

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

JOURNAL

for the

Industrial Militant —

for

International

Socialism

10th YEAR No 7

JULY 1960

SIXPENCE

JAPANESE LABOUR ON THE MARCH

JAMES PLANT

MILLIONS of workers in Japan have made it clear that they are not prepared to be pawns in the cold war. They are against American bases. They are against the Bomb. They are against the remilitarization of Japan.

On May 26th 150,000 workers and students demonstrated against the Kishi government's new security treaty with the United States. This demonstration was the culmination of a seven days' continuous protest campaign; over two million people took part in similar demonstrations and rallies throughout Japan. These demonstrations were, however, only a start: the biggest political strike in Japan's history took place on June 4th, organised by Sohyo, the militant general council of trade unions.

The strike involved 4,500,000 members of Sohyo and the members of 76 independent unions and one million students, sympathizers and members of small-scale enterprises; for example 20,000 small shops all over the country put up their shutters in support of the strike action. Even the government's National Police Agency had to admit that it was the largest unified campaign ever seen in Japan.

The continuing demonstrations found a focal point in the proposed visit to Japan of President Eisenhower, scheduled for June 19th, the day the treaty was due to be ratified. When Mr Hagerty, Eisenhower's press secretary arrived on June 10th to make arrangements for the visit he received a most impressive welcome: his car was besieged for an hour by about 1,500 students, many singing the 'Internationale', who left Hagerty in no doubt about their feelings.

Demonstrations continued unabated and reached a new peak on June 15th, a day of strikes, mass rallies and demonstrations against the treaty all over the country, with the biggest in Tokyo, when students twice stormed the Parliament building, fighting pitched battles with the police, and attacked the central police headquarters. These actions forced the government to call off Eisenhower's visit but they would not yield on the vital question of the security treaty. They had pushed it through Parliament in spite of the nationwide opposition and the fact that the Socialist MPs had walked out *en-mass* and that even some members of the government Liberal-Democratic Party voted against it.

WORKERS' AND STUDENTS' MILITANCY

Why these mass strikes and demonstrations and what do they portend?

The new security treaty is an integral part of United States military strategy in the Far East, the idea being to make Japan an aircraft and rocket base permanently anchored off the coasts of China and the Soviet Union. At the same time one of the principle results of the treaty, and the one that has aroused the most feeling and opposition, is that it will open the door to militarism again in Japan. "The original 'MacArthur constitution' decreed that Japan must never again be allowed to build up its armed might. The Korean war changed all that and today Japanese 'defence forces' number 170,000 in the army, 42,000 in the air force, and 30,000 in the navy. all use US tactics and equipment, but they are not equipped with nuclear weapons—yet." (*Newsweek*, June 20th, 1960.) No doubt the militarists will do their best to remedy this shortcoming once the treaty is ratified.

Anti-militarism is very strong amongst the working class and students of Japan, the workers have had bitter experience of militarism and the memory of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is still vivid. The Japanese ruling class however is not so concerned about a possible repetition of Hiroshima as it is about its profits: "only businessmen and government leaders and a few intellectuals(?) who realize that Japan's economic program depends on trade with the US defend the Security Treaty." (*Newsweek*, June 20th, 1960.)

The workers and students have shown an inspiring militancy and tenacity of purpose in this struggle; represented by the Japanese and US governments as a "communist plot" organized by a few

"agitators". In fact, in addition to the role of Sohyo, the movement has been spearheaded politically by the Socialist party and the student's organization Zengakuren, with the Communist Party playing a minor role. The leadership of Zengakuren has been largely dominated by the Communist Party since the war, but the militant students have been dissatisfied with CP sellouts and zig-zags and the organization is now mainly lead by "Trotskyists".

It is difficult, at this stage, to assess to what extent the Socialist party leadership has been consistent in this struggle. Now that the treaty has been ratified they may attempt to limit the movement; it is up to the working class to carry through the struggle regardless of any vacillations on the part of the leadership. They must not cease their efforts until the treaty is rescinded.

The revolutionary workers and students of Japan have shown what can be done. All Socialists and those who are engaged in the struggle against the Bomb and military pacts such as NATO should be inspired by these events, we should show our solidarity with the Japanese workers, and the best way to do that is by redoubling our own efforts.

GRAHAM ACOTT (NUM)

TORIES MOVE AGAINST MINERS

THE announcement that Alfred Robens is to be the next chairman of the National Coal Board has convinced many miners that this is one way the Tory government intend to implement their policy of decentralization in the mining industry.

We should study for a moment Mr Robens's reply to the demands from some areas of the NUM that he should refuse the job—"I would have thought that it was in the interests of your members for you to urge the Government to appoint a man as chairman of the Board who believes in public ownership"—and then consider how this can be reconciled to the Tory intentions for the decentralisation of the industry. Perhaps it is not the £10,000 a year salary that the chairmanship carries nor the unlikely return of a Labour Government to power in the near future complete with a lucrative Cabinet position that has convinced Mr Robens he should take the position.

CHAMPION?

Does he consider himself to be the champion of public ownership, the man who is going to defend the mine workers from their enemies, the Central Electricity Authority, the oil combines and the Tory Government? The *Daily Mirror* on June 15 informed us that "Labour

MPs are convinced that Mr Robens, before taking on the post, got an assurance from the Government that there would be no question of handing the coal mines back to private enterprise." But this is not the truth of the matter. In the same way that Sir James Bowman was used to implement the policy of pit closures, no matter how sorrowful or distressed it made him, the Tories are hopeful—no, certain, otherwise why the appointment?—that Mr Robens will be able to convince the miners that it is for their own good that the industry be decentralised.

MORE "FREEDOM"

If we also take into account part of an article in the *Daily Herald* also on June 15—that "Mr. Robens does not object to decentralisation if it means giving area and local managers more freedom in day-to-day decisions. But he firmly opposes any move to put mining areas into competition with each other." It is clear that Mr Robens is sold on the idea of decentralization and once it is implemented in the coal-fields it will not be a difficult task for the Tories to get the areas to have a price war with or without Mr Robens's permission.

ETU CONFERENCE

by A DELEGATE

EXECUTIVE PAPERS OVER THE CRACKS

Unreal unity in loaded conference

The Conference was a disappointing affair. Instead of dealing seriously with the activities of the Union on the industrial and political fields, it was more a demonstration, justified, it is true, of opposition to the intervention of the capitalist press, radio and television in the affairs of the Union. The unreal unity and solidarity which the leadership thus created was dexterously manipulated by Foulkes, Haxell and Co. In fact there has never been such a loaded and unrepresentative conference.

FAILURE

The failure of the Executive squarely to face the needs of the struggle for better conditions in industry was shown clearly in the contracting section of the industry. Despite the fact that the ETU has unilateral negotiating rights in contracting, it was patently clear that wages and conditions were not all they should be in this section. There were no fewer than 31 motions on the order paper on contracting questions, and it became obvious from some of the contributions at the Conference that there was underlying rank-and-file discontent. Repeated comparisons were made between the poor conditions enjoyed in contracting and those enjoyed by ETU members in other industries.

LACK OF FIGHT

The familiar cry, "Brothers, we have at all times put forward a militant case, but we are bound by such-and-such a union who have majority negotiating rights"—the excuse usually put forward by Foulkes, Haxell and Co. in respect of failures in other industries, simply will not do in respect of contracting, where responsibility is entirely theirs.

The weekly rate of pay of electricians in contracting is £10.16s.4d., that of other skilled workers £11.10s.6d., or 14/2 more. The Executive was content to re-echo the apologists from the rostrum in saying that the main reason for the lack of fight on the contracting front was due primarily to the toughness of the NFEA (National Federation of Electrical Associations) and the apathy of contracting members. Surely this is in contradiction to the facts. The contracting members have a tradition of being amongst the most militant in the union e.g. the magnificent response to the guerilla strikes, South Bank, etc.) which, coupled with a militant leadership, would be more than a match for Penwell and his men.

A very good, militant resolution was put by Belfast Municipal and Wallasey:

"This Conference is of the opinion, that the Executive Council should press for compensation from the employers equivalent to full payment of wages for the period of unemployment when men are declared redundant."

Alas, instead of this resolution, the apologists of Foulkes and Co. preferred to push forward a completely pious resolution lacking any militancy:

"This Conference condemns the Government for its failure to deal with the problem of unemployment."

"It views with grave concern the trend of post-war unemployment and the fact that the pre-war distress areas are re-emerging, particularly in Scotland, on the North East Coast, Wales and Northern Ireland."

"Conference calls upon the Government to use their powers to direct new industries to these areas and take such other measures as will secure work or maintenance at trade union rates of wages for all workers." (Aberdeen Supply, Belfast Central, Belfast Station Engrs., Blythswood, Glasgow West, Paisley.)

Again, as regards apprentices, the leadership failed miserably. Instead of throwing all their weight behind the apprentices in their struggles, the following kind of resolution was proposed: Conference "calls on the members in the contracting industry and the EC to take action to achieve a ratio of one apprentice to five journeymen in the contracting industry and asks for the full support of this Conference to carry this out."

This is a reduction in the ratio of apprentices and journeymen, and directly plays into the hands of the employers, some of whom want to dismantle the apprenticeship system, and to emphasize the use of unskilled labour in an attempt to introduce semi-skilled grades to supplant the apprenticeship system. Clearly the long-term view is a general depression of wages through the use of diluted labour.

CHAUVINISM

The following resolution was pushed through by Foulkes' friends: "This Conference views with concern the considerable extension of American capital investment in Scotland and the consequent influence which this enables the Americans to wield not only in our economic affairs but in cultural matters also. We deprecate the "Americanisation" of our way of life and call

upon the Government to end this state of affairs, if necessary by legislation."

This is pure anti-Americanism and nothing else. The unemployment figures in Scotland are among the highest in the United Kingdom, and would be higher if these industries were withdrawn, and it is a fact that the workers in most of the firms are enjoying wages and conditions superior to British firms. It is sheer lunacy to follow policies of this character; it can only succeed in alienating the ETU from the workers affected, who, let us be honest, could not care less whether the boss comes from Kansas or the Caucasus, (as one delegate put it).

BLATANT

Job militancy can be pursued in any factory, American or otherwise. Fords and other examples spring to mind. The answer to this problem must be to fight for 100 per cent trade union organization on the job, for militancy and the pursuance of the class struggle, rather than the blatant political and industrial cowardice expressed in the resolution carried (not too enthusiastically and with sore opposition) at Conference.

The question of who should control the Union journal "Electron"—the rank-and-file or the paid top bureaucrats—was important both in itself and in throwing light on the policies of Foulkes, Haxell and Co. In spite of the fact that discussion of the affairs of "Electron" was held in secret session, the *Daily Worker* nevertheless announced that "a suggestion to change the editorial board of *Electron*, the union's journal, was overwhelmingly defeated." (June 3).

DEMOCRACY

Actually the resolution to make changes in the paper was a very good one, in the best traditions of democratic control of union affairs. It was moved by Ipswich ETU: "This Conference calls upon the Executive Council to conduct the Union's journal *Electron* on the following basis:

1). The setting up of an editorial board consisting of five rank-and-file members plus two National Officers elected annually at Conference.

2). "That four pages of Journal be exclusively set aside for correspondence from members."

This resolution was vehemently opposed by the Communist Party leadership. At the same time, let it be remembered, Joe Scott, the Communist Party leader of the AEU, found it necessary to demand a democratization of the management of his Union's journal (the AEU). He wrote in the *Daily Worker* (March 4th): "Some branches want a form of democratic

control over the monthly journal. While casting no aspersion on any general secretary, past or present, this is a reform much overdue. It is wrong in principle for any one person to have control of the Journal, for on this basis it is, in fact, not the official organ of the union. What does the Executive Council suggest to the rules revision committee? Nothing to make the union more democratic. Quite the contrary."

The Editor of "Electron" is one man, Frank Haxell.

While Foulkes and Haxell were in no hurry to defend the democratic rights of the rank-and-file, they were very serious about defending the privileges of the union officials. According to a Conference resolution, President Foulkes and General Secretary Haxell get rises of £120, bringing their annual salaries to £1,350 a year—about £26 a week. These sums do not include "expenses", which for the year 1958 amounted, for Haxell alone, to £1,800!

ENTRENCHED

Officials should receive the average rate for the industry plus reasonable expenses.

The main weapon Foulkes and Co. used to entrench their position at Conference was the attack on them by press, radio and television. The note of approbation that the Conference started and finished on would have been entirely different if the scattered opposition, which existed at the Conference, and represented a wide rank-and-file opposition all over the country, had been directed on a principled basis toward industrial and political issues. The fight for inner-union democracy should be connected with the fight for a more militant industrial policy, for rank and file control over union affairs generally, for real defence of shop stewards (and not blacklegging by the EC as in South Bank), and for industrial action against the Bomb and missile sites.

RIGHT-WING
CHICKENS HOME
TO ROOST

We remember how, six years ago, the right-wing Labour leaders declared that German re-armament was necessary in the interests of democracy. Now the chicken has come home to roost. Lord Lansdown, Under-Secretary to the Foreign Office declared in a speech to the House of Lords that "there is in fact no prohibition in the revised Brussels Treaty against the manufacture by Western Germany of atomic, biological and chemical weapons outside their own territory".

(Times March 1)

JACK SELVIN, HOOVER SHOP STEWARD

HOOVERS: A PRE-SETTLEMENT

ANALYSIS

ON Tuesday (June 14) the Works Committee at Hoovers was called to be told that 870 workers in UK plants were to be made redundant (ie. surplus to requirements) because of hire purchase restrictions, which it was claimed, had reduced sales. Of this number 120 were to go from the Perivale factories.

After vainly protesting that these workers should be kept on the payroll until suitable alternative work was found, the Shop Stewards reported to meetings throughout the factories next morning. By a tremendous majority the workers instructed the Shop Stewards to represent their case, but the Company refused to negotiate until work was resumed. Meanwhile by press, radio, television and duplicated handouts the Company assured workers that surrounding employers were clamouring for their (the redundant workers) services; yet they refused to withdraw the threatened notices, pleading that negotiations must take place sometime so why not get back to work and discuss the redundancies!

Each day mass meetings have

reaffirmed the decision that all must stay on the payroll until suitable alternative work is found for workers declared redundant; a similar situation exists at High Wycombe where another 50 are threatened with unemployment. At Merthyr and Cambuslang it is reported that short time working has been agreed. Since this involves approximately the same overheads for a shorter working week it is a climb down by the Company and, in the unemployment conditions prevailing in those areas, an understandable compromise on the part of the workers.

SCRAPPED

But it should not be regarded as satisfactory, for it implies that human beings may be "scrapped" when it suits the employer. Short time working means short wages; since a full week's wages are taken as the basis for calculations when arguing cost of living, short wages mean voluntary acceptance of a lower standard of living, a ridiculous thing in this age of immense facilities for the production of wealth.

It wasn't so long ago that we were told that incomes would double in 25 years' time. If our incomes are to be increased it looks as if we must insist on taking part in the planning.

In the meantime we have to fight for the principle of work or full maintenance. As the statement of the Hoover Strike Committee (Perivale) states:

"The Hoover shareholders have a social responsibility to the people who made the £11,000,000 profit last year to pay them full wages until suitable alternative employment is found, either inside Hoovers or in another firm".

BUILDING ACCIDENTS

The number of accidents reported on buildings in 1954 was 16,075, and it rose to 17,346 in 1958. The number of fatal accidents rose from 214 to 258.

(Report on Safety and Health in the Building and Civil Engineering Industries, 1954-1958.)
You never had it so bad!

JAMES R HIGGINS

UNIONS AND THE ECONOMY

THE picture offered by the trade union scene is at first sight an extremely contradictory one. There is a situation where, on the one hand, the political development of the movement is leftward. The AEU and TGWU etc have voted against nuclear arms and in defence of Clause 4, with prospects of the NUM and NUR following suit; while on the other hand the amount of heat generated on economic and trade union demands is minimal. Superficially this would seem to contradict the Marxist theory on the rise of consciousness.

WORKERS' APATHY

In fact, this is a reflection of the apathy prevalent amongst workers generally. The shift in the balance of forces in the movement can be occasioned by shifts in the thinking and personnel of the conscious minority; and in this limited connection the Cousins phenomenon is an important one. In addition, the decline in direct influence of the Communist Party is a not unimportant factor resulting in their hopping on the anti-Bomb bandwagon, presumably on the principle, If you can't beat them, join them.

It is difficult, however, to conceive of this apparent divorce between the two levels of the movement continuing.

The signs of strain and contradiction in the economy are becoming increasingly apparent. First, there is the fear of inflation with the consequent HP restrictions and canvassing for an increase in the bank rate—measures which the authors of the *London and Cambridge Economic Survey* consider inadequate to stem the inflation which they predict for late 1960 or early 1961; while in consumer durable goods the market is already overstocked with TV's, washing machines, refrigerators etc. Orders are more and more difficult to obtain, with production in refrigerators alone over 30 per cent above last year. The immediate consequence of this has been the attempt by Hoover's to sack one-tenth of their labour force.

STIMULUS

Again, according to a survey by the Federation of British Industries two out of every five firms questioned were having increasing difficulties in getting labour. Further, from this same survey, 38 percent of federated firms report pressure on profit margins, and even more, a rise in unit costs. In May the balance of trade showed a deficit of £61 million.

From this it seems fairly clear that whichever way the Govern-

ment turns (it is likely to turn to further restriction) it will be in some difficulty. If HP restrictions are eased inflation rears its ugly head and the trade deficit increases. If further credit restrictions are carried, capital development is slowed down and redundancy begins to appear in the consumer industries. In either case the necessary economic stimulus for an increase in trade union militancy exists.

INABILITY

This is a situation where it is unnecessary to be swimming against the stream. The basic inability of capitalism to reconcile its contradictory elements is becoming apparent, and will become more so to greater numbers of workers as the coming struggles develop.

This is not to suggest in any way that the coming struggle is for power or that Marxists should ride off into revolutionary infantilism. Recruits will not roll in by the thousand. But there are serious possibilities of turning the Clause 4 fight into something more than a defence of Sidney Webbs deathless prose and giving the nationalization and anti-Bomb fights a logical reason for existence in the consciousness of large numbers of workers.

Creed of a Union Bureaucrat

In 1886 the Constitution of the quite conservative American Federation of Labour (equivalent to our TUC) spoke in terms of the class struggle: "Whereas, a struggle is going on in all the nations of the civilized world between the oppressors and the oppressed of all countries, a struggle between the capitalist and the labourer, which grows in intensity from year to year, and will work disastrous results to the toiling millions if they are not combined for mutual protection and benefit..."

NO STRIKER

Since then the bureaucratic leadership of the American trade unions has not progressed in its views, but on the contrary, has retrogressed. Now we find George Meany, the President of the American trade-union federation (AFL-CIO), stating (December, 1956):

"I never went on strike in my life, never ran a strike in my life, never ordered anyone else to run a strike in my life, never had anything to do with a picket line..."

"In the final analysis, there is not a great difference between the things I stand for and the things that the National Association of Manufacturers leaders stand for. I stand for the profit system; I believe in the profit system, I believe it's a wonderful incentive. I believe in the free enterprise system completely." (B. Cochran, editor, *American Labour in Midpassage*, New York, 1959, p. 85).

How similar to developments in this country. The 1918 Labour Party Constitution (including the famous Clause Four) was written by the extreme right-wing Labour leaders Sidney Webb and Arthur Henderson. Now it is too socialist for Gaitskell & Co.

Slum Schools

The National Union of Teachers has issued a booklet on Primary Schools. It states that 25 percent of the classes in these schools are above the "indefensible" statutory limit of forty children to a class.

A questionnaire sent out to 2,300 schools, which had a 64% response, showed that:

99 schools had no water sanitation, 485 schools had no hot water, 622 schools had no head teacher's rooms or staff rooms, 456 schools had to provide meals in the classrooms.

CHEAP SKATE

THERE is flagrant racial discrimination in British colonies where there are White Settler immigrants... In Bechuanaland, for instance the annual cost per child in the European schools was £77, while that in the African schools was £6. 3s.0d.

Colonial Freedom News, April, 1960

PETER SEDGWICK DISCUSSES

LABOUR'S GREAT DEBATE

THE Left, Social-Democratic and Stalinist alike, is now torn by bitter debate. Moscow and Peking exchange verbal attacks whose violence is in no way lessened by the "gentleman's agreement" to avoid identifying the opponent by name. Names, on the other hand, are freely bandied about in our own Labour Party's debate, sometimes at the expense of the discussion of policy which should take priority over personal abuse.

The solidarities and comradeships of yesterday are forgotten; yet the loyalties and alignments of tomorrow remain obscure. In the uncertainty which hangs over the very existence of the Labour Party in its present form, and over the totalitarian unity of the Communist camp, it is hard for Socialists to find their bearings.

Nevertheless, certain lessons are clear. First of all, the slogan of Unity, taken as an end in itself, has been shown bankrupt. Stalinist governments and Labour politicians alike have for years assured the world and their own followers that dissension must be hushed up, that the organizational boat must never be rocked, that Party Unity must outweigh all other considerations. Unity for what? Unity for Unity; such was the principle, in content if not in words.

Now, however, the enforcers of Unity (via the purge or the proscription) have themselves become disunited. The problems of peace and war, of Socialist versus capitalist power, of the very future of the movement, have forced themselves into the brains of those who thought to postpone such debates forever. It is now possible to look to an issue of "Pravda" or the next Fabian pamphlet and find there for a change a contest of ideas relevant to the working-class movement.

WHAT A SOCIALIST PARTY EXISTS FOR

Out of Stalinism's debate, nothing helpful for Socialism will result, except to the extent that the rivalry may strain the faith of the militant Communist workers of France or Italy. The spectacle of rival bureaucrats combing the Highly Selected Works of Lenin for quotations to fit their own case is of no serious interest. Both sides, Soviet and Chinese, are forced to resort to Cold-War gestures in order to prove their own ideological militancy. Whether Khrushchov, Suslov or Mao wins the game, the working class of the world will be the losers.

But, by contrast, the debate in the Labour Party is a vital and serious one, which deserves the attention and participation of all Socialists. The issues of Clause Four and the Hydrogen Bomb are each central problems of the Movement.

In the Labour Party debate they are linked together, and, what is more, merged into the very issue of *what a Socialist Party exists for at all*. Never since the days of 1917 and 1918, when the impact of World War I and the Russian Revolution forced the Labour Party to define its organisation and objectives, has the Movement been faced with such rock-bottom questions.

The concern of the Left should be to see that the Socialist case on all these issues is presented *as a whole*. Crossman argues brilliantly for public ownership and attacks the notion of the Labour Party as a respectable "alternative government"; yet he is picked by Gaitskell as a key figure to engineer an unscrupulous compromise over the Bomb—whereby Britain would contribute conventional forces to a NATO armed to the teeth with nuclear weapons.

STAND OR FALL TOGETHER

The CND organises magnificent marches and pushes one trade union conference after another into the ranks of Aldermaston; yet "politics" is still a dirty word for its leadership, and the Bomb is presented as a problem altogether separate from the system of social and economic power which both feeds on and nourishes the machinery of annihilation.

Robens denounces those Right-wingers who would make the Parliamentary Labour Party accountable to no one but the Whips, and, having thus established his Socialist credentials, departs for the National Coal Board and £10,000 per annum.

It cannot be stated too often: Socialism and anti-nuclear neutralism, Socialism and public ownership, Socialism and rank-and-file control over leaders, stand or fall together. Those who would fragment the struggle for the rights of Conference from the struggle for workers' control in the mines, or the struggle for unilateralism from the struggle for Clause Four, may indeed play a significant role against the Right wing on this or that issue; but in the long run, such "specialists" of Socialism will sabotage with one hand what they uphold with the other.

NO CRYSTAL BALL

Confronted with this unprecedented crisis of policy and leadership, we may be tempted to jump to clairvoyant forecasts concerning an organizational split within the Labour Party. Perhaps the hard core of the Right, Gaitskell, Jay, Wyatt, Crosland and their ilk, defeated at the next Conference or the one after, will lead a large Parliamentary caucus into some association with Liberal politics. Or, again, the Right Wing may manoeuvre trade union votes against

their mandates, or produce yet another meaningless compromise out of the hat, and gain a block-card victory at Conference at the expense of the defection of *Tribune* militants and unilateralist union leaders.

Optimistic blue-prints are no doubt already being drawn up in certain quarters of the Left in preparation for one or the other of these courses.

Socialist Review possesses no crystal ball which would enable us to verify either of these forecasts. Whether the Labour leadership will choose to become a Parliamentary rump like the French Socialist Party, or whether an attempt will be made to force the Cousin's block out of the Party, or whether a fresh prospect will emerge, unforeseeable at present, is for the moment unimportant. The organisational future of a great mass movement cannot be legislated by this or that Left-wing publication. In the coming months, the actual alternatives will be presented much more clearly as the debate proceeds.

STRUGGLE HAS BEGUN

In any case, whatever the organisational future may be, the policies to be fought for at present remain perfectly clear. Unilateral nuclear disarmament by Britain, and no truck with NATO. Public ownership of large-scale industry and finance, under workers' control, i.e. Clause Four undiluted. A revolutionary, radical alternative to Toryism rather than the "loyal Opposition" waiting for the "swing of the pendulum" to come their way.

Above all, the crying necessity for involvement in Labour's policy debate must not blind us to the struggle for human betterment and decency which takes place daily outside grand Conference halls and musty Ward rooms. The millions on the block-vote cards may line up on our side for a change; but they will remain a set of figures unless the millions of working-class people that they are supposed to stand for, appear on history's stage.

Labour's programme must be changed, but a programme is useless without a living cast. We must be out on the knocker for CND as well as inside the Party. "Private opulence and public squalor" is a fascinating theoretical idea in a pamphlet or review; for miners and teachers, for railwaymen and local government workers, it is a hard fact of existence against which thousands of them fitfully, and perhaps negatively, react every day.

The starvation of the "public sector" (apart, of course, from our opulent, yet "public" H-Bomb) can be presented to such workers and employees as a central concept through which to weld their discontents.

In the months to come the Left will be greeted with a combination of back-biting, unprincipled attacks, and complaints that a debate of any kind is going on at all. But there can now be no going back to that stable, complacent Labour Party where dissent was a safety-valve for the few, and the big-union steamroller could be brought out to ride over the protesting minority. Between that time and now the Great Divide has already taken place. The cracks in the earth are still opening, and no amount of official bulldozing will fill them in.

KRUSHCHOV AND EISENHOWER HELP

LABOUR'S RIGHT WING

ON the Labour side, Mr. Gaitskell and his senior colleagues may ruefully reflect that the breakdown of the Paris summit meeting provided the first occasion since the general election when the fortuitous pattern of events has worked in their favour. Labour leaders have not overlooked in recent months that the intensification within the party and the trade union movement of the campaign for the renunciation of nuclear weapons and the repudiation of defensive alliances had met with much of its success because the strain and immediate danger had been taken out of relations between east and west. Now that Mr. Khrushchov has shattered the dream of a disarmed world, the extreme left-wingers are temporally wrong-footed, some of the emotionalists are reacting, and steady trade union opinion is seeing clearly what Mr. Gaitskell has been arguing for.

Although the Labour leadership's reoriented defence policy was framed in outline before Mr. Khrushchov frustrated the Paris conference, what is known of it fits in neatly with the international situation that will exist when it is brought forward for the National Executive Committee, the General Council of the T.U.C., and the Parliamentary Party to give their approval. On the evidence of opinion within the Parliamentary Party it is certainly hard to believe that Mr. Gaitskell and his colleagues in the Parliamentary Committee will have any difficulty in persuading their rank and file to stand by the principle of collective security within NATO and within the American alliance.

From "The Times" 23. 5. 60

PHILIP JONSON ARGUES THE CASE

FOR DEMOCRACY IN "YOUNG SOCIALISTS"

THE main topics of discussion and controversy amongst members of the Labour Party since the last election have quite rightly been Clause Four, disarmament and the mandating powers of National Conference. While the big battalions have been rolling to and fro threatening each other with various forms of annihilation a quite important issue, relevant to the whole future of the party, has been steamrollered in to the background.

Since the disbanding of the League of Youth in 1955 by the NEC, because of its embarrassment to the 'democratic principles' of the party, the youth have been campaigning in various ways for some sort of organization that will allow at least some measure of democracy for their ideas and at the same time provide some point of attraction for all sorts of semi and non political youth.

There is no doubt that the Youth Sections, which succeeded the League of Youth, were a dismal failure. Although this coincided with the general swing away from the party at all levels (except during the immediate post-Suez period) we can be sure that this was for the main part due to the isolation of individual Youth Sections enforced by Transport House and encouraged by a number of constituency parties hostile to any form of youth organization.

But what of the present?

It would be very foolish to think that the party have given us the sort of organization we have at present out of sheer benevolence. The only conclusion one can draw is that the Young Socialists are the brainchild of an NEC frightened of the party's lack of appeal to young voters. From what we have seen of the Young Socialists so far it is evident that there is the same lack of democracy as before.

STANDING ORDERS REJECTED

At inaugural meetings of Federation and Regional groups party spokesmen assured us that we can control policy and organization at every level and in the same breath tell us that the NEC have already decided to have a national monthly youth paper in the autumn that a new youth badge is being designed, that new posters (of the most obnoxious type: really bright young people are joining the Labour Party—join the Young Socialists, for youth at the top), brochures and pamphlets for recruitment are being printed. When questions are asked about who decided on these cheap and vulgar methods of attracting young people to the party we have to be content with the reply that it is too late to alter any decisions of the NEC.

Over the past few weeks some YS branches in London have drawn up standing orders and model rules of their own choosing and submitted them to the London Region Youth Officer for his approval. The worthy gentleman replied post-haste saying that of course branches can adopt any constitution they like but if it differs from the one drawn up at Transport House then the branch concerned is no longer part of the Labour Party and will not be "able to play its part in the structure of the Young Socialists".

STAN BEDWELL

'VICTORY FOR SOCIALISM' MISSES THE BOAT

"Victory for Socialism" has now several years behind it; and yet it is no more tangible or likely to achieve its grand title than when it began. Although it has collected to its side some well known "left" figures in the Labour Party including several MPs, as the Americans say, it has missed out.

It is pertinent for the Marxist left in the Labour Party to apply a little of the scientific method of thinking to VFS and try to see what the future holds.

Marxists who participate in V for S discussions are soon aware that some odd bods are attracted. At a meeting at a London hotel, a few weeks ago, which discussed Clause 4 and the Plan for Engineering, for some strange reason a lighted coloured spot thrower began to work. The chairman V for S treasurer and L.C.C. member, suggested it was symbolic of the many-coloured views which were being presented in the discussion.

Again, as the Americans say, he sure said a mouthful. Perhaps the darkest of the hues, was the lady's who denounced the use of the term "working-class". She was wearing a CND badge.

The British Labour Party is unique amongst European work-

er's parties. It rests firmly and squarely on the trade unions; in the final analysis they rule the roost.

Therefore any real or genuine "left" crystallisation inside the Labour Party would have to be supported by a sizable amount of trade union or shop-steward support. Despite Ernie Roberts, Asst. General Secretary of the AEU whose contribution is not to be sneezed at, and a few others, shop-steward militants remain either attracted to the pole of momentarily and seemingly Stalinist action, or find their way into one of the several Trotskyist grouplets.

Despite "the importance of having Ernest" and virtually being controlled by a few Labour MP's V for S has not made the grade and does not look like doing so.

What therefore is wrong? You can criticise V for S because it has many careerist backers like some of those who made most peculiar contributions at the Blackpool Conference last year. But this is not the whole story. Many of the pronouncements particularly on international events, have a trenchant international Socialist ring about them. Although haltingly at first,

This game has also been played at inaugural meetings of Area Federations where the item on the agenda 'Adoption of Standing Orders' has been introduced with the remark that "no discussion is needed on this as standing orders have to be accepted whether you agree or not".

It is unfortunate that these issues cannot be decided until the first National Conference of Young Socialists (probably next Spring). There the fight will revolve around the suspension of standing orders in order to substitute the constitution we want for the version forced on us by the Party. This doesn't mean that we can sit back until then allowing the Party hacks to ride roughshod over the many new and inexperienced young people joining the Young Socialists.

FIGHT FOR FULL CONTROL

Already a resolution has been sent to the London Region deploring "the appointment—as opposed to election—of the Regional Committee and the lack of consultation with Young Socialists branches" on the structure of the organization. It would certainly help the final result at next year's National YS Conference if the Regional Committee's received resolutions of this sort at every meeting between now and next year. Resolutions are also needed calling for the election of an Editorial Board of YS members to control the new youth paper that we have been threatened with. We also have to push for full control over the choice of posters, badges and all propaganda and recruiting literature—in fact all decisions must be taken by us, not the "we-want-a-big-healthy-non-political-yes-sir-youth-movement" brigade at Transport House.

In the space allotted to this article there has not been room enough to discuss relationships between the Labour Party youth and YCND groups, NALSO, New Left and other organizations. This is a subject of such importance that the whole future of the Young Socialists may well depend on how these can work together. This will need a much fuller discussion.

Incidentally Morgan Phillips in his *General Secretary's Newsletter* (June, 1960) highlights the ostrich-like nature of bureaucratic thinking by saying, in his report on the Young Socialists, "The weekend school held at Ruskin College at Easter was a success by every standard". Mr. Phillips's remarkable observation in ignoring the fifty or sixty thousand young people marching from Aldermaston deserves the highest award for cretinism, even by Labour Party standards.

The Young Socialists are a new venture, particularly in terms of broadening the influence of left ideas within the Party, but we are faced with the same fundamental problem that faces all the other wings of the movement—that of internal party democracy. Until we can solve this problem the Party's face to the young people in this country will be a very spotty one indeed. Our immediate task is to fight for the right to do and say what we think.

Now that present boom conditions and welfare facilities have removed much of the distress (not the poverty), they are left floundering about. They have not seen the role of the working-class in social change.

What is urgently required is that the Labour Party—the political arm of the working-class—pushes aside its ineffective leadership. The road back for the Labour Party is one of renewing identification with the working-class and battling for policies of class content which show the direct relationship of the battle for Socialism in Britain with the struggle against the H-Bomb.

The main arena of the class struggle, of the struggle for Socialism, is in the factories, docks and railways. Into this arena, alas, VFS does not enter.

Workers are all interested in raising their status. They are all interested in tangible results of collective action (hence the Trade Unions). Until and unless the present shapelessness of VFS obtains some class bite by putting positive working-class political proposals into its set of declared aims, it cannot revive the Labour Party.

Meanwhile it is to be seen not so much for its possibilities but for its severe limitations.

most members of Victory for Socialism have flatly denounced the Clause 4 New Testament. So far so good.

We are now in a period when the initiative inside the Labour Party is with the "left". But to be serious, it has to be viewed as a working-class battle for the retention of the Labour Party as a serious part of the armament of the working-class in its onward march to overthrow Capitalism.

VFS, with its sloppy utopian unscientific—often anti-Marxist-middle-class content—is bound to pose more nationalisation as against the present amount of nationalisation (and we are not sure about even that after John Hughes' masterpiece) in a situation when all workers hate the bureaucratic edifice of the nationalised industries as erected by the Labour Government.

VFS, with its MP and would-be MP overseers, does not generally see the actual role of Parliament (at best a secondary one) in the advancement of the working class.

Over the past 30 to 40 years, many middle-class people were attracted to the Labour Party as a philanthropic institution for the relief of distress among the poor.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

By HENRY COLLINS

"The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is its natural manure."

(Thomas Jefferson).

ON July 4, 1776, the American Congress adopted the *Declaration of Independence* which Jefferson had just drafted. Fifty years after, to the day, the author of the *Declaration* died, having bequeathed to History one of the outstanding revolutionary documents of all time. "We hold these truths to be self-evident", it began, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it and to institute new Government."

Like other great revolutionary manifestos, the *Declaration of Independence*, arose out of a clash of powerful social forces whose interests could no longer be reconciled by diplomacy or politics. The Seven Years' War had ended in 1763, leaving England with vast colonial gains and a vast National Debt. The Government felt that the burden of wars, past and future, should be shared with the North American colonists who, it claimed, benefited from the security of the British Navy. The ungrateful beneficiaries thought otherwise, and after ten years of political resistance instituted a boycott of British goods. The British landed a cargo of tea in the port of Boston and the colonists dumped it in the harbour. As a reprisal, the port was closed. After that, it was only a matter of time before, in 1775, the fighting began at Bunkers Hill which culminated in the independence of the United States.

CONFLICTING INTERESTS

Such momentous developments could not have arisen solely from Bostonian high spirits or Jeffersonian eloquence. The American Revolution resulted directly from the growth of American Capitalism. Britain, by means of the Navigation Acts, tried to tie the colonists' external trade exclusively to the mother country. But for the North Americans it was more profitable to sell the rice and tobacco from the plantations and the timber from the New England forests to the Spanish and French colonies elsewhere on the American Continent. Smuggling became a major national pastime and the catching of smugglers the chief preoccupation of the Royal Navy. To the Americans, the demand that they pay additional taxes for the upkeep of that Navy seemed adding insult to injury. Moreover, since the Seven Years' War had freed Canada from the French, the protection of Britain now seemed a dispensable luxury.

It was in this situation that the slogan "No Taxation Without Representation" began to make sense to Americans, increasingly conscious that their interests conflicted with those of the British Sovereign.

Like all wars of national liberation which are led by a revolutionary class, the American War of Independence was complicated by the presence of a Fifth Column, the Loyalists, who supported King George on principle, hated democracy and valued their connexion with the old country. Much more important was the fact that in England there was a substantial body of opinion supporting the claims of the colonists. The Earl of Chatham was an imperialist who saw that the blindly reactionary policies of the King and Lord North were disrupting the Empire.

John Wilkes, who had been leading the struggle for "Wilkes and Liberty" since 1763, at the head of the London working class, identified the cause of the American rebels with the cause of democracy at home. So did a host of others who began to develop, under pressure of events, the idea of international solidarity.

DEMOCRATIC GOSPEL

Dr. Richard Price, a Unitarian and one of the leading economists of his day, wrote the *Discourse on Civil Liberty* in defence of the American Revolution. Joseph Priestley, Unitarian and chemist, went even further in his espousal of democratic ideas. Major Cartwright, who spoiled a promising career in the Navy by refusing to serve against the Americans, published a famous pamphlet in 1776—*Take Your Choice*—with unmistakable echoes of Jefferson's *Declaration*. "The all-wise Creator", said Cartwright, "hath likewise made men equal, as well as free; they are all of one flesh, and cast in one mould... There are, therefore, no distinctions to be made among men, as just causes for the elevation of some above the rest, prior to mutual agreement. How much soever any individual may be qualified for, or deserve any elevation, he hath no right to it till it be conferred on him by his fellows."

Cartwright's programme was almost identical with that later adopted by the Chartists: universal suffrage, annual parliaments, vote

by ballot, payment of members and equal electoral districts. Through the Society for Constitutional Information, which he helped to establish in 1780 and, later, through the Hampden Clubs and other organisations, Cartwright preached the democratic gospel in and out of season until his death in 1824.

Most remarkable of all, however, was the work of the former staymaker and exciseman, Tom Paine, who had emigrated to America in 1774. As Anglo-American relations were moving towards their crisis Paine issued, six months before the *Declaration of Independence*, a short pamphlet, *Common Sense*, which sold 100,000 copies in four months. If men were naturally equal, enjoying equal natural rights, Paine argued, then only representative government could be legitimate. "All delegated power is trust: all assumed power is usurpation."

FROM CHAOS TO TRIUMPH

But how could Americans enjoy their natural rights under the rule of a British king and a Parliament elected by a narrow oligarchy? Independence was a prerequisite of freedom, and for the first time in history the causes of national and political liberation were shown to be inseparably connected. "Ye that oppose independence now," he wrote, "ye know not what ye do; ye are opening a door to eternal tyranny, by keeping vacant the seat of government. ...Freedom hath been hunted round the globe. Asia, and Africa, have long expelled her. Europe regards her like a stranger, and England hath given her warning to depart. O! receive the fugitive, and prepare in time an asylum for mankind... We have it in our power to begin the world over again... The birthday of a new world is at hand."

Like other revolutionary wars, the American War of Independence began in chaos and ended in triumph. Out of the untrained irregulars of thirteen disunited states, Washington created an effective fighting force. The first decisive American victory was over General Burgoyne, who surrendered at Saratoga with 5,000 men. (The battle, and the monumental incompetence of the British Government which it exposed, were used by Bernard Shaw as the background to his *Devil's Disciple*.) International rivalries were exploited to the full to embarrass the British. Feudal France, Spain and, later, bourgeois Holland, joined the revolutionary colonists and paralysed the naval might of England. Supplies were interrupted, garrisons besieged and, against a nation in arms, Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown in 1781. After that the result was only a matter of time.

ARISTOCRATS UNSHAKEN

Discredited by defeat, the Government of George III was forced to make some concessions to the Whig opposition. The number of sinecures and pensions at the disposal of the King was sharply reduced and his control over the House of Commons correspondingly weakened. That proved to be, however, the limit of reform for the next fifty years. The landed aristocracy was still too strong to be severely shaken. The next steps could not be taken until technical developments had given rise to an industrial bourgeoisie and an industrial proletariat.

JOHN FAIRHEAD

CORFIELD ON KENYATTA

WHOOPS of delight from the Tory press greeted the publication of the Government Blue Book on the "Mau Mau" rebellion in Kenya, compiled by Mr F D Corfield.

Mr Corfield dismisses with a cursory reference the admitted grievances of the African majority in Kenya, and in particular those of the leading tribe, the Kikuyu, long the victims of spoilage and suppression by the settlers.

Instead he launches a vicious attack on the imprisoned leader, Jomo Kenyatta, at whose door he lays the whole responsibility for the "excesses" of the nationalist revolt of 1952. *He takes a stinging side-swipe at certain Labour MP's (among whom Fenner Brockway is singled out for special mention). On these,*

Mr Corfield comments: "These politicians obviously had no knowledge whatsoever of what was going on behind the clever facade so successfully built up by Jomo Kenyatta and his associates, whose prestige was, of course, greatly strengthened... by apparently close association with British politicians".

HYMN OF HATE

Discarding caution, this authentic blimp ascribes (incredible though it may seem) an equal share in the blame to the "liberalism" of the régime in Kenya, without which "Kenyatta and his associates would have been unable to preach their calculated hymn of hate".

contd page 7

CANDID COMMENTARY

By JOHN WILKES

J P W MALLALIEU writing in *New Statesman*, complains of the burden of elections. Elections, elections, elections, he says. You have no sooner finished with one election than you have to start thinking about the next.

Now I think this statement of Mallalieu's is significant. I have been in politics for more years than I like to remember, and this is the first time I've encountered the argument that elections should be made less frequent. I would suggest Mallalieu's moan is yet another sign

that the Labour Party has less and less active workers and, therefore, is finding it more and more difficult to do even the routine work.

Of course, this is because rank-and-file members are getting increasingly exasperated by the Party's policy. The Labour leadership may be able to steam-roller their way through annual conference, with the assistance of the block vote, but the Labour activist quietly votes with his feet.

FIG LEAF

G CARRITT, writes in the Communist party journal, *Marxism Today*. "Labour is challenged by capitalism, not by Russia. If by discussion and debate the accusers of the Establishment and Marxists can make common cause in Britain against the evils and abuses on which we are agreed, the Russian bogey will fade away and the fig leaf which hides the brutal capitalist state will fall. Then we shall all clearly see the enemy."

The intriguing question is: what precisely is the enemy keeping behind the fig leaf?

LANDED

Land for housing is not less than £3000 an acre, says the *Financial Times* (24 February). In the London "commuting" area it is £10,000 an acre. In Kingston a house selling for £7,150, the plot cost £2,500; in Horsham plot costs of houses selling for £3,500—£4,500 were £1,000. 77 acres in Sussex went for £27,000. As it is estimated that private contractors are putting up some 150,000 houses in 1960 at a cost of £320 million, the land, plot costs, of these will be between £80 and £100 million at least.

FIGHTING FUND

Our income in June was:

	£	s	d
Shoreditch	5	2	0
Islington	5	13	6
Hackney	5	0	0
Lewisham	4	19	0
Notting Hill	4	17	0
Holborn	6	0	0
Willesden	11	0	0
Harrow	1	12	0
Birmingham	2	0	0
Ipswich	10	0	0
Liverpool	15	0	0
Epping	10	0	0
Nottingham	10	0	0
Ramsgate	2	5	0
Total	40	4	6

WE NEED £40 a month. Up to the end of June we received £40.4.6. Thanks! and keep it up, Comrades should also remember that they could do us the world of good and themselves no harm by making all their purchases through London Co-operative No. 350498. Comrades! Help your paper by introducing it to your friends, by ordering bulk copies, by giving donations!

CORFIELD from page 6

Even Mr Corfield, however, should be satisfied with the proposal of the latest Royal Commission to give a vote to every literate African with an income over £57 a year. Why? Because the average income of a Kenya African is £48. No danger of excessive liberalism here!

REIGN OF TERROR

IF the Corfields want evidence of a real hymn of hate they should turn their gaze on Algeria, where despite the "liberal" mouthings of de Gaulle, the reign of terror proceeds with redoubled force.

All France has been shocked by the case of the 22-year-old Algerian girl, Djamila Boupacha, details of whose maltreatment and torture were revealed by the noted novelist Simone de Beauvoir in the conservative Paris paper, *Le Monde* (June 2). This issue of *Le Monde* (which ranks as the French equivalent of *The Times*) was seized by the Algerian authorities and its distribution in Algeria was forbidden.

CONFESSION!

Djamila Boupacha, who is now championed also by the non-political Françoise Sagan, was due to be sentenced to death, undefended, by a military court on June 17. She alleged that a confession had been forced from her by such methods as holding her over a bath and immersing her head for minutes at a time, and ramming the neck of a bottle up her uterus.

But Djamila's case is only the most notorious of many. Twenty Algerians were shot last month after summary condemnation and four more were sentenced. Forty-four persons, Algerian and French, have been arrested in France in June (so far), and five Communist leaders (among them Henri Alleg, author of *La Question*) have been given long sentences of imprisonment.

British socialists must redouble their efforts to end the dirty war in Algeria by exposing the aid given by Macmillan's government to de Gaulle and his butchers.

Disarmers march

TONY YOUNG (RAMSGATE YOUNG SOCIALISTS)

THE Whitsun march to Foulness, organised by the National Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, was not as large as the organisers hoped, or as might have been expected after seeing the thousands of young people who took part in the march from Aldermaston to London at Easter. The core of the march was about 250-strong, with some 300 more joining in at different times for part of the distance.

Puritans who insist that political activity must be miserable may not have been happy, but there is no doubt that the march was a very enjoyable protest. Everyone knows by now that if you come out publicly against mass murder the Establishment will damn you as (a) mad, un-British and ascetic, or (b) mad, un-British and licentious. So why not be happy?

The rather vague slogan of "Ban the Bomb" was certainly common, but it was encouraging to find that "No work on H-Bombs—No Work on Rocket Bases" and similar socialist slogans came out strongly, and no officious marshals tried to in-

terfere. No-one wanted to conceal his own views or those of others, and when the march passed a Conservative Club, there was furious booing and chant of "Hate! Hate", which might have distressed Communist Party officials as likely to offend the famous "progressive Tories."

An interesting feature of the march was the complete absence of those organisations which consider themselves the vanguard of the working-class movement, the Communist Party or the Socialist Labour League. "Challenge" and "The Newsletter" were sold at the assembly point, but only the Young Socialists and the Youth Campaign had banners. Surprisingly the "New Left Review", "Keep Left" and the Labour students were absent. Probably, the lack of interest shown by all these organisations partly accounted for the march not being larger than it was, although the decision to march away from instead of to London, and the absence of advance publicity comparable to that received by the Aldermaston event were also important factors.

IT'S RICH

"Our main inspiration is the party's general political line, showing us how to dare to think and dare to act" Shih Chan Chun, leader of the Chinese Everest expedition, Peking, June 2.

* * *

"They are guilty of individualism, ambition towards stardom, neglect of *esprit de corps*, unconcern for the collective, indiscipline, irresponsibility, selfishness and lack of regard for the spectators"—Rumanian newspaper *Scintea*, criticising a Rumanian football XI for their 2-0 defeat by a Czechoslovakian side., quoted in *Observer*, June 19.

* * *

In California, there was a recent ruling by a local court "that a couple who own land valued at nearly \$100,00, but for which they cannot find a buyer, should receive a state old age pension"—reported in the *Times*, June 14.

* * *

"The Knesset (Parliament) in Jerusalem today refused to censure Mr Ben-Gurion for expressing views about the Jewish Exodus from Egypt which contradict the biblical version"—reported in the *Times*, May 19.

* * *

"The program of the day was of formidable intensity: a swim, work with his secretary, tennis, racing, bridge, more work, half an hour's PT and massage, a dinner party and the Casino"—John Hislop on the late Prince Aly Khan, *Observer*, May 15.

* * *

"One feels one can never sleep when half the female population use no cream on their face at all"—Mark Ramage, director of an advertising agency and once private secretary to Lord ("I'll always be Herb to the boys") Morrison, *Observer*, May 22.

* * *

"Planning control should be in the hands of people with knowledge of land values—people in the property profession"—Herbert H Davies, past president, addressing the annual conference of the Incorporated Society of Auctioneers and Landed Property Agents, Bournemouth, reported in the *Times*, May 28.

* * *

"the firm (Colman Prentis and Varley) which sells Mr Macmillan is stocking a new line in Sir Roy Welensky"—*The Economist*, June 11.

* * *

"I am nobody's delegate"—Mr Woodrow Wyatt, at Leicester, reported in the *Times*, April 23.

* * *

"a movement is first of all its leadership"—Cyril Smith at Second Annual Conference of the Socialist Labour League, reported in the *Newsletter*, June 18.

OPEN LETTER TO 'NEWS CHRONICLE'

The *News Chronicle* has lost none of its Liberal and Quaker-like zest of the sensational and the lurid.

On Saturday, June 11, the credulous readers of this declining daily were informed that there was trouble amongst the "Trotskyites". Taking care not to specifically name the organisation concerned, as though the target was quite obvious, it accused 'thugs' of beating up 'two Trotsky leaders in a South Western London alley'. It was claimed that the alleged victims of the attack were 'too scared to report the matter to the police'.

Besides the accusations of beatings-up it was also alleged people inside the organisation were subjected to blackmail. Sleuths from Scotland Yard, it was claimed, were examining secret documents—let's hope it's not the department responsible for finding the murderers of Kelso Cochrane.

The *News Chronicle* here again, as in the past, is concerned with discrediting and smearing the left wing. In typical cowardly fashion, it avoids naming either the organisation or the individuals concerned, thereby avoiding libel action and having to substantiate its charges.

The organization that the *News Chronicle* refers to has recently undergone a number of splits and defections. The political merits of the opposing groups or tendencies will no doubt be discussed by Marxists and other left-wingers. That discussion can well manage without the interference of the scandal-mongering *News Chronicle*. It ill becomes a paper which enthusiastically supported the murder of millions of people in Korea to start poking its nose into the affairs of the Socialist movement.

Bob Pennington

Letter

MAY I trespass on your valuable space to take up and comment on some of the points in David Prynne's Papal letter on behalf of the Socialist Labour League?

According to the interpretation of marxism offered to readers in the May issue of *Socialist Review* by him, the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is inextricably related to his belief that only one party, yet to be created but an enlarged edition of the SLL, can lead the working class in fulfilling its "historic mission". But what right has he to assume that only one working class party in a given nation-state will struggle for the conquest of class power? Rosa Luxemburg envisaged a situation in which two or three working class parties could conceivably struggle for and succeed in constituting themselves into a genuine "dictatorship of the proletariat". Is he courageous enough to put Rosa Luxemburg into his category of "pessimists and capitulators"?

The key and dangerous ambiguity in the version of marxism to which he and the SLL adhere is the tendency to identify the "dictatorship of the proletariat" with the dictatorship of a single party over the proletariat. Having had some experience of the SLL, if only from a safe distance, I naturally wonder what would happen to other opposition working class parties or independent socialists if the SLL were to come to power and so constitute in practice the dictatorship of the proletariat? The way abuse was showered on Peter Fryer after he had baled out of the SLL gives me cause for considerable anxiety.

In any case once you assume that working classes cannot build socialism for themselves without a semi-military "vanguard party" you are thrown up against the problem of building a "dictatorship over the proletariat". (Hadn't the young Leon Trotsky something to say about this problem?) And it is, after all, an axiom of scientific socialism that a militant Labour movement cannot depend on well-meaning individuals to build socialism for the workers, however well equipped theoretically. Socialism is a 'do it yourself movement', anyway.

Prynne's arrogance and contempt for other socialists who have genuine differences of opinion with the SLL's interpretation and mechanical

application of Bolshevik principles springs from an uncritical acceptance of the letter, if not exactly the spirit, of Bolshevism. His contempt for other socialists outside of the chosen circle can be traced back to his mistaken notion that the SLL has been "ordained" by history to make the socialist revolution in Britain. I had mistakenly assumed that most socialists had given up such a transparently religious approach to political problems when they abandoned the ancient faiths of their fathers to join the socialist movement.

Besides, he is in for big disappointments if he thinks he can wriggle out of refuting for example the "bright idea of the Seven Hours League" by simply abusing Ken Coates. A theorist like Prynne ought to know that abuse is no substitute for argument. Moreover, Healy, the General Secretary of the SLL, can jealously guard his theoretical superiority by refusing to answer Walter Kendall's "Open Letter to Gerald Healy" in the "*Socialist Leader*". But by taking up the challenge against the traditional sectarianism of British marxists which has been excellently described and criticised by Ken Coates and Walter Kendall, Prynne has thrown himself into an exposed position. And unfortunately for the SLL, and the God-seekers within it, the rank and file of the Labour movement do not recognise the Papal infallibility of self-appointed "Bolshevik" leaders.

Prynne asserts that "the party is 'the memory of the class'". Really! In Hungary it was the memory the class had of the party which led to AVO men being strung up from the lamp-post of Budapest. As Trotskyist sections were completely and brutally wiped out by the Nazis during the second world war in many parts of Europe, I really wonder how the class succeeded in keeping its memory? And how were the workers subsequently able to make a bid—however unsuccessful—for political power in France and Italy without a "vanguard party" or a collective memory embodied in a party which had ceased to exist?

Until Prynne—or some other theorist on the SLL—can come up with some real answers to the problems I have just touched on, comrades could profitably re-read Walter Kendall's "Out of the Ice Age" in the March issue of "*Socialist Review*".

London N.6. James D Young
(correspondence now closed)

TORIES AND MINERS— ● from page 1

If this situation is allowed to arise it will mean that those areas where high powered mechanical mining is geologically possible will be in a position to underprice the other areas, which would then, because of lack of markets, be forced to close down. This is of course good old Tory policy: if you can't compete, get out. This will mean in reality that the areas most able to compete will be those situated close to large industrial areas, eg. the East Midlands and the car factories where there is relatively full employment and alternative work; and the areas that will suffer will be places like Scotland and Durham, where there is already a high rate of unemployment, causing suffering and hardship amongst the older miners and the breaking up of the mining communities.

What must we miners put forward then as our answer to these attacks by the Tory Government? Our policy should be:

AN END TO THE COMPENSATION PAID TO EX-OWNERS

For too long the burden of paying for what was a derelict industry has been placed on the Board. This money could be better used increasing the day wage rates.

NATIONALIZATION OF SUBSIDIARY INDUSTRIES

This to include distribution of coal and the concerns which supply the mining industry with machinery.

NATIONALIZED MINES TO FORM AN INTEGRAL PART OF AN OVERALL ECONOMIC PLAN

With the anarchy of competitive capitalism the miners' job cannot be secured. You cannot have a "socialist" island in the midst of a capitalist ocean. Planned economy is indivisible.

WORKERS' CONTROL IN THE PITS

This is the most important issue. Who knows the problems of mining better than the men who work in the pits? We don't need retired admirals and directors of sewing-machine companies to tell us how to do our jobs. What is wanted is not the present consultative committees which are only talking shops with no decisions taken, but a system where every miner participates in the running of the pits and where increased production is brought about: the benefits of this to be extended to the miners in the form of a shorter working week and longer holidays.

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, post paid. 12 issues: 8s. Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of *Socialist Review* which are given in editorial statement.

All communications to be addressed to 117 Carmelite Rd., Harrow Weald, Middlesex.

Printed by St. Martin's Printers (T.U.) 86d. Lillie Road, London. S.W.6. Tel.: FUL. 8637.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for international Socialist democracy. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The SOCIALIST REVIEW believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power on the basis of the following programme:

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Renationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation.—The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.

- Workers' control in all nationalised industries ie, a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.

- The establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all instances representatives must be subject to frequent election, immediate recall, and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.

- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions.

- The establishment of the principle of work or full maintenance.

- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.

- The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.

- Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants — without a means test — for all university students.

- Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

- Freedom from political and economic oppression to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the underdeveloped countries.

- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.

- The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.

- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow.