

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

8th YEAR No 17

MID-SEPTEMBER, 1958

SIXPENCE

MOSLEY'S MEN AT WORK

THE UGLY OUTBREAKS of violence against coloured people in widely separated parts of Britain make it urgent that we translate our shock at the occurrences into action to protect those who are being molested for their one "crime" of having a different coloured skin.

Why do coloured people come to this country, where difficulties crowd up on them almost from the moment they set foot on shore? Quite simply, hunger drives them from their own homes. Wages on a Jamaican sugar plantation for those lucky enough to find work are a bare £2-3 a week. Housing is shocking, so bad that even the slum tenements they occupy in Britain are luxurious compared with the shacks of the West Indies. Unemployment is rife, 25 per cent of the Jamaican population is unemployed. Others, like those on the sugar plantations, work only seasonally.

The big British firms prevent industrialization. It might lead to an all-round rise in wage levels; it would introduce a competitor in the market for what the imperialist companies consider their preserves. All that is built is railways and ports, to whip the produce away from the workers who produce it; fine hotels, perhaps, for the European tourists; big houses for the colonial administrators; and, most important, magnificent prisons.

AEU p. 2
DOCKS p.3

Companies like Tate and Lyle, that reap the super profits out of the cheap labour of the colonial peoples—the same Tate and Lyle that, if you remember, spent some of these profits conducting a vicious campaign against nationalization—are only too happy to see this feeling of superiority immigrating into Britain. "Divide and rule" has been the guiding policy of imperialism in the colonies. How well will it flourish in Britain?

Most Tories foster the idea lovingly. But to our shame, some

Labour MPs have taken their cue from them and are pouring out the same poison. James Harrison (North Nottingham), George Rogers (North Kensington) and Maurice Edelman (Coventry) have each singled out coloured immigrants for special treatment. As if coloured immigration is so important. Entrants from the West Indies rose to 24,000 in 1956 and are now declining. But there is an annual immigration from Ireland of 45,000. "In a couple of post-war years, Britain gave a home to Poles and people from the Baltic states in numbers that exceed the whole Negro population, old and new. In a single year, more Australians came to live here than Negroes in ten years." (*Tribune*, September 5). Furthermore,

Where is the Labour Party going? asks Graham Richards

The most important task of this year's Scarborough Conference, meeting in the shadow of an impending General Election, is to face up to reality. Unpleasant facts must not be smothered by electoral battle-cries, pleas for unity, and an uncritical acceptance of every utterance coming from the platform. Whatever the short-term advantages of plastering up the cracks, such action would, in the long term, be disastrous.

The first necessity is to take a clear look at the Labour Party's present position. In 1945 Labour had a parliamentary majority of 180 over the Tories. By 1955 the Tories had a majority of 67 over Labour. In other words, in a matter of 10 years Labour suffered an adverse change in relative strength of 247 MPs and, what is still worse, the Party does not appear to have made much headway since 1955. Despite Suez, the Rent Act, the rising cost of living, and many other blunders of the Tory Government, a recent Gallup Poll shows that, if a General Election were held now, the Tories would be returned again.

Why is this? Why has the Labour Party failed to regain lost support and, in face of Tory attacks, given some leadership to the British people? It is the task — nay, the duty — of this year's

there is an annual emigration from Britain of 60-100,000 every year or as much as the total coloured population of 190,000 in two years. No mention is made of restricting the movement of white people from the Commonwealth; only coloured (and very occasionally Irish) people are singled out.

Shame upon these crawlers before prejudice! They disgrace the Labour movement!

Divide and rule

Industrial management heartily endorses these "divide and rule" policies. In Lancashire employment Exchanges mark the cards of some firms NC (No Colour) because they refuse to take coloured workers. A *Birmingham Mail* (November 10, 1956) head-

line ran: "Maternity Wards Full — Coloured Influx Blamed."

The greatest insult to coloured immigrants in Birmingham was the appointment as Liaison Officer for Coloured People in the town of a former detective-inspector in the Kenya Police!

The poison has seeped well down to the middle class. As very few coloured workers qualify for council housing for lack of residential or other qualifications, they have to rely almost entirely on private landlords who extract exorbitant rents for grossly inferior accommodation. *Birmingham Mail* (September 17, 1955) reported the case of 34 West Indians who were evacuated from one house due to fire. Each of

[turn to page 8

Party conference to ask this question fearlessly.

The answer lies in the failure of the Labour Party to adopt a socialist policy. While the avowed aim is still to gain for workers the full fruits of their labour, no attempt is made to gear present policy to this ultimate aim. The continued existence of capitalism is accepted; at Transport House "Socialism" has become a dirty word. Yet it is with this drift to the right that Labour has lost its electoral support.

Attempting to justify this right-wing policy at last year's Labour Party annual conference, Hugh Gaitskell said:

The Executive could have come to you today and presented a document with a long list of further industries to be nationalized, without a new idea in it, and you would probably have received it with acclamation. Why did we not

do that? Because we would have been putting something to you which we did not believe we could carry out, and which the electorate were bound to reject.

Gaitskell's first excuse—sheer impossibility—rings rather hollow in an age when people are travelling under the Polar ice-cap and sending missiles hundreds of miles above the earth's atmosphere. Why does he believe a Labour Government could not carry out nationalization with workers' control? **Socialists have always known that no ruling class likes to be stripped of its power. Whenever possible they do not leave the historical arena without a struggle. But socialists have always had sufficient confidence in the working class—their solidarity, their militancy, to believe that the unpopular, numeri-**

[turn to page 6]

and can it win at Scarborough?

WILL LABOUR win the next General Election? As the inevitable event draws nigh, this question is being increasingly discussed throughout the working-class movement. Whatever different conclusions are arrived at, it is generally agreed that Labour's prospects are by no means as bright as its supporters would wish and active Party workers are continually asking themselves a second question:

What is wrong with the Labour Party and why is it failing to gain ground?

Anybody at all active in the political arena cannot but recognise this failure. He need not rely on the Gallup Poll to detect widespread apathy and cynicism among the traditionally Labour electorate. He meets it whenever he discusses political affairs.

(turn to page 4)

TU COMMENTARY

Geoff Carlsson, AEU Convenor, examines

REDUNDANCY, WAGES and the AEU

Three million workers were represented by the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, whose recent claim for a wage increase and shorter hours has been turned down by the Employers Federation.

Scant publicity was given out, no mass meetings on the claim were held, no demonstrations or marches, in fact a large number of the workers involved didn't know the essentials of the claim that had been submitted on their behalf. The top union leaders in many circumstances are as far removed as possible from the members on the factory floor. This is the unfortunate position in the Amalgamated Engineering Union of nearly one million members, and it would be foolish not to recognize this weakness, try to assess the reasons, and in turn build up once again a union that really represents the desires of its members and will again be in the forefront of progress.

Unity and strength

As far as most of our members know, there is an 'annual' wage claim for increased wages, and after six or nine months a sum of between 6s. and 11s. is usually obtained. The only occasion for many years in which the members were involved was in March and April of last year when the Confederation called its members out on strike to obtain an increase, and then, when the strike was gaining momentum and the workers beginning to experience their unity and strength, they were ordered back to work by a leadership which was afraid of its own supporters and the implications that arise from a successful struggle.

Jimmy Fullerton

We regret to announce the death, in a car accident, of James D. (Jimmy) Fullerton, an active member of the London Dock Liaison Committee. Jimmy, a former amateur boxer of brilliant promise leaves a widow and 5 young children. The Tooley Street area, comprising Sections 2, 7 and 9 are raising a fund on their behalf and raffle tickets will be on sale shortly.

Arising from the national stoppage and the return to work came the infamous agreement which tied the Union's hands for twelve months in respect of any further wage claim, and laid down the conditions for stifling factory militancy.

Since that time and the present claim, many new factors have arisen in the industry which have made the membership apathetic and have lost temporarily for our union the new spirit that was forged during the national stoppage.

Redundancy . . .

The most important of these factors have been redundancy,

short-time working, and the lack of leadership from the AEU Executive.

With the employers going over to offensive and attempting to smash the workshop organizations, it is imperative that leadership should be given to our members at this time.

. . . and Rights

For the first time in a number of years, growing unemployment has undermined the 'sense of security which many trade unionists have drifted into since the war. For them it means a new problem posed and a new answer needed. The reactions to this problem have been many and varied, depending on the strength of the organization in any given factory, **but standing out quite clearly from all other solutions is the idea of not accepting redundancy at all.**

Ways and means had to be found for keeping everybody employed, by sharing out existing work, introducing a shorter working week, transferring labour, etc. This fundamentally new conception of the workers' right to a job, poses a serious threat to the employers, because it begins to challenge their right of hiring and firing, and so raises the question of who controls the industry.

Ignoring the struggle

For the leadership of the AEU this problem should have been paramount. In fact, however, factories faced with such problems had only their own instincts to guide their policies. It is of course true that the AEU policy on redundancy is to resist it until suitable alternative employment is available, but like so many other aspects of policy it was only a decision of the National Committee and no real effort has been made by the Executive to guide or give leadership to those trade unionists actively engaged in fighting redundancy.

For many active members of the AEU, it seems that the Executive Council has been spending most of its time and energy fighting the Communist Party members who hold positions in our union, and forgetting the employers with whom we are in daily conflict.

Causes and results

The newspapers of course give prominence to such activity, and it is easy to recall the attacks on the Communists in the Sheffield and North London District Committees when they refused to give official backing to the strike over the sacking of the Communist Convenor of the Yorkshire Engine Company, and the refusal to back the strike for union recognition at the Master Vending Co., Cricklewood, at which the Convenor was also a Communist. It is very difficult to recall newspaper headlines of any attempts by the AEU Executive to implement in any way AEU policy to fight redundancy, or in any way to prepare the members for a campaign to realize other aspects of our policy such as the 40-hour

week, etc.

The latest redundancy dispute arising out of thirteen members getting notice, including the Convenor and a steward, was at Beatonsons, Park Royal. Three hundred and fifty men came out on strike and of the four unions involved it was the AEU Executive which refused to give official recognition to the dispute and ordered the men back to work.

One cannot be surprised that AEU members have become more cynical and uninterested in their union when they are faced with the attitude which their "leadership" has shown over the past year. Even on the question of the wage claim, militant members are questioning the wisdom of the leaders.

With instructions from the National Committee to press for a substantial increase and a 40-hour week, Bro. Carron, President of the AEU, asked the employers for a 6 percent increase, and a reduction of the working week to 40 hours by easy stages spread over a number of years.

Never had the figure of 6 percent been considered a "substantial sum." In fact it was against the spirit of the national policy, because even if granted it would only take up the rise in the cost of living since the last wage rise and would not improve our position at all relative to May 1957. With the 40-hour week which would have substantially helped those facing redundancy, no mandate was given which allowed Bro. Carron to ask for it on the Instalment System.

What kind of leaders ?

These are but a few of the reasons why the interests of AEU members are on the wane. A weak and vacillating leadership will only result in a weak and apathetic membership and because of such weakness the Employers were able to offer a miserable sum of 4/- to 5/6 wage increase with strings.

To obtain a real increase commensurate with our abilities and in line with the record profits still being made will need a fight by the union membership.

This fight, however, will not be forthcoming until confidence in the leadership is restored and the members can look with pride on an Executive Council that fights in their interests and not to their detriment.

It is my belief that the present leadership is the worst that the AEU has had for many years. It is time to change it.

Opportunity to fight !

Soon there will be nominations and elections for several senior positions in the Union, including the Presidency. It is up to the left-wing Socialists in the AEU to seize this opportunity and return the members whom they believe will make the AEU once again a real fighting organization of the British Engineering workers, and so win for us, and in conjunction with us greatly increased wages and decreased hours.

Solidarity Fund

The man who cut off the juice on the tubes during the bus strike is John Frederick Smith, of 77 Stockwell Gardens, Clapham Road, S.W.9. He supports a distraught wife and three young children.

We may not agree that this man's method of helping us was the best way, but we cannot deny that he acted from the finest motives—would there were more possessed with such feelings of class solidarity!

Fifty thousand busworkers need not feel proud of the fact that few of us have come to this man to inquire whether he was dead or alive, in poverty or sickness.

It is reckoned that he is about £6 in debt as a result of his attempt to assist the busworkers, and twenty-one Central Bus Delegates (including members of the C.B.C.) have already agreed to the Holloway Branch making an appeal on his behalf. Please send all donations to E J Mercer Russell, Secretary 1/377 Holloway Central Bus Branch, T & GWU, 11a Stonefield Street, Barnsbury, London, N.1.

SEVEN-AND-SIX Porticus writes

"THE tumult and the shouting dies, the Captains and the Kings depart": the National Dock Industry pay rise is with us. 7s. 6d. was offered, 7s. 6d. was accepted, despite the opposition of every London delegate to the Conference. The voting: 67 for, 16 against, of whom 15 came from London.

It has been claimed by the employers that this award will cost some two million pounds a year, a statement fallacious to a degree, for only if every single docker in the country worked a full week, every week of the year, could it possibly reach such a figure. But, of course, this is not possible under our present system, with thousands of "C" book men permitted only three days, and tens of thousands of Pool men doing just a day or so each week and "bumping" for the remainder. No, if this figure were halved, it could still prove a very conservative estimate.

Turning to the amount accepted, one finds a very peculiar picture, for it is not possible to divide the figure of 7s. 6d. into eleven equal amounts, and the docker is paid on the basis of eleven four-hourly periods every week. Any time a Pool man applies and is accepted for work, it is for a four-hour period; either the employer or the man may terminate the engagement at the end of that time; consequently, a proportionate amount of the 7s. 6d. must be allocated to each of the eleven four-hourly periods. The amount agreed upon and which was applied for when the raise came into effect in September was 8d. for each four-hour period, and eleven times 8d. is, of course, 7s. 4d.

THE COTTON CRISIS

by 'Federation Reporter'

THE Lancashire Federation of Trades Council devoted most of its time at its quarterly meeting in Manchester on August 30 to the serious crisis in cotton, and the general industrial situation in the North-West.

Quoting from the latest issue of the **Ministry of Labour Gazette**, the President, Mr Ellis Smith, MP, said that unemployment in the North-West was twice the rate in Scotland, four times that of Wales, and three times more than in Northern Ireland, all places that had a fair number of out of work. Within a 50-mile radius of Manchester, the position was serious. Altogether in the North-West there were 76,613 unemployed, with places like Blackburn having 1,759, Bolton 2,480, Liverpool 18,806 and Oldham 3,876; Manchester had almost 8,000.

A considerable section of the unemployed were from the cotton towns. In the last 3½ years well over 300 mills had been closed down and the process was continuing. The cotton operators were having to face unfair competition from places like Hongkong, where the workers were working an average of 80 hours a week, at much lower rates of pay. Japan, which he considered almost a

colony of the USA, was also a serious challenge to Britain, and had recently developed a policy of national planning.

He gave as his personal policy (a policy he said had nothing to do with the EC of the Federation) the following:

Firstly, there was an urgent need for a Ministry of Economic Planning.

Secondly, there should be a three-shift 40-hour week system introduced to increase exports.

Thirdly, there ought to be an International Labour Code, to which all countries should adhere. This code should have a fair contract clause, similar to that existing amongst British local authorities.

Fourthly, the international trade union organizations should get closer together, and stop fighting each other.

He further suggested that there should be a Commonwealth Plan, but declined to go further into the question at this stage.

The discussion that followed supported the chairman's statement in general terms but also criticized it sharply. Brother Vaughan of Oldham said the unemployment figures were not correct, many more were affected, but not registered as unemployed.

—and After from the Docks

Now this leaves 2d. to the credit of every dockworker completing a full week, and an exceptionally intriguing situation has developed. The union, not being sufficiently capable, as represented, of obtaining a suitable figure at the Enquiry, has circularized all branches to the effect that the Executive Committee have decided, and this without mandate, to gather in every single one of these outstanding credits and lodge them in a fund which shall be used for the "Docker's Welfare". What that means at present is anybody's guess.

Capitulation?

The general reaction of the Branches to this circular is not yet fully known, but several branches have already decided to contest the legality of the General Executive Committee's action and for several reasons.

Firstly, because with thousands of men employed on regular engagements, it is possible to pay them a fixed sum of 7s. 6d. each week without any difficulty at all, and secondly, where a Pool man is fortunate enough to obtain a full week's work, this could also apply, but the main reason, it seems, is not that they object to a Welfare Fund, but such a Fund has to be administered, and they object to the idea of providing additional plum jobs for officials, paid for by them with monies legally awarded to them wrongfully withheld.

The men argue, and with some justification, that the contribution of 1s. weekly demanded by the union, is more than enough for the services they are receiving, and when one considers the

lack of foresight which accepted the figure of 7s. 6d. and the lack of official backing during the last strike, it is easy to understand their attitude.

They ask also, what is meant by "Docker's Welfare" as stated in the circular? Does it mean that the union has capitulated in its request for a permanent Pension Scheme and is anticipating setting up its own scheme on the proceeds of what they gather in from the 2d. credits? If this is so, what has happened to their faith in the Labour Party's proposals for National Superannuation? In any case, whatever the intention of the union in this matter, the men argue, their opinions should have been canvassed and the union Executive is overstepping its duty in withholding monies legally awarded to the workers.

Duty to fight!

As a final word, many of the fabulously wealthy Insurance companies were built up on ½d. policies, so when one considers that these credits can bring in anything from £20,000 to £46,000 yearly with its potential investment yield one can fully understand the Executive Committee's desire to appropriate these monies. In view of the opinions expressed by those branches who have already discussed the circular, it is to be hoped that every other member of the Dock Industry will also agree to contest this unwarranted expropriation of part of their weekly wage, and tell the union that it is their duty to fight for the "Docker's Welfare", not to expect him to provide it from his extremely low basic wage.

JIMMY FULLERTON

See page 2

Other delegates thought the part dealing with the proposed embargo on foreign goods should be deleted, as what was required was an international working class struggle, not for each country to try to solve its own problem at the expense of others. Bro Heffer of Liverpool also took this view, and pointed out that the **Manchester Guardian's** correspondent had given figures on serious unemployment in that country; also that the **Japanese textile unions were being urged not to ask for wage increases, a rather familiar suggestion often made to British workers, on the same plea of cutting costs to export more.** One delegate had said that the crisis was due to the old machinery used in England. He took the view that the machinery was only a very tiny contributing factor. After all, the Detroit motor car factories had the "benefit" of automation, also the "benefit" of thousands of unemployed. **The basic question was that of who controls and owns the factories, it was the economic system that was responsible. The need was to remove the basic fault, not play around with schemes which solved very little. A boycott on goods was no answer. Solidarity-fund badges were being sold at the meeting; he felt it would be real solidarity to contact the Japanese, Indian, and other textile worker, co-ordinate our activities, and assist each other internationally in the struggle against our common enemy.**

Bob Wright, Stockport delegate, said we were now having an inquest on the results of wrong policies adopted at the end of the war. Had we had a genuine socialist policy rather than the one foisted on us by our so-called leaders the position would have been quite different. What was required was a socialist plan with ultimate international socialist planning. We could not blame the Chinese, or Japanese, people, or anyone else for developing their industries, it was a perfectly natural process.

Bro. Gay of Stratford accused the Chairman of being sectarian. We couldn't build a wall around Lancashire, we had to look at the problem on the widest possible basis.

A delegate from Bury Trades Council gave details of a letter he had received from Hong Kong in which facts were given of the bad conditions under which the workers were forced to work.

The following resolution was then passed and carried, with a number of delegates against, and many abstaining:

That the Lancashire Federation of Trades Councils is profoundly disturbed by the serious position of the Lancashire Cotton Trade, and the failure of the Government to adopt measures to safeguard the trade against unfair competition, or to provide assistance for a planned reorganization of this most valuable section of British Industry for maintaining full employment, and progressive economic prosperity.

It calls upon the Government to place a complete embargo upon imported goods manufactured in mills which don't conform to agreed international standards of labour.

All Trades Councils are urged to support the trade unions in the cotton trade in arousing public in-

INDUSTRIAL

terest for urgent action to revitalize the Industry. It calls upon all trade union officials to consult with their members to strengthen the campaign, and urges the Trades Union Congress to take immediate action in support of the resolution.

The meeting also decided that a broad Conference should be called at the earliest possible time to consider Lancashire's industrial future with particular reference to its growing increase of unemployment.

A rather heated discussion arose over a reply received from the TUC to a resolution which had been accepted by the Federation to the effect that the Federation was dissatisfied with the method adopted at the Annual Conference of Trades Councils of placing all serious controversial resolutions at the back of the Agenda which meant that they could not be given full consideration. Bro. Jackson (Preston TC) said that the TUC was trying to keep us in neat pigeon holes; we were alright as long as we kept our place. The real problems from the shop floor, which we get on the Trades Councils, were being kept off the Annual Conference agenda. We were told that it was being looked into, it was always being looked into, but nothing was ever done, except to make it more difficult. Delegates were generally agreed that the time devoted to Conference should be lengthened.

To sum up. The Federation meeting undoubtedly spot-lighted the problem, but failed to give the answers required. Many delegates felt dissatisfied with the resolution on cotton, but would not vote against it as there was nothing better with which to replace it. It is hoped that when the Conference on Lancashire's Industrial future is held, it will give a more positive lead. This is the prevailing mood of the delegates, and I am certain they will get their way.

BUSES

HOLLOWAY Central Bus Garage is canvassing other Central London Depots for support to rescind, constitutionally, the agreement which allows standing passengers.

"We feel," they state, "now has come a golden opportunity which our members have been looking for since the 1914-18 war. Now that the LTE is taking so many thousands of seats out of service, why should we not insist that our passengers sit down? For every 11 buses carrying standing passengers another bus AND CREW could be put to work."

"It is sometimes argued that if we do away with standing passengers the public will be against us. We feel that the public, if properly informed, will realise that the move is to their ultimate benefit. Anyway, nearly all attempts to improve busworkers' conditions are interpreted as being against the public interest. So, if we worried too much about imagined public reaction we would stand still for ever."

SR Industrial Report

TOWARDS SOCIAL

RENT ACT—Next Step

by Karl Dunbar, Willesden CLP

At a recent meeting, the Willesden Central Labour Party discussed what action should be taken to protect tenants who will, in the next few weeks, face the prospect of eviction from their homes. The fact was early established in the meeting that whilst we were all agreed that steps of a drastic nature would have to be taken, it was not clear exactly what those steps should be, and this is not surprising when one realizes the absence of any militant and clear-cut lead from the Party itself. If we, in the local organizations, were gathered to discuss how we could implement locally the call for a National campaign that would be simple, for we all know that only through a nation-wide protest can this Rent Bill be defeated. But the issue facing every local Party is simply "what do we do ourselves?" As one comrade put it: "This has become purely parish pump politics," which means all local Parties must go it alone.

Facing the issue

Well we faced up to the issue as best we could, recognising the weakness of individual local action, in comparison with a national campaign, yet not in any sense dismayed at the task before us, for we knew that sooner or later we would have to face the position of workers taking action themselves against the landlords without any prompting from us or anyone else. We also recognised that when the physical evictions take place, as they inevitably will, no 'higher authority' in the Labour Movement will have any success if they try to persuade their members not to take action. The factory workers, the transport workers, the dock workers, all of organized labour in fact, and not forgetting the housewives will act in defence of their homes, and willy-nilly the Labour Party and the Trades Unions will be forced to do something or be completely isolated from the rank and file.

With these thoughts in mind the local Party came to these decisions:

1. That we should encourage the growth of tenants' committees.
2. That public meetings shall be called in every Ward of the Borough, which meetings shall take place within a period of ten days.
3. That the Willesden Borough Labour Party pledges its full support to all tenants who 'meet attempts at physical eviction with physical resistance.'
4. That neighbouring boroughs already agreeable to common action should be immediately drawn together to plan united action.

5. That every attempt be made to bring the local trade union movement into the struggle.

6. That the Party Executive Committee shall meet within seven days to implement the decisions of the Party and that the EC shall co-opt anyone they think will assist in the carrying out of the Party's policy.

No doubt other Boroughs are taking action on similar lines to

Willesden, on the other hand some Boroughs are doing nothing at all. It is the desire of us all to see a great National Campaign, but failing that the next best thing is that we learn from one another how best to tackle the job of defending our homes. To do this we need a paper that will print the ideas and actions of the various Parties up and down the country, a paper that will also

maintain the consistent demand that "every weapon of the working class must be used to defeat the Tories." It is this need which makes me, for one, support the *Socialist Review*. Let the pages of the *Review* be a means to bring the working class closer together and so assist the spread of action out from our parochial boundaries to embrace towns, cities, counties, until the whole working class of Britain is united as one in defence of its homes. Then, perhaps, will come the day when 'kicking the Tories out' is not just a hopeful phrase, but becomes a reality and the working people of our country go on from their victory to establish a Government pledged to carry out Socialist policies.

LETTERS

A Case for Summit Talks?

During the recent speculation on the possibility of summit talks, conflicting opinions have been expressed by socialists as to whether the working-class can benefit from such discussions.

The argument, which I oppose, states that when the heads of Capitalist states get together it is wholly for their personal benefit. If the working-class gain in any way, it is purely coincidental and inevitably from wrong motives.

In my opinion the gain for anyone from such talks is no more than that which could be gained from talks between lesser representatives at, for example, the Security Council.

The reason, however, for the call for Summit Talks was the desire by the Governments of the main powers to create the impression that they were pursuing every avenue for settling "international disputes." If this aim was genuine, agreement would have been reached in the past and certainly without the present publicity. It is, of course, not genuine. However, the necessity to create the impression arose because of mounting public opposition to the present policies.

In Britain we should be proud that the Government has been forced to make this show. We should realise that it is a reflection of our strength, and that the more militant we become, so our power and influence will increase.

Our power, our interests

Obviously there is a limit to our influence over Capitalism, but the limit is some considerable way off, and when in fact that stage has been reached, the end of Capitalism will be in sight. As it is we have power and we can force the Government to negotiate. We can also force some of the negotiations to be in our interests. Naturally it is unimportant whether the adjective "Summit" is used providing the negotiations take place, and provided they are negotiations based to some extent on the interests of our class.

We can achieve success by campaigning on these lines. We will not succeed in forcing permanent guarantees from capitalists states, but we can obtain limited concessions; and the struggle to obtain these will strengthen us in our final struggle to abolish capitalism.

BILL CARTER

As you say, Comrade Carter, "provided they are negotiations based to some extent on the interests of our class." But who is to do the providing? When a convener negotiates with management, we know who our representative is. Even when a trade union bureaucrat negotiates with the employers, we know who he is, how

ever much he may drag his heels. But when the bosses (western) negotiate with the bosses (eastern), on whom are we supposed to depend? Who is to see that the negotiations are based "on the interests of our class"?

Strikes to the summit?

Then again, you say that the Tories' show of going to the summit "is a reflexion of our strength." Is it? We have seen strikes in support of wage claims, we've seen strikes against sackings. Some have been successful, some not. What strength has been used to press for talks? How many strikes? What threat of direct action? Even assuming that the Tories were pushed into it through fear of working-class pressure, is this the way to go about things?

Which way forward?

True, we might be able to force

an unwilling boss class to negotiate with its opposite numbers, even against its will. But, as you say, such negotiations are "not genuine." We will have strained our resources to the utmost to get them to meet, to press into their hands the key to the future, to allow them to settle their differences and carve up the world once again, as they have done so many times before. And with all this we will have come not one inch nearer working-class power. All our energies will have been mobilized to hand complete power to our enemies at home, the class which thrives on war preparations as maggots on a dung-heap. A socialist stand on summit talks is one which exposes them as a sham, a bosses' conference; one which presents the solution to the present impasse as working-class power. To pretend that capitalism can solve its problems, even temporarily, is to believe in miracles and the power of apathy.—Editor.

The Gentle Art of Conference Arrangements . . .

1. In the first place aim to see that undesirable resolutions are rendered completely innocuous by compositing or presented in terms so stupid as to be laughed out of Conference. In the case of recalcitrant delegates who refuse to give way, never fear, the Chairman will see to it that their resolutions are not called.
2. Be sure that all precautions are taken against any defects of sight from which the Chairman may suffer. Take care that his vision is frequently guided in the direction of the leaders of the big and reliable battalions.
3. Time is limited for speakers from the floor, but remember that platform stars can carry on till Peter blows his horn.
4. Avoid snap votes. These are likely to cut across the program of hard-worked officials who have to fit in a few rounds of golf, or a siesta on the beach with the wife, as the empty seats during the Conference sessions testify.
5. Be sure to provide for at least one good debate on a subject which everyone agrees beforehand, e.g., the cost of living. Everyone can let off steam quite harmlessly during a period when tempers might otherwise become frayed over some tiresome and nerve-racking resolution.
6. Finally, relax! enjoy yourself! Fortunately, the trump cards are in the hands of good, sensible men who will not let you down whatever the furore on the surface.

Even though Sir Tom O'Brien's daughter in 1957 found things dull after Ascot, a Labour Party Conference has plenty to offer. After all, the accommodation is good, liquid and solid refreshment is plentiful, and provided the weather is fair, a good time can be had by all.

R B O R O U G H 1 9 5 8

KEEP ALL THE H-BOMBS!?

by Raymond Challinor

Of the 428 resolutions on the agenda of this year's Labour Party annual conference, 142 of them—in other words, roughly a third—appear under the general heading **Disarmament**. More than a 100 resolutions oppose the manufacture, use and testing of H-bombs. Others call for the withdrawal of American H-bombers from Britain and for work on the building of rocket sites in this country to be stopped.

This crescendo of resolutions, each in its own individual way protesting against the lunatic policy of massing increasing numbers of H-bombs, echoes the growing opposition to this policy among the British people.

What is the Labour Party's attitude to this new movement? The rank and file's is obvious: their numerous resolutions against the H-bomb testify to their support. But what of the Labour leaders? Their position is explained in John Strachey's muddled and misleading pamphlet. Written in an attempt to persuade people that Britain should scrap all H-bombs, he calls his pamphlet **Scrap all H-bombs**. It would have been more honest, more in keeping with the aims of the pamphlet, had he entitled it **Bigger and Better H-bombs for Britain**.

Strachey's object is to create a false impression. He starts out by trying to show the differences between the official Labour Party and Tory Party policies. Shorn of the verbiage, it amounts to this: the Tories are for making the Bomb; the Labour leaders are for making the Bomb; the Tories want rocket sites, the Labour leaders want rocket sites. The only minute dissimilarities are that Labour would wait until after a summit meeting before they started erecting rocket bases and would suspend H-bomb tests.

Both of these points are trivial. It is highly unlikely that a summit meeting would end the Cold War. In fact, I am confident that it won't. For the discord does not arise from some misunderstanding or personal quarrel that can be settled by a chin wag; it stems from a deep and fundamental conflict of economic interests between the ruling class of Russia and the ruling classes of Britain and America. Such conflict cannot be ended by the rulers coming together, but only by the people of East and West coming together—and ending the rulers.

WHAT OUR LEADERS TRIED TO HIDE

1. **The Labour Government's manufacture of nuclear weapons.** It was Labour, not the Tories, who made Britain's first atomic bomb. The whole expense was hidden from Parliament—and the Labour Party conference—by listing the large sums spent under various obscure items in the official estimates. Neither the Labour Party nor Parliament had any say in the decision.
2. **The harmful genetic effects caused by nuclear warfare.** The first official Civil Defence Manual on Atomic Warfare, with a foreword by Attlee, who was then Prime Minister, had pages 4 to 39 omitted. From the sequence of the Manual, it is obvious that the missing pages related to the harvest of deformed and defective children that would be born to future generations if a nuclear war occurred. Fear of a public outcry when the horrible facts were revealed probably led the Labour Government to having second thoughts—and suppressing that part of the Manual—when in the printer's hands.
3. **Whether the Labour leaders, if in power, would be prepared to use the Bomb.** Gaitskell, speaking at Birmingham, was bluntly asked: "Would you be prepared to press the button?" After considerable evasion, he replied that he would not be prepared to dispense with the deterrent value of the H-bomb.

Since the summit meeting is doomed to failure—and every realist knows it—the Labour leaders are using this to make proposals appear more palatable and less bellicose. Instead of saying that they would not erect rocket sites until after an attempt had been made at a summit meeting to reach agreement, they could, with equal assurance, have simply written that they intend to go on and build them.

Meaningless proposal

Their second proposal—to suspend tests—is meaningless. The American, Russian and British Governments have all suspended tests. Sometimes it has been for five minutes, sometimes for five weeks, sometimes for five months. The transporting and assembling of equipment before a test and the studying of findings after a test all take time. Periodic suspensions are natural and inevitable.

The Labour leaders' proposal would only have been important if they had stated they would suspend tests indefinitely. As they have openly repudiated this idea, it means that the Labour leaders would be prepared to allow testing—trying to "perfect" more devastating methods of destruction—to continue.

Scientists agree that nuclear tests already carried out will cause widespread suffering. The British Atomic Scientists' Association calculates that, on the basis of tests carried out up till 1957, 50,000 people will die of bone cancer alone. Commenting on this, Bertrand Russell says, "If you give one man cancer, or cause one child to be born an idiot, you are a monster; but if you do the same injury to 50,000 you are a patriot."

Arms and Dead Men

"The record of the main European wars . . . is shown by the following index series (combining size of the fighting force, number of casualties, number of countries involved, and proportion of combatants to total population):

Century: 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th; and Index: 18, 24, 60, 100, 180, 500, 370, 120, 3,080, respectively.

Harold D. Lasswell, *World Politics Faces Economics*, 1945, p. 7.

When Strachey comes on to the main task of his pamphlet, an attempt to reply to those favouring unilateral nuclear disarmament by Britain, he trots out the same trite arguments as Macmillan. The bomb must be retained, he argues, to deter the Russian Government from carrying out any attack upon this country. He does not explain why, if only the H-bomb stands between Britain and military occupation, the Russian Government does not launch an invasion against any of the numerous countries with the doubtful misfortune of not possessing H-bombs, e.g., Yugoslavia, India. Furthermore, Strachey does not give the faintest reason for saying that Russia is deterred by Britain's H-bombs. Although Britain possesses only about three to every 100 possessed by Russia, Macmillan said in Parliament that Britain would not hesitate to be the first nation to use nuclear weapons if Russia were to invade with conventional forces. Despite the fact that Britain is a small, densely-populated island, highly vulnerable to nuclear onslaught, Russia's hundreds of H-bombs would not make Macmillan hesitate being the first to press the button. Why should we think that Russia, a huge, sprawling country, covering one-fifth of the world's land mass, will be deterred by the British Government's mere handful of bombs?

How many divisions! . . .

Strachey also argues that Britain must possess the Bomb to give her "power to influence events in general" (p. 15). Strachey clearly considers influences purely in terms of power politics. When considering the power of the Vatican one can well imagine Strachey, to paraphrase Stalin's famous question, asking: "How many H-bombs has the Pope?" And when, to his sheer amazement, he finds the Pope has none, sending the Pope a copy of his pamphlet along with a personal letter to His Holiness advocating the manufacture of H-bombs so the Vatican can again have "power to influence events in general." Since Strachey regards the power to influence purely in military terms, he omits any considera-

tion of the importance of ideals, the struggle for men's minds. In the long run it is these ideological factors that are crucial. The pen is mightier than the sword.

What sort of power?

The H-bomb is immensely powerful—and immensely weak. While it gives a country's rulers the power to blow another country to smithereens, it does not help in keeping a people in subjection. This is clearly illustrated by the antics of the American Sixth Fleet, at present cruising in the Mediterranean. *US News & World Report* (May 10th, 1957) boasted that "more actual destruction can be caused by one flight of the 180 aircraft of these Sixth Fleet carriers, with their atomic weapons, than was caused by all the bombing of World War II." Yet, with all this power, the Americans were unable to keep the Western puppet régime in power in Iraq. It could easily blow the oil wells—and everybody else—sky-high, but this would hardly help to solve the capitalists' problem: namely, how to continue their extremely profitable production of oil.

Deals that count

It is ideals that count. Imperialism is becoming discredited, Arab nationalism and the desire for ownership and control of one's own resources is increasing, and therefore we have the spectacle in the Middle East of the British and American Governments, with immense military superiority, being impelled to give way, to make concessions. Abadan, the Suez Canal, Iraq—where next? Even if the West increases its nuclear might tenfold, it cannot stop the march of the Arab peoples.

What chance of suicide?

The H-bomb is a weapon of mass destruction, not of class warfare. It can never be gently lobbed over a picket line or quietly dropped on some awkward London dockers. Like the dew that falleth upon the just and unjust alike, an H-bomb would kill capitalists as well as workers. While the capitalist might well not mind seeing some unruly workers out of the way, he would never countenance the use of a weapon which would blow himself, his factory and his fellow-capitalists up in a radio-active mushroom.*

Socialists say No

It is for this basic reason—the H-bomb can never be used in the class struggle for Socialism—that all socialists must inevitably favour banning the Bomb. Were Britain socialist—or Russia, for that matter—it would destroy its H-bombs. No conceivable situation could arise in which a Socialist Government could wish to use them. Respect for human life is an essential characteristic of Socialism.

Destruction and decay

On the other hand, capitalism, the decaying social order, squanders all its resources, including human life. Ever intensifying antagonisms, caused by the clash of economic interests, have smashed one capitalist state against another. As time has gone on, these collisions have become vastly more destructive (see chart). Finally, with the advent of the H-bomb, they have reached a pitch where they threaten society's very existence.

No analysis

Judged against this background, Strachey's pamphlet is sadly lacking. It does not contain any analysis of the economic rivalries that have generated the struggle for mastery of the world. It fails to give any lead to humanity on how to get out of this nightmarish universal preparation for extinction. Instead Strachey just scratches at the problem, tries to create the illusion that Labour's right-wing leaders will do something about it. It is to be hoped that the Labour Party conference, seeing through these deceptions, will call for an indefinite suspension of the tests and the banning of the Bomb.

* For this reason I cannot agree with Robin Fior when he writes, "the H-bomb is a deterrent aimed not at either of the rival imperiums, but at the forces of world revolution." (SR, August 1.)

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

First issue now out
2s. from Social Review

LP COMMENTARY

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1
Stan Newens asks

Can Labour Win at Scarborough?

It is clear even to the most optimistic that another 1945 is out of the question. That tremendous wave of enthusiasm which carried Labour into power with a majority of 148 seats in 1945 is as remote from the political climate of today as the Anti-Corn Law agitation of 1845. At the best, we can only hope for something better than 1950.

With this in mind, the eyes of all socialists will be focused on the Labour Party Conference at Scarborough this year. As the final debate on the new series of policy statements and almost certainly the last Conference before the General Election, this is probably the last opportunity for the Party to take some drastic step which will radically transform a bleak and dreary outlook ahead.

Apathy and Waste

For the past seven years the policy which has stemmed from the Party leadership is one of moderation.

This policy has been completely out of harmony with the ideas of the rank and file in the constituencies, as reference to resolutions sent in to the Labour Party Conference year after year will show. The result has been to dispel all but the last vestiges of enthusiasm from Party workers.

This loss of enthusiasm has not only denuded local organizations of some of their finest workers but also of their finest propaganda agents—the men and women who used to argue the Labour case on the buses and tubes, in the mines and at the factory benches, in the pubs and along the streets.

The vital issue

At least theoretically, Labour could make the required change at Scarborough. The most vital issue is the question of the H-bomb. If Labour came out in favour of unilateral banning of the bomb—as nearly a quarter of the resolutions ask—and initiated a real campaign to achieve this, she would attract more middle class votes than the advocates of moderation ever dreamt of. Nuclear disarmament is the key question at this year's conference.

However immense a victory the acceptance of a policy of a unilateral ban would be, in the long run it would not suffice to recapture the mood of 1945. For

this Labour would have to jettison the whole of its policy for mere reforms of capitalism in favour of a full-blooded socialist policy.

Must challenge Capitalism

Leaving aside **Industry and Society** it would have to make fundamental amendments to the policy documents **Learning to Live, Prosper the Plough, and Policy for Progress**. At present they merely tinker with the problems of capitalism—no more.

Further than this, the Labour Party would have to back the workers in their day-to-day struggles in a really effective way: in the factories, the docks, in their places of work; against rising prices and rising rents.

Prospects: No change

Unfortunately, the reversal of

the trend to moderation at present is highly unlikely. A handful of Trade Union leaders—often deeply entrenched against the possibility of rank and file pressure—can easily swamp the votes of the rest by means of the unjust block-vote system. The leaders of the Transport and General Workers' Union alone control as many votes as all the Constituency Parties put together, and the TUC easily defeated a proposal for a unilateral ban on the bomb.

Defeat again?

Thus, unfortunately, defeat for the left is practically a foregone conclusion, which means that Labour's election prospects will be entirely dependent on the unpopularity of the Tories when the event takes place. If the Tories are lucky, Labour's hopes will be dismal indeed, and the

demoralization among the rank and file which will inevitably follow a new defeat will be overwhelming.

Left must fight

We must not, however, lose heart. A determined fight at Conference by the Left can score a moral victory which will give heart to some of the disheartened and convince some of the unconvinced. Eventually conditions will change, the realization of the bankruptcy of present policies will spread, the need to struggle for a real socialist policy will be driven home.

and fight on!

The flame of socialism has not gone out and we must strive to keep it burning. We can do this not by retiring to our firesides, not by taking refuge in other Parties or outside groups, but by struggling for the ideals which we hold to be correct. If we are correct—and any socialist worthy of himself has the courage of his convictions—time will prove us so. When it does we must not be too dispirited and too isolated from the working class movement to turn the tide.

Where is the Labour Party going--ctd

cally small, class of rich people could easily be quelled.

Gaitskell, on the other hand, has little confidence in the working class. This clearly emerges from his second excuse—that the electorate would reject a socialist policy. This is based upon the assumption that the middle class, which is predominantly anti-socialist, holds the key to electoral success. Only when the majority of the middle class support the Labour Party has it any chance of winning a General Election. Therefore, the middle class must be pandered to, Labour's policy being stripped of the last fragments of socialist ideas, just so that the small businessmen and professional classes will vote Labour.

When this approach is examined, it is proved to be patently false. Dr. John Bonham's book, **The Middle-Class Vote** shows that Labour lost support among the middle class at precisely the same time as it drifted to the right. This is clearly shown when figures for the 1945 and 1951 General Elections are compared:

Business and Managerial:	
1945	1951
Lab.: 750,000	Lab.: 560,000
Tory: 2,370,000	Tory: 3,090,000
Professional and Higher Office Sections:	
1945	1951
Lab.: 670,000	Lab.: 540,000
Tory: 1,630,000	Tory: 1,630,000

The reason for this middle-class drift to the Tories is surely to be found in the Labour leaders' attempt to cajole middle-class voters. For, by stripping the Party's policy of the last vestige of socialism, the Labour leaders have shown themselves willing to administer the present economic system. With two parties competing merely to administer capitalism, the middle-class voter generally decided to vote Tory. The middle class consider it more natural and normal for a capitalist party to govern a capitalist system. In any case, they have far greater experience at this than the Labour leaders. **Therefore the Labour leaders have played into the Tories hands, given them a greater share of the middle-class vote, by omitting their one means of winning middle class voters—to show that they represented something fundamentally different to the Tories.**

The facts:

But, far more important, was the demoralizing effect of right-wing Gaitskellian policy upon the workers. Only 16 percent of the total electorate are middle-class voters and between one and two percent capitalists. Therefore, the overwhelming majority—and the most significant from a Labour standpoint—are the working class.

and the policies

But how can the Labour Party make a reasonable appeal to the working class when its policy even leaves the majority of its active workers stone cold? On all the important issues of the present time the Labour leaders dither like constipated jellyfish. Nuclear disarmament? Their only proposal—the same as the Tories—is to stop tests. Education? Those seats of ruling-class privilege, the public schools, cannot be touched, but the grammar schools can be thrown into turmoil. The House of Lords? After

opposing the Bill for Life Peers, the Labour leaders help to make the scheme work by nominating Labour life peers. Nationalization? The Labour leaders think that past nationalization has been "a success story"—and therefore propose to nationalize no fresh industries.

Gallup says so too!

All these attempts of the Labour leaders to make their policy appear to be all things to all men has ended with their policy meaning nothing to anybody. The Gallup poll shows that only 25 percent of the electorate regard Gaitskell as a good leader. In the last 18 months the number who don't know what to think of him—and one can appreciate their sentiments—has risen from 19 to 38 percent. The poll goes on to show that the adoption of "a more definite policy" would please three times as many Liberals as it would repel; twice as many "undecided" voters; and six times as many Labour voters.

The moral—turn Left

The News Chronicle of August 25th draws the moral—and it must also be drawn at the Scarborough Conference:

The poll clearly shows that if Labour is to win the election, by virtue of a positive appeal, the party has to turn to the Left and establish an image that is distinct from that of the Conservative Party.

Objective—Victory

To continue as at present, with a policy out of touch with the people, unable to cope with economic problems, is to court disaster. We must prevent the Labour Party falling into the limbo of the Liberal Party by ending our Party's present liberal policy. Only when we have our socialist objective clearly in view will we be able to go forward to victory.

SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose

16s.	subscription for	1 year's	issue of
8s.		6 months'	
4s.		3 months'	

SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Name.....

Address.....

Send to M Maddison

21 Aubert Park, London, N5

the ISIS Trial—a footnote from Stephen Witney, Oxford

THE OUTCOME of the Isis trial has left us all moderately relieved; for several weeks and during the trial in particular such moderation had not been looked for. A few acts of what Lord Punishment-is-a-Deterrent Goddard called "Youthful Folly" and the whole apparatus of the state—Lord Chief Justice, Solicitor General, Christmas Humphreys, dozens of policemen, ushers, MI-men, Fleet Street correspondents, flunkies of every variety—descended to wreak the vengeance of society. Total cost to the taxpayer must be in the region of £10,000. For what purpose? Well, the motives were never clear.

5 million for what?

Some people were saying that the pressure for a prosecution came only from the Foreign Office, some that a small group of MI men had felt affronted by the Isis article on frontier incidents, some were saying that had it not been for one very particular top man in the army no action would have been taken. And once all the hue-and-cry had been raised, all the little men in bowler hats sent in their reports and the machinery moved relentlessly on towards the inevitable conviction. **And for why? If one wanted to give any clear reply to this question it would be something about encouraging the others. From doing what? From letting the British people know what its £5,000,000 a year secret service spent its time doing. The Russians know anyway.**

Responsible to irresponsibles

This obscure organization, independent of all parliamentary control, appears to hold the Treasury at its mercy. A word from the MI and a minister will refuse to answer a question in Parliament, some possibly harmless person will have his privacy sacrificed, some ambitious young man will be denied for ever the chance of following the career he wants. He can appeal to a committee, theoretically, against the charge, that is, if he knows anything about it. Even the accounts are secret, concealed even from the Prime Minister, the men in the War Office, and from most of the MI men themselves. The great curse of this organization is its complete unaccountability to anyone. It holds up a great "Keep Away" notice for the Establishment. It has never relaxed from wartime pressure. Great areas of public life are shrouded in this way from the arc lights of public curiosity—even retired generals have to get special permission to publish their memoirs. The power of the Official Secrets Act is so great—its prohibition is absolute and unqualified—that it encourages one to assume that everything is secret unless specially exempted.

Keeping it quiet

The annoying thing about the trial was that so much of it was in camera. At the end the judge

told the jury—whom he dismissed after directing them to find a verdict of guilty—to forget everything they had heard as quickly as possible. I kept looking at them to see whether their features indicated signs of moral shock after each closed session. But

juries never seem perturbed about anything.

The lesson

The lesson to be learned from this pointless affair is that the Left, in the interests of demo-

and YS Notebooker Bob Flagg adds a postscript

I FEEL THAT Comrade Witney's hope that the next Labour government will disband the Military Intelligence "service" is little founded on the sad facts. Before the Right-Wing faces up to the more grotesque faces of the Hydra of contemporary capitalism, and tries to cut them out, they will have to mount a serious assault on the more obvious features — rent, interest,

profits for example. . . . And the history of Isis at the end of last term seems to support this. For over two years now, this venerable Oxford institution has become more and more "political." Last term, matters came to a head; first the H-Bomb, then attacks on the Queen, and Freemasonry, goaded the proprietor to action. The outgoing editor's nomination for successor was re-

jected, and the proprietor appointed a rich, raw young man to substitute pages of sport—beagling, polo?—for politics and theatre (immoral). However the raw young man was persuaded not to take the post, and the left's nominee was reinstated. But—and here lies the moral—no more attacks, on Freemasonry, Queens or H-Bombs. . . .

THE MOVEMENT

TODAY ERNEST TOLLER is all but forgotten; the plays he wrote are rarely, if ever performed; they are set against a background that might never have existed. But this background—the Germany of the years 1914-1923—helped to form the Europe we have come to know and (if we are honest with ourselves) come to dread too.

Toller was the head of the third Bavarian Soviet, and after the brutal triumph of the Ebert-Noske counter-revolution he was lucky to escape with five years in a fortress-prison. He saw the hope of democracy literally smashed in blood; his comrades tortured and murdered with barely a pretence of justice; and the forerunners of the soon-to-be familiar storm-troops marching through the streets of Munich.

"To the Memory of the Sailors Köbis and Reichpietsch who were shot on September 5th, 1917": so runs the dedication to Toller's play *Draw the Fires*. Köbis and Reichpietsch are two of the leaders of a Wilhelmshaven sailors' revolt. A year previously the German and the British fleets had met at Jutland. National solidarity in Germany—alarmingly expressed in 1914 by the Social Democratic Party's *volte face* and acceptance of the war—was crumbling in the face of terrible privations. As in the case of Russia, it was the military rank-and-file who suffered most. They were making the sacrifices—but for whom? . . . and for what? What did the Kaiser or the patriotic image mean to men dying in the filth of trenches, or being snuffed out in the giant hull of a battleship? What price "my country right or wrong" when there was no bread, and meat was crawling with maggots? The disenchantment was made more bitter and more final by the existence of a ruling class that made no sacrifices, only anguished utterances about "our boys doing their duty for the Fatherland".

Remember Toller writes M. Maddison

In *Draw the Fires!* we see the growth of political consciousness; the sailors experience the moment of truth and take the road to Damascus. Power falls eventually into their hands—"like a rotten apple," a perceptive stoker explains. "I tell you I don't like it at all," he goes on with a flash of intuition.

The sailors have the power, and the authorities are paralysed—for a time. But there is retri-

bution—Köbis and Reichpietsch die, executed for treason; see the fruits of their leadership. Was theirs, then, a pointless death? They had no inkling of the events of the next three decades; but does that make their action folly? There have been men like Köbis and Reichpietsch since—men with vision, true revolutionaries. There will be men like them again in the future. History will prove them, and not the sceptics or the pessimists, right.

SR BOOK SERVICE

35b Priory Terrace, London, NW6

Mosley—end from page 8

countries, if they can be persuaded to join the union, they prove to be very loyal members. The AEU in Birmingham did well some time ago to issue a leaflet directed to coloured immigrants pointing out the advantages of belonging to the union, and in the Standard and BMC strikes in 1956 the coloured workers proved their loyalty quite as well as the other workers, in some cases coming out 100 per cent where the rest of the shop was not solid. In the recent London strikes, coloured workers again proved their solidarity: The writer has come across no case of blacklegging on the part of coloured workers in any strike.

Misery for all

If there should be large-scale unemployment, a few thousand coloured workers would not

make the slightest difference to the prevailing misery. In the early 'thirties there were no coloured workers to speak of in Britain. Unemployment then embraced three million British workers.

Class the problem

Today, except for a few patches, there is full employment, with 25 million at work. There are 190,000 coloured immigrants in Britain, that is, one in 263 of the population or one in 115 of the workers. In full employment if the working class is united, extra organized workers can only add to working-class strength.

Our job is to make it clear to the whole people; class is the problem, not colour. Down with racialism and the society which breeds it! Join hands with the exploited of all colours to strike at the heart of our system—class division.

Mosley's Men—ctd

them was paying one guinea per week to live and sleep, some four in one room, with no fire precaution. A social worker in Birmingham found cases of three married couples in one room, in some houses 40 to 50 people. The same person reported a case in which one landlord collected £500 a week from 12 houses. It is quite common for landlords to charge vastly different rents for white and coloured people for exactly the same accommodation, and yet, the coloured immigrants are forced to accept these conditions. A *News Chronicle* (June 6, 1956) correspondent reported that only about 1 landlady in 5 would take coloured lodgers.

One would have hoped that the working class would have stood out solidly against this effort by their very own exploiters to split their ranks. Unfortunately it cannot be said that its ranks are firmly closed on this issue. Trade unionists may remember the disgraceful strike of West Bromley bus crews in 1955 over the employment of one single coloured worker (an Indian). In the same year members of the Transport and General Workers Union in Nottingham threatened to strike if coloured conductors were promoted to drivers before every white conductor had been given the chance. (They were later won over to a different viewpoint). Unrest among Birmingham transport workers led to a plebiscite on the employment of coloured workers. (The majority were against discrimination). At a conference of officials from leading unions in December 1954, a prominent Midland trade union official proposed that in case of unemployment, coloured workers should go first and in promotion white workers should have preference. (No seconder could be found and he was heckled throughout his speech).

Who is to blame?

Even from these facts, it is clear that an attitude of discrimination is by no means universal in the trade unions. Many unions, after discussing the question, have passed resolutions against any discrimination by race, colour or creed with regard to employment, promotion and firing (if redundancy occurs).

In April, 1955, Birmingham's Labour-controlled City Council passed, unanimously, a resolution that all Corporation posts, including town clerkship, should be open to persons of any creed and colour. The Birmingham Trades Council resolved by an overwhelming majority to oppose the restriction of immigration (February, 1956).

Typical of many statements is that of a shop stewards' committee in a large metal works. To the suggested employment of coloured labour, the committee replied:

We have no colour bar like some misguided organizations. All workers are on equal terms and provided our coloured friends join the appropriate trade unions, work at the rate for the job and obey the rules, they will receive the same consideration as anyone else.

The housing shortage, prevalent in all industrial centres of the world, is chronic in the poor

districts where the coloured people have come to stay. The position is so bad in North Kensington that the Council has simply given up and closed the housing list. Who is to blame? None other than the capitalist Government. But how useful a weapon for its peripheral fascist riff-raff to use to create dissension among the people, and how obnoxious the fodder given by the Tory MP for Central Nottingham, Colonel Cordeaux. When, after much sweat and toil, a small number of coloured people manage to ease their housing problem by buying a house, Colonel Cordeaux finds this to say: "It is . . . important to have a Bill to protect Englishmen against foreigners who buy up property and exploit Englishmen by charging exorbitant rent."

Insecurity and fear

Sexual jealousy is an immediately noticeable factor in the trouble. There are many more men among the immigrants than women, and in Nottingham there are more white women than men. But why should sexual jealousy be more virulent with regard to coloured than white men? Again the cause goes deep down to the roots of the social system which by white nations' exploiting the black peoples of this world, has encouraged the white man to consider himself superior and despise the association of his women folk with coloured men.

Of all feelings best suited to exploitation by fascist elements, insecurity and fear are the strongest. In the capitalist system which uses human beings as tools for profit-making, fear and insecurity are always either present or just around the corner. Perhaps the most potent factor working behind the scenes of the riots is the fear of unemployment. Nottingham has its highest number of unemployed since the war. Actually coloured workers suffer much more from unemployment than white, owing both to the fact that they are mostly unskilled and to colour prejudice on the part of managements and many misguided workers. There are about 3,000 coloured people in Nottingham's population of about 330,000, that is, less than 1 per cent of the total population, or over 2 per cent of the unemployed population. Yet of the 2,000 unemployed in the town, about 430 are coloured, i.e.: over 21 per cent.

Notting Hill Nazis

Exploiting these insecure conditions of capitalism are various racist organisations, Mosley's Union Movement in particular, is making magnificent capital out of the lumpen potentialities of the areas where coloured people are forced by the hidden colour bar of the more "respectable" areas to live. They have distributed a number of leaflets with the general tenor: "Protect your jobs—stop coloured invasion," have held a public meeting in the middle of the troubled area of Notting Hill, and have done all in their power, abetted by the League of Empire Loyalists and the Ku-Klux-Klan, to rule the streets. Their accusations remind one very much of the accusations made by the Nazis against the

Jews. These were the "international bankers" or "Communists" according to which you wished to harangue at the time. The coloured people are accused of "riding around in Rolls Royces and Cadillacs," "one month after he got off the boat buying a house and a big car," (quoted in the *Observer*, September 7), or alternatively of being filthy, ragged, illiterate.

Fight the gangs

To combat the activity of these gangs it is necessary to meet them where they are—in the streets. We must press our Labour Parties, trade unions and other organizations to which we belong, to conduct open-air mass meetings in the heart of the troubled spots. Upholders of elementary democracy for our coloured brethren will flock in thousands to such meetings.

Nottingham Socialists are to be congratulated on holding a meeting of coloured and white inhabitants the very day after the first outbreak, a meeting that proved peaceful (bullies are cowards) and entirely successful.

In addition, where it is at all feasible it is important to organize defence teams to go to the places where trouble is likely to break out, first to protect the coloured people by frightening away the gangs, and to speak to the onlookers and others in the area, reassuring them that the streets will not be monopolized by the hooligans, and winning doubters over to a sympathetic attitude to their coloured neighbours, whose lives are after all so much like their own, only perhaps harder.

Letters to the press, petitions, open churches, are important, but cannot compare in success with street activity, where the trouble takes place and the local population is sure to be encountered.

In addition, in our places of work, it is important to get over to the workers that it is the same government and the same bosses who exploit both the colonial workers and the British, and the most successful answer from the workers' point of view to their "divide and rule" policy should be "unity is strength."

Unite!

Draw the colonial workers who are unorganized into the trade union ranks. They are often reticent to do this or take part in any political activity for fear of repercussions either here or at home where they mostly hope to return, which would take away any security they may with difficulty have achieved. However, with the antagonism to exploitation that they drew in with their mother's milk in their home

turn back to page 7

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published twice a month by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, 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.

All communications to be addressed to the publisher, M. Maddison, 21 Aubert Park, London, N5
Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. TU, Potter Street, Harlow, Essex.

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 establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all instance representatives must be subject to frequent election, immediate recall, and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.
- 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.