

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

9th YEAR No 10

1st JUNE 1959

SIXPENCE

Labour must give the lead and, FIGHT THE RACE THUGS !

THE thugs that killed Kelso Cochrane this Whitsun will be caught and tried. The cell doors will clang behind them, the ritual sacrifice will have been made, but the real murderers will have got away and racial murder will go on.

Cochrane died for his colour. Thieves neither shout "Jim Crow" at a prospective victim nor return an emptied wallet. He died because the young hooligans who carved him had permissive authority to do so. He died because a "spade" is less human than any other, because housing is crowded an expensive and therefore nerve-racking. He died because landlords batten on the insecurities, exploit the weaknesses of immigrants and locals, foment violence and rack rents. He died because the landlord class in Government—the Tories—refuse to relieve the crowding, refuse to build houses, refuse to give back the jobs and security they filched.

* * *

He died because colonies are gold-mines for the mighty monopolists who want them and keep them weak and their people backward, ignorant, poor and uncultured. He died because every boy and girl is fed on superiority to this backwardness, ignorance, poverty and lack of culture, because the pinched souls and chests of our exploited seem less pinched at the sight of the even more miserable colonial migrant, because the maddened underdog of capitalism can bite a "spade" and not get kicked, because Mosley and his Fascist supporters and competitors are there to blow these sparks into a steady flame. **He was a victim of capitalism's attempt to buy class peace with race hatred. The murderer is still at large.**

* * *

As long as capitalism exists, so long will racial violence continue, so long will sections of the exploited replace class battles with racial battles, so long will colour solidarity mar class solidarity.

INSIDE

- **Printing Dispute** page 2
- **Scottish TUC** page 3
- **Ken Alexander** page 4
- **1931 Crisis** page 5
- **Fighting The Bomb** page 8

Labour must be clear ! — silence is complicity ! First, in Notting Hill. Let us wipe out the stains of racial prejudice in our local party; let Rogers, our MP, repudiate his past remarks and come out not only in condemnation of this and any other incident, but with a positive program to break with white solidarity and choose workers' solidarity, to lead the fight against Fascism and hooliganism and save the small coloured minority from physical and mental ghettos for the Labour movement. Let Union branches and other Constituency Parties press our comrades in Notting Hill to lead the fight against Fascism and racialism and for class solidarity.

PS.—At the time of writing, the whole work force at the Tokens, city site, is out on strike in defence of four coloured brothers, sacked for "redundancy". This is class solidarity in action.

A delegate previews the ETU CONFERENCE

IT IS towards Conference time that we should draw up a balance sheet of our Executive's policies, and make suggestions for the course of our future activities.

On balance our Executive is found to be lacking. On the industrial front there is its lamentable failure to support the busmen in the only effective way possible by the withdrawal of ETU labour from the underground and the blacking of juice from the power stations. Despite their constant criticism of the inadequacy of the general unions in struggle, they here showed a remarkable capacity to talk left and act right.

Again we well remember in an article in *Electron* Bro Foulkes castigating Bro Carron for negotiating on the basis of a twelve month wage-freeze a couple of years back, and then calmly reaching agreement on a similar basis for the electrical contracting industry.

More recently we have witness-

sed the cowardly retreat of the leadership in the South Bank dispute, in sending the ETU lads across the picket lines, betraying one of the first principles of trade unionism, the defence of the shop steward and job organization.

On the international front the much-publicized agreement signed jointly by the ETU and the French Electrical Workers on rocket bases has had little or no effect, because of the failure of the EC to **put teeth into it by encouraging the membership to black the bases.**

Through their opposition at the 1957 and 1958 Annual Conferences to motions calling for the legalization of independent working-class parties in Eastern Germany and the release of Harich and other working-class leaders in that country they demonstrated their Stalinist contempt for international working class solidarity.

The recent press statements on the situation inside the ETU
turn to back page

DEADLOCK IN THE PRINTING DISPUTE

BOSSES of the print employers federation and printing unions have failed to come to any agreement over the proposals and counter-proposals on conditions, etc in the printing industry.

Nine unions—all members of the Printing and Kindred Trades Federation—put forward a claim to the Master Printers and the Newspaper Society asking for a 10 per cent wage increase, a 40-hour week and other improvements.

The National Society of Operative Printers and Assistants have presented similar, but not identical claims for higher wages and a shorter working week.

Separate

The print bosses promptly turned down these claims in February and March. This precipitated the unions' executives holding a national ballot asking their members, with a flat yes or no, to endorse their executives' policy. This policy, giving the executive authority to ban overtime, limit shift work, stop the introduction of new apprentices, introduce "non-co-operation" campaigns, withdraw members from incentive schemes and, if they wish, call a strike.

Some eighty per cent of returned ballot papers gave support to this policy.

Early on in the discussions, NATSOPA agreed on a united front with PKTF. Two days later, NATSOPA had separate discussions with the employers and have since decided to go it alone on all fronts. The national press wrote rather gleefully of this "disenchantment" as being due to "a long-standing clash of personalities in the background" which appears to have "generated a misunderstanding about the terms of the co-operation agreement."

Disappointment

Meanwhile, the employers continued to press for a year's standstill and for union co-operation in output and efficiency measures. Although they were trying to put on a bold face they couldn't hide the fact that about 400 non-federated firms, mostly small, have agreed with the unions to shorten hours and concede any pay increase eventually negotiated.

When the employers' reply did come, however, the unions expressed their "keen disappointment" at the content. It stated that it should be possible to introduce a 42½-hour week "at an early date" provided that the unions agree to ease their restrictions on the industry's intake of apprentices. The reply went on to say that they thought it would be possible to work out with very little delay, ways and means of improving efficiency which would allow for higher wages without increasing costs.

The employers also handed over a "tentative list" of 22 suggestions dealing with the supply of labour, demarcation problems, etc. Some of the main points were:—

More concentrated training for apprentices (at present it lasts six years).

The elimination of demarcation difficulties.

The economical manning of machines.

More participation in incentive schemes.

The encouragement of increased shift working.

The recognition of "certain principles" relating to method study. Etc.

Speaking in reply to the employers' proposals, a NATSOPA official said, "the employers' suggestions would mean eventual unemployment, printing workers having 'worked themselves out of a job'. Printworkers are already doing a full week's work. Productivity per man and woman had advanced tremendously over recent years. In printing, taken as a whole, there was 'tremendous scope' for cutting away dead wood at high level.

PROFITS IN PRINT

Thomas Skinner & Co. (Publishers) (controlled by Kelly's Directories and therefore now in the Mirror-Pictorial Empire) showed an increase of net profits in the year to 28th February, 1959. Profits came out at £63,875 after tax of £57,371 compared with a net profit of £51,167 after tax of £51,079. And Valentine & Son (colour and art printers and publishers) increased their trading profit for the same period from £31,774 to £73,723. Straws in a prevailing wind?

