

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 27, 1953

FIVE CENTS

U.S. Anti-Franco Committee Gains

... page 2

Poland: Fake Wage-Price Reform

... page 7

Mechanical Ear in the Classroom

... page 4

MAY DAY 1953

Greetings to All Fighters for Freedom!

NATO's 'PEACE CRISIS'

By BERNARD CRAMER

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Council of Ministers, which meets on April 23 in Paris, faces a situation which sums up the grim irony of the Western bloc's policy in meeting the threat of Stalinist expansion. Presumably organized to solve the problems of a future war crisis, it assembles in Paris facing a "peace crisis" instead—and this it finds even more difficult.

The crux is not a military-technical problem but the economics of capitalism.

On this point there is little that we need add to the frank words of the N. Y. Times' economic correspondent in Europe, Michael Hoffman. More than anything we could write, these words give the lie to the hollow protestations of American statesmen, who pretend to be indignant at the charge that the outbreak of any kind of peace is a bogey for their system:

"Evidence pours in," he writes, April 14,

"from nearly every European capital, from Tokyo, Washington and Southeast Asia, that the economic framework of the non-Communist world has an alarming tendency to melt in any atmosphere slightly less frigid than the 'cold war.' In the face of this evidence, economists can only repeat earlier warnings that real relaxation of international tension would find the West in a serious and perhaps fatal economic condition...."

"... One thing and almost the only thing all Western delegates seem to agree upon is that there is no agreement in the West as to what the West should do if Russia were to reveal a major change in international economic policy or even a fairly big waver in her policy line.

"... Politicians and the public are having, for the first time, to face the fact that such moderate success as Western Europe has had in keeping its national economies functioning depends to an unhealthy degree on the continuance of arrangements that are essentially nothing but Western reactions to the tensions of the cold war.

"... Any serious reduction in their own armament burdens would make it easier for the Western European nations to devote their resources to other ends.

"But any serious reduction in United States military expenditures, one clear possibility if the cold war ends, would remove one of the main props of Western European economic activity, first, by reducing direct dollar expenditures in Europe and, second, by causing (so Europeans

(Turn to last page)

YPSL Convention Reaffirms Its Anti-War Stand

By JULES SOREL & ARTHUR HART

Since its victory at the New York Convention in 1951, the anti-war Third Camp wing of the Young Socialists (YPSL), youth group of the Socialist Party, has consolidated its position and strengthened its authority within that organization. At its 1953 convention, just held in Reading, Pa., over the weekend of April 11, the YS reaffirmed its position with regard to a number of key questions relating to the war, and took steps which bring them into even sharper conflict with the pro-war leadership of the Socialist Party, the organization to which they are affiliated.

Despite the hostility of the parent organization, which in a number of instances has sought to prevent the Young Socialists from pursuing a policy of cooperation with other anti-war socialist organizations, particularly with the Socialist Youth League, the present leadership of the YS has successfully consolidated its authority in the eyes of practically the entire youth organization. Only a few right-wingers remain who defend the policy of the Socialist Party against the militant and activist tendency represented by the anti-war left.

FEAR SP-SDF UNITY

Not only did the convention uphold the general line of the outgoing National Committee which had pursued a vigorous policy of opposing the war and favoring cooperation with the SYL, but the convention itself marked a further stage in the leftward development of the Young Socialists. The new National Committee represents a consolidation and strengthening of the anti-war left wing and the growing influence of the Marxist tendency within the anti-war forces.

In recent weeks the ties between the YS and its parent organization have been

(Continued on page 2)

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:

Not Only Russia Has To Show 'Good Faith'

By GORDON HASKELL

President Eisenhower's speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors was the American government's bid to "seize the initiative" from the Kremlin in the present "peace" offensive. This was the big diplomatic blow which Eisenhower's most ardent supporters and well-wishers had been awaiting impatiently for the past few weeks.

To the American public, the speech has been portrayed as a major contribution to peace in our time especially by the pro-Eisenhower GOP press. The Democratic papers have observed, with satisfaction, that in all essentials the speech conforms to the lines of American policy laid down by the Truman administration. Only the die-hard "Americanizers" of reactionary Republicanism have viewed with mixed feelings the emphasis with which the speech referred to a continuation of NATO policy in Europe, and its vague assurances that if Russia meets all American demands, some form of economic aid will be given to the backward countries of the world.

OLD LINE

In essence, the speech said this: America stands firm on all objectives and demands it has made in the course of the cold war. The American government welcomes the assurances of the Kremlin that it is willing to settle the critical cold-war issues peacefully, but demands acts as a proof of good

faith on the part of the Kremlin.

The "acts" demanded are: a truce on American terms, followed by a political settlement in Korea for uniting the country on the basis of free elections, but conditioned on the Stalinists ending military operations in Indo-China and Malaya (the fate of Formosa is not mentioned); an Austrian peace treaty; if these things are done, the unification of Germany with free elections, then its integration into a European army under NATO. Given all this, then the U. S. will be willing to consider disarmament, on a basis which has been fought over in the UN for years. Finally, if all this is achieved, Washington will urge on the American people a program of aid to underdeveloped areas. And Eisenhower also raised the question of Russia's liberation of its satellites.

It is hardly surprising that outside the U. S. the president's speech was greeted with far less enthusiasm than was the case here. For the speech proposed absolutely nothing new.

DOUBLE-EDGE SKEPTICISM

The only positive proposal in the speech, the only aspect of it which could possibly fall in the category of America's alternative to Stalinism's social appeal

(Turn to last page)

MAY DAY 1953:

This Breathing-Spell Is the People's Victory

May Day 1953 occurs in the midst of an enormous lesson being taught the world by its associated governments on both sides of the Iron Curtain as the "peace crisis" unfolds. It is the biggest lesson that the world's working class and toiling peoples can learn, bar none.

It is the lesson that, to gain our objective of peace with security and freedom in the world, the people can place no confidence in their ruling governments, but only in their own struggle against the policies of those governments.

If the world awaits a breathing-spell (at least a breathing-spell) in what up to now seemed to be an uninterrupted march toward tenuous clashes in the cold war, it is because the new masters of the Kremlin have fences to repair against explosive forces underneath their shakier seats of power.

If the Western bloc of capitalism, imperialist rivals of the Stalinist totalitarians, make peace proposals too, it is because its leaders know that their peoples will stand for nothing less.

The international workers' May Day, as a symbol, stands in our eyes for the truth that the greatest social force in the world is the pressure and struggle of the people from below. The sharpest ideological dividing line in the world runs between those who look to the ruling classes and their governments, or any other powers that be, to do good to the people, and, on the other hand, those who tell the people that they will get what they want, need and must have only if they fight for it themselves.

That goes double for the fight for peace in this "peace crisis."

Every time the pressure and struggle and threat of the people's fight, whether in the camp of the capitalist rulers or in the camp of the Stalinist rulers, forces their hand toward peace, there is a victory of the Third Camp. This is its victory even while weak, uncrystallized, unaware of itself, unled.

To those who scornfully ask "Where is this Third Camp of which you speak?" we answer: Gentlemen, the day the Third Camp forces of the world organize and mobilize so plainly, so strongly, so consciously, that even YOU can see it at last, that day will not be the beginning of its fight but will already be its final march to victory.

This breathing-spell is our victory, for we identify ourselves with all of those forces which the rulers of our world fear, because these forces fight for progress and hope.

But a breathing-spell only means that we have more time—more time to do what? More time, we urge, to break down the illusion that we must choose between supporting capitalist exploitation or Stalinist tyranny—more time to build the forces of socialism, which is the deadly enemy of both capitalism and Stalinism—more time to strengthen the bonds among real fighters for the genuine democracy of socialism—more time to carry on the struggle which, so far, has brought merely a breathing-spell.

We have won time. The importance of this is a measure of the period in which we live. By the same road, we have a world to win.

Anti-Franco Committee Gains Support As Center of U.S. Fight Against Dictator

By L. G. SMITH

NEW YORK, April 16—The anniversary of the founding of the Spanish Republic was commemorated on Wednesday, April 15, by a rally at Freedom House in this city. The rally was sponsored jointly by the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims, the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom, the Workers Defense League and the International League for the Rights of Man.

This rally was an important event not only because it served to keep before the American public the vital issues of defending Franco's labor victims and opposing the policy of the American government in its military deals with Franco. Over and above that, it showed that the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims has become the recognized center of the struggle against the pro-Franco policy in this country, and the organizer of labor, liberal and socialist solidarity here with the struggle against Francoism in Europe and in Spain itself.

The meeting was chaired by Frances Grant, secretary of the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom. The most significant thing about it was the wide representation of organizations which either had spokesmen at the meeting or sent messages of solidarity and support to it. On this basis, the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims can build truly significant national support for its objectives.

CAREY'S MESSAGE

The first speaker was Jack Perlman, who spoke on behalf of Rudolph Halley, president of the New York City Council, who was prevented from appearing in person by illness.

Perlman charged that there is "no backbone, no moral principle" in U. S. policy toward Franco. He said that to the degree that the American government gives support, by one means or another, to the Franco regime, we control how much brutality there is in Spain.

Following his address, a number of messages were read to the rally. The first,

from James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, read as follows:

"Believing in the dignity of man and in the importance of freedom, the American labor movement has fought and will continue to fight oppression wherever it occurs.

"History has taught us that totalitarianism is the same world over, whether it be in Malenkov's Russia, Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy or Franco's Spain. In all cases the people are made subject to the will of the state—rather than the state being made subject to the will of the people.

"This rally commemorating the twenty-second anniversary of the Spanish Republic shows that the suffering and the oppression of the Spanish people is not forgotten—and it must never be forgotten. The day we become unconcerned with Franco's terror we will have forgotten what gave birth to our own union movement.

"One year ago here in Freedom House a meeting was held to protest the execution of five democratic Spanish union leaders. At that meeting I said the following which I think bears repeating:

"Fear, terrorism and death must continue to be the foundations of Franco's oppression, just as they must be the founda-

tions of all other oppressions in the world today. And because Franco must continue throttling the voices and spilling the blood of other men devoted to democracy we have gathered here tonight.

"We are here because we intend that these voices that Dictator Franco thought he had stilled shall be heard by millions who never heard them while they lived. Not as symbols but as brothers who died that we might know better how to live—that is what we want their legacy to be."

"May this rally help to kindle a spirit of hope and courage in Spain today and bring nearer the end of Franco's reign of terror."

FARM WORKERS GREET

A second message read to the rally at this point was a telegram from the Chicago Committee to Defend Labor Victims of Franco, which read: "The Chicago Committee wishes to join with the organizations assembled in tonight's memorial meeting. With you we also voice protest of the subversion of freedom and democracy in Franco's Spain."

Another message read to the audience was from H. L. Mitchell, president of the National Agricultural Workers Union (AFL), who wrote: "The National Agricultural Workers Union wishes to join with other trade unions in condemning the denial of labor's rights and of human rights in Franco Spain."

"As bad as we consider conditions among agricultural workers in the United States, the men, women and children who labor in the fields and groves of fascist Spain would consider our members' wages and working conditions approaching heaven compared with what they must endure. I am told that there are over 3 million workers on the land in Franco Spain who are slaves of the state, forbidden to even protest as they die of starvation. These workers need our help and anything your committee may do to bring relief to our fellow agricultural workers in Franco Spain will be wholeheartedly

supported by this organization. We extend our greeting and best wishes for a successful meeting."

FROM SPAIN'S WORKERS

A cable from the Inter-Continental Secretariat of the National Confederation of Labor (CNT) read as follows:

"The Spanish National Confederation of Labor in Exile sends greetings to the sponsors, speakers and participants in the meeting against Franco at Freedom House. We express our hope that international solidarity may effectively help the Spanish people who will bravely fight against Franco's tyranny until Spain is liberated from the fascist terror and misery."

The last letter read at this point in the meeting was from the Workers Party of Spain (POUM):

"It gives us great pleasure to learn that your committee is organizing a rally in New York in defense of the labor victims of Franco's repression.

"We wish to express both our support of your rally and our warm appreciation of the magnificent work you are doing. For the Spanish anti-fascists who have been carrying on the difficult struggle against Franco's terror for years, it is no small comfort to know that across the Atlantic we have friends who remember us and encourage us and thus aid us to continue our resistance.

"We know that for you too the atmosphere has become more difficult. We know that those who preach and promote the support of Franco's totalitarian regime, of course in the name of 'anti-dictatorship,' have been becoming ever bolder and more powerful in your country. Their existence makes us appreciate your efforts all the more. That is why we are particularly pleased to make your good work known through our press and by word of mouth to all comrades and friends, both in the emigration in France and in the underground in Spain.

"It is our hope that the new-state of flux on the international scene may open new possibilities for the total liquidation of all totalitarian regimes.

"Please transmit our sincere and fraternal socialist greetings to our American anti-fascist comrades."

SUPPORT BY ICFTU

Following the reading of these messages, the rally was addressed by Miss Toni Sender, representative of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions to the UN. She ended her speech with the following appeal: "Americans should speak up much more clearly and promise our Spanish brothers that we will intensify our support and struggle on their behalf here."

The next speaker was Lewis Freeman, head of the New York branch of Americans for Democratic Action. He recounted his experiences as an officer of a corporation which was purchasing agent for the Loyalist government during the civil war in Spain. He stressed the necessity of organized work on behalf of the Spanish anti-Franco forces. "We must have organizations of people who believe in and love democracy, who feel that life without freedom is not worth living," he said.

At this point additional messages were read to the rally. One, from Spain's General Union of Workers (UGT) said in part: "The General Union of Workers numbers among itself men and women of Spain who have realized unlimited sacrifices to defend the principles of the liberty of man. In these past fourteen years, we have continued to defend the rights of unions, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and the inviolable rights of the human personality in Spain.

"The General Union of Workers is proud of your meeting which has taken place with the cooperation of people of various political points of view. But more, we ask you to press upon your administration that it must break all relations with the fascist dictatorship, that it must not give economic aid to help the totalitarian government of Spain work its misery upon our people."

SPANISH SP

The final message read to the rally was from the Spanish Socialist Party. After describing the Franco dictatorship and the struggle against it, the latter continues:

"On the 20th of last February, in the cells of the prison of the director general of security in Madrid, they killed our com-

(Continued on page 3)

YPSL Convention Reaffirms —

(Continued from page 1)

even further endangered by the unity negotiations now going on between the Socialist Party and the Social-Democratic Federation. In view of the possibility of merger between the SP (with which it maintains a kind of truce by mutual agreement) and the conservative, pro-war SDF (which considers the anti-war section of the SP, and of course the Young Socialists as well, to be "communist" and "even worse"), the YS held its convention under conditions of some uncertainty about its political future.

It was quite evident that the YS as a whole had absolutely no confidence that a united SP-SDF would behave democratically toward it, and would allow it the same measure of independence and even practical autonomy which it has enjoyed up to this time. In order to protect its interests it therefore adopted a resolution with respect to the projected unity which laid down a series of conditions which it proclaimed to be "the minimal terms we would consider acceptable."

These terms include the maintenance of a programatically autonomous youth section, democratically run and represented in the party councils through its own elected representatives; assurances of continued internal democracy; freedom for individual members to engage in anti-war activity outside of the control of the united party, and to maintain and support non-party publications promulgating an anti-war position. The main publication, of course, mentioned in this regard was the anti-war student magazine *Anvil and Student Partisan*.

CLOSER TO SYL

None of the Young Socialists seemed too sanguine about seeing these demands accepted by the octogenarians of the SDF, who consider the Young Socialists to be nothing less than "bolshheviks." That is why their resolution on unity included, as a "suggestion," the proposal that other anti-war Third Camp organizations be invited to participate in any unity convention; among them they listed the Independent Socialist League and the SYL.

For some time now, as the Young Socialists have been developing further leftward

toward a firm and uncompromising position of opposition to the war, they have been brought into ever closer relations with the SYL. Despite the many difficulties encountered as the result of outlived differences and separate traditions, the Young Socialists and the SYL have been drawn closer together in the course of pursuing their common aim of opposing the war.

The YS convention heard a report on and approved plans for a joint YS-SYL conference in New York in the next few weeks to draw up a statement on the war and the Third Camp. It reaffirmed, by an overwhelming vote, the decision by its outgoing national committee to approve local cooperative efforts between the two organizations, particularly in the form of building socialist clubs in common on the campus.

And finally, as a demonstrative gesture of its fraternal solidarity with the ISL-SYL in common adherence to a Third Camp position, it invited Max Shachtman, national chairman of the ISL, to address its convention and convey his organization's greetings. The warm reception which the delegates accorded Comrade Shachtman testified to the militant sentiments which dominated the entire convention proceedings.

DISCUSSION

But besides this it is possible to say that the dominant tendency at the convention was a left-wing, anti-reformist majority, more advanced than any known in the YS for more than a decade.

An interesting and significant minority resolution was introduced which proposed to abandon the traditional YS position rejecting "bolshhevism" because it meant (for the YS) "the concept of the seizure of power by a minority, the single party idea, and the absence of ethical restraints in relation to other groups." The speaker who presented this resolution pointed out that such a definition had nothing in common with what bolshhevism had represented historically, and that it was unnecessary to label as bolshhevism what should properly be called by another name. Despite the long-standing and deeply rooted fear of this bogeyman of

the SP, their definition of bolshhevism given above was reaffirmed by the YS by a vote of only about two to one.

The discussion on "bolshhevism" was typical to the extent that it revealed the genuinely broad character of the YS left wing. On the whole this majority probably resulted in a better position being adopted on many questions than would have otherwise been the case, for it encouraged free discussion unlimited by factional considerations. And such discussion in turn prevented any particular tendency, with its particular ideological variations, from dominating the convention as a whole.

MADE ADVANCE

Thus, while a number of delegates criticized, from a rather sectarian viewpoint, the policy of endorsing members' entry into the Liberal Party, the convention as a whole voted to approve this move. And when the pacifists introduced their particular proposals, they were for the most part rejected by the majority.

Whether or not the YS continues to develop in the direction it has been traveling undoubtedly depends in large measure upon the outcome of the SP-SDF negotiations for merger. It is obvious that the YS membership has little taste for going along into an organization which not only would have a radically different program from its own, but could also be expected to undertake organizational measures against the YS sooner or later. Under such circumstances the YS would be brought up against the question of even closer relations with the SYL.

In an informal public discussion with many of the delegates to the YS convention who stayed for this purpose, Comrade Shachtman restated the position of the ISL in favor of the unity of all anti-war socialist forces, and particularly the YS and the SYL. The response to Comrade Shachtman's remarks showed that they aroused a sympathetic echo in the thinking of a number of the YS delegates.

Whatever the future may bring in this respect, however, the convention indicated that the Young Socialists are entirely capable of pursuing a principled and militant political course.

LONDON LETTER

Labor Attacks the Tory Budget

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, April 15—I was sitting in a cafe at the time the government Budget was being announced. There was an atmosphere of nervous waiting, everyone watching the newspaper vendors for the first Budget edition to appear.

It is hardly surprising that people were so closely concerned. We are perhaps the most taxed people in the world. This Budget measured a slight relief, in that the basic rate of income tax was reduced from 47½ per cent of taxable income to 45 per cent. Were this the sum total of the government's interest in our pockets, this would be bad enough, but for many years the British people had to pay extremely high taxes like 100 per cent on luxury goods (e.g., jewelry), 66 per cent on semi-luxuries, with a minimum of 25 per cent on fairly essential things like pencils. Practically the only articles other than medicines upon which no substantial purchase tax was paid were various basic food items.

It is a result of these extremely stringent measures that, with comparatively small military aid in the past year, Britain has managed to keep a weary head above her economic waters. It would be very difficult indeed for me to convey the number of restrictions which have been necessary to ensure the country's partial solvency.

Last year, before the Tories came to power, as a result of the Korean war the terms of trade had been going in favor of primary-producing countries, against industrial nations. The very many reasons for this illuminate clearly various problems of the capitalist system but are

of little relevance to our present consideration. Nevertheless, with the stabilization of the Korean war and the reorientation of the British economy to a war footing, this country has been able to take considerable advantage of the freshly blowing world trade winds. Chancellor of the Exchequer R. A. Butler has honestly admitted the important contribution made to our erstwhile recovery by a more favorable world economic situation.

Last year's Budget, as we wrote at the time, was designed to produce a measure of deflation. By cutting investments and a policy of harder money, the Conservatives managed to produce such a slowing of its velocity that the cost-of-living index has risen little since last June. This policy aided the economy by decreasing home demand and therefore decreasing imports. Thus, despite a 2 per cent fall in productivity, the heaviest arms budget in peacetime history, and a fall in exports, last year's deficit of the United Kingdom of 398 million pounds was converted to a surplus of 291 million.

"INCENTIVE" BUDGET

From a more practical view, the present Budget, besides stopping the deflationary policy, has been called an "incentive" budget. Among its provisions are:

- (1) Decrease of income tax, as mentioned above.
- (2) Decrease of purchase tax.
- (3) Excess-profits levy to be ended, and allowances of 20 per cent made for capital expenditure on industrial buildings, 40 per cent on mines, and 20 per cent on plant and machinery.
- (4) Estate and death duties—which have, incidentally, been two of the most

important leveling factors since the war—can now be paid in chattels. This is to prevent the very rapid outflow of artistic treasures, many to America.

(5) Undoubtedly to catch votes, the government has exempted amateur sports and country cricket from entertainments taxes. This clever measure will cost the government only about \$600,000 in revenue, but will be worth its weight in votes.

Hugh Gaitskell, former Labor chancellor of the exchequer, delivered a heavy attack on the Budget, in submitting it to a penetrating analysis.

Butler had tried to prove that the improvement in the country's economic position had occurred as a result of government guidance, and government planning.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. As a result of measures taken in last year's Budget to cause deflation, a measure of stagnation had been seen in our economy. Not only production, overtime, investment and consumption had gone down, but there had been more short time in factories than in the previous financial year.

Gaitskell was glad that the Conservatives had abolished the excess profits levy, but wanted it to be replaced by a special profits tax, which would obtain the revenue but not decrease the incentive to increased production. Finally, Gaitskell made the point that to make people buy more, he should have decreased the taxes for poorer people, and cut purchase tax. These were far more efficient measures and much fairer to the working class.

To analyze the Budget provisions, it must be stated first that there certainly has been a considerable improvement in this country's financial position.

I would ascribe this firstly to a stabilization of the economy on a near-war footing. It is the turnover of an economy which is itself so costly.

A second factor has been the cutting of imports from Europe. This form of unilateral economic restriction may produce its adverse results next year, when the effects of similar cuts by the Continental powers have been felt. But the cutting of imports has been at least as much a falling off of prices, due to increased world production of many basic products, and the reorientation following the period of Korean stockpiling.

Yet another important factor has been the much greater confidence in sterling. This has been evident because world stock markets feel much more secure dealing with Tory than with Labor government stock. Furthermore, the confidence of businessmen in this country has naturally been more than helpful for a right-wing administration; such confidence has often expressed itself in a spirit of co-operation and tolerance neither expected by nor shown to the Labor Party.

LESSONS

I consider that this Budget has displayed many lessons to the Labor Party. Firstly, unless the party is prepared to abandon any pretense to socialism, it cannot expect to run British capitalism with greater aid from world capitalists than they accord to their own nominees. If the Labor Party wants to run Britain as a socialist party, it must not only destroy the power of British capitalists but also protect itself from the severities of climate of world reaction.

The Budget has clearly demonstrated that when it comes to running capitalism in this country, Britain is totally at the mercy of world forces beyond her own control. Further, when it comes to running the capitalist part of the economy, maybe the Conservatives can do as well as Labor. Labor's mission, properly, is to work to transform the system, not to compete with the Conservatives in the field of running capitalism.

It seems highly likely that both the Tories in England and Eisenhower in America will gain credit for any "relaxation in world tension." Whatever that will do to an American economy at present, I am not at all sure. In this country, however, it will strongly militate to the advantage of the Tories. They know this, and they may even have an election this year to prove it.

The Labor Party has a severe task to demonstrate that it deserves to be the government rather than the Tories. Only by advocating a socialist policy—and an imaginative one at that—can they hope to show the people that they have something different to offer which may produce more stable and permanent solutions to British economic problems. Just at present, however, the Tories have many trumps in their hands.

ISL FUND DRIVE

We Can Get It Over the Top

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

The Fund Drive is within striking distance of completing the quota of \$11,500. Another excellent week, which saw contributions of \$1228 sent in, raised the total income to \$9182 or 79.8 per cent of our goal. In the final phase we need to raise \$2317 to reach 100 per cent of the national quota. Can we do it? There is a very good sign that we can, though it will need the concerted effort of every branch in the country to put us over the top.

This week saw a considerable reshuffling of the standings. General led the field with \$500 collected, raising its standing to 109.8 per cent, or second in the standings. It still lags behind Stretator, which remains at the top with 120 per cent.

Right behind General are three branches which entered the 100 per cent standing this week. The Socialist Youth League, which has done exceptionally well in this campaign, has passed its quota of \$1250 and now has 101.6 per cent. The SYL is closely followed by Detroit with 101.5 per cent and Cleveland with 100.6. These two branches have also done remarkably well in the drive, and Detroit thinks it can rise even higher than its present standing.

DON'T LET UP

Several of the contesting areas are pretty close to making it, too. Oakland with 80 per cent, New York with 77.4 and Chicago with 77.4 are within striking distance. New York and Chicago have the larger amounts to get, but they have been doing a good job in these two cities and we would not be at all surprised that they will make the 100 per cent within the next two weeks. If they do, we are certain that we will coast in.

No one need rest easily, however, thinking that it is a certainty. There are still sections which are lagging far enough behind to threaten the success of the total campaign. These are the less-than-sixty percenters. They can well make the difference between the drive ending at 100 per cent or falling short of that amount.

Buffalo and Philadelphia with 63.6 and 51.6 are in a position to improve their standings easily, but Newark and Seattle are dangerously low at this stage of the campaign. With 24 and 16 per cent respectively, they have a real job ahead to make their relatively reasonable quotas. We are disappointed in Indiana and Akron, from whom we have not yet received a token payment on their quotas.

We have to really put on a full head of steam in the next couple of weeks to guarantee completion of our national quota so that we can celebrate May Day with a feeling of real accomplishment.

Box Score

	Quota	Paid	%
TOTAL	\$11,500	\$9182.75	79.8
Stretator	25	30	120
General	1,075	1181	109.8
Cleveland	200	203	101.6
SYL	1,250	1269.75	101.5
Detroit	500	503	100.6
Oregon	50	50	100
St. Louis	25	25	100
Pittsburgh	150	133	88.6
Oakland	500	400	80
New York	4,000	3096	77.4
Chicago	1,800	1316	73.1
Reading	50	35	70
Los Angeles	600	382	63.6
Buffalo	650	345	53
Philadelphia	250	129	51.6
Newark	250	48	24
Seattle	200	32	16
Akron	50	0	0
Indiana	75	0	0

YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

U.S. Anti-Franco Committee —

(Continued from page 2)

rade Tomas Centeno. Not content with this, these miserable liars have attempted to dishonor his name by publishing a notice in the official press saying that he was the leader of a 'gang of bandits.' We proclaim to the world that Tomas Centeno was president of the Spanish underground Socialist Party; that he was imprisoned because he was a socialist; that he was assassinated because he was a socialist.

"For us, tell your people this: that anti-fascist Spain cannot understand the activity of your government in aiding the enemies of the Spanish people; that there are no strategic reasons, nor political considerations, nor financial considerations which can justify, before the tribunal of conscience, this monstrosity which supposes that one can combat a totalitarianism in Moscow by helping a totalitarianism in Madrid. Tell your people that Franco has tried to create a false dilemma, a fatalism in which the only choice is between his fascism and Russian Communism. The dilemma is false. The Spanish people have demonstrated that between fascism and communism there still exists freedom and democracy.

"To you, our comrades, falls the honor to show that the American people will not help and protect Spanish tyranny."

Following the reading of these messages, the meeting was addressed by Gustavo Dorado, secretary-general of the Confederation of Spanish Societies in New York, and by Dr. Jesus de Galindez,

representative of the Basque delegation in that confederation. Dr. Galindez told the meeting that "what you are doing for the United States of America is something which McCarthy and the others cannot understand." He insisted that totalitarianism of all kinds must be fought by the assertion of positive principles of justice and equality rather than by simply opposing it or its extension.

