This includes:
Kick the Tories out!
Seven per cent Bank Rate means:
• lower pay—higher prices
• fewer houses—bigger rents
• scarcer jobs—fatter profits
Strike to safeguard wages!
March to force a vote!
Vote the Tories out!

There is only one answer to
LABOUR'S GREAT DEBATE

WE ARE GOING TO PRESS before the Labour Party Conference assemblies at Brighton, before the battle on nationalization policy is joined. However, we are under no illusions about the outcome. The leadership—Right and 'Left'—have taken up their positions, declared their 'war aims' and shown the working class that, whatever the fight is about, it has certainly nothing in common with the fight for socialism.

Readers of this paper need no lessons in the nature of the Right-wing's policy. As we said last month, "unwilling to fight capitalism, they will bite the hand—when they hear the Government—by courtesy of the capitalist class and within the limits set by the Class, that is, the movement demanding a militant lead against the Tories and the desire to socialize industry. Right-wing Socialists, the leadership has produced a policy of no substance but with an awesome shadow. The substance is that vast water paper baskets of boardrooms, the shadow—for clouding the minds of rank-and-fileers. As the Economist, Cassell's organ of Big Business, writes:

"The whole point about 'industry and estate' is that it is intended to be evasive; to mean very nearly nothing. If the vote at Brighton unexpectedly goes against the Right, the executive could, at a pinch, reconsider it and replace it next year by a document that said nothing in slightly different words. As the general election will be nearer than, some of the unionists who might vote against it this year will not be willing to rock the boat again; then, with tactful handling, all but a minority of militants would almost certainly accept some compromise short of a specific and rigid list for future nationalizations (which is what Mr. Gaitskell wants at all costs to avoid). At best for himself—and this is still probable—Mr. Gaitskell can withstand the fundamental onslaught at this year's conference. At worst, he should have a line of retreat already in which he can withdraw at the expense of looking only a little silly." (September)

Arithmetic of the Right

No, we needn't be surprised at the Right-wing leadership. They are acting true to type, true to their convictions. The thing about capitalism is a little here, a little there; add a small reform, subtract an injustice, multiply the result by a round sum, and divide the workers by guilt. But whatever you do, the result of this arithmetic must be a flourishing stock-market and a functioning capitalism. For after all, only booming profits can finance the reforms that keep the workers quiet and their 'leaders' in positions of power and privilege.

Small-talk from the Left

But what about the 'Left'? Where is the Bevanite leadership, those 'real Socialists', those 'Old Believers' (to quote Maurice Edelman, M.P., Tribune, August 16), whose socialism pounds and bubbles and cannot be tuned? Where is this fearsome lion conjured up by Mr. Gaitskell? . . . . All that can be seen is a nest of mice, scurrying about in small panics, shocked that the secret of the peace-peace pact has come out. And the Great Man himself, Old Bevanite and New Statesman, one-time miner and future Foreign Secretary, Mr. Aneurin Bevan . . . not a word from him in this greatest of debates within the Movement.

Let us explain. Bevan, Mikardo, Barbara Castle (and Cusin) are on this commission that prepared the nationalization-policy statement, in which they say: 'They know what they are about. They knew that, to quote Mikardo, 'it is the tendencies of future government to do either as much as it permits or as little as it compels' (Tribune, 16). And they would agree with him when he adds: now I admit at once that in management and social policies between the minimum and the maximum is much wider than is the case with any previous policy document.' (Ibid.)

Unity before principles?

And yet they let it pass. Jennie Lee tells us why. 'We all know,' she writes (Tribune, August 23), 'that the reason why so much is left blurred and open to a dozen different interpretations is the necessity of preserving unity at the top . . . . The only alternative to this method of settling controversies would have been to have had resignation or threats of resignations from the minority elements on the Executive.'

So that's it. In spite of the fact that the 'only unanimity which took place was between some of the TUC representatives and the Left-wing critics of the document on the NEC' (Barbara Castle, Tribune, September 13), the 'Left' was prepared to let the rank-and-file believe that the document was indeed unanimously agreed upon. And, as if that isn't enough, they feel aggrieved and betrayed because the truth stalked out, the gag pact emerged, naked and ashamed. Once out, scurrily. Clothe him with slogans. So Right his bones in phrases. Amendment follows amendment; addition; pile on re-interpretation. The issue is now condemned to fight to the death, to screamow to frighten away the eagle of socialism. The mice scamper into their lion-suits, busy about appeasing the British workers, 'trust us, trust us.' When you wake up to slack off Gaitskell, Wilson, Crossman, Williams, don't forget us, your revolution ary fighters, don't forget to put us—Bevan, Mikardo, Castle, Cusin—in their place.

What a spectacle! What a frightful facade of a face. Here we are with an issue that will decide the fate of socialism in Britain; we have a straightforward, uncomplicated task of rejecting a do-nothing policy statement, of reaffirming our belief in the common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange under workers' control; we have a chance of appeasing the heads of the Right-wing leadership to the rank and file, to the working class, which alone can fight for and secure socialization to do the job. Do you wonder at their history. And all these mice of men do is steal up behind our backs, join hands with the 'hustlers' and 'jockeys' for Ministries. Thus do they further away history for a portfolio!

