-all trends in American democracy. Because of this, student movements can often seek aid from outside organizations and can work in cooperation with them on the campus.

An excellent example of this is the Workers Defense League, of 112 East 19 Street, N. Y. C. This is a labor-oriented, anti-Stalinist organization which has put up a hard struggle for civil liberties, fighting for the rights of individuals in the loyalty and security program, the immigration department, the industrial security program, and so on.

Last summer, one of the WDL's cases, its defense of the rights of Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, in his attempt to get a passport, came to a victorious conclusion. Probably as a result of this achievement, the Independent Socialist League received the first hearing granted to an organization on the attorney general's list. The Workers Defense League is representing the ISL in this fight.

WDL'S WORK

The connection between these activities on the part of the WDL and the campus become apparent when the League's actions in defense of soldiers given undesirable discharges on the basis of pre-induction associations—many of them with student organizations—are brought to light. In these cases, the attorney general's list formed an integral part of the charges regarding student activity. In fighting for the discharge, the WDL was constantly forced to raise the basic issue: that of the list itself, of the fact that there were no hearings for any of the organizations, and so on.

Here is a practical opportunity for the student movement to use the resources of outside groups—in this case, the Workers Defense League—as an aid in their own work. Support of the WDL, use of WDL speakers and dissemination of WDL information on the various loyalty programs, are thus part of a campus campaign.

Or rather, they are part of a campus campaign only if the student movement understands its fight for student rights and academic freedom as part of a larger struggle. If there is this consciousness, if there is a political analysis motivating activity, then such movements can escape the fate of the Green Feather experience. There is no inherent need for campus action to be ephemeral, sporadic and, ultimately, ineffective: this usually happens only when campus action has no politics.

CRUCIAL COUNTERATTACK

There are other outside groups like the WDL. At the University of California at Berkeley, there is a Student Civil Liberties Union which works closely with the American Civil Liberties Union. Here the students have banded together in a democratic organization which makes use of the outside aid which is available to it.

Members of the Young Socialist League unit on the California campus have been instrumental in trying to persuade SCLU to adopt the kind of program discussed in this article. This case, and others like it, demonstrate that the student movement can fight back, that it need not capitulate to the repression.

This counter-struggle is crucial today, for the campus—and for the nation. It must be conscious, political, aware of itself as one part of the larger fight for civil liberties in the United States as a whole.

To make the student movement conscious, political and aware: this is one of the major activities of the Young Socialist League on the campus today. We urge all students who are committed to civil liberties—liberal as well as socialist—to join with us.

School Integration Is Still Marking Time in the South

By CHARLES KRAMER

In spite of the Supreme Court decision ending the legality of segregation, there will be few changes in the number of integrated schools this fall. With its hedging implementation ruling, the court has left much room for bigoted Southern whites to continue to foist their prejudices upon the Negro community for many years. Such Southern "statesman" as Talmadge of Georgia have made mockery of the decision by announcing that integration in Georgia, if it takes place at all, will require 50 to 100 years.

Much as the decision of the court was a necessary and long-overdue step in the fight for Negro rights in America, it hardly rates the glowing eulogies given it by liberals and labor spokesmen. The cynicism of some of the commentators deserves a word here. Many of those who praised the decision did so with the argument that "it will show the world how democratic we are here in the United States." The value of the ruling as a propaganda piece in the cold war is the most often stressed aspect of it. That Negroes have the right to equality, and that segregation is a basically undemocratic and repressive tool, is less often referred to.

As socialists we hail the decision of the Supreme Court although we can only deplore the fact that it did not set some time limit for the carrying through of integration. The thing that all sincere liberals and democrats must now do is struggle for the implementation of the Supreme Court decision. This fight must be carried out on every level in the North and South.

SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS

In the present period the ruling by the court will only have meaning if its implementation is made the arena of struggle by its supporters. The job of those who support the decision is to press for its becoming a reality at every opportunity. The labor unions, liberal organizations and radical groups must enter vigorously into the fight against those who would sabotage the decision by delaying it indefinitely. Only through militancy on the part of the Negro community and those whites who support their struggle can a victory in this area be achieved.

