

having helped to foment recent strikes in recent months.' **Sunday Telegraph**, 2.7.61.

So it went on, with all the ill-feeling on their side and all the amusement on ours. Much of their secret watching and waiting was obvious enough to go on television, one earnest-looking prowler earning the title of 'Inspector Migraine', and to be lampooned by a cartoon in **The Spectator**.

Suddenly, however, the **Daily Mail** correspondent, a Mr. Anthony Brown, switched pressure on to the 'Socialism Reaffirmed' Group and alleged that it was led by Dr. Christopher Pallis, writing under the nom-de-plume of Martin Grainger. There followed a vicious campaign of persecution against Dr. Pallis, a lecturer and (according to the **Mail**, 15.7.61) 'a brilliant neurologist.' The **Express** and **Telegraph** joined with the **Mail** in watching Dr. Pallis' home, a large number, once as many as 20, including photographers, being at his gate morning and night, reporting even small details of his life—such as that he ate his supper in the kitchen, questioning children and even pursuing him into the corridors and rooms of the London Post-Graduate School of Medicine, where Dr. Pallis is a valued lecturer and practitioner.

The **Mail** touched the uttermost depths with the statement that, if the doctor were not dismissed, the hospital might lose £1,000,000 in subscriptions from the U.S.A. and students from the Commonwealth. The systematic persecution brought an indignant protest from Labour MP Hugh Delargy in his **Reynolds News** column (16.7.61).

Under the gutter press(ure), the School faculty interviewed Dr. Pallis, but the bloodhounds must have been disappointed. The doctor remained. Said Dr. Newman, Dean of the Faculty, 'Since we do not propose to engage in McCarthyism or witch hunting, the matter is closed. Dr. Pallis stays with us.'

In passing, we would note the almost unbelievable number of factual mis-statements in these reports. Typical was this gem from the **Mail**: (15.7.61): 'The Solidarists will attend a meeting at Denison House in Vauxhall Bridge Road, London, tomorrow, at a gathering of the Trotskyist Rank and File Movement.' There is no group in this country using the name 'Solidarists', 'Denison' should be 'Denison', the Rank and File Movement is not Trotskyist (it is opposed by the various Trotskyist factions) and the meeting in question was not called by it, but by various libertarian groupings, including the SWF and CNT.

## National Rank and File Movement

The National Rank and File Movement has been organised to fight in defence of workers' interests, and in the course of that struggle to promote the policy of workers' ownership and direct control of industry. Such a movement must be independent. It must be free from political control and free from the control of the trade union salaried officials and bureaucrats. It must be firmly based on the principle of rank and file control.

### AIMS AND OBJECTS

1. To promote liaison between industrial militants (groups and individuals) and those political groupings which accept these stated aims and objects.
2. Promote financial help to members needing assistance, through dispute, victimization, anti-nuclear activity.
3. Encourage and actively assist the linking up of various industries in solidarity action.
4. Make available to workers in dispute, printing and duplicating facilities.
5. Collate lists of addresses, available transport, loudspeaker vans, etc., in all main centres, so that when fellow workers are in dispute and visit other towns, accommodation, transport and other facilities (such as facilities for raising cash) are at their disposal.
6. Work for international support in stoppages.
7. Bring to the attention of other workers the demands and requirements of workers in dispute.
8. To promote the policy and slogan of an "International General Strike Against War".

### MEMBERSHIP FORM

I accept the above AIMS & OBJECTS of the National Rank & File Movement and agree to pay an entrance fee of 1/- and thereafter a monthly subscription of 1/-.

Name.....

Address.....

Organisation and/or Union..... Date.....

For further information write: Secretary Rank & File Movement, C/o Room 12, 6 Endsleigh Street, London, W.C.1.

## THE SPANISH REVOLUTION —London meeting

THE MOST successful public meeting organised for many years by the Libertarian movement in Britain was held at Denison House, London on Sunday, July 16 to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the Spanish workers' social revolutionary struggle against fascism and to express solidarity with the Spanish people. Well over 300 people crowded the hall, decorated with the red-and-black flags of the CNT and SWF and by revolutionary posters. The five speakers, introduced by chairman **Tom Brown**, who recalled the hope the Spanish Revolution had brought to the workers of the world, represented the organisations who had jointly sponsored the meeting.

First was **L. Bailey**, of the Jewish 'Freie Arbeiter Stimme' Group (London), who had left a sick bed to keep his undertaking to speak. He recalled how the downfall of monarchies and empires in the present century, which revolutionaries had hoped for, gave rise, not to freedom, but to even greater tyranny in many cases. Such was the case in Spain, where fascism had temporarily crushed a brave, freedom-loving people. The Jewish Anarchists were always with those who opposed fascism.

**Philip Sansom**, for the London Anarchist Group, spoke of the great relevance the Spanish Revolution had at the present time, despite the difference in conditions between Spain of 1936 and Britain of 1961. Whether barricades were still an effective revolutionary method might be open to question, though they had been used to great effect recently by French peasants and in Cuba. But more important was what lay behind the barricades, the motivating force of action. In Spain it had been the ideals of libertarian thought, the struggle towards a free society. That was the greatest lesson of the Spanish Revolution.

**Salvador Guruchari**, of the Iberian Federation of Libertarian Youth, said that the FIJL in Paris were at that moment picketing the Spanish Embassy. Similar demonstrations were being held in other parts of France, and to a limited extent in Spain itself. The youth movement realised the hypocrisy of Western professions in favour of freedom and democracy. They knew that they could rely on no help from Governments in the struggle against Franco. Nevertheless, the struggle went on and would continue until the Spanish people overthrew fascism.

**Francisco Crespo**, who came from Paris for the meeting, spoke as delegate of the CNT. He recalled how the CNT had foreseen the fascist insurrection in 1936, while the Republican Government was dithering and refusing to take preventive action. It was the workers themselves who had confronted the Franco forces with armed resistance. The trade unions and working class organisations in other countries bore a heavy responsibility for Franco's victory, through their inertia and reliance on leaders. Non-intervention had helped put Franco in power and American aid was helping to keep him there. The role of the Communists in Spain had been to sabotage the workers' revolutionary achievements and their activities had split anti-fascist unity. Nevertheless the people had fought on two fronts for nearly three years—and the struggle still continued. The CNT in Exile was ready to help show the Spanish people were not vanquished.

**Ken Hawkes**, for the SWF, said the working class, demoralised by Social Democratic and Communist betrayals, had seen the Spanish Revolution of 1936 as the vindication of their old ideals. Anarcho-Syndicalist traditions in Spain had given the workers their ability to react to the fascist rising by revolutionary means. Seizing whatever arms were available, the men of the CNT-FAI had stormed the army barracks, formed workers' militia to continue the military struggle, taken over the factories, public utilities, transport, without waiting for orders from above. Education, care of the sick and aged, the emancipation of women had all been aspects of the social struggle, which had brought the greatest revolutionary achievements of history. Capitalists and politicians feared workers' control more than anything else, as had been shown by the recent British Press campaign against Syndicalism and the **Daily Mail's** despicable persecution of a Socialist militant. The Spanish workers might have been temporarily forced into submission, but their struggle continued underground and the example of the CNT, one of sacrifice and devotion to its revolutionary ideals, was a pattern for the workers of the world, one we should honour and strive to emulate.

Following the speakers and a collection, which realised £15. 10. 6., the CNT film 'Fury Over Spain,' made during the early months of the revolution, and showing the epic struggle of the militias, was screened. The ending, as a sea of upraised proletarian fists greeted the banner 'No Pasaran', to the strains of the FAI song, 'Los Hijos del Pueblo' (Sons of the People), brought a great, spontaneous outburst of applause from an audience that included a group of Syndicalist comrades who had come specially from Glasgow. Messages of solidarity were read from the CNT and FIJL in Paris.

