

# SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

JOURNAL

for the

Industrial Militant —

for

International

Socialism

11th YEAR No 4

APRIL 1961

SIXPENCE

## ACT AGAINST THE BOMB !

**T**HE Aldermaston marches have contributed to one victory, and one only. They helped the triumph of the unilateralists at the Labour Party's Scarborough conference last year.

Here is a lesson for all who wish to remove the menace of nuclear war. The future of anti-bomb activists is bound to that of the organized working class.

Observe the changing attitude of the Establishment towards the nuclear disarmament campaign. First they ignored it. Then they ridiculed it. Only when the campaign played a powerful part in changing the balance of focus in the Labour Movement did the representatives of the ruling class (on both front benches) begin to appraise it seriously. Only since then have they tried to stop its influence spreading and to tear its leaders down.

### STRIKE AGAINST POLARIS

For the Tories know that the Scarborough decisions could be but the first step on the road to effective action against the bomb. Macmillan and Gaitskell understand that a political decision against the bomb can lead to the next step: industrial action to enforce that decision.

The time is not yet ready for the mass implementation of the correct slogan: "Black the bomb, black the bases!" But it is possible to win wide support in the Labour Movement, particularly in Scotland, to the idea of a series of token industrial stoppages against the Polaris missile. The indignation of the Scottish workers, who are most directly threatened, against the nuclear submarine base in their midst is very great and ought to be expressed in a sharper way.

The way in which workers traditionally express their disapproval is by striking, even if initially only for one hour at a time. This causes discomfort for industry's tops, as opposed to Lord Russell's method, which causes discomfort for the workers' bottoms.

### JOIN THE PARTY

Side by side with these demonstrations, which should be called by every steward who can win his factory to the conception, and urged in the Union branches by all left-wingers, the work of political explanation must proceed.

Nuclear disarmament campaigners are needed urgently in the Labour Party to swell the forces of the majority faction, fighting to uphold the Scarborough policy. Starting from the fact, now no longer in doubt, that capitalism cannot do without the bomb and will continue at whatever cost to manufacture, test and base it in various parts of the world, those who wish to ban the bomb must understand that their real object is to disarm capitalism.

### CAPITALISM MEANS CERTAIN WAR

That is why the decision of the CND conference on March 5 to reaffirm the Campaign's opposition to NATO and similar alliances is so important. From now on the CND has only one meaning—as a force preparing Labour Party and working-class opinion for a decisive break with any foreign policy based on nuclear-armed

alliances to preserve capitalism. All its many tasks are henceforth subservient to this end.

It will be objected that by adopting these clear aims the Campaign will be losing its broad base of support. But the future is not to be glimpsed through the broad end of a telescope. Men and women are not led forward to new positions by watching the feet of those behind them, lest they march backwards and step on their corns.

The understanding of all honest people who wish to end war is heightened only by imparting to them the gleam of the socialist future, wherein war is unthinkable because it is unnecessary. And by showing them clear campaign targets, realizable in current Party and trade-union terms, at which to aim—stoppages against Polaris, and a Conference break with NATO.

Aldermaston IV will break new records in participation and effectiveness. But without clear leadership to the Movement, Aldermaston V could be an anti-climax and a disaster.

## Tory Attack on National Health Service

BY RAY CHALLINOR

**F**OR the overwhelming majority of the working people the recent Tory Government measures—increased Health Service charges, increased National Insurance contributions and, thanks to dear Mr Brooke, increased rents—are all part of a definite pattern, an attempt to whittle down the Welfare State and to attack workers' standards.

However, in a deeper sense, these measures accord with fundamental Tory philosophy. One of its bedrock principles is that people should be made to pay, as far as possible for everything they receive, whether they be luxury goods or the necessities of life: they should never (except, conveniently, through inheritance and "sound financial investment") get something for nothing. Those unable to pay their way, the victims of this highly competitive society, are

regarded as social cripples. They should be pitied, charitably helped—but kept on the bare minimum. Lest they grow indolent, the State should make their lot remain difficult; perhaps a bed of thorns will prick them into doing something for themselves. It is this idea, a guiding principle for workhouse administrators in the 19th century, that pervades all Tory social legislation.

But just as the ability to pay his own way, the amount of money in his pocket, is the criterion of an individual's worth, so must an industrial project be judged solely by its returns in hard cash. And when we look, in terms of hard cash, at exactly who is benefiting from the Welfare State it is certainly not the working class; and when the working class are losers it

cont. page 8

## TU COMMENTARY

HENRY CARTER AEU

**OUT** of the struggle waged by car workers against short time and the sack has come one of the most important industrial demands which workers can level at the employing class. Ford shop stewards were responsible, at a mass meeting to discuss more short time working, for raising the demand. **FIVE DAYS' PAY OR FIVE DAYS' WORK.**

Quoted from the *Guardian* of January 11th, J. Mitchell, Fords convenor, argued, "We want either five days' work or five days' pay. We are entitled to a share in the golden profits we have made for the company over the years"...

Here we can see the basis of a really good and worthwhile struggle, embracing the whole working-class movement, and this demand should be a cornerstone of resolutions which seek to find a solution to the problem of short time and unemployment. All the talk of 'compensation payments' seems very unreal when workers are faced with long periods of unemployment.

In Sheffield, a confederation spokesman expressed concern over the fact that engineering workers, thrown out of jobs through the car crisis, would find it almost impossible to obtain employment for a very long time. However, concern is not what we're looking for; rather we should be seeking a policy, embodying both long and short-term demands.

We should try to link the immediate future of engineering with present problems, by pressing for the nationalisation of heavy industry as outlined in the Confederation 'Plan for Engineering', and five days' pay or five days' work now. It is all too obvious that the Unions' head offices are barely capable of running their affairs, let alone advancing some real demands to meet the problems of the membership. Plenty of pressure from the branches and shop committees will perhaps, help to

enthuse a bit of life into the Executive.

JOHN BARRY AEU

**AS** each week brings us nearer to Labour's Annual Conference, we in the AEU can certainly congratulate ourselves on repelling the attacks of the anti-democrats.

Carron and company, try as they would find it too big a task to foist the so-called 'referendum' onto our membership.

All over the country, resolutions poured into Head Office condemning this proposal; some branches had decided to refuse to co-operate with the General Secretary if he sent out 'referendum' ballot forms.

We in our union cherish strongly the democracy which exists; of course there are anomalies, certainly there are abuses from time to time and in certain instances the full democratic rights of our members are not conceded.

But notwithstanding the faults, which give the right wing and the stalinists room to manoeuvre against the 'spirit' of democracy, we can still hold our heads up with pride, especially when we consider the total lack of democracy in some other unions.

