

THE NEWSLETTER

Edited by Peter Fryer, 180 Clapham High St, London, SW4. Subscription 9s. for 12 issues, post free.

a service to socialists

Vol. 1, No. 20

September 21, 1957

PUT AN END TO THE TESTS — AND TO TORY RULE

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT can stop the manufacture and testing of the hydrogen bomb by Britain—if it treats the issue with the same urgency and energy that it showed in its reaction to the Suez crisis last autumn.

In nine days time the Labour Party's annual conference meets at Brighton. From this conference there can and must come a call for an unprecedented mobilization of Labour's forces.

If the Tory Government cannot or will not cut through the thick web of Great Power diplomacy that has been woven around this question, it is up to the Labour movement to take matters into its own hands.

Protect our people from nuclear annihilation. Protect our children and our children's children from the biological effects of these tests. Protect the human race from the radioactive pollution of our food.

This is what the rank and file of the British Labour movement expects from the Brighton conference: a call for demonstrations and pressure of every kind—including industrial action—to sweep away a government that puts the British people in deadly peril.

The Trafalgar Square demonstration is an important expression of public opinion. But it is only a beginning. The National Executive of the Labour Party and the General Council of the Trades Union Congress have tremendous power at their command.

Let them use that power. Let them lead the organized workers to end the tests and end Tory rule.

These are urgent tasks. How urgent is shown by the replies of a number of Labour MPs and Labour councillors to two questions put to them by *The Newsletter*:

1) What is your opinion about the continued manufacture and testing of the H-bomb by Britain, the USA and the USSR?

2) What do you think ordinary people can do about it?

Their replies appear below. They are valuable expressions of opinion. It is up to everyone who agrees with them to act—before it is too late.

Frank Allaun, MP: It Needs a Labour Government

THE Disarmament Sub-Committee has broken up after 125 sessions without reaching agreement on a single point. That has been the fate of disarmament talks since 1927.

What now? Are we to continue the arms race, with the same result as that of all previous arms races—world war? Every decent man and woman will say 'No'.

Then what is the alternative? I am convinced that one great nation must have the courage and sanity to 'contract out' of this suicidal race in nuclear weapons and declare:

Whatever other countries do, we will have no more tests; we will cease to manufacture A-bombs or H-bombs; we will turn over to peaceful atomic purposes the nuclear material contained in the bombs already made.

A dramatic psychological effect

I believe this action would have a dramatic psychological effect. It would break the vicious circle, lessen tension between the Great Powers, and produce that atmosphere in which agreement to end the bombs forever would be possible.

It should be accompanied by a reduction by one half of our fantastic arms programme of £1.420 million a year and a devotion of the resources thus saved to constructive ends.

This is unilateral, one-sided disarmament, or, as I prefer to call it, disarmament by example.

Would this 'leave Britain defenceless'? We might as well admit, as Duncan Sandys himself has done, that we are defenceless. To be accurate we are **more** vulnerable as a base for H-bombs than if we did not possess them.

As Aneurin Bevan told the House of Commons in the Suez debate: 'Our civilization is too delicate for the use of the jackboot. A country can no longer impose its will on other countries by the use of force.'

Very many thinking people who have never called themselves pacifists have been driven by the growth of dreadfulness of modern weapons to the view that violence can now only achieve suicide. This is, of course, quite apart from the moral objection to dropping a bomb on cities of a million men, women and children.

What can ordinary people do about it? They can make their views known to their MPs by going to see them, writing them, sending them petitions. They can bring their influence to bear on the Prime Minister and other Cabinet Ministers. The TUC might well send its most powerful deputation round to 10 Downing Street.

As this government, however, is largely composed of militarists who believe that ends can only be obtained by force, I think a most important step towards saving mankind from disaster would be the return of a Labour Government with a determination to end the arms race.

(OVERLEAF: S. O. Davies, Fenner Brockway, Emrys Hughes, Walter Monslow, etc.)

S. O. Davies, MP: We Are Fighting for Survival

THE MANUFACTURE and testing of hydrogen bombs and all forms of nuclear weapons are, in the last analysis, the most dangerous form of criminal lunacy that has ever possessed the petty politician bewildered and overwhelmed by revolutionary scientific discoveries, and by the call of this age for revolutionary changes.

This has not been made more tragically obvious than in the speech of the present Minister of Defence at Canberra a few weeks ago. Read his words and decide for yourself whether you have ever read or heard anything as irresponsible.

He told his audience, and he tells every man, woman, and

Fenner Brockway, MP: Accept the Russian Proposal

1) I think Britain should accept the Russian proposal for the immediate cessation of H-bomb and A-bomb tests and that the continued manufacture of nuclear weapons should be stopped under international agreement and inspection.

2) Ordinary people should manifest their determination that these preparations for human suicide should be ended.

This determination can be expressed by demonstrations, letters to the Press and a tremendous pressure on Members of Parliament through letters and demands for interviews. An overwhelming expression of opinion could be effective.

Walter Monslow, MP: An Unceasing United Campaign

1) There should be forthwith a cessation of all nuclear tests and manufacture of the H-bomb by Britain, the USA and the USSR.

