

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

11th YEAR No 6

JUNE 1961

SIXPENCE

JOURNAL

for the

Industrial Militant —

for

International

Socialism

LABOUR AND THE BOMB

AT the time of writing the gloom emanating from the decision of the shopworkers and engineers to reject unilateralism at their annual conferences is still very much with us. It now looks as if the Scarborough resolution will be reversed at the Labour Party's annual conference this Autumn. For the moment it looks as if we must admit defeat.

But wait. It is not as if a world full of promise has been utterly smashed. The Scarborough decision was at best partial. The arithmetic of bloc voting added false stature to the Left, making it appear the majority view where it was no more than a vocal, organized section of the Party. The unilateralist leadership was undecided as to the next move, sat tight and allowed the initiative to fall to the Right.

So it was with the defeat. The number of unilateralists has probably not declined. What has occurred is the result of the Right organizing around the issue and delving into the reserves of support it can always find in the apathetic and most backward section of the Party and trade-union membership. If anything, the defeat shows the true relation of forces within the Party.

It also shows the weakness of the Left leadership. Where the Right gathered support by attacking the unstated implications of unilateralism—the withdrawal from NATO, the dissolution of the American alliance—the Left leadership shirked these issues. Cousins, Foot and the rest preferred to keep silent. Instead of uniting the greatest possible number on a clear anti-NATO program, complete with appeals to the workers of Europe and beyond, they sought a false unity in anti-Gaitskellism. They went as far as to support Wilson the natopolitician against Gaitskell the natopolitician in the Parliamentary Party elections. They gave the Crossman-Padley variant of Gaitskell's 'defence' policy their blessing (Cousins by voting for it in committee; Foot in *Tribune*, 3 March, on the eve of CND's annual conference). And as the personal struggle hotted up, so cooled their defiance towards the Bomb. In a word, they

helped build the bridge to Gaitskell which the weaker elements in the Party have now crossed in the name of unity.

What of unity? An appeal to it is certain to stir very real emotions in the Party. Where the Left leadership could have attacked Gaitskell and Crossman and Wilson for flouting Party policy and breaking Conference decisions from positions in which they were supposed to represent the Party; where this Left leadership could, in the name of unity, have called for a wholesale attack on Labour-Tory bipartisanship in foreign policy and in the domestic policy from which it arises, they let the Right assume guardianship of the Party's emotional heart.

We have seen with what result. But defeat this year is no more absolute than victory was last year. Then, the consistent Left had to damp down the flush of illusions; now our job is to combat demoralization, recoil and 'what's-the-use-ism'. We must use facts



and cool appraisal to wash away the tears; strengthen the connexions with CND and Direct Action in order to fight the Right more effectively, remembering how they, in their turn, put heart into the Party Left; and finally, we must clarify the implications of unilateralism: the fight against the Bomb is a fight against the Boss.

Reproduced by permission of *International Socialism*.

STALINISM NOT DEAD

T. Cliff

THIS is the central theme of the new Soviet Death Sentence Law for embezzlement and theft. The Law is in the "great" tradition of Stalin's rule.

Thus, under a law of 7th August, 1932, "On the Protection of the Property of State Enterprises, Collective Farms and Co-operatives and Institutions of Socialist Property," the theft of property belonging to the state, kolkhozes and co-operatives and theft on the railways or waterways, became punishable by death by shooting, accompanied by the confiscation of all property. If there were extenuating circumstances, the penalty incurred was imprisonment for not less than ten years and confiscation of all property. (*A Collection of Laws and Ordinances of the Worker-Peasant Government of the USSR*, Russian

(Moscow), 1932, No. 62. Article 360) Stalin christened this law "the foundation of revolutionary legality." (J.V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 209).

In point of fact this law was seldom applied in cases of minor theft. Therefore, when the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR passed a decree on 4th June, 1947, on "Protection of Citizens' Private Property," the first article of which reads: "Theft—that is, covert or open appropriation of the private property of citizens—is punishable by confinement in a reformatory labour camp for a period of five to six years. Theft committed by a gang of thieves or for a second time is punishable by confinement at a reformatory labour camp for a period of six to ten years" (*Pravda*, 5 June, 1947). Any

mitigation of severity in dealing with crimes against property was more apparent than real.

On the same day the Presidium also passed a decree on "Embezzlement of State and Public Property", which included the following articles:

"(1) Theft, appropriation, defalcation or other embezzlement of state property is punishable by confinement in a reformatory labour camp for seven to ten years, with or without confiscation of property.

"(2) Embezzlement of state property for a second time, as well as when committed by an organised group or on a large scale, is punishable by confinement in a reformatory labour camp for ten to twenty-five years, with confiscation of property.

"(3) Theft, appropriation, de-

falcation or other embezzlement of collective farm, co-operative or other public property is punishable by confinement in a reformatory labour camp for five to eight years, with or without confiscation of property.

"(4) Embezzlement of collective farm, co-operative or other public property for a second time, as well as that committed by an organised group or gang or on a large scale, is punishable by confinement in a reformatory labour camp for eight to twenty years, with confiscation of property." (*Ibid*)

A month later the Public Prosecutor's Office gave some examples of how the decrees were being carried out:

"(1) In the city of Saratov, VF Yudin, who had been pre-

cont. pg. 7 column 1

TU COMMENTARY

P.O. Engineers

B. Lynam

CIVIL service unions are not as a rule militant, and the Post Office Engineering Union is no exception to the rule. It has no strike policy, or more correctly a no-strike agreement with the Post Office. It therefore comes as a surprise to find the POEU involved in industrial action. This action has taken the form of a ban on overtime, or at least voluntary overtime. The original call for action came from the Overseas Telegraph branch and was primarily concerned with the grievances of the A-Optants.

This group of Technicians, who were employed by the Cable and Wireless company before the company was nationalised in 1948 receive a higher rate of pay than Post Office Technicians but, with the pay-rise of Post Office employees and the apparent 'standstill' of the "A-Optants" pay, the gap has rapidly diminished.

The A-Optants quite naturally feel that this is a deliberate attempt by the Post Office to break agreements made in 1948 and to force them to accept Post Office pay and conditions.

Discontent was also felt at the Post Office attitude to a pay claim submitted last November on behalf of the Post Office men. The passing of a proposition by the Overseas Telegraph branch brought the National Secretary, Charles Smith, hot-foot with a plea to the branch to wait a fortnight before implementing the overtime ban, so that all possible attempts could be made to prevent the need for such action. After a rather lively meeting, the proposal to wait a fortnight was accepted.

However after a fortnight the determination of the Overseas Telegraph men had in no way diminished, and the original decision was implemented. A call to other branches for support drew some response, and soon eight or nine London branches, and some provincial branches, banned overtime in support.

The next move by the Union's National Executive was a suggestion that a proposal for a one day token strike be put before the National Conference in June. The suggestion however is not as militant as it might seem, for it carried with it an automatic return to overtime working. A ban on overtime would certainly bring more pressure to bear on the Post Office than a one, or half a day token strike. It seems strange that the executive committee of a union that is in principal against overtime working anyway, should call its members back to overtime working.

Even more inexplicable is the attitude of the London Central branch to the working of the Television switching staff. Ten men are constantly on duty to

switch television programmes from outside London onto the London network. After the branch had decided to support the ban on overtime it was announced that the Television Switching Centre would be manned even if it meant overtime working. I understand that the Secretary of the London Central branch agreed with the management that the switching centre should be fully manned. The fact that the Postmaster General holds shares in ITA may or may not be relevant but Mr Bevin is no doubt feeling quite pleased with the London Central branch's secretary.

Here we have a classical example of the spontaneous action by rank and file members of a union being gradually crushed by the bureaucracy. It has been, like a certain daily newspaper, an eye-opener for many of the rank and file members who seem puzzled by the lack of support from their National Executive. At the time of writing it appears that the proposal to return to overtime working will be rejected by the majority of branches and that the National Executive will have to think again.

Cunards

Bill Fowler

"THE Government Bill providing for assistance towards the cost of the new liner was given an unopposed second reading."

This jolly little statement from the National Press underlines once again the complete failure of private enterprise to run industry, any industry, without massive financial bolstering from State funds.

How the Tories love to shout about the effectiveness with which private enterprise runs the nation's business! The 'captains of industry' fall all over themselves to 'prove' how well they manage the nation's affairs—what a disaster it would be if those 'socialists' ever got control.

Sir John Vaughan-Morgan, Tory MP for Reigate, fulminated against this Government's latest barefaced robbery of state funds by pointing out that Cunard had already been in receipt of Government assistance for 58 years.

The noble Knight is, of course, a member of the old school who really believes that 'private enterprise' means just that. What a rude awakening he would have if he went through the list of companies who have received billions in State aid. From ship building to machine tools, steel and aircraft manufacturers, they have all had their 'share' from the national kitty.

Another Tory speaking in the same debate pointed out that while the Government was putting money into the ship the

Cunard company was putting money into aircraft. What a glorious fiddle it is. And this bunch of high-class confidence tricksters proceed at the same time to cut and slash at the Health Service, raise rents, starve old age pensioners and throw millions down the drains at Wethersfield, Aldermaston and Holy Loch.

Let us remember the role of 'private enterprise' when next we go in for our share of the national cake.

Building

Omar

A cursory glance through the Annual Reports of the NFBTO is enough to show that a lot of time has been spent in an effort to prove the impracticability of one Union for the Building Industry; but very little time has been spent in the search for a solution of this vital problem.

A serious and logical argument against unification has yet to be presented by the opponents of unity. Almost all the leading personalities in the Trade Union Movement believe that the time has come when more rational forms of organization must be instituted; they also accept the principle of centralization and concentration into a unitary force, but when the time for action comes, they shrink their responsibilities. This may in part be attributed to tradition and its influence on the minds of craftsmen.

But social and technical progress has drawn the craftsman into its vortex just as it has other operatives in the world of

industry. It is no respecter of persons. These progressive changes have revealed that there is no hidden magic in their vocations and that the value of their labour is determined in the same way as that of any other worker, whatever his designation may be.

The time has therefore come for the displacement of conservatism by a more dynamic policy which will have as one of its aims, the complete reorganisation of the unions.

In 1958 the NFBTO missed an opportunity for demonstrating and implementing the principle of unity. On this occasion the approach was negative and the Council placed on record its inability to deal with the organisational problem. In the course of the discussions it was revealed that there were unanimous views on the need for unity but the delegates were convinced that the next generation or the one after must shoulder the responsibility for introducing such a progressive change.

The TUC has made certain recommendations which have been accepted by the affiliated unions to the NFBTO. All that is needed is their implementation.

The course charted by the TUC aims at merging the kindred trades into one unit; the trowel trades would unite and form one organisation; the woodworkers another and so on.

This in the opinion of the TUC was not an end in itself but the first step in the formation of a single building workers union based on industry.

At the present this is the most effective way of reaching a solution of this vexed question. If this is to be achieved an intensive agitation must be conducted at branch and job or site level.

SUPPORT

PUBLIC TRANSPORT DEMAND

DURING the past eight months London busmen have been trying to stimulate a widespread demand for a public enquiry into the LTE with the view to obtaining improvements in bus services. Although these efforts have yet to convince the Minister of Transport that an enquiry is necessary they have succeeded in encouraging many people and organizations to give voice to their transport grievances. This includes Borough and County Councils, Trade Unions, Trades Councils, local Labour Parties and Co-ops.

It is now time that these bodies join forces in a united campaign for improved bus transport.

To this end an all day conference has been called for: SATURDAY JULY 1ST at ST. PANCRAS TOWN HALL. (Credentials 2/6 from the London Busmen's Public Enquiry Campaign, Bill Jones, 3 Hale End Road, Walthamstow, E.17., LAR 1576)

At this conference it is intended to define a clear policy on public transport requirements and to appoint a widely representative committee to pursue the campaign.

You will note that we speak specifically of London Labour Organizations. We do so because since the busmen heralded the demand for a public enquiry, a number of organizations with an anti-labour outlook have joined in the popular demand and are making proposals that, although they may suit the particular interests of the proposers, will do nothing to remove the root cause of the troubles and will not provide Londoners with the reliable and convenient bus services to which they are entitled.

We have been asked to give publicity to the forthcoming conference, which we urge all comrades to attend.

E.M.I.

R. Johnson

WORKERS at EMI, Wembley, who are caught up in the latest merger of "giants", are standing firm against the threat of a wages cut which could lower their weekly earnings by as much as £2. Marconi Wireless &

The management wished to withdraw the document issued to each employee with their name and personal number. The Union refused it as illegal and had previously advised the members not to sign or in any way accept its conditions. The management adjourned for consultation and on return asked that the stoppage scheduled to

which answered the questionnaire was Chichester in Sussex. A number of men sent the District Council Secretary their pay chits, covering a period of several weeks, and, without exception, they were all less than £8 per week. This was no isolated instance.

Other answers told of men regularly working 12 hours a day for many weeks—and in some cases months—on end. Some men have never had their "rest day" free, while many others have never had a day off for months. Such is the situation which in many areas is reminiscent of the last century. Can it be wondered then that there is a such a serious shortage of staff. In many areas there is no alternative to railway employment, which of course means in most cases a take-home pay of less than £8 a week, all the year round.

The railwaymen have recently been offered a 42-hour week, which, of course, to the majority of railwaymen is a complete mockery. The three railway unions are also to submit an application for a wage increase. This time the railwaymen must stand firm for a decent basic wage for all railwaymen, and must be prepared to use their industrial strength to get it.

a ban on all-night work and "must not invoke strike action for a period of at least two years".

Labour has one weapon with which to fight the employing class—the strike. We have only two commodities to offer, our bodies and our brains; with these we wrest a living from a class whose entire resources are thrown into the struggle against higher wages and better conditions for the workers.

Not one reader of this column can recall a wages increase, a shortening of his working week or any other material advance, which has not been wrung from the employers by using or threatening to use this weapon.

The Mersey ship workers were on strike, and on the eve of the agreement eleven thousand other ship repair workers were ready to down tools in sympathy, as were seventeen thousand engineers in the Liverpool area. It appears that nothing less than cowardice forced our so-called leaders to sign away our members' right to strike. Fear that workers would paralyse industry, fear that the workers would begin to look to their rank-and-file organizations, threw the Union officials into a panic.

But this trend must be halted. We cannot go along with those who seek to undermine our strength for a few coppers an hour. United labour cannot be bought away from its true purpose. In the struggle for a better society, which includes the immediate and constant demands for better wages, shorter hours, longer holidays and better conditions, the fight to obtain justice for the old age pensioners, the fight to preserve our health scheme and to safeguard our homes from the attacks of the landlords and, last but not least, the struggle for peace, we must retain our RIGHT TO STRIKE. This most precious heritage, which the employers could not deny us, either by Government legislation or by terrorist tactics, must not be sold by those who claim to represent us.

DISMISSAL NOTICE—4th May.

To

This is to confirm that on and from the 15th May, 1961, your employment and general existing conditions will be continued by your new employers, Marconi's Wireless Telegraph Co. Ltd. If you wish to remain in Marconi's employment, they will, by June 1st, be offering you the conditions of employment which apply generally to their employees, to commence on a convenient date in the first week in July.

(Signed) J. G. Stanford,
Manager,
Personnel and Organization Division,
EMI Ltd.,
EMI Electronics Ltd.

AGREED: R. Telford,
General Manager,
Marconi's Wireless Telegraph Co. Ltd.

Telegraph Co, the new "owners", want to take over not only the plant but also the existing workers, but at an average of 5/10 per hour, as compared with present rates of 6/10 per hour.

EMI management are attempting to break a redundancy agreement of three years' standing and have issued a so-called contract which they expect the workers to sign. We have bluntly rejected this attempt to treat human beings as if they were pieces of furniture that automatically go with the premises. A total of 45 workers have already been made redundant, including four shop stewards, against which a complaint of victimization was recorded.

It is worth noting that one steward refused to accept his card and dismissal notice, and elected to remain on call until negotiations are completed. At a meeting on Thursday, 11th May between union and management, following the rejection of the infamous contract agreement dated 4th May (a copy of which is reproduced below) by the entire factory including staff employees, the shop floor negotiating committee made it clear that only equal or better conditions would be acceptable and they would require assurances that all existing local agreements should be transferred to the new company, this being EMI's responsibility. Failure to comply left them no alternative but to declare all employees redundant with prevailing compensation in lieu of notice, together with pensions and sickness benefits reimbursement as a result of severance.

The management, then taken aback, said the document was a dismissal notice which should take effect as from May 4th. The Unions took legal advice on its content, and exposed it as cheap trick masquerading in innocence. It was simply a direction of labour from one company to another giving only two weeks' guarantee of existing EMI rates and conditions.

take effect the following day, Friday 12th May (the last 7-hour working day under EMI prior to take-over) should be called off to allow negotiations to continue. They, for their part, would defer the take-over for two weeks until May 30th. This was agreed at a factory meeting and the AEU and ETU shop stewards asked that a meeting be arranged with a joint EMI and Marconi body for Tuesday, 16th May.

Note that although London North District Committee AEU has been kept informed and gave valuable advice, the entire negotiations have been conducted on the Union side by our factory committee.

A further comment will follow in next month's SR.

Railways

R. Mason

AT a recent meeting of the Southern District Council of the National Union of Railwaymen the myth that railwaymen are now receiving comparable wages with outside industries was completely exposed.

It is only little more than a year ago—after nearly two years of inquiry by the Guillebaud Committee—that certain wage increases were recommended for all grades.

While it was agreed that reasonable, but long overdue, increases were given to some of the higher grades, it was nevertheless felt that those at the bottom and in the middle were little better off than before.

The many answers by individuals and branches to a questionnaire sent out by the Southern District Council only confirms what most railwaymen already know: that for most railwaymen the only way to get a living wage is by working long hours, although, in many places, railwaymen are working the bare 44 hours. One of the areas

AN interesting vignette on Britain's affluent society comes from, of all places, Wormwood Scrubs, where a former director of Bowmakers, the industrial bankers, is serving a 7-year sentence for fraud. While he has been imprisoned, his own shares, looked after by a nominee, have risen in value so much that he has repaid the whole £200,000 that he swindled. Consequently, his sentence has been reduced by two years.

Perhaps, as he reclines on his prison-bunk, he reflects how, with effortless ease, his money continues to accrue, and that this method of making money without working is infinitely better than that employed by the poor thief languishing in the next cell. Capitalist business is only a continuation of robbery by other means—as Brecht ably shows in his *Threepenny Opera*.

Redundancy

Karl Dunbar

OF all the problems facing organized labour redundancy still looms high on the list. The AEU National Committee again went on record with the three point policy advanced last year:

1. No overtime where there is redundancy.
2. Where this fails, a guaranteed week of 34 hours be adopted.
3. If the employers refuse to co-operate, the District Committees are authorised to insist on a shorter working week.

Whilst this policy is a step forward from that of the

Merseyside

J. Wellstead

WE recently reported in the industrial column an agreement between the German metal workers and employers in which wage increases were agreed upon at the price of a "no strike clause".

Now in Britain a similar agreement has been concluded by the Mersey ship repair workers. For an increase of 1/6 per hour on the lieu bonus of skilled workers and proportionate increases for semi- and unskilled workers, the Confederation have agreed to withdraw immediately

cont. on pg. 4 column 1

T.U. COMMENTARY

cont.

T&GWU, whose policy takes the form of compensation payments, nevertheless we cannot accept it as a real advance. We have to consider redundancy in relation to another big problem, automation and concentration of industry.

Recent examples have seen workers accepting severe wage cuts to keep their jobs in factories threatened with closure. No amount of overtime banning is going to stop this sort of thing occurring.

Possibly our greatest danger lies in raising the slogans of yesterday and, without thought, attempting to apply them to the conditions of today.

The London North District Committee of the AEU recently adopted a resolution calling for 'The right to work', (a policy now adopted by the National Committee).

What does this slogan mean? The right to work for worse conditions? The right to work for lower wages? We cannot fight the boss class in 1961 with the slogans of 1921.

We need a policy against sacking which takes account of the growth of modern capitalism and which recognizes the threat of automation. The threat, which the American worker is now finding out to his cost, cannot be met by simply raising wages, or signing annual contracts.

We may soon need to find an answer to those workers who, having lost their jobs, cannot find another suitable job in their trade and are virtually unemployed for good, so far as engineering is concerned.

But to raise the spectre of 1931, and 3 million totally unemployed workers, and imposing that situation on the working class of 1961 is wholly unreasonable. We have advanced, our organizations are stronger, our morale is high and we have no reason to accept a situation of mass unemployment.

What should be done? I believe our first demand must be raised in the recognition of our strength. Five days' work or five days' pay for all.

It is obvious we will be entering into struggle with the employers again quite soon. The lessons of the car workers, so recently learnt, must prepare us for the battles to come. By all means let us demand a reduction in overtime; by that means we will assist in the struggle for higher wages.

But let the call go out, to safeguard our living standards, **5 DAYS' WORK OR 5 DAYS' PAY FOR ALL!**

The large-scale introduction of public funds, via the Tory Government, into every sphere of capitalist production cannot be ignored. Ship building, aircraft, steel, machine tools, all these employers have received fat subsidies, gifts from our pockets. We find the struggle is not merely against the boss, but also against his Government, in the most positive sense.



Angola massacre

Mary Bristow

IN the last two months 20,000 Africans, men, women and children, have been slaughtered by Portuguese troops in Angola. These soldiers, downtrodden, uneducated peasants, who regard the Africans as some kind of wild animal, are armed with NATO weapons and have even resorted to the use of napalm fire-bombs. With the onset of the dry season, the attacks will be intensified, until, presumably, the Africans have been "pacified" by mass murder.

For the past 500 years the Portuguese have controlled the oldest colonial empire in the world. They regard Angola not as a colony, but as a province of Portugal. There is no colour bar in Angola; there is no need

for one. The African worker is paid less than half the wages of his European counterpart and cannot afford such luxuries as public transport and other European pursuits. For the adult male there is a special system of corporal punishment for the "crime" of impertinence.

The fascist regime of Salazar derives its profits from coffee, diamonds and other sources of wealth from the colonies, all produced by forced labour. Africans are also farmed out to South Africa, where they live in compounds and are cut off from contact with other workers, in case they should get ideas about trade union organization and other revolutionary schemes.

There is little support for the African working class from the unorganized, oppressed working class in Portugal itself (average wage=£1.14.0 per week) no word from the Communists or their front organizations in Portugal to indicate any solidarity with the workers in the colonies. The "liberals" are so politically backward that they still feel that it is important to hang on to the empire. In fact, the only encouraging sign since Salazar announced his intention of clinging to the colonies at all costs in a speech last November has been the policy statement of Calvao, (see last month's SR) which includes freedom, progress and independence for the colonies among its aims.

There is little trade union organization in Angola and there appears to be none whatever in Mozambique, where the situation threatens to become as bad as that in Angola. However, the Mozambique National Democratic Movement has demanded that United Nations troops intervene to stop massacre and

mass arrests in the towns and villages and on the plantations. There have been suggestions that Portugal should be kicked out of NATO and that a United Nations Commission of Enquiry should be sent to both Angola and Mozambique. Also the USA has withdrawn economic support for Salazar.

But none of these measures can hope to achieve anything at this late stage without constructive support being given to the African workers by the organized working class throughout the world. While Governments discuss and Commissions of Enquiry enquire, the Portuguese Government can go on desperately pouring troops into the colonies and the small minority of European settlers (less than 150,000 in Angola out of a population of 5 million) can go on suppressing the Africans in any way they choose.

We must prevail on the British Government, which has so far played its part in the proceedings in its usual courageous and far-sighted manner, by sending the frigate *Leopard* to Luanda on a goodwill visit at the height of the trouble, to withdraw all support from the Portuguese fascist dictatorship.

We must demand an end to the general butchering of Africans under Portuguese domination and see to it that no aid, in the form of arms or troops, is forthcoming from Britain to further the cause of Portuguese imperialism.

We might also like to hear a peep from Mr Gaitskell about whether the NATO he supports will stop supplying weapons for imperialist sorties of this nature when it comes under the control of the politicians.

WHO SAID THAT?

THIS Bill invests ownership of all the colliery undertakings in a board of nine men—nine men not elected by, not even containing, a single representative of the mining community. It is not nationalization in the old sense of the word.... this is not Socialism; it is state capitalism. There is not too much participation by the mineworkers in the industry; there is far too little. There is not too much syndicalism; there is none at all. To the men, new owners will mean the Board. However gifted or eminent they may be, they will be more remote and more soulless than the old owners.

Mr Harold Macmillan during the debate on the Coal Industry Nationalization Act, 1946.

LEAFLET issued by a Liverpool CND branch on the occasion of a visit to that city by Mr Crossman.

CROSSMAN AND THE BOMB

or
Mr Gaitskell's "Second Strike"

THE nuclear policies of Richard Crossman, duly interpreted by Walter Padley, are now gaining ground in the Trade Union movement. The CAMPAIGN FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT is utterly opposed to these policies which are no more than Gaitskellism by any other name.

The Crossman/Padley policy

SUPPORTS the continuation of British membership in a NATO armed with nuclear weapons.

It DISGUISES this support by offering the proposal that these weapons should never be used first—as though the nuclear commanders could be trusted to wait until their homelands had been devastated before dropping the bomb on Russia.

SUPPORTS the presence of American nuclear bases—and in particular the Polaris submarine base—in Britain.

It DISGUISES this support by empty talk of 'ending the need' for such and also making it completely dependent on the will of the Pentagon to decide when this 'need' does or does not exist.

Padley proclaimed at the USDAW Conference that Britain had to have the Bomb because at some time in the future a situation might arise similar to that in which six million Jews were murdered. In order to deal with this vague possibility, he—and every person who accepts the nuclear 'deterrent'—is prepared to employ a weapon beside which the gas-chambers appear comparatively mild. The extermination practised by an Eichman can hardly be used to justify the annihilation threatened by a Crossman.

Each Polaris missile carries an atomic warhead having a destructive force equivalent to SIX TIMES all the bombs used in the last war—including Hiroshima and Nagasaki. When the base at Holy Loch has its full quota there will be ten submarines carrying sixteen missiles each. The destructive equivalent of 960 WORLD WAR II's in one base alone.

WE ARE NOW BEING OFFERED THE MAGNIFICENT CONCESSION THAT THIS HELL ON EARTH WILL ONLY BE LET LOOSE IF AND WHEN THE OTHER SIDE STARTS UP FIRST!

This is called 'collective security': this is the 'defence' policy which is supposed to swing the country behind Labour.

NO PERSON, GROUP OR GOVERNMENT CAN BE TRUSTED WITH THE H-BOMB.

Let Britain lead the World and let Labour lead Britain in recognising this. FIGHT AND FIGHT AGAIN TO SAVE THE SPECIES THAT WE LOVE—MANKIND.

WRONG APPROACH TO NEUTRALITY

N. Howard

THIS pamphlet displays just the kind of weak argument that makes Mr Gaitskell's task in reversing the Scarborough decision so easy. The main point in the Young Fabian-*New Left* argument is that Britain without nuclear weapons or bases would be able to assume leadership of a third force: a block of already neutral countries from Afghanistan to the United Arab Republic. This neutral block would act as an impartial but forceful mediator in all Cold War crises and thus break the Cold War impasse. Apart from the illogicality of trying to break out of the Cold War merely to become its umpire (for as every soccer fan knows the umpire has to choose one side or the other and usually gets the worst of both), the actual achievements of the neutral countries since the War have to be examined.

Apart from India's intervention in the Korean stalemate, none of the crises which have so frequently brought the world to the brink of nuclear war has in

any way been prevented or damped down by Mr Nehru, Mr Nkrumah or Marshall Tito. At the present time the neutral block is powerless to prevent the Portuguese massacre in Angola, the American intervention in Cuba or the guerilla wars in Laos and Vietnam. Will this neutral block in which Mr Nehru massacres the Naga hill people, in which Mr Nkrumah denies basic liberties in defence of capitalist profits and in which President Nasser employs Nazi generals as advisers, be any different under the leadership of a capitalist Britain?

When Mr Gaitskell heckles his critics by asking if their neutrality has any better future to offer he has the facts on his side. The very nature of the economic links which all neutral countries have with one or other of the great powers means that there is no such thing as present as a positively neutral country, able to pursue its own peaceful policies.

Only the forces which strive

Danish CP ZIG ZAG on the bomb

THE following article from Aksel Larsen, ex chairman of the Danish Communist Party, was sent to a regular contributor to *Socialist Review* who passed it on for publication. Readers who want more information about the recent Danish elections and the formation of the Peoples Socialist Party, of which Aksel Larsen is now a leading member, should refer to the April 1961 issue of *Socialist Review*.

DURING the vehement stir in world opinion, caused by the first appeal of Albert Schweitzer against the atomic bomb, the question was raised at a Copenhagen party meeting in May 1957, that the Communist Party should appeal to Russia, directly and through our press, to stop its A- and H-bomb tests and urge the other nuclear powers to do the same.

After the discussion, the proposal was rejected. In my final address I unconditionally recommended the idea, reasoning that test-explosions were of so great a danger to humanity, that in a situation where an agreement could not be reached on account of the refusal of Britain and the USA, then Russia ought to take the lead—to influence world public opinion and bring stronger pressure to bear on the Western powers.

That same night I wrote an article, which I delivered next morning to *Land og Folk* (organ of the Danish CP—Editor) for publication.

Some central committee members were shocked because I had taken such a stand. Several Copenhagen district committees passed resolutions against the Party chairman. The presidium decided that my article must not be published, and that I might not again express myself as I had done in public or at party meetings.

Still, I was allowed to present my proposal during negotiations with representatives of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party in August. So I did, and the idea was definitely rejected by the Soviet comrades, who, among other things, referred to the declaration of Khrushchov in June 1957, to a Japanese journalist:

"Concerning your proposal that Russia onesidedly should cancel the tests, this can be said:

for human advancement and freedom from all forms of imperialism in any country can be said to be neutral. Such a force is the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, but it will not achieve its aims in a capitalist Britain. It has to assist the struggle for socialism in Britain before its policies stand any chance of success.

It has to link up the fight against the Bomb with the fight for socialism. False alternatives

"Imagine the following: Russia decides to stop nuclear weapon tests and the other countries do not react to our step, but carry on their tests. Russia will, of course, lag behind, while in the meantime other countries will continue to make progress.

"Without having attained anything, we will, after a time, be compelled to resume tests. What will be the result? The arms race will continue at an increased speed and tempo. Therefore, a unilateral declaration by Russia would have no positive effect, but, on the contrary, may encourage the aggressors."

Most of our presidium were of the opinion that, since the Russian Communist Party held this view, we could hold no other. On the other hand, I thought it depended on time and circumstance—the so-called psychological factor—whether the Danish CP should ask Russia to take these moves. The majority of Copenhagen Committee were scandalized when I expressed my views at the conference in December 1957.

In the spring of 1958 however, Russia decided to stop immediately and unilaterally. It appealed to Britain and America to do the same, adding that, if they would not follow her example, she would have to consider their resumption.

This is exactly what I had said in the summer of 1957—and precisely what Khrushchov had rejected in June 1957. But how did the leaders of the Danish CP and *Land og Folk* react to this change of party line? By paying homage to the wisdom of the Soviet Union and saying that it now had done the only right and justifiable thing.

In other words, when Russia says "no", then it is correct. Later, when she says "yes", then she is undoubtedly correct too.

such as are offered in *Nato or Neutrality* (the pamphlet is worth reading for its excellent criticism of Nato) do harm to the fight for unilateralism, because they lead to the kind of neutrality which Sweden is experiencing, in which the development of Swedish nuclear weapons is being seriously considered.

Nato or Neutrality? A Young Fabian Publication 2/6.

Letters

Women

Dear Editor,

THANKS for the article on women in your last issue. Do not let it rest at merely stating the problem.

It's time Socialists did something about it. Where are our specific demands for reform on the lines suggested by your contributor? How many trade unions ever discuss or demand measures which will alleviate the burdens of wives? How much is there in the Labour Party programme or in your "What We Stand For"?

Women provide most of the early training of our children. What little hope for the passing on of Socialist ideals under the present set-up! Let us not think the problem of women is unimportant. Remember Engels found it worthy of study!

C. Bailey

Dear Editor,

I was surprised at the viewpoint expressed in your May issue by Jane Roberts that the increasing number of women in industry is an advance.

Living on a Council Estate where most of the wives work in factories, I have often counted up the hours of work performed by the women and their husbands to enable them to achieve a standard of living commensurate to the ideas of today. Where the husbands are working overtime and the wives are working full-time, I find between them they often complete 100 hours of work in one week.

When one considers that the Middle Class on far less hours of work and the wife staying at home, have a higher standard of living than the working-class, one can see that the working man and his wife are being doubly exploited. I do not call this the emancipation of women.

The necessity for rapid industrialisation in Russia, China and the other people's democracies resulted in a policy of women being regarded as primarily a producer in industry. In Russia the emancipation of women included sending them into coal-mines.

Of course, the same position existed in this country during the Industrial Revolution when women and children were employed in the mines and factories. This can be justified on the grounds of economic necessity, but no one would seriously suggest that the position of the women and children was a happy one.

Jane Roberts advocates that children should be brought up in creches and Nursery Schools. But does she really think that this is desirable?

I think she should realise that much of the treatment today of mental illness, delinquent children, deprived children, maladjusted children and in some cases criminals, is based on the

emotional and psychological development of the human being concerned since babyhood.

It has been discovered that to develop normally a child must have first an adequate relationship with its mother, and later an adequate relationship with its father. If we are to deny that a mother is necessary to a child, surely all the advance made in the field of psychology must be abandoned and we must return to locking up those with mental illness, (as in Engels' time); delinquent children must be punished, not helped to overcome their emotional problems, and criminals must be punished severely (shot for stealing, or boys sent to labour camps, as in Russia!). In fact, the institution child must become the norm.

Added to this, there is the maternal desires inherent in all women. If they are to be denied the pleasures of bringing up their babies and children, surely the incidence of neuroses and manic-depressive illnesses will rise sharply.

If Jane Roberts recognises the former arguments as correct, but feels the emotional dependence of the child and mother upon each other is reactionary insofar as it impedes the role of woman as a producer of commodities, would she suggest that we work towards a solution of producing babies in laboratories and sterilizing women?

Sheila Leslie

2 Simmons Close
Russell Lane.
N.20.

Caudwell

Dear Editor,

KEN Coates, writing in *Socialist Review* January 1961, has said that Christopher Caudwell in his appraisal of DH Lawrence was guilty of "gullible black and white judgements" and that he called Lawrence "a fascist". These are such extraordinary misrepresentations that they cannot be allowed to pass.

In fact Caudwell pays the art of Lawrence (and Gide and Rolland) the highest of compliments: "They represent the efforts of bourgeois art, exploded into individualistic phantasy and commercial muck, to become once more a social process and so be reborn. Whether such art is or can be great art is beside the point, since it is inevitably the pre-requisite for art becoming art again..." (Studies in a Dying Culture. p. 48.)

And again: "It is Lawrence's importance as an artist that he was well aware of the fact that the pure artist cannot exist today and that the artist must inevitably be a man hating cash relationships and the market, and profoundly interested in the relations between persons." (p. 56)

The passage that connects Lawrence with fascism refers to his ultimate solution and is quite unconnected with any immediate political platform. It reads: "Consciousness can only be abandoned in action, and the first action of Fascism is the crushing of culture and the burning of the books. It is impossible therefore for the artist and the

thinker to be a consistent fascist. He can only be like Lawrence, a self-contradictory one, who appeals to the consciousness of men to abandon consciousness." (p. 59.)

What Caudwell means by this he demonstrates quite clearly by a passage from Lawrence that speaks for itself: "My great religion is a belief in the blood, in the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong in our minds. But what our blood feels and believes and says is always true. The intellect is only a bit and a bridle. What do I care about knowledge? All I want is to answer to my blood, direct, without fumbling intervention of mind, or moral, or what not. I conceive a man's body as a kind of flame..." (p. 60)

Capitalism put Lawrence to flight, but as he retreated he fought an unending series of magnificent rearguard actions in the name of humanity. Could any one have done more? Caudwell's study of him is a brilliant exercise in revolutionary aesthetics and those who have now read *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in its original form, and who turn to Caudwell for added insight into a great man, will not be disappointed.

Peter Cadogan

Cambridge

N.U.R.

Dear Editor,

IT has been quite uncorrectly stated in the national press that the railwaymen have repudiated "unilateralism". Many people in the Labour movement believe this to be so, but, just for the record the position should be made quite clear.

As is generally known, the Annual General Meeting of the NUR in 1960 supported the unilateral renunciation of nuclear weapons. The AGM is the policy-making body of the NUR and its decisions can only be reversed by the AGM itself.

Quite recently the NEC of the NUR decided to endorse the TUC-Labour Party declaration on defence, but this is purely the opinion of the NEC and is only a recommendation to the delegates at the AGM. Therefore, the official policy of the NUR still remains "unilateralism", until such times as the AGM decides otherwise.

Stan Mills
(AGM Delegate—
Group 70 NUR)

89 Northborough Road,
SW16.

ALL SR READERS ARE INVITED TO
A LONDON NCLC SERIES ON:

MARXISM — SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM

3 PM—6 PM

ASSOCIATION OF CINEMATOGRAPH TELEVISION
AND ALLIED TECHNICIANS

2 SOHO SQUARE, W.1

June 10
CAPITALIST SLUMP AND
THE WAR ECONOMY
M. Kidron

Salazar

Dear Editor

IN a report of the NATO conference of Foreign Ministers on May 10, the *Times* stated "Lord Home made clear that the British Government would be glad to give what assistance they could to Portugal in solving African problems". If, by this

time, nobody has challenged the honourable gentleman on his plans for aiding and abetting the murder of the people of Angola we must make clear that, although tyrants like Salazar and Franco may be the friends of those who wear the Old Etonian tie, they are *our* enemies. And so is the friend and appeaser of the Fascists, Lord Home.

Bob East

Out now!

International Socialism No 5

Notes on Labour and the Bomb, Civil Disobedience, Positive Neutralism and Theory in the Labour Movement.

South Africa—a critical discussion on the stay-at-home tactic by the Socialist League of Africa.

Socialism and the division of Labour—a critique of Paul Cardan by Ken Coates.

US 'peoples capitalism'—by Dick Logan and Henry Paley.

A quartet of Bomb Poems—5 pages of book reviews.

3s for single copies, 10s for annual subscription (4 issues). From M Kidron, 47 Fitzroy Road, NW1.

WHOSE WELFARE STATE?

Valerie Owen

THIS, so we are told is a "welfare" state for which we should all be grateful. Children are healthier than ever before, with free medical attention, milk and orange juice, together with the bountiful gift of family allowances. Infant mortality is rapidly decreasing; gone are the days of rickets and empty bellies relieved only by charity soupkitchens. Indeed many things have been fought for and won: we take for granted that our children should be healthy and we all share in the benefits of modern medicine. But how much there is that remains to be won.

The psychologists tell us that the first five years in a child's life are of supreme importance, yet it is during these very years that the "welfare" state makes the minimum provision for the young, and refuses to accept responsibility, except for children deprived in some way of normal family life.

What about nurseries? Just try and find one. The LCC insist that both parents must be working at least 35 hours a week before a child is eligible for admission to a state nursery, and an overriding consideration is that the parents must be quite unable to make any other provision for the care of their children. This in general means that unless the child is solely supported by the mother ie. unless the mother is a widow, separated or divorced or with a husband totally disabled or in prison) it is highly unlikely that

a nursery place can be found. In any case the nursery charge that the LCC impose is inordinately high, £5.5.0 unless the income is especially low. Put this beside free education at the age of five in any state school and the disparity becomes absurd.

The welfare state has certainly not ended the inequalities between mothers of different social classes. If you are rich enough someone will take the children off your hands: in pursuance of the argument that a woman's place is with her children, should not legislation to prohibit nannies, mothers helps, and *au pair* girls be introduced? If the wealthy feel that help is needed with small children why should the working class woman by any different? Should she not be allowed to develop interests outside the home?

One fact must be faced: women today are not content to stay at home after marriage. They are demanding fuller lives. To close down the nurseries in opposition to this change in the pattern of society is Canute-like foolishness.

Moreover the virtue of tying a young child down to the mother for the first five years of its life is doubtful in the extreme. Froebel, Montessori and others suggest the necessity for method in education even for the very young. If you have sufficient money the two to five year old can spend his or her early years in the company of children his own age learning to adapt to a

It's Rich

"It is obvious that the H-bomb is merely an instrument for the political assassination of Mr Gaitskell." Letter from a District Secretary of the National Union of Agricultural Workers—*Evening Standard*, 18 April.

"Mr Macmillan said last night that Britain 'would not try to emulate' the Russian success in launching a man in space". Report in *The Guardian*, 15 April.

We who have formed this (British Space Development) company believe the money in space is more than any man ever dreamed of.—Sir Robert Renwick, quoted in *The Times* of 3 February, which says—The combination of engineering, electrical, electronic, and entertainment interests gives an indication of the direction in which the work of British Space Development is likely to move.

"I did not 'suddenly announce' that tea and biscuits would be served after the demonstration—it was part of a deliberate policy to keep up the morale of our supporters who may have been unsure of what was happening." Chief Marshall George Clark on the Parliament Square sit-down, letter in *Tribune*, 12 May.

"There is a very handsome and discreet new one available, nicknamed the 'middle class badge'."—St. Pancras and Holborn CND Committee, *Newsletter*, No. 3, 1 May.

Chipembere displayed other symptoms of mental derangement. When not under court discipline he would allow himself to utter words of bitterness against Europeans as a class—said Magistrate Cram, pronouncing judgement on Henry Chipembere, financial secretary of the Malawi Congress Party, reported in *The Times* of 11 February.

"Identical election addresses have been issued by two candidates taking part in tomorrow's election for the Leigh Park seat on Havant Urban District Council. The only difference is that one leaflet is blue with the word 'Conservative', the other green with the word 'Liberal'".—Report in *The Times*, 9 May.

world peopled by all sorts of individuals apart from mum. But these type of kindergarten cost money, and this is a commodity that the state is not too prodigal with for the children of working class mothers.

The neglect of children in the vital pre school years is a clear indication that the welfare state has not accepted its responsibilities. What preparation is given for the break at five, when the child is suddenly plunged

into community life? What help is given young mothers in training their young children, a task that even the most well-meaning of parents find difficult? We take so much for granted and yet we are still not demanding enough for our children. This is not a demand to shift responsibility from the individual but a demand that responsibility for the individual be accepted by the community.

cont. from pg. 1

viously convicted for theft... stole fish from a smoke factory. On 24th June, 1947... Yudin was sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment in corrective labour camps...

"(2) On 11th June, 1947, an electrician on the power lines of the Moscow-Riazan railroad, DA Kiselov, stole fur goods from a railroad car... On 24th June, 1947, the war tribunal of the Moscow-Riazan railroad sentenced DA Kiselev to ten years' imprisonment in the corrective-labour camps.

"(3) In the town of Pavlov-Posad, in the Moscow region, LN Markelov, stole clothing from the Pavlov-Posad textile factory. On 20th June, 1947... Markelov was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment in corrective-labour camps.

"(4) In the Rodnikov district of the Ivanov region, YV Smirnov and VV Smirnov... stole 375 pounds of oats from a kolkhoz. On 26th June, 1947, both were sentenced to eight years' imprisonment in corrective-labour camps.

"(5) In the Kirov district of Moscow, EK Smirnov, a chauffeur, was arrested for stealing

22 pounds of bread from a bakery. The people's court, sentenced EK Smirnov to seven years' imprisonment in corrective-labour camps.

That the severity of this branch of Soviet law is in marked contrast to the relative leniency with which murder, kidnapping, and other violent forms of crime, are dealt with, is highly significant. It becomes clear that, in Stalinist Russia, the individual is rated much lower than property.

Thus the Criminal Law of RSFSR lays it down that:

"Art. 136. Premeditated murder, if committed: (a) for mercenary motives, for jealousy (unless covered by Art. 138) or from any other base incentive, (b) by a person who has already been tried for premeditated murder or for inflicting grievous bodily hurt, and has undergone the measure of social defence imposed by the court, (c) in a manner endangering the life of many people or causing extreme suffering to the victim, (d) with the aim of facilitating or concealing some other serious crime, (e) by a person who had a particular responsibility for the victim's welfare, (f) by taking advantage of the helpless

condition of the victim, entails—deprivation of liberty for a period of up to ten years.

"Art. 137. Premeditated murder, if not committed in any of the circumstances described in Art. 136, entails—deprivation of liberty for a period of up to eight years.

"Art. 138. Premeditated murder committed under the sudden impulse of strong emotional excitement aroused by violence or gross insult on the part of the deceased, entails—deprivation of liberty for a period of up to five years, or forced labour for a period of up to one year." *Criminal Code of RSFSR*, Russian (Moscow, 1937, pp. 70-1).

Some other punishments laid down for violent crimes against persons are:

"Art. 147. Unlawfully depriving any person of liberty by the use of force, entails—deprivation of liberty or forced labour for a period of up to one year.

"Depriving any person of liberty by any method endangering the life or health of the victim or causing him physical suffering, entails—deprivation of liberty for a period of up to two years.

"Art. 148. Placing a person

known to be of sound mind in 'an asylum for mercenary' or other personal motives, entails—deprivation of liberty for a period of up to three years.

"Art. 149. Kidnapping, concealment or exchanging of another person's child for mercenary motives, out of revenge, or with any other personal object, entails—deprivation of liberty for a period of up to three years." (*Ibid.* p. 74)

All that has been said above serves as a new illustration of the statement of Marx: "Law as well as crime, i.e., the struggle of the isolated individual against dominant relationships has an origin which is not purely arbitrary. On the contrary, crime is rooted in the same conditions, as the governing power existing at the time." (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Russian Edition, Vol IV, p. 312). In Stalinist Russia the concept of the nature of crime and the punishments meted out to the offenders, are rooted in the subordination of humanity to property, of labour to capital, that is, in the basic contradiction propelling the bureaucratic state capitalist order.

Books to Read

Ioan Davies

Raymond Williams: *Culture and Society*, Penguin 4/-
The Long Revolution, Chatto & Windus 30/-
Border Country, Chatto & Windus 18/-

SO often do we find ourselves involved in arguments on the role of artists and writers in industrial countries that discussions supporting art v politics or politics v art has become one of the favourite games of the posh weeklies. The importance of Raymond Williams' work is to show exactly how false this distinction is.

Art, says Williams, is a form of communication—along with politics, education, the popular press, TV, radio, advertising, 'the market', family ties and even sexual relationships. Therefore to try to say that there is a division between art and 'reality' is false. Whether it succeeds depends on the economic and social patterns of society—whether the experience of any one individual can be transferred into terms that mean something to a large section of the population.

Where it is impossible to do this art may concentrate on trying to claim for itself some absolute value beyond which communication does not matter: but this is an artificial position where art has ceased to function because society itself has lost its necessary degree of community.

Raymond Williams develops his study of communication in three ways. First by looking at the English critics of culture and society and seeing how they develop the theory of the 'common culture'—Robert Owen, Dickens, William Morris, the Fabians, Christopher Caudwell, FR Leavis, among others—and though Williams becomes too involved in accepting their ideas of culture, he produces all the major issues that arise in such a study. In particular he stresses the need for recognising that the social-economic control that prevents a common culture also prevents each from developing his own abilities.

Secondly, his novel, *Border Country* gives a sort of case-history of a lecturer, taken out of his Welsh working-class background, living his own life in London unconnected with his family. The problem is familiar (Kingsley Amis, John Wain, John Braine, DH Lawrence, Angus Wilson all treat the same theme) but Williams is, unlike Amis, not concerned with the intellectual Ted, but with the personal meaning of the changes in communication that have taken place because of the industrial revolution. Where Amis laughed sardonically, Williams attempts to understand the changes.

In *The Long Revolution* he considers the whole series of communications and their interrelations with the economic structure. Taking them in turn Williams examines the development of education and literacy,

the history and role of the press, the part played in our lives by language, the social history of literature and drama, and the major issues in portraying realism in the modern novel. But what seems to me to be lacking in Williams' treatment is the idea of difference in art—the need, in spite of a 'common culture', for the full-throated rebel.

Strangely, Williams does not mention the social rebels of today—Aneurin Bevan, Dylan Thomas, Hugh MacDairmid, Sean O'Casey, the person in permanent protest following Henry Miller and Norman Mailer. And the origins of culture in rebellion (whether by individuals or classes) seems to me as important as the idea that culture is the public expression of private experience.

Exactly what prevents the realisation of social equality and common opportunity is traced in the last section of the book. Williams attacks the whole capitalist system of 'the market', 'the consumer'; he shows how the claims of 'individualism' in politics and art are really obscur-

Socialist Review

Fighting Fund

During the last month we have received from:

	£	s	d
Islington	5	1	6
Willesden	6	3	0
Camden Town	5	3	0
Shoreditch	2	0	0
Lewisham	2	0	0
Harrow	2	0	0
Ramsgate	2	16	0
Liverpool	1	10	0

We need £40 an issue

Total

26.13. 6

THANKS! and KEEP IT UP, COMRADES!

Send to SOCIALIST REVIEW APPEAL FUND, 117 Carmelite Road, Harrow Weald, Middlesex

ing the monopoly-power of the controllers. In the last analysis he is saying that we should be free to talk to each other, to live in a world free from fear or control, and he firmly puts himself in the line of the English Utopians.

All this is a valuable contribution to our study of ourselves and capitalist society. But in the end, having some idea of what is wrong, how do we set about the revolution? Williams claims it is a 'long revolution' in the development of a common culture. But how long? Skybolt, Thor, Polaris—with whom are we communicating?

WHAT WE STAND FOR

War is the inevitable outcome of the division of society into classes. Only the working class, controlling and owning the means of production, distribution and exchange in a planned economy, can guarantee the world against war and the annihilation of large sections of humanity. Planning under workers' control demands the nationalisation without compensation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land. International collaboration between socialist states must replace aggressive competition between capitalist states.

The working class will reach the consciousness necessary to change society only by building upon the experience in struggle of the existing mass organisations and organising around a revolutionary socialist programme.

This programme must include:

- The unilateral renunciation of the H-Bomb and all weapons of mass destruction, withdrawal from NATO and all other aggressive alliances as preliminary steps to international disarmament.

- The withdrawal of all British troops from overseas and the transfer of all British capital in colonies and other underdeveloped territories to their peoples.

- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow. Material and moral support to all workers in all countries in their fight against oppression and their struggle for socialism.

- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions, together with the implementation of the principle of work or full maintenance.

- The extension of the social services by the payment of the full industrial wage as retirement pension, together with the establishment of a free Health

- and Industrial Health service. The abolition of all charges for public transport.

- To help solve the housing problem: the municipalisation of rented property and the nationalisation of the building and building materials industries. The granting of interest-free loans to local authorities, with the right to requisition privately owned land.

- Free education available to all, including adult education. The abolition of fee-paying schools and the private school system. The extension of education in comprehensive schools. Increased facilities for technical and practical education. A vigorous programme of school building under a national plan. A free optional nursery schools service. Adequate maintenance grants for all students without a means test.

- Votes at 18 in national and local government elections.

- Firm opposition to all racial discrimination. Freedom of migration to and from Britain.

Pictures by courtesy of Tribune and Daily Worker

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.

JAP PEACE TREATY

PRESIDENT Truman and Marshal Stalin decided at a tête-à-tête to put off Japanese efforts to end the war two days after the first atom bomb test and three weeks before the bomb was dropped on Hiroshima.

The meeting was described in a transcript made by Mr. Charles Bohlen, State Department Soviet Affairs expert, and released with papers on the Potsdam conference. The meeting took place at Stalin's lakeside villa at Babelsberg on July 18, 1945.

The Russians, not then at war with Japan, had received feelers from the Japanese Emperor who wanted to send a mission to Moscow led by Prince Fuminaro Konoye. The Soviet leader showed the President a copy of the message, and asked whether it was worth answering. The President replied that he had no respect for the good faith of the Japanese.

Next day the Russians sent the Japanese a reply saying their message contained no specific proposal and accordingly could be given no definite reply.

MEDIATION REQUEST

On July 26 Truman, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek issued a call to the Japanese Government to proclaim immediate unconditional surrender, declaring: "The alternative for Japan is complete and utter destruction". A copy of the statement was given in advance to the Russians, who had still not entered the war against Japan.

On July 28 Stalin told his colleagues at a plenary meeting of the Potsdam conference that the Japanese Government had informed the Soviet Union that Prince Konoye's mission would be to ask the Soviet Government to take part in mediation to end the war and transmit the complete Japanese case. "Stalin said there was nothing new in this except that it was more definite than the previous approach and that it would receive a more definite answer than was the case the last time, and that the answer would be in the negative".

Reported in The Times May 8 1961.