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 nationalist government.

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 all demonstrations and rallies throughout Japan. These demonstrations were, however, only a start: the biggest political strike in Japan’s history, a nationwide, co-ordinated action, 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 united campaign ever seen in Japan.

The continuing demonstrations found a focal point in the proposed visit to Japan of President Eisenhower, scheduled for June 10th. The day the treaty was due to be ratified. When Mr Hargrave, 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 Hargrave 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, even in Tokyo, where students twice stormed the Parliament building, fighting pitched battles with the police, and attacked the central police head-quarters. The government 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 Party, the largest party in the House of Representatives, had announced it was to support the treaty.

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 principal 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 so-called “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, 43,000 in the air force, and 30,000 in the navy. They all use US tactics and equipment, and they are not equipped with nuclear weapons—yet.” (Newswave, June 20th, 1960.)

No doubt the militarists will do their best to remedy this situation. But 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.” (Newswave, 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 led by “Trotskyists”.

It is difficult, at this stage, to assess 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 struggles. 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 of us 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 a question 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.
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EXECUTIVE PAPERS OVER THE CRACKS

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 equal 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 contends 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 correct the maladjustments in industry and to take such other measures as will secure work or to create a closer network of social security for the unemployed for all workers."

(Aberdeen Supply, Belfast Cental, Belfast Station Engrs. Clydeside Glasgow Wear. 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 of the building and contracting industry and the EC to take action to achieve a ratio of one apprentice to five workmen in the building and contracting industry and asks for the full support of this Conference to carry this resolution 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 put forward by Foulkes' friends: "This Conference views with concern the considerable exodus of American capital and 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 the factories were not being taken over by 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. Forcible 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 United Nations and industrial cowardice expressed in the resolution carried (not too enthusiastically) by the other delegates and not a infrequent 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, Hazell 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 "the 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 Trotsky 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 for pages of Journal be exclusively set aside for correspondence from members."

This resolution was vehemently opposed by Hazell, the Party leadership. At the same time, let it be remembered, Joe Scott, the right-hand man of the 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. We are casting no aspersion against any general secretary, past or present, this is a reform much overdue. It is wrong in principle and practice to have control of the journal, for on this basis it is, in fact, not the national organ of the union. What does the Executive Council suggest to the rules regarding the journal, and how will make the union more democratic. Quite the contrary."

The Editor of "Electron" is one man, Frank Hazell. While Foulkes and Hazell were in no hurry to destroy 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 Hazell get rates of £120, bringing their annual salaries to £1,350 a year—about £28 a week. The same conditions and "expenses", which for the year 1958 amounted, for Hazell 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 given any basis toward industrial and political issues. The fight for miner-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 Hailsham, 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 pact against the manufacture by Webers of 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 Hoover was called to be told that 870 workers in UK plants were to be made redundant (i.e. 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 requested 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 the press, radio, television and duplicated handouts the Company assured workers generally. The shift of workers were clamouring for their (the redundant workers) services, but were being told to withdraw the threatened notices, pleading that negotiations must take place, and that workers should 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 those made sufficiently redundant. A similar situation exists at High Wycombe where another 600 workers are under threat of redundancy. 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 for the Company and, in the unemployment conditions prevailing in those areas, an unmissed opportunity 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.

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 Building and Civil Engineering Industries, 1954-1958.)

You never had it so bad!

CRED OF A UNION

Bureaucrat

In 1886 the Constitution of the quite coolly, but not sufficiently, Feder-ation of Labour (equivalent to our TUC) spoke in terms of the class struggle; it was that the 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 class...which grows in intensity from year to year, and will work disastrous results for society 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. I never ran a strike in my life. I never ordered anyone else to run a strike in my life. I never had anything to do with a strike."

"In the final analysis, it is not a great difference between the things I stand for and the things that the National Association of Manufacturer 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, capitalism..."

-Cochran, editor, American Labour in Midpassage, New York, 1959, p. 87

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 Gaitkell & Co.

SLUM SCHOOLS

The National Union of Teachers has issued a booklet on Primary Schools which 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 2,500 schools, which had a 64% response, showed that:

- 99 schools had no water sanitation.
- 455 schools had no hot water.
- 522 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 colonial policy, in particular in White Settler immigration in Bechuanaland, for instance the annual cost per child in the schools on the schemes was £77, while that in the African schools was £6. 36d.

Colonial Freedom News, April, 1960
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 the chief subject of our Labour Party's debate, sometimes at the expense of the discussion of policy which should take priority over personal abuse.

The solidarity and comradeship 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 succeeded 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 the Party is the unifying principle in Unity; such was the principle, in content if not in form. Now, however, the enforcers of Unity (via the purge or the proscription) have themselves become denunciates. 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 think of "Pravda" or the next Fabian pamphlet and find there a chance 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 that the rise of Stalinism in the ranks of the militant Communist workers of France or Italy. The spectacle of rival bureaucrats combing the Highly Selected Works of Lenin for quotations is in their case of a very 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, Sunol or Mao wins the game, the working class of the world will be the loser. But, by contrast, the debate in the Labour Party is a vital and serious one, which deserves the attention and participation of all Socialists. Clause IV of the Hydrogen Bomb are each central problems of the Movement.

In the Labour Party debate they are linked together, and, what is more important, are of the very interest of the Socialist case. In the Soviet Union, Mikhail Khrushchev is not the only man who is a candidate for the top job, for he is not the only man in the top job of the Labour Party as a respectable "alternative government": yet he is picked by Gaitskel as a key figure to engineer an unparalleled compromise over the fate of the state in Britain. But the Conservative Party would be expected to contribute conventional forces to a NATO armed with nuclear weapons.

STAND OR FALL TOGETHER

The CND organizes magnificent marches and pushes one trade union conference after another of the ranks of Alderman; yet "politics" is still a dirty word for its leadership, and the BNP 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.

Roberts 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 a year. 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 in the anti-nuclear or anti-racial movements, but in the end 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 tending to jump to illogical forecasts concerning an organization in conflict within the Labour Party. Perhaps the hard core of the Right, Gaitskell, Jay, Wyatt, Crossland 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 blueprints 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 an opposition force like the British, will emerge, unforeseeable at present, is for the moment unimportant. The organizational 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 unadulterated. A revolutionary, radical alternative to Toryism rather than the "loyal Opposition" waiting for the "swing of the pendulum" to come their way.

Above all, a surving necessity for Socialists 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 of people who block-vote Labour are not line up on our side for a chance; 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 on the lookout for CND as well as inside the Party, "Private opulence and public squaller" is a fascinating, if theoretical idea, but it is not enough. If miners and teachers, for railwaymen and local government workers, it is a hard fact of existence against which thousands of them fight, and perhaps negatively, not in some romantic spirit. The star 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 discontent.

To 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-unison steamroller could be brought out to ride over the many. But time has run out, and 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 EISENHEUER HELP LABOUR'S RIGHT WING

Of 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 had 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 defilatory 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. Khrushchev has shattered the dream of a disarmed world, the extreme left-wingers are temporarily 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. Khruschov frustrated the plan of the London Conference, knowledge of the recent meeting 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 Com-
FOR DEMOCRACY IN

The main topics of discussion and controversy among 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 battles have been rolling to and fro threatening each other with annihilation of the party, there has been a quite important issue, relevant to the whole future of the party, that has been steamrollered in to the background.

Since the disbanding of the League of Youth in 1955 by the NEC because of the bitterness of the NEUP and the primacy 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 and independence to the youth. The result of this coincided with the general swing to 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. This failure 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 branchchild of the leadership'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 have condemned the clause. The clause operates on three levels 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 new badge will be available, that the new badge will be used by the Youth Movement levying the money, and that the NEC have already decided to have a new Youth Section to be called the Young Socialists.

Over the past few weeks some WS branches in London have drawn up standing orders and model rules of their own choosing and submitted them to the London Regional Youth Officer for approval. The model rules provide 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 concern will be a branch 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, in spite of all the well known "left" figures in the Labour Party including several MPs the Americans say, it has missed out.

It is pertinent for the Marxist left in the Labour Party to apply to the policy of "Victory for Socialism" the same test that the Americans say, it has missed out.

What is urgently required is that the Labour Party and its political arm of the working-class—pushes aside its ineffective middle-class—content is bound to lose more nationalisation as against the present amount of nationalisation (and we are not sure about even that after John Hughes' masterly exposition of the situation when all workers hate the bureaucratic edifice of the nationalised industries as everted by Labour Government)

FVS, with its sloppy utopian unscientific—often anti-Marxist—middle-class content—issuing from the same source as the Labour Party is with the "left". But to be serious ,it has to be viewed as a working-class opposition for the retention of the Labour Party as a serious part of the armament of the working-class in its on-ward march to overthrow Capitalism.

FVS, with its sloppy utopian unscientific—often anti-Marxist—middle-class content—issuing from the same source as the Labour Party is with the "left". But to be serious ,it has to be viewed as a working-class opposition for the retention of the Labour Party as a serious part of the armament of the working-class in its on-ward march to overthrow Capitalism.

What is urgently required is that the Labour Party and its political arm of the working-class—pushes aside its ineffective middle-class—content is bound to lose more nationalisation as against the present amount of nationalisation (and we are not sure about even that after John Hughes' masterly exposition of the situation when all workers hate the bureaucratic edifice of the nationalised industries as everted by Labour Government)

FVS, with its sloppy utopian unscientific—often anti-Marxist—middle-class content—issuing from the same source as the Labour Party is with the "left". But to be serious ,it has to be viewed as a working-class opposition for the retention of the Labour Party as a serious part of the armament of the working-class in its on-ward march to overthrow Capitalism.

FVS, with its sloppy utopian unscientific—often anti-Marxist—middle-class content—issuing from the same source as the Labour Party is with the "left". But to be serious ,it has to be viewed as a working-class opposition for the retention of the Labour Party as a serious part of the armament of the working-class in its on-ward march to overthrow Capitalism.

FVS, with its sloppy utopian unscientific—often anti-Marxist—middle-class content—issuing from the same source as the Labour Party is with the "left". But to be serious ,it has to be viewed as a working-class opposition for the retention of the Labour Party as a serious part of the armament of the working-class in its on-ward march to overthrow Capitalism.

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

Workers are all interested in raising their status. They are all interested in tangible results of collective action (hence the Trade Unions). Unlike the present shapelessness of FVS obtains some class bite by putting forward 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.

"YOUng SOCIALISTS"

This game has also been played at inaugural meetings of Area Federations when 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 comprehensive party 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 deploiring "the appointment—as opposed to election—of the Regional Committee..." at the hands of the "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 full control over the struggle against the H-Bomb 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-air-youth-movement-at-all-costs" brigade of the NEC.

In the space allotted to this article there has not been room enough to discuss relationships between the Labour Party youth and VCNW groups. The end of the Labour Party and the NEC's and the Young Socialists' being "the smallest part of the structure of the organisation" 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 M. 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 Roehampton 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 eremitism, 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 sorry one indeed. Our immediate task is to fight for the right to do and say what we think.

PHILIP JONSON argues the case.

The Party is unique among European work-
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 greatest 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 class 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 the burden of war 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 result, the Bostonians were imprisoned. After the Seven Years' War, 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 Burke's British values and 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' economy to her own. But for the eighteenth-century 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 the Royal 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 this feeling 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 the wars of national liberation which are led by a revolutionary army, 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 feared their connection 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 colonies. Earl of Chatham, a political imperialist who saw that the blindly reactive 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, wrote even further in his eloquent defence 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 1778—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 no distinctions to be drawn 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, enjoyed equal 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 masses of national and political liberalism 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 vassals of the state 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. Of all the subjects of the earth surely one ought to have enough. 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 "Mrs. Dalloway." International rivalries were exploited to the full to embarrass the British. French France, Spain and, later, Bourbon Holland, joined the revolutionary colonies 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 re-weighed. That proved to be, however, the limit of reform for the next fifty years. The landed aristocracy was still too powerful to be shattered. The next step in the long line of technical developments had given rise to an industrial bourgeoisie and an industrial proletariat.

JOHN FAIRHEAD

CORFIELD ON KENYATTA

WHOPS 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, by means of veiled accusations of sporulation 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 somewhat side-squint 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 façade of the insidious plot hatched up by Jomo Kenyatta and his associate, whose prettily war, of course, greatly strengthened... by apparently close association with British politicians".

HYMN OF HATE

Discarding caution, this authentic blaim ascibles (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. M. WALLALLIEU, writing in New Statesman, complains of the burden of elections. Elections, elections, elections, he says. You'll find 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 many years than I like to remember, and this is the first time I've encountered the argument that elections be less frequent. I would suggest Mallalieu's mien 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 steamroll 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 Marxism can make common cause in Britain against the evils and abuses on which we all agree, the Russian bogey will fade away and the fig leaf which hides the brutal capitalist state will fail. 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 £250; in Horsham plot costs of houses selling for £3,500—£4,500 were £1,000. 77 acres in Sussex went for £3,300. As it is estimated that private contractors are putting up some 150,000 properties at a rate of 1,960 a day at a cost of £230 million, the land, plot costs of these will be between £80 and £100 million at least.

FIGHTING FUND

Our income in June was: £ 5 6
Shoreditch 5 2 0
Milling 5 1 6
Hackney 5 0 0
Lewisham 4 1 0
Norton Hill 4 0 7
Holborn 6 0 0
Willekens 1 1 2
Harrow 2 0 0
Birmingham 2 0 0
Ipswich 1 0 0
Liverpool 1 5 0
Epping 1 0 0
Nightingale 1 0 0
Ramsgate 2 5 0
Total 40 4 6

WE NEED £60 a month. At 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 to harm by making all their purchases through London Co-operative No. 350.

Comradest Help your paper by introducing it to your friends, by ordering bulk copies, by giving donations!

Disarmers march

THE Whitun march to Foulness, organised by the National Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, was not as large as the organisers had hoped, or as might not have been suspected after seeing the thousands of young people who took part in the march half a mile away from 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 encouraged to find that "No work on H-Bombs—No Work on Rocket H-Bombers" and "No work on socialistic slogans came out strongly, and no officious marshals tried to interfere. 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 a loud chant of "Hate! Hate!" which might have distressed Communist Party officials as likely to offend their "progressive prisoner." An interesting feature of the march was the complete absence of those organisations which might have helped to give the guard of the working-class movement, the Communist Party or the Socialist Labor League. "Challenge" and "The Newsletter" were sold at the assembly point. 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 instead of to London, and the absence of advance publicity contributed to the enthusiasm 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 date to think and dare to act," Shih Cha Shan, leader of the Chinese Everest expedition, Peking, June 2.

They are guilty of individualism, ambition towards standing, neglect of esprit de corps, unconcern for the collective, indiscipline, irresponsibility, selfishness and lack of regard for the spectators," Romanian newspaper Scintea, criticizing 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 owned land valued at nearly $100,000, for which they could not find a state buyer," 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 contradicted the biblical version," reported in the Times, May 19.

"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 Snowdon. ("I'll always be the hero 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 Incorporation of Surveyors and Landed Property. A report from the Economist, May 28.

"the firm (Colman Prentis and Varley) which sells Mr Macmillan is stockin 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.
The News Chronicle has lost none of its Liberal and Quixotic spirit and luster.

On Saturday, June 11, the creduulous readers of this declining daily were informed that there was trouble among the "Trotskysites" taking place not remotely name the newspaper 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 vicissitudes of the attack were "too scared to report the matter to the police."

Besides the accusations of beatings up it was also alleged that Trotskyites were stopped by blackmailed "sleuths from Scotland Yard, it was claimed, were examining secret documents—let's hope it's not the department responsible for "taking" secrets. Edward Cochrane.

The News Chronicle here again, as in the past, is concerned with discrediting and smear the left wing. In typical cowboy fashion, it avoids naming either the organization of the paper concerned, thereby avoiding libel action and having to substantiate its charges.

The organization that the News Chronicle refers to has presented to the government a number of splits and defections. The political merits of the opposing groups or tendencies will no doubt be discussed by Marxis and other left-wingers. That discussion will certainly not manage without the interference of the scandal monger News Chronicle. It will become a paper which enthusiastically supported the murder of millions of people in Korea to stok its noise into the affairs of the Socialist movement.

Bob Pennington

TORIES AND MINERS—

If this situation is allowed to arise it will mean that those areas where high powered mechanical technology is made 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, screw out. This will mean in reality that the areas most able to compete will be those situated close to large industrial areas like 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 up with then that answer to those attacks by the Tory Government? Our policy should be:

AN END TO THE COM-

PARISON PAID TO EX-

CERNS

For too long the burden of paying for what was a defect industry has been placed on the wool. The country could be better used increasing the day wage rates.

JATIONALIZE SUBSIDIARY INDUSTRIES

This to include distribution of corn, wheat, barley to supply the mining industry with machinery.

JATIONALIZED MINES TO FORM AN INTEGRAL PART OF AN OVERALL ECON

IC PLAN

With the anarchy of competitive capitalism the miners' job cannot be secured. You cannot have a "social contract" with a class of capitalistic employers. Planned economy is indivisible. WORKER CONTROL IN THE PITS.

This is the most important issue. We know that the "social contract" will be nothing 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 the present consultative committees which are only talking shops with no decisions taken, but a system where every man is in the running of the pits and where increased production is brought about: the benefits of this to be extended to all 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: £3. Opinions and policies expressed are those of the editors. No contributor does not necessarily represent the views of Socialist Review which are given in the following statement.

All communications to be address

Printed by B. Martin's Printers (T.U.) Ltd. 866, Lime Road, London S.W.6. Tel.: FUL 8637.

S S

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The Socialist Review stands for international Socialist democracy, against the mass mobilization of the working class in the industrial and political spheres to overturn the state and the establishment of Socialism.

It believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power to win the basis of the fol

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Remuneration of all de

- Workers' control in all n

- The establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of the state; all workers' representatives must be subject to frequent election.imme

- 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 fees. The establishment of 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 abolition of speculative rent.

- Abolition of fee paying schools. Education for everybody—comprehensive, schools and adequate maintenance grants—without a means test—for all university students.

- Opposition to all forms of racial, economic or religious discrimination. Equal rights and trade union recognition to all workers, whatever their national, religious or economic background. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

- Freedom from political and economic exploitation.

- The right to national self determination.

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

- The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction.

- The right to national self determination as enshrined in the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

- A Socialist foreign policy which seeks to further the universalisation of Socialist revolution.

Bob Pennington

Bob Pennington