the form of their political programme that contained solutions to the major social problems; how did he define socialism and in the light of the name of his party, how did he relate pacifism to action for socialism. To the first question he had no answer at all but merely mumbled something about the party not yet having had time to thrash out a common policy. I put it to him that one usually began with agreement, especially on questions affecting basic policy and if they weren't yet agreed on policy, how could they possibly have approached the electorate. On the question of defining socialism, he said something about workers' control, but this didn't mean anything because he couldn't explain what he meant by it and it wasn't a language difficulty, he just didn't know. He said his party was against the A- and H-bombs and was opposed to NATO and favoured a policy of neutrality between East and West. What this could ever achieve I leave you to guess.

However my position was very difficult. I was a guest in his house and by now he was becoming very emotional and angry. I put the basic party's case and stressed the importance of socialist understanding. In rather sarcastic tones he said that we were right, had always been right and probably always will be right, but that we will never get anywhere.

Vanguards

I should just like to report to you on one other discussion. The Dutch Labour Party also suffers from that schizophrenic complaint common to most labour parties — a left and right wing. This duality is organised on the left wing by an enthusiastic Trotskyist, one Theo van Tijn who works hard in Amsterdam in the service of a vain dream enunciated biweekly in the journal Socialist Perspective. The idea of the master plan goes like this. Working class understanding of socialism is not only impossible but irrelevant to the establishment of socialism, but a socialist minority with the support of the working class at a time of widespread indignation such as occurred in Western Europe in 1945 or Russia in 1917, can capture political power and by degree usher in the new social order in spite of the working class. Immediately such a minority would nationalise all private property without compensation and from this time money and currency would lose their functions of being a common measure of value and means of exchange. Wages would cease to be paid as the value of labour but as production was now for use, would become a means of rationing out what was in the common pool, until such times as the efficiency of socialist society produced an abundance in which case money and wages would disappear.

Thus van Tijn and his friends are the archetypes of future man, manipulators of social systems, modern messiahs taking the cult of leadership to religious proportions, in wanting to lead the working class out of its darkness.

I put it to van Tijn that socialism involves more than a mere legal formality over a change in social ownership. He could capture political power and decree what he liked but this would not mean that success was guaranteed.

I pointed out that we too aimed at the capture of political power, complete control of the state for the purposes of abolishing it, but that this aim must be the culminating point of a much longer process which is in fact the real work of establishing socialism, that is, convincing workers that socialism is the only solution to their problems and insisting on their understanding of that point.

At the moment, the working class supports capitalism in a positive way, not only at the polls, but is also identified in everyday life with its values and prejudices and completely caught up in the drives towards its social ends.

No matter what the pretensions might be of any party capturing political power at the moment, so firmly does capitalism exert its ideological grip over the working class, no other society is thinkable.

Socialism is a society based on equality. The privileges of propertied society will have disappeared and in their stead every member of the community shares an equal responsibility for the organisation of society. Another reason why the task of establishing socialism must be the work of the working class itself.

One other thing I must mention briefly is the National Institute for Social History in Amsterdam which is concerned with documenting the entire world history of left wing movements and trade unions. They have done a tremendous job. It is a library to which anyone may have access. Many people come to this centre to study. It is extremely important that they are in receipt of not only all our own publications but also those of our companion parties.

P. LAWRENCE
Socialist Party, Great Britain

SOCIALIST BEACHHEAD IN JAPAN?

(The following is an interesting series of correspondence with a contact in Japan.)

April 19, 1957

Dear Sirs,

Please let me know the WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY OF U.S.A. What are the differences between you and the Communist Party of U.S.A. or the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation?

I am a Japanese student, in Nagoya University. Please reply soon.

Yours Sincerely, 岩崎重夫.

Iwasaki Shigeo

June 9, 57

Dear Friend Shigeo,

I hope you will excuse the long delay in answering your request for information.

The World Socialist Party is basically different from all other organizations professing to be Socialist or Communist in that we begin with a totally different concept of what a Socialist or Communist society will look like fundamentally.

First of all, let us define Socialism. It is **not** a conspiracy or a dictatorship (of any variety), or a "transition" or a consumer or producer cooperative, or a period under which one "produces according to one's ability and receives according to the quantity and quality of one's work" or any other such nonsense. **Socialism** is first of all a **System of Society** just like Capitalism is a system of society and so on. In other words, it is a sum-total of human relationships which will be altogether different from the human relationships which exist today or which existed under Feudalism and Chattel-Slavery.

Instead of a set of relationships based upon wage-labor and capital, or landlord and feudal serf, or slave-owner and chattel, the relationships under socialism will be entirely class-less in character because socialism will be a class-less society in which there will be production solely for use and not for sale. In other words there will be no buying and selling; no working for wages or salaries; no private ownership of the means and instruments of production and distribution; no money; and no national or religious or "racial" boundaries.

The World Socialist Party and its Companion Parties in other countries maintain that the technical advances necessary for such a society already exist. That all that is required for its realization is the understanding and desire for it on the part of a majority of the world's working class, and of course the political organization requisite to carry it out.

Anything short of this is not socialism, nor can socialism be attained by means of a campaign for immediate