

# SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

**FORTNIGHTLY**  
for the  
**Industrial Militant —**  
for  
**International**  
**Socialism**

8th YEAR No 12

MID-JUNE, 1958

SIXPENCE

## THE WORKERS' ROAD TO PEACE

**WHICH ROAD TO PEACE?**  
This is the insistent cry of humanity. Insistent because the development of the means of destruction places before humanity the alternatives of war and death or peace and survival. These are the inescapable blunt alternatives.



Oh! I thought you said THAT button was for Coca Cola.  
by Belsky of the Daily Herald

A future war—considered inevitable by General Montgomery—will not be fought with “small bombs” capable of slaughtering a mere 200,000, as in Hiroshima. No, “Atom weapons of the power of the Hiroshima bomb are now regarded as primarily suitable for the tactical use by troops in the field,” says Duncan Sandys. We are to expect the “real thing”—total annihilation!

Which road to peace? France now joins deterrent-minded Britain, USA and Russia; soon it will blast its first A-weapons. Next, Germany.

Is it sufficient to rely on Governments? The tenuous hold of democratic forms has been demonstrated by the French crisis. Declining capitalism so easily declines into open dictatorship, and dictatorship is capitalism's means of fighting wars more “efficiently”.

Is it sufficient to rely on statesmen? At Brighton last October Bevan pleaded for the retention of the H-bomb. Five months earlier he had said: “If Britain had the moral stature she could say we can make the H-bomb, but we are not going to make it.” Thus are our statesmen “reliable”.

Which road to peace? Really it must be the road the people choose. Yet let not history repeat itself. The amorphous peace movement of the late 'thirties—when 10 million British people answered YES to the National Declaration Committee's question: “Are you in favour of an all-round reduction in armaments by international agreement?”—did not prevent the Second World War. On the contrary, the specific climate it created allowed the government to prepare for war with greater ease.

Today we are faced with a possible descent into barbarism. We cannot take any chances, for there is no way back once we are over the brink. Therefore we must choose the road leading out of the chaos of contemporary capitalism. The peace campaign must be solidly based on the Labour Movement, on the working class. From every factory, from every mine and shipyard,

from every Labour Party and Youth Section, the demand must be raised:

Industrial action against the H-bomb!  
Industrial action against capitalism's machine of destruction!  
For Peace and for Socialism!  
Black the Bomb!  
Black the bases!

## FRANCE

### The Lessons for British Socialists

by Raymond Challinor

WHATEVER THE FATE OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC, one thing is certain: the French Socialist Party (the SFIO) has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. In 1945, France, devastated by bombing and invasion, lay prostrate. One all-important question dominated everybody's minds: on what economic basis would French reconstruction take place—capitalism or socialism?

Overwhelmingly, the French people opted for a new social order. They remembered the grim social struggles of pre-war France, with its poverty, unemployment and instability. Two hundred families had controlled the economic life of the whole country. Industry had been run for profit, not to meet human needs.

#### Collaborators

During the German occupation most capitalists took the easiest—and most profitable—way out, and became **collabos** with the Nazis. Most left-wing militants, on the other hand, became members of the Resistance. Thus, at the end of the war a highly compromised and unpopular French capitalist class faced an armed, angry people.

How was it, then, that French capitalism survived? **Chief credit must go to the Communists and Socialist Parties.** Instead of demanding nationalisation with workers' control of the dominant sectors of economy, they politely joined the capitalist government. At the same time, they pleaded with the working-class to make special efforts so that French

capitalism could be put well and truly on its feet.

Alexander Werth in his book, **France 1945-55**, describes why De Gaulle, who was already showing extreme authoritarian traits, should want Communists in the government he headed. “They tended to keep the exasperated working-class both patient and diligent, and as untroublesome as possible. . . . Despite privations, the French working-class worked very hard throughout 1944, 1945 and 1946, contributed immensely to the restoration of the essential services and to the ‘normalization’ of life. . . . Thorez was a great help to de Gaulle in other ways: notably by approving, on January 21, 1945, the dissolution of the **milices patriotiques** (the armed resistance movement—RC) attached to the Liberation committees, and by discouraging strikes and ‘unreasonable’ demands for wage increases.”

#### The 200 families

Meanwhile, “the Aristocracy of Banking and Heavy Industry had kept its end up very successfully, and owned, directly or indirectly, half the urban house

turn to back page

### INDUSTRIAL FRONT

pages 2 and 3

### LABOUR PARTY

page 4

### YOUTH

pages 5 and 6

## TU COMMENTARY

## ● Busmen betrayed

"NEVER IN THE FIELD OF CLASS struggle have so many been served so badly by so few." This altered version of the famous quotation most aptly describes the General Council of the Trades Union Congress.

With 50,000 London busmen in the forefront of the wages struggle, facing a Government bent on teaching the workers a lesson, and with the obvious necessity of bringing maximum aid to the busmen, the General Council shrivelled up and became unrecognisable as leaders of a trade union movement.

With Sir John Elliott's warning that he intended to get tough with the workers, the TUC replied by advising the T & GWU not to spread the strike. Sir John Elliott says he can hold out without buses until Christmas, the TUC says don't spread the strike. When Sir John says then he will cut the services by 10 per cent even if the busmen do go back, the TUC says don't spread the strike.

## ● A Positive Policy?

AT THE ANNUAL CONGRESS of the National Union of General and Municipal Workers a special motion was moved by the General Secretary, Sir Tom Williamson, which expressed grave concern at the growth of unemployment and asked the Government to pursue a positive policy.

## Setback . . .

A motion from the Dundee Branch proposing that building work on Government rocket sites should be declared 'black' was thrown out at the ASW Conference on June 4 after the proposer's speech. Only three delegates thought the idea merited any discussion.

This same trade union leader who verbally fights the Government did not consider that the TUC special meeting on the busmen was important enough to attend.

## ● "Workers" control?

YET ANOTHER ONE of our hopefuls, Sir Tom O'Brien, Chairman of the Trades Council's Committee of the TUC, had the following remarks to make recently: he hoped that when nationalisation would not be a first-class priority. He was addressing the Annual Conference of Trades Councils. Of course not, Sir Tom, who would want to be so beastly as to attack Capitalism in such a manner. We all know that private enterprise is best, and only trouble-makers and Reds would suggest taking over the industries that have produced the pre-war slump and the

What a shameful betrayal by the leaders of 9 million organised workers. Whilst we may oppose the Tories for their anti-working class policies, credit must be given to them in one respect at least, they never produced such weak-kneed leaders as the Labour Movement possesses.

Whilst the capabilities of Tory politicians varies with the individual, they all fight grimly in the interest of their own class. It will be interesting to see this coming year's Honours List to see which of the Labour leaders has been honoured for his services to capitalism.

However there is the consolation to the busmen to know that whilst the misleaders of the TUC have sold them, the rank and file trade unionists up and down the country are solidly behind them. The spirit and determination of trade unionism has not altered, and eventually these boot-lickers of capitalism will be swept away and from the rank and file will emerge a new, vigorous and militant leadership.

What was without doubt the most important meeting that the TUC General Council had held for many years took second place as far as Sir Tom was concerned.

## and Advance

The annual conference of the Boilermakers unanimously passed a resolution on June 6 aimed at the Blacking of all work on rocket bases. Under its terms the Union's EC will approach the TUC to assist in securing acceptance of the demand by all affiliated members.

With the Government pursuing a positive Tory policy of attempting to smash the busworkers, and in addition, with a plan for over 2,000 busmen redundant, Sir Tom would have been placed in a rather embarrassing position, so soon after his "militant" speech to his own members.

growing unemployment and short-time working that we have today! With the demand for nationalisation might come the more devastating demand of workers' control and even Socialism—what dirty words they are! Of course if nationalisation of engineering, for instance, was proceeded with, the small firm of Bone Bros. in North-West London might be affected, and as AEU members will remember, when a strike took place some years back over a sacked shop-steward at Bone Bros., Sir Tom O'Brien turned out to be a Director! No more nationalisation indeed!

## END TIPPING!

says RON COYTE, cab section

WORKERS IN JOBS which provide a personal service, such as waiters, hotel-workers, petrol-pump attendants, and taxi-drivers, rely on tips for some part of their wages. If it is necessary to have these services in a modern community then those who work in these jobs are entitled to a return for their labour that does not include any part of it as charity or "dropsy." Nothing is more degrading to the receiver of tips than to have to dance attendance on a customer knowing that the amount he receives will be in ratio to the amount of obsequiousness he displays.

## Whims and Caprices

London taxi-drivers do not receive wages from the proprietor of the cab they drive, but are paid a percentage of the amount that is registered on the taxi-meter. If this was all they received there would not be any taxis on the streets of London. Tips are an important part of a driver's income and under the present wage system that operates in the London cab-trade it would be impossible to abolish them—but this does not mean that drivers should be willing to accept this system, or that it cannot be altered.

## ● Confed. claim

THE NEW PAY CLAIM for three million members of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions will very likely reach the talking stage by the end of this month.

This follows the expiry of the 12-month pay standstill agreement that was signed one year ago. With record profits being made in the industry, the members of the 40 unions in the Confederation should make it abundantly clear to their Executives that they want the increase, that they want the shorter working week without loss of pay, and that they will not tolerate any more strings to future agreements. Equally important, they should let their leaders know that the talks should be short and sweet, no more negotiations which drag on for 6 or 9 months as in previous years.

At intervals through the year letters are published in the national press, often bearing the address of one of the more exclusive London clubs, deploring the tipping of London cab-men. What the writer does not consider is that the amount shown on the taxi-meter is not the economic fare. Only part of the driver's wages are included in the fare and the remainder is expected as a tip. The companies that own the cabs are assured of their returns, for they take the lion's share of the fare and all they provide is the cab. The driver is in the invidious position that part of his wages depend on the whims and caprices of his passengers. This is a position that is not satisfactory for the drivers and one in which many wish to change.

## No Wages

The present system, under which a driver is paid no wages but commission, must be placed on an entirely new basis of daily or weekly wage. This means that every driver that the cab-owners employ should receive a daily signing-on pay when they present themselves for work. This would prevent what has happened in the past, and could happen in the future, the position of a cab-proprietor employing more men than

One example of an engineering firm should suffice this time—ENV Engineering Co. Ltd., with 1,200 employees. The profit before taxation was £479,111, an average of £400 per year per employee. Over and above this figure was the trifling sum of £202,000 for depreciation. According to the Chairman of the Company: "Our plant for industrial gears has been fully occupied and continues to be busy . . . We still have an impressive order book . . . Our export sales were the highest yet achieved in any one year." Very nice indeed, yet a few months back 53 employees were sacked at the branch factory in Aycliffe and an attempt to make 79 redundant in Willesden was later changed to a shorter working week after resistance from the workers.

GEOFF CARLSSON

## SOCIALIST REVIEW BULK ORDER

(Six or more copies post free)

Please send me.....copies of the next..... issue(s) of SOCIALIST REVIEW, for which you will bill me.

Name.....

Address.....

Send to SOCIALIST REVIEW,  
35B Priory Terrace London NW6.

These pages have been set aside for a socialist review of the industrial struggle. Help to make them complete by sending in news and comments.

# INDUSTRIAL

## T & GWU

cabs and so being unable to provide a cab every day for the men who through age, ill-health or trade union activities are out of favour. This wage should be coupled with a small commission rate that would provide the incentive, if incentive there must be.

### Fair Fares

This system would mean that the fares would have to increase but if this means that the driver's would receive decent return for their labour which did not depend on the generosity, or otherwise, of the passengers they carry in their cabs and the passengers knew that the amount shown on the meter was the total fare to be paid then a new relationship would be established. A relationship that would mean that those people who at present do not ride in cabs for fear of offending the "tipping-code" would use cabs more often and the drivers would be paid as a right not as a form of alms.

## ETU CONFERENCE : Rank-and-Filer gives a lead

TWO MONTHS AGO we published the text, of an important resolution from the Ipswich Branch to come before the ETU Conference at the end of May; Bro. Eric Clayton clashed with the Executive when he put forward his Branch's demand for industrial action to oust the Tories if a national campaign for their removal did not achieve success; Bro. Clayton had previously criticized the CP leadership when he spoke to a motion demanding the legalization of the West German Communist Party and the right of independent Socialist working class parties to exist in East Germany, and the release of Professor Harich and Socialist and Communist political prisoners.

### Contradiction

This motion was amended by the West London Branch which deleted the reference to the Professor and political prisoners and recommended negotiations for the withdrawal of all occupation troops instead of unilateral action by Britain.

## DOCKERS STAND FAST

THE DOCKERS' STRIKE IN SYMPATHY with the Smithfield meat lorry drivers is an example of solidarity which should inspire all sections of the working class. This fine spirit is very evident among all the dockers. As Wally Jones, of the strike committee, said to me: "In the old traditional spirit of trade unionism, when our men were asked, they declared the meat black."

### Calling the bluff

That was May 15. The men mainly involved in the early part of the strike, the 2, 7, 9 sectors of Tooley Street who normally handle meat, agreed to work other cargoes. But the employers, by putting permanent men who refused to handle "black" meat back into the pool and using unregistered labour—office workers, young boys, even women—provoked the dockers, and on May 21 West India Docks and London

Docks came out in sympathy.

The employers, scared of the consequences, agreed to withdraw the unregistered labour, and on May 24 the West India and Albert Docks returned to work, only to discover that the employers had broken faith and at Tooley Street had reintroduced unregistered labour and had been handling 8,000 tons of perishable goods.

### All out

The Tooley Street men therefore stayed out and were once again joined on the 27th by the majority of dockers in the other docks of London. The T & GWU, NASD and the Lightermen's Union were all involved.

### Other ports

Meanwhile, consistent with the spirit of solidarity that always inspires the dockers, and helps to make them among the strongest and most effective section of workers, support has been coming from other ports.

### Black labour or wages ?

The dockers have their own pay claim coming up, but this was not the issue in the strike.

Wally Jones said, "It is more important to deal with black labour than wages." As far as he is concerned, the issue of the dockers' firm control over their conditions of work weighs much heavier in the balance than the "measly rise" that can be squeezed out of employers, important though this is.

### Unofficial

The strike is unofficial, and of course the dockers want to get official recognition which we hope will be achieved by the time this is in print, if the dockers have not by then achieved success in their demand not to let "black" goods be handled.

### Support needed

Meanwhile no money is coming in to the men's families at all, and although their "mates" are doing what they can, and Covent Garden sent a good contribution, times are hard.

We hope other trade unionists will rally to their support in the same fine spirit as animated the dockers in beginning the strike.

SR Industrial Report

## SACK SIR JOHN ! says the Platform's "Punch"

SIR JOHN ELLIOT should be sacked. This £7,500 a year figurehead that wears out the plush carpets at 55 Broadway, is surplus to requirements. He is a permanent brake on London Transport services. He should be given his cards.

Sir John should be shown the door — not to placate Frank Cousins — not to satisfy 50,000 bus strikers—but in the interests of the 10 million people who use LTE services and for the good of the nation as a whole.

Sir John Elliot is chairman of the LTE. His job is to run an efficient transport service for the people of the capital city. Every year that he has occupied that post has witnessed a steady deterioration in the job he is paid to do.

### Give him his cards !

Every year the services have been cut. Every year fares have risen higher and higher. Every year the queues get longer. Every year the staff gets smaller. Every year millions of passengers desert the services.

Purely on the grounds of "results achieved," Sir John is a complete flop. Any managing director of a private enterprise concern who produced the same results as Sir John would have been given his cards long ago. Sir John has been feather-bedded at Old Broadway long enough. Let him get out and give London Transport a chance.

Sir John is entirely the wrong man to run a modern, nationalised transport system. He is better

suited to play the role of Lord of the Manor with an army of serfs to do his bidding. He showed this very clearly when Sir Wilfred Needen attempted to get the parties together just before Whitsun.

Was Sir John bothered by the fact that the buses had been off the roads for three weeks? Did he worry that ten million people were being deprived of their means of transport? Was he anxious to take all steps to end the dispute?

### Fifteen men

The languid and haughty Sir John instructed his secretary to telephone that man Cousins to the effect that, if Cousins thought it would do any good, he, Sir John, would spare a moment to tell him he was not prepared to budge an inch or lift a finger towards a settlement.

Sir John, of course, is NOT on dispute pay during the strike. He continues to draw the pay of not less than fifteen central bus drivers—so why should he worry.

Yet, if Sir John was given his cards to-morrow — not one of the ten million bus passengers would even notice his going — which is the real measure of his contribution to the smooth running of London Transport.

On the other hand—the saving of his £7,500 salary would put seven new bus crews on the road—which seems to me a very fair exchange indeed—So give him his cards.

Reprinted from Platform

## BUILD THE SOCIALIST REVIEW!

Please send a free trial copy of SOCIALIST REVIEW to the following:

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Send to SOCIALIST REVIEW  
35b Priory Terrace, London, W6

## LP COMMENTARY

RON LEWIS

## • Talking of Liberals

THE CURRENT ISSUE of 'Talking Points'\* is devoted entirely to an analysis of the Liberal 'revival.' This is something that we should be grateful for, for it evidences the fact that the Party-machine has noticed what has been happening electorally after all; there have been times recently when most of us have seriously doubted the Leadership's awareness of the present political climate.

While I think there are more important things to worry about than the winning of the expense-account class's vote, that **Talking Points** freely admits that some erstwhile Labour votes are going to the Liberals and that the reason for this to some extent is our failure to get the Party's policy over to the people, is a good job.

**Error**

We regret that in the last issue of the paper, the name of the statesman to whom the item **Birth of a Statesman** referred was omitted. It was Nye Bevan.

Like a good many more Party documents these days however, the analysis is better than the solution. It rightly spotlights the important element in Rochdale and Torrington, the influence of the belief that in these two constituencies for traditional reasons the Liberals stood a chance, and that the publication of the belief in so effective a manner via the public opinion polls itself became a magnet drawing in extra votes.

**Whose freedom to fight for**

I am sure that quite a useful number of people who are at present voting Liberal could be won for the Labour Party if we would resume speaking with the voice of Tom Paine and John Stuart Mill on important civil liberty issues. Of course I know that the Liberals talk a lot of rot about freedom. By freedom they mean freedom for the speculator, the rentier and the inefficient farmer. But occasionally they lend their weight to important civil liberties' questions and whether we like it or not they have some reputation, especially with the young, of being a Party opposed to tyranny.

Yet where will one find more genuine thoughts upon the freedom of the individual than in Marx and Engels? The whole tradition of the international socialist movement is bound up with the struggle to free the individual from the bondage of wage-slavery and his subservience to the minority-controlled state machine. If only the Party would devote more propaganda effort to fundamental socialist philosophy instead of to the tedious repetition of platitudes about 'serving the whole nation' and 'having a voice in world affairs,' etc., we would make much more progress with the middle class and in addition would do much to build up an effective body of militants.

## • Party propaganda

WHILE ON THE SUBJECT of getting the Party's policy over, I wonder how many Parties these days make any effort at all to do this. I am personally acquainted with a good many, and of those not one does anything serious at all between elections to influence public opinion. The reason for this is not merely apathy, it is rather the influence the pollsters and other political statisticians have had upon electioneering with their samples, and their dismissal of the candidate and his campaign being worth about 500 votes.

So many of the Party-workers have so had the various systems of electioneering drilled into them, like 'leave the Tories alone—we don't want to wake them up,' and 'the job of a canvasser is merely to locate strength (and find out whether they want a car),' etc., that all conception of our being a proselytising body seems to have vanished. The whole function of the Party machine is in their minds a neat tidy organisation concerned with mathematics, run on business efficiency lines in which time and motion study have far more importance than dialectical materialism.

**Agent's certificate vs. political economy**

Don't think I am an electioneering Luddite. Of course we should make full use of modern methods. But let us not forget our purpose, which is not so much to win elections as to win the enthusiastic support of the people in the struggle for socialist freedom and justice.

The constituency that concentrates on committee-room procedure, knocking-up and canvassing techniques, and would rather run classes on the Agent's Certificate than on political economy is doomed to failure. These techniques are merely the ways and means of ensuring that we poll our strength on the day: The big job confronting the Labour Movement today is to make sure we have some strength to poll!

It is only too easy to sit on one's backside and say 'what can I do, with Party policy what it is?'

**The grass roots of the movement**

Sure. For those of us who are dedicated to the socialist revolution and no ifs or buts, it is frustrating to have to proceed at a snail's pace towards our goal. But things won't get any better while we sit in a huddle in some Espresso dreaming of the golden age of 1848 or '71, of July days and October days, of barricades and bombs. The place for such people is the grass roots of the movement where they can make their influence felt in so many important ways.

In twenty years of politics I have met only a handful of marxists in the Labour Movement, but lots outside it. Yet where I've found marxists in the Party, that party has been an active and virile one.

**Explain the Rent Act**

The Rent issue is a real bread and butter issue and one which we ought to go at tooth

and nail. Furthermore, we should not merely concentrate on the people directly affected by the Act but we should endeavour to explain to the owner occupiers how this act will affect them—viz. by putting up the cost of living.

**The leaders we deserve?**

Every movement gets the leaders it deserves; if we can build up strong constituency parties who are in the forefront of practical issues in their constituencies the whole year round, and who if dissatisfied with Transport House leaflets, etc., print their own, then we would soon get a change up the top. For at present the leaders know only too well how few people we represent (in mosts cases). But if, when we made our criticisms of official policy, we had a Party of several thousand behind us and an active membership of several hundred then the picture would be different.

## • Parish pumps important

THERE ARE MANY WAYS in which the local constituency party can make an impression on its people even though the lead from the Parliamentary Party may at times seem wishy-washy. Chief of these at present is the Rent Act. As we have noted in this column before where the Party has control of the local authority, it can really begin to organize the people on revolutionary lines, as in the case of Dalkeith. Even where it is a minority, enormous issues such as the provision of half-way house accommodation for those likely to be evicted should be advocated and forcefully.

## • John Lawrence

I HAD INTENDED to comment on the John Lawrence affair, but elsewhere in this issue is a contribution on that subject. I will content myself with expressing my sorrow that the Executive has ignored my advice tendered a few issues ago to leave him alone. I don't say that I agree with him in every syllable. But he is alive and vigorous and I am sure that if the NEC stopped treating him like a leper (they declined to endorse his Parliamentary Candidature some years ago) he would mellow a bit . . .

\* a Transport House publication.—Ed.

**SUPPORT THE ST. PANCRAS LEFT!**

THE LATEST EXAMPLE of high-handed action by the NEC against a prominent left-winger in the Party is the decision to suspend John Lawrence, the leader of the Labour group on the St Pancras Borough Council, along with the whole of the South St Pancras Constituency Party.

Lawrence was recently in the news when he was arrested on May Day, along with other Councillors, at a meeting organised by the Trades Council which the local Fascists did their best to disrupt. May Day was being celebrated by the Council by the flying of the red flag over the Town Hall and the declaration of a public holiday for all Council employees.

Previously, under Lawrence's leadership, the Labour Group had refused to carry on with the farce of Civil Defence, the "fourth arm" of war preparations, as a gesture of opposition to the Government's arms policy. St Pancras has also been outstanding among London boroughs in its rents policy. At a time when rents have been going up else-

where, it has stood firm against increases, whether blatant or disguised as differential rent schemes, and no Council flat in St Pancras is let at more than £2 a week.

Perhaps this record is not to the liking of the NEC. It certainly had the support of the Labour Group itself and Lawrence had only recently been re-elected leader.

Now the NEC has suspended him without warning, and without giving any definite grounds for their action. He has the right of appeal to the NEC for his reinstatement and deserves the support of all rank-and-file members who care about Party democracy. It is monstrous that any member can be suspended at the decree of the NEC before any charges have been brought against him and he has the right to defend himself.

Send in resolutions now to the NEC demanding his reinstatement pending a full investigation.

P. MANSSELL

# YOUNG SOCIALIST

NOW  
TWICE  
MONTHLY

NUMBER 14

MID-JUNE 1958

## NALSO gets down to it —

writes Ken Coates, Nottingham

MAKE NO BONES ABOUT IT ; rebellion's in the air. You can tell just by looking at the paper : busmen on strike ; new socialist playwright discovered ; miners discuss unemployment threat ; angry young man is rude to queen. What sort of rebellion it is, though, is hard to measure ; partly because it's growing all the time, but partly because it grows higgledy-piggledy cutting across its own tracks. Thus, in the anti-bomb campaign, for instance, without any central organisation at all, you get amazing spontaneous actions : Oxford University organize an opinion poll, and before their results are out, half a dozen other places have followed on, organized, checked, and published results. Yet on the other hand, there's a terrific row in Reading, at the Labour Party meeting called to support the Aldermaston March, when the platform asks leave to keep half its collection, and that to be spent on crusading against the Bomb. Obviously, the revolt is deep ; it's no rebellion without cause ; equally obviously it doesn't fall into the mould that the hardened politicians, even those who are themselves in revolt, would expect or want. It's both an opportunity and a challenge for the labour movement.

NALSO, the Labour Party student organisation, hasn't escaped the ferment. In normal times, you wouldn't call us the most adventurous of organisations : but just because this revolt is about something, because it's not froth and wind, but very concerned with what sort of lives we're all going to live, if indeed we're going to go on living at all, NALSO, representing the sober young radicals in universities, has set off at a canter to catch up with the wild trade unionists, and the indignant Declarationeers whose books are all the rage. Have we gone bohemian ? No. The different crusades, to ban bombs and allow good plays and films to be made and performed, to maintain wage-rates (and grants) and counter the slush and foolery of the popular press : all these we see as being about something, as being part of the overriding need for a new society. At a moment when economic affairs seem likely to threaten the conditions we've already got, it may at first seem crazy to talk about what lies beyond the welfare state : but we feel that the only way to make sure that we don't end up in 1984, or just end, is to begin to think about just that question. In doing so, many of us think that the separate strands of revolt all wind together ; the Aldermaston marchers, the strikers, those who made the noise in the Royal Court Theatre the other week ; each needs the other unless we're all going up with a bang and a whimper.

### Questions for answer

So what ? So we want to take the initiative : we want to mix together, for a thorough discussion, the articulate representatives of all the rebels. In a big camp, we want colliers and dons, porters and poets, bomb-banners and queen-baiters to put their heads together and discover what does and what can lie beyond the welfare state.

Already, there are others who think that this is a worthwhile thing to do : Tribune, Forward, Universities and Left Review, and Nimbus, have agreed to sponsor such a gathering if we organize it. At it, we want the socialist movement that fought for the welfare state to be there in force, and to argue out such questions as who, the Industry and Society school or the Insiders school, have most nearly portrayed the world we live in : as whether or no there is a counter to the power of the establishment and what indeed the establishment is : as whether the opposite poles of popular-press opium and art for the minority can draw together, or whether indeed they are opposite poles ; as whether the slogan "workers' control" can mean anything effective or not : as how, if we can solve our own problems, we can avoid being blown up by others who haven't solved their's. What IS the logic of disarmament ? And can we end the cold war ? Will we, in short, be going into the "Red Sixties" or limbo ?

### Through the hoop

We want to confront Nye Bevan and A J P Taylor on the bomb, and Roy and Clive Jenkins on our contemporary economic and political set-up. We want sociologists and politicians to discuss with us the political and social structure of the elite we want to junk, and both groups to discuss with the Osbornes, Lessings, Tynans and Loguets the human and cultural implications of that structure. We want to cross-examine trade-union and co-op spokesmen for workers' control. And we want to meet young workers and students from Europe and the colonies to see what they feel about these things, and find if we can tackle any of them jointly. Above all we want the opinions of our own young (under-thirty) rebels. We must draw up the agenda for the discussion of our generation, and

this camp can do just that. We're setting about the collection of a really imposing bunch of experts to help.

### Come to Kessingland

In the meantime, we've found a site, at Kessingland, near Lowestoft, on the sea-side. We can put up, in huts, some hundreds of people, and more in tents when the huts are full : and

we can feed everyone into the bargain at a cost of £5 for a week. The week in question is from September 12th to 19th. So anyone who can come should send, now, a deposit of £1 to Ken Coates, 9 Waldeck Road, Nottingham. But since NALSO is very poor, and its sponsors are no richer, will any enquirers please send with their questions a stamped addressed envelope ?

## NOTEBOOK by Bob Hagg

### AN INTERESTING STORY

from the student front: For years now, students at the Bartlett School of Architecture, University College, London, muttered and complained about a reactionary professor. But this year something was done; a committee of six was formed to take action for his removal; a petition was circulated, and all but two of 160 students signed it. So far so good—discounting the perhaps natural annoyance of the authorities. But the next phase seems to have been misconceived—the whole of the Second Year applied for admission en bloc at another school, and some of them were admitted. The protest will now probably fizzle out.

It is in situations like this that a group of principled socialists can avoid such defeats. Labour Clubs must be prepared to give sufficient leadership, command sufficient authority to, where necessary, call a student strike and win it.

### Shoreditch School

I WENT to the second of Shoreditch Youth Section's day schools on June 1, and found it most worthwhile. In the morning Tony Cliff lectured on 'sex and Socialism,' showing how the social and economic structure of society is reflected in human relationships; that morals are an instrument used by the ruling class to maintain its position, and pointed out that a socialist morality is concerned with human values rather than price tags. All this was obviously new to some of the Youth Section members who came from various parts of the London area to the school.

In the afternoon, Roger Cox, the Section's chairman, a member of the Junior Workers' Committee of the North London District of the AEU, opened a useful discussion on the position of youth in the industrial struggle. The discussion covered familiar ground for regular readers of the YS, but ground well worth cover-

ing again.

The school would have been much more valuable if the London Labour Party were prepared to publicize such schools in the future; they claim that their youth organizing grant won't stretch very far, so they must be pressed to give all support to enterprising Sections which accept some of their responsibilities.

### Student Poll

THE RESULTS of the Cambridge H Bomb Poll are what we expected: the percentage of public schoolboys is higher than at Oxford, and there are fewer unconventional types among them—the Bevan position seems to be that of the majority, but though there is no need to 'be thankful for small mercies' it is worth noticing that there has been a shift to a Labourish point of view on this issue. The Campaign is, though, gaining ground, and as at Oxford, support in the women's colleges is strong. If it can survive the long empty summer without weakening, we may see some interesting developments in the coming period.

### and a note from Oxford

OXFORD'S CITIZENS have little need to worry about their security from Communist infiltration or attack. With the combined efforts of local industry and the American atom-bombers flying overhead Oxford is more than well protected. But some people are never satisfied !

Some ungrateful Oxonians have been heard to suggest that there is some danger from a D-47 carrying an atom-bomb crashing in Oxford. Danger is suggested to be likely from fire, H-bomb explosion, ordinary H.E. explosion, all attended with a greater or lesser degree of harmful radiation. Let them be assured that:

(continued next page)

# YOUNG SOCIALIST

## The Fight for Socialism . 6

Mike Kidron states the case for  
Workers' control

### A note from Oxford, contd

"Not all the bombers from Brize Norton carry H-bombs." Parliamentary answer to an MP's question on this subject.)

It has also been suggested that these planes should not be allowed to fly over Oxford. Presumably then they would have to fly round Oxford to protect it. Then Oxford would be merely off-loading its risks on to neighbouring towns such as Abingdon, Witney and Woodstock. If Oxford wants this protection then, logically and equitably, it must accept the risks that go with it, surely? Isn't it enough that the Americans are up there constantly on the alert to defend Oxford from any attack?

#### Saved by the PM

And while Oxford rests secure under the H-bomb umbrella from external dangers, what about internal risks and hazards? If all firms in Oxford followed the example of at least one of the local engineering firms there would be very little to worry about. In fact this firm had a very close shave recently! The fact that it emerged unscathed was due to the keen vigilance of its Personnel Manager.

#### And that was that

A university student was just about to be accepted for temporary Easter vacation work. It was all fixed up—the student had been shown the job—a simple light press operation—three weeks work starting the next day—he had been shown the shop and been introduced to the shop foreman—"Yes, we are always glad to help students."

*Personnel Manager:* "Well that's all right, then. Just put your name and address here please." Student complies and hands form back to manager.

*Personnel Manager:* "You are a member of the Communist Party, aren't you?"

*Student:* "Me? No!"

*Personnel Manager:* "Well our information say that you are, or were."

*Student:* "Well I am not a member now. I resigned some time ago. So you have nothing to worry about now."

*Personnel Manager:* "We still cannot employ you. The men would resent it!"

*Student:* "Resent what? Would they be annoyed with me for resigning? Do they think I ought to have stayed in the Communist Party? Or what?"

*Personnel Manager:* "Well you were associated with them at one time, weren't you? Sorry, there's no job for you here, and that's all there is about it! Good day!"

And that was that! It was a close thing. Another few minutes and the student would have been on the pay roll. Think of the untold damage this man could have caused in three weeks unskilled repetitive work—let alone the bad influence on the men. It being a well known characteristic of the British working man that

he will strike at the slightest hint from one solitary Communist. (And, presumably, any ex-Communist.)

Oxford is indeed fortunate in having firms like this one. By their vigilance Oxford's internal security is guaranteed. But once again you cannot seem to satisfy everybody. I have heard some people suggest that this firm was over-reaching itself by inquiring into the private political opinion of a prospective employee. Of course, I don't know what other creeds the firm objects to. Nor do I know how they keep their records up-to-date. No doubt they have what they consider to be satisfactory methods. Do they make mistakes? Quite possible, I suppose. Can you appeal against their decision? No, why should you? They are not operating a court of law.

#### Judge and Jury

Who is this firm, ask others, to set itself up as judge and jury? Well, aren't they free to employ or not to employ who they choose? And how can a firm exercise this freedom of choice unless it knows something about its prospective employees? Did I hear someone suggest that this was unwarrantable spying on the individual, or even undemocratic discrimination? Just the sort of thing that goes on in Russia? An infringement of civil liberties? Well—"only publishers, members of eccentric sects, Communists, criminals or extreme States Righters" are likely to be interested in civil liberties according to Dr. Robert M. Hutchins. Think of the benefits of such policies. If every firm and institution in the country adopted this practice then every Communist and ex-Communist, together with their families would be starved out of existence in a few short months!

#### The victim

But there is always somebody ready to carp and criticise! Supposing, some people say, this firm and others like it take a dislike to some other political or religious creed? Is no one safe from them? The answer is quite simple! All the other parties, like the Labour Party, have to do is to keep such firms happy by not offending them with undesirable policies!

And how do I know all this? Simple—I was the victim—Just a Poor Student!

# WRITE TO US!

#### Even Ownership has Little to do with Control:

The nationalized industries in Britain are supposed to belong to the people of Britain, yet they are obviously controlled by the capitalists of the country. Article 6 of the Russian Constitution reads: "The land, its deposits, waters, mills, factories, mines, railways, water and air transport, banks, means of communication, large state-organized farm enterprises (state farms, machine-tractor stations, etc.) and also the basic housing facilities in cities and industrial localities are **state property, that is, the wealth of the people** (my emphasis—MK). Yet the land, etc., in Russia is controlled by a small, independent bureaucracy. **Formal ownership does not necessarily mean control.**

#### Some examples

There are other, more common, examples of this difference between control and ownership. In a big Capitalist firm, there are voting shares and non-voting shares. The non-voters own the firm in exactly the same way as the voters, but only the voters have the right to elect the board of directors, i.e., only the voters control policy. Even then, not all the voters carry any weight in determining policy. A man with a few shares is usually not sufficiently interested in the firm to scrutinize its activities carefully or bother to come to the shareholders' meetings, while one with a big bloc of shares is. The many small 'owners' may work at cross purposes, the big owner has only his interests to look after. Usually, the ownership of about 25 per cent of voting shares is sufficient to give control of the whole company and of all the other Capitalists' money invested in it. (Sometimes only 5 per cent will do the trick.) Control doesn't always stop there, however. The company may hold 25 per cent of the voting shares in another couple of companies which, in turn, may hold 25 per cent of those in another few companies, and so on. Some companies called 'holding companies' are, in fact, specially formed to control shares in this way, so that one group of shareholders, although it really 'owns' an insignificant proportion of the total capital involved, might control a vast economic empire.

It is well to bear these facts in mind when capitalists come out with their beautiful schemes for 'co-partnership' in industry. **The sense of solidarity with the boss which sometimes accompanies the couple of shares doled out, blinds the worker to the fact that he has no say in running the plant.**

If ownership does not necessarily imply control, what is control?

#### How Do Capitalists Control Industry?

In order to control a firm, the group of Capitalists at its head need know nothing about it. The *Manchester Guardian* reported an analysis of 725 public companies, comprising about four-fifths of Britain's engineering output. It showed that over two-thirds of the Directors have no professional qualification and that 40 per cent of the companies' Boards have no technically qualified Director. Yet in the last 50 years the proportion of chartered engineers to the working population has increased fourfold. One only need add that a large proportion of Company Directors are themselves paid hacks of the really big investors, chosen for their know-how, to see how little Capitalists need know about industry.

The actual running of the firms is in the hands of paid managers and salaried technical staffs who have no say in 'policy'. And yet, although all the 'know-how' is hired, the control still lies in the hands of the non-professional directors. What is this control?

#### The Directors have the power of hiring and firing.

Although they know nothing about the actual process of production, they can tell a man who does by his record. If a manager produces a 10 per cent profit when every other company is raking in 20 per cent, that manager gets the sack. If he produces 20 per cent while others produce 10 per cent, every firm compete to employ him. The same goes for the rest of the technical and professional staff—they are hired and fired on the basis of their formal qualifications and on the basis of results which every man in the street can see. Very little training in arithmetic is needed to see the difference between 20 per cent and 10 per cent.

What gives the Capitalists the power to hire and fire their managers? The law courts, police, prisons and the army—the whole apparatus of repression which is the Capitalist State. If the manager should do the impossible and refuse to leave his office, he'd find himself behind bars in no time. If workers should again do what they've done so many times before and conduct a sit-down strike, they would find troops banging at the gates within an hour.

**Capitalists control industry, not by their superior knowledge, but by their monopoly of armed power (ably abetted by their control of the press, the radio, television, films and the other 'idea-fixing' industries).**

#### What Capitalists Can do, Workers Can do Better

When the workers take power in Britain, we can expect very little damage in the basic economic facts of the country. True, most indus-

## FRANCE —

the Economic background  
by David Prynne

WHAT IS THE ECONOMIC BACKGROUND to the present French crisis? The French ruling class, unable to solve the deep-seated economic problems of the country by means of the bourgeois parliamentary regime, seek a solution through an authoritarian, right-wing dictatorship, at the expense of the working class.

**US supports war**

The drain of the Algerian war has caused inflation and a recurrent balance of payments crisis, bringing France to the verge of bankruptcy. French gold reserves fell from \$1,278 mil. in January to \$775 mil. in December, 1957. Faced with this situation, France was compelled to ask the US for credits to the tune of \$655 mil. this February. The US was anxious to build rocket bases and feared that the lack of foreign exchange would force the French Government to cut imports, thus impairing production, causing unemployment and a political and social crisis which would upset the Western Alliance.

**The drain of war**

But the stumbling block was the Algerian war, costing three times as much a year as the US credits. The credits could not solve the crisis, but only delay the day of reckoning. The attempt to lessen the problem of inflation by limiting expenditure and by credit restriction, and to pay for the war by cutting down on spending in other fields failed completely and the balance of payments crisis was not solved, foreign credit two months after the handout showed a gaping deficit. The increase in industrial production in the first months of this year was only maintained by the expenditure of money raised abroad. In May, moreover, there was a new defence expenditure of 80 billion francs.

**Fight for Socialism — contd**

tries will be nationalized sooner or later by the Workers' State. True, the struggle for the Workers' State will take the form of trades councils, factory and shop committees mobilizing the workers to eject the capitalist owners. But capitalist owners, as the experience of nationalization in Britain and Russia shows, are not absolutely necessary to capitalism. Given State power the technicians, managers and bureaucrats can very easily perform the functions of the capitalist, even better than he can.

Yes, the Workers' State will inherit very many features of capitalism. Managers and technical experts will remain, and our ignorance, for which we have to thank the capitalist world in which we were brought up and which places the technocrats at such an advantage, will remain with us too. Possibly a whole generation will have to pass before this class difference between mental and manual labour disappears for ever.

**How to control the technicians**

In the meantime our main job inside the country (ignoring defence from external attack for the moment) will be to guard against the middle-class 'technocrats' becoming an independent body with armed power of their own. This must be done in two ways: **the job of hiring and firing technical and managerial experts must be in the hands of elected shop and factory committees with the power of striking against any sabotage or breach of faith on the part of these technocrats.** Second, **these committees and regional trades councils must have the full support of the Workers' State.** No separate bodies of armed men but the entire people armed.

Given these two conditions, the technocrats will obey the workers as they have always obeyed the capitalists.

How have the workers fared? Real wages of the French workers have declined during the last two years. Wages have lagged behind prices, and the official index of the cost of living rose by 15 points between February, 1957, and February, 1958. Only the wide difference between the wages of various sections of the working class has blunted the sharp struggles which would have resulted from wage demands. Food prices have continued to rise in recent months. Obviously, the French capitalist class would have the prospect of a period of intense industrial struggle for wage increases before it... then came de Gaulle. **The new Government is intent on keeping prices high, resisting any wage demands and by cutting imports (to help solve the balance of payments crisis) create unemployment.** The capitalist Government will not hesitate to attack the working class organisations in order to implement this policy. The struggle is not ended, despite the cowardice and betrayal of the Socialist and Communist Parties. **The choice is between a fascist dictatorship and workers' power, for, in this situation there is no hope for capitalist parliamentary rule.**

**Open choice**

Algeria is still the main problem facing de Gaulle—he cannot give up the struggle because of the Saharan oil and the presence of the colons: but before the US will consent to grant further aid, de Gaulle will have to try to end the war, as aid to the French imperialists by the US will still further estrange the Arab bloc. However, the US has to choose between the right-wing dictatorship of de Gaulle and civil war in which the question of working class power comes very much to the fore.

## REVIEWS

MIKE MADDISON

**A no place for specs.**

Collected stories of Isaac Babel. Methuen 18s.

"A RALLY had been called at the House of the People, and there Alexander Fyodorovich made a speech about Russia—Russia, mystic mother and spouse. The animal passion of the crowd stifled him. Could he, the only member of the audience without opera glasses, see how their heckles were rising? I do not know. But after him Trotsky climbed to the speaker's tribune, twisted his mouth, and in an implacable voice began: 'Comrades!'"

**Time running out**

So ends not only one of Isaac Babel's short stories (from "The Collected Stories of Isaac Babel") but an era of Russian history. Alexander Fyodorovich is Kerensky, and his time and that of the provisional government which he heads is running out—it is June, 1917.

**The Jew from Odessa**

Isaac Babel saw the death of the old Russia and the rise of the new. He was a Jew from Odessa, and a witness of the pogroms and of the terrorism of the Black Hundreds. After the Revolution, Babel was—for a short time—a member of the Cheka. In the famine year of 1918 he went on grain-collecting expeditions; he fought with Budenny's cavalry in the ill-fated Polish campaign of 1920. It is of these unique and terrible events that he writes, and as he writes, spans the chasm between the two Russias.

**Accepted by Cossacks**

Babel has written history, and to him history is very personal. He is concerned not with dialectics but with the identities, thoughts and actions of the Savitskys, the Afonkas and the Baulins—the soldiers of the Red Cavalry. As a Jew he was a man

apart (Odessa was a ghetto town) and the Cossacks with whom he lived and fought were the traditional enemies of the Jews. Their ethos was harsh and alien, and it took him a long, long time to be reconciled to it, and, more painful than this, to be accepted by them.

**Nasty little object**

"My First Goose" is a story that sums up all the dilemma of acceptance into a group. Babel has been appointed to the staff of one of Budenny's divisions. "What a nasty little object," laughs the divisional commander. "They've sent you along without making any enquiries; and this is a hot place for specs. Think you'll get on with us?"

**Master of silence**

A quartermaster, carrying Babel's kit, displays the same vulgar good humour: "Nuisance with specs... But you go and mess up a lady, and a good lady too, and you'll have the boys patting you on the back."

His future comrades, however, rag and torment him like school-boys. Only after demonstrating his toughness by killing a goose for his supper—a petty yet significant act of initiation—does Babel find solidarity with the Cossacks. But he has a price to pay, and he pays it in his sleep: "I dreamed: and in my dreams saw women. But my heart, stained with bloodshed, grated and brimmed over."

Despite his experience in these war-torn years, Babel never lost his sensitivity. He became one of the most acclaimed Soviet writers.

A decade later, stifled by the constraints of the stalinist epoch, Babel spoke cynically of himself as the 'master of the genre of silence.' After 1937, his silence was final—he 'disappeared' during the great Purge.

**IT'S TIME YOU READ**● **Automation—the Socialist Answer**

M Kidron 1/-

● **Russia from Stalin to Khrushchev**

T Cliff 9d

● **Stalinist Russia—a Marxist Analysis**

T Cliff 15/-

## FRANCE—ctd

property of France, and one-half of her solid financial assets, including gold and foreign exchange." (p. 225-320).

The perfidy of the Communist Party is easily explained. At the end of the war, before the Cold War began, Russia favoured collaboration with Western capitalism. One facet of this collaboration was helping the French capitalists to put their house in order. The CP did this despite the hardship it inevitably involved for the workers.

### Administering capitalism

The French Socialist Party pursued this policy because, like the right-wing Labour leaders in this country, they saw nothing wrong in coming to power and just administering—not changing—the social order. Their experience, therefore, is highly relevant to the Labour Party. It gives the answer—and in no uncertain terms—to the Gaitskellian arguments that on grounds of expediency, or because the electorate would not wear it, socialist proposals should be shelved.

### 'Socialist' Party responsible

As French capitalism is in a more advanced state of decay than its British counterpart, the consequences of reformism are more clearly apparent there. What is happening in France now will happen in Britain in the future if the Labour Party policy is not changed.

For the SFIO, perhaps more than any other party, must be held responsible for the present state of the Fourth Republic. Far from having a cure for the ills that afflict the Republic, the SFIO is itself part of the disease. Since 1945 it has had prominent party members in more than three-quarters of the two dozen or so French governments.

### Workers suffer

These governments have failed to grapple with the economic situation. Prices have soared, leaving wages hobbling after them; the country's relative economic position in the world has declined; and working conditions have remained extremely bad.

Throughout the SFIO, because it was prepared to administer capitalism, has been forced to side with Capital—and against Labour.

### Wars of exhaustion

In foreign affairs, Leon Blum's visit to Washington in 1946 committed the SFIO—and later French governments—to following America into the Cold War. As payment for services rendered, dollars were given to the SFIO to help keep its party paper, *Le Populaire*, going. (Werth, op. cit. p. 413.) But French governments were not content merely to play their part in the Cold War; they started their own private wars against colonial peoples. These were not on the comparatively small scale of the British Labour Government's wars against the Malayan and Kenyan peoples. The very weakness of France nurtured illusions of grandeur. Eighty thousand were massacred in the 1947 Madagascar revolt to show the unappreciative native population the benefits of French colonial rule; in Indo-China the bloody and hopeless war dragged on year after year, costing the French taxpayer over £3,000 million; and, finally, in Algeria an equally hopeless war to stop the native population having freedom and independence has not resulted in the collapse of the Algerian resistance movement—but might easily lead to the collapse of the French Republic!

### 'Socialist' profiteers

Throughout the SFIO supported colonialism. Leading members were implicated in the various scandals, such as the Algerian wine import scandal, and the Indo-Chinese currency swindle. In both of these affairs so-called socialists made fat profits. It helped to create the impression among the electorate that SFIO was like all the other centre-parties. "They were just as bad as each other," people said.

### Decline of a party

The effect of these right-wing policies on the strength and influence of the SFIO was disastrous. The membership in 1946 was 354,000. In 1947-48 100,000 members were lost, and a further 70,000 in the following year.

Present membership shows only 83,000 fully paid-up members. Nor is the decline purely numerical: the party has lost most of its working-class support. It is now a middle class party. Only 13 per cent. of those on its federal committees are actually workers. Furthermore, recruitment, particularly of youth, has been very poor. Phillip Williams in his book, *The Politics of Post-War France*, describes why: "The Socialist youth organisation (in France as in other countries) has always been looked on with suspicion by the party leadership. In 1947, on account of its long-standing Trotskyist tendencies, it was deprived of its autonomy, and therewith of much of its appeal to youth. In 1953 the organisation existed in only 45 of the 90 French departments." (p. 69.)

### Less and less support

Williams goes on, "Over the years since Liberation it (the Socialist Party—RC) has left the impression of an ageing bourgeois party, sadly lacking in dynamic energy, and continually buffeted by the attacks of more powerful rivals." Evidently agreeing with this verdict, the electorate has given it less and less support. Its vote slumped from 4½ million in 1945 to a little over 2½ million in 1956.

### The lesson for us

The lesson British socialists have to learn from all this is that these right-wing policies cannot be even justified on grounds of expediency, as the SFIO's declining membership and support clearly shows. And, what is more, by leaving untouched problems that are crying out for a socialist solution, it paves the way for the only other possible "solution"—namely, fascism.

## SR BOOK SERVICE

35b Priory Terrace, London, NW 6

## PARLIAMENT ON HOLIDAY

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published twice a month by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd., 35b Priory Terrace, London, N.W.6. (Tel.: MAlda Vale 9258). Subscriptions, from this address, post paid: 1 year: 16s. 6 months: 8s. 3 months: 4s. Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Socialist Review which are given in editorial statement.

Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. (TU), Potter Street, Harlow, Essex.

### SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose <sup>16s.</sup> <sup>8s.</sup> <sup>4s.</sup> subscription for <sup>1 year's</sup> <sup>6 months'</sup> <sup>3 months'</sup> issue of

SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Name.....

Address.....

Send to SOCIALIST REVIEW,  
35B Priory Terrace, London, NW6.

## WHAT WE STAND FOR

The SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for international Socialist democracy. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. The SOCIALIST REVIEW believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power on the basis of the following programme:

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Renationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation.—The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.
- Workers' control in all nationalised industries, i.e., a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.
- The inclusion of workers' representatives on the boards of all private firms employing more than 20 people. These representatives to have free access to all documents.
- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions.
- The establishment of the principle of work or full maintenance.
- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, linked to a realistic cost-of-living index, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.
- The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.
- Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants—without a means test—for all university students.
- Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.
- Freedom from political and economic oppression to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the underdeveloped countries.
- The unification of an independent Ireland.
- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas. The abolition of all weapons of mass destruction.
- A Socialist foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow.