

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 5, 1951

FIVE CENTS

Collier's GOES TO WAR
Or, How A-Bombs Brought Utopia

... page 6

Reuther's No-Strike-Pledge Line

... page 2

The Liberal Party's Halley Campaign

... page 3

Sugar Ray KOs Walter Winchell

... page 4

THE BRITISH ELECTION:

Tories In for Now; BLP Record Vote, Left-Wingers' Victory Point Way to Comeback

By ALBERT GATES

It seems odd to write of the electoral defeat of a party which emerged from an election as the largest party in the country. Yet on the basis of the British voting system, the Labor Party, with a larger popular vote than the Conservatives, sent 27 less of its candidates to Parliament.

The victory of the Conservative Party and its rather tarnished Victorian symbol, Winston Churchill, was not the result of his own lagging popularity, but of an unholy alliance with the Liberal Party, the one-time opponent of Toryism. It can be said that the Conservative Party is no longer what it once was under Bonar Law, Baldwin or Chamberlain; but neither is the Liberal Party any longer the representative of the once great party of Asquith and Lloyd George.

The Liberal Party abdicated. Therefore the Tories won. For some years it was being squeezed between the ever-increasing polarization of the classes in Great Britain, with both Conservative and Labor Parties contending for the leadership and support of the middle classes. In contesting only 100 district elections in 625 districts, it not only put its one-time enemy into office, but wrote fins to itself as an important political factor in British politics.

One correspondent pointed out that in running only 100 candidates for Parliament in this election, it guaranteed 200 district victories for the Conservatives. The fact that Clement Davies, spokesman for the Liberal Party, rejected Churchill's invitation to join the new cabinet, on the obviously spurious ground that he wished to maintain the independence of his party in the post-election period, speaks less for his aim than it does about Churchill's forthcoming difficulties.

How and why did it happen that the Liberal Party wrote its own death warrant? The answer can only be found in the particular and peculiar position of Great

Britain in the world today.

The party of "Free Trade" whose greatest advances coincided with those of the Empire has foundered since the end of the First World War pushed Great Britain down the scale of great powers. In this sharply divided class election, which emphasized the intensity of the class struggle on a British scale, the Liberal Party cast its lot and its future with the Tories. In joining hands with the party of monopoly capitalism in Great Britain, the party which bears the main responsibility for the depressed conditions of the middle class, the Liberal Party, will be fully repaid for its ignominious role.

THE CONTRAST WITH '45

This explains the mechanics of the Conservative victory, but it does not by any means go to the heart of the political situation, which is more important in explaining how the Labor Party failed in its efforts to continue to govern the country.

When the Labor Party came to power in 1945, it did so as the result of the boldest social program it had ever presented to the British people. The long years of the war had ended; the mass of people who supported Churchill during the war wanted nothing of him in peacetime. While this was a blow of unimaginable magnitude to this old Tory, the fact was that his party came into the election with nothing but its old program to challenge the bold, far-seeing program of the Labor Party which emphasized its intention of nationalizing the basic industries which had been brought to ruin by the monopolistic profit rule of British capitalism.

It was a program calculated to arouse the enthusiasm of the millions of workers and middle-class people who had had more than enough of Conservative domestic policy, characterized by the enrichment of a parasitic ruling class and impoverishment of the working and middle classes.

This enthusiasm was joined

He's No Hero to His People ...

As the British ballots were being counted and the returns indicated that Winston Churchill would assume office again, the CBS radio recorded the reactions of workers in the Merseyside area of England, the heavily industrialized, proletarian section around Manchester and Liverpool.

The commentator was "surprised" at the vigor, feeling and lack of conciliatory attitude in the replies to his question: "What do you think of Winston Churchill?"

"I don't think much of him. I think he is a warmonger. . . ."

"I think the world will suffer for it."

"After one term, hell be voted out."

"I think there will be fights and trouble in the working class."

"I think Winston Churchill is a warmonger."

"Winston Churchill is not a man for the peace or the people."

"I don't trust Mr. Churchill."

"I don't think much of Mr. Churchill. We've had enough of him. . . . He's a warmonger."

The simple and virtually unanimous replies are a sampling of what the election returns revealed. Class feelings are polarized as never before, and the label "warmonger" has stuck to Churchill.

Americans are accustomed to seeing the latter accorded the awe and praise due a man of heroic mold; among the workers of his own country, he is a prophet without honor.

with hope that the future was anything but dismal and that a planned society based upon the aim of improving the lot of the people as a whole could do what a disintegrating capitalist economy is incapable of doing.

In the early years of the Attlee government, the bold execution of the Labor Party program was accompanied by the immense joy and enthusiasm of the people. The nationalization of the long bankrupt coal industry, transport, railroads

and banking, the institution of a whole series of social improvements for the masses, provided the world with an experiment of incalculable significance and one worthy of support by the working class of the whole world.

This experiment took place in a deteriorating world situation where the outbreak of a new world atomic war threatened daily. The threat of such a war finally faced the Labor govern-

(Turn to last page)

NORMAN THOMAS AND THE THIRD CAMP

By MAX SHACHTMAN

Our idea of a "Third Camp," independent of American imperialism and of Stalinism, and opposed to them both, has met with all kinds of objections in the labor and socialist movements.

Our idea is wrong, we have been told by the official-Trotskyists (Cannonites), because there are and can be only two camps in the coming war (as in the last one) and in society as a whole: the camp of the working class and the camp of the capitalist class, the camp of the revolution and the camp of the reaction. The latter is represented by the United States; the former by Stalinist Russia and the other Stalinist countries. The place of every worker, every revolutionist, every socialist, every democrat is in the same camp with Stalinism—there is no room for such nonsense as a "Third Camp."

But since the Stalinist camp is a concentration camp, we have rudely declined to enter it,

even though all the property in the camp, its slaves included, is nationalized by the state.

Our idea is wrong, we have been told by any number of liberal and labor leaders, because the world is divided between those who want democracy and those who want totalitarianism. The former is adequately represented by the United States, and the latter by Russia. Washington threatens nobody, while the Kremlin threatens the entire world. The United States is the only force that can wage the war for the survival of democracy, and that's the camp all people of good will should enter and support. It alone has enough money, steel, oil, coal, aluminum, plutonium, troops, tanks, bombers, battleships to tell Stalin where to get off. Talk of a "Third Camp" is all right for academic theorists but not for practical people who are facing the genuine menace of being inundated by totalitarianism.

But since support of decaying capitalism by the workers' movement is precisely the reason, and the only reason worth talking about, why

Stalinism arose and grew to be the threat that it is, we have steadfastly refused to become part of the decay that generates Stalinism.

Our idea is wrong, we have been told, finally, by many ex-socialists who are being eaten alive by melancholy, pessimism and demoralization, not because it isn't a good idea, but because it is futile and utopian. If there were a Third Camp, with millions of supporters and large headquarters and lots of papers, we would not be the first to join it, to be sure, but as soon as it showed it has won or is about to win, we would quiver out of our desiccated skins and become its champions. We cannot, you understand, do anything to develop such a force. Having reached the ripe old age of twenty-seven or thirty-one, we are already worn out in our work for socialism and the working class. All we can hope for in our declining years is an armed victory by this most distasteful American capitalism over this most unendurable Stalinist totalitarianism. To this victory we are prepared to contribute almost everything: our gloom, our panic and, if need be, our cynicism.

Since it is no easy or pleasant matter to descend to

(Continued on page 7)

New Reuther Line Threatens to Tie UAW To No-Strike Pledge in the War Plants

Adopts Policy Previously Defeated by Union Convention

By P. JARMS

DETROIT, Oct. 27—A new line on the use of the strike weapon has come from the international executive board of the United Auto Workers (CIO). The new approach adopted on October 16 is, in essence, that in war plants locals shall abide by presidential directives stopping a strike and in "non-defense" plants strikes will be allowed to continue. When a strike is called off, the entire dispute is to be referred to the Wage Stabilization Board for decision on the merits of the case.

This new approach directly stems from Walter Reuther's position at the No-Strike Pledge Convention held in Grand Rapids in September 1944. The relevant section was: "The no-strike pledge will remain in effect in those plants wholly or partially engaged in war production. In those plants reconverted to the exclusive and sole manufacture of civilian production, the pledge of labor not to strike shall not be binding and the international executive board is empowered in accordance with the provisions of our constitution to authorize strike action where, in the interests of safeguarding and extending the rights of labor, such action is required."

TIMES HAVE CHANGED . . .

This position was crushed between those who then favored retaining the No-Strike Pledge (the Addes-Stalinist bloc) and the rank-and-file caucus which wanted the complete revocation of the wartime no-strike pledge.

But times have changed and Reuther now has an absolute majority; and the position that was overwhelmingly defeated seven years ago is taken out of the mothballs and dressed up and reported out as a "realistic approach."

The decision of the IEB came out of the issuance of directives by President Truman referring three strikes in progress to the Wage Stabilization Board. This action calls upon the union to abandon the strike and free collective bargaining and debate the issues of the strike before a commission appointed by the WSB. Failure to accede means that Truman, as in the railroad, miners' and copper strikes, would use the Taft-Hartley Act to break the strike.

The first of the three strikes concerns the Douglas Aircraft plants on the West Coast. The issue was an adequate wage increase to eliminate the wage differential between auto and aircraft, and between West Coast and East Coast aircraft rates. The strike was solid. It was featured everywhere, even by Life magazine. The idea in this strike as in all strikes of the past year was: NOW OR NEVER.

The Wright Aeronautical strike had as its main issue, besides a general increase, the elimination of the merit-spread provision. Merit-spread is the curse of the past in that the apple polishers and foremen's favorites get top rates first, and the regular guy gets tops only if he is a genius. The union wanted "automatic progression" whereby every few months a worker advances toward the top rate with a ceiling in three or four months. This procedure is accepted in the auto contracts.

BORG-WARNER STRIKE

The other strike is one against a defiant company by the UAW-CIO. The Borg-Warner strike is being conducted against one of the most reactionary companies in the country. They have over all the years resisted the UAW's program of a national agreement. The company's answer to the demand for a master contract always has been that all the companies that make up the parent company are independent subsidiaries and have no central direction. Bargaining locally has always meant bargaining by remote control, with none of the local managements able to negotiate anything without clearance from the main office of the company.