Militant Socialists need not be dismayed, yet our friends are worse than none. The very efforts they make to appear respectable in the eyes of the TUC officials is the power really lies. The anlilising socialist cannot be true to himself, true to the British working class and true to the future of mankind only if he continues to reject all compromises and fight for COMPLETE NATIONALIZATION AND NATIONAL PLANNING UNDER WORKERS' CONTROL.

OUT

James D. Young writes on

Capitalism, Labour and Youth

"The number of those who need to be awakened is far greater than those who need comfort"—B. Wil son, 1857.

The Capitalists seem to have found in armaments a guaranteed insurance against economic crises. This is the central economic fact of contemporary capitalist society. But any agreed disarmament or a strong Socialist movement of working class youth would, of course, upset them.

A recent examination of the impact of mass-media on "working class culture" shows up a sharp contrast between working class life towards greater conformity and even uniformity. But within the tempo and economic stability of British capitalism class struggles between workers and capitalists flare up from time to time.

The inability of capitalist society to satisfy the growing needs and aspirations of new generations of working class youth has created acute social and psychological tensions.

The frustration and militancy reflected in:

1. The tendency for young people to turn indoors. The literature of the "angry young men" is, for example, a literary expression of the frustration, confusion, anxiety, insecurity and hopelessness of a majority of middle and working class youth.

2. The tendency for a minority of young people to turn outdoors. They are not prepared to put up with the economic and cultural restrictions of capitalist society, as many of their fathers and mothers have done, they try to push the Labour movement further and further to the left.

They are the people on whose shoulders the future and salvation of humanity rests. But they will not be able to take humanity towards the future of Socialism unless they can spread Socialist ideas among the majority of their class.

Mr. J. Bronowski says that in the school population it is estimated that 55% of those children who could profit from a university education 65 per cent, come from working class homes. But only 25 per cent of the university population in fact comes from working class homes, and at Oxford and Cambridge the proportion is 12 per cent." In 1954 Mr. A. Smith, Vice Principal of Ruskin College, pointed out that the "best working class lads" cannot go to university as "the majority are still driven by economic pressure to add to the family income as soon as possible."

Thus does capitalism waste human and economic resources. Thus does capitalism condemn itself before the
The flag isn’t there for fun. It’s a scientifically angled sound mirror, beaming sound forward from the Speaker’s Balcony to the Trade Union Congress. (Contemporary with the Radio Show and the Trade Union Congress.)

WHEN IT WAS POINTED OUT TO the editor that (a) Parliament is in recess and (b) the audience is a bad time for creative literary endeavours, he ignored the suggestion and stuck to the line by saying that we could do the trick which somebody had once said was the “Parliament of the Working Class.” So Blackpool it will have to be.

Sir Tom Williamson gave the presidential address. It was a model. Golden platitude followed golden platitude until delegates sat in an ecstasy of wonderment—surely no man could speak for so long without committing himself!! However, he finally descended from his pedestal, and made a courageous attack on unofficial strikers, who, he said, had no time for him. Sir Tom thought that for unofficial strikers can have much time for Sir Tom Williamson.

To him that minority of trade unionists who ran away from their responsibilities by joining unofficial strikers are the traitors, the traitors and the traitors. To be seconded and to overturn the official constitution and policies of their own organisations... if that is their right that they have. But, oh, the progress of trade unionists and the prestige we must condemn and restrain those who organise, promote and lead unofficial movements into unofficial strikes.

If any of you think Sir Tom would have said “If I am to maintain my prestige and influence among the public, I must be wrong.” For the damage these unhappy men do is unforgivable. They undermine the working class movement by making the employers afraid of it. They destroy working class solidarity by holding elections and acting in organised groups. Their opposition to every movement that makes people fear that workers are in danger is just the opposite. Finally, to strike for higher wages is the grossest disloyalty to their workmates, and the living standards of their families.

CAPITALISM AND YOUTH

court of humanity. Yet by depriving thousands of working class youth of their right to a Palmer education, while an enormous amount of money is spent on war preparations, capitalism creates a terrific potential anti-capitalist movement.

That is why a very large sum of money is spent by the capitalists in education. It is a vital part of their strategy to mould the whole of the educational machinery, the cheap millionaire press, the cinema industry and the radio is all connected to this. In so far as young workers succumb to this they become useless to the capitalists and are not successful, because capitalist industry keeps the struggle to ground, always recruiting...


THE DISCUSSION of the Labour Party National Insurance Scheme was disappointing. Apart from recommendations for indexation of all age pensions raised to the not excessive level of £3 per week, no one had anything constructive to say. One would have thought that at least one speaker from the floor would have objected to a scheme the basis of which that capitalist will be in full operation by A.D. 2030, that is to say, through the year 2026. All the TUC delegates will be dead. It might be libellous to say that they will all be dead in 1976. But it might be said that by 1976 the present young thing must be wrong with a working class conference that (apparently) tamely accepts such profoundly anti-socialist proposals.

The concept, to be frank, is to abuse the local authorities to cause a “cuff,” in essence that the next two generations of workers should save up and lend the money to capitalists who will then be able to pay it back to the subsequent generations.

Loyalty is more than a right-wing reformist attitude. After all, a right-winger is supposed to be someone who, if not expressly the specifically Socialist, at least believes that the path should be gradual. The Labour Party proposals are not socialist in any sense since they do not propose for all practical purposes, that the economy will always be capitalist, and that the same crew of capitalists, at that.

With suitable modesty, this column may forebear to make its contribution to the next Labour Government. The following Board that will take a weekly contribution from each worker and invest the money in the football pools. The vast number of permisions possible would make success a certainty and the winnings would enable old age pensioners to be paid on a generous scale. This has a further advantage: if the pools were nationalised every Thursday and denationalised every Sunday, the capitalists would be forced to put their money in something able to get, week by week, his last week’s stake money back again.

The alternative is also being canvassed. One can see a fallacy in this should be wary of the Labour Party’s proposals since the basic idea is the same—that by capitalist manipulation of money one can create more value than that created by labour.

When something is suggested that at first sight looks expensive it is usually claimed that it could easily be paid for by everybody giving up, say, half a cigarette each week. The trouble is that taking everything together, the space available, if the cats’-eyes, for instance, not only would we pay up giving up, but which you paid to put to the end of the week. Delegates of two of the smaller unions, the Associated Blacksmiths, for instance, the Smiths, Woodcutters and the Guild of Insurance Officials,

Michael Millett deals with the labour market policies since the basic idea is the same—that by capitalist manipulation of money, one can create more value than that created by labour.

And the environmental concerns of H-bomb first breed and then feeds attitudes of apathy, inertia and hopelessness. And of course, as capitalists and workers try to produce such a product, there’s no choice but to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work and to work...
THE MOVEMENT draws the
LESSONS OF TUC 1952

OWEN ROBERTS looking back at Brighton
work of the 1952 resolution. A look at the text that follows will reveal the full import of this declaration.

"Congress," said the 1952 resolution, "reaffirms its faith in the principles of social ownership, but recognises that if its aims are to be achieved within the framework of a limited number of industries and services the full advantages of social ownership can only be realised if the Government fulfils the Labour Party's declaration that it will extend social ownership.

"Congress," continues the resolution, "therefore, instructs the General Council to formulate proposals for the extension of social ownership to industries and services where those now subject to monopoly control, such proposals to have regard to the possibility of the control of the industries by the merger of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions and other proposals submitted by other organisations." Congress further calls upon the General Council to formulate general proposals for the extension of social ownership to industries and services calculated to make possible the ultimate realisation of the resolution.

This resolution was not accepted merely by the General Council at the 1952 Congress. It was supported on the floor of the Trade Union Congress, which endorsed the resolution, and the vote where, despite the right wing opposition, it was passed by a majority of 1332 to 120 in favour of the resolution. The resolution was then instructed to draw up a report, present it to the Labour Party, and to the Labour Party for inclusion in the election

programme.

The result of this was the famous 1953 report on public ownership which only recommended the nationalisation of water. This, said the report, would do nothing to stop wage increases, but it was the only move which could stop wage increases, and the report had to stop wage increases. The 1953 report was adopted, and the Government was forced to make a deal with the Labour Party, and the Labour Party was forced to accept the nationalisation of water.

Shorter work-week

Similarly with the resolution in favour of a shorter working week passed at this year's Congress. The 40 hour week has been fought for in the past twenty years, but since the war this has been played down by the right wing of the Labour Party—while accepting the principle—has argued that the time was not ripe for that or that the matter was one for individual union negotiations. As a result of the Congress the General Council secured the defeat of a 40 hour week resolution at this year's Congress in a 132 to 120 vote. A deal was reached with the unions which included a shorter work week, but which did not go as far as the resolution would have had to do.

"Congress," the 1952 resolution, "is pleased to note the progress made in the movement for a shorter work week, and for the early return of a Labour Government.

Public ownership ayed

On public ownership a resolution was passed, and it is instructive to note how the General Council to carry out the terms of the resolution passed at the 1952 Margate Congress, and to give effect to any declaration of a policy within the
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In his second article on strikes, SEYMOUR PAPERT deals with STRIKES AND SOCIALIST TACTICS

The first part of this article (Socialist Review, July) examined the statistics of strikes in Britain over a number of years. The chief conclusions will be briefly recapitulated:

(a) The number of man-days lost to industrial disputes has been increasing year by year since 1951. The accompanying chart shows the statistics of numbers of men involved in the world war. The year 1926, when 162,000,000 men-days were involved is striking.

(b) An analysis of the officially given causes of these disputes reveals a long-term tendency for disputes over working conditions to be the chief cause of disputes, and a sharp cut in the expense of wage issues. In this respect—and in others such as the average length of strike Britain is closer to the United States than to other European countries.

(c) But there is one feature of strikes that is peculiar to Britain: the unimportance of trade unions in the country. Essentially this is because of the high proportion of workers who are employed by the government.

(d) The incidence of strikes does not depend in any simple and direct way on the fluctuations in the economy—years of prosperity are as likely to have as many strikes as years of depression.

II

There are impressive differences in "strike-prone" industry from industry to industry and place to place. Briggs is an example of a strike-prone industry. The industry is coal mining which usually accounts for nearly two-thirds of the total number of man-days lost in any strike. Transport (mainly the dockers) running second.

TUC end

This abolition of the right-wing influence which was established by the Blackpool Congress, provides the framework within which the left wing can now engage in a real drive within the trade union movement. Particularly when the added factor of the attachment of many new members of the Stалиnists elements within the leadership of the trade union movement is considered... this also included a number of members of the Blackpool Congress where those Stалиnists which do still remain in office... in the leadership... with the exception of the single delegate who got howled down when he tried to defend Russian actions in Hungary.

Task of the left

The task of the left-wing at this moment is to turn theninger resolutions of Blackpool into the everyday policy of the trade union movement. Every effort must be made to take all the forward-looking measures accepted at the Congress down to branch and workshop level and there to secure mass backing for their realisation in actuality. This will be the last chance to the right-wing attempts to water down the Congress decisions, a move possible because the right-wing maintains hold over most of the trade union organisational machine.

Nature of left-wing strike

The left-wing trade unionists must endeavour to extend left-wing trade union influence into the party, particularly on the issue of public ownership. The result of this should be to bring together the left and the trade unionists to constitute the Labour Party local organisations in a way which has been necessary for some time.

The Blackpool Congress, therefore, can mark the start of a new phase of Labour Movement—if the left-wing takes advantage of the situation it has created. Another phase of the movement is necessary, one in which trade unionists turn around there should be enough elbow room to make a decisive impact on the trade union policy and control of the workers.

The causes of unofficial strikes have provoked much head scratching amongst writers in the capitalist press and academic journals. The Manchester Guardian, for example, posed the question why miners earning £19–£20 a week should strike. "What," it asks, "can these miners want which they do not already have?" (29th September 12, 1957). The Economist periodically shifts its head over the folly of workers who lose more in waging a strike than they could gain in winning it, and the non-monetary costs of strikes often look too trivial to these folk that sociologists find it necessary to rake up explanations from Freudian psychology."

Basic conflict—who controls?

One point on which all these academic writers are correct is that many—probably the majority—of strikes arising on the shop floor cannot be understood simply in terms of the immediate dispute. There is always a long background of growing conflict. Resentment and anger increase to breaking point and the next issue, trivial or important, is fought out to the bitter end. The roots of the strike in the capitalist relations of production which reduce the worker to the status of a cog in the machine with no say in the running of the factory, no part in the ownership and organisation of his work, and with his future security entirely dependent on members of an alien class.

The situation is illustrated by an article in 'The Economist' writes about the Grimesthorpe coal strike of August-September 1947 which paralysed 63 collieries and cost 600,000 tons of coal. After 36,000 men had kept the strike going for three weeks in the face of strenuous attempts on the part of Arthur Horner (N.U.M. secretary) to get them back to work, the Economist...
wrote: "The real issue which is being fought in this" "struggle can be summed up as a struggle between rationalisation and socialism. The argument is that, in order to bring the coal face to appear merely the pretext for a showdown on whether contracts can be imposed on the workforce, on whether the industry is to be nationalised, on whether the leaders of the miners' union are to be able to impose contracts on the workforce, on whether the industry is to be nationalised, on whether the leaders of the miners' union are to be able to impose contracts on the workforce, on whether the industry is to be nationalised, on whether the leaders of the miners' union are to be able to impose contracts on the workforce. Many miners expected nationalisation to result in workers' control; instead it has resulted in the closure of collieries, the power being taken away from the miners' union and the machine leaving the individual miner face to face with the same managers. Unfortunately, this gives the impression to the striking miner that he is being forced to use the conciliatory machinery or to accept the offices of the more remedial kind. There seems to be no other explanation than that they wish to decide the issue themselves, without outside interference.

It would be vain to pretend that the miners had been forced to decide the issue themselves, without outside interference. The existence of a strong organised trade-union movement is to a certain extent, especially in the last few years, the war, has been a hard blow to the mining industry. The trade unions have been able to stand up to the challenge of the employers, who believed that they would be better off with the support of the employers. Would there have been fewer strikes without the big unions; or more often; or have the demands of the workers been more consistent or the workers more disciplined?

These questions are too abstract to answer. Yet we are worth posing for the sake of reminding ourselves of the conditions under which the present struggle for the control over the coal mines is taking place. The miners are fighting for the control over the mining industry.

Unions brake strikes

The Covent Garden incident illustrates the fact that the unions practice a restraint policy whether they call it that or not. The miners have decided to co-exist with capitalism, for if they really backed the movement of the miners, they would have to bring the economy to a standstill. It is not incidental that they act as a brake on the workers; it is an essential part of their position. The miners strike has a number of times been extended and prolonged, but it has not been clearly visible to the strikers, but on other occasions it has been clearly visible, especially if one goes back to the period of the Labour government. It is remarkable, in this period, how the NUM attitude to unofficial strikes, mainly:

"...is not an argument against the trade union's role in the social and ideological influences involved in a strike. This represents an important step in the development of a correct economic analysis. It will depend upon a correct understanding of the role and importance of non-economic conditions. It is necessary to make the point at the outset, for it is fundamental to a Marxist analysis it is often ignored by 'Marxists'." As Engels admitted, Marx and I are ourselves partly to blame for the fact that the younger people sometimes lay more stress on the economic than it is due to it, and he added that "I cannot exempt many of the more recent 'Marxists' from the reproach of Bloch, Marx-Engels Collected Works, Vol. II, p. 444.

