

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 3, 1957

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-
LIGHT

Popular Explosion in Formosa Indicts U.S. Pro-Chiang Policy

THE TSURU CASE

The tragic case of Canadian diplomat Herbert Norman put the spotlight on the witchhunt because of the drastic reaction of the victim. His suicide was a violent protest. But a similar wrong in the case of another eminent foreigner has gone unnoticed. It would seem that the living can get neither justice nor sympathetic attention.

The new case was publicized a bit by a letter in the N. Y. Times signed by four prominent members of the Harvard faculty: John K. Fairbank, J. K. Galbraith, Seymour Harris, E. O. Reischauer. It concerns Prof. Shigeto Tsuru, a leading Japanese economist and public figure, who has been lecturing as part of the interchange program at Harvard, where he took his doctorate in 1940.

The letter points out that this "distinguished guest, invited to our country in the spirit of cultural cooperation, was subpoenaed—not even invited—last March by the Eastland subcommittee and was questioned for two days about his activities as a student some twenty years ago." There have been "serious repercussions" in Japan, it says.

To be sure, there is certainly no indication that Prof. Tsuru intends to do anything spectacular to embarrass the witchhunters. Surely the significance of the case does not depend on this. As the letter-writers point out, the new element that is cropping up is not the rights of American citizens but the "involvement of foreign officials and visitors."

If anything, one learns from the letter, Prof. Tsuru has been embarrassed in Japan itself not by any revelations about his past but, on the contrary by the fact that he yielded to the Eastland committee even enough to testify before them in their witchhunting proceedings. We make bold to conclude, with some relief, that suicide, while definitive, is not the most effective way of combating the "dangerous thoughts" brigade.

SUBVERSIVE ANGLING

One of the more appalling facts about the state of civil liberties is that the city which is building up one of the worst records on the subject is none other than that bastion of Democratic liberalism, New York, under a mayor solidly backed by the ADA, the Liberal Party, and all other eminent opponents of McCarthyism.

The latest scandal—half-scandal and half-farce, like some of the nuttier escapades of witchhunters in certain areas—is the city's requirement of a loyalty oath from applicants for permits to fish in its reservoirs.

The commissioner in charge said it was a "security measure": no subversive must "be in any way familiar with our installations," he said.

However, if the said subversive spent his time around the reservoir not fishing but merely (say) mapping the area, he

(Continued on page 2)

By GORDON HASKELL

An explosion of anti-American feeling rocked Chiang Kai-shek's regime in Formosa's capital last week. A day-long series of demonstrations and riots directed primarily against the American embassy and other prominent buildings occupied by American installations led up to a siege of Taipei police headquarters by some ten thousand people demanding the release of prisoners captured by the police earlier in the day.

The demonstrations and riots grew so widespread that order could be restored only by placing the capital under martial law enforced by three divisions of Chinese troops.

The event which set off this demonstration of anti-American feeling was typical of one of the factors which leads to anti-Americanism wherever American troops are stationed abroad.

An American sergeant, accused of shooting and killing a Formosan near his house, was acquitted by an American court-martial. The sergeant claimed the Formosan had been peeping at his wife through a window, and refused to give himself up when challenged. The dead man's widow picketed the American embassy with her child, and a crowd gathered in sympathy. The Formosan press claimed that

the trial at which the American was acquitted had been rigged as mere eyewash for the local population, and that no real effort was made to convict him.

Whether the feelings of the Formosans about this particular case were justified by the facts is of secondary importance. What is clear is that at bottom they deeply resent the idea of foreigners exercising judicial powers over their own nationals in their country, and particularly in a case in which a Formosan had been the victim.

Further, the size and depth of the demonstration cannot be ascribed merely to the sudden rise of an irrational mob spirit. In this case, the "mob" was made up of a good proportion of the population of Taipei.

Its eventual concentration against the police headquarters also bespeaks a political sentiment which was by no means confined to anti-Americanism.

This aspect of the "incident" is especially noteworthy if one remembers that the overwhelming majority of the population are Formosans, and not Chinese at all. Of the 10,000,000 of the population, some 80 per cent are natives of the island, while the rest are mostly Chinese who rule over them by means of the 600,000 troops who came over to the island with Chiang at the time his regime collapsed in China.

WORLD-WIDE ISSUE

It should further be borne in mind that of all the governments in Asia, besides Rhee's regime in South Korea, there is none which owes its existence more openly and directly to continued American military and financial support than that of Chiang in Formosa.

Since the Korean war, over \$1 billion in military and economic aid has been poured into Formosa by the United States. The Seventh Fleet stands between the island and its invasion by the Communist forces in China. The government has a group of friends in high places in American political circles who give it an almost unique status

(Turn to last page)

CIVIL RIGHTS GETS THE
BIPARTISAN RUN-AROUND IN CONGRESS

... page 2

SOCIALIST REGROUPMENT IN FRANCE

... page 6

The 'American Forum': An Evaluation

... page 7

A Reply to Brooklyn College's President

... page 5

WITHDRAW AMERICAN TROOPS

The mass popular outburst against the American military on Formosa is causing all kinds of second thoughts about what U. S. troops are doing over there. What it should mean to everyone concerned with a democratic foreign policy is: **WITHDRAW THE AMERICAN TROOPS AND FORCES.**

The real consequence of their stay is to help the Stalinist regime in China, and only it.

That goes also for the Seventh Fleet, whose presence as a shield for Chiang Kai-shek's regime is a standing provocation of all of Asia.

This country has been startled to see the most violent anti-American explosion in Asia precisely in that place which has been the cherished and well-financed darling of U. S. foreign policy, under Chiang. It seems like the basest ingratitude. But that is because the people are not reckoned with.

The people of Formosa owe little to the United States. It is Chiang who does. But Chiang is seated on the island as a terroristic dictator over the population, not as their representative. What is startling is that the mass movement was able to unleash such force even under this repressive tyranny, which has its own concentration camps at its disposal.

Chiang cannot defend "the free world" against Chinese Stalinism. The aspirations for freedom were represented in the people's fury, not by the regime's soldiers and police.

The only democratic disposition of Formosa is to let the people decide their own fate in a democratic and free plebiscite. Such a democratic vote has been rejected by the Mao government, which also claims Formosa; it has been rejected by Chiang. But we believe that in a free vote—which could be taken only after Chiang and his imported myrmidons are cleared off—the Formosan people would choose to be ruled by neither the Stalinists nor Chiang, but by an independent Formosan government of their own choosing.

Instead of taking this direction, the U. S. has only recently announced the coming installation of a guided-missile station on the island—for nuclear-armed missiles, of course. The Formosan people, who never asked Chiang to come there, are trapped on a base for atomic annihilation.

The pattern of American foreign policy repeats here: For the sake of being able to brandish H-bombs, all the POLITICAL trumps are handed over free to the Stalinists.

But short of catastrophic war, the Stalinist world can be defeated only by political weapons. The capitalist West is showing itself, again, incapable of doing this. Washington's policy leads only from defeat to defeat. The people must say it: **Withdraw American troops and ships from the region; self-determination for Formosa.**

Congress Gives Civil Rights The Bipartisan Run-Around

By SAM TAYLOR

The likelihood that a minimal civil-rights program will be passed in this session of Congress has grown dimmer, if it has not altogether been extinguished. All the gold-plated promises and assurance of last January of some meaningful legislation have become more than slightly tarnished.

Senator Humphrey of Minnesota, the leader of the "mock battle" last January to end the filibuster rule, has officially joined the growing band of pessimists. Speaking in a radio interview on May 20, he said that he expected the Senate to make progress on civil rights, "though not necessarily this year." He added that he thought action would be more likely next year.

Civil rights has been smothered under tons of congressional oratory, first over the Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East and later over the budget. The passion, conviction and singlemindedness of purpose for these two issues was nowhere matched by any significant number of pro-civil-rights congressmen.

Everybody is supposedly for civil rights, so the theory goes, except the band of Southern die-hards; the president and the vice-president are for it. The party platforms, Democratic and Republican, are reasonably clear in calling for legislative action. A clear majority of both parties in both Houses of Congress are more or less on record in favor of civil rights, and some even think it is a good thing. Republican Senator Leader Knowland is reported to be for it; and Democratic Senate Leader Johnson believes it to be inevitable. Public-opinion polls show that a majority of Americans favor it too.

NO PUSH

But from none of the congressional founts of power has there been a clear-cut demand for the passage of a meaningful civil-rights program. Liberal congressmen who have virtually issued a call to arms over Dixon-Yates, natural resources and Hells Canyon power in the Northwest are yet to be heard from on civil rights.

The Southern Democratic strategy thus far has been if not brilliant, then at least more than adequate to out-manuever the pro-civil-rights forces.

It has been a strategy of feigning weakness, lack of last-ditch resoluteness and willingness to bow before the "inevitable" as a cover for a series of cleverly conceived and executed delaying tactics.

Last January after the defeat of the attempt to change Senate Rule 22, the filibuster rule, Senate Democratic Leader Johnson, who opposed the change, privately let it be known that while he was not for the proposed legislation, he would not stand in the way of its coming to a vote in the Senate. Besides, Johnson argued, it is not necessary to change the filibuster rule in order to enact civil rights.

Reports began to appear in the press that Democratic congressional leaders believed it to be a certainty that some kind of minimal program would be passed in the present session.

The Southerners knew they were licked, so the reports went. It is all a question of time; a formal and token opposition to the pending legislation is needed, but this is strictly for home consumption. The Dixiecrats see the handwriting on the wall; they see the "inevitable." Only don't push too hard; don't make an open fight, don't publicize civil rights. If you do it will only make passage more difficult, it will kindle the racists to make a last-ditch fight. Therefore leave it to the orderly processes of congressional procedure, and a minimal program will be passed.

While the press reports may have represented the thinking of Senator Johnson and Rep. Rayburn, these considerations did not govern the subsequent action of Senator Eastland nor Rep. Howard Smith of Virginia, chairman of the House Rules Committee. The Dixiecrat tactic is quite simple: delay civil-rights legislation till as late in the session as

possible, thereby increasing the effectiveness of the filibuster. If the threat of the filibuster in the closing weeks of Congress does not prevent the passage of any legislation, then it can force a series of compromises so as to make it merely an expression of a pious hope.

The hope of any kind of meaningful program hinged on the ability to change the filibuster rule last January. When that failed, even the enactment of a modest program such as the one currently bogged down became problematical even in face of mounting pressure for action.

Senator Paul Douglas said at that time that the failure to curb unlimited debate "meant the death knell to any meaningful civil-rights legislation in this session of Congress."

Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, also issued a warning in a telegram to leading senators:

"Report being circulated in Washington that rules fight is of no importance and that Majority Leader Johnson has promised that a civil-rights bill will be passed later in session and that he will secure necessary two-thirds vote for cloture is a technique for killing Jan. 3 [anti-filibuster] effort.

"Unless a workable rule is adopted Jan. 3, no civil-rights measure of any meaning or substance can be passed by the Senate. All friends of civil rights in Senate familiar with realities over past 20 years know this to be true. Their vote on Jan. 3 will be a test of their understanding of these realities in contrast to the divisive and unsupported assurances of Senate leadership."

It is acknowledged that the House will pass the proposed bill as it has done in

the past. But it has taken five months since the opening of the present session of Congress to even get it onto the floor for consideration.

Earlier in the session, most congressional backers of civil rights believed that if the program did not reach the floor for debate by the Easter recess the chances for passage were dim. It has taken the House bill six weeks longer to get there.

BIPARTISAN DEAL

The significance of this delay is that Democratic Leader Johnson said that he would not let the Senate consider the issue unless and until the House acts.

The responsibility for these scuttling delays falls equally upon the Republicans. It has been reported that a deal was reached between Southern Democrats and the Republicans in the House to delay getting the bill onto the floor until after the Easter recess.

The quid pro quo was that with the approval of the Eisenhower administration the Republicans would vote against bringing the bill out of the House Rules Committee in return for Southern Democratic votes against a resolution to create a committee to investigate monetary policy which would have been headed by Rep. Wright Patman of Texas.

"Treasury Secretary Humphrey and private bankers did not want Patman, an advocate of low interest rates and easy credits, heading such an investigation. Rep. Smith, chairman of the Rules Committee, delivered 38 Southern Democratic votes to defeat it." (N. Y. Post, May 14.)

According to the same report liberal Democrats held back in attacking the Republicans for the cynical deal and com-

mittee stalling because they know that, if there is any hope of breaking a Senate filibuster, they will need at least 40 Republican votes to get the necessary 64 to make the two-thirds majority.

GUTTING THE BILL

In the Senate the sledding is even more difficult. The Judiciary Committee, headed by Eastland of Mississippi, has a stranglehold on the civil-rights bill, and it has not given the slightest indication that it is prepared to let it go until the job of thoroughly emasculating the bill is completed.

Eastland, ably assisted by Senators McClellan of Arkansas and Ervin of N. C., and with the good-natured and silent support of the Republican minority, have been trying to amend the bill in such a way as to make it meaningless, or even objectionable to many of its supporters.

Basically the new legislation calls for (1) creation of a nonpartisan study commission; (2) setting-up of a special civil-rights section in the Department of Justice; (3) widened authority for the prosecution of civil-rights violation; and (4) new legislation to protect minority rights, specifically the right to vote.

The most serious thrust has been the attempt by Sen. McClellan to add a "right to work" amendment as a basic "civil right." If such an amendment can be tacked on it is virtually guaranteed that the labor movement would be forced into opposition on the entire civil-rights bill, and it might even draw a presidential veto.

Another divisive maneuver has been to counterpose "civil rights" to "civil liberties," and the "sacred right to a jury trial" in an attempt to divide liberal supporters. And it even managed to gather in a few liberals for a while.

Under the bill, the federal government would be authorized to bring civil suits for an injunction in a federal court to enforce existing constitutional guarantees. A violation of the injunction would mean contempt of court, and such cases are tried without jury.

There is a long tradition in the liberal,
(Continued on page 3)

SPOTLIGHT on the Week

Continued from page 1

(Continued from page 1)

would be entirely within the law. . . .

The great cosmopolitan city of New York thereby puts itself in the same class with that Midwestern city which required a loyalty oath from prizefighters before they could enter any ring other than a spy ring.

So it's an "excess"—to be sure. But where there are such fantastic excesses, it is not hard to understand what the normality is. In the case of New York City, its administration considers it quite normal, for example, to fire a subway washroom attendant who had been expelled from the Communist Party in 1939.

The appropriate comment on this was already carried in our March 4 issue when we reprinted a column by Murray Kempton on "The Liberal Immunity." He concluded:

"The mayor who permits this kind of thing deserves the contempt of any sensitive citizen. Instead he gets the endorsement of our liberal guardians."

ZOMBIES

A Mike Wallace program last week sent us rummaging through the files for a clipping that we'd put away in March.

The TV program was a breast-beating session with Eddie Bracken, currently the star of *Shinbone Alley* on Broadway. Interviewer Wallace kept prodding the actor about his opinion that he had been cut out of work in Hollywood because of his former political activities as a right-wing Republican anti-Rooseveltian.

Bracken admitted this was his opinion, but he now sought to emphasize only one thing. He was a reformed character, he insisted. Not that he had changed political opinion; no, he had now decided that he had then, and had now, no right to have a political opinion in the first place, since his function was to entertain people.

It was a little unclear whether he was saying he had no call to express an opinion or to hold one, since the distinction

did not seem to be important to him. It was more important to repeat that he knew nothing about politics, never did know anything, and that he was henceforth certifying himself as being as apolitically pure as the driven snow, untainted by any thoughts on the subject right, left or upstage center.

The spectacle was pitiful, grotesque, and appalling.

It was the image of this poor man crawling on all fours that reminded us of another story. It was "The Edward G. Robinson Story" as recounted on March 7 in the course of a N. Y. Post feature series on the life of the actor, generally sympathetically handled.

One installment detailed Robinson's "Ordeal in Washington," as a result of Red Channels charges that he had lent his name to many Communist fronts. The evidence as to the injustice of the charge made a now familiar tale; Robinson overflowed with proof of his 100 per cent American patriotism and protested that any contributions he had made to CP fronts had been unawares and only a small part of his total good works for all kinds of respectable causes.

What was different about the Robinson story was the detail put in print about the lengths to which the actor went to lick the boots of the witchhunters.

He pleaded with the House investigating committee to clear him: "You are the only tribunal we have in the United States where an American citizen can come and ask for this kind of relief," he told them. "Either snap my neck or set me free. If you snap my neck I will still say 'I believe in America.'" He defended the committee as a "legitimate tribunal!" and boasted that "Velde was very, very sweet to me; Walter was good too."

Asked if he had any information to help the Committee, i.e., if he knew of any Communists he could stool on, he fervently answered, "I wish to God I had," but could dredge up only names that the committee already knew. Today, he stressed, he limited his membership to "very good, conservative organizations."

When the Chicago Hearst press rescinded its invitation to him to speak at a patrioteering rally, he appealed the decision straight to the Lord of San Simeon himself, in a letter which assured Hearst, among other things, that "I am sure there is not a great deal of difference between us in our regard for the fundamentals of Americanism."

The likes of Robinson and Bracken are to be pitied as broken men, analogues of the moral zombies who reviled themselves in the Moscow trials. But the pity is mixed with revulsion, and with hatred of the system which has gutted them of self-respect.

DISARMAMENT

Speaking of the current fencing over disarmament between the Washington and Moscow debating teams, we see lying on our desk a cartoon kindly clipped out of the March 30 *New Yorker*.

It shows four high brass jubilantly inspecting a massive atomic installation inside a mammoth cave, complete with stalagmites and stalactites amidst the reactors and nuclear whatnot. Says one:

"Well, we're ready for open-sky inspection."

POINT FOUR

One of the infrequent voices bothering to speak up for the American Indians came from Philadelphia in March, when the Quakers' yearly meeting heard a report from its National Committee on Legislation.

"The Indian is in dire need of a Point Four program of economic, education, health and employment aid," it said.

The average life span of the Indian in this healthy land is only 39, and his death rate is 11 times higher than the rest of the nation. "The sufferings of Indians at the hands of the white man" are not a thing of the past, said the report. It pointed to the congressional act of 1953 as depriving them of both land and government protection.

AFL-CIO's New Code: Next Steps Are Due

By L. G. SMITH

Last week Labor Action discussed the implications of the adoption by the AFL-CIO of a Code of Democratic Practices to go along with the code of ethical practices already adopted. Now the text of the code adopted by the AFL-CIO Executive Council on May 23 has been published.

Despite the limitations of this code which will be mentioned below, its adoption is a big step forward for the American labor movement.

Prior to its adoption, members of a union in which democracy had been replaced by dictatorship had no real recourse inside the labor movement. If they could manage to rebel successfully and establish democracy, well and good. (That is the right, also, of the peoples of totalitarian countries.) But especially in the Old AFL, there was no possibility of appeal to the federation by members of any international against dictatorial practices. Such matters were, by common consent, considered completely outside its area of jurisdiction or concern.

Today this is no longer the case. The AFL-CIO has proclaimed that the protection and enforcement, in some manner, of the most common and elementary democratic rights within any union is the concern of the labor movement as a whole.

Members seeking to establish democratic rights and procedures in those unions where they have been abolished in form or in practice no longer stand isolated and alone. They have a legal, recognized basis for appeal to the AFL-CIO for help in their struggle.

Nevertheless, it must be said that the Code of Democratic Practices is so general that its application can only be foreseen in cases of the most flagrant violation of the forms of democracy. About all it seeks to cover is regular elections and conventions.

THE BIGGER PROBLEM

But on the much more pervasive problem of the bureaucratic control and manipulation of power in the labor movement, it is silent.