While our American liberals are used to speaking in ever-growing superlatives about how far the Negro has come in the past few years and how rapidly every trace of discrimination is disappearing from the American scene, anyone who examines the reality can hardly come up with such a glowing picture. The fact is that throughout the South the Negro is a second-class citizen whose life is in constant danger whenever and wherever he seeks to assert equality with whites. The vastness of discrimination even in

the North is a battle which is yet to be won.

In the colleges and universities of America the fact of discrimination is painfully apparent. The few Negroes admitted to various institutions emphasize the very many who are not.

In the South the situation is of course far worse. In recent years some few Negroes have been admitted to schools. First a few were finally admitted to do graduate work on the basis of court rulings that there were no "separate but equal" facilities for them to use. Then, a few were admitted to Southern colleges on a very restricted basis. This is essentially the level at which things now stand. The number of Negroes attending Southern colleges is far below the number with the necessary qualifications and even farther below any equitable distribution on the basis of population.

While the situation in the colleges and universities is bad and indicates the basic lack of equality of opportunity for the Negro, the situation in the primary and secondary schools is indescribably worse. The entire Southern school system is with few exceptions poor but the conditions under which Negro children are taught is appalling. The joke of "separate but equal" has too long been foisted upon the Negro community.

FIGHT IS ON

What has happened in the light of the Supreme Court rulings? Has integration proceeded? Unfortunately, no. Outside of a few of the more liberal areas in Florida, North Carolina, and Virginia, there has been little real attempt at integration. In Washington, D. C., integration has taken place on a minor scale and the "show-place" aspect has been emphasized again and again. One could easily believe that the only reason for the end of segregation at all is the cold war.

In the few areas where the attempt at integration has been made it has not been without violence. All sorts of terrorist and inflammatory actions have been carried out by bigoted Southern whites to prevent Negroes from attending "white" schools. In most cases, only the most token compliance with the decision has taken place. And this is only in a few areas. The largest part of the South still remains completely segregated with no steps taken toward integration at all.

The fight for integration is still in the future. All demagogic oratory to the contrary notwithstanding, the schools in the South still remain segregated. The Negro community is largely fearful of asserting its rights and only militancy will be able to push forward this important fight in the South. Those Negro forces which are carrying on the battle are waging a just fight which all must support.

Get the Challenge

every week — by subscribing to
Labor Action. A student sub is
only \$1 a year!

In the Present Stage of the Cold War:

The CP Youth and the 'Coexistence' Line

By MAX MARTIN

The arm of the Communist Party among student youth, the Labor Youth League and its assorted fronts, has, like American Stalinism in general, been engaged in executing a new "Popular Front" turn during the past few years.

Having reduced its political ideology and propaganda to two easily memorized slogans, "For Peace" and "Against McCarthyism," the LYL, which jocularly styles itself, "an independent Marxist youth movement," strives (it says) to win young people to a "new upsurge for a peaceful and democratic solution to national and world tension." That's how it was put by one Julian Lowitt in an article entitled "Youth and the Struggle for Peace and Democracy" in the August 1955 issue of *Political Affairs*, CP "theoretical" organ.

Given its current political line, Stalinism, as CP youth-expert Lowitt explains, issues stirring calls to youth to join the "new democratic political majority" in the fight for "a new era of peace and world friendship," a "progressive, pro-labor trend" in the 1956 elections, the "broadest democratic struggle" and "democratic youth unity." And it is no surprise that Lowitt hails the "maturing" of youth as manifested in the "growth in numbers, size and influence of Young Democratic organizations" and waxes rapturous over "such notable expressions in the organized youth movement on the peace question" as the adoption of a resolution favoring the UN by the 1955 convention of the Young Women's Christian Association.

It must sadly be noted that the CP youth organizations have in the past period been able to make certain limited gains among students and young people on the basis of the above "program." In addition, such Stalinoid currents as the "Sweezyites" of *Monthly Review* and the "Cochranites" of the *American Socialist* have, to a minor extent, spread their influence among some students. Given the relaxation of international tensions during the last two years, it is understandable that such ideas have made some headway.

