At the time of writing the gloom emanating from the decision of the shopworkers and engineers to reject unilateralism at their annual conferences is still very much with us. It now looks as if the industrial revolution will be held at the Labour Party’s annual conference this Autumn. For the moment it looks as if we must admit defeat. But wait. It is not as if a world full of promise has been utterly smashed. The Scarborough decision was at best partial. The arithmetic of bloc voting added false stature to the Left, making it appear the majority view where it was no more than a vocal, organised minority. The unilateralist leadership was undecided as to the next move, sat tight and allowed the initiative to fall to the Right.

So it ends with the defeat. The number of unilateralists has probably not declined. What has occurred is the result of the Right organizing around the issue and delving into the reserves of support it can always find in the apathetic and most backward section of the Party and trade-union membership. If anything, the defeat shows the true relation of forces within the Party. It also shows the weakness of the Left leadership. Where the Right gathered support by attacking the unthreatened implications of unilateralism—the withdrawal from NATO, the dissolution of the American alliance—the Left leadership shirked these issues. Counsins, Foot and the rest preferred to keep silent. Instead of uniting the greatest possible number on a clear anti-NATO program, complete with appeals to the workers of Europe and beyond, they sought a false unity in anti-Gaitskellism. They were as far as to support Wilson the natopolitician against Gaitskell the natopolitician in the Parliamentary Party elections. They gave the Crossman-Padley variant of Gaitskell’s ‘defence’ policy their blessing (Counsellors voting for it in committee: Foot in Tribune, 3 March, on the eve of CND’s annual conference). And as the personal struggle heated up, so cooled their defiance towards the Bomb. In a word, they helped build the bridge to Gaitskell which the weaker elements in the Party have now crossed in the name of unity.

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

We have seen with what result. But defeat this year is no more absolute than victory was last year. Then, the consistent Left had to damp down the flush of illusions: now our job is to combat demoralization, recall and ‘what’s-the-use-ism’. We must use facts and cool appraisal to wash away the tears; strengthen the connections with CND and Direct Action in order to fight the Right more effectively, remembering how they, in their turn, put heart into the Party Left; and finally, we must clarify the implications of unilateralism: the fight against the Bomb is a fight against the Boss.

Reproduced by permission of International Socialism.

STALINISM NOT DEAD

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

Thus, under a law of 7th August 1932, ‘…the requisition of the Property of State Enterprises, Collective Farms and Co-operatives and Instatutions of Socialist Property,’ the theft of property belonging to the state, kolkhozes and co-operatives and the railways or waterways, became punishable by death by shooting, accompanied by the confiscation of all property. If there were extinguening circumstances, the penalty incurred was imprisonment for not less than ten years and confiscation of all property. (A Collection of Laws and Ordinances of the Worker-Peasant Government of the USSR, Russian (Moscow), 1932, No. 62. Article 360) Stalin christened this law ‘the foundation of revolutionary legality.’ (J. V. Stalin, Works, Vol. VIII, p. 209).

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

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

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

2) Embezzlement of collective farm, co-operative or other public property for a second time, as well as that committed by an organised group or gang, is punishable by confinement in a reformatory labour camp for two to twenty years, with confiscation of property.

3) Theft, appropriation, defalcation or other embezzlement of collective farm, co-operative or other public property is punishable by confinement in a reformatory labour camp for a period of five to six years.

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

5) Theft, appropriation, defalcation or other embezzlement of state property is punishable by confinement in a reformatory labour camp for a period of five to six years.

In the city of Saratov, VF Yudin, who had been pre-

T. Cliff
TU COMMENTARY

P.O. Engineers

B. Lynam

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

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

The A-Optants quite naturally by the Overseas Telegraph branch the National Secretary, Charles Smith, hot-foot with a plea to the branch to wait a fortnight before implementing the overtime ban, so that a full and proper meeting could be held to prevent the need for such action. After a rather lively meeting, the proposal to wait a fortnight was accepted.

However after a fortnight the determination of the Overseas Telegraph branch had not diminished, and the original decision was implemented. A call for a boycott of the service in north London was followed by a fairly prompt boycott of the service in north London.

The next move by the Union’s National Executive was a suggestion that a proposal for a one day token strike be put before the National Court in June. The suggestion however is not as militant as it might seem, for it carried with it an automatic threat to return to overtime working.

A ban on overtime would certainly bring more pressure to bear on the management of the one, or half a day token strike. It seems strange that the executive of the Union should be in principal against overtime working anyway, should call its members back to overtime working.

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

Here we have a classical example of the spontaneous action by rank and file members of a union being gradually crushed by the bureaucracy. It has been, like a daily newspaper, an eye-opener for many of the rank and file members who seem puzzled by the lack of support from National headquarters.

At the time of writing it appears that the proposal to return to overtime working was rejected by the majority of branches and that the National Executive will have to think again.

Cunards

Bill Fowler

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

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

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

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

The noble Knight is, of course, a member of the old school who really believes that private enterprise means just that. What rubbish, awakens he would have if he went through the list of companies who have received assistance in State funds.

From ship building to machine tools, steel and aircraft manufacturers, they all have all had their ‘share’ from the national kitty.

Another Tory speaking in the same debate pointed out that while the Government was putting money into the ship the Cunard company was putting money into aircraft. What a glorious fiddle it is. And this bunch of high-class confidence tricksters proceed at the same time to cut and slash at the Health Service, raise rates, starve children in Wales, and throw millions down the drains at Wetherfield, Aldermaston and Holy Loch. Let us remember the role of ‘private enterprise’ when next we go in for our share of the national cake.

Building

Omar

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

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

But social and technical progress has drawn the craftsmen into its vortex just as it has other operatives in the world of industry. It is no respecter of persons. These progressive changes have revealed that there is no place for the fuddy-duddy in their vocations and that the value of their labour is determined in the same way as that of any other work, whatever his designation may be.

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

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

The TUC has made certain recommendations which have been presented to the building unions to the NBFTO. All that is needed is their implementation.

The course charted by the TUC aims at merging the kind of local union into one unit; the trowel trades would unite and form one organisation; the woodworkers would do the same.

In the opinion of the TUC was not an end in itself but the first step in the formation of one unit on industry.

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

PUBLIC TRANSPORT DEMAND

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

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

To this end an all day conference has been called for SATURDAY JULY 11ST at ST. GEORGE’S HALL (Credentials 2/6 from the London Busmen Public Enquiry Campaign, Bill Jones, 3 Hale End Road, Walthamstow, E.17. URI 1576)

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

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

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

R. Johnson

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

DISMISSAL NOTICE—4th May.

To:

This is to confirm that on and from the 15th May, 1961, your employment will be terminated.

Your present rate of pay is 6/10 per hour, as compared with present rates of 6/10 per hour.

EMI management are attempting to break a redundancy agreement of three years’ standing and to replace the existing contract which they expect the workers to sign. We have bluntly rejected their approach and are prepared to take our stand against human beings as if they were pieces of furniture that automatically go with the premises. A total of 45 workers have already been made redundant, including four shop stewards, against which a complaint of victimization was recorded.

It is worth noting that one standard leader of our RGHU card and dismissal notice, and elected to remain on call until negotiations are completed.

A meeting on 11th May between union and management, following the rejection of the notification of redundancy, was attended by a joint EMI-Marconi body for Tuesday, 16th May.

The management wished to withdraw the document issued to each employee with their name and personal number. The Union refused it as illegal and had previously advised the members not to sign or in any way to accept the conditions. The management adjourned for consultation and on return asked that the stoppage scheduled to take effect the following day, Friday 12th May (the last 7-hour working day under EMI prior to take-over) should be called off to allow negotiations to continue. They, for their part, would defer the take-over for two weeks until May 30th. This was agreed at a factory meeting and the AEU and ETU shop stewards agreed to a meeting later this week with a joint EMI and Marconi body for Tuesday, 16th May.

