

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 12, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**A DIAGNOSIS OF THE
LABOR BUREAUCRACY**

... page 6

Tito's 'Peace' Outfit Flops

... page 3

UAW Substitutes Pleas for Strike

... page 2

Correspondence from Israel

... page 7

Halley Wins!

NEW YORK, Nov. 7 (As we go to press)—The Liberal Party won a smashing victory over the two old political machines here today when it elected its candidate, Rudolph Halley, president of the City Council. Although Halley ran for the highest office to be contested in the elections on three tickets (Liberal, Fusion and Independent), he received more votes on the Liberal Party line than did runner-up Sharkey on the Democratic line, thus making the Liberal Party the strongest vote-getter in New York City at the present time.

Halley's campaign was conducted on a stright "clean government" program. Both registration and voting were very light in this election, a situation which usually benefits the machine candidates. Thus it appears that Halley's vote is to be interpreted as an anti-machine vote, a revulsion of the mass of people against the revelations on city and police graft and gangster tie-ups.

This same trend was shown in Philadelphia, where the Republican machine lost control of City Hall for the first time in 67 years. And in New York City it continues the anti-Tammany trend set last year when Impellitteri, a dissident machine Democrat, was elected mayor as an independent against the Liberal-Democratic and Republican candidates.

The anti-machine character of the vote was further shown by the two-to-one victory of the Liberal-Republican candidate for district attorney of Richmond County (Staten Island) over the Democratic incumbent who had been linked to the underworld in pre-election disclosures. This candidate, however, received the vast majority of his vote on the Republican line.

Nevertheless, the tremendous majority given Halley in this election (163,492 votes), as well as the fact that the vast majority of his vote was registered on the Liberal Party line rather than on those of Fusion and Independent, shows the vast potentialities of the Liberal Party in New York City politics.

CIO Threatens to Break Through Wage Ceiling as Convention Meets

WANTS MORE



PHILIP MURRAY

NEW YORK—Behind the dull cut and dried character of the proceedings of this 13th annual convention of the CIO is the story of the intense conflict between the official policies of the Truman administration—a wage freeze through alleged wage stabilization—and the pressing needs of the CIO members reflected in the wage demands of the steel workers' union to save themselves from the ravages of inflation.

Two major Truman spokesmen, Michael DiSalle and Eric Johnston, made speeches pleading with the CIO leaders to "hold the line" on wages: The Truman administration has already succeeded in pressuring the United Auto Workers (CIO) leaders into calling off three strikes—the latest being the Borg-Warner—and referring the issues to the Wage Stabilization Board.

In spite of President Philip Murray's high praise of President Truman during his first speech before the

convention, there is much evidence that on the wage issue the CIO leader is going to insist on a higher formula than the piddling 4-cent increase permitted by the Wage Stabilization Board policy.

The CIO resolutions committee is demanding in its resolution on wages that the WSB refrain from tampering with collective-bargaining agreements. As an example, three big rubber union contracts, whose wage provisions exceed WSB standards, are still being held up by the WSB.

EMBARRASSED

As against the pressure of the Truman administration, the CIO leaders know the pressure of the dissatisfied, embittered and resentful workers in the shops, and the shadow of John L. Lewis looms large in the background. No one thinks he is going to submit to the wage-freeze policy of the Truman administration without a real fight.

The acute embarrassment of the CIO leaders with regard to their political support of Truman, the man responsible for the present WSB setup, is emphasized by the fact that they criticize every board, agency, and almost every policy without daring to mention the one man who has the responsibility for them—Harry S. Truman.

The CIO complaint against the Truman administration is set forth in considerable detail in its

(Continued on page 7)

U.S. Liberals and the British Election

By GORDON HASKELL

The American reaction to the Tory "victory" in the British elections is a revealing index to the level of political life in this country.

Rejoicing in the large newspapers which represent the thinking of our own capitalist circles was to be expected. This celebration was only dampened by the hard fact that the Labor Party had piled up a larger vote than ever before, by the relative success of the Bevanites, and by the thought that in the face of this clear expression of the actual will of the workers of Britain the Tories would have to move very cautiously and slowly in carrying out their program.

A review of a good segment of the American labor press since the elections shows that most union papers either ignored the results of the elections entirely or carried a straight, non-partisan analysis of the event. Here again, it is not too surprising that the spokesmen of the American labor bureaucracy, which has set its face hard against independent labor politics in this country, should view with equanimity the political fate of the labor movement in Britain.

They can hardly be expected to understand more about politics abroad than they do about politics in their own country.

One exception to this appeared in an editorial in the November issue of the *Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employee*, official organ of the CIO union in the field. The opinions in this editorial have interest because they express a line of reasoning which is fairly prevalent among

American liberals. (A post-election column by Max Lerner was very similar.)

"NOT SO BAD"

The argument runs something like this:

According to American standards, the British Tories are really not so bad. "By the standards of Taft and McCarthy, therefore, Churchill must be considered as an unreconstructed Fair Dealer whose views on domestic issues are closer to those of President Truman than to his Republican critics." This is deduced from the fact that the Tories do not propose to denationalize all the industries which were nationalized by the Labor government, and that they have come out in favor of retaining most of the public-health and other welfare programs put into effect by their predecessors.

Further, this union paper is smart enough to see that in opposition it may well be the Bevan wing of the party which will grow strong-

er, and although it does not rejoice over this thought, neither does it follow the not-unusual practice in liberal circles of denouncing Bevan.

THE WAY OF IT

But the conclusions which the editorial draws from its premises are almost astounding. "Perhaps it is not too wishful to think," the editorial ends, "that the interest in the British elections may focus some attention upon our own elections this month. And the outcome of our elections in 1952 will probably be a more important portent of mankind's future than the indecisive balloting which gave England one minority government in place of another."

The editorial does not stop for a moment to inquire just why it is that the British Tories, heirs to an ancient tradition of rock-ribbed conservatism, imperialism, and bitter anti-unionism now behave more like Fair Dealers than like our native variety of reactionaries. That point is simply made to take a fall out of Taft and McCarthy, or to give the impression that nothing much separates the parties in Britain. But to state the obvious reason for this "liberalism" of the Tories would be to pass an indictment on the leadership of American labor.

For it should be sufficiently clear that the Tories cannot afford to act like our reactionaries only because the labor movement in Britain is so powerfully organized in its OWN political party, and has been so successful in winning the

support of such a wide section of the British people. For the Tories to proclaim the political sentiments of a Taft would be to bury themselves in political oblivion in Britain today.

THE DIFFERENCE HERE

And because this obvious conclusion is avoided, the editor is forced to end with his ringing but meaningless sentence. The experience of the 1948 elections should have been a sufficient warning: In the absence of a politically organized working class in America, even the "great victory" of the Fair Deal at the polls that year has produced a government in our wealthy country whose domestic program is far less liberal than that of the Tories in Britain. People who doubt this need only read the indictment of the policies of the Truman administration presented at the CIO convention in New York last week.

But at least this labor editor does not hail Churchill's success. We cannot say as much for the prominent liberals who edit the *New Republic* (Michael Straight, editor; Bruce Bliven, editorial director; contributing editors: Malcolm Cowley, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, Gus Tyler.)

LIBERAL YEARNING

The leading editorial in the *New Republic* for November 5 perhaps illustrates the dead-end of American liberalism as well as

(Turn to last page)

Reuther Substitutes Pleas to Wage Board As UAW Yields on Borg-Warner Strike

By P. JARMS

CLEVELAND, Nov. 5—After being turned down by President Truman, the International Executive Board of the United Auto Workers (CIO) recommended to the striking Borg-Warner workers that they call off their strike, return to work, and submit their case to the Wage Stabilization Board.

Behind this is the fact that the UAW leadership does not want to force a showdown with Truman. The idea is that Truman would be so mad at the UAW for "forcing" him to use the Taft-Hartley injunction that he would appoint a panel of people who would not give justice to the Borg-Warner workers. The board felt that going directly to the WSB would do more toward obtaining its goal of nationwide bargaining.

And so the three-and-one-half-week strike ends. Not because the workers were not determined to win this year. Not even because two Indiana locals accepted the meager offer of 9 cents an hour to break the auto workers' ranks. The strike was called off only because the labor movement is in a strait-jacket, with free collective bargaining being squeezed out in favor of WSB rulings. If the "Little Steel formula" was hated during World War II, the latest machinations of the WSB are not more loved.

The WSB this week ruled that the tool-and-die industry was not to be given special consideration and would have to be tied to the 10 per cent formula. Will insurance and pension increases be next?

RESPONSIBLE TO WHOM?

The UAW board's letter to the WSB is itself a damning indictment of its policy. In an attempt, no doubt, to touch the heart of the wage-board members, Reuther describes what the union is giving up. He writes that this is done because "we are . . . responsible and patriotic American citizens, yielding to the insistence of the president of the United States." He ought to explain some time why it is either "responsible" or "patriotic" to abandon the auto workers' legitimate struggle against a chiseling corporation because the White House "insists" on it.

Here is the UAW's letter.

Nathan P. Feinsinger, Chairman Wage Stabilization Board Washington, D. C.

