

# SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

JOURNAL  
for the  
Industrial Militant —  
for  
International  
Socialism

10th YEAR No 9

SEPTEMBER 1960

SIXPENCE

## A BLOW AGAINST THE BOSS IS A BLOW AGAINST THE BOMB

THE Summit collapsed, and so did Kishi. In Kishi's case the working class was there to see him go—six million struck to see him off; in the case of the Summit it was nowhere to be seen. Surely there's a lesson here for Campaigners: if the workers of this country and elsewhere are not brought into the struggle for unilateral and unconditional nuclear disarmament, the Campaign will remain an impotent, middle-class appeal to the Powers that Be to reach some agreement that would be mutually acceptable and that might, incidentally, save humanity.

It is true that conditions could hardly be more different in our two countries. Japan has endured the ghastly tragedy of atomic bombardment and, less well known, of fire pattern-bombing (which murdered 300,000 people in Tokyo in a single night). Japanese unemployment is high (kept that way partly by the unofficial embargo on imports into this and allied countries) and wages are low. The Japanese bosses are more integrated with US capital than are our own. An RB47 is not a U2. The differences are there, but the principle remains and the Cold-war coincidence of Kishi and the Summit underlines it: the only power on earth that can stop the Bomb and its attendant lunacies is a working class conscious that it wants to do so.

True, we have made some progress in this direction: the trade-union unilateralist vote might well upset Gaitskel's defence policy this year and force him to declare for the Parliamentary Labour Party's independence from such hindrances as Conference decisions. More trade-unionists were to be seen on the Aldermarch this Easter than ever before. Union officials are giving CND speakers a better hearing.

### NARROWING THE LIMITS

Good, but not enough. Machinery cannot substitute for men, not even union machinery. Sometimes it is their very distance from their members, their very middle-classness, that makes union officials the more receptive to CND propaganda. We need to pierce beyond them, to reach the rank-and-file worker. And to do this we have to make the fight against the Bomb live in terms as simple and as direct as the fight against the Boss.

And why not? Is it not true that the Cold Warriors stop short at, say, conscription, because conscription is *unacceptable* to the working class (as measured in votes)? Is it not true that the arms budget sticks at £1500 million a year (plus or minus £100 million) year in year out, no matter what the weather forecast at the Summit, and that this is so because a greater degree of waste (and taxes) might become *unacceptable*? Is it not then obvious that the Cold War can go on only within the limits that are *acceptable* to the working class and that every realized demand—every extra sixpence in the pay packet, every betterment of conditions—narrows these limits?

### INSIDE:

WHITHER LABOUR?	page 2
SEAMEN'S STRUGGLE MERSEYSIDE	page 4
SOUTHAMPTON	page 5
40 YEARS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY	page 6

If these propositions are roughly true, even very roughly, the Campaign has the means to grow in appeal. It should broaden its propaganda to take in all aspects of the struggle against the Powers that Be. Strikers should hear that the Campaign believes *a blow against the Boss is a blow against the Bomb*, Workers should know and see that CND will mobilize support for them not only as marchers but as workers. In this way working class action against individual bosses might be united and directed against the bosses'

cont page 8

## CENTRAL AFRICAN FLASHPOINT

by JOHN FAIRHEAD

THIS time a year ago the men who do the political thinking for the ruling class were overdosing themselves with optimism about their future in Africa. Given a certain amount of luck with the economic situation, it seemed that Africa might be at worst neutralized and at best swung safely into the western camp.

The boom seemed likely to last. The road to the summit had been charted and the rulers of east and west had already started out upon it. Khrushchov was, in consequence, not anxious to disturb unduly the world balance of power—specifically he was ready, among other things, to soft-pedal on Africa. Nasser was behaving himself, and de Gaulle's declaration of September 16, 1959, held out the hope of an agreement in Algeria. Even in trouble spots like Kenya, the less outrageous settlers were feeling their way to a compromise with some of the middle-class African politicians. The compass was set fair.

### ALL CHANGE

This prospect is already in ruins. Events in Algeria early this year showed that the settlers carried sufficient weight in French high politics to demand and obtain a reversal of the course towards compromise. The crack-up at the summit has sharpened international relations so that Khrushchov is now prepared to be awkward about every-

thing in Africa, even about Algeria (where, by contrast with the Chinese, he has until recently supported de Gaulle).

Most recently, the crisis in the Congo has stiffened settler resistance all over Africa to the demand for freedom from imperialism. Already Lumumba is learning to manoeuvre between the power blocks, and throughout central and east Africa the two sides are preparing for a showdown.

### FACADE COLLAPSES

Instructive in this respect is the collapse of the facade of partnership in what is likely to be the next flashpoint—the process of dismantlement has been admirably described by Michael Faber in *The Observer* (July 31). Some of the facts he summarizes are worth reproducing.

*In Southern Rhodesia a European can reckon to earn £614 a year (a figure which, because of lower taxes and cheaper goods, is the equivalent of about £750 here). But the African should not expect to earn more than £25 a year: in both cases this is the average wage or salary, representing the mean of totals far more extreme at either end of the scale.*

*Forty-two percent of the land is owned by two and a half million Africans; the European minority of 220,000 owns 50*

cont page 7

# LABOUR BELIEVES IN ?

by RAYMOND CHALLINOR

IN 1951 Labour Party members, despite many other disagreements, agreed on one point—the Labour Government's downfall was a temporary setback. Labour's fortunes would change. No one visualized Labour steadily losing support throughout the fifties. Why were we all wrong?

First I think we made a mistake in our evaluation of Toryism. Remembering the inter-war years we automatically expected the Tories to set out to restore unemployment, the means test and wage cuts. Then we assumed that the Labour Party, even with its inept, right-wing leadership could not fail to gain fresh support. Obviously we underestimated the Tories and overestimated reformism.

Labour's problem now, is not how to regain power, but how to survive. Everything indicates slow, inglorious decline. RHS Crossman, MP, Transport House manager in the last election thought the Party was lucky to do as well as it did: "It was only the three-week campaign which prevented a catastrophic landslide last Thursday. Without it we might have lost not 23 but up to 100 seats and been left with virtually no representation south of the Trent." (*New Statesman* 17 October 1959). The anti-Labour trend has grown. In the municipal elections Labour did worse than at any time since 1945. Many working class towns, once Labour strongholds registered heavy Tory gains. Despite the "Into Action Campaign" Labour lost 25,000 members last year.

## AN ULTIMATE GOAL

Members' morale is low. Direction, inspiration and conviction are lacking. Election work is done through force of habit.

The Labour leaders are aware of this crisis. Gaitskell at the 1959 Conference admitted "for an opposition to suffer three successive defeats is almost unprecedented in British political history". Explaining the reasons for the defeat he said "in my opinion, capitalism has significantly changed, largely as a result of our own efforts. The capacity of the government to plan the economy has substantially increased; the budget absorbs a quarter of the national income; public investment is now nearly half total investment; most of the basic industries are in public hands."