In a union like the United Auto Workers, for instance, the existence of union caucuses has a long tradition. In the typographical union there is a regular two-party system which is recognized and accepted by all as a normal situation. But in the labor movement as a whole, such organized expressions of union democracy are a rarity, and not at all the rule.

A respectable, honest, and democratic union (for white workers only, to be sure) like the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen has a rule forbidding any member to publish an internal paper or to circularize the membership in any way without express permission of the international president.

This is a widespread rule in the labor movement.

While the administration has the union paper and magazine with which to toot its own horn, an opposition can lay itself open to charges if it seeks to campaign among the members with a mimeographed bulletin. In many unions, the formation of an opposition caucus is regarded as an expression of "dual unionism" and treated accordingly. In most unions, while the whole paid staff of the administration is expected to put its shoulder to the wheel for any administration candidate or policy, a collection of money from members to finance an opposition slate is denounced as "factionalism."

A thorough discussion of the whole subject of union democracy would take voluminous pages. But the point to be made right now is this: there is obviously no reason to expect the top command of the AFL-CIO to promulgate a code of democratic procedures which would hold up as a standard for the whole labor movement the highest and freest standards of democracy which exist in the most advanced unions. For that to happen, a spirit of militancy and rank-and-file initiative would have to be moving through the working class at flood-tide.

What is involved right now is the elimination of the most crass and flagrant abuses which besmirch the labor movement and make it vulnerable to attack from without and corruption from within.

The Code of Democratic Procedures will hardly confer a vote on anyone. But it can be a big help to anyone who is ready to fight for his right to vote himself.

LABOR SCOPE

BECK DOWN—HOFFA ON PAN—RACISM NEXT

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, May 25

The headlines announcing the ignoble exit of Dave Beck from the labor movement should not obscure the far more significant events that are developing rapidly in the union movement.

At the rate that the AFL-CIO leadership is adopting new codes of conduct and practice — now totaling six documents — the second convention of the merged unions will hardly recognize itself next winter. The obviously and openly controlled racketeer unions will be on the way out of the official labor movement, their leaderships finding it more difficult daily to conceal their corruption and racketeering under cover of carrying a union card.

The struggle within the Teamsters union will be settled by next winter, with the full power of the AFL-CIO leadership behind the anti-Hoffa-Brewster-Beck forces. The action of the AFL-CIO Council in giving Beck's seat to John English, secretary-treasurer of the Teamsters union, was well calculated to hurt the Hoffa-Brewster-Beck machine.

In Michigan, over the weekend, Jimmy Hoffa suffered a major setback when the newly formed state-wide building-trades council was created with pro-Hoffa elements having no influence or power in it, although Hoffa had tried to capture control of this organization. His candidates were so coolly received that they withdrew from contesting any of the offices.

Of course, the fate of Hoffa depends partly on the results of his trials. But his opponents inside and outside the Teamsters union aren't wasting any time in cutting him down to size. Dropping his businessman role and playing the "labor leader" straight, Hoffa is seeking desperately to keep his influence in Midwest Teamsters' circles, but this becomes in-

creasingly difficult. The once invincible Beck can testify to the theory that the mighty can fall quickly in the labor movement.

NEXT: RACISM

The struggle within the Teamsters union has already established some fine precedents that will not quickly be forgotten. Local unions, individual leaders and rank-and-file groups are expressing themselves openly and critically on the issues facing this giant organization. The bureaucratic machine has been cracked wide open. Nor is this development confined to the Teamsters union alone.

The permanence of the reforms taking place in the labor movement depends, of course, on how fully and solidly the ranks utilize the occasion to intervene and remain active in the life of their unions.

While racketeering and raiding elements are making their last stand, another major problem of the union movement is temporarily out of the limelight but cannot stay off the stage very long. It is the issue of racism. For the AFL-CIO leadership has its gravest problem in the field of race relations.

There is strong suspicion, worth investigating, that the just announced association of union organizers formed down South is a move on the part of anti-Negro elements in the labor movement. There is more than one scandal in the South about the anti-Negro attitudes of many individual AFL-CIO representatives which ought to be brought to the light of the day.

Since the whole technique of the White Citizens Councils and anti-Negro elements in the South is to capture control of unions rather than try the obviously futile gesture of splitting, a major factional struggle is looming, unless the union movement does the inconceivable—tries to live with the racists in the union movement instead of destroying their influence, and eliminating them from all positions in the union movement down South.

India's Socialists and the Elections

The recent general election in India made little significant change in the standing of the parties as compared with 1952, and showed no substantial shift as between right and left, as far as the national picture is concerned.

Nehru's governing Congress Party maintained its seats and voting strength, while there was a bit of reshuffling among the opposition forces. The number of seats won by small splinter parties fell by 24 (from 72 to 48), and some of this may have gone to the Communist Party, which this year won 10 out of a contested 100 seats, instead of 6 out of 70 as in 1952.

Locally there were some interesting changes. In Kerala, a CP victory put the party in charge of the government, a development which has occasioned some expressions of dismay in world press comment. In Orissa, the rightwing Gantra Parishad emerged as a serious challenge to the Congress Party. In both provinces, the opposition gained at the expense of the independents, rather than of the Congress Party.

The Congress Party's biggest upset came in their stronghold of Uttar Pradesh. In this state, it now has only 286 seats, instead of its previous 390 seats out of a house of 430 members—a drop of 104. Nehru's party also declined in Bombay, because of the linguistic nationalism in this province which the central government has been combating.

Thus a leftist opposition has been strengthened in some important spots, including Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, and Nehru will be faced with the problem of how to deal with it.

SOCIALISTS TO FIGHT

The left-wing Socialist Party, led by Lohia, did fairly well: it won 8 parliamentary seats out of 35 contested. The right-wing Praja Socialist Party captured 19 out of about 175 contested.

In the southern provinces, however, it is the CP unfortunately which seems to have emerged as the principal opposition; the two socialist parties did not do

so well. In the North, the CP failed miserably.

But the left-wing SP is making preparations for a real struggle against the Nehru government. In the state of Uttar Pradesh, the party has launched a civil-disobedience movement for the repeal of some of the economic laws burdening the peasantry. It is prepared for the jailing of 7000 resisters. Last fall when a similar struggle against the Bihar government took place, 2000 supporters of the SP were put in prison.

Meanwhile all is far from well inside the right-wing Praja Socialists. A split may be maturing on the question of the coalitionist tendency represented by the leadership of Asoka Mehta in this party. Dissent on this trend has been voiced by Jayaprakash Narayan, who has been very critical of the Mehta line on the "Nehru question." Mehta wants to find increased areas of agreement and cooperation with the Nehru regime, while "J.P." strongly condemns the government.

The report is that Narayan is now talking of a final retirement from politics, including dropping all membership in the PSP. (He retired from politics a few years ago, for a while, to devote himself to the Bhoodan movement.)

It is also reported that supporters of Narayan's position have made approaches to the left-wing SP for reunification.

Civil Rights --

(Continued from page 2)

labor and radical movements of opposition to government by injunction. But here the situation is that the trial-by-jury issue is being raised in such a way as to subvert the right to vote and other civil rights. The standard procedure in contempt-of-court cases is that the judge tries the case without a jury, and there is no constitutional provision for jury trial in such cases.

If the Department of Justice had to go before a Southern all-white jury for the enforcement of civil rights it would be a joke. These juries are drawn from the same people against whom the Negroes' civil rights have to be protected. If forced to go to a jury trial, then civil-rights legislation to protect the right to vote would mean a dead letter in many parts of the South. And this is why the Dixiecrats have pressed hard for its inclusion.

IT WILL TAKE ACTION

The maneuvers by the Southern Democrats, the cooperative acquiescence by the Eisenhower administration and congressional Republicans, and the conspicuous absence of zeal by the liberals have forced the civil-rights bills into a precarious position. It is being fought on terms largely dictated by its opponents.

If some kind of legislation is finally enacted—a doubtful proposition at this point—then it will be a law whose terms have been dictated largely by its Southern opponents. It will be a law shorn of its "objectionable features"—which is to say, most of its teeth" as Times Washington correspondent Cabell Philips pointed out.

The moral of the impending debacle is that not even a minimum civil-rights program can be passed without an aroused movement of Negro and white people and the labor movement aggressively taking the leadership and fighting for it. No one is going to win historic gains on a silver platter. The Prayer Pilgrimage to Washington was a step in the right direction, but it was only a beginning.

**To Understand
Russia & Stalinism**

Is Russia a Socialist Community?
Debate between Earl Browder
& Max Shachtman 50

**Stalinist Apologetics: A Review of
Isaac Deutscher,**
by Max Shachtman. In three
issues of *New Internationalist*.... 75

**The New Course, & The Struggle for
the New Course,**
by Leon Trotsky & Max
Shachtman 1.50

Stalinist Russia,
by Tony Cliff 2.00

Stalin, A Political Biography,
by Leon Trotsky 4.00

The Revolution Betrayed,
by Leon Trotsky 2.50

**The Case of Leon Trotsky. Verbatim
Report of Dewey Commission Hearings
on the Moscow Trials** 4.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

**NEW YORK
LABOR ACTION FORUM**

Thursday, June 6

Bob Bone
ON
**THE STORY
OF THE
NAACP**

8:30 p.m. at L. A. Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

Shachtman Debates SWPer On Socialist Regroupment

By MAX MARTIN

New York, May 24

Approximately 300 heard Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, and Murry Weiss of the Socialist Workers Party debate "What Road to Socialist Regroupment?" The meeting was chaired by Clifford T. McAvoy of the Committee for Socialist Unity and a former leader of the American Labor Party in this city.

In his introductory remarks, Chairman McAvoy set the framework for the exchange of views on the all-important question of socialist unification.

I come out of, he said, what both sides here would call the "Stalinist milieu"; but I have broken with Stalinism, he added, and there are thousands—some say as many as two million—like me. Many of us are looking for the road to a new socialist movement in the United States. Thus, I am a symbol of the kind of person each side is interested in winning to his views on the question under consideration tonight.

Murry Weiss, speaking for the SWP, made the first presentation. The background for the regroupment ferment in the socialist movement, he states, can be found in the crisis in international Stalinism, as exemplified by the Khrushchev revelations and the events in Hungary. Thousands of Communist workers in this country are learning the truth about Stalinism; they recoil from it. They are seeking the road-back to Leninism. Hence the opportunity arises for a revolutionary socialist regroupment, which is the type of regroupment the SWP stands for, he explained.

Where the forces for a revolutionary regroupment will come from, he said, will be determined by the discussion now taking place. A free discussion, in which all groups lay their programs on the table, and joint united front action by all tendencies, are required as preliminaries for the realization of this regroupment, he insisted.

STRESSES PROGRAM

The SWP, he said, makes no condition that the assemblage of revolutionary socialist forces take place within its organization, nor does it say that its program must be the program of a regrouped revolutionary socialist movement. We present our program for discussion, not ultimatically, and urge others to lay their programs on the table too, to the end that all the different views may be compared and explored. The exact organizational framework and the exact program of the regrouped revolutionary socialist movement will be determined by the course of the discussion.

A regroupment movement, he explained, will place the demand for a labor party high on its agenda, and will fight against the betrayals of Stalinism and social-democracy, both of which are movements based on the labor bureaucracy. A new movement, he stated, will have to fight against the class-collaborationist labor bureaucracy, which he described as a "gang of trade-union State Department cops, with Reuther in the van." We will have to fight them in order to "liberate the workers from their bureaucratically imposed bondage to the capitalist class."

He reviled the SP-SDF, and the ISL's view that the SP should form the framework for socialist regroupment, calling the SP-SDF "another servant of capitalism," "scoundrels," and the like. He derided the SP-SDF's opposition to the "American Forum for Socialist Education" as "red-baiting." He asked Shachtman to explain "what's either democratic or socialist about social-democracy, either in its European or American varieties," pointing to the role of the Mensheviks in Russia in 1917, the role of Noske in Germany, the murder of Liebknecht and Luxemburg, the Spanish Civil War, the expulsion of the left wing from the American SP in 1919 and in 1937, etc.

TO FILL THE VACUUM

Shachtman opened his remarks by stating that the question of regroupment has to be approached in the context of current reality. That reality shows, he stated, a mighty labor movement and a magnificent Negro movement, both of

which are capable of accomplishing wonders, but which require the infusion of democratic socialist ideas for the realization of this potentiality. But there is no socialist movement today, only small isolated sects with little influence in the mass movements, exist. The main explanation for this melancholy fact, he pointed out, lies in Stalinism.

The CP grew in numbers, power and influence in the thirties and forties, far outstripping the small Socialist Party and the even smaller Trotskyist movement, because of its identification with Russia, which in turn was identified with economic growth, full employment, etc., and with socialism itself, at a time when capitalism was on its knees everywhere. The CP is finished today precisely for the same reason: its identification with Russia, now that all people can see the real face of Stalinism in that country. The CP will either break completely with Russia and with totalitarianism, thereby ceasing to be the CP, or remain what it was up till now; but in that case it is doomed.

The demise of the CP as a movement in the U.S. leaves a vacuum and poses a problem, namely, who will fill that vacuum? None of the existing sects can do it, he stated, not the ISL, nor the SWP. Nor can they all unite to produce a movement to do it. A new Debsian-type movement must be created for this task. And that means that all groups must "freeze" their positions on the one question which has served most to divide them in the past, their theories on the Russian question.

"I stand for freezing our theories, as opposed to freezing the sects," he explained. It can't be done by presenting our programs for adoption by the other organizations, whether this be done brutally or even subtly (as the SWP is doing), for while everyone is ready to present his program, and would be delighted to have it accepted by everyone else as the program for the new movement, nobody is interested in accepting the program of any of the other tendencies, or in even seriously discussing it, "since we all know each other's views quite well and have discussed them for years."

Agreement is needed, however, on the political aspect of the "Russian question," he said. You have a line on this too, he told Weiss. You demand that a regrouped movement stand for the "defense of the Soviet Union." What, he asked, do you mean by that? If you mean defense of and support to the Stalinist armies in a war against a capitalist state, then count me out of your regroupment!

Our condition is the defense of democracy everywhere, he went on, no less in what are called the "socialist countries" than in the capitalist ones. Nor is it a question of some flawless academic definition of democracy; all it means is the defense of all democratic rights such as socialists fight for in the United States: free speech, free press, free assembly, freedom to organize political parties and organizations, free elections, the right to strike, etc. There must be agreement to support all struggles for such democratic rights.

CHARACTER OF SP

The only organization which can fill the vacuum left by the CP, which can be the framework for a regrouped movement, is the SP-SDF. It can play this role because it is the traditional party of socialism in the U.S., because it once was a real movement, because it does not have a fully elaborated theoretical program to limit it, because it is not discredited or regarded with suspicion among the workers for any apology for totalitarianism, and because it has a clearer tradition of tolerating different views and tendencies within its confines than many other groups.

In connection with this last point, Shachtman referred to Weiss's remarks on the SP's expulsion of left wings in 1919 and 1937, and stated that its record is by no means perfect, but is better than that of others. Do you claim the SWP has a better record, he asked Weiss? The SWP, he pointed out, has had more splits and mass expulsions from its ranks in the

YOU and SCIENCE

LEUKEMIA AS A MEASURE OF H-BOMB TESTING

BY GENE LISTER

The risks of continued H-bomb testing have been much in the news. But only the governments of the great powers, United States, Russia and England, have the full facts to evaluate the risks involved. Since their prejudices are overwhelming in favor of the tests, the risks to life of this and future generations are neglected. It is easy, therefore, for the power-holders to minimize as a "small risk" the danger of radiation fallout.

Risks of radiation poisoning from nuclear-bomb testing have been bothering scientists since the inception of these tests. Despite the official secrecy regulations, scientists in recent months have been endeavoring to evaluate fully the radiation fallout danger. Aided by the American Association for the Advancement of Science's policy of showing more interest in public affairs, more and more scientists are speaking out against the menace. Some, both here and abroad, have moved even further toward social responsibility in science.

Early in April, 18 West German scientists, including four Nobel prize winners, announced that they were refusing to cooperate in any way in the production, testing and use of atomic weapons. Later in April the revulsion of decent people to the hazard was further strengthened when Dr. Albert Schweitzer, the 82-year-old missionary surgeon, philosopher and musician, appealed to the world, in a broadcast reproduced everywhere in the world except in the U.S., to end nuclear tests lest the human race commit suicide.

The official U.S. answer to Dr. Schweitzer was given by Dr. W. F. Libby of the Atomic Energy Commission as he repeated that the government plans to continue testing: "I do not mean to say that there is no risk at all. What I would like to demonstrate to you is that the risk is extremely small."

He then weighed this risk against that of "not maintaining our defenses against totalitarian forces." Libby, as a member of the U.S. war team, finds it easy to minimize the danger to obscure people scattered throughout the world.

Along with other American scientists Dr. Harrison Brown, professor of geo-

last seventeen years than all of the other groups put together!

I don't agree with the action taken by the SP leadership toward the Trotskyists in 1937, but the latter did not exactly have clean hands in the SP generally, nor in regard to the 1937 split, he pointed out. And for that reason I understand the suspicions which the SP has of Trotskyists, even their suspicions of the ISL (unjustified as I know these are), not to speak of their well-founded suspicions of Communists, he stated.

We aim, he concluded, at building a broad socialist unity. The SWP says its main concern is winning those who break with Stalinism. That is a concern of ours too; we wish to win those who are breaking from totalitarianism and moving towards democratic socialism. But this cannot be done by a sect; only a movement can do it.

The rebuttals by both Weiss and Shachtman revolved around disputations of points made by the other during the presentations. Weiss denied that the SWP stood for excluding from the regroupment those who did not stand for the "defense of the Soviet Union," to which Shachtman replied by quoting from an article in a recent issue of the *International Socialist Review*. The quotation said that the ISL "excluded itself" from the regroupment discussion because of its views on Russia.

BREAK WITH SECTARIANISM

Weiss denied that the Trotskyists had misbehaved in any way in the SP during the thirties, and Shachtman quoted from James P. Cannon's *History of American Trotskyism* to the effect that because of "... our fight in there, the Socialist Party was put on the sidelines. This was a great achievement, because it was an obstacle ... for a revolutionary party is one of clearing obstacles from its path. Every other party is a rival. Every other party is an obstacle."

(Turn to last page)

chemistry at the University of California, refuted Dr. Libby, pointing out that he begged two major questions:

"Do we really know what the risks are in sufficient detail so that we can be as confident as Dr. Libby appears to be? And what does he mean when he says that the risk is extremely small? It seems to me that from the beginning Dr. Libby has been so convinced that the H-bomb tests must be continued he has taken the attitude that the risks are small, even though he has rather clearly not known in detail what those risks are. This attitude, of assuming that the risks are small and then setting out to prove it, seems to me to be the foundation for the approach of the AEC to the entire fallout problem."

LOADED DICE

That the government is minimizing the fallout danger is further evidenced by an article, "Leukemia and Ionizing Radiation," by Dr. E. B. Lewis, Professor of Biology, California Institute of Technology, which appeared in the May 17 issue of *Science*. Here he describes the danger of leukemia, a deadly blood disease, as a result of radiation. Commenting on this report Dr. Harrison Brown states:

"Continued testing [of the H-bomb] at the present rate may well result in the death each year from leukemia of nearly 10,000 persons who would not otherwise have died."

The lead editorial in the same issue of *Science*, official paper of the AAAS, states as follows: "Thanks to Lewis, it is now possible to calculate how many deaths from leukemia will result in any population from any increase in fallout or other sources of radiation. It is apparent that the atomic dice are loaded. The percentages are against us and we ought not to play unless we must to assure other victories."

The avowed objective of H-bomb testing is victory in the arms race, and the victory of one world power over another in a war in which "there can be no victory." Truly then, within the confines of the present world's setup, the dice are loaded. This is no news to socialists but makes even more urgent the need to change the "rules of the game" before it is too late.

Shachtman in Philly

Phila., May 27

Last night over 30 members and friends of the Independent Socialist League and Young Socialist League gathered at the St. James Hotel to hear Max Shachtman. The national chairman of the ISL spoke on "Socialist Regroupment and Unity."

In the question period the audience indicated its interest in the particular aspect of the merger of the ISL and the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation and what an all-inclusive socialist movement would be likely to accomplish on the American scene.

Comrade Shachtman in his historical analysis of the development of the socialist movement pointed out that twice this country has produced something approaching a mass socialist party. These were the SP of the Debs era and the Communist Party in the late '30s and early '40s. The latter of course was "socialist" only in the respect that its followers thought it to be so.

The disappearance of the CP, said the speaker, has left a vacuum which the SP has a chance to fill. Shachtman postulated that a SP-SDF merger with the ISL could become a rallying point to build a mass socialist movement.

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

June 3, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 22

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. Business Mgr: L. G. SMITH. Associate Editors: GORDON WASKELL, BEN HALL.

Democracy and Academic Freedom at Brooklyn College

A REPLY TO PRESIDENT GIDEONSE

By DON NEWMAN

The Brooklyn College administration's concept of a "free" student newspaper found its fullest and sharpest expression a few weeks ago. In an interview printed in the N. Y. Post on May 8, B. C. President Harry Gideonse defended the school's actions toward the editors of *Kingsman* [see *Challenge*, April 22 and May 6] and, in general, attempted to shore up the sagging rationale behind the administration's undemocratic handling of the college paper. The *Post* had previously carried a number of articles reporting the administration's attack on *Kingsman*.

The *Post* article came at a time when general public interest in academic freedom on the municipal campuses ran high and student papers all over the city were leveling a flurry of editorial attacks and protests against flagrant denials of student rights. Gideonse's statements are instructive, not merely because of the picture they paint of the B. C. president's views on student papers, but because of the general considerations which they raise in regard to the rights of a student press.

The first question the *Post* posed to Gideonse was: "What in your opinion is the function of a college newspaper and of its editorial page?" The president's reply sets the tone of the entire article:

"Since the college collects—and allocates—this subsidy [the finances for *Kingsman*], it is the college's responsibility to see to it that the paper is representative of the college as a whole (and not merely of the small group that is connected with the paper).

"The staff policy should be 'open' and 'representative' (that is to say, there should be no small, self-perpetuating cliques)."

And farther on: "What we have at present is frequently described as a 'house organ' for a small clique dominant on the present newspaper staff. . . ."

THEY WONT DEMOCRATIZE

The columns of the Gideonse interview are copiously sprinkled with references to the "small group," the "self-perpetuating cliques," the "small clique dominant on the present newspaper staff." This notion of a *Kingsman* elite, one of the more slanderous pieces of propaganda kicked about by opponents of the paper, has no basis in fact.

Kingsman is staffed by some sixty students—hardly a cliquish number. Annually, democratic elections by the staff are held for editorial positions; surely a better "self-perpetuating" system could be devised.

It is interesting to note that although they decry clique control, the college authorities have taken no steps toward democratizing the selection of staff members further. Instead, the Faculty-Student Committee on Publications, on the very day that the Gideonse interview was published, decided that henceforth no student could be a candidate for a major position on the school publications unless he had been interviewed and "certified" by the committee.

Thus the hypocrisy of the administration becomes obvious. While calling for an increase of democracy in the operation of the paper, they interfere in the very area where that democracy is vital: the right of the staff to elect its own leaders without restriction, without impediment.

UNBASED SLANDER

Gideonse continues in the same strain: "The campus is full of journalistic talent that has been excluded from the staff

of the present paper, and it is well acquainted with recent examples of letters to the editor which have been deliberately repressed."

Where is this untapped "journalistic talent"? Who has been excluded from the staff? Who excluded them? Under what circumstances? Who testifies to their talent? None of these questions is answered by the president. (Are we to infer that no names will be divulged lest there be reprisals by the far-reaching aim of the omnipotent "clique"?)

It may be that noble intentions motivate Gideonse not to adduce evidence in support of his assertions, but it seems that the president of a college ought to feel the weight of certain ethical considerations in deciding whether thus to slander students of his own institution in a public press:

The campus "is well acquainted," says President Gideonse, with repressions of letters to the editors. The campus is acquainted with no such thing. There is, however, widespread acquaintance with the fact that no group on campus has enjoyed as much space in *Kingsman* over the past year or so as the Young Republicans—the Young Republicans who have been so caustically and vehemently opposed to the paper's editorial policies.

The simple fact of the matter is that no letter of political criticism that met the requirements of elementary good writing and deadline has been "repressed" by the present editors. Not only this, but *Kingsman* has frequently waived the 250-word limitation on letters for the sake of minority viewpoints.

But despite all the patent facts to the contrary, the president persists in his calumny that the college paper is undemocratically run by a clique dedicated to their self-perpetuation and the propagandizing of their own opinions to the exclusion of all others. To most people familiar with the B. C. scene, the spectacle of the administration, hag-ridden by a chimerical "clique," is a source of amusement, if not of psychological fascination.

MULTIPLE EDITORIALS

The issue over which the three editors of *Kingsman* had been suspended from their jobs, *Challenge* readers may recall, was the multiple-editorial policy. According to school rules, at least two opposing editorials must appear on controversial questions. In his *Post* interview Gideonse explained the administration's reasoning behind this regulation:

"Editorial opinions should be representative of the college (not merely of the editors), and in our case this means that a faculty regulation calls for several editorials on several sides if the issue is deemed to be controversial."

Upon his reinstatement as *Kingsman* editor-in-chief, Anatole Levkoff told the *Post* that "there were no repercussions when we ran single editorials which supported the views of the administration of the college, even though many of the students consider some of them controversial." This statement bugs pretty close to the truth, so far as the recollection of this reporter spans.

Gideonse later asserts that "We are

not interested in preventing anyone from expressing his own ideas, but we are interested in seeing to it that other ideas should also be expressed in editorials as well as in the 'Letters to the Editor' on the editorial page."

No one would claim that the BC authorities are "interested in preventing anyone from expressing his own ideas" (although it is certain that there are plenty of ideas they would prefer to hear sounded less noisily). However, one thing is clear. The goal of the administration in demanding multiple editorials is not to strengthen campus democracy, nor to give greater representation to the views of the student body, but to undermine the crystallization and cogent expression of those views.

RIGHT TO INDEPENDENCE

The political tone of the BC campus, to the extent that it takes any shape, is predominantly liberal. Is it undemocratic, therefore—indeed, should anything else be expected—for the newspaper to reflect liberal opinion in proper proportion? It is not democratic, really, to insist that half of the editorial space be allotted for the expounding of a viewpoint which has the concurrence of a tiny minority.

An editorial is an editorial, nothing more, nothing less. It is that portion of the paper set aside for the expression of the opinions of the editor. That is the traditional meaning and the current practice (except at Brooklyn). That is simple "Webster."

To say that an editorial must contain opinions contrary to those of the editor is to transform it from an editorial to a pro-and-con discussion. Pro-and-con discussions have their place in a paper, but so do editorials. If not, why have an editor? Why have an independent student-run newspaper?

A college paper differs from a commercial paper in the important respect that its opinions are not dictated by the special interests of the publisher or advertisers, but are the genuine expression of the editor, democratically elected by an open staff. College authorities abrogate this important difference when they interfere with the editorial operations of a student newspaper.

SECOND PAPER?

When the "Post" pointed out that "FSCP's latest study of the *Kingsman* was generally favorable," and that "the paper in the last year has also been named All-American by the Associate Collegiate Press for general excellence," Gideonse commented that "this favorable portion of the report was primarily due to the threat of the possible chartering of a second paper. . . ."

This kind of imputation of motives is, of course, beyond comment, but the question of a second paper is interesting.

After the administration's smashing of the previous, vigorously anti-administration paper, *Vanguard*, in 1950, *Kingsman* appeared as a conservative, pro-administration organ. But as time went on, *Kingsman*, reflecting the liberal complexion of the campus, moved in the direction of independence from the faculty and to a position of advocating an extension of campus democracy. The same phenomenon can be observed at City College in the case of the *Observation Post* and *Ticker*, which began as voices of editorial polarities and have since come to a more or less similar liberal posture.

Now, no one can oppose the formation of any new organ of student opinion per se, but one must, keep in

mind the fate of all previous publications which have responded to views of a small sector of the student body. One must keep in mind, also, that the establishment of a second, conservative paper would not guarantee the loosening of the administration's grip on editorial operations. The college authorities, proceeding from a rock-ribbed opposition to any politicalization of the campus, would continue to impose restrictions, and those restrictions would become more markedly oppressive as the younger paper began to struggle for its own independence.

The point is that the administrators fear the formation of independent political groupings on campus. They fear the organization and mobilization of students behind any banner, for any cause, in defense of any rights.

The reason for this is not hard to find; it inheres in the whole history of Brooklyn College.

Gideonse and the ranking administrators have bitter memories of the days when BC was widely vilified as the "little red schoolhouse," and when they, with embarrassment, had to begin their relentless weeding out of student radicals. During this period was begun the generation of an atmosphere so poisonous and stultifying in its effect on free thought and expression, so perniciously soporific in its effect on political activity, that the campus is only lately being aroused from its apathy.

PHRASES AND FEARS

The position of the school heads is clear. On the one hand, as academicians, they must be perpetually mouthing hollow and vapid criticisms of the lack of intellectual spirit on campus. On the other hand, as employees of the city, ever-mindful of a restimulation of those politics, they must align themselves with every spineless, anti-intellectual element in the college—careerism, apathy, pseudo-detachment, and academic philistinism.

Academic freedom cannot take root at Brooklyn College until the authorities realize that their primary responsibility is not to the "community" (whatever that vague and distorted word can mean) but to their own students—a responsibility poorly discharged by a heavy-handed paternalism or protectionist attitude.

President Gideonse does not do well by his students to suggest that they may not be granted the same rights as their fellows at Columbia or any "paying" college, or that because they get their education "free" they have a special commitment to "society" and must be willing to suffer limitations on their intellectual growth and inferences about their maturity.

Is it wisdom to talk at them so much about "institutional rights"? They may come to think that there is a price tag even on academic freedom.

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the *Challenge* or the YSL.

A New Attempt

Socialist Regroupment In France

By A. GIACOMETTI

Since last year a certain number of new groups and publications have appeared in France which represent, each in their own way, steps toward a long-awaited clarification and realignment in the labor movement.

It has been our intention to give these groups and publications the detailed description they deserve. In the meantime, two should be brought to the immediate attention of LABOR ACTION readers: the review *Arguments* and the monthly paper *La Commune*. Of all recent attempts to clear the way for a united, independent and militant labor movement, they represent the most significant and, one may hope, the most successful.

Arguments is a quarterly.* Its editors are Colette Audrey, a writer, in pre-war years a member of the Socialist Party's "Gauche Révolutionnaire" and of Marceau Pivert's PSOP, at present also the editor of *Nouvelle Gauche*, the bi-weekly of the New Left; Edgar Morin, a sociologist; until 1949 a member of the CP, today one of the leading intellectuals of the revolutionary Marxist left; Jean Duvignaud, a sociologist, and Roland Barthes, a writer, both of the same intellectual family as Morin.

In their preface, the editors write: *Arguments* is "not a review, but a bulletin of research, discussion and clarification, open to all those who place themselves in a scientific and socialist perspective." It collaborates closely with a similar publication appearing in Italy called *Ragionamenti* "The effort of *Arguments* becomes particularly meaningful at a time when the decomposition of Stalinism compels everyone to rethink old problems and to seek new perspectives."

Articles in the first two issues included critical investigations of the ideas of Karl Mannheim, of Fritz Sternberg, of certain French Catholic critics of Marxism; studies and discussion of the ideas of Pierre Hervé; on the relationship between the "underdeveloped" countries and the highly industrialized, imperialist powers; on automation and its ideologists; on the Brazilian sociologist Gilberto Freyre; on Brecht.

Typical of its approach is a remark by Morin in the first issue:

"One of the dangers of Marxism is to leave aside the research of new facts and to confine itself to the systematization of already acquired knowledge. But the new empirical research makes certain demands upon us: without such research, even limited as it is, our 'theories' would remain simple speculations. For us, the answer to the problem 'What must we look for?' is precisely this: everything that could contradict our point of view. We must look for everything that could put in doubt a Marxist interpretation of the history of the 20th century; this is the only method that will enable us to confirm it."

The purpose of *Arguments*, then, could be described as an attempt to turn Marxism once again into an instrument of creative social analysis, capable of assimilating the new data uncovered by empirical research in different fields of science (particularly in the social sciences); further, into a truly revolutionary social science, capable of understanding the complex relationships between different social facts, and therefore capable of becoming an ideological basis for a new socialist movement.

FIND COMMON GROUND

On a different level, *La Commune*

**Arguments*, Editions de Minuit, 7 rue Bernard Palissy, Paris 6e. \$1.50 a year.

Paris

seeks to solve the same problem, and to fill the same need. If *Arguments* is trying to reconstruct a social science for a movement, the purpose of *La Commune* is reconstructing the movement itself.**

The common ground which made this attempt possible was provided by the Hungarian revolution and by the Algerian war.

Early last December a group of left-wing trade-unionists and intellectuals drafted an "appeal for the liberation of the labor movement." The group included, among others, Paul Ruff, a leader of the "Ecole Emancipée" tendency in the Teachers Union; Walusinski and Daniel Martinet of Cercle Zimmerwald; Dechézelles of the New Left; Hébert, the leader of Force Ouvrière in St. Nazaire, one of the few places where F.O. is a clean, well-organized and militant union; Lambert, Chéramy and Renard of *La Vérité*; Marceau Pivert of the SP; several intellectuals who had been members or sympathizers of the CP, such as Morin, De Massot, Mascolo; the surrealist poet André Breton; Jean Rous of the Committee for Justice and Freedom Overseas.

They had been brought together, the appeal said, in a common struggle against the Algerian war and for the right of the Algerian people to self-determination; against the Franco-British expedition in Egypt and against the Russian aggression in Hungary. The time has come, they decided, for socialist action against capitalist imperialism and against the Stalinist bureaucracy.

Such a socialist, democratic and revolutionary action is only possible on the following basis, they said:

(1) The capitalists must be made to pay for the consequences of their own policy: the workers must oppose the wage freeze, the increase in the cost of living. In order to do this effectively, they must use the mass strike, as against successive partial strikes, advocated by the CGT leadership, which only divide and demoralize.

(2) The workers must free themselves of all bureaucratic machines which paralyze and distort their action. The workers demand that their parties and unions be democratic, that they recognize the rights of minorities and of free discussion. The workers must control their own organizations instead of being manipulated by them.

(3) The basis of all international policy must be the right of peoples to self-determination. This implies the abolition of all colonial systems, first of all the French colonial system, as well as the right of the peoples in the "popular democracies" and in the USSR to run their own affairs.

(4) All those who accept these fundamental principles can cooperate without discrimination and exception.

CENTER FOR REALIGNMENT

On this basis the original group proposed the organization of a "Liaison and Action Committee for Workers' Democracy" (CLADO). The Committee was not meant to be a new party: every one of its members is free to maintain his own

***La Commune*, c/o Miss Suzanne Walon, 33 rue des Petites-Ecuries, Paris 10e. \$1.50 a year.

organizational and political commitments. Its purpose is to enable all those who agree with its principles to cooperate in shaking off the rule of the "machines" in the labor movement and to stimulate independent working-class action wherever possible.

By the end of the year, the original group had been joined by representatives of the *Nation Socialiste* group (Lecœur and Hervé) and the publication of a paper was decided. In February, the Committee had made contacts in 27 departments (out of 89) and had reached a membership of 200, including 100 outside of Paris.

In April the first issue of *La Commune* appeared. In the editorial, Paul Ruff described the impact of the events in Hungary, in Egypt and in Algeria on the French working class, showed the urgent need to find ways and means to fight against the criminal policy of the governments and explained the aims of the Committee:

"We do not have, and never had, the intention of creating one more party. Our aim is at the same time more simple and more ambitious:

"To give left-wing militants an opportunity for serious discussion, outside of any electoral considerations, outside of rivalries of tendency, class or organization; to provide the means for honest information on problems which are suppressed by the mass-circulation press; to restore the habit of considering militants of other organizations as comrades who differ with us on certain points, not as enemies or traitors. We think that the situation is sufficiently difficult and confused at the present time that no organization, no party, no person can pretend to offer on all essential problems a solution acceptable to all; that nobody is either above or below criticism, and that the present problem of the Left is precisely to permit its different tendencies to meet. In short, the task is to rediscover the real meaning of working-class democracy."

The first issue features a document on workers' councils in Poland by Morin; articles by most of the signers of the appeal; by Claude Gérard; by Gustave Stern, who is close to *Révolution Proletarienne*; an interview by Messali Hadj. I shall not describe the issue further; readers of *Labor Action* who read French should subscribe and see for themselves.

THE NEW CLIMATE

All this calls for several remarks.

It is important to realize, in the first place, what is new in initiatives such as *Arguments* or *La Commune*. The ideas for which these papers stand are not new, and there have always been papers that defended them with a greater or lesser degree of clarity. What is new is the attitude of the people involved and the political context which makes possible their cooperation in one movement.

After the war, Europe was teeming with publications defending a revolutionary socialist policy of some kind or another. Far from being a sign of vitality, the multiplication of these papers was a symptom of retreat and decomposition. What seemed most important in a time of confusion and prostration was to maintain political clarity until such a time when clear idea would again appear relevant to political practice. Consequently, each split produced a new publication which began a bitter war on the others, often on secondary or historical issues.

Today this situation no longer exists. After a long period of passivity and withdrawal, the working class is again seeking to impose independent solutions. In

France, strikes are increasingly run by the workers themselves as they see fit, if necessary against trade-union functionaries. No apparatus is safe: in the CP, there is for the first time a genuine opposition press.

Events have clarified many issues. In the past, left-wing militants might quarrel whether a "political" or a "social" revolution would take place in the Stalinist countries; now the revolution is here, and the immediate political consequences have made this less relevant than it used to seem. In the face of pressing practical tasks, it has become clear that people who do not agree as to who was right or wrong at Kronstadt can work together nevertheless.

This does not mean that these past differences were all meaningless or unimportant. It means, though, that a relationship of mutual trust and close collaboration has again become possible among persons who agree on the essentials: opposition to capitalism and Stalinism on the basis of independent working-class action.

CHANGES ARE COMING

In the second place: what is characteristic of *La Commune* is that it cuts across all groups of the Left, but nevertheless stands on a firm political basis.

There are other signs that point in the same direction. *France-Observateur*, for instance, has recently published a joint report on Poland by four revolutionary intellectuals who had gone to see for themselves: Edgar Morin, Claude Lefort of *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, Dionys Mascolo, formerly a Stalinist sympathizer and Roland Barthes, an independent socialist. Less than two years ago it would have been absolutely impossible for these four people to agree on this kind of issue, and publish it in this paper.

By cutting across different groups in this manner, *La Commune* foreshadows coming changes in the French labor movement. After the devastation of the SP by Mollet and the unavoidable weakening of the CP, it is certain that the new socialist movement in France will not look exactly like anything that goes under that name today.

Neither will the trade-union movement remain the same. Force Ouvrière, according to its president Bothereau, can expect a period of "heavy punishment" as a result of its subservience to the Mollet government's wage freeze and colonial war. The Catholic trade-union federation (CFTC) is tending to split as its left wing abandons the idea of confessional unionism and moves toward the ICFTU; the CFTC metal workers have applied for membership in the International Metalworkers Federation of the ICFTU after a referendum in which 70 per cent of the membership voted to leave the Catholic trade-union international and to join the ICFTU. The Stalinist leadership in the CGT is losing its grip and will find it difficult to survive a period of mass struggles which it can no longer control.

READAPTING MARXISM

What the new socialist and labor movement will be like nobody can foretell, but papers like *La Commune* give an indication of the coming line-up: all those who support the independent struggles of the workers against every bureaucracy now in existence.

A final remark about *Arguments*: Here too there is a superficial similarity and a profound difference with the post-war period.

After the war, it could be heard very frequently that the traditional Marxist assumptions had to be re-evaluated, revised or adapted to deal with the new situations. These suggestions were often sincere: it was true that new problems had arisen, and that many of the organized Marxist movements were not prepared to apply their theory creatively to the new situation.

But somehow the great revision, loudly demanded and often announced, never came off. In some cases, the intellectual resources of the would-be revisionists were not adequate to the job. In other cases, it turned out that the talk of revision was only a pretext for leaving socialist politics. The reason why people like Collinet, Rousset, Silone, Macdonald or Bell could never undertake a serious revision of Marxism is that they lacked the revolutionary purpose without which such a revision is not possible.

On the 'American Forum': An Evaluation and Criticism

By H. W. BENSON

The American Forum for Socialist Education, headed by A. J. Muste, announced its purpose on May 13: to promote "study and serious untrammelled political discussion among all elements that think of themselves as related to historical socialist and labor traditions, values and objectives . . . however deep and bitter their differences may have been."

Its National Committee is made up of a wide-ranging group of radicals, including people identified with political groups and publications such as the following: Clifford McAvoy and Milton Zaslow of the Socialist Unity Committee; Muste and others from Liberation; John T. McManus of the National Guardian; Dorothy Day of the Catholic Worker; Doxie Wilkerson and Albert Blumberg of the Communist Party; Bert Cochran of the American Socialist; Farrell Dobbs of the Socialist Workers Party.

Several members of the Socialist Party joined as individuals without implying endorsement by the party, which later repudiated their affiliation and instructed them to withdraw. Others are well-known individuals not affiliated to any existing groups, like Kermit Eby, Sidney Lens, W. E. B. DuBois and others.

What has brought a group of such varied opinions together, from organizations that have hitherto been bitterly hostile to one another, is more than a desire for mere discussion in general. The Forum was made possible by the great interest in the possibilities of socialist regroupment in the United States and the desire by many to take a step that might further the reunification of the various groups.

While everyone is bound to follow the course of its future discussion with a lively interest, it takes on special significance as an experiment in facilitating socialist regroupment; for its efforts are clearly slanted toward going through an experience from a certain point of view, however vaguely or indefinitely it may be formulated.

A WITCHHUNT LAUNCHED

The Forum met the instant hostility of the bourgeois press. The Herald Tribune turned over its columns to the FBI stoolpigeon Herbert Philbrick, whose comments were what might be expected from any member of his profession on any subject. The N. Y. Times dedicated a special editorial, in more lofty tone, advising socialists that the Forum could not help their cause. This is the first time the Times has displayed any interest in American socialism except to try to defame and distort it. Its advice will be weighed for what it is, the considered opinion of a bourgeois and anti-socialist organ.

The N. Y. Daily News rushed in to demand a government investigation of the new body, suggesting that it be added to

the "subversive" list without delay. Senator Eastland's Internal Security Committee was prompt to oblige; four Forum sponsors were subpoenaed to appear before it: Cochran, Blumberg, McAvoy, and Zaslow.

Not long ago, these witchhunt methods might have destroyed the Forum, making its political discussions impossible in an atmosphere of police intimidation. But the power of the witchhunt today is on the decline; socialists will remain contemptuous of the advice of their enemies on how to rebuild the socialist movement.

They will not permit the overhanging threats of government intimidation to stand in the way of discussions on socialist unity; they will not be frightened away from any correct step to bring it about.

NUB OF THE PROBLEM

The setting up of the Forum was preceded by a series of public meetings and conferences to discuss and debate socialist unity and the means of effectuating it. The initiative had been taken by A. J. Muste who succeeded to an encouraging degree in inducing representatives of virtually all groups to confront one another in public discussions. It was following these discussions that the Forum, again under the leadership of Muste, was established as a permanent institution.

The Independent Socialist League participated in all discussions, whenever it was invited, presenting its views on the reunification of the movement; it has made clear that it will follow the same course in the future. However, through its chairman Max Shachtman who was invited to serve on the Forum's National Committee, the ISL announced that it would decline to serve as a sponsor. (Shachtman's letter was published in LA last week.)

The ISL is ready, as before, to discuss and debate all the issues with any group. But it cannot take responsibility for collaboration with other radical groups in a common organization which does not take a clear public stand for democracy everywhere. Especially is this the case where representatives of the Communist Party are included.

At a meeting in March, when the final decision was taken to go ahead with the Forum, a member of the Socialist Party, speaking as an individual, proposed that the new group commit itself publicly to democratic socialism by calling for democracy in every country, including those dominated by Communists. This was re-

jected and by this action, the future of the Forum was cast under a cloud.

Some time before, Shachtman had written Muste:

"I am prepared and even eager to discuss with anyone and everyone, regardless of his affiliation, the minimum basis required for that cooperation and dispelling of suspicion and hostility which are needed if socialist reunion and progress are to be achieved. To confer and discuss, or even to debate vigorously in public—that is one thing. To join now in a common organization—is another. That implies that the sponsor, and any group he is prominently associated with, takes political responsibility for the enterprise. I am ready to take responsibility for something like your 'American Forum' regardless of the wide differences among its proposed sponsors on a host of theoretical and tactical questions, including the most controversial ones. But only with the provision that such a Forum is explicitly committed, on the basis of common agreement of its sponsors, to support of democratic rights for all, not less in what some call the 'socialist bloc' of nations as in capitalist nations. I can discuss with those who reject such a commitment. I cannot unite in a permanent organization with those who still find it impossible to repudiate that totalitarian denial of full rights to the people in the name of socialism which they so rightly and promptly condemn and combat under capitalism.

"If the sponsors of a national 'Forum' can agree in simple, forthright English to such a commitment, so essential in the light of the past discredit of the name of socialism, I would be honored to associate myself with the enterprise despite all differences that exist otherwise on questions of theory and tactics. If they cannot agree on such an elementary notion—if they equivocate or evade it altogether—the new organization will lay itself open from the start to charges and suspicions from which I fear nobody—not you or I or others—could convincingly defend it. It would start under a cloud that I would not want over my head."

QUESTIONABLE METHOD

Why, the question arises, was the Forum unwilling to make such a simple declaration for democracy?

The charge has been made that it is merely a "Communist front." This, of course, is nothing but the hysterical reactions of ignoramuses.

Actually, the big majority of the individuals and groups involved in the Forum are already on record for democracy and against Stalinism; the Communists on the Committee, Wilkerson and Blumberg, are identified with the Gates wing in the CP. In the fight inside the CP before the last convention, the Gates group had declared for the democratic road to socialism and in its own way had protested the suppression of Hungary by the Russian army.

But although each was ready, in varying degrees, to commit itself to democracy everywhere, the Forum constituted of the same groups was not ready to make the same declaration. In taking this contradictory position, the Forum sponsors were undoubtedly motivated by a desire not to exclude anyone.

Even here, however, it is noteworthy that no representatives of the Foster or Dennis wing of the CP were asked to participate. This would indicate that the participants would like to circumscribe the Forum and dissociate it from outright Stalinists, but "diplomatically" and without a clear political declaration.

It seems to us that what prompted the sponsors to ignore the quintessential question was among other things a desire to facilitate discussions with the Gates wing of the CP, to maintain contact with those who have already broken from Stalinism or are about to do so and who remain inside the CP. That aim, as the ISL has made clear, is perfectly legit-

imate. What is questionable is the method.

GATES AND THE CP

The course of the Gates group inside the CP can be of considerable significance in affecting the course and prospects of a renewed socialist movement. It is not a matter of Gates as an individual but of the group which looks to him. It is a symbol and representative, not only of those who remain in the CP but of the thousands that have already left the CP and who reject Stalinism with repugnance. It is essential that socialists do everything possible to influence its direction, to help and to push it toward a clean break with Stalinism.

But the Gatesites on the Forum committee represent not their own tendency but the Communist Party, which is something quite different. The CP remains identified with the dictatorial regime of the Kremlin; its convention refused to denounce and repudiate the attack on Hungary.

The Forum hoped to escape this cruel fact of life by classifying its leading committee members as "individuals," not as official representatives of organizations. But this remained only a formal distinction. Virtually all members of the known political groups and publications joined with the endorsement of their organizations, except the SPers. Wilkerson and Blumberg were careful to explain that they were acting with the permission of the CP National Committee and made clear that they could not continue to participate if the declaration for democracy everywhere were adopted.

To be sure, the CPers were by no means alone in rejecting such a declaration. Others, particularly the SWP, reacted to the proposal with extreme hostility.

The problem and position of the Gatesites in the CP is not a simple one and we do not presume to map out a prescribed course of tactics for it to follow. Doubtless, they are reluctant to throw hundreds if not thousands into the arms of Foster and Dennis by premature moves.

But one thing is clear: in the end, if the Gatesites are to play the role that they can in a renewed socialist movement, they will have to break clearly and cleanly with Stalinism and the Stalinists, lest everything in the past be wasted. And that fight against Stalinism cannot be postponed indefinitely.

Foster's openly Stalinist wing is gaining strength as those who are looking for a new road continue to leave the CP. More important, the party bears the onus of Stalinism and those who come forward as its representatives cannot escape the political consequences.

PREMATURE

That is the real situation. What ruined socialism in the United States was its identification through the CP with Stalinist tyranny; it cannot be rebuilt and regain its proper place in the labor movement unless it makes clear that it is for democracy everywhere, no less in Communist countries than in the U. S.

If for whatever reason the Forum could not make such a declaration, then its constitution at this juncture with the forces and on the basis possible at this time was, in the view of the ISL, premature.

The Socialist Party-SDF has already taken a strong official position in opposition to the Forum.

In his Weekly on May 27, I. F. Stone expresses his misgivings sharply.

"The Forum must be defended against the inquisitors," he writes. "Politically, however, the Forum seems a dubious venture. Its basic assumption is that non-Communist and Communist Leftists can through discussion find a common ground for socialist 'education.' I doubt it."

And he concluded: "How can those of us who really believe in freedom join forces with those for whom civil liberty is but a cynical and self-serving tactic, to be abandoned for thought control wherever they are in command? How build a new movement to meet American needs in alliance with people who will jump through the hoops on signal from Moscow? There are still good and devoted people in the Communist Party but they will not make reliable allies until the party disappears. Until then, we must defend its rights 100 per cent but beware any attempt to re-establish its influence."

(Turn to last page)

MUSTE DEFIES THE WITCHHUNTERS

A press release by A. J. Muste makes known another facet of Senator Eastland's witchhunting "investigation" into the American Forum.

A letter from the Eastland subcommittee requested Muste to answer a series of questions about the Forum: the relation of the CP's Albert Blumberg (a Forum national committee member) to the group; when its formation was first suggested and by whom; what meetings were held and by whom attended; its sources of funds, and the like.

In reply Muste courageously and commendably rejected and repudiated this witchhunting attack; his response brands the questions as evidence of "the existence of the virus of political inquisition, one of the marks of totalitarianism, in the highest quarters."

Muste states: "On grounds of con-

science and in line with my conception of my duty as a citizen in a democratic society, I must decline to answer the questions. . . ." His primary reason is his "firm conviction" that the inquisition "into the political—the same would be true of religious—views and activities of citizens is evil, a resort to methods characteristic of totalitarian regimes, and unconstitutional and profoundly un-American."

If subpoenaed, he informed Eastland, "it would be impossible for me to do more than appear and state my reasons for declining to answer your questions" of this nature. He added that "if this shall come to pass, I shall not appeal to the 5th Amendment."

This latest witchhunt by Eastland, who is also well known as a bulwark of racism in the Senate, merits the most vigorous opposition by every socialist and democrat.

Formosa Explosion — —

(Continued from page 11)
in American politics.

Nevertheless, the Taipei riots clearly raise the question as to whether the mass of the population of Formosa would not be willing to give up all these advantages in exchange for an end to American support to "their" government, with all this entails in special privileges both for the Americans and for the supporters and hangers-on of the Chiang regime.

Further, the Taipei riots cast a glaring light on a problem which is by no means confined to Formosa.

Right now there is strong feeling in Japan about a case in which an American soldier shot a Japanese woman gathering empty cartridges on an American firing range. Despite the fact that the American was off duty when he shot the Japanese woman, and thus the killing did not fall within the "status of forces" agreement between the American and Japanese governments, the American military has refused to turn him over to a Japanese court for trial.

Here again, the particular incident may or may not lead to major political repercussions. But the political fuel for them is certainly present.

The Japanese Socialist Party stands for drastic revision of the Japanese-American military treaty. It has stood in the forefront of opposition to the extension of American firing ranges and other military facilities at the expense of Japanese farmers' land.

The fact that a succession of Japanese governments have backed the American demands in no way determines the question of the popular feeling about the presence and activities of the American military in Japan. It simply means that this becomes a political issue within the country.

THEY WONDER WHY

In the Philippines, also, a major crisis in American-Philippine relations has also been brought about by differences over the location and extent of American military instal-

lations. Even if these differences are eventually settled on the inter-governmental level (and the U. S. has strong means for applying pressure on the Philippine government to assure settlement on its own terms), the fundamental political problem involved will not be resolved so easily.

And finally, there is, of course, the case of Okinawa which stands in a class by itself. Since the American armed forces are actually the government of this island, they have been able to proceed with utter disregard for the wishes of the local population, and have done so. In this case of an outright territorial grab, the local population has used every avenue open to it to express its hostility to continued American occupation.

The mass demonstrations in Taipei have led to a spate of articles in the American press which seek to explain to the American public why it is that, despite all the sacrifices made by the United States on behalf of these Asian countries, anti-American feeling continues to manifest itself and even grow.

Emphasis is laid on cultural and economic differences between the American troops and local populations, the sensitive feelings of peoples who must rely on foreigners to defend them, and the like.

All these factors play their role, no doubt. But what the American press plays down, if it mentions it at all, is that in each and every case, though differing in degree, the basic source of anti-Americanism is that the United States plays the role of *superior* with regard to the countries where its troops are stationed.

In each and every case, the fact of American overlordship may be more or less acceptable to the *government* in the country involved, often because it may feel it has no choice in the matter. But this does not mean that it is acceptable to the people, or that as time passes it can become more acceptable to them. Quite the contrary.

The recent popular explosions

representatives of the CP may collaborate "normally" (so to speak) with all other groups even while they remain in a party identified with Stalinism; it implies that all the others can collaborate with them without coming to grips with the key question of democracy.

That may be possible for a time within the close confines of the American Forum. But it will not do in the broad arena of the labor and Negro movements. It is toward these great popular mass movements that socialists look. Insofar as the Forum creates the illusion that the hostility of these mass movements toward Stalinism can be momentarily ignored, it disorients its founders.

For the reasons stated above, the ISL and its spokesmen have refused to take political responsibility for the American Forum by serving on its committees. Presumably, the Forum does not require that all socialists endorse it as an institution before joining in the confrontation of opinion in which it is interested. Should the Forum go ahead and organize discussions of the serious problems which face the socialist movement, there is no reason why all socialists should not participate in such discussions from their own point of view.

against Russian overlordship in Poland and Hungary have demonstrated how strong are the feelings of the peoples in these countries for true national independence, for the right to make their own decisions. Although in most cases in which popular feelings against the presence of American troops are manifested the local regimes do not enjoy the same universal detestation as did those of Hungary and Poland before the revolutions of last October; and although in most cases American troops do not play the same decisive role in maintaining the regimes as do the Russians in Eastern Europe, it is the same *kind* of feeling which is involved.

ALTERNATIVE

But general supporters of American foreign policy may say: What is the alternative? Is it not better for our troops to stand in these countries as a line of defense against Communist aggression, even if the people resent them, than for them to come home and leave these peoples to be conquered by the Communists?

At one time, this argument may have sounded very "practical." It sounded just as practical, in fact, as the same argument given the Russians and the Poles and the Hungarians for the need of Russian troops in these countries. Today, aside from men with the mentality of an Admiral Radford, few put the argument forward with much conviction.

The demonstrations in Taipei, bastion and bulwark of the "American defense system" in the Far East, should serve as another warning. America's foreign policy, including its policy of military alliances and far-flung military installations, is headed for a series of further *political* disasters.

What is needed is a real campaign for the withdrawal of American troops from all countries

Broad Movement

It appears that the demonstration in Taipei was not purely spontaneous, in the sense that it was touched off by the emotional appeal of the widow in the case. Many of the demonstrators are reported to have carried small flags with anti-American slogans painted on them, and to have slapped stickers with similar slogans on American cars overturned in the rioting.

It appears that as in the anti-Russian demonstrations in Poland and Hungary, students were in the forefront of the agitation and preparation for the demonstration.

Chiang's government has announced that after thorough investigation it is convinced that no political party or faction was behind the demonstration. **THIS MEANS THAT IT WAS A BROAD POPULAR MOVEMENT.**

Attempts to attribute some of the attacks on and destruction of American installations to "criminal elements" who are supposed to have joined the demonstrators are clearly calculated to hoodwink American public opinion on the real political meaning of the demonstration. The fact is that although the American Embassy was utterly gutted, nothing was stolen. While the demonstrators were smashing up the furniture and equipment of the embassy, it is reported that students kept shouting "Destroy everything, steal nothing."

where they are stationed as part of a political offensive for democracy all over the world. One of the immediate goals of such an offensive would be to force withdrawal of Russian and Chinese troops from all foreign countries in which they are stationed.

Such a withdrawal on both sides would mark a tremendous advance for democracy and for peace all over the world.

Debate — —

(Continued from page 4)

Weiss stated that Shachtman wishes to abandon revolutionary Marxism for social-democracy, referring to an earlier statement by Shachtman that he wished to "break loose from the past," and again repeated his line about there being nothing democratic or socialist about social-democracy in general or the SP in particular. To which Shachtman responded: "I have not broken and will not break with my ideas, with my revolutionary views, with my Third Camp position, with Marxism. But I do wish to break with every sectarian outlook and habit, with every outmoded practice, with everything from the past which stands in the way of creating a new united democratic socialist movement that will begin the urgent task of bringing the ideas of socialism to the American workers and people."

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now, such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League.

Get All Your Books from

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

On the 'American Forum' — —

(Continued from page 7)

The hostility of the bourgeois world to socialist regroupment in any form, even to any discussion of it, we take for granted and go ahead without concern. But the suspicions of laborites, especially of other socialist groups, we cannot simply shrug off.

Arguments will be made against the Forum that have been advanced against all socialist groups, based on misconceptions, on defense of capitalism, on error, on prejudice. Some will shun it, perhaps, because they are still under the pressure of the witchhunt mood. These arguments and these moods we can and should properly resist and combat. But that is not all.

Serious questions are asked of any socialist organization: Where does it stand on democracy everywhere? What is its attitude toward collaboration with organizations which cannot repudiate totalitarian tyranny? These questions and these misgivings are of a different type; they are legitimate and must be faced.

It is as a symptom and symbol of such inescapable questioning that we view the stand of the SP-SDF and I. F. Stone.

The setting up of the Forum at this time creates an immediate misunderstanding for all concerned. It implies that