MORE ON REUTHER'S NO-STRIKE MOVE—

In Headlong Retreat Before Gov't Pressure

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Oct. 27—Pentagon officials, backed by President Truman, have demanded a no-strike pledge from unions, specifically the United Auto Workers (CIO), in all plants involving war work, and this development has served to climax the crucial dilemma of the Reuther leadership.

Already, the UAW-CIO leaders have called off two major strikes under government pressure. The plants involved were Douglas Aircraft in Long Beach, Calif., which had been shut down for over 45 days, and a one-month strike at Wright Aeronautical in Paterson, N. J.

At the moment the Truman administration has twice requested the UAW to call off another important strike, the Borg-Warner, which involves ten plants. The key issue in this walkout is the establishment of a national contract.

Pentagon officials blamed all lags in war work on the UAW, with a report that all out of 24 walkouts in war plants were directed by the UAW. The Pentagon utilized the occasion of the retreat of the UAW leaders in the aircraft situation to try to turn it into a rout.

Of course, at the last convention of the union in April a resolution against any no-strike pledge was passed. And only recently in his speech to 500 UAW leaders in Detroit, Walter Reuther militantly proclaimed, "When we're right, we'll strike!"

This year was the year to establish a national agreement on pensions, hospital and medical-care programs, and general wage matters.

The Borg-Warner strike has been weakened by local settlements at two Indiana plants. The international UAW leadership tried everything to convince the locals of unified action but local leaders in an unprincipled manner forced local settlements and are working while the rest of the chain is striking.

THE NEW LINE

The IEB, faced with the presidential directive, moved that the Douglas and Wright workers be asked to comply because of the "defense" situation, and that the Borg-Warner strike be continued.

It states:

"In view of the facts that (a) the production being impeded by the Borg-Warner strike is overwhelmingly civilian in character and (b) none of the defense items involved have been shown to be in any way critical in connection with current military needs, the UAW-CIO International Executive Board sees no valid reason to request the workers involved to recess their strike.

"We respectfully request President Truman to reconsider certification of the UAW-CIO dispute to Borg-Warner in the light of the full facts on the proportion and nature of its defense production which we do not believe were available to the president at the time he certified the cases to the WSB, and to withdraw certification on the basis of these facts so that the normal processes of collective bargaining can be resorted to in resolving this dispute.

"In the event President Truman finds the interruption of production by Borg-Warner of any defense items is, in fact, injuring the defense effort and that such work cannot be handled by other corporations, UAW-CIO will be willing to work out with the appropriate government agencies practical arrangements, to effect resumption of production of these items while the strike remains in full effect with respect to the corporation's civilian products.

"In the interests of promoting sound collective bargaining, on which in the long pull industrial stability must rest, we urge the president to instruct the appropriate government agencies to redirect their efforts toward removing the basic obstacle to production in the Borg-Warner Corporation to accept its responsibilities by abandoning its recalcitrance and bargaining in good faith on a national agreement in conformity with the established practice in its industry."

To retreat gracefully to a Truman directive may be good politics if one's politics is to protect one's presidential candidate before the workers' eyes. However, the worker in the shop needs militant representation and not political maneuvering with the Fair Deal.

THE T-H ISSUE

The other question, and a much more important one, is the use of the Taft-Hartley injunction. The auto workers have heard of a lot of bad things about the T-H Law but have never actually felt it on their own backs.

ARBITRATION NOW?

The tone of this statement is one wholly out of character with the UAW. It surely should be seen that one of the advantages John L. Lewis has is that he never allows himself to beg for anything; and with Reuther devoting full time these days to wiping out pro-Lewis sentiment in the UAW, he will not gain any new supporters by that approach. Truman of course, rejected the whole plea without any ceremony.

If the policy is carried out it means that to a considerable extent collective bargaining becomes a thing of the past and that compulsory arbitration is with us. The character of the WSB and the appointments to head up the commissions of inquiry in the Wright and Douglas strikes makes this obvious. Professor Harry Shulman of Ford arbitration fame has the Wright case; and Ralph Seaward, formerly of GM and Inter-

strike remains in full effect with respect to the corporation's civilian products.

Is it a wonder that the chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board, Nathan P. Feinsinger, immediately requested again that the UAW call off its strike? After all, whether or not Borg-Warner is or isn't doing "war work" is a "military secret," isn't it, and that's a military question, not a union question, say the brass in Washington.

Thus, long before any war emergency, the UAW, in contradistinction to any other major union in America, finds itself retreating headlong in its major war policies. Even Phil Murray's steel workers probably will do better than that in forthcoming negotiations!

What effect the calling off of the two aircraft strikes will have on the UAW's organizing drives in that field remains to be seen.

IN RETREAT

In the first reply to President Truman on his request that the UAW call off the Borg-Warner strike, the UAW adopted a formula which commits the union to a no-strike pledge in war plants.

The UAW statement says: "In the event President Truman finds that interruption of Borg-Warner production of any defense items is in fact injuring the defense effort, and that such work cannot be handled by other corporations, the UAW will be willing to work out with the appropriate government agencies practical arrangements to effect resumption of production of those items while the

national Harvester, has the Douglas case. The companies now can afford the phony excuse of patriotic motives to prevent the workers from obtaining their justified demands. Arbitration is, after all, horse trading and never gets the union as much as direct strength can, as is clear especially when one views last year's great gains in the John Deere and UAW International Harvester strikes.

To retreat gracefully to a Truman directive may be good politics if one's politics is to protect one's presidential candidate before the workers' eyes. However, the worker in the shop needs militant representation and not political maneuvering with the Fair Deal.

THE T-H ISSUE

The other question, and a much more important one, is the use of the Taft-Hartley injunction. The auto workers have heard of a lot of bad things about the T-H Law but have never actually felt it on their own backs.

The trade-union leadership throughout the country, including the UAW's, has not adequately explained Truman's use of the T-H club in the past strikes. Reuther, to be sure, for the record issued a statement in the copper strike but never went further in bringing the matter to the ranks.

Posing this issue in the three strikes as sharply as possible would also have helped in the final settlement. It would also place the status of free collective bargaining before the entire trade-union movement.

The IEB has not acted in the interests of the workers in these three strikes. The same stand that was taken on the Borg-Warner Corporation was also indicated for the Wright and Douglas workers. Justice for the auto workers' needs will not be accomplished by allowing the matter to go to compulsory arbitration and praying for a good settlement.

strike, this opposition local will certainly make political hay.

CRISIS TO CRISIS

The serious character of the crisis in UAW policies was indicated by the fact that it took two days of sessions of the top policy committee to reply to the second Truman request for calling off the Borg-Warner strike. (How cruel can politics be! Their boy Truman, the man they want to support in 1952, doing this to them!)

UAW officials informed the Wage Stabilization Board that they would call off the strike "if it can first be agreed that the dispute is single in nature and that one final agreement shall result covering all ten plants."

The UAW publicity department described this as a further retreat, since the union under this offer would send all striking workers back on civilian contracts as well as war work.

Meanwhile, in the Detroit area, layoffs continue slowly to increase the unemployment lines, now estimated to contain over 100,000 workers, and the unrest, dissatisfaction and bitterness in the shops grows apace.

In the face of these events of great magnitude, the UAW leadership flounders from crisis to crisis, its chief concern and its most violent hatred and animosity directed not toward the forces responsible for the tragic situation but toward any and all critics in the UAW, even if all they do is merely state the facts of the crisis.

The Halley Campaign and the Liberal Party: Vigorous Electioneering at Top on Gangbusting Won't Build Party

By PETER WHITNEY

NEW YORK, Oct. 29—While we have justly signaled the progressive step which the Liberal Party took in putting its own candidate in the field against the hacks of the Democratic and Republican Parties, in the election for president of the City Council, the character of the party's campaign for its candidate Rudolph Halley has also quite confirmed the criticisms which we made at the same time. [See LABOR ACTION for August 27—Ed.]

As we stated then: "Nominating its own candidate for the outstanding office represents progress for the Liberal Party—slow, tiny, anxiously respectable, but progress. Socialists who, like ourselves, will unhesitatingly vote for its independent candidates, including Halley, and call upon all workers to vote for them, do so not because of the candidate the party leadership has selected, but in spite of him; and not because of the kind of political campaign that is at present indicated and will very likely be conducted until November, but in spite of it."

In point of fact, the election campaign has made clear that the Liberal Party's step in putting up its own candidate has not been followed by further policies which could effectively utilize this to build the Liberal Party, regardless of the final vote which Halley may pull. And this is so not only because the main if not exclusive emphasis of Halley's campaign has been gang-busting instead of a positive program to arouse the labor and liberal masses of New York around the Liberal Party.

In general, the Liberal Party itself has been soft-pedaled throughout the period although it is the majesty of Halley's campaign and the active force behind the two other electoral devices supporting Halley—the City Fusion Party and the "Independent Party."

WON'T BUILD PARTY
The campaign has been run on a city-wide scale, with the major emphasis on television and radio appearances by the candidate, rather than local activities and campaigning which could be used to build the local assembly district clubs of the Liberal Party into more solid organizations.

Since the clubs are aroused from their passive—and in some cases lethargic—state mostly around election time, the failure to involve the clubs in this campaign means a further delay in building the kind of political force in New York City which functions from day to day in behalf of the working people on a local scale. Even where some local campaigns are being run, these do not get the indicated support and attention of the Liberal Party leadership because all strength is being thrown behind Halley.

Nor does Halley's campaign as an "independent" help in the process of building up the concept and organization of the Liberal Party as the party for New York laborites and liberals.

Here again the short-sightedness of the Liberal Party leadership is revealed. Halley has been getting excellent publicity in the city press, and were the campaign more closely tied in with a plan to consolidate the party clubs and union groupings, the Liberal Party could be making great strides organizationally, rather than serving as Halley's vehicle

with the dim hope of future rewards trickling down.

