

SOCIALIST REVIEW GROUP
(CLIFF)
(950-62)

Socialist Review

Vol. 2. No. 1.

APRIL—MAY, 1952

SIXPENCE

CONTENTS

	Page		Page
One Way Only! — But Which Way?	1	South Africa To-day	8
Lessons of the E.N.V. Strike	4	The Old Firm	10
U-Scheme and You	5	Spoils of War	11
Where Ignorance is Bliss	6	Even Beaverbrook's Sore!	12

ONE WAY ONLY! — BUT WHICH WAY?

MUST THERE BE A SPLIT?

As we go to press, the newspapers are busily engaged in splashing melodramatic stories of the Attlee-Bevan dispute. The Press lords can ill conceal their desire to see an irreconcilable split develop, not merely in the Parliamentary Labour Party, but in the British labour movement as a whole. It would be a great day for the Tories if this occurred: disunited, disorganised and squabbling, the movement would be unable to offer effective resistance to the next wave of attacks on the living standards of the workers.

Whilst it is, therefore, a healthy reaction that the rank-and-file should seek to preserve unity, we must sharply disagree with those who call for unity at any price, for the only unity of any value is that based on political agreement. We must also violently disagree with those who suggest that the differences should be discussed behind closed doors. This would be not only disastrous, but futile, because one of the factors in the making of the present crisis is that, despite so-called conferences, Labour's real policy—the one the Government has actually carried out—has, for six years at least, been decided in precisely that way, behind the doors of Transport House and No. 10, Downing Street. As the *New Statesman* (March 15th, 1952) put it:

"As long as Mr. Attlee was Premier, every decision was taken secretly in the Cabinet, and the Parliamentary Party was not even consulted before these Cabinet decisions were presented to Parliament. In the same way, annual conference became a mass meeting to applaud policies evolved by Mr. Attlee's Cabinet. Conference and the Parliamentary Party could, of course, influence Ministers in private discussion; they could protest, usually unavailingly, against glaring errors. What they could not do was to formulate policy or take decisions."

This procedure is dangerously similar to Party democracy on the Tory pattern. According to Sir David Maxwell Fyfe—and he should know!—their "final arbiter" on matters of policy is not their

annual get-together, but Winston Churchill. Whether or not that suits the Tory rank-and-file we couldn't care less, but it's certainly not good enough for Labour.

Political differences are certain to arise in any labour movement that is not sterile: the important thing is that they should be discussed without regard to personalities, fully, frankly and openly, in a democratic atmosphere, free from block votes, threats of expulsion and all other bureaucratic devices, with all the parties to the discussions having only one ultimate concern: that the resultant policy shall advance the socialist cause.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE REVOLT.

The revolt of the 57 M.P.s reflects the uneasy and rebellious mood that the policy of the leadership has created amongst the rank-and-file. This vote against the war-plans that Churchill has inherited from Attlee, was cast in deliberate defiance of specific orders. Followed as it was by the abortive attempt to have the rebels thrown to the wolves, and thereby to nip the growing left-wing movement in the bud, it is without doubt the worst rebuff suffered by the Attlee leadership in the whole post-war period. This is far worse, from their angle, than the electoral defeat last year, for that, to the Attlees and the Morrisons was merely another round in the parliamentary game of "ins and outs," a game they have long since settled down to play as "respectable" pillars of British capitalist society.

This rift in the parliamentary lute undoubtedly opens up a prolonged struggle of ideas within the British labour movement. In order that this golden opportunity to win the movement for a socialist policy shall not be mishandled, it is essential that the basis of the present conflict and the real character of the participants shall be clearly understood.

THE ROOTS OF THE DISPUTE.

This crisis is not something that the wicked Bevanite bogey-men have planted on Attlee's doorstep at dead of night: it stems directly from the complete failure of the Attlees and the

Deakins to lead the workers in struggle against the Tories. Measured against the evil Tory plans to drive our living standards down to coolie level, their tactics are grotesque.

Not content with their own miserable failure, they do their utmost to pledge the workers against using the one weapon the Tories fear above all others: the political strike. Why should the workers submit to heavy blows below the belt and, at the same time, agree to continue the fight with one hand tied behind their back? Who can genuinely dispute the right of the miner, for example, to decide whether or not he shall hew the coal without which his class enemies could not possibly cling to power for even one more week? Far-sighted workers realise this, and, in South Wales and Sheffield for example, are striving to organise themselves for militant action. This is a tangible effort to counter the vicious slashes of the Butler Axe, and stands in direct contrast to the shilly-shallying of our simon-pure Parliamentarians.

A CLASS BUDGET.

Who could assess from, for example, Hugh Gaitskell's "opposition" that the Butler Budget is one of the most cunning and venomous pieces of class knavery that has been contrived for many a long day? Taken in conjunction, as it must be, with the social service cuts and other measures previously announced, his Budget can only result in a shattering rise in the cost of living and in unemployment. Unless the workers take effective action, it's full speed back to the dole queues and the soup kitchens.

The lower-paid workers, to whom income tax relief is a grim joke—they don't earn enough to pay any!—suffer immediate reduction in their real incomes. But they will not suffer alone, for the slashing of the food subsidies, increased petrol-tax, purchase-tax changes, and the raising of the bank rate, etc., will inevitably and rapidly, reduce the real incomes of the rest of the working and lower middle classes. The few wretched crumbs of tax relief and increased allowances with which the Chancellor has baited the trap, do not even begin to compensate for the reductions in real incomes that soaring prices have *already* effected.

Effective opposition to the Budget and the other vicious measures the Tories intend to introduce can only be achieved on a socialist basis. What we are at present witnessing—crisis after crisis following upon each other with unfailing and sickening regularity—must, in the last analysis, be attributed to the decline of world capitalism. Each year, each day it is allowed to continue its senile existence, spells increased misery for humanity. Its slumps and wars become ever more frequent and severe. To-day they threaten the very existence of civilisation itself.

Consequently, our epoch poses one central question: *for* or *against* capitalism? There is no evading the question and no middle course. Even social-democratic parties must answer, and, when they come to power, they must answer either by changing the economic system, using the vast productive forces and potentialities of society for

the material betterment of the people, or by becoming, willy-nilly, pliant tools of the capitalist class.

1945 AND ALL THAT.

If, in 1945, the British labour leaders had wished radically to change the economic system, they had the most favourable circumstances that could ever be hoped for. With their overwhelming popular support, they could easily have overcome any undemocratic resistance to the wishes of the people. But Attlee's Government chose to administer ailing British capitalism, and made not the slightest attempt to destroy it, to replace it with the system we claim to be superior in every way; the socialist system.

Even Transport House is now prepared to admit * that the concentration of wealth into ever fewer hands—the normal trend within monopoly capitalism—was unimpeded by the six years of Labour rule.

The real government of the country was left in the hands of the same old retainers of the ruling class, trained for capitalist officialdom at Eton and Harrow. The various key departments—Home, Foreign and War Offices—continued to be dominated by these people; and, with the same advisors went the same advice. Meanwhile, the Press, without rebuke—let alone action!—by the Attlee Government, combined its slanders of the workers and of socialism with an adroit defence of capitalist profiteering.

By leaving control of the State, the Press and the bulk of industry unaltered, the Labour Government was quietly digging its own grave. The inexorable logic of their chosen rôle meant doing things contrary to the interests of the working-class, such as maintaining and extending conscription, freezing wages, and placing nationalised industry under bureaucratic control.

From 1945 until 1948 the appearance of being progressive could be maintained with little difficulty. Devastation due to the war had created an international demand for goods that even the industrial colossus across the Atlantic could not satisfy single-handed. Britain cashed in on the seller's market and experienced unexpected prosperity. With a greatly expanded national cake, the British capitalist class was not too disgruntled when the Labour Government gave the workers a few crumbs, a few reforms. They were satisfied so long as they could continue their orgy of profit-making uninterrupted by strikes and social disturbances.

Only when the boom ended, in 1949, and full employment began to depend increasingly upon the arms drive did Labour's rule become really irksome to the capitalists. They were no longer willing for the workers to enjoy a comparatively high standard of living and decent social services. By some pretext or other these things had to be whittled away.

As the economic situation worsened, the first cuts were imposed. The Labour Government was not chary of making them; they lowered working-class living standards and left capitalist wealth virtually untouched. Had Labour been returned to

**Monopoly*, Labour Party pamphlet, Aug. 1951.

power in October they would certainly have carried through further stringent economies. In fact the very plans for Butler's first cuts were drafted before Labour was defeated.

POT AND KETTLE.

How can anyone expect this "leadership" effectively to oppose measures not substantially different from those which they themselves would now be enacting if they had been returned to power? And this similarity of policies between the Labour leaders and the Tories extends over the whole gamut of world affairs. Even when, to placate the rank-and-file, an Attlee or a Morrison indulges in a little shadow-boxing with the Tories on foreign policy, the result is a disastrous fiasco. Churchill has only to make public the news about Attlee's atom-bomb, or to spill the beans about Morrison's secret agreement with Washington—an agreement that virtually gives Truman *carte blanche* to extend the war to China—and, to the tune of Tory jeers, the miserable bubble of their "opposition" is ignominiously pricked. Like the Tories, they support the monopolists of Wall Street in their struggle with the state-capitalist magnates of the Kremlin, for the domination and exploitation of the world.

The game is up! These "leaders" can now be seen in their true colours. They are the fifth column within the labour movement. By bamboozling workers not gullible enough to be sucked in by the open representatives of the capitalist class, the Tory Party, they divert the movement from its task of destroying capitalism. They are, to use De Leon's apt phrase, the labour lieutenants of the capitalist class. If any progress towards socialism is to be made, the labour movement, both its political and industrial wings, must liberate itself from these leaders. The utter bankruptcy of their class collaborationist politics must become ever more apparent as the problems of British capitalism become more acute. Churchill's rule will bring misery and unemployment and it will be clear for all to see that these evils will be remedied, not by a mere change of faces at the top—Attlee's for Churchill's—but only by the destruction of the out-dated economic system, and its replacement by socialism.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

Much human suffering can be averted if the policy of the labour movement can be changed quickly enough. The attack on our living standards can be repelled if a bold, resolute socialist programme is adopted.

It is, therefore, of great urgency that the left-wing organise themselves to remove the present leadership, repudiate their commitments and scrap their policy. In this connection the present Bevanite opposition is of tremendous importance, for it is the first serious break with the Attlee-Morrison leadership by any substantial or influential section of the movement. Even though it is, at first, confined to one or two issues, the vital thing is that such a break has been made. It is a great step forward.

In this situation, the first task of socialists is to defend Bevan and his colleagues against the Party bureaucracy. In the local organisations, both

political and industrial, the campaign against rearmament must be developed and the area of disagreement with the leadership widened as much as possible. In the course of the struggle wide sections of the rank-and-file will develop far beyond the ideas of Bevanism, and will begin to forge a leadership really serious in its determination to achieve socialism.

QUO VADIS BEVAN?

Our support for the Bevanite leaders in their struggle with the official leadership must be given without spreading or holding illusions as to their political characters.

Popularity gained because of past "left" utterances has been unscrupulously exploited by people like Strachey and Strauss in their efforts to pass counterfeit political coin without detection. But the most eloquent and successful—and by the same token, the most harmful—of this new crop of "guilty men" has been Aneurin Bevan.

At conference after conference he has been the star spokesman of the N.E.C. on the "sticky" questions: on matters ranging from opposing the immediate abolition of the tied cottage system to persuading delegates to swallow such reactionary documents as *Labour and the New Society* and *Labour Believes in Britain*. On such occasions his mouth fairly bulged with "left" phrases, but they were only used to cloak the policies he was defending. He was Attlee's left hand man.

The fact that Bevan is at present engaged in a bitter struggle with his former chief must not be permitted to obscure his past record, especially as, despite the controversy, he continues to defend the ideas that were the basis of his fraternal services for Attlee and the N.E.C. He does not admit the necessity of drastic alteration of policy,* but harks back to the dismal past, hoping to breathe new life into reformism. He offers a policy that is, no less than Attlee's, doomed to be shattered on the hard rock of capitalist reality.

This means that Bevan is not at all dependable; lacking the rudder of the Marxist approach, he can be swept to any corner of the troubled political seas. It cannot be excluded that he may even, like the pre-war "leaders" of the left-wing, return to his quiet haven with the official leadership. Those who discount this possibility should study the history of the Socialist League. Its leaders, Cripps and Strauss, made speeches far more "left" than those Bevan is making to-day and finally suffered expulsion from the Party. But both crawled back into the fold, and later, as "loyal Ministers of the Crown," enthusiastically and without a blush, operated the very policies they had previously condemned.

To-day's left-wing must learn from the history of the Socialist League: the rank-and-file must forge its own policy and leadership, not simply accept a ready-made one, neither Bevan's nor

*For example, in *One Way Only* (p.16): "There is no need whatsoever for the Government and the Party to engage in a frantic search for new policies to deal with the present situation. All that is needed is the resolute implementation of the ideas which the Party has already worked out and the policies which it has already adopted."

anyone else's. Only in this way can we guard against the ignominious collapse and betrayal of the left-wing organisation when things get hot, as happened in 1939 when the Socialist League was proscribed.

PRINCIPLES OR MATHEMATICS?

In any case, acceptance of the Bevanite line would hamstring the left-wing. It would confine the struggle to the question of the *size* of the rearmament programme; whether £4,700m.—or is it £5,200m. now?—should be spent, or whether it should be restricted to £3,600m., so as not to endanger the British *capitalist* economy. Instead of enmeshing itself in such dubious mathematical posers, the left-wing must hack at the very roots of the problem: against the *principle* of rearmament.

Besides becoming embroiled in the task of explaining why £3,600m. is good whereas £4,700m. is bad, every Bevanite has worse problems to face. He must explain why the working-class should approve the expenditure of a single farthing—let alone £3,600m.!—in order that "law and order" shall be maintained for the "benefit" of coloured workers who have been ill-advised enough to have been born in the British Empire, and in order to support Dollar Imperialism in its struggle with Russian Imperialism. The Bevanite must also defend the use of British troops in Korea to bolster the corrupt regime of Syngman Rhee, he must accept the Truman-Attlee agreements, and . . . on no account must he denounce Churchill as a war-monger!

All this is Bevanite doctrine that can be verified by reference to the speeches made in Parliament by Bevan, Jennie Lee, and Freeman. That these speeches are heavily salted with left phraseology makes not the slightest difference to the essence of the politics expounded.

On affairs at home the Bevanites are not one whit better. They defend the record of the Labour Government, practically lock stock and barrel, and, except for the sugar and cement industries, oppose further nationalisation. They never speak about workers' control of industry, except perhaps to oppose it; veto strike action against the Tories, and accept the continued existence of British capitalism for an indefinite period.

By accepting Attlee's reformist quackery, as at bottom it does, Bevanism undermines the case against him. For workers anxious, not only to defend themselves against the Tory onslaught, but also to continue the fight for socialism, it is no more suitable as an ideological weapon than is the discredited policy of the official leaders.

BUILD THE LEFT WING.

On May Day, our traditional day of re-dedication to the Socialist cause, we must, this year, renew our determination to co-ordinate left-wing activity and to work out a programme for the only kind of rearmament which can benefit the worker; that is, the *ideological* rearmament of the labour movement. This is the only way to help prepare our movement for the battles ahead; the battles against the unholy alliance of the neo-Tory right-wing Labour leadership and the Tories proper.

The co-ordinated left-wing must forge links with all other forces throughout the world that stand *for* socialism and *against* both the imperialist war-blocs. Thus alone will it be possible to conduct more effectively than at present the only genuine struggle to prevent war—the struggle for international socialism.

LESSONS OF THE E.N.V. STRIKE

by G. Carlsson (member of Strike Committee)

In last issue of *Socialist Review*, the first weeks of the dispute at E.N.V. were fully dealt with. The strike has now ended. After examining the settlement reached and the methods employed to reach it, we must draw the lessons that the strike holds for future struggles.

On January 23rd. the strike committee, summoned to meet by Bro. J. Scott, an E.C. member of the A.E.U., was informed that the E.C. had met the Chief Conciliation Officer of the Ministry of Labour on January 16th. Following upon this discussion the Minister of Labour had appointed a Court of Enquiry. The E.C. of the A.E.U. and the Employers' Federation had agreed that this Court of Enquiry's findings *should be binding on both sides.*

This news was received with mixed feelings by the Strike Committee. Some members severely criticised the E.C. for taking this important step without first consulting the workers concerned. Bro. Scott argued this was the first time the A.E.U. had forced the employers to accept an "independent ruling" in a dispute, "a great advance for the Union." He said we could not now repudiate this Court; we had "pledged our word," and to withdraw would result in unfavourable publicity.

Whilst it is true that Bro. Scott—a leading Stalinist—was speaking on behalf of the E.C., he at no time intimated that his own views were *different to those of the E. C.*

Our misgivings were based on experience of previous Courts of Enquiry. Most decisions had turned out to be against the interests of the workers. We argued that the E.C., instead of agreeing to a Court of Enquiry, should have intensified the struggle by drawing more workers into action. (During the whole thirteen weeks of the strike the E.C. at no time "blackened" E.N.V. work). However, our Committee, presented with this *fait accompli*, had little alternative but to accept.

The Court of Enquiry, held on January 30th. was comprised of one from the Employers' side, (not from the Engineering Federation,) one T.U. official (not A.E.U.), and a chairman nominated by the Minister of Labour, Professor Jack of Durham University. The Court's findings, issued on February 1st., read:— (All emphases mine G.C.)

"We have carefully considered the evidence and submissions of the parties, and we should like to place on record our opinion that the substance of the dispute under review *in no way justified the action taken by the Shop Stewards' Convenor and later supported by the Union.* We see no reason why the normal disputes procedure of the industry should not have

been operated, and *we strongly deprecate the use of strike action in this case.*

"We find that the foreman was at fault in that his attitude was not always strictly in accordance with the best interests of the industry or with the observance of the procedure laid down for it.

"On the other hand, we can find no justification for the summary *disregard of a written apology and guarantee submitted to the Convenor* on 9th November. It was agreed at the hearing that the Convenor had full knowledge of the procedure laid down by mutual agreement, and the events as described to us show, in our view, quite conclusively that the procedure was neglected by him.

We therefore find, and so recommend, first, that full working at the E.N.V. Engineering Co. be resumed without delay; second the foreman concerned in these proceedings should be transferred to other work in the company, commensurate with his abilities; and third, *that the Convenor concerned in these proceedings should be removed from his Convenorship.*"

Msgivings voiced earlier by some members of the Strike Committee were shown to have been fully justified, for this statement is largely an indictment of the Convenor and the Union.

POINT 1 " . . . *in no way justified the action taken by the Shop Stewards' Convenor and later supported by the Union.*"

In fact, the Convenor's action was, that, at the request of the Shop Stewards' Committee, he called a factory meeting. The mass meeting itself decided upon strike action.

POINT 2 " . . . *we strongly deprecate the use of strike action in this case.*"

Who can remember an occasion when a Government-sponsored "independent" body did support strike action?

POINT 3 " . . . *disregard of a written apology and guarantee submitted to the convenor . . .*"

The foreman had apologised on no less than three occasions previously. It does not seem unreasonable that his apology should have been disregarded, on this fourth occasion, as of negligible value.

The E.N.V. workers have won an important victory by the removal of the foreman, but they have also suffered a severe setback by having to accept the third recommendation of the Court.

That this democratically elected representative of the workers should have been removed from his position by an outside body is a precedent to be viewed with the gravest concern by organised labour.

What right have Courts of Enquiry, with their "independent" Chairmen—usually, as in this case, individuals totally divorced from the life of the workers—to decide whom the workers shall or shall not have as their representatives? Our movement fought many bitter battles to win the right for workers to have their own representatives. We cannot afford to allow it to be filched from us.

The responsibility for the present situation at E.N.V. must to a large extent devolve upon the E.C. of the A.E.U. for consenting to such a Court of Enquiry.

Despite this setback, the workers at E.N.V. have learnt valuable lessons during their struggle. They know that their only allies are organised workers, they have no doubts now as to where the sympathies of the police lie, they understand the need to defend their rights, and above all they understand the class nature of "independent" Courts of Enquiry.

From A.E.U. members everywhere let the following demands go forward to our Executive Council:—

1. No more participation in Courts of Enquiry.
2. In future industrial disputes, bring the full weight of the Union into the struggle from the beginning. Make our A.E.U. a real fighting Union.

U-SCHEME AND YOU

by Peter D. Morgan.

The Report of the Douglas Committee on the future of Utility goods has been passed over by almost the entire National Press without comment or with only the most perfunctory remarks*

This article examines the reasons for the introduction of the U-scheme, comments on the effect thereof and discusses the proposals of the Douglas Committee.

Clothing including footwear—was probably the most important class of commodities covered by the Utility Scheme. It was also the first to be regulated in this way (July, 1941).

Schemes for furniture and other items of household use followed later, but the reasons for their introduction were the same as for clothing so the underlying plan will be outlined as a general principle.

The U-Scheme was originally brought in to counter growing war-time inflation and the danger of industrial unrest due to general scarcity of goods. So when commodity-rationing was introduced, maximum retail prices were imposed to allow those who possessed coupons or dockets to purchase at least a portion of their ration-entitlement. But whilst establishment of maximum prices for matches or soap is a comparatively simple matter, its extension to clothing or furniture involves the consideration of very complicated price-structures covering a wide variety of goods of many different grades and qualities. Implicit in the scheme therefore, was the initiation of Government inspection and this was eagerly welcomed by various national bodies—such as the British Standards Institution—which had for years been attempting to build up minimum standards of quality in industries notorious for shoddy goods. Even more eagerly the Trade Unions jumped at this opportunity to put out of business some of the old sweat-shops and to clean up some of the rotten wages and working conditions. The greatest value of the Utility Schemes, from the consumer's point of view, was of course, that Utility goods were exempt from Purchase-tax. This positive incentive to purchase U-goods placed manufacturers in the same position as those

*This article was written before the Budget. Readers know, of course, that the U-Scheme is now scrapped in favour of the D-scheme. Ed.

doctors who would prefer to devote their time to private patients but know all too well that they must look after the capitation fees from the panel patients.

This is not to say that these trades did not share in the post-war boom; the following tables of expenditure on furniture and clothing testify that they did very well indeed!

	1945	1946
	£m.	£m.
Furniture and Furnishings	92	176
Footwear	94	108
Men's and Boy's clothing	130	157
Women's Wear	293	346

(National Income and Expenditure, 1938-46, Table 25, H.M.S.O.)

Money figures are not yet available for the following years but the following indices confirm that a steady upward trend continued:—

(in percentages: 1948 = 100)

	1946	1947	1949	1950
Durable household goods ...	69	90	114	130
Clothing	72	82	112	118

(National Income and Expenditure, 1946-50, Table 17, H.M.S.O.)

The same story is also expressed very clearly in the figures of profits for those years although, unfortunately, no separate figures are given for the furniture trade:—

(in £m.)

	1947	1948	1949
Textiles	112	145	157
Clothing	38	44	48

(National Income and Expenditure, 1946-50, Table 8, H.M.S.O.)

This trend continued until mid-way through 1951. Even the 1951 figures are up. "An analysis of company profits published by the *Financial Times* shows the gross profits of 84 clothing firms who published reports in 1951 amounted to £17,346,000 compared with £13,956,000 in 1950." (*The Garment Worker*, Feb., 1952.)

In addition to this, £31m. in subsidies was paid over to cloth manufacturers alone during the years 1946-48 in order to maintain Utility price-ceilings.

However, the startling rises in wholesale prices of imported raw materials since the Korean war began and the general tightening of money in this country have knocked the bottom out of the market for household goods and wearing apparel. In any case, it is now all too obviously Government policy to 'discourage' spending on such luxuries as clothing and furniture. This explains the proposals of the Douglas Committee: that the Utility Scheme should be abolished in favour of the "D" Scheme. The "D" Scheme would place a graduated sales tax on the value of goods above a certain unspecified figure. £1 has been widely mentioned—a figure which, at to-day's prices, would embrace the vast majority of household goods and most clothing. At the same time, the Report piously recommended the Board of Trade should encourage industries to adopt certain minimum standards. The manufacturers had encouragement before the war, but with precious little result.

Even the Press felt unable to recommend this miserable proposal for a step backwards. The *Birmingham Mail* (Feb. 21, 1952) commented "It would shift the burden of tax from more expensive to cheaper goods and hit the lower income groups." The Report has had an almost unanimously adverse reception from the public and the Trade Unions. Even the Furniture Development Council—hardly a socialist body—considered it "a matter of paramount importance that the Utility scheme should not be given up." The Housewives' League—of all people!—have also found the scheme unpalatable.

Despite Attlee's protest in the House of Commons (Jan. 31st, 1952) against these proposals, which, he opined, "would favour the wealthy against the poor," it has to be remembered that the Douglas Committee was set up in July, 1951, under Attlee's own Government, and its very composition ensured that something along these lines would appear. Only one trade union representative was invited to serve, and yet it consisted of eight members, and included representatives of the F.B.I., the Retail Distributive Association and the Wholesale Textile Association.

As Socialists, we realise that all attempts to restrain the greed and inefficiency of capitalism are doomed to failure in the long run. But at least the U-Scheme had distinct advantages over one which quite clearly sets out to assist the drive to cut the workers' living standards in the interests of re-armament. March 1st, 1952.

WHERE IGNORANCE IS BLISS

By Brenda Grant.

Of all Conservative attacks on the Social Services, that on education has been most widely criticised. In cutting education, they have angered not only the working class, but also most of the school teachers, and education officials.

However, the fact that a five per cent. cut is so serious shows how desperately marginal was the British educational system after six years of Labour rule. This article will therefore attempt to assess the cuts against the background of the condition of education when Labour lost office.

The first Tory retrogression was the exclusion of the Minister of Education from the new Cabinet. Nevertheless, the new Minister, Miss Horsburgh, soon made her name known via the issue of Circulars 242 and 245, which, although officially merely proposals, have largely the effect of decrees.

Circular 242.

Circular 242 asks Local Education Authorities to reduce expenditure on Main Grant Services by five per cent. In some areas, it suggests, smaller reductions could be made; in others larger. It will affect the progressive authorities, who have planned ahead, more than it will the backward authorities, to whom it will merely be an excuse to "economise" still further. The chief items to be cut are school transport, further education, grants to students, nursery schools, school medical and dental services, teachers' salaries, the number of teachers, expenditure on playgrounds, recreational training, stationery and provision of special facilities for

backward, blind, deaf, dumb and crippled children.

Within a few weeks many examples of these economies have been reported. Here is a brief selection:—

Special Schools.

Cornwall intends to "save" £1,000 "at the expense of children who are deaf, dumb, blind and backward."

(*Reynolds News*, 10th Feb., 1952).

Nursery Schools.

"Warwickshire Education Committee adopted by 21 votes to 13 to-day a recommendation of a special economy sub-committee to abolish the county's eight nursery schools and classes with effect from March 31st."

(*Manchester Guardian*, 22nd Jan., 1952).

Students' Grants.

"At a packed meeting of Guild Council last Monday evening, it was decided by an overwhelming majority, to deliver a strongly worded protest to Miss Horsburgh, the Minister of Education, against the proposed reduction in Education Expenditure. Originally these "cuts" were to have been made in 'Educational Administration' (whatever that means!) but many local authorities have already reduced the amounts of their grants to University Students."

(*Birmingham University Guild News*, 31st Jan., 1952).

Medical and Dental Services (Northants).

"In the medical inspection and treatment service savings include £1,496 on salaries by omitting provision for an additional school dentist and dental attendant and a medical officer, and £1,552 on drugs, medical requisites and apparatus. Provision of a second mobile dental clinic has been deleted from the estimates."

(*Northamptonshire Evening Telegraph*, 2nd Feb., 1952).

Teachers.

Cornwall Primary Schools. "A saving of £27,000 was effected by cutting out provision for the engagement of six head teachers, 21 assistants and ten other staff."

(*Western Morning News*, 18th Jan., 1952).

In spite of all these cuts the *Sunday Times* (27-1-52) reported:

"Although the economies already announced by education committees will effect a substantial reduction in the forecast increase of £20,000,000 for the year, they may well not exceed a half of the Minister's target of five per cent. of the total main-grant expenditure. No authority has yet been reported as exceeding five per cent., and most are considerably below. Doncaster will reach the target and Manchester is close with economies of 4.7 per cent., but the figure for Sheffield, for instance, is 0.86 and for Cardiff 0.6." To these examples might be added London County Council with a cut of £1,120,000 or 4.4 per cent. of the original estimates, and Middlesex County Council with £457,710 or almost three per cent. Birkenhead, on the other hand, had given a lead to all

Labour-controlled Authorities. They have "rejected the Ministry of Education's request to cut down their financial estimates."

(*Birkenhead News*, 23rd Jan., 1952).

Although the cuts, according to the Conservatives, were to be chiefly in administration expenses, this has not been so, largely because it could not be so. The educational expenditure of a typical county council is allocated as follows:—56 per cent. to teachers' salaries, books, stationery, school medical service, and special educational treatment; another 20 per cent. covers rent, rates, taxes, heating and lighting, loan charges, cleaning and maintenance. Thus the 5 per cent. economy mentioned in Circular 242 is "officially" not intended to affect approximately 76 per cent. of the Authority's expenditure (in the case of a typical county borough the expenditure which should not be affected is approximately 87 per cent.; therefore, the five per cent. economy should fall on the remaining thirteen per cent.)

(Figures from *Tribune*, 22nd Feb., 1952).

* * * *

Circular 245.

The other edict, Circular 245, has been justly termed by Fred Peart, M.P., "the Charter of the Slum School."

Its effect is well expressed by a county education officer:

"In paragraph 21 (of Circular 245), the Minister states that she will consider requests for additional expenditure in the minor building programme only if such expenditure is devoted specifically to providing new school places. In other words, we are entering a period of unknown duration during which improvements are practically ruled out unless those improvements are solely to provide new spaces for additional children. Consider the effect of this decision on a rural area which suffered from the economic depression in the years before the war. In such an area there will be a number of schools where teaching conditions are intolerably bad and a great number of these schools will be all-age schools. For the children who go to these schools it will be as though the Education Act had never been passed."

(Quoted in *Times Educ. Supp.*, 22nd Feb., 1952).

The decision of the Government—under heavy pressure from the Labour Party and Trade Unions—not to alter the period of school attendance for the time being, coupled with the need to provide for the "bulge" of about a million children born in excess of the normal birthrate during the war and the immediate post war years, limits the extent to which plans for additional school accommodation can be cut. The position is already desperate, as the following report shows:

"In Lancashire the effect of Circular 245 is to reduce the primary and secondary building programmes for 1951-52 from £1,155,280 to £294,000. The 1952-53 programmes will amount to about £1,200,000. For 1951-52 this means that 11 schools out of 16 will be struck from the programme. Some of these may not find a place in 1952-53."

(*Times Educ. Supp.*, 22nd Feb., 1952).

Mr. George Tomlinson, M.P., the former Minister of Education, contends that there will be 200,000 children between five and fifteen years of age without a place in school in two years' time. These economies have nipped in the bud 75 per cent. of the 1951-52 school building programme and yet they will save only 30,000 tons of steel, less than one quarter of one per. cent. of the national output. It should be noted that these cuts will not apply to the public—i.e. private!—schools, to which most leading Conservatives prefer and can afford to send their own children.

Tory Excuses.

The Tory plea in attempting to justify these iniquitous cuts is two-fold. In the first place, they say, Britain is suffering from a very serious economic crisis. Consequently all sections of the community must sacrifice certain luxuries in the interests of the nation as a whole. The hypocrisy of this is too obvious to deserve comment. We'll discuss it seriously on the day when profits cease to be made from re-armament.

But their second plea is more specific and more difficult to answer. For example, Mr. C. Hollis, M.P., Chairman of the Conservative Education Committee, has had this to say:

"The cuts are not on last year's expenditure, but on next year's proposed expenditure. It had been proposed to increase educational expenditure by about 10 per cent. So even if 5 per cent. should be knocked off that increased figure the present Government will still be spending more money on education than has ever been spent by any other Government in the history of this country."

(*Times Educ. Supp.*, 22nd Feb., 1952).

Whilst this claim is undeniably true, it ignores the sharp decline in (it must be countered) the real value of money, the ever-increasing expenditure on armaments, and above all, the marginal state of the educational system. But the very fact that the Conservatives can truthfully make such a claim should lead us to examine the state of education under the Labour Government. During their six years in power they could have made Britain's educational system worthy of a socialist society. In practice, they failed even to implement the 1944 Act fully, and no socialist could consider that Act as a socialist educational charter. In January, 1951—i.e., under the Labour Government—there were 34,103 classes with over forty pupils on the registers, including 1,123 classes with over fifty pupils, in primary and secondary schools (other than nursery and special schools) maintained or assisted by local education authorities. Tory cuts can, of course, only worsen this already deplorable situation, and must be fought by any and every means, but, nevertheless, it is wrong and dishonest to claim that the Tories have fundamentally reversed the educational policy of the Labour Government. Like the Tories, Attlee and Co., subordinated education and other social services to the re-armament programme.

The Three R's.

However, the Tory record in education is appalling. It is worth recalling, for example, that in the 1860's, Robert Lowe, at that time vice-presi-

dent of the Education Department of H.M. Government, said (and the House of Commons applauded him):

"The lower classes ought to be educated to discharge the duties cast upon them. They should also be educated that they may appreciate and defer to a higher cultivation when they meet it, and the higher classes ought to be educated in a very different manner, in order that they may exhibit to the lower classes that higher education to which, if it were shown them, they would bow down."

The Tories also did their best to thwart Fisher's Education Act of 1918, which aimed at "the establishment of a national system of public education available for all persons capable of profiting thereby." And the spirit of Robert Lowe lived on in the Education Act of 1921, which laid down merely that children between the ages of five and fourteen should "receive efficient elementary instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic."

A Policy for Labour.

In the Labour Movement the struggle must continue for the adoption of a socialist education policy, including the following points:

- (1) Equal educational opportunity for all, regardless of sex, age or district.
- (2) Immediate raising of the school-leaving age to sixteen and to eighteen within five years.
- (3) Immediate large-scale re-building programme for the schools, colleges and universities, and the provision of suitable hostels for students not living at home.
- (4) Immediate increase of grants to all students to an agreed national scale, with equal grants to all students doing the same work.
- (5) Abolition of all local educational authorities; for administration by the Ministry of Education with local consultative councils of student and teacher representatives.
- (6) Abolition of all religious training in State Schools and Universities.
- (7) Immediate standardisation of examinations throughout the country to the highest level now prevailing.
- (8) Abolition of all "closed" scholarships and similar awards and a re-distribution of the money in the form of open competitive awards.
- (9) Abolition of all military training in schools.

SOUTH AFRICA TO-DAY

by David Taylor.

Part I—THE BACKGROUND TO "APARTHEID"

It is a prevalent idea in Britain that the present oppressive regime in South Africa only came into being in 1948, when Dr. Malan and his Nationalist Party came to power. It is the object of this and subsequent articles to dispel this and other myths. We will, therefore, give the background to the present situation in South Africa, show the various conflicting forces that

are present on the contemporary, social and political scene, and finally, compare South Africa with other parts of British Africa.

In 1652 the first white settlers from Holland, under Van Riebeeck, came to South Africa. This year, the tercentenary of that event, is the occasion for great celebrations on the part of the white community of South Africa.

The non-white people of South Africa, however, have no cause for celebrations. For them 1652 marks the beginning of a racial discrimination and oppression in South Africa.

South Africa was a poor agricultural country with a small number of white settlers and a large native population. The latter became tractile and were assimilated into the European economy only after they had been forcibly subdued by a series of savage wars. Once the power of the Xosas, Zulus and Basutos had been broken and most of their land taken away from them, the African people were forced to earn their livelihood by working on the farms and plantations of the white men. These farmers wanted to ensure a plentiful supply of cheap, docile labour: hence the first pass laws and colour-bar legislation in South Africa.

The discovery of diamonds and gold in the 'seventies and 'eighties of last century accelerated the process.

In 1894, under Cecil Rhodes, the Premier of the Cape at that time—himself the most powerful magnate in the Kimberley diamond fields and Johannesburg gold mines—the Glen Grey Act was passed. This Act legalised the forcible division of the land in the Transkei into small pieces. This land had previously been held communally by the African people. At the same time certain cash taxes were imposed. To pay these the African men were obliged to work for a period in the diamond and gold mines. Thus began the migratory, cheap labour system on which the economy of South Africa has been built.

The lack of a common native policy—an inevitable result of the division of South Africa into four independent political entities—became an important motive force for unification. Victory in the Boer War and her consequent control of the whole of Southern Africa, enabled Britain to establish the Union of South Africa in 1910. Effective political control was placed firmly into the hands of the white settlers. Disputes between the English-speaking and Afrikaans-speaking sections of the settlers were seen to be of minor importance compared with the great advantages to be gained by operating a unified white policy against the non-white peoples. The word "against" is used here deliberately because it is clear that from the very first years of the Union of South Africa the main object of the government was to further restrict the freedom of the non-white population and to force them into the white economy on the terms laid down by the Europeans. Hence the first major step of the new government under Louis Botha and Jan Smuts was the Native Land Act of 1911 which further alienated large areas of land from the Africans and prohibited them even from buying land in most parts of the country.

Incidentally, far from being a great democrat, Smuts was deservedly described by the South African poet, Roy Campbell, as "the butcher of Bulhoek and Bondelswart." The epithet refers to two infamous occasions on which he sent troops bloodily to subdue the Africans. Connected with the political life of South Africa for over fifty years, holding high office during a great part of that time, his share in the gradual enslavement of the non-European people was far from insignificant.

Let us list some of the disabilities under which the non-white population of South Africa laboured at the time when Field-Marshal Smuts last went out of office and Dr. Malan's Nationalist Party took power. The Africans had no effective political rights whatsoever. Until 1936 a few Africans had remained on the common electoral roll in the Cape Province, subject to strict property and educational qualifications. In 1936 even this limited right was taken away and three *white* representatives out of a parliament of 159 were to be elected by the Africans. The coloured people of the Cape still retained the limited franchise that the Africans had possessed until 1936. The Indians of South Africa have never had any representation at all. Therefore, of South Africa's population of 11½ millions, 9 millions had no effective political rights. Schools, residential areas, places of recreation and amusement, transport, hospitals and even cemeteries were segregated. Africans were forced to carry a number of passes. The economic colour-bar was even more complete. Africans were debarred by law from almost every skilled occupation, their trade-unions were not recognised and it was illegal for them to strike. In spite of the general labour shortage both during and after the war, the position of the African workers actually deteriorated in the face of the rising prices. The basic wage of an African miner has risen by only 7d. per shift since the 1920's i.e. from 2/- to 2/7d. per shift. Although the African people are still largely a peasant people, land hunger is rampant. Only six per cent of the rural land is owned by the 1.8 million rural Africans, whilst a mere 114,000 white farmers possess the remainder.

By 1948, the pattern of segregation and subjection was almost complete. It was left to Dr. Malan, with his doctrine of *Apartheid*—this word, incidentally, is merely Afrikaans for segregation—to put the finishing touches to the South African Police State. Certain 'anomalies' have now been 'corrected!' For example, non-Europeans were still permitted to travel freely on the Cape Town suburban railway. This 'privilege' has now been withdrawn and separate compartments installed. The Coloureds have now been taken off the common electoral roll just as the African were in 1936. Marriages between white and non-white are now forbidden. The Group Area Act permanently entrenches the existing residential segregation and the Suppression of Communism Act is designed to quell, not only the activities of the Stalinists, but all opposition to the *status quo*. We are not underestimating the viciousness of the present regime in South Africa, but simply showing the essential continuity between present conditions and the past.

The Herronvolk mentality is by no means the monopoly of the Nationalist Party of South Africa and of the Afrikaans-speaking section of the white population. It is merely that Field-Marshal Smuts and his United Party employed subtler methods and used kid-glove tactics, relatively speaking, whilst the leaders of the present regime are crude in their methods and openly avow their intention of "keeping the native in his place"!

(Part II of Comrade Taylor's article, which discusses the alignment of forces in South Africa is unavoidably held over until next issue.—Ed.)

THE OLD FIRM

by Percy Downey.

The recent increase in the price of electricity to the domestic user brings into sharp relief the character of the British Electricity Authority. An investigation of the history and set-up of this nationalized industry proves conclusively that the B.E.A. serves, not the interests of the working class, but that of the capitalists.

Compensation.

The total liabilities in respect of compensation stocks and other capital obligations at vesting day was as follows:—

British electricity stocks	£341,921,407
Loans of former undertakers ...	18,637,687
Local Authority loan debts	176,500,132
Further compensation to local authorities in respect of severance	5,000,000
Total ...	£542,059,226

The majority of the £342m. total compensation stocks went to share-holders of companies and the remainder to share-holders of the former Central Electricity Authorities and of four former joint electricity authorities.

No compensation stock was issued to local authorities. The only "compensation" given was a sum of £5m. to be divided among all the local authorities concerned. This has not yet been paid.

After paying £342m. to the old owners, the newly created B.E.A. found it necessary to raise £250m to modernise the industry in order to satisfy the increased demand for electricity, clear proof that the electricity undertakings nationalized were greatly over compensated. This is even more scandalous when it is borne in mind that of the total capital expenditure of over £331m. from the birth of the industry to vesting day on April 1st, 1948, almost £135m. represented revenue surplus re-invested in the industry. Therefore, more than a third of the money invested was directly created by the workers engaged in electricity undertakings.

Interest and dividends drawn from the industry between 1923 and vesting day totalled almost £219m. (No figures are available of interest and dividends paid prior to 1923) The total capital invested since the beginning of the industry was a little over 190m. Thus the coupon clippers have pocketed sums considerably in excess of what they

have invested in the industry—an excellent case for saying to the old, parasitic owners, "Boys! You've had it!"

This glance at nationalised electricity clearly shows that the Attlee-Citrine brand of "Socialism" is something far removed from the socialism envisaged by the pioneers of the working-class movement.

Marxists have always claimed that unless industry is nationalised without compensation and placed firmly under the control of the workers, exploitation will continue. As we shall show, this point of view is confirmed by the manner in which the industry is controlled and the way in which it deals with the different types of consumers.

Personnel of Board.

Chairman at £8,500 p.a. is Lord Citrine. He was Asst. Gen. Sec., E.T.U., 1920; Ass. Sec., T.U.C., 1924-5; Gen. Sec. T.U.C., 1924-46.

Deputy Chairmen at £5,000 p.a. are Sir Henry Self, Perm. Sec. Ministry of Civil Aviation, and Sir John Hacking, Chief Engineer, Central Electricity Board. E. W. Bussey, Gen. Sec. E.T.U., 1941-8 is a full-time member at £3,500 p.a. Dame Caroline Haslett, Director of the Electricity Association for Women and a member of the Women's Consultative Committee of the Ministry of Labour, Sir William Walker, an Alderman of Manchester, and Lt. Col. E. H. E. Woodward, Director and Gen. Manager of the North Eastern Electric Supply Co., are part-time members at £1,000 p.a. Sir Norman Duke, Sec. of the Scottish Home Dept., N. Elliott, Gen. Manager of London and Home Counties Joint Electricity Authority and L. Howles, Gen. Manager of the Midland Counties Electric Supply, are Chairmen of Area Boards at £4,000 p.a.

It is clear that these people are nothing but the "old gang" plus two or three trade-union bureaucrats. These latter have not been elected to their positions, but, on the contrary, have been appointed and have, in any case, severed their connections with the working-class movement.

Prices to the Consumers.

Much more electricity is used by industry and commerce than by domestic consumers. Of 41,479 millions of units sold during 1949-50, only 13,460 millions were sold to domestic users.

Since the total revenue of the B.E.A. for 1949-50 was £215.46m. and total expenditure was £207.30m., the cost of electricity per unit was 1.20d. and the price per unit sold was 1.24d. (These figures include revenue from sources other than sales of electricity).

It is not possible to discover the average cost per unit to the domestic consumer because the Analysis of Income from Sales of Electricity, B.E.A. *Annual Report*, 1949-50, combines domestic, commercial and small power users. On average, however, these pay 1.52d. per unit compared with 1.45d. the year before, an increase of 0.07d. Together they bought 19,145,895 units for £120,885,877. On the other hand, large power users bought 20,544,895 units, and paid

only £79,188,018 or 0.93d. per unit. Big Business, therefore, whilst using approximately half the electricity produced, buys it for much less than it costs to produce. The small users use less than half of the electricity produced and yet pay a total sum one-and-a-half times as great as that paid by Big Business.

Electricity was originally produced in the interests of big business, other users being encouraged to buy at cheaper rates, in order that it should be used when industry closed down for the day (as electricity cannot be stored). To-day the position has been reversed. The tendency is for the small users to provide the major part of the revenue of the electricity industry, to the advantage of big business. Further proof of this contention is contained in the following quotation:

"Last year Lord Citrine took credit for the fact that the average price to industry had been brought down, while the average price of supplies to domestic and small power users had gone up. This he rightly held to be a desirable trend."
(*Economist*, 13th Oct., 1951).

Wanted—a socialist policy.

This is the same old firm but with a new sign-board. State-capitalism has replaced private capitalism and the main burden of the industry has been placed even more firmly on the backs of the working class, both as workers within the industry and as consumers: all to the advantage of the capitalists, who, whilst continuing to draw large sums of money in interest, are also getting cheaper electricity. This method of nationalisation was without doubt a contributory factor in Labour's defeat in the last election, for on balance, nationalised industries showed little or no benefits to the working class.

Therefore the Labour and Trade Union Movement must adopt a real socialist policy of nationalisation without compensation and under the control of workers' committees. The money thus saved can be used to improve wages in the industry and to cheapen the price of its product to the housewives.

(Facts and figures quoted in this article have been extracted from the February 1952 issue of *Electron* (Journal of the E.T.U.) and from *Annual Report of the B.E.A.*, 1949-50 H.M.S.O.)

SPOILS OF WAR

P. Mansell reviews
Stalin's Satellites in Europe,
by Y. Gluckstein,
(Allen and Unwin, 21/-)

Books about Russia and Eastern Europe which are published to-day by the apologists of capitalism not only condemn the Stalinist system root and branch, but seek to show that the monstrous oppression of which it is guilty is some form of socialism or communism, and thereby discredit these ideas in the minds of their readers. Stalinists and their fellow-travellers also claim that socialism exists in Russia and the "People's Democracies." This propaganda is an equal disservice to the working-class movement, for if these regimes indeed be socialist, then most people would much prefer to dispense with socialism.

The approach of the book under notice differs fundamentally from both these points of view.

Here, for the first time, is a profound Marxist study of the post-war developments in Eastern Europe.

Dealing with his subject in three main sections—the economy of the satellites, their political life, and the "rebellious satellite" Yugoslavia—the writer has packed an enormous amount of precise and well-documented information into this book. In the space of a short article it is not possible to do more than touch upon a few of the little-known and significant facts which he brings to light.

In dealing with land ownership, Mr. Gluckstein shows that, contrary to the belief sedulously fostered by the Communist Parties, an agrarian revolution was *not* carried out in *all* the countries of Eastern Europe after the war. In some the changes were very sweeping, but in others, such as Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, the changes were trifling compared with those carried out *before* 1939. The extent of this pre-war land distribution by governments which by no stretch of imagination could be called socialist, but in some cases were clearly semi-Fascist, completely refutes the argument that because the Stalinists distributed the land in, for example, Hungary, they have, by virtue of that fact, introduced socialism. This familiar argument continues, of course, with the claim that the widespread state ownership in Eastern Europe, as in Russia, is a proof that these are workers' states. But this proposition does not survive Mr. Gluckstein's analysis. He shows that many of the industries became national property after 1945—in some cases *before* the Stalinists came to power—because the defeat of Germany had left them ownerless, and *not* as the result of successful workers' revolutions. So far was Russia from regarding nationalisation as a principle, that the mixed companies—owned half by Russia and half either by private capitalists or the national states—were untouched by nationalisation.

The traditional pattern of trade between imperialist powers and their colonies is for the former to export manufactured goods to, and to import raw material from, the latter. How then can one speak of Russia as an imperialist power when, with her backward economy she is obliged to some extent to reverse this process? Mr. Gluckstein explains that although Russia is indeed forced to some extent to industrialise her colonies in order to increase her own industrial potential, the terms on which she carries on trade with her satellites can leave no doubt that this process is at least as rapacious as the exploitation suffered by the colonies of the older imperialist powers. Poland for example was forced to sell coal to Russia at \$2 per ton—one authority says \$1.25—at a time when she could have got \$12 per ton elsewhere.

Discussing political life, the author makes it clear that democracy and workers' control simply do not exist in the satellites. The Stalinist method of gaining power by infiltrating into the Army and police; their persecution of racial minorities like the Germans in Sudetenland; recognition of state churches; their "elections" at which only one list of candidates appears—all these are the very antithesis of working-class methods and ideology.

Questions which must be answered by any who claim that the countries of Eastern Europe are workers' states are: Unless the fullest democracy exists how can the working-class control the state and if they do not control the state how can they be said to control the statified economies?

How stable is Stalinism? Since the war we have seen the giant strides which it has made in Eastern Europe and China. Is it likely to establish itself for a whole historical period? Mr. Gluckstein points to the rupture between Tito and Stalin as a clear indication of the strains and stresses within the Russian Empire, and analyses the fundamental causes of the rift as economic and political. Russia's opposition to the speedy industrialisation of Yugoslavia and to Tito's policy of slow collectivisation of the land are analysed as well as his project of Danubian Federation. While describing Tito as the successful leader of a national movement in a colonial country, the author does not make the mistake of raising him to the status of a proletarian hero. Tito was and remains the leader of a bureaucratic state-capitalist regime. Nevertheless, he is a portent. In Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania and even in "Free Greece," prominent Stalinist leaders, who had previously been praised as extravagantly as Tito, have, since 1948, been disgraced and "purged" for "nationalistic deviations." How much more likely, contends Mr. Gluckstein, is a similar development within the Communist Parties of Western Europe should they come to power. Here Stalin would be faced by a highly organised working class, accustomed to basically democratic methods of struggle. How could the French working-class, for instance, be persuaded that Russia is the central centre of the universe or the lavish dispenser of socialist gifts when it would be obvious that the standard of life in Russia and the cultural level are so far below their own? This is one of the fatal contradictions within Stalinism. To fight against private-enterprise capitalism it must have the support of the working class; to come to power, and still more to stay in power, it must convert working-class parties into subservient, bureaucratic state machines.

The book ends on the note that "Stalin's Empire has no future": that materially and culturally backward Russian state-capitalism cannot hope indefinitely to hold more advanced countries like Poland and Czechoslovakia, far less Western Europe, should she conceivably conquer it.

This capable study—which we unreservedly recommend to our readers—advances ample proof in support of the author's thesis that the "People's Democracies", like Russia, are bureaucratic state-capitalist regimes. It also gives fresh confirmation to the point of view consistently advocated in *Socialist Review*; namely that Stalinism constitutes as great a threat to the working-class as does Western Imperialism, and that only by opposing the war-plans of both blocs can we achieve our socialist aims.

EVEN BEAVERBROOK'S SORE!

"ALL paper users from the publishers of Fleet Street to the grocer using wrapping paper along High Street, will be staggered at these bumper profits," wrote the "Daily Express" in its City columns, on Friday last, in a caustic reference to the record profits of the Bowater Paper Corporation.

"And those publishers who have had their papers and magazines snuffed out by rising cost of paper will have cause to wonder," the "Express" added.

The Bowater Corporation had reported, that morning, consolidated profits for the year ended September 30 last totalling £10,275,537, compared with £5,395,488 for the previous year.

The Daily Express, discussing the Bowater figures, went on to make the following comments:

"Take a look at newsprint, such as the Daily Express is printed on. Its price has soared from £33/5/- a ton at the end of 1949 to £66/18/3d. now—doubled, like the Bowater profits, which were as much as £3,693,000 in 1949." . . . It is a vast profit to extract out of paper-making when paper users are up against it.

"Are Sir Eric and his fellow paper-makers satisfied with this great prosperity? Not a bit of it—they are at this very moment said to be asking for yet another increase in the price of news-print.

"If that happens, more newspapers, more magazines will be forced to the wall. Prices of those which can survive will be forced up, with a two-penny newspaper becoming a near certainty.

This big paper profit—the rest of the industry has reported profits up from £14,000,000 odd to £28,000,000—should be well studied in high places."

(*World's Press News*, Feb., 15, 1952.)

Readers of *Socialist Review* will welcome its appearance in print. We believe that, at this time, when questions of profound importance are being raised in the Labour movement, it is important that the ideas contained in our journal should be given as wide a circulation as possible. Therefore, to help us to meet both the heavier cost of producing a printed version and the evermore rapacious demands of the paper-barons we appeal again to all readers and sympathisers to contribute to the funds.

Donations should be sent to the editor and publisher:—

WM. S. AINSWORTH,

16, Rowdale Road, Birmingham, 22a.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

3 issues	1/10d. post free.
6 issues	3/7d. post free.
12 issues	7/- post free.

Orders with cash, should be sent to the above address.

Published by Wm. S. Ainsworth, 16, Rowdale Road, Birmingham, 22a; and

Printed by Oliver Amey, Fox Street Printing Works, Preston.