URGE ACTION

Norman Thomas then delivered a speech in which he attacked the "practicality" of giving military and financial support to Franco. Although Thomas said that he is for "heavy armament" against the spread of Stalinism, he emphasized the idea that "the net total of our position depends on where we will stand ideologically." He insisted that regardless of the formal recognition of Franco's regime by the American government, we must "cry out night and day against the Spanish dictatorship."

The meeting closed with brief addresses by Dr. Robert Alexander of Rutgers University, Joe Shane, educational director of the Knitgoods Workers local of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, who spoke on behalf of ILGWU Vice President Louis Nelson, and Miss Victoria Kent, minister plenipotentiary of the Spanish Government in Exile who addressed the meeting in Spanish.

The meeting adjourned after a collection was taken to support the work of the committee, and after passing resolutions against any aid by the American government to Franco, and urging the CIO, AFL and independent unions to reiterate their stand against the government's Franco policy. They were urged to activate their anti-Franco policy by all means at their disposal. Copies of the resolutions are to be sent to the proper government officers, the American labor movement, and the Spanish anti-fascist movements in Europe and Spain.

Don't Miss the ISL's
MAY DAY DINNER
on May Day evening
(See Page 8)

Next Week's Labor Action

is our annual special number solely devoted to presenting the Independent Socialist viewpoint on a specific subject. It will deal with

SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY

and the issue as a whole will be the equivalent of a 40-page pamphlet on the topic.

TRANSITION for TODAY

ENGELS' DRAFT OF 'COMMUNIST MANIFESTO'

By PHILIP COSEN

During the past year or so a number of publications have appeared which should be of interest to the student of Marxism, and it will be worthwhile to note them in this column. LABOR ACTION has already given attention to: Marx's *History of Economic Theories* (the "fourth volume" of *Capital*), and *The Russian Menace to Europe*, by Marx and Engels.

For this week we draw your attention to the recent publication of that short and very interesting first draft of the *Communist Manifesto* which was made by Friedrich Engels, and which goes under the title of *Principles of Communism*. In a new translation by Paul Sweezy it is now available in pamphlet form, published by the Monthly Review, price 25 cents.

Engels' *Principles of Communism* has been out of print for over a decade, and was never easily available even then. The pamphlet edition put out around 1925, with Max Bedacht's translation, is a rarity even with collectors; and its other publication in this country was as an appendix to the book-size annotated edition by D. Riazanov of *The Communist Manifesto*—which is nearly as scarce, and prohibitive in price when it is found. (Sweezy notes also an Australian edition in English.) It may be that the present new edition will be just as scarce in 1960. We recommend you get it now.

In 1847 Marx and Engels were charged by the Communist League with the task of drawing up the league's program. As Engels explains in his introduction to the finished version of the *Communist Manifesto*, the new Marxist group then preferred to call itself "Communist" in order to distinguish its views from the various types of "socialists" of the period. Later on, when Marxist socialism virtually swept the field clean of these earlier movements, this use of "Communism" became identical with Marxist socialism, up until the Russian Revolution. Engels' *Principles*, like the *Communist Manifesto* itself, has a section devoted to the pre-Marxian "socialism" from which they distinguished themselves.

TWO PASSAGES

Two passages in the *Principles of Communism* are perhaps best known, or at least have been most often mentioned in Marxist literature. Sweezy points to one of these in his brief introduction: Engels' answer to Question 16 (the form of the work is question-and-answer).

"Will the peaceful abolition of private property be possible?" asks Engels, and the answer he gives has never appealed to those industrious Marx-scholars who collect isolated quotations for government prosecutors on "force and violence."

Engels replies (and we should read "Marxist" where he writes "communist")—

"It would be desirable if this could happen, and the communists would certainly be the last to oppose it. Communists know only too well that all conspiracies are not only useless but even harmful. They know all too well that revolutions are not made intentionally and arbitrarily, but that everywhere and always they have been the necessary consequence of conditions which were wholly independent of the will and direction of individual parties and entire classes. But they also see that the development of

the proletariat in nearly all civilized countries has been violently suppressed, and that in this way the opponents of communism have been working toward a revolution with all their strength. If the oppressed proletariat is finally driven to revolution, then we communists will defend the interests of the proletarians with deeds as we now defend them with words."

Another passage is equally famed; for obvious reasons Sweezy does not call it to his readers' attention. As an independent (that is, non-CP) Stalinist, Sweezy emphasizes Stalin's old "socialism in one country" theory as a foundation of his own ideology; he stresses it, as a matter of fact, as strongly as the Stalinists used to.

It happens that Engels took up this question directly and explicitly in Question 19: "Will it be possible for this revolution to take place in one country alone?" His answer begins flatly "No." Discussing a couple of reasons for this, he continues:

"It follows that the communist revolution will be not merely a national phenomenon but must take place simultaneously in all civilized countries, that is to say, at least in England, America, France and Germany.

This part of the reply is sometimes cited to indicate that Engels was even claiming that a revolutionary seizure of power must break out "simultaneously" in all advanced countries—which, of course, would be nonsense—but there is no real reason to interpret his thought in this way. The reply continues:

"It will develop in each of these countries more or less rapidly according as one country or the other has a more developed industry, greater wealth, a more significant mass of productive forces. . . . It is a universal revolution and will accordingly have a universal range."

On another page Engels writes (Question 11): "It follows that if the workers in England or France now liberate themselves, this must set off revolutions in all other countries—revolutions which sooner or later must accomplish the liberation of their respective working classes." It is perfectly clear here that Engels is not thinking of "simultaneous" revolutionary seizures of power, but rather, that he is taking up exactly the same question as Stalin did—and giving exactly the contrary answer.

STRESSES DEMOCRACY

In other sections Engels sketches the rise of capitalism, its economic laws and the meaning of socialism. The *Principles* contains one of the not-very-plentiful passages, by either of the founders of scientific socialism, which summarize the social goal they set—the new social order. This brief definition under Question 14: "a system in which all these branches of production are operated by society as a whole, that is, for the common account, according to a common plan, and with the participation of all members of society." (Italics added.)

In Question 18, furthermore, he stresses that the socialist revolution "will establish a democratic constitution" and that through democratic institutions "the direct or indirect dominance of the proletariat" comes into being. It is interesting to note, however, that while making this perfectly clear he ends up in Question 14 with the following summary: "In fact, the abolition of private property is doubtless the shortest and most significant way to characterize the revolution . . . and for this reason it is rightly advanced by communists as their main demand."

The point is, that while Engels views democracy as integral to socialism, as distinct from modern Stalinoids who in principle equate socialism merely with "nationalization" ("abolition of private property")—he does point to the latter, the more economic form, as the "shortest and most significant way to characterize the revolution" in terms of a "main demand." He doubtless could not even have imagined the modern Stalinist thesis that the economic form not only can but must exist without the democratic content, while still continuing to call the bastard result by the name of socialism.

Much of the popular explanation of Marxist ideas is oversimplified in the *Principles*, even as compared with the *Communist Manifesto*, but, then, it was intended as a very simple statement indeed. That is one of its useful features.

Youth and Student Corner

The Mechanical Stoolpigeon in the Classroom

OAKLAND, April 21—Near the shore in an abandoned Kaiser shipyard at Richmond, California, there squats a small institution of higher learning, Contra Costa Junior College. In the quonset huts and "temporary" buildings that serve as classrooms and campus, silhouetted by rusting giant cranes, several hundred students from the almost entirely working-class area of the northeast San Francisco Bay region have been getting a taste of college life since the end of World War II.

Heretofore there has never been any indication that this small school would ever get publicity on a national scale; in fact, even area-wide publicity would have come as a surprise to the students and faculty up until this week. Few besides those who attend or work there have ever seen it, so out of the way is its location. It is not rich enough to support successful athletic teams, nor have the students the money or time to engage in athletics or the extra-curricular activities which are the main sources of publicity for most schools.

This will now be changed, no doubt. It is just a matter of time until everyone who is vitally interested in academic freedom will hear and know the name Contra Costa J. C.

On April 13, the Board of Trustees settled a long dispute and voted to approve the use of Marx and Engels' *Communist Manifesto* in the school's "Great Books" course. If there are those who doubt that even this in itself, in these troubled times, will bring the school much

publicity, the condition attached to the approval by the Trustees will end all doubts.

Attorney George R. Gordon of Martinez, vice-chairman of the board, and C. T. Butler, board secretary, stated in addition that "if the book, sometimes known as the bible of Communist philosophy, is to be used, the student discussions of the book must be recorded for review by the trustees."

The one compensation other than the low tuition that attendance at this small school once held was the freedom of inquiry due to the liberal curriculum and lack of outside interference, as is sometimes the case in a small and little-known institution. Justifiable pride was taken in this by both students and faculty, for Contra Costa J. C. offered those who came to learn a more open market for the discussion of ideas than any of the nationally known colleges and universities in the Bay Area; in a mature atmosphere almost completely devoid of the "rah-rah" atmosphere of "college life."

A fight to preserve this atmosphere, vital to learning, can be made and made successfully. A student-faculty organization built around the need to obtain the right to study and discuss freely any and all books that contain information on the subject matter of a course could do the job, all the more successfully if this organization enlisted the help of the trade unions that are strong in their area and of which many of the students are members.