The approach is one which I would wish to extend to Tony Cliff.

Firstly, consider Cliff's quotation regarding the "bourgeoisie and the aristocracy": "...and the capitalists of the 'advanced' countries do braze them; they are in a market situation, so to speak, direct and indirect, overt and covert." Is it sufficient to refute Lenin and Engels on the grounds that the workers are in direct conflict with the owners of economic tributaries, e.g., differentials, as Cliff seeks to do? Surely the first task of an economic analysis is to comprehend the forms that bribery can take in the existing society. As an example, return to the situation in which the British Board of a nationalised industry, or a knighthood, may all be considered as direct bribes and incentives offered by the existing set-up to a very small number of labour leaders. But, in order to show how their methods have become an integrated part of imperialism the indirect bribes are of greater significance. In my own social sphere as a student I am in contact with a very small number of indirect bribery. The Education Act has made it possible for workers to organise and gain in the management and control of industry, the professions, the higher levels of the Civil Service.

The new bribes

The political consequence of this has been that the best brains of the working class are being recruited into the running of the new "bourgeoisie" and the working class movement is being robbed of many of the people who have otherwise supplied its leadership. If any group through this net they are attracted from the factories, shops, mines and offices into adult colleges such as Ruskin and Kiercich which fulfil a similar function to the Universities. It is unnecessary here to show how closely these forms of bribery (ultimately economic bribery) are integrated into the present social structure.

The main point is this, that bribery of a small minority of the working class does take place but that it has developed a new technique since Lenin and a last attempt to "suck the cream" is sucked into the middle class, but not all of it. Thus arises which operate to attract young people into the middle class via the Universities also operate to deny this function in the "educable" working class organisations. Not all the potential administrators go into the education side of the Imperial Service, the Civil Service; an increasing number are turning to these "respectable" work" is a necessary condition for their careers. Thus the National Union of Students and various the Labour Party are becoming quite as important to such students for their "trade training" as the University faculties themselves. But the young students are not the only ones who are enmeshed adhering to "the bourgeois against

CORRECTION:

Several comrades have drawn my attention to a misleading remark in my last part of my article last week. In the body of the text I wrote: "It would be rash to venture an estimate of the number of blacklisted strikers who have thought through the implications of their position and experiences (i.e. in unofficial strikes). But fortunately this is not the case." This could be taken to mean that it is not important for Marxists to contribute to raising the level of understanding of their own experiences. What I meant to say was that we can see that important developments are taking place without having to venture an estimate of the number of workers who have reached a high level of political consciousness.

An error crept into Mary Kupperman's Historical Question in last month's Socialist Review; instead of Bakunin, founder of Anarchism, who was the first owner of the name of Lenin's companion should have been given as Bakharin, the Bolshevik leader and major theoretician. — Editor

Ray Southall is now a student of Philosophy and English at the University of Wales, and was a Publicity Manager of the Birmingham Trades Council Journal; he was also the Treasurer of the Tredegar, of the "mass of the proletariat," similar enticements (incentives) are held out to present labour leaders; these, however, have not been accounted.

That there would be ... an increasing differentiation of living standards between the different layers of the working class is relevant to the point at issue. It is irrelevant, that is to say, to the "bourgeoisie" and the mass of the proletariat, of the "bourgeoisie" and the mass of the proletariat, of the "bourgeoisie" and the mass of the proletariat, of the "bourgeoisie" and the mass of the proletariat.

All of which is to be distinguished from that other process whereby an increase in the living standards of the working class as a whole is procured. As Tony Cliff has pointed out, this process is known as "bourgeois, and to understand this surely we would need to know a lot more about the process which underlies Reformism. But, and here I return to my earlier point, a real analysis, however skillfully conducted, would not enable us to reach a full understanding of the process which underlies Reformism.

Impact of propaganda

It was Marx, if I remember rightly, who wrote that the ruling ideas of any period were those of the ruling class. Thus radio, television, cinema and press become, in a sense, the overriding importance if we are to understand Reformism in Britain. An extremely important aspect of the problem is the sult of capitalist development and prosperity. The link between the two is a highly effective propaganda machinery. The "past reforms" which are "geographically" and "historically" a working class have to be looked at carefully. As Tony Cliff points out in this context, the "bourgeois against
IRISH SOCIALIST POLICY VERSUS THE I.R.A.
by Senator Owen Sheehy-Skeffington

Since Fermangh and Tyrones never asked to be disjoined from the rest of Ireland, their removal consis-
tently “opted out,” in the only constitu-
tional manner open to them—by violent revolution. Ireland will be whole, or it will be divided collectively. This division, consequently, useful activity to end partition should be directed, on both sides of the border, towards the solution of the living conditions of all our people. In the North, a step towards this would be the beginning of the end of the annoyingly frustrating Anti-Nationalist and Anti-
Catholic discrimination in local elections, on and Government boards, commissions, etc. In the South, anti-
partitionists would do well to study what it has proved possible to do in the social field in the Six Counties, and to decide what exactly would be the situation among all-Ireland Repub-
licans of their dreams.

Connolly said in 1901:

Unfair to divide from her people is nothing to me; and the man who is buzzing over with love and energy, is worth all the gain and all the sacrifice that yet pass unavowed through our streets and witness all the wrong and suffering which we have endured, but to which we have not yielded. The degradation wrought upon the people of Ireland—aye, wrought by Irishmen, Irishwomen, Irishmen—will not pass unavowed, without bursting end to it, is, in my opinion, a fraud and a lie in his heart and soul. The combination of chemical elements he is pleased to call Ireland.

Heroes instead of progress

I know many who are at one with me on that point; and I would urge them to use their influence to turn the very real spirit of self-sacrifice of those years into active struggle, for the end, for the work, for the cause. For the cause, for the people, for the nation, for the race, for the ideal, for the country.

Unfortunately, the military method is conventionally held to be a glorious one; and in some Irish circles today the prospects of another civil war is being received with startling equanimity—partly, perhaps, because of exag-
gerated and unthinking anti-partition propaganda by all our political parties, but largely, in my opinion, because we have so far proved unable or unwilling to apply the high principles of Con-
noolly to our own people. We realise this one is necessary and desirable. And if we flare up and lash out at our neigh-
bours who have, in the event, done rather more than we have done.

Military action is not the answer, however. Neither the I.R.A. nor the British military have won a step. Far more could, in fact, be achieved by intelligent, organised pas-
sion. The military victory first occurs; by extending the hand of friendship to all Northerners of good will, of all shades of religious belief, as seeking, the good-will of the rest of the world by an attitude of unselfish peace, then we might apply, to see our own problems in a world per-
spective.

Old but good advice

In May, 1915—a year before he was murdered—Francis Sheehy-Skeffington, my father, wrote an “Open Letter” to Thomas MacDonagh which he printed on paper, and in Irish Citizen, in two passages which seem relevant to the present situation:

Can you not conceive an organis-
a, a body of men and women banded together to uphold in Ireland the rights and liberties of the people of Ireland, a body animated with the same great motives, by a band of comradeship, trained and disciplined in the ways of self-
sacrifice and true patriotism, and equipped with the weapons of intellect and of will that are irres-
sistible—such an organisation prepared to dare all things for their object, prepared to suffer AND TO DIE rather than abandon their principles—but an organisation that will not lay it down as its funda-
mental principle: “We will prepare to kill our fellow men.”

Ireland’s militarism can never, in so great a crisis as that which confronts Germany or England, but it may be equally fatal to the interests of Ireland. European militarism has drenched Europe in blood: Irish militarism may only crimson the field from which no Irishman will escape unharmed; it would be disaster enough.

One great danger arising to resorting to violence is that, since it is so much easier to organise people to pull trigg-
ers than to get them to think out effective means of combating the enem,

The complete military victory often leads to a confused or stagnant political state. The circumstances of Ireland in 1921 about half the courageous and self-sacrificing Republican movement did not know whether the proposed Treaty was or was not a forward step towards what they had been fighting for. And for five long years after that, during which period the border was reluctantly “frozen” by the 1925 Anglo-Irish Treaty, the large numbers of Repub-
licans abstained altogether from the Boyne because they could not make up the provision of radio, television, etc., strengthen capitalism: it is hardly neces-
sary to point out what makes these of Labour Party policy. Further, that the strenghtening of capitalism tends to weaken the working class, to make the working class feel like the working class; the machinery of bribery (University education) and of prope-
rity (public relations) are jealously guarded by the working class. In this sense a reform-
ist would condemn the work of the working class as an army for the defence of capitalism.

My general criticism of Tony Cliff’s argument is that the argument from all the others and in so doing produced a crude economic determin-
sim instead of a Marxist analysis. But surely the final condemnation is that, having done so, the author should have assumed that Lenin wrote in the same spirit.

I SOMETIMES FEEL HOW TEMPTING IT IS TO START UP a new party. None of the existing organisations quite suits me so why not gather together some friends and set up a new body which will be right? One advantage of a new body is that on a few basic principles, the new party will be born. If we fall out with each other first split, why then two parties will be born! Wether such arri-
avements and divided griefing is healthy is another matter.

The Socialist Forum movement has attained something magnificent called, and if it should continue to grow successfully, more rewarding. It has sought to bring together people on a wide front, in order to produce instant agreement on all important questions, to create a framework in which socialists who disagree on many, many things, big and small, can nevertheless live together and, perhaps, work together as best they can.

It is a long, long time since we saw people of such different background come togeth-

The “new” comradeship

If the Forum movement has achieved nothing else, this comradeship of the left is worthwhile, and, in my own view, is the natural prelude to a more solid and effective political unity.

We ask you...
After years of ebb, the flow of military has started breaking over.

The Greek Trade Union Movement

For the past ten years, the labour movement in Greece has offered a picture of authoritarian control and of conditions ranging from semi-colonial to fascist. Few countries have been so ravaged by war and civil war, by occupation and economic depression than Greece; the labour movement was set back more than a decade.

Before the war, trade-unions and working-class parties had a strong position, and the movement definitely could look back on an old tradition of militancy and integrity. There also developed in Greece the oldest revolutionary opposition to the Comintern: the "Arche-Marxist" movement. For a time the Arche-Marxists put forward a stand not only for agrarian reform, but for a general uprising of the working class. It was not against the political power of the king and the Greek government, but against the government in its narrow sense.

Crushed between East and West

This situation was completely reversed by the dictatorship and the war. During the war, the Stavroula succeeded in taking control of most of the resistance movement, largely because of the activities of the Arche-Marxists, who realized the political importance of the movement a year too late. The rise of the Nazi occupation and the underground activity during and after the war, the Arche-Marxists suffered tremendous losses, and from the Stavroula, which was of the extreme right, and from the Stalinists, who were to out exterminate them. About 1,500 members of the party were killed, and a further 2,000 were arrested, or had half or more of the total membership.

From the end of the war until now, that is, until the Stavroula and semi-illegai remaining members of the party were in no position to initiate or lead important working-class struggles. Neither was the Arche-Marxist movement. At the end of the war, the Stalinists had also taken control of the trade-union movement, and for the second time by the British army, the capitalists and the Court, the Stalinists were repressed and replaced by a trade-union movement completely controlled by the reactionary government. It is necessary here to stress the role of the Greek trade-union movement, in making the Mediterranean ports safe for American arms shipments. Irving Brown, like the rest of the group of "white-collar" workers, is a man who conceives his role to be one of "fighting communism" which has led him to be a right-wing opposition and actually on the political basis of the Right. He has become a "patriot". In other words, a policy which is not in the best interest of the Greek people, more so than the official Communist Party itself.

A local union boss

In Greece, Irving Brown produced a man named Fotis Makris, to whom he handed over the whole trade-union movement. All opposition to Makris was brutally suppressed with the help of the police. Just to make sure, Mr. Brown had all the trade-union leaders "shut-up" and turned over directly to the Greek Federation of Labour (i.e. Makris) who in turn stove them out to the industrial unions affiliated to the GFL. If an industrial union or local group developed, or the federation was called "communist" and cut off without a cent; no union, no union money anywhere about the personal agreement of Fotis Makris.

Whether this is not the case, Greece ports have become safe for American arms shipments. What is certain, on the other hand, is that Makris has behaved in the same way as every Greek government up to now on the grounds that he was the "provisional" man who had sworn Greek working-class in a bag, and the only man who could be trusted. That is also the case. In the history of the Greek trade-union movement no significant strike or wage-rise occurred for about ten years. In the meantime, the drachma was devalued, slashing the price of 50 per cent., and the price of olive oil (an essential staple) has doubled in two years, with no reaction from the GFL. Makris also approved law No. 2553 which enabled the Minister of Labour to carry arms wage-rise obtained by collective bargaining on the plant-level, as well as any other wage-rise based on collective bargaining. This enables the Minister of Labour to change the provisions of any contract between the workers and the employer, or to make changes in the wages of the workers. Today, over two million Greeks have an income under $2 a week. The Greek working class became one of the poorest in Europe.

Resistance to the common front of enemy government, police, military and Irving Brown never ceased. It came, on the one hand, from the Stalinists, who were suffering not only because of the police, but because of the political situation in the country.

Youth and miners act

On the other hand, opposition came from the sectors where the Arche-Marxists had succeeded in maintaining themselves, and from a new generation of independent, young trade unionists. There have been and, and so, the independent opposition received constant support from the new generation of workers who were again and again driven into opposition to the official government. The demands and every economic demand becomes a political demand in the shops, State and national unions are indistinguishable. Under the pressure of the opposition, Makris and his supporters have had to go.

One focal point of the opposition has been the Greek Federation of Miners (GFM) with a membership of about 40,000, which was expelled from the GFL about two years ago for refusing to accept Makris' directives on the workers' rights and demands. In the face of this, the leaders of the Independent Federation of Miners (CFH) which it at 37th Congress last June strongly condemned the GFL.

A "general's" strike

The "general strike" of last June is significant for the present situation of the Greek trade-union movement because of the curious sequence of events that led up to it. In the course of several months, the government began to get worried about signs of discontent in the working-class: a discovers which had been a political threat. In February 1956, before the general elections, a "Popular Front" was formed by the liberal opposition and by the EDA (legal front for the CP) which came close to winning the elections. The rise of the neutralist feelings generated by the Cyprus dispute. To understand some of the events, the government decreed a general wage-rise of 5 per cent. The employers' federation opposed the wage-rise, and was put against the government in the State Council, an institution which decides the constitutionality of a law. The Greek supreme court is unpredictable. It took the occasion to review the entire labour legislation; it decided that the wage rise was unconstitutional, but also that the law on check-offs was unconstitutional and hence invalid.

Check-out for check-off

As soon as the decision became known, Makris began manoeuvring to get the new law passed that would re-establish the compulsory check-off under a different form. But, for reasons of its own, the government was reluctant to comply. Consequently, Makris threatened the government with a strike unless he made preparations for it in May. First there were to be several 24-hour "demonstrations" with the aim of forcing a pay rise and leading up to a general strike in the whole country on June 18. The public was made to think that there were adequate ones (they involved different wage rises) but in fact they were only used to bring pressure on the government to maintain the check-off system.

As soon as Makris started agitation for the strike, the GFL affiliated to it, and began supporting it. Stalinist streamers and signs began appearing in Makris' meetings. The rest of the trade-union opposition also supported the strike, and clearly disassociated itself from Makris. In June, first instatement of the strike began in Athens and Piraeus, with middling success.

Who ate them?

At this point, Irving Brown, oblivious of everything but the Stalinist support for the strike, went to Athens and asked Makris to call the whole thing off. Makris, who felt that he was fighting for his job, refused, and Irving Brown intervened with the government to have the strike of his own political body. A curious episode occurred during those days: in an interview with the Athens correspondent of Le Monde, Irving Brown forgot himself sufficiently to complain bitterly about the ungratefulness of Makris, who was being hit the hand that fed him for so long, and is reported to have exclaimed something to the effect of "I'll make you 50,000 dollars and look what he is doing now!" The correspondent of Le Monde, who later went to Athens, said that Irving Brown had said, and asked him if it was true that the Greek government had promised 200,000 dollars from Irving Brown. Makris is reported to have said into a rage: "the dirty so-and-so only gave us $3,000, here are the 200,000 dollars he promised and he wants to suggest here that any of his colleagues is lying, but if what they say is true, the question arises: who are the 177,000 dollars collected from American workers' dues? Who ate them?"
Nearly all the books which have appeared on New China to date are either pro-Kuomintang or pro-Mao. The authors, or their publishers, are Chinese Communist party officials. Now for the first time a genuine third camp study has appeared. Without an overt attempt at either Kuomintang or Mao Tse-tung, the author, Yngvel Glickstein, subjects their quackery, disingenuousness and mendacity to a critique very clearly based upon a profound grasp of the Marxist method.

The purpose of the book is to use the Chinese Communist party as a basis upon which to review the economic development of China, past and recent. The book is a valuable addition to the literature on China today, because previous works have tended to pass over China's economic history too lightly, or to present China's economic development as a clean cut, if horrendous, story without question. In this respect, the book is a welcome addition to the literature.

The author's method is not a new one but is a familiar one to those who have studied China. However, the book is a welcome addition to the literature because it is based on new and independent research and analysis. The author has access to sources that have not been previously used, and he has developed a new perspective on China's economic development.

The book is divided into two parts. The first part, which is the longer, is devoted to the history of China's economic development. The second part is devoted to the present situation in China, with special reference to the recent economic reforms.

The author argues that China's economic development has been skewed by its political system, which has given undue emphasis to the development of heavy industry at the expense of agriculture. This has led to a situation where the rural population is extremely poor, while the urban population enjoys a high standard of living.

The author also argues that China's economic development has been hampered by the lack of a market economy. The government has been the dominant force in the economy, and has used its power to direct the flow of resources to the benefit of the state, rather than to the benefit of the population as a whole.

The author concludes that China's economic development has been a failure, and that the situation is unlikely to improve in the near future. He argues that a genuine market economy, with the government playing a more limited role, is the only way to achieve economic development that is beneficial to the population as a whole.

The book is a significant contribution to the literature on China, and is a welcome addition to the debate on China's economic development.
SOMETHING NOT TOO DIFFERENT

The discussion of the Labour Party National Insurance Scheme was dis-appointing. Apart from recommendations, there is little else, though the increase to the 6% rate is £3 per week, no one had anything constructive to say. One felt that one speaker in the floor would have objected to a scheme of which is that capital-ism will still be in full operation by A.D. 2030, that is to say, through-out the present century of us, all the TUC delegations will be dead. It might be believable to say that they will have no psychologists. Everything must be wrong with a working class conference that (apparently) tamely accepts such profoundly anti-socialist policies.

The concept is, to be frank, perfectly feasible. In essence, that the next two generations of workers should save up and fend the money to capitalists who will then be able to pay it back to the subsequent genera-tions.

There is more than a right-wing esthetic altitude. After all, a right-winger is supposed to be someone who, though not necessarily Socialists, believes that the path that must be gradual. The Labour Party proposals are not socialis-tic, or even anarchistic since they do not demand all, for practical purposes, that the economy will always be capitalistic, and run by the same crew of capitalists, at that.

With suitable modesty, this column can make it clear: the next Labour Government should set up a Board that will take a weekly contribution from every worker and invest the money in the football pools. The vast number of permissions possible would make success a certainty, and the winnings would enable old age pensioners to be paid on a generous scale. This has a further advantage: if the pools were nationalised every Tuesday and denationalised every Friday morning each worker would be able to get by week, by week’s last week’s stake money back again. And those who believe they can see a folly in this should be wary of the Labour Party’s proposals since the basic idea is the same—that by capital-ist manipulation of the football pools they can create more value than that created by labour.

When something is suggested that at first sight looks expensive it is usually claimed that it will be paid for by everybody giving up, say, half a cigarette each week. The trouble is that they are not things to be禁 hoc, not only would we be giving up smoking, but we would also be giving up something else.

Delegates of two of the smaller unions, the Associated Blacksmiths, the Amalgamated Weavers, and the Guild of Insurance Officials, continued from page one
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