The universal fear of a third world war and the universal and profound wish for peace have led masses everywhere to latch on to the formulas of "peaceful co-existence" and "Big Power negotiations" as the road to a peaceful world. The events on the international scene since the end of the Korean war, particularly those of the last few months, have strengthened and nurtured these illusions. The Stalinists, as originators, popularizers and promoters of these catch-phrases, become the recipients to some extent of the support which the phrases themselves muster.

PHONY 'PEACE' LINE

That the CP has been able to register some gains on the campus reflects in part the immaturity and lack of political experience of the current campus generation. Today's college students have no knowledge of the role of Stalinism during the war; they are unlike the more politically sophisticated veteran-student who dominated political life on the campus during the early years following World War II.

To many students the claim of the LYL to be fighters for peace is genuine coin. The pretensions of the student Stalinists and their organizations that their political aims are those of realizing a peaceful world, and that their method for so doing lies in urging the United States and Russia to get together and resolve their differences in some unspecified fashion or other, appear to many students who reject the witchhunt to be true. For fear of aiding the witchhunting attacks on the CP, which we together with such students reject, there are some students who regard any other view on the nature of Stalinism as a witchhunting slander.

But these students are mistaken. The first thing which needs saying about the current Stalinist "peace" line is that it is phony.

The aim of the LYL, like the aim of the Communist Parties throughout the world, consists of service to the Russian ruling class, whose agent it is, and aid to Russian foreign policy in particular. The Stalinists peddle their "peace" line today because it is in the interests of Russia for them to do so, but they are not for peace. They are partisans of the victory of Stalinism in the struggle for world domination between Washington and Moscow.

When the United States and Russia

were allied on the same side during World War II, the Stalinists played the "Win the War" song. In the interests of Russia, the Communist Party was the most ardent supporter of the war effort, slandering struggles for Negro rights as "disrupting the war."

In the unions they acted as strike-breakers and favored speed-up, incentive pay and other reactionary measures. They called upon the workers to sacrifice everything for the war, these "partisans of peace" did. And earlier, between June 1941, when Germany invaded Russia, and December 1941, when the United States entered the war, the CP, reversing its opposition to the war of the Hitler-Stalin pact period, had called for American participation in the military struggle embroiling Europe. From the entrance of Russia into the war until some time after its end, the predecessors of the LYL (American Youth for Democracy and the Young Communist League) had proposed and favored the draft and peacetime UMT.

LYL DRESSES UP

Only with the beginnings of the post-war antagonism between the U. S. and Russia did the CP and its youth organizations become opponents of militarization of American youth and "fighters for peace." Now as then, the CP youth served the interests of the Kremlin.

To characterize Stalinism in this way does not in any way mean diminishing the struggle for defending the rights of Stalinists. On the contrary. But students who fight for the civil liberties of the Stalinists must do so with a clear understanding of the nature of the political force whose rights they are defending. To entertain illusions about Stalinism and to join with it in the struggle against war and the witchhunt is to aid the most despotic system and political force in our time.

As part and parcel of their "new look," the Stalinists have now depoliticized their propaganda and organizations and have eliminated all pretenses to theory

New Young Socialist Movement — —

(Continued from page 1-C)

and political significance is combined with social activity and "socialist fraternization."

An extension of this work was the debate between Hal Draper, editor of *Labor Action*, and James Wechsler, of the *New York Post*, sponsored jointly by the Young Socialist League and the New York region of the Students for Democratic Action. In this case, the point of view of independent socialism was counterposed to that of liberalism before a large student audience.

ACTIVITY ON CAMPUS

On campus the YSL works for the advancement of student rights and the protection of the academic freedom of students and teachers. At the University of California at Berkeley, the YSL has been a leading force in the creation of a Student Civil Liberties Union which functions as an adjunct of the California ACLU. It was particularly successful in its fight against the imposition of a "loyalty" oath for ROTC students, its militant action working as an inspiration to student groups throughout the country.

In recent months the YSL has been active in the struggle to gain support in the United States for North African independence from French colonialism. The Los Angeles unit of the League held a successful picket line in front of the French consulate of that city protesting against French colonialism in North Africa. The New York unit is in the process of preparing such a demonstration for some time in the very near future.

Under the impetus of its recent convention and summer camp the YSL looks forward to continued growth in membership and strength in the near future as part of

and to any over-all worked-out theoretical views. They appear on the campus as typical "Joe College" types. The LYL organ *New Challenge* is a slick, digest-size magazine, condescendingly written on the level of a 12-year-old, full of pictures and articles on sports and other topics of "popular" interest. In-between, the CP political line on "coexistence" and the "Geneva spirit" is sandwiched in phrases, the most concrete examples of which are quoted above.

COEXIST—HOW?

Everybody in this world, more or less—from the Kremlin and its agents and abettors in all countries, to Eisenhower and the leaders of the nations of Western Europe, to Nehru and Tito—is for "coexistence," so long as this is not spelled out any further. And for good reason: in and of itself the phrase has little meaning.

Coexist? On what basis? Solve the outstanding differences between the United States and Russia and settle international disputes? With what solutions? Here's the rub.

The Stalinists among the youth are vague about such matters because not to be vague means to reveal that they are for the solution of all questions on Russian terms. The LYL, like the Kremlin, wishes "peace"—that is, it wishes a world-wide victory of Stalinist totalitarianism peacefully, if possible. And so in the cold-war period it works for peaceful victories by the Kremlin.

But if this is the jagged rock over which the Stalinists stumble, it is likewise the hot potato which causes those sincere non-Stalinists among students and other sections of the population who stand on the program of "coexistence" to stutter. It is far easier for the Stalinists to fill the air with hypnotizing cries of "Coexistence or No Existence" than to try and spell out a program on which this is to be achieved. And those non-and anti-Stalinist students who genuinely desire peace, and who believe that a mutual accommodation of the big powers

is the road thereto, have the same difficulty and too often solve it in the same way.

A program for solving international problems has to do two things. It has to offer a lasting barrier to war and it has to meet the elementary criteria of solving the various international problems in a democratic and progressive manner. It has to meet the elementary needs of the people everywhere for the right to determine their own destinies, the right to be free of all exploitation and oppression.

Indeed, these two criteria are one, because only such a program can realize the solution of the problems which face mankind, including the problem of war and peace, in a progressive and peaceful manner.

DEMOCRATIC SOLUTION

The idea that the leaders of the U. S. and Russia should solve these problems behind the backs of the peoples of the world is, in and of itself, in contradiction with these conditions for a peaceful world.

To be sure, the two rival imperialisms can reach limited agreements over this or that question as a result of the pressure upon them and in their own imperialist interests, and some of these agreements may contain some benefits for the people, as did the withdrawal of occupation forces from Austria as a result of the Austrian treaty.

But a democratic solution to the problems of Germany, Formosa, Indochina, North Africa, Korea, etc., will not come from the oppressive, totalitarian imperialism of Russia which holds large sections of the world's population under its reactionary sway for the benefit of the Stalinist bureaucracy; nor will it come from the United States which organizes the capitalist world under its hegemony and from which it skims the cream, and which yesterday overthrew the legally elected government of Guatemala by force and violence and installed a reactionary regime subservient to it in its place.

Nor will it come from these two imperialist war camps acting in concert after a negotiated deal.

Only the struggle of the masses of people all over the world in behalf of their own needs and interests, in behalf of the rights of all nations and peoples to determine their own destinies, can do that.

its effort to create a socialist youth movement in the United States which can play a significant role.

As Hal Draper, editor of *Labor Action*, told the delegates to the recent Young Socialist League convention, "Now more than ever before, the responsibility for the future of socialism in the United States rests with the youth."

JOIN THE YSL!

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

Send me more information about the Young Socialist League.

I want to join the YSL.

(NAME—PLEASE PRINT)

(ADDRESS)

(CITY)

(STATE)

(SCHOOL IF ANY)