The UAW-CIO Policy Committee tonight voted to recommend to the Borg-Warner workers that they recess their strike and return to their jobs and accept certification of their dispute to the Wage Stabilization Board.

The committee came to this decision only after the most serious consideration and only after hours of discussion. We came to it reluctantly, convinced in our own minds that, in view of the company's unreasonable attitude, the workers had no choice but to strike and further convinced that, in view of the negligible amount of defense work performed in Borg-Warner plants, the case should not have been certified to the Wage Stabilization Board but could and should have been settled through the regular processes of free collective bargaining.

Nevertheless, in spite of this sincere and strongly-felt conviction, we are, as responsible and patriotic American citizens, yielding to the insistence of the President of the United States.

We believe, however, that we have a moral obligation to the men and women we represent to point out to the Wage Stabilization Board, to the president of the United States and to the various defense agencies, that here again, as happened repeatedly in World War II, labor is required to carry the full burden of responsibility in these industrial disputes be-

considering the manner in which such cases are handled by the government in emergency situations.

Here, as in all such cases, all the pressures of government were directed against the workers and their union. Every effort was made to force the workers to give up the only economic power which they possess against an arrogant and autocratic management—the withholding of their labor power—on the fallacious assumption that the sole responsibility for the stoppage of work and the interruption of production rests with the workers and their union. No government pressure was exerted against the management of the Borg-Warner Corporation in an effort to have the corporation grant to the extremely reasonable demand of the Borg-Warner workers for a national agreement.

Unless this attitude by government of putting the full responsibility for industrial disputes on the workers is revised to an attitude that takes into consideration the responsibility of the management involved, we sincerely believe that free collective bargaining, which in the long pull is the only basis for sound labor man-

agement relations, will be further jeopardized by increased indifference and arrogance on the part of management and the defense, effort as a result, therefore, will be seriously impaired.

In view of the sacrifices which these workers are making by returning to work without the assurances of a national agreement, which they deserve, the president has imposed upon the Wage Stabilization Board a tremendous responsibility in certifying this case to you. We trust that all the members of the board will discharge that responsibility on the basis of the merits of the case and in the light of the patriotism and loyalty to the national welfare which the Borg-Warner workers are exhibiting.

Membership meetings of the various UAW-CIO local unions representing Borg-Warner workers will be arranged this week-end to vote on the Policy Committee's recommendation.

Walter P. Reuther President, UAW-CIO

It is about time the labor movement started to think about the fate of free collective bargaining. It is time that the issue of getting off the government boards, where labor serves merely as window dressing, be raised once again. To continue to function within the present confines of the WSB means that the workers will not get what they are really entitled to.

It is about time the labor movement started to think about the fate of free collective bargaining. It is time that the issue of getting off the government boards, where labor serves merely as window dressing, be raised once again. To continue to function within the present confines of the WSB means that the workers will not get what they are really entitled to.

It is about time the labor movement started to think about the fate of free collective bargaining. It is time that the issue of getting off the government boards, where labor serves merely as window dressing, be raised once again. To continue to function within the present confines of the WSB means that the workers will not get what they are really entitled to.

It is about time the labor movement started to think about the fate of free collective bargaining. It is time that the issue of getting off the government boards, where labor serves merely as window dressing, be raised once again. To continue to function within the present confines of the WSB means that the workers will not get what they are really entitled to.

It is about time the labor movement started to think about the fate of free collective bargaining. It is time that the issue of getting off the government boards, where labor serves merely as window dressing, be raised once again. To continue to function within the present confines of the WSB means that the workers will not get what they are really entitled to.

NEW YORK DOCKERS GOING STRONG ON 3rd WEEK —

It's the Biggest Wildcat Strike Since 1930s

NEW YORK, Nov. 6—After three weeks, the Port of New York dockers, tied up by the longshoremen. Not since the days of the founding of the first CIO union in the mass production industries fifteen years ago have we witnessed an "unofficial" strike of such proportions.

Of the 40,000 dock workers in the area, not more than 3,000 have been working. Of these, perhaps half have been sent to work by the newly formed strike committee to handle military cargo. Hundreds of ships and piers are immobilized. The value of cargo tied up has been estimated as high as one billion dollars. Boston harbor is shut down in a sympathy strike of ILA members.

An official strike committee now directs the movement; it is constituted by 23 men representing 41 locals of the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA); it has announced that no settlement or agreement to end the walkout will be made without a vote of the strikers themselves.

RYAN FLOPS AGAIN

President Joseph Ryan of the ILA failed again to start a back to work movement. Last week he announced that "the Port of New York is open" and promised to lead a powerful strikebreaking action by so-called "loyal" ILA members. But his threat fizzled when, at the appointed hour, instead of thousands of eager workers only a few dozen of his class followers showed up to walk through picket lines, gaining courage only under the protection of hundreds of New York police.

This week, a similar move failed just as dully. A dozen of Ryan's followers in Local 791, the Chelsea local which spearheaded the walkout, demanded a special local meeting to vote on calling off the strike. When the strike leaders refused, the New York District Council of the ILA, controlled by Ryan, announced that it would convoke a meeting of Local 791. With great fanfare and bombast, Ryan's men again heralded the breakup of the strike and predicted a big turnout for the meeting.

But hours before the meeting was supposed to begin, hundreds of strikers began assembling in the streets in front of the hall. Soon a mass picket line of over 800 men circled the building and

the loudly touted anti-strike meeting was called off by its sponsors before the chairman had an opportunity to pound his gavel and call it to order.

The strike committee announced that it was already receiving material assistance from several CIO unions. These were reported to be the United Brewery Workers, the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, and the National Maritime Union.

The active shock troops of the strike have been the flying squadrons of 2,000 longshoremen who demonstrated before the offices of the New York Shipping Association of the employers, paraded outside of the Commodore Hotel where the Ryan-controlled top officials of the ILA were meeting, and swept from pier to pier calling workers off their jobs. On the morning of October 30, for example, it was announced that 24 ships were being worked. By afternoon, after visits from the pickets, all but 6 were abandoned.

"FRIENDLY" ADVICE

New York newspapers, whose first strike accounts were faithful and almost sympathetic, seem to be injecting a new tone.

At first, their distaste for the mobster-union official coalition that dominates the anti-strike leadership made them shy away from criticism of the strikers. But the strike is dragging out a little too long for them. Revulsion against gangsterism on the waterfront begins to lose its acute nature as some of the papers begin to suggest that the time has come for a work return.

A fact-finding panel chosen by the state Industrial Relations Commission has already opened its hearings, and representatives of the strikers and of the ILA top officials are presenting testimony. This committee has the power to make recommendations. What its recommendations will be, of course, no one knows; but everyone does know that even if its proposals were sympathetic to the strikers, it has absolutely no means of enforcing them. Neither Ryan nor the shippers are obligated to yield to its suggestions.

The New York Times advises the strikers to return to work while the fact-finders look for facts, assuring them that "they may expect a square deal from this group of

public-spirited citizens." The strikers, however, respectfully decline, preferring to bolster their case with a unified strike front. Their decision is well-advised.

New York, with its eight million inhabitants, can boast of thousands of fair, public-spirited citizens. But up to this time, they have proven singularly unable to give the longshoremen a "square deal"; and they have been equally unable to clean out racketeering from the waterfront. Despite the spectacular testimony of the Kefauver hearings, many months have passed and only the longshore strikers have taken an action which, if successful, would weaken the grip of the mobsters.

THEY PREFER GOONS

The ship owners prefer a union influenced by shady, even criminal, elements despite the fact that millions of dollars every year are filtered off the docks by racketeers, rather than deal with a decent militant union that would fight hard to raise wages and improve working conditions. One New York Times writer, in his sympathy for the plight of employers now annoyed by the "madly denying contrary and irrational" "average dock-walloper," lets the cat out of the bag:

"Leading shipping companies who have been dealing with Joe Ryan and his ILA for many years," he writes, "shudder to think what would happen if the Ryan hierarchy were overthrown to be replaced by men with less control of the hot-headed opinionated and stubborn sea-lawyers and salt-water politicians who make up the Eastern seaboard's waterfront labor force. They contend that the New York waterfront has had a relatively good labor record in the past despite the present general sense of perpetual upset."

And racketeering has been part and parcel of these "good relations," fleeing the longshoremen through all sorts of kick-back angles. For the first weeks of the strike, the daily press was apt to point out that mobsters were in control of just those piers that remained at work. This is being forgotten. It is now suggested, not too subtly, that the vast majority of longshoremen are eager to get back to their jobs but are kept away by the threats of a "tiny minority."

treatment which the UAW received in Washington is toned down. In point of fact, the UAW men were handled as if they were members of the Communist Party. They were talked to nicely at first, but then came the mailed fist, the ultimatums, the refusals to answer legitimate questions.

Last week we raised the question of Reuther's covering up for his presidential candidate. This week it is certainly clear that the UAW is decisively interested in saving Truman's face at the expense of necessary union interests. The UAW's letter itself confirms that "all the pressures of government were directed against the workers and their union" in this case. Yet it entrusts the settlement to this same government!

