

# SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

**FORTNIGHTLY**  
for  
**Industrial Militant**  
and  
**International**  
**Socialism**

8th YEAR No 6

MID-MARCH, 1958

SIXPENCE

## SOCIALISTS and the H-BOMB

ANGER, HORROR AND FEAR are swelling the protest against H-Bombing and nuclear rocketry. Thousands have been moved to condemn it. At meetings, through petitions, at by-elections the murmur has crystallized into words: "No, no. We don't want it. Scrap the Bomb. Scrap the Tests. Disarm!"

As socialists we cannot be content with words alone. For us it isn't enough to add our voice, our vote and our signature to the many that have been given. Of course we support the lobbies, the petitions, the resolutions; of course we participate in any move to rouse the people to the full horrors of Capitalism's dilemma.

The Labour leadership can claim our support in any move they make—even the most fractional—to stem the Tories' madness; the **Daily Herald** can claim it when it pushes this leadership to declare for unilateral disarmament; those that criticize the **Herald** for not going so far as to propose the renunciation of NATO have our allegiance—we shall go with them all, and further.

But we want more than words. Words alone have never changed the course of history. They did not stop the Russian butchers in Hungary; nor did they prevent the British attack on Egypt. We want action.

We see the H-Bomb and its rocket delivery as the final, last-ditch blackmail to which the ruling classes of East and West resort in defence of their property, their privileges and their control over humanity. We see them as the ghastly outcome of centuries of class rule, centuries of brutality, exploitation and organized violence against

the workers of the world. We see in them the heart and gut of capitalism, its new but vital organs.

For us, war and capitalism are inseparable; peace and the destruction of the class divisions in East and West are one. None but the workers can smash the guardians of privilege wherever they are; working-class action alone can exorcize the shade of total annihilation.

The workers of Britain are faced with the supreme task. Slowly, very slowly, they are measuring up to it. Glasgow plumbers are blacking work on rocket sites; the Liverpool Trades Council has registered support to all who do the same; 10 ETU branches in Kent have declared solidarity with any similar action.

**This is the way, brothers. This is the way to take the leadership in the campaign against the Bomb and the Bases. It is your right, your power and your future. Spread the action; take to the streets in mass demonstrations!**

**BLACK THE BOMB!**

**BLACK THE BASES!**

**These are the first steps to workers' control of the war machine and the destruction of capitalism!**

### **Socialists and the industrial front by James D. Young**

Trouble is in the air. The "new conservatism" is being replaced by the old Toryism. cursory examination of the economic and financial press shows that the employers are preparing to wage war on "the inflationary wage demands" of trade unionists. The "social engineering" of the reactionary captains of the welfare (or warfare) state now consists of shunting wage claims into committees of arbitration: a typical Tory delaying tactic. Moreover, the employers are marshalling their forces in order to shift the economic burden of inflation on to the shoulders of the organized workers. But whether capitalism inflates or deflates, it gets the workers anyway.

On the one hand, the Tories are appealing to the British workers to impose a wage-freeze on themselves; on the other hand, they ask trade unionists to cooperate with employers on joint-productivity committees. As workers, we are touched to the quick by these patriotic appeals: but facts are "chials that widna ding and darna be disputed." So—we are sick of living under a system of society in which

"wealth accumulates and men decay."

#### **Productivity Councils**

The Socialist attitude to productivity councils and so on will depend on circumstances: and comrades on the job are better judges of the grim circumstances of industrial life than right-wing trade union leaders outside.

If workers in a particular industry want to try productivity councils, it is our job to point out that the capitalist system is a form of exploitation of workers by employers. Our attitude should be: no collaboration with the bosses. Moreover, we should not refrain from saying that as long as capitalism lasts, class cooperation on productivity councils by one set of workers will always be at the expense of another set of workers.

#### **The bribes**

British capitalists can buy off sections of workers here partly because they have spare capital invested elsewhere where labour is cheap. We can point that out,

turn to back page

#### **ONE WAY TRAFFIC**



By courtesy of the Birmingham Journal

## T U Commentary

THE REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON Prices, Productivity and Incomes (Cohen Council), published at the end of February, comes down so blatantly on the side of the employers and their servants, the Tory Government, that even the Right-wing trade union leaders have had to come out in opposition to it. Without attempting to cover up its intentions, the Report says: Restrict wage increases, at least substantially below the average of the last few years; increased distribution of profits and dividends is given the green light, and a further rise in the figure of unemployed would not be unwelcomed.

As the *Times* on February 2, 1958, put it

Noting that the percentage of unemployment has so far risen to 1.8, the Council says that no one should be surprised or shocked if it proves necessary that it should go somewhat further . . .

In our opinion it is impossible that a free and flexible economic system can work efficiently without a perceptible (though emphatically, not a catastrophic) margin of unemployment of this kind.

On prices and profits, the *Times* goes on to report

the Council says that they cannot recommend the reintroduction or introduction of physical controls over investment, price controls, subsidies, or legislation enforcing dividend limitation, or the repeal of the Rent Act, 1957. They do not think that the tendency towards an increased distribution of profits in dividends since 1952 after a long period of standstill, is open to serious criticism.

These two quotations from the *Times* make it quite clear that as far as the working class is concerned, we had better start preparing for battle in the not-too-distant future.

\* \* \*

FROM THE COAL MINES, which for years have been crying out for more labour, more production, etc., we now find that they are producing too much, and there is a surplus of some 8½ million tons of coal; so, like the bosses elsewhere, the National Coal Board feels that the time has come to use the big stick.

Throughout the different regions, they are attempting to discipline by dismissal, miners who absent themselves from shifts, and, to make this palatable, the NCB attempts to get the workers to agree to such dismissals by having the recommendations come from the pit consultative committees which represent both management and workers.

It seemed to work in some areas. At the Bentley pit at Doncaster 10 miners were dismissed by such a joint body. The warning note was sounded by Brother A Machin, President of the Yorkshire area of the NUM, who said

Union members should not take part in the dismissal of other members by the Coal Board . . . With all these stocks of coal piled up, to go after a man who has had a shift off in a hard and dangerous industry like ours is ridiculous.

The Dairy Colliery, which was to have been the first in Lancashire to have these absentee miners in front of a disciplinary committee, have now had second thoughts, and a pit-head ballot is being conducted.

The lesson to be learnt from

Joint Production, Joint Consultative, or any other Joint body, is that the employers use the workers' representatives to increase production and profits, and to discipline their workmates. The fact that they still flourish in many industries is a sign of weakness on our part, and stems from the successful propaganda of the Employers and their Government, and points the discredit of Labour Leaders who like to see "both points of view" and talk of the "new spirit in Industry," etc., etc.

**From our trade union leaders should come the call:**

NO TRUCK, WITH JOINT PRODUCTION OR CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES.

**When trade unionists sit down with managements, they must represent one side, one class alone. No man can serve two masters.**

\* \* \*

TALKING OF DISCIPLINING workers must necessarily turn one's thoughts to that other body of 'Public Servants'—the Police. While it is by now common knowledge that the Police had dogs with them when dealing with the recent H-Bomb demonstrations in Whitehall, it is perhaps not so well known that they also had dogs at a Strike Meeting at Carlington, Cheshire, just in case of trouble . . .

In pre-war days, when demonstrations were more prevalent, demonstrators were acquiring a technique in handling the 'Cosacks,' and their effectiveness was therefore lessened. Perhaps the use of dogs is an ugly portent of the near future.

### Back to '26?

THE BOARD of the National Provincial Bank have shown their usual foresight. Blackleg transport has been organized to take their employees to work in the event of a London Transport strike. Merely another example of the class policies of this Bank, which not only refuses to recognize the National Union of Bank Employees (with over 25 per cent. membership here), but also maintains three Staff Associations to weaken the negotiating strength of its 12,500 workers.

TEN ETU BRANCHES in Kent sent in resolutions to Hayes Court, their headquarters, in favour of unilateral renunciation of the H-Bomb. A commission of enquiry has been duly dispatched to find out who is responsible for this disturbing militancy.

\* \* \*

MANY IMPORTANT ELECTIONS are due this year in the AEU. Militant AEU members must consider what changes to make.

\* \* \*

WE ARE HAPPY to learn that Sid Bidwell, our NUR correspondent, is standing for election as one of two Organizers being elected.

GEOFF CARLSSON

# STRIKES : DUBLIN

Public Employees show the way  
from Johnnie Byrne

THE STRIKE OF 3,000 DUBLIN MUNICIPAL WORKERS, which paralyzed the public services of Dublin and the Borough of Dunleary (Dun Laoghaire) for one week, provided a militant challenge to, and a resounding victory over De Valera's ministers' wage-freeze for civil servants and local authority employees; and, in doing so, showed up the inadequacy of the "10s. Agreement" negotiated between the Federated Union of Employers (FUE) and the Provisional United Organization of the Trade Union Movement (PUO).

To appreciate the importance of the strike, it is worth while looking at the events of the past year which led up to it.

Late in May 1957, the PUO (whose main job is to unite the two trade union centres) convened a Special Consultative Conference to consider a national wages policy in view of the 11 per cent. rise in the Cost of Living Index. At that Conference, the Committee of the PUO was mandated to negotiate with the FUE to agree a formula for a new wage increase.

### Talks drag on

Talks went on for four months, and in the absence of any likely agreement, the unions became restive. Late in September, 1957, when it seemed that the Conference would be re-convened to report failure, Mr. Lamass, Minister for Industry and Commerce, apparently warned the employers that failure to agree on a formula setting out principles and objectives in the new wage adjustment would end in a free-for-all, with the devil taking the hindmost.

In the last week of September, 1957, the Conference was re-convened. The Agreement now known as the '10/- Agreement' was recommended by the PUO negotiators for acceptance as the best that could be obtained in the circumstances. The Agreement was accepted by an overwhelming majority of the delegates.

The Agreement provided for a ceiling on claims of 10/- per week, representing roughly 7 per cent increase of wages against an 11 per cent rise in the Cost of Living Index, **which had meanwhile further risen by 4 percent!** While 10/- per week was the ceiling figure, clause 5b provided that where an employer could prove beyond all doubt, that if as a consequence of this figure being paid unemployment or higher costs would ensue, then a lower figure would be negotiated, and in some cases, no increase at all would be justified.

This last injunction was seized upon by the Government to deny public workers and civil servants any relief whatever. Although in the private sector most employers had conceded the ten shillings per week to adult males, and in-

creases pro rata for juveniles, the Government, through the ubiquitous Mr. Sean McEntee, Minister for Health, issued a directive to the administrative heads of local authorities not to concede any increase to their workers, and likewise, to the Civil Service arbitrators.

The unions representing the Dublin municipal workers, who had already negotiated at length with the City Manager (a powerful Town Clerk, subject(?) to the elected Council.—Ed.) which is the normal procedure, now took the only course in face of the Minister's directive — strike action.

On the first day of the strike, the Labour Court, quite out of character, cleared the decks for a hearing on the second day of the strike, and, again out of character, handed down their recommendation—in favour of the strikers—on the same evening. Normally, weeks and months pass by before disputes are heard and decisions handed down by the Labour Court, and so it would have been, **if the municipal workers had not struck.** And the strike was a smashing success, a victory for the public workers: the Court recommended payment of the full 10/- per week. A week later, the Government ate their words, and authorized the payment.

In the course of the strike itself, any leadership there was came from the Irish Municipal Employees' Union. Both the Workers' Union of Ireland (WUI) and the Irish Transport & General Workers' Union (ITGWU) dragged their feet with Larkin, General Secretary of the WUI, to his eternal shame, saying at a mass meeting, while the strike was going on, that he disagreed with the strike. Only the IMETU conducted the strike in an organized manner. Public employees throughout Ireland owe them a vote of thanks. Swift and militant action has more than justified itself in this Dublin strike.

**Unless and until civil servants organize a public campaign together with the industrial workers, they will suffer the whip-lash of de Valera's economic policy. Let them demand and establish their industrial rights—now!**

Readers :

Order your books through our  
new SR BOOK SERVICE

Help your paper! Help yourselves!

SR BOOK SERVICE · 35B Priory Terrace, London, NW6

# LONDON

## Plainclothesmen attack pickets

reports Pat Conroy, Strike Cmtee. Sec.

'YOU'VE NEVER HAD IT SO GOOD.' I doubt if one of our pickets would have agreed while the policemen frog-marched him off and tossed him into their van. He'd been standing there watching a bunch of blacklegs coming through the gate. Suddenly, two of them dived out of the group, twisted his arms behind his back, and started to drag him off. The other pickets appealed to the uniformed police on the gate to restrain these assailants, but received the astounding reply: 'They are policemen in plain clothes.' He was charged with insulting behaviour, found guilty and bound over to keep the peace for the next 12 months.

### Police turn out

Our misgivings had started on the first morning of the strike. Eight policemen were on the two gates, while a black maria stood by with more inside; the law had decided to give our 68 strikers the red-carpet treatment. Mr Levine had not only brought over his north American accent and sales ideas—he was using their strike-breaking tactics as well.

## SUPPORT the strikers

Messages and money to  
M. Byrne  
57 Netherwood Street  
London, NW6

Our demand was uncomplicated and to the point; **Union recognition.** The management's reply to our two delegates was brief, almost Hollywoodian. 'Here are your cards. Get out.'

That was 4.55 on Friday evening. The AEU branch met the same evening, so we all trooped down to have it discussed. The advice was: 'You've got to fight and win.'

**The fight is now in its fifth week.**

### The postman cometh

On the first morning of the strike, every worker, except the two delegates, received a letter from the management 'reasonably' explaining that they had no objection to unions, but every worker had the right to choose for him/herself, and that they, the management, stood firm on this right, and would give whole-hearted support to those who didn't join the strike; a few days later, another letter arrived, a shade less favourable this time, and containing the threat that if they had not made an appearance before the management within 48 hours, they would find their cards in the post.

### Manning the picket-line

During the 48 hour period most of us made our appearance, while the management spent most

of the time peering out of their offices at the picket line, but the cards arrived at the week-end, so this couldn't have been the kind of appearance they had meant. . .

### Solidarity

By this time we had made personal contact with most of the factories and union branches in the area and were winning support; the North London District Committee of the AEU had endorsed our action, and official negotiations were in being between the management on the one hand, and the AEU, Boilermakers and Sheetmetal Workers on the other.

### Plainclothesmen

The second week saw the unprecedented action of police dressed as workers coming out of the factory and arresting one of our pickets, despite the fact that uniformed police in their usual numbers were hovering around like mosquitos; more discussions with the management; and our lads withdrawing their tools, for the type that would fill our jobs when on strike would have no qualms about filling his pockets with our gear.

### Into the streets

In the third week Cricklewood experienced its liveliest and prettiest demonstration for many a long day. Our girls and lads marched down the main road for an hour-and-a-half. The busy shoppers stopped to read the placards, while the banners of supporting factories caused interested comment. For some of the on-lookers it struck a chord in their memories of the '30s; for others it gave an insight of days ahead. Shop Stewards Committees in the area were now writing in to Levine advising on and explaining the consequences of his medieval attitude to trade unionism, and that he was now up against the organized workers of North West London; **this strike has not only been a blow to the management, it has also given a much-needed shot in the arm to many of the local factories.**

### First sack; then strike

We entered our fourth week as determined as ever. Our pickets had done a heroic job, especially during the two days of blinding snow and sleet. The Musician's Union had intimated to the management that no more records would be made for their machines; lads from other factories were now coming down during their lunch hour to swell our picket line and a works convenor at a **solidarity meeting of stewards noted that some workers who had been made redundant at his factory were now on strike at ours. The inference was obvious; if the bosses get away with low wages and poor conditions in the smaller factories they would then turn their attention to the bigger, better organised ones.**

# INDUSTRIAL

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

A repeat performance of the third week's demonstration was an even bigger success. More factories were represented, and their delegations, who had taken time off work, and told their managements why, congratulated our girls and lads on their spirit and enthusiasm, especially as most of them had only entered the union ranks two days before the strike started.

The National Council for Civil Liberties are pursuing the case of the disguised policemen, and our local MP Maurice Orbach, is in contact with our Union regarding the matter.

### Settling in

The fifth week arrives and also the lorries at the gates. Our pickets, now professionals, explain the situation, bringing the sympathetic drivers round to our headquarters for a cup of tea: while the unsympathetic ones get something which is also hot but is not a popular English beverage. The blacklegs constantly change, old faces disappear, new ones arrive, and the management take them out in vans as our tactics wear them down. Included in the ranks of those disappeared is the boss himself — according to the General Manager, he's off to Canada. Last week a bloke angrily explained to one of our pickets that he'd come all the way from Manchester for some cash which was owing to him. The reason for his anger? He hadn't got it.

And so fellow-worker, you've read the diary of the strike now in its fifth week at the 'Master Vending Machine Co. Ltd., 82 Cricklewood Lane, N W 2; Moral and financial support can be sent to our treasurer, M. Byrne, 57 Netherwood Street, London, N W 6.

**Today it is our turn to fight and preserve the working class rights won by bitter struggles in the past. Perhaps, Brother, it will be your turn tomorrow.**

London, N W. March 3, 1958.

Most readers will have seen products of the **Master Vending Machine Co. Ltd.** (Levine Manufacturing Co.); few will know that those cigarette machines, automatic chewing-gum vendors and so on were made by workers whose first attempt at organization was met by victimization and strike (reported shortly in SR, mid-February). We are happy to print the story of the strike up to the beginning of its fifth week as given by the Secretary of the Strike Committee, Pat Conroy.—Editor.

## Hands off the Blue Union!

THIS PAMPHLET\* REVEALS the interesting story of a dispute between two unions in the transport industry, the National Amalgamated Stevedores and Dockers and Transport & General Workers' Union. The historical background of the dispute can be found when the dockers, who had begun to organize towards the end of the nineteenth century, and by 1912 were a constituent part of the National Transport Workers' Federation, went into the new Transport and General Workers Union, into which the federated unions had amalgamated in 1922.

**As time went on, the transport workers lost their dominating position in the union, and the dockers never took very kindly to the official machinery, so that more often than not, unofficial action was taken to remedy grievances.**

### General Council takes sides

This aspect of the dispute is only roughly sketched in by Mr. Hunter, but the immediate issue—the transfer of ten thousand

men from the T & GWU to the NASD is treated very fully. We can easily appreciate the alarm of the T&GWU and their appeal to the TUC and its General Council for assistance. We can see from the sections of the TUC Annual Reports dealing with the dispute that no union could ever have a better ally than the General Council: one only has to look at the terms dictated by the General Council (Annual Report, TUC, 1957) to the NASD, demanding from the NASD in clause 2, a return to the *status quo ante*.

### A pamphlet for all

We must realize, as the pamphlet points out, that these men are fighting for the right to belong to a union of their own choosing, and in that union to have all the necessary democratic rights.

Not only should dockers secure a copy of this pamphlet, but it deserves the consideration of every trade unionist.

I P HUGHES

Liverpool

\* 'Hands off the Blue Union' by William Hunter, Labour Review 3d.

# LABOUR PARTY Commentary

## • The start of Victory for Socialism?

THANKS TO THE NEC the much heralded inaugural meeting of Victory For Socialism was well attended. Indeed so well attended that an overflow meeting had to be held at Denison House. The two meetings were quite good jamborees. The speeches of Foot and Soper were full of good sense about the H-bomb and common ownership but were devoid of details about the ways and means of bringing their ideals to fruition.

Only at question time did the important issues emerge: namely how had the position changed since the NEC attack with regard to the formation of groups? when would the organization be put on a proper democratic footing—viz. when would a general meeting of members be held? what would happen if the NEC threatened to expel the MP members of the committee?

**The answers were safe and evasive, but nothing was said which really closed the door to the democratic growth of the movement. Whether it will in fact develop democratic roots, however, will depend on the strength and determination of the Socialist members of the group.**

## • The 'leaders' and the H-bomb

THE LATEST GALLUP POLL ought to cause a convulsion in the body of the Party-leadership that should shake Smith Square to its foundations. For it shows that the Party, far from gaining from the Tories, is itself losing popularity. I have already referred to this state of affairs in these columns and make no apology for doing so again. For years we have had to listen to the moderates telling us that our policies would not be voted for, indeed the whole basis of right-wing policy has been opportunism. Yet despite all their cleverness, moderation, and responsibility, our Party makes no progress. The Left should lose no opportunity in pressing home to the leadership the suicidal (in more ways than one!) nature of their policy. For they are more susceptible to matters of electoral expediency than anything.

In the last issue, I suggested that the best way to revive the fortunes of our Party was in opposition to the H-bomb. An illustration of the growing public concern about this weapon was the great London meeting on February 17th attended by over 5,000 people, followed by demonstration in Whitehall and Downing Street. Even without Labour's support, this event was impressive and portentous and the organizers have clearly shown that they mean business. **Labour leaders will ignore this campaign at their peril.**

As for the argument itself about the H-bomb and defence the logic of the deterrent seems to get weaker and weaker. Nobody can seriously suppose that these weapons will

## • Scottish labour in the van

A REALLY ENCOURAGING sign of virility within our movement comes from Scotland where the Dalkeith Town Council (Labour controlled) has resolved to fight rent increases and the institution of means tests which the Scottish Special Housing Association had proposed to introduce. And by fight, I mean fight. **The Council has sent a letter to all tenants calling upon them to resist the increases, and advising them of the fact that the Council intended to dismantle machinery for the collection of rents on behalf of the Association. In addition, the letter called upon the tenants to attend a protest meeting. At this meeting it was decided to set up a committee to be known as the Dalkeith Tenants' Defence Committee, the secretary of which is Jean Mann. This is the sort of real bread and butter issue for the working class**

What is clear from the current situation is this: that as a result of premature leaks to the press the NEC has appeared on the scene far earlier than they would have done had the leadership remained in the hands of comparatively unknown people. The establishment of local groups by the old VFS was already under way and in the present situation would have had considerable impetus. As it is there is considerable doubt whether local groups in the sense in which the old VFS committee envisaged them will indeed be formed.

Having said that however, it is necessary for us to declare unequivocally that VFS must be supported in its present dispute with the NEC. After all's said and done, these people, the 'leaders' of the group, are a matter of small consequence. **The important thing is that there is a strong body of opinion within the Party that is opposed to the present reformist line.** VFS may well have a part to play in the vocalization of that opposition and it is up to us to see that it does that job efficiently.

not be used other than by order of the American and British Governments. For in the event of war, things would move too fast. Obviously, if the weapon is to be efficacious as a threat the enemy will have to be convinced that its launching will be reflexive and that means that the decision to fire will have to be in the hands of operational commanders. And what might well happen then has been shown very graphically by the Sakiet incident, where "government approval" has been retrospective. Fortunately for the world, that operational commander had only "conventional" weapons.

It was disturbing to realize when reading the recent debate on foreign affairs, that my old boss Macmillan (I once cleaned his inkwells for a living) appears to be to the left of Gaitskell and Bevan. Certainly his appreciation of the fears of those older people who were conditioned by Munich are a reactionary factor in the present situation struck me as brilliant beside the stereotyped reiterations of Gaitskell, and the oh-so-confused speech of Nye Bevan; he is certainly beginning to feel uncomfortable in his role of Statesman.

Many people in our Party including the new Chairman of Victory For Socialism believe that the Party has moved a lot to the left in foreign affairs in the past year or so. This is an illusion. All that has happened is that the leaders have responded to a changed situation. But they have still responded too slowly, so that in today's circumstances the policy is every bit as reactionary as was the policy of Ernie Bevin.

**that we in the movement have tended to leave to the Stalinists in the past: it is most refreshing to see the Labour Party taking the lead.**

FROM SCOTLAND too, this time Glasgow, comes the heartening news that Council has decided to oppose the building of rocket bases. Who says the Scottish Labour Movement is dead?

From Islington comes news of disciplinary action against members of the Labour Group on the Council who voted against differential rents. This action contrasts sadly with the news from Dalkeith.

In general on this question of the withdrawal of the whip from Labour councillors, I feel that too many group leaders are trigger happy, and in this particular case it is sheer nonsense.

## • Hangers, whippers, hunters

TWO INTERESTING EXAMPLES from the animal section of our British Way of Life have occurred recently. First the use of dogs against the anti-H-bomb demonstrators, and secondly, the filibustering of Fred Messer's bill against stag hunting. Both are excellent examples both of the bloody-mindedness of the Tories and their devotion to class privileges. **The Party should lose no opportunity of pressing home to the people that the Tories are the hangers, whippers and hunters of our society, and that such open devotion to cruelty is another sign of their unfitness to govern.**

## • Cohen or May?

WILL THE COHEN COMMITTEE be another May Committee?

The answer is up to us in the movement, and fortunately so far, the reactions from the leadership have not been too bad. Certainly the TUC has reacted in a forthright manner (for them). But we must follow it up with a sound wage and price policy, for our working class tends to be very sectional and all too often one hears members of the working class criticizing the wage demands of workers outside their own industry.

## • Braddock

I AM HAPPY to record that Tom Braddock has at last been endorsed as a candidate in the forthcoming LCC elections. Tom, who was Labour MP for Mitcham from 1945 to 1950, has had a raw deal at the hands of the NEC. He has been refused endorsement as a parliamentary candidate since 1950 for his views on foreign policy (he was one of the signatories of the Nenni letter). At first the London Labour Party would not endorse him and referred the matter to the NEC. They, however, referred it back to London who have now done the right thing. Tom has also recently been selected Parliamentary Candidate for Kingston-on-Thames.

The decision of the NEC to withhold endorsement from Tom is nothing more than the foulest kind of stupid, blind bigotry. It is high time that the rules of the Party were amended to compel the NEC to give reasons why endorsement is not given. Every Socialist should campaign for Tom's endorsement. For he has never trod the Stalinist path; his one crime is to have remained consistent.

## • Robens

IN THE LAST ISSUE I gave Robens a bouquet, now for a brickbat. "They (strikes) are a blunt instrument with all the dangerous propensities of a boomerang," said Alf addressing that august body, the Industrial Co-partnership Association. He went on to reiterate the **Industry and Society** view of contemporary capitalism as being in essence solely managerial and hence it was impossible for the striking worker to hit effectively at those who made policy. I do not believe in strikes that are tactically mistimed, but there are times, and it looks as though a lot of them are coming, when the strike weapon must be used if the worker is not to surrender his rights. To describe strikes as an anachronism, is to attempt to disarm the workers, and **it is alarming that just as a big onslaught on workers' standards is getting under way that a prominent trade unionist and Labour Party member should speak thus.**

Ron Lewis

# YOUNG SOCIALIST

NOW  
TWICE  
MONTHLY

NUMBER 8

MID-MARCH, 1958

## REBEL FOR A CAUSE

When Glasgow students recently pelted Mr. Butler with flour and eggs they were not merely giving vent to youthful exuberance or snubbing at authority; they were demonstrating the undisciplined revolt of youth which is so characteristic of modern society. Undisciplined because these young people, together with other people who are "bored" "fed-up" and who "don't care," do not see the root cause of their disaffection, and hence do not know how or where to direct their energies and anger.

### Rebel with a cause

But why is there a revolt? The answer to this question, we believe, lies in the nature of capitalist society. Modern society seems to create the impression that the individual is helpless: helpless against the commands of government; helpless against the forces of war; helpless against the vagaries of the market. The energy, initiative and imagina-

tion of people is blunted by a society which increasingly relies on tradition, and in which authority and the seat of decision is seemingly remote and inaccessible. Our society is motivated less by ideals of human improvement than by the Hydrogen Bomb, the balance of power, profit and pornography. The uneasiness of youth is the rejection of a society which has no use for youthful qualities. It is a society which treats people and human qualities as things to be manipulated, and young people therefore revolt.

### Is there no cause?

Youth, it is clear, needs an ideology. But an ideology is merely a guide to action, and, according to some, there is nothing to be done. Witness AJP Taylor (*Manchester Guardian*, February 11, 1958), who believes that the Labour Government of 1945-50 "did its job too well" and left nothing to re-

form. Thus it seems that although youth is "fed-up" there is nothing they can do about it.

### The Socialist course

We, however, do not believe this. Indeed, as our article on Nationalization seeks to show, there is a great deal still to reform, and even more to get rid of altogether. Neither do we believe that the individual is helpless. The individual organized with his fellow men, learns to know and to change society. **The ideology which youth so urgently needs is Socialism. The socialist youth movement, the Labour Youth Sections, CAN be made to become the organization through which young people may develop and express their individuality. The Youth Sections must be made to channel the rebellion of youth into a healthy and effective course—the fight for Socialism.**

## Notebook

TRANSPORT HOUSE ANNOUNCES a new venture! A Youth Sports Day is scheduled for Beatrice Webb House in the summer, when lucky Youth Section members can get within shouting distance of real, live(?) NEC members, and perhaps a Miss, and even—hold your breath, chaps—a Mister Youth Section will be chosen.

\* \* \*

THEY'VE DONE IT. London Labour Party Youth Sub-Committee is planning a valuable week-end

## A meeting, a change and a policy

by Terry Martin South Hendon

WHEN THE AGM of the local Labour Party deprived the Youth Section of its usual meeting place, we had to look for other accommodation. We met in a member's house, and what a change there was!

Since last November when it was first formed, the Youth Section has been meeting under the nose of the parent party and subject to its close scrutiny. This time, no party officers were present and a very different atmosphere prevailed. The youth let their hair down and formalities disappeared.

At the end of the meeting, all agreed that it was the most successful yet held.

The whole episode shows the

school for October 18/9. London comrades should note this date; the subject—Annual Conference 1958 . . .

\* \* \*

SHOREDITCH & FINSBURY, that enterprising North London Section has arranged a useful day school for **Sunday, March 30th, at their Labour Hall, 114 Shepherdess Walk, E1**; there will be two sessions, the first, on 'Youth in Industry,' will be opened by Mike Kidron, Editor of SR; the second will be on 'Youth and the Labour Movement; all details of the arrangements for the school can be obtained from Shoreditch & Finsbury YS at Shepherdess Walk.

indifference of the parent party towards youth in the movement, and their unsocialist attitude towards the young in general. The lesson is simple. Until we show them that we want youthful socialist activity and friendship, nothing will change. Until we show them that we are not in the Labour Movement as bill-posters and canvassers, but also as young people determined to overthrow capitalism and to establish a humane, socialist system, this indifference will remain.

We must show our dissatisfaction in every way, use every channel to protest at the half-hearted, careless attitude of the leadership. In this way, we will show them that the youth of today desires a youthful tomorrow.

## The Fight for Socialism — 4

### for FULL NATIONALIZATION and NATIONAL PLANNING

by Michael Kidron

AS LONG AS EACH FACTORY, each shipyard, each shop is responsible to a single owner, or to a small group of owners, and as long as the only relationship existing between these groups of owners is competition, there can be no planning, no rational organization of production. This is what causes one of the strangest paradoxes of capitalist production: on the one hand there is the most meticulous organization within each factory where every process is worked out to the last farthing, on the other hand you find complete chaos and anarchy in the relations between the various capitalist organizations.

An American Socialist, Max Shachtman, has described very exactly the disorganized way in which Capitalism does advance and the logical answer to such chaos:

The trouble is that this expansion of production in boom times is in its very nature **unplanned**. For example, a 100 percent increase in wheat production does not require a 100 percent increase in the production of threshing machines. A 100 percent increase in the production of threshing machines may mean a 100 percent increase in the iron that goes into the machines, but only a 10 percent increase in the production of the tools by which the threshers are made. A 100 percent increase in the production of cotton textiles may require only a 25 percent increase in the production of textile machines. What is more, this small increase in textile machinery for one year may suffice to keep textile production at a higher rate for five years—the market for textiles themselves is more continuous than the markets for textile machinery, the one is used up far more rapidly than the other.

"If all the capitals could be joined under one roof, and production centrally planned with meticulous care, it would be possible to work out a schedule of expansion for each industry so that each would develop in harmonious proportion to the other. Planning on a national scale (eventually on an international scale) could regulate the proportions in which each industry should be expanded so that the whole of economic life advances harmoniously." (Max Shachtman, *The Fight For Socialism*, p. 53, New International Publishing Co., New York, 1946).

### Even Partial Nationalization—a success story

IN BRITAIN only 20 percent of industry is nationalized—the deficit industries at that—and yet their success from a capitalist point of view, has been remarkable.

Before nationalization, the railway companies were running at a loss, or rather, they weren't making as much profit as other capitalist investments. So the Government stepped in with a subsidy, with loans and with other forms of aid, and guaranteed the railway owners a net profit of £40 million a year (1940) which was later raised to £54

(continued next page)

## LET'S HEAR FROM YOU!

# YOUNG SOCIALIST

## FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM — continued

million a year (1944). When vesting day came and the railways were nationalized the owners received compensation to the tune of £1,065 million which was saddled on to the nationalized industry. The British Transport Commission now has to pay £59 million a year (1956) in the form of interest and redemption. And yet in spite of this, and in spite of the fact that British Transport doesn't get one penny in Government aid, it still makes a clear profit (£4½ million in 1956).

The same is true of the coal industry. Production has gone up by 25 million tons since nationalization. Output has risen by 2 cwt. per man-shift. The National Coal Board pays out over £21 million a year in interest and redemption to the ex-owners. It provides the steel and chemical capitalists with 20 million tons of coal a year at a price subsidized by consumers for coal-for-the-grate. And yet it makes a profit and the mineworkers have still been able to fight for and win a position as third in the wage list of the whole country (after being 62nd in the list for so long).

The British Electricity Authority shows the same trend. A surplus has been accumulated since nationalization (profits in 1955/6—£19 million) while its output has increased by 95 percent since nationalization (to be compared with a rise in manufacturing output of 54 percent.) Its prices have gone up less than those of any other major product. No wonder the Tory Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fuel and Power, Joynson-Hicks, handed it the laurels: "expansion has gone hand in hand with increased efficiency." (*Hansard*, October 26th, 1953).

The Gas industry can tell the same story, so can the British Overseas Airway Corporation and the Bank of England—all nationalized, all profitable from a strictly capitalist viewpoint.

### Limitations of partial nationalization

PARTIAL NATIONALIZATION may please the capitalists; it cannot satisfy a socialist. Not only has the state relieved the private capitalist of his least-profitable investments, not only does this state-capitalist sector still work in the interests of the private capitalist sector by paying huge compensation and by providing cheap services, but the state-capitalist sector is still caught up in the problems of capitalism.

# POLICY

## END CLASS EDUCATION

# ABOLISH PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by Peter Ibbotson

SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialist democracy. One of the hurdles in the path is the existence in the education field of two separate and distinct systems of education: the State-supported and the private. The former caters for the great majority of the nation's children; the latter for a small minority, some 5 percent. The former is paid for out of our rates and taxes; the latter is financed out of school fees and, in some cases, investment income, donations, gifts, etc.

The existence of these two systems of education sharply divides the nation. It creates a rigid caste system. Those educated at a fee-paying school, outside the state system, gain thereby professional or social advantage; and often this advantage is in no way connected with academic or intellectual attainments.

I call two witnesses to testify to the effect of the fee-paying system of education. The first is the present Prime Minister who in his book *The Middle Way* (1938) said, "It is possible to conceive of an educational system which would . . . give us at the same time better education and less class antagonism. In so far as snobbery and class alienation exists in this country, it is largely a product of class differences in education." My second witness is Sir John Maud who, as an Old Etonian and the first Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Education, is in a position to speak with authority. In his book *Local Government* (1947 edition) he writes "There is a great gulf between the private and public

system of education . . . and English education, unlike the American or the Continental, tends for better or for worse to emphasise distinctions of class."

### Entry fee

**The main citadel of class distinction in education is, of course, the hundred-odd fee-paying schools (largely boarding) known as the "public" schools.** At these schools, parents pay large sums of money annually in school fees: Eton, £443; Harrow, £426; Rugby £414; Winchester, £387; Stowe and Clifton, each £384, and so on. Indeed, the average fee at a "public" school is over £300 a year; and on top of this the parents have to clothe their boys, keep them during the school holidays, and provide pocket money and holidays as well.

Clearly the "public" schools are the preserve of the wealthy. They are not necessarily attended by the cleverest boys in the country. Certainly there is a competitive entrance examination, the Public Schools Common Entrance Examination, but this

If the private automobile factories can't find markets, steel production will drop and so will coal production and transport, whether nationalized or not. Miners and railwaymen will be out on the streets. Partial nationalization is no security for them.

If the private capitalists panic and start exporting their funds as they did in 1951, the state-capitalist sector cannot prevent it, not having control of 80 percent of the national capital.

**In sum, Labour's policy of partial nationalization was a clear gain to British capitalism, but no solution to its basic contradictions. It allowed the capitalists to pull out of deficit industries and invest more profitably elsewhere; it made the profitable industries more profitable by servicing them at subsidized rates with the products of the nationalized industries. It even gave the ex-owners all the say on the nationalized boards. And, if that was not enough, the Labour Government gave free rein to the representatives of Capital in the Government and especially in the administration of non-nationalized industry.** Of this policy, John Cates writes the following illuminating facts:

... government of business by business was a conspicuous feature of Labour's policy. At various times, the Leather Controller was an official of the United Tanners' Federation. The Match Controller was attached to Bryant and May, and, indeed, for a period had his offices on the firm's premises. The Footwear Controller was an executive of Dolcis. Employees of Distillers Ltd. filled the top positions in the Molasses and Industrial Alcohol Control of the Board of Trade. The Cotton Control was largely recruited from Liverpool cotton firms, and the Timber Control from trade organizations. Perhaps the largest share of control positions were staffed by people from Unilever. In 1947 there were 90 former Unilever employees in the Ministry of Food, 11 of whom possessed full executive and administrative powers. Nor were they the sole representatives of Business enterprise. Each of the commodity divisions of the Ministry was headed by an employee of a leading firm in the industry.

... under Labour a number of businessmen in government were paid, not by the government, but by the firms for whom they had been working, and in other cases firms made up the difference between government pay and the previous salary. And Sir Stafford Cripps admitted that some members of the Raw Materials Control "have always been permitted to keep in general contact with their firms . . ." (*New Statesman and Nation*, August 9, 1952.)

Although the Labour Party in power offered no alternative to capitalism in Britain, but on the contrary helped it to become more efficient, more able to cope with competition in international markets and gave it free rein at home, it solved nothing. Overproduction is still with us.

**Partial nationalization cannot eliminate this problem; it is not one step further on the road to Socialism, notwithstanding the Party document, INDUSTRY AND SOCIETY. Full nationalization is, and even full nationalization with the total elimination of the capitalist class, is only one step, only part of the answer.**

is prepared for at special boarding schools known as preparatory (prep) schools which the sons of wealthy parents normally attend between the ages of 8 and 13, at which age the Common Entrance is taken. These prep schools teach their pupils only the subjects needed for the Common Entrance: English, French, Latin, history, geography, scripture, arithmetic, algebra and geometry; no science, be it noted. Fees at prep schools, especially at those with the highest reputation, are high; £250 a year and upwards being normal.

### Payment for privilege

What do parents get for their money at these "public" schools? Only at a few schools is the standard of education higher than at a state grammar school. Where it is higher, it is due in the main to the better amenities at the "public" schools, and to the fact that the "public" schools can attract teachers with higher qualifications than the state schools can. Reason? Classes in "public" schools are smaller than at state grammar schools; an average of 13 pupils per teacher against 17.3 in the state grammar schools. And the "public" schools generally pay salaries in excess of those paid in the state system.

What parents do get for their

money is privilege. There is certainly a "public school free-masonry" which stands former "public" school pupils in good stead when they have left school. For example, 65 out of Britain's present 75 ambassadors attended "public" schools. Of the top managers in industry, 33 per cent attended "public" schools. 48 per cent of higher Civil Servants were at "public" schools. 260 out of 345 Tory M.P.'s. elected in 1955 were ex-public school. Judges, Bishops, Colonial Governors, and senior officers in the armed forces, are notoriously drawn from the ranks of former "public" schoolboys.

Attendance at a "public" school is very helpful to those who wish to go to a university, particularly Oxford or Cambridge. In 1955, 53 per cent of undergraduates newly admitted to Cambridge came from "public" schools; 42 per cent at Oxford.

The role of the "public" schools today is to prepare their pupils for the right jobs, the right social circles. Their basic function is social, not educational. And it is, in fact, the social function of the schools which, to parents, justifies the high fees charged.

**The existence of the "public" schools is an anachronism in present-day conditions when we** [concluded next page]

## Labour Anniversaries — 2

## THE MOVEMENT

## MARCH 9, 1763 — Birth of William Cobbett

THE GREATEST FIGURE in working class journalism, on whom Marx modelled his style and whose writing left wing journalists of today could study with advantage, began his political life as a Tory, a supporter of tradition and authority. Cobbett's army background, his love of the English countryside and of the sturdy, independent yeomen with which his imagination peopled it, predisposed him to support the establishment and to look with suspicion and hostility on French Jacobins and English Radicals. In 1802 he founded the **Weekly Political Register** and, as a conscientious political journalist he learned, though slowly, where the responsibility for rural evictions and slum housing really lay.

In 1806 William Pitt, the drunken and misanthropic symbol of reaction died, and high hopes were laid on the "Ministry of All the Talents" which succeeded to the government. Though there was a perceptible easing of repression it soon became clear that no reform would come out of shifting parliamentary combinations and William Cobbett, Francis Place, Sir Francis Burdett and Lord Cochrane began a campaign to mobilize public pressure for the return of radicals to Parliament. Burdett and Cochrane became MPs for Westminster—one of the few boroughs with any kind of popular franchise—in 1807, and with the support of Cobbett's paper, political radicalism re-emerged from underground.

## Reaction at home and abroad

The program of the new radicalism was at first extremely limited. War-time conditions created a profiteer's paradise and the House of Commons was corrupt beyond belief—bribery of electors by candidates and of MPs by the Government being accepted features of the constitution. While the war lasted, Cobbett and the radicals campaigned chiefly against corruption and for cheap government, with the aim of reducing taxes. The program appealed to those sections of the middle class which were being crushed by taxation without sharing in war contracts, and also to a growing number of workers, slowly coming to realize that their misery was increased by high taxes on the necessities of life.

Cobbett was well aware, however, of the connexion between a reactionary economic policy at home and reactionary political objectives abroad. The war against France, ostensibly for the defence of Britain against Napoleon, had among its objects the restoration of feudal monarchies in Europe. "The war, which began in 1793, is now over," wrote Cobbett on September 25, 1815:

"The troops are not all come home, the ships are not all paid off, the account is not wound up, but the war is over. Social Order is restored; the French are again in the power of the Bourbons; the Revolution is at an end; no change has been effected in England; our Boroughs, and our Church, and Nobility and all have been preserved; our government tells us, that we have covered ourselves with glory . . ."

## He turns to the workers

If parliament was to be reformed, however, so that the crushing weight of taxes might be relieved, the people—at least those of them who paid direct taxes—must be enfranchised. **But the cause of reform could not be won without mobilizing behind it the strength of the urban working class and Cobbett instinctively turned to that class**

## PUBLIC SCHOOLS — end

are trying to establish democracy. Many people have put forward schemes for "democratizing" these schools, by attempting to widen the basis of entry. The idea behind many such proposals is that the "public" schools recruit pupils only from the ranks of the wealthy, whereas they ought to be recruiting pupils from all strata of society. All schemes proposed by the "public" schools themselves, or by Tory so-called "reformers" such as the Bow Group, involve the expenditure of public funds on these schools, without any public control. In other words, public money is to be used to subsidise privilege; which is surely indefensible.

## Labour leader's policy

Unfortunately, many prominent Labour Party members have defended the "public" schools and have themselves suggested schemes to open the doors of the "public" schools to the children of the workers. But all these schemes involve, also, the subsidizing of the "public" schools with public money while leaving

them free of public control. The class-consciousness of the "public" school would remain, and the working-class would lose the cream of its intellect to the stultifying atmosphere of privilege. The only solution which will satisfy a Socialist is that all the "public" schools, and their ante-rooms the prep schools, and their many imitators the private fee-paying schools which flourish on smug suburban pride and snobbery, should be taken over by the state and turned into state schools. Preferably, they should become day schools, with mixing of the social classes; and it would be both socially advantageous and educationally sound to make them all co-educational.

Only by taking over the "public" and all other fee-paying schools (as the National Association of Labour Teachers has suggested in an excellent sixpenny pamphlet recently published) can we be assured of having a truly NATIONAL system of education. No longer class-divided, education would become an instrument for promoting social and hence national unity.

as it began, from the end of the war and for the first time in history, to emerge as an independent force in politics. His **Weekly Political Register** cost a shilling and a half-penny and was beyond the reach of working class pockets, though country workers had formed the habit of having extracts from the **Register** read to them in pubs.

## The "Twopenny Trash"

In November 1816, he wrote the first of his "Addresses to the Journeymen and Labourers" which he published simultaneously in his ordinary edition and in a special twopenny edition which, since it did not contain news but only articles, was exempt from the stamp duty on newspapers. The venture was a huge success, and "Cobbett's Twopenny Trash," as it was called by its critics and, before long, by its supporters as well, became a regular feature of the political scene. **Cobbett was no longer a middle class radical and champion of the rural workers. He had become the authentic spokesman and leader of the working class—the first leader of a workers' mass movement in history.**

In that eloquent first "Addresses to the Journeymen and Labourers," Cobbett wrote:

"Whatever the Pride of rank, of riches or of scholarship may have induced some men to believe, or to affect to believe, the real strength and all the resources of a country, ever have sprung and ever must spring, from the **labour** of its people . . . Elegant dresses, superb furniture, stately buildings, fine roads and canals, fleet horses and carriages, numerous and stout ships, warehouses teeming with goods; all these, and many other objects that fall under our view, are so many marks of national wealth and resources. But all these spring from **labour**. Without the Journeymen and the labourers . . . the country would be a wilderness, hardly worth the notice of an invader."

Cobbett went on to demand the vote for everyone who paid direct taxes. Soon he realised the inadequacy of this in a country in which the workers were impoverished by indirect taxes, and he began to work for universal adult male suffrage, which was to become the central demand of the Chartist movement twenty years later.

## The lack of organization

Under conditions of post-war crisis in which falling prices and demobilization combined to cause mass unemployment, Cobbett's influence among the workers was immense and working class journals, like Jonathan Wooler's **Black Dwarf**, mass meetings addressed by Cobbett's friend, "Orator" Hunt, and Hampden Clubs, organized by Major Cartwright were followed by renewed repression. The new labour movement was harassed by provocateurs and police spies. Cobbett warned the workers against falling into police traps, advising his readers, on February 15, 1817,

"to have nothing to do with any **Political Clubs**, any secret **Cabals**, any **Correspondencies** but to trust to **individual exertions** and **open meetings**."

**Essentially an individualist, Cobbett did not appreciate the strength inherent in working class organization. An agitation carried out through public meetings and journalism was as far as his ideas carried him, and when, in 1817, the Government suspended Habeas Corpus, so that any of its opponents could be arrested without charge, he left for the United States.**

After his return, in 1819, repression was intensified, and the Six Acts gave greater powers to the magistrates to suppress meetings and disperse gatherings. The fourth Act, especially directed against the cheap edition of Cobbett's **Register** and other working class journals, levied a fourpenny stamp tax on papers costing less than sixpence and appearing more often than once a month.

"It is quite sufficient to know that every printer, every bookseller, every publisher, every writer for the Press, is now liable to be banished, if he dare write, print, or publish anything which shall be regarded . . . as tending to bring into hatred or contempt, the **Government** and **Constitution** . . . as by law established . . . are we still to be told that we are free men? Good God Almighty!"

wrote Cobbett on January 6, 1820. Yet his advice remained the same:

"I am for making use of all the elbow-room, which we have yet left us by the Acts . . ."

Though he did not advocate organization, either legal or otherwise, under prevailing conditions, Cobbett gave every support to Arthur Thistlewood, who had planned to kill the entire Tory Cabinet at dinner when, after being first instigated and then betrayed by a police agent, he and the other "Cato Street Conspirators" were tried and executed. Cobbett published both Thistlewood's speech at his trial and a moving account of the dignified and resolute behaviour of the condemned men at their execution, in 1820.

Cobbett died in June, 1835. His greatness and his limitations were evident to his dying day. Both were displayed in his last articles, denouncing the new Poor Law, of the previous year, and the callous behaviour of the Poor Law Commissioners in enforcing the work-house test. He called for nation-wide resistance to the enforcement of the Act, but after his own fashion. "Half-a-dozen counties" he wrote

"are in a state of partial commotion; the jails are opening the doors to receive those who are called the rebels against the Poor-law Bill . . . here is the country disturbed; here are the jails filling; here are wives and children screaming after their fathers; here are these undeniable facts; and what is the cause? Not a desire to overturn the Government . . . not a desire to disobey the settled laws of the country; not any revolutionary desire; not any desire to touch any one of the institutions of the country. What is it then? Why a desire . . . to maintain the laws of their country, as they were settled at the time when the **present church of the country was established** . . . the very fundamental principles of the Government; and which are of two hundred and forty years' standing."

# PARLIAMENT

by MICHAEL MILLETT

Mr. Ridsdale (Harwich, Con. and Lib.) said nuclear war was suicide. Perhaps if every time they used the word 'war' they used the word 'suicide,' they would go more quickly towards disarmament.

The Times, February 27th

THE HOUSE has had a two-day debate on 'defence', the occasion being the publication of a White Paper entitled "Report on Defence. Britain's Contribution to Peace and Security"—the title makes it clear that a well-trained Civil Servant can find a good word for anything that is put to him.

The debate was a peculiar affair. It is this column's sad duty to study the reports of debates, and this one seemed particularly turgid and nonsensical. Could Ministers of the Crown, elderly men, with good lunches inside them, and wearing clean shirts, be standing up and seriously discussing warfare that would destroy England and themselves?

The truth is that the Conservative Government does not seriously believe in the prospect of atomic war. In other words, the plummy, unctuous tones of Ministers are not natural from birth; the effect comes because they are forever speaking with their tongues in their cheeks.

A few members took the debate seriously—it was cruel of the others not to let them in on the magnificent party romp. For example, Mr Ridsdale, whose speech heads this column and the Reverend Llewellyn Williams (Abertillery, Lab.) who said that he had no illusions about Russia or Communism, but he refused to continue thinking in terms of Russia as a power which sooner or later would and must make an aggressive war. He did not underestimate the awful consequences of Britain being occupied by Russia, but that would be better than an island completely ruined and devastated beyond repair.

## Behind the arms budget

The Government and most of the Opposition must have a defence program for various reasons: the need to keep in well with the Americans, who presumably think that all-out war is possible; the feeling that Britain has been a 'major' power for a long time, and ought to remain one; and, above all, the useful economic nature of the arms drive.

From the point of view of the Capitalist manufacturer, nothing could be better than making arms; production rarely has to start before firm orders are placed; profit margins are usually guaranteed in advance and equipment becomes obsolete so rapidly that demand, once started, hardly ever fails.

**SOCIALIST REVIEW** is published twice a month by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd., 35b Priory Terrace, London, N.W.6. (Tel.: MAlda Vale 9258). Subscriptions, from this address, post paid: 1 year: 16s. 6 months: 8s. 3 months: 4s. Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of **Socialist Review** which are given in editorial statement. Editorial communications should be sent to Michael Kidron, 30 Hamilton Terrace, London, N.W.8. (Tel.: CUNningham 9616). Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. (TU), Potter Street, Harlow, Essex.

To the Capitalist however, the cream of the joke is this: in the production of ordinary things, chairs and tables, cups and saucers, the output has to be sold to none other than the sort of people who made them. And when profits are added to the cost, which consists of wages, however can there be enough money to buy all the things made? If arms are made, this inconvenience, which leads to all those nasty slumps, is avoided. Instead, the

## Industrial Front — from page one

and add that the struggle for colonies has already twice in a lifetime landed us in a world war, and may do so again.

We can ask workers whether class peace and co-operation is worth Hiroshima or H-bombers overhead. And while pointing all this out, we can yet support any action which workers want to take (e.g. by struggling for higher wages) in their own short-term interests.

While the Tory Government continues to concentrate its fire on working class living standards, the respectable leaders of the Parliamentary Labour Party passively stand by and do nothing. Thus is created the apathy in the Labour movement which these self-same Leaders so often complain about. Thus are many working and middle class people inevitably brought to say: "They are all alike, all out for themselves; what's the good of voting"—as at the last general election.

## How to get rid of Tories

Meanwhile Socialists have got to destroy working class apathy by showing that the *status quo* can be changed, and that nothing is permanent. What should Socialists do by way of helping to change the present situation in the Labour movement?

It seems to us that in considering how to get rid of the Tories, the main thing is to fight against the right-wing assumption that the only weapon allowable to Labour is the Parliamentary one.

To say that because Macmillan has a majority in Parliament, we must passively obey whatever policy he proclaims, and do nothing except wait for the next election (which may not come till 1960) is absolutely ridiculous. Yet that is the line laid down by right-wing leaders like Gaitskell, Morrison, Shawcross and their like. This at a time when Macmillan has the power to plunge us into an American nuclear war any day—in fact, when the

working classes, in one way or another, are taxed for armaments. This consumption goes to futility and waste but on the way profits are extracted—stable, easy profits.

For ruling classes rearmament is the best thing invented since the pyramids, which were equally useful to the Egyptian aristocracy.

What matters the danger—and it is a real one—of an accidental thermo-nuclear war compared to all these golden numbers? Tip-top people have always had a suspicion that Canada has a healthier climate.

Americans can plunge us into it without even asking Macmillan's permission!

## The old moral

The moral is the old moral which was familiar to the Labour movement 40 or 50 years ago, that Labour must use both political and industrial weapons in the struggle against capital.

Of course fight the Tories at every election, but also refuse to obey their exhortations to suspend wage claims for the sake of what they call "the national interest."

## Which nation

The "national interest" of the Tories is not our interest. Our interest is not to make Macmillan's job easy, but to make it difficult in every possible way. So press all wage claims; support all strikes, official or unofficial, large or small; repudiate all obligations to the capitalist state, till the Tories are kicked out by the combined industrial and political boot of organised Labour.

## Root of evil

By showing how all the struggles of the moment (for example, the struggle against the plan to build rocket-launching sites in Scotland) are related to the struggle against the wage-and-profit system, that is, capitalism, we are actually fighting for the realization of the Socialist program: the nationalization of the means of production under workers' control.

And it is only with such a program clearly in mind, guiding every activity of the Movement, that we shall find the strength to reject the current policy of making peace (with the bosses) in order to wage war (with H-bombs) and replace it by waging class war to win peace and the fulfilment of man.

JAMES D. YOUNG

# WHAT WE STAND FOR

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

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Renationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation.—The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.

- Workers' control in all nationalised industries, i.e., a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.

- The inclusion of workers' representatives on the boards of all private firms employing more than 20 people. These representatives to have free access to all documents.

- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions.

- The establishment of the principle of work or full maintenance.

- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, linked to a realistic cost-of-living index, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.

- The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.

- Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants—without a means test—for all university students.

- Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

- Freedom from political and economic oppression to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the underdeveloped countries.

- The unification of an independent Ireland.

- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas. The abolition of all weapons of mass destruction.

- A Socialist foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow.

## SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

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

Name.....

Address.....

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