THE INDUSTRIAL STRUGGLE

We are going to press four days after the snow-ball engineering strike started, eleven days after the ship-builders came out, one day after the ship-building employers were met with a flat "no" to their offer of a five per cent. increase in wage rates with strings attached.

But even now, before the end is in sight, the Labour Movement has been able to learn some of the home-truths that have been left on the shelf for almost a generation of industrial "peace" and "coexistence." Younger workers especially are learning some of the things that their fathers can never forget.

Firstly, if we want something the bosses don't want to give even if it is only an "offer," we can get it through direct strike action.

Look at the record. The engineering employers said "no." No pay rise, no offers, no arbitration, not even discussions with the unions. They came into the struggle fully determined to force a showdown. They have been preparing the showdown for more than a year.

In January last year, they appealed through their financial press for three-quarters of a million unemployed—the Banker, the Economist, the Financial Times—all came out with the magic figure of 750,000. In February, the British Employers' Confederation lashed out at a number of boards of nationalized industries, including the National Coal Board and the Transport Commission, for conceding wage advances to their workers. In May, the Engineering and Allied Employers' National Federation set the pattern for the redundancies that followed the Tories' credit squeeze by reminding federated firms "that there was no nationally agreed redundancy procedure" and "that it was not desirable for any management to adopt any procedure designed to share the responsibility for decision on redundancy" (Times, May 24, 1956).

Later that month, "encouraged," said the Times (June 1, 1956), "by the appearance of underemployment in some sections of the industry," the Federation announced the rejection of a wage claim by the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Workers' Unions even before it had been presented. They then swung into the attack at Standards, BMC, and, most recently, Briggs and Fords.

Yes, they were certainly preparing for a showdown, for a "no offer" year and to hell with the consequences. But when it came to the test, and especially when it came to seeing the tremendous solidarity of the shipbuilding and engineering workers, they knocked under. "No discussions" turned into "discussions"; "no arbitration" became "arbitration"; "no offers" became "five per cent."; and "no pay rise" is sure to become "five per cent. plus." That is the power of direct action.

The second lesson to be learned from the strikes is that a great number of Labour MPs are for it that the Government is no umpire. As soon as we climb into the ring with the employers we find it's a two-to-one battle.

What could be better for the bosses than a Government that does the work of cutting living standards without anyone having to go to the expense of a lock-out, or the risks of wage-cuts? A Government that cuts food subsidies, raises rents, sanctions the Health Service, raises prices of school meals and children's meals; one that has created unemployment and short-time working, wages unemployment benefit from workers on short-time; one that uses Admiralty yards to blackleg on striking dockers—such a Government is a bosses' tool, not a impartial arbitrator. Labour MP seem to believe.

In the account of the Thatcher Government, the Lords of the Industrial Relations Committee have been given the same treatment as the Commons—arbitration bills are still the government's business, whatever the government's business is. They are independent only from working-class influence. All five of the Industrial Court are barristers. Of the seventeen appointed members of the Industrial Disputes Tribunal, twelve are barristers, three professors and one Principal and Vice-Chancellor of Glasgow University. The one who seems to have had the most industrial experience is the Lord Justice. He is M. S. Kirkby—he, at least, was Assistant Secretary of the British Employers' Federation from 1929 to 1939 and then General Secretary of the Iron and Steel Trades Employers' Association. Just the type of jobs for a Tory industrial arbiter!

Faced with such effective and obvious collision between the industrial bosses and the Tory jocks, the job of the Labour MPs is not to press for Government arbitration. Even did no great service by suggesting that the Minister of Labour appoint an "independent person" to hear both sides in the shipbuilding dispute. Trade-union arbitration have rejected the project outright—now that the union leaderships have been forced to be right, they know that the addition of a government umpire only makes it more of an uneven battle.

There has been too much complacency, too much confidence, too much complacency, too much confidence, too much confidence. Union and Party leaderships have taken the mass membership too much for granted. Too little has been done to bring home the issues at stake through mass propaganda—education. Too little has been done to bring home the mass of the people. Party really becomes the political wing of the trade union movement, relying on the union membership for its strength and constantly giving guidance in the things that affect this membership. The initiative of the rank and file, however, has been repeatedly obstructed. The union leaderships have been blamed for the apathy of the rank and file. The united front of capitalist employers and capitalist politicians must be fought, but it can only be fought effectively when each arm of the movement knows what the other is doing and when both are packing the punches of a militant working class, conscious of its aims and power.

Turn to Page seven
Irish Politics Today

By Patricia Rushton

former executive member, Irish Labour Party
former editor, "Irish People"
present secretary, Movement for Colonial Freedom

There are two real issues in Irish politics today; the partition of the country and the high rate of unemployment and emigration. These two problems are interrelated. Fianna Fail and Fine Gael, which have alternated in office to solve the first problem have therefore in the second.

