THE Aldermaston marches have contributed to one victory, and one only. They helped the triumph of the unilateralists at the Labour Party's Scarborough conference last year.

Here is a lesson for all who wish to remove the menace of nuclear war. The future of anti-bomb activists is bound to that of the organized working class.

Observe the changing attitude of the Establishment towards the nuclear disarmament campaign. First they ignored it. Then they ridiculed it. Only when the campaign played a powerful part in changing the balance of focus in the Labour Movement did the representatives of the ruling class (on both front benches) begin to appraise it seriously. Only since then have they tried to stop its influence spreading and to tear its leaders down.

STRIKE AGAINST POLARIS

For the Tories know that the Scarborough decisions could be but the first step on the road to effective action against the bomb. Macmillan and Gainskell understand that a political decision against the bomb can lead to the next step: industrial action to enforce that decision.

The time is not yet ready for the mass implementation of the correct slogan: "Black the bomb, black the bases!" But it is possible to win wide support in the Labour Movement, particularly in Scotland, to the idea of a series of token industrial stoppages against the Polaris missile. The indignation of the Scottish workers, who are most directly threatened, against the nuclear submarine base in their midst is very great and ought to be expressed in a sharper way.

The way in which workers traditionally express their disapproval is by striking, even if initially only for one hour at a time. This causes discomfort for industry's top, as opposed to Lord Russell's method, which causes discomfort for the workers' bottoms.

JOIN THE PARTY

Side by side with these demonstrations, which should be called by every steward who can win his factory to the conception, and urged in the Union branches by all left-wingers, the work of political explanation must proceed.

Nuclear disarmament campaigners are needed urgently in the Labour Party to swell the forces of the majority faction, fighting to uphold the Scarborough policy. Starting from the fact, now no longer in doubt, that capitalism cannot do without the bomb and will continue at whatever cost to manufacture, test and base it in various parts of the world, those who wish to ban the bomb must understand that their real object is to disarm capitalism.

CAPITALISM MEANS CERTAIN WAR

That is why the decision of the CND conference on March 5 to reaffirm the Campaign's opposition to NATO and similar alliances is so important. From now on the CND has only one meaning—as a force preparing Labour Party and working-class opinion for a decisive break with any foreign policy based on nuclear-armed alliances to preserve capitalism. All its many tasks are henceforth subservient to this end.

It will be objected that by adopting these clear aims the Campaign will lose its broad base of support. But the future is not to be glimpsed through the broad end of a telescope. Men and women are not led forward to new positions by watching the feet of those behind them, lest they march backwards and step on their own corns.

The understanding of all honest people who wish to end war is heightened only by imparting to them the gleam of the socialist future, wherein war is unthinkable because it is unnecessary. And by showing them clear campaign targets, realizable in current Party and trade-union terms, at which to aim—stoppages against Polaris, and a Conference break with NATO. Aldermaston IV will break new records in participation and effectiveness. But without clear leadership to the Movement, Aldermaston V could be an anti-climax and a disaster.

For the overwhelming major- ity of the working people the recent Tory Government measur- es—increased Health Service charges, increased National Insurance contributions and, thanks to dear Mr Brooke, increased rents—are all part of a definite pattern, an attempt to whittle down the Welfare State and to attack workers' standards.

However, in a deeper sense, these measures accord with fundamental Tory philosophy. One of its bedrock principles is that people should be made to pay, as far as possible for every- thing they receive, whether they be luxury goods or the necessities of life: they should never (ex- cept, conveniently, through in- heritance and "sound financial investment") get something for nothing. Those unable to pay their way, the victims of this highly competitive society, are regarded as social cripples. They should be pitied, charitably help- ed—but kept on the bare minimum. Lest they grow in- dolent, the State should make their lot remain difficult: perhaps a bed of thorns will prick them into doing something for them- selves. It is this idea, a guiding principle for workhouse ad- ministrators in the 19th century, that pervades all Tory social legislation.

But just as the ability to pay his own way, the amount of money in his pocket, is the criterion of an individual's worth, so must an industrial pro- ject be judged solely by its re- turns in hard cash. And when we look, in terms of hard cash, at exactly who is benefiting from the Welfare State it is certainly not the working class; and when the working class are losers it cont. page 8
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HENRY CARTER AEU

OUT of the struggle waged by our workers against short time and the sack has come one of the most important industrial demonstrations which has ever level at the employing class. Ford shop stewards were responsed to the call to discuss more short time working, for raising the demand. FIVE DAYS PAY OR FIVE DAYS. 

Quoted from the Guardian of January 11th, J. Mitchell, Fords convenor, argued, "We want either five days work or five days' pay. We are entitled to a share in the golden profits we have made for the company over the years".

Here we can see the basis of a real good and worthwhile struggle, embracing the whole working-class movement, and this demand should be a cornerstone of any discussions we seek to find a solution to the problem of short time and unemployment. All too often commuter payments seems very unreal when workers are faced with long weeks of unemployment. 

In Sheffield, a confederation spokesman expressed concern over the fact that engineering workers, thrown out of jobs through the car crisis, would find it almost impossible to obtain employment for a very long time. However, concern is not what we're looking for; rather we should be seeking a policy, embodying both long and short-term demands. 

We should try to link the immediate future of engineering with present problems, by pressing for the nationalisation of heavy industry as outlined in the Confederation 'Plan for Engineering', and five days' or five days' work now. It is all too obvious that the Unions' head offices are barely capable of dealing with such a far-reaching problem, and that we alone advancing some real demands to meet the problems of the membership. Plenty of pressure from the branches and shop committees will perhaps, help to enthuse a bit of life into the Executive.

JOHN BARRY AEU

AS each week brings us nearer to Labour's Annual Conference, AEU, we can certainly congratulate ourselves on repelling the attacks of the anti-democracy. Carron and company, try as they would find it too big a job, can't manage a coup d'etat on the so-called "refendum" on our membership.

All over the country, resolutions poured into Head Office condemning this proposal; some branches had decided to refuse to co-operate with the General Secretary if he sent out "refendum" ballot forms.

We in our union cherish strongly the democracy which exists; of course there are anomalies, certainly there are abuses from time to time and in certain instances the full democratic rights of our members are not conceded. But notwithstanding the faults which give the right wing and the militants room to manoeuvre against the 'spirit of democracy', we can still hold our heads up with pride, especially when we consider the total lack of democracy in some other unions.

However, let us chalk up a good solid victory. Already the National Press are bemoaning the fact that this year's National Conference is even more 'left' than last year's. May the industrial workers ever stand as the watchdogs of democracy, for as the struggle sharpen, we need to recall the old sayings of our class, such as 'the price of freedom is eternal vigilance'; only in this way, by repelling the anti-democratic forces of the right, can we guarantee the socialist future we know will one day be ours.

"OMAR" TGWU

It is hard to conceive in these days of industrial enlightenment a reason for the continued incursions by the craft unions into the vast organisational field of noncraftsmen engaged in the building industry. 

The latest attempt on this course is the NAOP or the Plasterers Society. For a century it has been an exclusive group always looking askance at the Labourer.

What has caused the change in outlook? It is certainly not a desire to raise the economic status of that class of operative; nor can it be a desire to improve the state of organisation in the industry.

A disturbing feature is the refusal on the part of the NAOP to discuss the change of policy with those of us in the so-called "non-organised" in this sector. What is there to fear from a frank discussion on organisation? Nothing except the fact that it would reveal the true strength of the Plasterers, which is anything but satisfactory. The estimated membership is roughly a third of the potential: approximately 300 out of a possible 10 thousand in London. It is clear that when allowances are made there is ample scope for the Plasterers Society among that class of operative to increase membership thereby add to its economic power.

Experience has already proved that a craft organisation cannot organise workers engaged in the same craft and industry its chances of success in another sphere are very remote, and up to now all efforts on their part have proved abortive.

The AUBTW had great hopes of success when it first entered this field but 'like the General Post Office' they have been more 'left' than last year's. 

The AUBTW and its members have to try to bring to our workers an understanding of what they are fighting for. That the NAOP will have a similar experience from which it may profit when it is too late. 

This scramble for members will tend to aggravate rather than improve the situation. What will benefit from these acts of disintegration? Certainly not the craftsmen or the Labourer.

Again we must turn to the facts, which speak for themselves. A strike is on due to the intrusion by the AUBTW the Contractors took advantage of the confusion and absence of union and launched their first major attack by insisting on the widening of the differential rate. The latest is not only a set-back to all operatives in the industry but gave the employers the green light, and the proof that no more upheaval would take place if a further attack was made in the future.

Since then a further widening of the differential has taken place resulting in a further degrading of the general operative. If operation as the strike on the first occasion and true to form, the craftsmen allowed this situation to develop unchallenged.

Whatever the gains which may accrue to the craftsmen from the disintegration of the general operatives and their segregation into a number of isolated groups the labourers can only expect to be rewarded with a further, worsening of their economic status in the industry.

LES BENNETT AEU

WHAT do last years financial results now mean in the engineering industry reveal to the workers?

The year began with a bang, many thousands of machinists, fitters etc. throughout the country found themselves off short time by Christmas. Household names like Ford, BMC, Vauxhall and Rootes were busy laying off employees who had virtually worked themselves out of a job.

We do not hear so much about that fearful word automation of the future, but the trend is obviously, steadily becoming aware of its effects. The displacement of both skilled and semi-skilled operatives by automatic operations assisted by transfer mechanisms is causing considerable hardship. Because this is taking place at an alarming rate our right to work and live a decent life with our families is becoming replaced by the anxieties of unemployment.

It is not time, brothers, for us to examine again the effects of automation with a view to demanding a share of some of the benefits if produces in such abundance for the employing class?
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Driver, (checked by the PCO).

Having compiled with these regulations, the cab and operator are then given permission to ply for hire within the metropolitan areas.

Mr. Gotla and his mini-cabs would ply for hire in the streets without any of these safeguards. Should he be allowed to do so? The dangers to the public are obvious. There is nothing to stop any of these cabs plying behind the wheel of any car and going on the streets to ply for hire. With no checks, it could be a pretence of telephoning home.

Mr. Gotla has a great deal of money behind him. The Evening Standard, on page 7,
The most promising action against the Government’s higher NH charges has been taken by the South Wales Miners. They are the only strike involving 35,000 men on May 1st. This was decided at their delegate conference held at Cardiff on March 12. The conference condemned the Tory Government’s callous and cruel treatment of the sick, disabled and aged people.

Whether this action will be taken by other industrial workers we cannot doubt that they many millions in branches, Districts and Shop Stewards Committees should be calling for similar industrial action.

Letter

Dear Comrade,

I read with considerable interest the article by W Cullen, NSP, (SR Feb 1961). I raised the matter of the tea breaks being abolished at a meeting of the Holloway branch of the National Society of Painters immediately after it was announced in the national press. At the meeting I must have been the only one aware of the fact that the national press, perverting the truth, did not believe the reported abolition of the tea breaks to be a direct challenge to the power which the employing class has usurped.

The outcome of this resolution was that we were informed by a circular from the General Secretary himself, Dick Cockop (Sir), that the report by the press was in fact a pack of lies, deliberately designed to damage the name of the union officials.

I have deplored many agreements reached by the unions with the building industry empresarios, leading us into the facts of why this should be so, and secondly, how to get out of the present state of stagnation and deterioration. first—we have 19 unions affiliated to the National Federation of the Building Trade Operatives, total membership one million; secondly—the financial state of the unions in fact is chronic in most cases; thirdly—the competition for members, verging on cannibalism, and in the main stemming from block to raising contributions to a reasonable level. This leaves the financial position of the union in the level needed to sustain any real action to establish wage improvements and decent general conditions; fourthly—duplication of effort and top-heavy administration is proving too much for the union to stand for longer without serious trouble.

The employers are only too happy with this situation. Also certain officials, with vested interests in maintaining individual unions, prevent amalgamation or the formation of an industrial union—which would be a real stimulus to stewards, and other rank-and-file members, to organise all and not only their own particular trade.

How can we solve the problem? (a) amalgamation, (b) a general raising of contributions. (c) a general raising of strike breaks and other benefits. (d) all present organisers to be absorbed into the amalgamated union, the cutting, if needs be, to be achieved by normal wastage, ie resignations, retirements, swindlery.

The union members can help this process by pressuring for amalgamation through their branches. Remember Brothers, this is our only way to finally achieve decasualisation of the building industry.

If the unions are not prepared to be progressive we must ourselves start an industrial union. I started the Progressive Industrial Construction Union at the beginning of 1960 with the aim of demonstrating the feeling on this issue, and I folded it up. A committee is now in progress of discussing amalgamation at the NFBTO HQ.

All members of the union concerned to get in touch with me if they are prepared to fight for really bring about amalgamation.

Edward J. Scott, NSP.
4 Catherine House
Philip Street, NI.
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A Strike Is For . . .

By Karl Dunbar

Very often 'left wing' papers publish articles dealing with industrial disputes in a manner which completely ignores the battle of all workers against their employers, disputes, namely the class nature of all such clashes.

A recent example was the Tribune handling of the Glasgow Caterpillar strike, which they had 'Anatomy of a Strike'. Drawing no conclusions nor pointing to lessons which other workers would benefit from. Tribune merely chronicled the events, a job which had already been done much more capably by the strike committee themselves.

Strikes are not haphazard events, or isolated examples of 'a victorian employer who won't move with the times'. Every industrial dispute, whether big or small is a reflection of the deep class division which exists between capital and labour. That employers, not capital is, incapable of solving the constantly recurring crises of overproduction.

As this is being written there are a number of industrial disputes, either taking place or just settled. The Dunlop Rubber Company and Ford's new factory, both in Liverpool, Belfast shipyard workers and the Nottingham factories of Raleigh industries, all involving nearly 30,000 workers, were all on the issue of sackings. Although these strikes were miles apart, in different industries even, they all ring the same bell. They are in fact a direct challenge to the power which the employing class has usurped.

In every one of the disputes dealt with workers challenged the right of their particular employer to arbitrarily deprive all, or some of, the employees of their livelihood. But these workers went a step further. They were, in effect, saying in effect, 'we are strong enough not only to challenge your power, but we can actually win.' This, in many instances, workers proceed to do, thereby destroying the myth of the infallibility of the ruling class.

Every sectional victory by the workers brings us nearer to the day when the unity of all sections is achieved. Every struggle against sackings witnesses new and indeed revolutionary demands being raised. Ford workers at Dagenham heard the idea of a Dagenham ADMU. DAYS WORK held out as the basis for the next struggle against sackings. The demand for joint board, or full maintenance is appearing more and more on union policy conference agendas.

There are some of the reasons why we, the industrial contributors to Socialist Review, try to draw from each dispute a lesson for the next. Each struggle literally predicts the next, points the way forward in fact for those who will themselves shortly be plunged into their particular battle.

We therefore support wholeheartedly the workers engaged in struggle, support without qualification the workshop organizations which themselves are the products of the class struggle. We shall continue to do this, playing that part we can in strengthening the organized movement for the battles which lie ahead.

If we can succeed in that task then our contribution will have been worthwhile.
INTERNATIONAL

The following letter was first published in the Michigan AFL-CIO 'Daily Bulletin' in 1961 and is not an anti-capitalist diatribe. It is, nevertheless, a useful addition to the article on Kennedy on this page.

To Whom It May Concern.

This is a letter from one of your former members. I cannot identify the writer, but I know he has had experience. I used to carry many labels: worker, man, husband, father, friend, provider, neighbor, member of the community, to mention only a few. But I no longer hold claim to any of these.

It is strange if I cannot claim a job. I cannot be a husband, father, provider, or even a man, because I cannot provide a living for my family, which is my first responsibility.

I am not a friend, neighbor, or member of the community because the only community to which I belong is the community of the unemployed—the hopeless, the dejected, the maimed, the dispossessed—the millions of society who occupy no role, perform no function.

The deception which I feel is somehow accentuated by the bright lights, the decorations, the people, the senseless, and the endless display of gifts and presents. As I mingle with the crowds of shoppers on my way to still another employment office, I feel a desperation and resentment which I try to fight back.

It is not their fault. They don't understand. I remind myself that there must have been a time when I didn't care, when, I, too, failed to understand. But it was a long time ago.

I have been unemployed now for more than three years in the heart of a busy, thriving city. It was 1957 when I received the last pink slip from the plant where I had worked for more than 20 years. But until now, somehow, I still had hope. I believed that some-

THE recent news that the number of American unemployed is now more than 5 million, that we have just passed the 20-year mark since the war—has been quite a blow to the Kennedy fans, right and left.

One of the most disturbing trends over the last few months has been the undeniable guilt to accuse Jack 'Bleeding Heart' Kennedy as the great champion of all classes, all races and all corners. Even some of the so-called left couldn't resist jumping on this bandwagon. To criticize 'America is losing - its influence - in the - free world' becomes a laughing stock.

Well, what really were the punch-drunk lefties so ecstatic about? As a president, Kennedy stays true to Eisenhower in his 'Farewell Address' to the nation warned:

"...we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security alone more than the net income of all United States corporations. At any moment, toll, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

Anyone who expects Kennedy's skin-deep liberal policies to strike at the very roots of American capitalism in the interests of the working class, or even peace, really can't have much faith in the giant, all-controllable forces that run capitalism.

"Wall Street" said the New York Times Jan. 31, 1961 "reasoned enthusiastically... to President Kennedy's State of the Union message. And the reason it so respondent.

thing would happen, somewhere a job would open up, this time they would not say, however old, 'You're too old. Nothing for you,' or 'All filled up. Nothing in your line.'

At fifty, with a wife and three children to support, the youngest only eight years old, I am expected to go on the dole, go out to pasture, and let the charities take over. I am healthy and vigorous. My body aches to do an honest day's work, but I can find nothing but occasional odd jobs.

We jobless want to be able to earn back our self-respect. We want to be important in the eyes of our wives and our children. And we are resentful for being stripped of our dignity.

I am a simple man with simple beliefs, not entirely without education. I was lucky enough to spend two years in a university before I enlisted in the army, more than 15 years ago.

We were told that we must fight to preserve the cause of freedom and democracy for people everywhere. And I believed deeply in that struggle. But now we face a different kind of struggle in this country in competition with which the Soviet challenge fades into insignificance. And that is the struggle to retain the faith and loyalty of all our citizens by providing economic security for them.

I read the papers, I listen to speeches, I talk with others who are unemployed. I had read about the coal mines in West Virginia, and the destitution which exists there. And I wonder what these people think. In comparison to them, I am living like a king.

Their understanding of economics is translated into the number of cents per day that is being spent on packages of 'surplus foods,' as if food can ever be surplus when people go hungry.

We cannot understand them, and you cannot, it is to continue to be strongly concerned about preserving our ideology unless all of us who wish to preserve it are willing to first put our own house in order.

We live in the wealthiest nation in the world. Our resources and productivity are unlimited. Why can't we find the answer to joblessness?

KENNEDY ON THE LEFT

By John Phillips

for the 1961 American Economy'. This was prepared by a task force appointed by Kennedy and headed by Dr. Samuelson, the US professor of Economics.

Samuelson's comprehensive report declares that alongside growing un-employment has come a constant increase in the cost of living and that to get the country's economy back on its feet the workers will have to meet additional cost-of-living rises.

Logically they conclude that this will meet opposition from the workers and the unions. By trying to get the "political" aspect of our wage demands, they will make our lives more difficult.

Surely all these facts point to one thing—that we as socialists must be diametrically opposed to Kennedy and his administration. Only when we maintain principled opposition to his blanket of 'new deal' argon can we show up Gaitskell, the American Communist Party (who are like mad during the election campaign) and certain writers around Tribune, not only for their lack of socialist consistency, but also for their seeming willingness, as I said in my second paragraph, to slip onto the bandwagon of public sympathy towards the all-American champion of capitalist ideals.
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WHICH WAY FOR THE CENTRE?

BY JOHN PALMER (KINGSTON YS)

LIKE the little child who itched to tell the mighty King that far from wearing a magnificent suit of invisible material he was just plain stalkers, Socialists have been long pointing to present and possible future Labour governments as if they were the boys playing for a raffle of a lifetime of being shared out among themselves. It is a thorny issue which has long been regarded as dialectically naked.

For a long time Crossman and others in the centre of the party have been trying to understand the political attitude made up of left- sounding cliches and phrases. Unfortunately for Mr Crossman they have not disguised the right wing body beneath.

The contributions to the latest defence debate by the Party leadership, Mr Wilson, Mr Gaitskell and Mr Foot are causing many on the left to reconsider the wisdom of supporting some of these champions of the centre in the struggle for socialism and party democracy against the Gaitskell group. The recent statements of these four issued after the acceptance of the new policy by the leadership have been enlightening.

Fundamentally Crossman and Wilson have had no difference of opinion with Gaitskell and his friends. Indeed in the last few days both factions have been energetically pointing out to the capitalist press that their differences are merely "a matter of degree... of emphasis." Some of us would prefer to substitute the word 'tactics' for 'degree' and 'emphasis'.

Mr Gaitskell does not like the Scarborough decision on defence (and on a number of other matters). Quite rightly he feels that the decision points in the opposite direction to that in which he would like to lead the party. In fact he suspects the decision as smelling of a neutralist, class conscious and even (horror of horrors) a nonParliamentary trend in Party thinking.

Faced with this Mr Gaitskell and his friends decided that the best way to agree a manifestation of rank and file action was to ignore it. Crossman and others differ with this view. They think that the baby has grown to big to be ignored, but also that it should be drowned in a flood of ambiguous 'left' sounding words.

These differences are no more than tactical ones. Their respective defence statements show this. Beyond that Mr Wilson has made the Crossman doctrine of working for a non nuclear NATO pledging not to drop the bomb first (as if that would matter much the nuclear finale got under way) and the Gaitskell doctrine in ratiocinating the whole language designed not to give too much of a scare to the generals and the capitalist class.

The issue between socialists and the leadership party goes much deeper. It revolves round the whether or not we should be committed to an all out military alliance. Capitalist Stalinists, whatever the circumstances and also whether or not class action and not political summits are the means for securing peace.

On these issues the Crossman group have not differences with the leadership. They accept the need for militarist alliances, with all their war engendering characteristics, and instead of class action for peace they make another hole in a further gathering of international boxes to negotiate disarmament. How a socialist can believe that capitalism would ever voluntarily disarm when so much of the system depends on an arms programme, Crossman does not indicate, instead he is supported by stickers and some attractive labels on his policy... and for the worldly hungry, a stronger UN and so on. He deliberately avoids the issue.

Some comrades in the party have been more surprised at the positions adopted by Foot and Cousins. After all these two have a record of opposition to the leadership, support for unilateralism and so on. They support the Crossman statement which differs only in wording to that which they declare themselves inescapably opposed to.

But should we be so outraged? After all while Foot and Cousins have taken 'left wing' stands on some issues, they have never been prepared to accept the 'left wing conclusions' which result. While they are prepared to involve the working class in the struggle for peace, they wish at the same time to keep it within carefully prescribed limits (of its making) and with only certain limited objectives in sight (particularly the replacement of the Gaitskell leadership with one of their own). In this respect they take a similar stand to the Communist Party. Hence it has been necessary, within the terms of the inner power struggle raging at top level in the Party, for the leaders to make a tactical support to 'Dick' at this stage. As they have stated, their objective is to secure the widest possible agreement in the Parliamentary Party for a defence policy, whereas they believe to be campaigning impressively for a根本ly lower Parliamentary level of the Scarborough decision. Or is it the this group have decided that the Scarborough path might have some unsettling implications for their own ambitions?

Having said that, however, the point should be made that our differences with Foot, Cousins, especially over their blatantly dishonest non fight. NATO gasps they cannot be of the same sort as those with the Gaitskell leadership. Which is leading to a positive assault on the class and socialist nature of the Party. One hopes that the error of the Crossman group, based on a negative concept of socialist class action, will be seen by their perpetrators for what they are, with a resultant strengthening of the left forces in the Party in their struggle against the Bomb... and all the class enemies and their agents.

In the meantime all sections of the party, and in particular the Young Socialists, should stand four-square on the Scarborough decisions. The battle against the Tories and the right wing should be forcibly conducted on this base.

NATO AND THE DANISH ELECTIONS

ONE of the arguments used by the right wing of the Labour Party to defy convention (1945) elected in the last election and received a setback when the Danish election results were announced last year. To help bury these arguments altogether we print below an article, translated from Correspondent: Januar (1961), by Torben Madsen of the Danish Peoples Socialist Party Student Movement.

THE legislative elections of November 15, 1960, are certainly the most surprising in the whole history of Danish parliamentarianism.

These elections show first of all that the welfare state, the Welfare State par excellence, the electorate, far from becoming stabilized round centrist groups which are losing their voice, tends to spread itself, and this to the advantage of the new extreme groups: the right-wing Independents, and the left-wing People's Socialist Party.

The PSP, which was only represented in Parliament by its leader, Aksel Larsen, gained 11 seats, but lost 1.4% of the vote, giving 15. Without means and almost without any organization, it was this party that managed to be tested an election; it had to fight at the same time attacks from the Communist Party (according to which the new Party was wrecking the unity of the working class) and attacks from the right, which saw it simply as a Communist Party in disguise.

But it is the origins of the PSP which are the important thing in its electoral success. It was born in 1955, from a split in the Communist Party. A fraction of the Party, led by Larsen, leader for more than 30 years and parliamentarian for 28 years, had for a long time been trying to defend the positions of their party, not only the questions of Hungary and disarmament. Oh the reasons the theses of the Larsen group were in fact those which Krushchev exposed in his copious UNO general assembly in 1959.

Besides this, Larsen had defended before the Political Consultative Program (1958) of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. He was finally ac
c
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ounced as a revisionist (Der Correspondent from Correspondent: January 1961) by Madsen of the Danish Peoples Socialist Party Student Movement.

fended before the Political Consultative Program (1958) of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. He was finally ac

the party for representation in Parliament. And the widespread opinion was that it was useless to vote for the PSP, a group which was doomed in advance.

Now, to defend the right of the PSP to explain the considerable success of the PSP? It certainly attracted a number of old communist voters. The Danish CP, which had 72,000 votes in previous elections, now has no more than 70,000. But this does not explain the 150,000 votes of the PSP.

It must be confessed that there has been a relatively important movement of old social-democratic voters towards the People's Socialist Party. This movement has probably affected more especially the working-class voters of the social democratic Party, following the wildcat strikes of last August. In addition, the PSP obviously received the votes of a certain number of old voters of the Radical-Liberal Party (the traditionally anti-militarist Party), since the party's programme, which was in all likelihood less acceptable to their parliamentary members last Spring. The Palmer and the Independents supported the "military defense" of Denmark, to say the project fixing Denmark's contribution to NATO.

Moreover, the "Parti de la Tete Unique", whose program was based on the theories of Henry George, according to which the costs of the war could be financially a special tax on land, practically disappeared from political scene and it is probable that the Palmer is not missed from this disappearance. The program of the People's...
BY PETER SEDGWICK

MR. John Strachey has now expanded the full-page-plus-of-quotes column he wrote in the "Observer" on the Sunday before the Scarborough defence debate. The result is hardly worth the astronomical (two-and-seventeen) difference in cost between the two newspapers, a strategic choice of ideological hardware and the original tactical version. The fall-out from Mr. Strachey's pay-off is as thick as industrial dust.

The unique nature of the hydrogen bomb's superpower status as a dictator of votes to combine the thrill of sadness with the pretensions of pacifism. The average Englishman will tell you proudly, "If they drop one on us, we will drop one on them," and, then, with a quick breath, "Of course it will never be used..." The Bomb is at once the jingoist's superweapon, lately in the line of succession from the Gatling gun, Dreadnought and V.2, and the super-peaceful Non-Proliferation Non-weapon (since it is intended never to be used) or even Anti-weapon (since it supposedly abolishes the possibility of war).

Both these attitudes are evident in Socialism In The Sixties. A post-nuclear Britain is described as "a weak Britain without weapons or allies." Any armament short of the Bomb is implied (in a rebuke to Cousins) to be as out-of-date today as the conversion思考Agitprop of yesteryear. The machine-gun era. In a remarkable piece of hysterical fantasy, hardly paralleled outside the American gutter-press, Strachey envisages the Russian General Staff detonating an H Bomb a day over British cities in order to bring a unilateralist Britain to her knees. (Amazingly he does not envisage the nuclear alliance with Russia to deter the equally likely, or unlikely, possibility of invasion from America or France.) Surrender is sprinkled as a synonym for anti-war (less than 49 times in 21 pages).

On the other hand, we are treated to some eleven pages of propaganda for Peace Through Deterrence. War, it appears, is getting less and less likely as "inivable" weapons like Polaris come into play on either side; it is assumed that neither side will be tempted to strike first if its opponent's Bomb-capacity cannot be obliterated at first blow. Murder does not stop to consider the fact that a large proportion of military research is devoted precisely to the study of-upkeep of the enemy's in vulnerability. Devices for the detection and destruction of fast submarines, for example, are a priority. Nevertheless, Strachey de- clares that armaments "should now be reduced and their replacement, if any, to a level..." as possible, but should also be reduced to the maximum practicable level.

This demand for a reduction in armaments would be, of course, in the rest of his argument, an inconsistent

hangover from pre-nuclear days: a few Sundays before the Scarborough defence debate, Atomic Academic—an increasingly common species in the "Observer" to the effect that 'disarmament' did not necessarily mean reducing armaments—its proper meaning nowadays lay in making bigger and better detection systems (and conversely we may suppose, anti-detection system systems), even if this meant increasing armament expenditure. And this armament is Armament. War is Peace. Strachey cannot eat his nuclear cake and have it. Strachey's final paragraph outlines his hopes for the future of mankind. The best he can offer us is "a world kept in order by the joint will of Russia and America, acting, no doubt, in the name of the United Nations., a gradual accommodation of the wills of the two great conserv- ators in the world in order", Strachey's role in the Popular Front days was largely that of an apologist for Moscow. During the Labour Government's term of office, he served as Under-Secretary for War, the military strategy of American capitalism. In his de- pendence for the future on both Washington and Moscow, he has telescoped his political career very neatly. Now, as then, he has been given where the calamitous policies of his government, and knelt before it. Paradoxically, this display of sophisticated aberration appears in a Fabian series entitled "Socialism In The Sixties". The dangers of war by accident, and war by 'escalation' from tactical to strategic weapons, seems to enter Mr. Strachey's consciousness scarcely at all. He talks of the not necessarily high risk of nuclear war in the immediate years ahead; he never tells us whether, if it came (literally) to the push, he would set Polaris off or not, or in what circumstances. With all Strachey's cool calculation of "first strikes" and so on, it is perhaps fortunate that the Fabian tortoise on the front cover of this volume, has lost its customary motto. This is quite boldly: WHEN I STRIKE, I STRIKE.
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Labour must lead on Central Africa

BY JOAN DAVIES

In spite of the sharp division in the Conservative Party over their Rhodesian Federation policy the Labour Party has not yet shown any clear lead in framing a policy of its own. Lord Salisbury and Mr. MacLeod may be at opposite poles in attitudes—but has Labour done anything besides tagging on behind MacLeod? The Prime Minister's speeches have not been official party spokesmen in the Commons and elsewhere have made clear that Labour's thinking is not as clear as Mr. Galtung and Mr. Nyasaland in determining the future of the territories.

2. The laying down of an economic plan in all three areas that makes available to the

Rhodesia and Nyasaland the ownership of the productive resources and breaks up the financial power blocks:

3. The guarantee by Britain of aid that will facilitate the creation of a Rhodesian & Nyasaland economy and further guarantee the training of specialists either within the territories themselves or elsewhere. Unless Socialists can press for these minimum conditions there is little point in continuing to war again. Salisbury. At present Galtung and MacLeod both support a façade of independence that no one can distinguish from the past. What Socialism is this?

Southern Region

Conference

BY JOHN BLOOM

TWELVE of the thirty resolutions on the agenda of the 15th annual conference of the Southern Regional Council of the Labour Party dealt with the current situation of large private ownership, housing and the recent report of the Royal Commission on Local Government in Greater London. The Southern regional council covers the counties of Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Hampshire, (including the Isle of Wight), Kent, Surrey and Sussex. The Labour Party now holds only five of the seventy-six parliamentary constituencies in the region, as a result of the calamitous policies of the right wing leadership. In the 1945 parliament the party

held twenty seats when there were less than 100 constituencies.

The Southern Regional group of the Co-Operative Party and the Croydon Borough Labour Party both call upon the regional executive committee "to convene area meetings, during the next six months, at which the unilateralist defence policy (approved by the Labour Party and the Co-Operative Party and supported by the Trades Union Congress) may be discussed."

The Surrey Federation of Trades Councils and the Wimbledon Constituency Labour Party want the regional executive committee "to organise a public propaganda campaign in favour of..." cont. page 8.
Mr Crossman can not only unite the party but could win back a greater measure of public support if he would clearly state that he would use the nation wide picketing as his disposal. There is really no need for Labour to apologize for being British first.—Frank McLeavy Labour MP, for Bradford East, letter in the Times, 1 March.

The way the tiger was rushing backwards and forwards, every time I got my sights on its head it could be somewhere else. I had a man next to me to advise where to aim, but he did not say anything—Foreign Minister Lord Home, in Nepal, reported in Economist, 4 March.

The manager of another company is said to have offered an official of the Tailors and Garment Workers a cheque to meet all the union dues of all his employees for a year, on condition that he kept away from the factory.—Times report on American companies in Britain, 27 February.

The radioactive isotope of stroncium is thought to be the most hazardous component in the fallout from nuclear tests for better or worse. Now everywhere, so scientists are studying its behaviour and turning its presence to good account.—Radio Times program preview, 1 March.

In a circular also read in the churches the Archbishop stated that anyone criticizing him for commenting adversely in any way on his Lenten pastoral would be committing a mortal sin, absolution for which was reserved to the Archbishop himself.—Times report from Malta, 22 February.

This reminds us of Czarist days before the Communists took over power in that country in the year of grace 1921. During the last few days of the Czar, every one of the able male population of that blessed country was a State Official. No wonder then, it was so easy for the succeeding regime to convert every citizen of that vast land into a State Subject or a State Servant.—Shri CH Bhalla, former Minister of Commerce in the Government of India, quoted in Indian Ship, p 65.

The British Communist Party must hold its 27th National Conference this Easter. As a prelude to this the CP weekly journal World News has included its column discussing a to discussion on issues that will be raised during the Conference.

A significant contribution to this discussion comes from Morley Stone, executive of the YCL paper Challenge. He criticizes the CP leadership for its opposition to the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. "We played down" he writes, "and underestimated the importance of the demand for unilateral disarmament Britain. But considering the latter as dividing the movement and diverting it from the main issue, we were late in associating ourselves with and giving full support to what has in fact come to be a common issue on which the left has fought and defeated the Gaitskellite right wing."

The writer continues his criticism by ironically stating: "The EC made the necessary adjustments in our line last May". But the leadership avoided a public declaration of this change: "no analysis of the reasons for the change (nor even any recognition that there has been one)". Let alone any suggestion that there could have been anything wrong. In our previous position, have ever been made to the Party or the public... in conclusion, he warns the Party that "modesty and readiness to admit and analyse our mistakes and errors is an attempt to represent ourselves in practice as always giving faultless political leadership are satisfactory if we are to be respected and trusted by the rising left wing in the Labour Party..." We agree.

DANISH ELECTIONS

Danish Socialists presented two characteristic features: the PSP is a socialist party independent of the two blocks; the PSP is anti-militarist and in consequence demands Denmark’s disarmament and withdrawal from NATO.

Abroad, it is the English right wing which has greeted the result of the Danish election with the most anxiety; these gentlemen find it difficult to understand that an important section of opinion in a member country of NATO can be opposed to this treaty. British imperialism is alarmed by the position of the PSP, which has emerged at the precise moment when the unilateralist left of the Labour Party is challenging the position of Gaitskell & Co, faithful guardians of the interests of the English bourgeoisie.

In this field, it is clear that the success of the anti-militarist march of last October contributed towards opening the eyes of a section of the Danish population. Moreover, it is highly significant that the military problem was ignored by the electoral platform of all the other Parties, which preferred to base their campaigns on the tax problems. But despite the success of the PSP, the other indications pointed out by the elections of November 15 must not be ignored, in particular the progress of the Social-Democrats, who are those with the broadest base and which separates it from all the other Parties. The SD-Radical Liberal coalition disposes of the problem of the absolute majority in Parliament and has formed the government. Compromising itself therefore continue in the name of socialism, and in the coming period the task of the PSP will be clearly, but without landing in that strange mixture of opportunism and sectarianism, which rules the CP.

The PSP will have to accomplish a tremendous task: its success is important, not only for Danish socialism, but also for European socialism which is struggling against conformism and the bureaucratic machines.

Results of the Danish elections of November 15:

Social-Democrats 1,024,039 (+ 6)
Rad.-Liberal Party 140,609 (+ 11)
Conservatives 436,005 (+ 32)
Agrarian-Liberal 511,338 (— 37)
"Taxe Unique" Party 52,232
PSP 149,482 (+10)
Communists 27,345 (— 5)
Independents 81,094 (+ 6)

(1) The PSP spent 85,000 crowns on its campaign: the SD 2 millions; the Conservatives 10 millions.
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HEALTH SERVICE

cont. from page 1

amount of medical research they have to undertake. However, according to the Times Review of Books, the E6.2 is spent annually on research by the industry. Also we can only guess how much less of this ‘research’ money is being used to benefit the patients themselves. The real reason is that the drug firms argue that their profits are justified because of the tremendous

S. REGION CONFERENCE

cont. from page 6

of the Scarborough conference decisions on defence and nationalisation. The latter add that the campaign should be held “during the summer.”

Housing is dealt with in two resolutions. The Ethir district committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union want the regional executive committee to conduct a campaign in support of the 1960 Scarborough conference decisions on nuclear disarmament.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

War is the inevitable outcome of the division of society into classes. Only the working class, controlling and owning the means of production, distribution and exchange, can end the world war and the annihilation of large sections of humanity. Planned, co-ordinated worker control demands the nationalisation without compensation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land. International collaboration between socialist states must replace aggressive competition between capitalist states.

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

This programme must include:

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

• The withdrawal of all British troops from the Suez canal and the transfer of all British capital in colonies and other undeveloped territories to their peoples.

• A Socialist foreign policy, distinct from neither Stalinism nor Moscovism. Material and moral support for world-wide struggles in their fight against oppression and colonialism. Understanding for social and national self-determination.

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

• The extension of the social services, the payment of the full industrial wage as the basic condition of the establishment of a free Health and Industrial Health Service. The abolition of all charges for public transport.

• To help solve the housing problem by municipalisation of rented property and the nationalisation of the building and building materials industries.

• Free education for all, including free loans to local authorities, with the right of all children to attend schools of their choice.

• Free education available to all, including adult education. The abolition of fee-paying schools and the private school system. The extension of education in comprehensive schools, with the aim of filling the gap for technical and practical education. A national network of school buildings under a national Ministry of Education with free optional nursery schools service. Adequate maintenance grants at all educational levels. Full attendance of all students without a means test.

• Votes at 18 in national and local government elections.

• Firm opposition to all racial discrimination. Freedom to emigrate to the pull from Britain.
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