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

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

Railways

R. Mason

AT a recent meeting of the Central Organising Committee of the National Union of Railwaymen the myth that railwaymen are now receiving comparable wages with outside industries was completely exploded.

It is only little more than a year and a half after nearly seven years of inquiry by the Guilbeaud Committee—that certain wage increases were recommend- ed for all grades.

While it was agreed that reasonable, but long overdue, increases were given to some of the higher grades, it was never-theless felt that those at the bottom end, and in the middle were little better off than before.

The many answers by individuals and branches to a questionnaire sent out by the Southern District Committee only confirms what most railwaymen already knew: the companies are now working longer hours. Many of the railwaymen are working the bare 44 hours. One of the areas which answered the questionnaire was Chichester in Sussex. A number of men sent the District Council Secretary their pay chits, covering a period of several weeks, and, without exception, they were all less than £2 per week. This was not an isolated instance.

Other answers told of men regularly working 12 hours a day for many weeks—and in some cases months—on end. Some men have never had their "rest" day for years while many others have never had a day off for months. Such is the situation with no expectation of any improvement.

The three railway unions are also committing an application for a wage increase. A long time ago the railwaymen must stand firm for a decent basic wage for all railwaymen, and must be prepared to use their industrial strength to get it.

AN interesting vignette on Britain’s affluent society comes from all places, Wormwood Scrubs, where a former director of Bowmans, the industrial bankers, is serving a two-year sentence for fraud.

While he has been imprisoned, his own shares, locked up by a nominee, have risen in value so much that he has repaid the whole £200,000 that he swindled. Consequently, his sentence has been re- duced by two years.

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

Redundancy

J. Wellstead

WE recently reported in the industrial column an agree- ment between the German metal workers which on which wage increases were agreed upon at the price of a "no strike clause". A British Steel agreement has been concluded with the Mersey shipworkers. The Southern District Committee only confirms what most railwaymen already know: the companies are now working longer hours. Many of the railwaymen are working the bare 44 hours. One of the areas which agreed to withdraw the question- naire was Chichester in Sussex. A number of men sent the District Council Secretary their pay chits, covering a period of several weeks, and, without exception, they were all less than £2 per week. This was not an isolated instance.

Other answers told of men regularly working 12 hours a day for many weeks—and in some cases months—on end. Some men have never had their "rest" day for years while many others have never had a day off for months. Such is the situation with no expectation of any improvement.

The three railway unions are also committing an application for a wage increase. A long time ago the railwaymen must stand firm for a decent basic wage for all railwaymen, and must be prepared to use their industrial strength to get it.

Three

Redundancy

Karl Durrbar

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

1. No overtime where there is redundancy.

2. If this fails, a guaranteed week of 34 hours be adopted.

3. If the employers refuse to compromise, the redundant workers are authorised to insist on a shorter working week.

Whilst this policy is a step forward from what the cont. on pg. 4 column 1
Angola massacre

Mary Britton

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

For the past 500 years the Portuguese have controlled the oldest colonial empire in the world. They regard Angola not as a colony, but as a province of Portugal. There is no colour bar in Angola: there is no need for one. The African worker is paid less than half the wages of his European counterpart and cannot afford such luxuries as public transport and other European pursuits. For the adult male there is a special system of corporal punishment for the "crime" of impertinence.

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

There is little support for the African worker, except from the unorganized, oppressed working class in Portugal itself (average wage—£11.40 per week) no word from the Communists or their front organizations in Portugal to indicate any solidarity with the workers in the colonies. The "liberals" are so politically backward that they still feel that it is important to hang on to the empire. In fact, the only encouraging sign since Salazar announced his intention of clinging to the colonies at all costs in a speech last November has been the policy statement of Calvao, (see last month's SR) which includes freedom, progress and independence for the colonies among its aims.

There is little trade union organization in Angola and there appears to be none whatever in Mozambique, where the situation threatens to become as bad as that in Angola. However, the Mozambique National Democratic Movement has demanded that United Nations troops intervene to stop massacre and mass arrests in the towns and villages and on the plantations. There have been suggestions that Portugal should be kicked out of NATO and that a United Nations Commission of Enquiry should be sent to both Angola and Mozambique. Also the USA has withdrawn economic support for Salazar.

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

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

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

We might also like to hear from Mr Gaitskell about whether the NATO he supports will stop supplying weapons for imperialist sorties of this nature when it comes under the control of the politicians.
LEAFLET issued by a Liverpool CND branch on the occasion of a visit to that city by Mr Crossman.

CROSSMAN AND THE BOMB
or Mr Gaittels' "Second Strike"

THE nuclear policies of Richard Crossman, duly interpreted by Walter Padley, are now gaining ground in the Trade Union movement. The CAMPAIGN FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT is directly opposed to these policies which are no more than Gaitkelsmism by any other name. The Crossman/Padley policy SUPPORTS the continuation of British membership in a NATO armed with nuclear weapons. It DISGUISES this support by offering the proposal that these weapons should never be used first—as though the nuclear command structure were to wait until the homelands had been devastated before dropping the bomb on Russia. SUPPORTS the presence of American nuclear bases—and in particular the BASES in Britain. It DISGUISES this support by empty talk of ‘ending the need’ for such and also making it completely dependent on the will of the Pentagon to decide when this ‘need’ does or does not exist.

Padley proclaimed at the US'DAW Conference that Britain had to have the Bomb because at some time in the future a situation might arise similar to that in which six million Jews were murdered. In order to claim any validity, be acceptable every person who accepts the nuclear ‘deterrent’—is prepared to employ a weapon beside which the gas-chambers appear comparatively mild. The threat of annihilation practised by the Eichhorns can hardly be used to justify the annihilation threatened by a Crossman. Each Polaris missile carries an atomic warhead having a destructive force equivalent to SIX TIMES all the bombs used in the last war—including Hiroshima and Nagasaki. When the base at Holy Loch has its full quota there will be ten submarines carrying sixteen missiles each. The destructive equivalent of 960 WORLD WAR II’s in one base alone.

We are NOW BEING OFFERED THE MAGNIFICENT CONCESSION THAT THIS HELL ON EARTH WILL ONLY BE LET LOOSE IF AND WHEN THE OTHER SIDE STARTS UP FIRST! This is called ‘collective security’: this is the ‘defence’ policy which the country and Labour.

No Person, group or Government can be trusted with the H-Bomb.

Let Britain leave the Atlantic Treaty and Britain in re-

cognize the Fight and Fight Again to Save the Species that We Love—MANKIND.

WRONG APPROACH TO NEUTRALITY

N. Howard

This pamphlet displays just the kind of weak argument that makes the CND struggle in vain. The whole argument is that Britain without nuclear weapons or bases would be able to assume leadership of a third force of neutral countries from Afghanistan to the United Arab Republic. This neutral block would act as an impartial but forceful mediator in all Cold War crises and thus break the Cold War impasse. Apart from the illegic-

ality of trying to break out of the Cold War merely to become its benevolent guardian, I fear that most people know the umpire to have no one side or the other and usually gets the worst of both), the actual achievements of the neutral countries since the War have to be examined.

There has been much talk of the intervention in the Korean stalemate, none of the crises which have so frequently broken out in the world to the brink of nuclear war has in any way been prevented or damped down by Mr Nehru, Mr Khrushchev, or Marshall Tito. At the present time the neutral block is powerless to prevent the Portuguese massacre in Angola, the American intervention in Cuba or the guerrilla wars in Laos and Vietnam. Will this neutral block be capable in which Mr Nehru massacres the Naga hill people, in which Mr Khrushchev denies basic liberties in defence of capitalist profits and in which President Nasser employs Nazis generals as advisers, be any differ-

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

Only the forces which strive for human advancement and freedom from all forms of imperialism can be said to be neutral. Such a force is the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. It will not achieve its aims in a capitalist Britain. It has to assist the struggle for socialism in Britain and in the neutral countries and in the development of nuclear weapons is being seriously con-

considered.

Danish CP

Zig Zag

on the bomb

THE following article from Aksel Larsen, ex chairman of the Danish Communist Party, was sent to a regular contributor to Socialist Review. We passed it on in order not to want more information about the formation of the Peopls Socialist Party, of which Aksel Larsen is a leading member, should refer to the April 1961 issue of Socialist Review.

DURING the vehement stir in world opinion, caused by the first appeal of Albert Schweitzer against the atomic bomb, the question was raised at a Copen-

hagen party meeting in May last year, that the Communist Party should appeal to Russia, directly and through our press, to stop its A and H-bomb tests and urge the other nuclear powers to do the same.

After the discussion, the proposal was rejected. In my final address I unconditionally re-

commended the idea, reasoning that test-explosions were of so great a danger to humanity, that in a situation where an agree-

ment could not be reached on account of the refusal of Britain and the USA, then Rus-

sia ought to take the lead—to come forward with a public opinion and bring stronger pressure to bear on the Western powers.

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

Some central committee mem-

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

Still, I was allowed to present my proposal during negotiations with representatives of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party in August. So I did, and the idea was definitely rejected by the Soviet comrades, who, among other things, referred to the de-

claration of Khrushchov in June 1957, to a Japanese journalist:

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

"Imagine the following: Russia decides to stop nuclear weapon tests and the other countries do not react to our step, but carry on their tests. Russia will, of course, lag behind, while in the meantime, other countries will continue to make progress. Without word any, attained anything, we will, after a time, be compelled to resume tests. What will be the result? The arms race will continue at an increased speed and tempo. Therefore, a unilateral declar-

ation would not have any positive effect, but, on the contrary, may encourage the aggression."

Most of our presidium were of the opinion that, since the Russian Communist Party held this view, it was very difficult to argue against it. On the other hand, it thought it depended on society and circum-

stances. The appeal was a political factor—whether the Danish CP should ask Russia to take these moves. The majority of the Copenhagen Committee were scandalized when I expressed my views as the conference in Denmark 1957.

In the spring of 1955 however, Russia decided to stop immedi-

ate tests and the appeal was led to Britain and America to do the same. If we would not follow her example, she would have to consider their resumption.

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

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

Such as are offered in Nato or Neutrality (the pamphlet is worth reading for its excellent criticism of Nato) do harm to the fight for unilateral disarmament, because it is the kind of neutrality which Sweden is experiencing, in which the development of nuclear weapons is being seriously con-

sidered.

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

Women

Dear Editor,

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

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

Women provide most of the early training of our children. What little hope for the passing on of Socialist ideals under the present circumstances do we not think the problem of women is unimportant. Remember Engels found it worthy of study.

C. Bailey

Dear Editor,

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

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

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

The necessity for rapid industrialisation in Russia, China and the underdeveloped countries resulted in a policy of women being regarded as prima facie a producer in industry. In Russia the emancipation of women included sending them into coal-mines.

Of course, the same position existed in this country during the Industrial Revolution when women and children were employed in the mines and factories. This can be justified on the grounds of economic necessity, but one would seriously question that the position of the women and children is the same today.

Jane Roberts advocates that children should be brought up in the home and not in the NUR. But does she really think that this is desirable?

I think she fails to realise that much of the treatment today of mental illness, delinquent children, deprived children, maladjusted children, and in some cases criminals, is based on the emotional and psychological development of the human being concerned since babyhood.

It has been discovered that to develop normally a child must have a first an adequate relationship with its mother, and later an adequate relationship with its father. It is for this reason that the mother is necessary to a child. Surely all the advance made in modern psychology must be abandoned and we must return to locking up those with mental illness (as in Engels's time); otherwise, the infant will be punished, not helped to overcome its emotional problems, and criminality must be punished severely (shot for stealing, or boys sent to labour camps, as in Hitler's Germany), the individual child must become the norm. Added to this, there is the maternal desires inherent in all women. If they are to be denied the pleasures of bringing up their babies and children, surely the incidence of neurasthenic, manic-depressive illnesses will rise sharply.

If Jane Roberts recognises the former argument as correct, but feels the emotional dependence of the child and mother's survival on each other is reactionary, just as it impedes the role of woman as a producer of commodities, would she suggest that we work towards a solution of producing babies in laboratories and sterilising women?

Sheila Leslie

2 Simmons Close
Russell Lane.
N.20

Caudwell

Dear Editor,

K.E. Coates, writing in Socialist Review January 1961, has said that Aristotle Caudwell in his appraisal of DH Lawrence was guilty of "gullible black and white judgments of the kind that people called Lawrence "a fascist". These are such extraordinary misrepresentations that they cannot be allowed to pass. In fact Caudwell pays the art of Lawrence (and Gide and Roland) the highest of compliments: "They represent the efforts of bourgeois art, exploded into individualistic phantasms and commercial muck, to become once more a social process and so be reborn. Whether such art is or can be great art is beside the point, since it is inevitably the pre-requisite for art becoming art again." (See A 45, p. 48.)

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

The passage that connects Lawrence with fascism refers to his ultimate solution and is quite disconnected with any immediate political platform. It reads: "We can only be abandoned in action, and the first action of Fascism is the crushing of culture and the burning of the books. It is impossible therefore for the artist and the thinker to be a consistent fascist. He can only be like Lawrence, a self-conflicted one, who appeals to the consciousness of men to abandon consciousness." (p. 59)

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

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

Peter Cadogan

Cambridge
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Salazar

Dear Editor,

In a report of the NATO conference of Foreign Ministers on May 10, The Times stated: "Lord Home made clear that the British Government would be glad to give what assistance they could to Portugal in solving African problems". If by this time, nobody has challenged the honourable gentleman on his plans for aiding and abetting the people of Angola we must make clear that, although tyrants like Salazar and Franco may be the friends of those who wear the Old Etonian tie, they are our enemies. And so is the friend and appeaser of the Fascists, Lord Home.

Bob East
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WHOSE WELFARE STATE?

Valerie Owen

THIS, so we are told is a "welfare" state for which we should all be grateful. Children are healthier than ever before, with free medical attention, milk, clothing, vitamins, and empty bellies relieved only by charity soup kitchens. Indeed many things have been "sold" and dear: for and won: we take for granted that our children should be healthy, that we will share in the benefits of modern medicine. But how much there is that remains to be won.

The sociologists tell us that the first five years in a child's life are of supreme importance, yet in our society, the notion that the "welfare" state makes the minimum provision for the young, and refuses to accept responsibility for children deprived in some way of normal family life.

What about the nursery? Just try and find one. The LCC insist that both parents must be working or within 25 hours a week before a child is eligible for admission to a state nursery. And an overcrowded nursery is that the custodians parents must be quite unable to make any other provision for the care of their children, and this is understood that unless the child is fully supported by the mother is, unless the "hours" limitation are not acceptable or divorced or with a husband totally disabled or in prison, it is highly unlikely that

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

This is the Criminal Law of RSFSR lays it down that:

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

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

"Art. 138. Premeditated murder committed under the sudden impuls of strong emotional excitement aroused by violence or gross insult on the part of the deceased, entails deprivation of liberty for a period of up to five years, or forced labour for a period of up to one year."

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

"Art. 148. Placing a person known to be of sound mind in an asylum for inebriates or other personal motives, entails—deprivation of liberty for a period of up to three years."

All that has been said above serves as a new illustration of how our society is dominated as well as crime, the struggle of the isolated individual against dominant relationships has an origin which is not purely arbitrary. On the contrary, is rooted in the same condition, as the governing power existing at the time. (K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, Russian Edition, 1911, p. 122).

Stalinist Russia the concept of the nature of crime and the punishments laid down for it, is the basic contradiction of the bureaucratic state capitalist order.
Raymond Williams Culture and Society, Penguin 4/-
The Long Revolution, Chatto & Windus 30/-
Bookshop Country, Chatto & Windus 18/-
SO often do we find ourselves involving arguments on the role of artists and writers in industrial countries that discussions supporting art vs politics of politics are heard as one of the favourite games of the posh weeklies. The importance of Raymond Williams' work is that it shows how false this distinction is.

Art, says Williams, is a form of communication—along with politics, education, the popular press, TV, radio, advertising, "the market", family, sex and even sexual relationships. Therefore to try to say that there is a "reality" that is "outside" this "reality" is false. Whether it succeeds depends on the economic and social patterns of society—whether it is "true" or "false" in the sense that one individual can be transferred into terms that mean something to a large section of the population.

Where it is impossible to do this art may contribute to the attempt to claim for itself some absolute value beyond which communication does not matter: but this is an artificial situation where art has ceased to function because society itself has lost its necessary sense.

Raymond Williams develops his study of communication in three parts. First by looking at the English critics of culture and society and seeing how they develop the theory of the "common culture"—Robert Owen, Dickens, William Morris, the Fabians, Christopher Caudwell, FR. Leavis—proposing that though Williams becomes too involved in accepting their ideas of culture, he is not a major figure that would arise in such a study. In particular he stresses the need for recognizing that the social background is preventing a common culture also prevents each from developing his own abilities.

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

In 'The Long Revolution' he considers the whole series of communications and industrial relations with the economic structure. Taking them in turn Williams examines the development of education and literacy, the history and role of the press, and the part played in our lives by language, the social history of literature and drama, and the major issues in portraying realism in the modern novel. But what seems to me to be lacking in Williams' treatment is the idea of difference in art—the need, in spite of a 'common culture', for the full-throated rebel.

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

Exactly what prevents the realisation of social equality and common opportunity is traced in the last section of the book. Williams attacks the whole capitalist system of the 'market', but he shows us to have the claims of "individualism" in politics and art are really obscure.
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WHAT WE STAND FOR

War in the inevitable outcome of the division of society into classes. Only by working class control and owning the means of production, distribution and exchange in a planned economy, can guarantee the world peace, end of war and the reconstruction of society. Planning under workers' control demands the nationalisation without compensation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance, 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 in preliminary steps to international disarmament.
- The withdrawal of all British forces from overseas and the transfer of all British capital into underdeveloped territories.
- A Socialist foreign policy subordinated to neither Washington nor Moscow. Material and moral support to all workers in all countries in their fight against oppression and their struggle for socialism.
- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions, together with the implementation of the principle of work by full democracy.
- The extension of the social services by the payment of the full social security wage as minimum pension, together with the establishment of a free Health and Industrial Health Service. The abolition of all charges for public transport.
- To help solve the housing problem: the municipalisation of rented property and the nationalisation of the building and building materials industry. The granting of interest-free loans to local authorities, with the right to requisition privately owned land.
- Free education available to all, including adult education. The abolition of free-paying schools and the private school system. The expansion of education in comprehensive schools. Increased facilities for technical and practical education. A vigorous programme of school building under a national plan. A free optional nursery schools service. Adequate training for all students without a means test.
- Votes at 18 in national and local government elections.
- Firm opposition to all forms of discrimination and freedom of migration to and from Britain.
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IAP PEACE TREATY
President Truman and Marshal Stalin decided at a secret meeting in Japan to put off Japanese efforts to end the war two days after the first atom bomb test and three weeks before the bomb was dropped on Hiroshima.

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

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

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

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