

# Socialist Review

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW,  
BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

MARCH 1962

4 d.

## RIGHT-WING THREATS IN LABOUR PARTY

JOHN FAIRHEAD

THE democratic rights of Labour Party members are again under fire. Recent weeks have brought to the front four further examples of this.

Mr. Morgan Phillips, already tasting the irresponsibility of freedom from office, has dropped a brick into the lap of his successor. He suggests that, "to save expense", the Party should convene its policy conferences every two years instead of annually, decisions between to be taken by a broadened National Council of Labour which would be a kind of corporate state of the Labour Movement, co-ordinating more closely the bureaucracies of the Movement's three wings and keeping rank and file intervention to a minimum.

The NEC has asserted in dramatic fashion its right to veto the constitutionally adopted prospective parliamentary candidates by its refusal to endorse AEU assistant general-secretary Ernie Roberts at Horsham. This has never been looked on as a safe Labour seat, and is an indication of how far Transport House is prepared to go to keep Labour Right.

Refusal to agree to such nominees to the "B" List as Jo Richardson and Walter Wolfgang has been underlined by the approval given to a certain Mr. Lesley-Jones, who wrote a letter to *Tribune* saying that he broke with Mosley in 1958 but is now a loyal supporter of Mr. Gaitskell.

The very hard bargaining line adopted towards the Co-operative Party, reducing to a handful the number of Co-operative-Labour candidates in winnable seats, can be explained only by the determination of the organization sub-committee to close this loophole to the Left Wing. All these events, coupled with the reimposition of standing orders on the PL, indicate a new offensive against the right of the Party member to advocate his views.

Marxists approach this question of inner-Party democracy on two related levels. They are concerned to point its political significance. And they must prepare now to force the fullest discussion of this issue as part of the campaign to isolate the far Right in the Movement and prepare its defeat.

In this second aspect we stand at the side of all those liberal-minded people who want to see a full and free discussion in the Movement, unimpeded by witch-hunts and proscriptions. All the latest happenings have disturbed such people very much, and from them will come wide support for resolutions of protest building up to a campaign on all four questions at this year's annual conference. It is absolutely important that all trade unionists submit such resolutions at once, so that a number of trade union annual conferences can go on record with a clear stand for democracy. The committing of trade union delegations to annual conference will be, as always, decisive; it is particularly necessary to oblige the Left trade union leaders to declare themselves. No doubt members of the AEU, whatever their differences with Roberts on this or that policy question, will wish to ask Mr. Carron for an explanation of his silence.

Squeeze  
and  
freeze  
in  
1962

JOHN PALMER

THE problems created for the Tories by the coincidence of a short term economic crisis and a long term adjustment in the British capitalist system, continue to pile up.

The squeeze on the living standards of the working class has now been in operation for about 9 months. It has taken the form of a cut in social services, higher purchase tax and social insurance contributions, and most important of all the attempt to impose a Pay Pause.

The trouble for the Tories is that although the squeeze has succeeded in the short term, and they have, (by the well known expedient of divide and conquer), managed to avoid, so far, any determined opposition from the working class, the green light for letting off the brakes has not appeared as expected.

Indeed the employers have both been expecting a reduction in credit terms long before now to help stimulate investment. Instead, despite the creation of "recession" conditions (higher unemployment, excess productive capacity and so on) the £ and the balance of payments position, remain as vulnerable as though we were going through a period of roaring inflation.

Exports have not as yet risen from their year old trough and all the time the dynamic of the West European economy, where so many export hopes have lain, is starting to slow down. With a continuing trade deficit the pressure on the £ remains as strong as at any time during the last two years.

On top of this the Government itself has overspent by more than £384 million. Above the line expenditure in the Tory £1,721 million 'defence' budget above has been £99 million. There will be strong sections of the employers who will demand a cut back in this expenditure if they are to try and impose a wage freeze.

Of course, and cut back in defence expenditure, in terms of production contracts, is out of the question because of the present stagnation in the

# WAGES: LESSONS FROM GERMANY

BY STEPHEN HERO

THE railwaymen's leaders who took what they were offered and made up for their low wage increase by having one of the Prime Minister's conducted tours for trade unionists have no doubt been reading lately of how much worse off the working-class will be in the Common Market. They ought instead to look at the wage increase won recently by the German metal-workers' union, I.G. Metall. The membership of the union is made up of workers who produce steel or deal with its products. It has 1,814,000 members and the wide spread of its membership ensures that it enjoys a strategic position in relation to the whole of German industry. The leader of the union, Otto Brenner, is politically of the Left as well as being an intelligent militant in union affairs.

The wage-increase was won in Baden-Württemberg and similar increases will have to be negotiated in other areas. It amounts to a 6 per cent increase, together with three more days' holiday each year. The employers were originally asked for 10 per cent and they offered 3 per cent. The union threatened strike action, not a large-scale strike, but a planned withdrawal of labour from key factories for short periods. It could present a strong case in the eyes of the public because the average wage increase in West Germany over the past few years has been in the region of a sixth less than for other workers.

The immediate morals for British trade-unionists are threefold. First of all, in the period of expanding capitalist affluence we should learn to set the standards of wage demands not by what we get now, but by what the employers can afford. We should step up wage demands, where we know that we can get them. And just here is where the shoe pinches and our second moral comes in. British trade union leaders don't on the whole know enough. They don't have enough economic information and they are not organised in the way I.G. Metall is, so that they can devise nation-wide strategies of attack upon the employers. Mostly we should not be wringing our hands over entry to

the Common Market, we should be preparing to use it as a new arena for class struggle. To do this we need to know the strengths as well as the weaknesses of our comrades in Europe. IG Metall is one of their strengths.

All this suggests moreover two tasks for the British Trade Union movement. One concerns the role of the TUC. In a period when industrial struggle is going to be far more central to the working-class than political conflict, the trade union bureaucrats are themselves going to have to make a show of militancy. In a period when new international horizons are going to be put up, the trade union bureaucrats are themselves going to have to reorganise. The TUC at the moment does little or nothing to coordinate industrial action. The cry of terror that is always raised—and that was raised recently at the meeting to discuss possible joint action against the pay pause—is "Remember 1926!" But the alternatives are not: either a General Strike or no coordinated strategy for the unions at all. The Left must make use of the new period with its new problems for the bureaucrats in order to raise again and again in the Trade Union movement the question of equipping and reforming the TUC as an instrument of struggle. There are good short-term tactical reasons for doing this in order to beat the attempt to keep annual wage increases down below 3 per cent. But there are even better long-term reasons for strengthening any institution which could speak for the working-class as a class and so strengthen class-consciousness.

Another task is that of redemocratising the union structure. The members of IG Metall feel much closer bonds with their union than do the members of the railwaymen's unions with their leaders. The core of the ETU case was the apathy of the membership. All unions in which small cliques take control tend to have an apathetic membership which both allowed the clique into power in the first place and then tolerates its bureaucratic habits. Merely reorganising union structure will not kill apathy. But the new developments,

and especially those springing from the Common Market, will force the unions to reorganise to some extent anyway. This will be an opportunity for the Left to press for more democracy, for fewer appointments for life and for more opportunities for the dismissal by the rank-and-file of officers who do not serve them well.

The point is that in the next decade change is coming anyway. What direction it takes is in part a matter of what the Left does now.

---

## ● SQUEEZE

*from page 1*

aircraft and ship building industry. The "economies" therefore will have to come in the social services and the subsidies to local councils, the nationalised industries and the farmers.

Again because of the difficulty which the Tories are going to have in selling the Common Market to the farmers, any immediate cuts in that direction seem very unlikely.

We are left then, despite denials from Selwyn Lloyd, with the prospect of either further direct cuts in the social services or a "tough" budget that will achieve by indirect means the same goal... a further sharp cut in living standards.

Tory periodicals like the "Economist" and the "Statist" are divided on the means to achieve this.

The "Economist" a cut in social services but no further restrictions in the budget while the Statist seems to be in favour of a judicial mixture of both methods.

Either way, from the point of view of the labour movement, the screw is going to get another turn. The only effective answer the powerful forces being brought to bear to lower the conditions of the working class, is the unity of all sections of the Labour movement in opposing any further squeezes or freezes. Being dealt with piece meal (like the miners and the railwaymen) the labour movement stands no chance.

It stands every chance if a united stand is taken on the basis of unqualified opposition to the attack.

# Ghana, Guinea, Guiana: three strikes

PETER SEDGWICK

ON September 4th of last year, widespread strikes broke out in Ghana, involving railwaymen, harbour workers, busmen and, eventually, workers in the petrol and motor industry. Starting in the provinces, the wave of strikes later reached Accra. The strikers were protesting against an "austerity" budget which incorporated a compulsory savings scheme, and price increases in sugar, flour and other basic commodities. The reaction of the Ghana Government was swift. On September 6th a state of emergency was proclaimed, empowering arrest without warrant. Tettebah, the secretary of the Ghana TUC, branded the strikes as "counter-revolution". A dusk-to-dawn curfew was imposed in the port of Takoradi. The combined effect of these repressive measures and of an appeal by Nkrumah to the strikers was a return to work on September 22nd. In October the TUC took over control of the National Union of Railway and Harbour Workers, and officials of other unions were dismissed. And in the new set of detention orders that swept most of the Right-wing United Party leaders into jail, many leaders of the recent strikes were also imprisoned. The Government subsequently published a White Paper stating that the strikes were all part of a reactionary plot fomented from abroad.

★  
In November, it transpired that the leadership of the Guinea Teachers' Union (in which French Communist influence has been particularly strong) had circularised a document critical of Government policies on a number of points; in particular, it demanded increases in pay. Upon a decision of the PDG (the ruling single party of Guinea), the twelve teachers' leaders were arraigned before the High Court (November 21st). Seven of the accused were acquitted: of the others, three were jailed for five years and two for ten years, simply for circulating the document. In the course of the trial, the students of the higher educational establishments in Guinea came out on strike, partly on the specific issue of the trial, partly as a general protest against the Government. "Fewer lorries — more rice" was a popular slogan. The youngsters' demonstrations were broken up the use of teargas and troops. The PDG's youth movement besieged and captured the schools,

which were then closed. The ringleaders were deported into the countryside.

In December 16th, the Soviet Ambassador departed, having been asked to leave. At the PDG Congress on December 25th, Sekou Toure, the Prime Minister, spoke of the "Machiavellian" attempt at a "Marxist revolution" that had just been crushed; this was the responsibility of a "Marxist-Leninist group" in contact with "the anti-Party Guinean group in Dakar, Paris and Moscow." The French Embassy was accused of assisting the propaganda of this Marxist-revolutionary plot. The Congress passed a resolution demanding a retrial of the convicted teachers, with the passing of the death penalty upon them.

★  
On February 16th of this year, a general strike, accompanied by riots, paralyzed Georgetown. The immediate occasion for these troubles was a budget whose austerity measures would have hit largely (though not exclusively) at higher-paid employees and the business community. The support obtained by the strike was therefore of a mixed nature: the Gaitskellite People's National Congress and the rabid Right-wing United Force backed the campaign; on the other hand, the proposed Budget hit the Negro urban workers seriously enough for them to respond overwhelmingly to the strike call. In the course of the riots nearly £10 million worth of buildings in the business quarter were burnt, whereupon the two Opposition parties joined with Jagan in appealing for a "return to calmness and sobriety." The Jagan government, of course, called in British troops to quell the disturbances, and as if this action were not already liable to draw comparisons with the 1953 intervention *against Jagan*, spread the identical story about a consciously-planned "fire plot", which had been put out by the Tory Colonial Secretary nine years or so previously. The difference was supposed to be that this was a capitalist and even CIA-backed fire plot (see *Daily Worker* for February 19th and 20th), in which the bourgeoisie had obligingly burnt down its own buildings. And (paradox upon paradox) this capitalist conspiracy was to be put down by the Tories' prompt dispatch of British troops for use against Negro demon-

strators, to the applause of our own liberty-loving Left.

It is not the purpose of these notes to answer the question: what else could Jagan have done? In passing, however, it might just be suggested that outright abdication would have been preferable to the support of imperialist bayonets. Whatever motives were behind the request for troops, it is plain that only one motive impelled their dispatch: the Tory government's concern to have a convenient garrison in B.G. to protect Booker's profits and the strategic interests of imperialism. On the best estimate, Jagan's action was panic-stricken and blind: but it is doubtful whether he deserves the best estimate. The fact is that there is a world-wide Old Boys' Network of ex-Marxist or pseudo-Marxist nationalist leaders, whose capacity for oscillating between the great powers is matched only by their skill in betraying their working class to the accompaniment of Leninist slogans. All of a piece are Sekou Toure's "democratic centralism", Nkrumah's verbal anti-imperialism and Jagan's advocacy (in a P.P.P. memorandum of 1956) of "an alliance between the working class and the revolutionary bourgeoisie" by which he means the Indian capitalists and commercial middle class). The excuses they offer, the lies they invent, the power-blocs they invoke in their suppression of working class will all vary from leader to leader, and in any leader from one phase to the next; what remains constant is the fact of suppression. An equally constant feature is likely to be the troubled waters of working class discontent. But this should not blind our eyes, as so many on the Left have been blinded, to the jailing of strikers, the acquiescence with imperialism, the hysterical lying of a bankrupt bureaucracy.

It may be said that industrial development in an ex-colonial territory leaves very little room, if any room at all, for independent trade-union action; that all the developments outlined above are, though disgraceful, still inevitable. To this it may be replied that the workers' resistance to such measures is also inevitable. And between the inevitability of bureaucratic repression and the inevitability of working-class militancy no Socialist should have to ponder for an instant where he stands.

# LETTERS

1.

Dear Comrade,

Alasdair MacIntyre's article Congo, Katanga and Uno (Socialist Review, January 1962) was no help to those who have been patiently trying, in such arenas as the Labour Party and the Movement for Colonial Freedom, to explain the role of the UN as (to quote Alasdair in one of his moments of truth) "a creature of imperialist powers". Unfortunately Tony Young's letter in the February issue only renders confusion worse confounded.

Who has tried to present Antoine Gizenga as a Marxist? So far as I know, not even Kay Beauchamp of the Communist Party, busy whitewashing Nkrumah's strikebreaking, has gone so far. We can agree that Gizenga is "not affiliated to the Soviet bloc", although it is probably true that the fostering by the Stalinists (now joined in an unholy alliance by MacIntyre) of illusions in the supra-class, "neutral" character of the UN was a factor in the death of Lumumba, who trusted these crooks, and the present plight of his successor Gizenga, whose safety like that of Lumumba has been "guaranteed" by the UN. In fact, both of these leaders were petty-bourgeois nationalists of the conventional type. But as such both are to be distinguished from Tshombe the Belgian-French-British stooge, and Adoulla the American stooge, and both (Lumumba and Gizenga) should have been given by socialists the same kind of support as is usually given to colonial leaders prepared to conduct a struggle, however limited, against imperialism.

At least Comrade MacIntyre takes a clear position, however wrong-headed. Perhaps by "critical support for the UN" "so that the worst extremes of famine and disorder (!) can be averted" Comrade MacIntyre, like any sappy little Liberal, means we should send food parcels while weeping over the resort to arms. But Comrade Young has no position at all, "because of the cruel fact that the ingredients of a human, socialist solution are lacking".

Alas, Tony, it is a cruel world, and socialist are obliged to operate notwithstanding. The factor common to MacIntyre and Young is their denial of the existence of a Congolese work-

ing class. I have news for the comrades. Automation is not yet so far advanced that the business of vast concerns like Union Miniere can be carried on without human labour. On the contrary, the number of male wage-earners (excluding domestics) in 1956 was 1,198,000, and in the same year there were 11 enterprises employing more than 10,000 workers and 89 employing more than 1,000. While agreeing that even these rather impressive figures constitute but a drop in the ocean, have we forgotten Lenin's remarks about the specific weight of the industrial working class in a backward economy?

The task of British socialists in the Congo situation is very clear. First and foremost we demanded the withdrawal of all imperialist troops, whether they be mercenaries of the UN or the UM. We then lend what support we can to the efforts which would be made by the nationalist forces, centred on Stanleyville, to clean up the remains of the stooge regimes. We finally do what we can to assist the emergence of the independent Congolese labour movement (which was in fact emerging before 1960) and to aid the organization of the revolutionary Party of the Congolese working class, however small, as the ultimately decisive factor.

One might be excused for thinking that, in this year 1962, such very basic and elementary Marxist propositions would not need to be argued in a paper like Socialist Review.

Your faithfully,

John Fairhead

2.

Dear Comrade,

Michael Kidron's cynicism and opportunism amazes me.

Writing in the December issue of "S.R." on Tory 'Planning' he advocates that the Trade Unions should co-operate on the National Development Council. He knows that the Terms of Reference will be so limited that the Trade Union representatives will only be able to acquiesce in a policy based on the Government White Paper on wages.

However, having supported this class collaboration with the object of "saving the reformist soul of the mass organisations", he then says we must turn to fighting this same collaboration.

What is this, Michael Kidron's interpretation of the Unity of Opposites?

Yours faithfully,

Sheila Leslie

3.

Dear Comrade,

Michael Kidron in the January edition of Socialist Review does well to point out the falaciousness of the arguments of the anti-Common Marketeers of the left. Their arguments have as a base the familiar neutralist and United Nations ideas—but there is still ample reason for opposition by the labour movement to entry into the Common Market.

I bet those who pour such scorn on the anti-Marketeers would raise the roof if, say, the left wing of some South American state had managed to block the efforts of their reactionary Government to drag their country into some Washington inspired alliance of S. American states. We would regard it as a victory for the working class and a defeat for the big business which profit from such alliances.

In Europe we must fight this last desperate defensive huddle of the capitalist countries. Entry into the Market would result in such a tremendous advantage for the Cold Warriors. They would be able to strengthen their hold and enlarge their life-span.

It would take a hell of a sight longer for the socialist movement to defeat its own right-wing leadership and establish real links abroad than it would for the European power politicians to gather together in a pose aggressive and confident, but becoming more and more desperate. It could result in real tragedies for the socialist movement.

Once you start acquiescing in such arrangements it is difficult to reverse the trend. Opposition, although it may not be successful, is healthy and develops our movement. International Socialism is a fine idea, but it will not be arranged by Mr. Edward Heath, and he will arrange nothing which could be a step in that direction.

Yours fraternally,

Clifford Brown

## Family Planning

JANE WILLIAMS

ALL bold Left-wingers attending the London Labour Party Conference will be needed to speak for a motion supporting the Family Planning Association. For North Lewisham Labour Party is asking the London and Middlesex County Councils to help and support the work of the Associa-

● contd next page

## EDITORIAL

AT LEAST this government does not need to buy crocodiles while it has Lord Home around to weep crocodiles' tears so copiously. Those who have more than the shortest memories will remember Home's laments over the inhumanity of the Russian tests. Now Home and those like him defend Western testing, just as the Russians defended their tests on the plea of military necessity. To increase radioactivity is to increase the risk of deformed children being born and it is to increase the risk of death from leukaemia. The number of deaths from leukaemia has risen sharply in the past decade. This is a reminder that the price of the next war is being paid now. The decisions to go on testing are not democratic; they are made at the top by men who cannot be held accountable in any real sense. The decisions to go on testing are inhumane; those who pay the price are unknown, the young and the not yet born among them. If Tory Ministers and Labour front-benchers really hold their positions sincerely, there is one way in which they could show it. Let them subject their children and grand-children to the highest doses of radiation which any victim of testing could possibly receive. If they would not do this, then presumably they hold that the price of their war policies is one for other people to pay. Behind the inhumanity of testing is the inhumanity of class power.

## LABOUR MONTHLY TWIST

October 1921: *"One of the most brilliant pieces of polemical writing in Socialist history... among the masterpieces of political argument"*—R. Page Arnot, reviewing Trotsky's *The Defence of Terrorism*.

July 1922: *"The greatest pamphleteer in history"*—Andrew Rothstein reviewing Trotsky's *Between Red and White*.

March 1924: Article on the Russian Communist Party controversy, quoting at length from the criticisms by Trotsky published later in his *The New Course*, and stating: *"The defenders of the Party machine, particularly Stalin, accused the opposition of forming an illegal group or faction within the Party ...Here again Trotsky stated the position clearly (quote from Trotsky) ...As a final answer to the continued denunciations of the opposition as a faction, Trotsky pointed out (quote again) ...The opposition ...also demanded a still more definite and far-reaching economic plan."*

April 1926: R. P. Dutt reviews Trotsky's *Where is Britain Going?* and issues a challenge to critics *"to name a single book by a single English author or politician, bourgeois or Labour leader, which is as close to the essentials of the English situation as Trotsky's book. It cannot be done."*

October 1936: *"Trotskyism is now revealed as an ancillary of fascism."*—R. Page Arnot.

Between 1936 and 1938 *Labour Monthly* contained a number of articles by Dutt, Rothstein and Page Arnot denouncing such early contributors to the magazine (between 1921 and 1924) as Zinoviev, Radek, Bukharin and Trotsky; these were all said to have been spies, saboteurs and counter-revolutionaries long before *Labour Monthly* was founded.

July 1961: *"Trotsky, that eternal echo of all the conventional West European vulgarisations of Marxism, therefore beloved by the West European bourgeois intellectuals, therefore so continually wrong on every major political issue"*—R. P. Dutt.

### ● from page 1

While making this campaign as wide as possible, we must as usual make our own position clear. Unlike the libertarians, we do not approach the question of democracy in the abstract. We want it to be safeguarded because we understand that only if positions are freely argued will the working class be able to reach a correct line in the fight against Toryism. We recognize the need for discipline in the Movement: more, we insist on it, since it is not possible to fight a ruthless enemy in an unorganized and sloppy way. Yet the cornerstone of this discipline must be the interests of the class. The attempt by Gaitskell and his henchmen to abuse the conception of working-class discipline to consolidate the alien class rule of his bureaucratic clique must be exposed and beaten.

ing rent of premises used for local clinics (this only applies in Middlesex), increasing financial assistance for which they already have statutory powers and by opening clinics themselves in areas where it is difficult to get voluntary workers.

Family Planning may not be a burning issue to militants but this resolution indicates some of the difficulties which face the Association and its customers. First, it has to depend on voluntary financial support out of which it has to rent premises and pay doctors and nurses, although many of the clerical staff are voluntary. It runs 12 clinics in London and 330 in the rest of the country; total attendances at the clinics last year were only 495,903. Anyone who has ever tried to attend will realise why so few actually get there. It is often difficult to discover existing clinics which may be held in Welfare clinics or hospitals which do not advertise the F.P. sessions which are usually held once a week for one or two hours. An appointment has to be booked well in advance as there is often a two months waiting list. Only large towns have clinics and bad public transport prevents the surrounding small towns and villages from benefiting from them. I heard of the plight of Norfolk villagers where clinic day does not coincide with the day the rural bus makes its trip to town. Once again, because it is a voluntary association, applicants have to pay according to means, as well as the cost of the individual purchases.

Even in these conditions the Association could be more effective with more publicity. Few doctors advertise clinics; health visitors do not go out of their way to send mothers to them. A recent attempt of the Association to advertise on London Transport was frustrated by religious opposition.

But it is the numbers of abortions and unwanted babies which are the strongest argument for extending the FPA and ultimately including it within the National Health Service as a service for all. Estimates of numbers of illegal abortions each year vary from 40,000 to 100,000 in this country, many of them committed by exhausted and desperate mothers who often ruin their health in the attempt. While half the girls who marry under the age of eighteen are already pregnant just because adult society is too selfish to be realistic.

Any delegate interested in this and similar issues—sterilisation, artificial insemination, suicide and euthanasia should read Glanville Williams on *"The Sanctity of Life and Criminal Law"*.

## IN THE RED

SOME anti-unilateralists in Britain have recently been trying a new line. "Don't sit; think," they urge. What they are pointing to is the vast and growing literature on arms and nuclear problems in the USA. "Over there," they say, "people study these problems. Here we just talk off the top of our heads." About this they are often right. I hope therefore that they will join in welcoming the publication in Britain (by Oxford University CND and Housman's Bookshop) of the Mershon Report on *Accidental War: Some Dangers in the 1960's*. This is a splendid piece of work, cool, objective and documented. The conclusion of this group from Ohio State University is that "there is a significant chance that a major accidental war may occur at some time in the 1960's." The report shows that when Mr. Macmillan talks of control over the decisions to use nuclear weapons, he talks nonsense. As the technology of war becomes more complex, decision-making is altered. "More sensitive radars are more likely to give spurious signals. Faster reaction times will require less human decision-making and a greater dependence on automation. Computers may be required to discriminate reliably between missiles and meteors in a few minutes at most. Increasingly reliable and unjammable and rapid means of

communication must be built. It is clear that the President has already been obliged to delegate, in fact if not in principle, some of his ultimate authority to order the use of nuclear weapons, first for defensive weapons, second for retaliation. He will be forced to delegate more.

★

SINCE the truth is what we are all after anyway let's lay another myth. It is being widely asserted without any evidence that behind the victory of the new Executive in the ETU lie the machinations of Catholic Action. Spartacus did a little quiet investigating here. He is glad to nail the lie that Chapple is a Catholic. He can find no evidence for a Catholic conspiracy at all. If any reader has any evidence, let's have it. Likewise let's forget the stories about the wonderful record of the CP leadership in the ETU as negotiators. In a period when the electrical industry was growing extremely fast and electricians were in an increasingly favourable position to negotiate, the record of the ETU Communists is scarcely outstanding. The attitude of Folkes and Haxell to rank-and-file militancy was always hostile.

★

DEEP shelters are all the rage in America. Nobody there is saving brown paper to wrap up in if there is a nuclear explosion. What is worse is the loss of contact with reality. It is widely believed in the USA that the Russians are also building a system of deep shelters. ("So they are preparing for war—so we'd better strike first." This is the refrain). The only evidence of this is one article in a Soviet journal by a technical expert on what sort of shelter you would have to build, if it was to be effective. But all Western reports from the Soviet Union agree that no shelters are being built. Try to tell this to your friends in the USA though, and you are liable to be taken for a Red Agent. A measure of the hysteria is what Dr. Hunt, who instructs American Civil Defence instructors, wrote in the journal of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory: "The good-goodies and the fancy pants—the brain minus the brawn—are most apt to fall by the wayside when war comes. Not if war comes—just when. There will be war . . . it is just a question of when, and the main thing we have to fear is people out of control—even more than the atom out of control . . . I recommend that everyone with a fall-out shelter include a gun in the equipment... I recommend shooting anyone who tries to invade a fall-out shelter." (*The Oak Ridger*, November 8th, 1961). Truth, as they say, is stranger than science-fiction.

## 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 organizations and organizing around a revolutionary socialist program, independent of Washington and Moscow, based on:*

*The unilateral renunciation of the H-Bomb and all weapons of mass destruction*

*The withdrawal of all British troops from overseas*

*The establishment of workers' control.*

*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 the editor Alasdair MacIntyre 47 Fitzroy Road, NW1.

Printed by St. Martin's Printers (T.U.), 86d, Lillie Road London, S.W.6.

OUT NOW!

INTERNATIONAL  
SOCIALISM

No 7

includes:

KRUSHCHEV'S CONGRESS  
DECLINE OF WELFARE  
REFORM AND REVOLUTION  
CUBA

2/9 post paid from

47 Fitzroy Rd., London NW1