

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

JOURNAL

for the

Industrial Militant —

for

International

Socialism

11th YEAR No 3

MARCH 1961

SIXPENCE

GIVE GAITSKELL MARCHING ORDERS



THIS year the march against the Bomb will be massive. More trade unions and Labour Parties will bring their banners than before. More supporters will be there. Young Socialists will be present in strength, despite their Annual Conference (arranged by some extraordinary coincidence for the same weekend).

But one banner will be missing, unless even at this late hour a correction is made. The Labour Party, which decided for unilateralism at Scarborough, will not be represented by its National Executive Committee. A careful study of everything that has recently come out of Transport House does not reveal an intention on the part of the Leader to set an example, his knapsack on his back.

Marxists have consistently argued that the heart of the movement against war must be the organised working class. Unless this heart is sound, the motions of the limbs will be feverish; the brain will be clouded.

That is why, much as we have admired the courage of the Direct Actionists, we have criticized their methods. To kick an opponent in the shins is good. To deliver a body blow to the solar plexus is better. The working class, which by withdrawing its labour could end the H-bomb, is the only force which can deliver that blow.

The workers are not ready for this action yet. But their Party has decided against the bomb. And the Party, mobilized fully in

support of its decision, could and should be preparing the whole class for action on the question.

If the leaders of the Party had really wished to carry out the instructions given them by conference, they would at once have approached the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament with proposals for joint action. They would have offered the support of every constituency and ward in organising this year's march. They would have suggested that they themselves should march at its head.

The attitude of the CND to these proposals is (and is likely to remain) a matter for conjecture. But it is hard to believe that even the most determinedly "non-political" of its supporters would have rejected them out of hand.

But the Labour Party Leader and Deputy Leader, who do not carry out conference decisions, but spurn and sabotage them, have naturally no intention of doing otherwise on this occasion.

At least they should be told the views of the rank and file. At least they should be made aware of what is expected of them. Constituency Labour Parties should demand official support for the Aldermaston March, with the participation of the NEC. They should say to the gentlemen who for the time being are floating on top of this Labour movement: "Lead, in the spirit of decisions taken—or get out!"



photos by
courtesy of
Tribune

INSIDE

T.U. COMMENTARY page 2

COUNCILS IN CRISIS page 2

ON THE WRONG TRACK page 3

REVIEWS page 4

APOSTLE OF MRA page 4

CANDID COMMENTARY page 5

THE DEVIL, GOD AND THE ORACLE page 6

NOTTINGHAM TEACHERS FIGHT page 7

REGULAR readers of *Socialist Review* will perhaps have ceased to examine our program—'WHAT WE STAND FOR'—on its monthly appearance on page eight.

This issue carries a completely new formulation of 'WHAT WE STAND FOR'. It is hoped that this new presentation will be of more use to comrades in arguing the relevance of Socialist ideas to their fellow factory and Labour Party workers.

TU COMMENTARY

KARL DUNBAR

AEU Assistant General Secretary, Ernie Roberts was forced to withdraw his name as a sponsor to the recent *Daily Worker* conference, under threat of "possible expulsion from the Labour Party". For Bro. Roberts this was not the first time such threats had been made, although his support for various public meetings has always been in his personal capacity and not that of his organization.

This interference in the right of the individual to publicly support causes in which he believes, should be condemned in the strongest terms by all who believe in freedom and democracy. Today it is Bro. Roberts, tomorrow it could be you.

FROM Germany comes the news of a plan to get non-unionists to contribute to union funds. We must agree that this is a new one in industrial thinking, but unfortunately there is a nasty sting in the tail.

The Building Workers Union charman, George Leber, argues that a 'solidarity contribution' by all workers is 'fair' because of the material benefits enjoyed by those workers through union negotiation. This is certainly an arguable point, one which could well be discussed in our own movement, and there would be some very interesting views put forward.

In the case of the German TU movement prosperity has resulted in a sharp decline in union membership. Ten years ago 40 percent of all workers were organised, today that has fallen to 32 percent.

Perhaps it is because of this that Herr Leber adds the sting of 'compulsory arbitration' to the proposal. But to deprive workers of their one weapon, the right to strike, is a price too high to pay for any immediate and certainly temporary benefits.

RECENTLY a dispute on the Shell building site, which lasted for over a month, again spotlighted the problem of the ever disappearing demarcation lines.

Similar to the well-known shipyard strikes over the use of new materials the Shell dispute concerned who should fix cast iron pipes for the cooling system of the air conditioning plant.

The unions involved were the Plumbers Union and the Heating and Domestic Engineering Union. It is all too easy to condemn this kind of dispute as unreasonable, indeed the Fleet Street press make this argument their *sol estock* in trade, but where workers' jobs are placed in jeopardy by an employing class who always seek to break down existing practices without reference to the workers conditions and wage rates, all workers must be on their guard.

But this is certainly a problem for the movement. With the introduction of new materials and new processes more and more demarcation disputes will arise, especially where work is scarce. We need a strong, united movement to fight the bosses. In the struggle against sackings and short time every link in the chain needs to be as strong as possible.

What should be our attitude towards these problems, problems which result in worker literally against worker, with the boss sitting back reaping the benefit of our disunity? Surely the answer lies in amalgamation. Let workers who exist in unions whose original craft status has virtually disappeared put their strength into another union with general and wide scope.

The T&GWU was built through the merging of many small unions—the AEU also—but there is still much to be done in the field of amalgamation.

It must be common sense to

strengthen our movement and there's no time like the present to grow new muscles.

THE news that the Tory Government intended to increase charges for certain items under the National Health Service was the cause of much comment in the workshop, and there was a general feeling that these should be resisted in one way or another.

A few Labour Party members who discussed this, and who were aware of the feeling that it engendered, decided to move quickly and get something done.

It was felt that although a motion of censure had been tabled by the Parliamentary Labour Party this alone would not cause the Tories to abandon their proposals. It was felt that extra parliamentary action would be needed.

The Shop Stewards Committee was approached, through the convenor, who endorsed the idea of a petition which called for *industrial action*.

The petition was drafted and in the space of a few hours 540 signatures were collected from workers at ENV. The petition was then sent to the EC of the AEU who we hope will consider it at their next meeting. The terms of the petition are as follows:

"We the undersigned trade unionists wish to place on record our protest at the increased charges which the Government intends to levy on items coming within the scope of the National Health Service. This vicious piece of class legislation will hit hardest at those who are least able to pay, and it strikes at the very roots of a very necessary social service. We call on our Executive Committee to press for action by the Labour opposition and the TUC, and pledge ourselves to support industrial action, which we insist our EC and the TUC should call, in order to reverse this proposed legislation".

We are hoping that this petition, with its call for action, will be answered by the EC in a positive manner. It would

however reinforce our aims if other workshop organisations, TU branches and Trades Councils sent in similar requests.