Printed and published by the S.W.F., 25a Amberley Road, London, W.9.

# WORLD LABOUR NEWS

ENGLISH PAPER OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

Vol. 2 No. 5 (11)

September-October, 1961

Fourpence

## Conspiracy against the workers

'It is necessary . . . if need be, to resort to all sorts of devices, manoeuvres and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate into the trade unions to remain in them and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs.'—**Lenin, Left Wing Communism, 1920.**

'I have never been and neither will I ever be guilty of fraud. I have never told a deliberate lie during my career.'—**Mr. Foulkes, Communist President, E.T.U., 17.7.61.**

AFTER a thirty-eight day marathon hearing in the Royal Courts of Justice in London, Mr. Justice Winn declared Mr. Byrne the lawfully-elected General Secretary of the Electrical Trades Union. From the day of judgment, June 28, Mr. Byrne was to replace Mr. Haxell, an avowed Communist, who had conspired, with four other Communist leaders of the E.T.U., to prevent, by 'fraudulent and unlawful devices', the election of the plaintiff Byrne in 1959. The five men, including President Foulkes, have announced that an appeal has been lodged.

The transcript of the entire hearing runs to 1,750,000 words, providing a well-documented revelation of how Communists acquire power, entrench themselves in office and proceed to destroy democracy. As in Eastern Europe, once the C.P. takes over, free elections become a memory. Not only was the E.T.U. controlled by Communists, said the judge, but 'it was so managed as to serve the ideals of the party.'

The national newspapers gave this ballot-rigging case reasonable if, at times, melodramatic coverage. The lengthy hearing in the High Court necessarily meant a lengthy court judgment, which took five hours to deliver, now being followed up by surveys, reviews and analyses. The E.T.U.'s own monthly journal, the 'Electron', still C.P. controlled, appeared as usual and contained no reference whatever to the case. The liberal 'Spectator', in order to accommodate the story of the E.T.U. case, held over its third extract from 'The Bootleggers—Al Capone.'

All this voluminous reporting could, as it were, overload the gun so that the real significance of the case could be lost in a tedium of words. And that could be a very real loss, for significant it certainly is for those who fight capitalism in all its forms.

The reports show, however, that we are now witnessing just another stage in a protracted internal struggle for power within the E.T.U. It is being waged by two warring, irreconcilable factions, neither of which can serve the true interests of the workers, whatever democratic procedures may now be established. Essentially it is a battle between the 'ins' and the 'outs', each more concerned with the annihilation of the other than with the development of an effective struggle against the bosses of an unjust social system.

The spoils of this power struggle will go to the victorious bureaucrats, as always. The smoke of the High Court conflict had not cleared away before the right-wing Byrne-Chapple faction responded to the Communist President's appeal for unity and solidarity at the E.T.U. Conference. There was no division on the salaries-grab motion and the rival forces voted together for a substantial rise for the officials. Brother Byrne and ex-Communists Chapple and Cannon, his two personal assistants, appointed by him after the Court verdict, joined forces with the Communist President and his comrades-in-arms in the grab for an increase of £3 a week for all of them. The top people of the union will now have to battle along together on £1,485

## IWMA's XI CONGRESS

THE XI CONGRESS of the IWMA will be held in France during September, when delegates from Syndicalist organisations will gather to discuss the urgent problems facing the working class and means of intensifying the International's activity. The SWF will be directly represented and delegates are expected to attend from the CNT (Spain), CNT (France), CNT (Bulgaria), USI (Italy), NSF (Norway), FORA (Argentina), FORU (Uruguay), IWW (USA), SAC (Sweden) and NSV (Holland).

a year, plus first-class travelling expenses, posh hotels and special allowances.

Frank Chapple and Les Cannon, whose defection from the C.P. after the Hungarian uprising cost them their union posts, played an important part in the conspiracy case. Both had detailed knowledge of the C.P.'s methods of retaining control over the policy and machinery of the union. Both are now on the union pay-roll as appointed officials. For each of them, elections, rigged or honest, are of no personal concern. They simply accept appointments and even the Communist-dominated executive council has abandoned its objection to their installation.

The right-wing Byrne-Chapple faction has come under fire because they obviously prefer some form of outside control and supervision of union elections to a campaign for genuine rank and file control. This outside control, in some form or other, is part and parcel of the State-Employer-Trades Union Congress alliance to curb all militancy. It could lead to State-regulated corporations on the Mussolini pattern.

In the High Court the E.T.U. Communists would not agree to let the Electoral Reform Society conduct their elections for a new executive council, which take place in September. Instead they agreed that the votes should be counted by the union's auditors, a firm of chartered accountants. This, of course, will not preclude fraud at branch level. The Electoral Reform Society already assists and advises several other trade unions, including the Mineworkers (N.U.M.) and the Railwaymen (N.U.R.).

Leaflets headed 'Electricians Defence Fund', issued at the E.T.U. Conference, predicted legislation interfering with the independence and freedom of the trade union movement and, on this issue, the Communists could rally great support, for certainly a hungry desire to achieve a tame-cat leadership of dog-collar unions has been the editorial line strongly expressed recently in the right wing press. It, however, it has been pressed home with greater effect lately in the context of the E.T.U. case, the Communist Party is to be branded with the responsibility.

The racketeering of the C.P. in union affairs, its anti-working class policies, its inherent dishonesty and corrupt bureaucracy gave rise to the seven-year campaign of John Byrne and provided him with the basis for his legal action and final recourse to whatever justice he could obtain from a capitalist court. Indeed, it has been said with some justification that, as the C.P. bosses have pursued policies of class-collaboration, have broken strikes and delivered the goods to the capitalists down the years, they well deserve it when a capitalist court delivers to them its adverse findings.

Moves by the Communist majority on the E.T.U. executive to strip Mr. Byrne of his authority after the court case prompted the hitherto reluctant Trades Union Congress to intervene and commence its probe into the E.T.U. The union leaders were accused of 'ringing' Mr. Byrne with four Communist-controlled sub-committees. After the T.U.C. grilling, a stiff three-point ultimatum was issued, demanding the barring of five leading members from holding any office in the union for at least five years, the resignation of President Foulkes and the reversal of recent decisions on the General Secretary's power to appoint staff. Needless to say, these demands were rejected by the E.T.U. as 'wholly unacceptable and unwarranted interference' in E.T.U. affairs. Since then the E.T.U. has agreed to postpone the operation of the four sub-committees, but it may be suspended or expelled from the T.U.C. next month.

And now the Labour Party has appointed its sub-committee to consider the political implications of the affair and whether the E.T.U. should retain its affiliation to the Labour Party in the light of its Communist leadership. As the E.T.U. gave £40,000 to the 1959 General Election fund, this amputation would be a painful one indeed.

Finally, Scotland Yard has appointed its sub-committee to peruse the 1,750,000 words at a probe attended by Commander Evan Jones, head of the Special Branch, representatives of the Director of Public Prosecutions, Sir Theobald Mathew and top C.I.D. officers. The Yard, in its preliminary report to the D.P.P., will deal with the

'problem of union branch meetings. It will probe how the few came to control the many.' (Daily Mail, 7.7.61.)

The Yard's final report to the Public Prosecutor will have to wait, seemingly, until after the appeal against Mr. Justice Winn's judgment but by that time, perhaps, the Man from Interpol, currently investigating the activities of Solidarists, Syndicalists and Rank and Filers may, with the help of the Man on the Tightrope, have discovered for them that capitalism is inherently corrupt and criminal, that so-called Communism is itself State Capitalist tyranny, that Communism will not be defeated merely by rooting out Communist officials, nor by Labour or Tory policies, nor by courts, codes and constables. This will only happen when the many workers who now, understandably, have ceased to attend union branch meetings, became imbued with the revolutionary idea of a genuine rank and file struggle organised at the base—in the workshops, factories and mines—to achieve the real social freedom that comes with workers' ownership and direct control of all industry.

M. CALLINAN.

## Australia in the doldrums

SYDNEY

**P**OLITICALLY, industrially and economically Australia is in the doldrums. Unemployment is growing daily and the lot of the workers is becoming desperate. Thousands are being thrown on the industrial scrapheap as 'redundant'. Official Government report states 120,000 registered unemployed are on the dole. Trades Hall reports that there are thousands of out-of-works not registered. There are 90 factories working on short time. The unskilled worker faces a hopeless situation. Labour politicians weep hypocritical tears and blame the Prime Minister of Australia, Menzies, for all the misery and starvation of the unemployed! Staggering as it may seem, there is no Labour movement in Australia that can give these victims of a ruthless and vicious system a lead, or suggest any form of action or organisation to alleviate the crisis that envelops them.

Introduction of the diesel engines on the railways and scrapping of the old steam engines has played havoc with the railway workers. On the long inter-state runs, there used to be what were called 'railway towns', where the steam engines changed for overhaul. These are now 'ghost towns'. The railway workers have been uprooted and had to leave for other parts in search of employment. The diesel engine now shoots right through non-stop. Owing to the mechanisation of the coal mines and the loss of trade to the railways and industry, thousands of miners are on the dole.

The waterside workers had a merry time during the war and for years after, owing to radical reforms introduced by the Government, such as the gang system, the rotary system, where every wharfie got a job in his turn, the shift work of eight hours and the veterans' gang, where the elderly wharfie got a light job on the wharf. It was Government policy to speed up the turn-round of ships and keep the wharfies contented. Communist members of the Waterside Workers' Federation like to boast to those who do not know that it was their Communist secretary, Jim Healy, who got these reforms, but such is a palpable lie. However, progress has caught up with the wharfies and many hundreds have had to leave the industry. With bulk loading of wheat, sugar, meat, etc., and the more scientific handling of cargo and the mechanical contrivances on the wharves, the ranks of the wharfies have been greatly depleted. Qantas Airways paid off 140 employees as superfluous, nearly touching off a nationwide strike, and other airlines have drastically reduced staff.

Gradually, but surely, automation is being introduced into many Australian industries and hundreds of workers are losing their jobs, as redundant. The growing unemployed army is reaching alarming dimensions and the 'great' Australian Labour Party is hopeless, helpless and useless to do anything about this rout of the working people. The labour politicians are job-conscious (for themselves) and sit idly by, twiddling their thumbs, completely bankrupt of any worthwhile remedy to grapple with this national crisis that threatens Australia. They don't seem to have a clue and are mentally paralysed in face of this rising tide of depression.

Some of them call themselves socialists, but they are completely nonplussed when faced with a serious economic problem. Some propound nostrums in the House as a cure-all for the nation's ills, but when brought down to earth and asked what is their remedy for the agony of the starving unemployed, they sheer off like an unbroken coil. Their stock argument is to blame the Liberal Party Government and its bungling and to call for a Labour Party victory at the next election!

On June 10 the Australian Labour Party held its annual Conference at the Sydney Town Hall, where 760 delegates waited in great expectation to hear their Federal leader, Mr. A. A. Calwell. For over an hour this 'great labour leader' indulged in a tirade against Prime Minister Menzies. He spoke of Menzies' many trips overseas, the numerous after-dinner speeches he had made, all the good food and drink he had consumed, how he fawned on the Royal family and how worried he (Menzies) must be at not being able to

attend the wedding of the Duke of Kent. He wound up by prophesying a 'sweeping return of a Labour Government at the next election at the end of the year.' A dull, monotonous, barren speech. Not one word about the tidal wave of depression about to engulf the continent. He was myopic and mentally stagnant. He is hopeless, useless, decrepit. And this is the man who hopes to become Prime Minister!

The amazing thing was that not one delegate of the 760 rose to ask the 'great labour leader' a question. One would have thought that, out of the hundreds of trade union delegates in attendance, one militant voice would have cried out against the somnolent, moribund attitude of the Labour Party, while thousands of members of the working class were suffering from want, hunger and despair. But no. They would not embarrass their leader.

The Right-wing reactionaries captured the Conference. All the old, staid, safe officials were re-elected to leadership. A committee of 40 was a complete victory for the Right-wing ticket. And so the Conference ended. It must have had a depressing effect on thousands of workers who were looking to it for some ray of hope and encouragement in their daily struggles.

The Labour Party has been responsible for bringing into being that monstrosity, the Arbitration Court, with which all Unions must be registered. This Court has many penal clauses which are used against striking workers and it hears all applications for trade union awards. After hearing arguments by the employers' counsel and the union advocate, the Court fixes wages and working conditions for that union. The Court also sits in judgment on any industrial dispute reported by the employers. If, in the Court's opinion, it is an 'illegal strike', the union can be fined and ordered back to work.

Just to report one case among many others, a strike took place at the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. steelworks at Newcastle, New South Wales over an issue of victimisation in which ten unions were involved. The company reported the strike to the Court and three judges decided it was 'illegal'. Each of the ten unions was heavily fined, the total penalty amounting to £5,275. In case of refusal to pay a fine, the Court can put its official in charge of the union for 'contempt'. If the union still holds out, the official has power to wind up its affairs.

If a union so desires, it can withdraw from the Arbitration Court, but it will then have no legal standing and all union awards and working conditions are at the mercy of the employer. An unscrupulous employer can (if he can get away with it) pay his workers what he likes and work them under any sort of conditions, because they have no legal award and are outside the protection of the Court.

Some big industrial unions have been heavily fined for 'illegal strikes' and, no matter how they protested, they finally paid the fines to save their unions from disintegration. This is something the Australian Labour Party has fastened on the necks of the Australian workers. The Labour Party, when it has been the Government, has jailed strikers, frozen union bank accounts and, with the help of the police and scabs, smashed strikes. Never yet has the Labour Party supported a strike. With this ignominious record, this anti-working class organisation has the audacity to call itself 'Labour'.

Thousands of Australian workers have become so fed up with the labour politicians that they vote informal at election times. This has been responsible for the Tory Party under Menzies being in control of the Government for the last 12 years. Voting is compulsory. Failure to vote: penalty £2.

But all is not lost. It is cheering to know that not every worker, no matter how hard up he may be, has swallowed the chloroform of the Labour Party, or been bashed into servitude by the Arbitration Court. There are still many rebel spirits scattered around the country, who remember the heroic struggles of the past for Revolutionary Industrial Unionism. Syndicalism is being understood and rallying the scattered forces. With voice and pen agitation goes on for Industrial Democracy, for job control and finally workers' control of all the instruments of production in a free society of voluntary co-operation and mutual aid.

N.R.

## Workers' Voice

The Syndicalist Workers' Federation is now publishing a weekly, duplicated paper, *Workers' Voice*, in addition to *World Labour News*. This enables us to report and comment on day-to-day struggles of the working class and each issue is packed with up-to-the-minute information. Specimen copy, 5d. post-free, or 2 for 12 issues, 5s. post-free, from SWF, 25A, Amberley Road, London, W.9.

### MAKING 'PROGRESS' AGAIN

'PROGRESS', the militant Apprentice paper, which the E.T.U. and employers have tried to shut down, is again appearing regularly. Its policy: to support the formation of a national rank and file movement of apprentices, cutting across trade union divisions. Write for a specimen copy (3d. postpaid) to Brian Bamford, 39 Alder Road, Rochdale, Lancs.

## Pie in the Russian sky!

**F**OR THE FIFTH time since the war, the Kremlin has repeated the promise previously given in 1919, 1928, 1936 and 1942, that Russia is now beginning the transition to Communism—the withering away of the State, and that there will be free bread in twenty years; a promise that parallels the one given in 1924, '32, '38, '46, '50, '53, '56 and '60 that in four years' time all political prisoners would be freed.

In my last article (WLN, July-August), I described how the rule of the salariat in Russia changed as it became hereditary; how these changing pressures determined much of current Sino-Soviet politics. Deliberately I did not touch on opposition currents, although they modify the main trend.

At the end of the war in most parts of Western Europe, governments under Social Democrat influence grafted a degree of managerialism on to traditional capitalism—a process that had started earlier and had grown up with the war. This grafting was done in the USA during the New Deal. The disillusionment with Social Democracy and with Stalinism that resulted from the rise of the new boss class killed, to all intents and purposes, the old, predominantly Marxist Left and caused the years of apathy that immediately followed.

There was then, even in the Anarchist movement, no real understanding of the nature of Managerialism. Burnham and others (taking to heart the words of their former master, Trotsky, 'if there is a new class domination in Russia and elsewhere, then Socialism is no longer in the order of the day') ratted, in order to climb on the new bandwagon, and joined McCarthy. Those Fabians who had bothered to notice the passage of history, proclaimed Managerialism to be 20th Century Socialism and abandoned even their former bureaucratic ideas of a changed society.

But, like capitalism, Managerialism has its contradictions and naturally by now these have produced movements of partial opposition. The first of these was the changed face of imperialism. In Lenin's day, capitalism produced wars because of the rivalry of competing national capitalisms; now, in the age of the International Cartel, these are unnecessary (although for political reasons the fear of war is often thought necessary), but the very fact that capitalism is no longer jingoist allows cartels to back emergent nationalist leaders. So the just cause of anti-imperialism became backed by the self-interest of the economic imperialists.

Nationalists have been able to appeal to the more humane inhabitants of the Metropolitan countries and the first cause to harness the natural revolt of its youth was that of opposition to imperialism. This anti-imperialism was, of course, not limited to the West and because so-called 'Socialists' the world over were imperialist, this tradition of revolt became at times aggressively anti-Socialist. In Britain the movement largely started as a coalition of bourgeois liberals and the small Libertarian and Revolutionary Socialist Groups. Indeed, it lost much of its impetus when, after the fall of the Labour Government, its members increased substantially and the Movement for Colonial Freedom was formed, incorporating Stalinists and Social Democrats.

But anti-imperialist struggles in the West had less political consequence than those in Eastern Europe. The risings of East Berlin in 1953, Poland and Hungary in 1956, challenged the status quo fundamentally, despite the fact that those rebels who had any political views, for the most part merely believed in liberalising State 'Socialism'.

The changing needs of Managerialism, the desire for security of employment among the Russian salariat, the risings and the resistance of Vorkuta, caused a considerable modification of Stalinism; first the Thaw, then, after Hungary, instead of starving the satellites to feed the Russians, the process was reversed. Important though this was, other side effects were more so.

Two political currents, for instance, were born in Britain. The one, Neutralist, the other, Liberal Conservative. On the one hand, the fact that it became possible to criticise Russia without promptly being labelled pro-NATO, and vice-versa, allowed a growth of Neutralism outside the small, traditional Third Way groups. In this current we find the New Left, the CND, the revival of Leninism and finally the Committee of 100. On the other hand, opposition to Suez, coupled with a desire to put Britain's house in order, the better to criticise Russia, caused many to ally themselves with the MCF, to oppose Apartheid, to support War on Want and finally to embrace such causes as the Abolition of Capital Punishment and Appeal for Amnesty.

Abroad, pushed by the New Neutralism, Liberalism directly challenged the status quo, producing in America the swing to the Democrats and elsewhere a crop of student revolutions. In Russia itself the end of the supply of pillaged food, coupled with the new growth of dissent, caused a wave of strikes and so once again the supply of food was reversed (a reminder of the macabre joke of 1927: 'To advocate starving the Workers to feed the Peasants is a

Bukharinist heresy; the opposite is Trotskyism; the orthodox policy is to starve both').

In Britain the rise of the CND forced the CP to change line, in order to prevent the emergence of an Independent Left, in which it had no influence (a nightmare for any Communist General Secretary). This in turn forced Russia's hand. For years her propaganda had depended on empty Peace Offensives and calls for Multilateral Disarmament. Without in any way meaning to challenge Managerialism, Neutralism and the New Left have done so, so thoroughly that the Establishment has had to turn, for defence, to open reaction. Mao Tse-Tung has, in returning to pre-war Stalinism, abandoned all post-war developments and Krushchev is forced willy-nilly to follow suit. In the States to the John Birch Society and Goldwater Republicanism, in French Algeria and in Korea to open fascism and in this country to a press witch-hunt against the Left; all are symptoms of resurgent reaction.

Not merely did the Neutralists not mean to do this, but, not understanding, they must needs deny it. Isaac Deutscher, concerned to show that the Thaw goes on, tries to show that Krushchev backs Casanova against Thorez and so attributes the source of an article in the latter's *La Voie Communiste* to Russia, whereas, as Sforza showed, it started in Yugoslavia and Casanova has had to turn to Tito—presumably because he is not so backed.

However, the foremost contradiction in Managerialism is no longer Imperialism; the Cold War, necessary to scare the 'proles' into obedience, has produced an anti-war movement; in some places this is harnessed to anti-imperialism—and nowhere more so than in Eastern Europe. If it results in another showdown—provided that this does not spark off a world-destroying war—Managerialism will crack and Communism be forced to make substantial liberalising concessions.

This liberalisation will probably only at first bring the same safeguards that in the West we take for granted, and which Marxists dismiss as unimportant until these are breached and the Marxists themselves are affected. But arising out of this amelioration will be, for the first time, currents of radical protest that challenge the institution of Managerialism directly, rather than its abuses. Radicalism that may well not be conscious.

Managerialism, at least until now, has needed a state of international tension, so Stalinoid Tweedledee glares at Natoid Tweedledee. It has also been synonymous with centralisation and the drive to authoritarianism; with automation, the conveyor belt and modes of production that destroy man's individuality, with forms of accommodation and transport inimical to community and with bureaucratic indifference.

When in the first half of the 19th Century, capitalism first established itself, the movements of opposition were primarily humanitarian protests and instinctive self-protective reactions on the part of the oppressed-unions and Chartism. The few conscious politicians who supported these were limited to embittered former radical republicans, who held the cause of Liberalism betrayed by their former comrades (much like the modern Trotskyists). The Utopian Socialists, while they supported the Movement, saw no reason to put their ideas in terms of 'practical politics', for essentially their views implied the rejection of the 'practical'.

Had these movements of protest gathered sufficient momentum to break the new order, others no doubt would have embraced Utopianism; but they didn't and an age of hope died. Later, when the working class became conscious of its separate existence, it was offered 'practical solutions', that merely called for the overthrow of the old and said nothing of the society of equals, leading almost inevitably to the Dictatorship of the Salariat.

Socialism could, given favourable circumstances, have risen from the Humanism of the Utopians; it could also have risen from Revolutionary Industrial Unionism; it could not rise from leaders, whether parliamentary or insurrectionary. We are, however, now in a position not unlike that of the pre-Marxian Socialists, fighting a rising class dictatorship. When Trotsky, in his 'Testament', said 'Socialism must be taken off the order of the day,' he spoke as a State Socialist. But the death of Marxism and its replacement by Humanistic Radicalism offers Syndicalism new opportunity.

LAURENS OTTER

JUST OUT . . .

## The Labour Party Illusion

BY SAM WEINER

A LIBERTARIAN LEAGUE PAMPHLET

8d postpaid

# WORLD LABOUR NEWS

PUBLISHED BI-MONTHLY BY THE SYNDICALIST  
WORKERS' FEDERATION, 25A, AMBERLEY ROAD,  
LONDON, W.9, ENGLAND

Yearly subscription rate: 2s.6d

## Economic crisis again

ONCE AGAIN British capitalism is going through one of its crises. . . newspaper headlines have made us aware of 'our dangerous position'; Labour politicians have jumped up in Parliament with pretended indignation, denouncing the Conservative Government for its 'reckless policy' etc; Macmillan has poured out the usual empty phrases about 'restraint', 'tightening our belts', 'making sacrifices' and so on and on and on. The financial pundits have warned that we must raise our tariffs, lower our tariffs, slow down the rate of growth of the economy, increase its rate of growth, join the Common Market, at all costs avoid joining the Common Market.

What is the nature of this crisis? While countries such as West Germany and Japan seem to be almost permanently in a state of boom, the British economy is invariably in a state of stagnation, or suffering from inflation. In fact, it has managed to combine the two simultaneously—a feat previously achieved only by a few South American countries.

The average annual rate of growth of production per man, for the period 1950-59 is:

Japan 6.1%	France 3.6%
Italy 4.7%	U.S.A. 2.2%
W. Germany 4.5%	U.K. 1.7%

As this shows, the British economy lags well behind. The capitalist press, employers' federations, politicians and Treasury officials were unanimous in their diagnosis. One after another came reports and articles agreeing that the British workers were a lazy lot, that we were consuming more than we were producing and, worst of all, that the workers were sabotaging the economy by wildcat strikes.

One can understand ruling class apprehension over wildcat strikes, in view of their daily diet of rubbish churned out by the *Daily Telegraph*, *Express* and *Mail*. Reading these papers, one gets the impression that half the workers are permanently on unofficial strike. In fact, the time lost by strike action is a mere fraction of one day per man year.

Regarding laziness, it is amusing that people who have never done a day's real work in their lives and others who occasionally manage to squeeze the odd half-hour in between golf should criticise those who often put in 50 hours a week.

What, then, is behind the low rate of growth? Looking at the countries in the above table, they appear to be listed in ascending order of percentage of population engaged in productive work. Japan tops the table with its very high percentage of productive workers and relatively low number of non-producers, while Britain, with her vast and ever-growing armies of tax officials, inspectors, managers, clerks and typists—and, of course, those of 'independent means'—comes last. (In London alone, the number of office workers exceeds productive workers, quite apart from other non-producers.)

Another important factor has been the high interest rates. Since February, 1955 the Bank Rate has been 4% and above. As under capitalism, all interest rates are largely dependent on the Bank Rate and, in turn, investment and therefore rate of growth are determined by interest rates, rapid growth is clearly impossible with such high levels of interest. The Bank Rate is now 7%. As a comparison, it is interesting to note that it stood at 2% almost permanently for nearly 20 years, from June 1932 to November, 1951.

The most efficient way of increasing the rate of growth under capitalism is to decrease interest rates by lowering the Bank Rate. Why does the State not do so? A main reason is fear of inflation. The lower the interest rates, the more money is indirectly made available to consumers for spending purposes. At first glance this might seem beneficial to the average worker. What happens in practice, however, is that with more money in circulation, prices increase, or—to be more accurate—the value of money, measured in terms of commodities (i.e. its true value) decreases.

Value of the £1 in terms of what it will buy:—

June, 1938	June, 1958	June, 1959	June, 1960	June, 1961
£1	7s. 2d.	7s. 1½d.	7s. 1d.	6s. 11d.

Inflation has a tendency to increase in momentum and, if not

stopped while at a moderate level, can easily get out of control, as happened in Germany and several East European countries during the inter-war years. Consequently, the British Government has been faced with a choice between a policy of high interest rates, leading to stagnation and possibly to a recession, or a policy of low interest rates, leading to inflation.

A few weeks ago, the Government decided on a policy of very high interest rates and a 10% increase in Purchase Tax. Any Bank Rate of more than 6% can be regarded as very severe and a Bank Rate of 7% will almost certainly mean that the economy will cease to expand until the Bank Rate comes down. In recent years, the British Bank Rate has been above 6% only twice—7% in September, 1957, immediately the recession of 1958 started, and 6½% in September, 1929, followed a few weeks later by the Slump, during which unemployment rose to 23% of the working population.

The effect of the 10% rise in Purchase Tax will be to raise prices in general about 1½%. The following table is based on figures from *The Economist*:

	Monthly averages					
	Jan. 1956	1958	1959	1960	1961	
Wage rates	100	114.0	117.0	120.0	123.5	123.9
Retail prices	100	109.0	109.6	110.7	112.3	112.7
Real wages (in terms of purchasing power)	100	104.6	106.7	108.4	110.2	109.9
	1961					
	Apr.	May	July (est)			
	124.2	124.5	125			
	113.3	113.6	116.1			
	109.4	109.6	107.6			

The effect of the Government measures can be summarised thus:

a) There will definitely be no boom in the near future, unemployment will increase in a month or two's time and will continue to deteriorate until the Bank Rate is reduced to a much lower level. It is probable that the Bank Rate will be reduced in 6 months to a year's time; if not, a major recession will probably set in.

b) Wages, in terms of paper money, will rise, but at a much lower rate. The Press will continue to denounce wages as rising too rapidly, although in real value they will be lowered to 1959 levels, unless an effective campaign of industrial action is organised to fight it.

KEN MORSE

## Literature

"Direct Action" pamphlets:—

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE UNIONS?	by Tom Brown	5d.
THE HUNGARIAN WORKERS' REVOLUTION		6d.
NATIONALISATION AND THE NEW BOSS CLASS	by Tom Brown	6d.
WORKERS' CONTROL		6d.
HOW LABOUR GOVERNED, 1945-1951		8d.
THE BRITISH GENERAL STRIKE (now reprinting)	by Tom Brown	5d.
THE LABOUR PARTY ILLUSION	by Sam Weiner	8d.
ETHICS AND AMERICAN UNIONISM	by Sam Weiner	8d.
THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE	by Tom Brown	4d.
BULGARIA—A NEW SPAIN		8d.
THE LONDON YEARS (autobiography)	by Rudolf Rocker	15s. 0d.
THE IWW'S LITTLE RED SONG BOOK		1s. 9d.
FRANCO'S PRISONERS SPEAK, 1s. 6d. (issued by the Spanish Ex-Servicemen's Association).		

INDUSTRIAL WORKER	(fortnightly organ of the IWW)	4d.
SOLIDARIDAD OBRERA and CNT	(weekly organs of the Spanish CNT)	6d.
VIEWS AND COMMENTS	(organ of the Libertarian League, U.S.)	8d.

All prices include postage

S.W.F., 25a Amberley Road, London, W.9

## China—bureaucrats breed starvation

IT IS WIDELY thought that the Chinese Communist revolution was a peasant uprising and that the Chinese party is a peasants' party. Neither is true. The Chinese Communist Party believed in the dictum of Lenin that a peasant movement on a national scale could not exist by itself, that leadership from the towns must be imposed on the countryside.

'The city cannot be equated to the village, the village cannot be equated to the city in the historical conditions of the present epoch. The city inevitably leads the village, the village inevitably follows the city. The only question is which of the urban classes will lead the villages.' Lenin, 'The Year 1919', Works, quoted by Trotsky in *The Third International After Lenin*.

The activists of the CCP were not peasants, though some were ex-peasants. They were a party of professional politicians and full-time officials, who did not work on the land. The chief theoretician of the party has said:—

'More than twenty years of civil war and national war have steeled our Party. Several hundreds of thousands of Party members have given up their respective occupations in society for a long time and become engaged in revolutionary military collective life and life-and-death struggle.' Lie Shao-chi, *On The Party*, Peking, 1951, p.17.

True, there was a mass movement, or movements, of the peasants to gain the land, but this movement for land was not the work of the CCP, but a national hunger of the peasant expressing itself in common action. This the Communists exploited. The true peasants worked long and hard for little, they had no time or money to travel about China to form a nation-wide organisation. This the Communists possessed and used to take over the fruit of the peasants' revolt.

Nor did the CCP have much sympathy with the aims of the peasants, 'The land to the tillers.' Its policy does not show the consistency that such sympathy must produce. The party line on the land question changed as rapidly as the weather. While in the villages the struggle between peasant and landlord went on, the CCP held aloof from the struggle. At one time, nationalisation of the land; at another, control of farm rents paid to landlords (in one important decree, rent was to be reduced by 25%).

A balance of power among the rural classes, poor peasants, landlords and moneylenders was to be held by the party, one party document stating:—

'... the policy of the Party is only to help the peasants in reducing feudal exploitation, but not to liquidate feudal exploitation entirely, much less to attack the enlightened gentry, who support democratic reforms. Therefore, after rent and interest rates are reduced, the collection of rent and interest are to be assured; and, in addition to protecting the civil liberties, political, land and economic rights of the peasants, we must guarantee the landlords their civil liberties, political, land and economic rights.

'In settling rural disputes, the working members of the Party and the Government should base themselves on the above principles and follow a policy of adjusting the interests of both sides. They should not take a one-sided stand, either for the landlord or the peasant.' Quoted by C. Brandt, *A Documentary History of Chinese Communism*, pp. 278-9, London, 1952.

China's pre-Communist land problem was not that of, say, Tsarist Russia—an abundance of good, fertile land, with peasant land-hunger; that is, a question of the distribution of land ownership. In China, land ownership was much nearer equity. Chinese Communist figures on this subject are grossly exaggerated, even by comparison with those of the Comintern; though, of course, redistribution of land on a basis of equality would have benefited most peasants, but without solving most of their urgent problems.

Mao Tse-Tung, for example, wrote: 'Landlords and rich peasants make up approximately only 8 per cent of the population, but the land they hold generally makes up from 70 to 80 per cent of all the land.'

On the other hand, a well-known sociologist, G. C. Chang, has said that 51.7 per cent of the land was worked by peasant owners, 22.1% by part-owners and part-tenants, 26.2% by tenants.

Bukharin, during the twenties and before he was overthrown by Stalin, was rated an expert on the 'Chinese problem' and as such had to present reports to Communist congresses. Here are his figures of ownership of Chinese land.

Owning	Percentage of families	Percentage of Land
1 to 20 mow (1/6 acre)	49.5	15
20 to 40	23	22
40 to 75	15	25
Over 75	11	36

15th Conference of the All-Union C.P., Moscow, 1927, page 25.

Nor was starvation chronic. Great natural disasters, such as

flood and drought, brought famine, but between such all-too-frequent visitations, the Chinese peasant's diet, in quantity and quality, compared well with that of other Asiatic peoples, such as India.

China's chief farming problems were insufficient fertile land, an enormous population dwelling in the river valley areas, the closely related problems of drought and flood and a general lack of tools, machinery and capital. In their narrow circumstances, the Chinese peasants did very well, but the size of their diminutive farms forced on them a garden economy and a diet of vegetables, rice, pork, chicken and fish. The Chinese have a high reputation as gardeners, being considered second only to the Japanese. But such cultivation can afford little pasture and few trees, so that the land suffers and flood dangers are aggravated. Little pasture, few cattle and the absence of a large chemical industry leave only human manure and the compost heap as sources of plant food.

China's chief needs then were the development of the broad lands of the north for grain and cattle, as the occupying Japanese intended, a chemical industry to supplement natural manure, a developed farm implement industry to lighten the labour of the peasants, a social organisation to tackle large-scale problems, such as flood, drought and locusts, plant research and teaching and relief from the burden of money lending.

To solve these problems, economic, social and technical organisations were needed, but Communism excelled only in political organisation, with an overwhelming emphasis on repression, a police and militaristic state. Old China suffered as much from armies as she has from natural disaster, but the greatest pride of Communism is the creation of the largest army the world has ever known. The technical problems they cannot solve; beans do not grow or hens lay by political decree from the capital.

What little liberty the Chinese worker had, has been destroyed; we shall look later at how much bread he has had in return. The peasants have been forced into farm collectives and communes, the family, a strong—and broader than European—unit of society has been almost abolished. All freedom and initiative, even a man's own leisure time are gone. We can best express this briefly by quoting Richard Hughes, of the *Economist*:

'The Commune inmate works, eats, rests, drills, studies and attends talks and self-criticism meetings in a way of life that is eternally supervised. The compulsory tie-up with the militia imposes a final crushing military discipline to this existence in group conditions.' *The Chinese Communes*.

Industry, a little heavy and a deal of light industry, could do much to lighten the labour of the peasant and increase his productivity, especially in the provision of small hand or oil-driven pumps for irrigation. In some parts of China as much as one-third of labour is expended in irrigation, often little more than scooping water by hand or bucket.

Instead, too much resource has been taken to make China a 'heavy industry' nation for military purposes, including making tanks, guns, aircraft and warships and even on nuclear fission ventures.

While Southern China did not have much heavy industry, apart from European investment, Japan, during her occupation, had built up a huge engineering, textile, chemical and mining industrial complex in the North. These factories were never held by Chiang Kai Shek's regime, but fell into the hands of the Russians, who looted them of machinery and stock before letting the Chinese Communists have them. The more need, then, for China to devote much of her industry to assisting agriculture, instead of embarking on schemes of military grandeur. The Korean War, for example, caused an acute shortage of industrial goods and the creation of a vast army of soldier ants added to the goods crisis.

Settlement of the vast open spaces of the North would solve China's problem of overpopulation. Of course, settlement could best be achieved by voluntary movement, as was the settlement of Canada, the USA and Canada, and as was the earlier settlement of those territories by the attraction of free land. Although much of the North is dry, drought resistant breeds of wheat, millet and maize could be developed or imported. The vast lands could be used for cattle raising, as in Texas, where cattle are raised, then driven north to be fattened.

Instead of lightening the peasant's task, the Communists have added to it by forced military 'spare time' training, forced labour on public projects and by such mad schemes as the thousands of backyard 'steel furnaces', producing 'steel' and iron by methods used by man emerging from the Stone Age, wasteful of time and fuel, delivering an all but useless product.

In 1958 came 'China's great leap forward', when nature smiled and the harvest was good and fellow travellers proclaimed with the rulers that Communism in China had conquered natural disasters. In fact, their harvest figures were, self-admittedly, grossly exaggerated and poor seasons followed. Boastful man was made to look foolish by the forces he had 'conquered', as ancient China had so often fore-

told, but the bureaucrats were unable to comprehend that ancient wisdom that balanced the seven fat years against the seven lean.

Too much has been put into heavy industry, too much into militarism. Bureaucracy has blighted the land with its plans and norms. No norm is suited to every plot in this vast land, where few are the same. Small-scale cultivation and peasant ownership, in the circumstances, give the highest yield.

The bureaucrats even attacked the birds. Sparrows were eating too much grain; the sparrows must be wiped out. Now they have discovered that sparrows, with some other birds, were the enemies of insect pests, which are now devouring the crops. An even greater disaster was the decision to decrease the area of cultivated land, and flog the remainder, to release peasant labour for military and political schemes.

Well-supported reports from China—supported, too, by the inference in Chinese Communist publications—show that hunger is widespread, though China has bought 4,500,000 tons of wheat from Canada, Australia and West Germany. The sober and sympathetic *Observer* reports, 11.6.61:

'In Canton thieves operate openly, stealing food and other comforts brought by visitors from Hong Kong . . . In other cities, beggars importune in streets flanked by dirty, neglected buildings and half-finished blocks on which no work has been done for months . . .

'In the People's Communes, hungry and disgruntled farmers have stolen food, raided communal grain stores, even organised minor riots, and there are bands of peasants in revolt or in hiding to avoid reprisals in the hills of Kwantung and Shantung . . .

'Even Communist Party and administrative cadres have been filching food, dealing in the black market which has sprung up . . .

'Malnutrition has bred disease, particularly dropsy. About one of every five refugees recounts that in his village between 5 and 30% are sick with it.'

And the hordes of poor refugees risk their lives to pour into overcrowded Hong Kong and Macao. Bolshevism steals both bread and liberty.

TOM BROWN

## CUBA

## In Castro's jails

The following statement, by relatives of political prisoners held by the Fidel Castro regime on Cuba's Isle of Pines, has been forwarded to us by the Movement for Syndicalist Action (MAS), New York delegation. For obvious reasons the names of the signatories are omitted.

\* \* \*

**I**N the Isle of Pines prison are those condemned by the so-called tribunals, both common law and political prisoners. Since the fall of the dictator Batista, it has been so crowded that Fidel Castro himself paid a visit, to offer an amnesty to common law prisoners, on condition that they enrolled in the National Revolutionary Militias. The offer was rejected with scorn by the common law prisoners, in solidarity with the political prisoners and it resulted in a volume of abuse never before heard in the prison.

This reached the point where a common law prisoner confronted the governor and strongly expressed his disgust at the discomfort and privations heaped on the prisoners. He added that even when Fidel Castro was imprisoned there, he was allowed a table to play dominoes, while now he did not even allow them to read newspapers, receive or send letters, or accept food parcels and water. As a result of this argument and because of the insults, the prisoner was taken from his cell, beaten up savagely in the yard and left for dead. Consequently the common law prisoners have refused to co-operate in cleaning and other prison tasks, being punished collectively by receiving no visits and being sent to forced labour in the stone quarries. This led them to protest to Fidel Castro himself.

Prisoners are now allowed to receive money. This must be handed in at the visitors' desk and later entitles prisoners to buy provisions at the so-called 'People's Shop' inside the jail. The money is needlessly withheld for a month or more; later prisoners sign vouchers for their requirements and have to pay twice their value. More important, the shop has no aspirins, plaster or any kind of disinfectant, and not even half the provisions needed, such as milk, bread, butter, fats, etc.

Prisoners are not allowed to receive lunches, thus breaking with a custom by which many families used to live by bringing lunches to the jail. On visiting days, half the visitors' provisions are confiscated and they are pestered by word and deed. They are forced to queue in the sun from 8 a.m. to 1 p.m., after walking three kilometres, following an all-night boat crossing without sleep (the boat sails at midnight). This boat offers a macabre spectacle after visits.

It has no doctor on board and relatives of the prisoners, after seeing the condition of their families, return morally shattered. There are often deaths on board. On the last trip (June 23) an old lady died and eleven others arrived in a grave condition.

As prisoners are not allowed to write or receive correspondence, they can communicate only by the prison's wireless telegraph and mostly only to give notification of permission for visits. They must arrange for reverse charges, as otherwise, if they give a voucher in payment, the warders keep the money without sending the message.

Food in the prison is shocking and of a bare minimum quantity. Macaroni, in bad condition, boiled and unsalted, is given for 15-day stretches. At other times, during some months, there have been only boiled dry peas, without seasoning. The daily water ration for drinking and washing is two gallons for nine men in a cell which previously housed only two. The water is brackish and dirty. Previously it was filtered through wrapping paper by the prisoners, but the supply of this was stopped on the pretext that prisoners wished to set fire to the place with it. Prisoners suffer thirst and are in a deplorable hygienic condition; the brackish water gives them ulcers and sores.

For five days before visits, rations are increased, so that relatives may not be unduly alarmed. After visits the cruelty starts again. On the following day they are given only salt meat and there is no water issue. In consequence there have been various cases of suicide and madness.

Prisoners are subjected to continual inspections, being driven from their cells by blows from rifle butts, in their underwear even if it is cold and at all hours of the night. Several prisoners bear bayonet wounds on their backs following these inspections. A young man of about 20 is in a grave condition from these blows. An average of 90% of the prisoners are sick or weak from hunger. Of some 10,000 prison inmates, only 10% receive medical attention, owing to lack of medicines, which must be brought by relatives on visiting days. And when are these visits? At one point none was authorised in five months.

The most cruelly-treated prisoners are old militants of the 26th of July Movement, who dared to criticise or plot against the regime. Many of them have disappeared and it is a terrible sight to see their relatives searching and asking for them on every visit.

During the invasion and preceding bombardment of the FAA, on April 15, boxes of dynamite were placed outside the cell doors and prisoners were warned that, if the invaders landed, they would be blown up with the jail. Meanwhile they were constantly ill-treated and if anyone showed his face against the wire netting placed over the bars, they were fired on to scare them. Food and water were cut during three days; three men died and several were wounded by shots from the militia.

The writers of these lines are relatives of prisoners on the Isle of Pines. We hoped to include details from prisoners in other jails, but do not wish to enlarge further. What we can state is that on the Isle of Pines during April 15, 16, 17 and 18 firing squads were very active under the direction of 'Patifino' (the person's nickname). A young man, Diaz Balbin, was executed without trial, together with many others whose names will be given in good time.

We offer this denouncement by mothers, sisters and wives of the prisoners through the democratic press and ask that these atrocities be investigated. We believe it would be better for them to be investigated, before denouncing them to world opinion, for these and other things seem impossible and had we not seen them with our own eyes and in the flesh of our relatives, we would not credit that such things could be possible in the 20th Century, under a regime that calls itself humanist.

We ask international public opinion to intercede for these defenceless beings, at the mercy of pitiless fanatics. Only by looking at photographs of Hitler's concentration camp victims can you comprehend the fate of our relatives. We hope these men will not be abandoned.

Cuba, June 24, 1961.

## IWMA world call

**THE TENTH CONGRESS** of the International Working Men's Association (Toulouse, September, 1958) agreed to support the formation of "Groups of Friends of the IWMA" in all countries where sections have not yet been set up, with the aim of gaining sympathy for our International and of spreading its principles and propaganda as widely as possible.

We address ourselves especially to comrades and sympathisers in Africa, Asia, Australia and the Americas, Uruguay and Argentina excepted.

It is desirable that "Groups of Friends of the IWMA" should keep close contact between themselves in each country and they will receive our Press, propaganda and news of other countries through the international secretariat.

All interested in this proposal should write to the IWMA Secretariat (AIT-CNT), 4 rue Belfort, Toulouse (H.G.), France.

## Canada—Old politics in a new bottle

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

**FROM** July 31 to August 4 a convention was held in Ottawa to officially launch a new party on to the Canadian political scene. This was the culmination of nearly three years of planning by the professional politicians controlling the C.C.F. and the C.L.C.

The C.C.F. (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) was founded in the Prairie provinces in 1932 in the midst of the depression. At its first national convention, held in Regina in 1933, it adopted a conventional reformist socialist programme, calling for the nationalisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange. This programme was dubbed the 'Regina Manifesto' by the capitalist press and used as a bogey to whip up prejudice against the C.C.F. ever since, even though the party moved rapidly to the right as the depression came to an end with the outbreak of war in 1939.

It reached its peak in the '40s, when it came within one seat of winning a majority in the legislatures of Ontario and British Columbia and was voted into power in Saskatchewan, under the leadership of an ex-baptist preacher, Tommy Douglas, who has managed to remain in power through four subsequent elections. Elsewhere the party has been steadily losing ground. It quickly abandoned its early socialist pretensions in a bid to convince the electorate that it could make a better job of administering capitalism than the three existing capitalist parties.

At its Winnipeg convention in 1956 it made a vain attempt to live down its 'socialist past' by adopting a new manifesto, in which it called for a mixed economy in which private and public ownership would each have a place. This, needless to say, made no impression on the capitalist propaganda media and it is still referred to as a socialist party by press, radio and television. Just before the launching of the new party, the C.C.F. contained groupings ranging from anti-communist Marxists on the left to liberal capitalists on the right, with the right wing firmly in control.

The C.L.C. (Canadian Labor Congress) with over a million members has not now, and never has had any leanings towards socialism (not even the authoritarian reformist brand favoured by the C.C.F. in its infancy). Its leaders are firm believers in the capitalist system but, being political realists they know that the only source of potential support in their drive for political power is the working class and, in order to win that support, they are ready to outbid the old-line capitalist parties in promises of more welfarism.

A third grouping at the founding convention was a block of delegates from 'New Party Clubs' that had been formed across Canada in the past two years. These delegates, who had had no previous connection with either the C.C.F. or the C.L.C., were the unknown factor. They could conceivably have pushed the new party leftwards and upset the plans of the professional politicians who were expecting to have everything their own way. In the event these new party club delegates turned out to be the most right-wing of the convention and enabled its organisers to make their right-wing policies the official party line without any trouble. H. L. Wiprecht of Ontario was quoted as saying 'I'd like to see a new liberal party. I would not like to see a new socialist party. There's nothing wrong with the Liberal Party now except that they're not liberals any more—they are conservatives.'

The actual convention went off just about as expected, with the organisers experiencing only one minor defeat in the choice of the party name. They wanted 'New Party', but in the balloting the figures were:—New Party 614, New Democratic Party 329, Social Democratic Party 164, Canadian Democratic Party 156, Democratic Socialist Party 76, Others 113. (Note how few votes went for the Democratic Socialist Party).

In the run-off, the 'New Democratic Party' won by 784 votes to 743 for the 'New Party'. Power was firmly entrenched with the national executive, with such devices as a rule that the national council of the party can overrule the local constituency party choice of parliamentary candidate and substitute a candidate of their choice. Of course this power will be used, in the words of the chairman of the constitution committee 'very sparingly and only in emergencies' (where did we hear that one before?)

One of the nastiest things about this convention was the way in which the misery of the unemployed was played upon in a vote-catching gimmick. A section of the programme was adopted promising a job for everyone and guaranteeing full employment for all Canadians as a social right. Now the founders of this party know very well that full employment can never be achieved in a capitalist system (this is openly admitted by the capitalists themselves here in Canada), yet they have no scruples when it comes to buying votes with promises that they know in advance that they cannot keep.

Dr. Eugene Forsey, research director of the Canadian Labour Congress, opposed this part of the programme arguing, correctly, that it was an impossible goal (impossible that is within the framework of a capitalist society). 'If a New Party Prime Minister took office on that platform', he predicted, 'there would be line-ups of job-

seekers as far east as Montreal and west to Kingston—you might as well tie a block of cement to the Prime Minister's feet and drop him in the Rideau Canal.' With this last sentiment we Syndicalists are in hearty agreement.

Leadership of the party went to Douglas the Prime Minister of Saskatchewan, who soon showed himself master of the art of double-talk, so essential to a successful politician. Diefenbaker, the Tory Prime Minister, had said just before the convention that the next election would be on the issue 'free enterprise' v. 'socialism' to which the N.D.P. leader replied 'I accept the Prime Minister's challenge for the issue in the next election, but let us put the issue in its proper terms. The choice before the Canadian people will be either a planned economy, designed to provide full employment and a high standard of living, or an unplanned economy where it's every man for himself.' When asked by reporters how long it would take the N.D.P. to provide full employment, as it promises, he replied. 'It depends, that's a hypothetical question. It would depend on the state of the economy when it came to power, the federal treasury's resources and the unemployment situation'.

The most ironic commentary on the whole convention happened several thousand miles away in Victoria, the capital of British Columbia. There the Social Credit government announced that it had nationalised the B.C. Electric Company, a giant firm that supplies most of the electric power in the province. The irony is, of course, that the Social Credit Party is the most fanatical of the capitalist parties and its leaders are continually ranting about the evils of 'atheistic socialism' and singing the praises of 'our glorious system of Free Enterprise'.

A recent dispute between Trans-Canada Air Lines and the Canadian Air Lines Flight Attendants Association gave rise to one of the most shameful acts in recent Canadian labour history. The main cause of the dispute was the 'jet speed clause' proposed by the Flight Attendants, which would credit Attendants with extra flying time when on the faster jet and turbo-prop planes. The union asked for its members to be credited with an extra 25 minutes flying time for every hour of actual flying time on D.C.-8 jets and 12½ minutes for every hour actual flying time on Vanguard turbo-props.

The company rejected the union claim and a strike was voted by the union membership. Before the strike date Trans-Canada Air Lines asked for assurances from the other unions representing crew members that they would cross picket lines and scab on the Flight Attendants. These assurances were given by the unions involved and so, faced with the promise of wholesale scabbing made to the company by their fellow workers, the Flight Attendants had no choice but to call off the strike and accept what terms the company was prepared to offer.

BILL GREENWOOD

Fleet Street bloodhounds  
on the Syndicalist trail

**MUCH** of the national Press in Britain has, for most of this year, been waging a campaign against Syndicalism.

'A newly formed group of Syndicalists, Left-wing extremists who believe in worker-ownership of factories, is suspected of helping to foment the strike of 2,300 workers at the Cricklewood factory of Smiths Motor Accessories. The stoppage is crippling the motor industry.' *Sunday Telegraph*, 25.6.61.

'The British authorities have asked Interpol to trace any link between the militant activities of Syndicalists in Paris and Brussels and the growing movement in Britain.' *Sunday Telegraph*, 9.7.61. . . . The international syndicalist body, the International Working Men's Association, has headquarters in France and is also active in Belgium and Cuba.' *Sunday Telegraph*, 9.7.61.

The same journal tells us that reports have been made by two groups of observers, who have been 'researching' this activity and reporting to the Federation of Engineering Employers and the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions.

The campaign against Syndicalism was joined by the *Daily Mail* and *Daily Express*, with a daily circulation of about eight-million. Also in the attack have been the 'Economic League', an employers' propaganda organisation; 'IRIS', a right-wing trade union leaders' 'information centre,' and a firm of private detectives.

Joined, later, with the Syndicalists as an object of attack is the National Rank and File Movement, of which the SWF is a part. Daily the attack went on, with the obvious intention of chilling the blood of respectable citizens, especially employers and T.U. bosses.

'The Government, the Labour Party and the trade union leaders have received a warning about the activities of the Syndicalists, the newly formed (sic) group of industrial activists, who are suspected of