2) Ordinary people should maintain an unceasing united campaign throughout the country, inviting representatives of the Christian Churches and all others of good will to participate.

Coun. H. Finch (BIRMINGHAM) Labour Must Give Fighting Lead

1) I am against the manufacture or testing of the H-bomb by any government.

2) Ordinary people will respond to a fighting lead. H-bomb 'Suez' demonstrations are needed. Labour and TUC leaders must be forced to give this lead.

The TUC have called for the ending of all tests. They should be prepared to call for 'industrial action' demonstrations as well.

Ordinary people should put the pressure on in their union and Labour Party branches for such action.

Coun. R. Mowatt (HENDON) Working-class Action is Needed

1) I am opposed to the H-bomb, as I am opposed to imperialist war. I regard testing as a preparedness on the part of the 'Big Powers' to defile and endanger the future of mankind to serve their present-day diplomatic interests.

2) The initiative must come from the Labour Movement, and we should demand—after the Suez pattern—that the Government cease the tests now.

Not merely petitions, or reliance on the United Nations, but working-class action!

child in this country that: 'We have taken a very bold step in deciding not to do the impossible. We decided not to defend the whole country but to defend only our bomber bases.'

The rest of the country will be blasted to rags and tatters, or the most fortunate will probably die a lingering and ghastly death.

The ordinary people must now fight for nothing less than their survival. They must demonstrate in their millions against this warmongering which means annihilation; the politicians must be made to understand that the making and testing of nuclear weapons must stop, and the trades unions must immediately realize that the fight now is for survival not only of their members but of the whole of humanity.

Emrys Hughes, MP: Stop this Useless Business

Britain should stop the manufacture of the H-bomb, go out of the business of making useless and obsolete armaments and devote all her energies and technical experience to producing the machinery and goods that the world needs for raising the standard of life everywhere.

That is the only way to build up a really sound economy on a solid basis.

Ordinary people should urge their MPs, their trade union leaders and everybody who can change public opinion and influence the Government to change its policy, which is leading to inflation and national bankruptcy and which might end in national suicide.

Coun. F. Evans (LEICESTER) Let All Play an Active Part

I think the manufacture and exploding of atomic and hydrogen bombs should be stopped by all countries. In any case I think Britain should cease their manufacture and use immediately.

The safeguards against any one country breaking an agreement on this subject could be worked out afterwards.

Ordinary people can help by taking an active part in their democratic organizations—not only Labour Party and trade union bodies, though these are the most important, but all organizations; by trying to get these policies adopted; by notifying their MPs, local councillors, newspapers and any other avenues open to them; in the last analysis by working for peace and common sense policies and a new Labour Government.

Coun. L. Lake (LEEDS) One Force Can Rally People

Much has been written about the genetic and other material ill-effects of the H-bomb. Equally terrible are its social effects.

Here is a weapon with the power to end civilization, manufactured behind closed doors and guarded by an army of secret agents. The people of the world stand perplexed and apprehensive.

Only one force can rally their latent opposition. This is the force of organized Labour. A clear lead must be given now by the British Labour movement for the immediate ending of the manufacture of all nuclear weapons.

WERE THERE MURMURS IN THE FO'C'S'LE?

An article in *Sovietsky Flot*, organ of the Soviet Navy, discusses instructions issued by the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the party organizations in the armed forces.

The key phrase appears to be: 'Criticism of commanders' orders and instructions is not allowed at party meetings.'

SCIENCE | New Facts on the Strontium Peril

By J. H. Bradley

A RECENT article in *Nature* gives an account of the official experiments on the uptake of Strontium-90 fall-out by plants—experiments whose meaning and ominous results no British newspaper has seen fit to mention.

Rigorous safety precautions were used, and the work was done with Strontium-89, which is safer but has exactly the same chemical behaviour.

The work, though very far from satisfactory, was more systematic and scientific than suggested by the official account given in the House of Commons.

It is interesting to note that higher strontium-calcium ratios are found in roots than in leaves and shoots, a result which is rather surprising and of great theoretical importance.

Even a little Strontium is dangerous

The very small amounts of strontium needed for these experiments do not appreciably influence the uptake of calcium. It is calcium which strontium replaces: very little strontium is enough to be dangerous.

Different plants show different degrees of uptake, which can be due in part to the different structures and levels of their roots. A fuller table of the uptakes as related to root structure and depth of ploughing could easily have been included, but perhaps would have made the question uncomfortably clear for some politicians.

It is urgently necessary to extend the trials beyond sugar beet, rye grass, and barley, to include important crops such as potatoes, green vegetables, lettuce, tomatoes, and wheat.

Indeed, one wonders why no crop for human food was chosen for these trials—sugar is, after all, the most carefully purified article of human diet!

Nor do the investigators put forward any reason for their choice based on the classification of plants.

It was shown that stubble led to 25 per cent greater uptake than fallow—a result of great scientific significance, which in itself can lead to extensive work and a good deal of elucidation of obscure questions in the uptake of minerals by plants.

Uptake after using a rotary cultivator was 0.388 per cent;

after ploughing to a depth of seven inches 0.526 per cent; after seven-inch and twelve-inch ploughing, 0.442 per cent.

The seven-inch ploughing simply brought the strontium down to the roots, while the figures given show that twelve-inch ploughing brought 70 per cent of it back to the surface, with the obvious result.

In addition, we are told that the 'hard subsoil' (chalk!) was at nine inches depth, so that twelve-inch ploughing brought an extra 25 per cent chalk into the topsoil, i.e., about 300 tons per acre.

It is not then surprising to learn that liming at half a ton an acre had no effect, even allowing for the very bad mixing in ploughing.

The ploughing trials are interesting as showing that in a heavily contaminated area after an H-bomb explosion, harrowing might be the best treatment to give. Fall-out should be buried as far as possible, to cut down direct radiation dangers.

The complete unreality of so-called Civil Defence in Britain will probably mean that this very important question of the best method of disposal will be completely ignored.

Again, we are told that fall-out is 'relatively soluble' but not relative to what. Maybe it really was 'much as when washed down by rain', but every scientist wants very good evidence before believing that.

It has solved no problems

This investigation has raised many problems, and solved none: which is not surprising, in view of the choice of those high-calcium conditions which any schoolboy can understand are bound to give the most favourable of all possible results for the Government.

Perhaps this why the strontium-calcium ratios are given for the plants, but not for the soil. Rough calculations suggest that the two figures are not greatly different if the soil has about one per cent chalk in the top 10 inches.

Unfortunately this figure is much too low, and the conclusion is that there is a strong preferential uptake of strontium—the very fact the Government wishes most to conceal.

Trials on the calcium-deficient Welsh mountains will tell a much worse story again.

The Week at a Glance

IRAQ: Security police arrested four men described as leaders of an 'underground communist cell' in Sulimaniya, northern Iraq. Large numbers of leaflets were seized.

INDIA: Five people were killed when police opened fire on a crowd of about a thousand at Thuval, a village in southern Madras.

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: Police used tear-gas to break up a demonstration by telephone workers striking for more pay and arrested twenty-five.

GHANA: Mr. Christopher Shawcross, QC, who last week reported Daily Telegraph correspondent Ian Colvin in the Accra Divisional High Court, was banned from re-entering Ghana.

GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC: Dr. Adenauer and the Christian Democrats won a sweeping victory in the elections, securing almost 15 million votes and an absolute majority of 43 in the new Bundestag.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC: East Germans recently beat up State officials in Sachsen-Anhalt, said a court at Hettstedt. One man was sentenced to two and a half years' hard labour for beating a local mayor who lost an eye as a result.

POLAND: The trial began in private of three former members of the Polish security service for 'illegally depriving a number of people of their freedom' and 'recommending and allowing other junior officials of the public security to apply physical torture' towards arrested persons.

FINLAND: The director of the Bank of Finland announced a 39 per cent devaluation of the Finnish mark. New rate for the £1 sterling is 896, compared with 676 before devaluation.

USA: Retiring director of the International Co-operation Administration, Hollister, announced that foreign aid funds are no longer to be used to finance profit-making industries financed by foreign governments. 'We play into communist hands when we help to socialize a country,' said one ICA official. The State Department later contradicted Hollister's statement, said there was no change in U.S. aid policy.

Newsletter Pamphlets

● The Lessons of the Covent Garden Defeat
HARRY CONSTABLE 2d.

● Russian Youth Awakes
MAURICE PELTER 2d.

Obtainable from The Newsletter, 180, Clapham High Street, London, S.W.4.

Automation Demands Real Nationalization

THOSE delegates to the Labour Party annual conference who intend to speak in the discussion on future nationalization policy would do well to give their attention to the National Executive Council's report on automation.

True, this is only an interim report, and a fuller document will be issued later for discussion at the 1958 conference.

But the delegates will find here cogent arguments why 'old-fashioned' nationalization remains imperative, not simply as a means of resuscitating bankrupt industries or to punish 'wicked' capitalists who place private gain before public good, but as an essential first step on the road to socialism.

UNEMPLOYMENT OR ADVANCE? Automation puts before our industrial society the choice of two roads.

If the ownership and control of the means of production is left in the hands of the capitalist class, the introduction of automatic machinery will mean that many hundreds of thousands (perhaps millions?) of unskilled and semi-skilled machine minders and clerical workers will find themselves unemployed.

The capitalist economists will see realized their most cherished dream of a high reserve army of labour which could be used to drive down the standards of all workers. Capitalism will once again have achieved 'normalcy'.

Alternatively, effective control and direction of the introduction of the new industrial techniques can open up rich fields of human advance.

LEISURE FOR CULTURE. The increased rate of production will make possible a greater amount of leisure in which working men can expand culturally.

The sciences and arts will be enriched as never before in human society. But this can only happen if the means of production are firmly in the hands of the whole of society.

During the industrial revolution the Luddites destroyed the new machinery; this was their blind reaction

to forces they did not understand. For them the machine was only a threat to their livelihood.

But the Labour movement has come a long way since then. Today it knows that the machine can be an ally in the march to a better civilization and a fuller life—but only if the machine comes under social ownership and control.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS. The NEC document asks four questions which it does not attempt to answer.

It wants to know:

How far management is capable of the imaginative enterprise and willingness to invest that are necessary if automation is to be introduced on an adequate scale;

Whether management has a sufficiently enlightened approach to the problem of co-operation in industrial relations;

How receptive British workers are to new ideas and how ready to cultivate new skills; and

Can the trade unions adapt their machinery to respond to the new demands that may be made on it?

The answers to these four questions depend almost entirely on the nationalization policy which will emerge at Brighton.

NEXT — WORKERS' CONTROL. With the decisive sections of industry firmly in the hands of the State, the Labour movement will be able to move on to the next phase—the discussion of workers' control over management, which will immediately change all existing conceptions of industrial relations.

With the change-over from production for profit to production for use, the British workers will show that they are not only ready but eager to try out new ideas and acquire new skills.

And in that context the part trade unions will have to play in the new society will also be worked out.

George Cunvin

PRESS

ENTRANCED . . .

'She was composed. She was consummately at ease . . . Her clear, sweet voice was wafted over the crowded floor . . .

'By no means did she read the speech closely. She was constantly glancing around with calm eyes as she went on unhurriedly, pausing between sentences, conscious of dignity and making dignity conscious. A beautiful voice, happily still a little girlish, but maturing and enriching.

'The audience was entranced with her naturalness . . . Mr. Harold Macmillan . . . thanked the Queen for her trouble . . . with a twinkling eye and a smile . . .

Daily Express, September 13.

. . . DISILLUSIONED

'Mr. Ian Harvey . . . underlined the significance of [Mr. Macmillan's] words with loud handclaps. These were rather feebly taken up by some of his colleagues . . .

'Mr. Macmillan rather spoiled his "spontaneous" praise of the Queen by reading his speech from a carefully prepared script written long enough before for some members of the audience to be following him on duplicate copies . . .

Daily Herald, September 13.

INDUSTRY

LONDON BUSMEN WANT 25s. A WEEK RISE —BUT WILL FRANK COUSINS AGREE?

By Our Industrial Correspondent

THE NEXT big test for Frank Cousins is being set for him by the busmen. The London Road Transport Passenger Committee of the Transport and General Workers' Union has decided that a claim for a 25s. increase in wages should be submitted to the London Transport Executive.

The General Executive Council of the Union is discussing the claim this week.

Last year the London busmen claimed an increase of £1 and threatened to strike when the LTE refused this. After private conversations with the employers Cousins reached an agreement on an increase of 7s. 6d. per week, which he only managed to sell to his members by getting it back-dated ten weeks to November 1, 1956.

This sort of cheating soon becomes obvious, however, when it is discovered how little 7s. 6d. will buy these days.

Because Cousins smoothed things over then does not mean that he is going to find it so easy now.

Cousins was then faced with demands from his provincial busmen members, who for a long time have put up with low rates compared with those applying in London.

A strike of nearly 90,000 workers, lasting nearly two weeks, took place in London on the principle of the rate for the job.

It was aimed at ending the differential between the wages of London busmen and those paid to the men working in the provinces. This meant a claim for between 25s. and 30s.

Everybody knows what happened. The Industrial Court, without even hearing a case from the union, awarded 11s. The Government was not yet ready for a real showdown.

At a conference of his members it took Cousins about three hours to convince them to accept the award, and the almost 50-50 vote which resulted showed what many busmen were thinking.

The London Transport men supported their brothers in the provinces throughout; many branches made donations to the strike fund, and London busmen refused to work over routes normally covered by provincial workers.

Had the union asked for their active support as a demonstration of their agreement to the principle of the rate for the job, there is no doubt they would not have hesitated to come out on strike in sympathy.

It is easy for both sections of passenger transport within the TGWU to see the anomalies which continue to exist in their industry.

There is no co-ordinated system of transport in the country. On the one hand there is the LTE, serving London and the suburbs, and on the other there are the services owned by the municipalities and those run by private companies.

The busmen know that the only way to give the public the service it needs is to take over the whole industry and plan it on a national basis.

Uniform wages and conditions

This would eliminate the differentials now existing between the two sectors of the industry, and a uniform system of wages and conditions could be introduced.

In fact the National Committee of the TGWU in the Passenger Transport Section has gone on record for 'the complete public ownership and control of the road passenger industry', and has asked that the next Labour Government should legislate to this effect.

On the surface it appears that Cousins has the choice of either supporting the London busmen as a single unit—despite the still outstanding claim for the provincial men—or refuse to submit the London claim on the basis that this will upset the recent award to the provinces, which decreased the differential.

And it is quite possible that this is the way he will put the question to his General Executive Council this week, especially bearing in mind that of its eleven bus delegates only one represents the LTE workers, and the rest are from company or provincial services.

London's claim quite justified

The TGWU is well known for its policy of using one section of the membership against another, and Cousins is quite capable of continuing the method.

But the claim on the part of London is completely justified, especially remembering the measly 7s. 6d. increase of ten months ago.

The right thing for the TGWU to do is to support the claim, and at the same time reopen negotiations on behalf of the provincial busmen for the abolition of the London differential.

In this way the whole of the passenger transport workers would be solid and strengthened in the fight to maintain their standard of living, and at the same time a unified wage system could be achieved.

Such a clear policy would also lead to a far better understanding of the situation on the part of people outside the industry—whereas it can only lead to real confusion if the London claim is negotiated, then followed once more by a claim on behalf of the provinces.

FORUMS

LONDON FORUMS TO CONFER ON AIMS

A SPECIAL autumn conference is being held by the London Socialist Forum to discuss the aims and work of the socialist forums and to consider a statement of aims and a number of organizational proposals.

Forum members 'and other interested individuals' are invited to the conference, which takes place at the Holborn Assembly Hall on Sunday, October 20. The conference fee will be 2s. 6d. per person.

Proceedings will begin with a discussion on 'The British Labour Movement and the Aims of the Socialist Forums', opened by Mercia Emmerson and John St John, with Joe Young in the chair.

After a tea interval the draft proposals for the policy and organization of the forum movement will be considered, discussion being opened by Ian Ramsay (secretary of the London Socialist Forum) and Dick Goss, with John St John in the chair.

Statement of aims

This is the statement of aims, as agreed by an extended meeting of the London Liaison Committee of Socialist Forums last July:

1) The London Liaison Committee of Socialist Forums considers that the Forums should continue to be independent discussion centres bringing together as many shades of socialist opinion as possible.

They should not aim to become rivals or alternatives to existing political parties. Their aims should be:

a) To discuss problems of socialist theory.

b) To maintain regular appraisal and criticism of the current policies and actions of socialist parties at home and abroad.

c) To help to evolve a clearer perspective for the achievement of socialism in Britain, and to formulate the more detailed current policies required, and to seek to influence opinion in favour of them.

2) For the furtherance of these aims the following methods are strongly recommended:

a) The London Liaison Committee should establish as soon as possible a Speakers' Panel to assist local forums.

b) The Committee should also circulate to local forums suggested topics for discussion and study.

c) The forums should endeavour, within the fields of chief interest to their members, to carry on discussions in as systematic a manner as possible and to publish or circulate to other forums any agreed conclusions or results arrived at.

d) Forums should where possible set up study-groups on particular questions, aiming at the production of written conclusions, policy proposals, etc.

e) Forum members should be encouraged to participate as fully as possible in the specialized socialist study-groups being sponsored in London by the Universities and Left Review Club whose functions are recognized as being similar to those of the forums.

f) The forums should strive to establish close relations with other organizations of the Labour movement and to secure the widest possible participation of their members in the forums.

g) The journal Forum should be supported as the main link between local forums, which should contribute articles, reports and news to it.

h) Liaison between forums at regional and national level should be maintained and developed.

Organizational proposals

These are the organizational proposals that will be put before the conference:

1) **Quarterly conferences** of representatives (any number) from each local forum. The conferences shall have power to

(Continued overleaf)

FORUMS (Continued from previous page)

take decisions by majority vote on matters arising from the 'Statement of Aims' of the London Socialist Forum.

2) **Liaison Committee** shall be elected by the conference once a year and shall be responsible for arranging quarterly conferences, implementing decisions, generally co-ordinating [the] work of [the] London forums, and maintaining links with forums and similar organizations throughout the country and abroad.

It shall have power to appoint sub-committees to carry out particular tasks under its control.

3) **Sub-committees.** The following are recommended at the present time:

(i) **Publications** To be responsible for Forum and all matters relating to the publication, distribution and sale of literature.

(ii) **Central Meetings** To be responsible for arrangement of all central London meetings; to produce a speakers' panel for large meetings and for local forum meetings.

(iii) **Forum Development** To assist the development of existing forums and to help create new ones.

Amendments to these documents will be accepted from forums by the conference secretary, Richard Goss, 42, Beaconsfield Road, Eltham, London, S.E.9.

DOCUMENT**JOSEPH CLARK'S LETTER OF RESIGNATION**

This is the full text of Joseph Clark's letter of resignation from the U.S. Communist Party, as published in the *New York Daily Worker* on September 9, 1957.

REGRETFULLY, this will be the last time I speak my piece as an editor of the *Daily Worker* and member of the Communist Party. After 28 years of association I am resigning from both because I find it is no longer possible to serve the cause of American socialism through them.

I continue to adhere as strongly as ever to the ideal which brought me into the communist movement—a world free from poverty, racism, injustice and war.

This has become a categorical imperative in the atomic age. Unless the exploitation of man by man is ended it is impossible to conceive of humanity living in both peace and freedom.

It is a grievous comment on the situation in our country, as well as in the Communist Party, that I am the first to resign from the party by making it known through the *Daily Worker*.

The most recent meeting of the party's national committee was told that at least 7,000 of the 17,000 reported members last year, have left the organization. About 60,000 quit in the previous decade.

However, the great majority could not resign publicly because they were never able to declare their affiliation in the first place. This is because freedom of thought and association in our country has been infringed by legislation such as the Smith and McCarran Acts.

Furthermore, many who resigned were concerned, as I am, lest opponents of democracy and socialism utilize their resignations to defame the high ideals for which they joined the Communist Party and to which we have devoted some of the best years of our lives.

It is a source of pride to me that I have never concealed my views and aims. This includes that very first classification interview when I joined the ranks of the United States Army and served my country together with 15,000 other communists in the armed forces.

Among those who left the party before me were the great majority of its working class and Negro members, active trade unionists, as well as writers, scientists, professionals and also party organizers, Smith Act prisoners, *Daily Worker* editors and reporters.

Loss of membership is only one indication of the complete isolation of the Communist Party from the struggles of American labour.

Having once been the major organization—in 1935-1945—to continue the century-old socialist tradition in this country, the reason for such total isolation today must go far deeper than the mistakes we made.

Many of those mistakes have been catalogued by the self-criticism of the party during the past year.

But fundamentally, the demise of the party is related to that of every other socialist movement in our country since the days of the first Marxists here.

Not content with growing directly out of the struggles of the American people, and basing themselves on the specific conditions of American life, these movements have unwittingly tried to impose their dogmas on the struggles.

The party became a sect primarily because history rode roughshod over dogma. Since the trend is toward aggravation of this process the party has become a hindrance rather than a means for advancing socialism.

I was among those who greeted the progress recorded at the last convention of the Communist Party. It affirmed its American character and its dedication to constitutional democracy. It proclaimed its independence and came out against dogmatism and sectarianism.

The convention promised a search for new paths and new organizational means through which the American people would arrive at socialism.

This was a natural result of the crisis in our movement following the revelations about the evil degeneration caused by Stalinist communism.

The hope and promise of that convention have not been fulfilled. Sad confirmation is found in the record of the last national committee meeting held July 27-28. A summary of the proceedings has been published in *Party Affairs*, vol. 1, no. 1.

Readers will notice that instead of a search for more effective means to advance socialism the meeting took up the most incredibly irrelevant questions.

★

For example, dozens of speakers discussed at great length what one of them quaintly called 'the question of Joe Clark.' One after another condemned my views. A grand climax was reached with full unanimity: 'that the national committee register its disagreement with the line of the *Daily Worker* foreign editor'.

Their judgment could be perfectly correct. I am only too keenly aware of my own fallibility. But while my views and my 'line' were condemned no one could detect what my views and 'line' were.

The *Party Affairs* bulletin reveals not a single reason, no argument, not one idea for that condemnation. As in the days of Stalin something is declared 'right' or 'wrong' with no obligation to tell why, what or how. One must accept on faith.

Such debate may resemble medieval scholasticism, but bears no kinship to the probing, analytical method of Marxism which fears no ideas or theories but subjects them all to calm analysis.

Though the national committee voted against removing me as foreign editor it explained that was because of 'its relations to outside forces at the present time, when we are in this difficult, weak stage'. At a different stage, other steps, presumably, will be in order.

★

The fact is that I find it difficult to write as I please in the *Daily Worker*. Not that my writing is directly censored.

But within the framework of harassment in the party and an obligation to those who share many of my views, but are concerned with proper 'tactics' in the inner-party struggle, I simply do not express my views as I would like to.

Though the reader won't find it in the record of the national committee meeting my view is that socialism can be served only by a complete break with Stalinism.

The latter perverted socialism by substituting autocracy for democracy. But Marxists have always advocated socialist democracy, which they uphold as more libertarian than any yet attained.

It is my view that to advance the all-important goal of American-Soviet friendship one must win the people for strong opposition to the cold war diplomacy of John Foster Dulles. But to do this one must also take a critical view of what is wrong in the Soviet Union.

Are we helping socialism and the Soviet people if we seem to go along with Khrushchev when he proclaimed that Malenkov was responsible for the evil that Stalin wrought?

I have no doubt that Malenkov, as well as Khrushchev, was implicated in those evils. But the roots of the evil require a better explanation than the 'character' of Stalin or Khrushchev's latest gloss: 'Malenkov not only did not restrain Stalin, he very skilfully took advantage of Stalin's weaknesses and habits in the last year of his life.'

To support Khrushchev against Molotov and Malenkov, as the party and Daily Worker have done, is no service to socialism or the Soviet Union.

Wrong though Molotov has been, the Soviet people face the perspective, and I think will succeed, in producing a new leadership, one which is not responsible for the crimes of Stalin as BOTH Molotov and Khrushchev are. American socialists should be partisans of socialism everywhere.

But one cannot have an independent stance, or a scrupulous regard for truth, and support the 'unity' of the Soviet Communist party behind Khrushchev, as the Daily Worker did editorially.



Since there is no prospect that a common sense, Marxist view will prevail in this regard, party membership has become incompatible with a truly socialist position.

The only effective posture from which American Marxists can work for American-Soviet friendship—necessary if mankind is to survive in a time of hydrogen-headed ICBM weapons—is that of independence.

The issue was posed directly at the last convention of the party by the letter of Jacques Duclos, who, for a second time, meddled in the affairs of the American communist movement.

The essence of the Duclos letter was rejected by the convention. But, unfortunately, it was not argued or specifically refuted in a way which would establish beyond a shadow of a doubt the independence of the American Communist Party and demolish the slanders of J. Edgar Hoover.

I refer particularly to Duclos' declaration that proletarian internationalism 'implies solidarity with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.'

History is replete with instances where the opposite is true. In 1939 internationalism required support for the anti-Hitler war, not the shameful neutrality of both the French and American Communist Parties.

And in 1956 proletarian internationalism required solidarity with the Hungarian workers opposing Soviet intervention. It demanded support for the Hungarian workers who formed a solid phalanx of workers' councils and for their 100 per cent solid general strike.



It meant solidarity with the views expressed by Janos Kádár in his November 1 radio address when he was still with the Hungarian masses, and said:

'Our people have proved with their blood their intention to support unflinchingly the [Nagy] Government's efforts for the complete withdrawal of Soviet forces.'

There is no prospect that party leaders will rebuff the Duclos argument quoted above, not in generalities, but with specific reference to the Duclos letter. All efforts that I made to get a specific refutation of the Duclos statement were rebuffed.

Therefore to remain in the party tends to lend support to the disastrously un-Marxist policy which has time and again isolated us from the American workers, as in 1939.

Communism on a world scale has been the major current in our time through which socialist transformations have taken place.

The successful revolutions in Russia, China and Yugoslavia, and the socialist transformation in Poland last October, have advanced socialism as an issue for our time.

But these revolutions have created no guides or patterns for socialism in most Western countries, and certainly not for ours.

Marxism realized its greatest triumph in the Russian and Chinese revolutions. It also reached its most serious crisis as a result of Stalinist perversion of the Communist movement.

Within the Communist countries there is great hope for socialism in the complete elimination of Stalinism which deprived socialism of its humanism and high moral principles and which replaced scientific method with a religious-type dogma.

Within our own country communism has made an important contribution to the welfare of the people.

A high point was reached in the decade of 1935-1945. We were to some degree in the mainstream of American labour and of the country.

Social security, the industrial organization of labour, the development of a popular folk culture, integration of the Negro people, were important achievements of American democracy to which we contributed.

But that is past and no movement can live in the past. Even during the period of our greatest success we were never a mass party and we were never able to bring socialism into the arena of American political thought and action.

It therefore seems to me that we are entering a period when all questions relating to socialism and America are up for reconsideration.

Certainly no organization exists today as a proper vehicle for socialism. No fixed dogma can guide our study. Our starting point must be American reality, as it is today, not as it was a century ago when Marx studied it.

We must begin from fact. This is a virtue of Marxism we have often forgotten. And we must above all maintain the moral and humanist essence of socialism.

The very best friends I have, some of whom are still in the party, may justly ask why I take this step now.



Why didn't I resign at the time of Khrushchev revelations on Stalin, or during the Hungarian uprising? The reason is that I had hopes for the cause of those opposing Stalinism within the party. The Daily Worker opened its pages to free debate unparalleled in any other American newspaper.

But nevertheless, the hope I had for the party died. The hope I have for socialism remains as it has for 28 years. The discussion, the ferment and debate about these questions will bear fruit.

And out of the struggles and ranks of the American working class will come the new organizations that will help us find a path to a free commonwealth of all who labour.

The striving for freedom, equality and justice has motivated and continues to motivate the majority of communists everywhere.

All can therefore find a way better to serve the American people in their quest for greater freedom, abundance and peaceful coexistence. I, for one, shall try to do so.

JOSEPH CLARK

CINEMA

NOT SO BITING AS IT COULD HAVE BEEN

A King in New York

CHARLIE CHAPLIN'S latest film could have been a biting satire on contemporary America. Charlie plays exiled King Shahdov, thrown out of his country by a revolution and forced to seek safety in the 'land of the free'.

We see the King finger-printed by the immigration authorities, see him ogling beautiful women on the television screen while taking a bath. We visit a cinema showing trashy film trailers to an audience of hysterical teenage rock-'n'-rollers.

We see the corrupted 'morality' of the Un-American Activi-

(Continued overleaf)

CINEMA (Continued from previous page)

ties Committee, where a ten-year-old boy becomes a hero by being a stool-pigeon, and naming all his parents' Communist Party friends. We see the Committee powdering their faces ready for the television cameras, only to be drenched by Charlie's fire-hose.

Yet the film is not up to Charlie's standard. Technically it is badly edited, and many of the scenes are too drawn out. The early scenes with his ten-year-old son are overdone.

None of his attacks on the American system is directed at basic issues; atom bombs are mentioned, but nothing is really said about them. The only consistent attack is directed at commercial television.

The evils of modern America are depicted as a 'passing illness', and the film ends with Charlie leaving for Paris, hoping the future will be brighter.

How different were the messages of 'Monsieur Verdoux' and 'The Great Dictator', where Charlie demanded action from the audience. Even so, the film is well above average.

Bob Potter

STALIN'S VIEWS ON IVAN THE TERRIBLE

By Leonard Hussey

FILMGOERS who remember the Russian film star Nikolai Cherkasov as the Tsarevich Alexei in *Peter The Great*, or in other roles, will be glad to know that Moscow's Foreign Languages Publishing House has brought out an English version of his fascinating memoirs, *Notes of a Soviet Actor*.

What a pity, though, that one passage, of some historical interest for the light it throws on Stalin's outlook, has been omitted.

In the Russian original, published in 1953, Cherkasov

records how, with Eisenstein, he visited Stalin in 1947 to discuss the second part of the film 'Ivan the Terrible', which they were then making.

'Talking about the activity of Ivan as statesman, Comrade Stalin observed that he was a great and wise ruler who guarded the country against penetration by foreign influence and who strove to unite Russia.

'In particular, speaking of Ivan's progressive actions, Comrade Stalin stressed that this tsar was the first to introduce a monopoly of foreign trade, adding that after him only Lenin did this.

Terror organization was 'progressive'

Joseph Vissarionovich mentioned also the progressive role played by the Oprichnina [Ivan's terror organization—L.H.] and said that its head, Malyuta Skuratov [a sort of Judge Jeffreys in Russian popular tradition—L.H.] was a great Russian commander who died a hero's death in the Livonian war.

'As regards Ivan's mistakes, Comrade Stalin remarked that one of them was that he did not manage to liquidate the five remaining big feudal families, adding humorously that "here God hindered Ivan".

'The Terrible Tsar would liquidate one Boyar family, then spend a whole year praying for forgiveness for his "sin", when he should have acted even more resolutely! Then Russia would have been spared the Time of Troubles . . .

'At the end of the interview, Joseph Vissarionovich asked how we proposed to conclude the film.

'I replied that the film was to end with the campaign in Livonia and Ivan's victorious arrival on the shores of the Baltic . . . His cherished dream has been realized and, gazing far out to sea, he ends the film with the words: "We take our stand upon the seas and here we will stay!"

'Comrade Stalin smiled and exclaimed cheerfully: "Well now! That's just how it was—and even a good deal better!"

LETTERS**'YOU FORGOT THIS CLP'S FIGHTING LEAD'**

IN its commentary of September 14, entitled 'Towards Brighton', THE NEWSLETTER states:

'Unhappily none of the motions about the Rent Act, as they now stand on the Brighton agenda, is entirely adequate . . . Mass demonstrations up and down the country; refusals by Labour-controlled councils to help implement the Act; organized resistance to evictions: these are the only steps which can meet the situation.'

It is a pity that you have forgotten so soon the Small Heath CLP motion, which still stands (unamended) on the Brighton agenda.

The Newsletter itself, in reviewing the preliminary agenda [July 27], stated that this resolution gave a lead on the Rent Act.

I quote the resolution in full for the benefit of your readers and I do hope that all who are delegates to the conference will fight tenaciously for it to become conference policy.

'Actively encourage all resistance'

This conference notes that the Tory Government has ignored the nation-wide protests made against its pro-landlord Rent Act.

'Recognizing that the implementation of this Act will cause misery and hardship to millions of tenants, it resolves to campaign nationally against the implementation of the Act.

'It declares that for this purpose it will actively encourage and participate in all movements by tenants to resist rent increases and evictions and will endeavour to link them to the Labour Party and trade unions—and will support any industrial action taken to prevent the landlords implementing this reactionary Act.

'Conference pledges that it will approach all wings of the Labour movement to win support for this policy.'

Birmingham 9

(Coun.) H. Finch

WHAT WINCOTT'S LETTER DOES NOT SAY

SOME readers of THE NEWSLETTER may have noticed that the *Daily Worker*, which kept silent about the Len Wincott case during the whole period of his imprisonment and exile, has now published [September 12] what purports to be a statement from him.

Apart from its unconvincing character and marked stylistic difference between this and the 'Spirit of Invergordon' of which Wincott's authorship is proven, the following points remain to be settled:

(1) Why if Wincott is free must letters go to him c/o Charles Coutts and not direct?

(2) Whether the Soviet Government is willing to state publicly that Wincott is free to return to England with his wife to visit his family if he wishes?

(3) What compensation he has been offered by the Soviet Government and what public rehabilitation has been given him?

Until these points are satisfactorily settled the reality of Wincott's 'freedom' will remain open to doubt.

The pressure which may have been brought to bear to obtain this statement is obvious.

The hypocrisy of the Communist Party, which reviled all those who carried on the campaign which brought his release from imprisonment and exile and now seeks to gain credit for the release this campaign has brought, passes all imagination.

London, S.W.19

H. Kendall

THEIR LIFE BEGAN IN 1953

That Stalinist propaganda about the happy life of collective farmers was phoney—at least until recently—is admitted in an article on a group of collective farms in Rostov region in *Sovetskaya Rossiya* of September 5:

'It was not so long ago that these collective farmers could only dream of paid holidays, old-age pensions or going to health resorts.'