

# SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

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

9th YEAR No 1

JANUARY 1, 1959

SIXPENCE

## Letter to Readers

*A year ago we became a fortnightly. At one go we doubled our monthly circulation, doubled the number of our correspondents, doubled our income and also, alas, doubled our deficit.*

*We have had a reasonably successful year. Socialist Review has been able to interpret the sharpening industrial struggle, the deepening colonial crisis and the incipient movement for peace clearly and dispassionately. We have shown that the Labour Movement has the resources and strength to kick out the Tories, destroy their capitalist system, and end the abominable threat of nuclear warfare. We have shown that it can accomplish these momentous tasks only if it rid itself of the mental and material shackles imposed on it by the right-wing and stalinist leaderships in the movement.*

*That we are not alone in these views can be seen on the docks and building sites, in the factories and garages where SR is increasingly being sold.*

*But it hasn't been success all the way. Twice this year we have had to skip an issue when sales promised to show a seasonal fall. Each issue has been an excruciating search for funds.*

*We know that you are proud of this paper; spell your pride in pennies. SR is a fighting organ; send us some material ammunition.*

*Your fraternally,  
Editor.*

*PS.—A number of 'regulars' have not cleared up their 1958 debts yet. Let's have it, Comrades.*

## into action — for SOCIALISM

AT LAST we have it—Labour's new policy, the fruit of the last few years of "re-thinking", nicely served up to the waiting electorate in a glossy new pamphlet—**The Future Labour Offers You**. The Shoreditch electorate, incidentally, found it so inspiring, that two days after its well-publicised appearance 75 per cent of voters in this working-class constituency did not bother to go along to the polls in the by-election.

Most of the attention in the Press has centred on the appearance of the pamphlet—the shiny covers, the lavish illustrations, the cartoon, the thumb indexes, etc. Technically, the presentation is excellent, and a welcome change from the dreary looks and turgid prose of some of its predecessors.

But the policy will not sell on these merits. The contents of the parcel count for more than the wrapping.

The party has launched its "Into Action" campaign on the basis of the pamphlet, with the aim of recruiting more members, improving constituency organization and generally getting into trim for the coming General Election. So the pamphlet deserves close study and analysis. It is, of course, a summary of points from the various policy statements that have been appearing such as **Learning to Live, Prosper the Plough**, etc., most of which have been discussed in the **Socialist Review**. But the publication of the new pamphlet provides an opportunity of looking at the policy as a whole. Some of the main proposals—and lack of proposals—are examined below.

### Housing: Retreat?

THE FIRST section of the pamphlet deals with housing. Labour is pledged to restore the essentials of the Rent Restriction Acts—fine. The Party's declared purpose is to ensure that everyone has a decent home with reasonable security of tenure—fine again. But there is an ominous vagueness about method. There is no undertaking to municipalize all unfurnished rented accommodation. To help the millions of tenants who are admitted to be living in shocking conditions Councils are merely to be **empowered** to buy rent-restricted property and modernize it. What about Tory Councils

(and possibly some Labour ones) that will not choose to exercise their powers or proceed only at a snail's pace?

Councils are to be helped to speed up their program of new house building by a reduction in interest rates on loans. But there is no definite promise of how many houses will be built. More significant is the omission of any reference to the fundamental problems of a capitalist society which underlie the housing question. **As long as the land remains in private hands the cost of housing will be inflated by the cost of buying or renting land. As long as the building supplies industry is not nationalized the cost of providing houses and therefore rent levels are outside the control of the local authorities. Until government and local authorities are given a definite responsibility for providing homes for all at low rents the problem will only be tinkered with, not solved.**

### Expanding whose economy?

THE pamphlet promises a restoration of full employment through industrial expansion. Certainly unemployment cannot be tolerated, but **how can industrial expansion be guaranteed when the major part of the economy is to be left in private ownership and exposed to all the hazards of capitalist boom and slump?** In the section of the pamphlet on public ownership the only industries where an extension of nationalization is promised are steel and road haulage. In other words, **there is not going to be even the pretence of comprehensive planning of the economy—let alone any attempt to put the planning under workers' control.** The pamphlet does not at any point pose the question of whether capitalism should be replaced by socialism, and if so, how. The underlying assumption throughout, so much taken for granted that it does not need to be explicitly stated, is that the existing economic order is to remain, with a few minor touchings-up.

Under this heading, "Your Job", the party leaders offer rather better conditions for the workers. But why tolerate wage slavery at all? Are we back in the nineteenth century when the slogan "A Fair Day's Pay for a Fair Day's Work" seemed

adequate? Almost this very phrase is used in the pamphlet when it is stated that the trade unions know that "they will not have to struggle against a Labour government to get a fair deal for their members". What on earth is a "fair deal" for the workers other than the full fruits of their toil, and what then becomes of capitalism and the capitalist?

## THIS ISSUE

**4-Page Industrial features & forum, letters etc.**

BY REFUSING to pledge itself to abolish the public schools as a separate category and absorb them into the national system of education, the Labour leaders believe in the continuance of the class structure in education. The emphasis on new building to abolish slum-like schools and on increasing the number of teachers in order to cut the size of classes are, of course, good reforms. But regarded purely as vote-catchers they have lost some of their pull since the government produced its White Paper on secondary education and made much the same kind of promises.

(turn to back page)

Yet, when all is said, this is at least not a socialist program—although the word is thrown in very occasionally like a kidney or two in a steak pudding. Something is happening to the Labour Party. It is true that this sixpenny-coloured pamphlet winds up by reproaching the Tories, in the good old style, for believing that "the economic future of fifty million people packed on a small island can—and should—be shaped decisively by free-for-all scramble with private profits as the prize." But so apparently, and fortunately, does Labour, now that it has inscribed expansion instead of equality on its banner. Certainly the Labour Britain suggested by most of the new programme sounds vastly more acquisitive and less confiscatory than anything that the old socialists have ever acknowledged before.

**Economist, November 29, 1958.**

## TU COMMENTARY

## Peter Berkeley reviews current issues

## 1 The Right to Work

TEN YEARS AGO, on December the 10th, 1948, the United Nations issued their Declaration of Human Rights. Their action was applauded throughout the world, for did they not argue that all human beings, irrespective of their race, colour, class, their language, religion or political opinion, were indeed one, with an equality of dignity, respect and right? Universally, it was agreed by all that none should suffer slavery, torture or attack either upon his person or his property and neither should one have to endure the penalty of unjust exile.

In addition to the rights which must follow, concomitant upon such a Declaration, such as those of free speech, a vote and social security, they also insisted that every human being possessed the right to work. What a simple statement is the last? The right to work! And how easy it seemed to say this in the world of 1948, especially in Great Britain with the boom of full employment in full swing. Here we enjoyed the first fully mandated Labour Government, endeavouring, albeit with some trepidation, to introduce a certain measure of social security and an uninterrupted continuation of this blessing of full employment. It wasn't as yet a "Workers' Paradise", but the door was opening, somewhat slowly it is true, but nevertheless it was opening.

Come forward to 1952, with a change of Government, a change of attitude. Professor Jack, in his presidential address to the British Association, seems to have forgotten the Declaration, for he says that the trouble with our economy is too full employment, a statement that could hardly be reconciled with "the right of every human being to work", and yet, this same Professor is a favourite choice of the present Conservative Government when deciding the Chairman of an Industrial Dispute Inquiry. How, in the light of his own statement, can such a man be impartial? His very words in 1952 expressed his bias and its direction, revealing itself to the full in his conduct of the Smithfield Inquiry just a few months ago.

Journey forward still further, to the 3rd of December this year; to a luncheon in London addressed by Sir William Garrett, president of the British Employers' Confederation, and hear the text of Sir William's address. "The latest figure of unemployment in Britain was 514,000, but the fact is that of this number, there are only 70,000 adult skilled and semi-skilled men." His argument is that more than three-quarters of the persons unemployed are unskilled, and therefore deserve no consideration, for, "The Confederation feels it is very important in dealing with the present situation that the Government should not recreate the acute shortage of skilled labour which has so long bedevilled our efforts to increase efficiency. I think the facts show that these are not the times for drastic measures."

In other words, Sir William argues that the Government should not take any positive action to reduce the present unemployment figures, because by so doing, they might create a shortage of skilled labour and in any case, unskilled labour doesn't matter. So much for Sir William Garrett's interpretation of the Declaration of Human Rights exactly one week before its tenth anniversary.

## Employers' contempt

In the light of these incidents, and they are by no means isolated, is it any wonder that relations between employer and employed are depreciating rapidly and that in the absence of any action from the Unions concerned, the more trade union conscious workers are combining to form militant groups designed solely to lead the workers in what might well become a rearguard action in defence of their working conditions? One thing is more than certain, unless the workers realise the full intent of the employers and react accordingly, they will soon find the employers riding rough shod over all their so-called rights despite the platitudinous lip-service accorded the Declaration on its appearance ten years ago.

## 2 Bans : NASD &amp; Panlibhon

INCONGRUOUS, IRRATIONAL, ILLOGICAL! What adjective can correctly describe the rulers of our TUC. Fully armed with the knowledge that they were shortly to introduce a ban on the Panlibhon shipping, discussions about which had been going on for weeks attended by Bro. Tom Yates and Bro. Tim O'Leary, these completely inconsistent officials decide to banish from membership of the TUC the National Amalgamated Stevedores and Dockers Union for something that happened over four years ago.

Is it to be wondered at, if, when the ban was introduced for a period of four days, the members of the NAS & DU felt themselves unencumbered and continued working? Unlike their colleagues abroad who had to bow to their country's law and work throughout the time concerned, the men of the NAS & DU were completely untrammelled by the ban for they were no longer members of the body that imposed it.

How foolish can you get? Just to add to the inconsistencies of this very peculiar episode, the world's largest tanker, the "Universe Apollo" of 69,000 tons, was launched in Japan on the 6th of December last. Built by a US controlled shipyard for an American company, it will fly a Panlibhon flag.

## Unions

Additionally, it has been revealed of late that no person in Greece is allowed to earn more than the Greek Prime Minister. One of the biggest owners of Panlibhon shipping is

Mr. Onassis, who is reputed to earn more than £22 every second through this medium. Mr. Onassis is a Greek. Could this be just another inconsistency?

## 3 Nationalization or Socialization?

THE control of the nationalized industries, despite the original intention, is far from Socialist in its outlook, with the Government using them as the break on the national economy. Prices of their products are purposely kept low, despite the higher cost of materials essential for their use. Profits are wiped out by continuous compensation and the wages of the workers in the industries are kept pegged at the lowest possible level, and now, if this wasn't enough, many of the Coal Board's pits are to be shut down in the latest "economy" drive.

If the plan at present in vogue is put into effect as suggested early in the New Year whole villages in Wales will be abandoned, men getting on in years will have to move to other areas, despite the ties which bind them to their homes. Unemployment will increase and we shall see once more the depressed areas of the years before the war where men were given no interest but allowed to stagnate and rot.

In view of this, workers everywhere must give the fullest possible support to the miners' massed campaign which is being planned for South Wales and the Forest of Dean areas. Scotland, too, with the highest unemployment in the whole of Britain, is also engaged in a full-scale protest. Strike action is not contemplated at the present but most certainly cannot be ruled out.

It is possible that we may see unprecedented activity on the part of the current Union officials, with them leaning over backward in their endeavours to resolve this problem without injury to the workers. The reason, of course, is not hard to find, it is simply that the General Secretary of the Union is due to retire next year.

## 4 Jack Report (BOAC)

ONCE MORE, the attitude of airline employers threatens to bring about a stoppage. This time it is Airwork, who by virtue of their merger with Transair and Air Charter, are threatening to sack 300 men at present employed at Blackbushe Airport. The proposed dismissals carry no compensation, and the men are preparing for a fight. Let us all wish them luck in their endeavours and not hesitate if material assistance becomes necessary, more especially if events follow the line of the stoppage at BOAC in relation to which the Court of Enquiry's Report has just been published.

In the chair at this enquiry whom do we find? None other than our old "friend" Professor Jack, in consequence of which it is easy to understand the ridiculous bias which makes this report one of the most confusing ever produced.

Everything appertaining to the stewards or officials, with the exception of the Archangel Mathews, is recorded as mischievous and disruptive, but, with one slight exception, the management gets off scot-free.

Bro. Sid Maitland is a Communist and for this he is castigated beyond measure, despite the old Declaration and its stand for freedom of political opinion. Every action that he took was wrong in the eyes of the Court. Mikardo too, was a really bad boy. He was mischievous, and all this in face of the facts that a resolution was tendered within two days of the commencement of the strike, which, had it been accepted, could have settled the question very quickly.

No mention is made of the real cause of the stoppage, the unwarranted procrastination which greeted the request for a wage increase although the Court is sufficiently gracious to concede that it was "singularly unfortunate" for Sir Gerard d'Erlanger to refuse to meet the National Joint Council, when it was endeavouring to its utmost to reach an agreement.

The Court suggests that the authority of the National Joint Council must be re-established, but how this is to be done with a "mischievous" chairman and employers who stand aloof, it fails to say.

All in all, other than an occasion to express a political bias, an action of which, the Court itself accused Ian Mikardo, the report offers no positive recommendations of any description, and from the workers' point of view, was just a waste of time.

## The Boss : Unions' best friend?

Mr C S Garland, President of the National Union of Manufacturers, said in London yesterday that shop stewards were "an excrescence on the trade unions."

Speaking at the annual meeting of the union, he said "The shop steward system as it has developed is thoroughly bad. It is one of the greatest menaces that we employers have had to face.

"It cuts across the legitimate functions of the trade unions, and in my view it is essential for the future prosperity of British industry that the Government and the trade unions should together work out a solution to be expressed in legislation to restore to the trade unions their responsibility for what goes on in the shops in which their members work."

Shop stewards would destroy the unions if the evil was not controlled and its growth checked, said Mr Garland. They did not so much express existing grievances as manufacture new ones.

"We all know that these men, very largely Communist inspired, regard themselves as something above the immediate management. They are uncontrollable, either by the management or by the trade unions, which have to patch up and endeavour to put a reasonable face on the troubles they cause."

The Times, November 11, 1958

# ETU — what's wrong ?

## asks Brother 'Nero', London

# INDUSTRIAL

IS THERE NO alternative leadership to the present Communist Party in the Electrical Trades Union except the Catholic Action, Freemasons and other such reactionary groups? The CP would have us believe there is none. But the bosses are more clear sighted. Their healthy respect for the ability of the ETU membership to struggle, forces them to realise that a **real Socialist leadership** is a much more likely and dangerous alternative. Such a leadership would use, for the benefit of the members, important elements at present corrupted by the Communist Party.

Examples of corruption and perverted loyalty are numerous. Here is a recent one. A recent CP-dominated ETU Rules Revision Conference produced a rule that puts even conservative reaction to shame. It dealt with unemployed members' benefits. Benefits, originally paid on a day-to-day basis from the start of members' unemployment, are now to be paid on a weekly basis with the member qualifying **after a full week's waiting period.** (The Communist Party claims that it seeks to abolish the national three-day waiting period. What humbug!) The ETU waiting period furthermore has to be served afresh with every period of unemployment. Therefore, if a member is unemployed six times in one year, it means that he has six weeks without benefit. Odd days are cancelled, so that after serving three weeks less one day, you draw one week's pay.

### Ignoring the members

The title of this article is: What's wrong? As a member of many years' standing, and also an ex-member of the Communist Party, I feel qualified to answer. **The main fault is the complete failure of the Communist Party, after capturing the Union's leadership, to give first consideration to the membership; its failure to introduce honest policies or reasonable leadership.** In the immediate post-war period, while they were shadow-boxing with the employers, the ETU leadership looked reasonably impressive. Later, under double pressure, they capitulated, and today it is only by introducing all the established tricks of right wing leaders can they continue to control the union. It is not my intention to delve too deeply into the motives of the Communist Party and its relationship to trade unions; I simply advance the fact that all CP policies are subservient to the requirements of the Soviet Union.

Current events in the ETU are by no means accidental; if, as I shall prove later, seemingly incompetent people are placed in authority in the Union, it is for very competent reasons. The Communist Party, on gaining control, could have called upon the service of the most militant and capable job leaders in the union. Looking back, we can say that for obvious reasons the CP

'Nero' is a well-known member of the ETU in London

did not do this, but in the majority of nominations for office, used their bloc vote to put in "moderates", long-service shop stewards, foremen, heads of departments and long-service workers in all branches of industry, members who look upon the Union as a career, men easily controlled, who would accept any directive. A militant member in any union, it must be remembered, is normally a person dedicated to Socialism and the working class, and therefore difficult to corrupt.

### Control versus democracy

The ETU leadership has given a lot of attention to keeping its full-time officers and minor officials reasonably happy. For instance, a recent conference called to consider the unhappy state of the Union's finances raised members' contributions considerably, closed the Union's College and also its convalescence facilities, but raised the wage of officials. **It is significant that since the end of the war all officials' wage increases in the ETU have by-passed the membership—they are granted by EC recommendation to Conference. It is significant, as it reflects the growing power of the officials at the expense of rank-and-file democracy.**

Slowly but surely the CP's policy of Democratic Centralism has been firmly established in the ETU. **The Union's affairs are completely under the control of Committees. The only contact between the membership and officials are shop stewards and other committees. Mass meetings in the ETU are a thing of the past, their death having been speeded up when they slipped from official control.** Readers may well ask: What's wrong with shop-stewards' committees? Nothing, if they are serving their correct function. However, in the ETU many committees take on a "stooge" character. For example, the Union's Building Section (called the Contracting Section) have a committee that is virtually controlled by permanent shop stewards from outside sections. Contracting members are casual workers on one-hour contracts. On the committees their stewards are joined by others from sections which have long-term workers who get the same rate and who serve to ensure the continuity of official policy. These committees endorse policies (usually on wages) **after** they have been settled and serve as the Officials' excuse for not meeting the members.

### Branches & Ballots

**Recently the power of the trade union branch has been considerably reduced. The disciplining of members has been handed over to sub-committees of area committees who have flagrantly abused their duties recently in dealing with the opposition in the union to the CP.** The case of Leslie Cannon is a classic example. He was absent when the committee put him on trial, fined him £5 and suspended him for five years on a minor breach of rule. Compare this with the fact that "blacklegs" before the com-

mittee have escaped with 5s. fines. The conduct of ballots in the ETU has received much publicity. Of course the Woodrow Wyatts are not opposed to ballot-fiddling, provided they are done by the right people: these people are fervent supporters of the "Black Circular" — a very democratic measure!—that takes a member's contributions and denies him the Constitution of his Union!

But the ETU's replies to the charges of fiddling are worse than pathetic. Woodrow Wyatt quoted branch figures of over 100 per cent votes cast... The ETU reply quoted opposition branches which abused the ballot in the same manner, and it cut Woodrow Wyatt's figures for supporting branches to 95-98 per cent. The fact that the average poll in the Union is really 8-10 per cent is kept out of the picture completely. In fact, both sides fiddled the ballot in the Fraser-Cannon vote which was the indirect cause of Cannon's expulsion; but Cannon's fiddles were disqualified, and Fraser, who lost by hundreds of votes, was declared the winner. The union leadership is most definitely at fault here, by making use of a postal vote in which no arrangements for checking had been made. This could easily have been arranged, by numbering the ballot papers with a detachable slip for each member, allowing all the votes to be checked overnight if desired.

However the fiddle is necessary to get the type of candidate desired by the CP returned. On these matters we see confirmed the point made earlier. The bosses' uncertainty as to what type of leader would replace the

present ones prevents them from making a concerted attack on the CP leadership. The majority of the members of the ETU know from experience that character of the Press, and I would venture to suggest that these attacks have strengthened and not weakened the leadership's position.

### Sectarianism

A factor that has hindered the development of a socialist alternative within the union has been the miserable conduct of the ultra-left members of the union, their breaking up into small factions (a man's blood group, his every action, must be just right to qualify him for membership) and their abuse of the workers' only serious weapon, that of the strike. By their irresponsible conduct they have undermined militancy and allowed the union scope to break strikes.

### ... and the future

I do, despite many of the things said, hold out hope for the future of the ETU. The membership, which has a record second to none, is waking up to the many unsavoury things being done in their name: **I am confident that this membership will get back to fundamental socialist principles of the ownership and control of industry, will break this phoney "democratic chain" established under CP leadership, and produce a leadership worthy of the members, elected democratically and not fiddled into position as now. Future leaders in the ETU must be encouraged to accept criticism as the life-blood of progress and encouraged to give the workers a free hand in their struggles for higher wages and living standards.**

# INDUSTRIAL

Tramp-Navy, SR building correspondent discusses

## Homes for the future and Direct Labour schemes

**H**AVE WE all forgotten Labour's policy statement, **Homes for the Future**? How many Labour Party members have read it? How many Labour Councillors on Labour-controlled Local Authorities have read it? If Comrades in our Movement have read it, what are they doing now to make this policy a reality and to overcome the many difficulties it presents?

These thoughts have been worrying me greatly. Indeed, they have become an obsession since I heard that Harold Wilson has become a "Timber man".\*

### Five years to learn

**Homes for the Future** says that we will need a building force of two million—three-quarters of a million more than we have now. It also says that wherever possible Local Authorities will introduce Direct Labour schemes which would, of course, do away with the private contractor.

Getting three-quarter of a million extra building workers is easier said than done. It takes five years' apprenticeship to become a carpenter, bricklayer, plumber or plasterer—far longer than it takes to become a teacher or a lawyer. Even the much ridiculed navy or builder's labourer has to have a wide knowledge and experience of excavation, concrete and machinery—all of which just cannot be learned overnight.

### Wanted: policy for recruitment

Now, in the policy statement which deals with education, **Learning to Live**, the study group understood that we cannot have education without skilled teachers. They therefore deal very constructively with the recruitment and training of teachers. Why has this not been done in **Homes for the Future**?

The Tories' juggling with Bank Rate and their whole monetary policy has meant that fewer parents are now inclined to send their kids into our industry. You

\* Harold Wilson recently became economic adviser to timber merchants Montague L. Mayers, whose profits last year were £499,000.

cannot blame them. We find that fewer building employers are even now bothering to take on apprentices.

In the last period of scarcity, after the last war, we had—as an emergency measure—six months training courses, after which one became a bricklayer, etc., etc. I feel that an attempt to try this again would completely prostitute the craft status in our industry and open the door to jerry-building. Also, with new techniques coming in, we cannot allow any weakening in our bargaining for our share of the wealth created with the help of these new devices. **There will have to be immediate and forthright discussion between the Labour Party Executive and our NFTBO on this question of recruitment. I would like you, Reader, to send your views on it.**

### Direct labour the answer

**Direct Labour schemes can help to solve these problems now.** Experience in Edmonton, Hammersmith, Jarrow, Glasgow and the numerous other places where these schemes have been introduced over the years have shown that opposition had to be overcome from many quarters. There was always the "esprit de (Tory) corps" of the consultant engineers and architects which proved a very formidable opposition. Then there are the many Labour Councillors who are building contractors by occupation, and so against anything that would prevent them feathering their own nests.

Despite such opposition, however, wherever it has been introduced, Direct Labour has saved the ratepayer thousands of pounds.

### Chance for the L.C.C.

In this connexion, I am amazed at the London County Council which has probably the largest building program in the world. **If this Labour-controlled Council were to cut itself off from the private contractors, it would be the first major step towards nationalizing the industry. It could provide an apprenticeship scheme and working conditions**

**which would attract the cream of the nation into the industry. It would save the London ratepayer millions. But above, all, HOMES FOR THE FUTURE would become a concrete and realistic plan overnight.**

Why, why, why do our Labour LCC Councillors keep fawning and grovelling to the private sector?

### Signs — but no life

It is quite true that they have a miserable, puny Direct Labour Section of around 800 men, and that along places like the Wandsworth Road we see sites with huge signs — "LCC Direct Labour". Get on to one of these sites and you will find most of the work being done by private contractors. When I asked why the reinforced concrete in floors, staircases, etc., could not be done by Direct Labour, the answer was: "cannot get the plant". Yet the firm that was subcontracting was hiring the plant itself and still making a fat profit.

Last year, when the London Labour Party sent out a questionnaire to Metropolitan Borough Labour Groups on

## Unionists must fight Discrimination declares Joe Southall, NUR

**I**T IS NOW a little distance away from the race riots in Nottingham and Notting Hill, but race hatred still exists and animosity between white and coloured worker smoulders all the time, waiting to be fanned into a blaze. The British Union—Mosley's organization—which has always based itself on racial antagonism, is busy with its "Keep Britain White" propaganda. Many well-meaning workers—members of trade unions—falsely believing that they are acting to preserve workers' standards and conditions, have fallen victims and are themselves guilty of chalking and marking the fascist slogan: "K.B.W."

### Patriotism or Socialism?

No amount of resolutions passed by the TUC or Labour Party can remove the feeling of racial superiority which the white worker feels he has over the coloured immigrant. It is of no avail to tell the white worker that the West Indian comes from poverty in search of food, clothing and shelter in greater measure than he can ever hope to get it in any foreseeable future in the land of his birth. It is no use either telling him that the immigrant comes for the same reasons which force the majority of Irishmen to leave their homeland; or for the same reasons that the many thousands left their neighbourhoods in the depressed areas before the war for better chances to live.

And it is no wonder because the British worker has been

Direct Labour, only nineteen bothered to fill it in. We learned that eight Labour-controlled Councils operated schemes and that eight Labour-controlled Councils did not. Those that did not, gave the fantastic excuse that they could not get plant or craftsmen. About this time, NFBTO Secretary, Sir Richard Coppock, was writing about unemployment in our industry.

### A policy from the ground

**Comrades in Labour Parties who know nothing about building but believe in decent housing, I ask you to get discussion going in your Parties on Direct Labour. Request speakers from the building unions if there are no delegates from building branches to speak to you on the subject. Report to the building branches any failure to attend on the part of their delegates.**

Do these things, or else we shall have building contractors springing up overnight like mushrooms and sabotaging our plan for **Homes for the Future**. We already have 92,000 of these contracting parasites eating up the ratepayers' money. Let us have no more.

"educated" to believe that he is superior as a Britisher and most of the messages he receives from his Labour leaders are absolutely devoid of internationalist teachings. He has been taught about "our" balance of payments problems. Most of the contributions from the supposed "socialist" intelligentsia in the Labour Party stink with national patriotism as distinct from a real international appreciation of the problems of mankind. Labour's Colonial policy is couched in the terms of the white man handing out doles to his inferiors.

Officially the TUC and the Unions have no policy of racial discrimination. Legally, Britain does not uphold forms of distinction; but they exist. The NUR, for example, has now enrolled West Indians working on London Transport for the most part, but there is a deep animosity towards them by the other rail workers.

### Socialism or Barbarism

And this is how it runs: the railwaymen freely say that before coloured workers were being recruited, the London Transport was acutely short of labour and would have been forced to concede substantial improvements in wages and conditions were it not for the immigrants. The basic wage rates of railwaymen are notoriously low. **Here, it will be noticed, there is no feeling of reliance on their own organized strength plus solidarity with their coloured comrades, but a hope that full employment will create a labour scarcity condition to**

## 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**,  
M Maddison, 21 Aubert Park, N5

We are happy to reprint a statement issued by the Shop Steward's Committee, Associated Automation, Willesden. Readers will be kept informed of the course of the conflict which has its roots in re-organization following the absorption of a relatively small firm into a large, monopolistic grouping.—Editor.

# Elliott-Automation : sackings in Willesden — but workers fight on

## INDUSTRIAL

IN 1956 the Halls Telephone factory passed into the hands of the Elliott group. A new company ASSOCIATED AUTOMATION was formed to conduct the business; in 1957 this Company was taken over by a holding company ELLIOT AUTOMATION, which now controls the capital and policy of all the firms in the ELLIOT empire.

In 1956 an impression of great expansion was created. Old methods of production were changed; the factory was divided into production divisions; the machinery was shuffled like a gigantic pack of cards; the staff increased, and new jobs appeared.

Then in 1957 small redundancies started. At first very small—twos and threes excused on the grounds of cutting unnecessary overheads. But since Christmas last year the lists have grown; over a hundred hourly-paid workers have been sacked, and one of the main divisions, manufacturing vending machines, now employs a mere handful of workers.

Naturally the workpeople look at developments in other Elliott factories; and the fact that the

### with Socialism !

give them favourable bargaining terms.

Recently I discussed the colour problem at an NUR branch and found a solid front amongst all those attending which exhibited some of the worst features of race-hatred. They were angry that I described "K.B.W." as a fascist slogan and it was quite apparent that many of those present had been guilty of using it. I suggest that when race-hatred shows itself at branch official level, it is time the whole Labour Movement sat up and took notice and sought the reasons why.

Do not tell us that the way to defend and improve our standards is to demonstrate and strike, they said. Where is this call being made by the Labour leaders. Believe me, said one, the Labour Party has done itself a lot of harm in issuing its declaration on the colour question. They must be entirely out of touch. Gaitskill doesn't have to live or work with them on the job, said others.

#### This is our job

It was evident to me that fascism is winning this round and that the Labour leadership is inert because it is not really internationalist at all, but chauvenist in the last analysis. But there is still fortunately the great body of Socialist rank and file who desire world socialism which means the abolition of the boundaries of the nation.

Bristol Instrument factory in Weymouth, acquired by Elliott's three years ago, is now completely empty, with a "For Sale" sign swinging outside the gate, causes many people to think twice when they see similar trends developing in the Willesden factory.

Many inspired articles have appeared in the technical and financial Press. They pay credit to the research and new ideas for which Elliott's are partly responsible. Andrew Shonfield, writing in the "Observer" of November 30th, was so carried away by these articles that he referred to Mr. Leon Bagrit (one of the leading personalities in Elliott's) as "visionary whose nearest point of focus is round about the year 1970."

This visionary and his eight co-directors are doing very well out of it all. They collected between them in 1957 the tremendous sum of £46,665 in directors' fees. So the directors, who don't produce anything, get over £6,000 apiece; and the workers, who produce everything, get the sack. Did somebody say something about "fair shares"? And some of these directors have their fingers in many pies; and they get a cut out of the other companies as well. Mr. R. E. F. de Trafford, for example, who is the Chairman of Elliot Automation, is also the Chairman of Phillip Hill, Higginson & Co., Atlas Assurance, and Styrene Co-Polymers, not to mention being a director of William Deacon's Bank, Lewis Berger & Sons, Langley Alloys, Electronic Trust, etc. No doubt about it the sacked workers can queue up at the Labour Exchange after Christmas happy in the knowledge that the directors are not

### Work & the Bosses

By November 17 there were 536,000 people out of work in Great Britain, according to the registers at employment exchanges. Of these, 238,000 had been without work for more than eight weeks.

Between October 13 and November 17 unemployment rose by 22,000, the figure of wholly unemployed rising by 32,000, and that of the temporarily stopped falling by 10,000. As a proportion of the estimated total number of people in work, unemployment in November was 2.4 per cent. A year earlier, it was 1.5 per cent.

"I think the facts show that these are not times for drastic measures, and it is most important that the Government should not bring about again that situation of overfull employment which has been the cause and accompaniment of the inflation to which we have been subjected for the last 12 years."

likely to suffer.

#### Christmas spirit

The Shop Stewards in the Willesden factory have now been asked to agree to some 50 skilled workers being sacked from the Instrument division. Curiously enough the sackings are proposed shortly after the announcement that Elliott's have finalised negotiations with Consolidated Electrodynamics of Pasadena, California, for the production in Britain of a wide range of analytical and control instruments of a new type; and when other factories in the group are working excessive overtime, and are miles behind hand with their de-

livery dates.

Confident that work can be found without any difficulty to keep this excellently-equipped instrument shop in full production the Shop Stewards have refused to accept the sacking of workers. Nevertheless the Management is proceeding with the sackings, and the first batch of 30 will be sacked now but paid up until Christmas . . . how the spirit of Christmas lives on, eh? A mass meeting of the factory has endorsed the decision to reject the sackings and the Unions concerned have been asked to convene a Conference to press the workers claim for the right to keep their jobs.

## COLONIAL

### The case of the Cameroons

IN THE criminal scramble for Africa towards the end of the last century, the Cameroons fell to German Imperialism. After the First World War Germany lost control over them and the British and the French obtained a mandate from the League of Nations. France got 166,800 square miles of territory while Britain got 34,000 square miles.

Since then the colonial powers have strengthened their hold and even though the Cameroons are Trust Territories, scant regard is paid to administering these areas as such. A Trust Territory is supposed to "march towards freedom", but the French have virtually annexed it, while the British have divided it into two, one half of which is practically a part of the Northern Region of Nigeria.

The population of the Cameroons is nearly 4,500,000. The country is rich in mineral wealth which is as yet mostly unexploited. Very good quality timber and plantation goods like bananas, cocoa, coffee and tobacco constitute the major items of export.

Imports and exports are monopolized by the colonial powers with the result goods are exported at a cheap rate and sold at very high profits abroad. It also means that imported goods are expensive, since goods from countries other than France and Britain are not allowed to be imported in most cases. The means of communication are poorly developed. The terrible poverty of the people is apparent when, as is the case in the French Cameroons, their average income is only about 20 francs a day (cf. *Freres D'Afrique*, June, 1955, p. 2).

We have mentioned import-export monopolies. Their stranglehold can be judged from the fact that 25 European firms control 90 per cent of exports and 90 per cent of imports.

meters in length and breadth is rented at 3,500 francs a month by a number of persons and that in certain regions the people have to pay a tax of 1,800 francs a year for every person who has reached the age of 14, you can see that it is impossible for these workmen to live in a human way" (*France Catholique*, February 26, 1954).

Conditions have not changed much since the above passage was written. The appalling health and sanitation conditions are a direct consequence of poverty and negligence by the rulers. There is one doctor for every 25,000 inhabitants, one bed for every 366 persons. Even these limited facilities are more for the Whites than for the Africans.

After forty years of Trusteeship, barely 6 per cent of the population is literate. The people have no redress for their grievances. As for the "famous" Western justice, M. Ajoulat in his book, *Le Kamerun de Demain*, says: "in the Cameroons there is a white law and a black law, in other words one type of justice for the whites and another for the blacks."

These conditions are not unique in colonial territories. Also, because the examples taken here are mostly from the French Cameroons, we must not presume that conditions in the British Cameroons are better in any significant way.

Like the rest of Africa, the Cameroons are also beginning to wake up. Already, brutal repression has to be frequently applied by the colonial powers. Before long we will hear more of the struggle developing there. Yet this part of the colonial empire is considered so unimportant that there is no mention of it in the Labour Party statements on colonial policy. We must not shelter behind this ignorance and support the struggle in the Cameroons by writing the fact of the situation down as news.

## FORUM

Peter Sedgwick, Liverpool answers Emmett in his analysis  
'The Pretenders'

NO LEFT-WINGER doubts that the leadership of the Labour movement is in bugling reformist hands. Some Socialists, though, seem to think that having said this very loudly, in greater or less detail, with the further proviso that their own brand of leadership is the only "correct" one, there is little else to talk about. For such comrades, faulty leadership is the missing sign in the equation that would otherwise add up to Revolution, the gap in the circuit whose closure would electrify the masses into active Socialist consciousness.

## Follow my leader

Socialists who think and act in these terms may be justly called The Pretenders. The throne of working-class leadership is, on this view, held by a usurper of some kind, of doubtful authenticity and probably bastard petty-bourgeois stock. If the true heir, equipped with the right royal birthmarks of "clarity", "scientific Socialism", "Socialist humanism" or whatever, were to occupy his lawful place, all would be well with the movement. The typical behaviour of a Pretender is to try to discredit the credentials of the usurping King (by means, e.g., of close scrutinies of Comintern history, or of plausible scandal-mongering) and to establish his own authority, particularly by tracing a connection of lineage between himself and, e.g., Keir Hardie, William Morris, Rosa Luxemburg, John MacLean or Leon Trotsky.

Pretenders are so pre-occupied with the problem of Kingship (or leadership as they insist on calling it) that they seldom bother to find out the attitudes of their prospective subjects, the working class of this country. Or rather, if they do draw upon the opinions of workers, they do so in such a way as to add to the lustre of their own particular claim to royalty.

## Victory for 'Socialists'

Very few Socialists are altogether free of Pretender-like faults. Some trends in the movement, however, are especially prone to such vices. Victory For Socialism, to take an example, specializes in establishing a claim by issuing draft edicts which are intended as a counter-blast to the corrupt decrees of the official hierarchy, and by insinuating its friends into positions of favour in the Court (or Parliamentary Labour Party). These drafts, accompanied as they are by very little in the way of agitation and local action, have practically no effect—as can be seen from the voting at the last Labour Party Conference. **The dream of "capturing the machine", envisaged by certain VFS top-liners, is doomed by the essentially passive role allotted to the workers in the process of social transformation. The function of the masses is seen as one of recognizing the righteousness of the VFS programme once it has won acceptance at Transport House, and thence of voting its proponents into Westminster at (it is hoped) five-yearly intervals. Workers' control in industry is seen by VFS (in its pamphlet INDUSTRY YOUR SERVANT) as an afterthought to its general program for public ownership, not as a platform inseparable from any kind of nationalization which is not to be a disguise for State-capitalism.**

For VFS, the struggle for Socialism is seen as taking place primarily within the Labour Party machine, not as dependent upon the growth in experience and action of millions of ordinary people. Without this conscious involvement of the majority of the working class, VFS's program would in fact be as empty as the Left resolutions of the Co-operative Party's "millions", even supposing that the Transport House machine could be made to yield. And it is hardly likely that the "machine" would change hands at all, in the absence of a radical and widespread change in working-class consciousness.

## Masses and Media

The Pretending ambitions of certain Universities-and-Left-Reviewers are rather more specialized. The "mass media" of

television, films, advertising and the popular Press jointly form the Throne now unlawfully occupied, the Machine being driven by the wrong hands. An expose is produced, brilliant, sensitive and often jargonized, of the whole poison of "mass-culture". Give us the tools, these young men plead, and we can begin the job of spreading the values of socialist humanism. Once again, as with VFS, the appeal falls on no ears but their own. Once again, the part assigned to the working class is one of mute, intuitive approval. In most of the meetings of the ULR Club (though not in most of the ULR magazine) the working class is discussed as the **object** of social enquiry, or as the **recipient** of social welfare; never as the **subject** and the **agent** of social change.

## If only Trotsky . . .

The Pretenders who have excited most recent attention in the trade union movement are undoubtedly those from the **Newsletter** brand of Trotskyism. The Throne to which these comrades lay claim is that occupied by orthodox Communism; hence the somewhat weird self-description of "Bolsheviks" which they are fond of using. Article after article is produced in **Labour Review** and the **Newsletter**, replete with minute facts and dates, to the effect that the Communist Party has, for some years, been getting the wrong orders from Moscow. If only Trotsky had been running the Kremlin, one gathers, they would have had the right orders. Strange to say, the whole system of giving and obeying orders from a centralized international office is never challenged. Similarly, the satellite organizations of the CP's Rightist periods are roundly lambasted. Yet the CP "front" organizations aimed at the working class, such as the Minority Movement, are not only not criticized, but even taken as a model for present action. (If anybody doubts that the Minority Movement was such a "front", let him ask himself why its existence could be "switched off" so easily in 1929.)

For the **Newsletter**, the claim of Trotsky to the Marxian mantle must be kept inviolate. Soviet degeneracy must therefore have begun when Trotsky was under attack, not when he shared the power. The butchery of the Kronstadt rebels, the expulsion of the Workers' Opposition, the dragooning of the Soviets and unions, the betrayal of the anarchist armies, the creation of the one-Party State, all of which took place in Trotsky's hey-day, are passed over in silence. All controversy with the CP takes place **within** the assumptions of Leninist centralism. "The proletariat can take power only through its vanguard . . . The Soviets are only the organized form of the tie between the vanguard and the class. A revolutionary content can be given to this form only by the party." (Trotsky, **Stalinism and Bolshevism**, 1937.) The ice-pick that smashed through the Old Man's skull in 1940 was possibly also something of a boomerang.

## If only we . . .

The **Newsletter** Marxists are Pretenders in a double sense. Not only do they pretend to the title of Bolshevik leadership; they also have to pretend, to themselves as much anybody, that the possibility of attaining this title genuinely exists. The workers, we are always being told, are waiting for a revolutionary lead. All that is needed is somebody to stir them up. The British working man prefers the TV set to the TU meeting, not because of full employment, not because of Imperialist prosperity, not because he likes being with his wife and kids, but because the Labour and CP leaders have betrayed his deep militant aspirations. The masses really want to abolish the H-bomb, unilaterally and all, but they would hate to see it done by any other means but direct industrial action. So—"Black The Bomb! Black The Bases!" the cry goes up from the Bolshevik vanguard; to be parroted enthusiastically by **Socialist Reviewers**,

guiltily by ULR types. The result is just about nil.

Again: the workers of Notting Hill are quite obviously dead against the race-riots, and are just waiting for Peter Fryer to tell them to sweep the racialists (Mosley's boys, of course) off the streets. The Bolshevik vanguard is not slow to oblige: "Form patrols of trade unionists! Chuck your MP out of the Labour Party!" The only trouble is that the youthful proletariat seems to have got the slogans mixed up; instead of blacking the bombs at Aldermaston, they went off and bombed the blacks in Notting Hill.

## Hysterical materialism

Recent industrial activities of the **Newsletter** group have been analysed by Robert Emmett in **Socialist Review** a couple of issues back. Some of his allegations misrepresent the **Newsletter's** industrial aims. His implication that the November "Rank-and-File Conference" was called to set up a counter-machinery to the union branches is simply untrue. While the claims of the Conference's sponsors smack of the Hysterical Materialism noted above (" . . . opened a new chapter . . . marked a milestone in British working-class history"), it was obviously tremendously useful as a gathering of militants from all over Britain, and its Charter of Demands is an excellent program indeed. This remains true, however much we may criticize several aspects of the running of the Conference: the attempted exclusion of **Socialist Review**, the enormous proportion of time taken up by the platform, the cagey refusal to give the number of organizations represented by delegates, without which information the figure of "500 present" is very vague.

## Some responsibility BUT . . .

Where Emmett is right is in his careful statement that the **Newsletter** must accept **some** responsibility, along with the union bureaucracies and the altogether vicious employers, for the South Bank fiasco. It is quite likely that the AUBTW and other union executives would have let down their workers in any case, even if the **Newsletter** had not been so prominent in the dispute—we cannot tell. But the presence of the **Newsletter** in force as an outside Pretending body, and the unnecessarily provocative attitude of these outside individuals to the union executives, was **bound** to draw fire from the bureaucrats concerned, and to line up the wavering South Bank workers with the union officials. Having said that, it still remains that the AUBTW official witch-hunt against Behan, Maguire and other militants is disgusting and must be combated by every Socialist. I am sure that Robert Emmett would agree; to compare his criticisms with the smears of Fleet Street, as the **Newsletter** does, is ridiculous. Pretenders are notorious for the game of identifying their particular interest with the cause of righteousness.

## The danger of 'Pretending'

All the tendencies which have been criticized above have substantial achievements to their credit in the movement. All of them contain in their numbers many Socialists of outstanding calibre, before whose experience and principle any of us must feel humble. Any political formation, like any individual person, possesses not one self, one "role", one nature, but many, varying from situation to situation, some good and some bad. The fault that I have called Pretending is only part of the collective personality of these formations. In some circumstances, however, this failing may emerge as a powerful and even decisive influence for ill. In the Bard's words:

These men—  
Carrying, I say, the stamp of one defect,  
Being Nature's livery or fortune's star—  
Their virtues else—be they as pure as grace,  
As infinite as man may undergo—  
Shall in the general censure take corruption  
from that particular fault.

## P Mansell, North London, replies to Geoff West: Work in the Labour Party!

# FORUM

THE ARTICLE in the last issue by Comrade West arguing for the immediate establishment of an independent socialist party outside the Labour Party raises very important questions of tactics which should be thoroughly threshed out in the columns of SR. This article is offered as a contribution to the discussion.

All Marxists must look forward to and work towards the creation of a genuinely Socialist party capable of winning the allegiance of the mass of the workers and bringing a Socialist society into being. It is easy enough to define this as a long-term objective. It is a far more difficult and controversial matter to determine the right immediate steps towards this goal.

Any discussion of tactics must proceed from an analysis of the present political consciousness of the workers and of the way in which it is likely to develop in the near future. Comrade West does not give any such analysis, so that it is impossible to say on what assumptions he bases his conclusions.

He would surely not dispute that at present there is very deep political apathy. The stagnation inside the Labour Party—only a fraction of the membership taking any active part in its work—reflects the apathy outside. **Some militants are no doubt alienated from the Labour Party by the right-wing policies of the leadership. But it is certainly not the case that masses of workers are eagerly seeking an alternative party. The Labour Party commands the allegiance—even if it is the pretty passive allegiance—of the great majority of the workers.**

What evidence has Comrade West that the industrial militants who are disgusted with Labour Party policies will rally to an independent party? He asserts that "British workers regard a political tendency as serious when its spokesmen take part in Parliamentary and local elections". Maybe they do "regard it as serious"—whatever the phrase means, but not so serious that they vote for it. If a group puts up a candidate out of all proportion to its real strength, it pays a heavy price for its adventurism. The history of British Marxists—pseudo and genuine—is littered with examples from the days of 1885 when the Social Democratic Federation put up candidates in two London constituencies and got 59 votes between the two, and 1950 when the CP put up 100 candidates and all were defeated.

The building of an independent Socialist party will be a long and difficult job. Reformist illusions in the working class go very deep. They can be shattered only by experience. Reformism must be tried and found wanting. Only then will the revolutionary alternative appear convincing and inevitable. As the industrial and political struggle sharpens, as it is bound to do, the effect will be felt inside the Labour Party.

This is not to say that the Labour Party will be transformed into a revolutionary organization. But it does mean that more workers will take an active part in the life of the Labour Party and, at the same time, the cleavage between leadership and rank and file will become more marked. In a period of deeper conflict than the present, the emptiness of the Gaitskell policies will be exposed.

It is not the task of Marxists in the Labour Party, as Comrade West implies they do, to spread illusions about the leadership. On the contrary, the *Socialist Review* has been consistent in its criticism of the right-wing and of a good many so-called Leftists.

Comrade West argues that because the CP exists as a sizeable working class party outside the Labour Party, there would be scope for another independent Socialist party of something like the same size. This method of argument by analogy is misleading. It ignores the fact that the CP has had 40 years in which to build up its tradition. Even the mistakes and crimes of

its leadership have not completely destroyed its basis nor the prestige it has taken to itself by claiming to be the heir of the Russian Revolution.

Even so, the CP survives only with difficulty and makes a negligible impact on political life. How much smaller would be the impact of a new party starting to-day, certainly without the handicaps but also without the advantages of CP's tradition. Instead of arguing "the CP exists, therefore a Marxist party has a chance of developing", it would be more profitable to consider whether, even in its palmiest days, the CP was ever more than a small sect with totally inadequate links and relationships with the mass organizations.

### The Revolutionary Communist Party

Comrade West raises the question of whether the Revolutionary Communist Party justified itself as an independent organization between 1943 and 1948. In my opinion, it was not justified. It is of course always easy to be wise after the event. In 1943 it no doubt seemed that the prospects for an independent party were good. With the Labour and Communist parties both committed to support of the war, it seemed that

## POLICY

### asks STAN NEWENS, HARLOW

THE PROVISIONS of the Bill dealing with New Towns now before Parliament are in line with what the Tories have been saying for some time.

Instead of allowing the appropriate local authority to take over all properties when development is in effect completed, it provides for these to be vested in a National Agency to be called the Commission for the New Towns.

This represents a change in the attitude which the Conservative Party adopted when the original New Towns Act was passed in 1946. At that time, Messrs. Boyd Carpenter, Reid (now Lord Reid), and Molson in the Commons, and Lord Munster in the Lords expressed support for the idea of local authority control which the Labour Government proposed. This support has now disappeared.

The reason for this change of opinion is not difficult to divine. The fact that New Town Councils are likely to be under Labour control for a long time to come has raised many fears among local industrialists from whom, of course, the Conservatives draw what little support they have.

#### Protect our money!

Mr H L M Wilson, for example, a Harlow Conservative leader and local industrialist, was reported by the local Press as saying that "only a national agency which was directly supervised by the Treasury in what it did with the money drawn from industrial properties would satisfy the firms which were putting vast sums into new town factories." (*Harlow Citizen*, August 9, 1957.)

The root cause of the fear is as the Tory MP for Horsham has stated, that New Town rates, part of which industry would pay, could be used to subsidise rents and amenities in the New Towns.

Few of the advocates of the Bill have said this in so many words. The *Times* speaks of "problems which are inseparable from monopoly" and Mr Bevin, who introduced the Bill in the Commons, argued that it was unwise to mix State management with politics. Basically, however, the objection is to the threat to profits. Labour controlled authorities would be much less likely to safeguard these than a so-called neutral national agency.

a party in open opposition to the war would attract wide support. With the experience of the First War in mind, a revolutionary wave towards the end of the war might have been expected. For various reasons this development did not take place in Britain. The radicalization in 1945 found expression, not in hostility to the Labour Party, but very strikingly in support of it, and even the experience of Labour in power between 1945 and 1948 led to no mass swing away from the Labour Party. It rather—temporarily at least—strengthened reformist illusions. It is little wonder that the RCP failed to appeal to more than a tiny handful.

#### Far too easy . . .

It is fatally easy for small Marxist groups to keep on seeing and hailing new and false revolutionary dawns. The times they do so is a measure of their weakness and isolation from the mass movement. It is hard to face the fact that building a revolutionary party may mean a long period of slow advance. Short cuts are impossible, to be realistic is not to be defeatist. What must, at all costs, be avoided, is isolation from the mass of the workers and the development of their political consciousness.

## WHAT FUTURE FOR THE NEW TOWN?

From the point of view of the residents of the New Towns, the transfer of Development Corporation property to the Commission will be a heavy blow. For it will mean, if it is carried out, that the possibility of democratic control of their real resources in the interests of the whole population will have been lost.

#### Vague

If, as Mr Bevin suggested in his summing up, the Commission is permitted to sell property even without the consent of the local authority, it will be very difficult to reverse this, once put into effect. For if site values rise as the result of new development, the private buyer will presumably be able to ask a much enhanced price for his property in the event of re-purchase by the authority.

Labour's policy on this subject is woefully vague. The 1946 Act, while it provided for the eventual transfer of the New Towns to the Councils, in principle was much too vague about the manner and time of takeover.

#### . . . but a clear statement

Furthermore, at the present time Labour has failed to make it sufficiently clear what will happen if, as is to be expected, the new Bill becomes law. A clear and unequivocal statement that Labour will completely nullify these steps and provide for local authority ownership immediately upon taking office is required. This must be fully publicised.

#### and a new dynamic policy

The Labour Party must also develop a real and dynamic policy on New Towns in general. The creation of these new centres was one of the real achievements of the Attlee Government, and as Hugh Dalton stated in the debate it is high time the Labour Party declared "We shall build more New Towns."

It is not enough merely to oppose; positive action is required. For Labour Parties in the New Towns, there is a job to be done. A real policy must be formulated and no effort spared to see that this is accepted and promoted by the Party at national level.

## Editorial—ctd

THE PAMPHLET completely fails to define a Socialist foreign policy. It presupposes that the world will always be dominated by the "great" powers and their diplomatic manoeuvres. Disengagement is proposed with a neutral zone in Central Europe whose freedom and security would be guaranteed by the powers concerned. The Labour Party leaders cannot surely be so naive as to believe that any paper agreement between Imperialist powers will be observed if it comes into conflict with the interests of one or other of them, or that these differences can be permanently reconciled? Again it is the great powers who are to settle the Middle East. No whisper about self-determination or even consulting the populations of the area.

In the cleavage between the American and Russian blocs the Labour leaders take their stand firmly on the American side. And in the good cause of "Western democracy" unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb is dismissed. In other words, in all essentials Labour and Tory foreign policies

are identical. There could hardly be a more complete exposure of the Socialist pretensions of the Labour leaders. On the most crucial issue facing us they have nothing distinctive to offer.

### The Socialist alternative

The Socialist alternative must be to repudiate all talk about achieving peace through pacts with Imperialist powers as fostering a dangerous and possibly fatal illusion. Peace can be achieved only through the international solidarity of the working class—even though such "old-fashioned" ideas are out of favour among the top people in the party. The interests of the workers run counter to, and not in harmony with, the interests of the ruling class and governments. Of course no "respectable" party can put in its program an appeal to the workers of other countries over the heads of their governments. That is not playing fair according to diplomatic convention. But these artificial barriers between one working class and another must be overridden. A Socialist Britain need not confine itself merely to appealing to the workers of other

countries for solidarity. It could make a decisive contribution to world peace by refusing to make nuclear weapons, by withdrawing its troops from other countries and by giving economic help to the backward countries free of "strings" or any exaction of interest on investments. In this way it would not only demonstrate its own convictions but expose completely the hollow peacemongering of both the power blocs.

The verdict on "The Future Labour Offers You" must be that it fails dismally to pose a Socialist program either in home or foreign affairs. Its whole purpose is to persuade that the Labour Party will not seek to destroy capitalism and all its attendant evils. On the contrary, it will run capitalism more efficiently than the Tories, always provided it can persuade the workers to remain content with a few crumbs in the way of reform and amelioration. The task of Socialists in the Labour Party to campaign ceaselessly for the party's policy to be changed. We need Socialism now, not at some vague, unspecified time in the Never Never Land.

## WHAT WE STAND FOR

The SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for international Socialist democracy. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The SOCIALIST REVIEW believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power on the basis of the following programme:

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

## LETTERS

### More on the South Bank

IT can be said with every justification that the right wing element within the Unions concerned in the South Bank dispute sold our members down the river and gave great satisfaction to McAlpines. The right wingers have shown their true colours (capitalist colours). Kemp, the Building Trade Group Secretary of the T and GWU and Brandon, the Regional Secretary, have come out into the open.

The leader of the unofficial strikers paid a call upon these two characters to request that a special Trade Group Committee meeting be called; this the two officials did not think necessary, despite the fact that it was proved beyond a shadow of doubt that McAlpines, the firm involved, had broken the Civil Engineering Agreement which was signed on the fifteenth of October. The whole affair was spotlighted at the Regional Committee meeting held on the twenty-ninth of October when the following decisions were made:

A. That an Emergency meeting of the Region No. 1 Building Trade Group be called immediately.

B. That we request the General Executive Council to enquire into the whole of the circumstances connected with this dispute.

In fact, it can now be seen that the decision of the two officials, i.e.—Kemp and Brandon, has been thrown out in favour of the unofficial strike leaders' opinion. The two officials were really bowled for six, and smiling Charlie Brandon for once lost his smile. The right wingers will really have to put their thinking caps on to save face and we can well imagine the cloak and dagger work being carried on at this very moment.

Whatever will the clever Bro. McCleery, Divisional Secretary of the ASW think up to appease the members when he has already told them that Sir Robert McAlpine's, the Building Contractors and Union Destructors, have promised and agreed to take back all the ASW stewards on the South Bank? Bro. McCleery requested McAlpine's to implement

the agreement. Sir Robert McAlpine's are having one big laugh at him and have, in so many words, informed him that he must be daft—or dreaming—for McAlpine's cannot remember any agreement, and, in fact, McAlpine's have sent Bro. McCleery away with a flea in his ear. This right winger must now be cultivating some doubts in his own mind about the honesty of big business men. With his experience with these firms, we are surprised that the truth takes so long to get home.

The right wingers cannot last very long in the Unions. The members are getting more disgruntled every day with them and their two-faced, underhanded methods. The word Socialism is something foreign to them, and the quicker the Union members wake up to this and clear this right wing element from their ranks, the quicker will we see true Socialism.

Fraternally,  
"NIPS"

Westminster T & GWU Branch.

A further letter from S Papert has been held over for reasons of space.

The GEC subsequently vetoed an enquiry and sent the matter back to the Region. Officialdom seems to be desperately trying to lay a ghost.—  
Editor.

### Terrorism

IN THE DECEMBER 1 issue of Socialist Review, in an editorial on Cyprus which I found extremely good, I was sorry to find the following sentence: "No Socialist can condone terrorism."

This statement does not make a clear enough distinction between imperialist terror against an oppressed nation, and anti-imperialist violence which an oppressed nation is compelled to resort to in fighting for its national liberation. Any Socialist worth his salt will make the sharpest distinction between the two, the former being reactionary, the latter progressive.

Surely one will distinguish between violence against a mad dog threatening a child, and violence against the child himself.

Yours fraternally,  
C. Dallas.

### SOCIALIST REVIEW BULK ORDER

(Six or more copies post free)

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

Name.....

Address.....

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

### 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 M Maddison  
21 Aubert Park, London, N5

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published twice a month by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, post paid: 1 year: 16s. 6 months: 8s. 3 months: 4s. Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Socialist Review which are given in editorial statement.

All communications to be addressed to the publisher, M. Maddison, 21 Aubert Park, London, N5

Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. TU, Bush Fair, Harlow, Essex