"Overloading of administrative charges by emoluments was notorious. The society remained in no doubt that the industry could, and should, pay increased wages and establish a 40-hour week."

We are convinced the industry can well afford to meet their claims. They say the employers made a profit out of the last pay rise three years ago by charging their customers more than they conceded to the workers.

Struggle

There the matter rests at present. It is quite obvious that quite a bitter struggle will take place before one or other is victorious. Although one or two "top" papers have talked about a compromise, it seems hardly likely that such a thing will happen. The unions have already placed themselves in an uncompromising position by asking their members what to do (and being told pretty decisively), and the Master Printers are least likely of the two to lose face.

FOOTNOTE

In the event of a strike, it is believed that sympathetic action by transport workers engaged in bringing supplies could not be ruled out. (We heard that at South Bank, too!)

Also it is reported that the employers have contacted Continental firms about contracts in the event of a strike, but print unions affiliated to the World Federation of Trade Unions have informed the PKTF that none of the members will touch "black" work.



NEWS IN BRIEF

Just to make sure the workers get both sides of the story . . . "workers pressing for a rise should consider whether the granting of their claims would benefit the bosses . . . the vital need was by some means to introduce in wage talks a fuller appreciation of the broad social and economic consequences of decisions taken in a particular sector of industry There should be a full-

ler appreciation, too, of the long term harm of continuing increases in the price level."

MR HEATHCOATE AMORY

And

Unions could only go so far in enforcing discipline. In places of employment where there were unofficial disputes, even where they were instigated by outside forces deliberately to raise trouble, they still remained a challenge not only to the unions but also to the management. Where you have good management, you have good trade union organization and good trade unions. The two things go together. It is a question of management and unions so conducting their affairs over a period as to make respect for union rules and agreements with employers the accepted thing . . . The progressive employer had not only learnt how to live with this greater equality, but had gained advantage from it.

MR ALAN BIRCH

Chairman of the TUC.

This article first appeared in "LABOUR REPORT" Kensington L P monthly journal

TAKE ACTION AGAINST OMO

by councillor P O'HEA

NOW, when I first heard people talking of OMO I thought it was some kind of detergent. I now know that OMO stands for the latest evil the London Transport Executive is going to foist on the people of Central London if we don't wake up and fight. OMO is the LTE latest brain-wave to make London Transport pay — OMO is a one man operated bus.

Complaints

It has been apparent, particularly with the recent bus cuts that LTE has lost all consideration towards exercising its first legislative duty, the duty of providing the people of London with a transport service. Unfortunately, up to now the suffering public has with wanton venom directed its shower of complaints on the unfortunate conductors, and not at the LTE and its Tory masters whose real purpose is, of course, to discredit all forms of Nationalization.

Double decker

The LTE is now to spend millions on a fleet of one man operated single decker buses holding thirty-six passengers. You and I, as usual, are expected to provide the 'lolly'. How long is it going to take the OMO to collect the fares at each stop! To give the change to the "Sorry, I've only got a note types"! To answer all questions in Thomas Cook fashion? To shoulder abuses when he is ten or more minutes late? Will these extra

duties and abuses impair the skill and concentration needed to drive us safely through London today? The OMO bus will force many people to provide their own transport, causing more congestion and making London traffic look like a tortoise's dead march. Our double decker now holds over sixty and it takes up less space than twenty cars carrying this equivalent number of passengers. The "Luddite" argument cannot be flung at us.

Action!

You may ask, how soon can we expect the introduction of OMO? Judge for yourselves the fact that negotiations are now in progress between the LTE and the London Central — repeat central — Bus Committee of the T&GWU. They are deliberating on extra pay for "OMS" and the fate of the unfortunate conductors. Are the people of London being consulted by the LTE of the suffering OMO's will cause them? Are the LTE considering the millions of productive hours lost queueing? Are they considering the economic effects of paralyzing London's traffic? I wonder.

Action! Action! Action! That is the only answer. Let us fight through our Wards, our Co-ops, our Trade Unions and Public representatives. Let us inform the LTE and their overlords that Kensington will not stand by and watch what we proudly once boasted of as the finest transport service in the world disintegrating before our eyes. Let us ban OMO.

from Nan Milton

TU COMMENTARY

Scottish trade union congress

REPORTS of the recent annual conference of the Scottish TUC make sorry reading for an old-fashioned Socialist like myself. Many excellent resolutions were passed, but most of them would be quite acceptable to any progressive Liberal. The General Council's solution to Scotland's grim and urgent problem, unemployment, is—more Government subsidies for private industry! In support of its motion "Scotland's Industrial Needs", General Secretary, George Middleton uttered this gem:

If you disregard this particular aspect of private investment or assistance to private investment, then you disregard Colville's £50 million, the demand for £4 million to build the graving dock. . . . That is the road to Socialism—inasmuch as you get the Government intervening in private enterprise."

Days past

It's a far cry from the days when George, then one of Glasgow's leading Communists, was vehemently denouncing members

of the Labour Party and the ILP, as social-fascist traitors. Now he makes Transport House seem left-wing, for this is what they have to say about the £30 million for Colville's.*

* (Pamphlet "Big Pools Win" issued by Transport House.)

One big steelworks is to be built in Scotland. Good. It should have been started long ago and it would have been if the bungling de-nationalisers had not got to work . . . The Government, the Nation, the taxpayer—YOU will guarantee the money for the new steelworks, all £50 millions of it, at specially reduced rates of interest lower than the rates at which most local authorities can borrow.

But a private company, Colville Ltd, will get the gravy. Sir Andrew McCance, Chairman of the company, has just told his shareholders that the new mill should "contribute to the general profits of the company".

Now you know why THEY want to keep the present set-up. But what about the rest of us? . . .

I hold no brief for the Communist Party, past or present, but all credit to Communist Abe Moffat, President of the Scottish NUM, who moved an amendment demanding increased support for the nationalized industries. Rather than concentrating on giving support to private enterprise, said Abe, they should be concentrating their energy on public industry and the development of nationalized industries. At one time this would have seemed a very mild kind of Socialism, but it was defeated by 207 votes to 180. Where, oh where, has the "Red Clyde" gone?

Union aims

But what aim should the Union set before itself as the ultimate end and purpose of all its endeavours? Our reply is: "The common ownership of the mines and direct control of production by the workers in the mining industry." So far as is compatible with majority rule in society and final power being exercised by the delegates of all the industries, we desire that the workers in each industry shall have autonomous control over their own work. Only in that way can economic freedom be realised . . .

• Amalgamation

THIS year's President, Alex Moffat, who resigned from the Communist Party after the Hungarian Revolt (all honour to him), made a firm and fair chairman during the clashes which arose between left and right, but in his presidential address he was able to give rein to his own personal opinions. He stressed the need for STUC initiative in trying to end the craft and sectional outlook which undermined the unity and power of the movement, by amalgamation and better forms of organization. Marxists have, of course, been emphasising this for over 50 years, and I can think of no better comment than a little bit of Scottish Socialist history.

Democracy

We want an industrial democracy in which the means of production shall be owned by the community and largely controlled by the workers in each industry. . . .

Future society

We conceive of our Union as the embryo of the future society. The organization that we are building up now has to be constructed with two requirements in view; first, how it can best be made an effective weapon in the present every day struggle; and, second, the necessity of the Union being formed in such a way that in the day of the triumph of the working class it will be easy for us to replace the capitalist, productive administration with our own democratic method, and to carry on production uninterruptedly.

J McDougall

One of the most notable pioneers of pre-Communist Party Marxism in Scotland was brilliant young Jimmie McDougall, who forfeited his career as a bank clerk rather than give up his extensive socialist activities. He it was who delivered the inaugural address at the foundation conference of the Scottish Labour College in 1916 in place of his colleague John Maclean, who had been arrested the previous day. McDougall himself was arrested shortly afterwards along with ILP leader James Maxton, and sentenced to 18 months imprisonment for anti-militarist activities.

The intelligent reader will readily see that nationalization of mines in no way meets our demand. So far from welcoming any proposals for nationalization, the Reform Committee expressly repudiates them. While recognizing that the necessary evolution of society may quite possibly involve our passing through a period State ownership, we recognize that this need not necessarily be accompanied by any amelioration of the workers' lot, and is in fact, as repeated experiences have shown, almost sure to lead to the increased exploitation and subjection of the workers. . . .

Reform movement

On his release he worked as a miner in Lanarkshire, and immediately set about organizing a Reform Movement in Scotland after the style of the one in South Wales which had been organized before the war by Labour College pioneers such as Cook, Ablett and Mainwaring. Most of the immediate demands of the movement have now been realized, but the pamphlet written by McDougall, **Manifesto of the Lanarkshire Miners Reform Committee** could still be an inspiration to all Trade Unionists. Here are a few quotations:

Freedom

We of the Industrial Union movement demand clearly and unequivocally direct control of the mines by the miners, limited only by the right of the social majority to have the final word upon all vital questions of production. No half measures, no cunningly-devised capitalist compromises, no proposals for the workers to share with the employing class or their State will satisfy us. Our aim is freedom at our work, and only direct control by ourselves can ensure this. . . .

L T E : SEVEN LEAN YEARS

THE seven-year long, Tory Government-cum-LTE rape of London Transport is graphically illustrated by the following figures tracing the decline of staff and road operations:—

| | 1952 | 1959 | LOSS |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Drivers & Conductors | 47,101 | 35,818 | 11,285 |
| Inside Staffs | 8,875 | 5,495 | 3,380 |
| Total | 55,976 | 41,311 | 14,665(26.2%) |
| VEHICLES | 10,216 | 8,557 | 1,569(15.5%) |
| CAR MILES | | | |
| RUN | 429,729,000 | 320,194,000 | 109,535,000(25.7%) |

More than one in every four of operating staff have gone. One in every six vehicles have disappeared. One in every four miles run have been wiped off the slate.

If the whole national labour force had been reduced in the same proportion as L.T.E. staffs, there would be an army of six million unemployed in Britain today.

Maintenance staffs in the garages, which, in 1952, were allocated in the proportion of five men to every six vehicles, now stands at five men to every eight vehicles, to the obvious detriment of the cleanliness, roadworthiness and safety of the vehicles.

In sharp contrast to operating staff, figures for supervisory grades are:—

| SUPERVISORS | 1952 | 1959 | INCREASE |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------------|
| | 2,555 | 2,915 | 360 (14.0%) |

Had the supervisory grades been reduced in the same proportion as the operating staffs, there would be 1,023 less supervisors employed today—at a saving in annual salaries of £767,000—or enough to pay the wages of 750 bus crews and put back on the roads 375 buses for two scheduled duties per day.

Finally, while the period since 1952 has been the "Seven Lean Years" for staff and public alike, the five members of the L.T.E. have waxed fat. Here are their salaries:—

| L.T.E. MEMBERS: | 1952 | 1959 | INCREASE |
|-----------------|--------|--------|--------------|
| Lord Latham | £5,000 | £7,500 | £2,500 (50%) |
| A. H. Grainger | £3,500 | £5,500 | £2,000 (57%) |
| L. C. Hawkins | £3,500 | £5,000 | £1,500 (43%) |
| B. H. Harbour | £3,500 | £5,000 | £1,500 (43%) |
| Anthony Bull | £3,500 | £5,000 | £1,500 (43%) |

In 1953 Lord Latham went back to "big business" and made way for Sir John Elliot. Now, with his blushing honours thick upon him, Sir John hands over to Mr. A. B. B. Valentine a pale skeleton of what was once the finest transport system in the world. Once again the L.T.E. is "Under Entirely New Management" but, as the new chairman has already made clear, the same old medicine is to be dished out to staff and public.

(With acknowledgement to Platform, organ of the London busmen and women.)

FORUM

Replying to Eric Heffer's criticism, Ken Alexander

defends his

SOCIALIST WAGES PLAN

SOCIALIST REVIEW disagrees fundamentally with KEN ALEXANDER'S approach and with the arguments he uses in replying to Eric Heffer's criticism (SR mid-April) of his and John Hughes' pamphlet, **A Socialist Wages Policy**. However, we welcome this contribution to an important discussion and hope that readers will signify their concurrence by participating.—Editor.

ERIC HAFFER'S critical review (*Socialist Review* mid-April, 1959) of the pamphlet **Socialist Wages Plan** by John Hughes and myself was a piece of good old-fashioned left-wing demolition work. He questioned our right to call ourselves socialists; he imputed motives—"the object is to soften the struggle"; he used political swear-words—"reformist method of thinking", "complete break with Marxism"; he poured scorn—"Hughes and Alexander have never heard of the class nature of the usual arbitrators"; and he misunderstood and without hesitation assumed the worst—"they do not, however, call for increased Nationalization and expanding public ownership as part of policy" (please refer to pages 7 and 40 of our pamphlet).

Stalemate

With the sound of all this tumbling masonry in their ears, standing somewhat dazed amongst the rubble, Hughes and Alexander are left peering through the dust looking for just one thing—the signs of some new, alternative building going on. But instead, when the dust settles all they can see is a pure white signpost. Inscribed on one finger of this signpost is "Forward to Socialism!" and on the other is "Back to Fundamentals!"

Eric Heffer would probably argue that both signs point in the same direction and that to draw attention to this fact is worth much more than a pamphlet "which can only confuse and divert the worker". But the fact remains that this signpost has been standing largely ignored for a very long time; we are not deafened by the tramping feet of workers seeking out the road to socialism which goes by way of "the fundamentals".

Our pamphlet starts from this fact and tries to suggest a means by which the "politics of stalemate" which at present chokes the British labour movement can be cut through. The main means suggested is the development of an alliance between the industrial and political wrongs of the movement aimed at increasing labour's share of national income and securing a steady growth in working class consumption.

The state

Much of Eric Heffer's opposition to our proposals arise from what he has concluded is our view of the State under capitalism. He quotes us: "The State in a mixed economy is involved in responsibility for a wide range of economic policies which decisively influence the size and dis-

tribution of the national product. It will carry out policies either primarily in the interests of capitalists, or in the interests of the wage earners". Then he goes on to ask "The same State? Is then the State a neutral body, itself a reflection of the mixed economy?" and answers his question by saying "The British State is a class State created by and for the British ruling class".

pressures

I accept that John Hughes and I could have been more explicit and thorough in our treatment of this crucial issue. We did not make clear what I think is an important distinction—between the policies that can be wrung out of a capitalist State and which can favour the working class relative to other sections of the community, and the ultimate policy question of the abolition of capitalism and exploitation the defence of which is the main function of the capitalist State.

Making this distinction it seems perfectly possible to argue as we do in **Wages Plan** that government power could be thrown in behind an egalitarian income policy if sufficient political pressure were built up to insist that it were, and yet not to indulge in woolly thinking about the character of State power under capitalism of the kind properly objected to by Eric Heffer.

Reforms won

In a short article in a recent *New Reasoner* (No7) I put this point as follows: "... at some point for capitalism to concede to the demands being made upon it would be impossible without disrupting the working of the profit system and at that point democracy must retreat or capitalism must be replaced... the State concedes or resists according to the logic of capitalist class interest and would have to be radically transformed at some point... although considerable reforms can still be won within capitalism a sticking point will eventually be reached". Contrast this with the unequivocal position taken up by Eric Heffer: "Before we can get any real change in the re-distribution of income, a steady growth in the national product, and a stabilization of prices, the power of the capitalist class must be completely broken, and that surely means taking their real source of power out of their hands. Industry must become the property of the public, under the control of the workers".

Here is a very important difference of opinion. Eric Heffer appears to hold the view that none of the things we suggest as policy aims can be achieved this

side of a thorough-going socialist revolution. Our view is that this seriously underestimates the strength and character of the political pressures which the British labour movement is capable of exercising. Does Eric Heffer deny that working class political pressures have made considerable inroads into the arbitrary exercise of economic power by capitalists? Or does he argue that such inroads have been made but that at this particular juncture of time, now, we find ourselves at the end of the road: that the capitalist class has no further room for manoeuvre? This would seem a very doubtful proposition, but it is a logical possibility.

No concessions?

So how do we deal with it (assuming for the moment that it represents reality)? We could either preach the theory that capitalism is no longer capable of making concessions or we could demand concessions that put the theory to the test, demonstrate it and carry the struggle forward on the basis of that demonstration. In our pamphlet we adopt the last approach. In doing this we believe that there are still concessions to be won and that the winning of these will bring socialism nearer.

Eric Heffer does not believe in the possibility of winning these concessions, it appears. But what has he against putting our

respective analyses to the test by helping to make these demands upon the capitalist system. The practical alternative would appear to be to preach "the final solution as the only thing worth bothering with". So it would be if millions were theoretically convinced of the need for socialism; how easy it would all be then. But millions are unconvinced, and this is a political fact which hard-headed socialists of the calibre of Eric Heffer must surely fit into their scheme of things.

Can I ask Eric Heffer, and readers of *Socialist Review* to have another look at the arguments of **A Socialist Wages Plan**? And I think it is worth their remembering as they do so that the demands of the program "What we Stand For" adds up to at least as radical a break with capitalism as we know it as do our proposals in **Wages Plan**. Yet "What we Stand For" is advanced within the context of "a really consistent Labour Government" and not a policy which could only follow upon "the power of the capitalist class being completely broken". Comrades; you are either as "guilty" as we are of "reformist illusions", or much more guilty of obscurities of thought and expression. So have another go at the pamphlet, this time in an open minded and comradely spirit.

The pamphlet

The pamphlet **A Socialist Wages Plan** is available 2/4d. post free from New Reasoner Pamphlets, 52 Marlborough Avenue, Hull, Yorkshire.

Socialist Review

Fighting Fund

We need £20 an issue

During the last fortnight we have received from:

| | £ | s. | d. |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| P.S. (Bristol) | 1 | 13 | 0 |
| Readers in N. Kensington | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| S.R. (Liverpool) | | 10 | 0 |
| Readers in Holborn | 2 | 8 | 6 |
| Readers in Harlow | 1 | 10 | 0 |
| Readers in Shoreditch | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| Readers in Islington | 4 | 12 | 0 |
| B.H. (Willesden) | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Readers in Hampstead | 4 | 15 | 0 |
| Total ... | 24 | 13 | 6 |

THANKS! and KEEP IT UP, COMRADES!

I enclose a contribution of £ s. d. to the
SOCIALIST REVIEW Fighting Fund.

Name

Address

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

There are lessons for us to-day in,

THE MOVEMENT

LABOUR'S CRISIS OF 1931

P Mansell

IN 1931 the Labour Party took one of the severest knocks in its history. The memory of that year is still vivid in the recollection of its older members and has passed in to the consciousness of the younger generation. For most, it signifies the betrayal of the Party and of the working class by a handful of their leaders. MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas are the villains of the piece. There is no doubt about the guilt of these men. It was they and a few others who openly sided with the Tories, in the guise of forming a "National Government", who divided the party and led to its confusion and weakness in the following decade.

But it is wrong to see in 1931 only the exposure of this clique of guilty men. The lessons of the crisis are far more profound and need to be learnt to-day, long after the MacDonalds and Snowdens are safely in their graves.

1931 was not an isolated phenomenon. It must be seen as the culmination of a whole trend of development—the product in the shorter term of the immediately preceding period and in the longer term of the nature of the Labour Party itself.

Starved

When the Labour Government took office in 1929, it had behind it a period of successive defeats for the working class. The wave of post-war strikes had culminated in the General Strike of 1926, when the workers betrayed by their leaders had been defeated by a confident and determined ruling class before they had had an opportunity of fighting. The miners, the most militant group of workers, were starved into submission after a solitary and bitter struggle of 6 months. Rank and file trade unionists were disheartened and disorientated, the militants discredited. The right-wing leadership was correspondingly strengthened. Open class collaboration took the place of class struggle. Ideas of joint consultation were peddled in discussions between TUC potentates and monopoly capitalists like Sir Alfred Mond.

On the political as on the industrial front, the right wing within the movement was on the offensive. From the late 'twenties dates the practice, still very much with us, of issuing lists of proscribed organizations with which party members were forbidden to have any dealings. Rebellion was punished by wholesale suspension of constituency labour parties. There were frequent clashes between the leadership and the League of Youth that demanded full political rights within the party. The ILP, the main spearhead of the left within the party, was becoming more and more openly critical of the drift to the right and demanding a far more radical program for Labour than the leaders were prepared to accept.

Vague program

Divisions within the left unfortunately played into the hands of the right wing because the Communist Party was just entering on its wildly sectarian "third period" and, on orders from Moscow, denouncing all social democratic parties indiscriminately as "social-fascist".

It is hardly surprising that Labour fought the general election of 1929 on a program full of vague general principles that could not be held to commit anyone to any definite course of action. The biggest problem facing the government was bound to be unemployment. Already over a million workers or nearly 10 per cent. of the insured population were idle. But faced with this fundamental problem of capitalist crisis the workers were offered only a vague program of "National Development" on Liberal Keynesian lines.

Labour returned

Nevertheless, so completely were the Tories identified with reaction that Labour was returned as the largest single party. It had a majority in Parliament of 27 over the Tories, but this majority was smaller than the 57 Liberal MPs. In such a situation, the Labour Government could either refuse to take office at all; or take

office and start implementing a full Socialist program and if defeated in the House by a coalition of Tories and Liberals go back to the country on a clear issue; or take office and aim to keep in office by doing nothing to antagonise the Liberals who held the balance. For a government really intent on achieving Socialism, the only possible course would have been the second. The Labour government preferred the third.

slump

In the Cabinet all the key positions were held by right-wingers. George Lansbury was the only man of the left and he was in a comparatively minor post. Home affairs were dominated by MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas. On all matters of economics, Snowden, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was regarded as the unquestioned expert.

During the period of office of the Labour government the slump deepened. The figures of unemployed continued to rise—nearly two million in 1930 and two and three-quarter million in 1931. Capitalism could hardly have exposed itself more completely. The ripeness of society for Socialism could hardly have been more plainly demonstrated. But the Labour cabinet could not think beyond a few minor palliative measures. They were totally unprepared for sweeping changes.

Even the limited measures of public works advocated by Lansbury and Mosley (then a left-winger) foundered on the rock of Snowden's financial orthodoxy. His horizon was limited by what he believed to be the essential need to balance the budget and so demonstrate to the capitalists of the world the traditional financial "soundness" of the country. He set his face against any increase in taxation as this would discourage capitalist enterprise. Savings had to come from public expenditure and particularly from expenditure on unemployment allowances.

Benefit cuts

To help in putting across to their own supporters the monstrous doctrine that the poorest section of the workers should bear the heaviest burden, the government set up early in February 1931 the notorious "May Committee". Its report, in July, painted the gloomiest possible prospects for the economy. It advocated a 20 per cent. cut in unemployment benefit (already at a subsistence level), cuts in the pay of public servants and reduction in expenditure on public works. This report played a major part in creating an atmosphere of crisis and so strengthened the hand of the government for any drastic measures it cared to take.

Then, superimposed on the chronic economic crisis, came the financial crisis of the summer of

1931. European banks, including the great Austrian Credit-Anstalt, collapsed in quick succession. Foreign investments were withdrawn at an increasing rate from London. The Bank of England advised the government that loans could not be negotiated from foreign bankers unless solvency was assured by a balanced budget. Armed with this advice and with pressure in the same direction from the Tory and Liberal leaders, MacDonald and Snowden then set about persuading their colleagues in the cabinet to agree to a series of economy measures.

It was estimated that savings of some £78 million were needed. The significant fact is that the whole cabinet agreed to savings of 56 million, including the introduction of the means test for applicants for "transitional benefit" (paid to unemployed workers before unemployment benefit proper began) and to increase the rates of insurance contributions (that is, making the employed workers carry more of the burden). For the remaining savings, MacDonald and Snowden argued that there must be a cut in the standard rate of unemployed benefit. Nothing less would satisfy the international bankers and the other parties, with whom regular consultations were going on. This last demand proved too much for the majority of the cabinet to swallow, particularly after the TUC had made its opposition clear. MacDonald made the split in the cabinet final and irrevocable by agreeing to head a so-called coalition government with the other two parties. By doing so, he not only covered himself with ignominy but salvaged the tarnished reputations of his cabinet colleagues. By refusing to take this step with him, they were able to divert attention from the fact that they were prepared to go so far along the road with him in "solving" the crisis at the expense of the workers.

Lessons

What was on trial in 1931 was not just a group of Labour Party politicians, some already corrupted by association with the capitalist class, others probably more confused than corrupt. What was on trial was the whole conception of reformism. The idea that a working class party should concentrate on minor reforms, which in total would add up to a socialist transformation, might have some chance of temporary success in a period of capitalist boom. But in a period of slump, the bankruptcy of this conception could not be hidden. A Labour government had either to be better capitalists than the capitalists or else had to change the whole system and substitute a workers' state for a capitalist state. Inevitably, granted the assumptions that dominated the thinking of the Labour party leaders it was the first alternative that was chosen.

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

CLASS IN EDUCATION 2 LABOUR AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

by Peter Ibbotson

This is the second of a series of extracts from 'Class in English Education' by Peter Ibbotson, which first appeared in the October 1958 issue of *Labour Teacher*, quarterly journal of the National Association of Labour Teachers.

Readers are invited to send their queries on educational matters (enclosing a stamped addressed envelope) to us. Those of general interest will be answered by Peter Ibbotson in our columns; those of interest to the sender alone will be answered by post. Whatever the question, we shall be glad to help.—Editor.

NOT only do the public schools "lie at the root of the failure to unify the nation," but their existence denies equality of educational opportunity to all. The public school pupil enjoys special advantages, due solely to the fact of his attendance at a public school, over his LEA contemporary. Opportunities for higher education are greater for the public school boy or girl; so is opportunity to secure lucrative executive positions.

Take the triennial report (1950-53) of the Ministry of Labour's Youth Committee, for example. In this we find reference to the fears of many teachers that industry has little opportunity to offer the maintained grammar school boy on the executive side. Yet two pages further on the report says that there are excellent opportunities for the public school boy in industry and commerce—on the executive side!

Rejected

And in a circular letter to parents dated April 1957 the headmaster of a successful and expensive boys' prep school in Sussex, referring to the "Socialists" who "maintain that all education should be free and that all schools should be nationalised", says that "many big business concerns, such as the tobacco and petroleum companies, would greatly deprecate the loss" of the public school system of education.

Since the continued existence of the public schools is socially and educationally unsound, being antagonistic to the success of the LEA secondary school, it follows that we who believe in democracy must do something to bring that existence to an end. A number of "solutions" have been propounded in Labour Party circles to what is called "the public school problem"; four were canvassed among the education working party, though only three are referred to in *Learning to Live* (my first and second being telescoped), and all are rejected except the tepid non-interventionist No 3.

Solutions

1. The public schools are good, and their benefits should be available to all instead of only to those who can afford the fees. Therefore the public schools should be compelled to sell 75 per cent. of their places to LEA's who will, presumably, select children to fill them on the basis of the 11+ exam.
2. As above except that the percentage of places to be sold to the LEA's is 25 per cent.
3. Leave the public schools

alone and improve the LEA schools so much that no-one will want to send his children to a fee-paying school.

4. Abolish fee-paying in all schools and hand over the hitherto independent schools to the LEA's.

Notable advocates of each solution are, respectively, Michael Steward, Hugh Gaitskell, the late George Tomlinson, the NALT whose pamphlet *A Policy for the Public Schools* (9d by post from NALT, 30 Hartham Rd., London, N7) details a comprehensive and reasoned programme for abolishing fee-paying and incorporating the schools inside the LEA system. The salient points of these proposals have, by the way, been incorporated by Victory for Socialism in its *Equality in Education*. . . .

A man who pays fees for his son's education at a public school is, in present circumstances, buying his son an assured position of power—perhaps social, perhaps economic, perhaps political—in adult life. It is altogether wrong that positions of power should be able to be bought. The true Socialist disapproves of fee-paying on principle; unlike Aneurin Bevan who has said in *Tribune* that he would not prohibit private education: "to do so would introduce State interference at too sensitive a point in the relation between the private citizen and the community."

Definition

It is also equally amazing to find fee-paying also defended by the Labour Party itself. In *Learning to Live* we read that it would be "an unjustifiable invasion of liberty" to prohibit a citizen from spending money on private school fees; and it goes on "the citizen has a right to decide for himself. If he . . . wishes to buy private education, he cannot in a free society be prohibited from so doing."

This is of course pure sophistry. Socialists take their cue from JA Hobson who carefully distinguished between **property** and what he called **improperty**. **Property**, he said, covers that field of personal expenditure (clothes, furniture, gardens, etc.) which is personal to ourselves and our families; whereas **improperty** covers that field of expenditure which has an impact on society as a whole as well as on the individual. Expenditure on education falls within the category of **improperty**, and we should no more allow it to be bought and sold than we would allow the sale of commissions in the forces, or seats in Parliament.

BOOKS

REVIEW BY
RICHARD KAY

SCRAMBLE AT THE TOP

TEJUNE over simplification and inability to present the conflict of basic ideas behind the friction of Labour Party personalities prevent *The Road to Brighton Pier* (Arthur Baker, 16s.) from rising above the mud-slinging level. In this book Leslie Hunter—ex-Daily Herald Lobby correspondent and husband of Margaret Stewart (*News Chronicle* industrial correspondent featured in Anti-Steel Renationalization Campaign advertisements)—has given an account of tensions, enmities and open virulence in internal Labour politics which will warm the cockles of every Tory heart.

As Mr Hunter was privileged to entertain and receive favours and inside information of an often confidential nature from many Top People in the Labour Party hierarchy (particularly from Mr Morrison's camp), it is sad that in his disclosures he has only provided the *Evening Standard* with a squalid serial and left politicians on all sides with doubts about the wisdom of confiding again in any political journalist.

Show down

Few would deny that the Labour Party's democratic mechanism is ponderous and allows leaders who are an inadequate reflection of the face of the membership, and in fact are evolved within the Parliamentary Party rather than elected by the mass of the Party. However it is just not true that recent Labour Party history has developed almost entirely through the ambitious clash of antipathetic and, indeed, often unsympathetic personalities.

Mr Hunter would have us believe in the importance of furtive right-wing meetings at Mr Stokes' house in Westminster, with their culmination in an approach to Morrison to attempt to persuade him to have a show-down with Mr Attlee to force his retirement and believe in Morrison subsequently sacrificing his career rather than split the Party further (p 147).

We are told this resulted in a decisive interference of support to Mr Gaitskell who was already beginning to enjoy the limelight following the publication of Attlee's now famous remark to Percy Cudlipp during the Summer recess of 1955:

"I have had a long innings and I shall be glad when I can hand over to a younger man" (p 134), and his "fine showing" at the Margate Conference that October. So it is inferred that Gaitskell's eventual rise to the Party leadership was as a direct result of Morrison's sacrifice.

To imagine that this travesty of the facts about the last years of Attlee's leadership, which explains the rise of Gaitskell in these terms of Morrison's refusal to degrade himself by becoming a right-wing lackey to take advantage of Bevan's isolation, is anything more than a crude, impudent and uncharitable example

of prejudice, would be to indict Hunter with political illiteracy quite inconsistent with his position on the Daily Herald at the time.

It's interesting that having been a mouthpiece for Morrison, Hunter should set down without comment Bevan's indication on the eve of the 1950 General Election of how Morrison's advocacy of a policy of reassurance was anathema to him:

"I am not interested in the election of another Labour Government, I am interested in the election of a Government that will make Britain a socialist country" (p 22).

Judging from the book as a whole, the author is just not interested in fundamental differences of faith, but only in the clash of personal ambitions and the more sensational they appear the better.

Of course the story of Bevan's preoccupation with power, his conflicts with the Morrison-Deakin right-wing, and the unique balancing position of Attlee in the centre is not new. Nor is the idea that mutual sympathy between Attlee and Morrison was lacking a new one. However we are presented with a picture of the former hanging on to the leadership in the midst of growing quarrels which injured the Party, not because he wanted to stay, but because he was determined to wait until it was too late for Morrison to take his place—a situation about which Morrison (according to Hunter) refused to tackle Attlee face-to-face.

As the Party did ultimately put Morrison at the bottom of the poll, it is inconceivable that Attlee was able to judge his Deputy's fitness to lead at that stage of Labour's history a little in advance and had simply given time for the mass will of the Party to show overtly. But, to suggest as Hunter does, that Attlee deliberately contrived Morrison's defeat insults the intelligence of anyone who cares to dodge the mud flung from the pages before him in order to see the whole episode in perspective. Small wonder to find in the preface the defensive statement:

"Attlee has shown he is more than capable of defending his past actions if he considers them unjustly interpreted." (p 14).

One wonders whether Hunter is as capable of defending his ugly narrative. If it serves any useful purpose apart from as a handbook for Tory hecklers, it is as a clear warning to all true socialists within the Labour Party that while the workers' cause can be weakened by a timid leadership and undermined by fractional disputes which should rightly be exposed, it can also be betrayed by irresponsibilities and opportunists in positions of confidence.

The lesson is in this book—let us make sure we learn and act on it.

by
Michael Millett

PARLIAMENT

THURSO and Hola are both British, they are both the responsibility of Parliament. On the Thursday before the Whitsun recess, Thurso engaged the attention of the Lords and Hola that of the Commons. These minor similarities apart, they might be in different parts of the universe.

In Thurso, an errand boy had his nose bloodied by a policeman. Unwisely, the legal authorities decided to take no action. Parliament, the newspapers and the public consider this such an affront to justice that an elaborate and expensive tribunal has to make a judicial investigation of the matter.

In Scotland and in England, people are proud of, one might say complacent about, the standard of justice. Some people are so proud that no effort has been too great—particularly when inexpensive native troops were available—to spread the light to the heathen. Along with Christianity, taxation and "suitable" standards of education British Justice was exported for trifling returns like copper, diamonds, oil and crops. "Practical training in mining and agricultural techniques were provided gratis. After many years an academy was set up at Hola in Kenya for the reform of the unregenerate.

At this place it has become evident that, unlike motor cars, the second grade models of justice have been exported, whilst the superior sort stays at home.

In this concentration camp, an inquest in Kenya has disclosed that:

Prisoners were beaten with sticks to force them to work. Eleven men died under these beatings.

The camp was riddled with scurvy, a disease caused by malnutrition.

Such a state of affairs in, say, Dartmoor, would be quite unthinkable. The situation would

never be allowed to get that bad. And it should be remembered that the majority of those imprisoned at Hola have not committed serious crimes at all. If they had they would have been executed under the emergency regulations. Their only offence was in belonging to illegal organizations.

However, the Government in Kenya will not prosecute anybody because there is "insufficient evidence". Only eleven murdered men.

The opposition is going to demand a full scale enquiry after the recess, and with luck, and after considerable agitation, those responsible at the camp and their superiors in the Kenya Civil Service may be punished. It would be a dreadful thing if anybody who has any responsibility for this affair should hold a Government post again.

But their dismissal will not solve anything. Abuses of this sort are not due to the excesses or inefficiency of individuals. Hola camp is the latest example of History's clearest lesson, that no people can rule others without defiling their own hands.

★

Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown.

Mr. Marples, the Post-master General said that:

"The Post Office had spent more on advertising in the past two years than in the previous three, he added—sometimes we get advertising without spending money. When I was a guest in the United States of AT&T and the Bell Telephone system, they had a television program which cost \$400,000 for an hour. In that program they got a plug of about two and a half to three minutes. When the Queen graciously came to Bristol, we got far more than that free of charge.

Soft soap and votes

CRESSIDA LINDSAY

MOST of the sales talk these days is aimed at women, for, as we know, women mainly do the shopping. And it is easy to become so saturated by sales talk so that there is little room left for clear judgment. For, like the psychological pill, it may be a dud inside, but it works because it looks good and you think that you need it.

It seems that our intake of advertisements on television has reached a point where we are ready to believe the impossible about ourselves. For here at last the soap, I mean sweet manufacturers, have come across the real thing, an amazing feat you'll say, it must be, for now you can eat to your heart's content and not get hungry, I mean you do get hungry after you've eaten it, no what I mean is, you eat it, its nourishing all right, chocolate and all that, but it doesn't spoil your appetite because it isn't food. I mean it doesn't . . . well you know, buy it and see.

It struck me on last local

election polling day that, the canvassers don't stand a chance with the housewives against the black soap man (or is it the soap white man?), or the beautiful girl who wakes (unruffled, remember) to a sparkling cup of whisky—I mean tea—in the morning. For he is selling votes, not wrapped up in a carton, but a plain vote, advertising people and the future.

Now surely a vote is the one thing that cannot be ignored? Especially by women, who having once shouted for independence, now shun it for the beguiling safety of housework. The vote is the one really independent action married women have. Here at last comes a day when, with clear judgment and a pencil, women can help put into power the people who will really effect their lives and best serve their interests. For me, at any rate, I find it a most thrilling and satisfying thing, to go, and with a dirty black cross (not been in the launderette, notice) I mark down my choice.

RUSSIA :

The king is dead, long live the king !

Comrades! The cult of the individual has caused the employment of faulty principles in party work and in economic activity; it brought about a rude violation of internal party and Soviet democracy, sterile administration, deviations of all sorts, the covering up of shortcomings and the varnishing of reality. Our nation gave birth to many flatterers and specialists in false optimism and deceit . . . Comrades! We must abolish the cult of the individual decisively, once and for all.

—From Khrushchev's "secret speech" at the 20th CPSU congress, Feb. 25, 1956.

From speeches at the 21 st Congress of the CPSU, January 27—February 5, 1959:

NS Khrushchev's report to the present congress constitutes a new, great contribution to Marxist-Leninist doctrine. It gives a profound and comprehensive analysis of the tremendous constructive work which has been done in the country . . . since the 20th Party Congress. . . . [It] fills the heart of every Soviet man with a sense of joy and pride.—V Semichastnyi, Secretary of the CC of the Komsomol.

I should like to suggest that much of what has been achieved along the path shown by the great Lenin is the result of the unflagging initiative and personal example of Comrade Khrushchev, his profound practical knowledge, and theory, and his close ties with the broad working masses. (Applause)—EI Andreyeva, Chairman of the Komintern collective farm, Tambov oblast.

We owe the successes in building and launching artificial earth satellites and cosmic rockets, above all, to the Presidium of our party's Central Committee and to Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev personally, who exercises constant leadership over the activities conducted in this direction. (Applause)—DF Ustinov, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The theses of Comrade Khrushchev's report . . . point a clear road for biology.—AN Nesmeyanov, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Comrade NS Khrushchev drew the attention of hydro-builders, scientists, engineers, draftsmen and workers to the need to make the building of electric power plants less costly. . . . In order to fulfill the tremendous task linked with the building of electric power plants and power lines, we must in the very near future implement the advice and instructions of Comrade Khrushchev.—IT Novikov, USSR Minister, Construction of Power Stations.

Now, as is known, we have already set about the fulfilment of the program for the accelerated development of the chemical industry, worked out on the initiative of NS Khrushchev.—LJ Brezhnev, Secretary of the CC of the CPSU.

The questions relating to the reorganization of education raised at NS Khrushchev's initiative are a new striking manifestation of the Leninist, attentive, keen, and careful approach to the needs, desires and peculiarities of each nation.—IR Razzakov, First Secretary of the CC of the Kirghiz CP.

I consider it my duty to state that thanks to the daily solicitude of the Communist Party, its Central Committee, and Nikita Sergeevich personally, our armed forces fully meet present-day military requirements . . . —Marshal K Malinovsky, Minister of Defense.

You know full well, comrades, that the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union, its Presidium, and Comrade NS Khrushchev personally pay exceptional attention daily to foreign political problems, and concretely guide our foreign policy.—A Gromyko, Foreign Minister.

The problem of training universally-developed and well-prepared builders of a Communist society . . . was raised by Comrade Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev and was worked out under his personal leadership. . . . Life showed . . . the correctness of Comrade NS Khrushchev's proposals relating to the reorganization of management in industry and construction. (Applause)—II Kuzmin, Chairman of the USSR Gosplan.

. . . within a short time Comrade NS Khrushchev twice visited our republic and gave us much useful advice concerning the development of the economy and culture of the republic. Just for the fact alone that the further upsurge of cotton-growing has been insured in our country, we can thank mainly the indefatigable activity of the Presidium of the CC and Comrade NS Khrushchev personally. (Applause)—T Uldzhabayev, First Secretary of the CC of the Tadzhik CP.

We must say quite plainly, comrades, that in the great political, theoretical, and organization work that has been carried out in all spheres by our Leninist Central Committee, beginning with the solution of the most complex and urgent international questions, the consistent struggle for the cause of peace, for the prevention of war, the solution of the most important questions of the development of agriculture, the collective farm system, the reorganization of the management of industry and construction, and ending with questions of science, literature and arts, the questions of enhancing links between school and life, the outstanding role belongs to the initiative, the rich political experience and tireless energy of Comrade Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev. (Stormy applause)—PN Pospelov, Secretary of the Presidium of the CPSU.

. . . nobody will forget the tremendous services and labors of the indomitable Leninist—the First Secretary of the Central Committee, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev—in re-establishing the Leninist collective leadership of the country. . . .

—A Kolusehinsky, First Secretary of the Ornsk Oblast.

HOW TO FIGHT THE BOMB

BY CLLR R CHALLINOR

Newcastle — under — lyme civil defence committee

CIVIL DEFENCE received a thorough trouncing when they staged their first mass evacuation exercise—**Operation Exodus** in North Staffordshire recently. The Authorities supposed that an H-bomb had been dropped on the Manchester area. In a flash the mushroom-shaped cloud had risen and, fanned by a southerly wind, had carried the deadly radioactive dust through Cheshire and into Northern Staffordshire. On the fringe of the fall out area lay the Newcastle Rural District, where people could only be saved if they were evacuated quickly. Civil Defence wanted to see how more than 2,000 civilians could be transported, taken to rest centres, and fed.

The exercise was based upon a number of weird assumptions that might easily have come out of *Alice in Wonderland*. They said much for the Authorities' powers of imagination, but little for their powers of realistic penetration. They supposed that, in

the eventuality of war, the enemy would drop only ONE bomb. And, to give the British people a sporting chance, this would be of only ONE megaton. If the enemy were so naughty and so inconsiderate as to drop an H-bomb of ten megaton, then the fall out would be up to 500 miles in length and 100 miles across. In which case, "Operation Exodus" would be completely futile.

Picketing

Our newly formed Stoke and District group of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament set about exposing **Operation Exodus** for the expensive piece of tomfoolery it actually was. We started by picketing the Newcastle Council meeting and, much to our own amazement, got the majority of the Labour Group to come out spontaneously against allowing CD to use the Corporation premises for their exercise. Only an unholy alliance of right-wing Labourites and Tories saved the day.

people aboard. We had the inspiring experience of actually seeing buses that should have been full coming in completely empty.

Cars packed with CND supporters trailed the buses. When they arrived at pick-up points, our comrades jumped out and tried to persuade people not to co-operate with the CD Authorities. Women, having put their children on the bus, took them off again after they had read our leaflets. And of those who came on the exercise, many expressed sympathy with Nuclear Disarmament.

Miscalculated

Things were not going very well for the Authorities. Besides having to contend with the CNDers at pick-up points and outside rest centres, their own organization fell down on the job. A whole convoy of army trucks twice lost its way, had to ask passers-by, and retrace its steps. When it eventually reached its destination — Kidsgrove — Mervyn Jones of *Tribune*, told the crowd of the convoy's circular tour. A further annoyance for CD Authorities was that their one and only geiger-counter at Kidsgrove was accidentally dropped on the floor and broken. It would in practice have been impossible for them to have known whether Kidsgrove was inside or outside the belt of radiation.

First last

The net result of the exercise was that Civil Defence transported about 700, not more than 2,000 as they originally calculated. And, another ominous thing from their standpoint, was that a number of their own CD workers were far from immune to the case for nuclear disarmament. Indeed, although Civil Defence had to bear the financial burden of the exercise, it was a complete and unqualified success for CND.

This was the first national exercise of its kind. If the authorities are foolish enough to hold further ones, there is no reason why the result should not be the same. It is important to remember that CD workers are, on the whole, sincere and conscientious. Nothing should be done to alienate them. It should always be stressed that our quarrel is not with them but with the Tory Government, who place the British people in the front-line in the eventuality of a Third World War, without providing the least protection.

Effective

The villagers were surprisingly sympathetic to us. We found them in general agreement with our position and some put CND signs in their windows. But we felt that, even so, we would make little impact upon the 2,000 volunteers to the Civil Defence Authorities.

But the day showed us to be wrong. When the buses went to collect the volunteers, they came back with an average of ten

ETU — end

would seem to indicate that there is a real possibility of changes taking place in the leadership. But we members of the organization should be alive to the dangers of concentrating criticism on abuses of democracy (eg ballot fiddles) and allegations relating to inflated expense accounts. These malpractices are far more prevalent in the right-wing general unions, and there and in other unions the rake-off gleaned by the top bureaucrats is by no means clear.

If such attacks are to be made, they should embrace a call for a general clean-up in the trade union movement by the rank and file of the movement and the establishment on a wider basis of the right of recall of officials. It is not out of place to mention that the constitution of the ETU compares very favourably with other unions on the question of the right of recall.

We in the ETU must realise that our interests will best be served by developing a principled left opposition. The leadership must be questioned on issues of basic policy, and I sincerely hope that Brothers will concentrate their approach to the June Conference on issues of this nature, such as those previously mentioned, and others. Important as is the exposure of abuses of democracy and financial excesses, the opposition must not channel all its efforts into sniping at bureaucratic weaknesses.

It is vitally important that basic industrial issues such as wages, defence of shop stewards, automation and unemployment are crystallized into the struggle for socialism: the mobilization of the membership in the day-to-day conflicts with the employers and the building of a systematic program for the defeat of the Tories and for the nationalization of industry under workers control.

BOOKS!

BUY
YOUR BOOKS
THROUGH
S R
BOOK SERVICE
35b
Priory Terrace
London
N W 6

Then, Stoke CND turned its attention to the villages to be evacuated. An intensive campaign, aimed at showing the public that only when the bomb had been banned would there be effective protection was begun. They were shown that the main function of Civil Defence was to act as a tranquilliser, a sedative that took the public's mind away from the very real dangers the Government's nuclear policy inevitably involved.

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.

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