However, let us chalk up a good solid victory. Already the National Press are bemoaning the fact that this year's National Committee is even more 'left' than last year's. May the industrial workers ever stand as the watchdogs of democracy, for as the struggle sharpens we need to recall the old sayings of our class, such as 'the price of freedom is eternal vigilance'; only in this way, by repelling the anti-progressive forces of the right, can we guarantee the socialist future we know will one day be ours.

"OMAR" TGWU

**IT** is hard to conceive in these days of industrial enlightenment a reason for the continued incursions by the craft unions

into the vast organisational field of noncraftsmen engaged in the building industry.

The latest to embark on this course is the NAOP or the Plasterers Society. For a century it has been an exclusive group always looking askance at the Labourer.

What has caused the change in outlook? It is certainly not a desire to raise the economic status of that class of operative; nor can it be a desire to improve the state of organisation in the industry.

A disturbing feature is the refusal on the part of the NAOP to discuss the change of policy with those responsible for organisation in this sector. What is there to fear from a frank discussion on organisation? Nothing except the fact that it would reveal the true strength of the Plasterers, which is anything but satisfactory. The estimated membership is roughly a third of the potential; approximately 3000 out of a possible 10 thousand in London. It is clear that when allowances are made there is ample scope for the Plasterers Society among that class of operative to increase membership and thereby add to its economic power.

Experience has already proved that if a craft organisation cannot organise workers engaged in the same craft and industry its chances of success in another sphere are very remote, and up to now all efforts on their part have proved abortive.

The AUBTW had great hopes of success when it first entered this field but like the General Unions they have enrolled many thousands and have failed to hold them. If the facts are anything to go by, then it can be predicted with a degree of accuracy that the NAOP will have a similar experience from which it may profit when it is too late.

This scramble for members will tend to aggravate rather than improve the situation. Who will benefit from these acts of disintegration? Certainly not the non-craftsman or labourer.

Again we must turn to the facts, which speak for themselves. A short time after the intrusion by the AUBTW the Contractors took advantage of the confusion and absence of

unity and launched their first major attack by insisting on the widening of the differential rate. This was not only a set-back to all operatives in the industry but gave the employers the green light and the proof that no major upheaval would take place if a further attack was made in the future.

Since then a further widening of the differential has taken place resulting in a further degrading of the general operative's status in the industry. As on the first occasion and true to form, the craftsmen allowed this situation to develop unchallenged.

Whatever the gains which may accrue to the craftsmen from the disintegration of the general operatives and their segregation into a number of isolated groups the labourers can only expect to be rewarded with a further worsening of their economic status in the industry.

LES BENNETT AEU

**WHAT** do last years financial results, now coming from the engineering industry reveal to the workers?

Although the year began with a bang, many thousands of machinists, fitters etc. throughout the trade found themselves on short time by Christmas. Household names like Ford, BMC, Vauxhall and Rootes were busy laying off employees who had virtually worked themselves out of a job.

We do not hear so much about that fearful word automation of late, but nevertheless we are continually becoming aware of its effects. The displacement of both skilled and semi-skilled operatives by automatic operations assisted by transfer mechanisms is causing considerable hardship. Because this is taking place at an alarming rate our right to work and live a decent life with our families is becoming replaced by the anxieties of unemployment.

Is it not time, brothers, for us to examine again the effects of automation with a view to demanding a share of some of the benefits it produces in such abundance for the employing class?

## GIVE US FARE PLY MR BUTLER!

BY BILL CROUCH TGWU.

**TO** ask for fair play under a capitalist system may be expected too much, but one is entitled to at least some semblance of it. The cab trade, for some peculiar reason, is always considered fair game by the national press. They seem to have some weird idea that it is a tightly held monopoly and that any attempt to break it must be commended; hence the proposal by Mr Gotla of Welbeck Motors to start a fleet of mini-cabs has

been not only welcomed, but even acclaimed.

Let us be quite clear on this point. Anyone can become a cab-driver. Anyone can become a cab proprietor. The restrictions come solely from the Home Office and the Hackney Carriage laws.

In the interest of the public the restrictions on both vehicles and drivers are severe, and stringently applied by the Public Carriage Office.

The vehicle must be built to satisfy the specifications of the PCO. Hence the shape, size and, indirectly, price, of the present London Taxi Cab. It is rigorously inspected annually and must be open to inspection at all times of the year.

The driver must be of good character, (checked by the police) sound in wind and limb, (checked by police doctor) have a phenomenal knowledge of London and be a first class

driver, (checked by the PCO).

Having complied with these regulations, the cab and driver are then given permission to ply for hire within the metropolitan area.

Mr. Gotla and his mini-cabs would ply for hire in the streets without these expensive safeguards. Should he be allowed to do so? The dangers to the public are obvious. There is nothing to stop anyone capable of climbing behind the wheel of any car and going on the streets to ply for hire. He need only make a pretence of telephoning home.

Mr Gotla has a great deal of money behind him. The *Evening*  
cont. on page 3

THE most promising action against the Government's higher charges has been taken by the South Wales Miners. They are to hold a one day token strike involving 83,000 men on May 1st. This was decided at their delegate conference held at Cardiff on March 12. The conference condemned the Tory Government's "callous brutal and cruel treatment of the sick, disabled and aged people."

Whether this action will be taken by other industrial workers we cannot foresee, but there is no doubt that the many militants in Branches, Districts and Shop Stewards Committees should be calling for similar industrial action.

## Letter

Dear Comrade,

I read with considerable interest the article by W Cullen, NSP, (SR Feb 1961). I raised the matter of the tea breaks being abolished at a meeting of the Holloway branch of the National Society of Painters immediately after it was announced in the national press. At the meeting I moved a resolution, deploring this particular agreement, which was sent to the London Area HQ. My branch, being aware of the way the national press pervert the truth, did not believe the reported abolition of the tea break to be true.

The outcome of this resolution was that we were informed by a circular from the great one himself, Dick Coppock (Sir), that the report by the press was in fact a pack of lies, deliberately designed to damage the name of the union officials.

I have deplored many agreements reached by the unions with the building industry employers. Let us go into the facts of why this should be so, and secondly, how to get out of the present state of stagnation and deterioration: first—we have 19 unions affiliated to the National Federation of Building Trade Operatives, total membership one million; secondly—the financial state is very poor, in fact really chronic in most cases; thirdly—the competition for members, verging on cannibalism, is the main stumbling block to raising contributions to a reasonable level. This leaves the financial reserves far below the level needed to sustain any real action to establish wage improvements and decent general

conditions; fourthly—duplication of effort and top-heavy administration is proving too much for the union to stand much longer without serious trouble.

The employers are only too happy with this situation. Also certain officials, with vested interests in maintaining individual unions, prevent amalgamation or the formation of an industrial union—which would be a real stimulus to stewards, and other rank-and-file members, to organise all and not only their own particular trade.

How then can we solve the problem? (a) amalgamation. (b) a general raising of contributions. (c) a general raising of strike pay and other benefits. (d) all present organisers to be absorbed into the amalgamated union, the cutting, if needs be, to be achieved by normal wastage, ie resignations, retirements etc.

The union members can help this process by pressing for amalgamation through their branches. Remember Brothers, only this way will we finally achieve decasualisation of the building industry.

If the unions are not prepared to be progressive we must ourselves start an industrial union. I started the Progressive Industrial Construction Union at the beginning of 1960 with the aim of demonstrating the feeling on this issue, and I folded it up. A committee is now in process of discussing amalgamation at the NFBTO HQ.

I ask all members of the unions concerned to get in touch with me if they are prepared to fight to really bring about amalgamation.

Edward J. Scott. NSP.

4 Catherine House  
Philip Street, N1.

cont. from page 2  
Standard 10. 3. 61, tells us that he has placed an order worth £260,000 with Renault's which, even in French, ain't hay! Even so, to make his venture a success, he must be able to pick up passengers in the street. And so we come to the crux of the matter—the law—the Hackney Carriage law relating to the right to ply for hire.

And it is here that we are stuck. The legal advisers of the T&GWU tell us that he cannot get round this law. Mr Gotla has said on television that he doesn't like the phrase, "get round the law". As I may be working for him this time next

year I must be careful. I'll just say he has to find a way under, over, or through it. His legal advisers tell him, apparently, that he can.

If he does so, it will completely undermine the London Cab Trade.

It was under these conditions that between 3,500 and 4,000 indignant journeyman drivers, practically the whole T.U. membership, (others belong to other organizations) smarting under the injustice of the Home Secretary, packed Seymour Hall on March 9th to listen to Cab Section Secretary Jim Francis give a resume of the position. With the help of Bob Mellish MP and the

## 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.

## A STRIKE IS FOR . . . ?

BY KARL DUNBAR

VERY often 'left wing' papers publish articles dealing with industrial disputes in a manner which completely ignores the basis of all worker/employer disputes, namely the class nature of all such clashes.

A recent example was the *Tribune* handling of the Glasgow Caterpillar strike, which they headed 'Anatomy of a Strike'. Drawing no conclusions nor pointing to lessons which other workers would benefit from, *Tribune* merely chronicled the events, a job which had already been done much more capably by the strike committee themselves.

Strikes are not haphazard events, or isolated examples of 'a victorian employer who won't move with the times'. Every industrial dispute, whether big or small is a reflection of the deep class division which exists between capital and labour, and occurs simply because capitalism, is incapable of solving the constantly recurring crises of over production.

As this is being written there are a number of industrial disputes either taking place or just settled. The Dunlop Rubber Company and Fords new factory, both in Liverpool, Belfast shipyard workers and the Notting-

ham factories of Raleigh industries, all involving nearly 30,000 workers, were all on the issue of sackings. Although these strikes were miles apart, in different industries even, they all ring the same bell. They are in fact a direct challenge to the power which the employing class have usurped.

In every one of the disputes dealt with workers challenged the right of their particular employer to arbitrarily deprive all, or some, of the employees of their livelihood. But these workers went a step further. They were saying in effect, 'we are strong enough not only to challenge your power, but we can actually win!'. This, in many instances, workers proceed to do, thereby destroying the myth of the infallibility of the ruling class.

Every sectional victory by the workers brings us nearer to the day when the unity of all sections is achieved. Every struggle against sackings witnesses new and indeed revolutionary demands being raised. Ford workers at Dagenham heard the idea of FIVE DAYS PAY OR FIVE DAYS WORK held out as the basis for the next struggle against sackings. The demand WORK OR FULL MAINTENANCE is appearing more and more on union policy conference agendas.

These are some of the reasons why we, the industrial contributors to *Socialist Review*, try to draw from each dispute a lesson for the next. Each struggle literally predicts the next, points the way forward in fact for those who will themselves shortly be plunged into their particular battle.

We therefore support wholeheartedly the workers engaged in struggle, support without qualification the workshop organizations which themselves are the products of the class struggle. We shall continue to do this, playing what small part we can in strengthening the organized movement for the battles which lie ahead.

If we can succeed in that task then our contribution will have been worthwhile.

Cab Trade Committee he is demanding that a trade which has implicitly obeyed the Hackney Carriage laws, that has worked efficiently and well, should receive some assurances from the Home Office for safeguarding the cabmen's livelihood. Such assurances so far have not been forthcoming.

One point that must be remarked. Bro. Ted Sheehan, Regional Secretary, was loudly acclaimed when he told the men that the T&GWU would stand firmly behind them and their demands. A fighting fund has already been started; if it comes to a showdown, the cab trade will be ready.

# INTERNATIONAL

THE following letter was first published in the *Michigan AFL-CIO News*. Whilst not an anti-capitalist document it is nevertheless a useful addition to the article on Kennedy on this page.

To Whom It May Concern.

This is a letter from one of your former members. I cannot identify myself because I no longer have identity.

I used to carry many labels: worker, man, husband, father, friend, provider, neighbor, member of the community, to mention only a few. But I no longer hold claim to any of these.

I am no longer a worker because I cannot find a job. I cannot be a husband, father, provider, or even a man, because I cannot provide a living for my family, which is my first responsibility.

I am not a friend, neighbor, or member of the community because the only community to which I belong is the community of the unemployed—the hopeless, the dejected, the morose, the destitute—the misfits of society who occupy no role, perform no function.

The dejection which I feel now is somehow accentuated by the bright lights, the decorations, the tinsel, and the needless display of gifts and presents. As I mingle with the crowds of shoppers on my way to still another employment office, I feel a desperation and resentment which I try hard to fight back.

It is not their fault. They don't understand. I remind myself that there must have been a time when I didn't care, when, I, too, failed to understand. But it was a long time ago.

I have been unemployed now for more than three years in the heart of a busy, thriving city. It was 1957 when I received the last pink slip from the plant where I had worked for more than 20 years.

But until now, somehow, I still had hope. I believed that some-

thing would happen, somewhere a job would open up, this time they would not say, however kindly, "Sorry, too old. Nothing for you," or "All filled up. Nothing in your line."

At fifty, with a wife and three children to support, the youngest only eight years old, I am expected to fold my hands, go out to pasture, and let the charities take over. I am healthy and vigorous. My body aches to do an honest day's work, but I can find nothing but occasional odd jobs.

We jobless want to be able to earn back our self-respect. We want to be important in the eyes of our wives and our children. And we are resentful for being stripped of our dignity.

I am a simple man with simple beliefs, not entirely without education. I was lucky enough to spend two years in a university before I enlisted in the army, more than 15 years ago.

We were told that we must fight to preserve the cause of freedom and democracy for people everywhere. And I believed deeply in that struggle. But now we face a different kind of struggle in this country in comparison with which the Soviet challenge fades into insignificance. And that is the struggle to retain the faith and loyalty of all our citizens by providing economic security for them.

I read the papers, I listen to speeches, I talk with others who are unemployed. I had read about the coal mines in West Virginia, and the destitution which exists there. And I wonder what these people think. In comparison to them, I am living like a king.

Their understanding of economics is translated into the number of cents per day that is being spent on packages of "surplus foods," as if food can ever be surplus when people go hungry.

We cannot expect them, and you cannot expect us, to continue to be strongly concerned about preserving our ideology unless all of us who wish to preserve it are willing to first put our own house in order.

We live in the wealthiest nation in the world. Our resources and productivity are unlimited. Why can't we find the answer to joblessness?

# KENNEDY AND THE LEFT

BY JOHN PHILLIPS

THE recent news that the number of American unemployed is now more than 5½ million—the highest in fact since just before the war—has been quite a blow to the Kennedy fans, right and left.

One of the most disturbing trends over the last few months has been the undignified rush to acclaim Jack 'Bleeding Heart' Kennedy as the great champion of all classes, all races and all comers. Even some of the so-called left couldn't resist jumping on Jack's emotional 'America - is - losing - its - influence - in - the - free - world' bandwagon.

Well, what really were the punch-drunk lefties so ecstatic about? As a prelude to Jack's term of office Eisenhower in his 'Farewell Address' to the nation warned

"... we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security alone more than the net income of all United States corporations... Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society."

Anyone who expected Kennedy's skin-deep liberal policies to strike at the very roots of American capitalism in the interests of the working class, or even peace, really can't have much of a clue about the uncontrollable forces that run capitalism.

In fact: "Wall Street" said the *New York Times* Jan. 31, 1961 "responded enthusiastically... to President Kennedy's State of the Union message."

And the reason it so respond-

ed was simply that along with his gloomy appraisal of the domestic and world situation was a promise to step up the arms race. The attitude of American big business to this is crystal clear. Thus spoke industrialist T. Coleman Andrews on October 29 last:

"If the Soviet should present a sincere and reliable proposal for peace, it would throw us into an industrial tail-spin the like of which we have never dreamed."

Many who looked hopefully at Kennedy to lead the world out of the nuclear impasse failed to heed a remark in his inaugural address which was an implied pledge to step up arms spending. For, immediately after proposing that "both sides begin anew the quest for peace", he said:

"We dare not tempt them ('the enemy') with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed."

These words were given point by the announcement of Executive instructions already issued "to increase our airlift capacity... step up our Polaris submarine program... (and) accelerate our entire missile program". Moreover, as *Business Week* February 4 reported: "A new surge of Government defense contracts was on its way even before President Kennedy's order went out to all agencies this week to boost the rate at which they were placing new orders."

All this explains why they called the substantial rise in stocks a 'Kennedy market'.

To turn from Kennedy's attitude towards disarmament—what does his administration have in store for the American workers? A good indication can be gained from the report entitled "Prospects and Policies

for the 1961 American Economy". This was prepared by a task force appointed by Kennedy and headed by Dr. Paul A. Samuelson, professor of Economics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The report declares that alongside growing unemployment has come a constant increase in the cost of living and that to get the country's economy back on its feet the workers will have to meet additional cost-of-living rises.

Logically they construe that this will meet opposition from the workers and "Will it not be possible" they ask "to bring Government influence to bear on this vital matter without invoking direct controls on wages and prices?"

All the signs seem to indicate

the return to Government regulation of wages, hours and working conditions.

Surely all these facts point to one thing—that we as socialists must be diametrically opposed to Kennedy and his administration. Only when we maintain principled opposition to his blanket of 'new Deal' jargon can we show up Gaitskell, the American Communist Party (who vacillated like mad during the election campaign) and certain writers around *Tribune*, not only for their lack of socialist consistency, but also for their seeming willingness, as I said in my second paragraph, to jump onto the bandwagon of public sympathy towards the all-American champion of capitalist ideals.

## Socialist Review

## Fighting Fund

We need £40 an issue

During the last month we have received from:

	£	s	d
Islington	6	17	0
Willesden	4	2	6
Camden Town	5	3	0
Shoreditch	8	0	0
Hackney	4	10	0
Lewisham	2	8	0
Harrow	10	0	0
Birmingham	2	17	6
Ramsgate	2	7	0
Liverpool	2	0	0
Total	38	5	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 Carmelite Road, Harrow Weald, Middlesex

## Which way for the Centre?

BY JOHN PALMER (KINGSTON YS)

LIKE the little child who itched to tell the mighty King that far from wearing a magnificent suit of invisible material he was just plain starkers, Socialists have been longing to point out to gentlemen like Mr Richard Crossman that they have long been regarded as dialectically naked.

For a long time Crossman and others in the centre of the party have paraded around with a political attire made up of left-sounding clichés and phrases. Unfortunately for Crossman they have not disguised the right wing body beneath.

The contributions to the latest defence 'rethink' by the Party leadership of Messrs Crossman, Wilson, Cousins and Foot is causing many on the left to reconsider the wisdom of supporting some of these champions of the centre in the struggle for socialism and party democracy against the Gaitskell group. The recent statements of these four issued after the acceptance of the new 'policy' by the leadership have been enlightening.

Fundamentally Crossman and Wilson have had no difference of opinion with Gaitskell and his friends. Indeed in the last few days both factions have been energetically pointing out to the capitalist press that their differences are merely... "a matter of degree... of emphasis." Some of us would prefer to substitute the word 'tactics' for 'degree' and 'emphasis'.

Mr Gaitskell does not like the Scarborough decision on defence (and on one or two other matters). Quite rightly he feels that the decision points in the opposite direction to that in which he would like to lead the party. In fact he suspects the decision as smelling of a neutralist, class conscious and even (horror of horrors) a non Parliamentary trend in Party thinking.

Faced with this Mr Gaitskell and his friends decided that the best way to combat such a disturbing manifestation of rank and file action was to ignore it. Crossman and others differ with this view. They think that the baby has grown too big to be ignored, but also that it should be drowned in a flood of ambiguous 'left' sounding words.

These differences are no more than tactical ones. Their respective defence statements show this beyond doubt. Great play is made in the Crossman doctrine of working for a non nuclear NATO pledged not to drop the bomb first (as if that would matter much one the nuclear finale got under way) and the Gaitskell document says the same thing in rather more diplomatic language, designed not to give too much of a scare to the generals and the capitalist class.

The issue between socialists and the Party leadership goes

much deeper. It revolves round the whether or not we should be committed to any military alliance, Capitalist or Stalinist, under any circumstances and also whether or not class action and not political summits are the means for securing peace.

On those issues the Crossman group have no differences with the leadership. They accept the need for militarist alliances, with all their war engendering characteristics, and instead of class action for peace they make another hoary plea for a further gathering of international bosses to negotiate disarmament. How a socialist can believe that capitalism would ever voluntarily disarm when so much of the system depends on an arms programme, Crossman does not indicate; instead he covers up by sticking some attractive labels on his policy... aid for the worlds hungry, a stronger UN and so on. He deliberately avoids the issue.

Some comrades in the Party will however, express rather more surprise at the positions adopted by Foot and Cousins. After all these two have a record of opposition to the leadership, support for unilateralism and so on. And now they are prepared to support the Crossman statement which differs only in wording to that which they declare themselves inplacably opposed to.

But should we be so outraged? After all while Foot and Cousins have taken 'left' wing stands on some issues, they have never been prepared to accept the 'left wing conclusions' which result. While they are prepared to involve the working class in the struggle for peace, they wish at the same time to keep it within carefully proscribed limits (of their making) and with only certain limited objectives in sight (particularly the replacement of the Gaitskell leadership with one of their own). In this respect they take a similar stand to the Communist Party. Hence it has been necessary, within the terms of the inner power struggle raging at top level in the party, for the Foot-Cousins group to lend their tactical support to 'Dick' at this stage. As they have stated, their objective is to secure the widest possible agreement in the Parliamentary Party for a defence policy, whereas they should be campaigning vigorously for the implementation at Parliamentary level of the Scarborough decision. Or is it the this group have decided that the Scarborough path might have some unsettling implications for their own ambitions?

Having said that, however, the point should be made that our differences with Foot-Cousins, especially over their blatantly dishonest non-nuclear NATO gimmick, cannot at this stage be of the same order as those with the Gaitskell leadership, which is leading a positive assault on the class and socialist nature of the Party. One hopes that the errors of the Foot-Cousins group, based on a negative concept of socialist class action, will be seen by their perpetrators for what they are, with a resultant strengthening of the left forces in the Party in their struggle against the Bomb... and all the other evils and menaces of Capitalism.

In the meantime all sections of the party, and in particular the Young Socialists, should stand four-square on the Scarborough decisions. The battle against the Tories and the right wing should be firmly conducted on this base.

## NATO AND THE DANISH ELECTIONS

ONE of the arguments used by the right-wing of the Labour Party to defy conference decisions—that unilateralism means electoral suicide—received a setback when the Danish election results were announced last year. To help bury these arguments altogether we print below an article, translated from *Correspondances Socialistes* (December 1960 January 1961), by Toni Madsen of the Danish Peoples Socialist Party Student Movement.

THE legislative elections of November 15, 1960, are certainly the most surprising in the whole history of Danish parliamentarianism.

These elections show first of all that in Denmark, the Welfare State *par excellence*, the electorate, far from becoming stabilised round centrist groups which are losing their voice, tends to spread itself, and this to the advantage of the new extreme groups: the right-wing Independents, and the left-wing People's Socialist Party.

The PSP, which was only represented in Parliament by its leader, Aksel Larsen, gained 11 seats in Parliament on November 15. Without means and almost without any organization, it was the first time the PSP had contested an election; it had to fight at the same time attacks from

the Communist Party (according to which the new Party was wrecking the unity of the working class) and attacks from the right, which saw it simply as a communist Party in disguise.

But it is the origins of the PSP which are the important thing in its electoral success. It was born in 1958, from a split in the Communist Party. A faction of the Party, led by Larsen, leader for more than 30 years and parliamentarian for 28 years, had for a long time been trying to defend some of their positions in the Party, notably on the questions of Hungary and disarmament. On this last question the theses of the Larsen group were in fact those which Khrushchov exposed before UNO general assembly in 1959.

Besides this, Larsen had de-

fended before the Party the Ljubjana program (April 1958) of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. He was finally accused of "revisionism" and then expelled following a campaign organized by the immovable stalinist faction. Many members of the Party gave up their cards and followed Larsen. So as to organize the Larsen group as a Party and to allow its leader to keep his seat in Parliament, a campaign of support was organized and soon collected 18,000 signatures. Thus the People's Socialist Party was founded.

A minimum of 60,000 votes was needed throughout Denmark for the Party to be represented in Parliament. And the widespread opinion was that it was useless to vote for the PSP, a group which was doomed in advance. How, therefore, can we explain the considerable success of the PSP? It certainly attracted a number of old communist voters. The Danish CP, which had 72,000 votes in previous elections, now has no more than 27,000. But that does not explain the 150,000 votes of the PSP.

It must be confessed that there has been a relatively important movement of old social-democratic voters towards the People's Socialist Party. This movement probably affected more especially the working-class voters of the social-democratic Party, following the wildcat strikes of last August. In addition, the PSP certainly received the votes of a certain number of old voters of the Radical-Liberal Party (the traditionally anti-militarist Party), disillusioned by their Party whose parliamentary members last Spring supported the "military agreement", that is to say the project fixing Denmark's contribution to NATO.

Moreover, the "*Parti de la Taxe Unique*", whose program was based on the theories of Henry George, according to which all public enterprises could be financed by a special tax on land, practically disappeared from political scene and it seems likely that the PSP benefitted from this disappearance.

The program of the People's

cont. on page 7

## REVIEWS

BY PETER SEDGWICK

MR John Strachey has now expanded the full-page-plus of nuclear apologia that he wrote in the *Observer* on the Sunday before the Scarborough defence debate. The result is hardly worth the astronomic (two-and-sevenpence) difference in cost between this full-scale strategic chunk of ideological hardware and the original tactical version. The fall-out from Mr Strachey's paper bomb is, as ever, distinctly dirty.

The unique nature of the Hydrogen Bomb enables its devotees to combine the thrill of sadism with the pretensions of pacifism. The average Englishman will tell you proudly, "If they drop one on us, we will drop one on them", and then, with the next breath, "Of course it will never be used..." The Bomb is at once the jingoist's super-weapon, latest in the line of succession from the Gatling gun, Dreadnought and V-2, and the statesman-peacemaker's Non-weapon (since it is intended never to be used) or even Anti-weapon (since it supposedly abolishes the possibility of war).

Both these attitudes are evident in Strachey's pamphlet. A non-nuclear Britain is described as a "weak Britain without weapons or allies". Any armament short of the Bomb is implied (in a rebuke to Cousins) to be as out-of-date today as the cross-bow of Agincourt was in the machine-gun era. In a remarkable piece of hysterical fantasy, hardly paralleled outside the American gutter-press, Strachey envisages the Russian General Staff detonating an H-Bomb a day over British cities in order to bring a unilateralist Britain to her knees. (Amazingly he nowhere advocates a nuclear alliance with Russia to deter the equally likely, or unlikely, possibility of similar bombardment from America or France.) "Surrender" is sprinkled as a synonym for 'unilateralism' no less than 49 times in 21 pages.

On the other hand, we are treated to some eleven pages of propaganda for Peace Through Deterrence. War, it appears, is getting less and less likely as 'invulnerable' weapons like Polaris come into play on either side; it is assumed that neither side will be tempted to strike first if its opponent's Bomb-capacity cannot be obliterated at first blow. Strachey does not stop to consider the fact that a large proportion of military research is devoted precisely to the task of upsetting the enemy's invulnerability. Devices for the detection and destruction of fast submarines are now a top priority. Nevertheless, Strachey declares that armaments "should not only be made as mutually invulnerable, and as equal as possible, but should also be reduced to the maximum practicable extent".

This demand for a reduction in armaments would be, if Strachey were right in the rest of his argument, an inconsistent

hangover from pre-nuclear days: a few Sundays before Scarborough, a Hydrogen Don (or Atomic Academic—an increasingly common species in the USA) wrote in the *Observer* to the effect that 'disarmament' did not necessarily mean reducing armaments—its proper meaning nowadays lay in making bigger and better detection systems (and conversely we may suppose, anti-detection-system systems), even if this meant increasing armament expenditure. Disarmament is Armament. War is Peace. Strachey cannot eat his nuclear cake and have it.

*Strachey's final paragraphs outline his hopes for the future of mankind. The best he can offer us is 'a world kept in order by*

*the joint will of Russia and America, acting, no doubt, in the name of the United Nations', a gradual accommodation of the wills of the two great conservative super-powers "to keep the world in order". Strachey's role in the Popular Front days was largely that of an apologist for Moscow. During the Labour Government's term of office, he served, as Under-Secretary for War, the military strategy of American capitalism. In his dependence for the future on both Washington and Moscow, he has telescoped his political career very neatly. Now, as then, he has seen where naked power predominates, and knelt before it. Paradoxically, this display of sophisticated abjection appears*

in a Fabian series entitled "Socialism In The Sixties". The dangers of war by accident, and war by 'escalation' from tactical to strategic weapons, seems to enter Mr Strachey's consciousness scarcely at all. He talks of the not necessarily high risk of nuclear war in the immediate years ahead; he never tells us whether, if it came (literally) to the push, he would set Polaris off or not, or in what circumstances. With all Strachey's cool calculation of 'first strikes!!! second strikes' and so on, it is perhaps fortunate that the Fabian tortoise on the front cover does not appear carrying its customary motto. This is quite baldly: WHEN I STRIKE, I STRIKE.

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

2 SOHO SQUARE, W.1

April 8  
DIALECTIC MATERIALISM  
Alasdair McIntyre  
May 13  
WAGE LABOUR AND  
CAPITAL

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

## Labour must lead on Central Africa

BY IOAN DAVIES

IN spite of the sharp division in the Conservative Party over their Rhodesian Federation policy the Labour Party has not yet shown any clear lead in framing a policy of its own. Lord Salisbury and Mr MacLeod may be at opposite poles in attitudes—but has Labour done anything besides tagging on behind MacLeod? Speeches made by official party spokesmen in the Commons and elsewhere have been particularly vague in defining Labour's attitude.

In the recent Commons debate hardly a single MP—let alone front bencher—mentioned the most significant point in the structure of the Federation; the large economic interests that are at the root of Welensky's and Salisbury's chauvinism. Make no doubt about it, the same interests that dismembered the Congo are working in the Rhodesias, and the African representatives at the recent constitutional talks seemed little aware of it. Some then did not define their positions beyond that of being for 'one man, one vote'.

What will be the provisions for economic control? What kind of 'transfer of power'? Having got rid of Welensky (in fact the pawn of the monopolists) how does the Government intend to ensure that the productive resources and the finance are in the hands of the Rhodesian people? The Labour Party is strangely silent. They 'support' Nkomo, Nkumbula and the other leaders; but they have not defined their position on the break-up of the European stranglehold on the wealth of the territories.

Even an all-Rhodesian electorate is no guarantee. Katanga seems to have been no lesson. Like the Belgian and French Socialist parties, Labour ignores the major point of independence: as in India, Ghana, Ceylon it would transfer power from one elite to another.

Socialists must speak out now for:

1. Elections that ensure the participation of all citizens in North and South Rhodesia and Nyasaland in determining the future of the territories;

2. The laying down of an economic plan in all three areas that makes available to the

Rhodesian and Nyasa people the ownership of the productive resources and breaks up the financial power-blocks;

3. The guarantee by Britain of aid that will facilitate the creation of a Rhodesian & Nyasa economy and further guarantee the training of specialists either within the territories or without.

Unless Socialists can press for these minimum conditions there is little point in crying havoc over Salisbury. At present Gaitskell and MacLeod both support a façade of independence that leaves the economic realities untouched. What Socialism is this?

## Southern Region Conference

BY JOHN  
BLOOM

TWELVE of the thirty resolutions on the agenda of the 15th annual conference of the Southern Regional Council of the Labour Party deal with nuclear disarmament, public ownership, housing and the recent report of the Royal Commission on Local Government in greater London.

The southern regional council covers the counties of Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Hampshire (including the Isle of Wight), Kent, Surrey and Sussex. The Labour Party now holds only five of the seventy-six parliamentary constituencies in the region, as a result of the calamitous policies of the right wing leadership. In the 1945 parliament the party

held twenty seats when there were fourteen less constituencies.

The Southern Regional group of the Co-Operative Party and the Croydon Borough Labour Party both call upon the regional executive committee "to convene area meetings, during the next six months, at which the unilateralist defence policy (approved by the Labour Party and the Co-Operative Party and supported by the Trades Union Congress) may be discussed."

The Surrey Federation of Trades' Councils and the Wimbledon Constituency Labour Party want the regional executive committee "to organise a public propaganda campaign in favour

cont. page 8

# DEFEND THE WELFARE STATE

BY JOHN SANGSTER ETU

**T**HIRTY years ago, faced with the 'problem' of over-production, the employing class immediately attacked wage rates and slashed public spending, producing the hungry thirties so well known to our older comrades.

Today, whilst quite willing to assault the living standards of the workers, capitalism seeks to achieve the same result by more indirect methods, so trying to maintain the appearance of being the champion of the Welfare State. (Evidence of a much stronger Trade Union movement and a more enlightened working class.) Approaches are made to the co-conspirators in Parliament to reduce taxes on goods, but as this loss will have to be made good, the alternative is yet another attack on welfare foods.

Already there has been an increase in National Health contributions, but still more finance is needed to cover the loss in revenue from reduced taxes on consumer goods. A direct attack on the workers' pay packet would be bad for propaganda (where would the 'you've never had it so good' slogans fit in), and lead to another bout of wage disputes. Therefore the next onslaught must be against welfare benefits, they must be reduced and if possible cut out altogether. The easiest method is to hit at the children. By making inroads on welfare milk and school dinners, the Tories know they have shifted the burden onto the working-class mother who will make yet another sacrifice so that her children will not go without.

In the process of 'softening up' those who will have to suffer, the propaganda machine has gone diligently to work. The national Press have, for some time, carried curious little reports about how much bigger and healthier our children are, and that welfare milk may have to be increased in price from 4d to 6d or 8d a pint, which, of course, we are told, would be no hardship in these days of plenty. We are also told that school dinners are not really necessary nowadays as malnutrition has been abolished and children don't really eat their dinners anyway. Figures were produced to show that children spent their dinner money on other things, thereby 'proving' that school dinners are a waste of public money.

ETU members are conscious of the threat to the social services and endorse all demands for industrial action in defence of those services. My own branch unanimously passed the following resolution in the hope that mounting pressure from the rank-and-file will stir the august bodies of the TUC movement into some semblance of unity against the Tories.

"This branch urgently requests its area committee to convene a

*mass meeting of all our members to demonstrate our open hostility to the savage attack on the National Health Service by the Tory Government: we further request that the area committee uses its initiative in formulating a really active industrial campaign to show the Government that workers of the Electrical industry will not tolerate any dismemberment of the Welfare State."*

Nothing has altered the role of the privileged class; they have the same object today as yesterday, the perpetuation of capitalism. It remains for the forces of the left to unite in the struggle against capitalism and in so doing to hold out before our class that vision of an alternative, a nation won for Socialism.

**T**HE British Communist Party is to hold its 27th National Conference this Easter. As a prelude to this the CP weekly journal *World News* has opened its columns to a discussion on issues that will be raised during the Conference.

A significant contribution to this discussion comes from Monty Johnstone, ex-editor of the *YCL* paper *Challenge*. He criticises the CP leadership for its opportunism towards the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. "We played down", he writes, "and underestimated the importance of the demand for unilateral disarmament by Britain. By considering the latter as dividing the movement and diverting it from the main issue, we were late in associating ourselves with and giving full support to what has in fact become a key issue on which the left has fought and defeated the Gaitskellite right wing."

The writer continues his criticism by ironically stating: "The EC made the necessary adjustments in our line last May". But the leadership avoided a public declaration of this change: "no analysis of the reasons for the change (nor even any recognition that there has been one!), let alone any suggestion that there could have been anything wrong in our previous position, have ever been made to the Party or the public". In conclusion, he warns the Party that "modesty and readiness to admit and analyse our mistakes, not an attempt to represent ourselves in practice as always giving faultless political leadership are necessary if we are to be respected and trusted by the rising left wing in the Labour Party..."

We agree.

## It's Rich

Mr Crossman can not only unite the party but could win back a greater measure of public support if he would clearly state that Labour will defend the nation with every possible means at its disposal. There is really no need for Labour to apologize for being British first.—Frank McLeavy Labour MP, for Bradford East, letter in the *Times*, 1 March.

The way the tiger was rushing backwards and forwards, every time I got my sights on its head it could be somewhere else. I had a man next to me to advise where to aim, but he did not say anything—Foreign Minister Lord Home, in Nepal, reported in *Economist*, 4 March.

The manager of another company is said to have offered an official of the Tailors and Garment Workers a cheque to meet all the union dues of all his employees for a year, on condition that he kept away from the factory.—*Times* report on American companies in Britain, 27 February.

The radioactive isotope of strontium is thought to be the most hazardous component in the fall-out from nuclear explosions. But for better or worse it is now everywhere, so scientists are studying its behaviour and turning its presence to good account.—*Radio Times* program preview, 1 March.

In a circular also read in the churches the Archbishop stated that anyone criticizing or commenting adversely in any way on his Lenten pastoral would be committing a mortal sin, absolution for which was reserved to the Archbishop himself.—*Times* report from Malta, 22 February.

This reminds us of Czarist days before the Communists took over power in that country in the year of grace 1921.

During the last few days of the Czar, every one of the able male population of that blessed country was a State Official. No wonder then, it was so easy for the succeeding regime to convert every citizen of that vast land into a State Subject or a State Servant.—Shri CH Bhabha, former Minister of Commerce in the Government of India, quoted in *Indian Ship*, p 65.

### DANISH ELECTIONS

cont. from page 5

Socialist Party presented two characteristic features: the PSP is a socialist Party independent of the two blocks; the PSP is anti-militarist and in consequence demands Denmark's disarmament and withdrawal from NATO.

Abroad, it is the English right wing which has greeted the results of the Danish election with the most anxiety: these gentlemen find it difficult to understand that an important section of opinion in a member country of NATO can be opposed to this treaty. British imperialism is alarmed by the position of the PSP, which has emerged at the precise moment when the unilateralist left of the Labour Party is challenging the position of Gaitskell & Co., faithful guardians of the interests of the English bourgeoisie.

In this field, it is clear that the success of the anti-nuclear march of last October contributed towards opening the eyes of a section of the Danish population. Moreover, it is highly significant

that the military problem was ignored by the electoral platform of all the other Parties, which preferred to base their campaigns on the tax problem.

Despite the success of the PSP, the other indications pointed out by the elections of November 15 must not be ignored, in particular the progress of the Social-Democrats, who are extending the wide gap which separates it from all the other Parties. The SD-Radical Liberal coalition disposes of the problem of the absolute majority in Parliament and has formed the government. Compromise will therefore continue in the name of socialism, and in the coming period the task of the PSP will be to denounce this clearly, but without landing in that strange mixture of opportunism and sectarianism, which rules the CP.

The PSP will have to accomplish a tremendous task: its success is important, not only for Danish socialism, but also for European socialism struggling against conformism and the bureaucratic machines.

Results of the Danish elections of November 15:

Social-Democrats	1,024,039	76 (+ 6)
Rad.-Liberal Party	140,609	11 (— 3)
Conservatives	436,005	32 (+ 2)
Agrarian-Liberal	511,338	38 (— 7)
"Taxe Unique" Party	52,232	0 (— 9)
PSP	149,482	11 (+10)
Communists	27,345	0 (— 5)
Independents	81,094	6 (+ 6)

(1) The PSP spent 85,000 crowns on its campaign; the SD 2 millions; the Conservatives 10 millions.



## HEALTH SERVICE

cont. from page 1

can only be big business that gains.

In fact, when we look at the eighteen largest drug companies in England (nine of them American subsidiaries) we see that their aggregate profits jumped from £m35 to £m46 from 1959 to 1960—this increase mark you being more than the increase in the NHS drug bill which the Government are imposing. To quote from the Civil Appropriation Accounts report published early this year:

*"the profits of these companies, expressed as percentages of capital employed, had been above those of general industry throughout the period examined and had lately tended to increase whereas the rate for general industry had been falling. While the position varied greatly between individual manufacturers and groups of manufacturers, it was noticeable that the profit rates of the British subsidiaries of American concerns had consistently been much higher than those of general industry."*

Of course the drug firms argue that their profits are justified because of the tremendous

## S. REGION CONFERENCE

cont. from page 6

of the Scarborough conference decisions on defence and nationalisation." The latter add that the campaign should be held "during the summer".

A fifth resolution, from the Area 26 of the Electrical Trades Union, calls upon the regional executive committee "to inaugurate a campaign in support of the 1960 Scarborough conference decisions on nuclear disarmament."

Housing is dealt with in two resolutions. The Erith district committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union want the regional executive committee to conduct "a campaign against exorbitant rent increases and against the proposed (rating) reassessments" in 1963.

The Reigate CLP "expresses its strong disapproval of the recommendations" of the report of the Royal Commission. Similarly, the Merton & Morden CLP "strongly opposes (its) proposals." Critical resolutions have also been tabled by the Maidstone CLP and the Mitcham CLP.

The Epsom SLP want the national executive committee of the Labour Party to call a conference of constituency Labour Parties affected by the report "for the purpose of examining its effect upon local government in the greater London area and to ensure uniformity of action by the Labour Party organisations in the area."

## OUT NOW!

### International Socialism No 4

3 shillings (post paid)  
from 47 Fitzroy Road NW1

amount of medical research they have to undertake. However, according to the *Times Review of Industry*, only £m6.2 is spent annually on research by the industry. Also we can only guess how much of this 'research' is merely finding out what other firms know in order to prepare another version of the same thing.

*"On the other hand advertising expenditure is beyond all reason. The cost of total advertising of 'medical products' in the press and on TV alone was around £10 million in 1960. But this does not include the flood of glossy, five-colour advertising material together with samples sent direct through the post to general practitioners and others in the medical profession, which, as every doctor can testify, involves quite a problem in refuse disposal, though figures of the cost involved are not available."*

All this racketeering on the part of big business is, as can be expected, aided and abetted by the Tory Government. In December last year some minor modifications to the NH scheme revised the definition of new drugs, which are free from price control during their first three years, to exclude drugs which owe nothing to fresh research.

*"A decision which shows how right those critics were who suggested that much of the so-called 'research' was not research at all."*

led 'research' was not research at all."

As well as directly assisting the big drug combines the Government have clamped down on the doctor and the individual trying to escape the pernicious and unnecessarily high cost of prescription charges.

*"The first result of the levy of 1s. per item in 1956 was that doctors tried to counteract the price increase to the patient by prescribing larger quantities at a time; indeed the Hinchliffe Committee found that the main charge was one of the main causes of waste and extravagance in prescribing. The Government has tried to tackle this with seemingly more energy than they have tried to tackle drug firms; at the beginning of 1960 a circular was sent to doctors telling them to limit the quantities prescribed to a week's supply except where larger quantities are clearly justified and steps have been taken to 'carpet' doctors who go in for 'excessive' prescribing. Thus the charges themselves have produced irresistible incentives to over-prescribing, and their own bit of machinery for trying to curb it."*

Some argue that, while the Health Service charges will increase ill-health in the community, it might restore the Parliamentary Labour Party to fighting fitness. For here at last is an is-

sue which they can get their teeth—or rather dentures—into.

Alas! this is extremely improbable. So far, all we have seen is a verbal battle, carried out strictly within the parliamentary framework. Whilst making Cabinet Ministers loose their sleep is highly commendable—their consciences should have done that long ago—it still doesn't alter things one iota. The Bill still goes through.

The Gaitskellites, in any case, are themselves too compromised to lead any principled opposition. For it was Hughie, our lad, who first introduced prescription charges. How can we expect him to point out that had the Government pegged the arms bill at last year's figure, almost all the money to be raised by Health charges could have come from that source? Being as much an apostle of the Cold War as Macmillan, Gaitskell has hamstrung himself. With his own behaviour when Chancellor of the Exchequer still fresh in people's minds, he cannot even hint that to spend £1,655 million each year on 'defence', that gives us four minutes warning of annihilation, might be a trifle too expensive, or that the money could be better spent improving old age pensions, the Health Service and the other social services.

Similarly, the Gaitskellites, by their own behaviour, have made it impossible to conduct a vigorous opposition to the increased National Insurance contributions. They were largely responsible for foisting on to the Labour Party the National Superannuation Plan, a plan which was the first to moot the idea of differential contributions. Instead of arguing workers should have an adequate pension as a right, the Plan tied it to the size of the insurance contribution.

Instead of paying for old age out of taxation, where the super-taxpayer would fork out the most, the Plan wanted to be self-financing. Using the same principles as embodied in Labour's official Plan, the Tory Government have, with a subtle twist, enacted a vicious piece of legislation, with regressive taxation in the form of a poll tax.

But of all the ways in which the Gaitskellites retard the struggle the most important is by perpetuating the myth of the clear division between political and industrial activity. As even the most simple-minded worker knows, although a shadow Cabinet Minister may not, the effect of the Tory Government's increased charges is to lessen his wages, the amount he takes home. It is tantamount to a wage cut. And, as such, the only effective countermove is to greet these measures as one would a wage cut. The Derbyshire Miners have pointed the way, by their suggestion of strike action. If the Labour Movement stood united, prepared to meet any attack on the Welfare State with, in the last resort, a general strike, then MacMillan and his colleagues would lose more sleep over that than they ever will through all-night sittings.

*All quotations and statistical information from Labour Research March 1961.*

## 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.

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.