

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

9th YEAR No 4

MID-FEBRUARY, 1959

SIXPENCE

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

LABOUR MUST WIN!

THE PROBLEM facing any political minority is how to convert itself into a majority by persuading more and more people of the correctness of its views and policy. For any individual or group that claims to serve the interests of the working class the problem is how to appeal to wider sections of workers and therefore how to orientate one's self towards the mass political and industrial organisations of the working class. Hence for left-wing socialists a key question is their attitude towards the Labour Party and their understanding of its nature.

The Labour Party came into existence as the political arm of the trade unions. The date of its birth—the turn of the century—is significant because this was in the heyday of British imperialism. Compared with the earlier period of its growth, capitalism seemed stable and likely to go from strength

In future all editorial matters to be sent to Michael Kidron

94b Regent's Park Road London NW1

Tel: PRI 3222

to strength. From the profits of world exploitation, the British capitalists were able to make limited concessions to the workers without undermining their own position.

Salvation in reform

The benefits of trade union organisation were no longer confined, as in the middle years of the century, to a small elite of skilled workers but were beginning to spread to the mass of the unskilled. In such circumstances, it was hardly surprising that the great majority of the workers looked for salvation to the reform of capitalism rather than its overthrow. They believed that through the use of the vote, which had become practically universal (except to women) in the '80s, more and more improvements could be secured, the worst abuses of capitalism curtailed, greater equality achieved, etc. These views were particularly widespread among the leaders of the established trade unions, who saw their function as being to win concessions for their members within the framework of capitalism, but not to lead an all-out onslaught against it.

They slowly came to see the need for a Labour Party, as a more reliable and more easily controlled political instrument than

their traditional ally, the Liberal Party, which found difficulty in committing itself simultaneously to the workers and to sections of the capitalist class. But although the majority of the trade union leaders were successfully weaned away from the Liberal Party they brought with them into the Labour Party the characteristic Liberal attitude of limited reforms.

Other organizations

From the beginning of the Labour Party, the attitudes towards it of the various Socialist groups have fallen into two broad categories. On the one hand, there were those who remained outside and aloof. Most conspicuous of these was the Social Democratic Federation. They took their stand on what they claimed was pure Marxist doctrine. They refused to associate with any group which did not accept the whole of their ideology. If the Labour Party would not proclaim the class war as an article of faith in its foundation document, then the SDF would not sully its purity by affiliation to the new party.

Faults of Sectarianism

The SDF saw as its task the constant proclamation of its Socialist ideas without relating them to the day-to-day struggles of the workers. In this way it might keep itself free from any taint of compromising with reformism but at the price of complete political sterility.

Thus although individual SDF-ers played notable parts in many industrial and other struggles, the party never became a real force. Its history should serve as an awful warning to any Socialist who is so confident of his own righteousness that he thinks he can despise the mass of the workers.

It is easy to see the faults in the sectarianism of the SDF. But what of the Socialists who tried to influence the Labour Party from within? The ILP was admirably placed to act as a 'ginger group' within the larger party. It had immense prestige, from the part it had played in forming the Labour

Party and from the fame of its pioneering leaders like Keir Hardie. Yet it had only a very limited success in pushing the Labour Party in a leftwards direction. While the ILP was still affiliated to the party, there was the experience of the first two Labour Governments, neither of which did very much about reforming capitalism, far less introducing socialism.

When the majority of the ILP decided to disaffiliate from the Labour Party in 1932, at a time when the leadership of the party was discredited by the 1931 debacle, it failed to establish itself as any real alternative, or as a political force of any strength. The minority who remained inside the Labour Party quickly lost their identity and became completely merged.

Main tasks for Socialists

In other words history so far has provided no conclusive proof of how best a Socialist group can make headway at the present stage. What it does prove without the shade of a doubt is that reformist ideas are very strong and very widespread throughout the working-class movement. It is utterly misleading to assume that the majority of the workers are impregnated with revolutionary fervour, prepared at once to dispense with capitalism if only a firm and consistent Socialist leadership is offered to them. This is a view that has been only too easily accepted in the last 20 or more years by left-wing socialists. They have argued that reformist ideas have taken root only among the top leadership of the Labour Party and trade unions and a thin layer of the more highly skilled 'aristocrats of labour.' From this it follows that the main task of socialists is to show up the deficiencies and betrayals of the leaders and expose the gulf between their ideology and policies and those of the mass of their followers. The hollow shell of reformism will be cracked, the workers recognise where their true interests lie, and capitalism and its lackeys will be swept away.

If this analysis were correct, then surely

(turn to back page)

On other pages

G D H Cole — an appraisal pages 4 & 5

E T U Discussion page 2

Tramp Navy page 3

Motor Car Industry page 7

FORUM

PROBLEMS OF THE LEFT IN THE E.T.U.

Following Bro. NERO

Bro. FRED WALTERS continues the discussion on

WHILST ACCEPTING a great deal of what your correspondent Nero says about the ETU (SR, January 1), I feel that his article is spoilt by a number of unsubstantiated statements and nebulous ideas, presented as self-evident truths, requiring no explanation. While criticizing the leadership on the question of ballots and the introduction of phoney democratic centralism he is on fairly safe ground but his analysis of the reasons for the failure of the CP in the ETU is sadly lacking. It isn't clear from his article whether he wants the leadership to lead and the rank and file to follow or vice versa but one gets the impression that all that is really needed is a change of leadership, and all will be well.

Extreme case

So much of your correspondent's thinking and reasoning is typical of the CP that one wonders why he is an ex-member. For instance, he characterizes the recent change of rule in relation to unemployment benefit paid by the ETU as "corruption and perverted loyalty." But he only tells half the story, making it plausible by citing an extreme case of unemployment, six times in a year. He suggests no particular motive for this change of rule, but his quoting of an extreme case suggests that he may feel that it is directed against the militant members in the relatively casual sections of the industry, such as contracting, studios, exhibitions, etc., perhaps to prevent their sometimes embarrassing activity." Whilst it is true to say that it is members of these sections that will be affected most, it is something of an exaggeration to suggest that active members of such sections are obliged to seek fresh employment every two months as the result of useful TU activity.

Benefits

If this is the reason for his opposing it, then it seems to be no more than specious special pleading, when one considers the fact that these sections only account for 15 or 20 per cent of the total membership of the ETU. It seems reasonable to suppose that the real purpose behind this change of rule is a quite genuine concern over the finances of the union and an endeavour to use that part of the funds allocated for unemployment benefit to the best advantage of the membership as a whole.

What your correspondent fails to mention is that whilst the rule has been altered in respect of day-to-day payments, and that a six-day waiting period is in force, the unemployment benefit has been increased from 15/- to 30/-, in fact doubled. It is surely an unquestioned fact that the first

The following very interesting article by Bro. Fred Walters continues the discussion on the problems facing the non-Stalinist left in the E.T.U. The Socialist Review stands for a policy of opposition to both the Right-wing and to the Communist Party. However, we cannot agree with the tactics proposed by Bro. Fred Walters. Nevertheless, we believe that only good can come from an exchange of views. In the next issue of the paper a reply, which for reasons of space could not be included here, will be published.—The Editor.

week of unemployment is not the most difficult, and that the difficulties increase week by week as long as unemployment lasts. It would appear that the six-day waiting period is helping to double the benefit for the period when it is most needed.

That it affects the member who has periods of unemployment of a week or less is not questioned, but surely a union's rules cannot be framed to satisfy the requirements of one small section, but must conform with that which is in the best interests of the union as a whole. Even if this section contains the most militant and therefore the most valuable members (a fact which is at any rate questionable). Do members having only limited periods of employment on a firm, and therefore limited contact with a particular group of members, do the most good? Must militancy always be equated with kicking up as much fuss in as short a time as possible, and then getting kicked off the job? (I do not suggest that this is Nero's idea of militancy, but I know it is prevalent among the ultra left, who he rightly criticizes.) One last point on unemployment benefit: would your correspondent prefer to continue with the old rule, payment of 15/- per week, including the first? No doubt, with everybody else, he would prefer the unemployment benefit to be 30/- for every week, including the first. But where is the money to come from? The ETU has been in financial difficulties and is only just beginning to get on its feet again, mainly as a result of long-overdue increases in contributions.

No substitute

The problem of changing the leadership cannot be realistically considered, without taking into account the whole of the rank and file, not just the minority who vote and take an active interest in the union. A change in the leadership which is not the direct result of a desire for change on the part of the majority of the membership will merely be to substitute one leadership for another. The new leadership would be subject to the same restraints and restrictions as any leadership based on a minority. It cannot act as it

would wish, because of the apathy and unreliability of the majority of the membership. Whatever the ballot returns show, when only 10 per cent of the membership is voting, whatever leadership is in office, the fact remains that it is the majority, who don't vote, who determine the effective policy of the union, if only because of their negative attitude.

Why haven't electricians got a forty-hour week, a sick pay scheme financed by the employers, why isn't the unions policy on overtime put into effect? Because the leadership don't want it? No. Because the only people that can put these policies into effect are the rank and file themselves, and no leadership can be a substitute for the rank and file. This is not to say a change in leadership is not desirable, but to believe that a socialist leadership will solve our problems is unrealistic. A change at the top without a change at the bottom is really no change at all.

Press influence

It may be objected that in considering the problem of establishing a socialist leadership we can only concern ourselves with the members who vote and who are active, which is perfectly true. But it is as well to remember that all members are potential voters and that in future elections a larger percentage of the membership may be encouraged to vote, by the Press, and there is no reason to believe that this increased vote will be a socialist one. Under these circumstances, relatively small groups within the ETU, competing for the leadership, on the basis of organizing ability, entails at least one very serious danger. That of letting in the Right Wing.

Press attacks on the union leadership in recent years have been comparatively ineffective, at any rate in so far as influencing voting sufficiently to dislodge the CP. This is possibly because as far as the capitalist Press is concerned, candidates like Holmwood, Cannon, Clayton, Reno, Chappell and Sullivan are just as much anathema as the CP themselves. But the ground has been prepared, and in the event of reactionary candidates being nominated in future elections, the influence of the Press may be

decisive, if the Left is split. Both the General President and the General Secretary stand for re-election each year together with the eleven rank and file members of the Executive Council. Nominations for the EC take place in June and for the other two positions either in September or December, and it is almost certain that Right Wing candidates will be forthcoming. Bro J T Byrne of Glasgow contested the General Secretaryship five years ago and will, no doubt, be encouraged to do so again. In a recent (January 26) article about the ETU, the Labour Correspondent of the Manchester Guardian noted the existence of opposition groups in different parts of the country, but that, at the moment, there is imperfect liaison between them. But he suggests, "There is plenty of time for negotiating still, however, and the task of members who want an integrated opposition to the leadership will be to bring together the traditional elements of dissent like Mr Byrne with the ex-communists who have provided the 'ginger' in the recent disputes around London."

£1,000 a year

If these groups do in fact exist, it is to be hoped that this council will not be headed. Bro J T Byrne is a member of Catholic Action and if the choice is between that organization and the CP there is no question that it is the CP which must be supported. The question of changing the leadership, in the present period, is fraught with danger and if it entails the splitting of the Left in the union, then it must not be attempted. Far better the CP than the Right Wing ETU members wanting neither the CP or a Right Wing reactionary leadership but a socialist leadership must not look for short cuts or quick results, but must combine their efforts and campaign in the branches, and win there the mass support which any leadership must have if it is to be in any sense real and effective.

Your correspondent Nero attacks the increase in officials' wages, and rightly so, but curiously enough does not attack the principle, or lack of it, of officials' wages being in excess of the members they represent, and again rather curiously, suggests that "a militant . . . is normally a person dedicated to socialism . . . and therefore difficult to corrupt." Is this really true, are socialists a special breed, unaffected by changed circumstances? How many Knights of the TUC, not to mention the Garter, have reached there via the ranks of the militant socialist, how many transplanted to the House of Lords having set out all fire and good intentions? Would Nero fiddle to keep an officials' job worth a £1,000 a year?

Surely the real issue here is not
contd. next page

that officials get their increases by "EC recommendation to conference," but whether in fact, officials should get more pay than the rank and file? Few normally aspirated people, dedicated or not, can withstand the effect of the change from the workshop, factory, building site, etc., to the comparative ease of an officials' job plus an increase in pay of several pounds a week. If you accept the idea that officials should have more pay than the members then you must also accept the fact of regular increases, granted by conference. The fact that this particular increase (the first in three years) was passed at a conference to consider the state of the union's finances is irrelevant.

If officials got no wages at all it wouldn't have solved the problem. But if they got no more than the average paid to electricians, it would certainly do a lot to reduce the cynicism of the rank and file, many of whom are of the opinion that they—the officials—are only in it for what they can get out of it. And as often as not they are right. Nero's suggestion 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," is only true in so far as the majority of members do not attend their branches and therefore have no part in the election of Conference delegates. This is another example of the half truth used as the basis for slander. It isn't enough to criticise the CP just because it is the CP and therefore wrong, this is a ridiculous attitude which won't get us anywhere. We could after all get Bro Nero presiding at a socialist dominated conference representing 10 per cent of the membership, using corrupted and perverted socialists to endorse EC recommendations.

Tactics

It is to be hoped that Bro Nero's confidence in the rank and file is not misplaced and that in fact we "will get back to fundamental socialist principles of the ownership and control in industry," and "produce a leadership worthy of the members, elected democratically and not fiddled into position as now," in the not too distant future. However, it will be what to do in the immediate future, this year in fact, that will be exercising the minds of all socialist members of the ETU.

The question we have got to answer is whether to oppose the CP with socialist candidates in the forthcoming elections, and in the event of this, whether to support them or the CP. The risk entailed has already been outlined and it is my opinion that it is too great, and that the chances of success are too small. Neither Foulkes nor Haxell should be opposed for the following reasons. The Left has not yet had time to organise, and the effect that the Press will have is too uncertain to make an attempt to dislodge the CP more than an adventure. With three candidates the vote will be split, three ways, and it will be the Left that will be split, to the advantage of the Right.

A further indeterminate factor will be the percentage of the membership that will vote. The percentage vote may remain the same, which would favour the

ON FEBRUARY 20 next a panel of the Civil Engineering Construction Board is being held to consider the re-employment of the victimized stewards on the Shell-Mex (McAlpines) site. In view of the fact that no stewards have been re-employed to date, we feel that branches should submit resolutions demanding and mandating their leaders to accept nothing but the re-employment of the boys.

● Declining membership is making the ASW call Area Branch Delegate Conferences.

● Joe Rootes, the new London Divisional Secretary of the AUBTW, is, together with his officers, launching a vigorous Into Action campaign again on the question of declining membership.

● There is a rumour that rigor mortis has set in on the 1958 ad hoc committee discussing the 40-hour week. I hope that the ad hoc committee now set up to discuss our 4d an hour wage claim does not act like tortoises on a go-slow.

● A small deputation of building workers lobbied Members of Parliament on the question of unemployment, and Labour Members on the extension of Direct Labour schemes.

● Joe Saunders, the Federation Steward on the Daily Mirror site, was sacked at the end of last month for alleged bad time-keeping. But an NFBTO panel has requested the unions and WC French's to discuss his re-employment. Workers on the site feel

CP, or, what is more likely, it will increase as a result of the capitalist Press giving publicity to the elections, and this will most certainly benefit the Right Wing. The idea that Press attacks strengthen the leadership by promoting group patriotism is a myth, at any rate in the case of CP led unions. If it was certain that the issue would not be determined by the first ballot (i.e. no candidate would have a larger vote than the combined votes of the other candidates) and that a second ballot would have to be held between the two candidates with the highest votes, then the risk could possibly be taken.

This last factor is, I think, the point upon which the issue turns. Many objections will be raised against this line of argument, one being that unless there is an alternative to the CP and the Right Wing the Right Wing will win. This presupposes that the undecided voters and those induced to vote by the Press, are looking for a socialist alternative. This is unlikely to be the case. For the most part it will be an anti CP vote purely and simply, and not pro anything. A further objection will be that it is doing the CP's work for them. That is quite true. But I'd sooner work for the CP than the Catholics or Smith Square and Great Russell Street.

It will be far better to spend the next five years working patiently in the branches getting control of area committees and gathering support at the annual policy conferences in preparation for the next elections and the biennial elections for the EC, with a CP leadership, than face five critical years under what I think is the only possible present alternative to the Right Wing and the Catholics.

TRAMP NAVY DISCUSSES ORGANIZATION AND WAGES IN BUILDING

that WC French's may employ Brother Saunders on some small job out in the wilds. They have decided to take strike action if French's try any monkey tricks on the indomitable Brother Saunders.

● Socialist Review readers will join me in expressing our very deepest sympathy to Mrs. Upton and her young daughter on Phil's tragic death on the Shell-Mex site. Phil was a vivacious character and as decent a workmate as one could wish to meet.

● Lead Needed

THE TIME 1959—the year of technical progress, the mechanisation of our industries. The year the Tories offer the workers the big bait against Socialism—10/- shares in capitalist enterprises—and maybe the workers will be mugs enough to think the profit from this will one day give them control of a great industry, or otherwise, as a consolation prize, they will be put on the Board of Directors of the industry he has sunk his great wealth into. OK, you dreamers, you get-rich-quick merchants, put your 10/- back into your pockets, shake the cobwebs out, and inwardly digest the following facts of life.

The trade union movement is taking a big step forward this year to bring your standard of living into line with the technical advancement within industry. I will deal with one industry in this article—the building and civil engineering industry. Here the aim is a 40-hour week and 4d. an hour increase in the basic rate. Can we achieve this? YES. How long will it take? SOME TIME NEVER. I say this because there is not a strong militant lead being given by certain sections within the building trades unions.

The National Federation of Building Trade Operatives, for instance, patted themselves on the back for getting 1d an hour increase, while they did nothing at all about the 40-hour week. You have been fobbed off by that penny, and you should not allow yourselves to be fobbed off again. I mean you, and you, and YOU. **If you are a trade unionist, go to your branches and demand by way of resolutions that your union take more militant action to obtain the 40-hour week and the 4d an hour rise.**

How are calls for militant action treated by different unions? The Brixton L/S branch of the Amalgamated Union of Building Trades Workers sent a resolution to the executive calling upon it to organize demonstrations and public meetings in different areas in support of the wage claim and the 40-hour week.

INDUSTRIAL

AND WAGES

The following is a resolution by the Edinburgh (1) Branch of the same union:—

"This branch calls upon the Executive Council to press the General Council of the TUC to convene an emergency Conference of the Executive Committees of affiliated unions which are at present pressing demands for increased wages and reduced hours, the purpose of the Conference being to organise a country-wide campaign in support of these claims and to bring about united demonstrations by the unions in all large towns and cities."

The response, or lack of it, is really amazing considering how many branches were sending in similar resolutions to their Executives or Group Committees. The following AUBTW Executive resolution in reply to the two branch resolutions is typical:

"That the communications from branches relative to wages be received. Whilst the Council is not in principle opposed to the idea suggested by the Edinburgh (1) Branch, having regard to the stage reached in wage claims in various industries it does not think that the present is an opportune time to make representations to the TUC."

Militant action

What, when, where is the opportune time for the NFBTO to take militant action? The membership of the whole trade union movement is close on 10 million, some three-eighths of the whole of the working population of the country. What can be achieved by this force is much or little according to the strength or weakness of the leaders. But we will never get a leadership that will really put up a strong fight for working class standards until some fumigating is carried out at the top level of the trade unions. I refer to the TUC. No trade unionist should be allowed to hold any official position in any union or the TUC if he is in a managerial position or on the Board of Directors of any industry, for a unionist so placed must perforce speak with a split tongue and must inevitably have divided loyalties.

On the offensive

The employers are on the offensive and all are doing their utmost to squash the building workers' claims for a 40-hour week and 4d an hour increase. We are determined that we the workers, the lifeblood of this country, shall benefit from technical progress. We were not born to make money for parasites, to slave to enrich other people by our labours, and are determined to derive full benefit from our productive efforts to enrich and brighten the lives of the working class. Employers, remember! We are human beings, who desire comfort and more leisure in our short lives, and that is why our mass determination will beat you.

THE MOVEMENT

We are late in paying our respects to G D H Cole who died at the beginning of this year. Nevertheless, we present this appreciation of his work within the British Labour Movement as a token of respect to his integrity and sense of purpose, knowing well that he would have taken our criticism of some of his views and actions in the spirit they were intended.—Editor.

G D H COLE

AN APPRAISAL OF HIS LIFE AND WORK

by ERIC HEFFER

MY ACQUAINTANCE with G D H Cole is solely through his books. I cannot, therefore, pretend to know anything of his personal life, and know only a little of his general political work. I wish to write about him as a political theorist, which he undoubtedly was; a very rare bird indeed, as far as the English scene is concerned.

Often contradictory

Cole probably wrote more books than any other Socialist of his generation. On my bookshelves there are at least 24 different volumes, and about a score of pamphlets. He certainly wrote many more. Cole was a member of the Labour Party, but it seems was never really happy in it. He rejected the Communist Party as being undemocratic and an agent of the Soviet Union, yet he consistently advocated a policy of unity in action with the Communists, especially in Western Europe. His position on many things was often contradictory, but on most questions he retained a perfect clarity of vision. Cole in some ways idealised the working class (a common fault amongst intellectuals) yet on certain occasions abused them for being stupid and servile.

Guild socialist

It seems to me, from a careful reading of Cole, that he was constantly being pulled in a number of directions at the same time. He could never quite make up his mind in which direction to travel, apart from the very broad direction of a socialist goal. He knew what he wanted, but did not quite know how to get to his destination. To the very last (as far as I can see) he called himself a Guild Socialist, and it is in this sphere that he made his biggest

contribution to socialist thought. In fact no one who is really serious about how socialism should operate, can afford to overlook his work. On the question of workers' control, and the workers' place in industry, no one in Britain has given greater attention than Cole. We can all learn something of value from his writings on this subject.

The writer

His other great achievement was as a Labour Historian. Everyone irrespective of their political position in the movement owes Cole a debt in that direction. From his pen, came such standard works as the **History of the Labour Party, An Introduction to Trade Unionism** and his monumental work on the **History of Socialist Thought**. These latter volumes are in themselves a justification for Cole's existence and future Labour historians will be eternally grateful. If one wishes to know the real struggle between Marx and the Anarchists then Cole's work provides the material; if you wish to know the Second International in greater detail than is given in James Joll's slim volume, then turn to Cole, his two volumes on the subject are well documented.

disillusioned

I am certain that Cole lived his last years in great disillusionment. It was obvious to him that the Labour Party had failed as a Socialist body. In fact his conclusions were that the Labour Party was not, and could not be called, a Socialist Party; and equally the Welfare State was not Socialism or anything approaching it. He was doing his best to revive Socialism as an International force, and was instrumental in establishing an international socialist centre known as

the World Socialist Movement.

Cole rejected what he called Reformism, yet never embraced genuine revolutionary politics. He was very much a reformist himself and his struggle to change society never got beyond the channels of constitutionalism. This was the greatest weakness of Cole, and sprung from his rejection of Marxism, although he accepted many Marxist views.

Three stages

In evolution, Cole probably had three main stages; his early period of Guild Socialism, his middle period which was still undoubtedly left-wing but becoming more blurred in outline, as against his clear-cut perspectives of the early period, and his last period which was a return to his radical youth but still a little less positive in relation to Guild Socialism. I suppose if one wishes to label him he could be called a Left Social-Democrat, but essentially a social-democrat.

Let us, therefore, look a little more closely at his evolutionary stages.

• THE THEORIST

COLE defines Guild Socialism as a proposal for the co-management of industry by the State and the Trade Unions. The ownership of the means of production had to rest with the community, i.e. through the State, but the trade unions were to be recognised as the controllers of industry. Production would be determined by demand, this demand being made through national and local consumers'

organisations. The methods of production were to be the concern of the people in the Guilds, the workers would elect their own officials, and these would operate through self-governing corporations with very wide powers.

The Guilds would include everyone in the industry from the general labourer to the general manager, and would therefore be an association of independent producers. Cole developed this general theory a little further, and argued that the State and the Guilds should at national level establish a joint board. These bodies in turn were to be linked up on the consumers' side with Parliament, and with a Government department, but must not come directly under a Government Department and a Cabinet Minister.

The state

This theory really was an attempt to marry syndicalism with social-democracy. It accepted the syndicalist conception of electing officials, and the workers' bodies to direct and control industry, but at the same time saw the continuation of Parliament and Parliamentary Democracy. Cole put it this way: "Syndicalism, like most theories that have something vital behind them, is right in what it affirms, and wrong in what it denies." Cole saw the State as a necessity at all times, and argued it always had a right to intervene. However, he did want to change the character of the State, and make it a genuine democratic organism.

The trade unions

To the early Cole, the functions of the trade unions had to be twofold. Firstly, as a weapon to combat the employers, but

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

4/- post free (bulk order 2/6 per issue) From M. MADDISON

equally, and just as important, to develop as a self-governing independent corporation with functions of its own, which would both destroy and succeed capitalism.

These theories had much in common with the later views of the "Workers' Opposition" in Russia, the difference being that as the Workers' Opposition were not wedded to constitutional change they naturally accepted the need for revolutionary overthrow of the ruling-class, a position that Cole could not bring himself to accept.

Producers guild

Cole rejected the idea of "Trade" Unions, and put forward most vigorously the Industrial Union concept. These "Greater Unions," as he called them, would be more useful to the workers than "trade" unionism in many ways. Firstly, they would be able more easily to recruit all workers into a union. Secondly, they would help break down sectional division, and would be a better fighting organization; and thirdly, they could more easily transform themselves into the Producers' Guild. However, we were not to wait until we had industrial unions in all industries, as soon as possible the whole of industry should be nationalized, and then the workers should be assisted to set up the Guilds. Here Cole gives warning, he says: "There is, however, a grave danger that, when nationalization comes, the State will not realise its responsibilities and industry will be run on bureaucratic instead of autocratic principles."

Partnership

Cole sums up his view on the Trade Unions in the following terms: "The Trade Unions must fight in order that they may control, it is in warring with capitalism that they will learn to do without capitalism, but they must realise their freedom in partnership with, and not in opposition to, the State." (World of Labour.)

With the collapse of the Guild Socialist movement, and the period of class collaboration following the General Strike, Cole turned his efforts more towards the Labour Party as such.

• THE TACTITION

COLE could well be considered a forerunner in theory of the present "theories" of the Communist Party.

During the "middle period" he wrote his book "What Marx

really meant," and in it he developed a theory on the State not unlike that which today emerges from the **British Road to Socialism**. Cole says that undoubtedly Lenin was right in saying that Marx was for the destruction of the bourgeois State-machine, but then proceeds to say: "The case is different in the parliamentary countries as long as they remain parliamentary. For these States, while they retain their essentially bourgeois character, do embody considerable elements of democratic service, as well as of coercive capitalist authority, and have been 'liberalised' to such an extent as to accord, for the present, considerable rights to the opposition. If they can be seized and controlled there are forces in operation within them that are fully consistent with the purposes Socialists have in view."

There is very little difference here with Gollan's theories, yet at the time the entire Communist Press made an onslaught on Cole, led by that old warrior, TA Jackson; Jackson certainly dealt the theory some heavy hammer blows, but later when the Communist Party adopted the same position, TA unfortunately was conspicuous by his silence.

"People's front"

It was during this time (1937) that Cole supported the idea of a "People's Front," dedicating a book by that name to Sir Stafford Cripps, Cole proposes in the book that the Communist Party be allowed to affiliate to the Labour Party, or if that is unacceptable to be allowed in as individuals. However, as an illustration of what I said earlier, he makes it perfectly clear that he has no intention of stupidly jeopardising his membership of the Labour Party.

Unity

He in fact took the Communist Party's position in the Socialist League, saying it ought to be disbanded, and that the individuals continue to fight, as individuals inside the Labour Party. In 1935, Cole wrote his book, "The simple case for Socialism," which he calls, "A plain statement . . . of the reasons for his faith." Again in this Cole returns to advocacy of Guild Socialism as well as closer ties with the Communist Party. It is clear from his writings of that period that Cole could not envisage a movement developing separately from Social-Democracy on the one hand and the Communist Party on the other. There is no doubt that without intention he greatly helped to strengthen the position of the Communist Party, playing down his criticisms of Soviet policy. I think this was due to Cole, like most people at the

time, being bewitched by the growth of Fascism on the one hand and Soviet industrial success on the other.

Now let us turn to the later Cole.

• SINCE 1945

COLE was completely disillusioned with the efforts of the 1945-51 Labour Governments. Some have suggested that this was due to the fact that the leaders failed to use his talents. I doubt that very much. **It is much more likely that his bitterness was due to the failure of the Labour Party to make any real inroads against the power of the capitalist class.** What really happened was that all Cole's old Socialist beliefs welled up and forced him to speak out, perhaps despite himself. One has only to contrast his pamphlet **A Guide to the Elements of Socialism** written in 1947, couched as it was in moderate terms, full of hope, with his bitter onslaught of 1954 in his pamphlet **Is this Socialism?** to see the extent of his shift in feeling. In his 1947 pamphlet Cole deludes himself by believing that the pattern of take-over of industry was transitory in character, and hopes that stage by stage real power will be transferred to the workers through their Trade

BUY YOUR BOOKS THROUGH S R BOOK SERVICE

35b Priory Terrace NW6

Unions. In 1954, he says, "It is not so easy as it was to contemplate with ecstasy, or even with equanimity, the prospect of all or most of the means of production, etc., being nationalised, if that is to mean their administration by a series of public boards on the model of the Coal Board, the Transport Commission, and the BEA."

He then raises the whole question of State power, and says that experience in Russia and in Britain now gives rise to a fear of putting too much power into the State's hands. The "bottom

dogs still remain" and further he says (as far as the Welfare State is concerned) "I cannot feel that it is even on the way to becoming Socialist."

Control

Cole then again (and this is his main theme throughout all his works) returns to the question of Industrial Democracy, ie the actual position of the worker in controlling industry and society. **He makes the vital point, so often overlooked today, that "Neither Trade Union bargaining nor joint consultation makes the worker a responsible partner in industry."** "Social ownership," he says, "is only half the battle; the other half is real participation by the workers in control—not only at the top, but at every level from the work group upwards." To make this absolutely clear he emphasises, "By participation, I do not mean merely consultation; I mean real control."

New vigour

Cole ends his pamphlet by saying he realises that what he says may be bad electioneering, but that does not worry him. Why be elected, he argues, unless one intends to introduce socialism, if not, then tell the people what you do stand for, but do not pretend to be socialist.

Cole further developed his view in two further pamphlets in 1956: 1. **What is wrong with the Trade Unions?**, and 2. **World Socialism Restated**. Cole keeps to his basic themes, but with a renewal of vigour, as if he felt he had not too much time left to begin to rebuild.

Great humanist

G.D.H. COLE was essentially an honest man, who, despite his limitations in theory, made a great contribution to the working-class movement. It must be remembered that during a period when practically everyone had abdicated the field in relation to Workers' Control and Industrial Democracy, he kept it alive. His pro-Stalinism was not acceptance of the Soviet forms of bureaucratic rule or industrial control, but mainly dictated by the need to create, as he saw it, a united front to fight Fascism and reaction. He undoubtedly helped to lead many astray, both in theory and practice, but despite all that, despite severe criticism we must have, let us honour him as someone whose heart was with the workers. Despite his class background and financial position, he was a great humanist. We must accept the positive in his work, whilst rejecting that which might be considered woolly and negative.

ROSA LUXEMBURG COMMEMORATIVE EDITION

21 AUBERT PARK, N.5

PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY — A SHAM

WRITES

JOHN COMLEY

VERY OFTEN we hear politicians telling us that we live in a **Free Country**. They have a catchword, too, the **Free World** (Spain, Portugal, Cyprus, South Africa?), which they contrast with the countries under Communist control, and tell us how lucky we are and how happy we ought to be. It's easy enough to call Britain **Free** — but what exactly does it mean?

If we push hard for an answer we may get something like this—Britain has parliamentary democracy, which means that everyone, excluding certified lunatics, infants below 21 years and convicts, has the right, at certain specified intervals of time, to have some kind of say in electing a Member to represent him or her in that noble institute just up the river from Victoria Station. This is popularly believed to ensure that the country is governed by popular will, and that "one person, one vote" is the best and fairest way of demonstrating what the popular will actually is. If most of the country vote for Sir Algy Crumpet, then a Tory Government gets in; if Bill Stokes achieves that majority, then we are jollied along by a "Labour" administration. From then on we haven't any further part in the proceedings; Members and Cabinet carry on a lot better without us.

Consulted?

Hitler once wrote that the bigger the lie, the greater the number of people that could be persuaded to believe it. **Now this—the belief that the actual governing of a capitalist country is in any important sense directed by the "popular will"—I consider the great lie of this century.**

There has always been a tendency—increasingly obvious today—for Parliament to be used simply to cover up the political and economic activities of a numerically insignificant minority. Was Parliament consulted before Britain attacked Egypt? How many members of the Cabinet, even, knew what was going to happen? Two? Three? Half a dozen? Was the sanction of Parliament ever asked before bombing planes flew against Port Said? Never, not once. **Hostilities were declared by a handful of men—the same handful who might well plunge us into the Third World War.**

Private war

It's sometimes argued that "on-the-spot" decisions are necessary, that we can't always wait for a full argument, stating all the pros and cons, before acting on a question of peace or war. But let's look back a little further. In 1914 Britain went to war against Germany, a war which reflected little credit on either side. **On the**

evening hostilities were declared, the people of this country were astounded to read in the newspapers of a whole series of political and military commitments, hitherto strictly secret, which had never once been debated or even mentioned in Parliament. Asquith had in fact denied the very existence of such commitments, when questioned in the Commons, on more than one occasion. Was he a deliberate liar, or merely the dupe of his own General Staff?

Later still there was the time when Churchill, that paragon of international virtue, was, as Home Secretary, conducting his own private war against the Russian Bolsheviks. Both Lloyd George and Bonar Law, under heavy public pressure, claimed that the troops were being withdrawn from Russian territory—when in fact they were advancing in a desperate attempt to aid the reactionary General Kolchak. Again the Commons were bamboozled by deliberate lies from the highest sources.

High policy!

I have tried to suggest that "parliamentary democracy" is a sham, and that Parliamentary processes are, in really important questions, merely used as a blind for the men who really exert control. Only rarely is their hand shown in public. The so-called "Curragh Mutiny" affords a clear example. The Liberal Government passed a Bill affording Home Rule to Ireland — and British officers garrisoned there refused point-blank to obey orders from Westminster. In this act of sedition they were actively encouraged by the House of Lords. Yet, instead of facing courts-martial, these seditious officers were encouraged; action against them (according to Asquith) was unthinkable on grounds of "high policy"! **The popular will of both Britain and Ireland had been directly flouted by a handful of uniformed bourgeois—and Parliament, the representatives of the electorate, was powerless, too afraid, to act!**

The facade

And so it goes on. Secret treaties, military pacts, "gentlemen's agreements," which never reach the attention of our Westminster representatives — when was the question of the building of rocket-bases debated in Parliament? Has the electorate ever been asked? Not that the occupation of Number Ten by a Gaitskell instead of an Eden would have made any difference to that particular question. The facade of Government may change, but the machinery ticks on behind it. To oil its course there is always the vigilance of the Official Secrets Act. An awkward ques-

tion in Parliament is shelved on the grounds that an answer . . . "would not be in the national interest!"—only too true, if by **national interest** we understand the interests of British monopoly-capitalism. The Secrets Act is a useful gag for Members of Parliament and private individuals

alike.

Remember the **Isis** article, which resulted in the jailing of two undergraduates?

"When the fleet paid a 'goodwill' mission to Danzig in 1955 they (the monitoring spies) were aboard. . . . A plane 'loses' its
contd. next page

TUNE — TIPPERARY

1.

The British economy's in a really shocking mess,
The miners and the railwaymen are doing less and less,
The shipyard men do nothing, for they're far too fond of tea,

It's a good thing that we still possess an Aristocracy.

Chorus

*It's a long way to the Riviera,
It's a long way to go.
It's a long way to the Riviera,
And to dear old Monaco.
Good-bye to dear old England,
God save the King;
And to prove that we are patriotic
We'll be back next spring.*

2.

The unemployment figures are increasing, it is true,
There's more than half a million of the blighters on the 'Bru';

A few months unemployment and these workers are in tears,

But you won't find us complaining we've been unemployed for years.

Chorus

*It's a long way to the Riviera,
It's a long way to go.
It's a long way to the Riviera,
And to dear old Monaco.
If there is an election,
We'll send you on our X.
In the meantime try and keep things going,
Send us on our cheques.*

3.

The price of corned beef is awfully high, we've heard it said,

The bakers say that they will have to raise the price of bread,

Because the British worker is behaving like a clown;
So we'll go on eating pheasant till they bring the prices down.

Chorus

*It's a long way to the Riviera,
It's a long way to go.
It's a long way to the Riviera,
And to dear old Monaco.
Good-bye to dear old England,
God save the King;
And to prove that we are patriotic
We'll be back next spring.*

MATT MCGINN.

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 M Maddison

21 Aubert Park, London, N5

JOHN COMELEY

contd.

way; while behind the frontier tape recorders excitedly record the irritated exchanges of Russian pilots. . . . The famous Lancaster bomber incident near Berlin was deliberately provoked in this way. . . ."

The article went on to mention . . . "the monitoring stations all along the frontier between East and West, from Iraq to the Baltic, . . . avidly recording the least squeak from Russian transmitters—ships, tanks, aeroplanes, troops and control stations . . . this breach of the Geneva Convention can provide accurate estimates of the size and type of Russian armaments and troops, and the nature of their tactical methods. . . ."

When was Parliament asked to grant finances for such dubious proceedings?

Dangerous state

But who are the people actually pulling the strings in our democratic Britain? They aren't the debutantes and the glassy-eyed, middle-aged young men with no chins who hover in orbit round Good Queen Liz. They are not as obtrusive as that. Only occasionally is a name familiar—like that of the Cecil family, which has provided royal hatchet-men since Tudor times until today. The majority of them are more retiring, more familiar with the boardrooms of the international clearing-houses than with the Court. They are the men who hold the interlocking directorates in banking and the armament industries, the men who've found Room at the Top, who weld private enterprise into one gigantic cartel. These men, the rulers of the City of London, are the power behind the Westminster Parliament.

This marks the evolution of State power into its highest and most dangerous, because largely invisible, form. It makes a mockery of formal Parliamentary procedure. That is why the system must be smashed, by a thorough reform of the Parliamentary system (including abolition of the Lords) and the taking under social ownership (workers' control) of all industry and banking interests—not merely in order to do away with economic exploitation in its most direct sense, but before we can even commence to build the Socialist Republic in Britain.

ECONOMICS UNCERTAIN FUTURE FOR CAR INDUSTRY

says JOHN CRUTCHLEY

UNEMPLOYMENT last year rose and production in most sectors of the economy declined. The major exception was the car industry. Last year for the first time over a million cars were produced. This topped the previous record of 898,000 in 1955 by 10 per cent. Commercial vehicles were not so successful. Although 12½ per cent above the 1957 figure this was still below the 1955 total.

PERMANENT WAR ECONOMY

Engineering people in Sheffield are prepared to guess that at the peak of rearmament 15 per cent or more of its output went into armaments, specialised vehicles for the Ministry of Supply, and into the aircraft that were cut off in mid-stride at the beginning of this year.

Last year's defence cuts essentially marked the beginning of the recession for Sheffield. They have indeed left some industrialists ready to say: 'Unless the Government starts equipping a traditional army again, and the Navy begins to believe in ships once more, we shan't see the average level of activity of the last five years for a very long time.'

The main reason for the boom was increased export sales although the ending of HP restrictions gave an extra boost in the closing months of the year.

The greatest increase was in exports to the Dollar Area. In the American market Britain regained the lead over Western Germany that was lost in 1957. There has been a swing away from the gigantic American cars to smaller family cars in America. This has benefited European exporters. It is estimated that 400,000 foreign cars were sold in America in 1958. Nine per cent of the total (*Economist*, October 25, 1958).

Car production does not play the dominant role in the British economy as it does in America where it is said that what is good for General Motors is good for the United States. In Britain there is one car for every thirteen people compared with the American 1:3. But it is becoming increasingly important.

During the 1956-7 investment boom the car recession was mainly responsible for keeping the industrial index flat. During the general recession in 1957-8 the car boom kept the index up.

Britain still has more car manufacturers and models than the USA, but the industry is becoming increasingly monopolised. The three biggest producers, BMC, Ford and Vauxhall (alias General Motors) share 75 per cent of the total output. These three plus Rootes and Standards account for 92 per cent. Compared with: USA, three largest firms produce 90 per cent, France, four firms produce over 90 per cent, and Italy the largest firm produces 80 per cent of total output.

Britain excluded

It is impossible to forecast accurately the future of the British car industry in the next few years. But it is not particularly bright.

Britain is now virtually excluded from the largest expanding car market in the world—Western Europe. The Common Market reduced tariffs between the six participating countries by 10 per cent on January 1st, while tariffs to the rest of the world remained the same. West German car producers will benefit most from this scheme and they will be able to increase their output substantially. This will make possible vast economies of scale and the Germans will be able to compete more efficiently in Britain's export markets, particularly America.

Markets problem

It does not seem possible that imports of cars into America will continue to increase. Already American manufacturers are planning to bring small cars into production this autumn. This means British car exports will not increase as rapidly as they did in 1958.

The only important export markets remaining to Britain are

contd. page 8

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.

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

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

LABOUR MUST WIN!

continued from page one

one or other of the left-wing movements that have arisen in the past would have succeeded in working the trick. It is useless to blame their failure entirely on subjective factors such as errors of judgment or the personal shortcomings of individual leaders. If a mass Socialist movement were so near the surface it would not have been frustrated by such accidental factors (This is not, of course, to say that errors and shortcomings did not exist).

But on the contrary, we see that the Labour Party is still firmly entrenched as the mass party of the workers. There may not be any great enthusiasm in its ranks at the present time. But there is even less enthusiasm for any other workers' party. Moreover the leadership today is probably more openly right-wing than at any time in its history. Even Ramsay MacDonald in the '20s felt constrained to use a more 'socialist' phraseology than Gaitskell adopts.

Labour Governments

Looked at by a Socialist, the record of the Labour Party leadership in the last 40 or so years is wide open to criticism. There were the miserable records of the first two Labour Governments; the failure in the '30s to counterpose a policy to the Tories' drift to war; coalition with the Tories in the pursuit of an imperialist war and then the return to power with a thumping majority

in 1945 when there was every opportunity to make an end once for all with capitalism, but nothing of the sort was achieved. It seems incredible that any party could emerge unscathed and apparently hardly shaken from a period of tremendous convulsions in which it had played so inglorious a role.

Yet if the viewpoint is shifted to that of the average worker or rank-and-file member of the party, does the record look so black? The failures of the first two Labour Governments are excused on the grounds that they were minority governments, barely able to keep their heads above water and with no energy to spare for far-reaching policies. Even the collapse of 1931 can be interpreted in terms of the treachery of one or two individuals. Enough of the leaders dissociated themselves in time from MacDonald to save from ignominy the policy that had led to disaster. The second world war appeared to most people in this country not as a war for British imperialism but as a necessary means of checking the march of Facism, and the Labour Party was regarded as doing no more than its obvious duty in sinking its differences with the Tories in the prosecution of the war. The post-war deeds of the Labour Governments are regarded as having laid the foundation for an advance to Socialism by nationalizing some of the country's basic industries and the full employment which ac-

companied the boom conditions was gratefully attributed to Labour policies. It is not surprising that there are still millions of workers who accept the view that capitalism can be gradually changed by a series of piecemeal reforms and see in the Labour Party the instrument for doing precisely this.

Socialists who believe that these are illusions and dangerous illusions, because they disarm the workers ideologically and confuse them, nevertheless have to reckon with them. An ostrich-like attitude is fatal. Before reformist ideas are shattered, the working class will have to undergo a whole series of experiences. It is the task of socialists to analyse these experiences and show, in the course of the workers' struggle, why and how capitalism must be destroyed. The process will be one of education for socialists as much as for any other section of the movement.

Today the left wing must accept a limited perspective and a period of slow growth. In the immediate future the principal task must be to ensure the return of a Labour Government at the next General Election. It will be catastrophic from all points of view if the Tories get back. First, because a Tory Government is always bad for the workers. Second, because another defeat for Labour would have a terribly demoralising effect on the party and on the working-class movement generally. Third, because it is essential that the Labour Party leaders should have to face the challenge of office again. Let us see how 'The Future Labour Offers You' looks in reality, and whether it solves the workers' problems. If it does not, the education of the workers will be advanced much more rapidly and much further than by any amount of anti-reformist agitation.

TELEVISION KNOWS

a comment on advertising

THIS MORNING as I battered the frozen butter with the handle of a knife my daughter informed me that if I used 'Stucko margarine' it would spread like cream and she added 'give me all the vitamins I need.' All this was delivered with the preciseness of a television announcer. Later on when she saw that I was cooking sausages she said 'I hope they're Walls' and then: 'Mummy why don't you use Omo when you wash my blouse?' It makes things whiter than white.' I asked her how anything can be whiter than white and she tells me that 'television knows.'

Yes, Television knows how best to get at the mothers, the women, the chief buyers of most goods. I have been thinking a lot about television lately, I suppose we all have. Though I have not a set (my neighbour is the culprit) I can feel its presence, and its threat on my private life (or is it any longer private?)

However, I tell myself that I am a progressive person. I make use of the clinics, think carefully before voting, am in favour of sex education, universal suffrage, brotherhood, etc. . . . But with the discoveries of new medicines come the discoveries of wider screens, with better hygienic conditions in factories, come the master soapless detergents and then—the advertising. Didn't my grandfather swear that the wireless would corrupt the home and haven't there been, in the wake of every progressive move, those who cling to their childhood and refuse to admit the new? The time has come, however, when one no longer has the time to wonder whether one disagrees or agrees with the invasion of the latest inventions, into our society things are thrust upon us.

And here now is the television set come to 'corrupt the home,' where does my progressiveness end, and where can I discriminate? If I keep my children away from it there will come a time when they will no longer be able to talk to other children, not knowing the new television language or what was on the night before.

We cannot ignore it, or its influence, neither can we expect our children to be dis-

criminate with its use. (Cinemas soon will not bother to mark their films with an X or an H, children will be able to see them on television anyway.)

It has been said that 'Evil communications corrupt good manners,' this by a man who had to shout through a rusty telephone. I am all for better communications, they are keys to our progress. **But my communications from the world in general seem to be in the control of a few, very few men (we must never forget that they are men and not just organizations) whose one aim is selling something—anything it seems.**

I would like to think that one day there might be thousands of small television stations, not owned by anybody but there to be used by anybody. I would turn the knob on my set and see perhaps my great aunt Emily dancing the quadrille, or someone in Africa standing in what looks like a telephone box showing me what he looks like, how he smiles, and something of his country.

Yes, better and better communications but from and to people who want to know about each other, not simply from a seller to a buyer.

CRESSIDA LINDSAY.

UNCERTAIN FUTURE FOR CARS — CONTD

the 'white Dominions.' These markets are not expanding as rapidly as those of Western Europe or America. Because they are predominantly raw-material producing countries they are the first to be hit by fluctuations in international trade and this forces them to cut their imports. In an attempt to increase their industrial capacity they are investing in their own car industries.

More cars

More cars will be sold at home in 1959 because HP terms have been eased and banks are more willing to give their middle-class customers credit to buy cars. Nearly 100 per cent more cars were sold under HP terms in

November than in October last

HOW NOT TO ACHIEVE OFFICE

In an editorial entitled 'Social Democracy' which appeared on the 22nd of last month, **The Times** gave this hint to the Labour Party:

In Britain it has a chance of returning to power at the price of renouncing most of its characteristic doctrines. In Germany it has already made this sacrifice, and seems indefinitely condemned to opposition all the same.

year and nearly 60 per cent more than in November, 1957. (**Observer**, December 21, 1958). This in-

crease is only a temporary boost and will not continue at this rate throughout 1959.

Moreover only 25 per cent of new cars sold in Britain are subject to HP agreements. 25 per cent of total British car production or 50 per cent of cars sold in Britain rank as capital investment (**Economist**, October 25, 1958). These cars are bought by firms for the use of their top bosses. These sales are influenced by business prospects not HP agreements.

Trouble ahead

Therefore, unless exports can be increased or purchase tax reduced, the British car industry will run into trouble by the summer of this year.

Finally, the increased output

Sparks in Florence!

The management of the Galileo Company, a well-known firm making optical instruments and electrical equipment, has reported to the police 400 workers for illegally occupying the company's factory in Florence. The workers took action on Friday of last week to prevent notices of dismissal sent them from being carried out.

Times, January 16.

in 1958 was achieved with a total labour force smaller than in 1955. The significance of this fact I will examine next month.