The Chinese Brink

At the time of writing the battle around Quemoy is still raging. Quemoy and the other off-shore islands, including Formosa (Taiwan), are as Chinese as the Isle of Wight is British. US Imperialism has as much right to occupy the island—through its quisling Chiang Kaishek—as Nazi Germany had to occupy the Channel Islands. The British Labour Movement must make absolutely clear its relentless opposition to US imperialist aggression against China.

Why has there been this sudden flare-up around Quemoy?

For the United States, the loss of Quemoy, so soon after the fiasco of the US landing in Lebanon and the British landing in Jordan, can mean a further loss of prestige in the East, another international defeat of its attempt to gain or keep allies all over the world.

However, the immediate cause of the flare-up cannot be explained by US imperialist policy alone. The battle started some six weeks before the time of writing with an order by Mao Tse-tung to fire his mainland guns on Quemoy. What was the motive behind this move?

To argue, as does the Chinese Communist press, and the Daily Worker here, that Quemoy and Formosa may serve as jumping-off grounds to attack mainland China, is to fleot geography and history. Quemoy is smaller than Hong Kong, which is not less Chinese than it. But British occupation of this island has not for one moment been attacked by Peking. Quemoy is much further than Hong Kong from the industrial centres of China (or Russia), so far, indeed, that from a military point of view it would be as logical to speak of Chile in South America as a jumping-off ground for the conquest of Britain. The Japanese who occupied Formosa from 1895 until the end of World War II, made no use of the island in the great offensive against China in 1931, or in 1937-45. The mere presence of foreign troops cannot, therefore, explain Mao's decision to pull the trigger.

The bombardment of Quemoy followed Khrushchev's visit to Peking on August 3rd. That military matters were discussed by the Russian and Chinese leaders is apparent from the presence at the talks of both the Russian and Chinese Ministers of Defence. What advantage do these leaders seek in inflaming the atmosphere around Quemoy?

First there is the possibility of inflicting political humiliation on US Imperialism hard on the heels of its Middle East embarrassment. Secondly, in face of the heightening social tensions in China which accompany the difficult task of industrialization, and the increased sacrifices demanded of the people for capital accumulation, it is useful for Peking to create an atmosphere of national danger, a nightmare of encirclement. It is no accident that during the bombardment of the Quemoy the establishment of military discipline was decreed in agriculture and industry, and the so-called giant communes were formed.

Thus Mao plays his game of brinkmanship.

Dulles, in following his particular policy of brinkmanship, well knows that the main US deterrent force is not in Formosa, but elsewhere, above all in Britain, and the other countries of Western Europe. American bases in these countries can be used to bomb Russia if need be. And while these bases with their H-bomb-delivering B.59s are numerous, the number of Russian missiles capable of delivering H-bombs over the big distances separating Russia from the US is relatively small, the United States may win a war.

If the contending Powers should fall over the brink, the United States reckons it possible that, with its large area and big distance from any Russian base, it need not mind when its own bases are destroyed, especially if the available number of Russian ICBMs is small (as it probably is at present, and will be during the next couple of years). Similarly China, with an area larger than that of the Continent of Europe, mostly agricultural and with few centres of concentrated population, may conceivably survive a nuclear holocaust, even if she lost some hundreds of millions of people. However, Britain, Western Europe and possibly Eastern Europe and Russia could not survive. For us in Britain a nuclear war is the end of everything.

We in this country can do very little directly against US brinkmanship in Quemoy. However, we can pull down one of the pillars of the United States' aggressive policy by breaking the military alliance with her—putting an end to NATO and all it stands for in the way of US bases and British nuclear weapons. The British Labour Movement, in the name of Socialism and the survival of mankind, should demonstrate and struggle against any involvement of Britain in the war-policy of US Imperialism!

For an end to American aggression on Chinese territory!
An end to US bases in Britain!
An end to the building of missile sites and the testing and production of H-bombs!

Fight for the 40-hour week
by Graham Richards

Resolutions on the agendas of the TUC and the Labour Party conference calling for a 40-hour week are signs of a mounting discontent among workers over the length of the working week. In part, this growing concern can be attributed to the country's economic situation. When the threat of unemployment arises, workers almost instinctively react by calling for available work to be shared through a reduction of hours. At the same time, they argue there should be no corresponding cut in wages.

But much of the present agitation has its origin in a far more fundamental cause: the realization that the present working week does not leave the worker with sufficient time—or put him in the right frame of mind—to live life to the full. After spending a boring and frustrating day at his job, he has not got sufficient energy to develop his many interests and talents. Life is reduced to a mere existence—living to work and working to live.

The 10-hour day

The need to shorten the working day was fully acknowledged by the early socialists. For example, Karl Marx referred to Ten Hours Bill, passed by Parliament in 1847, as 'physical and moral regeneration' for the workers.

After thirty years' struggle, fought with most admirable perseverance, the English working class, improving a split between the landlords and money-lords, succeeded in carrying the Ten Hour Bill. The immense physical, moral and intellectual benefit hence accruing to the factory operatives, half-yearly chronicled in the reports of the inspectors of factories, are now acknowledged on all sides.