Partition, in the name of protecting the minority has viciously attacked the welfare of the majority, and has created more problems than it set out to cure; and the evil it created are now used by Ulster Tory as an excuse for the perpetuation of partition.

Geoffrey Bing has pointed out that the exclusion of the potentially radical working class on the North-East has been a grave loss to the country as a whole, and has undoubtedly contributed to the colouring of constitutional practices on the South along purely Catholic lines. This, of course, is one of the reasons why the Church holds so much power in the South...and that power is now used as an argument as to why partition should continue. Even before it was enacted, partition was attacked as a purely nationalist idea in Ireland, who realised the harm it would do the working class both sides of the border.

James Connolly wrote in 1914:

Prophecy come true

"Such a scheme would destroy the Labour movement by disrupting it. It would perpetuate in a form aggravated in evil the discrimination prevalent, and help the Home Rule and Orange capitalists and clerics to keep their rallying cries before the public as the political watchwords of the day. In short, it would make division more intense and competition of ideas and parties more confounded."

Everything that Connolly prophesied has come to pass. With the workers divided reactionary Governments have ruled in Ireland on both sides of the border. The result is an unemployment in Southern Ireland of over 66,000 (9 per cent) and an emigration figure of approximately 40,000 a year. In 1924, a labour unionist made the comparison: "If all the people of Fine Gael and Fianna Fail were laid side by side, the total would be approximately equal to the United States of America."

Death of a Labour Party

In the South the passions and personal bitterness aroused by the civil war obscured real social and economic questions for a number of years. As soon as the Civil War was over, Labour leaders realized the need for trade union organization. In 1925, the Irish Labour Party took the first steps towards bringing the trade union movement into a central body. In 1926, the union movement began to take shape and the Irish Labour Party was formed. In 1927, the party held its first conference and was registered as a political party.

The Trade Union movement in Ireland has shown itself much more politically aware than the leadership of the Irish Labour Party. If progress is to be made, the rank-and-file of the Labour Party must replace the present leadership with men of more militant, more active, and more intelligent organizing ability. If Fianna Fail and Fine Gael are to be overthrown, the people are quite willing to vote for progressive candidates if they can find them. The Labour Party had a genuine Socialist policy and had run a militant campaign in the last election. If T.U.C. politicians might have been returned in greater strength and would certainly never have been the heavy losers it was.

Seen in this light, Fianna Fail's overwhelming victory of 78 out of 147 seats is obviously not so much a vote for Fianna Fail policy as a vote against the inept leadership of Fine Gael. The high vote gained by Sinn Fein (they put up 19 candidates, got 65,000 votes, and 4 of their candidates lost their deposit), is not so much an indication that the people believe in the programme against Ulster, but that they realise the importance of Partition in Irish life and are willing to support those who question the question of independence. If Sinn Fein had any socialist and economic programme to offer, and if they had not been so vague about their position, they would not have entered the Dail, they would have received much more support.

Need for Socialist policy

The main lesson of the election is that the Communists and the Nationalists have a policy and will vote for it where they find it. It is the duty of the Labour movement to put forward a radical policy and to build a socialist party in the South of Ireland. Until that is done no progress can be made towards solving the problem of Partition, and no progress can be made towards a socialist future for Ireland. If this is to be achieved, the Labour Party must get back to its old principles, oppose Ulster, fight unemployment, and ensure that the trade union movement is more politically aware.

Labour's "bye-bye" to the Tories

By Owen Roberts

The catalogue of Tory set-backs in recent by-elections reads like a travel agent's. From Beckenham through the alphabet to Wednesbury, Tory votes have slumped and majorities have shrunk into almost microscopic proportions in many cases. From Romford to wonderful Labour's have succeeded in gaining two seats; but in all cases the voting returns have revealed a smaller percentage of the poll for the Tories than in any two by-elections for Labour.

The slide rule and graph paper experts have spent a great deal of time analysing these results in purely statistical terms and from their examination they have extracted what they believe to be the central feature of these by-elections. Tory setbacks, they say, are primarily due to a series of mishaps, but it would be misleading to attribute all the blame to these invidious people. It would be much more accurate to consider the political situation prevailing at the time of the by-elections, and to analyze the reasons why the Labour Party has succeeded in gaining two seats; but in all cases the voting returns have revealed a smaller percentage of the poll for the Tories than in any two by-elections for Labour.

The slide rule and graph paper experts have spent a great deal of time analysing these results in purely statistical terms and from their examination they have extracted what they believe to be the central feature of these by-elections. Tory setbacks, they say, are primarily due to a series of mishaps, but it would be misleading to attribute all the blame to these invidious people. It would be much more accurate to consider the political situation prevailing at the time of the by-elections, and to analyze the reasons why the Labour Party has succeeded in gaining two seats; but in all cases the voting returns have revealed a smaller percentage of the poll for the Tories than in any two by-elections for Labour.

There is undoubtedly an element of truth in this. Many earlier Tory supporters, particularly among the middle-class, have lost a great deal of the faith they had two years ago. Victims of the Tory propaganda—and in particular the Tory Party's extravaganzas about living standards—the have become disillusioned by the outcome of the past eight elections and are demanding change.

The result is that they have temporarily withdrawn their support to the Tories until the party has been re-elected to power.

But to make this premise the central feature of an analysis recent by-election trends overlooks several important features. In at least three of the by-elections—Cambridge, Luton North, and West Bromwich, the figures indicate a definite swing to Labour in real and absolute terms. In these places the drop in Tory support was accompanied by increased support for the Labour Party; the ineffectual conclusion being that people in these areas were sufficiently fed-up with Tory policies to transfer their votes to Labour.

This occurrence, in three-by-elections held in the South, should serve to warn Labour supporters against falling into the old habit of voting for the swing away from the Government that has been purely negative in nature and fails to reflect a Labour victory at a general election. The emphasis which has been placed on two small negative aspects of the by-elections by the Tories is merely an attempt to dampen the growing trend towards Labour at a national election which is now growing space within the Labour Party. And the men who are now preparing the way for these leaders are prepared to subscribe to similar views is another indication of their inability and unwillingness to wage an all-out struggle for power now.

Another fallacy currently being created in some Labour circles is that Labour gains in recent by-elections are due to improved Party organisation following the Wilson probe set in...
CAPITALISM, SOCIALISM and the
"MIXED ECONOMY"

By Michael Kidron

British capitalism came out of the war very much weaker than it went in. Capitalist homes and about 40% of British industry was destroyed or worn out. The Labour Movement in the country had achieved and maintained a unique position. It had organized and maintained the trade unions, the building societies and the co-operative movement—under the leadership of the Labour Party, the Socialist Party of Great Britain and the Communist Party of Great Britain. The trade unions were the most powerful economic organization in the country, and the Labour Party was the most powerful political organization in the country.

One of the major divisions between the Left and the Right in the British Labour Movement today concerns the future of industrial democracy. The Left, represented by the New Left, the right by the TUC and other conservative organizations, subscribe to the view that the government—whether Conservative or Labour—should take the initiative in industrial democracy, and that the open-shop solution is the only way to ensure a democratic industrial organization. The right, on the other hand, believe that the government should stand back and allow the free play of market forces, and that contracts should be the basis of industrial democracy.

The trade unions are the real power in the country, and they are not going to be pushed around by any government. The Labour Party is the only party that can represent the interests of the working class, and it has the means to do so. The government should support the trade unions and the Labour Party, and not try to undermine them.

Capitalism has failed to solve the problems of unemployment and poverty. The government should not continue to rely on the free market to solve these problems, but should take a more active role in creating jobs and providing social services.

We must vote for the Labour Party, and support the trade unions, to ensure that the government represents the interests of the working class.
We could go on and on showing how the control of private capital by the Labour Government was either not attempted at all or riddled with loopholes in the control of import and export licensing, allocation of raw materials, price and quantity regulations and so on. But enough has been said of the key control—control over the use to which capital and private property was put by the Labour Government was far from able to harness the private sector to the common ends of the party of the former so wished. Of course, where the Labour Government tried in the same decade to regulate the capital, there were few conflicts (as in the case of the nationalization of the banks) and private property was used on which it was willing to stake its life.

Lack of planning

Despite a number of committees that grew, changed and then grew tired from lack of work, there was no central planning agency with real powers. Planning decisions—and during the post-war period of economic scarcity the planning process—were made by many committees with priorities of production and distribution. These plans were taken and accepted by the capitalists themselves—made by a host of unco-ordinated and unco-ordinated industries. That is how so many contradictory instructions could issue from one and the same government.

For example, in January 1951 Sir Harley Shawcross, President of the Board of Trade, urged a “dramatic increase” in textile production and exports exactly one week after the Minister of Labour, J. J. Strachey, told the industry that it would have to reduce its labour force in the interests of controlling prices. Uncontrolled, the automated petrol stations were opened on the very day that petrol supplies to private cars were reduced, on the orders of Labour and turned over to a private contractor. And there were other cases of the same kind—dilatory action when asked to do something. This is because the state when it is given real power by the working class is able to control the activities of capitalism.

Who controlled the controls

It is not only that the Labour Government was approved by those who had no interest in capitalism. It was also the case that those who had no interest in the government in office—was that Big Business itself administered the controls over business. Even the Civil Service had to make way. The following facts, taken largely from Rogow and Shore’s excellent work, are revealing.

The Chief Planning Officer, 1947-1951, was Sir Frank Blake, Director of British Aluminium and two other companies. The Capital Controls Committee consisted of bankers, stockbrokers and industrialists plus one Treasury official who, being the Secretary, took no active part in the proceedings. The chief industrial advisor to the Board of Trade was Sir William Price, managing director of the British Rayon Federation. Most of the advisors and commodity directors for the Ministry of Food and its various representatives of business interests, paid by their firms, were people like the ill-fated posts in the Ministry of Food, twelve of them, senior posts. A director of the Iron and Steel Nationalisation Panel headed the Steel Reramplishment Panel of the Ministry of Supply and the personal control of the Ministry was drawn largely from the Non-Ferrous Metals Federation.

G. R. White, an official of the United Leather Drivers of America, a leather controller at the Board of Trade. The match controller in 1946 was a good friend of R. W. Churchman, who was the president of the largest paper manufacturing firms in the country. Major F. J. Stratton, the beef controller and the hosiery, furniture and tobacco controllers or advisors were all involved in a close relationship with the Ministry of Food. Annapurna, the Liverpool’s cotton firms supplied the bulk of Cotton Control personnel, the Ministry of Food financed the mail-order business that was almost completely staffed by industry people, working to a large extent and on a monopoly basis, i.e., paid by private industry.

Newspaper, meat, etc.

Newspaper was allocated by a trade body, the Newspaper Registration Committee. The Meat Importers’ National Defence Association and the Whole Meat Supplying Association controlled the imported meat. Rationing of clothing was the concern of trade unionists while the production of the “sweets” trade was in the hands of the cocoa and confectionery trade unionists. While there were insufficient resources to ration the food, the Food Ministry, itself, was allowed to classify and distribute the raw materials without further authority from the state. The Ministry of Health was established by the separate government of India.

The Mond Nickel Co. imported all nickel, sanctioned by the Ministry of Supply, and the National Sulphuric Acid Association which consisted of three sulphuric acids producers. While the Ministry of Materials became the sole importer of tungsten ores and manganese resources, a new company whose management would include representatives of three private firms in the trade.

The Ministry of Food worked with private companies in a big way. As members of the Ministry of Food’s Auditor General for 1950-51 states: “Importers, brokers, wholesalers and others displaced by the Ministry, were allowed to conduct activities were formed into associations to render export services to the Ministry in the purchase, storage and distribution of foods as Ministry agents. The remuneration of these commissions amounted to some 4 million a year and is fixed with the general intention of maintaining the earnings of their members at or about the pre-war level so that the trades will retain the means to resume their functions in due course.”


Not for nothing

It is not at all surprising to hear that businesses made a good business out of controlling business. The Controller of General Resources, for example, for example, that £848,000 a year was paid to the oilseed processing industry. The Ministry of Food closed the factories and could not be reopened. “The Ministry of Food paid £2,400,000 a year to the railways, to offset the cost of using railways for producing sugar for internal consumption, although information gathered in a huge racket outside showed output and exports greater than in 1939. It was not until February 1951 that the Ministry had to admit its error and started to investigate refining costs and profits!

Sabotage by bonfire

And when business thought that the time had come to get rid of controls altogether, they were in a good position to do so. As Rogow and Shore write (p. 66), “Pressure to de-control industries put upon the Government by its advisers, was a factor of importance in the controls ’bonfire’ of 1948-50.” It was stated that the newspapers and periodicals did not feature a detailed criticism of the policy, but that other newspapers, for example, the Times, the Daily Telegraph and the Daily Mail, did feature a critical view and, to cite Chilvers in turn, and to cite Chilvers, how the former controller of meat and livestock in the Ministry of Food attacked the bulk purchase of meat, how the former London Regional Director of the Ministry of Works attacked the Board, how the Chairman of the Milk Marketing Board criticised Government milk policy, the Minister of Food attacked the Milk Marketing Board the same day that he was speaking, and how the Chairman of the Cotton Board did the same in his sphere. On one occasion a member of the Economic Planning Board went so far as to state the need for a “pool of unemployment” in flat defiance of the Government’s objective of full employment policy. They sum up by saying, “Controls are less likely to be best administered by hostile or anti-socialist controllers.”