Gaitskell's statement is important. Hitherto, all right-wing Labour leaders argued that their ultimate goal was socialism. Unlike the Left-wing, they sought to introduce it gradually and peacefully. Gaitskell now admits that the Labour Governments of 1945-51, far from laying the foundations for a socialist society actually strengthened capitalism. This he ascribes to "our own efforts". Now he con-

siders it futile for Labour's programme to contain any socialist measures.

Gaitskell assumes that any large-scale unemployment is unlikely. Government action is always ready to avert a slump and will guarantee a steadily rising national income. The present economic system, according to him, is now sound and everybody except a few doctrinaire socialists should oppose drastic changes. Gaitskell consequently rejects any excessive increase in public ownership.

## THE SQUEEZE

The argument that state supervision has improved the stability of capitalism is true—at least in the short run. Throughout the fifties the national income has expanded and in varying degrees, everyone has benefited from it. But prosperity is based on the permanent war economy. Every year the arms industry must absorb £1,600 million, providing wages and work and averting mass unemployment. How long can the arms race continue?

A slump in the long run seems inevitable. Russia's rapid industrial advance is steadily influencing world trade. Since 1948 she has zoomed from sixteenth to fifth in the list of exporting countries. In ten years time Russia will be able to disgorge vast quantities of goods onto the world markets. This is likely to have serious effects on Britain's export position. Even discounting Russia, Britain is unable to hold her own against the Common market countries or Japan. *The World Economic Survey*, published by the United Nations shows Britain's output grew at the rate of 2.2 percent per annum from 1950 to 1958. American output grew in the same period 3.3 percent, French 4.3 percent and west-Germany's 7.4 percent. Britain is being squeezed out. During the fifties Britain's share of the world's exports of manufactured goods has dropped from 25 percent to 17 percent. As competition intensifies this decrease is likely to continue.

## WRONG ANALYSIS

Assuming that British capitalism is viable, remains stable and that the long-run tendency is not towards economic depression, even then Gaitskell's analysis is still wrong. He believes there can be a tiny strip of affluence in a sea of poverty thereby ignoring the unstabilizing effect on Britain of the underdeveloped countries. It is not possible to build permanent affluence in one country anymore than it is possible to build socialism in one country. Although an affluent Britain may create a contented people at home its effects on the underdeveloped countries will be to fan the already burning flames of discon-

tent.

In these countries powerful movements are emerging which are sure to end foreign domination. The demand for economic independence and control over their own resources is gaining wider support amongst the peoples. Egypt's nationalization of the Suez Canal, Cuba's nationalization of US sugar and foreign oil are but a beginning. Imperialism will continue to suffer still heavier blows.

But imperialism is the basis of reformism. As British imperialism weakens so too does reformism. Previously Britain shaped the destinies of her Empire, today the situation is reversed. Before long the wind of change will blow some cold draughts around London investment houses.

Politically, Gaitskell's analysis is equally shaky. If, as he assumes, capitalism is able to continue making concessions why should the electorate turn to the Labour Party? Capitalist governments always seek to reconcile two conflicting interests—the maximum satisfaction for their own supporters and financial backers, with the minimum public satisfaction. A Tory government makes concessions reluctantly in response to popular pressure and to keep the votes of its more lowly supporters. It can only do this within certain limits. If public demand becomes so great as to endanger the profit-making system then the conflict becomes insoluble. Then the Government must either take the unthinkable step of opposing the interests of the capitalist class or take the alternative measures which loses it its popular support. Such a crisis is dependent on the economic conditions that determine the extent of the concessions to be made and the size and intensity of public demand.

## UNIONS' ROLE

The stodgy and unimaginative approach of the Right-wing contributes to their own electoral defeats and they fail to rouse the people to fight for demands that the Tory Government will be unable to satisfy. Crossman in his pamphlet stresses this danger of Labour acting as though "it were a Shadow Administration". He says: "Instead of concentrating on a strategy of attack, exposing topical grievances while crusading continuously for three or four clearly defined socialist objectives, the Opposition tends to behave with the cautious responsibility normally associated with a Government." The more Labour moves to the Right the less well it does at elections.

The Gaitskellites are also imperilling the traditional alliance between the Party and the trade unions. Douglas Jay claims "What we have to do is to tear off the false mask of sectionalism and class consciousness." If Jay's advice is followed, the role

of the unions inside the Party will be considerably lessened. The unions are class organizations, relying on the support of people pursuing sectional interests. They can hardly be reconciled with the vision of an all-embracing party representing the community as a whole. Tony Crossland even considers the unions to be a growing liability and feels that they do not get Labour the vote and in fact some of their activities alienate the middle class voters. In the Deakin era the union block vote could always be used to batter down the constituency parties at annual Conference. The recent decisions of the unions on Clause 4 and nuclear disarmament show the Right-wing that the unions are far from reliable allies.

## AN OPPORTUNITY

In his pamphlet *Can Labour Win*, Crossland argues for the transferring of effective control of policy making to the Parliamentary Party and a lessening of the unions' power. He also hopes that the unions will be prepared to give the Party more money!

The Labour Party is the historical product of the trade unions who have sought through it the achievement of their class aims. The attempt to transfer the Party from an instrument of the working class into a party representative of no class is a drastic and fundamental change. Trade unionists will regard it with the same horror as the regulars at the pub would view an attempt to change the "local" into a branch of the Temperance Society.

The Right-wing by following this course are committing the very crime they accuse the Left of ..... disuniting the Party, by challenging its basic class principles and disrupting its alliance with the unions.

In spite of itself the Left now has a glorious opportunity to win. On public ownership and nuclear disarmament, the Right-wing leaders are threatened with defeat. Larger sections of the public are rejecting Gaitskell's policies as quite unrealistic.

## FIRST BATTLE

We must not view a Left-wing victory at Scarborough as anything but the first battle in a long campaign. To win the war the Left must strive to win those young people who are such ardent supporters of nuclear disarmament and who are just coming to politics. Ironically, it is the activity of CND, activity not specifically directed at the Labour Party, which has had such a tremendous effect on the Party. With so few active members Labour is highly susceptible to political pressure even from the outside.

The political instability is heightened further by a lack of serious political education and

## DISCUSSION FORUM

## Congo: Revolution without Ideology

by IOAN DAVIES

THE crisis that has wrecked the administration of the new Congo Republic is one that throws UNO, the USSR, the Capitalist West and Pan-Africanism into the melting-pot together. In spite of the naive analysis last month in Socialist Review, this is no clear-cut situation and a plea that the East and West leave Congo to settle its own fate is as foolish as it is uninformed.