SIDESTEPPING

As for Halley's campaign itself, it is entering its final stage and Halley continues to play the role of the shining knight in armor, crusading to rescue the fair city of New York from the evil grip of corruption and gangsterism. Halley forthrightly denounces the links between Tammany Hall and the criminal underworld and calls for an end to mobster Frank Costello's iron rule.

Halley is eloquent indeed on publicizing the truth about mob rule in New York and its partner-in-crime, the Democratic organization. But for a candidate of the Liberal Party and of substantial trade unions he is strangely silent on a host of city problems which have arisen during the course of the past few weeks. It is high time that he made his position clear on these problems vitally important to the labor movement of New York City. It is highly doubtful, to say the least, whether sidestepping these problems brings him votes, but what is certain—and what is of much greater concern—is that it does the Liberal Party itself no good.

When the workers of the Sanitation Department staged a slowdown under the leadership of their union in their fight to get a 40-hour week, the department heads retaliated with several repressive steps against the workers involved. Where was Halley's ringing voice to speak out for the city employees in their fight for the long overdue 40-hour week? Instead he mumbled weakly about the necessity of having a com-

mission to study the question and that men of good will could surely settle the question.

Although the official CIO and AFL City Councils have endorsed the Democratic Party candidate, Joseph Sharkey, for council president, important and influential unions have endorsed Halley, and he has made a strong attempt to get still further support from the labor movement. What better wedge could he find to drive between the CIO and AFL and their candidate, Sharkey, than to come out squarely in support of the sanitation workers and pin Sharkey to the wall?

SILENT ON STRIKE

Still another and even more important opportunity has been thrown away by Halley to win the rank and file of labor to his banner. For two weeks the dock workers of New York have been engaged in a heroic strike against both their reactionary Ryan leadership and the gangsters controlling the New York waterfront. The list of the mobsters involved, headed by Anthony Anastasia of Murder, Inc., reads like a who's who of New York's gangsterism. These are no small fry but the big-time operators themselves and their men.

Gang-buster Halley rises to the occasion with—silence, deep and profound, from his corner. Where are the television appearances and the radio speeches in support of these workers, backing their attempt to rid themselves of these vicious leeches? It might be considered strange that a candidate campaigning almost exclusively on the issue of corruption and gangsterism should become totally silent when 20,000 dock workers de-

mand to clean up their docks and their union.

Surely the labor movement which is behind Halley has a right to demand that he declare himself behind the strikers. Only in this way can he widen his labor support and win the rank and file of the CIO and the AFL. Among the unions backing him are the Ladies Garment Workers, the International Association of Machinists, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Paper and Pulp Workers, and the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Workers Union.

These unions ought to demand that Halley declare himself unequivocally on such issues as the sanitation workers' fight for the 40-hour week and the dock workers' struggle against the unholy alliance of a rotten union leadership and mobsters. Halley should become the ringing spokesman for the right of the city's policemen to organize their own union, as well as for strengthening the hand of city employees in collective bargaining with the city administration. His cautious pussy-footing policy in the hope of winning votes will never convince unionists that he is really their candidate. Even from the most practical point of view, i.e., votes, a pronounced pro-labor and pro-union stand could win Halley thousands of votes and cut the ground from under Sharkey.

The Liberal Party's step forward remains as such, but it also remains hesitant and partial. It will take further experiences before the party is ready to shape a policy of action consistent with its first independent candidacy for high city office.

Ryan Scabherding Fails against Dock Strike

By BEN HALL

NEW YORK, Oct. 30—Striking longshoremen continue to tie up the Port of New York after fifteen days of a work stoppage which began on October 15. This movement can hardly be called a "wildcat" strike any longer; it is a powerful uprising of the rank and file of the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA).

It is organized and led by a group of local officials of the New York area, headed by John Sampson of the lower West Side Chelsea local. It has gained the support of ILA locals in Boston and Baltimore. Two officials of the Philadelphia local, which so far has remained passive, came to New York for a conference with Sampson and announced that they had been "misinformed" about the issues involved, presumably by Ryan, lifetime ILA president and chief enemy of the strike in the union.

This strike, which remains solid, is directed against the leadership of Ryan, against the shipping companies, against the gangsters who infest the industry, and against the wage formulas of the Wage Stabilization Board. It is clearly the most powerful and most stubborn strike movement of the rank and file and secondary leadership, acting in defiance of one of the most

traitorous top officialdoms that weseed in a state board of mediators to see if they can patch everything up. Naturally, the strikers can expect little from such a board, but the very fact of its entry on the scene is a slap at Ryan who assured the world that the strike was ending rapidly.

SUPPORT BY COMMITTEE
A "prominent citizens" committee headed by the former ambassador to Argentina, Spruille Braden, calling itself the New York City Anti-Crime Committee, intervened by calling upon Dewey for action against "inefficiency, crime, and political corruption" on the metropolitan waterfront.

Needless to say, it sees these sins and evils not in the actions of the strikers but in the record of their opponents. A committee statement attributed the strike to resentment against control of the piers by "gangsters and venal politicians."

It charged that the ILA leadership was "dominated by mobsters" who give the union members "no opportunity to get a hearing on their grievances." The statement refused charges that the Communist Party was participating in the direction of the strike and insisted that the "vast majority of the longshoremen are decent, God-fearing and patriotic citizens who have repeatedly demonstrated their abhorrence of communism."

If anything, this is an understatement. One group of strikers met at their local headquarters where they were blessed by a Catholic priest. From there, they moved to the 50th Street piers to battle police and Ryan's strike-breakers.

The New York Steamship Association, organization of the shipping companies, in an open letter to Ryan, announced that it would not reopen negotiations on the contract which touched off the strike. This was merely its way

of announcing support to Ryan. The companies have filed "unfair labor practice" charges against the striking locals, bringing the NLRB into the picture. It remains to be seen if its authority will give aid and comfort to the would-be strikebreakers, gangster-led.

TRUMAN'S ROLE

The only group of officially honest, liberal and fair-minded men who pretend ignorance of the real issues in dispute are the representatives of President Truman. Truman himself called upon the strikers to return to work without bothering to concern himself with such trifles as this: Who will protect the strikers and militants against the gangsters if they simply end their walkout?

The strike leaders replied: How about setting up a special committee to hear our grievances? Truman lapsed into silence.

A Federal Mediation Commission brought its useless labors to an end by issuing a simple declaration calling for a work-return and a recognition of the sanctity of the contract signed by the ILA and the shipping companies. When the strikers replied that the results of the membership referendum on the contract had been falsified by Ryan, that only a small percentage of the actual votes had been counted, the commission replied in its most dignified manner—by leaving town.

A great "back-to-work" movement announced by Joe Ryan turned out to be a great big bust. On Sunday, October 28, he boasted that he would break the strike on Monday. His men were going to work, so he said, and no picket line would stop them. "The Port of New York is now open," he said. His loyal supporters would "go through and over the picket lines, but never around them." Monday came but Ryan's strike-breakers never showed up.

After a full mobilization he was able to round up only 100 men by Monday afternoon to work only one pier. And there they met over 200 pickets. The strikebreakers were saved from annihilation only when 200 policemen held back pickets and permitted them to go to work. The same 200 police were needed to protect their retreat in the late afternoon. "At this rate," wrote Murray Kemp-ton in the Post, "all poor Joe [Ryan] needs is 40,000 cops and his problems are over."

WHERE WE STAND

To get acquainted with the ideas of Independent Socialism, send for the special issues of LABOR ACTION listed below:

May Day Issue 1950

THE PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM OF INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

May Day Issue 1951

INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

Ten Cents Each

LABOR ACTION, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

IN BERKELEY
SYL Class on Marxism: Its Meaning Today
 Sundays at 8 p.m.
 Nov. 4: Contemporary Critics of Marxism.
 Nov. 11: Marxism—Its Meaning Today.
 2308 Durant, Apt. 5

IN NEW YORK
SYL Hallowe'en Party
 Saturday, Nov. 3
 Games, Dancing, Refreshments, and that great dramatic production, "Dear Comrade," an original portrayal of Life in These United Fronts.
LABOR ACTION HALL
 114 West 14 Street

Los Angeles Readers:
 The new address of the Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League in Los Angeles is:
 P. O. Box 2571
 Terminal Annex
 Los Angeles 54, Calif.

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.

Sugar Ray KOs Walter Winchell

By PHILIP COBEN

The Stork Club isn't the most important front in the fight against Jim Crow, to be sure, but Josephine Baker has done a service in demonstrating how to react against racism no matter where you find it. As a habitual non-frequenter of Sherman Billingsley's snob paradise, we were somewhat surprised to find out that his anti-Negro (and anti-Semitic) reputation was even well known among his clientele. We think it's a good thing that it was challenged at last even though the breakdown of racial barriers there won't directly extend the dining possibilities for the Negro people in Harlem or Atlanta. It's an example and it's encouragement to go after less tinsel banquets. We're interested to see that it took a celebrity from France's less polluted atmosphere to get the other celebrities on the picket line that was organized on East 53rd Street by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Where were the others who have been basking all this time in the atmosphere of the American Way of Life?

Perhaps part of the answer to that is supplied by a by-product of L'Affaire Baker, which may be even more useful in its effects than any slap on the wrist that Billingsley's celebrity showcase may get from his friend Mayor Impelleretti. That's the angle involving Walter Winchell, who regards J. Edgar Hoover as the greatest man he ever saw through a keyhole.

It also involves Sugar Ray Robinson, a good friend of Winchell's, who wasn't even aiming at his pal when he delivered one to where the latter's guts ought to be. Whereas Joe Louis had immediately wired La Baker to count on him for financial support in any action she might undertake against the Stork Club (he was in training camp at the time), Sugar Ray seemed to be dodging at first. Now he's made a clean breast of it.

It was Winchell who tried to get Sugar Ray into Billingsley's corner. Winchell claims that he had left the Stork Club before the Baker episode; but whether he witnessed the incident or not, the fact is that since then he has consistently refused to attack Billingsley and has instead concentrated his vilification against Baker and her friends, while protesting that he is one of the best friends the Negro people were ever fortunate enough to have.

Robinson now reveals that Winchell had talked him out of helping Baker. Winchell had said: "You know I don't agree with Sherman Billingsley's policy but although I've known him for 23 years, I would have had to break with him had I seen anything being done to Miss Baker because of her color."

Some of His Best Friends Are Etc.

The funny thing, though, is that Winchell never had any lack of knowledge about Billingsley's or the Stork Club's racism. It was Winchell who had told Robinson about the situation at the club long before the present:

"I called him [Winchell] up once and told him I'd meet him down at the Stork Club," recounts Sugar Ray, "and he said, 'I wish you wouldn't. Champ, Sherman Billingsley doesn't like Negroes, and he doesn't want them in his place, and if you came down there and he insulted you, I'd have to break with him although I've known him for 23 years.'"

Engrave these words upon a tablet, wreathe it with scallions and place it forever under a portrait of WW with the caption "Fearless Fighter Against All Un-American Doctrines."

I can't look, pleads Winchell, I might get mad.
Or: Please don't provoke this race-hater into doing his stuff before my very eyes, so that I can't pretend it doesn't exist.

Or: Sure, I'm against Jim Crow—look how I advise my Negro friends to avoid discrimination.

Or as the Colonel Winchells say down South: *Ouah race relations ah fine down heah, sah, I do decla', as long as the niggahs stay wheeah they belong.*

But Sugar Ray finally spoke up. He announced that he was going to demand in the Damon Runyan Cancer Fund Committee that Billingsley (a prominent member) be kicked off unless he "cleared up this situation immediately."

It would appear that at least part of Sugar Ray's resolution came from what we like to call mass pressure. His own public was giving him a hard time, even to such a foolhardy extent as the following incident which he recounts:

"Just the other night I was walking up the avenue and a fellow came up and grabbed me up around the neck and demanded to know, 'You're Ray Robinson. Just where do you stand on this Jo Baker matter?' I had to tell him, 'Daddy-O, ungather my drygoods or I'll have to let you have it.'"

Instead he let Winchell have it, as gently as possible, because they're pals. In fact, Walter just kind of got in the way of his left hook at the rascalioneous Billingsley.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 45 November 5, 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: WAlkins 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, GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Asst. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIX

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

SUICIDE BY OIL, by Marcelle Michelin.—The Nation, Oct. 27.

The Iranian dispute fixed U. S. attention on its own backward oil wells in Venezuela, for fear that nationalist ideas might prove contagious. This article throws some light on what has been happening in Venezuela economically under the impetus of its oil boom.

"Foremost oil exporter and second largest oil producer in the world after the United States . . . Venezuela, while flooded with American dollars, is paradoxically undergoing a major economic crisis. In fact, its economic well-being is threatened by the very petroleum production that finances two-thirds of its national budget and pays for more than five hundred million dollars' worth of annual imports from the United States. Venezuelan economists . . . are warning that the nation is living on borrowed time and that unless it divorces its destiny from oil it will be committing economic suicide."

In brief, the trouble is an old one in countries whose resources are exploited for the benefit of a foreign economy, with a small native ruling class skimming some of the takings. The Venezuelan economy has grown so full of disproportions as to be monstrously lopsided.

That applies in the first place as between the classes.

"Venezuela appears extravagantly wealthy. Caracas, the magnificent capital, has a pulse-quickening 'get-rich-quick' atmosphere. But the Venezuelans to whom black gold has meant a better way of life are the fortunate minority of

the cities and oil camps—landowners, businessmen, factory hands, government employees, corporation bureaucrats. The people of the pueblos and the fishing villages go on laboriously wresting what sustenance they can from earth and water."

The economists, however, would be less perturbed if that were all. Even as far as the new rich classes are concerned, the economic situation is full of danger. The puffed-up economy rests on a thin column of oil; the newly gained wealth has gone into the pockets of the wealthy; there has been no diversification of the economy for any long-range prosperity; everything is topheavy.

" . . . this land still produces food for only 2,000,000; but the population has more than doubled, and the national budget has been multiplied by twenty. . . ."

"There is an illusion of well-being, a surface prosperity without foundations to sustain the future. Such a nation does not develop in a normal rhythm; it is pressured by an outer force into an expansion beyond its potential. Venezuela's whole economy is a parasite on oil, with its artificial prices, artificial markets, artificial purchasing power. Prices have soared beyond all reason."

It is no new observation that the relationship of dependence upon an outside imperialism is almost equally noxious for an underdeveloped country whether it is squeezed to death or whether it falls onto a bonanza. The future of Venezuela may be mirrored in Bolivia, with its tin economy and American-manufactured crises.

THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY ON THE HOME FRONT

By MEL HACKER

Ohio State University's faculty and students are engaged in a fight for academic freedom which is rapidly achieving the proportions of the loyalty-oath issue at the University of California. This summer Dr. Harold Rugg, professor emeritus of Teachers College, Columbia University, accepted an invitation to speak before the student body. Immediately after his address several Columbus papers raised the cry of "Why Rugg?" (Dr. Rugg is considered in some quarters an "educational radical.")

Soon after this, the governor-appointed Board of Trustees adopted a gag rule requiring all proposed campus speakers to be cleared with Dr. Howard Bevis, college president, for loyalty and background screening. When a Quaker pacifist, Dr. Cecil Hinshaw, was denied permission to speak to a Fellowship of Reconciliation group, campus fears over thought-control were aroused. The faculty swung into action.

Headed by Dean Donald P. Cottrell the faculty of the College of Education unanimously urged the trustees to rescind the gag regulation. The University Faculty Council, the University Religious Council and community, student and religious leaders supported this action. Methodist Bishop Werner called the regulation a step toward rule by fear.

Then the second bombshell exploded. The Board of Trustees demanded that all faculty-sponsored questionnaires be cleared by the president. No reason was advanced for this ruling. Faculty members saw a direct connection between the gag rule and the questionnaire issue. They both intruded upon the rights of free speech and free inquiry. Dean Cottrell noted that the two rulings showed a distrust of faculty intelligence and integrity and prevented the faculty from carrying out their own professional and academic duties.

SCHOLARS IN STRAITJACKET

Faculty spokesmen charged that these rulings would be injurious to the institution. Prominent speakers would not go through the degrading process of being screened in order to speak on campus. Dr. Milton McClean,

coordinator of religious activities, disclosed that unless the trustees' ruling was changed the Religion in Life Week scheduled for Jan. 11-18 would be canceled. The vagueness of the regulations made it impossible to know who would obtain permission to speak. Professor David Spitz of the political science department asked if Dr. Rugg's books as well as his ideas would be banned. Where would the pressure for thought-conformity lead next?

Physical Society, the Society for American Archeology and the Central States scheduled at Ohio State University would probably not be held there. Every speaker who read a paper, appeared in a panel discussion or participated in any other way would have to be cleared by Dr. Bevis. Faculty educators decided these groups would not accept such censorship stipulations.

Trustee-faculty conferences are taking place. Brigadier General Carlton S. Dargusch, chairman of the Board of Trustees, declared that "As long as I'm a member of the board of trustees, no Communist, fellow traveler, fascist or Nazi is going to have an invitation to speak here." The faculty is eager to settle the issue but apparently is in no mood to compromise with basic principles.

Resisting trends in a number of Southern states that have admitted Negro students to their colleges, Georgia, South Carolina and Florida white-supremacy advocates have threatened to abolish public education altogether rather

than see it democratized. Florida's Board of Control for Education recently retaliated against Florida Negroes who refused to accept makeshift and un-accredited law, pharmacy and engineering schools hurriedly established at the Negro State College at Tallahassee. They voted to discontinue the allocation of tuition funds to Florida Negroes who wish to pursue, in out-of-state institutions, studies not available to Negroes in Florida. The Florida Supreme Court has also defied a United States Supreme Court decision upsetting Jim Crow on the Miami municipal golf course.

At Fairmont State College (West Virginia) campus liberals fighting American Legion attacks on "subversive" books and staff personnel voted against requests that college librarians stamp as subversive all books so labeled by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The farcical indictment against four individuals who supported the rights of Harvey Clark, a Negro bus driver, to move into the all-white community of Cicero, Illinois, was dismissed by a Chicago judge last week. The indictment, charging them with conspiracy to incite to riot and devalue property was thrown out for lack of evidence. "There is no law on the statute books," stated the judge, "which makes it a criminal offense to conspire to devalue property." Meanwhile no action has been taken against those behind the Cicero riots.

S. F. BAY AREA — Hear MAX SHACHTMAN

on
The Struggle for World Power
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 23 at 8 p.m.
NORWAY HALL, 3829 Piedmont Avenue
OAKLAND

Youth and Student Corner

Report on the Student Federalist Convention

By HENRY GALE

PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 23—In its convention in Philadelphia, Oct. 19-21, the former youth section of the United World Federalists confirmed its split with the parent group by establishing itself as a fully independent federalist organization. It adopted as its name the somewhat flamboyant title "World Order Realized through Law and Democracy," the initials of which spell out "W.O.R.L.D."

The basic problem confronting the new organization was: how to establish an appealing, dynamic, and progressive policy within the framework of federalist ideology and tradition. The form it took at Philadelphia was that of a discussion on relative emphasis: Which should have greater weight in the program—the demand for world government or demands for "social justice"?

This formulation differentiates the tendencies within the federalist movement. The leadership of UWF would unhesitatingly answer that what is all-important is world government and that including anything else in its program would be at best a useless diversion and at worst could scare away powerful elements that might otherwise support world government.

At Philadelphia, this position was without defenders. There was virtual unanimity as to the need for a bold social program if the movement is to have any chance of growth. At the same time, there was a very widespread reluctance to give up the old federalist slogans or to abandon its emphasis on world government. This difficulty was met by retaining the demand for world government as a "primary purpose" of W.O.R.L.D., while simultaneously putting forward a series of principles none of which are directly related to world government.

RADICAL PROGRAM

It is these principles which best denote the character of W.O.R.L.D. and the prospects inherent in it. The most important are: Support to the struggle of colonial peoples to govern themselves; support of the right of peoples to control their own economic destinies; elimination of all forms of political, racial, and religious discrimination, and opposition to "the present attack on civil liberties in the U. S."

These points, of course, can be found in many liberal programs, without very special significance. But when combined with the radical aspects of federalist ideology, it acquires a greater meaning. For when other liberals proposed a program of this sort, it has been vitiated by the needs of American imperialism, whose support in the world power struggle occupies a pre-eminent part of their program. The federalists, on the other hand, are not committed to the support of either bloc. Indeed the logic of their position requires opposition to both. Therefore, they are capable of taking a more consistent position in support of these principles.

This is the promise of the new organization. Its fulfillment depends on development in the direc-

tion pointed by Philadelphia. Before evaluating the work of the convention, a glance at the basic federalist ideology is in order. This movement for world government, which first came into being on a significant scale after World War II, is based in essence on recognition of the fact that the growth of modern technology has made the political organization of the world along lines of absolute national sovereignty historically obsolete.

The federalists took as their starting point rejection of the sovereignty of the national state. To reject the authority of the state, however, means eventually to reject the claim to authority of the class it represents and the status quo which it defends.

This, then, is the radical aspect of federalist doctrine, which is contradicted by the demand for immediate world government. The latter proposal recognizes the status quo in all countries as the basis on which an immediate world government is to be erected. The prevalence of this utopian form of the federalist idea is no accident. It is the only form in which federalism can remain an acceptable ideology to "powerful interests."

STUDENTS UNPREPARED

Yet, when a split approached, the initiative was found to lie in the hands of UWF. The issue was precipitated by UWF's dismissal of virtually the entire student staff and by its proposal to liquidate the Student Division into the main organization. As Lustig put it, "In plain words then, we are being faced with the choice of being swallowed up or of getting out. And in view of the somewhat one-sided appeal of the alternatives it is probably not wrong to say that we are being thrown out."

This "arrogant" behavior of UWF had a dual effect on the federalist youth. On the credit side, it solidified the youth in its determination to maintain its independence, so that its leadership, at any rate, remained intact during the critical period of the new organization's birth. This advantage, however, was paid for by the fact that the youth had thoroughly prepared neither the organizational nor the political basis for the split.

BASIS OF THE SPLIT

This contradictory aspect of federalism has been present throughout the movement's history and was at the bottom of the several early splits. However, it did not come to the surface until the intensification of inter-imperialist antagonisms had posed its problems unavoidably, and even then was never formulated with any clarity until the split at the Des Moines convention of the UWF.

If it is one of the outstanding peculiarities of the development that the split took place more on a "horizontal" line than a "vertical" one. In spite of the presence of serious political issues, it was the Student Division which broke away, while no split took place within the adult UWF. This is attributable to the almost completely upper and middle-class character of UWF.

The real nature of the antagonism between the student and adult divisions of UWF was well expressed in one of the most significant documents put out by the youth, *Toward a New Student Federalist Organization* by H. Lustig. The writer characterizes

the youth thus: "The student leaders are politically often left of center; . . . they are almost uniformly quickened by the desire to make the world over in the image of economic and social justice for all races and peoples."

As to the adults, on the other hand, "The leadership of the corporation [UWF] is more or less strongly influenced by conservative businessmen. . . . They envision, in many cases, a world government as the only agency capable of preserving the status quo for America and for their economic class."

This gap had steadily widened throughout the history of UWF. That period had been one of continual adult-youth tension, which had at times reached such dimensions that several of the largest student chapters were threatened with expulsion for violating discipline in taking such actions as fighting "anti-subversive" legislation (University of Illinois) or supporting a labor candidate in an election (University of Chicago).

WEAK COMPROMISES

In the absence of any solid left-wing tendency, the convention delegates were dominated by the desire to conciliate all differences which might lead to defections. Everyone seemed cognizant of the fact that a recently split group is subject to disintegrative effects from internal dissension and the heterogeneity of political tendencies present served to point up this feeling. The result was a policy of continual compromise to the point where it was sometimes difficult to discern any real content in the vague resolutions on behalf of justice, freedom and so forth. In the long run this will serve to weaken rather than strengthen the new movement.

The advantage which the new federalist organization has over traditional liberal movements is its refusal to take sides in the cold war and its rejection of the power politics of imperialism. However, in its desire not to "alienate" any present or potential support, the convention refused to take a position of concrete opposition to both the American and Russian policies. It also refused specifically to condemn Stalinist totalitarianism. This was not the result of any serious illusions about Stalinism but was opposed on the basis that it might seem to give support to the U. S. bloc.

Yet, these defects should not be overemphasized. They are not inherent in the political basis of W.O.R.L.D. but represent a remnant of the past stage in the movement's history. The course set at Philadelphia, if it is carried through, can overcome it. In a period when every liberal youth group in the country is in the process of accommodating itself to cold-war pressures, the new federalist organization represents a distinct move in the opposite direction. Socialists can only welcome this and seek wherever possible to collaborate with the new movement on questions of civil liberties and political action.

Labor Action FORUM • New York

Thursday, November 8, at 8:30 p.m.

AFTER THE BRITISH ELECTION

Speaker:

ALBERT GATES

Secretary, ISL

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

What Is INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM?

For information and literature about the Independent Socialist League, write:
114 W. 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

114 W. 14th St.

New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.

I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

NAME
ADDRESS
SCHOOL (IF STUDENT)
CITY ZONE STATE

By HAL DRAPER

Collier's magazine has pulled off what its editors no doubt consider to be a glamorous journalistic stunt in its October 27 number. The entire issue is devoted to accounts by various well-known writers of the Third World War and its aftermath, written from the vantage point of 1960 in social-science-fiction form, under the head of "Russia's Defeat and Occupation, 1952-1960."

Says the preface by the editors of Collier's: "We do not think that war is inevitable. We are emphatically opposed to any suggestion of a 'preventive' war." Seeking further to take the curse off the manifest impact of the issue as a whole, they use the running title "Preview of the War We Do Not Want." The whole thing, they emphasize, is a warning to Stalin—the dearly sought object is peace.

The intent can perhaps be granted to them. If the result strikes many (including the Nation) virtually as "war-mongering," that is implicit in the given view of their road to peace. For Collier's contribution to the fight for peace is simply to shake the big stick at Stalin: *We'll smash you to smithereens in the next war, it is boasting—You can't beat our atom bombs.*

This is the full extent of Collier's self-styled "appeal to the reason of Joseph Stalin and the men around him." This is what is supposed to "have an effect on the course of history"—to quote Robert E. Sherwood, who is also the leading contributor to the Collier's phantasmagoria. To be sure, this brandishing of the A-bomb as a contribution to peace is also the main content of the "peaceful" thinking of the Truman administration and its Republican rivals. Collier's is not alone. It has merely made the picture over-true.

If liberals think that Collier's is "warmongering," they would do well to ask themselves whether Truman and Acheson have had anything very different to say.

Washington Okayed It

Presumably Collier's cover picture is also designed to scare Stalin into peace. It depicts an American soldier with fixed bayonet standing guard over an occupied Russia. "We are prepared to believe that the editors of Collier's do not have the slightest conception of what such a picture will mean not to Stalin but to the peoples under Stalin. It strikes the keynote of American domination and American chauvinism which reeks out of every article in the issue."

This war atrocity by the editors of Collier's cannot be passed off as the aberration of one magazine or simply a fantasy. For one thing, it is revealed that the whole idea was cleared through Washington: "Our over-all conception of this issue was confirmed in study and consultation with top political, military and economic thinkers—including high-level Washington officials and foreign-affairs experts, both here and abroad."

For another thing, the accessories-before-the-fact (the contributors) represent an interesting array of prominent personalities, who must carry joint responsibility.

For the contributors, the picture of the Third World War is partly childish fantasy and partly political self-revelation. It is the latter we are interested in. The articles tell more about the ideas in their heads now than about things to come.

From the vantage point of 1960, none of the contributors sees any attempt to combat Stalinism in advance of the war except through the piling up of military strength. None, including Walter Reuther, even mentions any role played by Point Four projects or other proposed alternatives to all-out atomic destruction. None even mentions any role played by dissatisfaction behind the Iron Curtain as a deterrent to the war. All "peace" projects were a failure—except the A-bombs.

Utopia via A-Bombs

The moral is clear. There is no hope in a POLITICAL offensive against Stalinism. A world of peace, happiness and well-being was won through a war of unparalleled brutality and atomic destruction, and this is what we must be reconciled to. This is the future.

The would-be liberals (again, including Reuther) who lent their names to this "over-all conception" have something to answer for.

In fact, while there is much harking-back to the pre-war cold war, one of the few references to anyone who proposed alternatives to the A-bomb "road to peace" is a vicious dig against Aneurin Bevan in the course of Robert Sherwood's main piece. It seems that "The night before [the launching of the war by Stalin], he [the British prime minister] had listened to speeches by extreme left-wing Socialists demanding drastic reductions in rearmament expenditures."

(We might mention at this point another barbed aside by Sherwood: it seems that two of the CP leaders who had jumped bail were later dropped by parachute by a Russian plane for sabotage. . . .)

To be sure, it would have been difficult to develop the over-all picture of a happy world through military vic-

tory while paying any but slanderous attention to anti-war alternatives today. This was inherent in the Collier's project, even if the editors had thought of protesting their good intentions on this too. In this sense, warmongering is inherent in the very scheme of presentation. But this was not merely a possibly unforeseen result and we do not have to probe subjective intentions. It simply flowed naturally from the thoroughly chauvinist and imperialist ideology which characterizes their thinking now, camouflaged under the 1960 fantasy.

If we do not learn anything much (from the liberal contributors included) about why liberalism was as futile in preventing war as Bevan's dastardly anti-argument speeches, we do get more detail on how the war actually broke out. It started with an attack on Yugoslavia by the Stalinist armies, signalized by an (unsuccessful) attempt on Tito's life.

As a speculation this is as good as any other, of course; but Sherwood does not let it rest at that. As if in anticipation of the kind of whitewash propaganda we would be subjected to in such event, Sherwood proceeds to make Tito a duplicate of the gentle, baby-kissing Stalin we were introduced to in 1941.

The Yugoslav scene is replete with crowds of peasants cheering and singing "Tito, our little white violet." . . . "Tito had been coming ever closer physically to the people. In recent public appearances he had often been engulfed by crowds of admirers. . . ." Then, he was stunned by the bomb "but not so badly that he was unable to give immediate orders for medical aid for the victims of the outrage." Soon "He was the hero of the hour." . . .

What! No Lollypops?

But this gilt job on Tito is as nothing compared with the picture of the war itself as fought by the U. S. Of course, it is indicated that a lot of people are killed, as may be gathered from the extent to which atom bombs are thrown around. But aside from the strictly unavoidable gore this is surely the most sportsmanlike war (at least as far as the Western side is concerned) since those far-away days when a French captain stepped out in front of his own ranks, bowed to the enemy lancers in front and said: "Gentlemen, you shoot first!"

The general idea is: "It wasn't so bad after all. . . ." The war was fought "as humanely as possible" (Marguerite Higgins). Russian plants were hit on Sundays lest there be people working there (Stuart Chase). "Atomic attacks were preceded by 10-day—sometimes 30-day—warnings" (ditto). "The unlimited atomic holocaust did not occur" (Hanson Baldwin). No one, however, reports that a special compartment of the warhead was filled with lollypops for the Russian kiddies.

U. S. (pardon—UN) atoms were strictly reserved for war-production plants. The Russians, to be sure, wasted their A-bombs on New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit (twice) and other cities, but it was not until they hit Washington that the Americans decided that this just wasn't cricket and (under popular pressure only) dropped one over Moscow. ("We felt nothing. It was the most professional, nerveless military operation I have ever seen," reports Edward R. Murrow as the Kremlin goes up in protons and electrons.)

Maybe that senator had something to do with the reluctant stroke of revenge: we mean the venerable white-haired one who, in atom-bombed Washington, "his eyes streaming. . . lifted both fists and shook them fiercely" just before a soldier raises the flag and "As it catches the breeze above the ruins, a sigh as of a tremendous wind sweeps through the vast crowd. And now everybody is crying and cheering together."

Europe doesn't get atom-bombed at all, and if this doesn't make them feel better about rearmament the editors of Collier's can do no more for them. In fact, only Germany is a battleground at all, and while the Germans won't like this touch, the demands of stark realism are not to be entirely denied.

They Lived Happily Ever After

At home, the people of the United States did not even suffer "serious hardship," according to Dr. Harry Schwartz, despite cuts in civilian production. The A-bombs were inconvenient but "they never knocked out as much as 10 per cent of American industrial capacity."

Given the idyllic picture, we need not expect any notice at all to problems of civil liberties and such. We are not told whether the Stalinists were put in those McCarran concentration camps. If would, at any rate, have been a sour note in a picture dominated by the tender concern of the General Staff for all but Russian Sunday workers.

This grotesquerie is perhaps Collier's substitute for the comic relief which is otherwise absent from their pages. It is continued in the even more angelic picture of the post-war world, especially its Russian sector. The Russian people have never been so happy before. All is sweetness and light. A few years after the end of the war the description of their relative prosperity would make most Europeans envious today. The UN is heaping food, clothes, medicine, machinery and all kinds of goodies upon them, including free trips to see the world. (All this is simply big-hearted humanitarianism, redoubled by love of the poor Russian people, since we learn in other pages that the West is getting nothing in return . . . except the total gold production of the Kolyma mines. The businessman's touch simply can't be kept down indefinitely.)

This aspect of the vision of the future is simply pap. It is more enlightening to move on to the political questions of the Russian occupation which play a large part in all the contributions.

A great deal of space is devoted to the democracy of

the new Russia. We should keep in mind that the "over-all conception" called for a picture of American benevolence and democratic humanitarianism such as nearly passes imagination. The contributors keep repeating that the crux of U. S. post-war policy was to force nothing at all on the Russians but to let them find their own way. The contributors are therefore presumably straining their fancy to depict a democratic post-war policy. But they can no more free themselves from their chauvinism than from their skins.

The most startling example of this happens to be also the central question, namely, the setting up of the new Russian government. We learn remarkably little about this, considering the concentration on the new political setup. At the head of Russia, agree the contributors, is a provisional government. How did it get there? Not by election, since no national elections have taken place as yet (five years after the end of the war). There was no national insurrection movement to produce a national provisional government (only local revolts and strikes as the Western armies neared). The conclusion is inescapable that all of our fictional democrats are tacitly assuming that this government was simply appointed to power by the occupation and thus maintained!

Quack at Work

This untrammelled democracy in post-war Russia, then, is headed up by appointees of the foreign conquerors. . . .

But the real slowdown on the new Russian politics is given by Arthur Koestler. From his piece, explain Collier's editors, "came the sparks which ignited the imaginations of all" connected with the project. It is to be believed. It is by far the vilest in all the pages between the occupation soldier on the cover to the TV ad on the back page.

Koestler first purports to describe the first local election in the Ukraine. He lists the contending political parties. There is a monarchist party. There is a separatist party. There are seven other political parties plus a variety of "cranks, religious sectarians and world reformers" . . . but there is not hide nor hair of a democratic socialist party that comes into existence.

This tendency, Koestler is telling us, does not exist among the people under the Stalinist tyranny! Political charlatanism can scarcely go further.

Among the seven political parties is, however, a group called "The Avengers of Trotsky" (!). He adds: "They are a minor headache for our security service." The monarchist—i.e., czarist—party, however, is not a headache for the cops, as far as Koestler is concerned. In fact, they get the largest number of votes, together with the separatists! Piling slander on slander, then, Koestler represents the Ukrainian people as being largely pro-monarchist in sympathy, while democratic socialism does not even exist as a political tendency!

Koestler's second "igniting" contribution to an understanding of the peoples under Stalin is the view that . . . they are no longer really human beings as a result of the Stalinist terror! "It may take at least a generation to change the robots back into humans again." Over half of the voters in his election no longer even understood what a ballot is for and merely mark "Da" on their slips, you see.

"Da" with American Accent

This political charlatan, no doubt, did not even see that he contradicts himself in the second part of his story, which deals with the revolt of the slave laborers of Kolyma and their setting up of a "Convicts' Republic" all by themselves. How this was done by non-human robots is not explained. In the Ukraine, "the man in the street is still unable to take elections seriously." That's because of the effect of Stalinist totalitarianism; as his protagonist explains: "when you say to a Russian the word 'election,' he will twitch with fright and yell 'da.'" He deepens the point: it is all in accordance with Pavlovian conditioned reflexes that the robots have become dehumanized.

While Koestler's prize piece is enough to make at least this writer want to retch with disgust, two other writers venture different explanations of the Stalinist tyranny that come under the head of entertainment.

• Oksana Kasenkina: "there was one great flaw in Stalin's thinking; he did not like the Russian people."
• Marguerite Higgins and Senator Margaret Chase Smith indicate that the trouble was that there were no women in influential positions.

The new Russia is to be reborn in the image of America. The contributors can imagine few better ways of depicting a new and happy life without Stalin than by foisting the innocent enthusiasms of Americans on the Russian people.

Item: Top best seller in the new Russia is an unabridged edition in Russian translation of . . . the Sears, Roebuck catalogue. (Koestler—American chauvinist by adoption.)

Item: Popular favorites on TV film are Martin and Lewis, Milton Berle and Sid Caesar. (Erwin Canham of the Christian Science Monitor.)

Item: Leading comic strip is Little Orphan Annie. (Ditto.)

Item: Best-selling magazines are Russian editions of Life, Time, the Reader's Digest, the Saturday Evening Post, Newsweek and, of course, Collier's.

Item: Gala event for Moscow's women is a fashion show—in a stadium seating 50,000 where no one could see anything anyway. . . . (Higgins.)

Item: The Red Army Theatre Company is playing Guys and Dolls. (Priestly.)

In this comic-opera Russia, it is no surprise to find (Continued bottom of next page)

Thomas and the Third Camp

(Continued from page 1)

this level once again, reference will have to be made to our answer on other occasions.

Now we have a new kind of objection to the idea of a "Third Camp," a really new one. Of all we have faced up to now, this objection is the most welcome one. It comes from Norman Thomas, in a New Leader article entitled "Why No One Can Be Neutral—The Futility of the Third Force."

In nature, it is a personal manifesto by the leader of the Socialist Party, who indicates the depth of his respect for it by presenting a policy which ignores completely the one set forth only recently in a statement issued by its National Executive Committee, of which Thomas is but one modest member.

Wherein lies the "futility" of the idea of a Third Force, as Thomas calls it? Perhaps in that the threat of attack by Stalinism is so imminent that there is no time to mobilize an independent force on a world scale? Perhaps in that there isn't even a possibility of mobilizing such a force, because everybody is already aligned either on the side of the Kremlin or the side of Washington and nobody but a few impractical dreamers is even interested in a force independent of the two?

Not at all. Those clever arguments we hear from others. Thomas has a distinctly different view. He starts right out with the statement that the idea of a "Third Force" has captured the minds of millions all over the world!

Take even the United States, which has "many well-meaning Americans" in it. "Consciously or unconsciously," writes Thomas, "these good people, although most of them are not philosophical pacifists, believe that somewhere in America and in the world, there must be a force which can be evoked to preserve the peace without making it necessary for them to take sides in the conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. This they see merely as a power conflict, one power—the USSR—being worse than the other, but neither deserving the support of those who shudder at the thought of atomic war. Hence the popularity of the idea or the complex of ideas associated with the familiar phrase, 'the third force.'"

Thomas Attacks Lohia

That's in the United States. And elsewhere? Bigger, stronger, more popular!

Thomas continues: "That idea—again quite naturally—is far more extensively popular in Europe and especially in Asia than here in America. The escutcheon of the existing democracies is not bright and shiny but stained with many blots. America has her cruel race discrimination. The so-called [Hear, hear!] democratic powers of Western Europe were the imperial masters of Southeast Asia and almost all of Africa. Reflections like these inevitably strengthen the instinctive desire of peoples for peace through some third force. They are convinced that they, or all that they care for, would be destroyed in a third world war, no matter which of the two great belligerents might win."

(The reference to the so-called democratic powers of Western Europe" is downright inadequate. Miserably equivocal document though it is on the whole, the statement by the Socialist Party's National Executive Committee is a big improvement on Thomas. It says, and so rightly: "The natural distrust of colonial peoples for the Western world was deepened by the attempt of the European powers to reassert control that they had lost in war. And a new hostility to the United States grew out of the experience that the Europeans flew back in American planes and marched in with American guns.")

There is more from Thomas: "In this desire for a third force, Nehru without doubt has the general sympathy of the Indian people and of a great many other Asians. The Indian Socialists are very critical of some of Nehru's domestic policies or his lack of a policy. Certain Socialists have been more outspoken than Nehru in criticizing Stalin's Communism. Nevertheless, the Indian Socialist Party has its own third force policy."

The idea of independence from Stalinism and capitalist imperialism as incarnated and represented by the U.S.A., is, then, vastly extensive, among tens and hundreds of millions ("the general sympathy of the Indian people and of a great many other Asians"), among more millions in Europe ("extensively popular in Europe"), and even in this country ("a great many well-meaning Americans"). The conclusion is therefore inescapable: the idea of a "third force" is futility itself. Or, as Thomas writes after indicating how widespread and popular it is:

"It is nevertheless a very dangerous idea, wrong in principle and completely impractical."

The words are very vigorous, and there ought to be some reason to justify them. So far as it is possible to

judge from his article, Thomas gives two of them. One is represented by his criticism of the "third force policy" of the Indian Socialist Party.

"That able Indian Socialist and leader of the peasants, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, on his recent visit to America, interpreted that policy in words which would expressly include Peron's Argentina as a possible member of a third force. His third force would include countries under governments as corrupt and generally unsatisfactory, from a democratic point of view, as Egypt. Just as many Americans assume that it is enough that Franco should be anti-Communist, Dr. Lohia seemed to assume that for purposes of the third force, it would be enough that a nation should not be included in any existing American or Russian alliance."

We heard the address delivered in New York by Dr. Lohia. What we heard in no way bears out Thomas's interpretation of his view. Neither is it borne out by what is said and repeated week-in and week-out by the official English organ of the Indian party, Janata. Dr. Lohia is doubtless able to speak for himself about this interpretation, and if and when he does it will not be hard to judge whether it is he who needs defending or Thomas.

Bearers of the "Fittful Light"

But let us take Thomas's interpretation at face value. Let us assume what "Dr. Lohia seemed to assume," that his ideas "expressly include" Peron's Argentina "as a possible member" of a third force, as well as governments as corrupt and undemocratic as the Egyptian.

The "third force" thereupon stands condemned as dangerous, wrong in principle and, on top of it all, completely impractical—characteristics which are enough for Thomas to decide not to support it, even though it is the aspiration of hundreds of millions of the oppressed and troubled, and not to work for it, not to enter it, but only to damn it as futile. "No one can be neutral!"—so Thomas remains in the camp of the American government. That's all right in principle and completely practical.

In the same camp, however, and not as a "possible member" but as an actual supporter is Peron's Argentina! It gives Washington some minor headaches, no doubt; but there is likewise no doubt that it follows the basic Thomasian principles that "no one can be neutral." In the war between "the fittful light of our existing democracy and the total darkness of imperial Communism" (as Thomas puts it), there is no question that Peron is with Washington. That, however, is not enough to force Thomas into horrified flight out of the camp dominated by Washington.

In the same camp, likewise, is the government of Franco, which, say some carping critics, is almost as corrupt and "generally unsatisfactory from the democratic point of view" as the Egyptian. If a couple of its toes are not yet fully planted in the American camp, it is not for lack of desire—on the part of Franco or on the part of Truman OR on the part of the editors of the New Leader. The mere prospect of the Egyptian government being part of a "third force," perhaps especially in light of its criminal decision to have Egypt ruled by Egyptians instead of by aliens who have imposed themselves upon her by force of arms, is distasteful to Thomas. But his stomach acquires an iron lining when he sees himself in the same camp as Franco. In any case, lined or unlined, Franco's entry into the American imperialist camp is not accompanied by Thomas' exit from it. Principle is principle, to be sure, but why make a fetish of it? If the end is noble, the means are justified.

If the newspapers are reporting truthfully, it now seems to appear as though the Vatican might conceivably be drawn openly and directly into the camp of battle for "the fittful light." Carping critics consider this a violation of an old democratic principle of separation of church and state; other carping critics look upon the Vatican as "generally unsatisfactory from the democratic point of view" and the harsher ones regard it as the oldest of the most reactionary forces in the world. Thomas' judgment on this is not clear to us. He may even be critical toward the move, even if not carping. But it is a safe bet that the presence of the Vatican in the camp he has chosen will not impel him to abandon it.

Ditto Chiang Kai-shek. Ditto Syngman Rhee. Ditto Bao Dai. Ditto Adenauer. Ditto the reactionary Catholic political machines in Europe and elsewhere. Ditto dozens of others in dozens of other countries.

Second Reason

Why is Thomas so unforgetfully severe with the "third force" because of what Dr. Lohia "seemed to assume" and so tenderly tolerant toward the American imperialist camp for what it actually is and is actually doing? And if Lohia's idea were thrice as wrong as Thomas says it is,

what is so difficult about presenting and promoting a program, an elementary but consistently democratic program, for a Third Camp which would by its very nature "expressly include" the millions of people Thomas describes and "expressly exclude" Peron—as well as that other scarecrow with which Thomas frightens himself away from the "third force" believe it or not, the Moslem League!

The only other reason we can read in Thomas's article is positively hilarious. He writes: "I am earnestly contending that hope for us all in the United States or in India depends not upon a third force but upon the rapid improvement of democracy." This from an avowed socialist! It is not easy to believe, but we copied it word for word.

In an attempt, obviously vain, to match this formula, we suggest: "The hope for raising the standards of all workers depends not upon trade unions but upon a rapid improvement in wage scales." "The hope for the Spanish people depends not upon overturning the Franco regime but upon a rapid spread of democracy in Spain." "The hope for socialism in the United States depends not upon Norman Thomas and his party but upon a rapid growth of a socialist movement." (This at least makes some good sense.)

The hope of all of us depends upon the rapid improvement of democracy! This is not a discovery, but it is true. And just who is it, or what force is it, that will effect this improvement of democracy, rapidly or at any other rate? Not Stalin, of course. Then who?

The Truman administration? On that we need say here nothing more than is pointed out in the recent statement by the National Executive Committee of Thomas' party: ". . . the Korean war, which socialists supported [Fine socialists, those!] strengthened all those tendencies against which socialists must fight: militarization of civilian life and of the economy; reactionary drives against civil liberties; the increasing brutality of military techniques; the extension of American military rule abroad." A "rapid improvement of democracy" is not clearly visible in this restrained description.

He Has a Job . . .

So, if the authoritative voice of Thomas' party means anything, it is not Truman we can look to with hope. Indeed, the voice goes further: ". . . where there is no democratic alternative, communist totalitarianism—not Western democratic capitalism—will fill the vacuum." And "For most of the world, capitalism is outmoded and cannot supply the capital needed to raise the level of life cannot supply the capital needed to raise the level of life in the underdeveloped countries." (We repeat: cannot.)

A deplorable situation. If not Truman, if not Churchill, if not Adenauer? Chiang? Franco? The Roman pontiff? If, as there is some reason to feel, they cannot effect the "rapid improvement of democracy," who and what are left? Such mass movements as the British Labor Party, the German Social-Democracy, the Indian Socialist Party. But it is precisely these organizations which represent and reflect and speak for—clearly or not so clearly—the millions who want to be independent of Stalinism and American imperialism and to oppose them both! And what is more, their effectiveness in actually achieving an improvement of democracy is in direct proportion to the extent to which they do act independently of the Kremlin and Washington.

Thomas' job is clear, if his words mean what they say. Convinced of the futility of the Third Camp, of its dangerousness, its terror in principle and impracticality, he should urge the German socialist workers to reverse their direction and move closer to the position of complete alliance with American imperialism of Adenauer and his crowd; he should urge the British workers, who have just shown where they stand with regard not only to the Stalinists but also to those who have compromised their hopes and future by the alliance with American capitalism, to reverse the encouraging direction they have taken and move closer to the position of the extreme conservative wing of the Labor Party, if not of the Conservatives themselves.

In India the same. Everywhere else, the same. Even in his own party, whose official statement says, like "so many well-meaning Americans," that "This is no ideological war against slavery, but the opportunist clash of world power with world power"—the same.

There indeed is a job we regard as futile! At any rate, we wish Thomas no success in it. We remain socialists, who are for that rapid improvement of democracy, that struggle for socialism and peace, which depends above all and entirely upon the Third Camp, the organized, militant, independent movement of the millions of workers and peasants all over the world whose aspirations are just and identical with our own.

represented not by troglodytes like Taft or Hoover but by semi-liberals and intellectuals who no doubt pride themselves on their comparative enlightenment. It is a combination of raucous saber-rattling and imperialist vainglory sugared with promises of benevolent paternalism. It is hard to say which element would be more deeply resented by non-Americans, on any side of the Iron Curtain.

What makes the whole thing so monstrous, what makes even the imbecilities less amusing than they should be to any one fortunate enough to be able to take a detached view, is that the utopia which is promised to us (and the Russians) is expressly written to awaken our enthusiasm for an unparalleled war of destruction. It paints the horror of our times, the threat of atomic war, as a god-sent to civilization.

This is the cheery Looking Backward which our highest-priced capitalist thinkers can produce today.

Collier's Goes to War: Or How A-Bombs Brought Utopia

(Continued from page 7)

that capitalism is being restored too. This job is undertaken by Stuart Chase.

It is clear that part of the "over-all conception" for Russia is the restoration of good old private enterprise. The editors of Collier's make this explicit in their preface. True, even in 1960 Stuart Chase is not able to describe just how this happened, since it hasn't happened as yet. But he gets it all mapped out with the help of a reborn Russian economist. ("As neither of us had any particular economic ideology, we found it not too hard to agree," is Chase's priceless side remark on his fictional collaborator.)

The economist finally raises the \$64 question: where will the capitalists be found to run the new capitalism? The solution, by Chase:

"Until a class of enterprisers—they must be Russian—can be trained, the provisional government will have to continue operating industry. Later, plants could be sold to

private enterprise—as in Puerto Rico. Some operations, however, could be leased or sold to foreign businessmen immediately, under proper safeguards, as in NEP days."

The Puerto Rican plants to which Chase glibly refers have, in fact, gone to foreign (U. S.) capitalists, not natives. But where will the Russian "enterprisers" be found with rubles to buy the plants, even after being "trained"? Since the obvious answer is that the only such would be the "Soviet millionaires" and enriched ex-bureaucrats who batted on the Stalinist regime, it is perhaps just as well for Chase that he gives the question short shrift. That is even apart from the economic and social feasibility of turning the former bureaucrats and totalitarian magnates into capitalists.

It is quite an exhibition, this special issue of Collier's, an exhibition of much of the American mentality today, and in particular its political and social illiteracy—as

British Election: Tories In — —

(Continued from page 1)

ment with a dilemma. It must either accommodate itself to its senior partner, the United States, by increasing its armaments to the point of endangering the British economy now basically altered by the nationalizations which it had initiated; or it must boldly adopt a program of independence by adherence to its domestic program, thus gaining support among the peoples of the world by a genuine program of socialist internationalism to turn the tide against reactionary Stalinism.

But it is the tragedy of the British Labor Party that in the field of foreign affairs, its lack of a socialist-internationalist program could call for peace and at the same time forestall capitalist and Stalinist imperialism is replaced by insular views, lack of boldness and a prosaic but self-defeating defense of the disintegrating empire.

THE ANTI-BEVAN ANGLE

It is not merely that the middle classes were tired of the austerity of their lives in a nation overburdened by its share of Western imperialist armament. They supported the Tories in sufficiently large numbers because in accepting the prospects of another war and becoming increasingly anxious in the present state of world crisis, they preferred a Churchill to an Attlee to head the state.

But above all the Liberal Party, just as much as the Conservatives, feared Aneurin Bevan and the left-wing forces behind him in the Labor Party. Anything but this left wing. It is obvious that they were not going to take any chances on the ability of Attlee and Morrison to contain the "wild Welshman" and his friends. This explains why so much of the campaign by the Conservatives and Liberals was directed against the Bevan wing of the Labor Party.

Looking back at the political situation in Great Britain, it is easy to see now that the break came when Bevan and his comrades resigned from the government because they could not support the new program proposed by Attlee which would have altered the course of the Labor Party in carrying out the rearmament of Great Britain.

LEFT WING CALLED IT

The outstanding feature of the new government program was the budget calling for an expenditure of 4,700 million pounds for rearmament. The only way in which such a program could be carried out was at the expense of the working class in the first place and the middle classes in second, because it was predicated upon a halt to the nationalization program and the social-welfare benefits. While Bevan and his group argued foolishly on international questions, denying the extent of Russian rearmament and innocently accepting Stalin's falsified figures on his war expenditures, they did drive home with unerring accuracy the point that the program could not be carried out successfully at all given Britain's economic position, and that, if it were attempted, it could only hurt the British masses. This was tardily and partially recognized by Attlee.

Within a period of a few brief months, Britain's economic situation worsened rapidly. America's military requirements on Britain as a precondition for economic aid, while selling materials at inflated prices and crushing her on the world market, made Attlee's course untenable. The imbalance produced by the enormous arms budget (given Britain's economic position, a far greater drain upon her economy than U. S. rearmament is here) created an economic crisis. The dollar reserve of the country was quickly depleted. The unfavorable balance of trade grew worse. The fuel shortage be-

came more ominous with the coming of the winter months.

In the most decisive aspects of domestic policy, including arms and exports, balance of payments, manpower and welfare program, the Bevan group was proven correct as against the party leadership. Counterposing its own program to Attlee's, it demanded that the government maintain and realize the nationalization program, social planning and industrial democracy.

How? The Bevanites proposed to reduce the arms program, keep living costs stable, attack distribution costs, maintain a general price freeze, ban or tax heavily all dividend increases over the 1947-48 level.

In the field of foreign affairs, however, the Bevanites—aside from the inaccurate utterances about Stalinism to which we have referred and attacking the unnecessary subservience of the government to the demands of the American ruling class—did not differ from the government in any principled way. Their limited international program did not vary

it was the way in which Bevan and his comrades fared. We have already indicated that the main attack of the reactionary coalition was against the left wing, the "extremists."

It was not a mere personal matter to Churchill although the element was undoubtedly present. He was impelled to direct his fire against the Bevanites and to campaign personally in behalf of his son, Randolph, against Michael Footie, editor of the *Bevanite Tribune*.

Happily, son Randolph received an even worse trouncing than he did a year ago. But everywhere, the Bevan candidates swept into office with greater majorities than in 1950. They did it with a bolder domestic program as indicated above. It would have gone far better with the Labor Party, even though it received a popular plurality, had it carried out the same kind of campaign.

STRUGGLE AHEAD

The Labor Party failed to win the support of the bulk of the middle classes because, faced with a social grouping that could be won by either the Conservatives or themselves (the Labor Party did win their support in 1945 and to a lesser extent in 1950), the main leadership of the party did not offer a bold program to the electorate as it did in 1945. On the obviously powerful issue of foreign affairs, its conduct enforced the belief among the timorous middle classes that Churchill could do much better along the same lines and would find the United States more tractable than did Attlee, particularly in an American Congress so largely populated by cave-dweller politicians living in fear of the British "socialists." The Labor Party weakened its position in this respect because it did not offer anything boldly different from Churchill's program.

The tremendous popularity of the Bevanite candidates has, however, an even more important bearing on the events of the next period.

What will Churchill do now that he has regained power? Will he proceed to carry out the pre-election threats of the Conservative Party? Does this mean the end of all nationalization and the "welfare state," and the beginning of an assault upon the conditions of the working class? The answers to these questions will not be long in coming.

The new prime minister has set up his cabinet of old cronies, the leaden-minded Tory old guard. These gentlemen come to power with archaic economic and political conceptions worthy of an out-lived period of British imperialism. In addition, the pressures of the social situation in Great Britain have produced a conciliatory group of "Young Turks" in the Conservative Party, whose influence is as yet mainly disregarded by the old guard.

WORKERS ON GUARD

But Churchill has himself begun to speak in more conciliatory ways since the election. He is fully aware of the power of the Labor Party, the militant mood of the working class, and the enormous prospects which the Bevanite wing has of winning control of the party. Therefore, what Churchill will do depends largely upon the pressure of international events, the current mood of the British masses, and his tenure of office. The refusal of the Liberal Party to join his cabinet dictates caution to him.

The Tories are committed to such immediate measures as the denationalization of the steel industry, decentralization of the nationalized coal administration, reduction of governmental administrative expenses, etc. They no longer speak of total denationalization or of a wholesale destruction of the socialist legislation of the Labor Party. They understand the reality, i.e., that the

program which the Labor Party carried out during the past six years has affected the basic structure of the economy at its heart. They know that re-establishment of the old structure would create economic chaos if only because of the certainty of working-class resistance. This is the mightiest factor in Great Britain today: the working class remains organized, mobilized and militant.

Yet the same pressures of the world situation and the demands of the armament program will squeeze the Churchill government to the limit of its endurance. There is no doubt that Churchill counts heavily upon aid from the United States to help him weather these storms. Such assistance will depend in part on the manner in which the new government chips away at the "socialistic institutions created by the Labor Party." The Churchill government is a bourgeois government; its ideology remains what it was despite its tactical resiliency.

Bearing all the conflicting and contradictory elements in mind, it is impossible to escape the con-

clusion that the new government must and will begin a war against the working class that will gain momentum if it is initially successful.

CAN THEY LEARN?

The intensification of the struggle in Britain, which is indicated, will have the most profound repercussions inside the Labor Party and on the outcome of the struggle between the Attlee-Morrison and Bevan wings for control of the party. The Bevan group has a rather simple program: it demands nothing less than the carrying out of the complete program of the Labor Party for total nationalization of the basic fabric of the British economy, the abolition of the British bourgeoisie as a bourgeoisie. As already indicated, it is a group without a theory or a very coherent body of principle as its guiding line, but it is the articulate spokesman, without being a leader in the vanguard-socialist sense, of the finest elements of the British working class.

It is too early to say what the effects of the election defeat have been upon Attlee-Morrison, whether the defeat has pointed the lesson to them, namely, that a watering down of their program, a compromise with their capitalist class and its imperialist allies, means a loss of mass support. How is it possible to say this in view of the immense vote of the Labor Party? It is possible because the significant factor of that vote is that while it showed that the working masses wanted no part of Toryism, they plainly expressed their preference for the militant-wing of the Labor Party presently represented by the Bevan group. We believe this is now clear to everyone.

TORIES' LAST STAND

Joseph Shaplen, writing in the *New York Post*, stated what we believe to be a crucial aspect of the present situation. He wrote that this is the last chance for the Conservative Party in England. Either it would understand the meaning of the vote for the Labor Party and accommodate itself to the real desires of the British people by becoming a party of social reform, dropping its Tory principles and practices, or it will disappear as a decisive factor in British politics just as the Liberal Party has.

We should like to approach this question from another angle. The Labor Party lost its right to govern in this election. But its real power has grown. It is of the utmost significance that the great body of new voters supported the Labor Party. It can even increase this support of the masses by conducting itself as the militant, crusading leader of the British people and the nation as a whole, by fighting boldly with a full socialist program, in the manner of 1945.

It is because the Bevan group more nearly corresponds to this need than any other in the Labor Party that it deserves the support of the workers of England and the cheers of the workers everywhere. For the Labor Party can and will return to power once more, as the Tories show that they will not "accommodate." But it will do so not on the basis of a watered-down program and a weak-kneed accommodation to the pressure of reaction, but as the fighting representative of the progressive working class. The working class of Great Britain holds a key to the future of the working class everywhere; they cannot afford to fail.

Subscribe to
LABOR ACTION

WEEK by WEEK...

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism. A sub is only \$2 a year!

Today



CHURCHILL

Tomorrow?



BEVAN