The mixture as before

On the basis of the Labour Government’s experience in running a so-called mixed economy, a socialist must conclude that it was a mixture in words, not in fact; that, at least so far as the private sector was concerned, there was no balance of the state with the private sector, diminishing themselves to any government or social control against their will, to a plan or to anything but their own representatives looking after their own interests. Indeed the very concept of a mixed economy should mean a mixture of socialism and capitalism—a sterile hybrid: how can the two live amicably together when one enforces social control on the other or when the state blocks means of production? As used today, the slogan of a mixed economy is nothing other than a relapse of the old system, private capitalism aided by nationalized industries that are run by a capitalist class looking after the interests of capitalism—very much the mixture as before.
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Where is China going?

In answer, TONY CLIFF writes on MAO TSE-TUNG and STALINISM

During recent events in Hungary the Chinese press came out firmly in support of Moscow’s oppressive policy. This was particularly the editorial for November 5th in Peking’s People’s Daily, entitled “Celebrate the Great Victory of the Hungarian Peasants.” It stated: “The joyful news has arrived that the Hungarian people... have overthrown the reactionary Ngya Government which betrayed the Hungarian people and the international nation.” Every victory of Russian arms in Hungary was applauded in even more glowing terms.

On December 29, 1956, the People’s Daily published a major pronouncement— an editorial of truly historical importance, “The Dictatorship of the Proletariat.” This approved the general course of Moscow’s policy, in the main justified Stalin’s career, supported Russia’s policy in Hungary and revealed to the world its chief emphasis: the “leading role of the Soviet Union in the Socialist camp.” Chou En-lai again denounced the Russian policy as it had been throughout his tour of Moscow, Warsaw and Budapest in January this year. If he attacked the “dictatorship,” he applauded the loudest after Khroustchev had said: “All of us Communists... consider the USSR the model country for us, we are to be as true to Marxism-Leninism as was Stalin himself.” (Manchester Guardian, January 18, 1957)

Unnoticed

To the unappreciative Communist, suffering under the profound illusion that Mao and his regime are not Stalinist, this must come as a great shock. However, to anyone using the Marxist method of analysis, with its emphasis on class and class exploitation of politics, Mao’s extreme right is the more extreme Stalinism is not unexpected. Much has been written about the main policies of the Chinese regime under Stalin and the key role China’s role in the world diplomacy of the period. The Chinese bourgeoisie proved incapable of accomplishing this. The Chinese bourgeoisie was not the driving force of the 25-27 revolution, the world slump and the Japanese invasion, being plywooded and leaderless, not so as a result of the lack of work of the industrial workers. For lack of power, the Chinese bourgeoisie was incapable of accomplishing this. The Chinese bourgeoisie proved capable of accomplishing this. The Chinese bourgeoisie was not the driving force of the 25-27 revolution, the world slump and the Japanese invasion, being plywooded and leaderless, not so as a result of the lack of work of the industrial workers. For lack of power, the Chinese bourgeoisie proved incapable of accomplishing this. The Chinese bourgeoisie was not the driving force of the 25-27 revolution, the world slump and the Japanese invasion, being plywooded and leaderless, not so as a result of the lack of work of the industrial workers. For lack of power, the Chinese bourgeoisie proved incapable of accomplishing this. The Chinese bourgeoisie was not the driving force of the 25-27 revolution, the world slump and the Japanese invasion, being plywooded and leaderless, not so as a result of the lack of work of the industrial workers. For lack of power, the Chinese bourgeoisie proved incapable of accomplishing this. The Chinese bourgeoisie was not the driving force of the 25-27 revolution, the world slump and the Japanese invasion, being plywooded and leaderless, not so as a result of the lack of work of the industrial workers. For lack of power, the Chinese bourgeoisie proved incapable of accomplishing this.

The plans

The rate of industrial growth at by Mao in his first Five-Year Plan is quite ambitious, although it falls short of China’s aims in her first Five-Year Plan (see Table 1). The main objectives are China’s industrial resources that even after her first Five-Year Plan and the will of the Chinese regime, the Soviet Union’s rate of production, not only after its first Five-Year Plan, but even before it was started. This can be seen clearly from table 2: China will need a number of Five-Year Plans to reach that planned line even before it was started, and that is the rate of exploitation is high and rising. This was underlined by a People’s Daily editorial, stated: “In 1952, the workers of State-operated enterprises produced a yearly average range of 100 million People’s Dollars per worker. Of this, except for 500,000 to 700,000 for the average monthly wage for each worker, 94 per cent were actually taken out of workers wages and income created for the State.” (People’s Daily, December 13, 1955). The above figures probably exaggerate the rate of exploitation of the workers, but there is no doubt that it is immense.

Grewing exploitation

As time goes by the rate of exploitation is increasing, as can be seen clearly from the data shown even the rise mentioned in this table.

The exploitation of the peasantry is especially extreme, taking 80 to 90 per cent of the total out of the industrial workers. For lack of power, we shall mention only a few facts to indicate the growing exploitation.

Vice-President Chen Yan stated that in the year July, 1955 to June, 1955, the State acquired in the form of grain tax and compulsory deliveries of products, a total of 92 million tons of grain, or some 30 per cent of the total grain output of the country. (New China News Agency, April 30, 1955). This figure is not far behind that taken by the Russian state as taxation in agriculture, in 1949, when the figure was some 33 per cent. (A. Arina, “Kolkhozes in 1938.” Sotsialisticheskoe Chelovechestvo, Moscow, December, 1939).

The figure for China exceeds what peasants were compelled to pay to landlords under the Kiamtang regime—some “30 million tons of rice” from the Writes: “The exploitation of...” (China Reconstructs, Peking, January-February, 1955).

Forced labour

Capital being so very scarce and labour supply so plentiful and cheap, the natural result is the widespread use of forced labour—including prisoners—against any resistance.

Unlike Moscow, Peking is not shy about giving information on forced labour. This comes from a “Report on the Work of the Kwangtung Provincial Government during the Past Ten Months,” given by Ku Ta-nu, its Vice-Chairman, on September 15, 1951, it was stated that in the province of Kwangtung alone during 10 months, a total of 89,701 counterrevolutionaries were arrested, 28,352 of whom were executed or otherwise deprived of their crimes who were punishable by death, but who, with the acquiescence of the public were sentenced to death, but had their execution delayed for two years, during which time it was feared to be undertaken force to labour to give them a chance to reform themselves.” (China Reconstructs, Peking, September 18, 1951). If some 60,000 people were condemned to slave labour in only one of China’s 27 provinices in a matter of 10 months, the (continued next page)
The size of the slave labour force in the country as a whole must be huge. Po-Lo, Lai, a former slave, claimed that in three years "more than two million bandits" were liquidated. (New China's Economic Achievements, 1949-1952, p. 152, the majority, presumably, if taken to work. A milder form of forced labour is the compulsory conscription of peasant workers, also called "self-employment." (China Daily, October 20, 1951) There is a total labour force of 10,370,000 workers mobilised for various con- 

gress and women's representative. (People's Daily, October 30, 1951). The average pay for this kind of work was some 2.5 
cents of rice for a 12-hour day. (Calculated from the book of 
The China Youth Journal published an open letter by a student called 
Chang Kung-hua, accusing her father of being an agent of Chiang Kai-shek. 
The letter opens with these words: "I find myself to be a member of the New 
Democratic Youth League, and you are using your influence to 
smear me. Between us there is no 
thing in common now. I rather would be a daughter of the people than 
be a slave of the special agent. It is our sworn principle that we will never 
exist with the enemy. So no matter 
where you hide yourself, we will get you in the end. You just wait and 
see." Youth Journal (Chinese), Peking, May 8, 1951.) 

Such a level of depravity imposed by the reactionary state was not 
possible, indeed not even reached, by Stalinist Russia.

Cult of the individual 

The cult of Mao is, in a way, even more extreme and nauseating than the 
cult of Stalin. Portraits of Mao hang everywhere. Five stores high, they adorn Shanghai and other cities. 

Trains carry portraits of Mao over the tracks. The tiny peasant houses where paper replaces the former 
keeper; and a kind of grace is said before meals by the household. "Thank 
Chairman Mao for our good food." His pictures occupy the tiny household shrines where formerly the family神位 were kept. A report of the Peking Municipal People's Government quotes 

a peasant approvingly: "Formerly we worshiped Kung Kuan, who was said 
to be a god. What possible use have I now for a god? Whom shall we worship? 
To my mind, we should worship Chairman Mao. There is a law of General 
Secretary's Office. The Leaders of Municipal People's Government on 
Agrarian Reform in Peking Suburban Area, as decided by General Secretary 

Sons against fathers 

Nothing shows the extreme of totalitarianism reached in China more than 
the demand that children should denounce their own "counter-revolutionary 
relatives." To give one example: The 

China Youth Journal published an open letter by a student called 
Hsiao Ch'ien, How the Tilers Win 
Back their Land, Peking, 1954, p. 791."

China's Stalinism 

The basic facets of the Stalinist re- 
gime are the subordination of consumption to the needs of quick capital 
growth, the brutalisation of the management of industry, the limitation of 
workers' legal rights, the enforced "collectivisation" of agriculture, the 
differentiation of society into privileged 
and pariahs and the totalitarian police state. All these traits are to be 
found in Mao's China. Being a relatively 
late comer and rising quickly, 

However, it is the second of these 
forces that we shall imme-
diately concern ourselves. The rating 
system is a backhanded hint to local 
officials that they will be held to account for how the products of their factories 
towards the care of the local poor and destitute. 

China's" (Office of Price and 

Valuation Officers) assess the ability to 
pay of all property-owners within a 
given size and the tax model on the 
proportionate share thereby de- 
termined. These properties are, broadly 
categorized into three kinds: (a) 
(factories and industrial 

corporations, commercial 

and commercial premises.

to the consumer in higher prices 

is neither here nor there. This is 
an element of atavism in Socialism that the 
electors must learn.

Now the second group of rate-payers 

will find it easier to resist. In 

Birmingham this is estimated to have cost the city Council 9d. of the 4s. in rates this year.

The Government's attempt to define 

the term "owners'' is that the shops-keepers are having a hard time just now. Even 

two years ago such a definition was regarded as being too tight. But the 

industrials, sensing they were on to 
a good thing, the Government 

The major current argument to treat them in the same way— 
which the Government duly did! Which gives some weight to the view that 

the last decade of the fifties has seen the product of the last thirty, industry has been booming and 

record profits made. The fact that 

that the industrial houses would merely pass 

this on to the consumer in higher prices 

is neither here nor there. This is 
an element of atavism in Socialism that the 
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TOWARDS THE C.P. SPECIAL CONGRESS

—By John Mann

We are happy to publish this article by John Mann, a member of the Com- munist Party. It is of especial interest in view of the coming Easter Holidays. Members of the Labour Movement will see in it the broad current of ideas and feelings running through the ranks of the CP, their hopes for the Congress and their fear that these hopes are in danger of being disappointed.

The Socialist Review does not agree with many of the views of the author. We believe that his picture of a new Labour Party "thrown into the wilderness of Stalinism" has more to do with "wishful" than with "thinking." We disagree with the idea that there is a place for an independent Marxist Party in Britain. We feel that the Labour Party might be necessary at some future date. We attach much greater importance to the Marxist Forums—set up mainly by ex-members of the CP. That does not change our generally sympathetic attitude to the coming Congress. It is the author's job to say what he wants, and we state what we feel is unjustified or misstated in his article.

The BEST MARXIST PARTY we have is soon to hold its first ever Special Congress. After Bayeux, the feeling that the Party had to do it, and soon, was so strong that the leadership was forced to call a Congress... Before the Great Change was intolerable. So the planned Conference was called. A new talking shop was taken over by the Congress with full power to sing out the old policies, and the old gag of "new thinking" literally on the point of resigning in hopeless disgust, decided to “stay in and fight.” Before the Congress could, must, change everything.

Well, what did we hope to get from Congress, and what are we going to get?

Labour Unity

First and foremost we hoped for a new and realistic approach to Labour Unity. For without unity, there can be no contrast to the solidarity of the British CP is just a bad joke. A few thousand crude talking shops was planned to be opened here, for the "lay off" of the CP. The British Labour movement has an important role to play in the coming Congress, with a vital importance to the unity of the labour movement, according to the phrase. We have an important role to play in the coming Congress, with a vital importance to the unity of the labour movement.

In fact, whenever a Tory starts con- demning subsidies, Socialists should jump in with both feet and point out these two subsidies mentioned above. The loss on industrial rates has cost British industry, since 1929: the second subsidy (to commercial premises) will cost the country £1,000,000,000.

Naturally, the less the capitalists pay—the more the share of the ordin- ary people in the cost of living, the more local authorities have to face the same kind of raising costs that everyone else has to face. The richer you are, the more your local Council uses petrol, too, you know it, wages, and so on. So we hope that these two subsidies will be left out of the new rates and that they will not be made up of new taxes.

The result of this discussion is that these subsidies are to be cut, and that the local authorities will have to pay their way. They will have to pay their way by cutting down services, but at the same time, the local authorities must not be allowed to cut down services in a way that will hurt the people living in the area. That is the basis of the new rates.

The labour movement has too long been dominated by an outlook which interpreted the struggle for socialism as a matter of fighting the capitalist class. There is a danger that the CP will fall into this trap once more. But there is no need for that to happen. The CP is fighting for the ideals of socialist society, not just for the interests of the working class. The CP must be able to appeal to all those who share those ideals, not just to the workers themselves.

The independent organization of the CP and the independent trade unions must be maintained. But the CP must also work to build up a broader base of support, in order to make its ideas and policies attractive to a wider audience. The CP must be able to appeal to all those who share the ideals of socialist society, not just to the workers themselves.

Also, the independent organization of the CP and the independent trade unions must be maintained. But the CP must also work to build up a broader base of support, in order to make its ideas and policies attractive to a wider audience. The CP must be able to appeal to all those who share the ideals of socialist society, not just to the workers themselves.
READERS who have been watching the antics of certain British newspapers which have been giving away racehorses, might think like in an endeavour to boost circulation figures, be interested to learn that newspapers are still finding it difficult to get readership.

The difficulties started at the beginning of the year when one of GoA's "democratization" measures, the state subsidy paid to the Polish government press was withdrawn. This subsidy, according to the Warsaw daily Zycie Warszawy, amounted to more than a thousand million in each year and its abolition caused a serious increase in newspaper and periodical prices. Immediately, advertisement graphs plunged steeply downwards.

According to an article in the weekly Zycie Warszawy, for the week ending 17 December, the number of newspapers returned unfilled was 70,000 in December to nearly 259,000 at the end of the second week in January—just 14 days after the state subsidy was abolished. "Particularly serious," said the paper, "is the return unsold of large numbers of newspapers. This is in a speaks of a substitution in the number printed."

The Polish press is trying to overcome this reader resistance in ways not altogether unfamiliar in other parts of the Western world. "Cheese and fiction" are some of the methods being used. The Danzig daily Niedziela, in an article recently organised a competition to choose "Misa Coastline," and published the first three graphs of the competitors. Another paper, the Gazeta Blajstowska, is featuring a serial of the novel "Cycle Grodorzece" in the e-paper Pro Primus.

This is interesting because Pro Primus is a paper for young intellectuals and it played a very large part in the campaign for the return of GoA.

While on the subject of the Eastern European press let's mention the law covering the press in Hungary. According to the state controlled "trade union" newspaper Nepszabadsag on February 20, this law proves that "everyone is free to publish his thoughts in the press, provided these thoughts are in harmony with the interests of the working class in the social and economic state system of the people's democracy." Which is a roundabout way of saying that critical writers that they will get no space in Hungarian publications so long as Kadar is the editor in chief.

NEWSPAPERS in Eastern Germany have their trouble too. On March 10 the KPD weekly, Nickstaher, pub-lished a crossword puzzle. One of the clues was: "A Socialist writer and holder of the Harry Mark Prize for 1953." (the latter being one of the top motion by the Party leaders after the 1955 general election defeat. That there has been an improvement in Party organisation is undeniable, but this is a major reason for Labour gains to look at things in a different light. Constituency parties fighting recent by-elections know from personal experience that their members have worked much more smoothly because they had an unprecedented flow of voluntary workers into the party in many cases. This was done because the necessary jobs were done by new volunteers. These volunteers did not enter into the by-election light as a result of improved organisation but as a consequence of an ever increasing desire by Party rank-and-filers to get to grips with the Tories. In other words, the recent by-elections have had what the 1955 general election lacked—the public support of rank and file militants.

Rents issue

The central issue around which many of the by-elections have been fought is also a classic example of a localised issue, which is the Rent Bill. The Rent Bill has been the spearhead of Labour's fight and, as a natural corollary of this, Labour workers have had to counterpose Labour's alternative to them. They have been able to do this with enthusiasm, because Labour's plans for the publicisation of all rented dwellings and the ending of private landlordism is, in spite of certain weaknesses, one of the few positive measures of clear-cut socialism currently figuring in any party programme. Thus, in addition to being anxious to come with the Tories, rank and file retaliants have had the added incentive of being able to see how a policy of public landlordship can smash down Tory plans and solve the problems of private landlordism.

GE now Left policy?

All of these facts lead to several conclusions. First, the right time is ripe for a general election and a big drive to sweep the Tories from power. Second, the programme of the National Front by-election was announced Hugh Gaitskell had hoped this would be a sign to the Tories that their Rents Bill, such a small demand, growing gradually up from the Labour Party ranks. Since North Lewisham Gaitskell seems to be read- ing the government's policies more clearly than in company with the "Daily Herald" and Morgan Phillips, called for a general election. This is good—but not good enough. General elections are brought about by needs, not words. And the task of the Party leadership now is to respond to the widespread desire in the Labour Party for an all-out attack on the Tories on every issue and every occasion.

A second fact to emerge from the recent by-elections is that, contrary to the wafting of the "new thinkers", there are thousands of rank and file Party members who will work their fingers to the bone providing they are given something worthwhile. Party plans for publicisation of all rented dwellings have proved the effective antidote to the Tory Rents Bill, now the Party needs a bold Socialist programme capable of being sold related to the overall economic problems facing Britain. Therefore the task facing the Labour Party is twofold. First an all-out cam- paign against the Tories to drive them from office. Secondly an immediate implementation of basic Socialist measures into the Party's current programme. If these two things are tackled the road to Socialism in Britain will have been paved, and the Party firmly decided that it has been for many years.

WHO KNOWS?

Chance readers might even become regulars.

Regulars might even take extra copies of the Socialist Review to give to friends.

Friends might even send a donation.

WHO KNOWS?