It is about time the labor movement started to think about the fate of free collective bargaining. It is time that the issue of getting off the government boards, where labor serves merely as window dressing, be raised once again. To continue to function within the present confines of the WSB means that the workers will not get what they are really entitled to.

It is about time the labor movement started to think about the fate of free collective bargaining. It is time that the issue of getting off the government boards, where labor serves merely as window dressing, be raised once again. To continue to function within the present confines of the WSB means that the workers will not get what they are really entitled to.

It is about time the labor movement started to think about the fate of free collective bargaining. It is time that the issue of getting off the government boards, where labor serves merely as window dressing, be raised once again. To continue to function within the present confines of the WSB means that the workers will not get what they are really entitled to.

TITO'S "PEACE" OUTFIT FLOPS: Yugoslavs Try to Use Prestige to Whitewash U.S.

By RICHARD TROY

The reports on the recent "Conference for Peace and International Cooperation" held in Zagreb, Yugoslavia, once again remind us that the *sturm und drang* period of Yugoslav Titoism has definitely passed. What was displayed was a new high in the Tito regime's development of its pro-Western orientation in the cold war.

As such, it was another shock for socialist elements (especially in Europe) whose illusions about the "revolutionary" nature of Titoism had been mounting up to the outbreak of the Korean war, and who expected a democratic-socialist and internationalist development. LABOR ACTION, as its readers know, set out to combat these illusions, analyzing the regime's social and political character as—in brief—"national-Stalinism." In line with the national interests of its own ruling bureaucracy, the Yugoslav state is following the line today which, in its time, led the Moscow Stalinist bureaucracy to seek an alliance with Anglo-American capitalism (against the threat of Hitler Germany) in the days of People's-Frontism in the late '30s. Between the break with Moscow

in 1948 and the present stage, Belgrade went through a period of posing as an independent halfway house between East and West. But there was and is nothing in the ideology of its national-Stalinism which could give such a course a solid political basis in socialist principles.

YUGOSLAV LINE

The rapid shift (i.e., its pro-Western slant) which Belgrade propagandists have undergone bears this out. In fact, little in recent Stalinist history illustrates with such lucidity the wholly demagogic character of Stalinist "ideology" as the about-face shift which Titoist propaganda on foreign policy has taken in the past three years.

It is not much of an exaggeration to say that in no country in the world today does the United States side of the cold war get a better press than in Yugoslavia. This seems phenomenal, but it is quite true. In its own restrained but persistent way the Yugoslav press justifies, or at least fails to criticize, almost every move of American foreign policy. The whitewashing techniques which it once developed for the description of the imperialism of Moscow it now employs for the imperialism of the United States. For example, it is vigorously denied by the Yugoslavs that the United States attempts to dominate in its relations to smaller countries; the American policy in Korea, even Iran, is defended, etc.

JUDAS-GOAT ROLE

And the conference itself certainly made it look so. It was at this conference that Yugoslavia made its most significant pro-Washington commitment up to this point; its role throughout the entire conference was to attempt to convince the various "neutralist" tendencies represented at Zagreb that, in the present world crisis "neutrality was," in their words, "a snare and a delusion." The chief Yugoslav delegate, Vidmar, defended the North Atlantic Pact as the "inevitable reaction" of the Western powers to Russian imperialism; he offered up no criticisms of that "reaction." He pleaded with the delegates to abandon their neutralist illusions and (it appears) follow the example of his government: Side with the West.

STATE DEPT.'S FINGER

On exactly whose initiative the conference was called it is difficult to determine. Formally, of course, the agencies of the Yugoslav government were responsible for the conference; there has been an official Yugoslav "peace" organization jogging along for some years, and this seemed to be the

culmination of its efforts.

But there is some evidence along other lines. In the first place, the actual proceedings of the conference suggested to the careful observer that the United States might have had a hand in it: The aim of many of the American-Yugoslav speeches certainly fits in with present American goals in Europe. In addition, Philip Mosely, the State Department expert on Yugoslavia, attended and played a prominent role.

In the second place, the New Leader ran an editorial this week in which it said that the idea of the conference was "projected here." It also referred to parleys held in New York between "prominent anti-Communists" and Yugoslav officials on which the conference was supposed to have been based.

The New Leader was, apparently, disappointed in the results of their efforts since the Yugoslav government would not let in certain "prominent anti-Communists" (Koestler, Burnham, etc.). However, in any case, whether the initiative came from New York, Washington, or Belgrade, there was likely a great deal of collaboration between the three in the planning of the show.

PEACE-MONGERING

The N. Y. Times correspondent Handler reported: "The Yugoslavs have let it be known in the corridors that they believe that all delegates would be well advised to avoid raising the concrete controversial national and international issues of the day and to confine themselves to a discussion of the principles of peace."

The reduction of "peace-mongering" to the absurd could scarcely go much further than in this divorcement of the "principles of peace" from any discussion of "the concrete controversial national and international issues of the day."

But it seems that in spite of these corridor directives, the foreign neutralists raised a bit of a rumpus. While it goes without saying that Russian imperialism was denounced from all sides, U. S. policy also was under fire again and again. It got so bad at one point, complains the New Leader, that the Yugoslavs, in embarrassment, had to get up and defend their benefactor Washing-

ton. The attacks provoked Mosely and Gilbert Harrison, the representatives of the American Veterans Committee, to make a number of flag-waving speeches. In addition to the scanty attendance, this inability entirely to control the anti-Western speeches is what perhaps led the Times, as well as Coblenz of the N. Y. Herald Tribune and the New Leader, to term the conference a great failure—even in their eyes. This, in brief, was the conference. No program or ideas which might arouse the European masses were put forth; no new ideas on the launching of a democratic struggle against Stalinism were advanced. The Europeans heard the somewhat familiar call for all anti-Communists to gather under the banner of the Stars and Stripes for the coming crusade; everything was subordinated to this. It was, then, no surprise that neither Mosely nor Vidmar roused any enthusiasm among their adversaries at the conference. And Yugoslavia's "ideological" capital among European radicals vanished further.

Grave Decision

The OPS has exempted tombstones from price controls. It claims that they are of "insignificant importance" to the cost of living.

What Europeans?

From a United Press dispatch datelined Paris: "An American feels mighty fine here with a couple of 50 dollar bills tucked in his emergency pocket. [W. Averill] Harriman has about 5,650,000,000 dollars for Europe. And the Europeans want money in any amount. They want money more than they want peace, in a manner of speaking." —N. Y. Post, Nov. 6.

MAX SHACHTMAN'S TOUR

The national speaking tour of Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, has begun with a series of meetings in Buffalo, New York. Shachtman, editor of *The New Internationalist*, will cover the major cities from coast to coast speaking on "The Struggle for World Power" and "The Elections in Great Britain."

In Buffalo, Shachtman spoke on "The Struggle for World Power." He will also speak on this subject in Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Chicago and on the West Coast. He will speak on the British elections in Chicago and Berkeley. Arrangements have been made for him to speak at Stanford University under sponsorship of the Student World Federalists. Reports on these meetings will appear regularly in the columns of LABOR ACTION.

While on tour Shachtman will discuss questions of war policy with branches of the ISL. These discussions will relate to material which appeared in the three recent issues of *The New Internationalist*.

Tour schedules for the East are now completed and are included in the following listings:

Buffalo	Nov. 2-4
Pittsburgh	Nov. 5-6
Cleveland	Nov. 7-8
Detroit	Nov. 9-11
Chicago	Nov. 12-14
Seattle	Nov. 15, 16, 17 & 18
Oakland	Nov. 20, 21, 22 & 23
Los Angeles	Nov. 24, 25 & 26
Newark	Dec. 14
Philadelphia	Dec. 16
Reading	Dec. 15 or 17
New York	To be set

Buffalo Hears Shachtman on War

BUFFALO, Nov. 4—Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, successfully launched his current national tour at a public meeting in Buffalo yesterday.

Shachtman's analysis of the present "Struggle for World Power" was favorably received by the mixed audience of workers and students. A sizable proportion of the audience heard Shachtman elaborate the ISL position on the war for the first time. They expressed their interest in the League by asking varied and pertinent questions during the time

allotted for that purpose, by buying subscriptions to LABOR ACTION and the *New Internationalist*, and by contributing funds to help defray the expenses of Comrade Shachtman's tour.

A distinctive feature of the meeting was the fact that all but two or three of the original audience stayed on well into the night discussing the political issues raised. When the meeting did finally break up long after midnight a good section of the audience organized a spontaneous house party which lasted till morning.

U.S. Backs Stand On Iran Crisis Of Oil Cartel

"Despite carefully-planned reports to the contrary, the inside fact is that the State Department, throughout the talks with Mossadegh, has been trying to pressure him into doing business with the British oil trust that Iran has officially repudiated. That is, the State Department is attempting to put over a deal for the British that they couldn't put over themselves."

"This was admitted by Assistant Secretary of State George McGhee at a private conference with officials of the International Cooperative Petroleum Association.

McGhee, a one-time oilman himself, has been handling the negotiations with Mossadegh since Secretary Acheson's departure for the Paris conference of the United Nations. The ICPA officials met with McGhee in an effort to win State Department backing for their plan to solve the explosive Iranian oil crisis.

"Our proposal is that a cooperative, in which a number of countries participate, should be organized to handle Iranian oil," explained Howard A. Cowden, Kansas City, secretary-treasurer of ICPA. "We know definitely that Premier Mossadegh is very interested in this idea, and we have reason to believe he is willing to accept it if it is approved by the State Department."

"That cooperative proposition is completely out of the question," declared McGhee. "If Iran wants to settle this controversy, she will have to deal either with Anglo-Iranian Oil Company or Royal Dutch Shell Company."

"Why, that is exactly what the international oil cartel is demanding," exclaimed Cowden in surprise. "Mossadegh couldn't agree to anything like that. Surely you know that. It would be suicide for him to do so. Anglo-Iranian and Royal Dutch Shell are the two companies that Iran is fighting and has kicked out of the country."

"Nevertheless," replied McGhee, "that is the situation and that is what we are insisting on." "You mean the State Department is doing that?" "McGhee nodded affirmatively." —Robert S. Allen N. Y. Post, Nov. 6.

CHICAGO

MAX SHACHTMAN

ON

AN AMERICAN SOCIALIST LOOKS AT THE BRITISH ELECTIONS

Monday, November 12, at 8 p.m.

Roosevelt College, Rm. 420 (Congress & Michigan)

LOS ANGELES

MAX SHACHTMAN

ON

THE STRUGGLE FOR WORLD POWER

Sunday, NOVEMBER 25, at 8 p.m.

Case Hotel, 11th & Broadway (Conference Room, 6th floor)

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 world-wide 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!

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th 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
Address
City Zone
State Tel.

VISHINSKY: A Stalinist Success Story

From the current issue of The Challenge, bulletin of the Association of Former Political Prisoners of Soviet Labor Camps, we excerpt the following notes by Nilsky on the early biography of Andrey Vishinsky, the present Russian foreign minister. The author begins by recalling the speech made by Vishinsky in Tula in 1918 denouncing the Bolsheviks for dictatorship and violence. Later this Menshevik orator became one of the careerists who crawled onto the bandwagon, first making a public appearance as a prosecutor in the early trial of the SRs (Socialist-Revolutionaries). Nilsky's sketch continues—

For this "wet business" [Russian underworld slang for murder] the small-town lawyer Andrey Yanuarovich was rewarded with the post of rector of the First Moscow University. In this job, forgotten by all, he remained until 1928. Here, assuming the role of theoretician, he concocted a little book *About Communism*, filling it with quotations from everywhere. But instead of fame and a career, the book brought him the wrath of his masters and a severe spanking. After that Vishinsky was silent for a long time. He introduced in his university a course in criminal prosecution, but his lectures were dull and the classes were always empty. His flat, pallid phrases produced no response in the hearers except fatigue. The students ignored and despised him.

It was revolting to see the man humbly toadying to the student members of the University Party Bureau (Party Bureau), or carrying favor like a lackey with Krylenko, Poshukanis, Stuchko and other important Communist personages of the time who lectured at the university.

The students called him "the red-haired lackey." He kept his nickname until the scandal that ended his university career.

It is characteristic that not only the non-partisan students, but also the party members held their "rector" in contempt, consistently defeating his candidacy in elections to the party bureau of the university. On these occasions Vishinsky tearfully reminded his hearers how he had helped to bring about the bloody sentences at the trial of the Socialist-Revolutionaries. But this repelled them even more; outcries were heard from the audience: "Why don't you tell how you attacked the Bolsheviks in Tula, lickspittle!"

In one of his speeches at the university in 1927, Vishinsky said: "Communism is a piece of roast pork and a pair of good boots." In reply, there were shouts, "That's a huckster's Communism! Go to Okhotny Ryad!" [A market in Moscow.] The audience clapped, whistled, shouted, and did not let Vishinsky continue.

LITERALLY KICKED UPSTAIRS

At the end of 1927 Vishinsky again attracted attention. It was at the height of the struggle against the so-called Trotskyist opposition. A discussion meeting was being held in the university's largest auditorium. The Central Committee's line was represented by Yaroslavsky, the opposition by another member of the Central Committee, Rakovsky. Yaroslavsky was hooted down at the meeting and not allowed to speak. The students clearly supported Rakovsky and carried him out to the car on their shoulders, singing the Internationale.

At this moment the rector of the University, Vishinsky, in plain sight of the thousands of students assembled there (many of them were non-partisan), placed his fingers in his mouth and began to whistle [Russian equivalent for booing.] He obviously was trying to provoke a scandal, and his attempt succeeded, but in an unexpected direction. The students nearest him threw themselves upon him and beat him up. At first they slapped his face, and when he fell, they kicked him with their feet. Without his eyeglasses, which he had lost in the shuffle, with a bloody nose, urged on by kicks, Vishinsky crawled on all fours to get away from the crowd of angry students.

On the following days, whenever he appeared at the university, the students shouted at him: "Whistler! Hooligan! Red-haired lackey!" The indignation of the students was so great that Vishinsky began to hide himself, afraid to appear in public, and the district committee of the party was obliged to punish him for discrediting himself as rector. Soon he was removed altogether.

However, Andrey Yanuarovich attained his purpose—he attracted the attention of high party dignitaries. He was, you see, "a staunch Stalinist," persecuted and beaten up by the opposition—a "victim." Vishinsky was appointed Zavglavproforb and Zannarkompros (Chief of the Department of Professional Education and Vice-People's Commissar of Education).

Soon afterwards the Communists fabricated the Shakhbinsk case, in which a number of engineers and others were accused of sabotage. Vishinsky presided over the Special Collegium of the Supreme Court which tried the case and again pleased the Kremlin. More trials followed. This time Vishinsky appeared as prosecutor of the "bloody dogs" Kamenev, Zinoviev, Rykov, Bukharin, Pyatakov, and others. Again he pleased his masters, an officious, cringing funkier who did not even trouble to mask his function, capable of carrying out the dirtiest and most terrible assignments without a second thought.

It was not by chance that Stalin entrusted the organization and "legalization" of the murder of the basic cadres of old Bolsheviks to the erstwhile anti-Bolshevik Vishinsky. Stalin is an expert in "wet business."



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 46 November 12, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WAKHNS 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, GRADON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Ass. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIXS

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

WHY FIVE MILLION FRENCHMEN VOTE COMMUNIST, by Herbert Lüthy.—Commentary, September.

After some discussion of the fact that "the mechanism of representative democracy is in rather poor working order," Lüthy, a Swiss political writer, gets down to the nub of his question: economic stagnation.

"Why is it morally and almost physically impossible for the French workman—taking him as the 'typical' Communist adherent, though quite different social categories are also in the party following—to vote for a party other than the Communists? The answer is readily forthcoming: The Communist voter has no other way of registering his demand for change except to go to the other extreme and plump for De Gaulle—a leap which many accomplished in the extraordinarily critical situation in the autumn of 1947, but which under normal circumstances is too great. All the other parties stand in defense of the status quo, even if against their will, as in the case of the Socialists. And the blunt, key fact is that this status quo is morally intolerable or physically unbearable for millions of Frenchmen, for whom it means stagnation and atrophy." (Italics in original.)

One item from his review of the "unbearable" economic situation:

"All the victory bulletins of the Finance Ministry and of the Monnet Plan are glad tidings for those newspaper readers who find the going tolerable. But for the French wage earner, they are a standing provocation. He hears that France has reached its best pre-war standard

and he even believes it when he sees the well-stocked shops. But he is far more aware of another set of official statistics, which tell him that the average French salary has gone up only twelvefold since 1938 while the cost of living has increased 23-fold. This salary keeps body and soul together, that is, he has enough to eat; but shoes have become a luxury which he can scarcely afford. Housing? In Paris alone, 35,000 families of three, four or more persons live in a four-walled space, in single hotel rooms, or in some sublet maid's room under the eaves. Yet not a house in Paris was destroyed by the war! . . . If there is no radical change, Paris will be a city of ruins in 20 years.

"In short, though the economy is at full employment and maximum productivity, the economic product of this full employment economy seems in some mysterious way to be volatilized before ever reaching the consumer and without doing any visible good to the country. What else can the French worker assume than that an evil confederacy, which he calls 'capitalism,' is skimming off the wealth of the nation and stealthily, gobbling it up?"

Lüthy himself does not believe any such "demagogic oversimplification" about capitalism, counterposing "American pattern" capitalism to the French variety. But then he also seems to think he is refuting the "oversimplification" when he writes: "It is a gross and dangerous error to suppose that the trouble lies with a handful of 'big capitalists'—the 'trusts' or '200 families.'" One oversimplification deserves another.

THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY ON THE HOME FRONT

By MEL HACKER

The violent Cicero riots, in which a Negro family was prevented from moving into an all-white community, are not a new phenomena in American life. They reflect a long-standing class and caste bias against minority and lower socio-economic groups in America as well as the acute housing shortage.

Charles Abrams, public-housing authority, suggests that from these conditions the idea of the "pure, homogenous neighborhood" arose. There was accompanying resentment against the "ignorant Finns," "dirty Russians," the undesirable Jews, Negroes, South Europeans and Asians.

With the growth of our suburbs after 1920, racial zoning laws became popular, but they were soon declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. However, federal housing officials still followed the policy that a family should never live near those with "a higher or lower income scale than its own" or with those of another color, race or nationality. A mixed condition would create instability and would "depress property values."

THEORY OF THE "ELITE"

The real-estate "national code of ethics" pledged that realtors would "never be instrumental in introducing into a neighborhood members of any race or nationality whose presence would clearly be detrimental to property values in the neighborhood." Violation of this code meant expulsion.

The Federal Housing Administration of 1935 accepted these theories and encouraged the use of racial restrictive covenants to keep out "incompatible racial elements." It even lamented that the children of the more "elite" might be compelled to attend school with pupils of a lower level of society.

The Chicago and Detroit housing riots, the use by the Communist Party of the racial issue, and American middle-class squeamishness and conservatism regarding social problems, encouraged a civic hush-hush attitude toward these ugly problems.

CHANGING THE PATTERN

The Cook County and Detroit riots were therefore no localized affairs. They reflect the social pattern of "homogeneity" in our neighborhoods and the anti-racial indoctrination backed from 1935-1949 by federal sanction. The Cook County jurymen felt that they were acting for their community. Many of its citizens, much of its press, police, officialdom backed them.

A full-scale drive to alter segregation policies must strike at the heart of American economic and social patterns. A meaningful housing program will run afoul of our war economy, the vested interests of large realty corporations, the fanatical hold that segregation has upon people in our insecurity-ridden and class-ridden capitalist society.

Mixed housing projects, programs of action by union and civic groups on the community level and political-economic action on a national level can lead the way toward a solution of the national disgrace of segregated housing and living.

Two decisions of the Supreme Court on November 5 called a halt to what even the majority of the court considered excesses in the government's vicious conduct of its witchhunt. One denounced the high bail set for the most recent batch of arrested CP leaders. This had been set as high as \$100,000, for William Schneiderman, later reduced to \$50,000.

Pointing out that the government justified this unconstitutionally "excessive bail" only by referring to the bail-jumping of other CP leaders, it said that "Such conduct would inject into our own system the very principles of totalitarianism" which the laws are supposed to guard against. In a separate opinion Justices Frankfurter and Jackson went further to propose that the court should be

Youth and Student Corner

Re Journalistic Morality: A Letter to 'ADA World'

By DON HARRIS

In the September issue of the *ADA World*, the following item appeared on the student news page, entitled sarcastically, "Sweezyites Yet."

"In most cases today liberals on the campus, assuming a petty-bourgeois radicalism, will not act without the Stalinists if they will act at all. So states a member of the Socialist Youth League in the Sept. 10 issue of LABOR ACTION. Writing on a desirable 'United-front Policy with Student Stalinists,' the SYLER urges united action with Communists and fellow travelers because 'If you keep mum, totally ineffective liberals may find themselves in control and unable, normally, to handle the situation.'"

"Introducing a new Godfather, the SYLER continues, 'In fact, where a coalition is involved, I have found the Sweezyites especially useful as allies in preventing liberals from taking over. The latter usually both things up, a la California, by succumbing to compromises and palliatives.' The run-of-the-mill liberal is far more dangerous in a position of authority than the Stalinist. . . ."

"[The above writer does not represent SYL's official view on organizational relationships.—Ed.]"

This week, the following letter was sent to the editor of the *ADA World*, together with a request that it be printed in a forthcoming issue.

November 8, 1951

Editor, *ADA World*:

In your September issue, an item appeared entitled "Sweezyites Yet" which conveys somewhat of a wrong impression about the Socialist Youth League, as the result, mainly, of a factual error. We are sure you will be willing to print this correction.

The item in question consists mainly of quotations from LABOR ACTION's Youth and Student Corner, which is edited by the SYL. While we were glad to note that in brackets beneath you report that the quoted remarks do not represent the SYL's official point of view, the fact that the writer is described as a member of the SYL implies that his views have some standing in our organization.

The fact is, as there was no reason to assume otherwise, that the writer whom you quoted is not a member of the SYL nor do his views on organizational relationships have any support among our membership. Aside from this, however, the form in which you present the quotations omits mention of two relevant facts.

First, the quotations are from a letter written for the purpose of disagreeing with the policy of SYL set forth in an earlier article. This article argued that student socialists must, in relation to the different forms of campus Stalinism seek to "isolate them politically and organizationally to the end of having them democratically ousted." By failing to state this as the SYL's position, your readers are left only with the impression created by quotations from an exponent of the policy of "peaceful collaboration" with Stalinoid tendencies.

Second, the letter from which your quotations were taken was answered in the very same issue, by the editor of the Youth and Student Corner, i.e., an official spokesman for the SYL's official point of view. In answer to one of the very sentences you quote, he wrote "that . . . is sheer political fiction that provides the basis for a capitulation to Stalinism."

The Socialist Youth League has no objections to the *ADA World* reporting differences of opinion that are aired in the pages of LABOR ACTION. When you do so, however, we would request that enough of the relevant facts be presented so that your readers will not suffer wrong impressions created by incomplete reporting.

Sincerely,
Socialist Youth League
Don Harris, National Secretary

Since the student news page of the *ADA World* is edited by

THE NEW YORK SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE PRESENTS A CLASS ON THE POLITICS OF INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM SUNDAY EVENINGS AT 8 P.M. BEGINNING NOVEMBER 18

- 1 November 18
The Scientific Interpretation of History (Historical Materialism)
Discussion Leader JACK MAXWELL
 - 2 November 25
The World We Didn't Make
Discussion Leader ANNE RUSSELL
 - 3 December 2
Leviathan in Crisis
Discussion Leader JACK MAXWELL
 - 4 December 9
Stalinism: The Road to 1984
Discussion Leader GERTRUDE BLACKWELL
- AT LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 WEST 14 STREET, NEW YORK CITY

NEW YORK

SYL Friday Forum

"THE LONELY CROWD"—A Review

Speaker: STAN GREY

Friday, NOVEMBER 16, at 9 p.m.

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street

- 5 December 16
The Way to Freedom
Discussion Leader PHYLLIS HOFFMAN
- 6 December 23
Democracy and the New Society
Discussion Leader HAL DRAPER
- 7 December 30
The War We Needn't Have
Discussion Leader JULIE FALK
- 8 January 6
Where to Begin
Discussion Leader JACK MAXWELL

Diagnosis for the Labor Bureaucracy: Fortune Magazine Sees Hardening of the Arteries

By WALTER JASON

The anxiety displayed in union circles, notably the United Automobile Workers (CIO), when anyone mentions the two significant articles published in *Fortune* magazine on the status of labor and labor leaders in America today, suggests that the author, Daniel Bell, made some rather telling points in his candid analysis. To be sure, the very publication itself of any serious analysis of labor is a form of criticism of labor's hierarchy, which never permits it within the union movement.

Bell knows the labor movement well, and in his articles cannot be dismissed with the evasive remark, "Well after all, *Fortune* is a business magazine—what do you expect?" as some of the apologists for the labor bureaucracy insist.

The clever if somewhat tongue-in-cheek standard by which Bell judges the labor movement does have a certain nasty tone, but then the labor leaders do leave themselves wide open for precisely this kind of attack.

In his first article entitled "The Language of Labor" in the September issue of *Fortune*, Bell seeks to answer the question "Why does the union movement still use 'violent rhetoric'?"

He writes: "Labor talked as if it were still a weak minority. It talked as if it were politically helpless before a marauding business class, as if its living standards were constantly under attack, as if its own small voice were the only defender of the national interest against the greed of special interests."

What Bell then points out is that such an attitude does not flow from the yardstick of measurement which every labor reporter hears repeated *ad nauseam* at every union convention including the forthcoming CIO convention.

Double Standard

Bell says: "Labor had come a long way by 1951. The signs of its success were self-evident: almost every major industry in the U. S. was unionized, and in many the 'union shop,' the hallmark of security, had been achieved. Labor's forebodings that after World War II industry would 'break' unionism were unrealized; in fact the contrast between managerial attitudes of 1919 and 1951 was itself a measure of the distance achieved. Labor leaders were eagerly welcomed on civic boards, community chests, and patriotic organizations; in many instances the wealthier labor organizations were constantly importuned for financial contributions—surely a flattering indication of having arrived. A growing number of union leaders had come to sport, with academic élan, the gown and scarlet hood of honorary degrees. And finally, scores of younger union officials were serving with distinction in ECA missions and as labor attachés in American embassies throughout the world.

"This fact of power and achievement was the reality."

Now the contradiction which Bell suggests is not so much one of reality, for both things are true—labor is weak and labor has made gains. What is involved is the fact that labor leaders use a double standard. More precisely, they are used to doubletalking, and this catches up with them; for one minute they are screaming to the world "We are being robbed!" and the next minute they are telling the rank and file "Look at all the great gains we made under our wonderful leadership!" The nub of the matter is that the language of labor is not, as Bell indicates, due mainly to the heritage of other more militant days, as much as it is a necessary means of "communication" between a restive, dissatisfied and embittered rank and file and the leadership.

The Lewis Type

The classic example of this technique in making rapprochement between the leadership and the ranks is, of course, Walter Reuther, who is a veritable artist at talking the radical language of the auto workers and acting the labor statesman in Washington.

However, the first article, no matter what union leaders think, is not the sore point as much as the second one is entitled—"Labor's Coming of Middle Age," published in the October issue of *Fortune*. This article has three major

aspects. It assumes as its background the very thing that Bell challenges in his first article, namely, that labor is on the defensive and very much concerned and worried about the future.

The first part of Bell's article deals with John L. Lewis and Walter Reuther as symbols of two different philosophies current in the labor movement. He points out that labor has two courses at the present time. First, the John L. Lewis method:

"One alternative to leaning on the president has been loudly suggested by John L. Lewis. Forget the 'controllers' political mumbo-jumbo," he says; rely on your own economic strength. . . .

In 1951 Lewis has been reiterating this literal, empirical distillation of his own experience. His advice: play the free-enterprise game the way the rules were originally set, for the tooth and claw of the economic jungle. 'The tendency of the CIO and AFL,' he asserts, 'to constantly agree in Washington that some government board will have the right of life and death in every economic sense over the 62 million workers' is intolerable. That's what the Stabilization Board in Washington, with the long-haired college professors who work for it at \$50 a day and expenses, are trying to put over on American labor,' he gibed."

Reuther in Eclipse?

As against this, he presents the ideas of Walter Reuther:

"Significantly, Lewis' raucous bid for leadership was made before an auto workers' audience on Walter Reuther's home ground. More than any other labor leader in recent times, Walter Reuther has represented the opposite view—of the trade union as a force for social planning. Those who had dreamed of a liberal-left coalition on the style of the British Labor Party saw Reuther as the coordinator of this bloc. To Europeans, Reuther is the best-known name in American labor."

"Yet Reuther today is in partial eclipse. Most other labor leaders are resentful of him, some because of his ambition, some because of his intellectualism. Public reception of recent 'Reuther plans' has been leaden; one, a trillion-dollar hundred-year scheme for world economic development, sank without a trace; a more recent plan for putting machine-tool production on an assembly-line basis received an equally indifferent notice. With the political climate against him, Reuther can only sit and watchfully wait. He has refused positions in the mobilization program (although he nibbled at the idea of becoming C. E. Wilson's assistant). His friends have suggested his appointment to the UN delegation, where his forensic talents might be ably employed against Mr. Malik. At the moment, Reuther is in danger of becoming something very much like the Tom Dewey of the labor movement."

Going Bourgeois

Readers of LABOR ACTION can easily recall the various events in recent times which have led to the growing unpopularity of Walter Reuther. Certain the Lewis philosophy of "let's get ours, they're getting theirs" is bound to be more and more attractive, and in this lies the crisis in the UAW top leadership. Actually the bulk of the CIO leadership, especially that around Philip Murray, CIO president, tends to have the Lewis philosophy, even if they are unwilling to follow the man. No one who recalls the dramatic

actions of John L. Lewis in World War II can underestimate what he or his idea of getting "more" can do in the coming period.

The second aspect of "Labor's Coming of Middle Age" that makes the labor leaders extremely sensitive is Bell's blunt analysis of the status of the labor leadership. The crisis of the labor movement in terms of leadership has arisen because of the exhaustion of the left, Bell points out. He gives three main factors as responsible for this. "One, there is the plain fact that America's labor leadership is tired and aging, that no new blood has appeared in the last few years." Along with this he points out that "the labor leader in his social attitudes and style of life is a member of a new class. His salary is high, he is a public figure, he enjoys a powerful place in society, he travels to international conferences." Or to use Bell's pithy phrase, "they are going bourgeois."

Trend to Business Unionism

"The second depressant of labor's social conscience has been the threat of Russian Communism. Victor Reuther prefers to work for the CIO in Paris. Irving Brown of the AFL has also chosen to stay in Europe, although as a former official of the War Production Board he could have been a top labor man in the mobilization. The realities of the East-West struggle are more exciting than the pallid issues at home. Altogether, the unions have supplied thirty-one men to the ECA labor program and many others to the State Department labor-attaché staff.

"At the same time, the dispiriting record of the British Labor government has left the Socialist wing of U. S. labor with little to cheer. Nationalization has turned out to mean little change in the power of the unions, and it has inspired no new élan in the ranks of the British workers."

The third factor is the remarkable resiliency of the American economy. The sum-total effect of this has been a marked trend toward business unionism as the major motif of all union actions. The dismal failure of the CIO's political-action program has further tended to drive labor in the direction of concerning itself primarily if not exclusively with wages, hours and working conditions.

U. S. Needs a Bevan

And this is where Bell ends his analysis, but in our opinion this is where the perspective of the union movement just begins. In the first place, the insistence of the business unionists, be they John L. Lewis, Philip Murray or a conservative section of the UAW, that labor should get "more" indicates a sharpening of the class struggle with more political overtones precisely because everything flows to and from Washington. Necessity more than past failures will determine labor's political-action policies. Nor is there anything on the social scene that indicates that the labor leadership in America can play an essentially passive and defensive role any more than the British Labor Party was able to be defensive.

In his own peculiar way John L. Lewis today, by insisting on "more" for the workers, follows a pattern coinciding with that of Nye Bevan of England, no matter what Lewis' personal political philosophy may be. How ironical in this situation that Walter Reuther, whom many considered the potential Bevan of America, stands to the right of Attlee. Nor is it accidental of course that in UAW circles, mainly hostility was expressed toward Bevan while the official Reutherites had their sympathies for the dull, conservative Attlee.

The convention of the CIO in New York this week will be important in so far as it reflects these cross-tendencies, tensions and uncertainties which are the dominating theme of the labor movement in America today.

Unless all indications are wrong, the European unionists who are expecting some hope from the CIO movement, especially Walter Reuther, are doomed to disappointment. But in our opinion sooner or later a counterpart of the Bevan movement in England, precisely because of the success of the Bevan movement, will be found in the American labor movement.

Read

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

America's Leading Marxist Magazine

35 cents

\$2.00 a year

CORRESPONDENCE FROM ISRAEL

"The Spirit of Three Years Ago Has Disappeared"

TEL AVIV, Oct. 24—With the aggravation of the Suez conflict, official circles here are trying to utilize the heightened tension in the Near East to make the people forget the dangers that surround Israel itself.

The population, which has been apathetic enough, has been further discouraged by yesterday's announcement by the minister of trade and industry in the newly constituted Mapai-clerical cabinet, Dov Jossel.

Joseph announced that the food rations, which have already reached a near-hunger level, will be reduced still further in the interests of "stricter controls." He put this in the form of a call for greater sacrifices, to fight the black market, etc. But there are still no efforts being made to curb the swelling deprivations of the agricultural black market which mean hunger for the cities, nor to rationalize the

helplessly disorganized food production of the kibbutzim (cooperatives).

In a way the food situation helps the Mapai government by demoralizing the masses, discouraging effective reactions against its policies. The left-wing non-Stalinist workers have abandoned their efforts to organize independently, caught between the pressure of "socialist" exploitation by the Mapai on the one hand and on the other hand the unceasing propaganda of the two Stalinist parties (Mapam and the Israeli CP). So, for instance, the *Achdut Haavoda* wing of the Mapai party, which is opposed to the party's pro-Stalinist line but has not clarified for itself exactly what is wrong with it, has decided after all to remain in the ranks of the organization. The other proposal by its minority was to join Mapai.

As regards the international political situation, it is the accepted view of one and all here that Israel will serve in the Mediterranean zone for the Western imperialist bloc and its armies. The Stalinist forces fight this with their well-known vociferous cries about "never fighting the Russian army." All the parties, without exception, fatalistically accept identification with either Western or Russian imperialism as "necessary."

As a result of sheer hunger and belief that a war is near, the spirit of some three years ago has disappeared utterly. It is indeed difficult to find anyone who looks forward to a change for the better. The interests of the people are the immediate ones: food for the next two or three meals, how to get a shirt on the black market, how to improve working conditions. In all their dreariness the situation is

that of a land on the eve of disastrous inflation.

In the "transfer camps" for new immigrants—where tens of thousands wait, some of them having been there for more than two years—the coming of the first rains has unnerved even the Oriental Jews, who are the only ones who do not find the food and clothing situation desperate, since many of them had no better conditions in Yemen and Iraq and were moreover in constant danger there.

IN THE CAMPS

The tents, often sheltering families of twelve and more, fall under the onslaught of the water; thick black mud, oozing everywhere; the corruption and indifference of the party-designated government employees, who are selected for the different camps

in accordance with an unofficial quota for each party and paid by the government—all this has brought about a state of near-desperation in many camps.

But bureaucratism reigns supreme: some 30 Iraqi immigrants' families, who settled four months ago near Tel Aviv on abandoned ground and built themselves wooden huts preparatory to working in the city, were expelled with brutal violence, including the indiscriminate use of clubs on men and women, because their dwellings were "not planned." The huts were destroyed. Since they had nowhere to go, they were distributed back to the various transfer camps.

Still, like last year, the army will probably take over the camps, as the greedy but inefficient government agency's workers give up before the onslaughts of the winter weather. Moshe SILBER

CIO Threatens Breakthrough on Wages—

(Continued from page 1)

wage-policy resolution. It points out that wages are the only element in the economy subject to rigid controls.

The CIO says there is no equality of sacrifice, and it warns the Truman administration it will never submit to discriminatory wage freezes or other unfair policies.

After Johnston delivered his plea for "self-restraint" on the part of the CIO, President Murray made a stirring emotional plea for a recognition of these complaints and a change in government policy. Murray emphasized that the CIO members were "willing to make any sacrifice, even life for this country," but he demanded an "equality of sacrifice." This was the closest to an actual debate on ideas at the convention on wage policy.

Later in the week, the issue will again come before the convention when Nathan Feinsinger, chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board, speaks, and is followed by Manly Fleischmann, National Production Authority Administrator.

Nothing illustrates the dilemma of the CIO leadership better than

the ironic spectacle of its "friends in Washington," invited to speak at the convention, all asking the CIO to continue support of a wage freeze which would lower the standard of living of its vast membership.

It's enough to suggest the slogan for the CIO, "Protect me from my friends, I can take care of my enemies."

The tragedy of the CIO at this moment in history is that there is no open discussion of this key domestic issue at the convention. Rather, it is one of those affairs that reminds one more of a banquet and pleasant gathering of a group of associates than a vital, militant and vibrant labor union convention.

Unless all signs are mistaken, this convention will be the scene of an almost unheard-of phenomenon for an organization claiming a democratic tradition. Every report, speech and resolution will be adopted unanimously, and in most cases without any discussion.

Contributing to this cut-and-dried character is the silence of the segment of the CIO leadership once known for its vocal advocacy of new and attractive trade-union ideas. The Walter Reuthers and

George Baldanzis of this convention are playing a purely passive role.

AGING BUREAUCRATS

The entire convention is set up in the stamp of its tiring and rapidly aging leader, Phil Murray.

The promotion of Alan Hayward to executive vice president, a pre-convention arrangement which will be adopted formally at this session, suggests that the CIO will continue in that direction, a triumph for routine unionism personified by key figures like Murray, James B. Carey and David J. McDonald of the steel workers' union.

In national politics, the future portends a tail-ending of the Democratic Party; in foreign policy, largely a State Department line; and in internal CIO politics, a hardening of its structure along the lines of the steel workers' union.

The usual jockeying for public opinion on the issue of unity between the CIO and the AFL will continue to mark the efforts of both labor hierarchies, each far more worried about the prestige,

power and division of control than in basic union, to which so much lip-service is paid.

The divisive effects of the "bureaucratic urge" to power is illustrated perhaps best by the growth of jurisdictional disputes, not merely between the CIO and AFL, as well as the Stalinist unions, but also by the intense dis-

putes within the CIO on jurisdiction.

As a result the CIO had to adopt the unusual program of setting up a special arbitration board to handle this intra-union problem, with a provision that recourse to legal action against another "offending" union is now recognized as legitimate official CIO policy.

Readers Take the Floor . . .

Keep Smiling

To the Editor:

In the novel entitled *The 25th Hour*—a grim satire of impersonal cruelty today—a displaced person, victim of years in concentration camps and displaced-person camps, was given the chance after only one day's freedom of either enlisting in the Western European army to fight Russia or else being separated from his family and sent back to another camp. Tormented beyond endurance by the past and coerced in the present, he "enlisted" and had a picture of himself and his family (everyone was enlisting, wife, son, and baby) taken by an insensitive army occupation officer. He was being told to "keep smiling."

To this grim but semi-fictional

horror story should be appended the following caption appearing below three fiercely smiling faces in uniform in the *This World* section of the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Oct. 28, 1951 (the italics are mine):

"The Statue of Liberty, lifting her 'lamp beside the golden door,' looked good last week to 44 new U. S. soldiers on their way to Camp Kilmer, N. J. They were refugees from Communist countries who had enlisted in Germany and will be eligible for U. S. citizenship after a five-year hitch. Some 2500 more will follow them under a recent law of Congress. Many requested that their last names be kept secret, fearing retaliation against their relatives who still remained in the Communist countries." Oakland, Calif.

J. WALKER

For living Marxism—read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

MURDER IN MEXICO

The Assassination of Leon Trotsky

by General Sanchez Salazar in collaboration with Julian Gorkin

The story of the assassination of Trotsky written by the ex-Chief of the Secret Service of the Mexican police who was in charge of the investigation.

235 pages

\$2.50

Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y. (Orders must be accompanied by payment)

UMT vs. U.S. Social Patterns

The special commission on Universal Military Training appointed by President Truman last June has reported back, with a proposed program for six months' compulsory UMT for American youth.

As the National Council Against Conscription points out, this Truman-appointed group was stacked in the first place. Chairman is James W. Wadsworth who is the "father" of the National Defense Act of 1920; his original draft of this act included UMT but the clause was taken out by Congress.

Wadsworth was also the sponsor in the House of the Burke-Wadsworth Act of 1949 which was the draft law under which men were conscripted prior to the Second World War. During the war he saw a chance to put across labor conscription and therefore joined in planning and drafting the bill which he introduced in the House in February 1943 (the Austin-Wadsworth bill). After the war he continued to press for the adoption of a UMT law.

A second civilian member of the commission is Karl T. Compton, who testified for UMT before congressional committees on several occasions following the war. He was the chairman of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training which in May 1947 issued a report favoring UMT.

The third civilian member is the Texas millionaire, Will Clayton, formerly head of Anderson, Clayton and Company, largest cotton brokers in the South. He has been active in the group which calls itself the Committee on the Present Danger, which through wide use of radio, magazine and newspaper publicity spearheaded the drive for UMT during 1950.

The other two members of the commission are military men, Lieutenant General R. S. McLain and Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid.

(INCAE release)

In the October 1951 *Coronet* magazine is a preview of what you may expect if UMT is adopted. *Coronet* Films, with the help of the Department of Defense, has produced a series of 14 films to "help young people prepare to give their best to, and make the most of, military service." These films are to be shown to high school students throughout the nation as a part of the high school curriculum. There is "one for each week of a semester course."

Coronet in this article, "Classroom Movies for Tomorrow's Draftees," explains why these films are needed: "With the passage of the Universal Military Training and Service Act last

June by Congress, the nation endorsed new principles which demand great psychological adjustments by our young people and their parents."

Coronet then describes "the cultural pattern of America" which must be changed. "The boys and girls now in high school have grown up taking certain principles for granted. First, peace is basic. Youngsters have been taught to abhor violence and to value 'getting along with others.' This philosophy runs all through their training from infancy through high school.

"Second, military training and war are identified as the same thing. The beginning of training means the beginning of war. . . . But this military training does not mean the beginning of war. It may even mean the end of war."

Here it is! The threat of UMT is a threat to the entire "cultural pattern of America." It is intended to change peaceful, democratic attitudes to those of violence. It is intended to make training for war sound like training for peace. And to aid in this change—even before Congress has finally considered the question of UMT—*Coronet* Films, with the cooperation of the Department of Defense, will begin to propagandize the nation's high school children.

LONDON LETTER

Fruits of Victory for Churchill: 3 Crises

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Oct. 28—Speaking of the election result in Britain, there is the story about the Salvation Army lassie who was orating at an open-air meeting in Hyde Park. "Last night I was in the arms of the Devil," she cried, "tonight I am in the arms of the Lord."—"How are you fixed up for tomorrow night?" came a voice from the audience.

This is, in fact, the problem of the British people today. Yesterday the Labor Party was in governmental power; today the Tories form the government; but how are the British people fixed up for tomorrow?

There is, to be sure, no getting away from the fact that the Conservatives have been returned, although their vote was a quarter million less than Labor's. With a precarious majority of about 30 over Labor and 18 over all, it can hardly be said that a landslide had occurred for them. In fact, there was a shift of only about 1 per cent. As Attlee said, what happened was that "when it came down to it . . . more Liberals supported the Conservatives than Labor" in those constituencies in which no Liberal candidate had been put up for election.

Thus we see that there has been no fundamental shift; there has been a crystallization at the opposing poles. On the whole, the working class and veterans have stood solidly behind Labor. This election was fought around the issue of a socialist program, which the Conservatives marked up as their main target, and the results show that the people of England are more class-conscious than ever.

Now, the trade unions have for long been wedded with the Labor Party in an association which ad-

versity has strengthened. Likewise, the party itself has closed up its ranks against the common foe. All Bevan's supporters were returned to Parliament, some with increased majorities. The natural swing to the left accentuated by loss of power puts the Labor Party in a more progressive mood than before.

Many socialists are of the opinion that the Labor Party will be inspired anew by a spell of opposition; they think it had run out of ideas. Although it could still remind people of pre-war depressions, although its record since the war was one of service to the people, it did not offer a bold direction for the future in sufficiently dynamic and imaginative fashion. But Labor gets its support despite the Korean rise in prices, despite the situation in Egypt and Iran; and this—as Moragn Phillips, secretary of the party, said—is something with which they could be well satisfied.

Nevertheless, any government that comes into office now is faced with the trio of crises which has haunted Labor for the last six and a half years.

First, there is the balance of payments. In the last quarter, Britain's gold and dollar reserves were depleted by \$600 million. This is a measure of the lack of balance between her imports and exports. It represents about one fifth of her total gold and dollar reserves.

The second crisis is the perennial coal crisis. Industrial and domestic use of coal and electricity has outrun the ability to supply it. In the winter when so much is used for heating, the supply of 220 million tons per year just cannot keep up. Hitherto the government has made a special ap-

peal to the miners, and many worked overtime in the winter. But it seems doubtful if the appeal of a Tory government will induce enough cooperation from the National Union of Mine Workers.

The third crisis is that of foreign relations. While a Conservative victory has guaranteed the tolerance of the United States, it has put all Africa and Asia on their guard.

A typical comment came from the *Hindustan Times* of India: "There is deep regret that the Attlee government, which was responsible for the new India policy and present friendly Indo-British relations, is going out from office. . . . It is well known that the Conservative Party in regard to India inspires no enthusiasm in this country. . . ."

The general economic problems will be the most difficult for the Tory party. At present the country is trying to support a full rearmament program and the present standard of living. The rearmament program will cost 4,700 million pounds (about \$14 billion). Britain will have 900,000 men under arms, and one in ten

of the active population will either be in the armed forces or producing equipment for them. During the three years of this program there will be 82 out of 1000 working for the cold war (as compared with 74 in the United States).

There is the solution that home consumption must be cut down. The Conservatives themselves take such a view. Bevan and much of the Labor Party take the opposite stand, that armament must be scaled down. Much as the Tories would like to bring about some unemployment, decrease home consumption and increase "initiative" (profits), the trade unions would just not allow the Tories to get away with it.

This is the case with full employment and with all the social services. The Conservatives dare not take them away. They cannot roll back history, if they tried it is not unlikely that the trade unions would call a general strike.

This is the dilemma of the Conservatives. As we pointed out in our last pre-election London Letter, they will have to keep virtually all the controls which they have been howling about. They

will have to continue rationing. About the only independent measure that they will be able to take is the abolition of the limitations on dividends. But six million workers have already suggested the possibility of a request for a pay rise in this eventuality.

The inability of the Conservatives to implement the more reactionary measures in their program will lose them support among their own business interests and will certainly expose to the world the hollowness, destructiveness and insincerity of their criticism of Labor's rule of the country.

The Labor Party emerged from the election unscathed. All its cabinet and senior ministers were returned. A few years of Tory rule may persuade the vast majority of the British people once and for all that theirs is not the way.

We would predict that by the next election the Tories will have so exposed themselves that Labor will be returned with a sweeping majority and we will see the last of Tory rule in Britain, given an effective and dynamic policy offered by Labor.

Liberals and Britain — —

(Continued from page 1)

anything can. There is no concern here for the welfare, let alone the political feelings, of the British workers. There is no sense of the political and social values involved in the continuing contest for power between the classes in Britain. The dominating consid-

erations are: British-American relations and a vague and ill-digested program for abating the arms race.

"Winston Churchill is once again prime minister of Great Britain," starts the editorial. "We suspect that he could be elected president of the United States. It is not for us to rejoice or to weep at the downfall of the Labor Party. It is to help free Churchill to act on a world scale, so that his bold imagination and incomparable prestige can serve world peace as in the days of the Grand Alliance."

Here we have once more the old liberal yearning for the Great Man. More Britons voted against his party than for it—No matter! He represents the era of British imperialism to the peoples of the colonial world—Never mind! His party came to power with a program which promises a retreat from the advances made by the workers of Britain—That's their worry!

GOOD OLD DAYS

The important thing is to get back to the good old days when Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Good Old Winnie sat around the table and settled the fate of the world. Of course, there was another figure there too, but the liberals don't mention him in this connection these days. . . .

These American liberals are happy with Churchill. But, they say, the United States owes him a slight obligation. Our government must see to it that Churchill does not become "the prisoner of a deepening economic crisis." If we do that, and if the wartime political partnership is re-established, and if Churchill succeeds in pushing through his capitalist United States of Europe based on the Schuman plan, something or other, quite probably good, is bound to be the upshot of it all.

THE HARD WAY

The significant thing about this editorial is not the inadequacy if not downright foolishness of the particular program it lays down for the salvation of the world. But it is rather the fact that these spokesmen of American liberalism obviously feel themselves much closer politically to the Tory Churchill than to labor's leader Attlee. (Of course, for Bevan they have nothing but fear and hatred.)

British politics are an invaluable source of instruction for us in America. But it must be sadly admitted that even the best teacher cannot help people who are determined not to learn. The American labor movement and the American liberals may have to learn politics the hard way.

ONE TORY MANEUVER— ONE PRO-TORY SLANDER

With the empty gesture of a ham actor, Winston Churchill has cut the salaries of himself and other cabinet officers for three years or as long as the rearmament program will be going ahead at full blast. The total saving for the treasury was about \$87,000 a year. To the men of wealth involved, the cut meant less than nothing.

Among the British workers who had just voted overwhelmingly against the Tories, and who face the possibility of further decreases in the standard of living through Tory rule, this act must have seemed like an insulting slap in the face, a cheap caricature of Labor's slogan of "fair shares."

But to the American Tory-worshippers (and where Churchill is concerned, these include not only our die-hard conservatives but also quite a few people who consider themselves "liberals") the prime minister's act seemed "if not a stroke of genius, a bit of inspired practical politics."

That line comes from Raymond Daniell, the *New York Times* London correspondent, who has been performing more like a Tory publicity man than a reporter. "Back in power again," he writes, "the Conservatives lost no time in showing an aristocratic disdain for the emoluments of office that Labor could not show."

Daniell has been working over the same theme repeatedly, the general idea being to convey to his readers that the British Labor Party is composed of a bunch of money-grabbing cheap-skates whose desire for office is whetted to no small degree by the income to be derived therefrom. The Tories, on the other hand, are made to appear as men who seek office from a disinterested desire to perform a public service.

Just before the election he wrote slanderously: "If [the Labor government] wanted . . . above all to remain in office because of the emoluments involved."

"There is this difference between a Conservative and a Labor government. To the former, public office is an avocation. To members of the latter, job holding at public expense becomes a vocation and end in itself."

There is no doubt that for many Labor government officials the prestige and income of public office was sweet in itself. It is a credit to the idealism of even the right-wing leadership of the party that during six years in the government there has been hardly a breath of scandal connected with any Labor Party man connected with it. A far cry indeed from the greedy wallowing in the public trough which has been the hallmark of the politicians of both American capitalist parties;

And as for the Tories, if public office is an avocation, it is not an unprofitable one. Although their salaries may be a mere drop in the bucket compared to the income they receive from their various enterprises, they can rightly feel that a Tory government in office is the best possible guarantee that their enterprises will remain profitable. A government staffed by them is indeed an executive committee for handling the affairs of the ruling class as a whole.

SPECIAL

COMBINATION

OFFER!

Books and Pamphlets

by Leon Trotsky

The Permanent Revolution	\$3.50
The Lesson of Spain25
Marxism in the U. S.35
Fascism, What It Is, How to Fight It15
The New Course	1.50
Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay25

ALL FOR ONLY \$5.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 W. 14th St.
New York 11, N. Y.

The Handy Way

To Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION

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

Please enter my subscription:
 NEW RENEWAL
 6 months at \$1.00
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

ZONE APT.

CITY

STATE

Bill me.
 Payment enclosed.

Labor's Second Stage

The first statement on the British election results by a prominent leader of the Bevan group, carried by the *London Times* for October 29, has aroused widespread comment in Britain. R. H. S. Crossman is quoted as saying:

"One of the most instructive facts which has emerged from this election has been that not a single prominent Bevanite failed to be re-elected. The Bevanites are the only people who were honest in facing the rearmament crisis—the fact that you cannot have rearmament and maintain the social services, the standard of living, and the export drive. We put forward a constructive policy and curiously enough the Liberal voter was only scared, not by Bevanism, but by the parody of Bevanism put out by the press.

"We must work out our program of the second stage of socialism, and there has been no constructive thinking in the movement since 1938 or 1939. Unless we can get a socialist wage policy, unless we are prepared to socialize the trade unions, we shall have no permanent socialism.

"I am not prepared to advocate further nationalization until I can see an answer to the problem of workers' control and workers' participation in the nationalized industries we have already. I am not depressed. I believe a period of Toryism will revive our faith and reinvigorate it with a little genuine passion; and with passion and vigor and a little clear thinking I believe that from this period of Toryism, not without pain and suffering, will emerge the second phase of British socialism."