

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

JOURNAL

for the

Industrial Militant —

for

International

Socialism

10th YEAR No 12

DECEMBER 1960

SIXPENCE

SOCIALISM, THE BOMB AND NEUTRALISM

BY PETER SEDGWICK

A STARTLING change in mass political attitudes in Britain was recently uncovered as the result of a survey conducted on behalf of Washington by the official United States Information Agency (which, it may be presumed, is reasonably equipped with the staff and techniques necessary to the proper gathering of such information). Asked whether Britain should, in the present world situation, side with the United States, with Russia, or with neither, the largest single group (46 per cent of the sample) replied: *Neither*. The Administration was so alarmed at this proof of what is rightly called the spread of "neutralist sentiment" among its allies that it suppressed the report from publication.

What is even more interesting than the actual findings is the fact that it should have taken a survey commissioned by a foreign government to register the progressive sentiments of British working people. In the normal course of events it might have been expected that so marked a disagreement with the foreign policy of a ruling class would have been disclosed, expressed and fostered through the activity of a political party of Opposition. In fact, of course, up till now the "official channels" of political expression have been closed to any expression of fundamental dissent. The electorate has at no stage been asked to vote for or against NATO, the Bomb or a neutralist alternative; these questions have been decided in advance for them by the Right-wing (Labour or Tory) politicians. On foreign policy the British people has since 1945 always had to face a "single list of candidates."

We do not exaggerate the scale of mass disillusionment with traditional imperialist solidarities. No doubt the Kennedy Administration will take energetic measures in the Public Relations field to reinstate the myth of the Western Alliance in the minds of the cynical working classes of Europe. While we are proud of the striking popularity of the slogan *Neither Washington or Moscow!* for which this journal has campaigned (sometimes in considerable isolation) for the last ten years, we are under no illusions that we are responsible for more than a limited growth of "Third-Force" Socialist consciousness, in certain sections of the committed Left. Nevertheless, the lessons are plain: it should now be clear that, in their zeal to preserve NATO at the expense of the Party Constitution, to save, *not* the Party that they love, but the H-Bomb that they love, Gaitskell and his clan are not, as they claim, preserving the Labour Party from the prospect of electoral "massacre" (a word which comes oddly from the lips of those whose only objection to Polaris is that they will not be "consulted" in the decision to launch annihilation.) On the contrary, they are now exposed as men determined to block the only channel whereby a clean, clear, socialist

alternative to bourgeois foreign and military policy might be effectively offered. *They*, not the proponents of official Labour policy, are the apostles of impending massacre, whether electoral or thermo-nuclear.

Vigorous steps must now be taken to ensure the success of Labour's anti-nuclear policy. The Appeal for Unity campaign, representing hundreds of Constituency Parties all over the country, must be supported to the hilt. (Readers will find details of this campaign printed elsewhere in this issue). Particular prominence must be given to the demand for official platform speakers against the Bomb as a necessary counter-balance to Gaitskellite speakers, and for official pamphlets and leaflets (and, especially, radio and TV broadcasts) stating the case accepted at Scarborough.

Secondly, the Gaitskellites must never again be allowed to get away with plausible arguments while Labour's nuclear disarmers flounder in emotional slogans. Now as never before, Socialist attitudes towards strategy and foreign policy must be developed and

contd page 6

STRUGGLE AGAINST ALGERIAN WAR

BY JEAN-JACQUES MARIE, ed. *Correspondences Socialistes* (Paris)

ON the 1st November 1960 the Algerian war entered its seventh year. Launched on the 1st November 1954 by a government of the left-centre (Mendes France-Mitterand), it has become the turntable of French politics. It was because the fourth parliamentary republic was unable to find a solution to it that it collapsed to make way for the bonapartist regime of General De Gaulle.

De Gaulle assumed power on the 1st June 1958. In contrast with his predecessors he was perfectly aware that it was impossible to crush the Algerian Revolution with a military victory that would allow a return to the status quo. What he wants, and this emerges clearly from his speech of the 1st Nov., 1960, is the establishment in Algeria of an autonomous bourgeois state, capable of keeping order and protecting the basic interests of French imperialism (Saharan oil, the maintenance of private property, and preventing land-sharing). This presupposes concessions which are at the same time both great enough to disarm the rebels without provoking a rising of the ultras in Algeria, and limited enough to

ensure that the revolutionary movement is really demobilised, 'pacified'.

SFIO

But such a programme needs time; and De Gaulle has taken his time. It is this, much more than the real content of his policies, that has little by little stirred anew the agitation against the Algerian war; it is almost solely the agitation of students and intellectuals. The Communist Party has, since 1958, done everything to prevent any sort of mobilisation of the working-class against the War; the SFIO, now integrated into the Gaullist regime, no longer stands for anything in the working-class; the *Partie Socialiste Unifie*, formed in March, 1959, by the fusion of the dissident left-wing of the SFIO and of various groups on the left, still has little influence... The sabotage by the CP therefore automatically signifies the absence of the working-class, as a class, on this front of protest against the War.

The students form the mass of those determined to 'do some-

contd page 7

INSIDE:

T.U. COMMENTARY

page 2

CRISIS IN CAR INDUSTRY

page 3

WILL GAITSKELL BAN LABOUR PARTY?

page 4

SCOTTISH WORKERS FIGHT POLARIS

page 5

TU COMMENTARY

THE unofficial national Committee of shop stewards in electricity supply industry should be disbanded.

(Frank Foulkes)

by D. O'Neill

In spite of the fact that earlier this year they declared the shop steward *now* to be the trade union's most important man—and power, they said, was at the bottom—a couple of noted lefts in trade unionism, the Franks-Foulkes and Cousins—have decided to act against him.

The unofficial shop stewards' committee in the electricity supply industry is the target. The committee was formed because the delaying tactics, successfully used by the management, continued to defeat the brains of the union's paid officials: it was felt by the stewards and the rank and file, that direct action had become necessary. The committee has certainly jerked the fulltime officials into awareness; they now suggest replacing the committee by closer liaison between themselves and the stewards at District and Works level if the employers agree to the change in the constitution of the National Joint Industrial Council which is necessary to make the closer liaison possible.

One cannot honestly see the employers refusing this request; rank and file activity is frowned upon by the employers and by the union officials—the one for fear of his life, the other for fear of his job and if his job is his life what's the difference? It has been printed somewhere that Mrs. Cousins is further left than her famous husband. Perhaps this is so, but on the above showing, who isn't?

No doubt there is a great scheme afoot to settle all the problems in electricity supply: Mr. Foulkes will dip into his conjurer's hat and pull out a two-year agreement, with the usual escape clause to keep that terrible rank and file quiet, on similar lines to the one he has recently negotiated on behalf of contract electricians. Glory will once again be in its proper place.

JUNIOR WORKERS' COMMITTEE

by Frank Harwood

THE recent national apprentices' strike, which resulted in a wages increase for all engineering apprentices, does not seem to have stimulated any significant enthusiasm among the junior workers for trade unionism. Only eighteen delegated apprentices attended the AEU London Annual Junior Workers' Committee last month, so it is not surprising that the elected union leaders may only be service to the demands of the apprentices. However, the general opinion, like Thomas, will be that the Union does not attract attention to apprentices' problems, this does not square up with the fact that the leadership gave little support to the national strike. It was said that the PWC must be a rallying point for young work-

ers and branches should be set up in every factory to assist the young worker in the harder struggles ahead. This is an excellent idea, if we can get some support for this from the District Committees: then by next year it is possible that we may have to hire a bigger hall to accommodate the meeting. It is obvious that new blood must be infused into the JWC. Apart from the attendance there were some who considered that apprentices were not used as cheap labour. I don't think that the vast majority of young workers agree with that idea.

The following resolution was carried unanimously: "This youth conference believes that if the employers have not conceded an increase in apprentices' wages by October 1961 the Confederation should call a national strike by all apprentices until the claim is met." We have some time before us, brothers, in which to strengthen our forces; don't let the time pass idly; get into the branches and the shop stewards' committees, and demand the fullest assistance in setting up JWC branches in every factory.

ENGINEERS' WAGE CLAIM

by Karl Dunbar

THIS annual conference instructs the Executive Council to make an immediate application for a general increase in the consolidated rate for manual workers in the Engineering and Shipbuilding industries, without restrictive conditions, retrospective to the date of the claim and to undertake a vigorous publicity campaign in support of the claim."

In contemporary Britain one sees vigorous publicity campaigns for all kinds of trash: one might say that the whole affair has been reduced to a matter of form; the *Financial Times* announces, weekly, news of forthcoming campaigns.

But surely that bulwark of working class strength, the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions (40 Unions totalling more than 3 million members), missed an excellent opportunity of advancing the political education of the working class on a mass scale and, at the same time, letting non-unionists know what a trade union really is (re-establishing old products in a new way is the point of many publicity campaigns) when it did not carry out to the letter its resolution passed in June at Llandudno.

Press reports suggest that the £1 rise asked for will be granted; further news has been temporarily sunk in one of the usual channels. Let us assume that the £1 is awarded with little ceremony, will it then be seen to be right and proper and to have had a publicity campaign? Emphatically NO! Nobody but a fool conducts a vigorous publicity campaign, in the modern sense, unless he knows he is certain to win anyway.

No matter what the outcome is the increase will be seen as something given, in the goodness of their hearts, by the employing class instead of a victory won through struggle. The resolution was circulated to branches last month—5 months after it received "unqualified support" at annual conference. The vigorous publicity campaign will not be carried out by Brothers Colman, Prentis and Varley but by the active members in the branches and on the shop floor.

Resolutions must go forward at once, we want nothing less than £1 and we want action now!

"JOURNAL" AND THE BOMB

by J. Bennet

THE AEU monthly "Journal" has, at long last, provided some controversial material. We are invited to submit comments direct to Executive Council on the article in the November issue of the "Journal" dealing with the behaviour of the AEU delegations at the TUC and Labour Party Conferences this year. Excellent—let us hope

some of the comment is printed in next month's "Journal", or will the EC play the whole experiment down with the reply: your comments have been noted, etc. etc., and then slam the door in our faces?

Why is the EC inviting our opinions, *now*, so late after the event? It is within their power to test the feelings of the membership, at any time and on any issue, by opening up the pages of the "Journal".

UNILATERALISTS must view the Executive Council's apparent revolutionary openhandedness with concern: Carron means to make the AEU multilateralist at next year's National Committee, thus making the world safe for American bases and Mr Gaitskell's "Labour" Party. For "Executive Council" read Carron: we have never had a President as powerful as he. One AEU member summed up his position aptly: 'It is Ace, King, Queen, Jack, Ten, every day of the week for him.'

By all means let us comment on the delegation's behaviour; readers of Socialist Review and any Socialist member of the AEU will know what to say.

FLEET STREET JUNGLE

"LINE - OFF"

BY GEORGE JEROME

The following article by a printing worker, Bro. Jerome, deals with the closure of the *News Chronicle* and its effect on printing workers. It suggests one reason for the closure. Whether this is a tenable reason we have not enough information to judge.—*Editor.*

THE terms 'line-off' and 'line-on' in the printing industry mean the stopping and starting of work. The recent line off in the *News Chronicle* and *Star* is one that will be long remembered for its cynical disregard for the welfare of the workers concerned, and the apparent lack of political principle in the "Liberal" proprietors.

The unanimous expressions of sorrow from the Tory press at the demise of an organ of Liberal opposition (albeit a feeble opposition) are hypocritical in the extreme if examined in the light of the eventual ownership of the paper and the dubious manoeuvring in the weeks before the sell-out.

The financial difficulties of the Cadbury newspapers date back at least 4 years. About 3½ years ago proposals from the Union chapels in the firm were ignored, and the first *Daily Herald* offer because of the *Heralds* TUC connection (a connection apparently politically more unbearable than the Mail's close connection with the Tory party) was turned down.

With so much warning of their difficulties why then did Cadbury sell-out to the Mail? This question has exercised the minds of many of the solemn pundits of the press, but without success. I feel that one theory that is not only feasible, but fits the facts, has not been given the airing it deserves.

First let us consider the offers that were made, supposedly

after the deal with the Mail had been finalised:

The second *Herald* offer 4 weeks before the line-off could have been considered. The Australian combines offer could have been considered. The Roy Thompson offer could have been considered. The Liberal party offer could have been considered.

All were offers that would have kept the papers alive and printing under their own names. But the story goes that the Mail sell-out had already been completed before all these offers were made. If this were the case

contd page 3

AID?

Since the war we have heard a great deal about the aid capitalist countries grant to the underdeveloped areas! Most recently much has been made of the USA's grant of 600 million dollars to Latin American countries. Alas, much more than that has been taken out of these countries by the worsening of their terms of trade with the United States caused by the decline in prices of the major exports of Latin America. This deterioration "led to a reduction in dollar income of some \$1000 million in each of the past 10 years." (*The Times*, 7th September).

IAN DAVIES DISCUSSES THE

CRISIS IN THE CAR INDUSTRY

ONE of the obvious facts of the motor industry over the post-war years has been the concentration of production in the hands of five major firms. These (BMC, Ford, Vauxhall, Rootes, Standard-Triumph) are at present responsible for over 90% of the national motor output. At the same time the development of the industry has depended to a large extent on rapid introduction of new technological methods, which, coupled with the demand for cars and lorries that has marked the last ten years, has caused a radical re-organization of the industrial machinery. Between 1948 and 1958 the net output of motor firms increased from a value of £179 million to £432 million, an increase in units from 498,000 to 1,336,000. Meanwhile, the capital expenditure per employee has increased from £50 in 1948 to £138 in 1958, while comparing real earnings with productivity, the figure has dropped by 15% in the five years since 1955.

OPTIMISM

These figures point to the growth of automation and the consequent decrease in the number of employees in contrast with the increase in output and profits. Net profits have increased by 52% since 1954, though the number employed has remained static or decreased (5,000 less in 1959 compared with 1955). In addition the motor bosses have seen every opportunity to increase production while the market appears favourable, so that although the market for cars is by no means predictable, the output has been stepped up whenever the demand has increased, to the extent of anticipating the future demands, although there may be little warrant for increased optimism.

W. GERMANY

But the motor industry, more perhaps than any other, is liable to fluctuations of the world market. Two main obstacles to a smoothflowing trade are the chances of a recession in the USA (where a minor cut in demand would be sufficient to wipe out British exports of cars) and the inability of many under-developed areas to purchase any substantial quantity of cars. In addition the increased production of other industrial areas (e.g. the Volkswagen in Germany and the new "compact cars" in the USA) could cut the ground from under the feet of British producers. How does the industry attempt to cope with difficulties? By systematically planning its production and attempting to gain fresh markets abroad—in the Dominions and in the far East, for example? Not on your life! Reaching out for the more obviously quick returns, the bosses step up production and retract only when stung. The result is a completely erratic system of

production organization and a loss of place in the race for world markets. Although in 1950 Britain produced 55% of the world supply, by 1958 she was down to 27%, while Western Germany had increased from 9.6% to 35%. Her passenger car output rose slower than Germany's—the 5,500,000 produced in 1950 rose to 1,100,000 in 1958, while Germany's rose from 200,000 to 1,200,000. In France and Italy there were similar increases.

WAGES

What has this meant in terms of labour? In the first place, because of the varying demand for cars and other motors, the conditions of employment have been as erratic as the industry's own organization. As the firms have attempted to gain quick returns on the world or home markets they have varied the employment conditions and have either increased automation or taken on increased numbers of workers. Thus the work has been geared entirely to the demands of varying output. The terms of labour in the different firms have therefore been completely dependent on local conditions and have consequently showed inconsistent patterns. Wage rates have been decided to fit the numerous changes and read like a bizarre capitalist joke. As firms have restricted output or introduced new machinery or automation, the workers have had to make their own agreements and the management has attempted to curtail demands by introducing a bewildering series of wage differentials, bonus payments, overtime rates, etc. Thus it is impossible to talk of averages in wages over areas, for the conditions vary to such an extent that calculation becomes arbitrary. But it is useful to mention the general trends by indicating the difference in the Midlands as contrasted with Ford. Though the rates for skilled workers in Coventry and Birmingham vary round 10/- and 9/- an hour, in Fords they stand at 7/2; production workers are round 8/- to 10/- with 6/6 at Fords; and unskilled workers range between 5/6 and 6/-, but are fixed at 5/8 at Fords.

It is therefore essential that the negotiations be conducted from the shop floor. The Union representatives, buried in their bureaucratic world, have been unable to enter into the struggle, and rather than come to agree with the necessity of shop steward negotiation, have raised fiendish cries of 'unofficial strike', of 'insubordination' and 'wildcat'. The shop stewards have seen the situation in much clearer light and have alone been able to perform the function of spokesmen. Thus the second main effect of the present disorganization of the motor industry has been the increasing

conflict between the rank and file and the union hierarchy. It has clearly shown the lack of direct contact with the workers and exposed the bureaucracy of the union élite. While present disorganization continues the stewards alone can be the direct representatives.

POLICY

The 'Economist' of September 24th showed that the output of cars fell in August by 8,000, and the weekly rate for the month was over a sixth below that of May and June. Production is being cut by 15% and Vauxhall is down by 20%. The competition from the European Common Market countries together with the US recession and the production of the American "compact cars", and, so long as it lasts, the hire-purchase squeeze, is certain to make for increased contraction. Workers are already thousands upon thousands of workers are on short time, and thousands have got the sack.

A militant policy is needed to face this crisis.

Car workers cannot afford to face another defeat as in 1956. Then the trade union officials, hand in glove with the employers, agreed to a miserable pittance as "compensation" to sacked workers.

STRUGGLE

Reduction of the purchase tax on cars and a general easing of hire-purchase restrictions can give some help to the industry. Again a cut in car prices by squeezing out some of the fat profits of the industry could help somewhat to enlarge the market for cars. Reductions in the crippling fuel tax could also help. Trade with the underdeveloped countries—assisted by generous credit from Britain (a much more useful exercise than wasteful "defence" expenditure)—and trade with the countries behind the "Iron Curtain", could also help.

Above all, and immediately, what is needed is a struggle against sacking with a pittance for compensation. This struggle should be combined with a demand for the 40-hour week without loss of pay and three weeks' annual holiday, followed by a progressive reduction of working hours.

PLANNING

The car industry urgently needs planning. Notwithstanding Gaitskell and Co. the instability in the car industry shows that capitalism continues to be a system of insecurity. Capitalist takeover bids are still the order of the day. Ford, who pays something like 2s. an hour less on the average than wages paid in the Midland firms, are set on their bid. Clause 4—defending the public ownership of industry—should now be translated into action.

A campaign of the whole labour movement should be

launched for the nationalisation of the car industry under workers' control. Socialist planning should be the answer to capitalist anarchy.

"Redundancies" and dismissals... in spite of the fact that the motor industry has never had it so good, reaping its highest-ever profits, working conditions and guarantees have never been worse. In spite of the persistent claims by the manufacturers for easier hire-purchase terms, the failure in the industry is due to more basic causes.

"LINE-OFF"—contd

surely the workers on the papers could have been given far longer notice than in fact they were given.

The reasons become clearer when it is remembered that the print Unions are well organised and exercise complete control over the flow of skilled and unskilled labour into the trade, and that this situation has never been acceptable to the employers. This was a major factor in the decision to sell out, as opposed to a take-over and continuous printing.

By selling out, 3000 workers were thrown on the London print market. The unions have to find work for their members on the unsatisfactory day to day basis, and those for whom this is not available have to be paid benefit from union funds, with the moral and financial weakening of members and unions if the situation is prolonged.

On the shop floor the management, with a saturated labour market, are able to hold the threat of unemployment over the heads of militant print workers.

Fortunately the situation from the point of view of the workers is not as bad as the unions at first thought and the employers had hoped. It may be asked what prompts my assertion that an attack on the unions is the reason for the sell-out. I can answer that best by pointing to the political implications of this exercise.

It was not surprising that the closure of the papers brought forth the usual volley of abuse against the unions in order to shift the blame on to a section of the TU movement which has been in the forefront of the fight for a more Socialist Labour Party and for unilateral nuclear disarmament. This highly conscious section of the working class want and are prepared to fight for socialism. Little wonder then that the employers took this at first sight contradictory step and murdered the Star and News Chronicle. The lessons of this should be clear to all trade unionists: the necessity to fight for the retention of conditions won in the past and to push forward to a socialist solution of present problems is still with us, with as much force as at any time in the past. Capitalism is just as dangerous when it can afford to be liberal.

RAY CHALLINOR ASKS,

Will Gaitskell ban the Labour Party?

HUGH Gaitskell's slander of Labour Party members during the H-bomb debate at Scarborough—he called them fellow travellers—is bursting with sinister implications. It is not the type of thing you would expect from a Labour leader, who should be seeking to build a bridge to the rank-and-file, to unite the Party, and not to fan the flames of internal discord.

Moreover, it is an example of 'the smear', a traditionally Tory tactic. In the past, and at the present time, some of the more unscrupulous Tories strive to misrepresent the socialist case and identify it with communism. For example, in 1924 the Tory Press concocted the mythical 'Zinoviev letter', which purported to show that the Labour leaders were closely associated with the Communist International. Since then, it has been frequently trotted out at elections to scare people into voting Tory. Lies, falsifications, smears: we expect these from the Tories. But we don't expect—and should not tolerate it—from the leader of our own Party.

Unfortunately, Hugh Gaitskell has the knack of smearing his opponents. Speaking at Stalybridge in October, 1952, he attacked party workers as communist. He said: 'I was told by some observers that about one-sixth of the constituency party delegates appear to be communist or communist-inspired.' He asked that "the National

Executive should give immediate attention" to weeding out the supposed communists.

Two years later Gaitskell gave tacit support to a sensational *Sunday Pictorial* campaign against the Labour Left. In a big, front-page splash, headed 'DANGEROUS VOICES', the *Pictorial* solemnly assured its readers that, at the 1954 Scarborough conference, "at least twenty speeches will be heard which have been deliberately written by Communist Party members... sympathisers and supporters."

Writing the following week in the *Pictorial*, Gaitskell did not feel under any compunction to deny charges that had so unjustly been made against fellow party members. Nor did any feeling of loyalty to the Labour Party lead him to defend Aneurin Bevan, who had been subjected to a vitriolic attack by the *Pictorial*. Instead, he added fuel to the fire, by making his own personal attack on the Labour Left.

1954

While Gaitskell made his difference with the Bevanites perfectly plain, he also made it obvious that there were those with whom he felt a certain similarity of view: "I doubt if foreign policy will play a big part in the next election—not because it is not important, but because Mr. Eden has, in fact, carried on most of our policy as developed by Ernest Bevin." (*Sunday Pictorial* 2. 10. 54) No doubt this explains Gaitskell's reluctance to attack Eden over Suez until the rank-and-file of the Labour Movement, by its strong expression of hostility to the Government's policy, had pushed him into opposition.

In 1954, Gaitskell came out with some other strange opinions which, in the light of the current Labour Party conference, deserve more careful consideration. Interviewed by the *Ceylon Daily News* (12. 3. 54), he was asked what he thought should be done if, in any country, the Communist Party looked like coming to power through the ballot box.

Gaitskell replied, "The democratic parties are entitled to stop it by suppressing the Communist Party. Democracy can only work if parties observe what are called the 'rules of the game'."

Now suppose Gaitskell sincerely holds—and we have no reason for thinking he doesn't—his views on the Bomb. He thinks, as he told the Scarborough conference, unilateral renunciation by Britain of the H-bomb would be disastrous. It could easily lead, he argues, to the break up of NATO and the West being left defenceless. In other words, supporters of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament are, in Gaitskell's eyes, if not communists, at least fellow travellers. For they are paving the way for communist domination of Western Europe.

Under these circumstances, would it not be proper, if Gaitskell still accepts the principles he enunciated in the *Ceylon Daily News*, to stop the unilateralists by taking undemocratic measures? Would it not be better to flout the Party's membership, disregarding conference decisions?

And, let's assume support for banning the Bomb continues to grow. Let's assume that—as I sincerely believe will happen—at some time in the future the Parliamentary Labour Party votes, along with the annual conference, overwhelmingly for nuclear disarmament. We would then have a Labour Party united and convinced of a policy Gaitskell has described as "neutralist, pacifist, and fellow travelling".

If the Party, with such a policy, looked like coming to power democratically, at a General Election, would Gaitskell favour banning the Labour Party? It is the logic of his position.

We have a right to know. We have a right to know how far Gaitskell is prepared to abide by democratic decisions in the present dispute. Perhaps, if the Parliamentary Labour Party voted unilateralism, he would favour the Shadow Cabinet disregarding the decision, just as he now intends to disregard the decision of annual conference. Perhaps, he would rather have a Franco-type regime in Britain, with no democracy but tied to NATO, than he would a "fellow

contd page 5

Two resolutions have some our way. Readers should fill in the space provided, attach it to the resolution they wish and use it where they can—*Editor*.

CONFERENCE MUST DECIDE

We, the undersigned members of the Labour Party, declare that unity in the Party can only be achieved through wholehearted acceptance of the authority of the Party Conference by all sections of the movement, including the Parliamentary Labour Party, and the implementation of Conference decisions by the National Executive Committee and the Party's standing machinery and paid officers.

We believe that unless the authority of Conference is maintained in this way, the prospect before the movement is one in which Party policy will be arbitrarily determined by the Parliamentary leadership.

We refuse to allow the Party Conference, and affiliated Trade Unions and Constituency Parties, to be reduced to the impotent position of debating resolutions without deciding policy.

NAME	POSITION	ADDRESS
(Block letters please) IN PARTY		

WE SUPPORT ANNUAL CONFERENCE DECISIONS

LABOUR, CO-OPERATIVE AND TRADE UNION MEMBERS

We wish to place on record our belief in the democracy of our movement. In the past, when such decisions as for German rearmament have been taken by Conference, we have not attempted to overthrow the democratic process simply because we didn't agree with the decision.

We have always reserved the right, as democrats, to continue to put the minority case before the Party membership and by such means influence the Party to change the existing policy at the next Annual Conference.

Never, at any time or on any issue, have we sought to deny the right of the movement to take decisions, no matter how wrong we may consider these decisions to be. But it becomes increasingly clear that the avowed Right Wing of the Party and their supporters in the Trade Union leadership, are determined to violate the democratic process and impose their will upon the movement. This is a situation which cannot be allowed. We reject the argument that anybody in the Parliamentary Labour Party has the right to ignore the Conference when it suits them.

It is the duty of the rank and file members of the Party and the Unions to now make their position crystal clear: 1. To defend the democratic process. 2. To support every Labour M.P. who stands against the overthrow of Conference decisions. 3. To demand from all our elected representatives, at every level, their unqualified support for both these principles.

WE SUPPORT ANNUAL CONFERENCE DECISIONS

LABOUR, CO-OPERATIVE AND TRADE UNION MEMBERS

NAME	ORGANISATION
------	--------------

WHO IS BREAKING THE BOYCOTT?

The following instructive letter appeared in the *Tribune* of 9th Sept.

'I have just returned from a fascinating holiday in Russia, travelling both ways by Russian ships. I enjoyed my holiday very much indeed and found the people kind, friendly, open and with very good manners indeed.

I found a very great deal to admire and little to criticise but there was a big "fly in the ointment" which really upsets me.

On the ship and in Russia the only oranges were South African "OUTSPAN".

I tried to make all sorts of excuses for their presence but cannot. While in Moscow we bought a copy of *Daily Worker*, the only English newspaper allowed into the USSR and on the front page on August 12 was a denial that the USSR was trading with South Africa.

This caused hollow laughter—now, on my return to this country, I find that diamonds are also being bought.

What is the use of the South African boycott, which we have all been scrupulously carrying out, if a country, the size of Russia, breaks the boycott after urging others to boycott?

Maureen Proudman
London S.W.15

HARRY McSHANE SHOWS HOW

SCOTTISH WORKERS FIGHT POLARIS

IT is true to say that many of the Scottish people are disappointed because they cannot get a copy of "Lady Chatterley's Lover" and have turned to reading the adventures of "Dandy" Mackay who was sent to prison for his part in a bank robbery. But a larger and more intelligent section of the Scottish people have turned their attention to Holy Loch where it is proposed to establish a Polaris base.

The fight against the base, sparked off by Glasgow Trades Council on 2nd November, is involving a rapidly growing number of people. There are some who want the base for the silliest of reasons. One man said it would prove an additional attraction to Dunoon. Another said it would bring work. It is now said, on good authority, that it will bring about 30 jobs. No statement like that was attempted when the base was discussed by the Trades Council.

The discussion at that Trades Council meeting was on a higher level than usual. There was nothing of the jargon one expects on such occasions. Out of 247 delegates present, only two

voted against the resolution condemning the base. The meeting was in line with the Clydeside tradition. The main attack was directed against the present British Government with little or nothing being said about Russia or America.

SPREADING OUT

The various bodies interested in nuclear disarmament in Glasgow have had an informal meeting with the Executive Committee of Glasgow Trades Council. The Joint Committee comprising representatives from the Glasgow City Labour Party, the Co-operative Movement and the Trades Council have met to discuss future plans. Already several processions and public meetings have been held. Meetings on a wider scale are being planned.

The Scottish TUC and the Scottish Labour Party have made it known that they are opposed to the base. Various trades councils, including Edinburgh, have joined in the struggle.

The well-known Scottish daily paper, "The Scotsman" threw its columns open for discussion on the matter. The Christian at-

titude was strongly emphasised in the discussion. The Rev. Dr. George MacLeod came out strongly against the base. There were some, of course, who wanted the base to defend Christianity from Communism.

WEAKNESSES

It would be idle to deny that some leading figures in the Labour Party are supporting the base. Glasgow's Lord Provost, Mrs Jean Roberts, would not allow Glasgow Corporation to discuss the matter. Quite a number of the Labour councillors were quite happy about her decision. The last has not been heard of this.

TRADES COUNCIL

There are other councillors in the West of Scotland who favour the base. The Tory elements also support the base. This was to be expected but it will not be allowed to hinder the campaign. Mr John Johnstone, the Secret-

ary of Glasgow Trades Council, has made up his mind that the working class movement will not slip into the background during the struggle. The Trades Council will support the efforts of all other bodies opposing the base. It will, in addition, take other steps to keep up the pressure against the base being established at Holy Loch.

SIGNS

This is not only a Scottish question. Protests made outside of Scotland show that this is generally realised. It seems, however, that Scotland is getting more than its share of bases. It is only right and proper that the strongest possible resistance should stem from Scotland. That is what is happening.

The signs are that it will lead to a general struggle against the war preparations. The tone of the discussion at the meeting of the Trades Council, mentioned above, seemed to indicate that.

GAITSKELL AND THE LABOUR PARTY—contd

travelling" Labour Party coming to power.

Gaitskell has, throughout the 'fifties, been the archpriest of the Cold War. Inevitably it leads him to advocate a policy that runs directly contrary to the best interests of the Labour Party. In 1950, he proposed cuts in the National Health Service to pay for a greatly expanded arms programme. As Chancellor of the Exchequer, he was able to win the Attlee Government over; Bevan, who regarded the NHS as the Labour Government's supreme achievement, sought to prevent this onslaught on the social services. He resigned from the Cabinet, and the great dispute began. In other words, Gaitskell's zealotry for prosecuting the Cold War caused the great divide, provoked dissension with the Party, and contributed to the downfall of the Labour Government. Significantly, the Labour Party now recognises that the NHS charges were a retrograde step and that the next Labour Government should abolish them. However much H-bombs cost, and however much Gaitskell may want to amass more of them, he cannot suggest paying for them by continuing NHS charges without going against the declared policy not only of the annual conference but also the Parliamentary Labour Party.

The second great issue of the 'fifties—German re-armament—followed the same pattern. Although no Labour candidate had advocated furnishing the ex-Nazi generals with arms at the 1951 General Election, Gaitskell had no qualms in going against the election policy, like those he has over nuclear disarmament. Nor did Gaitskell feel, as he evidently does now, that dissenting MPs should be allowed to follow the dictates of their consciences. Six MPs were expelled from the Parliamentary Labour

for actually having the audacity to vote against German re-armament.

Yet to-day the Labour Party is united in regarding German re-armament as a dangerous move, likely to create East-West friction and international incidents. The Labour Party proposes disengagement in Central Europe, the emergence of a non-militarized zone. This policy is directly at variance with the position Hugh Gaitskell held throughout the German re-armament debate.

During the past ten years, Hugh Gaitskell's political behaviour has fallen into a definite pattern. He has raised issues that divide the Labour Party. For a time he has won the day on these issues, enforcing rigid conformity from dissenters, but later, faced with the turn of events and the weight of opinion against him, he has had to beat a quick withdrawal.

But his latest escapade—trying to hold back with Canute-like fortitude—the rising tide of support for nuclear disarmament, has led him into a difficult, untenable position. A consistent warrior in the Cold War, he grows more and more similar to the late Foster Dulles, who thought he saw communists under every bed, table, and lavatory seat. Gaitskell even sees them among his fellow members of the Labour Party while, at the same time, he favours depriving Communists of democratic rights.

For democratic socialists Gaitskell has reached the end of the road. The Labour Party has been sacrificed too long on the altar of the American alliance. What is needed is a clear lead for national survival and national independence, a foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow. And Gaitskell is completely incapable of giving such a lead.

STATEMENT

FRIGIDAIRE WORKERS' STRIKE

WE are glad to reprint the following extract from a Reads "Frigidaire" leaflet published by the Frigidaire Strike Committee, North London:

On November 1st one of our members, while being timed on a job on an assembly line, was considered by his foreman not to be working fast enough. Before the man was able to complete the next job he was shifted by the foreman, and transferred to the stores. The stewards objected to this action, and tried to settle the matter on the spot, but without success. It should be stated here, that in Frigidaire the piecework system does *not* provide for mutual agreement on the job times. It is the foreman who accepts the time for the job.

TURNED DOWN

After protracted negotiations the stewards proposed to the management that the Divisional Organiser be called in, our member put back on the assembly line, and the dispute negotiated without pressure from either side.

This proposal was turned down by the management. After further negotiations, the management said they would put our member back on the assembly line but that they would take away his merit money (2d per hour). When this was reported by the stewards to his Section, our members (35 in all) stopped work. On Monday 7 November, two other assembly lines decided to stop in sympathy, involving 120 men.

At our request, the Divisional

Organiser came to a meeting of the members involved in the stoppage.

At the meeting it was again decided that the stewards make an attempt to reach a settlement with the management, and again propose that our member be put back on the assembly line without penalty, and the Organiser called in. The stewards saw the management, but the management rejected both the matter of the member being put back on his line, and to meet the Organiser. On Tuesday 8 November, an All Factory meeting voted to stop work at 8am the next day. This was carried by an overwhelming majority. The Organisers of the AEU, TGW, GMWU, ASW, ETU met the management on Thursday 10 November, at 2.30 pm. During the course of these discussions, the management made it quite plain that the issue is now the *growth of Trade Unionism within Frigidaire*.

SUPPORT

We have built up a solid organization and will fight to the bitter end to defend it. We are confident that with your assistance we shall bring this dispute to a successful conclusion.

Please send all financial support to:— Mr. M. Wright, 5A, Holmstall Avenue, Edgware, Middx.
PS We hear that BOAC workers and dockers have backed Frigidaire products and donations have come in from Harrow, Hendon and Willesden Labour Parties—ed.

REVIEWS

POLITICS

THROUGH CRITICISM

AT THE

LONDON FILM FESTIVAL

FILMS have dominated the scene in the past month, and in the post-Fourth London Film Festival hangover, critics have been forced into blinkers against the glare (cf. C. A. Lejeune's review of *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* in the "Observer"). Your Reviews Editors have not suffered from this complaint since they have not been able to get tickets for some of the major films. Of the shows we did manage to see, the British *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* (now at the Warner, reviewed elsewhere on this page) and the American *Shadows* were the most interesting. An impromptu film, *Shadows*, like its contemporary *The Savage Eye*, shows the ugly underslip of American life—a world which embraces huckster and beat, the neurosis of Greenwich Village and the Bowery. The main character spends his life with two friends, hunting for cheap booze and sex as the only opiates for his boredom. Ostensibly race-conflict is the main issue of the film, but in fact the problem is subordinate to the harsh portrait of lives without purpose. Something similar was attempted in *Notte Brava (and Les Cousins)*: in the Italian film, now at the Cameo-Poly, a group of Roman tarts and hoodlums joins up with a gang of idle upper-class boys for a night of disconnected incidents, violence punctuated by listlessness and boredom.

YOUTH

The problem of Youth is becoming fashionable without its full implications ever being clear; at present, only in film and novel can the full violence and amorality of a generation that has a stake in nothing but sensation be shown. It is partly in this context that one can see *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*—only a blind anarchism that struggles up from the morass of a loyalty-less generation. In startling contrast are the two films we saw at the Festival—from Hungary, *For Whom the Larks Sing*, and from India the final episode of Satyajit Ray's superb trilogy, *The World of Apu*. The former is a romanticised fragment of Hungarian peasant life in the 1920's. Zhdanovism has been pushed

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 St. Martin's Printers (T.U.) 86d. Lillie Road, London. S.W.6. Tel.: FUL. 8637.

JANET

BROWN

back to the stage where a relatively innocent film can be made and exported, although we are still to see a really good film emerge from Hungary. Gentle and tender, the film bears as much relation to history as the average American Cowboy film. Perhaps sentimentality is the new liberalised propaganda method—the Hidden and Tender Persuaders. *The World of Apu* on the other hand, despite similar accusations of sentimentality, shows not the slop but the strength of emotion. The subject, Apu's loss of a wife whom he originally only married to prevent the curse of Krishna falling upon her, and his final reconciliation with the son whose birth killed her, might perhaps, if mishandled, lay the production open to the danger of being a mere handkerchief film; but the sensitivity of the photography, which, if possible, adds even greater depth to the psychological insight of the acting, makes a profound impact on the watcher.

POLITE

Cameras were also at work in another production we saw this month, not at the Film Festival but at the London Casino. Cinema is currently showing *South Seas Adventure*, a marathon production that cruises through the south seas, stopping en route to glimpse the shallower aspects of a nineteenth century dream-world. This is the stuff the petit-bourgeoisie found so stimulating in Kipling, and one of the roots of the traumatic imperialism of the 1890's. All may sit in the cosiness of a cinema, at home with a lavish endowment of all subsidiary delights of cinema-going, ice-cream and coffee in your seats, and marvel at the strangeness of foreign lands and the idiocies the white man must overcome to bring civilisation and progress. But the message is now overlaid with the gutless liberalism that has inspired so many tea-party organisations, the painless belief in human brotherhood (but our daughter still cannot marry a black man). It is an index of the revival of the petit-bourgeoisie, of the growth of the white-collar stratum, that the London Casino can exist; it is a polite version of the pre-World War I music-hall, with the heartiness and the vulgarity, and the warmth extracted to preserve—the onlookers' respectability.

DOG FROM RUSSIA

Some of the more notable of the new productions which we missed, but which should certainly be interesting, are Ray's *Jalsaghar*, Bunuel's *The Young One* (Mexico), Antonioni's *L'Avventura*, and *Lady with the Little Dog* from the USSR.

SATURDAY NIGHT AND SUNDAY MORNING

"SATURDAY Night and Sunday Morning", from the book by Alan Sillitoe, is the first British feature film since the war to show life in Britain as it is really lived by millions of people. The smoke, the noise, the congestion and the gut-tearing hurry of life in a factory-town in the north of England can provide only one escape for an energetic young factory-worker. He sets out to get the maximum out of a selfish environment with the minimum of effort; and yet, despite the high wages, the wardrobe full of suits, the telly and the beer, he is aware that all this is not enough. His amoral approach to human relationships and to Brenda, the married woman he makes pregnant, is one of take much and give little, a philosophy he has learnt from 'them bastards' who run the factory, take his taxes, put him in the army, and build bombs which would burn up the land for one hundred miles around Nottingham.

Unlike the book, the film is unwilling to go into such details as A-bombs, abortions and the young worker's hatred of the television, but enough remains of his protest and dissatisfaction to make him a very sympathetic character despite his behaviour.

Throughout the film one is made strongly aware that the prosperity of the working-classes is not sufficient. In their surroundings, and in their prospects for the future, the workers of 1960 are little better off than their

parents, dead from the neck up, with tele-visual hypnosis. A film which states this as clearly as *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, and puts the blame on 'them bastard bosses' is a rare event in the British cinema.

N. Howard

RTP AT UNITY

Unity Theatre has a long and illustrious tradition in the Labour Movement—it celebrates this month its twenty-fifth anniversary. Its links with the Communist Movement have meant, since the war, that socialists in general have found it impossible to support it. Now, however, it is making a genuine attempt to broaden its support in the wide Labour Movement. Such has been the measure of its success that it is once again able to support a mobile theatre to take round to industrial and civic centres in the provinces plays of interest to socialists. Its initial production, *The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists*, was recently shown in the London theatre (1 Goldington Crescent N.W.1) before being taken on tour. This famous socialist novel, written in 1902 by Robert Tressell, an Irish house-painter, and now adapted to play-form, carries a message and a force which have lost none of their vividness. The novel ends on a note of optimism but, in keeping with the times, the play leaves the lonely socialist worker abandoned by all except a few close friends, kept alive only by the inspiration of his political belief. The play should be seen, both for its humour and its uncompromising message.

John Ashdown

SOCIALISM, THE BOMB, AND NEUTRALISM—contd

explained to the fullest extent of logic. In particular, Gaitskell's trump card, the bogey of German nuclear armament (which he now opposes after years of acquiescence) can only be countered by an insistence on the necessary international character of the movement against the Bomb. This is not an idle, Utopian vision. Two years ago the West German Campaign Against Atomic Death reached a degree of mass enthusiasm that has not so far been achieved by the British CND: demonstrations on the scale of the third Aldermaston March in each city. After a temporary eclipse, this movement is now reviving in new forms. A Labour Party consistently committed to the abandonment of the Bomb and its alliance, and to a foreign policy independent of Washington and Moscow, its line unclouded and unhindered by the manoeuvrings of the Nuclear Bombardiers, would find ready allies within the Labour movements of Germany, France and other NATO powers. It is essential for Labour campaigners to recapture this sense of international solidarity. Sometimes the term "unilateralism" has been taken, by certain of its supporters as well as by its opponents, to imply a kind of isolationism, a withdrawal by Britain from a dangerous world. The word "multilateralist" has now been coined as a self-description by the Right Wing in an effort to smear all the opponents of the Bomb with this insinuation.

But the simple truth is that "unilateralism" must mean the independent action of many peoples against the Bomb if it is to succeed. The division in the movement is not between "multilateralists" and "unilateralists". It is between anti-Socialists, militarist dunderheads, and plain lunatics on the one hand, and internationalist Socialists of various hues on the other. It is as simple as that.

What is being attempted in the campaign against the Bomb is nothing short of revolution (i.e., a decisive change in relations of social power). This anti-nuclear revolution implies a socialist domestic policy (i.e., Clause Four) if its Socialist foreign policy is not to be sabotaged by economic vested interests. It equally implies, as we have stated, an orientation towards the encouragement of "neutralist" forces abroad, not only through diplomatic agreements with this or that ex-colonial state, but also through appeals to the Labour and anti-nuclear movements of advanced countries; where necessary, over the heads of their Governments. Socialist "neutralism" has in fact got to be thoroughly subversive. So far the Right of the Labour Party and the Tory press have appreciated these implications to a much greater extent than has the active Left.

Algerian War

from page 1
thing' against the War. For about a year now a certain number of them (two to three hundred) have found no satisfaction for this desire except in individual protestations to which they have turned, insubordination (that is to say, refusal to leave for Algeria) or desertion. *These, however, can lead to nothing.* Insubordination and desertion, organised by networks stuffed with police, and directed by irresponsible petit-bourgeois, can only achieve the exile, abroad or in prison, of young men who ought, in the normal course of events, to form the vanguard of the struggle against the war, not vegetate, cut off from everything, incapable of action, in some foreign country, without hope of return. It was this situation that led the National Union of Students (UNEF) to propose at the beginning of October a national demonstration against the War in the Place de la Bastille, in the centre of Paris. Immediately the CGT (the Stalinist TUC) replied that this proposal could only sow confusion, and criticised the call for a national demonstration violently, giving as suggested alternatives, local demonstrations and delegations to local authorities. The Paris region departmental union of the Force Ouvriere upheld the appeal, while the national level federal bureau of the same union condemned it; the CFTC (Christian TUC) adopted

a wavering position. Only the National Federation of Education (FEN, an autonomous union of teachers and professors) unanimously supported the UNEF and its action.

The policy of the FEN is to pressurise the regime to force it to make peace on the lines of its own policy (uncompromising application of self-determination). The FEN did not try to mobilise the latent opposition to the War among a large section of the population on the basis of a policy different to that of General De Gaulle. The same is true of the CP and the CGT. However these last two did all that they could to prevent the national demonstration from taking place. Their tactics consisted of a constant substitution of one- or two-hour token strikes and local demonstrations for the project of the students. The militants were told: these children's tantrums do not concern you. At the Central Committee of the CP, Thorez criticised 'the regrettable Leftist tendency of the UNEF'. In the course of the daily meetings of the Paris representatives of the various unions, it became more obvious everyday that the Stalinists wished to sabotage the project now it was begun. Thus *l'Humanité* (the CP paper) on the 20th October 'greeted the decision of the CGT which called on workers to organise one hour token strikes and demonstrations outside firms and in their towns...'

On the morning of Thursday, 20th October, the prefecture of the Seine Police announced that

the national demonstration at the Bastille was prohibited. The regime refused to risk the clash of forces between its police and the fifty or sixty thousand demonstrators who would doubtless gather in the centre of Paris. The students decided to hold a demonstration despite the prohibition. The Stalinists were more than over opposed to it. From that moment, both sides planned their tactics; who would be first to capitulate to the regime, the Stalinists or the others? The students' ambition to mobilise their ranks against the War, come what may, and thus, since the demonstration was prohibited, *against the regime*, forced everyone back against the wall.

The Stalinists 'capitulated' the first... In fact, they did not really capitulate. They were afraid that by continuing their dodging manoeuvres they might allow their militants to be swept into a real struggle against the War, then against the regime; and this is exactly what the CP does not want! It does not want to risk a remotely revolutionary situation developing. It therefore cut all links, smashed all links, all hopes of unity, in the direct action whose grand champion it unceasingly claimed to be. The Seine Departmental bureau of the CGT announced on the 25th October that 'it was not associated and would not associate with an appeal to assemble on the 27 October for this prohibited demonstration'. The political bureau of the CP declared on the same day 'that conditions were not ripe for a national demonstration in Paris which was prohibited, to muster the mass of the partisans of negotiation'. At the same time, the CP and the CGT sent out orders for the 27th October: token strikes of one hour within the plant (sic!) and local demonstrations... really a second sabotage of the planned national demonstration—workers could not demonstrate simultaneously at their place of work and in the centre of Paris!

From then on a compromise was inevitable; the UNEF, the FEN, the CFTC, and the FC extracted permission to hold a meeting on the 27th October in Mutualite Assembly Hall; but the CP and the CGT, determined to the last to sabotage unity of action against the War, accused the organisers of the meeting of having plotted all this with the police in order, naturally, to 'divide the working-class'... and demanded, finally, to associate with the meeting and to participate in the selection of speakers as a condition of their attendance. The FEN and the UNEF asked them, as a first step, to retract their slanders. The Stalinists refused.

The meeting was held without them. 15—18,000 people assembled, mainly students and intellectuals. Workers mobilised elsewhere or 'demobilised' by the CP were scarce, despite the attendance of the CFTC and the FO. The CP had shown its power but only negatively; it had succeeded in its tactics of division. The developments in the meeting had proved that the desire for struggle was not lacking; they showed that it was perfectly possible to hold a prohibited street

demonstration with the participation of workers who were largely under the control of the Stalinists; the clash with the regime would not necessarily have resulted in the victory of the latter.

Unfortunately, though the holding of the meeting was in itself a great step forward, its conclusion was much more disappointing. The organisers were merely content to say that De Gaulle must be forced to do what he had said he would do. They allowed an impassioned crowd to leave without giving the slightest direction for action in the near or distant future. The only directive given was: 'Disperse outside in calm, silence and dignity'. At the exit the police carefully divided the stream of people. Some hundred metres down the road squads of police charged without warning on scattered groups of students, and on those who, dissatisfied with the meeting's conclusion, were shouting 'Peace in Algeria' and 'Negotiations in Algeria'. These 'remonstrations', spontaneous or instigated by the PSU, were condemned in advance to brutal repression—they were dispersed in four different directions, and no practicable organisation had been prepared. The barbarity of the police exceeded all comment... More than a hundred were injured—some of them foreigners—five hundred and thirty were arrested, one student was charged with assaulting a policeman while his foot was crushed... such was the balance of peace vengeance against the partisans of peace.

And now?

Since 22nd October, the agitation has calmed down, the fever abated. The students know that they cannot fight the regime alone; to be the vanguard does not mean isolation. They are waiting for a new initiative from some other quarter. Meanwhile De Gaulle clings to his old policy, one day to the left, one day to the right. After the trial of military insubordinates a month ago, comes the trial of the fascist insurgents of January 24th; after the sanctions against the intellectuals who signed the manifesto of the 121, supporting insubordination, comes the dismissal of the ultra, Jacomet. De Gaulle is once again the uncontested master. Everyone is waiting for him to decide. The thousands of students who refused to join this game risk more and more being charged with insubordination and desertion—and this can only increase their isolation. How much longer will De Gaulle be able to profit from the general resignation of the country to plot his policies in peace? he has tried to wear down his opponents slowly but surely, but the gradual deterioration of the situation could equally well one day turn against him. It is not definite that each day makes more likely the success of a policy which only rallies behind it the unity of a facade. De Gaulle has, however, the ace of trumps; beside the fascist ultras, who would propose another policy in Algeria? *no-one*. He is the master of history so long as he is alone in wishing to control it.

IT'S RICH

"A NATIONAL housing shortage no longer exists". Dr. Charles Hill at Woverhampton, October 29.

"We cannot envisage a nuclear situation where there will be enough blood"—spokesman at CD exercise, 'Altogether Heave', reported in *Observer*, September 25.

"Private ownership of the means of production can claim protection by society as long as it does not hinder the establishment of social justice".—Basic program of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, 1959, p. 11.

"ADENAUER JETS BUZZED THE ROYAL PLANE"—Headline in *Daily Worker*, October 26.

"A man has still to be above the average in physical fitness and character; and well over a third of recruits last year in the Metropolitan police, for instance, came from grammar or public schools."—Christopher Pulling, "What is a Policeman Worth", *Times*, October 30.

"White farmers in the Umtali area of Southern Rhodesia have rejected proposals for a minimum of 15s. a week and detailed ration scales for African labourers." *Observer*, November 6.

"...there is a fear that if the unemployed are given support some of them may be inclined never to work again." *Times* report on Congo, July 27.

"The mayor of the little commune of Aromas, near Dijon, has protested to his local prefect, claiming that his authority is being undermined by madmen. It appears that the 148 sane members of the village are outnumbered by the inmates of a local lunatic asylum, who in France are entitled to vote, and recently have been voting as a block for the Opposition. The mayor's protests, however, seem to be based not on any inherent lack of judgment in the voters but on the fact that, coming from all parts of France, they should not be allowed to control the affairs of Aromas." Reported in *Times*, November 10.

Mobutu troops, when asked by Mobutu to help to look for the body of the accidentally drowned West German Ambassador go on a tour of the city's bars with Lumumba himself, 'due to a confusion in the interpretation of orders'." "The Congo Madhouse", *New Statesman*, October 22.

PETER CADOGAN DISCUSSES

Freedom of Speech

SINCE, as Rutherford observed, "all great truths are simple" they are the very ones that are most easily overlooked. Thus we all cheerfully acknowledge the principle of the freedom of speech—and in practice deny it. Of all the unsolved problems in front of us this strikes me as being the most urgent, since without the correct political method we shall be incapable of any progress at all.

It was not until a few months ago that what seems to be the truth about this subject finally dawned upon me. I owe the discovery to the students of Cambridge.

During the last academic year the University Conservative Club asked Oswald Mosley to come to Cambridge and speak in the Union, and I decided to go along and take part in the opposition. The Labour Club (with Brian Pollitt and a handful of CP types) made up a back bench block. When Mosley entered the Chamber he was given the full "Sieg Heil" treatment. When some sort of order was established and he got up to speak a student walked straight up to him and flung a jelly in his face. (All this did in effect was to make him seem the injured party and he duly capitalised on it.)

BARRAGE

Mosley then spoke at some length and amongst other things (after assuring us that he was not anti-semitic!) propounded his incredible case for total apartheid in South Africa—two wholly separate states, one black and the other white. He then faced a fierce barrage of uninhibited questions and the meeting ended with a minor masterpiece of irony uttered by a young Tory as a formal vote of thanks.

This experience was for me a final lesson in the significance of the freedom of speech. Hitherto I had taken the CP view that the freedom of speech did not extend to fascists. Now I clearly and fully appreciated for the first time that provided one believed in the intelligence and humanity of people then freedom of speech for a character like Mosley was the best political inoculation against him.

In Cambridge now Mosley has no mystique. He has been seen, heard and found wanting. Even the extreme Right would, I think, agree with that.

Does freedom of speech for fascists signify giving in to them? Of course not. Free speech means exactly what it says. It does not mean freedom for the rough house. If fascists, or anyone else, turn to violence then socialists should be ready with overwhelming force (and I mean force) to stop them in their tracks, but not to stop them speaking.

Untruth is self-exposing. Reaction is self-confounding. Once we understand that our socialism is nothing if not an increasingly valid reading of the truth, then it is possible for us

to deliberately create the combination of circumstances in which the worthless withers of its own worthlessness. This is in the nature of freedom.

Now to take an example from the other end of the political spectrum... One of the left-wing groups (won't say which) recently came out with this proposition: "The consolidation of working class power will require the violent crushing of all political tendencies aiming at the preservation or re-institution of exploitation."

What does this mean? Simply that the people who put it forward have a complete lack of confidence in the intelligence of the common people. The socialist revolution in this country will not take place until the overwhelming majority of the people support it. In that circumstance the only possible reason for subsequent police-state action must arise from the mistaken policies of the revolutionary leaders who are required to take coercive action to maintain measures on which they know they cannot carry conviction. Where there is mass conviction and mass movement "violent crushing" is utterly redundant. Yet people who do not understand this presume to think they can build the revolutionary party! No wonder it doesn't get built!

The Labour Movement today is stultified and hag-ridden by an infamous regiment of dogmas: blind faith in the bureaucratic machine (the Right); the infallibility of the Soviet Union (stalinist); Parliament can solve all our problems (VFS); the Labour Party is death (ILP); that the Russian leaders are not beyond hope and persuasion and Russia still a 'workers state' (trotskyists); all power to Healy (SLL); UNO is the answer (NLR);

belief in a vanguard elite (various); industrial action is the answer (Workers Party); the slump is inevitable (various); capitalism can go on 'buying time' almost indefinitely (Cliff).

There is a characteristic common to all of these. The members (or more particularly the leaders) of each group will regard their own particular dogma as *not* open to discussion in the pages of their own press. They will simply vilify anyone who tries to alter that. Dogma and criticism cannot co-exist.

Thus today real criticism on the Left is suppressed by the Left itself. The idea that capitalism is to blame for everything is not true and is in itself a common and dangerous dogma. There is a fundamental source of error within ourselves. It lies in our mistaken method.

This is what Lenin was getting at when he said that "criticism and self-criticism is the law of development of the party". And it follows from it that any group on the Left today that fails to grow in the present fertile political atmosphere is failing not from objective circumstances at all but because of its refusal to recognise the very law of its own development.

May I, in conclusion, put a question to my fellow socialists? Between us there are profound differences of opinion. Between ourselves in conversations and meetings we have the fiercest arguments. Are the things we disagree about only petty incidental questions or matters of great moment? Since they are clearly of the second order how is it that we do not have them out in print in all the journals and papers to which we have access? Have we so little confidence in ourselves and socialism?

Socialist Review

Fighting Fund

We need £40 an issue

During the last month we have received from:

	£	s	d
Islington	5	13	6
Hackney	5	12	0
Shoreditch	5	7	6
Notting Hill	5	0	0
Manchester		6	0
Lewisham	2	13	9
Harrow	2	0	0
Ramsgate	3	2	0
Belfast		3	6
Edinburgh	1	7	6
Epping		14	0
Total	31	19	9

THANKS! and KEEP IT UP, COMRADES!

I enclose a contribution of£.....s.....d. to the SOCIALIST REVIEW Fighting Fund.

Name
Address

Send to SOCIALIST REVIEW APPEAL FUND, 117 Carmelite Road, Harrow Weald, Middlesex

Comrades should also remember that they could do us the world of good and themselves no harm by making all their purchases through London Co-operative No. 350498.

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 nor Moscow.