JIM STEVENS. ETU

WITH last year's victories of the London Transport power workers—which achieved at long last Central Electricity Authorities' rates and conditions for workers in the electrical engineers department—one problem remained unsolved, and is receiving the full attention of both rank-and-file members and TU officials.

This is the total inadequacy of the BTC Sick Pay & Pension Scheme. The pension scheme is governed by Act of Parliament and is therefore not negotiable, but we have room to manoeuvre over the sick pay scheme.

"If we can work under CEA conditions why can't we be sick under the same conditions?" says the ETU's National Officer, Bill Benson, thereby echoing the opinion of the vast majority of the workers. An attempt has already been made by the LTE to evaluate the CEA sick pay scheme in terms of a weekly cash allowance paid to us in our wage packet. This was rejected by the TU officials who received the endorsement of the vast majority of our members. This attempt to give a few pence to a man when he is fit and well against full pay when he needs it most is utterly ridiculous and will be resisted with all means at our disposal.

Attempts are still being made by some shop stewards to heal the splits in TU unity which occurred during the power strikes.

A small chink of light is the attempt in the Sub Station Engineers action to reconvene the now extinct shop stewards monthly meeting which gives a chance to shop floor stewards to have direct access to those stewards who sit on the official negotiating machinery. If this is successful it could be the break through we are working for.

Socialist Review

Fighting Fund

We need £40 an issue

During the last month we have received from:

	£	s	d
Islington	9	9	6
Willesden	7	2	0
Harrow	11	0	0
Camden Town	4	2	0
Shoreditch	1	16	0
N. Lewisham	1	6	6
Ramsgate	2	18	0
Liverpool	1	0	0
Total	38	14	0

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 Camden Road, Harrow Weald, Middlesex.

COUNCILS IN CRISIS

BY RAY CHALLINOR

COUNCILLOR—NEWCASTLE—STAFFS.

THE Labour Party's National Executive Committee, having acquired an aversion to all conferences since Scarborough, have decided not to hold a conference for Labour Groups on Local Authorities this year. It took this decision, I might add, quite unilaterally, without first seeing whether the Liberal or Tory Parties intended to suspend theirs. Also, it took this decision without considering the urgent needs for co-ordinating local government policy, and synchronizing all efforts to bring the maximum pressure to bear on the Tory Government.

rates, a feeling of discontent prevails and, as the St. Pancras rent strike shows, could be harnessed against the Government. However, where Labour Councils just carry out the directives from Whitehall, becoming little better than tools (in every sense of the word) of Tory policy, then it is often the Labour Party that receives odium.

Labour councillors are frequently effected by a peculiar disease—council cretinism—which afflicts the eyes, making them so short-sighted that they see no farther than the parish.

contd. page 3

ON THE WRONG TRACK

BY STAN MILLS

IN March 1960 the Guillbaud Committee made its report on railway pay. To judge by the ecstasies which convulsed the capitalist press for some time after the report one would have assumed that the golden age for railwaymen had arrived.

The real facts bear little resemblance to those presented in the press. While it is true that some grades at the top of the scale received reasonable (but long overdue) increases, some are still in the position of finishing the week with a take home pay of less than 8 pounds with the majority in the 9 to 10 pounds per week income bracket.

Many railwaymen of course supplement their meagre wages with excessive overtime and it is a commonplace for a railwayman to work 7 days a week for months at a stretch. For thousands of others however this opportunity to supplement wages does not exist.

Recently the Branch Secretary of the Wear Valley and Shildon NUR branch was reported in the local news paper as saying "That the ever present danger of men becoming fatigued and strained through too frequent turns of duty cannot be ignored". This report followed a statement from the Branch that the management had cancelled rest days for signalmen in the Darlington district for the holiday period which extends from April to October.

Why, it may be asked, is such action by the management necessary? The short and only answer is the shortage of staff caused by the miserable pay and conditions on British Railways.

If the BTC think that the Guillbaud wage awards will keep the railwaymen happy they would be quickly disillusioned

by a glance at the number of requests pouring in to the NUR headquarters from branches calling for a new wage claim.

We are never allowed to forget that British Railways are in the red—but what is carefully kept from us is that the stockholders, moneylenders, and big business

tycoons are cashing in to the tune of thousands of millions of pounds when rail workers are hard pressed to make ends meet.

The former owners are to be paid 970 millions plus 3% interest by the year 2008. To repair the depredations of the former owners prior to Nationalisation, the BTC has to find 1580 millions for modernisation. Private industry will of course take a large chunk of these millions in juicy contracts for electrification, diesel and diesel electric locomotives. By 1963 the money lenders will be reaping an annual harvest of 85 millions due to the Railways having to borrow money on the open market at rates of interests of 6% or more.

Ultimately the solution to the railwaymen's problem is a political one. Although minor improvements can be obtained by determined struggle we cannot expect any real change under the existing set-up.

The Labour movement must put an end to this farce and en-

sure the return of a Labour Government pledged to a programme of Socialist Nationalisation under Workers' Control. The NUR was in the forefront of the workers' control movement before the 1914-1918 war and it must become increasingly apparent that the aims of the pioneers of railway unionism are more consistent with the best interests of both the workers in the industry and the travelling public—who will be better served by rail workers committees than the present bunch of retired generals, superannuated civil servants and company directors.

In the meantime we should press for the end of high compensation, the shifting of the railway deficit to the National Debt, and penerous subsidies to nationalised industries requiring improvement.

Only by a positive demand for socialist planning and control of transport can the railwaymen expect to gain the full fruits of their labour.

Brooke's Scheme Means Higher Rents

BY A. MEPHAM

AS economic climate grows ever colder so Tory legislation becomes more and more obviously distinctively class legislation. The Tory squeeze on housing and rents applied gradually over the past seven years, (i.e. since the 1954 Rent Act) has evolved as a threat not only to the living standard of private landlord tenants, not just as an attack upon council tenants as such, not even to mortgagees alone; this calculated drive now embraces all who have a roof over their heads.

Every time the Tories push up rents of privately owned property, so automatically our councils are forced to raise their rents; equally automatically up goes the price of new housing and interest rates. The Tories' latest proposals, deliberately discriminating against councils which seek to maintain a fair rent, will force another round of rent raising.

"Designed to penalise those councils which charge grossly

uneconomic rents" (*Daily Telegraph* 15. 2), there will be a means test under which councils will have to prove their willingness to enter the super rent-raising stakes, before receiving their housing subsidy of £24 per year per house. Should any councils refuse to accept this economic blackmail, then they will receive merely £8 per year per house.

The facts are plain, economic rents are utterly impossible, and are made so by the constant demands for higher and higher profits by the manufacturers. Building materials costs have risen tremendously and the monopolies commission only recently pronounced judgement against the price fixing by the building materials firms.

Apart from the attacks on council tenants, the Tories aim to give £25 million to approved housing societies on the same conditions as those applying to local councils through the public

works loan board, to build houses to let at unsubsidised rents. "The rents may be £4 a week exclusive of rates" (*Guardian*, 15. 2). Already the Tories and their landlord friends have brought untold misery into thousands of homes through the vicious class legislation aimed at proving that housing is fit only for profits and not for human needs.

The complete cynicism of the ruling class can be seen when on the same day that Henry Brooke makes his proopsals the "defence" budget is increased by £39 million.

There can be no hanging back at this stage of the battle against Toryism; all sections of the community are affected and this should prompt Labour to discard the outdated methods of pursuing the problems of this or that particular section and rally the entire working class for the really fundamental battle against the Tories.

from page 2
pump. This results in unedifying spectacles of Labour-controlled councils wasting their time fighting one another instead of the Tories. For example, Staffordshire County Council and Dudley, at the time both Labour, spent £50,000 of public money in legal costs fighting each other over a strip of land. Of course the Tories were jubilant about this and used it at the election—it helped them to gain control of Staffordshire.

Further, the recent boundary changes in the West Midlands caused another rash of petty

squabbles which, as the Tories are adept at divide-and-rule, will inevitably rebound against Labour. One of the effects of these changes is likely to be the re-carving of parliamentary boundaries so that several Labour MPs, including the forthright Harold Davies of Leek, are almost certain to loose their seats.

The lessons of this are obvious. Labour councillors can only be united when they are struggling together for a common aim. It is the absence of any sort of progressive lead that creates disunity.

SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose 8s. subscription for 1 year's issue of SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Name

Address

Send to 117, Carmelite Road, Harrow Weald, Middlesex.

REVIEWS

HAROLD MOHR

SINCE the nationalisation of the mines, railways, electricity, gas, etc., under Attlee's Labour Government, the problem of the actual interrelation between state industry and private industry continues to need clarification. Recently a study was published* which explores the relationship between the 'public' and private sectors of the economy. It explores the effects on the nationalised industries of government action designed to strengthen the capitalist economy. "This relationship is found to be one of subordination to the short-run needs and interests of capitalist industry."

Subordination of the nationalised sector is an inevitable corollary of the confusion within the Labour movement on the function of nationalised industries, of short-run private business pressures and an anti-inflationary emphasis in Government policies. Subordination is a result of the attempt to transform Britain by evolutionary policies. It has only succeeded, however, in transforming 'socialism' (nationalised sector) into an adjunct of monopoly capitalism. Although Hughes does not draw all of these conclusions, and although he limits his analysis to the more 'obvious' deficiencies of nationalisation, the pamphlet undoubtedly exposes both Right-wing Labour and Tory economic policies in this field.

"BREAK-EVEN" RULE

For example, official Labour thinking in nationalisation was (and is) hopelessly inadequate. It "turns upon the equating of public service with current consumer satisfaction; this, in a situation where the economy remains predominantly capitalist and the main consumers of nationalised goods and services are none other than capitalist industry and commerce."

The result of this was the so-called "break-even" rule—that the revenue of a nationalised industry should, taking one year with another, equal its outgoings. Of course, the acceptance and pursuit of this policy was based on more than one consideration, political expediency and the pressures of private industry seeking products and goods on the cheap were important also in this connection.

The results of this "break-even" policy have been disastrous. The nationalised industries have failed to raise from their revenues funds for development, and have even failed adequately to cover depreciation. Consequently they "not merely had to borrow to finance all their net capitalist formation and all their stock-building, but also two-fifths of their estimated capital consumption in the last decade."

The contrast between the two sectors of the economy could not be clearer, there is no doubt who is the senior partner: "The public corporations had a large deficit after allowing for de-

a review of John Hugh's pamphlet "Nationalization in the Mixed Economy"

preciation... and a much larger one after allowing for net investment. By 1958 this involved them in borrowing over £500 million p.a. The company sector not only had a large surplus... after allowing for depreciation, but even after financing all their net investment in Britain." ...

But this is only the first chapter of the story. Our hero is not only trapped but subject also to blackmail. This pricing policy (with its attendant debts) represents in effect an annual subsidy to industrial and commercial users of nationalised goods (and these amount to over 50% of the total sales of the 'public' sector). It means a subsidy of well over £100 million p.a.

PARASITISM

Deficits mean mounting debt burdens. To give just one example: interest payments (of all nationalised industries) in 1947 amounted to £91 million p.a. By 1958 this sum had risen to £221 million p.a., and by the mid-1960's the industries together will probably be paying out something like £350 million p.a. Not only this. Weakness breeds disease—Parasitism. Rentiers ("i.e., people who live by 'clipping coupons', who take no part whatever in production, whose profession is idleness"—Lenin's apt description) draw "from the public corporations each year... over £250 million."

However, the exploitation of the nationalised sector does not end here. Between 1949-58 the nationalised industries purchased about £12,000 million of goods and services from private industry, which is a rate of purchase of about £1,500 p.a. Yet there is no clearly formulated procedure or set of rules for awarding contracts. (Personal connections with private firms occasionally result in 'deals'). No effort is made to break through cartel rings. Summarising the findings of the Monopolies Commission Report on 'The Supply of Electrical and Allied Machinery and Plant', Hughes writes: "The Monopoly Commission found that manufacturers were fixing common prices despite variations in cost of production; this protected the position of the high cost producers and meant very high profit margins for the low cost producers. The manufacturers justified this partly in terms of the high cost of capital investment and and research. Central Electricity Authority orders accounted for 80 per cent of the home market trade in major generating equipment... As an example of what was happening, the Report showed that profit rates on cost for members of the cartel on large motors and alternators sold in the home market had been 9.3 per cent in the boom year 1937, but were over 25 per cent in 1951 and 1952." Could exploitation be carried further?

The answer is Yes. The Tory Government and their friends on

MIXED UP ECONOMY

the Boards have consistently used the nationalised industries for purposes of wage restraint. Wage issues have not been viewed on their merits, but "have been narrowly viewed from the angle of cost of production... on an accounting calculation of the price rise any wage increase would precipitate." Moreover, the government has frequently intervened "with the intention of delaying, reducing, or outright refusing wage increases."

Consequently, the rate of increase of the wages of workers in the nationalised industries has lagged behind the rate in other major industries, as Hoghes' calculations clearly show:

	Earnings, Men Oct. 1952 to Oct. 1959 percentage increase	Industrial Earnings Index — Men
Paper and Printing	64%*	119
Vehicles	58%	112
Chemical and Allied	56%	101
'ALL INDUSTRIES'	51.5%	100
Electricity Supply	50%*	95
Gas Supply	43%	91
Tram & Bus Service (not LTE)	50%*	90
Coal mining	33%	122

Is further proof needed of the subordinate role of the 'public' sector? Or of its exploitation by Tory governments?

Perhaps a few words, finally, to clinch the issue on the government's intervention in pricing policies. When prices have risen in the private monopoly sector (over which the government has little control), as they did when the economy moved towards full capacity in 1950-51; 1954-55;

1959-60 "the government has relied on exerting disproportionate pressure on the nationalised industries in an effort to stabilise the price level." An example of this sort of behaviour was the Government's refusal in 1956 to allow the Transport Commission to increase freight charges. "It is said," to quote the Financial Times on this issue, "to be an independent decision of the Commission. Independence is an ambiguous word. There is indirect pressure and there is direct pressure... the Government has employed both."

This is an interesting and clearly argued pamphlet. The author's evolutionary socialism impairs somewhat the value of

the later sections, but the first two-thirds of the work are of great interest. Too little is known in the way of hard facts of the nature of the 'mixed' economy. Perhaps this pamphlet will set socialists searching and thinking.

*Nationalised Industries in the Mixed Economy, by John Hughes. Published by Fabian Society, 1960. 4/-.

JOHN McGOVEN — APOSTLE OF MRA

BY HARRY McSHANE

MR John McGovern's autobiography, "Neither Fear Nor Favour", would have been really interesting had he dealt more fully and accurately with the events he refers to. Knowing that I was almost certain to be mentioned in the book I had a personal interest in reading it. Having read it I now wonder why he troubled to write it. Perhaps the boost given to M.R.A. in the final chapters is regarded as sufficient justification for the effort.

It is the story of an individualist who hardly ever played a part in the mass struggles on Clydeside. He opposed the first world war, but, although a plumber to trade, he was not involved in the industrial struggles of the period. I first met him at a stormy pro-war meeting in 1916, when I seconded an amendment, in his place, because his foreman was on the platform.

He tells about getting tickets of admission to a pro-war meeting duplicated. He also tells about stewards being armed with metal piping to defend a meeting addressed by Ramsay MacDonald. As a member of the I.L.P. he played an active part in propaganda work from 1916

onwards. He names some of the active figures of that period, but, strange to say, there is no mention of John Maclean.

The 40 hours strike is only mentioned in passing. It takes up nine lines in which he refers to the riot and says, "Shinwell disappeared for a time". Shinwell was the most prominent figure in the strike. After the riot he went to the Trades Council office and destroyed some papers. He was arrested and given a longer sentence than any of the other accused men.

He disposes of his association with Guy Aldred and the Anti-Parliamentary Communist Federation in a few pages. His break with Aldred is glossed over. Having heard two conflicting versions of the quarrel I think it is a pity that McGovern did not provide his readers with a fuller account.

McGovern went to Australia for a short period. On his return he went back to the I.L.P., became a Parish Councillor and, later, a City Councillor. On the death of John Wheatley, early in 1930, a new parliamentary candidate had to be selected for Shettleston.

The I.L.P. put forward the

name of John McGovern. There were queries about his trade union membership leading to protests by Glasgow Trades Council to the Labour Party. Despite this, McGovern was selected. He won the seat but the methods adopted to make him the candidate were discussed at the Labour Party conference in 1931. He was expelled from the Labour Party and was the only I.L.P. candidate in Glasgow to have a Labour Opponent in the 1931 general election. There is nothing about this in the book.

It was during 1931 that he began to take part in activities organised by the National Unemployed Workers' Movement, of which I was Scottish Organiser, and, later, National Chairman. McGovern played no part in the organisation of marches or demonstrations. He simply walked in and took part when he felt like it. He never came near the offices of the organisation.

He tells of a riot that took place in October, 1931. According to his version he turned up and was arrested while Kerrigan, Middleton and McShane failed to turn up. I called that demonstration and did turn up. I was in the dock along with McGovern.

The demonstration was a follow-up to one held a week earlier when the effigy of a Glasgow magistrate was burned on a public square. Kerrigan was with me at that first demonstration. McGovern was not there. He was not expected, just as he was not expected at the demonstration discussed in his book. At this second demonstration, I had the assistance of Robert McLennan, now Assistant Secretary of the Electrical Trade Union.

We had the demonstrators assembled on Glasgow Green when we saw the police mass near the entrance. It was a dark night so we went down the ranks to tell the demonstrators what was happening and to warn them against provocation. When we got to the head of the demonstration again the baton charge had started. It was then we got to know of McGovern's arrival and arrest. McLennan and I took scattered remnants of the demonstrators out of the Green. McLennan was hit with a baton.

McGovern says that I turned up disguised. After the demonstration was scattered I decided to keep an appointment with a man from another country, at midnight. I had to pass through a street where there were still many policemen. I took a tram and there I met a member of the E.C. of the Communist Party who insisted on me wearing his hat and coat. On the road I remembered about a meeting of the Free Speech Council, of which I was a member, and decided to call in there. I was, of course, wearing another man's hat and coat.

On the following Sunday, a mass meeting was addressed by Maxton, Buchanan, Aldred and myself. An attempt was made to keep me off the platform but the workers wouldn't have it. The other speakers deplored the arrests and the casualties and used them as a warning for the future. To this day, I have always felt some satisfaction over the fact

that I met the wishes of the workers present by asking for more militancy and better organisation, so that next time the casualties would be on the other side. I am not ashamed of that.

McGovern and I were acquitted, but ten others were sent to prison for three months. He says a lot about imprisonment, but he was only there from the Thursday until the following Wednesday. That is all the imprisonment he ever had. One could easily get the impression from McGovern's book that the demonstrations were finished after that riot. There were many more, and there was a riot in 1932, when 14 policemen were injured without a single casualty on our side. Sir Percy Sillitoe refers to this in his book. I did not shed a tear.

Dealing with a hunger march in which he took part, McGovern refers to a decision that the unemployed ask for a hearing at the Bar of the House. He says that this was comforting to Wal Hannington and myself as we had been censured for a similar

decision during a previous march to London. This is not true. It is the other way round.

We were demanding that we be allowed to present a Petition containing one million signatures of people protesting against the Means Test. There had been a battle in Hyde Park on the day of the arrival of the marchers. There was another battle at Trafalgar Square on the Sunday. We had arranged for a march to the House of Commons on the Tuesday evening. McGovern met us at Fulham workhouse on the Monday and suggested that he present the Petition. We turned him down. That same evening McGovern attacked Hannington and myself in the House of Commons. He said we preferred "to rely on their massed strength to force Parliament to allow their deputation to appear". The "Evening News" congratulated McGovern on "smoking out Messrs Hannington and McShane". "The Times" congratulated him on his discovery that the marchers were out to "incite disorder". On the

Tuesday morning Hannington was arrested. Hannington and I were criticised by C.P. leaders for meeting McGovern. The whole story had been distorted. Throughout the book, McGovern criticises many of his earlier colleagues. He confuses dates and fails to deal fully with a single event.

His obsession with the Communist Party completely distorts his view. In this connection, he refers to his two visits to Spain. He does not mention the fact that after his first visit he wrote a pamphlet, "Why The Bishops Back Franco". After his second visit he wrote another, "The Red Terror In Spain". Much of what he says about the Communist Party is true but he does exaggerate.

He has great praise for Maxton. The greatest living man is Frank Buchman. The M.R.A. is hailed as having the solution to all problems.

He may be of some value to Buchman and company, but he is no loss to the working class movement.

ALL SR READERS ARE INVITED TO
A LONDON NCLC SERIES ON:

MARXISM — SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM

3 PM—6 PM

ASSOCIATION OF CINEMATOGRAPH TELEVISION

AND ALLIED TECHNICIANS

3 SOHO SQUARE, W.1

March 11
HISTORICAL
MATERIALISM
John Fairhead
April 8
DIALECTIC MATERIALISM
Alistair McIntyre
May 13
WAGE LABOUR AND
CAPITAL

Tony Cliff
June 10
CAPITALIST SLUMP AND
THE WAR ECONOMY
M. Kidron

CANDID COMMENTARY

BY JOHN WILKES

WRITING in the right-wing *Socialist Commentary*, John Fox argues that the trade union block vote, cast for unilateral nuclear disarmament, did not represent the feelings of the majority of their members, only a vocal, highly active minority. He suggests trade unions should ballot members on this issue. Now, if Fox favours the principle of holding a referendum, why doesn't he propose holding it on a national basis? There's a far better case for it.

Whereas trade unionists have had an opportunity of considering the question of nuclear disarmament on a principled basis, of voting either for or against at trade union branches and conferences, the electorate has had no such chance. At the last General Election with the choice of governments led either by MacMillan or Gaitskell, the question of nuclear disarmament, the most vital of our epoch, was never really raised during the Election.

Being a supporter of the old fashioned theory that people should have a say in their own destiny, I am not opposed to the idea of a referendum. It would be interesting to know—and by no means a foregone conclusion for the MacGaitskells—if the British people wanted American

bases in Britain. Do they favour Britain being in an alliance with ex-Nazis generals? Are they supporters of the Government's present policy of cutting expenditure on the health services but not hydrogen bombs? I wonder.

WHATEVER happens in the next few months, CND has got to do a lot of fresh thinking. And Dr. Donald Soper has adequately shown it isn't coming from him. Writing in *Tribune*, he admits "the Prime Minister, who was able to contain the resignation of Lord Salisbury, is in no great danger today from unilateralists." Later in the same article he argues "CND has won a battle". How you can win while leaving your opponent unscathed is something Ingmar Johansen would no doubt like to know before he has a return bout with Paterson.

"There is solid ground for hoping," Soper continues, that the leaders of the Great Powers would conclude an agreement for multilateral nuclear disarmament. CND had, in Soper's opinion, helped to create the favourable climate for this dramatic achievement. Almost before the printer's ink used for Soper's article had dried, President Kennedy made a rude noise in his ear, announcing a

further expansion in America's missile programme. Immediately, big business and top brass in the States greeted this announcement with wild delight, share prices rose, and hopes of great expectations increased.

Is Soper—or anyone else for that matter—so naive as to think that Kennedy, who was loyally supported during his election by the arms lobby, would sign a disarmament agreement that would put many Americans out of business and endanger the whole economy? It is here that politics, the need for a socialist analysis of the causes of war, creeps in. It is here that CND shows its fundamental weakness. Instead of lugubriously announcing that "I see no possibility of linking CND with a specifically socialist objective", Soper should be working towards that end.

For the future of the Labour Party depends on an influx of youthful idealism and enthusiasm from CND. And CND, unless its efforts are to be squandered in ineffectual protests, must see that its future is bound up with the Labour Party, the only political party capable of achieving the objective for which it so ardently strives. It is no use CNDers clutching at straws, hoping the

cont. page 8

The Devil, God and the Oracle

BY GEOFF WESTON

THE London Labour Party and its paid servant, Bill Jones, the London Region Youth Officer have started their campaign on how to win friends and influence young people and in the process spend Party funds which could more profitably have been devoted to LCC Election propaganda.

Of course, they were only carrying out NEC instructions with the speed and puppy-dog obedience accorded in ancient days to the utterances of the Delphic Oracle. Alas, even that analogy rings slightly false, for the NEC's divinity is even more suspect than that of the Gods.

Nevertheless, Comrade Jones dutifully passed on to the London Flock, on pain of excommunication, the latest undemocratic Encyclical stating that "Keep Left" was the work of the devil rather than of God, and in good old Medieval tradition, Young Socialist branches were instructed not to support or assist in any way the publication and distribution of this subversive tract. Because in the words of the Oracle himself; "Our Young Socialist Organization is making good progress and the number of Branches in the country is nearing 700... obviously such a promising organisation can bring nothing but dismay to our political opponents".

Was this an oblique reference to a certain Party, unmentionable by name, because of the obscenity Laws and four letter words? Alas; no! Bill Jones became more explicit. "One such (political opponent) is the authoritarian Socialist Labour League, whose political philosophy based on revolutionary communism, has little in common with our ideals of democratic socialism. There can be little doubt that "Keep Left" is associated with the SLL..." And thus, in true Inquisitorial fashion, the NEC took upon its shoulders the combined and onerous tasks of Accuser, Examiner, Judge and Executioner. Like Salazar's and Franco's opponents "Keep Left" was found guilty without having been given any chance to defend itself.

The Right are repeating the old mistakes; they are trying to fight ideas by proscription instead of by better ideas. Ideas can't be destroyed. Many people have learnt that; even the Medieval Church did, when they tried to silence Galileo. The NEC might try to learn from the past and perhaps copy the Catholic Church in their present and painfully slight emergence of liberalism.

One thing is clear; bans and proscriptions are wrong and often defeat their own purpose,

tending to make the suppressed or heretical ideas even stronger and rallying to them a lot of marginal support from people who have an innate sympathy for the victimised. "Keep Left" has already gained in support of this nature.

But, could the NEC action be a case of political subterfuge? For the Annual Conference of the Young Socialists is being held at Easter (when the large majority of Young Socialist's thoughts will be turned towards Aldermaston, Wethersfield and Trafalgar Square rather than towards the Oracle, God or the Devil) and the NEC, being scared of a resounding vote in favour of unilateralism, observance of Conference decisions, clause four and other heresies, is trying to confound and confuse the issue, hoping that there will be a spate of "Keep Left" resolutions in order to keep discussion of others issues in the background. It's hard enough to fight for one cause, let alone two, with constitution fiddlers and vote-riggers splitting subtle theological hairs over the meaning of words.

It's clear that "Keep Left" can easily divert attention from the real struggle in the Labour movement. But in London, one thing can be done. At the Annual Conference of the London Labour Party a move should be made to force the reference back of the Youth Report. It seems that procedural manoeuvres are the best answer to an Executive who defy both reason and morality.

TWO SOCIALISTS IMPRISONED

TWO socialists, Sal Santen and Michel Raptis are imprisoned in Holland because of their efforts to help the Algerian National Movement, the FLN, in its struggle against French oppression. Arrested on July 12, they have still not been brought for trial. Throughout the long months of waiting the Dutch Authorities have displayed a callous disregard for all human consideration. The two men are kept without reading matter and are allowed to have no visitors, except their wives, who are permitted to see them for 15 minutes a week.

This effort to justice has evoked widespread protests. In France Jean Paul Sartre, the well-known philosopher and novelist, has protested, while in this country 12 Labour MPs and a number of trade union branches have expressed opposition. Register your own protest, both individually and through the Labour Movement, by writing to the Dutch Embassy in London.

RUSSIA'S BOMB!

BELOW we reproduce the whole correspondence that was published in the columns of *Tribune* recently on the question whether Socialists should support Russia's having the bomb. It is quite characteristic of the Communist Party leadership that it did not find it necessary to justify Russia's having the bomb. Bureaucrats have no respect for ideas, and for people's thoughts.

Gerry Healy, of the Socialist Labour League, came out in defence of Russia's having the bomb. He dealt with the question seriously, even if one may, as the present writer does, disagree with him. The same cannot be said of the contribution by the other Socialist Labour League member, Brian Pearce, which is full of innuendo and personal smear. Discussion on such a serious matter should not be allowed to deteriorate. The letters of Sedgwick, Alan Bennett, John Daniels and Ken Coates, raise the central issues. Assuming Russia is a workers' state, should it have the bomb? Should a Socialist Britain have the bomb? Is the argument an H-bomb "deterrent" applicable to a workers' state? Can the bomb be used in a civil war, annihilating the class enemy while protecting your own class? Is internationalist propaganda and activity compatible with genocide. In publishing these letters, we hope to help the discussion to go on, and clarify the whole problem of a Socialist attitude to the bomb.

Editor

CONSIDERABLE damage is done to Labour's unilateralist cause by the policy of the Communist Party on neutralism and nuclear weapons. It has been true, of course, for some time now that CP and YCL contingents have paraded in CND demonstrations as if the *Daily Worker* had never accused the first Aldermaston march of "dividing the broad movement."

We should, of course, welcome sinners come even late to repentance. It would have been the height of irony if that CP-influenced union vote had lined up with Gaitskell this year as it has done previously. But is this repentance particularly sincere?

Any unilateralist who tries arguing with CPers over the Russian bomb will soon find that they are quite capable of eloquent exposures of the Western "deterrent" theory, while arguing that Russia must have the bomb to defend herself against the capitalists.

Dr. Arnold Kettle argues in the October issue of *Marxism Today* that a Socialist Government should have "not only principles" but also "as long as is necessary, H-bombs."

Presumably this right would apply also to a Government pursuing the Communist Party's "British Road to Socialism."

Dr. Kettle states in the same article that neutralism is all right for a capitalist Government but that Socialist neutralism is "opportunistic" and "unrealistic." This can only mean that the Left is supposed to advocate a nuclear alliance within the Warsaw Pact rather than NATO.

Amazing as it may seem, this double-think is even found outside the Communist Party, among self-styled Marxists in the Socialist Labour League and the Labour Party.

They will argue that a Socialist Britain will use "every means" including the bomb to defend itself against intervention. How they propose to undertake "defence" with this weapons is never explained (any more than it is by the Tories).

The cynical advocates of a working-class H-bomb should have the good grace to stay away from CND demonstrations

and to stop making pseudo-attacks on Gaitskell, whom they fundamentally support.

When Mr. Gaitskell was asked not long ago "can you reconcile the brotherhood of man with the threatened annihilation of mankind," he replied, "Interpreted in the right way, yes." The "Marxist" friends of the Hydrogen Bomb would have no different answer.

In the remote event of their ever achieving power, they would not abolish the Nuclear Weapons Research Establishment but sanctify it with the Red Flag. The rest of us would still have to march from or to Aldermaston, that is if we were allowed to do so, which is doubtful.

The antics of this unscrupulous minority cannot justify any Right-wing smears against CND or official Conference policy. The crowd in Trafalgar Square last Easter and the unilateralist mass of delegates at Scarborough would have howled down and speaker who offered them such blatant sophistry.

Peter Sedgwick

MR. Peter Sedgwick talks about the H-bomb as if it is something that exists outside the class forces which dominate society (*Tribune*, November 11). It is not the H-bomb which has brought the world to the brink of disaster but the economic crisis of capitalism of which the H-bomb is a by-product. As long as capitalism continues, other, more dreadful, weapons may well be on the way.

The Soviet Union is not a capitalist country. Despite the bureaucracy at the head of the State, it remains a country in transition to Socialism. The revolution of 1917 destroyed the capitalist property relations and established new relations based upon the nationalisation of all the basic industries.

The existence of the bureaucracy has not altered this basic fact any more than the bureaucracy of Sir Thomas Yates has changed the National Union of Seamen from a trade union into a company union.

The laws governing Soviet economy are fundamentally dif-

ferent from those of a capitalist society. Its leaders are not, therefore, driven to war in the same way as the leadership of the capitalist states.

In considering the H-bomb, Marxists make a distinction between the Socialist economic basis of the Soviet Union and the capitalist economy of Britain and the United States. We are for disarming the capitalists through the struggle for Socialism, but until this is done and a real possibility of international Socialism arises, then the Soviet Union cannot give up its H-bomb.

Mr. Sedgwick has become obsessed with a form of H-bomb neurosis, so he dismisses a Socialist Britain, the Soviet Union and capitalist America as one and the same thing. Having lost his way in relation to Marxist theory, he overcomes his difficulties with some schoolboy joking.

The Scarborough decisions were important because they opened the door, not to pacifist neutralism but to a real struggle against the war preparations of the Tory Government.

The British Labour movement must encourage the Soviet people to support the struggles of people everywhere against capitalism and imperialism. It is in this context that Marxists welcome the recent discussion by the Chinese.

Khrushchev's policy of relying upon peaceful co-existence with the imperialists, through the manufacture of nuclear weapons rather than relying on the struggle of the international working-class is absolutely wrong.

The Chinese are right to insist that all aid must be provided for the revolutionary movements all over the world fighting against imperialism. It is this struggle which will in the end be decisive.

G. HEALY

THE tortuous arguments used by Mr. Healy (*Tribune*, November 25) to justify Soviet possession of nuclear weapons makes a mockery of the so-called scientific Socialism that his

organisation professes to exemplify. For, on the one hand he condemns the reliance of the Soviet Government on nuclear strategy and on the other goes on to say that the Soviet Government cannot possibly give up these weapons until the real possibility of international Socialism exists. One might not indecently enquire who precisely decides when the latter possibility is reached?

Surely many of the arguments which Mr. Healy seemingly considers valid in discussing British unilateralism are as apt in relation to similar action by the Soviet Government. Suppose the latter were tomorrow to announce the cessation of manufacture of these weapons, and were to invite UN scientific observers to witness destruction of existing stockpiles, etc., what a propaganda gesture this would constitute!

The pressure which would then be brought to bear on the American Government to do likewise would be immense. This surely too is more akin to Marxist reliance on the strength of the working people's right hand than the doubtful arguments of negotiations from might across the diplomatic table.

Such an action would cut right across the present stalemate modes of thinking, and would open up new prospects for peace, as well as offering fresh resources of finance to aid the underdeveloped areas and the hungry peoples of this world.

Of course Mr. Healy might complain that upon such a gesture the Americans would seize the opportunity to attack the Soviet Union. Whilst accepting the danger inherent in this possibility, certain awkward questions have to be faced. If America has been hell-bent on the destruction of the Soviet Union then why didn't she attack when she had a monopoly of atomic weapons; and if capitalism has to go to war anyway at some time on the Soviet Union wouldn't it be preferable for the Soviet Union to attack first—or does Mr. Healy draw the line there?

Alan Bennett
London, S.W.4.

We are indebted to Mr. Healy for his letter (*Tribune*, Nov. 25), supporting a Soviet Socialist H-bomb. For years we had wasted our time fighting for unilateral renunciation by Britain when all we had to do was to get a Socialist Government to make "our" bomb a weapon for the world revolution.

It is heartening to feel that our revolution will be made secure from American imperialism by being able to wipe out millions of comrades in New York and Chicago. No doubt, if Whitehall should commit another "Suez" before we get to power, comrade Healy will feel it a revolutionary honour to be annihilated in Clapham in radioactive glory.

I am sure the whole British working-class can be won to this clear understanding of its duty and will carry Mr. Healy's banner proudly into the next world, crying "Long live the Socialist Labour League" and "glory to the great (though slightly degenerated) Workers' State which fraternally freed us from capitalism".

Eric Morse

WHEN Soviet Russia's survival depended on signing the evil treaty of Brest Litovsk, Lenin found himself obstructed by people with an itch for phrase-mongering, whose statesmanship he summed up in the proposition: "I stake everything on the international working class, and that means I can commit any folly I please."

For some time the Trotskyist movement has had the misfortune to attract a type of person who saw in it primarily an anti-Stalinist movement, and who, moreover, interpreted anti-Stalinism as hostility to the Soviet Union.

Trotsky often crossed swords with them, and one may suppose that he often had occasion to say to himself in relation to their statements: "I am not a Trotskyist."

Such people used "defence of the Soviet Union" as a ritual slogan, to be accompanied by a wink. Its purpose for them was

merely to claim the glamour of the October Revolution, without accepting any responsibility.

Increasingly, as the Socialist Labour League has shown that it means business so far as defending the Soviet Union is concerned, such people have turned against it. No longer can it be regarded as a soft option which permits one to be a "Red" without incurring the risks associated with Communist Party membership.

Brian Pearce

★

We are sorry to see that Mr. Gerry Healy no longer attaches any importance to the international solidarity of the working class (*Tribune*, November 25).

What he has failed to realise, in giving his blessing to Mr. Khrushchev's H-bombs, is that though it is true that the social systems of America and Russia are different, the implications of H-bomb ownership are the same.

It is ludicrous to own H-bombs without being prepared to be the first to detonate them. There is no point in the Russian leaders waiting for American H-bombs to touch down on Moscow before they issue orders to demolish London and New York. The first to strike is the most likely to survive, even though this likelihood is statistically insignificant.

Perhaps Mr. Healy thinks that the Russians have patented selective H-bombs, capable, in the words of the old song, of preserving the workers by "dropping them leaflets while we bomb their bosses".

We think that in the absence of such miracles of Soviet science, actions of Russian workers to disarm their leaders would do more to help us to disarm the madmen of Downing Street and the Pentagon than any amount of dialectical sophistry by Mr. Khrushchev.

As for the dialectics of Mr. Healy concerning whether or not the Soviet H-bombs are healthy or degenerate workers' bombs: we think them more likely to lead us into primitive Communism than the other sort.

John Daniels Ken Coates

EDUCATION —

NOTTINGHAM TEACHERS FIGHT FOR SOCIALIST POLICY

BY JOAN FERGUSON

A plan for Comprehensive Schools in Nottingham. (Nottingham Branch of the National Association of Labour Teachers. Copies 6d. post free from E. Stones, 7 Barnfield, Wilford, Nottingham.)

EVERY reader of *Socialist Review* knows that the central problem of the Labour Movement is not one of getting people to see what ought to be done but of convincing the mass of ordinary people that they can do a great deal towards seeing that what *ought* to be done, is done. In the jargon, the problem of socialist advance is how to

mobilise the workers for struggle.

This pamphlet, "*What about Us?*" is of much wider significance than its sub-title suggests. It has been prepared by a group of socialist teachers in Nottingham and presented to the Labour-controlled City Council as a detailed blue-print showing how the City's secondary schools could be converted into a fully "comprehensive" system with the complete and final abolition of the hated 11 plus selection examination by 1962.

In the opinion of your reviewer (an ordinary parent in Nottingham) the publication of this

plan will do more for socialism in Britain than a thousand would-be Marxist *pronouncements* on "Socialist perspective's for Education"—for the very good reason that it breaks out of the charmed circle of the socialist *élite* and speaks homely common-sense to ordinary working-class parents. The plan clothes with living flesh, in terms of this well-known Nottingham school and that particular area of Nottingham, the Labour Party's national policy on comprehensive schools.

The thousands of parents who will read it will see that, whatever bloodcurdling screams the

Tories make about "sectarian politics interfering with education", they are themselves left-wingers—at least as far as education is concerned. And that will do a lot more to win Labour Votes than will any wild-cat schemes for picking phoney disputes with the Chief Constable.

The news from Nottingham is that the pale-pink Labour Councillors are afraid both of the plan and of their own rank-and-file. So whilst refusing to accept or throw out the Labour teachers scheme, they are busy

cont. on page 8

It's Rich

Mr. Tshombe is not visibly an object of Belgian hostility.—*Economist*, 28 January.

In a healthy and developing democracy, it is not unusual, it is perfectly normal, that the parties, on the whole range of topics, represent similar or even identical commitments.—Willi Brandt, German Socialist Party's Shadow Chancellor, at the Hanover Conference of his Party.

They (Trotskyists) have turned their attention to the Y.S. movement because they are dismayed to see such a large, brilliant organ of democratic Socialist.—Part of editorial in *New Advance*, the official paper of the Young Socialists.

The Pacific Maritime Association agreed to pay a carefully calculated \$27,500,000 to the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, led by Mr. Harry Bridges, over a period of six years in return for the right to decide how many dockers were needed in working gangs, the size of sling loads and the number of times cargo is handled.—*Economist*, 28 January.

He (Brian Pearce) twitted Mr. Abe Moffat, the Scottish miners' Communist leader, for having agreed . . . to put down a motion at the Communist Party conference this Easter, calling for unilateral nuclear disarmament by the Soviet Union. As a theorist, Mr. Pearce thought . . . that such a proposal for the Soviet Union would be a backward step.—From *The Guardian's* report of the *Daily Worker* conference Next Steps for Labour, 6 February.

CANDID COMMENTARY

cont.

Big Powers will disarm themselves; it is time they clutched a Labour Party membership card.

ALTHOUGH I am an aged political animal, well passed my prime, I still can't help being amazed, amused, and held in a childlike trance by the wide variety of acts in the right-wing Labour pantomime. Not merely did that versatile part of comedians, Woodrow Wyatt and Jim Matthews, join Aims of Industry, an extremely reactionary Tory front organisation. But big hearted Woodrow did his own solo turn, pleading the hardships of the supertax payers on over £6,000 a year. Unfortunately, there is no report of his solicitude extending as far as the old age pensioners, who are on less than 60 shillings a week.

Then, there's Wee Georgie Brown. He has been visiting the despotic feudal sheikdom of Bahrain, where oil appears to be the only thing that flows freely. Quite appropriately, since incarceration appears to be the second largest industry of Bahrain, our Georgie visited the prisons and found everybody "perfectly well and lively".

No sooner had the prison doors clanged behind him than *The Spectator* took the liberty, or rather, as the Sheikh himself would say, the license, to attack our Sir Galahad: "It does not seem to have occurred to Mr. Brown that political prisoners might feel it unwise to make major complaints to such

breezily transient visitors in the presence of their gaolers. Nor does he seem to understand that he might have a duty, irrespective of the conditions under which the prisoners are being kept (and it is most unlikely that what he saw was normal before world-wide publicity was given to this case), to say something about the rigged trial in which these men had been 'sentenced', and at which the British Government actively connived. Nor does Mr. Brown have anything to say, irrespective of the conduct of the Sheikh of Bahrain, of the British Government's part in the affair in arranging for the illegal transfer of three prisoners to St Helena and their wrongful imprisonment there for the past four years."

In the same issue of *The Spectator* another of the right-wing's bright-eyed boys—Antony Crosland—comes in for criticism. Nicholas Davenport writes, "How Mr CAR Crosland can tell readers of *Encounter* (February) that under the Tories 'we still have full employment and planning' passes my understanding." Well, it passes mine, too.

I know it is far too much to expect our right-wing Labour politicians to become socialists, but wouldn't it be a good thing if they were sufficiently daring, courageous and extremist to take a drastic step leftwards—and become good liberals?

ANOTHER *Socialist Review* scoop! Heated controversy has broken out among Civil Defence workers. Guess what over. The four-minute warning? No. The difficulty of evacuating millions of people to non-existent safety areas? Wrong. Try again. The need for deep, underground shelters? No, I'm afraid you're miles out. The journal *International Civil Defence* reveals the closely-guarded secret: "Much controversy has arisen in the British Civil Defence Corps over the lower part of the dress to be worn by women volunteers."

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.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

War is the inevitable outcome of the division of society into classes. Only the working class, controlling and owning the means of production, distribution and exchange in a planned economy, can guarantee the world against war and the annihilation of large sections of humanity. Planning under workers' control demands the nationalisation without compensation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land. International collaboration between socialist states must replace aggressive competition between capitalist states.

The working class will reach the consciousness necessary to change society only by building upon the experience in struggle of the existing mass organisations and organising around a revolutionary socialist programme.

This programme must include :

- The unilateral renunciation of the H-Bomb and all weapons of mass destruction, withdrawal from NATO and all other aggressive alliances as preliminary steps to international disarmament.
- The withdrawal of all British troops from overseas and the transfer of all British capital in colonies and other underdeveloped territories to their peoples.
- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow. Material and moral support to all workers in all countries in their fight against oppression and their struggle for socialism.
- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions, together with the implementation of the principle of work or full maintenance.
- The extension of the social services by the payment of the full industrial wage as retirement pension, together with the establishment of a free Health and Industrial Health service. The abolition of all charges for public transport.
- To help solve the housing problem: the municipalisation of rented property and the nationalisation of the building and building materials industries. The granting of interest-free loans to local authorities, with the right to requisition privately owned land.
- Free education available to all, including adult education. The abolition of fee-paying schools and the private school system. The extension of education in comprehensive schools. Increased facilities for technical and practical education. A vigorous programme of school building under a national plan. A free optional nursery schools service. Adequate maintenance grants for all students without a means test.
- Votes at 18 in national and local government elections.
- Firm opposition to all racial discrimination. Freedom of migration to and from Britain.

EDUCATION cont.

preening themselves in public on how "progressive" the Nottingham LEA is. They "believe" in comprehensive schools—so long as nobody makes proposals to introduce them into the City. "Abolishing the eleven-plus exam", so our Labour City fathers believe, is a good slogan for the annual election manifesto—but not really practical politics for tomorrow.

This NALT plan puts Labour councillors in Nottingham fairly and squarely on the spot. The teachers' proposals have been widely supported by Trade Union branches and Ward meetings. A special City Party meeting has had to be called to discuss the plan. But the act of publishing the plan as a pamphlet for wide distribution to parents is sound socialist strategy. The Labour teachers have gone over the heads of the professional "stallers", the party bureaucrats who believe in narrowing every discussion as a means of blocking democracy to the working people themselves.

The Labour Councillors, in full view of the electors, have now to answer with a plain "yes" or "no" the question "Where do you stand on education and the eleven-plus exam? Are you merely for soothing chatter and pie-in-the-sky promises whilst continuing to administer the present system of class-privilege in education? Or do you really believe in comprehensive schools and abolishing the eleven-plus exam?"

What terror this blunt question appears to have struck on the hearts of Nottingham City Labour Councillors! This is the direct result of the brilliant strategy of the Socialist teachers behind the campaign—viz. work out the practical implications of Labour policy and take these, ever the heads of the tame bureaucrats to the voters.

If your reviewer refrains here from describing the proposals made in the pamphlet or from outlining the excellently-written arguments which it marshals in their support, there is only one reason. She believes that every SR Reader should get a copy, study it and go and do likewise in his own area. Congratulations to the socialist teachers of Nottingham on this brilliant piece of socialist advocacy.

READ

INTERNATIONAL

SOCIALISM

No 3

3 shillings (post paid)

from: 47 Fitzroy Road, NW1