

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

8th YEAR No 7

1st APRIL, 1958

SIXPENCE

The Road to **ALDERMASTON — and BEYOND**

EVERY INCH of the way to Aldermaston is paved with protest; every pace in the fifty-mile march cries out at the havoc created by the Bomb in men's minds, in their bones and in their future generations. The anti-Tory whisper is now a statement. The statement must become a roar. The roar a mighty thundering—Ban the Bomb! Out with the Tories! Brotherhood not Blood!

There is not one of the marchers but wants an end to this mass murder; not one of the onlookers but is chilled by the paralysis which the rulers of West and East have invoked. Each and every one of us wants an end to the awful threat. Ban the Bomb! Out with the Tories! Brotherhood not Blood!

But how? Marchers to Aldermaston, can our uniform tread shake the Tory edifice of 'defence'? and disarm the damn deterrent? Is it enough to form a peaceful column, wind out of the Capital and say: Look! Look at this mighty demonstration?

We know the Tories. They hear not, see not, nor speak not. They house the file of marchers in their scabbard of police and turn to other business—the making of the Bomb, the building of Bases, the gouging of profits from death and mutilation.

But that business is our business. It is we who make and build. It is we they profit from and then pound to radioactive dust. It is we they despise as playthings and obedient servants. But it is also we they depend on for their armoury.

Marchers to Aldermaston, let us never forget—ours is the power to make or break the Bomb. We have dedicated ourselves to its destruction. We have shown a unanimity of will and feeling surpassing anything seen for decades. Now is the time to march on, beyond Aldermaston, into the factories and the building sites, back to our normal lives and occupations, to

BLACK THE BOMB!

BLACK THE BASES!

to put a workers' veto to capitalism's orgies of violence as the first step to workers' control of the war machine and the destruction of capitalism.

Anti-Strachey — 1

page 7

The industrial front

pages 2-3

"Let the socialist in the trade union branch sort out the local bus garage and get his branch to send the busmen a message of support. Let the local trades councils invite the busmen to send representatives to give the facts and counter the lies that will be spread by press and radio should a dispute develop."

We're all in the busmen's fight! writes a garage delegate

THE MARATHON London bus wage talks have at last reached the "show-down" stage. The positively last "venue" has been explored. The last "channel" has been investigated. The appeal to "reason" has been listened to. The urge for "restraint" has been observed. The last "red herring" has been employed. The postively "final" appeal to the "impartial" arbitrators has been made. Sir John Forster has made his award—it spits in the face of the London busmen and—through them—of the seven million trade unionists now prosecuting wage claims.

A class issue

The award, on which the London busmen's delegate conference must now take its decision, has been dictated by the Tory Government and is in complete accord with their declared policy. The award fully meets the requirements of the LTE and of the employing class as a whole. The award is the carrying out in practice of the views of the "Cohen Council." The fight on this pay claim now ceases to be a matter between 50,000 London busmen and their employer. It becomes a class issue upon which the future standard of living of our people will depend—and it must be fought as such by the whole Labour Movement.

The award offers 8/6d. to 36,000 central drivers and conductors—nothing whatever to 7,000 country area drivers and conductors—nothing at all to 8,000 garage maintenance staffs. On the cost of living index alone

an increase of 9/- for ALL staffs is indicated since the last award. Even while the wage talks have been under way—a whole series of "economy" measures—tightening of schedules, reduction of services, "localization" of operations, reduced Sunday work (carrying pay at time-and-a-half) have combined to reduce the busmen's earnings by a sum greater than the present award. Thus, the London busmen are asked to endorse an award which, in March, 1958, will leave every man and woman involved worse off than when the pay claim was first made in February, 1957.

turn to back page



B
"It's real mink—wasn't it clever of him to make all that money when there wasn't a leak?"
—By Belsky of the Daily Herald

TU Commentary

• Black the Bomb!

PUTTING TEETH INTO THE CAMPAIGN against the H-bomb and rocket sites was the news that Aberdeen plumbers had blacked work on the sites, Glasgow Council, Liverpool Trades Council and numerous ETU branches in Kent had declared their solidarity with any similar action. Now from Willesden comes the news that the local ASSET branch have requested their (London) District Committee to contact other unions in the field of construction and transport to declare an embargo on rocket site construction. Their resolution continues

We believe that only the organized industrial power of the workers allied to the political power of the Labour Party can force the Tory Government to abandon its suicidal policy.

A similar resolution calling for the Blacking of all work on rocket launching sites was passed by the **East Acton branch of the AEU** to be sent to their District Committee, and also to the Willesden Trades Council. More and more such resolutions are needed to transform verbal opposition into action.

Let the organized might of the Trade-union Movement show the Tories that when we say NO H-BOMBS! NO ROCKET SITES! then we really mean it.

• Ban overtime

WITH UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES RISING all over the country, many sections of workers are beginning to see the folly of years of overtime working, and **bans on overtime are now coming into force** in factory after factory. The same is occurring in the shipyards and the docks. Joiners and electricians are operating an overtime ban in the **Tyne and Blyth ship-repair yards** where already 1,200 out of 9,000 ship-repair workers are unemployed. In the **coal-mines**, where recruitment of labour has ceased, pressure is now mounting for the National Union of Mineworkers to put an end to Saturday shift working.

Sections of **London dock-workers** have also banned overtime working; over 1,000 men are unable to find work each day. From **Merseyside**, comes news of the ban by 40,000 building workers in order to avoid redundancy (reported elsewhere in this issue).

• Sack Mac

AS READERS WILL KNOW, the Cohen Committee Report suggested that we should not be alarmed if unemployment was at a somewhat higher level. The Prime Minister, in a written reply to Mr Charles Pannell, one of the trade union MPs, said the Cohen Committee

is an independent body and the Government is not responsible for the views it expresses.

While the Government is not responsible for the views expressed by the Committee, some ministers at least hold similar views. I presume Macmillan is responsible for his own Minister of Labour, Macleod, who, speaking at

Mitcham on 5th March, said

You would expect from now on that the figures of unemployment are going to fall as the seasonal trades begin to pick up. But it may be this year that the decrease in unemployment will be less marked than usual.

Surely the only people who should qualify for redundancy at this moment are the Cohen Committee, the Minister of Labour, and his Tory colleagues.

• Land workers

THE BIENNIAL CONFERENCE of the **National Union of Agricultural Workers** is being held on the Isle of Wight next month, and the motions on the Agenda show that this union is just as wide-awake to the problems of the day as are other unions. There are 35 resolutions from branches calling for a 44-hour week, 38 for wage increases and 37 for payment of wages during periods of sickness. On problems not specific to agriculture, is one from **Fullney branch, Holland, Lincs.**, which says

That this Conference calls upon the Government to immediately abolish the policy of conscription into the armed forces and to use the money and resources thereby made available to help to raise the standard of living of mankind throughout the world.

Last but not least, there are four resolutions demanding the banning of the H-bomb. Our country cousins are giving a lead which their town brothers would do well to follow.

• Time to change

IT SEEMS LIKELY that agreement has been reached between the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions and the TUC over the plans for the public ownership of the aircraft and machine-tool industries. This change of ownership could not come quick enough for those employed in these industries. Since the redundancies on the Isle of Wight, we have to add 400 more at **Bristol Aircraft, 150 Boulton & Paul workers** in Worcester and about 100 more at the **Victoria Machine Tool Company** in North Acton. These are just a few examples from a long list in all parts of the country.

If these firms can't find jobs for the workers who helped make them prosperous, then it is high time that a change of ownership be effected.

• Mines & means

WORKERS OF DARFIELD MAIN COLLIERY, Yorkshire, were on strike for two days in early March over a wage grievance; pending discussions they returned to work. Like workers elsewhere in all other industries, I have no doubt they received the usual hard luck story from the boss. "There's no money in the kitty." "Work harder—earn more!" etc., etc.

If only those workers on strike had been ex-mineowners! They don't have to work harder to get their share; there's plenty of money in the kitty for them! Since nationalization of the mines £300,000,000 has been paid in compensation to the ex-owners.

Surely we should demand, when a new Labour Government is installed, that every new nationalization scheme should be on a basis of **workers' control**, with compensation payments based on a means test.

• Correction

Correction. Although it is true, as stated in my last trade union commentary, that a number of ETU branches in Kent had resolved to block work on rocket sites, it was premature to say that the EC had sent a commission of inquiry to find out what was behind the resolutions. That might come later.

GEOFF CARLSSON

Our Trades Councils have a glorious history of fight in defence of workers' standards. Although a lot of them are at the moment suffering from the lethargy that is only now beginning to be shed by the Labour Movement, they are a crucial part of our armoury and one which we shall use more and more in the future. Militant socialists want to know about them and their activities, want to know in order to help them take their real place as an active, leading part of our Movement. Let us hear, Brothers. A paragraph or two; a record of decisions taken, a sketch of the major arguments—that is all we want in order to present readers with as balanced a picture of the British Trades councils as possible.—Editor.

BIRMINGHAM TC

1 - condemns the Tories

2 - almost fights them

INDUSTRIAL ACTION, past, present and future featured prominently at last month's meeting of the Birmingham Trades Council when a motion submitted by Birmingham AEU No. 4 Branch was debated. The motion read

"that this Trades Council is opposed to the findings of the Cohen Committee. We protest most strongly against this further attack upon the living-standards of the working-class. Furthermore, we ask the TUC to convene a meeting of all Trades unions, especially those with wage-claims pending, with a view to calling for national industrial action to impress on the Government that the workers will not tolerate any lowering of their living standards."

Delegates saw the Cohen Report as a green light for further attacks on working-class standards, criticized the lack of fight in the leadership of the Movement (Robens, who thinks strikes 'anachronistic' achieved dishonourable mention) and called for support for bus- and railwaymen in their present struggles.

An amendment deleting all reference to national industrial action was moved and seconded. It substituted for the deletion

"We ask the TUC General Council to convene an emergency congress of the TUC to find ways and means of combating the Cohen Report."

Amendment carried

A spirited attack on the amendment and on the faint-hearts that distrust the powers of sacrifice and solidarity of the working class could not save the day and it was carried by a narrow margin of 38 to 33. Put as a substantive motion it was carried overwhelmingly.

Insurance contribution

Also carried, this time **new** was a resolution

"That this Trades Council vigorously protests at yet another increase in insurance contributions; condemns the Tory Government for deliberately pushing up the cost-of-living in contradiction to its election program; deplors the attack on the workers' standards of living which makes nonsense of any call for wage restraint under the present conditions. It further requests the TUC to examine the whole method of financing the National Insurance Scheme."

In moving the resolution, the first speaker made some telling points. He opened

"How peculiar that the Tories can find any amount of money for armaments, rocket-bases or bloody suppression in Suez or Cyprus, and yet cannot find a few million when it comes to financing the Health Scheme. But really money is their God: human life is a secondary consideration for them."

next page

SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose ^{16s.} ^{8s.} ^{4s.} subscription for ^{1 year's} ^{6 months'} ^{3 months'} issue of
SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Name.....

Address.....

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

MERSEYSIDE

The fight against unemployment begins

by Eric S. Heffer

TWO IMPORTANT EVENTS have recently occurred, which have begun to sharpen the struggle against unemployment here on the Merseyside. The first is that from March 1st, a complete ban on overtime has been imposed by the Mersey Branch of the NFBTO in the Building and Civil Engineering industries, and secondly the Confederation of Ship-Building and Engineering Unions have reached an agreement with the Mersey Ship-

Repair Employers on the recruitment of labour. This last measure is designed to combat the re-emergence of the evil "stand-system," a system which degrades the worker, and delights the employer, as it emphasises their power and economic control.

Both these events, are in themselves a symptom of the growing unemployment, and emphasize that **the time has arrived to attack, before we are unable to do so, because of the weakened state of the movement.**

1—The Building Ban

This ban will affect 40,000 workers, and will be rigidly applied. Some workers would consider that the ban is overdue, but whatever one's feelings are about its timing, it's to be welcomed, as a necessary step, quite rightly linked with the fight for the 40-hour week, and the 8d. an hour increase. On the leaflet issued by the Federation the point is made "Work that cannot reasonably be undertaken during the working day can be done by organizing a night shift, and labour for this will be supplied from the ranks of the unemployed." On the 40-hour demand it says, "If we are to secure our demand, then we must end systematic overtime."

The leaflet also gives some interesting facts on Profits, Safety and the Bank Rate effects, which help to underline the points on the building industry already made in earlier numbers of SR. It is understood that the larger jobs in the area will be holding mass meetings to be addressed by officials on the Ban and the Federation's demands, also a meeting and march are being organized centrally for all the workers involved.

Brum TC—end

He referred to the Labour Government opening the breach by first introducing charges and reminded delegates that at the time the Birmingham TC had warned that the Tories would take full advantage of it. He felt that there must be an end to these continual increases in contributions, that surely we could find "a more enlightened way of financing Insurance." He ended by throwing out to the delegates the suggestion that a 'pay-as-you-earn' system might be adopted.

Some delegates were not sure about the suggestion for PAYE, since workers are taxed too much anyway, but the motion itself found general support.

SR Industrial Report

It must be bluntly stated, the official movement has seriously dragged its feet, and the rank and file have equally been slow off the mark. This, however, is being overcome and a meeting is soon to be organized. It is perfectly clear, as I have emphasized else-

Though the industry had begun the year at a record level of activity, the total volume of construction in 1957 was no higher than in 1956. This year it will certainly be lower. New orders are not matching the volume of contracts being worked out; unemployment has risen more than seasonally; and demand for building materials has dropped.

Economist, March 8

where, the claims will only be met by struggle, and part of that struggle is obviously to get the official movement really cracking. Militant words are not enough, it is deeds that count. That is why all militants have welcomed the Ban, but see it as only the first step.

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.

2—Ship repair 'stands'

PRIOR TO THE SECOND WORLD WAR, during the "good old days" unemployed Ship-repair workers formed "stands" outside of the offices of the employers along the dock road. Such stands were actually recognized in the local agreement. Since 1947 such stands have officially been abolished, although recently they had begun to form again due to the growth of unemployment. Such "stands" take away completely the dignity of the worker and reduce him to the level of cattle. Foremen would look the men over, like a bull in an agricultural show, and almost feel over muscles for strength.

This system, the unions quite rightly say, must never again be allowed. Firstly because of the degradation, and secondly because the "Blue-eyes" get chosen, whilst militant Trade Unionists or others who have stood up against the bosses are continuously overlooked. Equally the pernicious system of buying one's job in a public house must be defeated, and these are the reasons why the Mersey District of the Confederation of SEUs have gone forward to strengthen the old agreements on the engagement of labour.

All labour now, must be recruited from the Labour Exchange. Men must not seek their employment by going to the firms or the ships and neither must the employer take lists of names to be contacted when required. **The most serious weakness in the agreement, however, is the fact that the employers have been left with the right to nominate 10 per cent. of their labour force for repair jobs.** A right which is obviously open to serious abuse. The officials are hoping that because of the numbers involved this clause will largely be a "dead letter."

Equally, as yet the agreement has not been applied to Cammell Lairds, the large Ship-building firm at Birkenhead, who employ almost as many men as the rest

of the Ship-repair firms combined. Stands have been formed of late at Lairds, one Joiner describing to me in detail its operations. It is clear that **Cammell Lairds cannot be made an exception**, and it is understood the Confederation are seriously considering the position.

One real difficulty is the problem of the men who are interchangeable. That is the so-called "finishing trades" who work both in Shipping and Building. Many of these men, sign at Labour Exchanges which are not designated as Shipping exchanges, and therefore feel they will be at a disadvantage when work is available in shipping. These problems too are under consideration and Ministry of Labour officials are meeting TU representatives on the whole problem in the near future.

The problems outlined above are obviously the result of the capitalist system. Unemployment is its product, and to resolve the questions completely, the system must be ended. That is our main job, all else must be considered as interim measures, which ease the burden, but never completely get rid of it.

Recruitment through t.u.'s

I would suggest that on the question of recruitment of labour in both Shipping and Building, **all labour should be recruited through the Trade Union.** A system which operates to some extent in the US Building industry, and in other countries. We should demand of a Labour Government that this be their policy, coupled with the pledge to bring both industries under public ownership. In the meantime, **let us resist all sackings, and fight every slight increase in unemployment.** The lead given on the Merseyside can well be followed elsewhere.

Let the TUC really begin to give leadership and not toil behind events, as is the trend at present.

Page six and . . .

"In present circumstances, they (i.e. the Government) would not make extra money available for further inflationary wage increases, and their attitude in regard to those the Government directly employed would be in line with what they expected from others." Mr. Heathcoat Amory, Chancellor of the Exchequer speaking at Shaldon, Devon, Times, January 18, page 6.

. . . page four

"The British millionaire is no longer a vanishing phenomenon. Figures issued by the Inland Revenue yesterday show that the number of people in the millionaire class—generally accepted to be those with an income of more than £100,000 a year—is increasing." Times, January 18, page 4.

BUILD THE SOCIALIST REVIEW!

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

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Send to SOCIALIST REVIEW
35b Priory Terrace, London, NW6

LABOUR PARTY Commentary

• Kelvingrove means 'renounce the bomb'

KELVINGROVE, another Tory seat, falls to Labour, but victim more of the Rent Act than Labour's alternative. With no official Liberal in the field, some 40 percent of the electorate didn't even trouble to vote. An increasing number of people are now crying unmistakably, 'plague on both your houses.'

The one thing which would save the situation, that is to produce a swing towards Labour, would be for the Party leadership to take a bold line on the H-bomb.

The seven-point program

They have it is true, in consultation with the TUC produced a seven point program which represents a considerable retreat from the bad old days of implacable hostility to any kind of unilateral action. But the extent to which they believe in their new program, or believe it to be a reflection of the wishes of the members, may be shown by their plans to hold a series of delegate conferences of Labour Party members throughout the country, the purpose of which is clearly not so much to launch a campaign to rouse the people, as to try and win over the Party.

The last time such meetings were held was over German re-armament. In the end it was not the Leadership who converted the members, but the members and events which converted the Leaders. If the world stays in one piece long enough I am sure that we will witness a similar retreat on the H-bomb.

For their attitude on this question can no

more be sustained by logic than their German re-armament views. **Even the new program makes a mockery of the conception of the H-bomb as a means of defence. Either one believes in the value of the deterrent, in which case arms oneself with the most modern means of launching it, or one renounces the Bomb altogether. You cannot have the Bomb and say you will not use it first, and will not fly continuous patrols with it ready for action. And such is the essence of the official view in the Party.**

In reality our leaders are not deceived about the defence value of the bomb. Their chief motive is the same as the Tories—to keep Britain in the big-power club. The danger is that this ambition is contagious; France has already announced her intention of joining, and next, who knows? Sooner or later some crank will let one off, and the situation will be beyond control.

Events will force their hand

I am convinced that before long, the Labour Party will be compelled by events to renounce the bomb. How much better it would be to do it now and ride on the crest of popular opinion rather than be dragged by it.

The behaviour of the Stalinists on this question is interesting, for they too are opposed to unilateral action. One is tempted to recall Ernest Jones' charge against the anti-German re-armers at the 1954 Conference, that they were following the Communist line. Any comments, Ernest?

• Socialist policy for local elections

IN APRIL we shall be having a little 'general'—the County Council Elections. The results will certainly show a big swing towards Labour for we had big losses the last time they were fought (1955).

It is not easy to arouse enthusiasm for these elections because of the apparent remoteness of County Hall, with the possible exception of London, where that body is a housing authority. Yet the scope for Socialists is far wider than in Borough and Urban District matters.

For County Hall is the nearest thing we have to a regional parliament. Properly used by socialists, the county council can have an enormous influence upon the community, as in the case of London. And even in opposition, Labour members can perform a real socialist job on these authorities.

What are the issues likely to be this time?

Education will as usual be first, with promises to end the eleven plus, and make the schools fully comprehensive. And since the introduction of the block grants, socialists will be making even a stronger appeal for election because of the justified fear that Tory majorities will cut education.

Because the school teachers are better or-

ganized than anybody else there is a tendency to think that education is the only service likely to be affected by the **block grant** system. But, of course, every service will be, and Labour Groups will have to face up to the fact that local government is going to cost the ratepayers more.

I have always believed that the fear of electoral reaction to an increase in the rates was unjustified. Provided the money is spent on things which are to the **evident** benefit of the community, rate increases may be proceeded with without fear.

What is needed is a little more imagination in local government and I give full marks on this to Coventry for building the first theatre in Britain since the war, and out of the rates!

A real job awaiting Labour county councillors, is to deal with the effects of the **Rent Act**. For if that Act remains unaltered in October, many families will be evicted and it will fall to the lot of county welfare departments to cater for them. A big must is to keep the family united, for too many authorities take in only the wife and children. Further, considerable improvements will need to be made to the rest homes, for many of them are like scenes out of Dickens.

Apologies

We must apologize for two errors in our last issue: our editorial stated that the **Glasgow** plumbers have blacked work on rocket sites; we meant the **Aberdeen** plumbers, but hope that their Glaswegian brothers will prove that our error was no error but merely a case of faulty timing. The second occasion was when we failed to attribute authorship to the article on William Cobbett. The Editorial Board would have liked to have claimed it as its own, but readers should know it to be the work of **Henry Collins**.—Editor.

A battle, too, ought to be waged on the **day nurseries**. Tory authorities are causing these to be closed down at a time when the social climate has so altered that many mothers are now compelled to work, so that a greater need than ever exists for the nurseries.

In **town and country planning** matters, the emphasis is permissive rather than directional. Here, above all else, is a field peculiarly adaptable to socialist methods.

One final word. County Councils play a big part in **civil defence**. Progressive Labour Candidates will be pledging themselves to abolish this wasteful service which today is no more than a branch of internal propaganda.

• VFS

MILITANT SOCIALISTS have a duty in defending the right of **Victory For Socialism** to organize around their opinions against the NEC's bureaucratic interference. But VFS has a duty to militant socialism not to retreat and compromise. If they fail in that duty, the rank and file will suffer severe disappointment.

I am alarmed to see the anxiety with which members of the VFS Executive are rushing to disassociate themselves from official connection with the Aldermaston March. For the record, one of the bodies intimately connected with the march is the Hydrogen Bomb Campaign Committee. This Committee was set up by, you've guessed it—VFS! So much for the pledge to carry out the policy of the old VFS Committee.

I see from Tom Paine in **Tribune** that VFS have set up a committee to consider policy in relation to Industrial Democracy consisting of full-time trade union officials. With all due respect to these officials, and I have many friends in this category, I cannot see anything very much related to real industrial democracy coming from people who have a vested interest in keeping things pretty much as they are.

• Labour lawyers branch out

I SEE that the socialist lawyers were asked to consider setting up a parliamentary panel and fund, 'in order to redress the balance at selection conferences.' Out of 273 members, this organization claims to have 24 members in the Parliamentary Labour Party. I bet Cousins would like to have that kind of balance for the T & GWU! This resolution originated from the Manchester **Branch**. It appears the taking of silk and whatever solicitors take, enables this pressure group to form branches without incurring the wrath of the NEC.

Ron Lewis

Readers:

Order your books through our
new **SR BOOK SERVICE**

Help your paper! Help yourselves!

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

YOUNG SOCIALIST

NOW
TWICE
MONTHLY

NUMBER 9

APRIL 1, 1958

POLICY FOR YOUTH

by Harold Freedman, Chingford YS

A FAVOURITE pastime of charitable organizations, bishops, angry old men and disgruntled newspaper editors is to denigrate youth. "Lazy," "apathetic," "unambitious," "ignorant," "too much to spend"—the epithets could be multiplied infinitely.

These are the opinions of people enamoured of capitalism. They are the opinions of people, furthermore, who occupy important positions in society, the people the "posh" newspapers designate as "responsible." Their opinions "matter." So they do, indeed, and this, to Socialists, should be a cause for concern.

Profit and loss

Their views are negative, and this for a very good reason. "Responsible" adults would like to coach young people in the ways of the old world, the world of capitalism, of profit and loss, of responsible government, of constitutional monarchy: they wish to throw youth into the limbo of the boy scouts' and the girl guides' movement, into clubs run by superannuated colonels; they wish to bestow on youth the blessings of the Salvation Army, the Archbishop of Canterbury (youth is sin, AID is sin, homosexuality is sin, divorce is sin, sin, sin, sin) free enterprise, self-help, ICI, the London School of Economics, and the rest.

Universities poetry 1

If, in fact, as the fly leaf of this anthology* maintains:

Universities Poetry is an attempt to bring together in one volume a comprehensive selection of poetry being written in the Universities of Great Britain by undergraduates.

then we have here an opportunity to make some observations on the prevailing ethos of undergraduate life. At such a time as the present when the universities seem to be coming out of their political isolation and entering into national politics on questions like Suez and nuclear weapons, the attitudes of the more articulate students such as are represented in this collection must give us pause.

Personal isolationism which microcosmically repeats the pattern of political isolation is to be found permeating most of the poems in this collection. Many of the contributors are still

"In this solitude of my love and fear"

(Part Eleven of Celebration by

* Universities Poetry One, price 3/6d. Available from the Editor, University College of North Staffs., Keele, Staffs.

All that is anachronistic, unappealing and decaying is offered to the youth on radioactive plates (bone cancer—what a lark!), and the youth are sick and refuse to eat. Hence the angry cries of the Establishment; hence, too, the battalions of research workers, heavily armed with the very latest American sociological jargon, engaged in the pursuit of youth.

In other words, according to the "responsible" the role of youth in society is to educate themselves in the ways of the old world, to fit in with things as they are.

But this has never been the case, and is not so today. Invariably young people, both individually and collectively, have been on the side of progress. The history of art and of science, the history of political and economic struggle, all show young people in the forefront as initiators, revolutionizers, as people concerned not with what is, but what should be. That youth lacks the experience and knowledge accumulated in the past is true, but not tragic. **In our world of continual movement, of birth and decay, of perpetual renewal, the task of youth is to absorb the best of the past in order to seek for the embryo of the future. What is today will not always be, therefore it is the right of the young to change. Young people should ignore the**

Reed) where

"Loneliness blooms on a wild wet wind"

(Nocturne by Naomi Wentworth).

By themselves the lines of Wentworth and Reed give no indication of the literary merits of UPI, but they have a certain sociological importance—they are thematic and represent very well a pervading feeling of individualism gone sterile. But the poets here are terribly aware of being cut off from wider areas of social consciousness, social effort and social values; this is a change for the better which you must examine for yourselves. Some of these apprentices are making an honest attempt to reach out for larger themes, as you will see when you read Ghose for example, or Sargeant and Udolff.

The fact that we find in this collection a serious attempt by a few contributors to break with impressionism and to establish firm and impersonal relationships based upon wider, social, experience is a sign of the times and one which is very welcome.

RAYMOND SOUTHALL

The 'Young Socialist' has recently received complaints that its attitude towards youth is vague and that it lacks a clear and consistent program. We cannot completely agree with this. Yet we feel there is a measure of truth in this criticism. We are, therefore, inviting readers to discuss "A Policy for Youth." The first article appears below. It discusses what a Socialist attitude towards youth should be and suggests a minimum program of demands. Further articles will follow.—Editor.

"experience and knowledge" necessary to perpetuate things as they are and concentrate on the future.

Fathers and Sons

On this question even the Labour movement is confused. Witness the recent correspondence on the question of Youth in the *Railway Review*, the weekly journal of the National Union of Railwaymen. Every correspondent assumed a static world in which there are good things as well as bad. The good must stay, the bad must go. Amongst the good, some seemed to imply, was the bureaucratic structure of the union! An attraction for youth, indeed! Another correspondent wrote, "In the management of affairs, in adjusting the fine balance of human relations and in maintaining a just standard of equity, matters which are not solely governed by law or logic, age must always be superior to youth."

Oh? Is the "management of affairs" so efficient? H-bomb, depression, strontium, overcrowding, arbitration, bureaucracy—fine management indeed! "Adjusting the fine balance of human relations"—well! Listen to Dr J A C Brown:

Between 1911 and 1936, the death-rate from exophthalmic goitre in England rose by 400 percent in males and 230 percent in females—in spite of improved methods of treatment. In 1924, it was estimated that about 140,000 people in the United States died of high blood-pressure, but in 1940 the figure had risen to 375,000. From the United States it is further reported that every second bed in hospitals is occupied by a mental patient; that one in every six men rejected by the army is turned down on grounds of mental disorder, that 600,000 people are in institutions for chronic alcoholics with an estimated two million heavy drinkers outside. In Scotland between 1931 and 1936 (a period when unemployment was at its height), statistics show that gastric ulcer increased by 130 to 140 percent; 'nervous debility' by 90 to 100 percent, and gastritis by 110 to 120 percent. I am not unaware of the various fallacies involved in these figures. But, whether or not the figures be accurate, the fact of the increase in stress diseases is beyond doubt. The psychological and psychosomatic disorders are diseases of stress, and their increase has occurred predominantly in Britain,

the United States, and the industrial countries of Western Europe. (J A C Brown, *The Social Psychology of Industry*, 1954, p. 261.)

A delicate adjustment indeed! Statements such as those that appeared in the *Railway Review* assume that this is the best of all possible worlds, that the older generation have things under control, and that society as we have it today is the conscious construction of mature minds. I cannot agree with this and therefore reiterate my point, namely, that the youth are the heirs of the future and the future implies a radical break with the past.

A socialist program

This is, I think, a positive, Socialist attitude. However, we need more than mere attitudes, we need a program around which youth may educate and organize themselves. As this is only a contribution to a discussion I shall limit myself to a few points which I think are fundamental to any socialist youth policy, in the hope that other contributors will add to it and elaborate.

(1) Reorganization of the educational system. This would include:—

(a) Comprehensive school system;

(b) Free State education up to 18;

(c) Apprenticeship as part of the education system. This would be the first step towards the abolition of the division between mental and manual labour.

(2) Full adult status at 18. This, of course, would include the right to vote.

(3) The abolition of conscription.

(4) An independent Labour Youth movement, with the right to participate in the formation of Labour's policy.

LET'S
HEAR
FROM
YOU

YOUNG SOCIALIST

TOM MANN —

Revolutionary Socialist

By Jimmy Young

TOM MANN was born at Foleshill, near Coventry, on April 15, 1856. He died at the age of eighty-five on the 13th of March, 1941. His father was a colliery clerk; his mother died when he was a small boy. At the age of ten he was sent to work in a coal mine. By the time he was fifteen he had begun his apprenticeship as an engineer, and five years later he came to London.

The country was then in the throes of an economic crisis. The end of the "epoch of prosperity" had come and ushered in mass unemployment. The workers were beginning to stir and shake the chains of wage slavery; and revolutionary socialist ideas were in the air.

In 1881 Tom Mann joined the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, the forerunner of the Amalgamated Engineering Union. At about this time Henry George's book, *Progress and Poverty*, appeared, and made a deep impression on Tom Mann and other workers who were awakening to the realities of class society. Such workers were soon to see through the weaknesses and inadequacies of George's proposals for the reform of the capitalist system. In fact, as Tom was blacklisted for helping to organize the unskilled workers on

the job he gained a much clearer insight into the nature of the economic workings of capitalism than Henry George.

Tom joined the Social Democratic Federation in 1885. It was at this time that he learnt from Eleanor Marx the fundamentals of Marxist economics which he passed on to thousands of workers during his life. But like many of the outstanding working class Marxists of the time he had to break free from sectarianism and hostility to the trade unions before he could fulfil his role as a revolutionary leader.

Tom Mann is best known for the outstanding part that he played in the great dock strike of 1889, and for the subsequent organizing that he did in building up "new unions" of unskilled and hitherto unorganized workers in the docks and gas works. Working for 18 to 20 hours a day in the struggle for the "dockers' tanner" (a minimum wage of 6d. per hour) he displayed great talents as an organizer and agitator.

But Tom Mann was a revolutionary Socialist. Consequently, he tried to persuade the workers that final emancipation could only come with Socialism, and that only they could bring it about. So from the very begin-

ning of the strike Tom Mann warned the other strike leaders against listening to the advice of the astute Cardinal Manning, who had been acting as a go-between between the strike leaders and the dock directors. Then when whole families were starving, and when the dockers were really against the wall, the dock directors issued an ultimatum refusing to pay more than 5d. per hour. At this very critical stage in the strike Tom Mann persuaded the strike committee to put out a strike Manifesto for an All-London strike in support of the dockers.

The Tory Press was infuriated. The strike committee took fright and withdrew the strike Manifesto. But the Australian and American workers had already begun to pour thousands of pounds into the strike fund; and Cardinal Manning persuaded the dock directors to make some sacrifice rather than run the risk of "riot and revolution."

The dockers' demands were met in full. And the unskilled workers had been taught their first lesson in the strength of working class solidarity.

Then in 1906 he helped to form the Victorian Labour Party in Australia and soon became editor of its paper, *The Socialist*. His views on the need for working class unity and participation in the day-to-day struggles are, in a typical editorial, put thus:

We are not of those who contend it is sufficient to preach Socialist doctrines and await results, without taking part in political agitation and directing the attention of those we may to the Socialist goal. And so it is necessary to be clear minded as to programs and the measures to be submitted for the consideration of the electorate . . .

However, he had subsequently to point out that the Australian Labour parties and trade unions had, so to speak, captured the bourgeois Parliaments, but were so lacking in Socialist purpose that they made no effort to advance towards working class power.

In 1908 Tom Mann participated in the bloody Australian coal strike at Broken Hill, where he discovered the real source of working class power by—at the point of production. He therefore turned to Syndicalism and propagated and encouraged the idea of the workers resorting to direct action to overthrow capitalism.

In 1912 he was arrested for his famous "Don't shoot the workers" speech. He got six months in jail. But the strikes of 1912 showed him the limitations of Syndicalism, and he began to think about the role of a revolutionary Socialist party. He now urged the workers to depend on themselves; to make their trade unions the backbone of their lives; and to build up a strong revolutionary Socialist party to unify their diverse daily struggles into a common channel for the realization of the Socialist Commonwealth.

In 1916 he identified himself with the revolutionary section of the British Socialist Party. In 1921 he joined the Communist Party. Four years later he became the President of the National Minority Movement. In 1931 he was jailed for three months because of his agitation for the unemployed.

Like many another good revolutionary Socialist he fell into the mire of Stalinism, but the real, revolutionary Tom Mann belongs to us.

PARLIAMENT

by MICHAEL MILLETT

THE PARLIAMENTARY LABOUR PARTY has come in for quite a lot of criticism recently, so it is a pleasure to be able to congratulate Members on their sustained and ingenious opposition to the Rent Act.

They are using the novel procedure of successive motions seeking leave to introduce Bills to modify different parts of the Act. The leave is always refused of course—what have the Conservatives a majority for?—but each motion provides a good opportunity to remind the Government and the public of the misery that the Tories will unleash on the country in October.

This has been happening nearly every week for at least two months and the Government is fast coming round to the view that it is not really very funny.

Mr. Orbach of Willesden East, in moving one such motion said that he had himself received a notice of eviction and

The Minister had repeatedly stated that plenty of accommodation would be available from October as a result of the Rent Act. In accordance with the Minister's advice he had approached property owners and estate agents all over London. He sent out 24 letters last week, and received two replies; the first from a Tory County Councillor who denounced the Rent Act, and sent him the keys of a flat which turned out to be unsuitable; the second from the Beacon Insurance Co., who advised him that their waiting list for flats was now so extensive that

no useful purpose would be served by adding further names.

He quoted a case which is probably typical:

A Hampstead property was bought for £950 in 1954; the two sitting tenants were paying £190 and £180 a year respectively. The Landlord . . . took the best of the three flats. To the other two tenants, as soon as this monstrous Act was passed he offered new leases, for three or seven years, at £450 each a year, exclusive of rates, and be responsible for all repairs. (Opposition cries of 'shame'.)

The Minister's advice was negotiate, and yet:

There have to be two or more parties to a negotiation, and when the Landlord would not negotiate, what did the tenant do? What the Minister meant was that negotiation should mean the acceptance of the landlord's will.

Mr Rippon (Norwich South) was the only Government member to reply. (They probably draw short straws for the unenviable task.) His only real argument was, 'that there was likely to be a surplus of houses for sale.'

Although this is possibly true, the only reason for it is that few can afford them. After all, the cheapest houses start at about £2,000 and money is now at 7 per cent which works out to payments of at least five pounds per week, and in building the cheaper estates some speculators are trying to extend the suburbs of London halfway to the Midlands, to Leighton Buzzard for example.

Notebook

AS WE GO TO PRESS the ballot papers are rolling in from Colleges and universities. After their deep political sleep of the last ten years, the student population is waking up and taking notice of the world around them. The majorities are against present 'defence' policies; it is only minorities which have, as yet, a positive, socialist alternative. But minority or majority, what is of overwhelming importance at the moment is that university youth is once again becoming political. What a change from the position only a few years back!

ANTI-STRACHEY—from page 7

of trust and co-operation could have effects beyond imagination. But Strachey sees none of this: management is sacrosanct.

All this can be summed up in a sentence: Strachey, in his revolutionary and in his reformist periods, criticizes capitalism within the framework of accepting the division of society into a class of producers and a class of organizers. In doing this he is giving expression to the desires of a bureaucracy which would like to be integrated more fully into the class of organizers and believes that it could do the job better than the private capitalist can.

The most fully developed example of such a bureaucracy is the ruling group in Russia; and it is this group which has most consistently propagated the ideological position which Strachey shares: it too criticizes capitalism only in terms of "idle rich", slumps and pauperization. It dare not attack the real class division within capitalist production, for it practises a similar division in its own factories. The propagation of a picture of socialism in its own image is the most pernicious of the many anti-working class acts of the Russian government and its satellite communist parties in every country and must be held largely responsible for the low ebb of revolutionary socialism after the second world war.

A FORTNIGHT AGO, the basic division in what Fleet Street indiscriminately labelled 'Angry Young Men' became obvious to even the most thick-headed publicist. The small brawl which followed the performance of an anemic play by one of the 'what-we-need-is-Faith' boys echoed the '30s when some religious writers were saying the same thing, applauding Hitler, and blaming the 'Reds' for the evils of unemployment. The statement attributed to Colin Wilson, that 'We'll stamp you out! Anderson, Tynan, Logue!' may be a portent for the future. If we get much more unemployment, it won't only be Left-wing intellectuals who will have to hear such threats.

John Strachey's 'Contemporary Capitalism' has become the bible of right-wing Labour. In this first article of a series devoted to analyzing Strachey's ideas, SEYMOUR PAPERT deals with

FORUM

STRACHEY, SLUMP and CLASS

MR STRACHEY has two sides which warrant attention. The one is his ability to inject false economic thinking into the labour movement. The other is the evolution of his concept of socialism. In his first aspect he needs to be refuted because, in many ways, he is a specially clever individual, and we shall do so in subsequent articles; in his second he needs to be studied as a specimen which is important just because there is nothing special about him. His development is typical of many thousands who have retreated from militant socialism to reformism or abstention.

But it is not a healthy organism which dies so young. In this article we shall examine the corpse of Strachey's "socialism" to show that right from the beginning it suffered from a malignant disease. Our main concern is not Strachey but the diagnosis of the disease and the identification of the sources of infection.

We shall examine two books by Strachey: **The Nature of Capitalist Crisis** (1935) and **Contemporary Capitalism** (1956). **Capitalist Crisis** is written as a text-book of "marxist" economics. **Contemporary Capitalism** is riddled with fatuous attacks on Marx, many of which could be answered directly by quotations from the earlier work. **Capitalist Crisis** contains statements such as: "Equipped with this knowledge (i.e. of Marxism) men will comprehend the necessity of revolution." **Contemporary Capitalism** is the most sophisticated rationalization of reformism. Nevertheless we shall show that the position of the new Strachey follows logically from that of the old. Statements that are ever so revolutionary in form can be ever so conservative in content.

The critique of capitalism

The heart of socialist doctrine is the critique of capitalism. To find out what kind of socialism inspired Strachey in 1935 we start off by looking at his critique of capitalism. He writes (p. 19):

"... whether the occurrence of crises (i.e. slumps SP) is accidental to or inherent in the capitalist system. This is the master question. For upon it must necessarily depend our attitude to the existing society. If we come to the conclusion that catastrophic crises are accidental to capitalism, then we shall certainly work for their gradual elimination by appropriate reforms. For who would be so mad as to recommend the scrapping of the system itself if the catastrophes which it is bringing upon us were remediable?"

Observe what he does. He seizes on a particular feature of capitalism, erects it into a permanent and necessary feature and finally makes of it the very criterion for judging and condemning capitalism. The miserable life of the worker even under boom conditions, the dehumanization of work, the debasement of all values to the money motive... all these are now nothing. If we can only prevent slumps we should be mad to recommend scrapping the system.

The extent to which he makes everything centre around the one partial aspect of capitalism comes out vividly in his remarks on fascism. We read (p. 342):—

"If it were true... that the fascists are the agents of a separate class... able to set up a workable economic system, which would end the present chronic state of crisis... then there would be a great deal to be said for the fascists."

What he says about fascism is not of any importance in itself but it casts an interesting light on his uncritical acceptance of Russian society as truly socialist. The last elements of workers' control had been wiped out, one man management installed in the factories, millions of peasants had died, the trials had begun—but Strachey has one criterion for judgment: there are no slumps in Russia. Surely the Russian workers would be mad to recommend a revolutionary overthrow of their regime.

How important is the slump?

True to his guns, he assumes that the workers, too, see only one evil in capitalism—that it throws them into ever increasing crises:

"Indeed if it were possible so to reform capitalism that it would maintain human civilization even at the level of the last fifty years (!!!)... capitalism would probably survive indefinitely" (p. 18)

A statement more full of contempt for the working class could hardly be imagined: they are beasts who might be driven to stampede by ever increasing torments but will remain docile "indefinitely" if their stomachs are kept even half full! In the light of this it is not at all surprising to find that Strachey gives up the very idea of overthrowing capitalism as soon as he finds himself in a situation where no deep slumps are apparent.

Strachey as an individual is not important: what matters is that hundreds of thousands of militants absorbed this idea—from Strachey and others—that the essential feature of socialism is a stable, slump free economy, that the essential evil of capitalism is the slump and the inevitable, absolute pauperization of the workers. The devastating effects of this are still a dominant feature of the labour scene. When these militants came into a period which was not dominated by pauperizing slumps they were left with the conclusion that socialism had nothing to offer them and was irrelevant to their problems.

And, equally important, they had no theoretical arms with which to analyze the various forms of bureaucratic state-ownership: in terms of what they had been taught Russia is socialist and British nationalization a fore-taste of socialism. No wonder, again, that they turned away from "socialism" as experience taught them what nationalization was and time brought a fuller picture of Russia.

Class division — the fundamental issue

But if workers turned away from "socialism" they did not turn away from struggle. Not only have the post-war strikes been numerous; in many ways their content shows a new maturity. It is significant that Strachey can write a whole long book on contemporary capitalism without the slightest attempt to analyze these strikes, or even to discuss the problems of industrial relations which have become more and more worrying to the industrial economists. The point is that these things lie outside his horizon. He knows how to criticize capitalism in only one way: whether it pauperizes the workers or raises their standard of living. The fact that the class struggle can continue despite higher wage and employment levels than were considered possible before has no place in his philosophy.

To us, however, and to a whole tradition of socialism, these things are comprehensible and a constant confirmation of the real contribution of Marx—the class nature of society. OUR critique of capitalism is that it divides society into those who produce and those who have control over the means of production. From this division comes the host of particular features which we criticize in capitalism—the dehumanization of relations, the irrationalities of production (of which the possibility of slumps is only one)—and from it comes the chronic state of conflict which exists between the classes.

Our picture of socialism is determined by this. A socialist society is one in which this division has been abolished and with it the whole material and ideological apparatus which exists only to maintain the position of the rulers (the police, the hierarchy of foremen, managers, etc., in the factories, social prejudices, the possession mania, etc. etc.).

Workers' control of production

We cannot discuss here how every aspect of life would rapidly be transformed in such a society—we shall confine ourselves to only two of these in order to show up the nature of Strachey's ideas.

In **Contemporary Capitalism** Strachey makes it clear that he believes the hierarchy in the factory to be necessary. In fact he writes (p. 191):

"For it must be agreed that the leaders of the economy, the skilled technicians and the high executives (as contrasted with the functionless shareholders) must, at our stage of human development, receive very considerably higher incomes than the rank and file of the community. Moreover, it has now been discovered by trial and error that this must be so, in the contemporary stage of human development in any society, whether capitalist or communist."

Against this we say that daily experience of workers' organization under capitalism and, especially, the few but brilliant examples we have seen of actual workers' control (Paris Commune, Factory committees in Russia in 1917 and Germany in 1919, Hungary in 1956) all teach us that workers are perfectly capable of organizing production without any "high executives" at all, let alone highly paid ones.

Smashing the chains around production

The second aspect is the prospect for increased production in a re-organized society. We have already seen that he doesn't grudge the "high executives" their excellent salaries; and for good reason because he thinks that they organize production in the best of all possible ways. He is prepared to criticize the finance and the marketing side of capitalism, but not a word is said against the managerial side. The only prospect he sees of increasing the welfare of the workers (apart, of course, from preventing slumps so as to stop it from falling) is the expropriation of the idle rich. This appropriation could be used, he says, to increase investment and so, eventually, consumption but he warns that although it "would not indeed double the rate of investment... it would... make a useful difference" (p. 192).

As opposed to Strachey's "useful difference" we see quite other possibilities of increasing production and making it more human. A large part of this increase would come from a re-organization of the factories. On the most obvious level it is obvious that many methods of production could be used which are now impossible either because they don't suit the capitalist or because the workers will not accept them on account of the very real danger that they may lead to redundancy or to the undermining of hard-won price- and time-agreements. On a deeper level there is the enormous wastefulness of a system which reduces the bulk of work to uncreative routine: the freeing of the creative abilities of the whole factory in an atmosphere

(contd. on page six)

The Busmen's fight — ctd.

Exclusion of the so-called "country" staffs from the award is made on the grounds that work in the central area is more "irk-some." This tender regard of the employers for the well-being of the driver piloting his red juggernaut along Oxford Street is truly touching—we could almost believe it—if we didn't know that it was a hypocritical lie to conceal their real aim.

Divide and rule

The country service staffs have been excluded from the present award solely for the reason that 177,000 provincial busmen, whose wage claim is pending, have traditionally fought for parity with the country staffs of the LTE. The differential character of the award is thus designed to decapitate the provincial busmen, even before their claim is tabled. The provincial busmen want to march in step with the country section of the LTE? Very well. Give the LTE country men nothing—and thus decide the fate of the provinces before they even reach the negotiating table.

One has only to understand that the British Transport Commission is the biggest provincial bus operator to appreciate the real motive for exclusion of the LTE country staffs and the source from which such a policy springs. The Tory Government instructs the British Transport Commission—the British Transport Commission instructs the LTE. The LTE rejects the claim—the Industrial Court sits on the case. The Tory Government instructs the Industrial Court. The Court excludes the country men—and the provincials have "had it" before they even get cracking. Nice work—if you can get away with it.

Cut-price Judas?

So, much depends on the London busmen's decision on this award—and particularly on the central men. History has it that Judas was offered thirty pieces of silver as the price of betrayal. The central London bus driver

and conductor is being asked to act the role of Judas at cut rates. For 8/6d. he is asked to betray his immediate colleagues operating in the wilds of Watford, Windsor, and Leatherhead, and, in the process, to help defeat the provincial busmen and slow down the whole wages movement.

The London busman never has—and never will—play such a role. **The delegate conference will, I am confident, reject this award and demand plenary powers for strike action.** Such a decision rests in the hands of the General Executive Council of the T & GWU—and, whether they accept this challenge of the Tory Government and the British Transport Commission—will be determined not alone by the 50,000 London busmen but by the attitude of the rest of this million-strong union and the whole Labour Movement.

T & G plus NUR = victory

One of the most encouraging features for many years past has been the development of closer relations between the busmen and the underground railwaymen in the course of their joint wage negotiations. The Central Bus Committee (T & GWU) and the London District Council (NUR) have each expressed full support for the other. Quite openly, each has expressed the view that neither should continue working if the other becomes involved in dispute. Joint meetings and discussions have been held—sadly, it must be said, without any assistance or encouragement from the top union officials on either side.

It is high time the local organizations of the Labour Movement began to take a hand in this bus fight. London Transport is not just a matter for argument between 50,000 busmen and the big-heads of the LTE. More than ten million Londoners (and near neighbours) depends upon LTE services for their only means of transport. With the connivance of the Tory Government this

great public service, once the envy of the world, is being hacked to pieces in the interests of bondholders and tax collectors.

More than 1,000 buses have disappeared from the roads in the past three years. Fares have reached impossible levels. The service has become so bad that the ironical question can be asked: "Have we time to ride—or shall we walk?"

London Transport is seen—not as a vital public service—but as a huge milch-cow for vested interests. Every year £6,000,000 is taken by bondholders as their "interest" rake-off. A further £4,500,000 goes into Government coffers on diesel-oil tax alone. The "state-owned" vehicles pay the Government £800,000 a year in vehicle tax and license fees for the privilege of running on the roads. The LTE, which recoils with horror from the prospect of spending £4,000,000 to meet the full claim of London busmen thus hands out a cool £11 millions in this way.

Truly, London Transport is taking London for a ride—in more senses than one—and it is time the Londoner began answering back. Every man, woman and child in the LTE area makes 300 journeys a year on London's buses. You are the cash customers—and that gives you the right—and the duty—to take a hand.

What to do

Let the delegate on the local trades council and labour party—the shop steward—the woman at the co-op—the trade unionist on the tube—the man in the bus queue—join in the argument. Let the socialist in the trade union branch sort out the local bus garage and get his branch to send the busmen a message of support. Let the local trades councils invite the busmen to send representatives to give the facts and counter the lies that will be spread by press and radio should a dispute develop.

The London busmen alone are a small group—backed by the millions of trade unionists who use their vehicles—they are an invincible army.

I have always supported the Irish struggle for independence. I agree entirely with what Mr Lavin said in your columns on this matter (SR, December, 1957).

I recall John MacLean standing in the dock in Airdrie Sheriff Court, charged under the Emergency Powers Act for speeches made to locked-out miners. He extended both his arms straight out in front, one above the other. He said that the top hand represented the ruling class, and the bottom hand the working class. He quickly reversed them, bringing the bottom one on top, and said: "revolution means that!"

That is the John MacLean I wrote about.

Yours fraternally,
Harry McShane,
Glasgow.

COMRADES, we like receiving both bouquets and brickbats. If it is to be the latter, see that you present "a clear-cut case supported by well-presented facts."—Editor.

Reader-writers, Before rushing through your pads and blunting your pens, think of our space and think of the needless purchase tax you're paying the Tory Government. We have received a number of letters which are simply too long to be included in this issue and will have to be held over until pressure on our space eases. In future, make 250 words your outside limit (not your first target) or resign yourself to the tender mercies of our editorial guillotine—Editor.

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.

LETTERS

I CANNOT GUESS what was biting James D Young when he decided to attack me for no reason at all (SR, March 1).

I did not set out to write a biography of John MacLean. I am more interested in his class attitude than in his stand for Scottish Independence during the last few years of his life. When I wrote the few memoirs (SR, January 1), I thought only of John MacLean the Marxist.

He was sent to prison a number of times—but never as a Scottish Nationalist. I am the only person alive who knows how MacLean moved towards Scottish Nationalism

Again — Maclean . . .

in the last three years of his life. I was in daily contact with him during most of the time he was not in prison; and when he was, I visited him on a number of occasions.

I did not know that I was regarded an enemy of Scottish Independence. It is true that I do not consider Scotland an oppressed nation; but neither do the Scottish workers.

James D Young should remember that one Scottish Nationalist, in a straight fight with Labour, did get to Parliament. Did he fight for the workers? Not on your life!

The position in Ireland is different.

. . . and us

WE HAVE recently noticed an increasing tendency towards emotionalism in SR, a tendency which can lose the support of the more serious-minded readers. As Marxists, surely our cause is based on fact, and any attempt to augment it by emotion will court disaster.

There are ominous signs of economic storms ahead, and if SR is to be a positive force during this period it must develop a reputation for presenting a clear-cut case supported by well-presented facts.

A Jowett
John Sharp
London, E8.

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.