Marx went on to add that a further advantage of the Act was that 'the worker knows now when that which he sells is ended, and when his own begins, and by possessing a sure foreknowledge of this, is enabled to pre-arrange his own minutes for his own purposes.'

Voluntary overtime

While this provision was embodied in the Act, British workers ever today are far from achieving a clear, distinctive division between their own and their bosses' time. The famous dockers' strike in October, 1954, was fought over this very principle; namely, that overtime should be voluntary, that dockers should not be always at the beck and call of port employers, with no time they could be sure to call their own.

Jimmy Fullerton

Coloured workers

Rent Strike, 1915

Ireland—the Socialist answer
TU COMMENTARY

WHAT MAKES A DOCKS MILITANT

Throughout the country expressions of dissatisfaction have been voiced in relation to what has been called the "Union's sell-out," the acceptance of 7/6, as settlement for the National Dockers' Pay Claim.

Men are asking how Bro Tim O'Leary got away with demonstrating so ably that an increase of 5/6 per day would only bring the basic wage up to a level with the standard of living and the cost of living, could execute such a somersault and accept without discussion of any kind, this increase of so small a sum and their feeling is that the Union leaders are continuing out of touch with the rank-and-file's desires.

Peace at any price seems to be their aim, despite the fact that in this latest settlement the initiative in negotiation has been allowed to drift into the hands of the employers. Small wonder that the men throughout Dockland are saying that it is high time that these present Union leaders, having proved that they are unable to cope, should depart and make room for others more capable of handling the Dockers' affairs.

The very sad death of Bro Jimmy Fullerton, reported in our last issue and commented on

40-HOUR WEEK—contd.

All this is a sign of the remarkably little progress made through the years to shorten working hours. As long ago as 1869, American Federal employees had an eight-hour day. The Dockmen erreanungusery had a ten-hour day. In 1931, the Dockmen's Union changed this for a world-wide struggle for an eight-hour day. At the First May Day rally in London, 200,000 thronged into Hyde Park.

Lost leaders.

But the struggle for the eight-hour day has always been hampered by the struggle for the control of trade union leaders. Always ready to pay lip service to the idea, they have refused to join the struggle to within the confines of the present economic system. When the situation is really critical, these leaders must be made to understand. Consequently, the agitation was sparked of much strength—

We mean to think things over; we're tired of toil for nought. But bare enough to live on; never an hour for thought.

We want to feel the sunshine, we want to smell the flowers.

We're sure that God has willed it; and we mean to have our hours.

We're summoning our forces from shipyard, shop and mill.

Eight hours for work, eight hours for rest, eight hours for what we will.

By J. G. Blanchard, written during the campaign for an Eight-Hour Day in America, during the 1870s.
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Comrades gather at Shadwell Gardens to mark Jimmy Fullerton's last journey

NED BURKE, the writer of this obituary to his fellow-militant, Jimmy Fullerton, is known throughout London's Dockland as a life-long fighter for dockers' rights. He is a steward at New Fresh Wharf and was one of the leaders in the recent Tooley Street strike—Editor.

JIMMY FULLERTON

FOR MANY YEARS, we in Dockland have set the pace for the trade union movement and determined its character, in that within the ranks of the dockers, members of the trade union movement have voiced disagreement with official policy. They have considered it a policy of appeasement and not of progress.

Bro. Jimmy Fullerton from the London Dock, recently killed in a car crash at the age of 31, was one such man. He believed that the trade union movement held a sacred trust for fellow dockers. His belief did not stop at conversations in ships' gangs and on the like. It went further. It went to committees, it went to public meetings, not only in London but in other ports. It went with honesty and feeling and true sincerity. For there was a man, a man of the people, a man that when you took his hand you took his heart.

When dockland said goodbye on Wednesday, September 17, it said goodbye in a manner people said it to elder statesmen and people of public importance, because it knew it had lost a fighter for the rights and principles of dockland, a man that held trade unionism above any personal gain, a man that said "we must go forward, there is a lot to be done, and it must be done now,"

Bro. Jimmy Fullerton will not be forgotten by us who adhered to his doctrine. It is on the backs of the Jimmy Fulltons that the emptiness of our dockside will be achieved, that the Dockers' Pension and Sick Benefit will be attained.

NED BURKE
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Comrades gather at Shadwell Gardens to mark Jimmy Fullerton's last journey
Action on the colour front
1. Willesden by Karl Dunbar

So far, the little corner of Willesden, where I live, slum in character as it is, has not seen any outbreak of anti-colour violence. This is due to the social ingredients for such an outbreak do not exist. On the contrary, slum conditions have always led to social mobility rather than race animosities.

Labour Party ward I went to met coloured workers. Not that we had not met before; we had never found any difficulty in getting along with them. Running in the streets, going to shops, backyard scrap dumps, old bomb sites, run-down "clubs" and pubs, we get on quite well. But we were told that the new window next door, or a mob may start chucking bricks and stones about, then we will lose our line news, for the moment that is.

Housing—the crusade
To the Whites, who have to live here year in year out there is nothing particularly glamorous or exciting about our seedy streets, with their little shops, backyards, scrap dumps, bomb sites, run-down "clubs" and pubs. We are, however, slowly rotting away. To us there is only one constant demand, housing—"Get us a flat, a bed and let's pull the whole stinking lot down and build a new Carlton which will come off the back for a start, a strong and healthy and strong, both in mind and body. However, we must face the fact of today, what we want and what we have are two very different things, so we recognize that a great number of coloured people are unsettled and around our area and that whilst we have managed to get along fairly well together over the years, the propaganda of Fascism, coupled as it is with the slum conditions, can make the situation at a moment of handover unknown to us.

As chairman of the local Labour Party ward I went to meet coloured workers. Not that we had not met before; we had never found any difficulty in getting along with them. Running in the streets, going to shops, backyard scrap dumps, old bomb sites, run-down "clubs" and pubs, we get on quite well. But we were told that the new window next door, or a mob may start chucking bricks and stones about, then we will lose our line news, for the moment that is.

2. Lambeth T.C.

Not only does the Lambeth Trades Council cover the greatest concentration of coloured workers in this country, but it is also active in their defence against Fascist intimidation and Nazism. We have asked its secretary, Jeff Farquhar, for a statement on the problem, which we publish below.

The black shirts have been hidden away but the goose-step marches and jackboots are again on the march in those parts of London where the coloured population resides.

Our coloured brothers and sisters looked to Britain for a so-called characteristically British welcome — and a freedom from repression and slights. Instead they were greeted by Fascist hooligans armed with flick-knives.

The people of Britain loudly voice their protest at the staging of hunts—exploits of the plutocrats but some give grand spectacle of "hunting the nigger," Fascism is again injecting its foul venom into the peoples of this country and generating a type of racial hatred never before known in Britain.

Aided and abetted by the police, they are a danger to us, and for all those who fear and haunted look on at the faces of our colour.

All wings of the Labour Movement can and must organize to end.

Our job
We all felt that no matter how important were the pronouncements on the matter of the riots, the real work would have to be done right here in our streets by working men and women of all different colours coming together. A beginning has been made, small as it may be, but it is within our power to make this beginning grow into something worthwhile, something lasting. It has been done in other towns and cities, now London must follow suit, and if I know my London, not Mosley or a thousand like him we will succeed in the vile work of race hate and race violence. We will not tolerate the Little Rock mentality in Britain.

PORTICUS—of page two

Communism, but the rank-and-file docker knows different.

Working had alongside these men the rank and file know they can be trusted, and although at times they cannot reconcile the desires of these men with the pocket and consequently cold-shoulder them, when the die is cast and a strike becomes a fact, they elect these men to lead them, conscious of the fact that they will not let them down, whatever the cost to themselves, both in time and money, for a strike leader must be a man of courage.

Such a man was Jimmy Fullerton, and it is to be hoped that the work he did for his unswerving service will be shown in the response to the various testimonial funds and collections for his dependents that are being made throughout the London Docks area.
HIROSHIMA — who’s to blame?
by Raymond Chalinor

AFTER dropping the atomic bomb, President Truman tried to justify the decision by claiming it helped to bring the war more quickly to an end and thereby not only saved the lives of Americans, but also Japanese, soldiers. These excuses—a typical humanitarian pose that politicians like to use to conceal their most dastardly acts—is a complete tissue of lies. There's no need whatsoever to drop it; it was just an act of wanton slaughter.

The truth in Japan was largely defeated by the United States Strategic Bombing Survey, an official American Government commission:

"By employing the methods of the Wehrmacht over Coventry of necessity, the decision to bomb, such a condition of general purpose and had been that the economy was grinding to a standstill. The responsible officers could read the situation and embraced surrender well before the bombing began. "The Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bombs were not dropped on Japan, nor by the testimony of the enemy leaders who ended the war; they persuaded Japan to accept unconditional surrender. The Emperor, Foreign Secretary, the Prime Minister, and the Army, Navy, and Air officers were in May of 1945 that the war should be ended and if it meant the acceptance of defeat on Allied terms (p. 12). Japan would have surrendered even if the atomic bombs had not been dropped, even if Russia had not entered the war, and even if no invasion had been planned or contemplated." (p. 13)

Japan says for peace

In Herbert Feis' book, The China Tangle, there is an account of how the Japanese Government tried to secure peace talks with the United States to end the war and to get Russia to mediate to end the war. These peace overtures, together with the Second World War, were turned down by Stalin to get us to始于 the war. This was a situation of the United States wanting to end the war and get Russia to mediate. This was the reason why the war was started. This was a reason why the war was started.

The CP and the H-Bomb

A DAILY WORKER editorial, August 7th, 1952, headed A Date to Remember, the paragraph of the Daily Worker editorial said:

The excuse that, in the long run, this atomic bomb was worth the price.

There has never been a crime committed in war which this excuse has not been used to justify it. It was used by the Nazis to cover up every relapse into barbarism.

As much, it was a favourite with Hitler and the Nazi admirals.

What they said:

It is well to remind readers of the Daily Worker of what the editorial of that paper stated on August 7th, 1945, the day following the dropping of the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima.

The employment of the new weapon on a substantial scale should include the surrender of Japan. Valuable lives in the Allied nations will be saved by the new discovery.

Thus, the Daily Worker had the honour of being the first copy of the Daily Worker paper in Great Britain to editorially call for the employment of the new weapon on a substantial scale.

The CP condemned the invasion of the atom bomb.

When the second bomb was dropped on Nagasaki, the concluding paragraph of the Daily Worker editorial declared:

The use of the atom bomb has monstrously advanced the war, with a consequent saving of human life. It is fortunate for the editors of the Daily Worker, and all of us, that they have the courage to face the world short memories.

It is also of interest to note that on August 8th, 1954, the Daily Worker commented that the invention of the nuclear bomb was a strong additional argument for co-operation between the United States and Russia. America and Britain. "It will enormously increase the strength of the three great powers in relation to all other countries." The Worker was probably the first exponent of atomic bomb diplomacy.

Unlock the Atom

On August 14th, 1945, the Daily Worker's front page head line read: "Japs still trying to haggle." In the article they denounced the Japanese for their delay in accepting the Allies' armistice terms and criticized the Allied Powers for allowing the Japanese to stage an armistice. The following passage was emphasized in the article:

There was no official hint of the length of time that the Japanese are to be allowed before the full force of the Allied Powers—following the atom bomb—is loosed against them. In a bluster intended to be final.

The French counterpart of the
Breakthrough to sanity—a policy for the Bomb
by Eric S. Heffer

A PATCH of sunlight in the war dark has at last curiously welcomed today. Such a ray of hope is the new pamphlet by Mr. Heffer. The pamphlet, issued by the Combined Universities Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, puts with the bomb of a dilemma, a dilemma which cannot now be repeated, because the outcome means either barbarism or sanity and a new society.

The pamphlet has the choice, mankind alone has placed itself in its peculiar situation, and it alone has the answer.

On the brink
Stuart Hall’s pamphlet is a very serious contribution to political thinking in the nuclear age. One doesn’t have to accept all he says to argue that he says important things, views which must be seriously studied.

Hall argues that both Eastern and Western politicians have got themselves into "a habit of mind, an inarticulate conviction, due to their respective cold war policies. Both NATO and the Warsaw Pact have prolonged this cold-war thinking, and the arms race has ensued, to the stage when it now continues continuously on the brink.

He rightly says, "Yet conditions have changed. The arms race, the arms race has continued, to the point that the arms race is one of mutual fear and suspicion." Further, on page 5, he makes the point that on many occasions, in speaking against nuclear armament, "nuclear war is, literally, a form of suicide."

The gun which we point at the sources of war in the Soviet Union is so triggered that it would blow our own brains out as well." Hall believes that the nuclear powers—both sides—would not hesitate to use the weapon. I agree, especially when we consider that US planes make regular flights to the island of Guam, which, who believes that the Soviet leaders would shrink from using all weapons to preserve their power?

International reaction
Hall marshals his arguments clearly and logically. I feel, however, that the danger of war growing out of internal revolt in the Soviet bloc countries. He believes that after Hanch had developed a revolutionary movement in East Germany capable of throwing off the U.S.S.R. domination, and Western Germany had intervened, the Russians would have retaliated.

This is a misleading of the situation. Firstly, it is doubtful that the people of the Soviet bloc will ever accept the situation that the people revolt against Stalinism. It is true that many of them revolt against Stalinism, but the danger of the capitalist West, new democratic socialist regimes, with Stalinism off their back, would present the picture of what the new society really would be like. The people of the world would have to do a struggle against the workers of the other countries and in this way make it null and void.

In any case, the Western leaders are never likely to rely on revolutionary movements as their allies (witness by their scurrilous treatment of the resistance movements in Western Europe at the end of the Second World War). People who abhor alienations in their own country are not likely to fight for a return of the old regime. Hungary, despite all the apologists of Stalinism, is the proof of this.
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Stalinism in decline
I have digested a little here, but I feel that the whole thing is important. Hall quite rightly stresses that we are at the turning point of history. For "Either we reconsider the whole basis of our present strategies and seek some positive and constructive road to survival, or we must consign out- selves and the human race to the scrap heap of history." He says, again correctly, that the West’s cold war policies have assisted to keep Stalinism (or its offspring) in power. The text, he says, "must bear a very direct moral responsibility for the Hungarian tragedy."

Stalinism is in process of breaking up. No longer will the policies which have fettered the Soviet Union be accepted without question. It is in this situation that we must have new(?) positive policies to put forward.

six aims
1. To halt the arms race.
2. To prevent the further testing of nuclear weapons.
3. To prevent the spread of nuclear warheads.
4. To force both sides to consider seriously the proposals for disarmament and disengagement.
5. To create such conditions of confidence between East and West that it will permit the settlement of political problems within a framework of collective security.
6. To transform NATO and force it to negotiate with the Warsaw Pact for the mutual security of the two armed camps.

It is in some of these points that I find myself opposing Hall. He argues that we ought not to demand that Britain leave NATO. He prefers that we should work through NATO to get a change, and within that change we would affect the policies of Dailles etc.

I cannot agree here. Britain is the European pivot of the NATO powers. If it is seen that its whole basis goes and it will collapse. We can also appeal directly to the workers of the other countries and in this way make it null and void.

In any case, to reach a position where Britain is considering leaving NATO would mean that we had created a new political alignment in the country, and this in itself would have far-reaching effects.

UN illusions
Hall backs the compromise measures of the Labour Party on disengagement, and here too he, in my opinion, fails to go far enough.

He places far too much faith in the United Nations, and seems to think that it presents a real hope. The United Nations, he says, must become an effective force.

This, I feel is naive. The UN is not a mystical power standing above society, that is in fact the conglomeration of states, all clinging to the UN in their own national interests. This is true even of the "neutral" countries like Switzerland, and as the world is dominated by capitalist politics, it is clear that these politics are the ones which permeate UN deliberations.

Here I shall be called a romantic. Someone living in a dream world, outside of reality. Hall says, "The only political problem is how are we to circumvent the bureaucratic of war through the iron curtain into the twentieth century, and who is to pay the 1000 dollar question. Hall, I am afraid, despite his good intentions, doesn’t really give us the answer.

Worker’s answer
The answer lies with the working-class. It is not reliance on negotiations (the end section on Disarmament negotiations, written by John Hodgds Roper, proves that), it is not reliance on Summit Meetings in the United Nations. It is in a positive, revolutionary class action. That is the key. Relly he back to the hollowness to build the rocket sites, industrial action to prevent local wars, and new forms of working class solidarity can be readily arise. The real hope is the strength and power of the working-class. Action by the workers, can and will lead to similar action in both the East and the West. Action by the workers, can and will lead to similar action in both the East and the West. Action by the workers, can and will lead to similar action in both the East and the West. Action by the workers, can and will lead to similar action in both the East and the West. Action by the workers, can and will lead to similar action in both the East and the West. Action by the workers, can and will lead to similar action in both the East and the West.

A Conference delegate probes the BLOCK VOTE

One thing that has been abundantly clear to active members of the Labour Party for many years is the fact that the Labour Party Conference is dominated by a handful of trade union leaders who are able to overwhelm any minority of which it is constituted, by votes on the part of the rank and file, by virtue of the block-vote system.

This system does not provide for the rank and file a large trade union to have anything but the remotest and most insignificant control over the way in which its votes are cast. Unlike the Constituency Labour Parties or smaller organisations, in the larger trade unions, rank and file members can work hard for years without ever arriving at the level at which resolutions are discussed or decisions taken.

This system would still be as undemocratic if the left wing clogged the block votes—a fact which some left-wingers fail to acknowledge.

Split by independence
Other more democratic methods of procedure would be for trade unions to split their block of votes into smaller units according to areas or industrial sections. Thirdly, in place of the Transport and General Workers’ Union sending 57 votes, as has been the case in a block of whom must vote one way, the areas of industry should send delegates—based upon membership as the present but free to vote as their own individual areas determined.

This would mean that areas would be encouraged to participate in political discussion and decisions would be taken much more in accord with the wishes of the members.

The present system of trade union block votes is equivalent to a system in which Constituency Labour Parties Conference were chosen on a national basis instead of through a Constituency Labour Part— for example at a national conference, every one of course this would mean that Constituency Labour Parties Conference would consist of nationally known figures only; the representatives of local rank and file within constituencies would disappear.

Undemocratic system
It is true that the ratio of delegates to the Labour Party Conference Constituency Labour Parties could not be granted to trade unions, owing to the impossibility of ensuring that the conference would be made up too big and unrepresentative for effective discussion to take place. None, however, the representation of trade union areas would not diminish the total voting strength of the Labour Conference, and so much more democratic reflection of views.

The main features of the system at present are indicated below where it is very clear that we are to break the ordinary conference, the Transport and General Workers’ Union and the other National Union of General and Municipal Workers and the Trades Union Congress. Under the present system, two million votes between them, and the six largest unions over 31 million votes.

On its own one union, the Transport and General Workers’ Union can balance all the combined votes of the Constituency Labour Parties throughout the country.

This system is not one which should be tolerated by a democratic

(link to next page)
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TORY "TRUCE" IN CYPRUS

Once again the inevitable has happened in Cyprus. The EOKA leader, Col. Grivas, has declared the truce of the last few weeks at an end, and promises strike are rapidly becoming the everyday pattern of events once more. The blame for this position in the island must rest fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the

White South Africa's new Premier

He did not agree with Sir de Villiers Graaff that the white population should be strengthened by large-scale immigration, as "with the present liberalism in many parts of the world, it would be impossible to find sufficient suitable immigrants. If immigrants were to be the solution, they should be people who would be allies of the white population here, and not people whose aim was to destroy western civilization." (Times, September 19).

British Government and its side in Cyprus, the military junta under General Kendrew.

Start of truce

At the height of the community disorders of June and July Macmillan sent a message to the island to be distributed widely by leaflet. It called for a period of peace on the island during which an attempt at progress towards a settlement could be made. EOKA, taking this call in good faith, responded with the declaration of a truce for the second time in 18 months.

Previous example

The EOKA leaders could have had no confidence in this call for peace and indeed the British Government's decision to carry out its plan for the island in the face of the Greek community's opposition shows that Macmillan's message was not worth the paper it was written on. But apart from this, the Cyripts had been given an excellent example of what a truce entailed during 1957.

In April of last year EOKA responded to a similar call and for nine months there was a suspension of "terrorist" activity. Immediately they were shown just how one-sided the military command in Cyprus considered such a truce. As soon as it was declared the security forces left their camps to engage upon the longest anti-EOKA operation of 1957. For ten long weeks they ambushed, patrolled and searched up in the Troodos Mountains and this "truce" is perhaps best remembered by the inhabitants of Milikouri who suffered under curfew during the whole of this period and sustained considerable losses in crops and livestock.

Nothing but provocation

The only political result of this truce of 1957 was worth nothing to the Cyripts people. Archbishop Makarios was released from Seychelles but forbidden to return to his homeland. However, revealed to them very clearly was who was really in control of the island. It was then the unwise decision of General Harding and the military command headed by Kendrew. Harding was not prepared to accept the truce of 1957 but deliberately sent the troops out on an operation before he was recalled to London in consultation with the Government concerning the cease-fire.

Today he is not on the island but waging his campaign of "no truck with murderers" from the columns of the Daily Express. However, the shadow of his rule still lies on Cyprus. With the waning of the fortunes of the civilians Government in High Fook the military junta have risen to a position of almost absolute control.

One-sided

They are still pursuing the policy of continued military activity whether there is a truce or not. So once again a period of suspended EOKA activity has been brought to an end by the deliberate provocation of the Security Forces. The nature of "truces" on the island once more stands revealed. EOKA are to be expected to lay down their arms and do nothing while the military forces continue hounding down, beating up and shooting Cyripts. What sort of "truce" is this?

Immediate policy

All this only lends further weight to the arguments in favour of the only immediate policy towards the strife-torn island. It is the job of every British Socialist to work to get this policy implemented.

Self-determination

Remove the military control of Cyprus from the hands of General Kendrew and his thugs. Withdraw the troops and allow the Cyripts people the right to self-determination.

Stop hiding, comrades!

According to the News Chronicle of September 24, our "influence is widespread and there are well-established provincial outposts". If only we knew what News Chronicle-man W. Roy Nash knows; if only it were true.

Next issue — a report of the Scarborough Conference by a delegate.
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FORTY YEARS ago the workers and housewives of Glasgow forced the Government to introduce the first-ever Rent Restrictions Act.

At that time, in 1915, there were thousands of workers in Great Britain. Private landlords had a complete monopoly of all rented dwellings and they could, and did, raise rents as often as they thought they could get away with it. The Government had to either pay up or get out.

War exploited

The first world war—the second—added to the existing housing problems, especially in the big industrial cities which became overcrowded with fresh enemy immigrants and new industries. The landlords of those days naturally tried to exploit the war to their advantage.

They raised rents, evicted those who couldn’t pay, and took in new tenants at higher rates.

In Glasgow, for example, the landlords informed their tenants in places for the first time, “Your rent will be raised by 25 percent.” Many families—especially those near the street—suffered a war way that the war—could not possibly pay the increase and angry meetings were held in the working-class districts of Glasgow.

Glasgow had the idea of refusing to pay—soon spread throughout the country, and the Glasgow Rent MOVEMENT gave the tenants every possible support right from the start.

Glasgow already possessed a "Labour Party Housing Committee" which had been organised by such people as John Wheatley (later to become the Minister of Health in the first Labour Government), Andrew Macbride, John MacLean, and Willie Galbraith (later to become a Communist MP).

Housewives organise

This Committee had been formed in 1913 to fight for the right of the Council to house the workers. They fought for right which did not exist at that time. Glasgow already owned its own tramways and it owned its own works and the Housing Committee agitated for the profits of these much-needed houses for the use of houses for the workers. It was some years before this agitation bore fruit. But the war increases being forced on the workers of Glasgow gave them other issues to fight on—and they did.

Meetings were held all over Glasgow and eventually in Glasgow the "Glasgow Housewives' Association" was set up under the chairmanship of an ordinary housewife, Mrs. Barbour. This Committee was bringing the women of Glasgow into the fight against the landlords.

Rental strike

The Rent Strike started in September, 1915, and by November more than 25,000 working-class families were refusing to pay rent. The bailiffs who tried to evict the strikers were driven from the doors by Mrs. Barbour. Housewives Committee. Empty houses were picketed and people who had agreed to pay the increased rents were not permitted to enter their new homes. Some of the actual participants, Mr. Willie Reid, MP, has written about some of the scenes in an article in the Glasgow Evening Times.

As soon as he heard in Glasgow was getting scarcer every day, people came from far and wide to see the houses that were refused to be let. To meet this situation the women, on their own free will, adopted a formula that proved to be a very effective weapon with their action in smashing the movement. The women announced that if the tenants refused to go into the houses in question, the rent would be put down by the tenants' representatives explained that the agitation was not increased by those who had moved into their house. They were told that the house would be put up to rent by the landlord. This procedure, as Mr. Reid described, was a calculated move to make it perfectly clear that they would regard this as an attack on the working class ...

Who is the Government?

By now the Government itself was thoroughly alarmed and, on October 15th, its representatives, the Secretary of State for Scotland, and the Lord Advocate, met James Steel and Andrew Macbride, the chairman and secretary respectively of the Labour Housing Society. For the Government, October 16, 1915, reported that the Conference lasted over two days and ended in an agreement put out by the tenants' representatives explained that the agitation had been increased and that those who had moved into the houses in question were being asked to leave. The house would be put up to rent by the tenants' representatives that the agitation was not increased by those who had moved into their house. They were told that the house would be put up to rent by the tenants' representatives explained that the agitation was not increased by those who had moved into their house.

Inside industrial movement

Successful efforts were made to get the support of the workers in the great engineering works and shipyards. A ready response was soon forthcoming from the newly organised Shop Stewards' Movement. Again quoting from the article by Willie Reid, we learn how an evacuation was prevented in Parkhead.

A solicitor in Palace Street had an eviction notice served on her by the landlord. On the day the sheriff's officer was due to call, the housewife called to enforce it. They instructed every mother in the district with a young housewife to be there between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m., complete with perambulator. Long before that, hundreds of people were packed outside the close and the house. It was packed with prams, cribs, and babies crying. They had all left their young with their "cousin" to look after. The raiding party could not get near the house. Moreover, the men of Parkhead Forge and other works in the district stopped to down tools at 11.30 a.m. and lend a hand if necessary.

By the time the sheriff's officers and their police arrived there was a crowd of something like 5,000 ready to give them a roasting welcome.

It was scarcely surprising that they decided to forget all about the eviction notice. and took them all home. The decisive intervention from the factories came when the late Lord Kirkwood—then plain David Kirkwood, the Coroner of Shop Stewards at Parkhead Forge—addressed the following letter to the Town Clerk of Glasgow:

I have been instructed by the Shop Stewards of the Ordinatory Department of Parkhead Forge to draw the attention of the Corporation to the housing conditions in the eastern district of Glasgow. The national demands have added thousands to the number of workers in Parkhead. As a consequence in increasing rents and the tenants have been made to suffer with the loss of paying this tax without being organised to pay the increase. As this might lead to the eviction of one or more families hereafter, I think it is proper that the people make it very clear that they would regard this as an attack on the working class ...

The Act signed

For over two hours the harassed Sheriff listened to the statements of the workers' deputations against which no one in the industrial action unless the cases were withdrawn. Eventually the Sheriff signified his agreement to the application of the landlord to withdraw his cases against the rent strikers.

It was a great victory for the workers in Glasgow but all over Great Britain—by far the most important victory for the workers, as it cut off all hopes of retaining their jobs and joined in!

The Great Alibon Works where the shipyard Gallacher was a shop steward, stopped work complete and both the day and night watch joined in the struggle. The scene in the streets surrounding the Court was described by Forward: "The policemen had had their hands on these men. We spared a thought for the 'agitators' who rescued them, so to speak, from their landlords' clutches. Whatever may be thought about industrial action to force a rent strike, there is no doubt that it was such action which was responsible for the Rent Restriction Acts.
from Northern Ireland GEORGE ADLER - INES on the need for a UNITED IRISH REPUBLIC

As the bombs of the nascent Irish Republican Army and of its splinter groups like Saor Uladh, exploiting the response that the newly formed Northern Ireland from the Irish Republic, the chances of Ireland's ever reunification appeared to become more remote. The illegal armiesOLUME declared that they planned to end the partition of their country, and, ostensibly following in the tradition of all the programme of Wolfe Tone in 1798, believe that this can be achieved by physical force. The British had already proved that they could hope to drive the British regiments out of Northern Ireland or to cause the overall collapse of the Northern Ireland Government. It appears that what they are trying to do is cause the collapse of the Republic and to bring the Irish problem to the forefront of world politics in much the same way as the Cypriots have focused world attention on their political grievances. The Irish Republicans are confident that at the bar of world opinion the British case for remaining in Ireland by upholding the Northern Ireland Government would collapse.

The IRA is, however, up against greater odds than the Cypriots. In their own place, the IRA has an even harder struggle than the dead Republicans from whom they inherited the struggle. The Irish Republicans and Fenians of the past were fighting an offensive battle against British troops and the Ulster fascists. The newly formed Irish Republicans of today are fighting a rearward action and they are a rearward that has been deserted by its former leaders. Mr De Valera has given up the struggle against Partition. While he may yet seize an opportunity to have Partition discussed at UNO, he has no desire to see Ireland turned into another Cyprus, neither have the clergy of the Catholic Church, who wield a powerful influence on Irish political affairs.

Role of Welfare State

But the odds against the IRA and the Cypriots, against all anti-Partitionists, are even greater than this. The border which they are striving to abolish is upheld by the Northern Ireland Government which, within the past 37 years, has consolidated itself into a particularly vicious and challenging regime. If, immediately after 1945, it looked as though the Cypriot Federation of the Unionist Party would fall, it was rescued by the Welfare State legislation introduced by the British Labour Government. This legislation was more or less followed by the Northern Ireland Government. The Unionists were also rescued by Mr. Costello's declaration of a "Republic" for the 26 Counties in 1949 and by the Irish Act that was subsequently approved by the Attlee Government. This Act strengthened partition and as a consequence produced the distrust, bitterness and chaos in Irish working-class politics.

Out of the wrangling aftermath of the Northern Ireland Labour Party emerged as a party supporting Partition. Indeed they had already been driven in this direction by a cleverly conceived campaign led by the former TSWP and by the British Labour leaders like the late Mr. Harry Midgley. (Mr Midgley was leader of the Northern Ireland Labour Party for more than 20 years but left the Labour Movement during the time he was a minister in the Unionist Cabinet.)

This was a tragic development because socialists have always believed that the working-class movements in England and in Ireland had so much in common that they would eventually and the partition that had been created by the Tories and so open the way to unity, peace and socialism in Ireland. Those socialists who supported the teachings of James Connolly believed and still believe that the first step towards socialism in Ireland was to unite the working-class in Ireland. They abhorred the way the Tories had driven up hatred and enmity by playing upon the religious differences and fears of the people.

Irish socialists were downcast when Attlee's Government passed the Irish Act in 1949 and when the Northern Ireland Labour Party split into those who were for Partition and those who wanted Ireland united. All hopes of having the Labour Party make up its mind on the partition problem by rational discussion within its own ranks faded away. In the election that followed, the Ireland Act the Labour Party in Northern Ireland took a terrible beating and lost all the seats it held in the Northern Ireland House of Commons.

The price of a seat

It appears, however, that since 1951 the Irish Labour Party has made some progress and in the general election of March this year the market for getting Members elected to the House of Commons. But the Irish working-class movement has paid a high price for these four seats.

It is doubtful, too, if any of the four NILP members in the Stormont Parliament have any idea of what socialism means in Ireland.

Socialist Review stands for the unification of an independent Ireland.

The following article, from a correspondent in Northern Ireland, shows something of the gravity of this demand in the Socialist Movement, the trend that has been initiated and the future of that demand is tied up with the growth of a healthy, non-sectarian Labour Movement in that country—Editor.

Attlee vs. Connolly

This was a tragic development because socialists have always believed that the working-class movements in England and in Ireland had so much in common that they would eventually and the partition that had been created by the Tories and so open the way to unity, peace and socialism in Ireland. Those socialists who supported the teachings of James Connolly believed and still believe that the first step towards socialism in Ireland was to unite the working-class in Ireland. They abhorred the way the Tories had driven up hatred and enmity by playing upon the religious differences and fears of the people.

Irish socialists were downcast when Attlee's Government passed the Irish Act in 1949 and when the Northern Ireland Labour Party split into those who were for Partition and those who

land. Indeed if these four MPs were assessed in terms of British politics they would probably be rated far worse than the right-wing of the Irish Nationalist Labour Party. Even the Tory Press and Unionist politicians in Northern Ireland cast jeering reflections on the "socialism" of the NILP's four MPs.

This is mainly because socialism has now been made to mean different things to different people in Ireland. The former Mr. Geoffrey Gordon, who was disbarred and Labour MPs were forbidden to discuss Irish Partition in public. Thus the Irish Republicans and anti-Parliamentarians lost the support of the British Labour Party.

Camp followers

This is the sorry predicament in which Ireland's two Labour parties now stand. Camp followers of Unionist policy in the North, handmaids of the Papal teachings in the South. They may remain there until Irish Socialists can get mass support for working-class union and independent working-class political activity.
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WHAT WE STAND FOR

The socialist review stands for international socialist cooperation. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of socialism and the democratic state. The socialist review believes that the British Labour Party and the British Working Class must be brought to general strike action under the following programme:

I. The comprehensive nationalisation of all industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on historical cost. The nationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation.

2. The establishment of workers control of all private enterprises within the framework of a planning commission. All workers' resistance representatives must be subject to frequent elections, and able to receive the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.

3. The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions.

4. The establishment of a full day's work or full maintenance.

5. The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, linked to a realistic cost-of-living index. Public health services and hospitals, free for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service. The extension of the housing programme by grant interest free loans to local authorities and the purchase of requisitioned privately held land.

Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. For free progressive schools and adequate maintenance grants—without any means test—for all university students.

Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination, national rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom for all from British rule to all workers and from Britain.

Freedom from political and social discrimination to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the under-developed countries.

The unification of an independent Ireland.

The unity of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas. The elimination of all weapons of mass destruction.

A socialist foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow.