

# SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

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

8th YEAR No 19

MID-OCTOBER 1, 1958

SIXPENCE

## VERDICT ON SCARBOROUGH

ANOTHER Labour Party conference has come and gone. What did it demonstrate? What verdict should we members pass on it?

First, the H-bomb. This was the most serious problem on the agenda of the conference, as it is the most serious on the agenda of mankind. This was the issue which had attracted most of the resolutions and probably aroused the deepest feelings among the delegates and those they represented.

Yet the only clear-cut statement that Bevan was prepared to make from the platform was to repeat the promise that the Party in power would end tests. He refused to be committed to ending the manufacture of the bomb. "We are not pledging ourselves to make it; we are not pledging ourselves not to make it, because we do not know what kind of weapon it will be." What a lame excuse! People are living their lives under the constant shadow of hideous destruction, they desperately want a lead, a real policy to end this nightmare and all the Labour Party leadership and its Foreign Secretary-designate can offer is . . . this wretched shilly-shallying. How can the "kind of weapon" affect the issue. Surely, a fundamental question such as this can and must be settled as one of principle. **Is it justifiable to manufacture and therefore be prepared to use one sort of bomb and not another sort? The people who would be killed or mutilated by any bomb are not likely to be worried by nice distinctions such as this.**

### Disaster in NATO

When he came to deal with the fundamental problem in foreign policy—the division of the world between the conflicting imperialisms of Russia and America, Bevan revealed again the emptiness of the leadership's policy.

Although his speech was spiced with some easy gibes at Selwyn Lloyd and that other sitting target, Foster Dulles, it contained no real analysis of the causes of international tension and wars, no specific solution to the problems. "We must learn how to live together" was the theme, "the common sense of the whole world" would be needed. Such pious platitudes do not get anyone very far. And when Gaitskell came to wind up he revealed even more plainly how close, in reality, is the official Labour policy to the Conservative policy. "I would regard a decision . . . to leave NATO . . . as disastrously dangerous to the peace of the world." Gaitskell or Macmillan?

### Pianissimo policies

There was no hint from any of the leaders of a Socialist foreign policy, of a determination to cut lose from the sordid manoeuvrings of imperialism and to establish the common front of the workers of all countries. But, of course, the concept of class divisions is one of those outmoded ideas which doesn't fit the leadership's new image of the Labour Party. Such a dirty word as class must not be mentioned.

At this conference, as at all others held in the shadow of a general election, the platform pulled out all the stops of "party loyalty": "don't do anything to antagonize the floating voter," "don't tie our hands when we get back to office."

This device was used as an argument against nationalizing the land. Crossman defended **Prosper the Plough** on the grounds that to win the next election Labour would have to make inroads on the Tory agricultural constituencies and that to do this it was necessary to be "cautious." The way to formulate a policy is not to study and seek to understand the economic situation, analyse its problems, decide on

the solution and then go all out to demonstrate to the workers—the main progressive force in society—that it is the correct solution. Instead, the process is stood on its head. First, decide what programme you think some sections of the electorate want. Choose those sections whose views will be the least determinate—the "floating voter" who by definition cannot make up his mind, or, if the working class, then the least politically conscious and militant members—then think up arguments to justify the conclusions you reach.

Of course, the whole business of arguing about what the electorate will stand for is only a convenient means of justifying the retreat from Socialism. **It is**

**overlooked that Labour's greatest electoral triumph so far, in 1945, was won on a policy which appealed directly to the workers and which they believed represented the first instalment of socialism. The middle class and its floating voters will never be attracted towards Socialism by a watered down Tory policy. If that is all the Labour Party offers, the great majority of the middle class will prefer undiluted Toryism.**

Right through the speeches of the platform ran the assumption, whether stated or only implicit, that the job of the Labour Party is to be a Parliamentary opposition, to take turn and turn about with the Tories, to keep the capitalist system ticking over, perhaps

*turn to back page*

SR industrial reporter

John Phillips gives the facts behind

## The Southbank lockout

READERS of these industrial pages will be familiar with some of the disputes which have taken place on the South Bank building site over the last few months.

The latest action taken by Mc-Alpines, the main contractors, that of sacking the whole labour force of 1250 men, is by far the most vicious and provocative that they have hitherto taken.

### Background

Let us examine the events which led to the dispute. The men have for some time been in dispute with the employers over the workings of the bonus scheme, and the latest plan put forward by the employers was rejected as being unacceptable. While this matter was being solved, a non-union man was taken on and put to work with the steel fixers and benders. He was repeatedly approached by the stewards to join the union, but refused each time.

Meanwhile the bonus scheme issue had come to no satisfactory conclusion as far as the men were

concerned, and so it was agreed to work to rule: namely that day shifts work a 44-hour week and night shifts would work a four-night week. On one of the nights that there was no shift, the non-union member continued to work. The stewards then approached the management and asked that the blackleg be removed from the site. This was refused, whereupon the steel fixers and benders went on strike.

Let it be quite clear at this stage that **the strike was over the employment of non-union labour and not over the implementation of the bonus scheme, as some newspapers would have us believe.** The management were given four days' warning that the strike would take place, which in fact started on September 16th. On the night of September 24th, some of the stewards sat on the steps of Transport House in order to get attention and official recognition of the dispute.

The following morning the Federation Steward, Hugh Cassidy, had an interview with Frank

**Transport worker see pp 2-4**  
**Labour party views pp 4-5**  
**Dr Zhivago, etc. pp 6-8**

## INDUSTRIAL

ROBERT EMMETT surveys the Tories' policy towards the nationalised industries and puts the case for a

# People's Inquiry into London Transport

**M**ETHODICALLY, deliberately, and in line with a preconceived political plan, the Tories are proceeding to destroy the people's transport services in the Capital City of London. In this plan they have the full co-operation of the stooges which they themselves have appointed as the "London Transport Executive."

## The Tories' aim

Their aim is not merely to use these services as a vast milch-cow to serve the interests of bondholders and tax collectors, not alone to depress wage rates and conditions of the staffs to bolster a general policy of wage restraint, but, also in the process to present the results of their own policy as the "fruits of nationalization," as a dreadful warning to the electorate as to what may be ex-

pected from any possible return of a Labour Government in the future.

During the months of May and June the entire road transport services were brought to a complete standstill as part of the Tory plan to use the London busmen as the cosh with which to beat down the rising wage movement throughout the country.

## Underground scab

**That they only partially succeeded in this aim was due to the magnificent fighting spirit of the London busmen during a seven-week strike. That they succeeded to any degree at all was due to a trade union set-up that permitted the underground railway system to be used as a flagrant strike-breaking instrument against the busmen — strike-breaking which, to their everlasting**

**shame, was encouraged and even publicly defended by the General Council of the TUC.**

Hardly had the wheels begun to turn again after the strike settlement than the LTE, with Tory backing, announced a ten percent reduction in all bus services. Whole routes were wiped off the map. More than 32 million miles were lopped off bus operations. Six hundred buses were put into mothballs and jacked up in the garages. Some 3,000 drivers and conductors and 650 maintenance men were made redundant. The queues lengthened as the service deteriorated, the Londoner was given the choice—"wait or walk."

## Forced down below

One of the declared aims of the LTE in cutting bus services was to "persuade" more Lon-

doners to use the underground railway system in preference to buses. The golden harvest that flowed into their coffers from this source while the buses were strike-bound had shown them that here was a source of revenue that had not yet been milked dry.

In fact, a very considerable transference of passengers to the underground railway system began immediately the first bus cuts began on August 20th. Incidentally, there is absolutely no limit on the number of human beings that may be stacked into trains in the dark bowels of London, although common decency has fixed a legal limit to the number of pigs that may be so transported.

Having thus forced tens of thousands of passengers, willy-nilly, to go "down below," the London Transport Executive, which, ironically, boasts the motto "Strong for Service," made its next public spirited move, by cutting the underground railway services also. Stations are to be closed down; first trains are to start half-an-hour later; last trains will finish half-an hour earlier.

An ever-declining service manned by an ever-declining staff. Fewer buses—fewer trains—longer queues—public irritation and frustration—with untold man-hours lost to production in the process. Such is the crowning achievement of the LTE ten years after the services were nationalized "in the public interests."

## Jacking up the fares

And, even as they mutilate the people's transport services with their right hand, the LTE's left hand is already preparing the next fares increase. For the 13th time in a single decade London must dig into its pockets for more millions to bolster and sustain a bunch of Tory stooges who, had they been operating a private enterprise, would long ago have been sacked for sheer incompetence.

How long is London to suffer under this set-up? How long will the Labour Movement, which, remember, was responsible for this so-called "nationalization," permit the Tories to use London Transport as a political punch-bag?

The London County Council, which, next to Parliament itself,

## Southbank lockout — end

Cousins who recommended a return to work. The stewards then went immediately back to the site and recommended a return to work. This was accepted by the men and the management were informed that the men would be starting work at 11 o'clock that morning.

## Lock-out

The management refused to accept this and then embarked upon their sacking spree. **It is interesting to note that there is ample evidence that the cards of the first 600 men were made up on the previous day (Wednesday) and were seen in McAlpine's office. In other words, before the decision of the men was known.** That was the position when notices, put up by the Civil Engineering Conciliation Board, of the sackings, were first posted up.

It is worthwhile to quote one or two points from this notice. (The Board is composed of four representatives of the T&GWU, four from the NUGMW, four from other building unions, and six from the employers).

Work has been repeatedly disrupted by a small minority of the labour force who have called a number of unofficial strikes and imposed embargoes on the recruitment of additional operatives. Sir Robert McAlpine and Sons had no alternative but to take the action they have taken.

## Stewards' lead

So much for Union support so far. Another example of how the "representatives" of the men were given their "support" was highlighted the following day at a mass meeting held on the site. Thus spoke Jack Ryan (divisional secretary of the AUBTW).

I am not concerned with whether or not this constitutes a lock-out. The most important thing is to look to the future . . . etc . . .

A brighter gleam came from

Fred Copeman (CEU), who hinted that action may be taken by his union members on other sites. The real fighting came from Hugh Cassidy who stated in no uncertain terms:

This isn't just McAlpines you are fighting. It's the whole Tory government and its policy . . . We are going to fight until every man is reinstated on the job.

After this meeting the stewards met and drew up the following resolutions:

1. That we now consider ourselves in dispute with McAlpines until such time as the sacked men on this site are all reinstated, and that we give the resolution maximum publicity.

2. That the works committee on this job must be present at all meetings of the affiliated trade union organizations held with McAlpines to discuss reinstatement. We feel we cannot accept the decision of McAlpines to sack wholesale and reinstate whom he pleases. Our policy is to go back as we came out—in an organized body.

Compare these words with the spineless utterances from the Union officials. Let us look at the record of the Unions in the dispute.

## Unions' record

**First, even though it is a trade union principle not to work with "nons," the TGWU refused to make the strike official. No reason for this decision has been given. Secondly the union-dominated Conciliation Board dared to say that McAlpines had no alternative. (Apparently it was too shameful to think of sacking the blackleg). Thirdly, all the building unions have rejected the second item from the shop stewards resolution to allow the works committee to be present at discussions between the management. No reason has been given for this decision. Fourthly, none of the unions has to date given any information whatsoever as to what is happening between them and the management. So much**

**for official class warfare.**

As for the "agitators" and militants, what have they done? By far the most important is a **resolution passed by all London branches of the Steel Fixers and Benders declaring the South Bank black until all the men are reinstated.** This means that McAlpines can employ all the building workers in London if they want to, but it will be impossible to start the job again without the steel fixers and benders.

What are the lessons to be drawn from the dispute? The most obvious is that there was a good deal of conspiracy on the part of the bosses, a ball set rolling by the Cohen Report. Also that the Unions must be given a good hard kick where it hurts, and their disgusting behaviour be taken to heart by all militant trade unionists. That the National Federation of Building Trades Operatives must be split wide open and rank and file site organizations based on industrial unionism be put in its place. Finally let all resolutions like the Steel Fixers and Benders' get the fullest support both in word and deed. **DECLARE McALPINES BLACK UNTIL ALL THE MEN ARE REINSTATED. BEAT McALPINES' LOCK-OUT.**

## 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

is the biggest representative body on a common franchise, is objecting to the latest proposed fares increase and has briefed counsel to argue its case before a Fares Tribunal. In the working class areas a number of local Borough Councils have protested against cuts in services. Local trades councils, Labour Parties, and other bodies are also protesting. Correspondence columns in scores of local newspapers bear eloquent witness to widespread public discontent—much of which is being turned into Tory electioneering propaganda.

### Milking the industry

**The time is ripe—rotten ripe—for a real, genuine inquiry into the affairs of London Transport. "Inquiries" have been held in the past, conducted by Tory nominees. This time a "People's Inquiry" in which those who use the vehicles and those who man them play a decisive role must get to grips with the problem.**

At the last inquiry into London Transport, conducted by the Chambers Committee in 1955, the terms of reference specifically ruled out from consideration two matters, i.e., "Finance" and "Control." This meant that no consideration could be given to such matters as the £5½ million annual tribute paid to bondholders, the £4 million annual rake-off taken by the Government via the penal 2/6 a gallon tax on fuel oil, nor the £1 million annual charge for the privilege of permitting "State"-owned buses to run on "State"-owned roads.

Even more important, it meant that such an "inquiry" could make no investigation of the political set-up by which a Tory Government was enabled to manipulate London Transport in the interests of bondholders and moneylenders on the one hand and of the Tory central office propaganda department on the other.

Small wonder that such an "inquiry" brought no relief to ten million Londoners who lie at the tender mercies of the LTE monopoly.

The overwhelming mass of LTE passengers are working people—the bulk of them trade unionists. The London County Council is a Labour-controlled body, as are the majority of London's Borough Councils. The biggest trade union in the country is the Transport & General Workers' Union—the body that organizes the bulk of London Transport staff.

### A people's inquiry

**There is overwhelming justification and the most urgent need for the elected representatives and trade union organizations in London to demand a "People's Inquiry" into London Transport.**

**Let the London Labour Party, the London Trades Council, the London Labour MPs, County and Borough Councillors, together with the representatives of the trade unions directly involved in the operation of LTE services, get together.**

**Let this mess of Tory corruption be cleared up as a preliminary to the operation of a real transport system for the Capital City—a system run for the people and controlled by the people.**

# TRANSPORT

## I — DOCKLAND RETREATS says Porticus

A FEW SHORT WEEKS ago, the National Press, albeit somewhat grudgingly, was eulogizing the men of Tooley Street for their firm and unbending stand on points of principle. From the moment the strike started in the Cold Store Sector until the end on June 22nd last nothing could deter them.

Other Sectors were in and out with the speed of the oars in a Varsity Boat Race, but Tooley Street and Tooley Street alone stood firm until their demands were satisfied.

It cost them six weeks' money, money they could ill afford, but to satisfy their trade union principles they gladly made the sacrifice, until eventually, realizing they could never be broken down, the Minister of Labour intervened to settle the Meat Drivers' issue and in consequence resolved the main issue of the Dock Strike.

### Come on, Tooley St.

Today, if rumour is to be believed, it appears that the mantle of leadership has been too hard to bear, for one hears the most distracting items of news from that famous street, which, if they are true, suggest a softening of backbone to a distressing degree and augurs ill times in the future.

Something has happened which if it had been suggested a few short months ago would have created uproar throughout the Sector. **Payment for bales of hessian in Java Wharf has been reduced by 2/- without the slightest protest from the men concerned.**

It is, of course, possible that the rest of the men in the "Street" have not yet heard of this event and are without knowledge of this initial attempt to worsen the conditions under which they work, but surely once this fact is made known **there must be a protest of the most vehement nature, for if one employer is allowed to get away with this sort of thing then it won't be very long before all other employers are tempted to try the same thing.**

Come on, Tooley Street! Let us see a spark of that wonderful spirit that made you the most talked of area in Dockland. The world looks to you for leadership in these matters. Tell these employers that you will not accept a worsening of conditions, that you are still pre-eminent in the fight for improvement, and that the slightest attempt to retard progress will be met by action of the strongest possible nature. Wake up, Tooley Street! The world is watching.

Despite the item above it is pleasant indeed to write that the one thing in which dockers everywhere are never lacking is their generosity to colleagues in distress, for having heard of the sad

case of Bro Jimmy Fullerton, all Sectors responded in the manner for which they are renowned.

The Meat Drivers, with whom Jimmy had worked in the past, immediately upon hearing of his death, made a grant of £200, the London Docks had a collection which reached something like

## 2—TROUBLE ON THE TRACK by Cllr N F Bradshaw, Newcastle

NINETY-FIVE percent of engine drivers are disgruntled, aggrieved and disturbed by the way British Railways are introducing its modernization scheme. Still greater annoyance is being caused by the fact that there is no tangible evidence that the Unions are doing anything about it. They appear to be sitting idly by while British Railways tramples upon workers' interests.

Even before modernization started, being an engine driver was no joyride. Awkward, irregular turns, often involving walking to work at 3 and 4 in the morning, has always been his lot. It seriously interferes with his social life. He is unable to make any definite plans because he is never sure what time will actually be his own. This is particularly irk-

**NORMAN BRADSHAW, who has been a railwayman all his life, is deputy leader of the Labour Group on the Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council. He was Mayor of the Borough from 1955 to 1957. During his term of office, he was the only Mayor in Britain to show solidarity with the ASLEF strike by coming out on strike himself.**

some to the family man. Frequently it leads him to feel that he is married to his job—not his wife—since he must turn out for work, irrespective of his own inclinations, whenever he is wanted.

### No easy matter

Besides being at British Railways' beck and call, engine drivers must be prepared to shoulder immense responsibility. Thousands of lives are in his hands. A moment's inattention, a signal missed—perhaps due to fatigue—can lead to awful disaster.

British Railways fully recognize this fact. It demands 100 percent physical fitness from its drivers, with regular medical check-ups. So stringent are its requirements that nobody wearing glasses is allowed to drive a train.

And driving a train is no easy matter. Drivers are now expected

## TU COMMENTARY

£130, Tooley Street handed over £118 10s., and another Sector has laid on a Boxing Tournament, the proceeds of which are to go to the widow.

**A truly wonderful effort indeed on the part of all concerned, but a terrible indictment of a system which permits 100,000 men to work without any provision for the future. When, oh when, is our Union going to wake up and fight for a Pension Scheme to meet the needs of the time?**

to be familiar with diesels as well as ordinary steam locomotives. When BR's modernization plans become slightly more advanced, they will also have to know how to drive a third type of engine—the electric train.

### Don't economise on us

An engine driver's job is skilled, requires a high level of physical fitness, and carries considerable responsibility. How much should he expect to earn? **Present rates, introduced in June, give a top link driver only £11 9s. 6d. for a 44-hour week. He gets £2 a week if ill. There is no superannuation scheme.**

Yet, even these miserable conditions are threatened by the way modernization is being intro-

duced. For, unless the unions are very careful, it will lead to wholesale redundancy. This can clearly be illustrated from my own personal experience. Driving a train from Stoke-on-Trent to Birmingham used to be a day's work. Now, in one 8-hour shift, a driver can go from Stoke-on-Trent to Birmingham, come back, and then do a return run to Manchester. As diesels only carry a driver, this means that **one man is now doing the work previously done by two drivers and two firemen.**

Railway economies such as these, carried out at the expense of the workers, must not be allowed to occur. Rank-and-file pressure must be brought to bear on the unions to resist strenuously any redundancy and down-grading. Modernization will result in many benefits for the Transport Commission through increased revenue. It is only right that these should be more evenly shared with the workers.

**ROAD HAULAGE — next page**

**TU COMMENTARY**

### 3. Road Haulage : Section 19 of the "Gorgonzola Cheese Act"

**T**HIS IS THE ACT with the "bigger and better" loopholes very much favoured by hungry drivers and unscrupulous operators. It is an Act famous for the ambiguity that permits a driver to do some form of work in garage, depot or warehouse not actually connected with his load or vehicle for any length of time and then go out with a load of wheeled death for eleven hours' driving. This is the Act that was legislated after years of trade union agitation for the protection of the driver against fatigue. And, amazingly enough, it is the principal target for a certain type of man to tear to pieces with cooked double and sometimes treble driving records.

Now ask yourselves, Brothers, is the slackness and very prevalent redundancy all due to a recession in the trade? And what of the head-on collisions on the roads caused by men falling asleep at the wheel? What a consolation to the widows and orphans of the innocent victims—usually a driver proceeding at reasonable speed and exercising the care that his job demands—to be told by the Ministry of National Insurance that such fatalities are classified as hazards of occupation.

And may I assure the reader that the portrait given is not morbidity carried to extremes—would that it were! The facts are there—and plentiful. Unfortu-

**JOE KELLY** the author of this article is a member of the Labour Party, formerly in Brixton and now in Mitcham. As steward for the drivers at Union Cartage he was a prominent member of the Smithfield strike committee wherein his plain and straightforward talking made him a figure of respect. Unassuming to a degree, he has, however, a wonderful grasp of the situation both from a political and a trade union point of view. His plans for the Road Transport Industry, if permitted to mature, could result in an entirely new charter for Road Drivers.—**Editor.**

Some extraordinary things can happen within the Act. Suppose a Ministry of Transport enforcement officer checks up on a driver and vehicle that have just completed a journey of 400 miles. The driver's record shows a stint of, say, 100 miles. Should the driver be asked to explain how he happened to collect the vehicle in question at a point three hundred miles from the original loading point, and he swears that he was brought by car, train or even helicopter, the onus to prove otherwise is on the Ministry's legal department. In fact, the more ridiculous the explanation, the harder it appears to disprove. I should think the lot of the conscientious enforcement officer must be the most frustrating in the whole Civil Service.

**Scabs cause sackings**

I should like the decent driver to think about the details given below, however hypothetical the case might seem. A straightforward firm engaged in long-distance work to Scotland, for example, would have to employ a shunter in London to load the vehicle, then, probably, another driver to take it about 200 miles en route to the half-way line, then another to complete the further 200. Finally, another driver would be employed at the destination town to deliver and probably pick up a return load. **This makes a total of four men engaged for a possible forty-eight hours, as compared with one scab driver who does the complete trip himself in a greatly reduced time, so enabling his unscrupulous employer to slash rates and obtain work formerly done by the bona fide carrier.**

nately they are so familiar and occur with such regularity that the national Press treats them with contempt and leaves the local papers to treat them as newsworthy items. Which all goes to show that a national scandal is not necessarily of national interest.

**What to do**

**It is up to the road transport worker with trade union principles to eliminate these zombies of the road using the trade union branch, the trades councils and every available public body. And again, shortly we shall be solicited by various parliamentary candidates for our votes. What a golden opportunity to obtain a promise (which, I admit, is no guarantee) that the anomalies in the Traffic Act will be given attention with a view to possible amendment and more vigorous enforcement.**

**JOE KELLY**

### Prices and . . . Profits ?

World commodity prices for food have fallen by about 7 percent during the last twelve months; so have food import prices. Yet retail food prices have risen on average nearly 6 percent during the period.

( January, 1956 = 100 )

Food Prices:	1957		1958	
	Apr.	July	Oct.	Jan. Apr.
World Commodity Markets	112	106	104	105 105
UK Imports	102	102	97	94 95
Retail	103	108	105	105 109

Retail food prices, therefore, have not fallen in line with the prices of imported food over the last year or so, though they both rose to a similar extent in 1956.

Treasury Bulletin for Industry, June, 1958.

**LP COMMENTARY**

### Scarlet standard lowered at Scarborough

by **Joe Southall**

**I**T IS DIFFICULT for young men and women, experiencing perhaps their first Labour Party conference, to appreciate to the full the real meaning of the words in the policy documents finally stage-managed and steam-rolled through by the Labour Party leaders and their ever-faithful servants, the over-paid trade union leaders. There is always a great welter of words to listen to, and Socialist sentiments mouthed by the bucketful. But the proof of the pudding is in the eating: how many real plans were really made at Scarborough to bear onwards the red flag of Socialism which the Dribergs, the Bevans and the Wilson-Gaitskells "swore" to do in that final solemn singing which winds up this giant assembly?

As you make your way through the lanes of expensive cars outside the expensive and majestic hotels from your modest accommodation, it gives you a clue to what life is all about in the "mighty" British Labour Movement. It is a racket of the first water and hardly fools a single member of the coming generation. Nearly every one of these great British Socialist leaders is rolling in wealth; they all enjoy the top privileges in the land. It is very natural that they struggle for the right to send their offspring to the Public Schools—that great bastion of privilege. **They will do anything for the workers of Britain and the colonial peoples except live like them and with them.**

Looking at the economic doctrine, **Plan for Progress** which

was fathered by **Industry and Society** the year before, it is essentially an address to capitalist intelligentsia—a pleading for a better and more carefully regulated capitalism. **Never has an economic document been produced in the Labour Party which so completely deserts the working class and fails utterly to raise a single worker's pulse rate in contemplating the possible advent of a Labour Government after the next General Election.** It is said freely by the newspapermen that Harold Wilson paces his bedroom the night before rehearsing his wise-cracking against Macmillan which helps to obscure the real ideas he is parading. It is Keynesian economic doctrine in the raw without a hint of apology. The idea of organizing the working class for the overthrow of the capitalist class is completely tossed away.

**H-Bomb apathy**

In the great H-bomb debate no one got to the rostrum to identify the threat with capitalist economics and the real struggle between the powers. Of course, Gaitskell got a great ovation when he made his forthright statement on Quemoy—but **how to fight for this stand was completely avoided.** If Suez is anything to go by it means you can call the Tories irresponsible criminals and reach for naughtier words from the dictionary, but when it comes down to brass-tacks, apart from words in Parliament (when it sits) you do absolutely nothing about it.

**Workers against war**

The identification of the working class—the rank-and-file trade unionist—with the Anti-Nuclear Campaign is an urgent necessity. But so far only two or three Labour MPs and one ex-Stalinist trade union leader have given it wholehearted backing. **It cannot succeed unless it wins the working class.**

Those who plead for the bomb—as Bevan does—plead for the interests of British capitalism and its NATO and all the other international alliances and entanglements. What a far cry from the days when Lenin in the first days of Soviet power in Russia

[contd. next page]

**BUILD THE SOCIALIST REVIEW!**

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

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Send to **SOCIALIST REVIEW,**  
**M Maddison, 21 Aubert Park, N5**

# Wanted — a socialist

## colonial policy by Dev Murarka

# POLICY

FOR SOME YEARS a myth has been sedulously propagated by the Establishment. It is claimed that the British Empire was not deliberately created but came into being during a fit of absence of mind. The truth is quite the contrary. But, the propaganda deeply colours the public mind. As a corollary to this legend it is also claimed that the Empire is being liquidated very fast because as people become fit to govern themselves they are being "granted" freedom. There is not a shred of evidence to suggest that this belief in the benevolence of Imperialism is shared by the Cypriots or the Africans in Kenya.

It is necessary, therefore, to remember that the British Empire, like all others, came into being because of certain social and economic factors. It is in the process of slow disintegration as the conditions which made its existence possible have changed. Link by link we can trace its growth and development and how at every stage it was closely connected with changing patterns of exploitation.

### Bones of weavers

As early as the beginning of the sixteenth century, the desire to "subdue, conquer and possess" foreign lands was motivated by the necessity to find markets for British goods. Till the second half of the eighteenth century the exploitation was direct and ruthless but the Industrial Revolution changed the system.

As a result, Britain became the most powerful country in the world. Markets were dominated by British goods which ruined the indigenous handicraft industries everywhere. Coupled with mechanical production here, the colonies provided cheap raw materials and monopoly markets. The bones of the weavers, wrote the British Governor-General of India in 1834, are bleaching the

### Scarlet standard — end

proclaimed an end to secret diplomacy and an end to all agreements sponsored by Tzarism.

And then we have the annual **Tribune** circus when Nye says to Michael you go your way and I will go mine. When Nye—in full oratorical flood—proclaims his belief in extending public ownership and keeps his mouth shut in the conference when Hugh and Harold proceed to bury it. Few Labour activists may have read his disgraceful **News of the World** article on the defence of **Industry and Society** last year. **The urgent need is to solidify the ranks of the Marxist left in the Labour Party and to organize for the impact of the Labour Government which will so easily be ended by the British capitalists with their phoney economic policies and their hesitant semi-imperialist foreign outlook.**

plains of India. This supreme economic power led to the doctrines of free trade and laissez-faire and military conquests elsewhere. Not surprisingly, Cobden and Bright were the most ardent supporters of ruthless suppression of the Indian Revolt in 1857.

### Height and decay

By 1914 the British Empire had spread over 12.7 million square miles. By this time Britain was losing export supremacy under pressure of serious competition from America and Germany. Still, the monopoly colonial market enabled Britain to maintain her leading position as exporter of manufactured goods. Britain also became an exporter of capital, not on a government to government basis, but in the form of private enterprise with the consequence that large parts of the colonies are infested with vast industrial monopolies like Unilever, Dunlop Rubber, ICI and others. If all this is the result of a fit of absent-mindedness, it has been a very profitable fit for the capitalists of Britain.

After the end of First World War signs of decay in the British Empire began to multiply. The Second World War has accelerated the process. In a significant despatch in 1942, the **Times** Singapore correspondent wrote:

"After nearly 120 years of British rule, the vast majority of Asiatics were not sufficiently interested in the continuance of this rule to take any steps to ensure its continuance . . . British rule and culture and the small British community formed no more than a thin and brittle veneer." (February 18, 1942.)

### Economic reason

The **Times** correspondent was too integral a part of the Establishment to mention the extraordinary capacity of "the small British community" to hang on like leeches and, as opposed to "the vast majority of Asiatics" the necessity of a small minority of Asians to collaborate with the foreign masters.

The Second World War shattered the myth of Western military invincibility. This strengthened enormously the Colonial Freedom movements all over the Empire. Bigger units like India and Burma, where national movements were better organized took advantage of Britain's weakness after the war to force a settlement. Elsewhere the struggle continued in a sharper form. The "granting of freedom" did not take place in these countries without struggle. Many are still struggling. Troops were withdrawn from one place only to be deposited in another. Cyprus replaced the Canal Zone. Malaya and Singapore replaced India and Burma. So much for British guidance to self-government!

This political obstinacy is not without economic reason. The colonial and ex-colonial countries

make possible the solvency of the Sterling Area. On the other hand, the determination of the colonial peoples to attain freedom is strengthened in the face of economic exploitation, poverty, hunger, and disease. How miserable their condition of living is can be measured from the facts given in the Labour Party's second statement on Colonial Policy. For instance the average budgetary expenditure on education in colonial territories as a whole in 1954 was eight shillings per head, ranging from £4 1s. 10d. in the Falklands to 1s. 7d. in Somaliland. This can be compared with the figure of £12 5s. 0d. in the United Kingdom. The same applies in the fields of Health, Agriculture, etc. The people in the colonial territories are increasingly becoming aware of their plight and see in freedom the necessary prelude to economic development.

### Labour's policy

The colonial question is assuming greater and greater importance in world affairs. This is reflected in three Labour Party pamphlets on Colonial Policy. We must examine these statements from a socialist standpoint and as members of the Labour Party. **Our first duty is to the colonial people who must be set free to raise their standard of living, to end exploitation by foreign capitalists and to find their due place in the modern world in a Socialist society. Added up, how-**

**ever, the Labour Party policy is a very tame one. It is reformist, obsessively constitutional and lacking true appreciation of colonial people's needs. It is better than Tory policy but this should not be a criterion for the Labour Party.**

### Details

Examined in detail, it gives an impression of being confused by some immediate complications. For instance, on the question of abolition of racial discrimination in colonies, the policy is full of safeguards for white minorities. True, in principal, the policy statement declares its belief in racial equality, but the extraordinary emphasis on what are termed transitional arrangements, defeats this purpose. There is also a dangerous tendency to champion minorities and show a lack of faith in majorities. On page 38 of **The Plural Society**, it is stated: "It may even be necessary to invest Governors with reserve powers for a period to protect legitimate minority interests against excessive nationalist ardour." The Tories could not have phrased it better. Such reserve powers have always been misused to the advantage of rulers in the past and it should not be advocated by the Labour Party. Our policy should be based on creating those economic conditions which make racialism impossible.

(turn to next page)

## VFS economic policy placed under a microscope by P Mansell

**INDUSTRY YOUR SERVANT** is Victory for Socialism's counterblast to the NEC's **Plan for Progress**, dealing with the economic and financial policies to be followed by the next Labour Government.

The pamphlet exposes the difficulty of effective central control over private capitalism. It emphasises the various ways in which firms can evade or infringe the Government's plan. To that extent it is more realistic than **Plan for Progress**, which blandly ignored these problems.

### Classes forgotten

Yet the greater part of the pamphlet assumes the indefinite continuance of the mixed economy and deals with methods of manipulating and not replacing the private sector. Discriminatory interest rates (e.g., to encourage industries towards the development areas) are proposed, not the nationalization of the banks. Taxation should be adjusted to encourage the ploughing back of profits and to penalise their distribution to shareholders.

**The main weakness in the pamphlet is the lack of any clear recognition of the class structure of society and of the role of the**

**State. The State is assumed to be an independent organ of power, capable of adaptation to different social objectives, instead of the instrument of the capitalist class.**

### Frontal assault

The fundamental character of the change from capitalism to socialism is glossed over. The final section of the pamphlet deals with "the transition to socialism." It envisages a step-by-step process, heavier death duties, a capital levy, etc. These are, of course, very good demands; so is the demand for the books and accounts of private companies to be open to inspection. But it is living in a dream world to suppose that the capitalists will sit back and allow the central bastion of their power to be captured, though they may be prepared to yield a few crumbling outworks.

Capitalism can only be finally overthrown by a frontal assault requiring the mobilization of the workers to take over both economic and political power. Capitalism has long outlived its usefulness. **Socialists should not be thinking in terms of how to manipulate such a system but of how quickly it can be replaced.**

## BOOKS

MAURICE SHADBOLT introduces the important new Russian novel

# PASTERNAK'S "DR ZHIVAGO"

If all the world became one stretch of asphalt, eventually a crack would appear somewhere and grass begin to grow again.—Ilya Ehrenburg, speaking of Boris Pasternak.

NOT so very long ago I sat across the table from Alexei Surkov, secretary of the All-Union of Soviet Writers, and talked about freedom of publication in the Soviet Union.

At that time the new Soviet atmosphere gave reason for optimism on the subject. Vladimir Dudinstev's *Not by Bread Alone*, though severely criticized, had after all been published in the Soviet Union; so similarly had Vladimir Nekrassov's *The Town*, Ehrenburg's *The Thaw*, and the recent novels of Vera Panova. The editorial staff of *Literaturnaya Moskva*, where Alexander Yashin and other brilliant young writers critical of Soviet society had first published, was still intact. And Konstantin Simonev still edited the lively magazine *Novy Mir*, from which the name Dudinstev first exploded upon the world.

I did not find that meeting with Surkov altogether satisfactory; there were a number of points I wished cleared up, and we were to have met again.

### Why no meeting

But that second meeting never took place.

I was not to know it then, but

the Khrushchev report on art and literature had already been delivered. And when I called again at that fine old Moscow house at Vorovskovy Street, which once served Tolstoy at a model for the home of the Rostovs in *War and Peace* and which now shelters the Soviet Writers' Union, I found Surkov gone.

As it turned out, Surkov's absence answered, in a manner profound and dramatic, all the questions I had ever ask about freedom of publication in the Soviet Union.

The reason? He had flown to Italy in an attempt to prevent publication in the West of a novel by Boris Pasternak, Russia's greatest living poet.

Now I find myself writing with sadness across that year of blasted hopes so tragically symbolized by the execution of Imre Nagy and his comrades.

### Hunted literature

Gaol and persecution are no new things for men of literature. In Hungary Tibor Dery and Gyula Hay, the writers who swore that never again in any circumstances would they write in support of a lie, are accustoming themselves to prison life. The dynamic young Polish writer Marek Hlasko now finds it more comfortable to live and write and publish in Paris. In Bulgaria, young writers whom I laughed and joked with over slivovitz last year have been deprived of even the most elementary means of earning a livelihood.

## Colonial Policy — end

In the second policy statement **Economic Aid**, too much reliance is placed on the paternalist colonial governments which are notoriously insensitive to public needs. **Instead of recognizing political freedom unconditionally, they make economic and constitutional advance a criterion of the right to freedom.** How are the rulers to judge the fitness of a people to freedom? Who are they to judge? Also, one would think that a party professing socialism would not encourage private enterprise in territories where it is still comparatively easy to plan for a socialist society. On the contrary, private enterprise is to be encouraged to exploit these territories.

### The 1 per cent

Too much has been made of the fact that the Labour Party plans to devote one percent of Britain's national income, or some £160 million, to colonial development. What does this mean? in 1956 British Capitalism extracted £178 million in profits from abroad, a large part from the colonial territories. Besides this, the Colonies have been forced to build up Sterling Balances to the tune of £83 mil-

lion per year (1945-1955) which, in practice means a loan from the poor colonies to the rich Imperialist power and a present of dollars to the developed parts of the Sterling Area. **Unless British capitalist property abroad is nationalized and taken over by the people of the colonial countries, and unless they are politically free to use their own dollar earnings for development (which means the withdrawal of British troops), even the one percent promised by Labour will be less than is extracted by British capitalism year after year.**

### Sack the secretary

Perhaps, the best part of the Party's policy concerns the small territories, whose right to freedom is unambiguously recognized. Still there is a danger that finding it comparatively easy to suppress national movements in these territories, a future Labour Colonial Secretary might be tempted to neglect them. We must jealously watch these small territories as a test of Labour's Colonial Policy. The real success of Labour's colonial policy can only be when the post of Colonial Secretary in a British Government becomes redundant.

MAURICE SHADBOLT is a 26-year-old writer from New Zealand now working in London and preparing his first book of stories, *In the Blind Canyon*. He travelled extensively through China, Russia and Bulgaria last year writing for New Zealand magazines. This article was originally commissioned by the Australian literary magazine, *Overland*.

Readers might not agree with everything Comrade Shadbolt writes—his distinction between Marxism and humanism, for example—but will certainly find his views on *Doctor Zhivago*, the important novel recently smuggled out of Russia, stimulating and enlightened by personal contact with Russian literary circles.—Editor.

And in the Soviet Union, Dudinstev, Nekrassov and Panova are paying the penalty of non-publication for their part in the "conspiracy of silence" that followed the Khrushchev report. Unlike Yashin, or the poetess Margarita Aliger who for so long bravely defended the young contributors to *Literaturnaya Moskva*, they did not pathetically recant their views in the official *Literaturnaya Gazeta*. Dudinstev now cannot even get a commission to write a newspaper article. Even the bold voice of Ilya Ehrenburg seems to be faltering and falling silent. The editors of *Literaturnaya Moskva*, like the staffs of *Young Guard* and other forward-looking magazines, have been scattered.

And Konstantin Simonov no longer edits *Novy Mir*.

### The "thaw"

THERE is not room to argue; one can only state the facts. In the Soviet "thaw" of 1955-56 Boris Pasternak completed a novel and, conscious of its controversial nature and of calculated risk, submitted the manuscript to a Soviet publishing house. At that time it appeared that the novel might actually be published in the Soviet Union; so Pasternak passed on a copy of the manuscript to a friend, the Italian Communist publisher Giangiacomo Feltrinelli, so that it might also be published in translation in Italy.

### Smuggled out

But preparations for publication of the novel in Moscow came to a stop. Alexei Surkov, on behalf of the Writers' Union and the publishing house concerned, declared that the novel

constituted an insult to the October socialist revolution of 1917; and reflected gravely on Soviet society.

The novel was not, after all, to be published; and Surkov went to Italy to retrieve the manuscript which had reached the West. But Feltrinelli was adamant, despite all pleas for return of the manuscript. He would publish Pasternak's novel in Italian; he would, moreover, see that it was also published in English and French. It had apparently become a matter of principle for Feltrinelli; and Surkov did not turn him aside from his course.

And because of this we now have the privilege of reading Pasternak's novel, *Doctor Zhivago*,\* one of the most astonishing and remarkable novels ever written in the Russian language; and one that towers over most other novels, written in Russian or any other language, of this tremendous century.

### Pasternak the poet

PASTERNAK was born in 1890; his earliest poetry appeared in the revolutionary years. From the first he revealed himself as a poet of originality and enormous power. Unlike his friend Mayakovsky, he was not a writer who could unburden himself freely, simply and directly; yet, for all the difficulty of his verse, he was a writer striving towards simplicity with images of explosive profundity.

And yet Pasternak, as a poet, has had the appearance of being almost silent a good many years now, for the reason that little of

\* *Doctor Zhivago*, by Boris Pasternak: Published by Collins and Harvill Press; translated by Max Hayward and Manya Harari; 510 pp; 21s.

## 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.

## DOCTOR ZHIVAGO continued

his work has been accepted for publication in Soviet magazines. To the Soviet public he is best known for his brilliant translations of Shakespeare and Goethe.

He is not a Communist; not a Marxist; not a socialist realist. He is a humanist, imaginatively tied to the best in Christian tradition and emotionally tied to the best in the socialist tradition; a Russian, as passages in *Doctor Zhivago* so movingly reveal, who loves his country and his people and feels for them in suffering and triumph.

### No room for him

Yet there was no room for a Pasternak in the literature of "the new Soviet man" which the Zhdanovs and Fadeyevs were trying to create. Or to state the issue more plainly, Pasternak did not join in the literary chorus of praise for Stalin.

And there is, it seems, still no room for a Pasternak in the Soviet Union today.

### Advertise in

# SR

the socialist meeting point

IF IT IS impossible, in a few lines, to summarise the story and achievement of *Doctor Zhivago*, it is also impossible to estimate the liberating effect that this novel must have on any socialist seriously considering the nature of the Soviet Union; or on any socialist seriously considering the relationship between literature and politics. The essence of *Zhivago* is its richness of ideas; the power of its vision.

### No great ones

For in the end it is not to the political thinker, not to the historian or philosopher, but to the poet, the visionary, to whom we must turn for understanding. As a novelist Pasternak remains a poet. Consider, for example, his symbolic vision of approaching revolution after a massacre of demonstrating workers by Tsarist troops:

... Then the sun, setting behind the houses, poked a finger round the corner and picked out everything red in the street—the red tops of the dragoons' caps, a red flag trailing on the ground and the red specks and threads of blood on the snow.

As we might expect from a novel in the grand Russian manner, Pasternak strings together a multitude of characters with coincidence in a richly-written narrative which spans some fifty years (between 1900 and about 1950). On the other hand, though, it is not the panorama of a *War and Peace*; the great ones, the Lenins, Trozky's and Stalins, never appear and are scarcely

mentioned. They do not concern Pasternak; his concern is with the Russian people, as people, and their capacity for love and hate, good and evil; and above all—their capacity for suffering.

### Which truth

Yet curiously, with that said, it must be added that Pasternak's vision is not a tragic one; there it takes its departure from that one other great novel of the Revolution, Sholokov's *And Quiet Flows the Don*. It is an optimistic book, an affirmation of life. We are carried, at the end as if along a clear sunlit stream winding out of the dark forest of war and revolution; when all is over, and the tumult gone, man and the children of man endure and prevail.

One knows in advance how those critics still stagnant in the Stalinist swamp will dismiss this novel. It will be said that Pasternak is subjective. Of course he is; and it is no use pretending that any artist's vision is any other than subjective. It will be said that he does not tell the whole truth about the 1917 revolution; or about Soviet society. Of course he doesn't. He doesn't attempt to tell the truth; but he does tell a very profound kind of truth about all revolution and all society, which is an altogether different thing; and he does tell a truth which enlarges our view of all human life and endeavour—for Pasternak, as a cool artist, sees the Russian Revolution as but another chapter in the marvellous history of mankind.

### Sputniks vs freedom

And, if at this stage we must particularize, he does enlarge our view of certain features of Soviet life. And these, let it be noted, are not handled in the manner of spectacular revelation; but as naturally as anything else in the narrative, as naturally as the bitter facts fall into the consciousness of any Russian. We ourselves must glimpse the awful tragedy behind such casual words as:

One day Lara went out and did not come back. She must have been arrested in the street, as so often happened in those days, and she died or vanished somewhere, forgotten as a nameless number on a list which later was mislaid, in one of the innumerable mixed or women's concentration camps in the north.

In the end, though, we must read Pasternak not for detail; but as we read any novel, for his breadth of vision and depth of insight as we follow his characters through "the terrible years;"

the survivors among whom find World War II "an omen of deliverance, a purifying storm." And yet . . .

Although the enlightenment and liberation which had been expected to come after the war had not come with victory, a presage of freedom was in the air throughout these post-war years, and it was their only historic meaning.

## MARXISM and FREEDOM

a review by Eric S. Heffer

IS MARXISM a theory of freedom, or does it mean despotism as many thinkers believe? That is obviously a fundamental question, one which has increasingly come to the fore since the Khrushchev revelations, and the Hungarian revolution. Many look at Russia, and believing that it is a Marxist state, rightly recoil with horror. They then develop illusions about the West, and equate Western capitalism with "freedom."

### Serious book

Freedom exists neither in the East nor the West, although the potential exists for its complete development. This is brought out most clearly in an epoch-making book by Raya Dunayevskaya (one-time secretary to the great revolutionary Leon Trotsky), entitled *Marxism and Freedom*. In its own way it is a landmark, and all those who call themselves Marxists should seriously study it. I am sure it will enrage some, reduce others to scorn or tears, but others like myself it will cause to pause and reflect. It is a serious book with a serious argument and is therefore important. Unfortunately it has not yet found an English publisher, and must be obtained from the USA.

### Marxism equals humanism

In her introduction the author sets out clearly her objective: "This book," she says "aims to re-establish Marxism in its original form, which Marx called 'a thoroughgoing Naturalism, or Humanism'." Does she do this? I am not quite certain. I am sure, however, that this book is an important contribution towards that goal, and is the most serious work on Marxism for many years. I say this without reservation, and also without necessarily accepting all her conclusions.

"Marxism is a theory of liberation or it is nothing," she says. Communism, on the other hand,

More freedom, in a relative sense, there may be; but when will the new Soviet leaders learn that all their achievements, all their production figures, all their sputniks, in the end count as nothing so long as Russia's greatest writer cannot be published in his own language, in his own country?

she condemns as "the theory and practice of enslavement." Communism, she argues, as we know it in Russia, China, Hungary, etc., has nothing in common with Marxism. Therefore it is not correct to call the Communists "Marxists." What they stand for and what they have built is a system of State Capitalism. It is not as some Marxists believe a workers' state in Russia, it is State Capitalist.

This process to State Capitalism is not confined to the East but is going on throughout the entire world, including the West.

It is her belief, however, that it is only now with the development of the totalitarian state is it possible to fully understand the philosophic foundation of Marxism.

### Each and all

Today we live in an age of absolute tyranny, therefore it is now possible to emerge to absolute freedom. It is precisely freedom that has been destroyed in the totalitarian states controlled by the Communist Parties. In the Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels say, "The free development of each is the condition of the free development of all." To get this, it is essential for the proletariat to take control, particularly of the productive process, because it is in production that the answers lie to the problems of today.

### Hub of revolution

The real battles are at the point of production. This is the hub of the revolutionary process. This is shown in the book by the examples quoted, how in 1950 miners in America went on strike against the introduction of the "continuous miner," a machine which meant a form of automation which reduced the workers to nervous wrecks. How in 1953 in East Germany the uprising be-

(turn to back page)

## INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

quarterly for Marxist theory

first issue out

Order now for the few remaining copies

80 pages price 2/- 2/6 by post 10/- one year from  
M Maddison 21 Aubert Park, London N5

## Marxism and Freedom — end

gan against an increase in the "norms" of work. Then again how in Hungary the workers during the struggle established "Workers' Councils" which were political instruments and combined the questions of production with the administration of society. It is at the factory and mine where the class struggle really takes place, and this Raya Dunayevskaya says is true not only in the West, but in Russia and the other Communist countries.

### New society

It is Miss Dunayevskaya's view that the working classes are today acting out the theory of Hegel's "Absolute idea." In fact, there is continuously taking place a movement from practice to theory. However, the movement from theory is almost at a standstill. This is due to the isolation of intellectuals from the working class. It is the author's opinion that the new society (socialism) is in fact present in the very lives of the workers.

### What is freedom

We live in the age of revolutions. Many people (some supposedly socialist) prove that revolutions are things of the past, and then along comes another revolution, and further hammer blows shatter their wonderful "theories." The big problem of our age is "What happens after the revolution?" **Is it possible for man to be really free or must a bureaucracy inevitably develop like those in Russia, China and Yugoslavia?** This question Miss Dunayevskaya answers in a positive manner by pointing out that it is the self-organization of the workers, through their own councils, such as the "Workers' Councils" in Hungary, where theory and practice are combined in a unity, which means that a bureaucracy could never arise. It is only when the workers are told what is good for them that a "plan" is essential which they must carry through, that the growth of a bureaucracy is inevitable.

### The party

The author argues that in the new conditions that exist, the workers no longer need "Vanguard Parties," elites who have all the answers. The workers, she says, are quite capable of solving their own problems, and at all times have turned to sane solutions when the opportunities were there. Thus the workers created the new type of union organization in America, the CIO, in Spain in 1936 the workers themselves took over the control of the factories, the workers during the war years created the resistance movements, and the workers in the post-war years have from time to time organized tremendous strikes. All without the need for a "Vanguard Party," and where such parties did exist with strength, such as France and Italy, etc., they headed off the movements and led the workers back into the blind alley of capitalism.

Miss Dunayevskaya's book has a broad canvas. She traces the

development of Maxism from 1848 to the present day. Of particular interest are her chapters dealing with Marx's support of the Abolitionists in the American Civil War, and the roots which Marxism has in America, also the one dealing with the famous Trade Union debate in Russia in 1920-21. She rightly puts great emphasis on this debate as the decisive one for the future of Russia. She rightly condemns Trotsky's position during that debate, but surprisingly enough defends the Bolshevik's action at Kronstradt.

Here, I think, she errs, as documents I have recently read seem to clearly indicate that Kronstradt was a genuine workers' movement and was something akin to the East German rising and Hungary, but on a much lower level, with, of course, the Bolshevik Party still not a bureaucratic Stalinist machine. The author rightly says elsewhere that within the guts of the revolution is the counter-revolution. Equally true is the reverse. The counter-revolution is a process, not a single event, and within it is the future revolution, and it is my belief that Kronstradt was in fact the harbinger of the future, which, of course, will be on a higher level.

## SR BOOK SERVICE

35b Priory Terrace, London, NW6

### Scarborough verdict — from page 1

even to run it more efficiently than the other side. Private industrial investments are to be encouraged, further nationalization is to be confined to steel and road transport and any "firm or industry failing the nation"—as if any "capitalist" enterprise exists to serve the interests of any but a fraction of the nation.

#### Public schools debate

It would be ludicrous if it were not tragic that the most heated debate and the closest shave for the Executive should be over the public schools. Of course, this is an important issue. But it is almost incredible that anyone calling himself a Socialist can be found to tolerate the system of public schools. And to propose their absorption into the State system of education is hardly a revolutionary proposal striking at the roots of capitalist society.

A good deal of newspaper publicity was given to the fact that on this question Cousins spoke and the votes of the T&GWU were cast against the Executive. Does this really represent a swing towards the Left among the top TU bureaucracy—a crumbling of the block vote as **Tribune** claimed. Hardly that. Although Cousins feels some pressure from

I have not, of course, been able to do justice to this book. It is brilliantly written and is clever in its arguments. It is a positive book, a helpful book, and, above all else, a book which opens up new fields of thought and possible action.

As one who has been trained in the leadership complex, and who has accepted much of the "Vanguard Party" theory, I find difficulty in accepting many of her arguments, especially those connected with what could be too great a reliance on spontaneous action by the workers. Perhaps I have misread her here.

#### New material

I would, however, urge all those who can to get hold of this book, read it, study it and discuss it, especially by writing to the author. I understand she is particularly keen to know what British workers think of it. Apart from Miss Dunayevskaya's writing the book is valuable in that it contains Marx's **Private Property and Communism** and his **Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic**, plus Lenin's **Hegel's Science of Logic**, all previously unpublished in English.

The book has a preface by the famous American philosopher, Herbert Marcuse, and can be obtained from Bookman Associates Inc., 21 Union Square West, New York, USA (price 6 dollars).

## 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.

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.