

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

July 8, 1957

FIVE CENTS

A Report on Denmark: Socialism and Political Trends

... page 6

THE MIND OF SPANISH YOUTH TODAY

... page 5

NAACP AT ITS DETROIT CONVENTION

... page 2

Two Discussion Articles: The SP-SDF and the 'American Forum'

... page 6 and 7

Who's Winning the Propaganda War Over the H-Bomb Disarmament Proposals?

By GORDON HASKELL

A world-wide popular revulsion has been growing against the nuclear armaments race which threatens the future of humanity. As knowledge and understanding has spread of the grave danger to the human race inherent in the large-scale testing of nuclear weapons, the demand has risen with increasing volume and intensity all over the world: *Stop the nuclear bomb tests! Take some steps to halt the suicidal arms race!*

The rulers in the Kremlin, ever alert to utilize the political possibilities of the popular yearning for peace and steps toward peace, have mobilized their supporters in all countries to latch on to this demand and push it for all it is worth. While they continue their own nuclear tests, they seek to organize and channel the peace and anti-nuclear-test sentiment in the capitalist countries for their own purposes.

Added to this, they have made proposals for "first steps" toward disarmament of their own, and have indicated a willingness to discuss the original proposal of the American government for "open sky" inspection as well as for the establishment of check-points to insure mutual compliance with an agreement to suspend nuclear arms tests.

For a few weeks it appeared that the American government would also yield to the popular pressure for "first steps" toward disarmament, including an end to nuclear-weapons tests. The political ad-

vantages of such a move are so apparent that it seemed the objections of the "big bang," "nuclear deterrent" admirals and generals would be overruled. But the prospects, brightened by President Eisenhower's statements, seem to have evaporated

THE 'CLEAN' BULLET

The following letter to the N. Y. Times makes a clean hit:

To the Editor:

The present concern of the world to perfect a more "humane" atomic bomb, i.e., one in which the radioactive fall-out would be minimum, reminds me of an invention that a fellow high school student made.

Before World War II he "invented" a mercurochrome-tipped bullet, so that if the bullet did not kill its intended victim, then at least the victim would not die of blood-poisoning.

IRVING SCHERLIS, M.D.

under the heat of the combined objections of the American military and some of the chief allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

A N. Y. Times headline on July 2 reads "U.S. ASSURES NATO NUCLEAR DEFENSE WILL NOT BE CUT." The article goes on to say that the Adenauer government of West Germany, which has based its policy on the NATO alliance, has been assured that nothing will be done to weaken the "nuclear deterrent" potential of NATO which is absolutely essential to the military concepts on which this pact is based. Adenauer has also been given assurances, the Times reports, that no inspection scheme will be agreed to which would involve the recognition of the East German government.

WHAT'S SECURITY?

The Times reports that Eisenhower has retreated from his "initial eagerness for suspension of nuclear tests" under the urgings of Admiral Radford and Lewis L. Straus, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. "These two officials were said," according to the Times, "to have advised the president that nuclear disarmament without adequate conditions would involve a loss of security."

But how can any steps toward disarmament, even "first steps," be taken which might not "involve a loss of security?" To this, no one knows or can know the answer.

For what is involved is the "security" of a power whose whole foreign policy is based not on an attempt to mobilize the political support and solidarity of the peoples of the world on the basis of support, in turn, to their own aspirations for freedom, democracy, economic progress and peace. What is involved is a policy which seeks "security" in arming to the teeth every government which it can draw into its own orbit, even when such governments use these arms to suppress subject peoples (France), or even the democratic aspirations of their own populations (Spain).

But does not the Russian government do the same thing? Yes, it does. But then why should anyone believe that they might be more willing to start on the road to some kind of arms limitation than the American government? There is no good reason for anyone to believe it.

But unless the American government is willing to risk a loss of some degree of military "security," there is no way of testing and exposing the real intentions of the Russian rulers! There is no way of taking the political initiative from them, and mobilizing the progressive desires and aspirations of the peoples of the world, including those within the countries ruled by Stalinism, to actually move toward the goals to which they aspire.

And now, a new gimmick has been devised with which it is hoped, at least, to turn aside some of the popular reaction to the government's refusal to actually press for or agree to a suspension of nuclear-weapons tests.

CLEAN DEATH

This is the argument that the atomic scientists have invented, or are on the road to inventing, "clean" nuclear weapons, and that further tests are necessary to develop them fully.

A new boon has been announced to humanity! Instead of nuclear weapons whose fallout could turn whole countries into uninhabitable wastes (including, with unfavorable meteorological condi-

(Turn to last page)

'Modern Republicanism'

Once upon a time, Republicans had themselves a picnic pointing out that in its 7 3/4 years the Truman administration collected more taxes than all previous administrations combined — from George Washington right through that lavish spender Franklin D. Roosevelt.

That staggering statistic not only impressed the Republic right—it impressed the liberals. The war-oriented economy behind the statistic masqueraded as welfare-statism, taxing the ill-gotten gains of the rich, etc.

Now the U. S. Chamber of Commerce comes forward to show that the Eisenhower administration will break the Truman tax-collecting record in 5 1/2 years.

Yesterday's Fair-Dealism is today's "modern Republicanism."

Or more exactly, the "modern Republicans" are those who have learned that they have to incorporate into the basic bipartisan political structure of capitalism what was once thought to be a hallmark of the liberal approach.

That's why one Republican has quipped, sort of bitterly: "A modern Republican is someone who talks like Franklin Roosevelt and votes like Herbert Hoover, or vice-versa."

Or as Fletcher Knebel of the Washington Star put it, from the same slant: "Modern Republican: a fellow who joins the New Deal 20 years late—then claims he invented it."

Or another pundit: "Modern Republicanism: Never put off till tomorrow what you should have done in 1873."

Sure, those bitter cracks are exaggerations, but they serve to underline some of the reasons why Fair-Deal liberalism finds itself with nothing to say, fresh out of ideas, and incapable of even being a decent fighting opposition in American politics.

Price Tag on the Filibuster

When you read about the fight over a civil-rights program in Congress, keep some figures in mind.

The figures help to cast some light the Way of Life the filibusterers are defending—and why they are defending it.

Here's a sample of the kind of statistics involved:

A couple of weeks ago the congressional subcommittee on labor standards was holding hearings on extension of minimum-wage coverage to farm workers, one of the most intensely exploited group of workers in the United States. Among this exploited group of farm workers the worst-exploited of all are the Negro croppers and farm workers. A leading sociologist of Alabama's Tuskegee Institute, Dr. Lewis W. Jones, appeared before the subcommittee on behalf of the National Sharecroppers Fund.

Jones pointed out that (according to the 1954 agricultural census) 50 per cent of the hired workers in agriculture were employed on Southern farms.

Of these Southern farm workers, only 19 per cent were classified as

"regular" workers. To be classified as a "regular" worker, you need work only 150 days or more during the year. That's "regular" work. The other 81 per cent were seasonal workers, employed less than 150 days.

The conditions of employment are further suggested in the fact that less than 12 per cent were paid on a weekly or monthly basis. The others were paid daily, hourly, or by piecework.

Their wages?

Monthly workers: 45 per cent got less than \$110 a month.

Weekly workers: 53 per cent got less than \$30 a week.

Daily workers: 60 per cent got less than \$5 a day.

Hourly workers: 83 per cent got less than 85 cents an hour.

Jones further pointed out: In the county where Tuskegee Institute is located, even the new worker-elite—the tractor drivers—were paid only \$5 a day, or 62 1/2 cents an hour. Cotton choppers were paid \$2-2.50 a day, or 25-31 cents an hour.

As we were saying, the Way of Life has a cash value, for some people.

NAACP Convention Plans Its Activities

By J. ARNOLD

More than 1000 delegates and alternates heard Dr. Channing H. Tobias, chairman of the Board of Directors, open the 48th Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in the city of Detroit.

The theme of his talks was "Calm Reasonableness" as he called on the members of the NAACP to achieve the goals they had outlined in previous years: civil rights, political effectiveness, equality in housing, integration in the schools, and other primary objectives of the organization.

Of particular significance was Dr. Tobias' stress on a nonpartisan policy for the Negro voting bloc. He stated that "The Negro vote cannot afford to be tied to any political party." This indicates that the leadership of the NAACP is spearheading a trend away from the Democratic Party in future elections.

This trend was definitely underscored on the following days when, in regional workshops, Clarence Mitchell, head of the Washington bureau and the chief NAACP lobbyist in the halls of Congress, stated flatly, "the Negro cannot win his rights without the support of both parties."

In many sections of the country the Republicans are making great inroads on the negro voters. This trend presages a strain between the NAACP and one of its closest allies, the organized labor movement, and especially the UAW which plays such an important role in the Negro struggle for equal rights.

The conferences of the NAACP operate committees and regional workshops. The various delegates are grouped in regions geographically and carry out regional discussions on various topics. The main topics at this convention were: housing, political action, job opportunity and FEPC, NAACP organizational methods.

RAUH'S PLEA

In these regional conferences expert speakers in the various fields are brought in and discussion is held. These workshops help enlighten delegates on various problems and give them an opportunity to express themselves which many would forgo if they could only speak before the entire convention.

Of course, one of the great weaknesses of regional workshops is that if a point of view develops in only one of the seven regions, the members of the other regions hear about it only on the last day when the convention assembles to vote on resolutions.

Walter Reuther and Joseph L. Rauh Jr. spoke at one of the mass meetings held by the NAACP. Rauh made a stirring speech attacking the Southern states' attempt to destroy the right of free association. (For the first time since its inception, the NAACP meets with its organization outlawed in five Southern states.)

Rauh pointed out that this outlawing of the NAACP constitutes one of the greatest threats to democracy that has ever faced this country. Should this attack on the NAACP by the various Southern states not be defeated, then the road is paved for the future outlawing of very many organizations of both a political and social nature. Then totalitarianism can come to the U.S. in a unique but quite indigenous form.

Rauh called the attention of the NAACP to a very important fact. "Civil rights and civil liberties are opposite sides of the same coin. They are inseparable and intertwined; one cannot fight for one without struggling for the other." Here he struck home a telling blow, for unfortunately the record of the NAACP on civil liberties is not so good. It does not spend much time fighting for the liberties of political dissidents; indeed it goes out of its way to avoid such struggles. Rauh really gave the NAACP something to think about on this point.

LABOR STRESSED

Walter Reuther delivered a good, but the same old, "Labor Leader's" speech. He spent a great deal of time developing the now-popular theme of so many liberals and others: Not that we should give the colored people of the U.S. their democratic rights because it is coming to them, but we had better give it to them because if we don't then the Communists will capture the hearts and minds of the vast majority of the colored peoples of the world.

This theme is quite often used today to convince everybody in the U.S. and abroad that we are great democrats. One might suppose if the Communist threat were suddenly removed at home and abroad, it would be difficult to find another good reason why we should attempt to live up to the democratic ideals that this country talks about so freely in Europe, Asia and Africa.

One of the real highlights of the convention was a labor dinner, organized by Herbert Hill, NAACP Secretary. Here the various trade-union delegates met and fraternized; there were speeches from Emil Mazey, Secretary-Treasurer of the UAW and other labor leaders.

Certainly today the labor section of the NAACP forms a very important factor in the struggle for democratic rights. It is not accorded the recognition it should have in the NAACP. The vast majority of the membership is only dimly aware of the great contributions that labor makes to the NAACP: the money that it gives, the organizational strength, its great social influence, its mass base.

This labor dinner was a step in the right direction, for if the NAACP ever expects to become a real mass organization with real influence, then it will have to turn to the workers. The professional class that now dominates the NAACP does not have what it takes for a real struggle for civil rights and civil liberties.

ON THE NEGATIVE SIDE

There was a mass meeting for the Rev. Martin Luther King of Montgomery fame. Huge crowds turn out to see him and he is given standing ovations whenever he is presented. The hall secured for him was too small and thousands were turned away at the door.

One of the great shortcomings of the convention was the lack of white delegates; there was only about two dozen. It appears that this shortcoming is in the local branches and not in the leadership, but it must be grappled with.

The two most important resolutions to come before the membership was one on Communism and one on legislative action, specifically the civil rights struggle on the floor of Congress. On the latter the NAACP voted full confidence to the floor leadership of men like Knowland and Dirksen, and this in view of their stand on Rule 22! This is another indication of the trend of the NAACP to "nonpartisanship" in politics, and what they mean by it.

On the anti-Communist resolution the NAACP maintained the 1950 resolution barring Communists from membership, even, as one leader said, "repentant Communists." This resolution is a grave violation of civil liberties and places the NAACP far to the right of the Supreme Court on this question. Here we have a mass organization fighting for democratic rights and denying such rights to others.

Group of Leaders Quit Canadian Communist Party

In Canada's Communist Party—called the Labor Progressive Party—the internal crisis brought to a head by the Hungarian Revolution has exploded with a walkout by a left-wing group.

In the middle of May, following a national convention of the party at which the Tim Buck leadership reimposed complete control, four former leaders of the party issued a scathing statement of resignation. Their viewpoint seems quite similar to that expressed in the American CP by the John Gates group, which however still remains in the party here.

The four are:

- J. B. Salsberg—long a National Executive member, and a well-known public spokesman of the LPP.
- Stewart Smith—Ontario leader of the LPP; former Toronto city controller; LPP National Executive.
- Harry Binder—Quebec organizer and former national treasurer of the party; National Executive.
- Sam Lipshitz—secretary of LPP's National Jewish Committee for 18 years; ex-editor of *Canadian Jewish Weekly*; National Executive till recently.

ASK REALIGNMENT

The statement by the four stressed that they still dedicate themselves to the cause of a better world. There is a reference to the countries which "with China in the first place, embarked on the path of socialism," to the post-war anti-colonial upsurge, and to labor gains at home.

"These historic changes in the world and in Canada demand new thinking and new alignments for progress and for a democratic socialist future based on the specific conditions and historic background of each country," says their statement.

"The need for new approaches was underscored with particular force by the shocking revelations of the terrible crimes and injustices that had been committed in the Soviet Union under the Stalin regime and in other countries under its influence, which constituted a complete distortion and violation of the very concepts of socialism.

"We together with many others in the

LPP carried on a struggle, particularly during the last 12 months for such necessary changes. But our proposals were rejected by the Tim Buck majority. The proceedings at the 6th National Convention and at the recent Metro Toronto convention of the LPP have convinced us that under its present leadership and with its present policies, the LPP is unwilling to make a break with its deeply rooted sectarianism and Stalinist methods of work and thinking.

"The continued uncritical acceptance by the LPP of all policies and pronouncements of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as the last, final and indisputable law of Marxism, the one-sided Stalinist attitude toward such explosive events as those that took place in Poland and Hungary last year, the refusal of the LPP leadership to raise its voice in protest against the unjust, anti-socialist actions of the Soviet leadership toward Jewish culture, Jewish social-cultural institutions and those of other nationalities—all these demonstrate the LPP leadership's lack of independent thinking, without which any socialist working-class party dooms itself to ideological sterility, political ineffectiveness and decline.

"We, for our part, will not approve of, nor associate ourselves with policies which are in conflict with the present and future interests of the Canadian working people and with the cause of socialism in this country.

"It is our opinion that the historically necessary task of regrouping the socialist forces in this country has to be undertaken. This is not an organizational task in the first place, but a political one, an educational one.

"What is now crystal-clear, however, is that the LPP cannot and will not perform this task. Those who genuinely seek a Canadian path towards a democratic socialist future have no alternative but to find new paths, seek new alliances, help create a new, fraternal atmosphere in the Canadian labor movement, to speed the process of healing the splits of the past and thus pave the way for a Canadian path to demonstrate socialism."

LABOR SCOPE

By BEN HALL

At a conference of the AFL-CIO's Industrial Union Department last month, George Meany returned to the subject of a labor party. Here is how *Labor's Daily* reported it:

"... Meany said labor has to adapt to conditions as they change. Today, he said, this means greater political and legislative action because it is in those fields that our enemies would destroy us. 'I haven't the slightest doubt that if it were necessary—and we thought a political party was necessary—I haven't the slightest doubt that we would take that step without the slightest hesitation. But up to the present, we don't need it.' The delegates from the affiliates of the 7.6-million-member IUD applauded Meany resoundingly when he mentioned the possibility of a labor political party."

A CHANCE FOR THE AFL-CIO

At the same conference, Meany deplored the effects of the disclosures at the McClellan Committee on unions. An AFL-CIO representative in the Midwest put it to him this way:

"Well, we have lost the positive approach. Every time we talk to someone about joining up, we are trying to defend the trade-union movement. We are talking negatively because people we talk to ask us questions about the things in the headlines."

New problems pile up.

A Senate Subcommittee on Public Roads called Maurice Hutcheson, president of the Carpenters Union, to testify on charges that union officials and State

of Indiana government officials had conspired to buy land and sell it to the state for highway construction at a net profit of \$80,000. He refused to testify, invoking the Fifth Amendment nearly 100 times.

Back at the McClellan Committee, evidence of unethical practices piled up against the administration of the Bakers Union. In self-defense, some of the present officers contended that when William Schnitzler, present AFL-CIO secretary, was an official of their union the identical practices were considered routine.

So far, these are cases which are forced upon the AFL-CIO for decision. It still has the opportunity to take the initiative in dealing with one situation that is guaranteed to erupt into another nation-wide scandal.

We refer to the International Union of Operating Engineers. When the McClellan Committee will get to it, we cannot say. Perhaps the committee braintrusters are holding it in reserve in case public interest in their activities begins to flag.

However, the Engineers have been before the AFL-CIO for some time now, at least since a rank-and-file reform group in Local 138 appealed for help to the Ethical Practices Committee. This is the local that has been under the thumb of the DeKoning family—father and son—who were convicted of extortion. The rank-and-ilers are protesting against employer domination of their local, against expulsions, against thuggery and dictatorship. Appeals to their international have been in vain.

(Turn to last page)

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

Max Shachtman

A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!

\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

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

A Survey-Report on the Danish Scene

SOCIALISM

AND POLITICAL TRENDS

IN DENMARK

By CARL H. PETERSEN

Copenhagen, June 7

On May 14 parliamentary elections took place in Denmark, and two weeks later the country had a new government; a coalition government consisting of Social-Democrats, Radicals and the Single Tax Party replaced the Social-Democratic minority government of H. C. Hansen.

The three government parties have a majority in parliament (93 against 75 in the conservative bourgeois opposition and 6 Stalinists). Hansen remains the leader of the government, in which the Social-Democrats have nine members while the Radicals have four and the Single Tax Party three.

The new government's program is to a great extent influenced by the Social-Democrats' point of view, but at the same time it is by no means revolutionary, nor is it really socialist. But more of this later in this article.

In the election campaign which preceded the elections of May 14 it was obvious that both the Communists and the Social-Democrats were on the defensive.

For the CP the chief stumbling-block was the Soviet Union's attack on Hungary in November 1956 and the party's defense of this attack. But also the 20th Party Congress in the Soviet Communist Party and its "unveiling" and acknowledgement of the crimes and atrocities committed by the rulers of the Stalinist world over a period of many years, definitely weakened the position of the CP which was heavily compromised by its moral co-responsibility for and support of these horrible events.

For the Social-Democrats there were particularly two unfavorable conditions: an almost permanent currency crisis during the last three years, i.e., almost the whole of the period in which they had been in power, and the government's interference in the form of a strike prohibition in April 1956.

THE CURRENCY CRISIS

The currency question has—with the exception of a few intervals—been Denmark's biggest "headache" for the last forty years or so, and it has played a big part in many election campaigns and political "appeasement-crisis" between different parties in the parliament. This was also the case this year, and the new government's first step will be to pass a number of laws to abolish or lessen the currency troubles.

Our almost permanent currency difficulties are directly connected with our extremely large foreign trade. There are few or no countries which do so much trade with the outside world per inhabitant as Denmark.

We export chiefly agricultural products, but lately there has also been a considerable export of industrial commodities, e.g., ships, cement and certain machinery. At the same time the percentage of agricultural products in the Danish export trade has dropped from 75 in 1939 to 60 in recent years. Denmark imports chiefly oil and coal, but also wood and paper and all kinds of raw materials for its steadily increasing industry, which since the Second World War absorbs more manpower than does agriculture.

The many currency crises have two main causes: (1) a deterioration in conditions of exchange, whereby Denmark's export commodities fall in price or stagnate while imported commodities become dearer—at any rate relatively and sometimes absolutely; (2) duty and import restrictions on Danish agricultural exports to our chief markets, England and Western Germany (and not least the

U. S.!) combined with direct state subsidies to the agriculture of these countries in various forms.

When both these causes appear simultaneously, which happens quite often, a sudden decrease appears in the Danish currency coffers—and that is what has happened recently.

The Suez crisis forced the import price of all kinds of oil up very high, not least because the American oil trusts deliberately and cynically took advantage of the situation in Western Europe; and at the same time a definite fall in the price of Danish agricultural products took place in England (bacon and butter).

Quite recently, however, the prices of these commodities have risen a little in England, and the Suez crisis has been overcome as far as sailing through the Canal goes, and because of this Denmark's oil import has become somewhat cheaper.

But the further outlook is as yet not very bright. It appears that the index for conditions of exchange between export and import prices since 1945 shows a steady drop for Denmark's foreign trade, even though once or twice during this period there have been very short-lived improvements.

FOREIGN-POLICY ISSUES

As the last two or three serious deteriorations in the exchange conditions have occurred under social-democratic governments the conservative-minded bourgeois parties have, during the last election campaign, succeeded in persuading many electors that a social-democratic government always leads to a currency crisis! The Conservatives' battle cry: "There will be no improvement before we get a new government!" was therefore not without weight.

In fact a much sounder attitude was that of the little liberal party, the so-called Radicals, which went like this:

"Our allies in NATO etc., that is to say, in the U. S., England and Western Germany, keep insisting that Denmark contribute more and more to military expenses; but at the same time they impoverish us with their customs and import restrictions on our agricultural products and their large subsidies to their own agriculture. This cannot continue, and we must make this quite clear to our allies through direct negotiations with them!"

It will be interesting to see whether the new government, in which as already mentioned the Radicals have a part, really will take a firm stand toward the great Western powers: the U. S., England and Western Germany!

Another matter of importance in this

connection will be the formation of the plans of a Western European Customs Union, "the six," and the free-trade area proposed in connection with this. As England seems determined to maintain that provisions must be kept outside the free-trade area, the result will perhaps be that Denmark will enter the Western European Customs Union.

The peasants and their liberal party have already during the election campaign supported this view, and as Norway is doing all it can to frustrate plans for a Scandinavian customs union, just as it prevented the formation of a Scandinavian defense alliance in 1949, it is very possible that Denmark will join "the six." But the matter is as yet undecided.

TRADE-UNION STRUGGLE

While the currency crisis has definitely been a handicap for the Social-Democrats in certain bourgeois and petty bourgeois circles during the elections, it was the policy of the prohibition of strikes which was the party's weak spot for the workers.

In March 1956, to everyone's astonishment, strikes started in the shipbuilding yards, the printing trade (which included all the non-socialist newspapers), parts of the building industry, and among the sailors and the workers in the oil companies, including these companies' transport workers.

The reason was that the new leaders of the employers categorically refused to meet any of the trade unions' demands. The stoppage of the bourgeois newspapers and of the distribution of gasoline and shipping transport caused great anger among the upper and middle classes and the peasants, while the workers were furious about the policy carried on by the employers in spite of the fact that most industries had had record profits and paid out enormous dividends.

When the bourgeois papers were stopped, the parties concerned demanded that the state radio give them a daily program which they could use to enlighten the country on their attitude toward the strikers. The radio top board agreed to this, with one addition—that the other parties should also have their say in this daily program which was called "Commentary on the Situation." These programs thereupon turned into great battlefields for propaganda, where the bourgeois politicians bitterly attacked the trade unions' and workers' "anti-social" demands and fighting methods and their "crushing of the freedom of the press," while the Social-Democratic government's representatives supported the cause of "reason and peace on the labor market," and only the Stalinists directly supported the workers.

One or two of the Social-Democratic trade-union leaders in these radio comments also supported the demands of the workers, but were hindered by the government's peace-at-any-price attitude.

In the middle of the conflict the government interfered and passed through

Parliament the prohibition of strikes in the oil and gasoline companies. This infuriated the workers even more, with the result that the mediation proposal, which included certain wage increases and introduced a health scheme, were rejected, although the trade-union leaders had recommended it.

But the compromises which had been rejected by the workers were immediately made law by the Parliament after being recommended by the Social-Democrat government. Only this little Stalinist group and one Social-Democrat (Hans Rasmussen, leader of the metal workers) voted against the proposition, and two other Social-Democratic trade-union men abstained from voting. Thereupon both the current strikes and those which were to come were forbidden.

This cynical interference with the trade-union movement caused a minor revolution. In Copenhagen all work stopped for two days as a protest against the prohibition of strikes, and 200,000 workers, after marching through the city, gathered in a protest meeting in the square outside Christianborg, the seat of the Parliament. In the large provincial towns, too, there were strikes and meetings, and in the months which followed protests were made at all kinds of meetings and congresses in the trade unions. It should be added that the huge workers' meeting outside Christianborg on April 13, 1956 was the biggest meeting ever held in Denmark.

The anger of the workers was tremendous, and the Social-Democratic Party leaders and the government had the great majority of the workers against them.

THE SOCIALIST PROGRAM

It must be admitted that against this background, the Social-Democrats did very well to increase their number of votes at the election a year later, and to lose relatively only 2 per cent.

This result is even better in consideration of the fact that the party was also weak in program at the time of the election campaign. At the party congress in January 1957 an election program was decided upon "for freedom and welfare," a program which in very general terms promises to work for greater investment, production and export, and also to take up the fight against unemployment, and which also mentions, in very vague terms, a little about improvement in some sections of social legislation, but 99 per cent of which is utterly lacking in any socialist content.

Only a couple of phrases in the program could possibly be interpreted in a slightly socialist direction—namely (again in a very vague form) it talks of making the employees interested in the running of industry, giving them influence in it, and says that social funds should be established for the employees. These forms of industrial democracy can be regarded as the beginning of the workers' taking over of the industries, in other words the beginning of a democratic socialist form of community; but it is much more likely that the authors of the program have only intended to set up cooperation and "understanding" between all parties in industry, to the advantage of productivity and an increase in production; in other words, the same tendency which is found among the bourgeois American trade-union leaders.

But whatever the intention may have been, these far from revolutionary phrases disappeared from the concentrated election slogans which the leaders of the party sent out in April. In the rest of the election propaganda "industrial democracy" took a very modest part; only very few of the party's candidates and press mentioned it at all.

Nor did concrete reform propositions which could have appealed to the mass of electors, and which have always been the Social-Democratic Parties' most important weapon and policy, take a large part in the Danish Social-Democrats' election campaign this year. The campaign stood on very shaky legs both from the socialist and reform point of view.

In 1953 the party had at least the "people's pension," which has now been passed in a somewhat watered-down form and with a very modest increase of the former old-age pension to be reckoned from October 1, 1957.

The election of May 14 gave the results shown in the accompanying table.

(Continued on page 4)

RESULTS OF THE NATIONAL ELECTION—COMPARATIVE TABLE

	No. of votes		% of votes		No. of seats	
	1957	1953	1957	1953	1957	1953
Social-Democrats	910,000	895,000	39.4	41.3	70	74
Radicals	180,000	170,000	7.8	7.8	14	14
Conservatives	384,000	365,000	16.6	16.8	30	30
Liberals	579,000	500,000	25.1	23.1	45	42
(peasants' party)						
Single Tax Party	123,000	75,000	5.3	3.5	9	6
(Retsforbundet)						
Communist Party	72,000	94,000	3.1	4.3	6	8
Independents	53,000	58,000	2.3	2.7	0	0
(reactionaries)						
Slesvig Party	9,200	9,700	0.4	0.5	1	1
(Germans)						
Total	2,290,200	2,066,700	100	100	175	175

Socialism and Politics in Denmark —

(Continued from page 3)

The percentage who voted was 83.7 this year against 80.6 in 1953, in other words higher than in any former normal election. The greatly increased participation in the election comes almost entirely from the non-proletarian part of the population and is advantageous practically only for the two middle-class parties, the Liberals and the Single Tax Party, both of which are the only parties to have gained a larger proportion of the votes than in 1953.

SINGLE-TAXERS GAIN

The Liberal Party's advance was expected, but the Single Tax Party's relatively much greater advance came as a surprise to everyone.

Gallup had forecast a modest victory for the party, but many expected a retreat, and even the most optimistic in the party's own ranks had only expected an advance of half the size.

It is definitely not on its central ideas of "complete ground tax" and "confiscation of property increase resulting from the development of the community," that the Single Tax Party has won its election victory. This has been achieved through a demagogical agitation against all other taxes, à la Poujade in France—against state control, state bureaucracy and restrictions; and the greater part of the party's new votes are votes of protest against these things and against all the other parties.

Many of these electors are politically indifferent young people and petty-bourgeois who normally would not vote at all, but there are probably also a number of former Stalinists among them.

The Single Tax Party's core of electors is very complex. The kernel of the party consists of a few thousand Georgists, for whom Henry George's teaching is an infallible religion which can cure all the evils of the community. Many of the supporters of the party are small farmers because the Danish small-holders' organizations have, from their beginning in 1902, had the "single tax" as the all-important part of their basic ideology.

ANTI-LABOR ATTITUDES

The party's violent agitation against duty and import restrictions has gained it a lot of influence among wholesalers, and its extreme economic liberalism and half-anarchistic enmity toward state control and state bureaucracy has caused many other independent tradesmen to look upon it with sympathy.

Among the working class its position is weak, because its dislike of state interference has never applied when it was a question of the trade-union struggle! On the contrary: the Single Tax Party has always voted for prohibition of strikes and other interference with the freedom of action of the trade-union movement.

Its semi-anarchism and "pure" Liberalism has as a rule a very anti-or a-social character. The catchword has been "Everyone his own!" and "Don't plague people with state authority!" but the spirit behind these catchwords has been the good old capitalist spirit: "Take care of No. 1!" and "What the hell have you to do with the others?" In other words, the exact opposite of the labor movement with its demand for solidarity.

Apart from its purely Georgist program, the Single Tax Party's ranks and members of parliament have as a rule all sorts of attitudes. There are, for example, pacifists and defense partisans amongst them, NATO supporters and neutralists of every kind; and regarding these and many other questions its representatives often vote against each other. It even happens that the group may have three attitudes toward a matter—for, against, and abstention! But the party is agreed that enforced national service should be abolished.

It has no daily newspaper, but keeps a very aggressive oral agitation going. Its president Viggo Starcke is a brilliant debater and a real demagogue; his talks on the radio before the election have several times gained the party thousands of votes and are also considered this time to have won a mass of "floating" electors for the Single Tax Party.

During the elections of the last ten years the number of votes for this party

has varied more than for any other Danish party; enormous percentage gains are balanced by just as large defeats, and the other way round.

BOURGEOIS PARTIES

I have written rather fully about the Georgist party, as Denmark is the only country in the world where this party exists; and I shall now deal with the other non-socialist parties.

We have up to now been spared—heaven be praised!—any special Christian party; and religion on the whole plays a smaller role in Denmark's political and social life than in most other countries. We have for example no Christian trade-union movement of any importance.

But in certain parts of the country, chiefly in Jutland among the farmers, the puritanical "Inside Mission" has an influence which is very much to be reckoned with, particularly in cultural matters, in the widest sense of the phrase. Almost the entire population belongs to the Lutheran State Church, but anyone who likes can without any difficulty leave the church and still maintain all his civil rights. The church as such is politically neutral; none of the parties are anti-clerical; nor does there exist any powerful political clericalism. In all the parties "clerically interested circles" are to be found, and these have the most influence in the non-socialist parties, namely the Liberals and Conservatives.

The leading non-socialist party is the *Left (Liberal) Party*. Its core is the independent farmer and before 1945 it was almost entirely a peasant party, but at the elections since the war it has won a certain amount of support in the towns, particularly at the cost of the Conservatives.

The Liberals have the support of an unusually wide-spread press, but they have not managed to establish any newspaper in Copenhagen, which, as far as the non-socialist press is concerned, is completely dominated by two large, old-established papers—*Berlingske Tidende* and *Politiken*. (The Social-Democratic press is owned and financed by the trade unions, but very many workers only read the bourgeois papers.)

According to tradition the *Left Party* is "liberal," but in fact during the greater part of this century it has been conservative. But it is only since 1945 that the party has accepted permanent financial support for its program from the Danish capitalists' organization—the *Union of Employers*—in the same way as the *Conservative People's Party*.

THE NOT VERY "RADICALS"

This is Denmark's other big non-socialist party. It represents the same interests as the right-wing parties in the other Scandinavian countries and has a similar ideology.

After the First World War it was based on universal suffrage and acknowledged in principle the necessity of social legislation. After the Second World War its traditional middleclass nationalism has been partially replaced and partially augmented by a certain democratic internationalism within the framework of NATO and a sympathy for attempt toward a unification of Europe. But in the 1930s strong fascist tendencies were to be found in the party, particularly in its youth organizations.

Its core is the well-to-do and bourgeois strata in the towns. In the country it has few supporters, mostly big property owners and a certain amount of big farmers, as well as a few "Inside Mission" fisherman and farmers in North West Jutland. At the election of May 14 both the Left and the Single Tax Party made inroads in a number of otherwise conservative groups, not least in Greater Copenhagen.

The third old-established non-socialist party in Denmark is the *Radical Left*.

It broke away from the old Left in 1905, when this party's majority gave up the belief that military expenses could be reduced, and ever since the Radicals have tried to keep these expenses at a "reasonable level." They were still supporters of military reductions at the time of the elections in May. In 1949 they voted against Denmark's adherence to NATO, and at the elections of 1950 and 1953 they agitated violently

against the NATO course, but without much success.

In the recent election campaign there was not so much of this enmity toward NATO to be found among the Radicals; in fact they supported the government's defense of NATO in its reply to Bulganin's note; and as members of the new government they have given their support to the declaration that the country's foreign policy will continue unchanged—in other words, will follow the NATO course.

Traditionally the party is "radical" in the non-socialist meaning of the word—supporting reform and strongly "social"—but in fact it has been a typical center party for many years. As almost permanent possessors of the key position which "tips the scales" between the Left Conservatives and the Social-Democrats, the Radicals have been able to exercise a very considerable parliamentary influence and have left their mark on the legislature more than any other party.

STALINISTS DECLINE

Both the *Social-Democrats* and the *Stalinist Party* resemble their counterparts in the rest of Western Europe. The fact that in spite of the already mentioned obvious weakness they did not lose more support than they did at the elections is largely because they are without competition in the community of electors to which they appeal. Although in 1956 they each in their own way compromised themselves more than ever before they still appear as the only representatives of labor interests.

Besides this, as far as the Stalinists go, they had already at the elections between 1945 and 1953 dropped from 255,000 votes to 95,000, or from 12.5 per cent of the total votes to 4.3 per cent; which means that the greater part of the independent and critical left-oriented workers and intellectuals had already left the party long before the 20th Communist Congress and the Hungarian affair.

There remained some party bureaucrats and the fanatical Stalinists, and some honest but very primitive radical elements who often hate the social-democratic "bosses" more than the capitalists, and more or less instinctively join up with the most revolutionary elements.

All this makes narrow limits for a retreat, and yet the CP lost 25 per cent of its few voters while a large number of the remaining 72,000 voted for the party "for lack of anything better."

One interesting point: the number of blank and invalid votes rose from 5,500 to 11,000, and most of this increase was due to disappointed Communists. In sections of the party itself a whispering campaign started that the discontented members should demonstrate against the leadership of the party by voting blank, which many of them did.

The number of members of the party and the circulation of its press dropped respectively from 60,000 and 65,000 in 1945, to 11,000 and 13,000 in October 1956. Both numbers fell heavily again after Hungary.

MINOR SETBACK FOR S-D

Two to three months before the elections some former Communists and a few former Social-Democrats tried to form a left-socialist party, but immediately broke into two minor groups, one of which is already abandoned and the other seems to stagnate as a sect of politically little importance, with a lot of opinions inside it.

The Social-Democrats were given great help, both financially and morally, by the entire trade-union movement in the election campaign—in spite of the previous year's strike prohibition, which even the trade unions' central organization leaders protested. (This was the first time in the 85-year-old history of the Danish labor movement that there was open disagreement between the trade-unions and the party's central leadership!)

Another asset in this year's election campaign was the Social-Democrats' tax proposal, which aims at creating just taxation for the wage-earners in relation to the rest of the population. Presumably the party has in this way retained and gained a number of votes from civil servants and functionaries

who otherwise have no feeling of class solidarity or ideological attachment for the traditional labor movement.

Finally the promise of the maintenance of rent control certainly helped the Social-Democrats in the populous rent-paying sections of the towns.

But in spite of these conditions and in spite of the fact that Danish electors are as a rule extraordinarily faithful to the party they have once chosen, the result was a minor defeat for the Social-Democrats. Otherwise the labor movement's portion of votes during the elections of the past twenty years has been more or less constant, but never so low as this year.

It is not very likely that the new coalition government will cause any great alteration for the better as far as this is concerned at the next election—unless the economic state of affairs appears particularly favorable.

There is a real danger that already next summer this government, and therefore the Social-Democrats, will come into conflict with the trade unions, which are expected at that time to attempt to take a definite step toward the reduction of working hours.

The Danish workers with their 48-hour week belong by now to the most backward among the more highly developed industrial countries' workers. Even the Russian slave community has recently proclaimed a shorter working-week!

If a labor struggle develops in Denmark during the early summer over the question of the shortening of working hours, it will probably bring with it violent disagreement between the party leaders and the trade-union leaders, and between the party and the trade-union movement, and the result of this will be inner dissension and outer weakening for the whole labor movement. But from a long-term point of view such a situation might perhaps bring about the crystallization of a real left opposition.

