

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

JOURNAL
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

10th YEAR No 8

AUGUST 1960

SIXPENCE

REPEL THE RIGHT — WING CHALLENGE

AT PRESENT, the roll-call of votes at the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party Conference is most encouraging to the Left. The move to water down Clause Four is almost certain to be defeated, at least in its present form of an outright "New Testament" parallel with the Constitution. The votes in favour of unilateral nuclear disarmament outnumber those against by at least a million. Yet all of us know that the Right wing is quite capable of manoeuvring the Conference arrangements in such a way as to deaden or even destroy the affirmation of Socialist principle that is so necessary for the future of the movement.

We therefore suggest a few thoughts which delegates to Congress and Conference, and their friends and associates in the different organisations of Labour, may ponder during the coming weeks, and perhaps take with them into their respective assemblies. The Left has too often gone naked into *this* Conference chamber.

An attempt may be made to persuade Conference to admit the "clarification" of Clause Four, not indeed to the high status of a Constitutional document, but as part of the National Executive's report, or as some other, less exalted form of policy statement. If we are not to be given a New Testament, at least Gaitskellism will have its Apocrypha (that collection of books which the English Church admits as, if not holy, at least "edifying" for the faithful to read).

However, there is nothing particularly edifying about the "clarification". Its basic assumption is that private and public ownership will co-exist as equally important forms in the indefinite future; it even lays open the prospect of the continued dominance of private property over public. Clause Four is not clarified, but only confused, and diluted by the Executive proposals. They should be rejected out of hand.

The possibilities of official manoeuvre on the Bomb are considerably wider. An attempt will be made to persuade some union delegations, and very likely the whole Conference, that "the situation has changed" since the day when the unilateralist resolutions they are pledged to support, were passed. Various "changes" will be canvassed. The failure of the Summit is already being mooted within the AEU leadership as though it were a telling condemnation of the National Committee's unilateralist policy, instead of (as it is) the most overwhelming evidence for the necessity for Britain to abandon the Bomb without waiting till the cows of international negotiation to come home.

NO CHANGE ON BOMB

The NEC statement on defence is also said to constitute a fundamental change of circumstance which the conferences of recent months unfortunately missed. If this argument were accepted, it would mean that the annual conferences of the trade union movement might as well pack up. Any policy which they endorsed, and which ran counter to the pet plans of the General Council and the NEC, would automatically be made null, void and of no effect by the simple procedure of issuing a Transport House statement on the issue concerned, which, yielding in no fundamental respect to the demands of the unions concerned, nevertheless possessed the magic, overriding property of being produced *after* the union conferences that framed the troublesome policy. Lateness thus becomes a substitute for argument. Our Labour leadership of tomorrow will be able to tell us all: "No need to put any resolutions on questions X, Y and Z on your agenda, chaps, because the NEC is going to issue a statement on these matters after you have taken your decisions; in fact, you needn't bother to decide on questions A, B, C...W either, since we might always turn out a pre-Conference statement on any of these."

All this, of course, quite apart from the fact that the official defence statement is complete eyewash. Its chief point is that Britain should contribute conventional forces to a NATO armed with United States H-bombs. The Tory policy of having our own Bomb as well was lunatic and jingoist, but it did at least have a little misplaced pride about it. The Labour Party's present proposals, accepting as they do the whole case for the deterrent, provide us with the same probability of being blown up as we have under MacMillan, but deprives us even of the "Made In Britain" label on the instrument of our destruction. Either let us have the Union Jack over our radioactive graves, or else let's live. And let's live by having nothing more to do with the Bomb, or the bases, or the missiles, or NATO. That for a beginning, anyway.

For, no matter how many statements the National Executive churns out, or how many telephone-lines in Scarborough hotels buzz with the noise of horse-trading in votes, nothing essential has changed since the recent weeks when the conferences of the separate organisations of the British Labour movement decided, in their great majority, that the Bomb should be given up, unconditionally and unilaterally, by this country. Nothing has changed, because the Bomb

● cont page 8

DEFEND THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

by JIM PLANT

THE Imperialists have been thrown into a paroxysm of rage over Fidel Castro's action in taking over the three big oil refineries in Cuba. The American press is screaming for military action against Cuba: "We hope Washington is planning to slap this lug down" frothed the *New York Daily News*.

Until the overthrow of the hated and bloodthirsty dictatorship of Batista, Cuba's status was that of a semi-colonial country. The greater part of Cuba's resources—sugar, mineral rights, light industry, public utility concessions, cattle lands—were in the hands of US capital.

Cuba, with no coal deposits or hydro-electric possibilities, relies exclusively on oil for its power requirements. Her oil needs have been met by three refineries owned by the American companies of Esso and Texaco, and the Anglo-Dutch Shell. These three imported practically all the crude oil from their own oil fields in Venezuela. The price of this oil is artificially high, for it is related not to the production costs of the area concerned but is fixed at a level so as not to undercut the high cost of American produced oil. This is true all over the world; Middle East oil sells in Britain, for example, at the same price as American oil, although production costs in the Middle East are only a fraction of American costs.

In June the Cuban government signed an agreement for the delivery of Soviet crude oil on terms that are particularly advantageous to Cuba. Soviet oil is \$1 a barrel cheaper than company oil; it is paid for with Cuba's staple crop, sugar; and payment is no drain on Cuba's dollar reserves. Under a 1938 law the oil companies must refine government owned oil, however when ordered to process the Soviet oil they refused. The result was the expropriation of the three refineries.

Many sections of the American ruling class are calling for drastic action against Cuba, including military intervention on the "Suez" model. We had an example of the same determination of the imperialists to hang on to their oil profits by any means, even if it brings the world to the brink of war, in 1958, at the time of the revolution in Iraq and the civil war in the Lebanon.

The direct connection between military action on the part of the State, and the oil capitalists was illustrated when, in 1958, the

● cont page 8

THE INDUSTRIAL STRUGGLE AND PEACE

Essential task for Socialist Trade Unionists

MY previous article (April SR) referred to the great industrial struggles now maturing in which a new militant leadership would be thrown up by the rank and file. It might be argued that the analysis given in the previous article ignored such factors as the ever-present threat of nuclear warfare. Obviously no plan to regain Labour's lost initiative can be based on the assumption that the status quo will last forever. All credit is due to the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament for stirring the conscience of the ordinary non-political citizen against war. Their efforts have been necessary because the Labour and trade union movement has failed to take the lead in the struggle against war. The most urgent task for Socialists is to bring the working-class organisations into action on this question. No form of independent action, however heroic, is a substitute.

The aim will not be achieved by purely propagandist and sometimes slightly hysterical appeals to the proletariat, in revolutionary fashion, over the heads of the governments. To the ordinary industrial worker this means nothing. But he can be brought to recognise the need and possibility of action through his trade union organisation. Before we talk about speaking over the heads of governments, we have to show the workers the link between their struggle for a better way of life and a struggle to release for constructive purposes the millions of pounds now devoted to weapons of destruction.

DIRECT ACTION

The stand made by Frank Cousins and the Executive of the T&GWU at their biennial conference and later at the Labour Party conference, although ambiguous in some ways, must have had more effect on the Cold War protagonists than all the revolutionary appeals of isolated left-wing groups. The question of an independent foreign policy for Britain no longer tied to American world strategy is now a major issue in the Labour Party. The fact that Cousins has been able to carry the mass of his members with him on this issue and make a strong intervention in the councils of the Labour Party is partly because he has showed himself prepared to support direct industrial action to realise the economic demands of his members in the bus depots and factories.

The immense potential strength of the mass organisation of the British workers has been created during a whole century of painstaking and single-minded effort. The real problem for Labour is to make full use of the levering power of this organisation to obtain the maximum social and economic advance within the present class system and then to break out of

by DUDLEY EDWARDS

this framework by taking control of the major industries in the interest of the community.

The practical solution of this problem is far more important than the rather abstract debates now going on about Clause Four. No declaration of aims, however militant the language, ensures that a Socialist party will consistently conduct an anti-capitalist struggle on behalf of the working class. On the contrary, all over Europe we have seen so-called Socialist parties foresaking the workers or taking up a neutral attitude as the class struggle has sharpened.

NO SHOW-DOWN

A clash is now maturing in British capitalist society. It may be postponed by the timidity and narrow outlook of the trade union leaders, on the one hand, and the moderation of the 'progressive' Tories, on the other. But any sharp fall in profitability would lead to the demand that Big Business should be given a free hand to 'teach the Unions a lesson'. Already, in a report published last year, the Employers' Federation have scolded the government for not allowing them to stage a show-down with the engineering unions.

Of course, it may appear that only 'shadow boxing' by the unions pays off. For example, when the government allowed an increase in pay to the railwaymen, it looked as if the men, who were ready for anything, had held the trump card. But the increase they got was one which, in the long run, was unavoidable. In fact, the threat of strike action had come three years too late. As a result of belated modernisation, involving rationalisation and loss of time, most railwaymen had been reduced to subsistence wages.

NEW LEADERSHIP

While the railway deal was being concluded, the representatives of three million engineering workers were meeting at York to discuss the flat rejection of their claim for an extra £1 per week. The employers' side showed willingness to compromise and the union executives came away empty-handed. True they got agreement on a 42-hour week without loss of pay—instead of the 40-hour week originally claimed. But it must be concluded that the engineering employers had the "green light" from the government to take a tough line, because the engineers, unlike the railwaymen, were not working for miserable wages but were basing their claim on the right to share in the expanding profits of one of the country's most important industries. Such a claim is regarded as unheard of insolence by the employers and some trade union bureaucrats.

They seem to have the idea that the only justification for wage increases is a rise in the cost of living. To demand more money to improve one's standard of living is regarded as irresponsible. Yet this is exactly what the workers ought to be seeking.

The workers to-day certainly expect more than just a few crumbs from the capitalist table. The mass advertising of hire-purchase goods, the awareness that, in the West at least, it is possible to mass-produce everything that is needed to give everyone a fuller and more civilised life, all this convinces the worker that he needs more than those officials who, at present, are content with such small wage gains.

Where is this alternative leadership to come from? The present trade union leaders are orthodox, right-wing Labour men. The 'Leftists' and the Communists therefore argue that the new leadership must come from outside the Labour Party. But this is logical only if we accept the idea that the Labour Party is a monolithic, highly disciplined political party, demanding allegiance to a hard-and-fast body of doctrine. But this is not so. Historically the Labour Party is the child of the trade unions. Without trade union support it is nothing. A new interest among the unions in the combining of industrial and political action must result in a change in the character and direction of the Labour Party. To transform the loose alliance of Labour Party, trade unions and Co-operative movement into the instrument needed to liquidate the capitalist system of production and replace it by a Socialist one, the marxists must first strive to change the political climate within the trade unions, in the same way as the Socialist pioneers did at the turn of the century, when the TUC was finally won over to the idea of independent working-class representation in Parliament.

Those best able to do this are the Socialist members of the Labour Party who seek to warp its framework and at the same time work for a militant policy within their unions. It is neither necessary, desirable nor possible for their efforts to be organised by some outside body or by an illegal underground 'centre' within the Labour Party. At some stage it may be possible to form a league of marxists to function within the Labour Party without coming into direct collision with the Executive (as the Fabian Society operates on the right). But by then the transformation of the whole movement will be well under way.

The process outlined above will take a relatively long period, perhaps a decade or more. This will displease those who emphasise their claim to be revolutionaries and those who argue that history will not allow us enough time to carry through such a slow process.

To think that nuclear warfare will soon cut short all our activities is in fact to panic. The struggle against war is part of the struggle for Socialism and while this struggle must be conducted with passion, it must also be waged calmly, methodically and scientifically. There are no short cuts for left wing socialists who really want to reach the goal of transforming society. Capitalism may create chaos and desperation, but we should not rely on the prospect of appalling suffering to drive the workers towards Socialism (even if we could rely on its doing so). We must base ourselves on the conditions now existing and believe that we can win through to Socialism, even if capitalism manages to avoid producing the sort of catastrophe it has produced in the past. Hence our aims can only be achieved through the existing mass organisations of the working class. In the words of the Communist Manifesto: "The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working-class parties. They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole. They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own by which to shape and mould the proletariat as a whole."

SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT

The Labour Party may often disgust us with its veneer of bourgeois respectability, but its social composition and historical background are nevertheless working-class. It remains for the workers to see it as an instrument of their own creation, as necessary in the struggle for their full economic and social emancipation as the trade unions in their sphere.

Already some of the comrades from North London are seeking to create a local association of Labour trade unionists with the aim of drawing more trade unionists into the political as well as the industrial struggle. If socialist trade unionists will take similar steps in their factories or trade union branches, the possibility of establishing a Socialist Labour government sometime in the 1960's would become a practical probability and the real aims of the Socialist pioneers to build a new classless society could begin to be realised.

Socialist Review has received an encouraging letter from a veteran Japanese socialist. It shows the main tendency in Zengakuren, the militant Japanese students' organisation, are revolutionary socialists who are very close to Socialist Review in their political standpoint.

SEAMENS' STRIKE

by NICHOLAS HOWARD

SIR Thomas Yates speaking to the press on the fourth day of the seamen's strike expressed his opinion that 'this thing will run its course as all unofficial strikes do' and that 'the younger element is to blame.' The strike ended ten days later with a threat of resumption if demands for a £4 a month rise, a 44-hour working week and the provision of shop stewards on ships, were not met within a month. Between them, both employers and union officials are responsible for the decline in the standards of seafarers' conditions and pay in relation to the average standards enjoyed by factory labour on shore. The complacency of Sir Thomas was typical of most of the officials of this bosses' union and the strength of the strike clearly marks an unprecedented and spontaneously active expression of no confidence in his union.

Discontent with the NUS has been growing since 1947, when the union in return for wage increase which did little more than establish the war-risk bonus as part of the basic wage, handed to the shipowners effective control of all matters concerning rates, hours of work and conditions. The constitution of the industry's arbitration body, the National Maritime Board put seafarers in the unfavourable position of having to negotiate through four different unions representing deck officers and engineer officers, radio officers, sailors, firemen and caterers, and shipwrights, with a united body of owners. The established service scheme, inaugurated in 1947, which guaranteed unemployed seamen a weekly unemployment pay of one third to one quarter of their last paid rate on top of the National Insurance Unemployment Benefit, came completely under the control of the shipowners. To most seafarers who signed the scheme's two-year contracts, the benefits during the years of full employment resembled little more than those of a free employment agency. Failure to take a ship because of discontent with conditions on board meant loss of all the contract benefits which would accrue during off-periods and made a mockery of the security of employment by the scheme.

But the employers' right to with-hold jobs by laying up ships, or to with-hold unemployment benefits by limiting the number of contracts, was not balanced by any seafarer's right to with-hold his labour. The seafarer could, by remaining unestablished, insist on his right to choose his own ship, but his right to protest against bad conditions was disregarded by both the unions and the employers, whether he was established or unestablished.

NUS REFORM NEEDED

The Ministry of Transport also evaded its responsibilities on the question of conditions afloat, which in general are far below those of Scandinavian ships. When new regulations regarding seamen's accommodation were introduced by amendment to the Merchant Shipping Act on January 1st, 1954, vessels built before that date were exempted from the requirements and the regulations became mere recommendations to any shipowner to comply. The Minister would intervene only if petitioned by representatives of a seamen's organisation, and needless to say, this rarely occurred though many of Britain's cargo ships were built under wartime conditions, and fall far short of modern standards of comfort. In the quarters of the catering staff conditions are particularly bad and it is no accident that strikes usually start in the catering department.

Several lessons can be drawn from the strike. Conditions at sea are not improving as rapidly as they should, and the NUS, with its army of paid officials—'delegates'—who usually report first to the captain and then to the crew when a ship arrives in a home port, is doing nothing to improve them. The reason the strike was not more widespread is because some of the wealthier shipowners pay an unofficial wage increase in the form of a fixed bonus to crews that show good service. However, companies can and do withdraw this bonus when signing on new crews, thus such wage increases are never stable. The seamen on strike just recently insisted that the NUS make a stand over the £4 increase and threaten a strike if it was refused or pared down. This is understandable when one considers that the basic monthly wage of an able seaman who has taken five years to achieve his rank, is only £33 5s a month, a rise of £3 15s since 1956. The weekly rate for the same man paying for his own food on a coasting vessel is £8 17s 4d which explains the predominance of coasting men among the strikers.

The difficulties of organising a seamen's strike are obvious. NUS rules specify that strike action can only be used if it is ratified by a members' ballot, but it has never allowed such a ballot. Seamen who have signed ships' articles are bound by law to obey the legal commands of the master.

There is a good case for a state-run seafarers' welfare organisation on the Scandinavian pattern, but with union-backed powers to enforce improvements in seafarers' conditions.

The strikers have put forward no demands for nationalisation. To them it is obvious that it would be workable in the ship industry only under conditions of greater public control of the entire national economy. Above all, the seamen need to strengthen their organisation. Hence their demand to have a shop steward in every ship. Hence also their demand that officials do not stay ashore permanently—thus losing touch with the rank-and-file—but go back to sea after two years officialdom on shore.

Unless the strikers' demands are met, and unless the NUS hearkens to the voice of the rank-and-file, there will be more trouble in this industry.

Power – a call to unity

LTE WORKER SUMS - UP

THE strike of workers at Lotts Road, Greenwich and Neasden Power Stations is at the time of writing in its sixth day. Far from there being signs of weakening on the part of our members, today has seen the call for a widening of the strike.

On July, the day shift workers at Lotts Road and Greenwich concluded an agreement giving the cash allowance of between 29/- and 34/- per week according to grade. The award covered all the three power stations involved in the present dispute and was the result of a 15-day strike of 80 AEU maintenance men from Lotts Road and Greenwich.

The nightshift workers, some 340, were not included in the award and so found themselves for the first time receiving no more wages than day workers. This was an impossible situation. A claim was made for shift workers and on July 6 notice of strike action was given, effective from July 10, unless the LTS bosses gave the shift workers justice.

On July 14, a meeting between management and unions resulted in the offer from the LTE of an immediate increase of 10/-, effective when the power station workers return to normal working. So far this offer has been rejected. The following day the sub-station operatives met to discuss the position and decided that unless there was a return to work by the power station workers, they would withdraw their labour the following morning.

"BLACK JUICE"

During the past week there have been many conflicting stories and rumours. This is understandable in an industry employing some 90,000 workers, spread over small sections, many working in shift systems. Contact between workers is therefore difficult, but there have been certain disturbing factors which cannot be glossed over by citing these difficulties.

For example, the tubes and trolley buses have been kept running, and quite effectively. This has been achieved by the use of blackleg labour, the higher officials of the LTE working round the clock in the power stations.

In the whole area you will not find a single official, over the rank of foreman, at his normal job. The question here is twofold. First, are all these supervisory grades members of the TSSA? If so, what are trade unionists doing acting as strike breakers? Secondly, why are the sub-station workers, the motor men, the trolley bus drivers and so on, not told that they are only at work by the kind permission of blackleg labour?

During the week the power stations strike committee issued two statements: one outlined the cause of the strike and called for "nothing to be done by other LTE employees which would damage the case of the strikers", and urged that "fellow trade unionists should ensure that no 'black juice' was exported from their system into ours." The second statement, a short typewritten bulletin, bluntly said that it was clear that "black juice" was being supplied from outside, and that the power stations were being manned by blackleg labour."

Unfortunately during the whole week nothing concrete was done to call upon the workers outside the power stations to cease work on the basis that they were operating through the employment of strikebreakers. It was evident that those workers so appealed to, would have walked out to a man.

The whole system under which the men work is quite archaic from a trade union point of view. For instance the power stations are covered by six major unions; there may be more. The maintenance workers outside are also in the same position: ETU, AEU, NUR, T&GWU, NUGMW, ASW and so on.

POWER COMMITTEE NEEDED

There have been attempts in the past to coordinate these unions into one effective body, but always one union has refused at the eleventh hour. The result of this has been that where the most members are congregated, ie, in the main workshops at Acton and Chiswick, for example, there exists an excellent bonus scheme which is however not extended to their colleagues outside. (Skilled maintenance members outside, earn a basic of £11 8s per week, no bonus, no extras except overtime).

What the industry needs is a fully representative rank-and-file "power committee" embracing all the unions in power supply and negotiating on that basis. A lesson could well be learned from the example of Ford's shop stewards committee. This would put an end to inter-union rivalry and lead to a new deal for all power supply workers.

This is the first step that should be taken. We must recognise that government policy dictates the wages and conditions of LTE members. Therefore the struggles of the future will become inevitably more sharp, more fundamental as the Tories turn the screws on government spending.

We should remember that the recent bus strike was not just an industrial struggle but also a sharp political battle, with the Tories claiming that the bus workers wanted to "bring the government to its knees". We are in the same position on the LTE and therefore we must seek to strengthen our organization as much as possible and present a united front against any attack of any section.

Sedgwick disagrees with Rex . . .

THIS New Left pamphlet, published in time for the recent Aldermaston March, contains many virtues and a few important vices. The virtues will be catalogued in order to induce every one to buy and read it. There are telling, detailed sections on the 1958 and 1960 Defence White Papers, on the origins of NATO, on the myth of the "Free World", on the United States *volte-face* in the disarmament talks, on Mr Dennis Healey's recent Fabian pamphlet, and on the unilateral case.

Each of these sections is backed by reasoned witty argument and in many cases by eye-opening quotations from official sources. The two central virtues of the pamphlet are first, its linkage of the Bomb, through the factually and logically based analysis that we have come to expect from Rex's writings, with NATO and the wider issues of the Cold War; secondly, its analysis of the strategic and technical data of the military *status quo*, as facts in their own right, in the lately neglected tradition of Engels and Tom Wintringham.

DISARMAMENT

My first disagreement with Rex relates to his estimate of the possible good that can be achieved by disarmament conferences conducted by capitalist and Stalinist governments. Rex argues that the CND should have a "secondstage" policy to be operated *after* British renunciation of the Bomb. This policy would partly consist in urging a comprehensive, multi-lateral disarmament agreement upon other existing governments.

Controversy has existed among Socialists for a considerable time concerning the degree to which demands for a radical turn in foreign policy should be presented as demands upon bourgeois governments at present in power. Engels, towards the end of his life, argued that Socialists should press for a disarmament conference attended by all European powers in order to halt the drift toward world war which he rightly foresaw as the only possible consequence of the arms race. Others, horrified at these proposals, denounced them as a snare and a delusion: the only safeguard against war was work-in-class organisation, and any suggestion that the Powers could be forced to disarm amounted to the creation of a fatally misplaced confidence. (The controversy is recorded in the standard biography of Engels by G Mayer).

The argument has gone on in much the same terms ever since. The record of disarmament conferences has so far confirmed the views of those Socialists who were willing to rush in where Engels feared to tread. Rex, however, states: "Today the Russians do want a disarmament agreement. It is pointless to argue, therefore, that because previous disarmament

conferences have failed, this one must fail too. If the opportunity be seized now, it is possible that we may be able to create institutions which will make H-bomb war impossible for all time. If it is not, we may find ourselves faced eventually with a Russian leadership which has returned to its former intransigence and the nuclear nightmare will be permanently with us." (p 16)

These words ring ironically, with the recent apparent switch in Soviet leadership and foreign policy. But even if Khrushchev were still pursuing a flexible policy Socialists would still have the permanent war economy in the West to contend with. Rex nowhere considers the thesis, cogently argued by Mills and Cliff, that the present level of military spending in the West provides an essential boost to the economy.

U.N.O. INEFFECTIVE

The second feature of Rex's "next stage" is "that Britain's whole weight and authority should be placed behind the United Nations General Assembly as the ultimate arbiter in international disputes". (p. 20) Rex sees the increasing prominence in the Assembly of uncommitted, underdeveloped nations as constituting sufficient grounds for trust in UNO as an effective arbiter. He cites the ending of the Korean and Indo-Chinese wars, and the Tory withdrawal from Suez as instances of successful mediation by independent Powers. Since the present alternative to nuclear war is some mediation of this kind, he asks: why not regularise the process of mediation *via* UNO?

The answer to this is, briefly, that, given existing regimes and existing socio-economic relations mediation can only be forced on guilty Powers by military stalemate (Indo-China and Korea) and economic blackmail (Suez) or inter-imperialist rivalry (Indo-China and Suez). Despite the anxiety of metropolitan Powers to avoid alienating the uncommitted nations the mere passing of resolutions in the Assembly does nothing of itself to arbitrate conflicts, in the absence of these cruder pressures. Hungary, Cyprus, South Africa and Algeria have all been denounced at UNO, without effect.

INTO SOCIALISM

Until radical changes can be forced in the power-structure of the industrial nations which mainly direct the Cold War, nothing permanent can be devised as a means of resolving great-Power conflicts. Yet Rex seems to envisage his "second-stage" policy as directed primarily to influencing diplomats and statesmen: "...one must ask whether the policy of unilateralism, *taken by itself*, is one which is sufficient to convince those who have the responsibility of government." (Rex's italics —

P.S.) Yet it is impossible to conceive of any adequate answer to, for example, Gaitskell's dire warnings of a Germany armed with the nuclear weapons rejected by a unilateralist Britain, unless the Campaign's "second stage" is directed primarily to *peoples*, if necessary over the heads of their governments.

Finally, it is disappointing that Rex's advocacy of the "second stage" nowhere includes any reference to the domestic problems a unilateralist British government might encounter. E P Thompson, in his chapter on *Revolution in Out of Apathy* (reprinted in NLR) has convincingly outlined a set of possible consequences to the British renunciation of the Bomb (including, for example, big-business resistance), which would put the unilateralist action into fatal jeopardy unless a revolutionary transition to Socialism was successfully carried through. This kind of approach amounts to saying that the "second stage" of the unilateralist case must be Socialism.

Whether unilateral renunciation of the Bomb must be pre-

ceded, or only must be followed, by a Socialist revolution, is a crystal-gazing detail over which it would be hair-splitting to argue. The point is that unilateralism must break through into Socialism, or go under. The only "institutions which will make H-bomb war impossible for all time" are those of an international Socialist commonwealth. The fact that this solution seems very far off at present should not tempt us to place any confidence in apparent solutions which may seem more realisable, but in fact solve nothing. Until international Socialism is achieved, mankind lives in danger of extermination. On the other hand, we will not bring Socialism nearer merely by advocating it in general terms. Part of our work for Socialism must be in stating the case against the Bomb and for its unconditional renunciation, to as many people as possible. It is the merit of Rex's pamphlet that so much of it is valuable, or rather indispensable, in this work. Its failings should not make any Campaigner hesitate to buy it.

. . . And Rex replies

I FIND Peter Sedgwick very much more Talmudist in this piece than I would have hoped. Surely it is not good enough for you to deal with the question of the possibility of negotiations between Russia and America by quoting Bebel, any more than it is for Tony Cliff to do so by quoting Rosa Luxemburg's denunciation of Kautsky. Apart from the fact that they were not discussing negotiations between a Stalinist and Capitalist state—I know you might say here that the problem is the same as the problem of negotiations between rival capitalist imperialist powers—there is the fact that we have H-bombs today and that the knowledge of what H-bomb war can mean is a factor affecting the motivations of capitalist and Stalinist leaders which did not have to be taken into account by Bebel and Luxemburg.

One does not have to be a sentimentalist to doubt the proposition that capitalists and Stalinists will say: "I will risk the destruction of the world rather than risk losing my profits or perks". Their profits and perks are only possible on the basis of a continuing non-radioactive world. This is why I think that the fact of nuclear weapons has altered the *structure* of world society, and that it is dogmatism rather than scientific socialism, which prevents people from admitting this.

Of course it is also true that old habits of thought die hard and that politicians cling desperately to the illusions of power politics. But the whole point of the campaign to my mind is to break down these illusions. It seems to me to be very evident that there are divisions amongst

the leaders on both sides of the iron curtain about the usefulness of negotiations. It is our job to throw our weight on the side of those who are realistic enough to understand what nuclear warfare means.

Of course, if it is true that either capitalism or Stalinism cannot make the necessary adjustments which disarmament involves, they will collapse. I imagine for example that in Britain a slump could be precipitated by a sudden reduction of state spending. Alright, this is the point at which the campaigners demand that full employment shall be maintained by a switch to new state expenditure of various kinds. If capitalism can't do this, well we get rid of capitalism.

LET'S SURVIVE

The reason why I didn't discuss the problems of re-conversion are purely administrative. A second part of the pamphlet was to have been written but was not ready in time. I don't pretend to be an economist myself, so I didn't feel that I could write with authority about this.

On U.N. It's precisely in the stalemate situations where UN initiatives *have* some significance, and it's these situations which at present might trigger off world war. I didn't claim that UN would be able to force action in non-stalemate situations like S. Africa. The problem, however, is how to resolve, say, the Berlin situation in the long run without resort to war. We could, I suppose, wait for the International Socialist Commonwealth, but Healy and Kidron and, indeed, Hall are taking so

Nye Bevan — a Socialist analysis

by JOHN FAIRHEAD

As I have said, the mistake was made by not following the socialist policy right through in a clean and direct fashion"

(Aneurin Bevan, *In Place of Fear*, p 99).

Bevan's death affords the opportunity to pass in review the pattern and progress of the British Left during his life-span. He reacted sensitively to the winds and storms which rocked the working-class movement for 50 years.

In his political testament and autobiography, written in 1952, Bevan describes his awakening to the reality of class struggle at the time of the miners' lock-out in 1921. In a passage which gives the key to his political outlook throughout his life, he retails Bob Smillie's story of the interview of the miners leaders with Lloyd George.

Lloyd George is said to have "threatened" the union chiefs with his own resignation and that of his Cabinet. And he taunted them with words which meant: "Run the country without us if you can, and if you dare".

Smillie and the others at once retreated. *And never once does Bevan question their action.* He draws, to be sure, the correct conclusion that the simplest syndicalism of 1910-1920 was inadequate when the chips were down. The workers, he rightly believed, must organize politically for the conquest of power.

Bevan's life, he tells us, became a quest for the source and the centre of that power and the means by which his own class might attain it. Throughout a lifetime of brilliant jousting in innumerable mocktournaments, this crusader never reached his grail.

Fixing his gaze on the parliamentary foreground, he was aware of the clash of interests in the middle distance, but never wavered in his early insistence on the subordination of the industrial struggle to the, for him, "decisive" contest at Westminster. For this reason, the horizon of workers' power lay always beyond his ken.

He chose to fight on Lloyd George's ground, neither proclaiming nor recognizing the need for workers in struggle to fashion the kind of Party which would prepare for power by seeing the capitalist state as the enemy and organizing to smash it. From his first days in politics he believed parliament and the state machine to be neutral agencies, which the workers must capture and use.

Within this context the whole tragedy of Bevan's political life, whose final act was played out at Brighton in 1957, may be seen to assume a pattern. "Democratic socialism", he wrote (p 170) "is a child of modern society... its chief enemy is vacillation, for it must achieve passion in action *in the pursuit of qualified judgments*" (my italics).

THE PARLIAMENTARY ROAD

Bevan's support of the People's Front before the war, like his participation in the Labour Cabinet later, was the product of this passionate pursuit of the lesser evil. His vision bounded by parliament, he was obliged to identify the enemy not as capitalism, but as the Tories.

The logic of such a position is inexorable, and Bevan did not hesitate to follow it. If parliament be the seat of power and the Tory party its repository, then what is required at all costs is to oust the Tories "vermin", as he rightly called them, but he shrank from insecticide.

This being so, the enemies of the Tories must "qualify their judgments" sufficiently to unite against them. Within this unity, the ultimate goal must pass into the keeping of "key people", and in the last resort of a "key man". By such reasoning Bevan concluded that his presence in a Labour Cabinet was the decisive factor. "You are *all expendable*", he told his henchmen in a famous outburst.

The important thing is that the Left-wing should benefit from Bevan's experience, which is simply its own experience refined and crystallized in the career of one man, incontrovertibly its most distinguished representative.

● *from page 4*
long over this! By all means let's get on with the socialist revolution, but in the meanwhile, let's try to survive.

On the question of the dangers of a German-American alliance, I would want to emphasise two points. One is that unless our unilateral action is followed by rapid moves towards international agreement the alliance will come into existence. But the other is that we should do everything we can by internationalising the campaign to prevent it becoming effective if Adenauer and Eisenhower try to set it up. I was certainly at fault in my pamphlet in not emphasising this second aspect. At the same time I think that a revolt of Europe against the bomb is such a speculative pro-

position at the moment that it is simply an illusion to suppose that this is going to prevent the American-German tie-up.

I would agree with the proposition that ND campaigning must eventually become a campaign for socialism. But the way in which I see this as happening is that some sort of disarmament agreement will be forced on the big powers, who will then get into economic difficulties which only socialism can solve. It is up to us to campaign under some such slogan as "Disarmament need not mean unemployment" to drive this point home. What I do resist is the version of Marxist doctrine which simply says "It's no good. We can't do anything to stop H-bomb war, while the present lot are in power.

There are signs that it is beginning to do so. Cousins, on whom Bevan's mantle has momentarily fallen, has already placed it on record that he is interested in a Labour government only as a means to introduce socialism.

Yet the disease is not eradicated. This very Cousins has stepped back on several occasions from calling the strength of the class into action—from the busmen's strike in 1958 to the anti-apartheid boycott in 1960, crippled by the absence of any lead to the dockers.

The British working class, revived by the post-war boom and in a stronger position than at any time since 1945, is already in a time of sharp skirmishes pending decisive battles.

The Left must find the way to lift the understanding of the movement to the point at which socialist consciousness so pervades the class in struggle that the challenge to capitalism can be issued. It can do this job only by first ridding itself of illusions in parliament as anything but an incidental arena of battle, and by understanding that the state power of capitalism can be smashed only by a Party steeled and prepared for this task.

GAITSKELL MUST GO!

by CLLR. BILL DOW

HURRAH! for the South Paddington Labour Party motion—first in the field with an agreed Resolution that Gaitskell must go.

How dare this party, which is certainly not one of the largest in the country by a long chalk, oppose the "Mighty Leadership". The members of the organisation do not agree with the *Daily Herald* Leader of the 14th July, when asking for unity in the Labour Movement, that their's is a shrill yelp from South Paddington. These members know very well that they are voicing an opinion of many members in the Labour Party and most certainly all of the active and militant workers who have the job of facing the electorate on the doorstep whilst canvassing, and, discover that after each election, that still more seats have been lost. The best organisation and election machinery does not win seats. It is necessary to have a strong leadership and Socialist policy.

We in the constituencies are not worried about the Tory voters who come out to support their candidates. Our biggest headache is that good Labour supporters and sometimes life-long Labour voters don't bother to go to the Poll. The reasons given to us on the doorstep for the "stay at home" attitude is that some say they do not see much difference between the two parties and others say, that if the Labour Party cannot agree among themselves by continually squabbling, why should they bother to vote. The latter is quite true and unfortunately, we have lost many seats. But, who is to blame? Hugh Gaitskell asks that we fall in behind him, and everything will be OK. But the rank and file do not want to follow his suggested watered down Socialist policies, he is completely out of touch with the mood and wishes of the rank and file in the three wings of the Labour Movement, and has been personally responsible for creating an unnecessary bitter controversy in the Movement with his new testament proposals on Clause IV of the Constitution. One Trade Union after another at its Annual Conference has rejected his proposals and faced with utter defeat, at this year's Labour Party Conference, he has now made a hasty retreat and dropped the ideas for an Addendum of Clause IV. The rank and file hope that this will be the last of the matter and that it will not be raised again in 1962.

SANITY AND SOCIALISM

Gaitskell and his cronies are also facing defeat at this year's Labour Party Conference on their Defence policy, for here again during the last few months, we have seen the Trade Union vote in a rising tide calling for renunciation of nuclear weapons and unilateralist lead for the abolition of nuclear weapons, but despite all this, Mr. Gaitskell and his friends have drawn up a new defence strategy statement which asks the British Public to hide behind an American nuclear weapon. It was bad enough previously under a British nuclear weapon, but what an awful thought that we are suddenly faced with a policy which ties us to American nuclear weapons under the dictates of the White House and the Pentagon. The militant rank and file of the Labour Movement are waiting for a strong and forceful leadership armed with a real Socialist policy. There is absolutely no case whatsoever to change the old Socialist ideas, of men like Keir Hardie, Lansbury, William Morris and other early pioneers, who laid the foundation stones,—only their clothes are old fashioned and out of date, but the basic Socialist principles remain the same.

Let's choose between (1) sanity and suicide by this country giving a lead to the rest of the world in the abolition of nuclear weapons, and, (2) between complete Socialism and Liberal/Tory type of "Socialism". The rank and file of the Labour Movement have chosen sanity and Socialism, whilst Hugh Gaitskell has arrayed himself on the other side of the barrier. Under these circumstances he ought to resign and make way for a leader who understands the feelings of the rank and file.

EARLY STRUGGLES FOR WORKERS' CONTROL

A VITAL SECTOR OF LABOUR MOVEMENT HISTORY

by JAMES HIGGINS

THE issue of Clause Four has reopened the discussion on the Labour Party's socialist *raison d'être*, and if only for this Gaitskell and his Frogmal circle are to be congratulated. The fact that the revisionists face certain defeat at the Labour conference is further cause for congratulation, and the frantic back-peddalling that the Gaitskellites are indulging in should cause no little pleasure to readers of Socialist Review. The victory over the revisionists will be a hollow one however if the opportunity is not taken of broadening the discussion on Clause Four into channels which have more direct connections with our socialist objectives.

It is true that nationalisation must be at the heart of socialist policy, not because we desire to replace private ownership by a state bureaucracy but because without collective ownership there can be no socialism. In this context the question of workers' control is one of vital importance if the theoretical advantage given by Gaitskell's ineptitude is to be confirmed. The issue of workers' control can once again become live to large numbers of workers in the Labour Party and Trade Unions.

The history of the fight for workers' control in the engineering industry immediately before, during and after the first world war is most effectively analysed by Branko Pribicevic a Yugoslav research student in his book "*The Shop Stewards Movement and Workers' Control 1910-1922*." This analysis in the period 1910-1922 is one that can provide some useful lessons for the future.

The movement for workers' control during the period under consideration (1910-1922) was divided into three main tendencies. First the Industrial Unionists largely under the influence of the success of the Wobblies in America (Industrial Workers of the World). Secondly the syndicalists led by Tom Mann and last the Guild Socialists. The first two trends were intensely suspicious of the Labour Party and in fact whatever solid basis the movement had was founded on disillusion with the meagre achievements of the Parliamentary Labour Party in which great hopes for social and economic advance had been placed.

DIRECT STRUGGLE NEEDED

The shift in this period was definitely towards industrial action. The reason for this seem fairly clear. Despite the existence of a sizable Labour group in the Commons, who it had been hoped would be instrumental in establishing minimum wages and shortening hours, in the period 1900 to 1913 wages rose only 6.5% while retail prices rose 16.5%. The general feeling not unnaturally was that more direct forms of struggle with the bosses were called for.

The classic socialist policy of nationalisation was to a degree discredited, owing to the increasing tendency of the government to intervene in disputes, naturally on the side of the employers. It was argued by many that if the state were only an instrument of the employers then no radical improvements could be expected from state nationalization. It will come as a surprise to many people today who have only recently realised bureaucracy as a factor in working class politics to discover that very early in the century state bureaucratic control of industry was anathema to most industrial militants.

The theoretical point which united the three main tendencies, was the deeply held conviction that capitalism could not be destroyed by political action alone. From this basic agreement the divergence on almost all other points was extremely wide. Industrial Unionists were organised in two sections, the Socialist Labour Party, the political wing and the Industrial Workers of Great Britain. The theory of the movement which was based largely on the ideas of Daniel de Leon can be summarised.

NEW REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

The workers should unite politically and industrially in a revolutionary party and new revolutionary trade unions. The trade unions would of course be organised on the basis of the one big union for each industry. By this parallel development of political and industrial consciousness the peaceful socialist revolution would be carried.

First the workers would, through the medium of the ballot box, elect a socialist majority in Parliament. On this happy day the Industrial Unions would proceed to lock-out the employers. The unions would in this theory be protected from counter-revolution by the socialist control of the government. As soon as the workers

had taken over the factories and mines, the socialist majority would adjourn itself.

In De Leon's words: "Any attempt to prolong the political movement would be usurpation". In the new society the whole administrative, economic and social structure would become the province of the Industrial Unions. This schematic approach, which fundamentally misunderstood the nature of the capitalist state, found a few adherents mainly in Scotland. The attempts to form the new industrial unions however were a failure.

Syndicalism which was imparted from France mainly by Tom Mann who had previously been an Industrial Unionist. Mann continued to call for "One union for one industry", but rejected the De Leonite method. The main feature of the Syndicalist programme was its insistence on the uselessness of political and in particular Parliamentary action. Only through revolutionary industrial action could workers emancipation be achieved.

NO AGREEMENTS WITH BOSSES

Unlike the S.L.P. the Syndicalists were prepared to work in the existing trade unions, and by amalgamation achieve the objective of industrial unions. Because of this willingness to work in existing mass movements, and take part in the day to day class struggles, the movement exercised quite an influence for a time. The Syndicalist League which was formed in 1910 welcomed everybody who was willing to take part in the class struggles.

The League insisted that the unions should not sign long term agreements with the employers and should abrogate all conciliation agreements. The ultimate weapon in the working class armoury would be the General Strike and when the workers, through the amalgamations and the daily class struggles, had reached a sufficient state of organisation in industrial unions the General Strike would be called, the employers expropriated and the new society under the control of the Unions proclaimed.

In general the syndicalists were delightfully vague as to the form the new society would take. Trades Councils and National Industrial unions were the basic organs of the new society, with Trades Councils and Unions separately federated. These two federations would unite at the top in a supreme Confederation. This structure was to be the basis of the whole organisation. The rigidly sectarian De Leonites would have nothing to do with the Syndicalists, in fact the S.L.P. spared no effort in attacking Mann and the League. Perhaps because of this the possibility of the two movements modifying the weakness in each others policy were lost.

Guild Socialism was the brain-child of a group of middle class intellectuals, the most prominent of whom was G.D.H. Cole. These people produced masses of documents—after the manner of their kind—attempting to lay down a policy which by a species of Fabianism would transfer the ownership of industry to Guilds of workers and consumers. The Guild Socialists evolved a complete system of organisation for the new society, which was certainly more practical than the often vague generalisations of the Industrial Unionists and the Syndicalists.

CORNERING THE MARKET

They repudiated parliamentary government on the grounds that no man could be represented in all his interests as a worker, consumer etc. The National Guild was to be an Industrial Union containing within its ranks all the technicians, managers and mutual workers in the industry. Both employed and unemployed would be full members of his or her appropriate Guild. All Guilds were to be members of a Congress which would plan the economic development of the country, settle inter-Guild disputes and cooperate with the Consumer Guilds.

The method by which this desirable result was to be achieved was called "Encroaching Control" which involved the gradual transformation of the Unions into Industrial Unions and the gradual taking over of managerial functions by these new unions. The employers, it was thought would not be able to resist, because the unions would have cornered the Labour market. The Guild Socialist ideas gained quite considerable support and immediately after the 1914-18 war the Miners and Railway unions adopted modified Guild programmes, and the Union of Postal Workers incorporated Guild Socialism entire into the Unions programme. Even today, despite the generally reactionary line of the U.P.W. the Union hierarchy still pay lip service to workers control in their policy of joint control.

These three trends were all represented with their faults and strengths in the shop stewards movement during the 1914-18 war. The history of this movement will be the subject of a future article.

CANDID COMMENTARY

by JOHN WILKES

THE Direct Action Committee, who have planned a summer campaign at factories producing nuclear weapons, have sent out instructions to their supporters. They have been asked to dress as normally as possible; to eschew beards and pony-tails. The organisers feel that peculiar dress is likely to alienate factory workers and lessen the chances of getting industrial action against the bomb.

This is, in my opinion, all to the good. It is high time socialists consciously strived to look normal. Quite often little things, like the way one dresses, can place an insurmountable barrier between socialists and our potential supporters. The sensational press frequently lay stress on the weird clothes worn by Aldermaston marchers and try to give their readers the impression that unilateral disarmers are a bunch of cranks and fanatics.

Indeed, George Orwell, in his book, *The Road to Wigan Pier*, saw the danger of this and wrote: "One sometimes gets the impression that the mere words 'Socialism' and 'Communism' draw towards them with magnetic force every fruit-juice drinker, nudist, sandal-wearer, sex-maniac, Quaker, 'Nature Cure' quack, pacifist and feminist in England... vegetarians with willing beards... shock-headed Marxists chewing polysyllables... birth control fanatics and Labour Party backstairs-crawlers."

FOUR MINUTES

It was the Duke of Wellington, I believe, who once said when he was inspecting his troops, "I don't know if they'll scare the enemy, but they damm well scare me" Such sentiments, with much greater justification, can be said of the Government's new nuclear policy. Disregarding all political and humanitarian consideration as irrelevant, the practical difficulties of equipping British V-bombers with the

FIGHTING FUND

Our income in July was:

| | £ | s | d |
|--------------|-------|------|---|
| Hackney | 4.10. | 0 | |
| Islington | 4.16. | 6 | |
| Notting Hill | 7. 5. | 6 | |
| Shoreditch | 2.17. | 0 | |
| Lewisham | 1. 5. | 0 | |
| Harrow | 1. 0. | 0 | |
| Ramsgate | 3. 0. | 0 | |
| Hendon | 1. 7. | 0 | |
| Liverpool | 15. | 0 | |
| Nottingham | 10. | 0 | |
| Ipswich | 12. | 0 | |
| Epping | 10. | 0 | |
| Total | £28. | 8. 0 | |

WE NEED £40 a month. Up to the end of July we received £28.8.0. Thanks! and keep it up, Comrades should also remember that they could do us the world of good and themselves no harm by making all their purchases through London Co-operative No. 350498.

Comrades! Help your paper by introducing it to your friends, by ordering bulk copies, by giving donations!

American Skybolt missile are so immense that anybody capable of second thoughts would surely have them.

The first difficulty is getting them off the ground. Mary Goldring in a BBC talk, now reprinted in *The Listener* (16. 6. 60), said, "We expect four or five minutes warning of Russian rocket attack, and it takes four minutes now to get a V-bomber off the ground without three or four Skybolts hanging under it like Christmas-tree decorations. With the extra drag it is going to be touch and go whether the bomber could be airborne before enemy bombs falls."

POT-SHOTS

But the real difficulties arise if—big IF—the V-bombers and their "Christmas-tree decorations" ever become airborne. Mary Goldring continues, "Skybolt will guide itself by the stars, but only if it is launched from precisely the right prearranged point. Think what that means. Ask any pilot if he thinks he can fly a big aircraft to an imaginary pin-head fixed in three dimensions in space, in order to release a rocket, and if he does not, goodness knows where the rocket is going to land."

What a comforting thought! "Goodness only knows where they are going to land." For the privilege of having a pot-shot in the dark, the British Government is prepared to pay extravagant sums of money. Besides purchasing these as yet untested Skybolt missiles, it is contemplating having aircraft in the air all the time, as the Americans already do. This would mean that, were all the V-bombers destroyed on the ground, there would still be a few already airborne which could go off on their deadly mission. But the cost of keeping one aeroplane in the air for one year is—guess what? You'll find the answer at the end of this column.

OVERBURDENED

At the same time as millions are wasted on armaments, Britain has built no new hospitals since the war. The Health Service is overburdened and understaffed. Increased suffering inevitably results. This was brought home to me recently when, as a councillor, I had to consider the question of extending the sick-leave of two Council employees. They both were totally disabled, unable to work, and awaiting operations for seven months. One was the case of acute hernia, the other of an affected pelvis. Most employers, not as humane as local authorities, would have sacked them rather than have them on full pay for seven months. They would not only have had the agony of their conditions, but also financial hardship and worry.

The cost of keeping one V-bomber in the air for one year is £27 million.

IT'S RICH

Signor Togliatti ... denied that last week's demonstrations had been organized by the communists. On the contrary the communists had made every effort to restrain the masses. *Times*, July 13

Counsel, cross-examining Col. Pienaar, head of the Sharpeville police force: "Do you think you have learned any useful lesson from the events in Sharpeville?" Pienaar: "Well, we may get better equipment." *Observer*, July 10

It is at the least discourteous to remove a person, even with his consent, from his domicile in a friendly country in such a clandestine way.

The Times on Eichman, June 22

...some AEU leaders seem to take the view that the new official statement (on defence) is not in conflict with the resolution passed by their national committee.

Times, July 12

"I think Mr. Kennedy is a very suitable candidate... I have danced with him and he was a very interesting conversationalist."

Janet Leigh, actress, at Democrats' Convention, reported in *Evening Standard*, July 12

"Masculine clothes worn by a woman alter the woman's own psychology, they tend to vitiate her relations with the opposite sex, and they can easily impair her maternal dignity in front of her children."

Cardinal Siri, Archbishop of Genoa, in a letter to clergy of his arch-diocese, reported in *Daily Worker*, July 12

Congo chaos plays into hands of imperialists

THE strikes of 1955-6, and the national demonstrations against Belgian rule early last year, are the key to imperialist strategy in the Congo immediately before and after Independence Day (June 30).

Faced with a demand by all African political parties for independence by January, 1961, the Belgian rulers decided to abandon direct political control even earlier, trusting to the inability of the African middle-class leaders to prevent the onset of administrative chaos. Out of such chaos the imperialists hoped to see the rule of Union Minière and the Société Générale secured through the dismemberment of the country and its administration by the Société's puppets.

NO DISCIPLINED FORCE

No strong African capitalist class exists in the Congo. Even African bureaucrats are lacking, the Belgian policy always having been rigid exclusion of African from top-grade administrative posts. The only force which could effectively have confronted imperialism, ousted it in struggle, and proceeded to construct a new order would have been an African political party based on the working class, organized and educated along Marxist lines.

Such a party is totally lacking. The Congolese National Movement (the party of the premier, Patrice Lumumba) mirrors all the weaknesses and the strength of such bodies as the Indian National Congress. The other main party, the Abaka (led by President Kasavubu) is tribalist and separatist in outlook. Only the People's Party, linked with the Left-wing of the socialist party of Belgium, even professes allegiance to socialism.

In such a situation the anger of the Congolese peasants, including the soldiers, has exploded with full force against the European oppressor, and has been diverted from the necessary ends of smashing the decisive economic might of imperialism.

Indeed, the imperialists have been able to take full advantage of the situation. Breakdown at the centre has enabled Moïse Tshombe, a demagogue of small ambitions, to set up a Huey Long-type hick régime in the wealthy Katanga province. Imperial interests, Belgian and international, have muscled into suggest federation of the Katanga with northern Rhodesia. The brain behind this scheme is said to be that of Capt E. Charles Waterhouse, former tory MP and member of the Suez group.

WITHDRAW ALL TROOPS

Waterhouse sits on the board of Tanganyika Concessions, which is associated with Union Minière, and has a 90 per cent share in the railway which transports Union Minière's products. This economic stranglehold, coupled with Welensky's troops, represents the main immediate danger to the Congolese.

The Labour movement here must keep up pressure on the government to prevent British or Central African Federal troops from being sent to the Congo. Socialists must campaign for the withdrawal of all troops, including those of the United Nations, who are there as policemen in defence of imperialist property. Congolese workers and peasants must be free to settle their own future.

THE RUSSIAN ORGANISATION MAN

by M. TUROV

A NEW and interesting book written by an American professor making a comparative study of management in the USSR and USA has recently been published.*

When describing to American businessmen the set-up in Soviet industry, their reaction was: "Why, the Russian managers use the same gimmicks as we do!... The Russians have the same organizational problems, and the same ways of handling them... I had rediscovered the American world of management, they said." (pp. 15-16).

The factory manager in Russia is as privileged as his "brother under the skin" in America: "It seems reasonable to think of plants with a total labour force of 500-1500 employees as receiving something in the order of five to six times the earnings of the average worker. To see this in American terms, the average wage earned by an American worker employed all year in manufacturing in 1957 was \$4300. An American plant director would have to earn \$22,000 a year in order to attain the same position relative to the average American worker as the Russian director holds compared with the American worker.

WORKERS' RESISTANCE

If the Russian manager is very similar to the American, the Russian worker too is not unlike his American brother. The Russian workers' reaction to pressure from above is compared to that of the American: "Just like American workers, Russians are concerned with avoiding speed-ups which lead to more work for the same money..." (p. 211) As in the USA, the Russian manager finds the most difficult bottleneck to overcome that of "output restrictions by workers." In both countries workers show resistance to the shift-work system.

The similarity in the set-up in the Russian and American factory shows itself above all in the relation between workers and foreman. "Managements in both countries have regularly wrestled with the issue of what to do with the foreman; they have come up with virtually identical theoretic solutions; and they have shared the same disappointment with the practical results achieved." (p. 277)

MORE THAN CHAINS

The privileges of the factory managers and Party officials explain the conservative policies of the Soviet rulers. "Neither the Red Executive nor his Party-official colleague is any longer the revolutionary of the 1920's... When Marx in the *Communist Manifesto* appealed for world revolution, he addressed himself to the worker who had "nothing to lose but his chains." The Red Executive and the Party ad-

● **REPEL THE RIGHT-WING CHALLENGE.** From page 1. is still there; because the borderline patrols are still scouting; because the 24-hour watch, H-bombers always in the air, is still kept; because the money for hospitals, factories, roads, schools, houses and all the decencies of existence is still being converted into murderous projectiles and poisoned warheads; because the cloud of Strontium-90 is still hovering over populations, and seeping down into crops; because in Hiroshima and Nagasaki babies are still being born deformed, and girls are sterile or dying; because the threat of universal obliteration is still mouthed by our statesmen; because if war began by accident we should all die; because local war might mount by stages into war by small atomic bombs, and from there into war by H-bombs; because our lives and the lives of those we hold dear are perpetually threatened by the classes in power.

Delegates, Brothers, comrades: all these things were true when your organisations voted in April, May, June and July. They will still be true when your organisations vote again, at Congress or Conference, in September and October. Whatever the platform may say, whatever points of order the chairman may rule, *nothing has changed.*

Change will begin when the Labour movement decides that the Bomb must no longer be made, used, or brandished, and acts upon that decision with all its power, industrial and political. There is no other way.

● **DEFEND THE CUBAN REVOLUTION.** From page 1. United States Senate Anti-Trust Sub-committee subpoenaed some notes taken by a top oil capitalist, A. C. Ingraham of Socony Vacuum, at a meeting of heads of oil corporations attended by the then Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

Dulles stated that he knew "the oil companies were interested in the nationalization issue" in Iraq and the Lebanon, and that "nationalization of this kind of an asset... should call for international intervention." Not long after this meeting US troops landed in the Lebanon and the world witnessed another perilous feat of brinkmanship.

To make the present situation all the more ominous, there are signs that capitalism is steadily losing the economic struggle in competition with the Soviet bloc. Thus Clarence B. Randall, steel capitalist and special assistant to President Eisenhower, told the Economic Club of Detroit, December 9, 1957:

"You now understand Sputnik but you don't understand the full import of the economic strength of Russia and the skillful, insidious way in which the future resources and markets of the world are being taken away from the American business community by the Russians. I say to you as soberly as I have ever said anything in my life, free enterprise is at the crossroads today in the world. This is the ultimate and final testing of the success of our industrial way of life."

The selling of Soviet oil to Cuba at less than the fixed world price is an example of further economic inroads into the vitals of capitalism. The implications of these developments are ominous; when a ruling class seems to be losing a struggle on which its very existence depends, feelings of desperation are likely to gain the upper hand, thus leading them to press harder for a military showdown.

The attitude of socialists in the conflict between imperialism and Cuba is clear: unconditional solidarity with the anti-imperialist struggle of the workers and peasants of Cuba! No war for oil profits! Hands off Cuba!

At the same time, we should not have any illusions about the Castro régime and its programme. The revolution carried out under the leadership of Fidel Castro was not a socialist revolution. Batista's overthrow marked the beginning of a movement which lashes out against imperialist domination, against the semi-colonial status of the country, with its consequent restrictions on, and distortions of, Cuba's economic and social development.

Today Castro's power rests on the armed revolutionary people, and he has had to respond to the pressure of the masses for whom the overthrow of Batista was only a stepping stone in the direction of independence from hunger and oppression. However the power of the people has not been consolidated by placing the nationalized concerns under workers' control and ownership and transforming the mass revolutionary organizations into the legal form of state power. This will not be done unless the working class group themselves around a consistent revolutionary socialist programme and leadership.

ministrators have a great deal more to lose—and they know it well. Their attitude toward world revolution and other threats to peace must inevitably bear the imprint of this knowledge." (p. 319)

* *The Red Executive. A Study of the Organization Man in Russian Industry* by David Granick. Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1960.

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, post paid. 12 issues: 8s. 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 117 Carmelite Rd., Harrow Weald, Middlesex.

Printed by St. Martin's Printers (T.U.) 86d. Lillie Road, London, S.W.6. Tel.: FUL. 8637.

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 ie, 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, 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 abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.

● The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.

● A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow.