

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

JOURNAL
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

10th YEAR No 1

JANUARY 1960

SIXPENCE

WITCH HUNTS AND WILD CATS

BY 'PUNCH'

Flushed with their latest electoral victory, the Tory Government is giving clear signs of its intention to attack trades unionism. The Labour Party has been defeated at the polls. Now the working class must be broken in its own stronghold. Wages must be held down. Shop stewards must be disciplined. In particular, 'unofficial' strikes must be outlawed. 'Trouble makers' should be sacked. Trade union money should no longer be available to finance parliamentary Labour

candidates. The House of Commons should pass into the permanent possession of the Tories. All of this is perfectly understandable. That is what big business put the Government there for. That is the nature of Toryism.

Cesspool

In well-drilled obedience to their master's voice, the Fleet Street press is in full cry. The old bogey 'red plot', which served

them so well for thirty years, has now been abandoned in favour of the rock 'n roll jargon of "wild cat" which now greets every move made by working men to defend themselves. That too is perfectly understandable. That is what the millionaire press is for. That is the nature of the Fleet Street cesspool.

Great Hunt

We do not expect leopards to change their spots, nor jackals to cease howling. But what of trades unionism? How is the leadership of the very organisations that are under attack meeting the Tory challenge?

Right at the very top of the top layer of the trade union hierarchy something is certainly being done. The greybeards of the General Council of the TUC have roused themselves from their slumbers and are up and doing. Are they erecting the barricades?

Tory Government shouts "down with the trade unions". The Fleet Street tripe-hounds whip up the hysteria about "wild-cats". The General Council jumps in to do the dirty work for both of them, using language almost identical with that of leader writers in the "Daily Mail." The "witch-hunters" of the T.U.C. and the "wide-boys" of Fleet Street, unite with the Tories and start the great hunt of the "wild-cats".

Of course, it is only 'unofficial' strikes that should be outlawed. Official disputes (i.e. those of which the big shots themselves approve) are quite constitutional, legal, and perfectly proper (unless, of course, they happen to be led by the ETU, old Ted Hill, or some such "commie" layabouts). And, if that doesn't strike you as being fair, reasonable, and ever so respectable, then you don't deserve to have a soft £25 a week job in this grand old democracy.

In the past two years the only official strikes have been the Busmen's and the printing workers'. Otherwise we have had a series of what the press is pleased to call "wild-cats". The image presented to the public has been of groups of workers fighting as to who is to draw the chalk line while patriotic managements mourn the loss of export orders.

Some unofficial strikes are the result of demarcation disputes. Such strikes tend to occur in industries which are declining (e.g., ship-building) and in places where unemployment is high (e.g. Scotland). In these the worker's fear of losing his job is expressed in a way which reflects the backwardness of the industry concerned.

A much larger number of unofficial strikes, however, are of quite a different kind and show what can be achieved by clever and far-sighted employers in their own interests. In 1949 wage claims put forward by the engineering unions were met by a offer of higher bonus rates. This, said the employers, would relate wages more closely to output. The employers' offer was accepted. To allow bonus rates to increase rather than basic wages then became a general policy of employers. The result is that now in many industries average hourly earnings are much higher than basic hourly rates. Workers have become uninterested in fighting for an increase in basic rates which are negotiated by the unions at national level. We now have disputes between employers and small groups of workers, at local level, about bonus rates for a particular job. Such disputes often lead to unofficial strikes. This is seen particularly in the building industry and in the BMC factories.

The employers have succeeded in dividing the workers. While the unions, because of their willingness to co-operate with employers in relating wages to output, have tended to become pushed out of the industrial picture, leaving the worker to struggle without support. That the busmen can still strike with the support of their union results from the fact that the nature of their work makes them difficult to divide: they either conduct or drive. Besides their union structure—branches based on garages—makes the formal machinery fit closely to the job. They cannot be divided any further according to the nature of their work (attempts have been made, however, to divide them on a regional basis) or into official and unofficial bodies. A man who earns 7/- an hour can hardly be expected to feel strongly about small increase in his basic 1/7. But he will readily see advantages in: a shorter working week without loss of pay. The shorter working week as an issue is especially important now that automation is reducing the demand for labour. It is also an issue in which workers can unite. **Working hours must be reduced. Hourly rates must rise to maintain basic wage levels. Bonus rates must increase in the same proportion as hourly rates.**

PLEASE NOTE

From now on all correspondence
should be addressed to

**117 CARMELITE ROAD,
HARROW WEALD, MIDDXX**

Are they calling upon all affiliated unions to unite and gird their loins for battle? Are the Knights of the Round (TU) Table donning their armour? Like hell they are!

The TUC General Council is conducting an enquiry into "unofficial" disputes, and, even before it begins its investigations, its most died-in-the-wool right wing spokesmen are given peak-hour spots on commercial television to denounce all such strikes and the shop stewards who lead them.

And so we witness a most nauseating division of labour. The

21 Years

It is at this point that the sheer snivelling hypocrisy churned out by Fleet Street literally makes one vomit. The ending of 'unofficial' strikes means virtually the ending of ALL strikes—and the Fleet Street boys know it. Lest anyone doubt this, let us take a look at the history of the London busmen. Let us rule out all the 'unofficial' disputes among Lon-

● contd. on page 8

HOW CAN WE MAKE THE LABOUR MOVEMENT MOVE?—see page 3

TORY MP

with acknowledgment to Labour Research

Of the 365 Tory MPs (including Tory associates) at least 156 (42 per cent) are or formerly were company directors; they sat on at least 537 companies. This includes 127 MPs on the "active list" now sitting on at least 467 companies, and 29 who were directors of 70 companies before they took office.

Many of their companies are small ones, and many are subsidiaries of larger firms. In the analysis below we have picked out 128 of the larger and more important concerns and attempted to show their size in relation to assets, or net assets. The combined results are as follows:

	£
6 Banks—assets	3,130m.
10 Insurance Companies—assets	727m.
2 Hire Purchase firms—assets	98m.
10 Investment Trusts—investments	39m.
100 Companies—total net assets	126m.

Banks

There are 6 MPs who are or were connected with Banks. They are:

Bank	Assets £m.	M.P.
Lloyds	1,267	*D. Heathcoat Amory
National Provincial	906	*J. S. Maclay
Martins	342	C. J. Holland-Martin
Yorkshire Penny Bank	102	ditto
Standard Bank of South Africa	352	ditto
National & Grindlays	161	Sir Toby Low

In addition, Sir J. D. Barlow is on the Manchester Board of Barclays Bank and E. R. G. Heath was formerly a merchant banker.

* An asterisk denotes former directors; when MPs join the Government they relinquish their directorships.

Insurance

At least 26 MPs are or were directors of Insurance Companies, including the following:

Company	Assets £m.	M.P.
Alliance Assurance	74	*J. Selwyn Lloyd *Hon. Hugh Fraser
Colonial Mutual Life Assurance	130	*Lord John Hope
London & Manchester Assurance	61	Peter Thorneycroft
General Accident, Fire & Life Assurance	101	Maj. W. Hicks Beach
Northern Assurance	89	Lord Hinchingbrooke
Guardian Assurance	128	C. J. Holland-Martin
Equity & Law Life Assurance	56	I. J. Pitman
Royal Exchange Assurance	85	Michael Hamilton
Planet Assurance	1.7	*Reginald Maudling
United Scottish Insurance	1.1	W. S. Duthie

Other former directors include Henry Brooke, while Geoffrey Lloyd was on a local board of Eagle Star. Other present directors of insurance companies include Sir A. N. Braithwaite†, C. F. G. Gough, E. H. Leather, D. Marshall, F. W. Farey-Jones; those on local boards include L. R. Carr, Sir Arthur Harvey, Sir Charles Mott-Radcliffe, Sir J. R. Robinson, Sir Cyril Black, R. G. Grosvenor, Sir T. C. Moore.

Anthony Royle (son of the Chairman of Home and Colonial Stores) was an insurance broker until he was elected; so was A. Tiley; Clive Bossom, Albert Costain, John Farr are members of Lloyd's.

Finance

5 MPs are or were connected with Investment Trusts, as follows:

Investment Trust	Investments £m.	M.P.
Premium Investment Co.	5.1	*Geoffrey Lloyd
Cedar Investment Trust	3.7	Sir G. C. Touche
City National Investment Trust	0.9	ditto
Sphere Investment Trust	7.9	ditto
Trustees Corporation	10.2	ditto
1929 Investment Trust	2.6	R. M. Speir
Hellenic & General Trust	4.9	ditto
London & Aberdeen Investment Trust	2.9	C. W. Cooper-Key
General Securities Investment Trust	0.4	D. Marshall
Melbourne & General Investment Trust	0.7	ditto

MPs connected with hire-purchase include Lord John Hope, formerly a director of United Dominions Trust (assets £94m.) and Sir E. Errington on Astley Industrial Trust (assets £3.8m.).

Others connected with finance companies include E. du Cann on Unicorn Securities; F. M. Bennett on Equitable Securities of Canada; Sir H. d'Avigdor-Goldsmid, bullion brokers; Cyril Osborne on a stockbroking firm.

† Sir A. H. Braithwaite died soon after the election.

Steel and Engineering

At least 25 MPs are or were directors of steel or engineering firms, and the firms concerned include several of the biggest.

Company	Net Assets £m.	M.P.
(1956-57)		
STEEL FIRMS:		
John Summers	53	Sir Spencer Summers
Dorman Long	74	Sir Toby Low
Samuel Osborn & Co.	6	John Osborn
ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING:		
General Electric	61	Sir Toby Low
Assoc. Electrical Indus.	114	Antony Head
Morphy-Richards	4.4	F. P. Bishop
Morgan Crucible Co.	13	*T. K. Vaughan-Morgan
A. C. Cossor	5.8	*C. I. Orr-Ewing
MOTORS & AIRCRAFT:		
Assoc. Comm. Vehicles	14	Sir Wavel Wakefield
Westland Aircraft	4.6	Sir N. J. Hulbert
Handley Page	3.7	Richard Collard
SHIPBUILDING & SHIP REPAIR:		
John Brown	25	Sir Toby Low
Grayson, Rollo & Clover		
Docks	1.7	P. Rawlinson
J. Samuel White	1.5	*Reginald Maudling
HEAVY & CONSTRUCTIONAL:		
Newton Chambers	5	Sir Peter Roberts
Walter Bros.	0.7	Alan Green
Richard Johnson & Nephew	6.2	*F. J. Erroll
Enfield Cables	4.0	ditto
MACHINERY MANFG.:		
Monotype Corporation	2.5	{*Harold Macmillan
Wellman, Smith Owen	2.2	{M. V. Macmillan
W. H. Baxter	0.1	{Sir Peter Roberts
Westinghouse Brake & Signal Co.	16	{D. Kaberry
Walmesley (Bury) Group	2.8	{Sir K. Pickthorn
Henry Simon (Holdings)	4.5	{Alan Green
Foundry Equipment	0.5	{T. V. H. Beamish
John Dale	1.9	{Sir F. Markham
		{L. R. Carr
Bestwood Company	0.9	{J. Enoch Powell
George Wilson Gas Meters	0.3	{Col. C. G. Lancaster
		{W. Compton Carr

Transport and Shipping

9 MPs are or were concerned in this group.

Company	Net Assets £m.	M.P.
(1956-57)		
P. & O.	104	
Wm. France, Fenwick & Co.	5.6	*John Maclay
Ropner Holdings	22	Sir Leonard Ropner
B.E.T. Omnibus	7.3	*Lord John Hope
Currie Line	2.4	ditto
East Kent Road Car Co.	2.4	T. V. H. Beamish
Lancs United Transport	1.3	Sir R. A. Cary

In addition to the above, Viscount Lambton is on Seaham Harbour Dock Co., C. W. Cooper-Key is concerned with a taxi firm, and A. E. Cooper and Sir Arthur Harvey are on air-line firms.

Property

7 MPs are or were directors of property companies:

Property Co.	Net Assets £m.	M.P.
Beaumont Property Trust	3.1	Sir Cyril Black
Rock Investment Co.	1.0	ditto
Haleybridge Investment Trust	2.5	ditto
ditto		Sir H. W. Butcher
Western Ground Rents	3.0	{W. T. Aitken and
Shop Investments	1.7	{J. G. Foster
First Garden City	1.0	{A. G. F. Rippon
Whitehall Court	0.7	{G. P. Stevens

Building and Building Materials

At least 15 MPs are or were directors of building or building material firms—these include the following:

Company	Net Assets £m.	M.P.
(1956-57)		
BUILDING CONTRACTORS:		
Richard Costain	7.1	Albert Costain
Sir Lindsay Parkinson & Co.	1.4	Sir A. N. Braithwaite
Bovis Holdings	1.5	Sir Keith Joseph
Taylor Woodrow	4.0	*F. J. Erroll
BUILDING MATERIALS:		
Eastwoods	5.3	Sir T. C. Moore
Gaskell & Chambers	1.1	M. Lindsay
Venesta	7.0	C. J. Holland-Martin
Peglers	2.2	Cyril Osborne
		{B. R. Braine
Assoc. Clay Industries	0.9	{E. Partridge
Crossley Bldg. Products	0.7	{R. M. Speir
Allied Brick & Tile Works	0.4	{D. Marshall
Alfred Lockhart	0.3	{G. P. Stevens

Hon. John Hare was formerly on S. Pearson, public works contractor and H. Nicholls was on a paint firm.

Ken Coates asks

HOW CAN WE MAKE THE LABOUR MOVEMENT MOVE?

"A horse . . . can only work from day to day eight hours . . ."—
Karl Marx, *Capital*, I.

THERE has been a great deal of discussion in the *Socialist Review* and elsewhere on the left, about the lessons of Labour's defeat, and the battle to prevent the Labour Party following the majority of the European social-democratic parties and Mr Jay in a tottering procession away from socialism towards a frigid Nirvana of alleged welfare, presumably presided over by Dr Adenauer, General De Gaulle, Mr Macmillan, and similar knights of social-democracy.

The struggle to prevent this is

working class, into one joint campaign on all these things. Clearly it is obvious that the place where this link-up must take place is the Labour Party: and that when it does, there will be a general cry of "all change" at the commanding heights of that worthy institution.

Lessons

But all this is very abstract. Many sects both marxist and "marxist" would subscribe to it as it stands; but the problem is to translate it into effective action, which means persuading other people that it is right. One

go: but this idea will remain an idea unless we find out how not to spread it, but to arouse it in other people's heads. You cannot sell socialism, however pure, like methodism or the salvation army: and if you try, you will build, not a movement for socialism, but an army of salvationists or a small tin chapel. The one in Clapham is no exception.

Where does this get us? Fortunately, we can seek help in history. On at least two occasions when the left in Britain was gelded by sectarian cliques, the road out proved to be the same. Readers of Peter Cadogan's excellent critique of Marx' attitude to the remnants of Chartism after 1848, in *Labour Review*, December, 1958, will be aware of the picture, so reminiscent of our own times, of a few hundred hopelessly divided stalwarts of the old mass movement, arguing among themselves and achieving less and less with each frantic acceleration of their efforts. Cadogan feels that Marx gave the wrong advice in these disputes, and his case is strong. But be that as it may, it is clear that Marx failed to get through to the real labour movement in Britain until he changed his attitude to Trade Unionism: and until, in the 1860's, he came to realise the pivotal nature of the question of the working day in the analysis of Capitalism. (See Dunayevskaya's fascinating book, *Marxism and Freedom* on this). One only has to compare the *Critique of Political Economy* with *Capital*, volume I to see what a difference was made to Marx by the struggles of the British workers on the question of the hours of labour, linked with their reaction to the Civil War in America. Speaking to the IWMA in 1864, he said this:

The ten hours bill . . . told indeed upon the great conquest between the blind rule of the supply and demand laws which form the political economy of the middle class, and social produc-

as possible, and to make, whenever possible, two working days out of one . . . while, on the other hand, the worker maintains his rights as a seller when he tries to reduce the working day to one of normal duration. There is here . . . an antinomy . . . right against right, both equally bearing the seal of the law of exchanges. Between equal rights force decides.

Tom Mann

These words would be food for thought in any event: but they are doubly underscored by the experience of Tom Mann. Tom Mann found himself very much in the situation of any young socialist in Britain today. The largest socialist sect, Hyndman's SDF, said many things he felt to be true. It appeared as a courageous opponent of the unholy order of things. Yet it was slow to advance, it grew in on itself, it was paralysed by the ridiculously pretentious figure and policies of its leader. Some valiant spirits, headed by Morris, did their best to establish a rival body, the Socialist League, which was, as Brian Pearce points out in this week's (Dec. 4, 1959) *Newsletter*, as if he had a bad conscience, over-run by anarchists and stultified in the process. (Did this make the other H. any more right? . . . First time as tragedy, second time as farce!) Tom Mann could not see anything to be gained by the infighting which so many of his colleagues saw as so important, and after a number of battles in the SDF against the stupidity of its attitude to the Trade Unions, he began, in 1886, without quitting the SDF, to transform his "Battersea Progressive Association" into an 'Eight Hours League'. It spread across London.

On every hand a greater result is being shown with less labour. And it must be so or there is no meaning in material progress. But less labour means in our existing system . . . not more leisure . . . but less wages, more unemployed, poverty and degradation. (Tom

After the end of Empire — page four

of crucial importance: and it is an important part of this struggle to point out, with Eric Heffer, that it is not enough to mouth noises about nationalization, but that it is also necessary to examine why nationalization of the Herbert Morrison variety does not arouse the enthusiasm of workers — never mind floaters — when it crops up as an issue in infrequent elections.

All the things SR has to say about the campaign for workers' control are clearly indispensable to any effective campaign for the political soul of the labour movement. At the same time, other key issues are clearly linked for socialists to this struggle, while non-socialists (whose number, among people who should be socialists, is growing alarmingly) see no connection whatever between say, the campaign for unilateral disarmament and the campaign for a socialist labour party.

All Change

For us, nationalization and workers' control and the disarmament of our own government, which is the easiest one for us to get at, are parts of the same concerted strategy: a strategy aiming at the overcoming of our sick national 'elites' and the establishment of a world socialist commonwealth. To us it seems silly not to realise that the enormous possibilities which human inventiveness have opened up, and the colossal dangers which narrow, blinkered political institutions still represent, are respectively stultified and exacerbated by the crisis of socialist thought and action which has hit the west since the end of the war.

Various groups of marxists realise, correctly, that the overriding problem of socialist strategy today is to bring together the campaign against the bomb and the embryonic militancy of the

attempt at this has been made by the SLL: and it has failed. The attempt is to establish a skeleton of a new party, which will be "right" where all the others have proved "wrong". This involves supporters of the attempt, whether they like it or not, in a salvationist campaign to "save" that small portion of the working people who are willing to be saved, from their bureaucratic misleaders. Once Gerry Healy's "good" cadre is inaugurated as replacement of Williamson, Carron, and Gaitskell's "bad" one, all will be well. So, we must present a policy to the workers, in which we show exactly what is wrong with the evil leaders, and we accompany this with a call to battle against them, which sounds magnificent until we review our troops. When David went into the camp of the Philistines, he was at least possessed of superior technology; but the slings and arrows of outrageous Gerry make little impact on the Goliath called Transport House. What is lacked by the socialists in brawn must be compensated for in brain, or the new David will be eaten before breakfast, and before he's finished calling his call to arms. Alas, one calls in vain to Gerry Healy with this music; little though the brawn may be, the brain is less. Yet all will be well if the lesson is learnt: and the lesson is not that Goliath's breakfast was eaten because it tasted nasty, nasty though it may well be.

History

It is that those rebels who wish to socialize the labour party must see their role as sperm, not skeleton, of the future: they must so act as to awaken people to work out their own programs, not to lull them off to sleep again with ready-made new ones. True, we have an idea where we want to

Nigerian General Election — page six

tion controlled by social foresight, which constitutes the political economy of the working class. Hence the bill was not only a great practical success: it was the victory of a principle: it was the first time that in broad daylight the political economy of the middle class succumbed to the political economy of the working class.

It was after this, in 1866, that Marx wrote the immortal chapter of *Capital* on the working day, which should be immediately re-read by all those socialists who have forgotten it. It is summed up in this paragraph:

The capitalist maintains his rights as a purchaser when he tries to make the working day as long

Mann—and His Times, by Dona Torr, p. 215.)

By 1887 the campaign had grown, in spite of the SDF, to the point when Cunningham Graham could try to introduce an eight hours bill in Parliament. But more: it proved to be the road to socialism for Keir Hardie, as yet a trade-unionist pure and simple. By 1889 it became the rallying cry of the Second International, and the first international socialist May day. As Dona Torr says:

"Whoever supported the legal eight-hour day was in fact chal-

● contd. on page 7

From now on

All Correspondence should be addressed to
117 CARMELITE ROAD, HARROW WEALD, MIDDLESEX

MICHAEL KIDRON

AFTER THE END OF EMPIRE

FORUM

The intellectual arsenal of the Left today often resembles nothing so much as a warehouse of discarded ideas and surplus slogans, souvenirs of the ideological battles of the past. The truth is that socialist theory has been on the defensive for some forty years now. Then we could point to a handful of volumes—Marx, Hilferding, Lenin, Luxemburg, Trotsky and a few others—as having pinned down capitalism for all to see, and turn to building the revolutionary party. That job is still to be done and is important, but anyone watching the disarray of the Left within the Labour Party or its ludicrously egotistical posturings outside, or the intellectual and organizational confidence with which the Right rumbles through conference after conference must doubt that the revolutionary party is the **summum bonum**, or even of much importance at this moment.

Highest Stage of Capitalism

The Left needs, above all, to know what it is fighting for—and not only in general terms: which of its programmatic positions are cardinal, which ephemeral; where it should be stubborn, where not. It is time for the Left to cease being the mastadons of revolution and for it to come to grips with **contemporary** capitalism and its mode of survival.

Lenin told us that “the highest stage of capitalism” was imperialism: Strachey—in a new book⁽¹⁾—that imperialism is no more, while Crosland has already affirmed that capitalism itself passed away long ago, partly, no doubt, because its imperial base was shaky. What, if anything, has happened to imperialism is of importance to socialists: if Lenin and Strachey are both right today and the stress is on today, capitalism is on its deathbed. We should stop prolonging the agonies of the Labour Party and investigate the economics of prefabricated barricades. If Lenin is right and Strachey wrong, we should want a far closer analysis of the subtleties of an imperialism that can—so we might be told—rule India, indirectly but nonetheless effectively, and yet chooses to adopt the barbaric crudities that featured in its relations with Cyprus, Kenya and now Central Africa. Finally, if Strachey is right and Lenin wrong, is the next admission to be that Crosland is also justified in shouting paeans to the passing on of capitalism to, it is hoped, eternal hell-fire? The problem is important.

World Convulsed by War

There is no point in following Strachey through the labyrinthine apologia with which he surrounds his central theme. Sometimes, indeed, it is difficult to make out whom he is trying to please. Is it the oil barons, Labour’s leadership, his own Marxist past? He pleads for enlightened self-interest on the part of the oil monopolists: anti-imperialism is good business, he implies, for “it will be by coming to terms with Arab nationalism, that we shall be enabled to carry on, for many years yet, a highly profitable business in oil.” (pp 175-6). He goes out of his way to give a plug to nuclear weapons (although preferring circumlocution to a frank statement) (p 226) and uses every Tory argument in the process, including that faded lily “self-respecting British independence in defence” “for the sake of genuinely good Anglo-American relations” (p 227). He justifies his own and the Labour Government’s record in Malaya and the Tories’ in Kenya with equal impartiality (p 256) and even reiterates support for the deposition, by force, of the democratically elected Government in British Guiana (p 257).

One could go on, but probing the limits of Strachey’s cachectic morality is a distasteful task and not the most rewarding. There’s more to be salvaged from his debates with Lenin on imperialism.

Strachey agrees with Lenin that, broadly, imperialism is a stage in the development of capitalism in which a number of structural changes—monopolization, for example—have occurred and which have made it imperative for capitalism to invest in the backward areas of the world rather than at home. This export of capital entails and is generally accompanied by armed colonization, i.e. political rule, the main purpose of which is to stand guard over the investments. He elucidates the thesis with an interesting account of the occupation of Egypt and South Africa (Chapter V).

For Lenin this was the highest, or last, stage of capitalism; for Strachey merely one stage in its development. Judged by almost any criterion Strachey is right: imperialist power in the political sense has retreated from most of the colonial world; what remains is quickly disappearing, notwithstanding the frenzied brutality of the Tories during some parts of the process. Even in the economic sense, there has been a significant withdrawal over the last few decades—although here the picture is less clear.

So far the argument—and the facts—are with Strachey. And no wonder. Lenin lived in a world convulsed in imperialist war the extent of which could not have been foreseen. In his own lifetime he witnessed the world being carved up to almost the last morsel. Borne on the movement that was soon to explode in revolution in Russia and the rest of Europe he can be excused the optimism which led him to underestimate capitalism’s powers of recovery and to believe that it

had reached its last stage.

But we can’t indulge in fantasy more than forty years later. We have to concede that imperialism as defined by Lenin is on the way out, barbarically at times, but nonetheless on the way out. Why? What has taken its place?

Strachey attempts the answers. Imperialism declined, he says, because

three new factors were emerging. There was, first, the appearance on the world stage of forces of colonial resistance to imperialism. Second, anti-imperialist, democratic pressures grew up within the remaining capitalist empires! second (sic) these pressures began to modify the distribution of the national income and so make non-imperialist policies possible. Third, a major non-capitalist society, in however ugly a form, appeared upon the world scene. (p 135)

There is no doubt which Strachey considers to be the decisive factor. Nowhere in the book do the first and third achieve more than passing mention. The burden of the argument is borne entirely by factor No. 2, the emergence of “democratic pressures” to which the whole of Chapter VII is devoted.

His thesis is simple. Imperialism was invoked by the pressure of surplus capital in the advanced capitalist countries. Even Lenin admitted, he quotes triumphantly, that

if capitalism could develop agriculture, which today lags far behind industry everywhere, if it could raise the standard of living of the masses, who are everywhere still poverty-stricken and underfed, in spite of the amazing advance in technical knowledge, there could be no talk of a superfluity of capital. (Quoted on p 110)

A Better Arithmetic

In other words, if there were other investment outlets, there would be no need for imperialism and the system would rot from within. Lenin said “if”; Strachey asserts that, in the event, the “if” proved redundant. Other outlets have emerged since then, he declares, not because capitalism looked for them or even wanted them initially but because

an all-pervasive democratic political environment has permitted the growth of counter pressures—industrial and political—which have enabled the wage-earners and farmers to force up their own standards (p 111).

He concludes that Lenin, like Marx before him “overlooked the economic consequences of democracy” (*ibid*).

Notice what has happened to the nature of capitalism at Strachey’s hands—the subtle transformation. It is wrong to believe, he implies, that capitalism is a system built upon an inescapable contradiction, namely between the productive potential and the consuming capacity it generates **at any level of mass consumption**, between capital and labour **however well off the latter might be**. He implies that it is wrong to see, resulting from this contradiction, a built-in tendency to generate capital surpluses which can only be liquidated by convulsive means. All we need is better arithmetic: given that such and such a quantity of pounds sterling represents so much surplus capital available either for export (=imperialism) or for home investment, by how much must we raise living standards=purchasing power=potential profit-bearing revenue for the capitalists to entice it to stay put? Alternatively, by how much must “democratic pressure” be raised to drive the locomotive of private enterprise forward? Under Strachey’s probe capitalism has lost its dialectic, lost the frenzied dynamism and permutability which constantly thrust it away from this ineluctable contradiction between production and consumption. It has become a tool, intricate but still a tool, incapable of swerving from the groove struck by any government⁽²⁾

So Strachey, having wished away the nature of capitalism, can now pose “democratic pressure” as the alternative to imperialism, or in his

⁽²⁾ What a far cry from the days when Strachey fought vigorously against the same mechanistic theories he has adopted today. See, for example, his *Nature of the Capitalist Crisis*.

● See next page

BUILD THE SOCIALIST REVIEW!

Please send a free trial copy of SOCIALIST REVIEW to the following:

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Send to SOCIALIST REVIEW,
117 Carmelite Rd., Harrow Weald, Middlesex

⁽¹⁾ John Strachey, *The End of Empire*, Gollancz, 1959, 30/-, being the second volume in a series designed to disarm the Left of its ideological and analytical equipment.

words: "Hobson was right in seeing that radicalism and imperialism were alternative solutions to the same problems" (p 112). But he does not simply leave it at that. He asserts flatly that "foreign lending could and did provide a method of preserving an extremely unequal distribution of the national income, thus averting social reform . . ." (pp 116-7).

One question clamours for attention: has social reform played ins-and-outs with imperialism in fact or only in Strachey's imagination?

Working Class Radicalism

First—the evidence: the period of classic capitalist imperialism covers the last three decades of the nineteenth century and the first years of the present one, rising to a crescendo—in terms of capital exports—in the years immediately preceding the first world war. **These were also the years of the sharpest increase in real wages.** To quote an authority Strachey would hardly dispute, the late Professor G D H Cole,

Real wages rose sharply at three points—between 1861 and 1864, between 1868 and 1876, and, apart from two brief set-backs in the early and late 'nineties, through the whole period from 1882 to 1900. (*Short History of the British Working Class Movement 1789-1947*, p 267)

In terms of radicalism, this period covered the great trade union struggles for legal recognition in the 'seventies, the important measures for social reform embodied in the Reform Act of 1884, the Redistribution Act of the following year and the local government Acts of the 'eighties and 'nineties. It culminated in the greatest and most concentrated period of reformist advance in British working class history—not excluding the post-war Labour Government—namely, the Liberal administrations of 1906 to 1914⁽³⁾. It saw the genesis of the Labour Party itself.

Neither Facts nor Logic

The facts are conclusive. They demonstrate that far from imperialism being pernicious to reformism, they are compatible. They suggest that Empire might have acted host to parasite Reform. And why not? There's logic to it. If, as Strachey agrees, imperialism's economic effect was to stimulate a depressed capital market by creating a demand for temporarily unrequited exports (the locomotives, mining and cargo handling equipment, etc., in which capital exports were embodied) by the same token it stimulated the labour market by providing employment, initially in the export industries and, subsequently, throughout the economy as the effects of increased activity spread. It was this long-term full employment (according to the standards of those days) that sustained the British workers' confidence in their power to effect improvements in conditions in the here and now, which in turn sustained the successful reformism that made Continental socialists despair of the British Labour movement.

But neither facts nor logic are for Strachey. He is determined to show that imperialism and social reform are mutually pernicious, that reformism is both answer and heir to imperialism. He cannot admit that they are twin products of the same stage in capitalist evolution, or that, since reformism is so very much with us and imperialism declining, it is simply a case of the former having changed its material base.

We are now back to where we parted from our Member for Dundee West. Two questions were then at issue: why has imperialism retreated? and what has taken its place? Strachey's answer to both was "democratic pressure", an answer which, insofar as it has any meaning at all, is based on a downright falsification of history. It is now our turn to expound.

Alice Strachey and the Smile

Imperialism while it lasted relieved the congestions of an enclosed capitalism; it helped to evacuate the accumulation of surplus capital both through investing it abroad and through the consequent chain reaction within the home market. But it could not last long: it encouraged imperialist rivals and local aspirants to capital accumulation (the first world-war; the nationalist movements of the nineteenth-twenties); it resulted—after a time—in net capital imports to the metropoli (culminating in the great slump of the 'thirties) which of course made nonsense of its alleviating effect; finally, it aroused national and social revolutionary movements of such magnitude as to threaten its very existence (from the Russian Revolution onwards).

(3) See eg. John Saville: "in terms of social policy, the Labour Government showed much less originality and initiative and were more in the stream of tradition than were the Liberals before 1914 ("The Welfare State", *New Reasoner* 3, Winter 1957-8, p 16)

SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose

16s.
8s.
4s.

 subscription for

1 year's
6 months'
3 months'

 issue of

SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Name.....

Address.....

Send to Socialist Review

117 Carmelite Rd., Harrow Weald, Middlesex

IT'S RICH

"The Soviet troops in Hungary are not there because of internal reasons"—Janos Kadar, Seventh Congress of Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, *Daily Worker*, December 1, 1959.

"Another attempt to put a satellite into orbit around the moon will probably be made from Cape Canaveral in January"—US announcement quoted in *Times*, October 28, 1959.

"But the end spoilt everything"—John Strachey, MP, writing of "our record of achievement on behalf of the Egyptian people during the period in which we were responsible for their welfare"—*The End of Empire*, p 88.

"It is not the purpose of this debate to reach conclusions"—Hugh Gaitskell, Blackpool Conference.

"Little is wrong with our policy—it's how it looks"—headline in *Reynolds News*, October 22, 1959.

"The main defect of our way of life has nothing to do with the economic system at all"—Jo Grimond, *The Liberal Future*, p 56.

"It was we who picked a fight with Transport House"—Gerry Healy, General Secretary, SLL at the National Assembly of Labour, November 15, 1959.

True, it has postponed stagnation for a generation, but not for ever. Stagnation returned to stay and now would not yield to the tried remedies. Meanwhile, imperialism reaped the whirlwind of world war II.

War came and went, but not entirely. Arms budgets are the highest ever in peacetime; production, finance, government and politics are to a large extent structured around them, feeding on them; they absorb and destroy significant proportions of the capital surpluses generated year in year out within the system; under their stimulus the economy is buoyant and the capitalists confident in its—and their—continuance. Where imperialism righted capitalism's bias to over-production productively, therefore imperfectly and temporarily, the arms economy looks to doing so destructively, therefore perfectly (but, for reasons I cannot adduce here, not permanently). If, then, imperialism made capitalism act willing host to reformism, its arms economy today provides even more sumptuous living for the parasite. Reformism is not and has never been inimical to imperialism as Strachey would have it in defiance of logic and fact, it thrived off it and has since adapted itself to changed circumstances. Reformism is now tucked well in with capitalism's permanent arms economy.

To sum up: Lenin was right in believing that

as long as capitalism remains what it is, surplus capital will never be used for the purpose of raising the standard of living of the masses (quoted on p 110)

but not in his prediction that

it will be used for the purpose of increasing those profits by exporting capital abroad to the backward countries (*ibid*).

In other words, Lenin held fast to the core contradiction in capitalism although he was overtaken by events in his description of its temporary solution. Strachey, on the other hand, while undoubtedly right in pointing out that things aren't exactly what they used to be, carefully bungs the baby down the plughole and declares that "democratic pressures" have changed the system fundamentally. Next stop—Crosland!

All Alice Strachey can now perceive of the enemy in his solipsistic Wonderland is its smile, the rest — teeth, claws, etc. — have disappeared. But if there is no class structure, no class struggle, what is there for workers to live for? wonders Strachey. After all, an uninhibited "I'm all right, Jack" society can be terribly unstable, terribly dangerous for the privileged. "We have a desperate need", he solemnly advises his friends (in the City, the Clubs and the Commons), "for a national purpose or ideal which stands outside and beyond the workings of our economic system: an ideal for the sake of which the system is worked" (p 231).

And so, he proposes the curtailment, "or even in the end", "over the decades", the abolition of "large unearned inherited incomes" (p 235), the perfection of "our democratic institutions" (p 238), the enlargement of educational opportunities (p 240), support of the arts and the conservation of natural beauty spots (p 243) etc., until the culminating violence to our credulity is reached: "The highest mission of Britain in our day is to help the under-developed world" (p 244)! "It will be", pontificates John (Macmillan) Strachey, "by serving the peoples of the world that we can be great" (p 247). Really!

We can leave him now, oblivious to a world in which capital is still monarch, shorn of Empire it may be but yet more terrible than hitherto, more refined and still more barbaric, more firmly bedded in blood and filth than it has ever been. We can leave him pondering the mysteries of "democratic pressures" while we turn to the job of imbuing the Labour movement with the consciousness of its collective power and human destiny. While he balances his moral sensibilities towards the backward world with his nuclear advocacies at home, we reaffirm our belief in workers' control, peace and international socialism.

'Our Man in Lagos'
gives us the background to last month's

GENERAL ELECTION IN NIGERIA

THE GENERAL ELECTION to the House of Representatives will take place on December 12th and 312 seats will be contested. There are 174 seats for Northern Nigeria; 73 in the East; 62 in the West, and three for Lagos.

There are three main parties with hosts of smaller parties mostly allied to them in some way or other. These main parties are:—the NPC (Northern Peoples Congress) led by Alhaji Sir Ahmadu Bello the Sardauna of Sokoto, Premier of Northern Nigeria (we call him "The Sardine"); the NCNC (National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons) led by Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe, Premier of Eastern Nigeria; the AG (Action Group) led by Chief Obafemi Awolowo, Premier of Western Nigeria.

Worst Thing

I believe it goes almost without saying that the NPC will win this election. The Northern Region is far more backward than the West and East. The NPC leadership is composed entirely of hereditary rulers-Emirs, major and minor chiefs and so on. The people revere these people with the same lack of logic that induces most Britishers to worship the Royal Family, and it would be unthinkable to them to vote for any other party. Apart from that, there is also a deep-seated fear that should they vote for another party their chief is going to find out about it and make them suffer. When you consider that the North has 174 seats which is more than the East and West combined, it is not really difficult to see why the NPC are going to win this election.

Nevertheless, their victory will be about the worst thing that could happen to Nigeria, a country about to become independent. The NPC leadership is composed entirely of the richest and most high-born men in the country, steeped in tradition and reaction and rotten with corruption. Indeed it is true to say that the whole country is run on corruption (it is common knowledge that certain Ministers and others get 10 per cent on every Government contract, etc.).

Methods

Their electioneering tactics forebode ill for the future. The concept of free speech is made farcical when gangs of paid thugs are employed to break up rival political meetings. All parties are guilty of this, however, but the NPC is, of course, in a far better position having more money than the other parties.

Their methods become even cruder when playing on the fears and superstitions of a primitive people. For instance, NPC agents have been spreading a tale in the villages that the Action Group have been stealing school children and sacrificing them to aid their efforts in winning the General Election.

The political campaigning itself is proceeding amidst great disorder. Bida has been declared a riot area and the Army has been sent in to keep order. This may very well happen in other towns. The tendency of the NPC which

Riot

is most alarming, however, is that of imprisoning their political opponents on trumped-up charges. I should not like to guess how many political prisoners are at present languishing in gaols in the Northern Region, but the number must be considerable. Large numbers of arrests have taken place recently in Kano and Sokoto of NEPU supporters and members. (NEPU—Northern Elements Progressive Union, an ally of the NCNC). In Kano on November 8th four leaders of the NEPU were sentenced to one year's imprisonment each by the Emir of Kano's Court on a charge of unlawful procession (the Emir of Kano, of course, being one of the pillars of the NPC). The "Unlawful procession" it seems lay in escorting a NEPU touring team to a place of reception. At the same time, of course, an NPC touring team was being met by supporters with cars, bicycles and donkeys, but strangely enough not one NPC man was arrested.

At Yawuri in Sokoto Province the NEPU have had to protest against the mass arrest and imprisonment of the party's members and supporters. The only crime these people have committed apparently is exhibiting the NEPU symbol.

Mr JS Olowoyin, General Secretary of the Action Group in Northern Nigeria, has exposed conditions in Ilorin where fourteen Native Authority policemen have been dismissed without notice for taking part in investigating cases in which NPC men were involved. Houses of Action Group supporters have been razed to the ground and looted. Action Group supporters have been terrorised by the police and discriminatory searches made of their homes. Mass arrests have also been taking place in this area of Action Group supporters.

I said a little while back that Bida had been declared a riot area and the following statement of an NPC man, Malam Usman Sarki, who is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Federal Ministry of Works, explains why. He declared at Kontagora on November 12th that no member of the Action Group or the NCNC would campaign at Bida and go scot-free. "We either kill Action Group and NCNC men or they kill us", he asserted. He then proudly said that this situation (engineered by the NPC) was one of the reasons why neither the Action Group nor the NCNC had been able to organise a branch at Bida. He carried on his speech with a warning that if the NPC won the Federal election the finances of the Western Nigeria Government would be investigated in view of the Action

Group's hire of helicopters at "£150 per hour". Malam Usman added that an NPC victory would be followed by the dissolution of both the Western and Eastern Houses of Assembly for fresh elections.

On November 18th Alhaji Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of Nigeria and Deputy President-General of the Northern People's Congress told the people of Zungeru that if the NPC won the Federal election, it would be very strict with the Action Group.

At a campaign meeting of the NPC Alhaji Sir Ahmadu Bello, Premier of Northern Nigeria and Leader of the NPC, declared that as long as his party remained in power in the Region, he would see to it that Northerners were given the exclusive right to purchase groundnuts and cotton. He emphasised that it was a sorry affair that throughout the length and breadth of Northern Nigeria, Southerners were monopolising all trades and even went "as low as to compete with Northerners for contract awards." I consider this a particularly stupid utterance designed to create disunity amongst the three Regions when the main job of the next political party in power in Nigeria will be to try and weld a nation.

So much for the political struggle, now for the industrial situation.

General Strike

In 1938 the Trades Union Ordinance passed into law and trade unionism was introduced into this country. During these 21 years, however, progress has been slow with regard to benefits conferred on the workers. The standard of living is appallingly low for the masses of the workers although a higher standard is obtained by those in white collar jobs, with a resultant rift between the two classes of workers.

The disorganized state of trade unionism will not really have a chance to alter until the country becomes more highly industrialized. As you know, Nigeria is very largely an agricultural country, but new industries are growing up all the time.

There was recently a 10 per cent Cost of Living Award (interim) which most firms complied with; the TUC of Nigeria first of all refused this award declaring, and rightly so, that this was not nearly enough. 10 per cent on a weekly income of 15/- to 20/- is not exactly a fortune. The TUC of Nigeria threatened a General Strike for the beginning of November, but later changed its mind and accepted the 10 per cent "under protest". A few days after this the general secretary of the Nigerian Civil Service Union stated that the Trades Union Congress of Nigeria had planned a General Strike for December 10th, and said that his union would definitely not participate. This was immediately denied by Mr LL Borha, general secretary of the Congress. Before the rumour was

denied however, the statement of the general secretary of the NCSU had sparked off a lively controversy which showed very clearly that a call for a general strike would be a complete washout. One after the other, Unions said that they would not participate in such a strike. The Government then took a hand by threatening with the sack any workers who joined a general strike, thus proving that the government is in league with private industry to keep the workers to heel. Actually a well-organized complete general strike on December 10th would be almost bound to be successful, in my opinion. The government could not afford a strike on the eve of the general election when the eyes of the rest of the world would be on Nigeria. However, the white collared workers let down the others every time. Apparently there is a general strike every year and every year it fails.

Explore

Nevertheless, the position is not quite as gloomy as it sounds—now and again small strikes take place which succeed and some of the workers are reasonably well organized, e.g. tin miners at Jos and coal miners at Enugu (also the railway workers).

The Electrical Workers' Union is very militant, but unfortunately most of these people are, politically, extremely naive. In Lagos recently the EWU suggested that the TUC of Nigeria should either affiliate to one of the political parties in the country or form a workers' party. I have not heard whether anything has come out of the suggestion. The second part of their statement was rather pathetic in its naivety—they called on the Nigerian Government to encourage the growth of trade unionism by enforcing the check-up system of collection of dues. They further asked that the Government should explore the possibility of establishing trade union schools. They thought that by so doing, the Government would have rendered a great service to the trade union movement in the country.

It seems not to have occurred to them that the last thing the Government wants to do is to "render a great service to the trade union movement in the country", or to encourage its growth. On the contrary, one of the main aims of the Nigerian Government is to smash the trade union movement. I suppose it will take a few years of bitter experience for this fact to sink in.

Socialist Review will continue as a monthly for a certain time. Subscribers will not suffer financially.

— Editor

• from page 3

lenging the great liberal party, and raising the banner of independent labour politics." (ibid, p. 225).

How a campaign on hours raises the question of independent working-class politics must be clearly understood: it is not simply a matter of tactics, or even of the fact that liberal vested interests could not support such a demand, important though this was. As Marx had it, "saving of labour time is increase of free time": and the struggle for free time is the complete essence of the struggle for the whole emancipation of labour. Nor is this something stuck in a book. Ask a worker who has whetted his appetite for shorter hours, why an increase in human cleverness does not automatically mean a reduction of toil. Why must we fight to gain the fruits of human ingenuity, when such ingenuity grows every day, as freely as the grass? All the traditional socialist answers to these questions retain their validity, indeed their novelty, once first the questions are posed.

Bigger Loss

Much water has flowed since Tom Mann died. How fares the shorter-hours movement now? Since the initial gains after the war, many of which are swallowed by fantastic overtime, what fate has fallen to the campaign to free men from labour, which is what socialism is?

Certainly a small movement could go far in awakening an enormous upsurge on this question. Miners, in whole areas threatened by redundancy, work a longer day now than they did in 1926. True, there is a five-day week: but on top of the increase from seven-hours to seven and a half which followed the 1926 defeat, nationalization brought in its train a bigger loss to many miners, who during the war had often won the right to leave work when their task was completed, and must now complete the minimum period whether they like it or not, in spite of the fact that in many coalfields they are expected to stay fantastic hours if anything goes wrong with the cycle of production, as often it may. How many railway workers can live without prodigious overtime? Where in industry is this not true?

Artificial Gap

Here, it seems to me is the way to revitalize labour: if Mr Butler thinks he can double living standards in 25 years, then let labour breathe down his neck to see that he does. If the Trade Union movement is largely stagnant, let us sort its leaders out not by simple denunciation, but by racing them over the course of the seven hours agitation. Instead of waiting for Victory for Socialism to gain the support of the mute mass, let us prod the mass and VFS to demand with the abolition of the bomb, the seven-hour day to celebrate it.

The absurd and artificial gap between 'Politics' and Trade-Unionism can be bridged in the same way: let the screws go on the parliamentary Labour Party for a seven hours bill: and let

• **Tory MP**—from page two

Newspapers, Print and Publishing

15 MPs are or were directors in this sphere:

Company	Net Assets £m.	M.P.
---------	----------------	------

NEWSPAPERS:		
Associated Newspapers	13	C. W. Cooper-Key
Yorkshire Conservative Newspapers	1.4	*Richard Wood
Portsmouth & Sunderland Newspapers	1.2	S. Storey
Barry Herald N'papers	n.a.	H. R. Gower
PUBLISHING AND PRINT:		
Macmillan & Co.	n.a.	{*Harold Macmillan
Methuen & Co.	0.6	{ M. V. Macmillan
Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons	2.1	{ Col. Crosthwaite-Eyre
Burns, Oates & Washbourne	0.3	{ I. J. Pitman
Butterworth & Co.	1.1	{ R. G. Grant Ferris
Lonsdale & Bartholomew	0.1	{ D. James
		{ P. H. B. O. Smithers
		{ J. M. Howard

In addition Richard Thompson was formerly on the Mayflower Publishing Co.; others in the print and publishing field include B. Batsford and Col. Lancaster.

And it seems appropriate to include here other vehicles of mass communication; the films and TV Sir Leonard Ropner, the ship owner is also on the Rank Organisation (net assets £53m.) and Sir Wavel Wakefield is on Rediffusion.

Textiles and Clothing

There are 9 MPs in this group also:

Company	Net Assets £m.	M.P.
---------	----------------	------

James Watts is proprietor of a textile firm. P. Bryan and Col. D. Glover are directors of clothing firms. J. Hall is on Charles & Co., a subsidiary of Gossards. John Cordle is managing director of a cotton business.

Food, Drink and Drugs

Company	Net Assets £m.	M.P.
---------	----------------	------

DRINK:		
Arthur Guinness & Co.	30	*A. Lennox-Boyd
Thomas Ramsden & Sons	2.9	J. R. Ramsden
Webbs (Aberbeeg)	1.5	John Hall
J. Hey & Co.	0.8	C. A. N. Hirst
FOOD:		
Cow & Gate	11	Sir Charles Taylor
Bovril	9	I. J. Pitman
Marshall's Universal	0.5	F. W. Harris
Trawlers Grimsby	3.4	Hubert Ashton
DRUGS:		
Beecham Group	24	Sir H. Butcher
Boots Pure Drug	28	I. J. Pitman

Maj. Hicks Beach is on Be-ze-be Food Products; H. E. Gurden on a fruit and vegetable canning business.

Overseas

Company	Net Assets £m.	M.P.
---------	----------------	------

In addition, F. W. Harris is on some of the East African subsidiaries of Marshalls Universal.

MALAYA, INDIA, CEYLON, ETC.:		
Ceylon Up Country Tea Estates	0.1	Sir J. D. Barlow
Klabang Rubber Co.	0.4	ditto

questions be asked the whole time as to why such a wholly beneficial and entirely simple reform is such an unconscionable time a-coming. Let our sociologists uncover the true mysteries of the welfare state, the million years of boredom that go into the purchase of its jaded joys. In the struggle, to win the struggle, let us have a seven hour league, and sow our fatal questions in all wings of the labour movement, and to make a worthy bride to the campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, two causes, for a change, which can win. And if, in an unexpected hurry, the seven

hour league finds the enemy has fled? Why, we can always start the six-hours league: it will pose some very important social questions.

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

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

Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. TU, Bush Fair, Harlow, Essex

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for international Socialist democracy. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The SOCIALIST REVIEW believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power on the basis of the following programme:

● The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Renationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation. — The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.

● Workers' control in all nationalised industries ie, a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.

● The establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all instances representatives must be subject to frequent election, immediate recall, and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.

● The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions.

● The establishment of the principle of work or full maintenance.

● The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.

● The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.

● Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants — without a means test—for all university students.

● Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

● Freedom from political and economic oppression to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the underdeveloped countries.

● The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.

● The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.

● A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington or Moscow.

Notting Hill Notebook

by C. C. Byfield

UNTIL India gained her independence in 1947, the "white" peoples of the world save for a few "cranks", had never given any really serious thought to their feelings towards the "coloured" peoples. The attitude to Kipling's "lesser breeds" was accepted as natural, and right, by high and low alike. But the freedom gained by India, made it necessary to adopt a more diplomatic approach; and when other nations of Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, emerged to form a block containing the greater number of mankind—with the larger share of the world's raw material—the question of race-relation strode forward to the head of the very important questions facing man.

Despite the importance of the problem however, the familiarity of the old attitude, and the economic considerations, make it very difficult to view the problem in an unprejudiced manner. The nearest thing to an unprejudiced approach so far, is the argument in favour of the right to self-determination; but this argument is negated by the argument in favour of non-interference in another country's domestic affairs. Which, as far as the Western countries are concerned, places the responsibility for a solution on the shoulders of the individuals within each country.

But the individual rarely acts from any but the most selfish motive. If there is nothing to be gained by regarding all men as socially, politically, and naturally equal, the individual will consider all efforts on his part to bring it about, a waste of time; and what's more, he, along with all other "reasonable" people, will regard as fools, those who spend their time trying to do so.

Which brings us to the question: Is there something to be gained by advocating complete racial equality For the individual, maybe not; for the nation, yes.

It is often said, in the West, that communism is able to make inroads into underdeveloped countries only because of the poverty common to those countries, but if the truth were known, we would probably find that Russia's equalitarian views capture the minds of these people much more than her low-interest loans. And if the West is not to become completely ostracized by the rest of the world, or worse still, find themselves involved in a racial war, they would be well advised to give to this problem the serious consideration it deserves, with the aim of putting it where it rightly belongs—in the dustbin of history.

• WITCH HUNTS from page 1

don busmen during the past couple of decades — and how many 'official' disputes have we left?

In 1937, London busmen were engaged in an official strike for a shorter working day. That strike was headed by the late Ernest Bevin. It was also headed by him. The strike was called off without even the formality of asking the opinions of the strikers or of taking a vote.

Almost exactly 21 years later came the second official strike of London busmen, led this time by Frank Cousins and ending with a compromise settlement that has produced the worst staff shortage within living memory.

Pride and Joy

So, according to the unholy trinity — Tories - Fleet Street - TUC — there was not a single issue affecting London busmen during the 21 years (1937-58) that warranted a dispute of any sort. They were sitting pretty, living off the fat of the land, without a care in the world.

Yet, it was precisely during those 21 years that the London busmen descended from No. 2 to No. 57 in the scale of national wage rates. The job that was the pride and joy of the trade union movement became despised and rejected by all but the most desperate. And, beyond any shadow

of doubt or argument, we busmen were put into that position by the policies of that very foundation stone of wage-freeze-witch-hunt, the late Arthur Deakin.

Coached

And this is the real burden of the Fleet Street 'wild-cat' song Deakin is dead, and his successor Frank Cousins, has not fitted exactly into his shoes, nor does he speak exactly the same language. If only he would listen to the mature, experienced advice of such revolutionary giants as Sir Vincent Tewson and Sir Tom O'Brien. If he would pattern his life on dear Lord Citrine, or Sir Lincoln Evans. If he would allow himself to be coached in the intricacies of democratic procedure by a master like Sir Tom (vote how you like as long as its for me) Williamson, what a load of worry would be lifted from the shoulders of the Stock Exchange.

Think Again

Let us make no mistake about what the Government, employers, and press are really after. Their talk about 'unofficial' and 'wild-cat' strikes is but a thin disguise for their real aim—to ban ALL strikes and thus destroy the only real weapon the trade unionist possesses.

From Platform, Rank and File Busman's Journal, December 1959.

Well, really, it's a bit much to present the problem of race prejudice in terms of an ideological cold war which would be suicidal for the labour movement to join. For years we've paraded the slogan "Neither Washington nor Moscow, but International Socialism" not because we like slogans but because there can be no solution to any of the fundamental problems of the world, including that of physical and psychological apartheid, within the orbit of East-West conflict. If there are to be solutions, they will be found outside the framework of Cold War politics, by destroying that framework and the class societies on both sides of the Iron Curtain which perpetuate it—Editor.



**41 years after her murder
1 year behind schedule
11½ months after the original
announcement**

4 months after reviewing it

we are happy to announce

ROSA LUXEMBURG

A CRITICAL STUDY BY TONY CLIFF

Nos 2 & 3 of International Socialism

Send 4/6 (Bound copies 8/6 post free) to

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