YOU and SCIENCE

THE ASTIN CASE: POLITICS VETOES SCIENTIST

By CARL DARTON

The encroachment of politics on science continually becomes more brazen. The latest incident involves such a prosaic subject as lead storage batteries. The current Washington episode emphasizes that purges in science are not confined to the "Eastern world," and when the American ideology of commercialism is threatened, "resignations" (fortunately, unaccompanied by confessions as yet), quickly follow.

The storage battery saga, sordid in its details as well as its implications, started with a routine report of the National Bureau of Standards in 1951. This report listed as worthless a number of materials offered commercially for rejuvenating or prolonging the life of lead storage batteries. Among the products listed was Battery AD-X2, mostly sodium and magnesium sulfate, manufactured by Pioneers, Inc., Oakland, Calif. Pioneers, as the result of these revealing scientific tests, suffered a large loss in sales.

Using the political way to maintain their profits this company, early in 1952, secured the assistance of the Senate Small Business Committee. Later in the year this committee issued a statement based upon hastily planned tests of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology which indicated that the battery additive fully met the claims of the manufacturer and was beneficial. Thereafter followed charge and countercharge, in which Allen V. Astin, director of the NBS, firmly but with dignity defended the scientific validity of the original NBS report. Also engineers and chemists of leading storage-battery companies supported the NBS report and condemned the Senate committee statement as being "a legal or political document rather than an impartial technical report."

On March 31 Drew Pearson's column broke the news of Director Astin's forced resignation. This was confirmed later in the day by the Department of Commerce. It was pointed out by Pearson that in its 50 years of existence politics had traditionally been kept out of the NBS. However, so powerful was the wirepulling that after the Post Office Department placed Battery AD-X2 on the mail-fraud list on March 3, Secretary of Commerce Weeks personally argued and pleaded with Postmaster General Summerfield and persuaded him to suspend the mail-fraud order. Pearson called this the quickest reversal of fraud seen in the postal department in years.

THE CAPITALIST MIND

Furthermore Assistant Secretary of Commerce Shaeffer, a Wisconsin supporter of McCarthy, unsuccessfully put pressure on the American Chemical Society to suppress publication of the NBS report. Shaeffer also banned further circulation of the report from the NBS files.

In his April 10 column Pearson disclosed the previous interest by Shaeffer, a fountain pen manufacturer, in the Bureau of Standards. It seems that the trouble started when the Federal Trade Commission asked Shaeffer to prove his advertisements that their pen really lasted "a lifetime." The Bureau of Standards, at the request of the FTC, set up a series of tests for the pen, but apparently asked

Shaeffer such embarrassing questions that he withdrew cooperation in the tests. According to Pearson, Shaeffer on his arrival in Washington told friends that he planned to shake up the NBS for the manner in which they had handled the pen tests.

The payoff in the whole incident was the statement of Secretary of Commerce Weeks: "I think the NBS has not been sufficiently objective, because they discount entirely the play of the market place . . . I propose to get the best brains I can find to examine into the function and objectives of the NBS and re-evaluate them in relation to the American business community and other agencies of government."

This highlights what has been all too evident, that while Eisenhower is busy on the golf course and leaves Congress pretty much to itself, the "American business community" is consolidating itself in Washington. It is apparent that it will stop at nothing to eliminate all "impracticals" who, using scientific evidence or not, challenge in the least way, its thirst for profits.

The Federation of American Scientists and Dr. E. V. Condon, former NBS director and president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, have sprung to the defense of Dr. Astin, demanding a complete and independent investigation of his ouster. A temporary victory was won when Weeks suspended Astin's ouster pending further inquiry.

It will, however, take more than this to reverse the habit of business, both in and out of the government, of throttling the activities of science when they interfere with profits. More and more, science, either in the "East" or "West" is only "free" when in accord with dominant political and economic objectives.

What science, as well as society as a whole, really needs—and we offer this at the risk of being ousted from the brotherhood of punsters—is a recharge of socialism.



LABOR ACTION

April 27, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 17

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, 1949, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

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

Greetings to Labor Action on May Day!

MAY DAY GREETINGS

**For the Third Camp
of World Labor
and Colonial Peoples!**

New York Branches, ISL

McCarthy Doesn't Scare Us!

MAY DAY GREETINGS

TO LABOR ACTION

ON ITS BIRTHDAY

Chicago Socialist Youth League

**Organize Youth for
Socialist Democracy**

Los Angeles SYL

**May
Day
Greetings**

Cleveland ISL

Greetings
from
the
Buffalo ISL

**For
A
Socialist
America**

Los Angeles ISL

**For the
Triumph
of
Socialist
Democracy**

Oakland ISL

Greetings
JANET MAXIM
ROBERT MUSSIGMAN
SAM FATSFESSEL
A FRIEND
Chicago

GREETINGS!

**Forward to a New World
of Socialism**

Detroit ISL

**Working
for a
Socialist World
of Peace and
Plenty for All . . .**

Philadelphia ISL

**Greetings
from the
Industrial
heart
of
America**

Pittsburgh ISL

In Memory of MARTIN ABERN

"The proposals for peace have been platitudinous, since the bourgeoisie is sure only of its main objective—to maintain the capitalist setup and to decide its tactics, methods and slogans according to the concrete situation. All proposals are imperialist in their economic aspects and include a police club as an essential adjunct—since 'justice' as a password is not sufficient to disguise exploitation as the practise. . . .

"Only socialism on a world scale can abolish imperialist war. Only socialism can bring self-discipline and self-development instead of bureaucratic regimentation. Only socialism can make administration the servant of men and the master of things—rather than the bureaucratic master of men and the servant of capitalist monopoly production. Only the socialist reorganization of society can be the answer and the road open to the masses."

—from "Tomorrow in America," by Martin Abern.
The New International, August 1942.

**Revolutionary greetings to the
socialist youth of the world:**

**For the victory of
the Third Camp!**

New York Socialist Youth League

May Day Greetings

**Keep Up the Fight
for a
Socialist America**

Chicago ISL

A DISCUSSION PAGE

The Third-Camp Road for Socialists in a World of War

The following discussion article is contributed by a young socialist who, as his article states at the beginning, "has been driven by the course of events" to a Third Camp position on the war. He invites us to comment, if we will, on his ideas. We certainly welcome his essential view on the need for building Third Camp forces in the world independent of the two giants of the cold-war camps, based as it is on his analysis of the U. S.'s capitalist foreign policy. That is most important, as the essential step toward a genuinely socialist war position, despite what we would consider some inadequacies in formulation here and there.

Of these the point which we would most like to discuss with him some time is his view that "the aim of socialists in world politics should be an agreement which would leave the world still divided into rival spheres of influence, but would enable Europe and Asia to survive... as ideological bridges between the two giants." We would ask Comrade Gersh to consider whether or not this sounds like a recommendation that socialists accept the imperialist status quo in the world. We would ourselves urge that the aim of socialists in world politics is to work for the abolition of both systems of exploitation, capitalist and Stalinist, together with their control over other peoples (spheres of influence), and that even more immediately, no lasting peace can rest upon acceptance of the division of the world into spheres of influence, with or without a bridge.—Ed.

By GABRIEL GERSH

Perhaps it may be worthwhile, amid the doubts and uncertainties which beset us nowadays on all sides, for a socialist to set down as frankly as he can the Third Camp position to which he has been driven by the course of events. In order to do this, I must first try to briefly explain why I am a socialist.

Socialism is an attempt to build a society in which there will be a fair chance for everyone to give his best in the common service and to receive everything that is needed for decent, healthy and enjoyable living. Socialism is based upon the belief that it is possible to establish social and economic institutions necessary for economic security without turning individuals into instruments of the state.

At bottom, it is much less an economic policy than a way of life. The economic changes which socialists stand for are put forward not for their own sake but as a means of advancing the well-being and happiness of the people.

Socialism is desirable and possible; but, though possible, it is a very difficult ideal to translate into terms of practical politics in the world today. During the past few years, European and Asian socialist governments have done much to fulfill a socialist program. Domestically, they have made more advances toward socialism than most people thought possible. This is why conservatives and reactionaries throughout the world are so upset; the very basis of their philosophy is that economic well-being and equal opportunity for all cannot be made to work.

And yet, it must be admitted, in this unstable world situation, everything European and Asian socialism has achieved rests on such shaky foundations that nobody can be sure whether it may not be swept away by a war against which neither high ideals nor sound domestic policies can offer any protection. For socialism, in the world today, is squeezed between two world colossi, each vastly superior to it in physical resources and armed might.

FOR 'THIRD FORCE'

In short, socialists are trapped between the Russian and the American leviathans. Unfortunately, socialists are in no position to constitute a third bloc in the conflict for world power. A Third Force, if thought of as meaning an armed force able to defend itself in war, is just nonsense. If the Third Force has any meaning, as I believe it has, it is a meaning in terms not of armed strength but of ideas held by many people in many countries.

What exactly is the Third Force? It means, in fact, that European and Asian countries under socialist leadership would develop an ideological pattern of their own, which would be different from both American capitalism and Soviet communism.

This Third Force would be a blend of socialist planning, social justice and political freedom. It would help the colonial peoples along the road of enlightenment and emancipation. It would try to prevent unemployment and the other scourges of capitalism. The ideological Third Force is something with which Stalinism would find it much harder to compete than with discredited capitalism and colonialism, as still represented by the United States.

The ideas of European and Asian socialism, if they can be expressed in foreign policy more effectively than they have been in the past, may yet enable the necessary social changes to take place in our time without the threat of war. At the very least, they are a more effective defense against Stalinism than America's negative policy of military strength.

ON U. S. POLICY

Granted that the Third Force is desirable, how can it be made effective in a two-bloc world? I believe that the crux of the problem lies in Europe's and Asia's relation with America. When economic aid was offered the non-communist world after World War II, Europe and Asia were told that there were no military conditions attached to it and that it would not make them satellites of America in the war, hot or cold, against communism. Today, however, Europe and Asia find themselves tied to a military program that involves precisely this, and commits them to heavy military costs which are courting economic disaster.

It may be argued that this is due to Russia's imperialist designs on Western Europe and Asia; that, by following a post-war career of expansion, the Russians made its conversion into a military alliance inevitable. That is substantially true; but its truth does not alter the fact that the result is disastrous.

It is disastrous above all for socialism because, as long as the cold war continues, the working-class movement throughout Europe and Asia is bound to

be split so as to be incapable of playing a decisive role either in national affairs or in building up international collaboration. This is so because the United States has allied itself with right-wing parties, as upholders of private enterprise and the status quo; and the strength consequently given to reactionary forces drives a large part of the working classes into the Communist camp. Without a *modus vivendi*, the workers of Europe and Asia must remain in a limbo from which escape can only be found in one or another extreme.

It follows that believers in socialism must seize every opportunity of working for such an armistice. The problem is that there are two conflicting views about the immediate course of action.

INDEPENDENCE FROM U. S.

Some socialists believe that the best hope for peace lies in mobilizing the military strength of the West and creating positions of strength on the basis of which a *modus vivendi* can be reached with Russia. Other socialists believe that the more Europe and Asia get tied up militarily with America, the less the West will be able to relieve the conditions which breed communism. These socialists hold that in pursuing a policy of deterrence through strength, the United States is wrecking the economies of the non-communist world and thus reinforcing the conditions which invite communism.

On the evidence of the last few years, the second view is true; unfortunately, it does not follow that the first is wholly wrong. Western Europe and Asia cannot do without a guarantee of American protection in the event of a Russian invasion. However, they can avoid committing themselves to military expenditures which they can ill afford, and they should resist American pressure to accept such commitments.

In effect, it is of prime importance to European and Asian socialists to express in action their independence of America. In doing so, they should appeal to the democratic forces inside the U. S. The best hope for a recovery of European and

Asian socialism lies in the ability of progressive forces in the U. S. to influence external policies and to force recognition in America that it would be suicidal to destroy communism either by a campaign of "liberation" spearheaded by atomic-bombers of the counter-revolution, or by physical containment.

ONLY SALVATION

In the meantime, the aim of socialists in world politics should be an agreement which would leave the world still divided into rival spheres of influence, but would enable Europe and Asia to survive, not as satellites of the U. S., but as ideological bridges between the two giants.

Under the present circumstances, socialism can but flounder along in the hope of a turn in events that will restore its chances; and no such turn can come easily as long as the fear of war dominates the situation. Only a detente in the state of feeling between the dominant groups in the Soviet Union and in the U. S. can restore the initiative to socialism by removing the main cause that keeps the mass of the working classes in both Europe and Asia subservient to the will of Moscow.

I believe that the only salvation for mankind is in averting another war and in working for a *modus vivendi* on the basis of a world in which communism, capitalism and socialism live together. The hope of this coming about lies in doing what we can to avoid an absolutely clear-cut division of the world into two camps—which is exactly that the Russians and the Americans seems determined to bring about.

World war would be ultimate disaster for democracy as well as for socialism. The aim of socialists, therefore, is to bring a Third Force into being before the drift toward war becomes inevitable. The Third Force cannot now be a great armed force; it can still, given the right leadership from European and Asian socialism, be a dynamic force for intelligent reasoning and perhaps constructive action.

PRO AND CON: DISCUSSION

Problems of War Policy: In Britain and Colonies

To the Editor:

I have already dealt with the first three paragraphs of the addendum to the London Letter of Feb. 17, published in LA of March 2 under the title of "Some Questions of War Policy." It remains for me to amplify the two following paragraphs that touch upon the socialist attitude to (1) a Bevanite Labor Britain and a Franco Spain linked together in a Western war alliance, and (2) the socialist attitude to a colonial country, faced with the prospect of the restoration of the status quo by a member-country of the Western alliance, looking toward the USSR for help and assistance.

The formulation which seems to have caused the trouble is this: "a Bevanite Labor Britain trailing on the left of the Western camp would merit a different and less 'sectarian' approach than a Franco Spain." Clearly, what is implied in this formulation is that as socialists we would characterize the war waged by the Western bloc as a whole, and in general, as an imperialist war. This would apply to a Franco Spain, a democratic capitalist America, a Bevanite Labor Britain, a bonapartist-capitalist Argentina, a feudal South Korea, a Titoist Yugoslavia, or any other country militarily allied against the USSR.

However, this basic attitude to the war in general cannot exhaust the meaning we attach to the basic principle of pursuit of the class struggle in peace and in war, independently of its consequences for the bourgeoisie. In the Second World War, for instance, revolutionary socialists denounced the war as an imperialist war. In Britain, naturally enough, socialists did not let the matter rest there. They put forward the profoundly correct slogan of "Break the coalition" [directed to the Labor Party, to break the government coalition with the Tories—Ed.].

When the Labor ministers were eventually forced to withdraw from the coalition after the end of the war in Europe, and found themselves in effective power with

the decisive general election of 1945, the position of revolutionary socialists in respect of the war did not alter. The war was still an imperialist war, even with a Labor government running part of it. The crimes against humanity perpetrated at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, for instance, were countenanced by a Labor government.

And yet there was a change on the part of the socialists. The fact that it was a working-class party administering the war, and not a Tory-dominated coalition, was certainly of some consequence. For it gave the socialist forces an opportunity of concretizing the meaning of the transformation of the imperialist war into a democratic, anti-fascist, anti-capitalist war. In this sense, the socialist movement found itself closer to the center of political events, found itself more able to influence the mass of Labor workers who had voted a Labor government into power in order to ensure a just, democratic—in a word, socialist—conclusion to the war.

Quite understandably, the change in the class direction of the war changed the attitude of revolutionary socialists not to the war but to the government in power. This went for the two other Labor governments that took part on the side of the United Nations in the last war—Australia and New Zealand.

It is in this sense that I have used the words "less sectarian." A Bevanite Labor Britain is obviously preferable to a Tory Britain. That is, whether peace or war is upon us. Socialists work for a change in the class character of society. The victory of the Labor Party, and more particularly the victory of a Bevanite Labor Party, is the reflection of a change in class relationships. To this change, socialists are far from indifferent. Certainly as socialists we would be more sympathetic, less "sectarian," to a Bevanite Labor government than to a Tory government, because such a government represents the first stage in the transformation of the imperialist war.

It goes without saying that a Republican government in Spain, replacing by

civil war the present Franco government during such an imperialist war, would merit the same attitude that Lenin himself indicated after the overthrow of the tsarist regime in the wake of the February Revolution. Lenin shelved the slogan "Transform the imperialist war into a civil war," not because the war was no longer imperialist but because the mass movement responsible for the overthrow of tsarism had reached a new stage of development. It was a question of explaining patiently the imperialist nature of the war. The principles were not altered, the tactics had.

Of course, it has been argued that given an undoubtedly progressive change in (say) Britain, from a Tory to a Labor government, what prevents socialists from supporting the Labor government as the "first stage in the transformation of the war?" To this apparently plausible argument, the contradictory character of such a change has to be pointed out. On the one hand, the change is a step forward, a progressive step at that, which merits the sympathy and support of socialists. On the other, it represents a temporary strengthening of the imperialist forces waging the war. The fact that an inefficient Chamberlain government, stupid tsarist government, or senile Franco government was replaced might well enable the imperialist war to be conducted more efficiently, more successfully. For this reason, Lenin was not prepared to support a Prince Lvov, Kerensky or Konovalov who represented the interests of those capitalists who wanted to wage the imperialist war more efficiently than the inept tsarist government.

ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES

On the subject of the colonial countries in a third world war, it has to be remembered that the USSR perhaps, and China almost certainly, will be able to "champion" many of the "backward" colonial countries. If, through some grave misfortune, the colonial and national parties of Asia or Africa were to "identify"

(Continued on page 7)

Fake Reform by Polish Regime Imposes New Burdens on Workers and Peasants

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The economic situation of the working class in Poland has never been too good; even in the pre-war period, the workers' wages were lower than in Germany, Czechoslovakia, and France, not to speak of Great Britain.

But they were always higher than in Russia, especially Stalin's Russia. Under the regime of the Polish "people's democracy," wages have been lower than pre-war but still higher in purchasing power (by as much as 50 per cent) than in Stalinist Russia, after 30 years of "socialism" and the "happy and joyful life" under the Kremlin.

For this reason, after strengthening its power the Polish regime reduced the level of wages to that of Russia, by the expedient of tying Polish currency to the Russian. By this means it was possible for it to go ahead with its 6-year plans, exploiting the enthusiasm of the workers and peasants for post-war reconstruction of the country, relying on promises of plenty for all after the plans had been fulfilled.

But, instead, the record of plan-fulfillment gets worse and worse, exploitation gets greater and greater, step by step with political oppression, wages sink lower and lower, and the goods available get fewer and fewer. Thus the workers have lost their enthusiasm for the country's reconstruction, and labor productivity has been going down.

NEW LAW

As the workers resort to "absenteeism" in the factories and mines, as a method of protection against exploitation, the government answers with violent campaigns against "vagabonds," "tramps," "idlers" and so on. The "People's Courts" have sentenced many workers to jail or forced-labor camps for "laziness," "absenteeism" and similar crimes.

But this whole campaign was ineffective, and the government was obliged to set up a new law on wages, last January 3. The new measure abolishes the "card" system for foodstuffs like bread, sugar, meat, etc., which acted as a wage supplement and was of substantial aid to the workers. Now

all these goods are on the "free market," at a higher price, of course.

Wages were raised by 40 per cent for the low brackets between 400-800 zlotys, and 15-27 per cent for the 800-2000 bracket. The government claims that the new system means a gain for the workers because the new market arrangement means plenty of goods at stable prices. The official press commentary says that the move is for a transition from the wage-basis to a labor-contract basis, that the latter is more efficient, that it permits the worker to earn more and to raise his productivity.

In reality, the rise in food prices will be greater than 100 per cent. The price of a kilogram of bread is now 3 zlotys; of "kasha," 3.5 zl.; meat 30 zl., sugar 15 zl. (an increase of 200 per cent); butter 70 zl.; a good dress, more than 1000 zl.; shoes 300-400 zl. It was the government which fixed the new prices, and by this means, the purchasing power of the nominally higher wages is down by 38 per cent, with relation to 1949.

HUNGER THE WHIP

The new law has as its aim the "transition from the wage-basis to the labor-contract basis." The wage has lost its importance as the basis of livelihood. Now the worker must labor not only on contract, but he will be obliged to put his wife and children to work in order to gain the most elementary living.

Hunger is being used as the whip to drive the Polish people to work in order to fulfill the new 6-year plan for new factories, smelting mills, heavy industry, autos, etc., under the sign of "guns instead of butter."

Heavy industry is being built up through the methods of primitive accumulation, by inhuman exploitation of the workers such as was known in Great Britain and Western Europe only at the beginnings of capitalism and described by Marx in his *Capital*. This is the "socialism" of the Stalinist empire.

What is it for? For the glory of Stalinist "socialism," and, in the first place, for its war aims. In the opinion of this writer, all of the regime's propaganda about peace and its whole peace offensive is only a smokescreen for war prepara-

tions. Poland has an army of 600,000 soldiers who are absolutely useless and parasitic economically. The Polish economy is forced to pay a high colonial tribute to its Russian "protector," in coal, steel, textiles, food, etc.

The bigger Polish heavy industry becomes, the poorer are the workers and peasants, the lower wages fall and the greater is the mass of misery and hunger.

ATTACK ON PEASANTS

The new law on wages represents also a new attack on the peasants. In spite of the fact that the workers must pay 50-100 per cent higher prices for food, there was no increase in the prices which the state pays to the peasants for agricultural products; but, on the contrary, the peasants will have to pay higher prices for industrial products which they buy from the state. With the very same law the bureaucratic state cynically milks both the workers and the peasants, appropriating a large part of the income which was going to the people.

The peasant policy of the Stalinist bureaucracy in Poland has gone through different periods. At first, after the distribution of the land, the government appeared as the protector of the peasantry. When some overzealous Stalinist officials tried too quickly to organize *kolkhozes* (collective farms), the government proclaimed that the organization of such collective farms must be voluntary. The regime was then too weak for an assault on the peasants.

But now the pressure against the peasantry has increased; and the government is using every device to force them into the collective farms.

The situation of the small and middle peasant is very bad, much worse than in the days of the independent republic. A farm of 5 hectares (10 acres) used to pay to the pre-war bourgeois government about 100-200 zlotys in taxes. Now, in the "people's democracy," which claims to have "liberated" the peasants, the same farm has quite different burdens. It must, in the first place, pay 1500-2500 zl. in taxes (the pre-war zloty was 5 to a dollar, the present zloty is officially 4 to a dollar); it must also supply a certain amount of grain, meat and milk. It is

absolutely impossible for the small peasant to carry this burden; he is therefore constantly in debt to the state and always under the pressure of the danger of being attached to the debt.

To lure them into its "cooperatives," the government releases them from these obligations when they go into a *kolkhoz*. But the peasants resist, because they know very well that this release from taxes is only for a very short time and that after it they will be reduced to virtual slavery on the land as in Russia.

So in 1951 Poland had only 3054 *kolkhozes*, representing hardly more than 2.5 per cent of the cultivated land surface. In 1952 only 1879 new ones were organized—bringing the proportion up to only 5.5 per cent of the land. Together with the state farms, only 17.5 per cent of the cultivated area is subsumed in this way.

FIGHT GOES ON

Thus the peasant question is a very difficult one in Poland and quite different from the situation in Russia itself or in the Ukraine.

In Russia the Bolshevik party first defeated and then absorbed all the opposition parties, including the peasant parties; after the defeat of the Trotskyist opposition in the party, the new Stalinist party, built on the ruins of the old Communist Party, became absolute master. The Russian peasants had no defense against the Stalinist bureaucratic apparatus. But in Poland the Stalinist party did not conquer power; it was brought to power on the bayonets of the Russian occupation army.

The opposition parties were not destroyed by the Stalinists; they were only suppressed and driven underground. They exist today and maintain their apparatus in exile as well as in the country. They resist the Stalinists' pressure and carry on work among the workers and peasants. The Stalinist regime is very much isolated from the working masses, especially from the peasants, and therefore very weak politically. It cannot force the peasants into the collectives because of its weakness, and therefore it resorts to the device of raising the tax and obligation burden for small peasants who hold out against going into the *kolkhozes*.

There is a religious problem involved here too: the peasants are by and large very devout supporters of the Catholic Church, and up to now the regime has been unable to subordinate the Polish Catholic Church completely to Stalinist policy, as it has done with the Russian Orthodox Church. Parallel to its attack on the peasants it launches assaults on the church and aims for domination of Catholicism by government policy.

More than 2000 priests have been arrested, including five bishops. The government tries to prove that they are all American spies, in order to pretend that it is not a question of religious persecution. But indeed the regime has a very long way to go before it will be able to master the peasant resistance in the country.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library, publishers of Signet and Mentor pocket books; publication date April 29:

How to Know and Predict the Weather, by R. M. Fisher; Mentor 168 p., 35¢. *Dream of Eden*, by Winston Brebner; Signet, 208 p., 25¢. *They Lived by Their Guns*, by Luke Short & others; Signet, 168 p., 25¢. *Back of Town*, by Maritta Wolff; Signet Giant, 352 p., 35¢. *Leopard in the Grass*, by Desmond Stewart; Signet, 192 p., 25¢. *Kiss Me Deadly*, by Mickey Spillane; Signet, 160 p., 25¢. *Shoot to Kill*, by Wade Miller; Signet, 144 p., 25¢. *Down All Your Streets*, by Leonard Bishop; Signet Double, 600 p., 50¢.

PRO & CON: Discussion on War — —

(Continued from page 6)

themselves with the camp of the "USSR, China and the People's Democracies," in the same way that the European Resistance movements "identified" themselves with the Western camp, it would be the duty of socialists to support them—notwithstanding their formal adherence to the Soviet bloc.

Of course, a purely Stalinist-dominated front is a different matter. What cannot be denied to such Partisan forces is their right to receive aid and assistance from the Eastern bloc. That this aid and assistance would not be forthcoming unless certain quite specific guarantees were given to the Stalinists, is beside the point. Such Partisan movements fighting the colonial powers of the Old or New World would quickly learn that they could not rely on either military aid from the Stalinist bloc or economic assistance—unless they became purely instruments of Stalinist power-politics.

These elaborations of "Some Questions of War Policy" will, it is to be hoped, clarify the points at issue.

Whether they coincide with the policy of the ISL on the war is a different matter altogether. Perhaps, further discussion on the concrete, particular issues involved is called for. There is certainly no difference on the fundamental questions and issues—opposition to imperialism and Stalinism. Concessions to defensism are not being considered. Nor for that matter are concessions to sectarianism and ultra-leftism being entertained. What is in dispute are issues of secondary importance.

Allan VAUGHAN

London, April 15.

Comment

On his first subject (Labor government and war), Comrade Vaughan's letter certainly does clarify his previous remarks with respect to the questions which we posed in our comment. Above all, he

makes clear that the "different attitude" he spoke of referred "not to the war but to the government in power," and that it referred to an alteration in "tactics," that is, to the socialist policy on how to oppose the war when it is conducted by a Labor government rather than a Tory-dominated government.

Two comments in addition, which may be helpful to the discussion: (1) As far as concerns a change in the class leadership of the government in an imperialist war: This change already takes place even with an "Attlee Labor" government, and not only with a "Bevanite Labor" government. This class difference is more important than the changes that might flow from the difference between "Attlee Labor" or "Bevan Labor" in power, although Vaughan writes almost exclusively in terms of the latter. What "Bevanism" may concretely mean in any new war is also rather indeterminate.

(2) One's thinking about socialist wartime policy under circumstances where a Labor government replaces the Tories in a war naturally cannot get very "concrete" unless one thinks of the total situation in which this change can be expected to take place. Just to illustrate this point with a perhaps extreme example: the coming of Bevan to power in a situation where this is merely a concession to a revolutionary upheaval. But we don't want to blueprint socialist tactics for various hypothetical future cases.

On the case of colonial countries: Here, if Comrade Vaughan will forgive us again, we think he is still unclear. Let's say "a colonial country, faced with the prospect of the restoration of the status quo by a member-country of the Western alliance [starts], looking toward the USSR for help and assistance." At one point, Vaughan merely writes in terms of "such Partisan forces" having the "right to receive aid and assistance from the Eastern bloc." But in other cases (as in his previous letter) he continues to say that such a colonial country "identifies"

itself with the Stalinist camp, although "identifies" is now put in quotation marks. But there is obviously a very important and even vital difference between the two. Perhaps Vaughan is using "identifies" in as peculiar a manner as he uses the term "sectarian."

Thus, to take a classic example, let's say that the Irish revolutionists of 1916 had the "right to receive aid and assistance" (concretely, arms) from the kaiser's government, which was the enemy of their enemy. But the whole point of the case is that they did not identify themselves with the German camp in the war—not at all! And then there is the other case, which in fact we put before Vaughan last time: the case of independence movements, in India and other Asian countries, which became collaborators and allies of the Japanese out of hatred for British imperialism, and which did identify themselves with the rival imperialist camp.

That term "identify" is too rubbery in Comrade Vaughan's usage, if he will forgive us again for having the opinion. He uses it also for still a third case: the European Resistance in World War II. We have already mentioned, in this exchange with Vaughan, that precisely the positive element in the Resistance movement (in our eyes) was the degree to which it did NOT "identify" itself with the Western camp, the degree to which it represented a third camp in development. Is Vaughan thinking of it this way, that is, not statically?

And finally, it is certainly not "beside the point" that any colonial country which turns to Moscow for aid is likely to face being taken into camp by Moscow domination. This is precisely a fact which concretizes the otherwise abstract "right" of an oppressed people to accept some kind of aid from one of the imperialist camps, a right it indubitably has, short of joining ("identifying" itself with) that imperialist camp.—Ed.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

NATO and the 'Peace Crisis' —

(Continued from page 1)

...fear) a tapering off in United States business activity and lower American imports. Europe's trouble is that it cannot get the good effects of less rearmament without the bad."

FRYING PAN AND FIRE

The last sentence hints at a basic contradiction of capitalism's Permanent War Economy on an international scale. It is easy to show, for example, that up to now NATO's economic problem has been that the European economies cannot stand the drain upon their wealth and resources necessitated by the rearmament demands of the U. S. It would appear, therefore, that the prospect of a cold-war truce, and the accompanying prospect of a letup on the strain, would tend to solve this problem at least partially, even if temporarily. And this is true, but it is only one side of the picture.

The other side of the picture centers around the U. S. sector of world capitalism, its only healthy sector, and its dependence on its own war economy. If there is a letup at this point, the repercussions travel back to Europe, with the "bad effects" which cancel the "good effects" of lessened strain on the Continent.

Economically speaking, peace can be even more dangerous than war—as long as the West is divided by the lines of capitalist national-sovereign states. The main line of division running through the West, as far as this is concerned, is between the U. S. and Western Europe.

Thus the U. S. is called on to make broad-minded sacrifices of its own economic interests, in order to soften these contradictions, at the behest of NATO's economic arm. This, the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation), last week presented Washington with a program to overcome the "feeling of gloom [which] already has engulfed a substantial part of the business community of Western Europe, according to the organi-

zation" (F. Belair in the Times, April 14).

The OEEC wants the U. S. to "lead the way" in removing existing restrictions from trade and payments and to restore free exchange of currencies, and it cogently argues that only the U. S. can lead the way because obviously it is the biggest creditor nation and the strongest economic unit in the network of Western capitalism.

"Leading the way" means: (1) cutting tariff rates without reciprocal concessions from Europe; (2) more advantageous customs procedures for European exporters to this country; (3) permission for foreign shipping to compete for American freight by cutting down on U. S. law-made requirements for using U. S. ships to carry foreign-aid shipments; (4) untying the getting of credits from the Export-Import Bank from the demand that they be used to buy U. S. goods and services, to the detriment of European competitors; (5) a bigger Point Four program.

And: "What may happen if the U. S. does not lead the way toward more liberal world trade and payments? Economic stagnation in most of Western Europe, is the answer given by most organization [OEEC] representatives, and they seem to fear this result more than the recurring crisis through which Western Europe has passed in the post-war period." (Belair, Times, April 14. Italics added.)

NOT IN THE MOOD

The fact that stares the NATO council in the face is that the U. S. not only has no intention of leading the way but it is backing up in the opposite direction. This is partly due to the new Eisenhower administration, and partly it is expected as a result of the effect of the "peace crisis" on U. S. policy, superadded to the existing tendencies of the new regime in Washington.

On Point 4, Dulles has indicated a pulling-back in expenditures, far from

enlarging the program. The NATO representatives from Europe fear that his stress on Asia will mean less for Europe. Five days before NATO was scheduled to get together, a communiqué summarized the result of OEEC's discussions with Washington, and—

"The U. S. made it clear today that it was not yet ready to go along with Western Europe's program for solvency through 'trade, not aid' nor to modify its commercial policy to facilitate foreign sales of goods and services in this country." (Times, April 18.)

American capitalists, feeling their oats now under Eisenhower, are in no mood to be do-gooders for their European brothers. The kind of businessmen in government who think that what's good for GM is good for the country are also those who just as sincerely think that what's good for them ought to be just as good for the rest of the world.

THEY'D FIND OUT

They are not going to cut their tariffs (and profits) for nothing, just to prevent "economic stagnation" in Europe—in the first place because they probably really believe that it won't happen there except for those furriners' general cussedness and inefficiency. These capitalists of ours really do believe that capitalism works fine, always will, and that all the free-enterprise system needs in Europe is a good kick in the pants from rugged, healthy specimens in the U. S.

Let, however, the European sector of world capitalism decline in "economic stagnation" and this country's brave representatives of the system would soon find that they cannot well run a capitalism-in-one-country. We hasten to add that we do not mean that this is the immediate prospect that faces them; it does, however, point to the heart of the problem which makes the Europeans croak like prophets of doom in the face of the "peace crisis."

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!

Not Only Russia, Mr. President — —

(Continued from page 1)

to the peoples of the world, was the reference to possible economic aid sometime in the far distant future, after every other problem had been settled to the satisfaction of the American government. And even this "promise" was overshadowed by the statement released the previous week by the secretary of state indicating that Point Four is to be scuttled and its hulk turned over to private business interests in this country.

Eisenhower demands that Malenkov show "good faith" before his "peace overtures" be taken seriously. The demand is reasonable. But the peoples of the world are not skeptical only of Malenkov's intentions; they are skeptical also of Eisenhower's. They may well ask that the American government and its allies also show "good faith" in their claim that they are interested only in peace, freedom and security for the world by "acts" of their own.

SOME "GOOD FAITH"

Eisenhower demands that the Stalinists end the fighting in Indo-China and Malaya as an act of good faith in Asia. Is the American government willing to give equal guarantees for the independence of both these countries from foreign rule? This independence is not demanded by the Stalinists alone, but is the common aim and

aspiration of every democratic and socialist movement in both these countries.

Eisenhower demands a united, democratic Germany, and independence for the countries of Eastern Europe. This is part of the program of every democratic and socialist movement in the world worthy of its name. But is he willing to insist on the liberation of Africa, Madagascar and the other colonies from French, British and other foreign rule? Are not "acts" required in these areas to prove the good faith of the American bloc when it presumes to speak in the name of freedom and democracy?

It is precisely because the American government and its allies are not willing or able to advocate or put through a truly democratic world policy that the initiative in the cold war as well as in the "cold peace" has been left in the hands of the Stalinists.

All the speeches about democracy, about non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, about plenty and security for the peoples of the world are a patent fraud in the mouth of powers which for centuries have imposed colonial rule on Asia and Africa, and which continue to dominate and exploit the backward areas of the world either politically or economically or both.

The Stalinists still retain the initiative because their tyranny is a new and less

well-known one; because they back the peoples of the world in their struggles against their present oppressors even while they prepare to saddle them with new ones.

WHO CAN TAKE INITIATIVE?

But the Kremlin is now faced with a crisis of its own, brought to a head by the death of Stalin. There is a fluidity in world affairs which has not been present for the past eight years, and which may freeze up again unless the moment is grasped and utilized. The American government cannot utilize it, as Eisenhower's speech has demonstrated once again. But there are forces in the world which can come forth with their own peace program; which can intervene in the present situation.

These are the great socialist movements of Europe and Asia. While the world is anxiously hoping for peace, and looking for some issue from the dread and fear which has gripped it for years, these movements can and should speak out. They should demand that all governments show good faith in implementing a truly democratic world policy.

They should seek to mobilize the workers in all countries where free labor movements exist behind a concrete program for a democratic peace. They should proclaim that the workers of the world will support no government which imprisons and exploits its own and foreign peoples while it demands that only its rivals show "good faith."

CHALLENGE

A seizure of the initiative in the "peace offensive" by the labor and socialist movements in the rest of the world, with a concrete program of democratic demands and democratic struggles for all peoples, would increase the "disarray and panic" behind the Iron Curtain which is so feared by the Kremlin, by appealing to its subject peoples, while it would deliver decisive blows to Stalinism as a social force everywhere else.

This would present a real challenge to capitalism and imperialism throughout the world. The social forces represented by Eisenhower in this country can be counted on to resist such a challenge. That is only one reason why it is vital for the American labor movement to raise its voice in the interest of a really democratic foreign policy for America, which alone is capable of "seizing the initiative."

Reserve May First for the

New York I.S.L.'s

May Day Dinner

Friday, at 7:30 p.m.

At the WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE

247 Lexington Ave., near E. 34 Street **Donation \$1.75**

Get Acquainted!

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

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

I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print) _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

ZONE _____ STATE _____

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

1 year at \$2. New

6 months at \$1. Renewal

Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print) _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

ZONE _____ STATE _____