## BROKEN DREAM

The capitalist control of Katanga's industrial wealth has been emphasised in sections of the press, and that Belgium intended to grant a facade of independence so that she could continue to control the economy of the country is only too obvious. But now that the Belgian dream has been shattered, the alternative is not altogether too promising. Of the whole Congo population of some 4 million men, just over one million were registered in 1959 as employed, with around 350,000 in industry. Congolese Trade Unions were

## LABOUR BELIEVES

from page 2

the effect of socialist ideas in an atmosphere dominated by the stale ideas of a bygone age could be dramatic and invigorating.

If the Labour Party is won for a socialist policy and that seems some way off—it would be wrong to assume that we would then have the sure recipe for success. The erosion of mass support may continue for some while. The fate of the American Socialist Party testifies to this. This Party once polled 900,000 votes in a presidential election, 1000 of its members held state and local office—56 of them as mayors, it ran 13 daily papers and 300 weeklies. Its leader Eugene Debs was a fearless fighter and a man of incomparably greater character than MacDonald. Yet MacDonald led the Labour Party twice into office, whereas Debs led the American Socialist Party into the wilderness. As Werner Sombart cynically suggested: "On the reefs of roast beef and apple pie, socialist utopias of every sort are sent to their doom."

## ONLY SOLUTION

Sombart's point is important because ultimately conflicting policies are based upon differing economic evaluations. If capitalism succeeds in solving its economic problems then material prosperity, general contentment and happiness will follow. Socialism will not be necessary. However, should the inner contradictions of capitalism inexorably lead to wars and slumps then socialism still remains the one and only solution for mankind.

granted legal status and the right to strike in 1957, but were effective as bodies only in Leopoldville, Stanleyville and Katanga, in which territory they entered into several agreements with Union Minière and the other industrial cartels. Wages rose in the period 1950-1960 but only in Katanga, where they trebled in cash terms, was there an appreciable increase. Housing conditions varied, but the administration, up to independence day, attempted (to its credit) to keep families together in industrial areas rather than follow the Southern African pattern of separation. This development intensified after the Belgian Socialists won power in 1954 and in 1957 put through legislation dealing with labour conditions.

## TRIBALISM

But the movement toward industrialisation was part of a lopsided social policy. The Belgians' deliberate attempt to prevent political education and participation led to an intensified tribalism. Where tribes were, as in Katanga, Kasai south, and Leopoldville, based on industrial and commercial centres they developed a nationalism of their own that had sympathy with the large capitalist (and sometimes clerical) organizations rather than with the Belgian political parties and the Pan-African movement. It was thus possible for the Union Minière to see in Katanga's Conakat party a useful ally against a strong centralised state. The only important Congo unity party (the Mouvement National Congolais) de-

## REAL TREASURE

In 1959 Unilevers made a total profit of £141.6 million and the firm's 25 directors received emoluments of over £275,000, equal to £11,000 each. No wonder chairman of the Company, Lord Heyworth, says he will "always treasure" the record of Unilever.

veloped in Stanleyville, an area of miscellaneous industries, large plantations and several groupings, none being particularly predominant. The MNC was formed in October 1958 and rapidly gained influence after Lumumba had attended the Accra conference in December of the same year. After the elections of 1959 and 1960, the strength of MNC became obvious only through Lumumba's ability to ally with small groups. The major achievement was a pact with Kasavubu's Abako party on the eve of independence, but this had slender chance of permanent success owing to the alienation of Katanga's Conokat—the Conokat always being closer to Abako than Abako had become to MNC.

The MNC had no fixed socialist objective but, unlike the Indian National Congress, it did not include many of the Congolese évolués and wealthier classes and had little support from the chiefs. Its programme at present is one of seeking aid from all countries, preserving a Nkrumah-type neutrality and establishing permanent links with other African states. But while it hopes to pursue the now familiar pattern of soliciting economic aid from both East and West and develop resources of the country on a broadly Titoist line, its main objective is to create the strong African state. Socialism is not here the essential element: it is the dream of the powerful Negro state of United Africa.

## EXCELSIOR!

IF you invested £10,000 in Ford Motor Co. in 1953 your shares would be worth £98,500.

To make sure that you didn't starve whilst waiting for your share values to rise you would also have drawn in the same period £11,899 in dividends.

## VILLAGE ECONOMY

The chances for socialist policies to be implemented in Congo appear at present to be very slender. Inside the Lumumba party there exist a number of Stalinists, Co-operative Party sympathisers, and several People's Party allies. But the economics of the Congo defy analysis. Although 20% of the population live in towns and a further 20% nearby in built-up villages, over half of the population is still employed in primitive agricultural and hunting pursuits. As a viable central economy the co-ordination of the territories is obviously a necessity, but given outside aid most could individually develop economies of some efficiency. But for administration there are fewer than 20 Congolese graduates, most living in Katanga and Leopoldville, while up to the 30th of June most of the education was still in the hands of missionaries.

## NO POLICY

The Belgian administration failed miserably in developing either a sense of nationality or indigenous tribalism or of provincial cohesion. Without a political policy, and given the rapid transition from colonial to independent status, it was inevitable that no nationalist or socialist ideology could develop. What was left was the shell of the old tribal factions and the germ of Pan-Africanism. Alongside there dragged the ghost of

the missionary social services, followed by the incipient socialism and the colossus of Union Minière. For the Russians there was little intellectual sympathy, the mere mention that they might land was enough to cause serious panic; while Ghanaian influence is suspected to the degree of the next tribe's.

## UNO ESSENTIAL

Lumumba's plans for a centralized state may be premature: without any of the discipline of the Red Army and without the experience of the Bolsheviks as a political unit he is attempting to create a state out of the fragments of imperialist mismanagement. The lack of a fixed ideology may not be a disadvantage because of the flexibility of the situation, but with tribal forces marshalling against him, the lack of popular peasant support will prevent him from holding the country. Unless the African Army marches on Elizabethville it looks as if we are in for another colonial compromise: but if only to prevent prolonged chauvinism the UNO presence is essential. Without a Socialist policy or adequate funds or political experience there seems little point in marching.

## JOHN FAIRHEAD

## EXPLAINS A POINT ABOUT HIS CONGO ARTICLE IN A LETTER

Dear Comrade,

An omission changed the meaning of a phrase in my article, "Congo Chaos plays into the Hands of Imperiaists". (*Socialist Review*, August, 1960)

What was printed was: "The Congolese National Movement (the party of the premier, Patrice Lumumba) mirrors all the weaknesses and the strength of such bodies as the Indian National Congress."

What I wrote was: "The Congolese National Movement (the party of the premier Patrice Lumumba) mirrors all the weaknesses and none of the strength of such bodies as the Indian National Congress."

This is a point needing elaboration; impossible in the limited space available. But the idea is linked with a fact I stated in the previous paragraph: "No strong African capitalist class exists in the Congo."

Yours fraternally,

John Fairhead

London, W.2

# THE SEAMEN'S GREAT STRUGGLE

## The situation in Merseyside

FOR, sometimes, quite lengthy periods, the class struggle lies dormant, being expressed in individual acts, and small sectional struggles; then it breaks out and masses of workers are involved, giving the lie to those who say the working-class is apathetic.

Such a situation now exists amongst those working along the docks fronts of the ports of Britain, and in particular it is expressed with great fierceness on the Merseyside. The so-called "affluent society" has largely bypassed the workers in this great port and wages and conditions are relatively low.

The centre of the National Reform Movement of the Seamen is Liverpool, and I might add that their poky offices are in great contrast to the palatial suite of the NUS.

### NEW LEAD

At the time of writing over 2,000 seamen on the Merseyside are on strike, and some of the world's largest liners are held up in the port. The demands of the seamen are simple. Firstly, a 44-hour week, and secondly the full £4 a month wage claim. The strike which was suspended for approximately 3 weeks to enable the NUS to meet the employers, was resumed immediately the NUS accepted less than the claim.

This raises a matter of vital importance. In the past, in practically all industries wage claims have been made, and then after negotiation much less than the demand has been accepted. It is against this practice that the seamen have made a stand. I predict that they have set a pattern which will be followed by other sections of the workers, and probably the first to follow the lead given will be the dockers.

### UNION FAILURE

In addition to the questions of wages and hours, the seamen are making a number of other demands. These are summed up in a brief statement they have sent to trade unionists in other industries.

The statement says: "On the following points we stand firm:

1. We want a clean union.
2. The right to free speech and withdrawal of our labour.
3. The 1894 Shipping Maritime Act to be abolished.
4. The union subscription to be on a democratic basis.
5. A forty-four hour week at sea as well as in port."

There are many other issues such as elected Ship Committees on all ships and an elected representative (similar to a shop steward) on all ships, but the above demands are the main ones in the present dispute.

by ERIC S. HEFFER

These demands are of long standing, and were raised as far back as the seamen's strikes of 1947 and 1955. The men regard the NUS as a company union and their anger is directed against the NUS officials whom they feel are the employers' main defence. As Vic Lilley, the National Organiser of the Seamen's Reform Movement said at a meeting in Liverpool, the Union "stinks".

### INTIMIDATION

The employers are endeavouring to intimidate the seamen by the use of the archaic Maritime Law of 1894, under which seamen can be fined or imprisoned for refusing to "obey a lawful order". They are also using the method of the injunction, a law ostensibly there to protect the right of the individual but now used precisely against the individual.

The Liverpool Trades Council and Labour Party at its July meeting passed almost unanimously two resolutions, both protesting against the use of the injunction against the seamen, one calling on the Parliamentary Labour Party to oppose its use by raising the issue in Parliament.

### SPONTANEOUS ACTION

The EC of that body meeting on the 16th August, issued a press statement opposing the use of the injunction and also stating that in association with the local Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions they develop further lines of opposition. It is contemplated that a meeting or demonstration will be called, as well as representations being made to the TUC and the Lancashire Federation of Trades Councils.

Already spontaneous action has been taken by thousands of the port workers. On Sunday 14th August, the dockers at a meeting called by the Port Workers' Liaison Committee decided to do two things: 1) To give 21 days' strike notice as their claim for a 40-hour week and 25/- a day had not been met, and 2) to have a token strike on Tuesday 16th to influence the docks committee of the T&GWU which met on Wednesday 17th to consider the employers' offer. They also decided to join the protest march of the seamen, against the legal action being used against Neary, Lilley, Keen and Flynn, all leaders of the Seamen's Reform Movement.

This protest march was supported by no less than 15 thousand workers (possibly many more) although the national press and the radio and television played it down. The demonstration was the largest held at the Merseyside since the war (a fact admitted by the *Daily Herald*) and the seamen were joined by dockers, power group workers of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, building trades workers from many sites, ship-repair workers, constructional engineers and paper workers. Many thousands of others would have joined in but got to know too late.

One of the features of the demonstration was the fact that workers along the line of the docks, when hearing of the demonstration during working hours, spontaneously left their work and joined in. The total number of workers who joined in the spontaneous token strike would be hard to define, but it was admitted by the National Dock Labour Board that over 10,000 dockers stopped work in Liverpool and Birkenhead.

### MILITANT MOOD

The mood of the men was summed up by Denis Kelly, the Chairman of the Dockers' Port Workers' Liaison Committee when he said, "We smashed Order 1305, and we will smash the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894."

Speakers included Bill Hart of the CEU, veteran leader of the seamen's strike of 1947, (after which strike he was jailed for 6 months for his part in that dispute), Denis Kelly of the dockers and ship-repair workers, and Councillor Eric Heffer, Vice-President of the Liverpool Trades Council and Labour Party, speaking in his individual capacity, but on behalf of those workers who were not dockers, seamen or constructional engineers.

### NO INJUNCTION

The main emphasis of all the speakers was directed against the use of the injunction in industrial disputes and for the repeal of the Maritime Act of 1894. The present seamen's leaders who are now before the courts, were likened to the Tolpuddle Martyrs and the many others since who have fought for working-class rights.

They are being attacked by people like Sir Thomas Yates, who called them "Reds", "Communists", "Irresponsibles" etc., representing no one but themselves. In fact they are hard-working workers who are fighting for elementary rights. It ill becomes Sir Thomas Yates, with his exclusive club in Devon, and

his Bentley, to attack workers who are fighting to strengthen real trade unionism. If British trade unionism is destroyed, it will not be by the so-called "rebels", but by the conformists, the so-called "leaders" like Yates, who in fact speak only for themselves. It must be remembered the Movement was built by rebels, like Keir Hardie, Tom Mann, Larkin and Connolly.

### DRASTIC REFORMS

The real essence of the present mass movement is the fact that it is largely being developed outside the official movement. This is not an indictment of the workers, but of the officials who are obviously failing to give the necessary leadership.

What needs to be done is for the entire movement to be brought behind the Seamen. Equally, pressure must be applied to the TUC to urge the General Council to throw their weight into the fight. Also the NUS must be told that by their lack of democracy they are bringing the trade union movement into discredit, and that it is time they carried out some drastic reforms.

### SEAMENS' DEMANDS

Every section of the workers must be involved, as the old slogans are still applicable, "Unity is strength", "An injury to one is an injury to all".

Let our demands ring out loud and clear.

SET FREE THE IMPRISONED SEAMEN

ABOLISH THE 1894 MARITIME ACT

END THE USE OF THE INJUNCTION AND SUPPORT THE SEAMEN IN THEIR STRUGGLE FOR HIGHER WAGES AND BETTER CONDITIONS

These are demands which we can all support. The dockers will no doubt be the next to be involved, so let us take our stand now. It is in my belief a new stage opening out for the British workers; we can see its beginnings now.

There has been much talk of apathy, the answer is now being given by the workers themselves. If the old machine contains them and doesn't give them full expression, then the workers will seek a solution by creating new organs of struggle. This fact must be learned by us all, so that we can take our stand with the new.

# AND A REPORT FROM SOUTHAMPTON

## Seamen want shop stewards — and a democratic Union

by BOB PENNINGTON

On the corner of Oxford Street, some 20 yards from the Sailors' Home, a group of men were gathered. Three of them were sharing one cigarette. A voice distinctively Merseyside, muttered something belligerent about "scorpes" a colloquialism peculiar to Liverpoolians when describing "scabs". Obviously these were seamen on strike.

My enquiry for the presence of the committee met suspicion. A bearded, check-shirted, six-footer, demanded of me: "What do you want 'em for?" I explained that I was from the press. Hastening to add the word socialist.

Expletives greeted the word press. A myriad of accents immediately questioned the antecedents of all reporters. The word socialist was no magic key either. A shock-haired little Irish steward concisely explained his opinions of the *Daily Herald* — an opinion that found general acclaim.

### THAWED

We reached more common ground when I explained my estimation of Sir Tom Yates, general secretary of the National Union of Seamen. The atmosphere thawed a little and curiosity replaced antagonism. Nevertheless conversation remained difficult.

Eventually the committee members were brought and after some discussion and perusal of Nick Howard's article in the last issue of *Socialist Review*, they decided that two of them would give me a statement.

### A STATEMENT

In view of the recent arrests and likely victimizations it was explained that committee members' names must not be published.

"We have a statement which we will read you first. Will you print it?" I was asked. After my assurance on this point, the following statement was read to me:

"We the merchant seamen in an industry that is vital to the nation's economy and existence consider that the shipowners are acting as virtual dictators pertaining to the seamen's welfare. We feel that we are fully justified in our present strike action.

In most of the major industries ashore, improvements in welfare and conditions have been brought about by the activities and diligence of various trade union bodies. When the Council of the NUS was originally instituted it was with a view to protecting the interests of the seamen. By virtue of the seamen's absence at sea, administration has been evolved through the top executive of the

Union—once gain in favour of the shipowners.

We are informed by the NUS that our contributions are compulsory. With this state of affairs we have no legitimate means of bringing pressure upon the Union to negotiate demands which will afford the seamen a reasonable rate of pay, a reasonable working week and tolerable conditions under which to work. Therefore the only alternative is to instigate an unofficial strike.

In the eyes of the nation who are so dependent on seamen this action is certain to incur displeasure. But we appeal to them to bear with us in the hope that we can effect an arbitrary group that will negotiate on our behalf for these salient features in the shortest possible time."

### TOP RATES

They informed me: "Before the rise that the NUS just got, a top deck-hand received £38 a month and so did a 'greaser'. A steward only got £36 10s. Mind you these are *top rates*. Many men get less. Now we have been offered another £2 10s per month.

"When we came out on strike last month we asked for £4 a month and a 44 hour week. The Union leaders assured us that they would stick out for that.

"After the July meeting between the employers and the NUS the talks were adjourned until August 8. Then the Union posted notices on board the ships about the claim."

### NO PROTECTION

A steward interrupted here: "That's right. They posted one of those up on the *Queen Mary*. It was signed by McDaid and Sutton—they are two NUS officials in Southampton—and said: 'The executive committee are behind Brother Yates in the demand for a £4 per month rise and a 44 hour week, with no strings attached.'"

"Like 'bloody hell' they were" commented one of the onlookers.

"The leaders then went to the talks of August 8 and sold us out by accepting a £2 10s rise" continued the spokesman.

"What about hours" I asked.

"We want a 44 hour week in port and out; which means we would get paid for all hours worked above 44 at overtime rates. Right now we have a 44

hour week in port but a 52 hour week at sea."

The men feel that at present they are completely at the mercy of the shipowners and that the Union gives them no protection.

"When we have a complaint we are simply told: 'Take it up with your Union when you get to port.' That's handy... for the shipowner, especially if you are on a tanker which might not be returning to port for another 12 months.

"We want to elect our own shop stewards on board ship so complaints can be dealt with on the spot. The Yanks and the Aussies have that system, why not us?"

### WATCH COMMITTEE

Confidence in the NUS leaders is at a low ebb and irrespective of any promises made by Yates and his coterie the reaction of the men will be sceptical. I enquired what their suggestions were for having greater rank-and-file control of Union affairs.

"We want all the officials to be elected every four years. The men are also demanding that a watch committee be elected. This would consist of representatives from every port—elected by the men and also paid by them so that its members will be responsible to them alone. Then the watch committee would sit with the Union executive and protect our interests."

### DEMOCRATIC

In contrast to the bureaucratized NUS, the strike committee is a most democratic body.

"At a meeting in the Guildhall last Tuesday the men elected their own committee. Every one of us are subject to recall—if the lads think we are not doing a good job then without any palaver, off we go! Each day we hold a report-back meeting. Then there is a national committee which consists of elected representatives from each port and this works in conjunction with the *Reform Committee*\* and is responsible for national organization.

### STAYING SOLID

"Although we have had a few lads knocked off and others threatened with victimization the lads have stayed solid.

"In Southampton there are nearly 200 of us out and the men from the *Saxonia* and other Cunard boats which don't sail until later in the week have promised to join us."

Where we were talking we could see the forlorn outline of the orange and black funneled *Queen Mary*, stranded at her berth like a lame duck. He pointed over to her: "She wont move. That's how we are going to win."

### BIG PROBLEMS

The problems facing the strikers are big. Many of the men live in other parts of the country so the committee are paying out 9s a night bed and breakfast in local seamen's hostels for them. They had managed to raise the fares of 40 men to send them home and they were hoping to send another batch off this week. Bill a 'greaser' from Leeds told me: "If necessary I'll sleep in the Park to win this one and so will a lot more of the lads."

### PAY DENIED

What has pleased the strikers has been the help they have received from other trade unionists, particularly the dockers who are taking collections amongst themselves.

What does incense the men however is the fact that many of them have pay due to them and although some of them have received their cards from the companies they are being denied their pay. Even on this important principle the Union has done nothing to support the men.

\*The Reform Committee is a full-time body elected by the seamen after the July strike. The function of the committee is to organize the fight for more rank-and-file control in the NUS. Its members' wages are paid from collections amongst the seamen.

AN IMPORTANT  
ARTICLE ON  
THE HISTORY  
AND DEVELOPMENT  
OF THE BRITISH  
COMMUNIST  
PARTY APPEARS  
ON PAGE 6

## WORKING CLASS HISTORY

# THE FOUNDING OF THE BRITISH COMMUNIST PARTY

by HENRY COLLINS

On August 1, 1920, the Communist Party of Great Britain was founded at a congress held in the Cannon Street Hotel, London. Its formation marked a new stage in the development of revolutionary ideas among the British working class. This stage in the story had started six years earlier when, on the outbreak of the first World War in August, 1914, the Second International collapsed ignominiously. Internationally famous revolutionaries such as Vaillant in France, Kautsky in Germany, Victor Adler in Austria and Plekhanov from Russia supported or even joined their respective governments in the cause of national defence.

Just over a year later an international Socialist Conference assembled at Zimmerwald, in neutral Switzerland. In a manifesto to the European working class, the Conference announced its intention "to re-tie the torn threads of international relations and to call upon the working class to recover itself and to fight for peace." There were no British representatives at Zimmerwald, but the Independent Labour Party and the British Socialist Party both declared themselves in agreement with its aims. Zinoviev and Lenin, on behalf of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party, signed the Conference manifesto but considered that it did not go far enough. It not only failed to condemn the treachery of the main leaders of international Socialism but it studiously refrained from calling on the workers to finish the War by revolutionary action. In a draft solution, rejected by the majority, the left wing delegates at Zimmerwald called for "the organisation of street demonstrations against the governments, propaganda of international solidarity in the trenches, the encouragement of economic strikes, the effort to transform them into political strikes under favourable conditions. Civil war, not civil peace—that is the slogan!" The draft was signed by Zinoviev and Lenin for the Russians, Radek for the Left Social Democrats of Poland and by representatives from Latvia, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland and Germany.

## REVOLUTIONARY RESPONSE

By 1916, when the International Socialist Commission which had been elected at Zimmerwald, called a second Conference, at Kienthal, disillusion with the War was spreading among the workers. The Left was correspondingly stronger and the Kienthal resolutions more radical. The agreed resolutions at Zimmerwald had called for a just peace, leaving open the question how this could be obtained. Kienthal declared bluntly that there could be no real solution short of "the conquest of political power and the ownership of capital by the peoples themselves", insisting, at the same time, that "the real durable peace will be the fruit of Socialism triumphant."

The Third, or Communist International for which Zimmerwald and Kienthal had prepared the way, and for which Lenin had been calling since 1914,<sup>1</sup> could only be set up after the War had been ended by proletarian revolution. In January, 1919, an appeal went out from revolutionary Moscow addressed to 39 parties and groups which were invited to participate in establishing the new International. Two parties in Britain—the British Socialist Party and the Socialist Labour Party—together with "the revolutionary elements of the Shop Stewards' movement" were included in the invitation. Though none of these bodies was able to send an official representative to Moscow in time for the foundation Congress in March, (J. Fineberg was there without a formal mandate), there was an appreciable response to the appeal from the most advanced sections of the British Left.

## HYNDMAN THE JINGO

The years preceding the outbreak of the War in Britain had seen the rise of an exceptionally militant trade union movement. Miners, dockers, seamen, railway workers and, during the War itself, engineers had been swept by rising prices combined with the feebleness of the Parliamentary Labour Party into a strike wave without precedent in British industrial history. Under the impact of these pressures the Social Democratic Federation had been reformed, in 1908, as the Social Democratic Party and, in 1911, as the British Socialist Party. However, the old leadership, headed by H. M. Hyndman, retained its control over the Party machine and over its weekly organ, *Justice*. When War came, the B.S.P., like most Socialist parties in the belligerent countries, jettisoned its internationalism in the cause of 'national defence'. There was a good deal of opposition to Hyndman's ingoism, however, and in 1915 the Party had decided to send a delegate to Zimmerwald, though it was not possible to put the resolution into effect. At the

Salford Conference, in 1916, the Hyndman leadership was overthrown, and withdrew from the Party. After that, the revolutionary internationalists were in full command. The B.S.P. gave an unqualified welcome to the October Revolution and Maxim Litvinov, the Bolshevik representative in Britain, brought fraternal greetings from the Soviet Government to the Easter Conference in 1918.

## INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

The Socialist Labour Party was rather a different kettle of fish. Founded in 1903 under the inspiration of Daniel de Leon, it started life as a breakaway from the S.D.F. Standing for strict industrial unionism, the S.L.P. refused to allow members, on pain of expulsion, to occupy any official position in an existing union. Towards the leadership of the S.D.F., as of the Labour Party, the S.L.P. adopted an attitude of intransigent hostility and complete non-cooperation. It never had more than a few hundred members, concentrated mainly in Glasgow, but they were highly disciplined and active. It made its attitude to the War clear from the outset, publishing pamphlets by Liebknecht, Radek and Clara Zetkin. It was probably the first British organisation to publish a work by Lenin—his famous *Collapse of the Second International*. Its first organiser was James Connolly, Irish Marxist and revolutionary nationalist, who died in the Easter Rising in 1916.

## LENIN AND THE LABOUR PARTY

In April, 1919, a month after the formation of the Third International, representatives of the B.S.P. and S.L.P. met with members of two smaller bodies—the Workers' Socialist Federation and the South Wales Socialist Society—at the Eustace Miles Restaurant in Chandos Street, London, to discuss the formation of a Communist Party. At this and subsequent gatherings there were heated arguments about the relationship of the Communists to the Labour Party and about their attitude to Parliament. On one wing, the Workers' Socialist Federation and the South Wales Socialist Society opposed all participation in parliamentary elections and any attempt to affiliate to the Labour Party. On the other wing, the B.S.P. favoured both courses, while the S.L.P., supporting parliamentary action, opposed affiliating to the Labour Party. Lenin found time to participate in the discussion, writing from Moscow on July 8, 1920, on the eve of the second Congress of the Communist International, "I personally am in favour of participation in parliament, and adhesion to the Labour Party on condition of free and independent Communist activity."

## CHEQUERED CAREER

At the Comintern's second Congress Lenin argued persistently with both Willy Gallacher and Jack Tanner, who, as representatives SR—19

of the Workers' Committee Movement, opposed all parliamentary activity as a diversion from the class struggle and a source of bourgeois-democratic illusions. Lenin elaborated his position in his classic "*Left-Wing*" *Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, which appeared in May, 1920. The Communist Party of Great Britain was established at the beginning of August, and Lenin's advice proved the deciding factor in the controversy.

The Party, which began with 10,000 members, experienced a chequered career in the 1920's. During that decade it made little progress in its struggle to win substantial industrial influence, perhaps its most remarkable success being among the unemployed.

The C.P.'s application for affiliation came up for final decision at the Labour Party's Conference in 1924. It was rejected by 3,185,000 votes to 193,000, though the resolution barring Communists from individual membership of the Labour Party was carried by the much narrower vote of 1,804,000 to 1,540,000. Writing of the Communist Party's prospects, in 1928, Max Beer, the leading historian of British Socialism, said: "Maybe that their day will arrive when a Labour Government, backed by a majority of its own, disappoints the hopes of the working class." The disappointment arrived in 1951, but the day did not. The reason will long be a source of profitable investigation by British Marxists.

<sup>1</sup>. See esp. the article 'Position and Tasks of the Socialist International', in *Sotsial-Demokrat*, Nov. 1, 1914, V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XVIII, p. 89.

GRAHAM AYCOTT DISCUSSES THE

## ISSUES FANCING THE MINERS

RECENTLY the mining industry has been passing through what appears on the surface to be its severest crisis since the outbreak of war.

At the end of the war the mining industry faced what seemed to be an insurmountable task. Short of men and in a run-down condition, due to lack of investment, coal was expected to provide the fuel needed by industry in the post-war boom.

### IMPORTED

It was unable to do this. Demand exceeded supply, and a fuel crisis came to be regarded as a permanent feature of the economy. During this period the policy was "Coal at any Price", the National Coal Board's aim being to mine every ton of coal possible without giving too much consideration as to the cost. Various alternative methods were adopted to make up the fuel shortage. Coal was imported from abroad and industry was openly encouraged to convert to oil. Miners gave up their 5-day week and coaled on Saturday mornings. Miners already in the industry were unable to leave and find other jobs under the Emergency Regulations introduced during the war.

### REASONS

Gradually this situation changed. Oil, which had all the time been contributing with coal towards the fuel needs of the nation, began to take a more dominant role, and win markets away from coal. From contributing 35 million tons of coal equivalent in 1955 (assuming that one ton of oil is equivalent to 1.7 tons of coal), it increased its contribution to 56 million tons of coal equivalent by 1959. During these four years the overall total of fuel required fell by 4 million tons but the consumption of coal fell by 26 million tons. The reasons for these changes between coal and oil are twofold. Firstly, the government had encouraged both industry and the electricity

authorities to convert to oil in the belief that it was impossible for the mining industry to supply all the demands likely to be made of it in the future. During the recession between 1956 and 1958 coal was one of the worst affected basic industries. During this period coal supplied to the iron and steel industry fell by 20 percent, to railways by 10 percent and to coke ovens by 9 percent. In comparison oil supplies increased to power stations by 333 percent, one of coal's traditional markets, 30 percent to other industries, 27 percent to domestic and miscellaneous users and in 1958 for the first time the railways began to use an appreciable amount of oil.

With these problems facing the industry the NCB was forced to alter its plans, which it did in its last policy statement "Revised Plan for Coal". This advocated two things: a) A reduction of production targets; b) Closing of uneconomic pits.

For the first time since nationalisation the Board was faced with a problem of redundancy. Instead of mining all the coal possible the Board now planned to close between 205 and 240 pits between 1960 and 1965. The majority of these are in areas where there is very little alternative employment. If men from these declining areas are to be offered transfers to others the tremendous social problems arising must be carefully watched by the NUM. There must be no groupings of newcomers on the one hand and the established on the other, such as happened in Yorkshire during the transfers of 1953-56. Also the transferred men must for a while have their earnings guaranteed from their old area if they are higher than those of the new area. (In the 1953-56 transfers 40 percent of the men's wages dropped after they were transferred.)

Although transferring of men is a very important subject, it is not as important as the problems of a) Another manpower shortage, b) The miner's social status.

It seems ludicrous to talk of a manpower shortage now after both the Board and the Union have been basing their policies on the problems of redundancies. The NUM has been quoted as saying: "The Board must guarantee alternative employment before closing collieries". "No miner will be sold down the road", but figures would indicate that if the present trend continues there will be no miners left to sell down the road. From a labour strength of 652,000 in 1959 the Board had planned to run manpower down to either 626,000 or 587,000 men by 1965 depending on the demand for coal. What in actual fact has happened is that there has been a mass emigration from mining and already, now in 1960, the labour force has dropped to 595,000.

### NO PRESSURE

During the past months the miner has suffered a cut in real wages. In the period of demand for coal the day wage worker was able to supplement his weekly wage by working overtime, both during the week and on Saturday mornings. Because there was no pressure brought to bear on the Union to secure any large increases on basic earnings, this period, favourable for securing such increases was allowed to pass by. With the changing of coal's position, the Coal Board started its economy drive. Saturday morning working was ended and overtime cut until it became almost non-existent. This means that the day-wage man, who makes up 60 percent of the labour force, 20 percent of these being on the surface and 40 percent underground, are having to live on about £10 a week before deductions. For surface workers it is more often less than £8. If men are to be encouraged to stay in mining, let alone be recruited to the industry, these wage rates must be substantially increased.

Can a case be made for this? Definitely yes, by applying the government's own yardstick that increases in wages must be accompanied by an increase in production. Even though mining has been going through a difficult period, productivity has been steadily rising. The industry has become more efficient and the output per manshift has reached its highest figure ever. But where would the money come from? Does it mean charging higher prices? Not at all! Since nation-

alisation the NCB has had to pay £240 million in interest and repayments to the former owners for an industry that was derelict. There is more than enough money being paid out here to give the lower-paid men more than the recent increase of 5/- a week they were awarded. (This is 10d. a shift including bonus). Two other ways of improving social conditions are contained in the Second Miners' Charter. A third week's holiday a year and payment of full wages when a man is unable to work through either sickness or accident. (Mining has one of the highest accident and sickness rates in the country.)

The prospects, for those willing to stay in mining and for the Union to press for material gains, are good. There is a manpower shortage rapidly developing, which will be accompanied in the future by an excess of demand over supply similar to that of the late 1940's. (The NCB expects to lift 3 million tons of stocks in the next year and lift all stocks during the next 3 years). With other industries doing just as they please the NCB are finding and will continue to find it impossible to plan for the future. You cannot plan one industry and have anarchy in the rest. In the present situation the NUM must move from the defensive position it has been occupying and adopt a far more militant, progressive role.

### CENTRAL AFRICA

from page 1  
per cent—and only one-twelfth of these Europeans are farmers. Their land, needless to say, is the best, and they have secured their mastery of the towns, too, by forbidding any African to own or rent premises in the main commercial areas. Africans are not allowed to grow the country's leading cash crop, Virginia tobacco.

Only four Africans passed their Cambridge higher certificate last year, and there are fewer than half a dozen top-grade African civil servants and no African officers in the armed forces or the police.

Only three per cent of the electorate are Africans—the great majority of Africans have no vote. In the constituency which returns Sir Edgar Whitehead, the premier, there is not a single African voter.

### NO LUXURIES

Mass pressure on even the most Right-wing African politicians is such that none, except pensioners and undisguised stooges, can afford the political luxury of staying outside the national movement. Earlier this year a group of Africans resigned from the liberal Central African Party led by Garfield Todd and attached themselves to the National Democratic Party (African National Congress).

cont on page 8

## ROSA LUXEMBURG

4/6 (bound copies 8/6 post free).

a critical study

by TONY CLIFF

Nos 2&3 of International Socialism

Send to:

Geoff Carlson, 117, Carmelite Road, Harrow Weald, Middlesex.

**SOCIALIST REVIEW** is published by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, post paid. 12 issues: 8s. Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of **Socialist Review** which are given in editorial statement.

All communications to be addressed to 117 Carmelite Rd., Harrow Weald, Middlesex.

Printed by St. Martin's Printers (T.U.) 86d. Lillie Road, London S.W.6. Tel.: FUL. 8637.

## LETTER

## ETU DELEGATE HITS OUT

WHO the hell does the delegate to ETU Conference responsible for the article in your July issue think he is? Because Conference overwhelmingly rejected him and his frustrated little clique he has the impertinence to suggest that the EC loaded the conference. Does he really believe that he and the other seven or eight who voted against the EC were the only delegates who really represented the rank and file of this union, and that the other 390 were merely stooges of Frank's Haxell and Foulkes?

If the ability of this delegate and his friends matched their arrogance, they may have found more sympathy at Conference, as it was, the performance of these aspirants to high office only confirmed the belief of the vast majority present, that it would be a sad day for the ETU if we were ever foolish enough to elect them to the leadership of this union.

### VICIOUS ATTACKS

Of course the contracting lads are a bit impatient at the fact that we have fallen behind in the wages struggle, but for that, we do not so much blame the EC as those within our ranks who, with the help of the press, radio, and T.V. have caused our EC to be subjected to many vicious attacks, which must have placed them under a terrific strain. Most of us feel that our General Officers would have to be more than human to fight off these attacks upon themselves, whilst at the same time waging what would be a bitter fight in contracting, in which they would need all their energy and resources. (I hope that this delegate will be playing his full part in the struggle when it does come, and not stand on the sideline urging us to stage a bloody revolution).

### SOFFICIENT FORUM

The resolution from Belfast Municipal and Wallasey to which he referred was indeed a militant one, but even the "simple" 390 would have had no difficulty in recognising the impracticability of accepting such a course as the policy of this union alone, apart from the fact that even if it could be implemented, it would not solve the problem of unemployment in the distress areas. Both this and the question of employment and apprenticeships for our youngsters will only be solved under a socialist society.

The resolution calling for changes in the "Electron" was overwhelmingly defeated because we like it as it is, and because the majority of us feel that our Annual Conference is a sufficient forum for us to air our views with regard to Union Policy. Those of us who are really

### A BLOW AGAINST THE BOSS—from page 1

as a whole, might indeed become a political struggle against the entire system and its monstrous issue—the Bomb.

For the Campaign to remain isolated from the class struggle is to remain weak. The choice is there, the example is there and socialists should be there to influence the one with the other.

Reprinted from *International Socialism*, Autumn 1960, published this month.

The above article is the first of four editorials in the current issue of *International Socialism* published this month. The others deal with power in the Labour Party, Russia's economic offensive and the working class in the West, and Congo.

Articles include: Bob Pennington on the Docks, Tony Cliff on Trotsky's views on Class and Party, Kan-ichi Kuroda on the anti-Kishi movement in Japan.

A story, a poem and five pages of book reviews are also included. Special feature: Four pages of Abu's graphic impressions of Poland. Send 2s 11d (post paid) to *International Socialism*, 90 Regent's Park Road, London NW1.

active in the trade union and labour movement have neither the time nor the inclination to write letters to any journal, whether it be ours or any other, in spite of the fact that some may think it nice to see their names in print now and again. We certainly do not hold the view that our being able to have letters published in the journal would add anything to the democracy of this union.

This delegate had to snipe at our decision to increase the salary of our officials. It may not be good Marxist philosophy, but the majority of the rank and file of the ETU do not want their officials on the cheap. Most of us appreciate that they are entitled to a decent standard

of living and that they fully earn all that they get—it is certainly not an occupation that one would follow for what he gets out of it financially. I might add that I do not remember the point of view of this delegate being expressed from the rostrum, perhaps he didn't have the guts to do it himself.

### NO AFFINITY

If your contributor really wishes to serve the members of the ETU let him stop making his stupid and vicious accusations and try to find that affinity with the active rank and file of the union which he so obviously has not got at present.

### ONE OF THE 390 STOOGES

UNFORTUNATELY our critics, like so many defenders of the Electrical Trades Union leadership, tries to avoid discussion on policy by resorting to lame excuses. To excuse the basic rate of our contracting brothers by blaming opponents of the executive is rather pathetic. Surely the best way for the executive to win the confidence of the members is by improving wages and conditions.

Incidentally, those critics of the EC who resort to "press, radio and TV", do not demand, as did our reporter, "a more militant industrial policy" with "real defence of shop stewards" and "industrial action against the Bomb and missile sites" If they did, they would not be so popular with "press, radio and television".

No one suggests that the ETU leadership can fight the bosses alone. What is expected of them is a campaign inside the TUC and the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions aimed at winning these organisations to a more socialist and militant policy. At present Haxell and Foulkes quite happily hide behind the cowardice of the Right wing.

The argument against a more democratically run *Electron* is most peculiar. Apparently it is permissible in the ETU for Haxell to be the sole deciding voice because he is a Communist Party member and therefore the repository of all wisdom. In other unions where the Communist Party members don't control the journal they run rank-and-file papers.

Like our correspondent we agree that our officials "are entitled to a decent standard of living". However he must admit that there is rather a difference between the contracting member's basic wage of £10.16.4d per week and Haxell's £26 per week and £1800 per annum expenses. With a differential like that you don't grow away from the members—you fly away from them.

Editor

### CENTRAL AFRICA

cont from page 7

leaders of which were arrested after last month's police shootings.

It is now clear that European big business is in no position to ignore the claims of its embarrassing junior partners, the settlers, who in turn have no intention of yielding without a struggle. The clashes over the coming few months are likely to be increasingly sharp, and the possibility of reaching a compromise with the African middle-class leadership (except possibly in Nyasaland) is very small.

Every socialist must make it his job to commit his organization to a clear stand—for the withdrawal of imperialist troops, including those of the United Nations, from Africa, and for a solution in favour of the African workers and small farmers. Such an outcome could greatly weaken imperialism (could for example topple such régimes as that of Salazar in Portugal and undermine de Gaulle, as well as strike a powerful blow at Wall Street and the City).

## WHAT WE STAND FOR

The SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for international Socialist democracy. 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. The SOCIALIST REVIEW believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power on the basis of the following programme:

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Renationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation.—The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.
- Workers' control in all nationalised industries i.e. a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.
- The establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all instances representatives must be subject to frequent election, immediate recall, and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.
- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions.
- The establishment of the principle of work or full maintenance.
- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.
- The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.
- Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants—without a means test—for all university students.
- Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.
- Freedom from political and economic oppression to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the underdeveloped countries.
- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.
- The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.
- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow.