A BLOW AGAINST THE BOSS IS A BLOW AGAINST THE BOMB

The Summit collapsed, and so did Kishi. In Kishi’s case the working class was there to see him go—six million struck to see him off, in the case that the Summit it was nowhere to be seen. Surely there’s a lesson here for Campaigners: if the workers of this country and elsewhere are not brought into the struggle for unilateral and unconditional nuclear disarmament, the Campaign will remain an impotent, middle-class appeal to the Powers that Be to reach some agreement that would be mutually acceptable and that might, incidentally, save humanity.

It is true that conditions could hardly be more different in our two countries. Japan has endured the ghastly tragedy of atomic bombardment and, less well known, of fire-pattern-bombing (which murdered 300,000 people in Tokyo in a single night). Japanese unemployment is high (kept that way partly by the unofficial embargo on imports into this and allied countries) and wages are low. The Japanese bosses are more integrated with US capital than are our own. An RB47 is not a U2. The differences are there, but the principle remains and the Cold-war coincidence of Kishi and the Summit underlines it: the only power on earth that can stop the Bomb and its attendant horrors is a working class conscious that it wants to do so.

True, we have made some progress in this direction: the trade union-unilateralist vote might well upset Galtieri’s defence policy this year and force him to declare for the Parliamentary Labour Party’s independence from such hindrances as Conference decisions. More trade-unionists were to be seen on the Aldermarch this Easter than ever before. Union officials are giving CND speakers a better hearing.

NARROWING THE LIMITS

Good, but not enough. Machinery cannot substitute for men, not even union machinery. Sometimes it is their very distance from their members, their very middle-classness, that makes union officials the more receptive to CND propaganda. We need to pierce beyond them, to reach the rank-and-file worker. And to do this we have to make the fight against the Bomb live in terms as simple and as direct as the fight against the Boss.

And why not? Is it not true that the Cold Warriors stop short at, say, conscription, because conscription is unacceptable to the working class (as measured in votes)? Is it not true that the arms budget sticks at £1500 million a year (plus or minus £100 million) year in year out, no matter what the weather forecast at the Summit, and that this is so because a greater degree of waste (and taxes) might become unacceptable? Is it not then obvious that the Cold War can go on only within the limits that are acceptable to the working class and that every realized demand—every extra sixpence in the pay packet, every betterment of conditions—narrows these limits?
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CENTRAL AFRICAN FLASHPOINT

This time a year ago the men who do the political thinking for the ruling class were overwhelming themselves with optimism about their future in Africa. Given a certain amount of luck with the economic situation, it seemed that Africa might be at worst neutralized and at best swung safely into the western camp.

The boom seemed likely to last. The road to the summit had been charted and the rulers of east and west had already started out upon it. Khrushchov was, in consequence, not anxious to disturb unduly the world balance of power—specifically he was ready, among other things, to soft-pedal on Africa.

Nasser was behaving himself, and de Gaulle’s declaration of September 16, 1959, held out the hope of an agreement in Algeria. Even in trouble spots like Kenya, the less outrageous settlers were feeling their way to a compromise with some of the middle-class African politicians. The compass was set fair.

ALL CHANGE

This prospect is already in ruins. Events in Algeria early this year showed that the settlers carried sufficient weight in French high politics to demand and obtain a reversal of the course towards compromise. The crack-up at the summit has sharpened international relations so that Krushchev is now prepared to be awkward about everything in Africa, even about Algeria (where, by contrast with the Chinese, he has met until recently supported de Gaulle).

Most recently, the crisis in the Congo has stiffened settler resistance all over Africa to the demand for freedom from imperialism. Already Lumumba is learning to manoeuvre between the power blocks, and throughout central and east Africa the two sides are preparing for a showdown.

FACADE COLLAPSES

Instructive in this respect is the collapse of the facade of partnership in what is likely to be the next flashpoint—the process of dismantlement has been admirably described by Michael Faber in The Observer (July 31). Some of the facts he summarizes are worth reproducing.

In Southern Rhodesia a European can reckon to earn £614 a year (a figure which, because of lower taxes and cheaper goods, is of the equivalent of about £750 here). But the African should not expect to earn more than £25 a year. In both cases this is the average wage or salary, representing the mean of totals far more extreme at either end of the scale. Forty-two percent of the land is owned by two and a half million Africans; the European minority of 220,000 owns 50
LABOUR BELIEVES IN...?

by RAYMOND CHALLINOR

IN 1951 Labour Party members, despite many other dis- agreements, all agreed that the Labour Government's downfall was a temporary setback. Labour's fortunes were to change, and the Longford and Wallasey by-elections were seen as the break-through. This was so, and after the General Election we assumed that the Labour Party, even with its inept, right-wing leadership could not fail to gain fresh support. Obviously we underestimated the Tories and overestimated our own potential. Labour's problem now, is not how to regain power, but how to hold it. Every day, the Tory System, slow, inglorious decline. RHS Crossman, MP, Transport House management, put it this way: I thought the Party was lucky to do as well as it did: "It was only the three-week campaign which prevented a catastrophic landslide last Thursday. Without it we might have lost 23 but up to 100 seats and been left with virtually no representation south of the Trent." (New Statesman 17 October 1959). The anti-Labour trend has grown. In the municipal elections of 1955 it was at its height and held as long ago as 1945. Many working class towns, once Labour strongholds registered heavy Tory gains. Despite the "Into Action Campaign" Labour lost 25,000 members last year.

AN ULTIMATE GOAL

Members' morale is low. Direction, inspiration and conviction are lacking. Election victory is done through force of habit. The Labour leaders are aware of this crisis. Gaitskell at the 1959 Conference admitted "for an opposition to suffer three successive defeats is almost unprecedented in British political history". Explaining the reasons for the defeat he said "in my opinion, capitalism has significantly changed, largely as a result of our own efforts. The capacity of the government to plan the economy has substantially increased; the budget absorption of the national income: public investment is now nearly half total investment; manufacturing and heavy industries are in public hands." Gaitskell's statement is important. Historically, all government leaders argue that their ultimate goal was socialisation. Unlike the Left-wing, they sought to achieve socialisation peacefully. Gaitskell now admits that the Labour Government would not be able to achieve the foundations for a socialist society actually strengthened capitalism. This is the case with "our own efforts". Now he con-

siders it futile for Labour's programme to contain any socialist solution. Gaitskell assumes that any large-scale unemployment is unlike the depression and-action against the workers is always ready to avert a slump and will guarantee a steadily rising national income. The present system, according to him, is now sound and everybody except a few politicians believe that the economic policies of the past decade have led to a stable economic growth. Gaitskell consequently rejects any extreme increase in public ownership.

THE SQUEEZE

The argument that state supervision has improved the stability of capitalism is true-at least so far as the short run. Throughout the fifties the national income has expanded and in varying degrees, everyone has benefited from it. But prosperity is based on the rearmament and war effort. Every year the arms industry must absorb £1,600 million, providing wages and working, averting mass unemployment. How long can the arms race continue?

A slump in the long run seems inevitable. Russia's rapid industrial advance is steadily influencing world trade. Since 1946 she has zoomed from sixteenth to fifth in the list of exporting countries. By 1959 Russia will be able to disgorge vast quantities of goods onto the world markets. This is likely to have serious effects on Britain's export position. Even discounting Russian, Britain is unable to hold her market share; and the Common market countries or Japan. The World Economic Survey, published by the United Nations, shows Britain's output grew at the rate of 2.2 percent per annum from 1950 to 1959. The American output grew in the same period 3.3 percent, French 4.3 percent and west-Germany's 7.4 percent. Britain is being squeezed out. During the fifties Britain's share of the world's exports of manufactured goods has dropped from 25 percent to 17 percent. As competition intensifies this decrease is likely to continue.

WRONG ANALYSIS

Assuming that British capitalism is viable, remains stable and that the long-run tendency is not towards economic depression, even then Gaitskell's analysis is still wrong. He believes there can be a tiny strip of affluence in a sea of poverty thereby obscuring the underlying effect on Britain of the underdeveloped countries. It is not possible to build permanent affluence in one country than it is possible to build socialism in one country. Although an average British may be contented at home its effects on the underdeveloped countries will be to fan the already burning flames of discontent.

In these countries powerful movements are emerging which are sure to end foreign domination. The demand for economic independence and self-reliance as their own resources is gaining wider support amongst the peoples. Egypt's nationalism under Nasser and Ceylon's, the nationalization of Union Bank in 1957, the growing resistance to the use of US sugar and foreign oil are but a beginning. The nationalism which in the past has suffered heavier blows. But imperialism is the basis of capitalism. As British imperialism weakness so too does reformism. Previously Britain shaped the destinies of her Empire, today the situation is reversed. Before long the wind of change will blow some cold blast across some London investment houses.

Politically, Gaitskell's analysis is equally shaky. If, as he assumes, capitalism is able to continue making concessions why should the electorate elect the Labour Party? Capitalist governments always seek to reconcile class conflicts and work for maximum satisfaction for their own supporters and financial backers, with the minimum political satisfaction. A Tory government makes concessions reluctantly in response to popular pressure and the trade unions. Since 1946 she has zoomed from sixteenth to fifth in the list of exporting countries. By 1959 Russia will be able to disgorge vast quantities of goods onto the world markets. This is likely to have serious effects on Britain's export position. Even discounting Russian, Britain is unable to hold her market share; and the Common market countries or Japan. The World Economic Survey, published by the United Nations, shows Britain's output grew at the rate of 2.2 percent per annum from 1950 to 1959. The American output grew in the same period 3.3 percent, French 4.3 percent and west-Germany's 7.4 percent. Britain is being squeezed out. During the fifties Britain's share of the world's exports of manufactured goods has dropped from 25 percent to 17 percent. As competition intensifies this decrease is likely to continue.

UNIONS' ROLE

The stodgy and unimaginative approach of the Right-wing contributes to their own electoral defeat and they fail to rouse the people to fight for demands that the Tory Government will be unable to satisfy. Crossman in his pamphlet stresses this danger of Labour acting as though "it were a Shadow Administration". He says: "Instead of concentrating on a strategy of attack, adopting logical and logical policies, they are running continuously for three or four clearly defined socialist objectives, the Opposition tends to behave with the cautious responsibility of a government." The more Labour moves to the right the less well it does at elections.

The Gaitskellites are also ironing out the traditional alliance between the Party and the trade unions. Davey in his pamphlet, "What we have to do is to tear off the false mask of sectionalism and class consciousness." If Jay's advice is followed, the role of the unions inside the Party will be considerably lessened. There will be further shifts of alliances, relying on the support of people pursuing sectional interests. The Conferences will be consolled with the vision of an all-embracing party representing the community as a whole. Tony Crosland even considers the unions to be a growing liability and feels that they do not get Labour the support they deserve. Some of their activities alienate the middle class voters. In the Deans the unions could be used to butter down the constituency parties at annual Conference. The recent decisions of the unions on Clause 4 and nuclear disarmament show the Right-wing that the unions are far from reliable allies.

AN OPPORTUNITY

In his pamphlet Can Labour Win, Crossland argues for the traditional role of the unions in the process of policy making to the Parliamen-
tary Party and a leasing of the union position. It appears that the unions will be prepared to give the Party more money! The attempt to transfer the Party from an instrument of the working class party into a party representing the interests of the middle class will become an ever more drastic and fundamental change. Trade unionists will regard it with the same horror as the regulars at the pub would view an attempt to change the "local" into a branch of the Temperance Movement.

The Right-wing by following this course are committing the very crime they accuse the Left of -----disrupting the Party, by challenging its basic class principles and disrupting its al-

ie with the unions.

In spite of itself the Left now has its glorious opportunity to win. On public ownership and nuclear disarmament, the Right-wing leaders are threatened with defeat. Larger sections of the public are rejecting Gaitskell's policies as quite unrealistic.

FIRST BATTLE

We must not view a Left-wing victory at Scarborough as any- thing but the first battle in a long campaign. To win the war the Left must strive to win those young people who are such ardent supporters of nuclear dis- armament and who are just coming to politics. Ironically, it is a battle being fought not specifically directed at the Labour Party, which has had such a disastrous record at the Party. With so few active mem-

bers Labour is highly susceptible to political pressure even from the Left.
by JOAN DAVIES

The crisis that has wrecked the hopes of the new
Congo Republic is one that
throws the UNO, the USSR, the
capitalist West and the neocolonial
Africanism into the mixing-pot
The capitalist control
of Katanga's industrial wealth
has been based on the control of
the press, and that Belgium
intended to grant a facade of in-
dependence so that it could
continue to control the economy
of the country is only too ob-
vious. But now that the Belgian
dream has been shattered, the
alternative is not altogether too
precarious. The Katanga popula-
tion of some 4 million
people, over 100,000 of whom were
registered with around 350,000 in
industry. Congolese Trade Unions

LABOUR BELIEVES
from page 2
the effect of socialist ideas in an
atmosphere dominated by the
state ideas of a bygone age could be
dramatic and invigorating.
If the Labour Party is won for a
socialist policy and that some way off — it would
be wrong to assume that we
then have the sure recipe
for success. The erosion of
mass support for the con-
stituency continued some time.
The fate of the American
Socialist Party testifies to this.
The 1950s saw a battle to
get 100,000 votes in a presiden
tional election, 1000 of its
members held state and
local government office. 56 of its mayors,
listed in 13 daily papers
and 300 weeklies. Its leader
Eugene Debs was a fearless
fighter and a man of incom-
parably greater
character than
MacDonald. Yet MacDonald
led the Labour Party twice into
office, whereas Debs led
the American Socialist Party into
the wilderness. As Werner Sombart
cynically suggested: "On the
reefs of roast beef and apple pie,
socialist utopias of every sort
are sent to their doom."

ONLY SOLUTION
Sombart's point is important
because ultimately conflicting
political parties cannot
resolve economic questions.
If capitalism
is sustainable, it can achieve
economic growth, but it cannot
sustain political stability.
Socialism
will not be necessary. How-
ever, the ideological con-
tradictions of capitalism inexorably
lead to wars and slumps then
socialism still remains the one
and only solution for mankind.

THE MNC had no fixed socialist
objective in the immediate
Indian National Congress, it did
not include many of the Congo-
ese revolutionaries who had
served their time in prison in
Katanga, where they trebled in
cash terms, was there an appreci-
able increase. Housing con-
ditions varied, but the ad-
ministration, up to independence
time, attempted to (its credit)
to keep families together in in-
dustrial areas rather than follow
the Southern African pattern of
separation. This development was
intensified after the Belgian Social-
ists won power in 1954 and in 1957
by keeping through legislation
dealing with labour conditions.

TRIBALISM
But the movement toward in-
dustrialization was part of a
compulsory social policy. The
Belgians' deliberate attempt to
prevent political education and participation led to intensified
tribalism. Where tribes were, as in Katanga, Kasai south, and
Leopoldville, based on industrial and
commercial centres they
developed a nationalism of their
own that could sympathize with
the large capitalist (and sometimes
clerical) organizations rather
than with the Belgian political
parties and the Pan-African
movement. It was thus possible for the Union Miniere to see
in Katanga's Comakat party a use-
ful ally against a strong central-
ized state. The only important
Congo unity party (the Mouv-
ement National Congolais)

to its advantage. The MNC had
gained influence in Katanga the
year before Lumumba had attended the
Acre conference in the
same year. After the elections of 1959
and 1960, the strength of MNC
became more apparent. Lumumba's
ability to ally with small
groups. The major achieve-
ment was a pact with Kasavubu's
ABAK party on the eve of in-
dependence; but this had slender
chance of permanent success owing
to the alienation of Katanga's
Comakat — the Comakat
always being closer to ABAK than
ABAK had become to MNC.

REAL TREASURE
In 1959 Unilever made a
profit of £14.6 million and
the firm's 25 directors
received emoluments of over
£275,000, equal to £11,000
each. No wonder chairman
of the Company, Lord
Heyworth, says he will
"always treasure" the record
of Unilever.

veloped in Stanleyville, an area of
mishandled industries, large
plantations and several group-
ings, none being particularly
predominant. The MNC was formed in
October 1958 and gained
influence in Katanga the
year before Lumumba had attended the
Acre conference in the
same year. After the elections of 1959
and 1960, the strength of MNC
became more apparent. Lumumba's
ability to ally with small
groups. The major achieve-
ment was a pact with Kasavubu's
ABAK party on the eve of in-
dependence; but this had slender
chance of permanent success owing
to the alienation of Katanga's
Comakat — the Comakat
always being closer to ABAK than
ABAK had become to MNC.

the missionary social services,
followed by the incipient social-
ism and the colossus of Union
Miniere. For the Russians there
was little intellectual sympathy,
the mere mention that they might
land was enough to cause serious
panic; while Ghanaian influence
is suspected to be the degree of the
next tribe's.

UNO ESSENTIAL
Lumumba's plans for a cen-
tpitalized state may be premature
without any of the discipline of
the Red Army and without the
experience of the Bolsheviks as a
political unit he is attempting to
create a state out of the
fragments of imperialist
management. The lack of a fixed
ideology may be not a disad-
VILLAGE ECONOMY
The chances for socialist
ECONOMY policies to be implemented in
in Congo appear at present to
be very slender. Inside the
Lumumba party there existed a
centralized State. This was a
number of Stalinists, Co-
operative Party sympathisers,
and several People's Party
affiliates. The economics of
the Congo defy analysis. Although
20% of the population live in towns and a further 20% nearby in
built-up villages, over half of the
population is still employed in
the agricultural and hunting pursuits. As a viable
central economy the co-
ordinating of the territories is obviously
necessary, but given outside
aid most could individually
develop economies of some ef-
iciency. But for administration
there are fewer than 20 Congo-
ese graduates, most living in
Katanga and Leopoldville, while
up to the 30th of June most of
the education was still in
the hands of missionaries.

POLICY
The Belgian administration
failed miserably in developing a
society among its own people;
indigenous tribalism or of pro-
vincial cohesion. Without a polit-
ical policy, and given the rapid
transition from colonial to
independent status, it was in-
evitable that no nationalist or
socialist ideology could develop.
What was left was the shell of the
old tribal factions and the
germ of Pan-Africanism. Along-
side there dragged the ghost of
the nature of the situation, but with tribal
forces marshalling against him,
the lack of popular peasant support prevented him from
holding the country. Unless the
African Army marches on
Elizabethville it looks as if we are in for another colonial
promise: but if only to prevent
prolonged chauvinism the UNO
presence is essential. Without a
Socialist policy or adequate
funds or political experience
there seems little point in march-
J JOHN FAIRHEAD
EXPLAINS A POINT ABOUT HIS CONGO ARTICLE IN A LETTER
Dear Comrade,
An omission changed the meaning of a phrase in my article, "Congo Chaos plays into the Hands of Imperialists". (Socialist Review, August, 1960)
What was printed was: "The Congolese National Movement (the party of the premier Patrice Lumumba) mirrors all the weak-
nesses and none of the strength of such bodies as the Indian National Congress."
What I wrote was: "The Congolese National Movement (the party of the premier Patrice Lumumba) mirrors all the weak-
nesses and none of the strength of such bodies as the Indian National Congress."

This is a point needing elaboration; impossible in the
limited space available. But the idea is in line with a fact I stated in the previous paragraph: "No strong African capitalist class exists in the Congo."

Yours, John Fairhead
London, W.2
THE SEAMEN'S GREAT STRUGGLE
The situation in Merseyside

FOR, sometimes, quite lengthy periods, the class struggle lies dormant. This is due in large measure to individual acts, and small sectional struggles: then it breaks out and leaves us no option but to get involved, giving the lie to those who say the working-class is apathetic.

Such a situation now exists amongst those working along the docks fronts of the ports of Britain, and in particular, and literally, on the waterfront.

The centre of the National Reform Movement of the Seamen is Liverpool, and I might add that their poky offices are in great contrast to the palatial suite of the NUS.

NEW LEAD

At the time of writing over 2,000 seamen on the Merseyside are on strike, and some of the world's largest liners are held up in the port. The demands of the seamen are simple. Firstly, a £4 a week, and secondly the full £4 a month wage claim.

The strike which was suspended for approximately 3 weeks to enable the NUS to meet the employers, was resumed immediately the NUS accepted less than the claim.

This raises a matter of vital importance. In the past, practically all industries wage claims have been made, and then after negotiation much less than the demand has been accepted. It is against this practice that the seamen have made a stand. I predict they will have set a pattern which will be followed by other sections of the workers, and probably the first to follow the lead given will be the dockers.

UNION FAILURE

In addition to the questions of wages and hours, the seamen are making a number of other demands. There are summed up in a brief statement they have sent to trade unionists in other industries.

The statement says: "On the following points we stand firm:
1. We want a union contract.
2. The right to free speech and withdrawal of our labour.
3. The 1894 Shipping Maritime Act abolished.
4. The union subscription to be on a democratic basis.
5. We want our working week at sea as well as in port.

There are many other issues such as elected Ship Committees on all ships and an elected representative (similar to a shop steward) on all ships, but the above are the main ones in the present dispute.

by ERIC S. HEFFER

These demands are of long standing and were raised as far back as the seamen's strikes of 1947 and 1955. The men regard the NUS as a company rather than a union, and the anger is directed against the NUS officials whom they feel are the employers' main defence. As Vic Lilley, the National Organiser of the Seamen's Reform Movement, said at a meeting in Liverpool, "the Union "stinks".

INTIMIDATION

The employers are endeavouring to intimidate the seamen by the use of the archaic Maritime Law of 1894, under which seamen who refuse to obey a lawful order can be docked or imprisoned for refusing to obey a lawful order. They are also using the method of the injunction, a law, ostensibly there to protect the right of the individual but now used precisely against the individual.

The Liverpool Trades Council and Labour Party at its July meeting passed almost unanimously two resolutions, both protesting against the use of the injunction against the seamen, one calling on the Parliamentary Labour Party to oppose its use by raising the issue in Parliament.

SPONTANEOUS ACTION

The EC of that body meeting on the 16th August, issued a press statement opposing the use of the injunction and also stating that in association with the local Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions they developed other lines of opposition. It is contemplated that a meeting or demonstration will be called, as well as representations being made to the TUC and the Lancashire Federation of Trades Councils.

Already spontaneous action has been taken by thousands of the port workers. On Sunday 14th August, the dockers at a meeting called by the Port Workers' Laison Committee decided to do two things: 1) To give 21 days' strike notice as their claim for 40-hour week and 25 - a day had not been met, and 2) to have a token strike on Tuesday 16th to influence the docks committee of the T&GWU which met on Wednesday 17th to consider the employers' offer. They also decided to join the protest march of the seamen, against the legal action being used against Neary, Lilley, Keen and Flynn, all leaders of the Seamen's Reform Movement.

This protest march was supported by no less than 15 thousand dockers (possibly many more) although the national press and the radio and television played it down. The demonstration was the largest held at the Merseyside since the famous Dock Strike (as reported by the Daily Herald) and the seamen were joined by dockers, power group workers of the Mersey Docks, railway and building trades workers from many sites, ship-repair workers, construction engineers, and paper workers. Many thousands of others would have joined in but got to work in time.

One of the features of the demonstration was the fact that workers along the line of the docks, when hearing of the demonstration during working hours, spontaneously left their work and marched in. The total number of workers who joined in the spontaneous strike would be estimated at 10,000, and this was admitted by the National Dock Labour Board that over 10,000 dockers stopped work in Liverpool and Birkenhead.

MILITANT MOOD

The mood of the men was summed up by Denis Kelly, the Chairman of the Dockers' Port Workers' Laison Committee, when he said, "We smashed Order 1305, and we will smash the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894."

Speakers included Bill Hart of the CEU, veteran leader of the seamen's strike of 1947, (after which strike he was jailed for 6 months for his part in that dispute), Denis Kelly of the dockers and ship-repair workers, and Councillor Eric Hefter, Vice-President of the Liverpool Trades Council and Labour Party, speaking in his individual capacity, but on behalf of these workers who were not dockers, seamen or construction engineers.

NO INJUNCTION

The main emphasis of all the speakers was directed against the use of the injunction in industrial disputes and for the repeal of the Maritime Act of 1894. The present seamen's leaders who are now before the courts, were likened to the Tolpuddle Martyrs and the many others who have fought for working-class rights.

They are being attacked by people like Tom Yates, who called them "Reds", "Communists", "irresponsible" etc., representatives of the bosses and themselves. In fact they are hardworking workers who are fighting for equal rights. It will become Sir Thomas Yates, with his exclusive club in Devon, and his Bentley, to attack workers who are fighting to strengthen real trade unionism. If British trade unionism is destroyed, it will not be by the so-called "secret society" players but by the so-called "leaders" like Yates, who in fact speak only for a very small section of the industry. The Movement was built by rebels, like Keir Hardie, Tom Mann, Larkin and Connolly.

DRASTIC REFORMS

The real essence of the present movement is the fact that it is largely being developed outside the official movement. This is not an indictment of the workers, but of the officials who are obviously failing to give the necessary leadership.

What needs to be done is for the entire movement to "unite under the banner of the Seamen. Equally, pressure must be applied to the TUC to urge the General Council to throw their weight into the fight. Also the NUS must be told that by their lack of democracy they are bringing the trade union movement into discredit, and that it is time they carried out some drastic reforms.

SEAMEN'S DEMANDS

Every section of the workers must be involved, as the old slogans are still applicable, "Unity is strength", "An injury to one is an injury to all".

Let our demands ring out loud and clear.

SET FREE THE IMPRISONED SEAMEN

ABOLISH THE 1894 MARITIME ACT

END THE USE OF THE INJUNCTION AND SUPPORT THE SEAMEN IN THEIR STRUGGLE FOR HIGHER WAGES AND BETTER CONDITIONS

These are demands which we can all support. The dockers will no doubt be the next to be involved, so let us take our stand now. It is in my belief a new stage opening out for the British workers: we can see its beginnings now.

There has been much talk of apathy, the attitude now being "don't let them show themselves". If the old machine contains them and does not give them full control, we shall see their voices will seek a solution by creating new organs of struggle. This fact must be learned by us all, so that we can take our stand with the new.
AND A REPORT FROM SOUTHAMPTON

Sea workers want shop stewards—and a democratic Union

On the corner of Oxford Street, some 20 yards from the Sailors’ Home, a group of men were gathered. Three of them were sharing one cigarette. A voice distinctively Merseyside, muttered something like “scabs” a colloquialism peculiar to Liverpoolmen when describing “seals.” Obviously these were seamen on strike.

My enquiry for the presence of the committee members, A bearded, check-shirted, six-foot, demanded of me: “What do you want ‘em for?” I explained that I was from the press. Hastening to add the word socialist, he exclaimed: “Great grove the press word. A myriad of accents immediately questioned the authenticity of all reporters. The word socialist was no magic key either. A shock-haired little Irish steward concisely explained his opinions of the Daily Herald—an opinion that found general acclaim.

THAWED

We reached more common ground when I explained my estimation of Sir Tom Yates, general secretary of the National Union of Seamen. The atmosphere thawed a little and curiosity replaced antagonism. Nevertheless conversation remained difficult.

Eventually the committee members were brought and after some discussion and perusal of Nick Howard’s article in the latest issue of Socialist Review we decided that two of them would give me a statement.

A STATEMENT

In view of the recent arrests and likely victimizations it was explained that committee members’ names must not be published.

“We have a statement which we will read you first. Will you print it?” I was asked. After my assurance on this point, the following statement was read to me:

“We the merchant seamen in an industry that is vital to the nation’s economic and existence consider that the shipowners are acting as virtual dictators pertaining to the seamen’s welfare. We feel that we are fully justified in our present strike action. In most of the major industries closer, improvements in welfare and conditions have been brought about by the activities and diligence of various trade unions. Similarly, the Council of the NUS was originally instituted it was with a view to protecting the interests of the seamen. By virtue of the seamen’s absence at sea, administration has been evolved through the top executive of the Union—once: gain in favour of the shipowners.

We are informed by the NUS that our contributions are compulsory. With this state of affairs we have no legitimate means of bringing pressure upon the Union to negotiate demands which will afford the seamen a reasonable rate of pay, a reasonable working week and tolerable conditions under which to work. Therefore we consider it necessary to instigate an unofficial strike.

In the eyes of the nation who are so dependent on seamen this action is certain to incur displeasure. But we appeal to them to bear with us in the hope that we can effect an arbitrary group that will negotiate on our behalf for these salient features in the shortest possible time.

TOP RATES

They informed me: “Before the rise that the NUS just got, a top deck-hand received £13 10s a month and so did a ‘greaser.’ A steward only got £5 10s. Mind you these are top rates. Many men get less. Now we have been offered another £2 10s per month.

“When we came out on strike last month we asked for £4 a month and a 44 hour week. The Union leaders assured us that they would stand out for that. After the July meeting between the employers and the NUS the talks were adjourned until August 8. Then the Union posted notices on board the ships about the claim.”

NO PROTECTION

A steward interrupted here: “That’s right. They posted one of those up the Queen Mary. It was signed by McDaid and Sutton—they are two NUS officials in Southampton—and said: The executive committee are behind Brother Yates in the demand for a £4 per month rise and a 44 hour week, with no strings attached.”

“Like bloody hell they were” commented one of the onlookers.

“The leaders then went to the talks of August 8 and sold us out by accepting a £2 10s rise” continued the spokesman.

“What about hours” I asked.

“We want a 44 hour week in port and out; which means we would get paid for all hours worked above 44 at overtime rates. Right now we have a 44 hour week in port but a 52 hour week at sea.”

The men feel that at present they are completely at the mercy of the shipowners and that the Union gives them no protection.

“When we have a complaint we are simply told: ‘Take it up with your Union when you get to port.’ That’s handy... for the shipowner, especially if you are on a tanker which might not be returning to port for another 12 months.

“Do we want to elect our own shop stewards on board ship so complaints can be dealt with on the spot. The Yanks and the Aussies have that system, why not us?”

WATCH COMMITTEE

Confidence in the NUS leaders is at a low ebb and irrespective of any promises made by Yates and his coterie the reaction of the men was sceptical. Enquiry what their suggestions were for having greater rank-and-file control of Union affairs. We want all our officials to be elected every four years. The men are also demanding that a shop committee will be elected. This would consist of representatives from every port—elected by the men and also paid by them so that its members will be responsible to them alone. Then the watch committee would sit with the Union executive and protect our interests.”

A DEMOCRATIC UNION

In contrast to the bureaucratized NUS, the strike committee is a most democratic body.

“At a meeting in the Guildhall last Tuesday the men elected their own committee. Every one of us are subject to recall—if the lads think we are not doing a good job then without any palaver, off we go! Each day we hold a report-back meeting. Then there is a national committee which consists of elected representatives from each port and this works in conjunction with the Reform Committee* and is responsible for national organization.

STAYING SOLID

“Although we have had a few lads knocked off and others threatened with victimization the lads have stayed solid.”

In Southampton there are nearly 200 of us out and the men from the Saxonia and other Cunard boats which don’t sail until later in the week have promised to join us.

Where we were talking we could see the fo'c’sle outline of the orange and black funnelled Queen Mary, stranded at her berth like a lame duck. He pointed over to her: “She won’t move. That’s how we are going to win.”

BIG PROBLEMS

The problems facing the strikers are big. Many of the men live in other parts of the country so the committee are paying out 9s a night bed and breakfast in local seamen’s hostels for them. They had managed to raise the fates of 40 men to send them home and they were hoping to send another batch off this week. Bill a ‘general labourer’ said to me: “If necessary I’ll sleep in the Park to win this one and so will a lot more of the lads.”

PAY DENIED

What has pleased the strikers has been the help they have received from other trade unionists, particularly the dockers who are taking collections amongst themselves.

What does distress the men however is the fact that many of them have pay due to them and although some of them have received their cards from the companies they are being denied their pay. Even on this important principle the Union has done nothing to support the men.

*The Reform Committee is a full-time body elected by the seamen after the strike July. The function of the committee is to organize the fight for more rank-and-file control in the NUS. Its members’ wages are paid from collections amongst the seamen.

AN IMPORTANT ARTICLE ON THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE BRITISH COMMUNIST PARTY APPEARS ON PAGE 6
WORKING CLASS HISTORY

THE FOUNDING OF THE BRITISH COMMUNIST PARTY

by HENRY COLLINS

On August 1, 1920, the Communist Party of Great Britain was founded at a congress held in the Cannon Street Hotel, London. Its formation marked a new stage in the development of revolutionary ideas among the British working class. This stage in the story had started when, under the impact of World War I, the British Labour movement, led by Rebecca West and others, had begun to develop a new understanding of the nature of the conflict. The idea of a world socialist revolution was taking shape.

INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

The Socialist Labour Party was rather a different kettle of fish. Founded in 1903 under the leadership of Daniel De Leon, it started life as a breakaway from the S.D.F. Staging a strike for industrial unionism, the S.L.P. refused to allow members, on pain of expulsion, to occupy any official position in an existing union. Towards the leadership of the S.D.F. as, of the Labour Party, the S.L.P. adopted an attitude of intransigent hostility and complete non-cooperation. It never had more than a few hundred members, concentrated mainly in Greater London, but they were highly disciplined and active. It made its attitude to the War clear from the outset, publishing pamphlets by Liebknecht, Radek and Clara Zetkin. It was probably the first British organisation to publish a work by Lenin—his famous Capital of the Second International. Its first organiser was James Connolly, Irish Marxist and revolutionary nationalist, who died in the Easter Rising in 1916.

LENIN AND THE LABOUR PARTY

In April, 1919, a month after the formation of the Third International, representatives of the B.S.P. and S.L.P. met with members of two smaller bodies—the Workers' Socialist Federation and the South Wales Socialist Party—at the Eastcote Milestone Restaurant in Chudowns Street, London, to discuss the formation of a Communist Party. At this and subsequent gatherings there were heated arguments about the relationship of the Communists to the Labour Party and about their attitude to Parliament. On one wing, the Workers' Socialist Federation and the South Wales Socialist Party opposed all participation in parliamentary elections and any attempt to affiliate to the Labour Party. On the other wing, the B.S.P. favoured both courses, while the S.L.P., supporting parliamentary action, opposed affiliation to the Labour Party. Lenin found time to participate in the discussion, writing from Moscow on July 1, 1920, on the eve of the second Congress of the Communist International. 


condrous COMMISSION

At the Comintern's second Congress Lenin argued persistently with both Willy Gallacher and Jack Tanner, who, as representatives of the Workers' Committee Movement, opposed all parliamentary activity as a diversion from the class struggle and a source of bourgeois-democratic illusions. Lenin elaborated his position in his classic "Left-Wing" Communnist, an Infantine Disorder, which appeared in May, 1920. The Communist Party of Great Britain was established at the beginning of August, and Lenin's advice proved the deciding factor in the controversy.

CHEQUERED CAREER

On the question of Encerrada, which began with 10,000 members, experienced a chequered career in the 1920's. During that decade it made little progress in its struggle to win substantial industrial influence, perhaps its most remarkable success being among the unemployed.

The C.P.'s application for affiliation came up for final decision at the Labour Party's Conference in 1924. It was rejected by 31,000 votes to 19,000, though the resolution barring Communists from individual membership of the Labour Party was carried by the much narrower vote of 1,804,000 to 1,540,000. Writing of the Communist Party's prospects, in 1925, Max Beer, the leading historian of British Socialism, said: "Maybe that their day will arrive when a Labour Government, backed by a majority of its own, disapproves the hopes of the working class." The disappointment arrived in 1929 and for some time to come was a source of profitable investigation by British Marxists.


Salford Conference, in 1916, the Hyndman leadership was overthrown, and withdrew from the Party. After that, the revolutionary internationalists were in full command. The B.S.P. gave an unqualified welcome to the October Revolution and Maxim Litvinov, the Bolshevik representative in Britain, brought fraternal greetings from the Soviet Government to the Easter Conference in 1918.

REVOLUTIONARY RESPONSE

By 1916, when the International Socialistic Commission, which had been elected at Zimmerwald, called a second Conference, at Kienthal, distrust with the WSPU spreading among the workers. The Left was correspondingly stronger and the Kienthal solutions more radical. The agreed resolutions at Zimmerwald had called for a just peace, leaving the question on how this could be obtained. Kienthal declared bluntly that there could be no real solution short of "the conquest of political power and the ownership of capital by the peoples themselves", insisting, at the same time, that "the real durable peace will be the fruit of Socialism triumphant."

The Third, or Communist International for which Zimmerwald and Kienthal were the stepping stone, and for which Lenin had been calling since 1914, could only be set up after the War had been ended by proletarian revolution. In January, 1919, an appeal went out from revolutionary Moscow addressed to 50 parties and groups, all of which were invited to participate in establishing the new International. Two parties in Britain—the British Socialist Party and the Socialist Labour Party—together with "the revolutionary elements of the Shop Stewards Movement" were included in the invitation. Though none of these bodies was able to send an official representative to Moscow in time for the foundation Congress in March, J. Findlay, without a delegate to London, and in a good deal of opposition to Hyndman's ingenuity, however, in 1915 the Party had decided to send a delegate to Zimmerwald, though it was not possible to put the resolution into effect. At the

HYNDMAN THE JINGO

The years preceding the outbreak of the War in Britain had seen the rise of an exceptionally militant trade union movement. Miners, dockers, seamen, railway workers and, during the War itself, engineers had been swept by rising prices combined with the fearlessness of the workers. The Labour movement was swept into a strike wave without precedent in British industrial history. Under the impact of these pressures the Social Democratic Federation had been re-formed, in 1908, as the Social Democratic Party and in 1911, as the British Socialist Party. However, the old leadership, headed by H. M. Hyndman, retained its control over the Party machine and over its weekly organ, Justice. When War came, the B.S.P. for the first time, began to discuss the war policies of the belligerent countries, jettisoned its internationalism in the cause of 'national defence'. There was a good deal of opposition to Hyndman's ingenuity, however, in 1915 the Party had decided to send a delegate to Zimmerwald, though it was not possible to put the resolution into effect. At the
ISSUES FANCING THE MINERS

RECENTLY the mining industry has been subjected to criticism for the way it is being run. It seems to be characterized by a lack of planning and an unwillingness to adapt to the changing needs of the times.

Imported

It is said that the mining industry has become complacent and has stopped innovating. This is a cause for concern as the industry is responsible for providing energy to the country. It is important that the industry is able to adapt to new technologies and meet the demands of the market.

Reasons

Gradually the situation changed. Oil, which had all the time been contributing to coal towards the fuel needs of the nation, began to take a more dominant role, and windmills were away from coal. From contributing 35 million tons of coal equivalent in 1955 (assuming that one ton of oil is equivalent to 1.7 tons of coal), it increased its contribution to 56 million tons of coal equivalent by 1955. During these four years the overall total of all fuel required fell by 4 million tons but the consumption of coal fell by 26 million tons. The reasons for these changes between coal and oil are twofold. Firstly, the government had encouraged both industry and the electricity authorities to convert to oil in the belief that it was impossible for the mining industry to supply all the demands likely to be made of it in the future. During the recession between 1956 and 1958 coal was one of the worst affected basic industries. During this period coal supplied to the iron and steel industry fell by 20 percent, to railways by 10 percent, and to coke ovens by 9 percent. In comparison oil supplies increased to power stations by 333 percent, one of coal's traditional markets, 30 percent to other industries, 27 percent to domestic and miscellaneous users and in 1958 for the first time the railways began to use an appreciable amount of oil.

With these problems facing the industry the NCB was forced to alter its plans, which it did in its last policy statement "Revised Plan for Coal". This advocated two things: a) A reduction of production targets; b) Closing of uneconomic pits.

For the first time since nationalisation the Board had been forced to react to a situation which the Government clearly considered to be a threat to the economy. In other words, the Board was being asked to make decisions which would have a serious impact on the lives of many people. This was a departure from the past when the Board had been able to make its own decisions without being answerable to the Government.

Rosa Luxemburg

The struggle for socialism is a never-ending battle. It requires determination, courage, and sacrifice. But it is also a battle that can be won. The International Socialist Movement is committed to this struggle, and we invite you to join us in this fight for a better world.

TOBY CLIFF

The article is a critical study of the mining industry and its impact on the economy. It highlights the problems faced by the industry and the response of the National Coal Board to these problems. The article also discusses the role of the government in regulating the industry and the impact of these regulations on the industry.

CENTRAL AFRICA

per cent—and only one-twelfth of these Europeans are farmers. Their land, needless to say, is the backbone of their economy. They understand the mastery of the towns, too, by forbidding any African to own or rent premises in the main commercial areas. Africans are not allowed to grow the country's cash crop, Virginia tobacco.

Only four Africans passed the Cambridge higher entrances last year, and there are fewer than half a dozen top-grade African civil servants and no African officers in the armed forces or the police.

No Luxuries

Major pressure on even the most Rightist African politicians is such that none, except pensioners and undisguised rentiers, could think of any luxury of staying outside of the national movement. Earlier this year the main opposition leader resigned from the liberal Central African Party led by Garfield Todd and attached themselves to the Democratic Party (African National Congress), cont on page 8

Graham Aycott Discusses the

Socialist Review
A BLOW AGAINST THE BOSS—from page 1
as a whole, might indeed become a political struggle against the entire system and its monstrous issue—the Bomb.

For the Campaign to remain isolated from the class struggle is to remain weak. The choice is there, the example is there and socialists should be there too, in the forefront with the others.

Reprinted from International Socialist, Autumn 1940, published this month.

The article is the first to be published in the current issue of International Socialist published this month. The others deal with power in the Labour Party, Russia’s economic offensive and the working class in the West, and Congress and Communist movement in Japan.

A story, a poem and five pages of book reviews are also included. Special feature: Four pages of Abu’s graphic impressions of Poland. Send 2s 11d (post paid) to International Socialist, 90 Regent’s Park Road, London NW1.

The SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for international Socialist democracy. Only two kinds of people are working class in the industrial and political arena: to lead the overall process and the establishment of Socialism.

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

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

2. Workers’ control in all national and area boards, subject to election, recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.

3. The establishment of workers’ control in all large factories and crucial enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. Workers’ representatives must be subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.

4. The establishment of workers’ control in all large factories, subject to election, free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.

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

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

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

8. The abolition of conscription and general mobilisations. No British troops from overseas.

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

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