

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

9th YEAR No 14

NOVEMBER 1959

SIXPENCE

LEFT MARCH, LABOUR!

The election defeat has cleared the air for debate within the Labour Party. The Right-wing can no longer hide behind organizational arguments or behind charges of disloyalty and disunity. On the contrary, the Left swallowed its tongue to maintain Party unity; we saw glossy after glossy eradicate the vestiges of a socialist platform and still swung into the election campaign with energy and enthusiasm. The time has now come for the reckoning.

* * *

For a few months at least, the Left will have the initiative. It was not **our** policy that was presented to the electorate; it was that of the Right; it was not **our** unprincipled opportunism that went chasing after the floating voter, but theirs; it is not the Left that is gouging out the last morsels of socialist tradition within the Party, that is selling out to Liberalism, but the Right.

In these coming months the Left must take the debate into every corner of the Movement. Every Ward Party and General Committee must be made a battleground for the defence of socialist nationalization, national planning and control of industry and society by the workers. The fight against the H-Bomb and military pacts, against British atrocities in the colonies must be made a fight for the conscience of the Labour Movement. The Left has the initiative for the time being. Let us make the most of it.

* * *

It is a time for the debate on principles. Many in the Party will be asking themselves afresh: what do we mean by Socialism? what is a socialist program? This paper will do its best to help clarify the fundamentals of socialist thought. We shall do our best to service the movement, by presenting clearly and undogmatically the case for nationalization and national planning under workers' control, for internationalism and for the class nature of the British Labour Party.

INSIDE

- **Berlin Diary** page 2
- **Labour and Youth** page 3
- **Future of the Left** pages 4-5
- **Prophet Unarmed** page 7
- **Notting Hill Notebook** page 8

We shall do this not in any spirit of "we know, but nobody else does". On the contrary, now as never before, the Left needs to unite within the Labour Movement. So long as it has the initiative, a united Left can do wonders in embedding socialist fundamentals in the Party rank-and-file and especially in its youth.

* * *

Finally, such a debate cannot go on in isolation. Opportunity must be given for it to take place. The Right-wing must not be allowed to get away with a mock two-day inquest at the forthcoming Annual Conference. Every socialist in the Movement should campaign with **Tribune** for a full week to discuss both the past defeat and the future direction of the Party.

* * *

The Party faces a fundamental choice: socialist principles based on working class activity and interests or middle class expediency based on the wish for 'power'. For the moment, possibly not for very long, the initiative lies with the Left. Let us take it, united and informed.

LIBERAL KISS OF DEATH

PETER SEDGEWICK

GRIMOND has dropped the hint. Roy Jenkins, Labour MP and (according to the **Observer**) one of Mr. Gaitskell's Poodles, has mused openly about the possibility. The **Observer** itself, in the same issue in which it launched its new column to prove that capitalists Are Human, has welcomed the idea in an editorial bearing the sonorous heading "LEFT". The Liberal-Labour alliance of the nineteenth century is once more being canvassed as a remedy for present ills.

Labour vices

Certain okay words are being bandied, whose pleasing, if vague, associations are calculated to further the proposed union. Progressive Anti-Tory. Left. And above all, Radical. What realities lie behind this smoke-screen of fine words?

The Labour Party, whatever its faults, is a party created to represent the working-class as an in-

dependent social force. Its vices and failures, whether of reformism or of jingoism, largely reflect the stage of consciousness which the working class of the oldest imperial country has attained. The history of the Labour Party began when the organized section of the working class realised that it had no need of benevolent bosses to speak for it in Parliament.

No tendency

The Liberal Party, on the other hand, however radical certain of its foreign and colonial policies may appear, is a bourgeois party. Its proposals for industry are only an attempt to buy off trade-union militancy by the issue of shares to workers (along the lines already followed by "progressive" managements such as ICI). Its opposition to the British Bomb is only the mirror-

● *contd. on page 8*

A BERLIN DIARY by Dev Murarka

AS THE PLANE comes down in darkness, Berlin emerges, a blaze of light. Even in those few minutes one cannot help noticing the characteristic width of roads for which Berlin is famous. One notices also the fresh look of the buildings. Behind this freshness is the story of terrible destruction which has reduced the city to a heap of rubble. Reconstruction is impressive, particularly in West Berlin, while East Berlin looks somewhat shabby and sad in comparison. This difference in appearance of the two Berlins is a real illustration of the character of divided Germany.

Politically, it is a tragic situation. The city is divided in two parts none of which theoretically belongs either to East or West Germany. In practice West Berlin with a population of more than two and a quarter millions is part of the Federal Republic though cut off from it by East German territory. East Berlin with a population of about one and a quarter millions is not only part of the German Democratic Republic but also its capital.

Weak Left

There is no telephone communication, no bus services and no common currency between two Berlins. But, the underground and overhead railways are owned by the East Berlin regime even in West Berlin and remain the only form of public transport between the one zone and the other. To maintain this partition the police are very much in evidence on both sides of the dividing line. Once while I was in East Berlin and had to make a phone call to West Berlin rather urgently, I was driven to a checkpoint on the eastern side where I had to get out of the car, cross the road to the call box in the western sector, and cross back within a few min-

utes. Such is the infuriating reality of Berlin.

Consequently, the level of political consciousness is high in Berlin but it tends to be of a monolithic nature. It is the other side which is constantly blamed for all the ills. Propaganda is crude, heavy and controlled. There is hardly any attempt to inform or educate the public and workers with objectivity. In East Berlin all political activity is controlled by the Socialist Unity Party under the domination of the Communists. But Berlin has a long tradition of support for the Social Democratic Party and in West Berlin it is still the favoured party.

Their leader, Herr Willy Brandt, is a shrewd politician who has benefited from the cynical behaviour of the communists in Berlin. Personally charming and popular he ultimately aspires to lead the SPD to power in Western Germany. **It is his contention that to get into power the party must drop its socialist tenets and become simply an alternative political party somewhat on the lines of the Democratic Party in America. The left inside the party is small and weak and there is a conspicuous lack of youth. The hold of the old leadership has weakened due to repeated failure in elections. As such the prospects for socialism in Germany is very gloomy. It remains to be seen, however, if Brandt can cash in on his reputation made in Berlin and carry the party with him.**

In Berlin itself, employment is high and wages average 2.8 DM per hour which is 5 per cent. lower than in West Germany. A representative of the West Berlin Federation of Trade Unions claimed that real wages were 10 per cent. lower in East Berlin and 20 per cent. lower in East Germany but I was not able to verify these figures. There are still about

38,000 unemployed but it was claimed that most of them were old white collar workers, a leftover from the days when Berlin was the capital, and it was difficult to find jobs for them. The Trade Unions are avowedly non-political and not very militant. until 1950-51 they followed a policy of wage freeze and are now shifting their attention to 40 hour week. An interesting feature of Berlin is that every day about 37,000 workers who live in East Berlin come to work in West Berlin and about 13,000 West Berliners earn their livelihood in East Berlin.

Deprived of its hinterland, hedged by a regime hostile or at best indifferent to it, its houses reduced to rubble, the survival of Berlin looks like one of those miracles we hear about in the Tory press. The reality is that Berlin was too big to be disposed of in the manner suggested by Secretary Morgenthau of America, namely to put it under the plough. Only too soon it became the focal point of cold war and both sides wanted to save it for their own ends. It became an instrument of propaganda. Hence the glamorous reconstruction of West Berlin, still heavily subsidised by allies. Hence the panic and worry of the communists who cannot compete in this commodity.

And the solution? It is very far off. Not even a hundred summit conferences will alter the troubled status of Berlin or bring a permanent relief to Berliners, who are the real sufferers. Nothing short of the dissolution of the two-bloc system and the re-unification of a Socialist Germany will do the trick.

Meanwhile, the West Berliners are really afraid of being reduced to serfdom by the East German regime. So, no one in West Berlin is prepared to accept a solution

which will deprive them the presence of Allied troops. In their presence they see, rightly or wrongly, the only security against the use of force by the Russians or the East Germans. On the other hand, the East Berlin authorities rightly point out that the propaganda activities and espionage based on West Berlin constitutes a serious problem for them. Their youth falls an easy prey to the seductive glamour of Kurfurstendamm. Their economy is undermined by the free exchange of 4-6 East German Marks for one DM. Above all they are worried that the example of a consumer economy, made easier by various types of direct and indirect subsidies, forces them to divert their resources towards a competition they would rather not have. The Western Powers are also not willing to let slip such a wonderful opportunity of carrying on cold war in the heart of enemy territory.

Travel

So the people must suffer. What is happening is that youth is leaving Berlin at such a rate that the city has almost ceased to grow. The economic prosperity and political deadlock have combined to induce a mood of dangerous cynicism and political apathy. One consequence is the remarkable interest in travel which the youth display in Berlin and bring to it that dedication which they reserve for studies and work. It has a pleasant result too. As a very dear old lady said to me in Berlin, "In 1914 and in 1939 the young men went to war with enthusiasm. Now, they travel and come back saying that all the other people are so nice. Why should we fight them," That is a gain. I hope it lasts even while in the name of self-defence instruments of total war are being created and organized.

CLASS IN EDUCATION—3

UNFORTUNATELY we find considerations of caste impinging on the education system at points other than the mere existence of the public and private sectors. The LEA system is itself caste-ridden particularly in the secondary stage.

Top caste

The typical organization of secondary education under an English LEA shows three types of school: grammar, technical and modern. Theoretically there is parity of esteem between these three types: in practice there is not. Grammar schools stand higher in the public regard than modern schools; indeed many parents feel ashamed if their children attend a modern school. (On this sense of shame, which in

middle-class and suburban areas—the Isle of Wight, the Hants and Sussex coasts, the dormitories of outer London, turns into snobbery, private secondary schools batten). And once again it is a fact that considerations other than educational affect a child's chances of admission to a school regarded as being in the top caste, ie, a grammar school.

Hertfordshire

In other words, considerations of class affect a child's progress up the educational ladder; the distribution of opportunity is not necessarily related to ability. In London in 1933-34, for example, less than a quarter of unskilled workers' children with an IQ of 130 or more, and only one third of skilled workers' children with similar IQs went to grammar

schools; and "the likelihood that a working-class boy will reach a grammar school is not noticeably greater today despite all the changes, than it was before 1945.

Rather less than 10 per cent of working-class boys reaching the age of 11 in the years 1931-41 entered selective secondary schools. In 1953 in South-west Hertfordshire the proportion was 15.5 per cent, and in Middlesbrough, 12 per cent. The proportion of children in each occupational group selected for grammar schools gives what has been called the "class chances" of a grammar school education.

After their investigation in SW Herts and Middlesbrough (re-

ported on at length in their **Social Class and Educational Opportunity**, from which came all the direct quotations in this paragraph) Drs Floud, Halsey and Martin say "there were in both areas considerable disparities in the chances of boys from different social classes. In general, the sons of manual workers had a chance below average, and the sons of non-manual workers a chance above average, of being selected for grammar schools", and they illustrate this by these figures showing the percentage class-chances for boys in 1953:

see page 7

S R BOOK SERVICE

35b
Priory Terrace
London
N.W.6

'THE YOUNGER GENERATION'

YOUTH

COMMENT AND CRITICISM

by WILL FANCY

IN THE SILLY SEASON at the beginning of the Election Campaign (when papers were driven to re-hashing the statistics of the 1955 results to make news) the Needs of Youth, rather than their Misdeeds, suddenly became front-page stuff. This was a result of the sudden appearance of the Report* of the Commission appointed by Gaitskell, on the problems of young people and how far they could be solved by public and voluntary bodies.

Wider Forum

The six men and four women of the Commission were probably considerably younger than the average NEC sub-committee although none were of the ages the report concerned itself with and none were members of Labour Youth Sections. In fact it was a commission of the administrators and heroes of Youth rather than of the Youth themselves. Gaitskell himself was reported to have been rather surprised at some of the imaginative recommendations and, although he was later able, without notice or apparent discussion, to pledge himself to no increase in Income Tax, he felt unable to commit himself specifically on any of them.

However, he gave the report a guided welcome and a number of Labour candidates — perhaps short of an issue — gave it considerably more. As the campaign got under way, however, the attention swung back towards the old people (who had votes) and then to the immediate material comfort of the floating votes of all ages.

The report deserves better. In printing it the Party have brought into a wider forum many of the ideas which young socialists have taken for granted for years. The collection makes some bitter attacks on present official attitudes towards Youth, is well documented and throws up thirty-six recommendations of varying precision. In the flatness after the electoral defeat it should not be allowed to be forgotten but should be discussed by wards and branches and at conferences. Youth sections, in particular, should fight for some of its more useful recommendations to be added to the Party Program by resolution of National Conference.

Builder

That said, it must be confessed that the Commission's analysis is inadequate and its proposals often provide no solution.

The language and the thinking of the Report is refreshing to the jaded reader of too many NEC blue prints, yet its basic drawback is the same as that of **Industry and Society** and other products of the last bout of official "re-thinking".

The way the NEC pros write their documents is probably like this. A preface gives an excellent description of the surface of some

present-day misfortunes; the symptoms are mistaken for the disease and any analysis of the fundamental causes slips into the report by accident. The specialists then propound their pet solutions to certain of the problems. Those that remain are dealt with by one of the vague general-purpose answers which can be used time after time without offending anyone. The more literary members then patch the lot together with their supply of clichés guaranteed to stir liberal consciences or to convince the other side that we are just, reasonable men.

Their role is that of the builder who tries to stop a house falling down by replacing a tile or cleaning a window.

The Youth Crisis according to the Commission is produced by three facts:—

1. Because of the post-war bulge in the birth rate, 200,000 more jobs will be required for school leavers in each of the five years (on top of the annual half million required now).
2. The withholding of Government encouragement and money from the Youth Employment Service, certain fields of teen-age education and the Youth Service was causing these services to break down even before the bulge began to hit them this summer.
3. The gap between the ideas and activities of youth and the adult community is widening.

Permanent

In the analysis of this last (pages 38-40) the Report comes nearer to the causes of the present apathy of Youth towards parties, trade unions, churches and youth clubs. It is not enough to say, as the Report does, that older people dislike the clothes, music and sexual practices of the young—they usually have. The Report hits the nail on the head with:

"Particularly true of working class young people—is the failing that **society itself and most of its institutions are still run by people of different outlook and class background.** This feeling extends to many of those who have direct contact with youth, particularly teachers and youth organizations, and, where it exists, is bound to vitiate the work they do . . . many teachers, certainly are themselves products of working-class homes. But the social outlook of the teaching profession is essentially middle-class. How much so was recently illustrated at the Careers Exhibition at Olympia, organised by the National Union of Teachers: the central symbol of the Exhibition was a series of connection ladders, rising from floor to ceiling with cardboard effigies swarming up the rungs. In this course the NUT itself is only reflecting the new post-war stress on getting on now one of the most dominant values of our society.

Again "the truth is, and many young people are quick to see it that for nearly half of all young people repetitive, often boring

work with no chance of improvement is their future lot"

This feeling, although perhaps more keenly felt among the young, affects most of the working class. They feel that the present setup is permanent and, anyway, they distrust the pretensions of the movements which might be expected to challenge it. They don't expect to have any say in running the government or the factory and content themselves with getting as comfortable as possible in their present situation, believing that only a big win on the Pools or Premium Bonds can radically alter it.

The proposals of the Commission for ending this alienation of Youth are unbelievably inadequate. They are, more sympathy from adult organizations, "second chance" training schemes for young people who feel they made the wrong choice of a job, outlets for young people's need for adventure and selfless service when Conscriptio ends, and votes at eighteen. The really relevant argument for votes at eighteen is the first one the Commission mentions, to give Youth "a sense of greater responsibility and participation in society"

In fact bringing a few teenagers into the electorate might extort a little more money from Governments for youth clubs and playing fields; but many young electors now suffer from the same dissatisfaction, wear the same clothes and share the same apathy as those under 21. And if adult suffrage has not given the workers the feeling that Britain belongs to them and should be run by them how will a couple of million teenage voters alter the situation?

The failure to carry their argument from the ballot box to the work-place is the greatest weakness of the Report. I have failed to find "Socialism", let alone workers' control mentioned in the whole report (capitalism appears once on page 35 in a reference to sex in advertising). The shallowness of the section "Earning" may be due to the make-up of the Commission (the nearest to an industrial worker seems to be a professional footballer) and of the bodies submitting evidence to it; whereas three national student organizations wrote in, the whole of industrial youth was represented only by the TUC and the Industrial Training Council. Even the title of this section is a misnomer, as it doesn't discuss wages or hours, the Report having previously commented that the average weekly earnings of teenagers have risen even faster than those of older workers (to a princely £5 14s. 0d. for men!).

Dodged

If it doesn't mention the control of industry, earnings or the need to remove the bar on industrial action by apprentices, what does the Report say? It warns of the danger of a million unemployed teenagers within the

next five years unless industrial output expands at the rate of 5 per cent. a year. It warns briefly of the dangers of the boring and repetitive jobs to which 50 per cent. of the boys and 60 per cent. of the girls are condemned, but finds no solution. It gives some facts on the overloaded, under-trained and under-paid Youth Employment Officers, 900 of whom are supposed to shove 500,000 school leavers (pre-Bulge figure) into jobs each year, and follow them up to the age of 18. Less than £2 million is spent on this service.

The Commission decided that the shortage of apprentices is not due to a lack of able applicants or to union restrictions but to inadequate training facilities and the diminished profitability of apprentice labour. **The suggestions that the first requires training to be transferred to expanded technical colleges and, eventually, public ownership and planning are dodged.**

Vague

The second argument of the Commission will need more justification. It is true that the gap between the earnings of apprentices and adult workers has declined relatively, and that day release—where it has been allowed to operate—has reduced the profit to be obtained from apprentices. But apprentices are still doing the work of fully-trained men during the latter years of their "training" and for only a fraction of their wage. The Commission's solution to the shortage is to subsidise the employer to take apprentices.

The Report's Educational proposals are vague. **There is too much talk of "a wider range of courses for the older pupil" and "a different relationship between the school and the more mature pupil" and not enough about which courses and what relationship.** There is the reminder that a nation which has never had it so good is still far from implementing three major proposals of the all-Party 1944 Act—raising the school leaving age to 16, compulsory part-time education to 18 and a comprehensive Youth Service.

Because of the teacher shortage the Commission felt that the most it could ask for on the first two points was target dates for their fulfillment some years ahead. It suggests the extension of day release to non-technical subjects, which would help the late-starters to get back into an academic or professional course if he wanted to and would perhaps make unskilled jobs less deadening

The Section in the Youth Service—one of those expert ones—is good. A witness from the Ministry of Education (which runs the service) is quoted as admitting, "it has been definite policy for some time now not to advance the Youth Service".

The Report is far from adequate, but it is out and we should make the most of it.

*The Younger Generation (Labour Party, 1/6).

LABOUR AFTER THE ELECTION

FORUM

THE FUTURE OF THE LEFT

MICHAEL KIDRON

WE DID OUR BEST. Party activists rolled up in thousands for canvassing, addressing and all the other necessary jobs. The poll was high (6 per cent. more than in 1945) the weather good. The organization near-perfect. The left put unity above all other considerations and accepted the most right-wing, unsocialist platform ever to have emanated from Transport House; they closed the ranks without reservation to put Gaitskell into power and postpone the reckoning with him and his wing until then.

It didn't work, and the fact that it didn't work has set off a chain-reaction of soul searching that promises to last well beyond the forthcoming conference. What happened? Was it that the Party leadership have not put up a consistent fight for the old aged pensioners all along, but remembered them only during the campaign? Was it that they have made it only too clear to militant workers that industrial disputes were none of their business and shouldn't even happen? Was it that they were on the defensive on nationalization, paring it away here, changing its nature there? Was it their colonial record that made their fight for African freedom seem so phony? Was it their reassurance to the City that the Pound would be put before employment? Was it their Tory position on the H-bomb?

Change or reform

It was all this. Labour, the party of reform *par excellence*, has shown little reforming zeal. Nothing it has said or done in opposition, nothing it has promised on the hustings could arouse much enthusiasm in anyone looking for more appreciable easement within capitalism than he was getting anyway, let alone anyone wanting an end to the system. To have an image projected at one during the election campaign is one thing. To be sure that it is the true image is altogether another. What, for example, has happened to the municipalization of housing and all the other bright products of the three-year re-think? Electors were not sure. They were not sure that the Labour Party was the party of change, of small reforms or of large historical steps.

But is that all? Can we honestly say with many of the political concerns, that had the party shown more fight for reforms, more principled concern for pensioners, a lively defence of nationalization and so on, over the years we would have definitely got back to power? Is there nothing other than the negative features of the Labour Party and its right-wing direction that can explain the defeat?

I believe there is if the lack of fight was the only reason for our defaulting support, there would have been no swing to Labour in

the areas of above-average unemployment (Scotland, the cotton belt and Northern Ireland) where a militant struggle for reform is more pressing than elsewhere; there would have been a greater turn towards the Liberals in those areas than in the country as a whole instead of which they lost votes in four out of the five constituencies in which comparison with 1955 is possible. If this were the sole or even major reason, at least Labour's Left would have escaped the rout. As it is, Mikardo lost Reading and over 4,000 votes, Orbach of Victory for Socialism dropped 3,000 votes and lost East Willesden, Michael Foot suffered one of the greatest swings towards the Tories (6 per cent.), Fenner Brockway just managed to hold on to Eton and Slough with the narrowest of majorities, having lost almost two-and-a-half thousand votes on the way, and so on. Similarly, deserters from the Labour Party would have turned towards the Left; but the Communist Party lost 17 deposits out of its 18 and its vote slumped heavily—14 per cent. of its supporters disappearing since the last elections in the fifteen constituencies which have been fought both times (the drop being from 30,090 in 1955 to 25,742 this year.

Americanized

The turn was definitely to the right and Labour's right-wing platform was simply not right enough to stop the tide. Not that the movement of support away from Labour should be exaggerated. We still polled nearly 12½ million votes; 43 per cent. of the electorate still support whatever program Labour puts forward. The swing in Parliamentary terms is violent compared with the movement in party support. Yet, small though the latter was (less than 3 per cent.) it was significant in that it was concentrated in the younger age group: the new arrivals to the voting register, and the under-thirties. How many old Party stalwarts learned poignantly that their sons appeared as 'doubtful' or 'against' on the canvass cards? How many learned that the loyalty to Labour, the blind unreasoning loyalty scarred into them by the struggles and sufferings of the 'twenties and 'thirties has not passed by heredity into the younger generation? that the environment of post-war prosperity has produced a new crop of working-class agnostics? to whom, in the words of the Party's Youth Commission "trade unions, political parties . . . have considerably less appeal . . ." and in whom "there is a great deal of indifference, even hostility . . . to the trade union movement?" that, finally, their move to new towns and boom power has weakened the social pressures that might have kept them 'loyal'?

"This section of the population", to quote Bevan who is once again busily turning his

coat, "has become thoroughly Americanized". "Their psychology . . . is compounded of two contradictory elements—contentment and apprehension. Contentment because their material horizons have expanded and apprehension because they know their new-found improvement is precarious and fragile." (*News of the World*, October 11). True enough. The new voting generation have never had it so good. No matter that their prosperity is compounded of overtime working, of wives earning, of hire-purchase and other debts; this compound is itself a product of the boom and is ministered successfully, so it seems to them, by the Tories

Caught

To sum up so far, prosperity has weaned the post-war generation of working-class voters perceptibly from their 'natural' loyalty to Labour by offering them tangible benefits in the Tory here-and-now; it has taken the steam out of the older generation's reforming zeal with the result that the Labour Party leadership had permissive authority to suffocate in a tasteless porridge of Butskellite policy all the idealism, all the power of change inherent in youth's frustrated condition, that might yet have appealed against the material gains and given Labour electoral victory.

The Labour leadership was caught suspended between the generations. The undying traditions of the older generation, its class loyalties proved an embarrassment to the opportunist empirics at the top bent on office at any price and on any program. The new voters found the fuddy-duddy philanthropy of the leadership unsuited to the brash realities of the Jasper world as they know it. The promise of return was not bold enough. Prosperity poisoned Labour's electoral prospects as surely as it has separated the generations; where it hadn't seeped through, in Scotland, the cotton belt, and Northern Ireland, young and old put their cross against the same candidate.

Prices down

The coincidence of prosperity and Tory rule hurt Labour. It is a coincidence based partly in a steady rise in export prices and fall in import prices that have improved Britain's overall terms of trade by more than 11 per cent. since 1954 and have helped to steady prices. It is based partly on the enormous increase in dollar and other foreign investments in the Outer Sterling Area since 1958, which have offset the loss of some 20 per cent. in its export income and have prevented a run on the slender reserves in gold and foreign currency held in London. Another element was the rise in unemployment, short-term though it was in most cases but sufficient

to reduce the pressure for wage increases which helped keep prices down.*

These factors operated, but they were not the only ones. Our young workers received their impressions not merely from the Tory world of 1958-59, but from the entire post-war decade in which changes in terms of trade cancelled out, in which unemployment was a factor of negligible importance and in which the strains of exchange crises alternated with the building of foreign reserves. There is something more lasting in the post-war prosperity than the coincidental luck of the Tories, something that confounds the interminable predictions of 'the slump around the corner' and rights Capitalism's bias to over-production, at least for the present. It is the permanent arms economy which has sustained the long-term boom and which has fixed the impression of continuing and inevitable prosperity in the minds of our young working class.

Reaction

This impression might not be misplaced for a number of years yet. The greatest immorality of all time—prosperity poised on a nose-cone—looks to carry on. Not so, however, the exceptionally favourable circumstances that have blessed the Tories over the past couple of years disappearance that will make most of the political running over the period of the coming Parliament.

First, the facts. The terms of trade are turning against Britain as the world industrial boom seeps down to the raw-materials producing countries and raises prices. The September Board of Trade figures (neatly held over until after the elections) showed a trade gap of £72 million, the highest since December of last year. Then, unemployment is dropping rapidly in this country and likely to drop further as the boom spreads over into the areas (Scotland, Northern Ireland) specializing in the production of capital goods. Already, some six million workers are covered by wage claims pending and many more will probably be joining the queue this season. All this and more point to the imminent loss of the exceptionally favourable economic climate which the Tories have enjoyed these last couple of years.

There is no doubt how they will react. Their majority of 100 in the Commons, the feeling that they can rely on a substantial minority of working class support, will give them the confidence to resist any encroachment on

* In the first eight months of 1957 10,865,000 workers received wage increases amounting to £4,526,000 per week.

In the first eight months of 1958 6,028,000 workers received wage increases of £1,754,000 per week.

In the first eight months of this year only 3,606,000 workers are receiving wage increases of £867,000 per week.

their good fortune. They will resist; but there is no occasion for a show-down, for an all out attempt to crush the working-class movement. Any cry of "back to the 'thirties" is as idiotic as it is irresponsible since so long as the no-war arms economy is a major factor in the West, they need not fear serious damage to the basic structure of their world however much they might be cramped for space every now and then.

Real danger

What can we expect, then? Legislation against strikes? against shop stewards' activities and unofficial action? against the need to 'contract-out', of the political levy? Possibly. But no show-down. Again, only possibly, but also possibly not. And for this reason.

The bosses' defence of their especially favoured position gained in the last couple of years will turn the focus of class activity towards the factories and building sites. As Bevan writes with heavy heart, the workers "will look upon Parliamentary debates as a meaningless charade, and they will seek their solution by means nearer to their hands" (*ibid*). The Americanization of class relations will go on as workers become industrially more demanding, more militant and politically more reserved. Under such conditions, the bosses have the choice of openly attacking as attempted by the engineering employers twice in recent years or of disuniting the workers even more by driving a wedge between the union leadership and its membership, by using the bureaucracy to sort out their 'rebel' rank-and-file militants and to conduct the war against shop stewards and such like 'firebrands'. Anyone who has followed the increasing independence of the trade-union leadership from its rank-and-file, who has watched their willing acceptance of a cooperative role within the industrial machine of recent years, or, who saw the delayed, lethargic response to Labour's election campaign cannot fail to doubt that the Tories and their pay-masters will find the second, less dramatic approach more fruitful in the long run. **The real danger at this moment appears to be an attempt to buy the political neutrality of the trade union machines, and their enthusiastic condemnation of anything 'unofficial' or 'unauthorized'.**

Ideological lines

What of the Labour Party? We must remember that it still commands an enormous vote. It has not by any means received a death blow. But the circumstances outlined above will put enormous pressure on it to swing more and more rightward as the class struggle, fragmented though it be, passes it by and assumes a more and more 'industrial' coloration. Militants will find it less, even less than now, sensitive to their needs; youth will tend to escape it; intellectuals ignore it.

The ideological lines in the Party are already drawn. The Right has marked a course towards a self-confessed, alternative capitalist party on the lines of Western Germany's SPD (the "Party of Free Enterprise"), to-

wards a final rejection of whatever traces of class identification remain. The Left has gathered around the defence of this class heritage and the class political platform: defence of nationalization, defence of national planning and so on. The Left is undoubtedly unorganized; its program is manifestly incomplete; its perspectives completely unthought-out. For the moment, however, it exists as a conscious tendency within the Party, more conscious than it has been for a number of years.

That the Right will ultimately be in the ascendant seems almost inevitable. The 're-think' over the last few years was made on their assumptions; the election fought on its policy. The Left offered no opposition, no platform. The Right is based on a profound trend in contemporary capitalism; the stability of a permanent arms economy. The Left on nothing more than a defence of traditions and a half-formulated, semi-socialist ideology inherited from a pre-arms-economy period. That the Left is doomed to ultimate atrophy seems almost sure.

New chance

But socialists don't always deal in ultimates. The very next period offers an opportunity for socialist propaganda and conversion such as we've not had for many years. At least over the next few months the Right, for the reason that they made all the running in choosing election issues, will be on the defensive. For the first time since the immediate post-war period, they will have to fight on ideological ground, on policy. They will have to justify their programmatic stand. This is our chance. **Now is the time to resurrect the fundamentals of socialism, to hammer them out in the eyes of a rank-and-file still smarting at the unexplained defeat. Now is the time to bring in the youth as a natural socialist battalion.** No matter that we remain the minority. No matter that we face an almost certain defeat. The more we gain over the next three months, the more difficult will it be for the Right to smoke out the socialist traditions of the Labour Party, the more fertile the soil too for a burgeoning of socialism in Britain in the future.

LETTERS

COMPENSATION IN BUILDING

"Omar" is to be congratulated on his comprehensive review of the relationship of the working class to the building industry (SR, October).

The question of compensation for businesses nationalized or taken over by the working class raises, I feel, a good many more issues that "Omar" deals with. Some industries, shipbuilding, chemicals and heavy engineering, for example, raise no particular difficulty. Each unit is so large that the nominal owners, the shareholders, have lost all functions of management and on take-over they can be dealt with on the basis of our program of "com-

pensation payments based on a means test." There will probably have to be various rather complicated provisions to ensure that small indirect shareholders—investors in insurance companies, unit trusts and the like—are not deprived of their savings. Something like a mass transfer of accounts to the Post Office Savings Bank might well be the best way.

Industries like building and retail shops are not nearly so straightforward. By sheer numerical strength the proprietors of this sort of business constitute a social problem of the first magnitude. Furthermore, an anti-socialist attitude on the part of so many people, with numerous relatives and friends amongst the industrial working class and in direct daily contact with it, cannot fail to powerfully inhibit the growth of socialist ideals amongst industrial workers. Nor is this problem a theoretical one, a bridge which only has to be crossed in the future. After 1945 the Labour government, needing to re-organize the country after the war, to make capitalism more efficient and in a limited way to make social progress, had to compulsorily acquire land, buildings, etc. The sorry mess made of this business has probably created more resentment against the Labour Party than anything else. Even more, I regret to say, than the decisions to manufacture atomic weapons and to use troops for strike breaking.

Proposals

In the worst instances, people were left with more to repay on mortgages than they received as compensation! Guess who they and their friends and relatives voted for in 1950?

The Town and Country Planning Acts are the background to a fascinating story of the damage that muddleheadedness and a misunderstanding of socialist ideas can do when let loose in a basically capitalist economy. Not that muddleheadedness and misunderstanding will exactly bring forth Utopia in a Socialist society either.

If a master builder is to make £20 a week for himself the turnover of his business cannot be much less than the £10,000 per annum mentioned by "Omar" as a possible lower limit for nationalization.

Indeed, if such a person is operating with little capital and hired plant he is really only a sort of pieceworker. It is not so long since metal workers on piece rates paid their own assistants. (Why, then, have metal workers been subordinated in factories and builders remain independent? Because the metal workers had only one customer, who was often the material merchant as well. Builders have many customers.)

To make some proposals. The most important is that no person displaced shall be worse off than he would be if he were a displaced skilled worker, irrespective of his past National Insurance, etc., position. He should have the same re-training rights.

All outstanding debts on the business taken over shall be either paid or abolished, depending on circumstances.

A proprietor shall have the right to only give up a part of his business, retaining a nucleus smaller than the minimum take-over size.

If any private dwelling is acquired the occupier, whether tenant, leaseholder or owner, shall have (whether or not he is entitled to it under the existing but moribund Town Planning Acts) either a council house and mortgage cancellation or the transfer of his mortgage to a comparable house, without loss. And in any case, a "disturbance allowance."

A useful rule would be that no independent building contractor could be a member of a local authority. Even now, publicans cannot be magistrates, and an extension of this sort of law would prevent much of the abuse of public contracts that now goes on.

I am not suggesting that private business men should have a charter of rights for all time. The working class must retain political flexibility for itself. What it must never do is to treat individuals according to political categories instead of as people with their own lives to lead.

Michael Millett.

London.

THE BRITISH ECONOMY AND THE WORKING CLASS

I have read in your issue of October, 1959, the very fair review by J. Crutchley of my booklet *The British Economy and the Working Class*.

There are one or two points which I would like to discuss. The reviewer points out that the fall in the relative consumption is due to the vast expenditure on arms—and he may be right. I have not made this comment in the pamphlet for the simple reason that I did not want to discuss any matter which does not follow logically from the official figures which I used. I refrained from doing so in order to make it impossible for the bunch of bourgeois economists to attack me on the grounds of sheer surmise. I believe it is important to hit the other side with exactly the same weapons they use against those who look at society from a Marxist point of view.

However,—and this is my second point—the reviewer did not mention the most important conclusion which I draw from the official statistics. I have shown that the standards of the working class are falling, that the workers are in the grave danger of losing the achievements of 1945. And I also show that they can fight back only when their industrial struggle is closely linked with the political struggle. Since there is no party which makes a revolutionary stand, I conclude that the main task of the working class is the building of a new workers' party.

I would be grateful to you if you would publish this letter to enable your readers to follow those arguments which I have given you above.

Kurt Map.

London.

Socialist Review and Workers' Control *from R. Simon*

LETTERS

socialist must propagate the necessity for it and instil confidence in it at every opportunity.

Elementary

This is elementary to anyone active in the movement. But activists will also know that the defence of socialist positions requires more than a restatement of fundamentals. At the present time of political retreat within the Labour Movement and rightward turn on the part of the Party leadership, it requires an

Of all the groupings to be found on the British Left today, **Socialist Review** is, I believe, the only one which places high on its program the demand for workers' control. When I first saw your paper a year or so ago, this fact encouraged me greatly to take an interest in it.

Approach

But since then I have gradually been coming to the conclusion that **Socialist Review** is in reality no more concerned with workers' control than all the other Socialist groups which mention the subject either not at all or only casually, in passing.

Your paper, as regards the kind of material you publish, the

within the framework of the British Labour movement, a movement for Socialism, has to begin with the real facts of the day. Their propaganda should not be plucked out of thin air or borrowed from some old, outdated program. It has to be based on a sound analysis of the present situation, and this means especially that it has to be in accord with the material experiences of the working class.

Appeals

An appeal based on the cry "depression is around the corner" or "the workers are starving under capitalism" is bound to fail in today's conditions. So is the

in such a way as to be a source of great disillusionment. The worker in the railways, the post office, the buses is little better off than if these were run by private enterprise. And really, who can get enthusiastic about the nationalization of steel (or anything else) when it is well known that it will only mean one board replacing another and no more say for the steel worker than before?

Thus it can be seen that workers' control is relevant to the conditions of today and derives from them. It is not an artificial notion nor just a dream of the Socialist future.

If the conscious struggle for Socialism were to put workers' control at its focus, it would gain a new and concrete meaning. The Labour movement badly needs a 'dose' of workers' control. At the same time workers' control needs to be made the slogan of a movement.

These are the jobs, I maintain, which **Socialist Review** should be doing. Instead of being just another faction of militants, you should become the leading and unceasing protagonist of workers' control. Each issue of your paper should devote much of its space to this subject, in one aspect or another. Every member of your group should become a propagandist for workers' control, raising and spreading the question everywhere.

In making these suggestions, I do not imply for a moment that here lies some short cut to Socialism. But I do say that around this central question you could begin to build that conscious movement of Socialists which is absolutely necessary if a change in the system is to be achieved.

R. Simon.

London, September 29.

Editor's Reply

By straining too hard at the essence Comrade Simon is in danger of losing the sense of wholeness and dynamism in the Labour Movement. Of course the core of socialism lies in workers' control; of course every conscious

Tight Belt

Since 1950 productivity has increased by nearly 60 per cent and on an average every car worker is producing £9 per week profit or the shareholder. After wages have been paid, every Ford worker produces £12 profit per week, BMC workers £8, Rovers £9, Standards £9 and Rootes £10.

all-out defence of nationalization and planning (pace, under workers' control); it requires a defence of the class nature of the Labour Party (pace, under workers' control); it requires a constant demonstration and reiteration of the unity of industrial and political action (pace, under workers' control); it requires an attack on the dug-outs of British Imperialism (under colonial workers' control). It requires all this and more over and above a crusade to instil workers' control as the overwhelmingly major plank in a socialist program.

in Detail

Defeatism takes many forms. One of its most dangerous is the rigid adherence to one idea, one slogan, however central it might be to socialist thought, as THE idea, THE slogan to be flourished at all times and under all circumstances. This might be called sectarian defeatism.

Finally, Comrade Simon could have put the space he has taken up to much better use by showing in greater detail, if we might quote, "that workers' control is relevant to the conditions of today and derives from them". We gladly welcome such contributions—Editor.

IT'S RICH

"The duty of all who wish to serve the nation is to find out where they consider its true interests lie, then to advance their views no matter what the immediate political consequences may be"—Aneurin Bevan, **News of the World**, October 11.

"A Labour opposition has to run very fast in order to stay where it is"—RHS Crossman, **New Statesman**, October 17.

"Back to the 'thirties", **Newsletter**, October 10.

"Our proletariat is in Africa", **New Statesman**, October 17.

"Mr. Foulkes ruled that politics must not be interpolated into the business of the (Confed.) meetings", **Times**, October 16.

"This confirms a theory I have long held, that the Russians are a profoundly unrevolutionary people, and indeed that the Russian Revolution never occurred", Sir William Hayter, **Observer**, September 27.

"Contributions to 'It's Rich' are gladly, nay, eagerly, welcomed", **SR Editor**, January to December.

kind of approach you have, is no different from the **Newsletter** or **Socialist Fight** or **Tribune** or the **Daily Worker**. Each of these puts forward its views on current matters, on foreign and colonial policy, on economic questions, strikes, etc. Each calls upon the workers to follow its line and advises them what to do. And **Socialist Review** does the very same things.

Frequently your paper points out that ultimate solutions can only be found in a Socialist society—but then so do all the other papers. To distinguish yourselves you sometimes, though less frequently, add "with workers' control".

To build

Socialist Review is, in my opinion, on the wrong track. To copy the "vanguard" approach of the other groups and newspapers will get you nowhere. If you stand for workers' control, you have both the opportunity and the duty to take on a different role altogether. With a change in the character of your work, you could play a far more influential and important part in the Labour movement than you at present do.

Anyone who wants to build,

slogan "socialism will raise your moral values" or "comrades, you are alienated under capitalism".

A concept

None of the existing Socialist groups have anything to offer which fits the changing circumstances and yet is realistically based. Either they are tied to conceptions now out of date or else they dream up new ones with no material basis. None of them is able to give the propaganda of Socialism its very essential new content.

But there is a concept which can form the nucleus of Socialist advance in this country; and that is the concept of workers' control. In present day conditions it is, I am convinced, the one idea which could capture the imagination of large sections of the British working class.

Relevant

Clearly it is relevant to the situation in the Welfare State which offers a certain security, but no voice in the running of affairs. Moreover, the nationalized industries, instead of being a source of inspiration to the workers both inside and outside them, function

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

REVIEWED BY C. GRANT-BURNS

THE PROPHET UNARMED

BOOKS

The prophet Unarmed: Trotsky 1921-1929, by Isaac Deutscher. OUP 38/-.
Trotsky's Diary in Exile 1935: Faber and Faber 21/-.

THE SECOND VOLUME of Deutscher's epic life of Trotsky will not disappoint those who have been anxiously awaiting it since whenever it was that they put down the first. What Deutscher has done is little short of miraculous: for he has stripped from the giant figure of his subject the prodigious slime in which it had been smothered by the detractors of the Stalin epoch, while at the same time managing to divest it of the unpleasing scent of carbolic sanctity which has been wafted around it by some of the more zealous and puritanical of the 'followers'. The man who emerges from these pages is in every sense powerful: powerful, as the title (from Machiavelli) implies, as much in adversity as in what the small-minded call triumph.

New prospects

One chapter of this book alone will give cause for the undying gratitude of a whole generation: the section entitled "Not By Politics Alone". This opens up exciting new prospects in every intellectual field. A big claim? Yes: but a mighty achievement; for Deutscher has summarized in 34 pages the enormous contribution which Trotsky made to the Marxist understanding of and approach to the arts and sciences: and this legacy of Trotsky's will have a profound effect on world literature when it is finally claimed by the young people whose intellectual growth is still stultified by the cruel hobbles of Zhdanovism.

Beginning

At the moment Trotsky's contribution to the cultural future of the Soviet Union is locked in the sealed rooms of the great libraries, waiting on the day when it will be disinterred. Deutscher has begun the exhumation: and all the rebellious poets of the secret literary circles of Moscow and Leningrad can be relied upon to complete it, when they are informed of its existence. The mimeographed sheets of poems and stories which pass from hand to hand throughout Russia and Eastern Europe already contain corrosive possibilities for the thought-controllers: but when Deutscher's 34 pages are mimeographed the dissolution will have begun.

Trotsky will awaken new muses, whose voices may arouse pangs of life even in the dropsical breasts of the pensioners of official art. For Trotsky's contribution to this subject retains at its kernel that sense of priorities which has, in England, given birth to the 'New Left', and throughout Europe caused young people to find out that they inhabit a different moral universe from that of their rulers. Socialism emerges from these writings not as a balance-sheet of pig-iron statistics, but as a bursting liberation of individual human faculties and prowess — or nothing. The students who come into this inheritance will see the guardians of orthodoxy as imposters: and the future Po Prostu of Moscow will have a bite and a direction, in the wake of these writings, which will astonish even its mordant predecessor.

History

But this is only one of the things that Deutscher has done. He has also told the history of the Soviet Union in perhaps the most gripping and (for all the complaints of ex-ambassadors) concise way we have heard it to date. He has summed up readably the gist of Trotsky's important comments in the failure of the Ger-

ART & SOCIETY ?

The many new office blocks in the centre of British cities, particularly London, are good business, if often bad architecture.—
The Economist, May 16.

man and Chinese revolutions. He has recalled Trotsky's brilliant writings on Britain. He has opened up the Trotsky Archives of Harvard to describe in detail the discussions of the Left Opposition in exile: a fascinating account which is completely new. Yet, above all, through it all, we are given this hero, warts and all.

The Man

The stature of Trotsky as man and thinker grows with Deutscher's dispassionate treatment. We see him hesitating, feeling his way, experimenting, even capitulating. At times he seems to lose his way entirely: he falters at crucial moments. He defies Lenin's warning that he must not "make a rotten compromise" with Stalin. He behaves at all times with loyalty to a cause which is straining loyalty past its utmost point. He struggles, at all times,

against the overwhelming apathy of an exhausted working class, and the disintegrative forces at work among his own followers.

Promethean

His supernatural honesty sets his feet upon the road of Ishmael, the outcast. In the very mortal weaknesses of the man, though, appears the prototype of the Man to come; the kind of man who was struggling from the rule of the knout and the katorga to become:

Sceptreless, free, uncircumscribed, but man
Equal, unclassed, tribeless and nationless,
Exempt from awe, worship, degree, the King
Over himself, just, gentle, wise but man
Passionless?—no, yet free from guilt or pain.

Deutscher shows Trotsky as a real follower of Marx: a promethean in the strain of Shelley, not a Calvinist dribbler of the incompetent species which sometimes passes as "Trotskyist" in these sad later days.

TROTSKY'S DIARY IN EXILE : 1935

THE 'DIARY' which Faber's have published would really be more properly called a scrapbook. It includes newspaper cuttings, pastings from books, and personal comments. It is a bit scruffily edited, but worth looking at for a number of reasons: one being that in it Trotsky discusses his relations with Lenin, and their part in the revolution, in a more reflective mood than is common in his political writings. But the heroine of this book is Natalia, his wife. Throughout it both he and her were aware that Stalin's axe was poised over them: they are shuffled from place to place on the remoter fringes of a collapse.

sing civilization, by cowardly politicians who themselves were to perish within four years. When the war submerged the old Europe, Trotsky's murder was virtually unnoticed. In such circum-

SHOP STEWARD

Who is the worst paid man today?
With haggard look and hair turned grey,
Who's blamed when things do not go right
Who gets no rest by day or night?
Though never having been to college
He must possess the widest knowledge
On rates of pay and hours of labour
And how to keep peace with one's neighbour.
Of income tax and how to pay it,
What's best to say, and when to say it
And how and which and why and when
Of all the problems known to men.
If with the foreman he is agreed,
He's sold the men or been weak-kneed.
When for the men he tries to cater,
He's called a blinking agitator.
Who is this chap? What! Do you know him?
Or how much you really owe him?
This chap, whose torment is assured,
Is no one else than your SHOP STEWARD.

AEU Journal, 1943

stances one would think that hope was impossible. Yet Trotsky, expecting it all, hoped mightily. The moral strength of an age is made by such men.

Happy is the land that breeds a hero. Yet, as Brecht has said, "unhappy is the land that needs a hero". Such men as this are not easily found. But they are more necessary to this world of cold war and frigid welfare than ever they were.

CLASS IN EDUCATION

	SW Herts	Middlesbro'
Professional workers, business owners, managers	59	68
Clerical workers	44	37
Foremen, small shopkeepers	30	24
Skilled manual workers	18	14
Unskilled manual workers	9	9

For all children the percentage class-chance was 22 in SW Herts and 17 in Middlebrough.

Another piece of evidence that non-educational criteria affect the chance of a grammar school entry comes from Birmingham

where it has been disclosed by the Education Committee that children from the working-class residential suburbs have a five times better chance of a grammar school place than the children from the congested central areas of the city.

This is the third 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.

SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose 16s. subscription for 1 year's issue of
8s. 4s. 6 months' 3 months'

SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Name.....

Address.....

Send to M Maddison
21 Aubert Park, London, N5

Notting Hill Notebook

NOTTING HILL, like Little Rock, has become identified throughout the world with racial conflict, and this Notebook will, from time to time, leave Notting Hill to report on the racial issues that occur outside this area, so as to give readers a broader picture of the "migrant problem", the things that are being done to eliminate it, and the people who do them. Before we do that however, we must say something about the general election results.

Like most people, we were stunned by the Conservatives' huge majority, but what interested us most was the fact that Mosley got 2,821 votes.

When one takes into account the fact that most of these voters must have known they were wasting their votes, it says a lot for the strength of their convictions that they were willing to do so. We, in the CPPA, will be watching for signs of Mosley's future intentions, now that he knows the full strength of his support.

The reduced majority of the sitting MP came as no surprise to us in the CPPA; in canvassing the coloured voters during the election, many of them said they couldn't see any difference between the Labour and the Tory party, and the white tenants of slum houses in the constituency were referring to this Labour MP as the "invisible man".

Political careerists make poor advocates for Socialism. We do not say that Socialists shouldn't eat off gold or silver plates, but not when half the peoples of the world have nothing to eat. We do not say that Socialists shouldn't accept peerages, but not when the bestowers of peerages are guilty of condoning the murder and imprisonment of blameless human beings.

Election Results

As a part of the 12,000,000 "barmy" people who voted Labour, we regret the opportunity lost by the Labour Party to activate the thousands of natural socialists within the Coloured community.

The election results confirm the fact that the goal of Socialism is not merely the acquisition of more material comforts, it is also a fight for better human relations. And when all the political ideologies and economic theories are threshed-out, there is still the individual to contend with. Prosperity, it is often said, is the enemy of Socialism. We don't agree. It is individualism that is the real enemy of Socialism. Until the burning concern for one's fellow men, that inspired the best fighters for Socialism in the past is rekindled, we will find it difficult to convince people of the rightness of the Socialist cause. To accept the argument that prosperity is the enemy of Socialism, is to agree to the charge that Socialism is a purely materialistic creed. This acceptance can be detected in much of the writings of present-day socialist writers. Hala, Dr. Banda, and Suez, were used by the Labour Party chiefly with the aim of embarrassing the Tories instead of presenting them for what they really were: despicable acts by despicable men.

Not Overwhelmed

These crimes, having been used in this way, the Tories were able to counter the attack quite easily by appealing to the nationalistic element in the people's make-up. One cannot appeal to the "good sense" of the people, one must appeal to their hearts. If there is any one thing that helped the Tories to win the general election, it was their appeal to the emotions of the voters. The Labour Party merely left the facts to speak for themselves; but facts should be sown in hearts already cultivated to receive them, and not just scattered in the hope of finding the people responsive.

We in the CPPA are not overwhelmed by the disappointment caused by Labour's defeat; and when we hear "socialists" advocating the abandonment of Socialism, we echo the thoughts of a young West Indian girl, who, on the eve of the general election, wrote to Mr. Gaitskell saying: "Long may you and your party live, and even longer will the lighted candles stand aglow for the Socialist Party in England and the World".

Notting Hill Notebook is written and edited by members of the Coloured People's Progressive Association of Notting Hill to whom we are acting as hosts. All views expressed in this column are those of the CPPA and all correspondence in connexion with it should be addressed to: The Secretary, Coloured People's Progressive Association, 14a Tavistock Crescent, London, W.11. (Tel.: BAYswater 3736.)

● from page 1

image of its complete subservience to the American alliance. There is no tendency within the Liberal Party (as there is in the Labour Party) which stands for any more decisive break with bourgeois assumptions. Its "progressiveness" is that of rationalized, streamlined, slightly civilized capitalism. The organs of Liberal opinion (*Spectator*, *Observer*, *Guardian*) combine a middle-class conscience on foreign policy with a blatant domestic Toryism on such issues as the Rent Act and industrial disputes.

Even on purely electoral calculations, Labour has little to gain from an "understanding" with the Liberals. The fluctuations in the Liberal poll since 1950 are far more a function of the number of Liberal candidates that happen to be standing than of any ideological undercurrents at work in the electorate. Where a Liberal replaced a Labour man as the "second candidate" in the recent election, it was usually in a Conservative safe seat. The most significant facts in post-war electoral history are not the ups and downs of Liberalism.

Since the election of 1950, the Labour Party and the Liberal Party have each lost a million voters. (The Liberal loss is of course largely due to the smaller number of candidates since that date.) The Tories have gained over a million; partly from 1950 Liberals, since theirs was an anti-Labour vote, and there are about a million more abstainers than in 1950. The phenomenon of Labour abstention (which lost the 1955 election) is still with us, although in lesser degree. The "missing voters" are still to be won back.

But the question cannot be dealt with in terms of constituency arithmetic. Political alliances, as Trotsky remarked, have their dynamics as well as their mathematics. Any degree of alliance with Liberalism could not fail to influence the content of Labour's program, and the balance of forces within the Labour Party itself. The influence would inevitably be in a Right-wing and anti-trade union direction.

It would be wrong, however, simply to shrug off the rise in the Liberal vote. Liberalism works by giving bourgeois answers to radical questions. The role of workers in the control of industry, democracy within the unions, national boundaries, the colonial and nuclear issues, all these problems are openly posed, in a distorted form, by Liberalism. Liberalism is a half-way house to Toryism for the majority of its adherents. For certain bourgeois Radicals, however, as for ED Morel and the young Marx, the natural transition may be towards Socialism. How far this change is possible depends on the energy and principle of the REAL Left: the Marxists in the working-class movement.

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 35b Priory Avenue, NW6.
Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. TU, Bush Fair, Harlow, Essex

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 or Moscow.