PARTY NEWS

DUBLIN, EIRE:— The opposition liberal parties, i. e., Government and "Parliamentary Opposition" parties all seems to be liberating now — and no wonder! The cost of living has kept ascending and the two rival Trade Union Congresses have collectively terminated the old wage agreements, and are at present running hither and thither between Government department and department and Labor Court (officially-blessed "conciliation" machinery!) and Party.

The break-away T.U.C. (the so-called "Congress of Irish Unions") has advised its member unions to limit their wage-claims to 12/- per week! 12/- per week or 3¼ d per hour on a 44-hour working week! And the cost of living and **profits and production** skyrocketing. It is clearly obvious that the C.I.U,'s 3¼ d an hour demand is not the demand of the members of its unions, for we have heard of no mass meeting of union members called to frame new wage-demands. This 3¼ d an hour is the C.I.U.'s contribution — as its own statement said — to the effort to "stabilize the economy." The C.I.U. executive decided the 12/- per week boost, not the union members. Yet it is the C.I.U.'s case against the Amalgamated Unions here that they are dominated by cross-Channel (British) executives. And here, in this most important instance, the C.I.U. blatantly practices what it alleges it is opposed to. Its union executives have decided on a wage policy without consulting the rank and file. Oh, Democracy, where hast thou fled? But perhaps there's some subtle distinction between domination by a British union executive and an Irish one. Anyway, it would seem it's more, much more, patriotic to be bossed by your own native capitalists and **union officials.**

As for "stabilization of the Irish economy": stabilization in whose interests? "Stabilization" is not far removed from standstill (wage-freeze). Irish workers will recall, with no feeling of pleasure, the notorious "Standstill Wages-Orders" introduced by the previous Government. **That** policy resulted in stabilization all right; stabilization of wages but **not** of profits and prices. Can we be so naive as to imagine that another dose of stabilization will produce any different results? True, the union executives (of both Congresses) may work the oracle again but it would not be surprising if they have greater opposition to overcome this time. There may be some minor skirmishes on the industrial front. Time will tell.

In the meantime, our need is for the increase of socialist knowledge. Our weekly notes in the "Mail" continue to appear besides not infrequent "letters to the editor" in both the "Mail" and "Irish Times." The Dublin branch continues its discussions after Branch meeting on Tuesdays. Three or four additions have kept the Dublin Branch well up to strength.

CCF AND SPGB LITERATURE

Vancouver, B. C.
October 4th, 1950

Editor "Western Socialist"

Dear Comrade,

In your issue of Aug.-Sept. you carry an article by Boreas, about the CCF National Convention held in Vancouver this summer.

This article deals with the situation very well and brings out a number of important and significant points, but there is one inaccuracy that I think it is important to correct, I refer to the remark about the banned pamphlet being "bootlegged at double prices."

All literature is sold at cost, and the proceeds go to buying more literature. I had three copies of the banned pamphlet "Is the Labor Government the way to Socialism." Two were sold and the last one I gave to a reporter after the incident.

Subsequently I have sold a lot of copies, since a new lot came in, strictly "on my own" as I was dismissed as Lit. Sec'y!

Incidentally, we had been selling that, and other SPGB pamphlets, through the Provincial Education Committee of the CCF for the past year.

The B. C. Section of the CCF has on hand other SPGB pamphlets. We have been able to buy SPGB literature ever since I can remember from CCF Headquarters. This "banning" action was a new departure. Though I will say in recent years the socialist literature has taken a back seat in B. C.

Comradely yours,
EVE SMITH

THE WESTERN SOCIALIST

VOL. 18 — No. 158 BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS JAN.-FEB., 1951

THE ASIATIC MUDDLE

The chips are down! Despite the lack of official governmental declarations and Mr. Truman's oft reiterated hope of "avoiding war," U. S. capitalism is involved in warfare both in the economic and military phases — a conflict which is rapidly shaping up as the fiercest in all history — a struggle for the world.

Back in the summer of 1950 the phrase used by the U. S. Government to describe what was transpiring with its economy was "creeping mobilization." The object was to bring enough military and industrial pressure into play to win the Korean War, but not to expand the mobilization to anywhere near that of the "emergency" of 1940. This tactic proved sufficient to push the North Koreans into decisive defeat, but the entry of China's "volunteer" army from behind the Manchurian border and the ensuing rout of the U. S. forces has brought about a quick step-up of mobilization in this country to a fast gallop. We are now blessed with the return of many war control boards with new titles and new charges d'affaires, while the drafting of the nation's youth into military service proceeds at a much faster pace. It looks as though American capitalism is heading once again toward total war economy.

It would seem, as of January 1951, that the lines are quite clearly drawn, the alliances firmly established. This appears to be a fight between the U. S. A. with its Western satellites on the one hand and Russia with her "comrade" nations in Europe and Asia on the other. But "there's many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip" and there's no guarantee that, despite the apparent community of interests between Russia and China for example, or between America and the nations of Western Europe, that the lineup of antagonists in 1951 will be the same in '52 or '53 or '54.

PERMANENT ALLIANCES?

Alliances and friendship pacts between nations have nothing permanent about them. They are not based upon so-called common ideologies but on economic and military expediency. It was sound economics and militarily expedient for the U. S. to ally herself with Soviet Russia and vice versa during World War II despite the so-called different ideologies. Nor has the Leninist background of the Tito regime in Yugoslavia and the Fascist ideology of Generalissimo Franco in Spain in any way inhibited an alliance between them and the U. S.

On the other hand is not because of Mao Tze-tung's espousal of "Leninism-Stalinism" that he has the Soviet Union as an ally. Only five years ago when its Chinese "comrades" were locked in civil war with the Nationalist armies, the U. S. S. R. signed a 30-year "Treaty of Friendship and Alliance" with Chiang Kai-shek's National Government and at