ON THE LEFT

At the Social-Democratic congress in January, real political criticism appeared for the first time since 1920; that is, criticism against the Social-Democratic minority government's unprincipled compromise policy, which the critics would like to see supplanted by a more solid Social-Democratic opposition policy. There were not very many critics and doubters, but they were by no means outsiders; two of the principal trade-union leaders and a couple of members of parliament were among them. There was of course no mention of a revolutionary opposition, but there was mention of a very strong criticism "from the Left."

At the CP's congress during the same month, a numerically small opposition appeared against the Russian attack on Hungary, and among the remaining party members trouble is brewing—especially among the intellectuals in the party, which in their paper *Dialogue* have an organ to reach the rest of the country. But also in the neutralist "sympathizing" monthly *Free Denmark*, oppositional, expelled and resigned Communists vigorously express their open criticism after Hungary.

It is moreover symptomatic of the whole atmosphere that even the leader of the party, Aksel Larsen, has once or twice during the last year—very tentatively and certainly for tactical reasons—shown a slight tendency toward independence from the Russians in a few less important questions.

It can finally be said that critical tendencies are also apparent among the Social-Democratic intellectuals, particularly in the "Free Forum" association and this organization's paper of the same name.

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

July 8, 1957 / Vol. 21, No. 27

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 HASKELL, BEN HALL.

A Look Into the Mind of Spanish Youth

By N. MOLINS FABREGA

The problem of Spain involves unknown quantities which cannot easily be fathomed without direct contact with the Spaniards in Spain. Probably the most important of these unknown quantities concerns the true attitude of the Spaniards themselves with respect to the regime. This is of particular interest to us Spanish refugees living in the Americas, who are those most geographically separated from their own country.

The chance of a trip to Venezuela and a long stay in that country have given us an opportunity to become familiar with the most general reactions of the Spaniards of Spain, for today Venezuela is the Latin American country receiving the largest number of Spanish emigrants who give up their austere life in their homeland to remake their lives in countries offering greater economic security.

The one characteristic common to all of the Spanish emigrants to Venezuela is dissatisfaction with the Franco regime. We could not find one single person who favored it, not even among the priests and monks, of whom not a few have settled in that country.

The Spanish emigration in Venezuela is primarily composed of farmers from the Canary Islands and from the northern and north-eastern regions of Spain. Next come a considerable number of laborers and intellectuals from the larger cities, especially Madrid and the cities of Andalusia. Few come from Catalonia, although today the Catalans are emigrating as they never have before, which in itself is symptomatic.

All with whom we spoke were unanimous on one point: life in Spain is unbearable on every level; even the clergy agreed with this, for the most part.

NO LOVE FOR FALANGE

But what was most interesting to us were the reactions of the younger people who have received no education other than that provided by the regime. We had an opportunity to live for about two weeks with a representative group of these younger Spaniards: farmers, laborers and students, traveling as emigrants on board a Spanish ship in the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico. All were between 17 and 24 years of age.

One might have expected that the one-sided and hermetically sealed education that they had received would have at least ingrained in them a certain respect for the regime and its outstanding personalities, but nothing of the sort. Among the thirty to forty youths who composed this group not one had the slightest love of Falangism. A very few, three or four perhaps, held that the Generalissimo was a good man and that the sins of the regime should be

The accompanying article was published in the magazine Iberica (June 15), whose editorial board is headed up by Salvador de Madariaga and Norman Thomas, as a militant liberal voice against Francoism. The writer, N. Molins Fabrega, is a Spanish author and archeologist who lives in Mexico.—ED.

blamed rather on the top-ranking military and ecclesiastical authorities who surround him and who profit by the depredations with which the Falange victimizes the Spanish people.

Where their peculiar education had left its mark was in their concept of Spain's recent history. A veritable abyss has been created between the Spain of today and that of before the Civil War, especially with the respect to the years of the Republic and its leaders. In reality this negative attitude with respect to the men of the Republic and the Republic itself was reflected in them as a resentment.

From listening to their parents and elders they had come to the conclusion that one lived better in the Spain prior to the Republic, even during it, and that the country had been slowly but surely progressing, while on the other hand it had been their lot to be born and brought up in a hungry Spain which seemed to be going backwards, bereft of hope for the future, all because of the men who did not know how to hang on to the "happy" Spain that they have heard about.

RESENT THE PAST

The logical consequence of the comparison between the Spain that was and the Spain that they themselves have known creates in them a resentment toward those whom the regime's propaganda presents as having been responsible for the Civil War. Hence the youth have no confidence in anyone but themselves and their own general ideas concerning the grave problem of Spain's political future are expressed in terms different from those of their own elders, and are even more at variance with those of the traditional and declared enemies of the regime.

These younger generations do not seem inclined toward reconcili-

ation, as do the majority of adults who went through the Civil War. In their youthful longings and enthusiasms they see Spain as divided into two decidedly hostile and irreconcilable sections. On the one side they place the supporters and vested interests of the regime, on the other all the people who suffer from hunger and lack of liberty. Among the former are the Falange, the clergy, high ranking military officers and police, against all of whom the youth believes that one must struggle without respite, as only in that way can the power which they support and with which they have abused the people for so many years be overthrown.

ANTI-AMERICANISM

Their heroes are not to be found among the old political leaders of the Republic or Monarchy; they are rather among the personages of the regime itself who have revealed themselves in recent times, more or less publicly, as opposed to its formulas and continuity. In reality what most concerns the mass of the Spanish people of today is not so much the problem of liberty as, quite simply, the problem of bread, which they have lacked as long as they can remember. To them the concept of liberty is an illusion. That is why there is reason to fear that with the fall of the Franco regime, as in Italy after Mussolini, it could be the Communists who would inherit a good many members of the new generation. Their minds have been prepared for this by the Falangist system.

Abetting this danger is the opinion which they have formed of the North American democracy which they see giving aid to the Franco regime. The admiration which Spain's youth feels for the United States is without parallel, yet this admiration has suffered serious reverses from the collective accusation that it is thanks to the American government that Franco has remained in power since the end of the war. They also accuse the American government of self-centeredness in permitting Franco to convert Spain into a potential battlefield of a possible atomic war.

Due to non-information or misinformation, which was not remedied by those who should have made it their business to do so, Spanish youth pins certain hopes on the USSR, the country which they consider the most active enemy of the regime which oppresses them and condemns them to chronic hunger. But this does not mean that they are Commu-

nists. We did not encounter one single Communist among all of those with whom we spoke, either in Venezuela or on board the Spanish ship.

Another curious contradiction revealed by these new generations relates to their attitude toward the Church. They sense a great aversion to the clergy, whom they accuse of supporting the regime and of profiting from it for material rather than spiritual gains, and of unrestrained meddling in the civil life of the Spanish people. Yet we had opportunity to observe that the majority, almost the totality, attended religious services without any pressure having been put on them, as happens only too frequently in Spain. Evidently their aversion toward the Catholic clergy of Spain has not led them to irreligiousness.

TO BRIDGE THE GULF

These reactions that we have noted among these representatives of the new generations of Spain should serve as an alert to all who are interested in finding a solution to the untenable situation of Franco Spain.

Expatriated Spaniards should multiply their efforts to instruct the youth of Spain in the true history of their country prior to Francoism, especially regarding the realities of the Civil War. The democracies, especially America, should give some thought to the spiritual chaos which their aid to Franco precipitates among the Spanish youth of today, and realize that in this youthful mentality such aid only benefits Communism and the USSR.

The Spanish refugees should realize that their long exile and sparse relations with the new generations, who have not been able to develop in accordance with the evolution of the outside world, fatally separates the one side from the other.

Had a good labor of information been undertaken during the years of exile, it would not have avoided all the errors of the Falangist education, but it would at least have served to crystallize orienting elites among the youth in Spain, who would serve as a positive reserve for the transition which will take place.

There still is time to make up for this neglect. Failure to do so would be a grave error of omission which would increase the danger of chaos in Spain on the fall of the present regime.

A DISCUSSION ARTICLE

The SP-SDF And the 'American Forum'

By MAX SHACHTMAN

No question is of more urgent importance to socialists today than that of socialist regroupment.

In answering the question, we start from the facts as they are—both the unpleasant facts and the encouraging ones. In the most advanced capitalist country in the world, with the most numerous and powerful labor movement in history, and in the presence of the outstandingly important mass movement of this country's most important minority, the Negro people—there is no socialist movement. Organized socialists are divided among themselves into at least a dozen contending groups and periodicals, all of which put together would still be without significant influence among the American people. In any case, they embrace only a minority, a small minority, of those who are still committed to the goal of socialism, of those who at one time or another were members of some organization but who are at present unaffiliated.

Of the latter, there are an inestimable number who are burned out, indifferent, cynical or antagonistic. They are the hopeless ones who cannot be counted on for the socialist movement of tomorrow. But there are others whose numbers also cannot be known but who surely run into the tens of thousands. Whether they are at the extreme of the doubter or at the extreme of the ardent optimist, they are in different degrees interested in the prospects of a reanimated socialist movement, and available to such a movement as a vast reservoir of strength.

WHERE WILL THEY GO?

Many, very many indeed, are precious elements for a socialist movement. They include people with considerable knowledge and understanding, talents and experience. Can they be recruited again and therewith be set tomorrow on the broader road of recruiting the far greater numbers who have not yet acquired a socialist consciousness and conviction? That depends.

The big majority of them (I emphasize again, I am speaking of those who are not burned out or hostile, but still willing to serve the cause of socialism) belonged at one time to a genuine movement, one that was capable of intervening with some degree of effectiveness in political life, in the life of the mass organizations. Most of them cannot be drawn into a tiny propaganda group, or into a sect whose virtues are negated by its determination to remain a sect. A minority of them once belonged to just such propaganda groups; not many of them, either, are likely to be attracted again by sects which stand in the way of a reconstituted movement. In one way or another, all the existing groups have appealed to these formerly affiliated socialists. The meager fruit of the appeals should be instructive.

However, this is but one side of the picture. There is another—and it is not only encouraging but, we believe, highly encouraging. It is constituted by the fact that the clear majority of the presently unaffiliated who still regard themselves as socialists is made up of those who were formerly in and around the Stalinist movement. That movement dominated the political, intellectual and organizational life of American radicalism for almost a quarter of a century.

Its sway was paralleled by—indeed, it was the main cause of—the decline, isolation or stagnation of the Socialist Party and of the small left-wing groups. To attribute the former power of Stalinism in this country to tricks, maneuvering, chicanery and demagoguery, all of which it practiced as freely then as it does now, is superficial and even absurd. The reasons for its rise are not simple ones, to be sure. But however they may be estimated, the outstanding fact is that their open, enthusiastic and unashamed defense of the Stalinist regime did not

stand in the way of its expansion. In fact, generally speaking, the contrary was the case.

MASS FLIGHT FROM STALINISM

All that is changed now, changed profoundly and for a long time. What was once an asset is now a devastating liability.

Some of the present dissidents in the Communist Party who are trying to think their way out of the irresolvable crisis of their movement still play with the notion that their fatal decline to impotence in the past few years was caused by "ultra-leftist" or "sectarian" mistakes. That is sheer nonsense. Not because the basic cause lies in the fact that the disillusionment with the myth that the Stalinist regime in Russia and the satellite countries represents progress, democracy and socialism has overwhelmed literally hundreds of thousands of former partisans of the Communist Party.

What the regime revealed about itself in its explanation of the murder of Beria, in its brutal crushing of the East Berlin uprising, in the spectacular disclosures of Khrushchev, and above all in its barbarous slaughter of the Hungarian revolution—all the sensational events crowding each other in the last three-four years have done more to shatter the Stalinist myth, and with it the Stalinist movement, especially in the United States, than a thousand theoretical and political polemics. The outstanding result has been the mass flight from the Stalinist movement, the thousands upon thousands that have broken to one degree or another with Stalinism.

THEY WANT A MOVEMENT

They are lost — the vast majority of them irrefragably — to the Stalinist movement. But are they lost to the socialist movement? That too depends.

Like many others, I have talked with numbers of them who, there is every reason to believe, are quite representative of literally thousands of others. In some instances, the break with Stalinism is remarkably superficial. But in a gratifyingly great number of instances, the break is basic and irreparable. These people want a socialist movement dedicated to a genuine fight for democracy—not in the traditional tongue-in-cheek style of the Stalinists who are so vociferous in condemning the denial of democracy here only to justify its denial in the Stalinist countries, but in an honest and honorable way, that is, for full democratic rights for the peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

They want, not a refurbished sect, but an effective political movement, and many of them are prepared to start all over again to build it with devotion and loyalty. They want a movement with a free, democratic internal life, in which different views on a whole series of controversial questions can be presented and responsibly advocated, but they shun doctrinarianism, endless wrangling and exhausting factional warfare, authoritarian quotation-mongering, and the permanent practise of the refined art of splitting hairs down to the finest dimensions. Their sentiments are healthy and proper. We share them.

For the reasons that have been set forth in these pages before, we believe that the Socialist Party, of all the organizations in this country today, is the one indicated as the framework for the regrouping and reunion of a viable democratic socialist movement. It CAN become such a movement. But only IF it sees

and boldly grasps the exceptional opportunities that lie within hand's reach for it.

It is positively remarkable that the Socialist Party, as a party, has taken no initiative at all to seize the golden opportunities which, it should be obvious, will not lie there in eternal patience waiting to be utilized. In fact, it gives no outward sign that it is even aware of the opportunities which have not existed for it for years and years. This is explained in part by its recent preoccupation with reuniting with the extreme right section of the former social Democratic Federation that did not join in the recent unification. But that does not and cannot justify the complete absence of any positive attitude toward the problem of a renewal of the socialist movement that has aroused such lively and widespread interest.

MISSING THE MARK

The leading editorial of the June 1957 issue of the *Socialist Call*, which is the official organ of the SP-SDF, is a deplorable illustration of the point. It is devoted to the American Forum for Socialist Education recently formed under the chairmanship of A. J. Muste.

The Forum is attacked and support of it is rejected. Most of the editorial is devoted to the reasons for the "friendly approach" of the Stalinists to the Socialist Parties everywhere following the advice of Khrushchev in his speech to the 20th Congress of the Russian Stalinists. (The editorial vaguely suggests, too, that the "militant" Trotskyites, presumably the SWP, reluctantly follow the CP in this approach to the SP. If the SWP's attitude in recent months toward the SP represents such an approach, in the eyes of the *Socialist Call*, you wonder what the "approach" of stark hostility would look like.) The CP is simply applying "on the American scene the political directive derived from the Soviet Union."

The editorial continues:

"This remains the prime objective of the CP regardless of the three different trends (Gates, Dennis, Foster) which are currently expressed in the Communist Party. This 'split' represents guesses on the part of the three groups within the CP as to which way the new Soviet line will evolve. There is no difference of opinion as to the necessity of supporting the Soviet regime and in seeking to carry out the new 'friendly' attitude toward the SP-SDF."

To put down the position and fight of the CP's left wing as nothing more than a "guess" that differs from the "guesses" of Foster and Dennis on the way the "Soviet line will evolve," is not just missing the mark, but not even shooting in its general direction. The fight in the CP has its limitations and woeful inadequacies. But it is unique in the past quarter century.

WE CAN'T IGNORE THEM

If it is true, as the *Call* says, that the American CP "has never deviated in its subservience to the Soviet political line," then it is all the more significant that an outstanding group of its leaders carried on as much of a fight as they did to condemn publicly the cruel massacre of the Hungarian revolution and to refute scornfully the official Moscow line and lie that the uprising was the work of fascists.

(It might even be suggested that the *Call* would be a little reinforced in its contempt for the Gates faction if it, in turn, condemned publicly, as its Chicago convention did officially, the massacre of the Algerian revolution by the government of Guy Mollet—instead of by the over-delicate indirection of publishing the protests of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions against the suppression of trade unions and union rights in Algeria by Guy Mollet and Robert Lacoste who are not even identified as leaders of the French SP.)

But let us grant—as we do not, actually—that the *Call's* analysis of the fight in the CP is adequate and correct. To the *Call*, it is of no moment. But surely the fact that many thousands have quit the Stalinist movement—not their belief in socialism, but in Stalinism—is of importance and even of momentous importance. To ignore the CP and its internal fight is one thing. To ignore the multitude that has abandoned the CP, that will not touch it again with a barge pole; to ignore those who have not abandoned socialism but are reconsidering fundamentally the relationship between the fight for democracy, the fight for socialism and the inseparability of the two—that is another thing. And about them, there is not a word from the SP press, and not even a sign that it considers a word or two to be necessary.

The SP is affiliated to the Socialist International. Very good, that gives it many and powerful friends abroad. But has that made it so powerful and influential in the United States that it can cavalierly ignore the existence of those who made up the bulk of the radical movement in this country up to a short time ago?

The same holds for the SP's attitude toward the Forum. We are the last ones to reproach it for refusing to join and support an organization for which we of the Independent Socialist League have declined to take responsibility. We feel all the more confirmed in our declination when weeks and weeks go by with all sorts of explanations and justifications for the Forum published, but not one word is heard from its supporters or its chairman as to why it was so easily possible for all of them to espouse democratic rights in the United States and yet refuse to commit the Forum to a similar espousal in the Stalinist countries.

SHALL WE DEBATE?

The *Call* editorial says:

"Although the American Forum does not represent a major operation on the part of the CP, it is an indication of its ability to break out of its isolation and to entice individuals to lend their names to an organization, a fourth of whose national committee is composed of Communists, ex-Communists and current fellow travelers. Moreover, the first public statement of the American Forum is most beneficial to the Communists. The basis of announced discussion is not the nature of the Soviet dictatorship, nor the CP as its American outpost, but a 'discussion of the program of a democratic socialist movement' in the United States. Thus, by implication, the CP is given a certificate of reliability in the Socialist community."

Let us grant this too for a moment, as we do more or less and in the rough. Does it then follow for the *Call* that, unlike the Forum, spokesmen of the SP-SDF are prepared to discuss or debate with the Stalinists on "the nature of the Soviet dictatorship [and] the CP as its American outpost"? No, and not at all. We, for example, are prepared for such debates on all appropriate occasions, and where they have taken place, we have had little reason for dissatisfaction with the results of our championing of democratic socialism against totalitarian Stalinism. But, officially at least, the SP does not favor such debates and has not taken part in them (except in one or two local instances).

The *Call* puts itself and its party in an indefensible position when it chides the Forum for failing to do what the SP itself refuses to do! It rejects proposals; it makes none of its own. It condemns a false course; it offers no alternative. Its negative attitude is, where it is not right, at least subject to fair debate. Its positive attitude is not debatable because it simply does not put one forward.

The Forum at least sets out, consciously, to reach the tens of thousands now unaffiliated who, we cannot repeat too often, were mostly partisans of Stalinism up to recently. Its approach to the problem is wrong, in our view, but it tries to face up to it. Is the SP interested in reaching these tens of thousands, if not as its main task then at least as one of its important ones? It gives no sign.

It really congratulates the CP when it speaks of "its ability to break out of its isolation." What indication does the SP (Turn to last page)

A DISCUSSION ARTICLE

The SP, the 'Forum' And the 'Crash Program'

By HAL DRAPER

The current issue of the *Socialist Call*, organ of the Socialist Party-SDF, contains two striking articles which bear heavily on two related aspects of the "socialist regroupment" talk nowadays. One aspect is the problem of the American Forum for Socialist Education which was set up under the chairmanship of A. J. Muste; the other is the "SP orientation" being presented to the ISL by its PC majority.*

The *Call's* editorial deals first with the American Forum. It is not a question simply of participating in it. As far as participation is concerned, this writer also believes that the formation of the Forum was and is a mistake, and that socialists should take no responsibility for the group by appearing on its national committee.

That simple conclusion can, however, stem from quite different approaches; and I think we have to be very clear ourselves about the approach which is lengthily presented in the *Call*, on behalf of the SP-SDF.

By discussing it as a remarkable example of how not to criticize the Muste group, perhaps we can help to clarify the problem from another side.

For it is important to note down, as part of the data, that what Muste is trying to do (though in what we think is a wrong way) is not only a laudable aim but an important one.

That is: to build a bridge for those people in the Communist Party (whom we would expect to find in the Gates group) who sincerely wish to find their way to some kind of new democratic socialist activity, but who do not wish to join the ranks of those who quit the CP to go over to the State Department or to the State Department liberals or the State Department socialists.

The American Forum cannot do this. (I would underline heavily the approach taken by I. F. Stone: nothing should be done that gives the CP a continued reason for existence in the eyes of its discontented.) But the only means through which this very difficult problem can be worked out is by friendly and persistent contact, in all channels, with the CPers who are rethinking their party's fate and position.

There is no easy way, certainly, but a rock-bottom "must" is the persistence of socialists in finding ways to these people, and not ways simply to revile them. Where local joint forums of the American Forum variety have been formed, every possible effort should be made to remain in friendly contact and discussion with them, participating in whatever activities will be fruitful for the clarification of all concerned.

This has got to be a positive side of our attitude on the American Forum, at the same time that we press our opinion that it is a mistake to form "all-in" groups for "general socialist" propaganda and activity, together with the CP (or anyone else who cannot commit themselves to socialist democracy on both sides of the Iron Curtain).

THE CONSPIRACY THEORY

The way not to approach the problem is by spitting in their face, denouncing them as political lepers until they confess their sins, and pretending that the whole discussion in the CP is nothing but a conspiracy to fool . . . the Socialist Party.

This is roughly the approach taken by the *Socialist Call* editorial, filled out with touches characteristic of the *New Leader*.

To begin with, the *Call* seems to complain that the *N. Y. Times* gave the

*For a general presentation of the minority view presented by Comrade Haskell and myself—against Shachtman's "crash program" for dissolution-and-entry into the SP—see the first pre-convention issue of *Forum*.

Forum too much publicity—thereby puncturing the "Communist Party article of faith" that "it is impossible for the CP to get a square shake in the 'bourgeois' press." It would appear from the context that this lack of faith in the objectivity of the *Times* vis-à-vis the CP is as absurd as the old picture of Stalin as a "good gray grandfather"!

The indictment of the Forum which is then presented is given in terms of—conspiracy. In the center of this conspiracy is the SP. Khrushchev at the 20th Congress gave out the new line to be friendly to the Socialist International. The American CP moved to implement this new line. That's all.

That's all that's behind (a) the views of the Gatesites; (b) the activities of "various Trotskyite groups" who have been paying attention to the SP. So writes the *Call*. It's all a "familiar pattern," it says; apparently just an elaborate show to fool the SP. To put it gently, this is rather egocentric, among other things.

This is how the SP sees the outbreak of discussion meetings a few months ago in which Communists appeared on the same platform with non-Communists. Many of these were organized by Muste and the Fellowship of Reconciliation; another by I. F. Stone, who is vigorously anti-CP; etc. For the *Call*, this phenomenon simply marked the move by the CP to implement Khrushchev's new line!

Another "implementation" was the article by Steve Nelson in *Political Affairs* of last November—one of the most outspoken attempts by a Gatesite to think through some new ideas, however tentatively.

"This [implementation of the Soviet directive] remains the prime objective of the CP regardless of the three different trends (Gates, Dennis, Foster) which are currently expressed in the Communist Party. The 'split' represents guesses on the part of three groups within the CP as to which way the new Soviet line will evolve. There is no difference of opinion as to the necessity of supporting the Soviet regime, and in seeking to carry out the new 'friendly' attitude toward the SP-SDF."

'AREA OF OPERATION'?

That's all the *Call* sees in the CP inner conflict, more or less of a piece with the report on that subject put out last week by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Where does the American Forum come in?—"Although the American Forum does not represent a major operation on the part of the CP, it is an indication of its ability to break out of its isolation and to entice individuals to lend their names to an organization. . . ."

So the Forum is a CP "operation," though not a major one. This conspiratorial view of a sincere attempt is stultifying, and fatal to any effort to solve a problem of vital importance to the rebirth of the socialist movement.

For good or ill, the vast majority of those who have been touched by radical ideas in this country have been products of the Communist mill. No new socialist movement of any significance (let alone one of mass size) can come into existence except by attracting and giving new political life to elements who learned to think of themselves as socialistic in one or another of the orbits of the Communist movement, and who have broken away or are breaking away.

They see no place to go, no "home" to

come back to. The SP cannot attract them, nor can any State Department socialists, nor can any sect however good its program. The problem is how to build bridges that can lead them out of the Stalinist circle, instead of leading innocents back to it. But the SP approach is to point a stern finger at them and say: *We will not be tainted by you!*

It is not only the American Forum whose conspiracy is detected by the astute editors. There are also "the Trotskyite groups" who cooperate in the new CP line. This might be assumed to refer to "the Trotskyite groups" who participate in the American Forum; but the editorial adds: "The Trotskyite groups, particularly the SWP, are somewhat reluctant followers of the CP view that the SP-SDF should be a primary area of operation."

So the view of the SP as "a primary area of operation" is now denounced as the CP-Khrushchev conspiratorial scheme to trick the SP masses; and the "Trotskyite group" are smeared into it; although the SWP, of course, has been screaming quite the reverse.

Having thus exposed the conspiracy from Khrushchev to New York, the editorial ends with "the desirability of the unity of those socialist forces in America whose dedication to democracy is beyond question."

It is not clear whether this formulation "beyond question" is tighter or looser than the U. S. loyalty program's formulation of "beyond reasonable doubt."

STATE-DEPARTMENT SOCIALISM

The exposition on the American Forum is further bolstered by an article, written by Leon Dennen, on "Moscow's New Line on Socialists," which goes through the prescribed social-democratic litany on the sins of Leninists, Stalinists, Trotskyists et al.—from the Constituent Assembly to the Stalin-Hitler Pact to Trotsky's "advocacy of Communist terrorism" to the Hungarian Revolution, and many other things.

We find out in the course of this that (a) Kerensky's was "the first democratic regime in Russia" and that it was probably a fatal error of the West when it failed to support Kerensky; and (b) that the French Socialists "are in the unenviable position of being at once vocal internationalists and strong defenders of the petty bourgeoisie." There is no mention of the fact that Guy Mollet's vocal internationalism has been lately expressed most vigorously in bloody suppression of the Algerian freedom fight by methods of massacre and torture among others. This is an especially unfortunate omission in view of the fact that the editors of the *Socialist Call*, in spite of an SP convention resolution adopted as far back as a year ago, have still not found a few lines of type to condemn the Mollet government for its Algerian policy, thereby simultaneously suppressing a convention motion and suppressing manfully their instinctive desires to speak out on behalf of national freedom and justice.

Leon Dennen, however, has the space to point his article toward the climactic conclusion that the whole Communist conspiratorial play for the Socialists, as noted, is intended "to provoke a crisis in the non-Communist nations, isolate the United States and destroy NATO." Thus by spurning any taint from the American Forum et al., the SP is doing its bit for all of these paladins of humanity. It is a grandiose Atlantic role, and it is no wonder that the *Call* cannot pay strict attention to minor facts which detract from its dignity.

Thus the phenomenon of the American Forum, which raises such grave problems for serious socialists, is (a) put into the framework of the American Party Line's conspiratorial theory of the crisis of Communism; and (b) counterposed to

a pro-NATO version of socialist politics.

This is precisely the sort of thing that is guaranteed to force the healthy trends in the CP and the CP periphery back into the Stalinist fold, without issue, without exit. These elements are by no means homogeneous, so one cannot speak of them *en bloc*. Few of them can be drawn in the direction of a State Department socialist sect, however, or a movement which presents this as its face. Not the healthy trends, that is.

Those that may have no political repugnance to this course as a result of their own evolution will be attracted not to a reformist sect but to the real reformist movement in the U. S., which is not in the SP but in the Democratic Party and its lib-lab annexes. Those who are repelled by the alternative of a sterile reformism which does not have any compensating advantages in terms of masses, will think twice before separating themselves from their "home" in the CP, which they think of in some way as a mistaken revolutionary movement. Others may be simply lost.

THE POLITICS OF IT

It's no use simply to chide the SP for its refusal to be "tainted" with these disillusioned Stalinists. Anyone who thinks it's merely blindness on their part is being quite blind himself. The rational politics behind this "blindness" is quite clear.

The SP wants no part of an influx from this quarter. It is busily facing to its right. It too wants an "opening to the right"—to its own right.

If the SP opened itself up as a "home" to attract (or even allow in) a swarm of ex-CPers who want a new left movement, then—such is the slimness of the SP's own cadres—it would literally be swamped. It would be political suicide for the present political tendency which leads the SP. They are understandably not anxious to do this, on the basis of their present politics. They are against it for the same reason that others are for it.

They might possibly be persuaded, some day, to admit very quietly a much smaller number, especially if they are convinced that these will easily adapt themselves politically to the SP's own orientation to the right. That, of course, is what Comrade Shachtman is counting on. Here one trouble is that, as Shachtman moves right to woo the SP, the SP is in turn sidling to the right to appease the right-wing SDF-Verband-Förderung elements who are putting the squeeze on it now.

It is a political question. It is not a matter for scolding. The SP is simply not ready for a political unity with left socialist elements. This is why Shachtman's "crash program" is disorienting to the ISL. The SP's backwardness in this respect does not and should not change our own aspirations for unity, nor our efforts to change the minds of SPers; we are for negotiations with the SP to take advantage of all possibilities of united action and eventual unity that exist. But what is needed first is negotiations.

KICKING IN THE PROPS

What the *Socialist Call* articles go out of their way to do is to deliver a very rude blow to the bases of the Shachtman rationale for dissolving into the SP. They publicly proclaim, with pointed if not always accurate references to "the Trotskyites," that they will have nothing to do with the role which Shachtman has arbitrarily assigned them—of being the hospitable "all-in" center for general socialist regroupment.

The right-wing social-democrats who lead the SP thereby kick the props from under Shachtman's whole approach. They are saying: *We do not believe in this "all-in" movement which you envision—precisely because the overwhelming forces that are floating around available for it are ex-Stalinists—as you explain—who are still Stalinists-Leninists-Bolsheviks in OUR eyes.* We happen to like our social-democratic reformism; we will not let these Bolshheviks take us over; for otherwise our kind of socialism will be swamped.

These are their principles. It is disingenuous to censure them for holding to them, even though we may regret that they have them. They are being a good

(Turn to last page)

SP and 'American Forum' — —

(Continued from page 6)

propose to give of "its ability to break out of its isolation"—an isolation, we are ready to assume, that every SP comrade knows his party to be in?

FANTASTIC OBJECTION

The *Call*, in justifying the refusal of the SP to appear on the platform in symposiums or debates with the CP, writes: "It [the CP] sought to gain respectability by appearing on the platform or in joint activities with groups or individuals who had never been compromised by their support of the Soviet dictatorship. Regardless of the criticism to which the CP or the Soviet Union might be subjected in the course of such debates, the Communists achieved their goal in the very act of being accepted publicly as equal participants with other groups identified as socialist."

There is no other word for this than: fantastic! It is more than doubtful that there is another Socialist Party in the world to take such a position. On that ground, why would a socialist ever debate with a defender of capitalism, including a most reactionary defender?

Does the writer mean that in a debate between a defender of Stalinist totalitarianism and a defender of socialist democracy, the former would come off the better of the two? that his arguments would be more persuasive? that the criticism and attack upon Stalinism would be so feeble or so obscure that even a half-intelligent audience would be misled about the gulf between the two? Is it the judgment of the *Call* that that was the case in the Boston debate some months ago between Norman Thomas and How-

ard Fast; or that it would be the case in such debates as Norman Thomas has declared himself ready to engage in with, say, John Gates? Does it assume that "an audience which might have been unavailable to them [the Communists] if they had appeared under their own auspices" would be more easily influenced by a Stalinist presentation than by a socialist presentation? Or that that part of the audience that the Stalinists might supply is composed of congenital idiots or people under a permanent anesthetic and therewith immune to the persuasive powers of a socialist criticism of Stalinism? If it has any such notion the living reality of the veritable mass of people who have fled from the Stalinist movement in utter revulsion should be ample refutation of it.

NEED A POSITIVE ATTITUDE

In its conclusion, the *Call* editorial says: "The values of democratic socialism are more than sufficient to resist the encroachments of the totalitarian doctrines of the Communist Party."

Right! Excellent! Irrefutable! But—only if these values are put forward, are challengingly presented, are publicly defended before foe as well as friend, are asserted wherever it is possible to get a hearing for them, and not simply by repeating them contentedly within a small circle of good and convinced friends and comrades. Only if they are proclaimed everywhere and to all as the adequate basis for the regroupment of all—and we mean, to put it plainly, not only the Independent Socialist League, but of all who are ready to support the fight, in the editor's own words, for "democratic rights for workers on

both sides of the Iron Curtain," the fight for the democratic road, which is the only road, to socialism.

A negative attitude has its place for a socialist, in the sense that he rejects a course of action, a road, which he considers false. If he confines himself to that, and does not supplement it with a vigorous positive course of his own, he sterilizes his possibilities for growth.

It is precisely such a positive attitude on the urgent and enormously important question of uniting all democratic socialists under one banner that is lacking in the SP-SDF at present. It does not show aggressiveness and self-confidence that are called for if the really splendid opportunities are not to be forfeited for a long time to come.

LABORSCOPE

(Continued from page 2)

The National Labor Relations Board recently ordered employers not to recognize the local; an NLRB trial examiner had recommended that the local be disestablished as employer-dominated, but the board had rejected this recommendation by a vote of 2-1. Here is one case where the AFL-CIO can begin action to clean house without waiting for the government.

BECK AND McDONALD

Last month *Steel Labor*, like many another union paper, reported one news item to its membership under the headline: "Beck Dumped by AFL-CIO—Guilty of 16 Basic Charges." We may assume, then, that the McDonald-Beck-Lewis alliance is now formally buried.

Readers will remember that Dave McDonald, just before the AFL and CIO united, had been maneuvering ostentatiously with Beck, among others, to underline a threat to break away from the CIO and form some new union center. Now Beck is gone. McDonald himself hasn't fared so well either in recent steel union elections.

The *Midwest Labor World*, official Teamsters Union bi-weekly, editorialized against Reuther and the UAW just before the publication of the UAW policy on the Fifth Amendment, when it was reported that the UAW would not take any action.

"So that's the story?" the editorial concluded, "The Fifth Amendment is exclusively for the use of Auto Workers and Communists! If anybody else uses it, they're bums and don't belong in the labor movement! That's all we can make out of Reuther's action."

This is typical of the pressure that was exerted on Reuther leading to the modification of the UAW position. It should be noted that in all the debates about the McClellan Committee, the *Midwest Labor World* has spoken as though Beck were the victim of some terrible persecution without bothering to examine the charges against him.

"A Fund for Democracy in the South" has been established by the United Packinghouse Workers Union at a recent meeting of its International Executive Board. The fund is to be built from local union and district council contributions.

The aim is to raise a minimum of \$20,000 to aid Southern opponents of segregation who become the victims of racial violence. It will help to rebuild damaged homes and churches and will support individuals against economic reprisals. Aid will be administered through the Southern Leaders Conference headed by Martin Luther King.

Just after merger, the AFL-CIO announced the establishment of a similar fund to be raised by the whole federation but that was all. Nothing has been heard about it since. The action of the Packinghouse Workers Union is the first public step toward renewing the plan in practice.

Don't miss a single week of

LABOR ACTION

A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

SP, Forum, 'Crash Program' —

(Continued from page 7)

deal more principled about it than people who think they can be kidded out of their views by dangling visions of the big, broad movement which is to come into existence . . . over their political bodies, they fear.

So behind the venom and misrepresentation against the American Forum which fill the *Call* articles is a rational political line. This also is why they use the same ammunition to fire away at the concept of using the SP as "a primary area of operations." That thought is a beautiful one, but presently unreal; for the marked-

out subject doesn't intend to stand still for the operation.

If only the SP rose to its opportunities, sighs the PC majority, what a wonderful movement we could build! No doubt: if only the girl were beautiful, rich, intelligent and sweet-tempered, she would make an excellent wife. But under the circumstances we are not well advised to try to rush into matrimony.

The political bases for socialist unity still have to be laid, including working out a common attitude on the shape of a new socialist movement which can appeal to the fugitives from the CP orbit.

Disarmament—

(Continued from page 1)

tions, the country from which they were released) the scientists look to the day when they will have weapons which will destroy a mere few million humans in the immediate area of the detonation.

Commenting on the "clean weapons" argument for a continuation of bomb tests, a member of the Board of Editors of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* wrote the *N. Y. Times*:

"We are told that our tests are developing cleanliness. The naive may wonder when we are going to tell the secret to the Russians and the British, and when indeed to the French, Chinese and even the Argentinians so they will not have to travel the long road of dirty testing.

"The direct value of cleanliness is of course that it makes a more valuable military weapon, one of more predictable effect. The secrets will be carefully guarded, and there will continue to be dirty tests in a growing list of countries, if tests are not stopped.

"While we focus great attention on our need for tests to develop these new weapons, we should be just as aware of the same need of the Russians. We may magnify the importance of their making progress toward a clean weapon. It is based on the mere hope that they would choose to use only clean strategic weapons against our cities."

BEHIND THE GIMMICK

The writer, David R. Inglis, continues with the argument that war with even the cleanest of nuclear weapons would mean the killing of "tens or hundreds

of millions," and "obliteration of the institutions on which civilization depends," and goes on to say that:

"All thought on armaments and arms limitations must be, sincerely dedicated to the task of avoiding such war. The question of clean or dirty bomb tests, important though it is, pales almost to insignificance in comparison."

Inglis is a thousand times right. As a matter of fact it is the disproportion of significance of the "clean weapons" argument to the urgency of suspending all bomb tests in the interest of humanity's future which leads us to refer to it as a gimmick whose real object is to turn aside popular revulsion against the government's policy.

The popular demand for an end to all bomb tests on both sides of the Iron Curtain should be pressed with ever-increasing volume and intensity. But especially in the United States, such a demand standing by itself tends to become blunted and confused if it is not accompanied by a demand for a change in the concept on which American foreign policy is based.

As long as American "security" rests on arms and armed alliances, there is a certain insane logic to insisting that the more the better, including the nuclear weapons of the future which require continued testing for their development. The demand for an end to the nuclear-bomb race can only become truly effective when it becomes linked to a demand for a foreign policy based on support of the democratic aspirations of the peoples of the world.

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!

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Please enter my subscription:

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE