

SOCIALIST REVIEW

JOURNAL
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

11th YEAR No 7

JULY/AUGUST 1961

SIXPENCE

WHOSE UNITED EUROPE?

STAN BEDWELL

THE approach to the thorny question of Britain and the European Common Market by Michael Foot and the Tribunites underlines the complete theoretical muddle which constitutes the remnants of Bevanism in the British Labour Party.

From frightening stories of the possibilities of the British Labour market being flooded by Italian unemployed; sharp increases in the prices of food for every single man, woman and child; the dismemberment of the good old British Commonwealth and Empire; right over to the acceptance of De Gaulle and Adenauer—we have been warned.

No wonder in such a string of clouded thoughts (all in the fair name of Socialism) it is confessed that lines on the Common Market do not run alongside the usual divisions ever for example unilateralism or the Clause Four controversy.

For the Marxist the question is simple. We are concerned with no less than the abolition of the nation capitalist-state; we are out to establish no less than a Federation of United Socialist States of Europe (East and West) and eventually a United Socialist States of the World.

They are indeed lofty aims but nevertheless the only beacon for humanity to follow.

We do not raise this as does the Socialist Party of Great Britain which disdains to address itself to the practical problems of the TU Movement.

When you ask a worker if he is glad or sorry about the Common Market he wants to know what there is in it for him. And that instinct is perfectly sound.

Whether you get a co-ordinated Western European Economy with Britain outside or in, the worker will gain or lose according to his ability to struggle through his own economic strength in combination with his fellows.

For Foot and Co. to really discuss the capitalist problems arising from the Common Market, they must be prepared to say what they have to say to the workers of all countries. If your arguments cannot stand up in front of an audience of Western European Trade Unionists, whatever gives birth to your thoughts it is not International Socialism.

LITTLE ENGLANDISM

What we have had from Clive Jenkins of ASSET is an outburst of Little Englandism. He was reported as saying at his conference that Britain is 'in danger of becoming a European off-shore island'. So what? That is precisely what we are.

The system of imperial preferences and heavy subsidy support for British agriculture, which provides less than half home needs, is a capitalist system and for capitalist needs. The sterling block is a currency empire for finance capitalist purposes.

If there is division in the British capitalist camp over the Common Market it is a division about how to make the most of British capitalism in the future. The big combines see it as a chance to tool-up for a considerably extended market; while the heavily tariff protected inefficient industries see the writing on the wall.

Macmillan is well aware of all the problems involved. The other day in the House of Commons he accused Shinwell of growing jingoistic in his (Shinwell's) old age. The Prime Minister can afford his arrogant swagger while Labour Party spokesmen confine their attention to the problems of a "commonwealth" scattered all over the earth.

The problem of the Common Market is another milestone in the hauldown of British imperialism.

It is nonsense for workers' representatives to get involved in the abstract arguments of British capitalism; whether to sweat for a "protected" or "free" trade. It is as foolish as arguing for the return of mid-Victorian capitalism with its larger elements of "freedom". Workers will address their minds to the scare of the Common Market in exactly the same way as they have to confront other forms of capitalist integration at home in the form of mergers, take-overs and combines.

Mergers and large-scale capitalist enterprise for private profit are the order of the day; mergers and the solidarity of trade union organisation should be the order of the day for the workers.

If therefore we regard it as a Tory headache what should the attitude of a real Socialist-Workers Government be?

First of all it cannot be separated from the Cold War, just as the capitalists and their Government do not separate it here. There is no doubt that the OEEC originally was seen by Western European capitalist countries as the means of consolidating a 'third' economic and consequently political power bloc. But those whom the Gods wish to destroy, they first make mad.

continued on page eight

THE NET TIGHTENS

BY JOHN PALMER

THE dramatic falls in the value of industrial shares and government equities on the Stock Exchange last week has spotlighted what may prove to be the start of a major economic crisis.

The first warnings of stormy weather ahead in the capitalist economy were clearly given when Mr Selwyn Lloyd presented his now famous 'rob the poor to feed the rich' budget last April. Then he clearly stated that he had taken wide powers to deal with any economic crisis that might arise... leaving us with little doubt that HE at any rate had confidence in the future.

The two most important powers he then took were directly aimed at slashing working class living standards: firstly by using the payroll tax to create a pool of unemployed and secondly by exercising the other powers to increase taxes and retail prices, designed to drastically cut consumption.

Since then we have seen prices start to rise, interest loans on house mortgages rise and a further increase in rents. Added to these must also be included the national health charges, increased insurance contributions and the other measures taken in and before the budget. All these steps have been taken to reduce costs in industry, which are at present elbowing Britain out of the world capitalist markets. Indeed realisation of the far-reaching deterioration of the British balance of payments situation, because of the industrial stagnation of the last two years, has led to a run on sterling, leaving the Tories less cash in hand to pay for the deficits in their foreign trade.

The Tories' predicament, then, is the classical capitalist contradiction. They cannot stimulate demand for fear of raising costs even further, while to take deflationary action would lead to a further loss of confidence in the

cont. page 8

SON OF FRED

THE increasing tendency of officialdom to coin words, the constituent letters being first letters of other words (PLUTO or pipe line under the ocean being an early example) is a blight on the language which becomes daily more intolerable. Nowhere is this more pronounced than in the British Post Office, as is instanced by this article reproduced from the "Live Wire" organ of the Metropolitan North West Branch of the Post Office Engineering Union. The FRED of the title refers we understand to a machine known as the Functional Routine Enumerating Device.

TO help our readers who do not have the time to keep abreast of the latest developments, here is a survey of what they may expect in the future and what new initials they will have to learn.

A typical Auto. exchange of the future will be "T" shaped, with a small cylindrical stem and a large elongated crosspiece. This crosspiece will house the switchroom and clerical staff. It is estimated that, with the aid of STD and other devices, an operating staff of 250 will suffice for a 10,000 line exchange with, of course, a corresponding increase in clerical staff.

To those who may express surprise at the lack of automation in this direction I would quote an old Chinese saying 'The maker of raincoats does not pray for a heatwave'. There are, however, two devices of interest. The first is a replacement of the ENG service. Customers will dial 'ENG' plus a 'customer recognition code'. This selects the customer's fault card and punches date/time holes.

A scanner notes any previous faults. If these are less than three in 24 hours a recorded apology is switched on, promising swift action. This service is called Basic Apology Handout or BAH. An extension of this apparatus is designed to operate when the number of faults of more than three days duration reaches 200. This operates a low-power radio transmitter which breaks in on TV and Radio with a recorded promise that everything

short of having engineers actually working on the fault is being done. This is called Group Announcement Wireless Distribution or GAWD.

We now come to the part of the building of most interest; the small cylindrical base housing the apparatus. To obtain the required strength to support the top structure and to keep the apparatus free from dirt, it is made without doors or windows and is hermetically sealed. Access is obtained via an air-lock and steps from the ceiling. The engineer on duty breathes by means of an aqua-lung strapped to his back. This is the Pneumatic Harness Engineering Workmen or PHEW.

It has been realised that the complete absence of daylight would affect health and cause sick absences. This has been overcome by providing all supervisory lamps with double filaments to generate Ultra Violet light. This is Daylight Imitation Double Duty Equipment or DIDDLE.

The possibility of an engineer working alone and sealed off, having an accident has also been taken into consideration. Metal strips are set into the floor and should he be lying across these strips, the variation in capacity will operate an alarm in the switchroom. This is Survey Absent Disabled Indolent Staff Technique or SADIST.

With apparatus so complex it is essential that only qualified men should work on it. In future staff obtaining City and Guilds Certificates will, in addition, be injected with a radio-active isotope. An unqualified engineer approaching a rack of equipment will fail to 'trigger-off' the built-in Geiger counter. This failure will operate buzzers tuned to give a slightly derisive note and to cause a steel shutter to fall, thus sealing off the rack. This is Barrier Unqualified Routining Personnel or BURP.

This wholesale automation will result in a surplus of engineering staff. To make the best use of these redundancies Observations will be fed into a computer. At the end of the day staff will be told where to report the following morning. This scheme is Concentration Redundant Auto. Personnel. How it will work out has yet to be seen but experts say that if present trends continue the North West Area is likely to have the biggest load of Concentrated Redundant Auto. Personnel in the London Telecommunications Region.

TU COMMENTARY

Smiths strike BY SID HOVELL

ONCE again the motor industry is faced with a crisis, this time promoted by an accessory manufacturer from whom little has been heard hitherto. Many folk will be asking at this stage, "What have Smiths got to do with this?" the general impression being that this company is associated with domestic clocks.

Let me hasten to add that Smiths are an empire within an empire, controlling 23 plants, employing 20,000 workers and producing almost all instrumentation for motoring and motor transport for aviation, for industry and the professions, for shipping and home appliances. Whilst, at the moment, four of these plants are out in dispute—namely Cricklewood (MA1)—Watford, Whitney and Cheltenham, I propose only to deal with the set-up at Cricklewood (Motor Accessory 1).

For many years MA1 enjoyed—by virtue of militancy—good industrial relations with management, and rates and conditions are said to have topped the poll in the NW London Area. Now, according to my information, they stand at 14th in the list. Redundancy in 1954 took care of the "trouble-makers" and for some time a vacuum existed, of which the management took full advantage. However, whilst militancy thrived very slowly amongst the mass of workers, a very capable works committee evolved, under the able leadership of Bro Jock Graham, a born negotiator—and certain of our conditions together with improvements were regained.

However, over the past few years, the management have adopted—on the advice of their advisors from the personnel department—a system of delaying tactics wherever negotiations were concerned.

To give a personal example, throughout the period during which I was toolroom steward, whenever I was instructed by the department to negotiate a matter with the management, my co-steward and I would adopt normal procedure, and request a meeting with the management—that is, the works manager. The answer to this request would arrive in anything from two days to two weeks and an appointment arranged probably for something like a fortnight's time. On two occasions, as I recall, we arrived at the conference room with our prepared case, only to be greeted by a minion of the personnel department, with apologies for the manager's absence. Enquiries as to his being empowered to negotiate elicited the fact that this was not so, but he thought we could have a little chat around the subject.

Consequently, due to this type of approach to negotiation by the management, our negotiations came to take months in settlement, and as these tactics were adopted in many cases of departmental and works committee negotiations, frustration is rife amongst stewards and has helped to engender this strike.

As to the present issue, because of loss of bonus earnings, due to the wage recession in the

industry (£120 per annum in my own case) and the cut back in piece-work earnings, in a period of rising costs, 17 separate departmental claims were presented to the management. The works committee attempted to aggregate these claims into an overall factory claim and consultation was sought with the management with a view to finding a formula that was acceptable—bearing in mind that all other factories in the combine have parity agreements with the parent company—namely MA1 Cricklewood.

This the management refused, and informed the convenor that if he so desired he must institute a specific claim of his own. Having no alternative, a claim based on piece-work differentials was presented and rejected out of hand.

In consequence a works meeting was convened and a decision taken to stop work—we are well aware of constitutional procedure, and of the management's desire for this course to be taken—past experience having made us wary of taking this course with Smith's management.

The works have signified willingness, at all stages of the dispute, to return to work upon the management's guarantee that they will discuss our claim by a certain date; they have received this information, formally, on two occasions to date and this second time the information was given by the works committee in the presence of Bros Berridge, Birch and McLaughlin of the

AEU and Bro O'Brien of the NUGMW—the management categorically refused.

Bearing in mind that approximately three-quarters of the 2,000 workers in the dispute are women, that many are young women earning approximately £8 per week and in many cases paying £3 or £4 per week in lodging rent, it is amazing that their solidarity is taking the strain so strongly. It does appear that we will have to face cases where dire hardship prevails and I would ask all organisations and factory committees who can help us face these troubles to do so generously.

REINSTATE

BRO GILBERT

AT the National Conference of Guards and Shunters, held in Margate on May 26th and 27th the following resolution standing in the name of the London District Council was considered at the Joint Session.

"This Conference strongly condemns the despicable action of the B.T.C. in victimising Bro. T. Gilbert, Secretary L.D.C. No. 3 Camden Town Depot.

"We demand that our N.E.C., if they have not already done so, declare this to be a case of victimisation and to act accordingly."

After an extremely lively debate this resolution was put to the vote. Result: 269 For. 1

cont. next page

cont. from page 2

Against. 1 Recorded Astention. Bro Gilbert's case will be discussed at the AGM in July. A number of branches and District Councils have appealed against the NEC decision—"that no further action be taken". The National Conference of Guards and Shunters condemned his dismissal as an act of victimisation and called upon the NEC to act. All this with good cause for the case was one of blatant victimisation.

The reasons outlined in Bro Greene's circular for reversing the NEC decision of "We are adamant Bro Gilbert must be reinstated in his former position" puts the management in a still more villainous light. They said—"We have ample evidence that Gilbert refused the order first and then got the men to back him by striking." Where and what is that evidence? For it never has been produced at any stage of the disciplinary hearing. Every shunter concerned gave evidence that Gilbert acted on their instructions. Since the issuing of the circular they have declared—"We stand by that evidence".

The management have brought in one fresh piece of evidence. They said to our Head Office in Bro Greene's circular—"On the night of December 8, 1960 a train of 45 wagons pulled into the yard at 4.15A.M. and fouled the engine that should have shunted that train—Gilbert refused to take the rear portion off this train."

The management never used this evidence at the disciplinary hearings for the simple reason it is untrue and would have been proved untrue by the witnesses.

The management knew they could give no valid reasons for their determination to keep an engine idle all night and were forced to invent one. It made our members case stronger and instead of accepting it as gospel,

the NEC should have been even more determined to secure his reinstatement.

To our members at Camden, the management's desire was plain—the engine was kept idle in order to dispense with its use. The united action of the shunters upset this plan.

To charge in and dismiss the LDC Secretary on such an issue strikes at the heart of militant action on the job against local attempts to bring about redundancy.

Our London District Council has, from the beginning, fought for Bro Gilbert's reinstatement,

and we should do everything possible to see that Chalk Farm's appeal to the AGM is successfully carried.

★

This report has been reprinted from Unity, organ of the London District Council NUR, June 1961.

REVIEWS

BOOK

DESPITE the limitations both of his vision and his ability to draw the relevant lessons, Mr Desmond Greaves has produced a book well worth reading in *The Life and Times of James Connolly* (Lawrence and Wishart). All Socialists, and particularly British and Irish ones will benefit from a reconsideration of Connolly as a labour leader, and a reconsideration of his ideas.

A hatred of capitalism with 'all its works and pomps', a complete rejection of blinkered sectarianism, and a searing insight into the necessary connection between theory and action... these were the great Connolly qualities. Who can say that they are not needed in the Labour movement of today more than ever?

Despite his hidebound Stalinist philosophy, Mr Greaves has the authentic historian's touch. (Just as well, perhaps, that Connolly was shot by British forces in 1916 and not later, when he might have caused concern in other quarters.)

One of the most interesting passages in the book is that dealing with Connolly's long but

The Life and Times of James Connolly

A Raisin in the Sun

rather fruitless flirtation with the romantic International Workers of the World in America. The lessons for American labour abound in these pages which contain, in microcosm, all the failings and inadequacies of the American labour movement.

A good book to be read for background. Do not, however, expect any guiding morals for the future from Mr Greaves. He and his 'Connolly Association' in Britain are far too concerned with capturing political power for the CP for that.

FILM

THE importance of the film "A Raisin in the Sun" for socialists lies in its symbolic nature. On the surface the plot seems a fairly bourgeois one; the coloured man living in a rat-trap of a flat, where his son has to sleep on the living-room sofa, where his mother's word and his mother's God are law, is becoming more and more obsessed with money, and estranged from humanity. His ambition is to make more and more money, until he will be as rich as the white man he envies and, so he believes, able to look the world,

especially his son, in the face.

He invests his dead father's insurance money (entrusted to him by his mother to do what he likes with) in a liquor store which does not materialise and it seems that the family will be completely shattered by this. But, as the career-girl sister's Nigerian boy friend points out, there is something wrong when all the dreams in a family are "based on something which might never have happened", i.e. the insurance money; and, having put the down-payment on a house in an all-white area, the coloured man finally manages to overcome his desire for money and refuses to be bought out for a higher price by the "welcoming committee". Thus he attains manhood.

The importance of the film does not, however, lie in his reaching manhood, but in his realisation that if he wants to rise above his position of slavery and humiliation he must act for himself and not wait for money to do everything for him.

HELLISH BUDGET

THE American "Heller Budget" estimates that the wage which a US worker needs weekly to maintain a modest standard of living "necessary to health and reasonably comfortable living" as \$120 to \$127 a week, the former figure applying to those who rent their homes and the latter to those with homes of their own. This is £42 16s to £44 10s. The average weekly earnings of US factory workers in 1959 were \$89.47 (£32). The only industries and trades in which production worker averaged the weekly wage "necessary to health and reasonably comfortable living" were rubber, steel, synthetic rubber, plumbing, flat glass working and electricians. In contrast—"about \$25,000m. of potential revenue is lost in the US through tax loopholes, and \$5,000m. by illegal evasion", according to Professor Gray of the University of Illinois. "Most of this loss occurs in corporations and high income brackets".

Po Engineers Conference

THE Post Office Engineering Union has met in conference this month at Scarborough and contrary to our prediction in SR last month the Overtime ban has been rejected by 600 votes in a total vote of roughly 70,000. In its place an Executive proposal for a one day stoppage was overwhelmingly successful.

This result is depressing enough in all conscience for as the *Times* so rightly said, a prolonged overtime ban would be far more harmful to the Post Office than a token stoppage of one day. But worse was to come.

The General Secretary Charles Smith a bureaucrat who has learned well the art of making militant noises without actually committing anyone to anything) in supporting the proposal for a one day strike went on to say that the strike would only be called if the Post Office would give the Union assurances that

our action would not be considered breaking service. Striking as it were by kind permission of the Post Master General.

The Union is now paying for years of sterile anti-communism which has meant that the Executive Committee has been composed of a set of ineffectual stooges because to the ruling Catholic Activist caucus any nitwit is preferable to a Communist. (Under this general heading anyone who has had a thought to the Left of Rarum Novarum can qualify for the dirty word Communist.) That the Communist Party as an organised faction in the POEU has been practically non-existent since 1956 is apparently beside the point.

The Union Establishment has been able, through the series of joint committees which proliferate throughout the structure of the Post Office, to disregard the

BY J. HIGGINS

members as a force in wage negotiations. The formulations of Royal Commissions which tie departmental wages to conditions in "comparable" outside industry effectively ensure that wage levels in the Civil Service lag behind those of our industrial colleagues.

That the whole set-up of Civil Service formalism is now being questioned is all to the good. What is heartening is that 10,000 Post Office Engineers in London felt that wages struggles were something which could be most effectively expressed in rank and file action against the boss. The contact between Branches and the liaison committee which helped to steer the overtime ban should be broadened and should consider ways and means of bringing the members in to a fuller awareness of their power in the fight for better conditions and wages.

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

BY PETER SEDGWICK

A number of recent happenings have served to underline the need for a drastic re-appraisal of society's attitude to punishment. There have been the savage jail sentences of 25 and 42 years imposed on two men found guilty of espionage (although one might have thought that any kind of spying was commendable, in creating the equal "balance of terror" so eagerly praised by official strategists). There has been the sentence on Victor Terry, hustled out of the court-room before he could hear the result of his appeal to the Lords. There has been the extension of the death penalty in the Soviet Union to such crimes as embezzlement and forgery, thus creating a criminal code reminiscent of the grisly days of pre-Victorian England. And, praised be for something positive for a change, there has been the opening of the National Campaign for the Abolition of Capital Punishment, on a scale which augurs well for its ultimate success.

Behind the current prejudices about punishment, in whatever country, stand a whole mass of irrational, ill-informed, sadistic and hysterical attitudes, stemming variously from the low cultural level of the ruled and the maniac obsessions of their rulers. In the wise words of one nineteenth-century writer:

"What right have you to punish me for the amelioration or intimidation of others? Besides, there is history—there is such a thing as statistics—which prove in the most complete manner that since Cain the world has been neither intimidated nor ameliorated by punishment."

This seemingly sweeping generalisation is true especially of what may be called the physical punishments (ie any form of judicial killing or beating). A few examples must suffice here.

As far as flogging is concerned, a pre-war Departmental Committee of the Home Office established that violent criminals who had had the "cat" tended, if anything, to commit more violent crimes afterwards than those who had not been so brutalized. Concerning capital punishment there is an abundance of statistics comparing the murder-rate in different countries with and without the death penalty; no significant difference emerges. The annual number of murders in Britain has been fairly constant in recent years, in spite of the wide fluctuation in the degree to which hanging was or was not in abeyance.

The figures behind those facts have been widely publicised in such papers as the *Observer* and the *New Statesman*. Other statistics, on the effects of capital punishment on military desertion, are less well known, and

deserve some quoting (if only because certain Left-wingers still apparently feel that the firing-squad is a more efficient, moral, Socialist, or just romantic form of judicial killing than the gallows). In the First World War over three thousand death sentences were passed on members of the British Army for desertion and "cowardice", and 36 of the condemned were actually executed. The death penalty was abolished for these offences in 1930 and, despite strong pressure to the contrary in 1942 from General Auchinleck and all his Army Commanders (and a similar, though less imperious recommendation from General Alexander in the same year), it was not re-introduced during World War Two. The average yearly incidence of desertion in World War One was in fact considerably larger (10.26 cases per 1,000 troops) than in the last war (6.89 per 1,000), although the stress of battle in 1939-45 was "incomparably greater, in the long run, than that experienced during the First World War" (R H Ahrenfeldt, *Psychiatry in the British Army in the Second World War*, p. 273, from which the above figures are taken).

It may be noted that shooting for desertion was a current practice both in Trotsky's Red Army and in certain of the International Brigades during the Spanish Civil War (although it was successfully resisted by the British Battalion).

Given these facts, the onus is on the world-wide proponents of capital punishment to prove that their methods are any more effective against forgery, embezzlement, treason, sabotage or rebellion than they are against murder, desertion or (one may add) sheep-stealing and the other capital crimes of the pre-Victorian calendar.

Why, in the teeth of so much evidence, do working-class, middle-class and ruling-class people persist in regarding these barbaric penalties as necessary? Part of the answer lies, as has been mentioned, in the impulses to destruction and torture that lie beneath the surface in all of us, and which are fully realised within large numbers of individuals in conditions of colonial war and totalitarian oppression. The belief in "an eye for an eye" evident in all moral traditions which owe much to the Old Testament (Christianity, Islam) is also partly to blame. Above all, there operates the persistent anti-scientific habit, inculcated over centuries, of regarding human beings as freely responsible and rational calculators who decide on their actions in the light of all the likely consequences. Hence the argument for "deterrence". This view of human behaviour simply does not do justice to the actual work-

ings of the minds of men, particularly criminal types (like poisoners or politicians). In fact such people choose what to do on the basis of all kinds of irrational, socially distorted motives. Which is why murders still take place and why nuclear war is at present more likely to happen than not.

The above argument is very sketchy, and especially does not pay enough detailed attention to the special reasons that ruling classes have for being cruel. It should be emphasized that no case for absolute pacifism has been put. People are not killed in wars as a form of deterrent punishment, but as a trial of naked force.

Two more quotations. First, Rosa Luxemburg, who was certainly no pacifist: "The

proletarian revolution needs no terrorism to attain its ends, and its supporters abominate murder. It needs none of these weapons because it fights against institutions, not against individuals. Because it does not enter the struggle with naive illusions, it needs no bloody terror to revenge its disappointments."

Finally, our Abolitionist of the last century: "Is there not a necessity for reflecting deeply on an alteration of the system that breeds these crimes, instead of glorifying the hangman who executes a lot of criminals to make room only for a supply of new ones?"

(Note: the quotations in italic are taken from an article in the *New York Daily Tribune* of February 18, 1853, by Karl Marx.)

Preparing for Blackpool

JOHN FAIRHEAD

October. On the contrary, they must profit by the example of the Campaign for Democratic Socialism and continue to organize a consistent campaign in every union and throughout the constituencies.

The Left should be grouped on a minimum program of reaffirmation of the Scarborough decisions, opposition to all bases and a break from nuclear alliances—in the first place, from NATO. Those who stand on this program should systematically visit all who can be won to it, and convince them of the need to attend all Party and trade union meetings and vote for it.

The summer must be used to recruit intensively to the Party on the basis of the Scarborough policy. The branches of Victory for Socialism should send speakers to every trade union branch which will accept them. We must ensure adequate explanation and wide support for the program of the Left.

The unity-shouters must be told plainly that unity is possible only on the basis of (Scarborough) Party policy. Unity is immediately available to all those prepared to accept the Scarborough decisions and operate them. Those who are not willing to do so must bear the full responsibility for any disunity.

A flood of resolutions demanding adherence to Scarborough, a break with NATO and opposition to bases; the removal of Callaghan, Crossman and Wilson from the NEC; a great summer campaign to take the Scarborough policy to the people, and to extend and revitalize the membership: these are the tasks of the moment.

We on the Left must show that we, too, are prepared to fight and fight again to save the Movement we love from the agents and fellow-travellers of Toryism who would destroy it.

WHAT are the prospects for Blackpool? Already certain leaders of the left-of-centre are using the AEU and USDAW votes to opt out of the struggle in the interest of "party unity". The way is being cleared for a rotten compromise.

The New Statesman, which for months has conducted a personal, apolitical vendetta against Gaitskell, is already trying to make its peace with the leader. In a recent television interview with Malcolm Muggeridge, editor John Freeman saw no reason why the Party should not unite behind Gaitskell. "If the Parliamentary Party chose him as leader, then good luck to them," he said.

Michael Foot, in *Tribune*, has poured scorn on the USDAW leaders. He forgets his own sorry capitulation to the Crossman-Padley proposals when they were first mooted. Occupying their usual rearguard position, the editors of *New Left Review* on May 15 invited Gaitskell to address a closed meeting of the London Left Club. All these gentlemen are getting ready to trade in their claims to political leadership in return for a life insurance policy.

They all make one mistake. They are gathering to hear the will before the corpse has been laid out. The fact is that, despite the serious reverses of the last few weeks, unilateralism is by no means dead.

Left-wingers must not relax their efforts between now and

SOUTH AFRICA

Why the strike failed

BY DEV MUMARKA



Verwoerd's bloody repression of the South African people

DR Verwoerd's mouthpieces have gleefully concentrated on the comparative failure of the strike call by the Africans against the inauguration of the white South African Republic. But the failure does not imply any African support for the antics of Verwoerd's government.

The causes are simple enough and can be listed under three headings. First and foremost is the disunity between the different groups. On the question of the strike this manifested itself by a section of the Africans quietly ignoring the call. The strike underlined the tactical and political inadequacies of African leadership. This drawback is blocking African progress and radicalisation of African politics. The African masses are ready but not prepared to distinguish between subtle political differences of their leadership, which is hesitant and timid.

Secondly, the occasion was ill-timed. To African masses it

made very little difference whether the country was called a republic or a dominion. The issue was sufficiently academic for them not to risk too much for it. Even so, had the call been for a one day strike the response might have been better. By spreading it over three days the leadership ignored the economic realities. The Africans are not in a position to stretch their resources for such long periods unless the issue is a burning one in terms of bread and butter. Clearly the issue was not important enough.

In the third place the extent of Verwoerd's preparedness is not realised. Weeks before Republic day, Africans were under pressure. Their leaders were taken into custody, their houses were turned upside down and all the resources of a tyrannical state were stretched to the utmost to coerce the people away from strike. Then on the eve of the strike came the massive display

of armed strength.

True enough, there was a hard core of leadership which went underground but it was too scattered and too circumscribed to be of any effective use. This points to a serious shortcoming. By the very nature of the struggle in South Africa, a powerful organisation is required. Such an organisation will have to be partly underground and partly in the open. It should be capable of waging struggle effectively whenever the occasion demands it. This is nowhere in sight at the moment. Due to the peculiar geographic position of South Africa it is not possible to conduct any movement from outside the country. Unless the Africans pay some attention to this problem, again and again, they will be frustrated in their struggle. This is the most salutary conclusion which the Africans can draw from their own failure.

This, however, does not absolve us from continuing to in-

crease the pressure on South Africa. There is ever greater need for making the boycott really effective. This depends on the workers of this country. Unless they give a lead the world will continue to tolerate Apartheid.

"PEOPLE'S inspectors" are using cameras in Hungarian factories to check the efficiency of labour. According to the Communist weekly *Hetfoei Hirek*, a photographic record of the course of work in the Ganz-Mavag locomotive factory in Budapest taken during several weeks of inspection showed that 14-16 percent of the total work time was wasted—*The Times*, October 13 1960.

SPACE VOLUNTEER

WHERE Russia leads, let it not be said that English womanhood is far behind. Mrs. Doris McGarvie Munn, widow of Colonel Hugh McGarvie Munn of the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders, tells me that, when the Russians put their first sputnik into orbit, she wrote to their embassy in London offering to become the first women in space.

"I thought it would be wonderful if an English woman went up first," she said, as we sat chatting in the lounge of a small hotel in North Kensington.

"They didn't want me because I was an Englishwoman and not a Russian. That, I think, was the whole reason behind it."

Mrs. McGarvie Munn, who is in her late sixties, looked wistful.

"I did so want to be in Gagarin's shoes. Look what it would have meant for England.

"The danger would not have troubled me. I have a good head for heights. I don't know such a thing as fear. I was the first woman in India to play polo. Side-saddle.

"I wouldn't even have minded Krushchev hugging and kissing me in public as long as I had done something for my country."

from the *Evening Standard* April 17 1961.

Socialist Review

Fighting Fund

During the last month we have received from:

	£	s	d
Islington	10.	1.	0
Willesden	2.	16.	0
Camden Town	3.	5.	6
Shoreditch	3.	17.	0
Lewisham	1.	19.	0
Harrow	0.	15.	0
Ramsgate	1.	10.	0
Liverpool	1.	10.	0
Leeds	1.	0.	0
Wembley	0.	6.	6

We need £40 an issue

Total

27. 0. 0

THANKS! and KEEP IT UP, COMRADES!

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

WUNDERKINDER

continued from page seven

and sevens. There's no doubt who will win—Big Business is mobilising its lobby to get us into the Common Market. But Macmillan has to be a shrewd operator if he can console small business, ditch it and preserve his crown intact. The drift is part of the act. He has sent his bright young men off to the colonies (and tied Powell down

to health), packing the key posts at home with centrist mediocrities. He knows, as the Party does, that the change from a stagnant Commonwealth to brash and booming Europe is the decisive transition to the Organisation Economy: in the deathly pause before he plunges, another chapter in Tory history has to be closed as cleanly as possible.

Letter

LAWRENCE

DEAR Comrade,
I agree with Peter Cadogan that Christopher Caudwell was a most interesting and exciting thinker, and I think I said as much in my review of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (January 1961 *Socialist Review*). But I don't think I am at all guilty of misrepresenting him, either in saying that some of his judgements were made too hastily and simply, or in accusing him of laying 'fascism' at Lawrence's door.

Cadogan himself confirms what I said about this, in the very act of dissenting from it. If one reads the section of the essay concerned, from pages 55-61, it is clear that although Caudwell sees that Lawrence is a great artist, he measures him against a naive standard (naive from the point of view of literary criticism rather more than of politics) of 'going forward or back', or of being necessarily fascist or communist, (by which Caudwell meant 'stalinist'). Lawrence's 'ultimate' fascism is grounded on this assumption, as far as Caudwell is concerned, and that's that.

But how can one talk about Lawrence's 'ultimate' solution as being either fascist or communist? Caudwell himself sees well the contradictory nature of Lawrence's thought: on what grounds does he claim that the 'ultimate' resolution of the contradiction is fascist? For that matter, how could such a resolution be 'ultimate'? How ultimate is 'ultimate' in this case? Surely, if one wants to describe Lawrence's politics, there is a wide vocabulary of far better epithets to use than this. Marx, in the section on Feudal Socialism in the *Communist Manifesto*, might provide a few. In any case, what is it that allows us to assume that Lawrence's 'solution' is the thing that matters in talking about his work? Surely it is almost the least significant thing about his work, which is far too rich and full to be held in the confines of a pamphlet, still less a prescription.

The same essay also contains other interesting examples of generalisations which have come unstuck, or which were never even stuck together in the first place. One of these is a little homily about the novel as the last surviving bourgeois literary art form. If Peter Cadogan wants people today to gather the rich best of Caudwell to themselves, he must surely realise that the generation of Beckett, Osborne, and Arden will meet statements like this with understanding, but as inconsequential. It is no use raving at them for not prostrating themselves before the oracle: better far to learn from a man whose thought is alive with dim truths and lively errors, than to lean on a god whose truths have

mortified along with his sacred nonsense.

Nottingham
Fraternally
Ken Coates

PS This reminds me that the article which has sparked off this argument was rather badly roasted by *Socialist Review's* own tame printer's devils. The last paragraph was gibberised out of all recognition. Perhaps this is an opportunity to put things right: it read:

'But that's the trouble. Life is all one. You can't love in one small corner of it, and use the rest of it, of your fellows, to feed your love. They will feed your love with the poison of your relation to them, and it will fester. Either you use others, or you don't. Until we don't, Lawrence has not come into his own, however many read his books and dream the loves he dreamt. When we have abolished the slavery of the wages system, and tamed the factories with brotherhood, that will be Lawrence's day. Yet I think his book will help to bring it nearer.'

DIRECT ACTION

DEAR Comrade,
As one who has been I suppose a reasonably hard-core direct actionist may I comment on Peter Sedgwick's article?

Since only a minority of Industrial Workers believe in Unilateral Disarmament, it is obviously absurd to call now for a General Strike, or even seriously pose a policy of blacking the bases for the immediate future. Both of these policies are obviously the objective. Now although there is certainly a very small minority of direct actionists which thinks in terms of personal witness, and of the protest that we can do now, the majority of us are concerned with the most effective way of getting Industrial Action (this does not necessarily mean that all people who take part in direct agree on the best way).

Socialist Review believes that by working within the corpse of the Labour Party it is getting to the masses; others not merely doubt this, but believe that being tainted by the putrefaction of that party is not going to endear you to any workers' nostrils.

There are three basic forms of illegal action, lacking violence, that concern us. The first is a purely symbolic demonstration aimed at getting press publicity in order to carry one's message to workers that way. (Soper and Mervyn Jones have shown in *Tribune* and the *New Statesman* that they regarded the 1958 actions in this light, as a way of influencing the Labour Party; Bertrand Russell while thinking in terms of workers on the shop floor, not their representatives in Parliament, thinks in similar terms.)

The second, which would be applicable if most of the unions were already blacking the bases, and if these were being run by predominantly "blackleg" labour, would be to maintain in conjunction with the various groups

obstruction at any and every opportunity—provided that it did not endanger life and limb. It would be opportune to use such methods as sabotage, which at this stage would merely alienate people.

The third method, non-violent resistance proper, is designed to challenge the conscience of the people operating nuclear bases (or other evils) by one's readiness to take their violence on oneself; it is applicable at all times both now when we are in a minority and tomorrow—when, if we survive, we shall be in the majority; there is abundant evidence to show that people who have been subjected to Government propaganda and to conventional ethics are challenged and later converted by this method, where they have not merely by argu-

ment or by the number of pamphlets that we are likely to be able to afford to publish.

I would readily agree that Gandhi was no Pacifist, and that Indian Independence was not won by non-violence; but to anyone who thinks this disproves the case for non-violence, I would say have you looked at India recently. I would also agree that Bhavé and the post-Gandhi Gandhian movement is also only partially pacifist, becoming incidentally increasingly less so; which is why Bhavé works with Nehru on so much, and why with Naga hillmen persecuted, with incredible poverty, and with all the other evils of India, the only thing that Bhavé considers worthy of Satyagraha campaign is "immoral film advertisements".
Dunoon
Laurens Otter



The misery of Algeria

FREE RAPTIS and SANTEN

ON the tenth of June, 1960, Michael Raptis (who writes under the name of Pablo), and Sal Santen were arrested in Amsterdam. Both of these men are leading members of the Tritskyist Fourth International, Raptis being the secretary of that body, and Santen a member of its secretariat. They were accused of forging papers, counterfeiting money and running guns to assist the Algerian FLN.

At the same time, German police arrested four people in Osnabruck, accusing them of counterfeiting. Some four weeks later, a Mr J Zwart, who seems to be an associate of several European police forces, went to the Dutch police to tell them that he had been producing counterfeit money.

Of the four people arrested in Germany, one was immediately released, two denied all knowledge of any ring of counterfeiters, while the fourth, a Dutchman, 'confessed' to having been involved in the printing of counterfeit money, alleging that Pablo had organised a circle of counterfeiters, and that Santen was an intermediary. Subsequently Zwart was released, after which he stated that he "had nothing to do with this affair".

Pablo and Santen have denied any participation in the counterfeiting of money. They have accepted the responsibility for helping to produce false papers, and industrial equipment, for the future Algerian state. They have

cont. on next page

HAROLD AND HIS WUNDERKINDER

BY NIGEL HARRIS

THE 'economic miracle' of Erhardt and Federal Germany has only verbal analogies with British economic policy, but Britain has its Mr MacWonder. A slightly flirty Edwardian spinster of doubtful antiquity (or, as someone said, a man trying to look like a rat), Mr Macmillan, the mirage, is wholly created by Colman, Prentis and Varley.

But this is not to detract from his talent at keeping alive. Leaders of the Tories are notorious for being smothered with adoration when the sun shines, and quietly murdered when it rains. The corpses of Balfour, Austen Chamberlain, Neville Chamberlain and even little Eden are kept in the crypt where Tory leaders are baptised as King, just to remind the newcomers of the 'horrid fate that follows failure.

The warning is needed. Being leader is a slippery game—the hard core of the Party must always be out bribing new allies to keep it alive. There are landlords wanting rents up, the brewers wanting tax off, insurance wanting the Bank rate changed, the exporters wanting subsidies, the farmers wanting a tariff on food imports, the importers wanting the tariffs taken off; little business wants protection from trade unions and competition, big business wants 'competition' and expansion, fixed income receivers want deflation, heavy capital wants grants—the scramble for the public purse is as violent as it is subdued behind the oak doors of clubs and committee rooms.

The only decisive force holding the lot together is the common threat that might deprive them all of everything—the working class. The shadow of this 'threat' in the Commons is Her Majesty's Opposition: they keep the political arm of the ruling-class together on those rare occasions when differences become more important than fears—and it also reminds the government how far they can go without upsetting the ballot box.

More importantly, at the pre-

sent time, the split in the Tories is fairly clear—big business is out to capture the Party. The Party historically belongs (look at the back-bench) to the baronets, the professional and retired service officers, ex-Indian Civil Servants, medium and small business, and the tattered remnants of the landed gentry. Their day is done—inter-war stagnation was their contribution to history. But they are still powerful—more than anything else they seek to stay still, prevent themselves being pushed out of the ruling class; they want stability, security, and destruction to all opposition from below. Crucially, they need the State to protect them, not just from challenge from the working class, but more importantly, the steady erosion of their domination by Big Business.

Big Business has no vested property interest—the managers don't earn enough capital to be *entrepreneurs*. They don't care about stability—their stake only increases with economic expansion. They're so big that 'security' means merely restriction for them. These are the planners who compare rates of growth, who see German business booming and expanding: but who are checked every time government restriction cuts back investment to keep the price index static (and so helps the first group). And, importantly, Big Business does not need the State except as a co-ordinating agency—heavy capital in declining industries needs Government grants for prestige investment (cf. the Cunarder ship, which the Cunard company *could have* financed, but preferred to by-pass to invest in more profitable air travel), but in the main, left to themselves, the organisation men will manage. The only problems arise in old and changing industries—and they can be set up as public corporations. So far as accessory State help is required, the big firms are already replacing the Welfare state as private welfare empires, the new corporate state.

And now the Opposition is weak, the Tories have difficulty in keeping together—or rather in restraining their wilder men. The League of Empire Loyalists appears as a separate organisation, and the rather violent Anti-Violent League ets off steam for the indignant but scared. More importantly, in the Commons and outside, important voices are raised critically. Hugh Fraser (of Helbert Wagg investment bankers among other jobs) supported by Weeks of FBI and Beaver of Guinness slate government economic policy, demand a government plan for expansion and denounce the obsession with stable prices and the Balance of Payments (cf. Schonfield, *Observer*, Jan. 15); on the right, Hinchinbrooke denounces the trend to government interference, and Nabarro trounces 'creeping socialism': what we need is stable prices and the destruction of the trade unions.

BEAT'EM

So far as the press is concerned, the little men make the running—the men who were carefully kept out of the Tory Conference at Scarborough. The hall was full of white collar workers—young and new professional, business executives, journalists, ad men,—who applauded when one Young Conservative declaimed that 'the lowest priority should be given to reducing surtax'. They accepted without protest Ministerial pronouncements on Africa (which would have exploded the Party a few years ago), hints at the Common Market (what happened to the Empire and British Sovereignty?), modest criticisms of some employers' attitudes to the unions. So successful was the magic (even 'Beat 'em, mammy' was staged after the TV cameras were supposed to have left for the day), that Butler complained of the lack of opposition, and the *Economist* (22 Oct, 1960) com-

mented: 'the passing of anodyne motions by overwhelming majorities at times brought the proceedings perilously close to the ridiculous'.

In Parliament, conflicts cannot be so easily rigged. Even in the Cabinet, strains are great between the Lloyd-Home orthodoxy and the new men, MacLeod, Powell and Sandys. Powell is all for cutting the State back (cf. his earlier resignation on this issue), Marples brashly juggles to increase State expenditure. In the interim, Amory's neutral budget last year is compensated by a gesture at the little men by Lloyd (so far as the big firms are concerned, the increase from the Chancellor's right hand in surtax concessions is taken away on the left by increased profits tax). But the general emphasis on present security ('You've never had it') earned its critics—the Bow Group demanded that old-age pensions go up to cover the traces. So up they went, enough to answer the criticism, not enough to scandalize the old Tories or help the pensioners.

On Africa, the doubts are more serious, as they are over the Common Market. Big Business might be prepared to slide off the whites onto the black bourgeoisie in Central Africa, but small business still depends too much on cheap labour and the protection of caste rule. What renders the resistance weak is the common fear from below, the lack of any alternative leadership (Salisbury's gesture was dramatic, but he's only a backwoodsman), and the object lesson of Algeria. The fear does not prevent 30 voting against government policy; and, on a less crucial issue, joining 39 other rebels to reject Butler's refusal to reintroduce corporal punishment. The flogging issue is always a useful index of what people are thinking about other things.

And while Rome crackles, Macmillan waits—6 or 7, sixes

cont. on page 5

cont. from previous page
cited their complete and unconditional support for the Algerian Revolution as the real reason for their arrest and detention. They claim that the crimes of which they are accused simply serve the police as cover for what is in fact a blatant act of political oppression.

The press has reported that a clandestine press has been discovered in Osnabruck. The police claim that it was intended to use this to counterfeit money for the use of the FLN, although none had actually been printed by the time of the arrests. The only evidence for this accusation is in the 'confession' of the Dutchman who was detained by the Germans. But the presence of the somewhat sinister figure of Zwart in the background of the case, and the fact that the French terrorist organisation, the

Red Hand, has been operating in places as far apart as Switzerland and Belgium during the period before the arrests, even to the point of assassinating supporters of the FLN, give rise to the suspicion that a frame-up has taken place.

Originally, Pablo and Santen were to have been tried in December, but for some reason known only to the Dutch authorities, the trial was postponed and has not taken place up to now. During the whole of their imprisonment Pablo and Santen have been treated as common criminals, and denied all the privileges due to political detainees. Although they have not been tried, they have been denied visitors, books or newspapers. Their health has deteriorated in confinement.

Not only is it a scandal that neither Pablo nor Santen has

been brought before the courts, although they will soon have been in prison for a year. There is also the great danger that they will eventually be deported, either to France, where they may very well be in considerable danger from the attentions of official and unofficial opponents of Algerian self-determination: or, in Pablo's case, to Greece, where he would be likely to suffer real and dangerous persecution at the hands of the authorities.

Protests to the Dutch authorities have already gone from many organisations and individuals. Many labour MP's, including Messrs. Baird, Zilliacus, Silverman and Warbey have appealed for the immediate release of Pablo and Santen, and this appeal has been endorsed by Ian Mikardo, Ernie Roberts, Clive Jenkins, Donald Soper and Isaac

Deutscher among others. Jean Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, and many other leading French intellectuals have also appealed on behalf of Pablo and Santen, as has Jorge Amado, the doyen of Brazilian writers. Protests have been sent to the Dutch authorities from MPs in Indonesia, Brazil, Ceylon, and other countries.

In England the weakness of the following of the Fourth International combined with complete silence in the newspapers, has meant that very little has been done to campaign for the rights of these prisoners. Protests should be sent to the Dutch Embassy and Government, demanding the immediate release of Pablo and Santen, and people should urge their organisations to do likewise.

Ken Coates
John Daniels

A RIGHT FLING

BY PAUL HIGSON

THE Young Socialists held their first annual rally at Skegnes at the beginning of last month. It was the first Young Socialist event which has finished with officialdom saying that another one would certainly be held.

Only afterwards was it learned that the young people who arrived for a good time were looked upon by Labour agents etc. as being extremely dangerous saboteurs bent upon smashing the Derbyshire Miner's Welfare Holiday Centre. It was an odd holiday—constantly crowding into the camp theatre, being told we were 'the vanguard of social revolution', 'the shock troops of change', the dungaree brigade of something or other, applauding, and leaving for the bar (there were at least four) feeling completely unchanged.

There was a succession of speakers. Harold Wilson was in favour of nationalisation, but recruited chairman Bert Wynn to agree with him that workers' control was inferior to 'competitive socialism'. In eighty minutes of speech from George Brown and Barbara Castle the word "defence" was not mentioned once. Brown demoralised the left no end by telling them he was once like them—a tactic often employed by right wingers. During the week members attended one of three courses—on the Young Socialists, which was the most popular, international affairs and socialism in theory and practice.

But of course the highlight of the week was the event marked in the programme as "Put your questions, Rt. Hon. Hugh Gaitskell".

We walked into the hall to find that the agents were marshalling the Gaitskellites into a solid bloc at the front of the hall. These comrades were supported by some mysterious adults.

Then, to the tune of the Trumpet Voluntary, played on a Melotone organ, our leader walked in. Spontaneously, at a

prearranged signal, the Gaitskell bloc rose to their feet cheering. Therefore, by looking only in one direction, it would seem as if the YS had suddenly been converted to Gaitskellism. The left sat embarrassed, watched by squads of agents (some of whom had removed their spectacles for the event).

The questioning was almost completely hostile, and Mr Gaitskell gave the same old answers—we cannot change our policies between elections, we must have Party discipline, it would be wrong to go to the country advocating anything as doctrinaire as nationalisation. Heckling, described as "mild" by the local paper, took place as well as applause, which seemed to coincide with the nodding of Mr Underhill's head—for he was seated on the platform with his neck muscles working nineteen to the dozen.

At the end Mr Gaitskell looked suitably modest when somebody started singing "For he's a jolly good fellow", but leapt to the microphone to chastise us when we started chanting "Ban the bomb". The leader left to the RAF March Past.

NO SKYLARKS

Out of an estimated YS membership of 20,000 (HR Underhill's figures) about 400 people were present at the Rally. No doubt those who have youthful dreams of Westminster considered attendance at the Rally imperative—while those in the YS who have an utter contempt for anything arranged by the Party were absent. The affair was as right wing as any gathering of Young Socialists will ever be.

Added to this, the comrades who were responsible for the skylarks at the Conference had become extremely conscious of their public image, leaving any heckling and dissension to the undramatic left, many of whom were too peaceful for this kind of thing.

EDITORIAL from page one

The boom of the Six has led to considerable improvements in wages, standards and holidays for the workers involved through their organised trade union effort. In many respects they are leaving the British worker behind.

A British Socialist Government seeing itself as a leader of developing European Socialism would welcome all steps to absolute freedom of trade and association with all peoples. At the same time it would expose the machinations of the British and European capitalists.

Because of the past there would have to be step-by-step economic arrangements, and workers most heavily affected must be retrained or fully maintained in the transition. But these are secondary issues to the central theme of "workers of the world unite". Foot and Co. have raised them as first issues.

The post-war economic problems of Western Europe thrust integration upon the Six; the 1960's are thrusting new terms on British capitalism. It will be much easier for us to end capitalism here and raise the banner of common ownership when we can cut 'we Britishers' down to size.

THE NET TIGHTENS

cont. from page 1

pound. All the signs indicate that the Tories have resolved on some generous doses of unpleasant medicine to remedy their condition. The medicine will, however, be administered to the working class. While no action will be taken to prejudice the still abnormally high profit margins of the capitalist firms, while the relief for the supertax stock exchange financier will go ahead and while there will be no direction of the nation's resources which might interfere with the wishes of private industry, attention will be paid to the workers.

TOTAL profits for the British Motor Corporation during the year ending July 1960 were £33.5m, made on sales of £346m—a return of 1s 11d in the £. With an output of 669,000 units this meant a profit rate per unit of £50. Capital employed was £93.3m. This means that the directors watched their assets make them a profit return of 36%.

Already employers are firmly digging their toes in over wage claims, despite the fact that prices and profits have risen faster than wages. It now seems certain that the Tories are hell bent on creating a large pool of unemployed workers. This will serve the purpose of reducing industrial costs, though not profits, while also cutting consumption. This way the Tories hope to make the working class pay for the international trade deficit. But perhaps the most serious indicator is over the proposal, which had now got government blessing, to cut down on the entry of Irish and Coloured workers into Britain.

All the sham Tory ideals about 'racial equality in the Commonwealth' have now been dropped as soon as the capitalist class has seen an end of the profitability of bringing in foreign labour. The lessons for the Labour Party and the Trade Union Movement are quite clear. An immediate campaign must be put under way to fight any threat of unemployment and any form of discrimination which might go with it (whether it be racial, or religious as in the slump that hit the Belfast shipyards). The need is urgent and the hour is late indeed.

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.