

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

9th YEAR No 7

MID-APRIL 1959

SIXPENCE

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

QUIT AFRICA!

THE CRUEL pattern of colonialism is nowhere more plainly to be seen than in Central Africa, where in addition to distant imperialist rule which crushes the native population through the cold paper calculations of profits, there is the local settler population which daily tramples on their very flesh, in order to preserve the high standards and all the attendant political, cultural and snob values that these profits allow them.

The stranglehold of British plus settler imperialism is so strong that only a giant upheaval of the colonial peoples themselves, and the taking of their destinies into their own hands can dislodge it. **We can lend invaluable assistance to this great movement by battering at our own guilty imperialist government and doing our utmost to ensure that it is thrown out of office, forever.**

Vested interests

The Tory Government, particularly the Prime Minister himself, is intimately tied up with the exploitation of the Africans in the area of the Central African Federation. Julian Amery, son-in-law of Macmillan, and Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, was a director of "Chartered" (the British South Africa Company), which virtually rules Southern and Northern Rhodesia behind the scenes. President of the Company is Lord Robbins (elevated to the Lords last year), a notorious anti-Socialist. Nyasaland Railways Ltd., which owns the railway system in that country, has Mr. C J Holland-Martin, MP, as a director; he is a brother-in-law of Macmillan and Joint Honorary Treasurer of the Conservative Party since 1947. (LRD Fact Service, March 7, 1959.)

Differential wages

These companies that control the economic life of Central Africa make huge profits, much more than are made by similar sized companies in this country. The reason is that unlike here, they can keep the wages of the majority African workers down to below subsistence level.

An idea of their level may be gained from the fact that the average income per head of population in the Federation is £44. This figure includes the very high incomes of the 300,000 Europeans that live in this territory of 7 million Africans. And as African wages are on average a mere one-twentieth of the Europeans' wages, the level of African wages is lower even than this paltry £44. (Compare this with Britain's average income of £300 per head.)

In the best paid sector of the economy, mining, 76 per cent of the Africans in 1956 received less than £3 3s a week, 46 per cent

less than £2 13s. There were 39,035 African miners. Compare this with the wages of the 6,852 white miners. These received an average of £46 a week. In the 3 years advancement towards "partnership" till 1956, a mere 428 Africans had been trained for more skilled jobs, another 268 were undergoing training—"partnership" indeed.

How could the Africans be better paid than they were when of the £52 million net profit of the four principal copper mines that they slaved to create in 1955 over half left the Federation for the pockets of overseas shareholders—the Macmillans and their families.

The miners are the best paid workers. Others fare worse. In employment outside the mines, railways and Government services, 49 per cent of Northern Rhodesian workers earned less than £4 10s a month in 1956. In farming 84 per cent were earning less than £3 a month. For the Federation as a whole the average wage for African workers in "food preparation" was £29 a year and in tobacco manufacture (a profitable crop for European growers, and one of the Federation's principal exports) £60 a year. In Nyasaland, the statutory minimum wage is 1s 3d a day, rising to 2s for industrial labour in the most industrialized region. (**Dominion Status for Central Africa?** by Kenneth Kaunda, A UDC and MCF publication.)

Trade unions attacked

It was not very well known at the time of Garfield Todd's resignation from the Southern Rhodesian Government, when he was accused of liberal tendencies, that one of the proposals he supported was for a minimum wage for Africans in the towns of £6 a month.

Any improvement in African conditions would eat into the super-profits of the settlers and the British imperialists, so that they consider it imperative to clamp down sharply on any African organization which attempts to preserve or raise standards in any way, namely trade unions in the economic field and the African National Congress in the political.

From the time of the Labour Government up to Federation in 1953 certain limited trade union rights were permitted to African mineworkers and some other African workers in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland (as opposed to European-settled Southern Rhodesia where these rights were not allowed.) But after Federation with its fine, hollow "partnership" phrases, most of these rights were done away with, making the trade unions impotent as defensive organizations: picketing was virtually prohibited, compulsory registration and official inspection of all financial transactions were imposed on trade unions, thus giving the authorities complete power over them. This being insufficient for the European overlords, all leaders have now been arrested and imprisoned or restricted to parts of the country far from their workplaces.

Africans dispossessed

The position of the Africans on the land is pitiable, not only because they are denied possession of the good land of their countries, but also because they have no security of tenure of the land they do own. Southern Rhodesia is the most glaring example. Here, under the Land Apportionment Act, more than half the area of the best land of Southern Rhodesia is reserved for the quarter million Europeans, a quarter is not yet allocated and a quarter remains for the 2 million Africans. To carry out the Act, 45,000 Africans in 1957 were turned off land they had lived on for generations. This does not include another 20,000 Southern Rhodesian and 30,000 Northern Rhodesian Africans who were moved to make room for the water that will give power to the Kariba hydro-electric scheme. Fenner Brockway and other MP's got the Government to agree to pay £10 per head to the Northern Rhodesian Africans. (It does not, however, seem sure that they got all this.) The Southern Rhodesian Africans got nothing save 8 of their number shot and 81 dead from diseases resulting from the removal, and a refusal of rations while resettling and growing their first crops (*Ibid*).

(contd. page 7)

INSIDE

Buses

A socialist wages policy?

Aldermaston to London

Japanese labour movement

Parliament

page 2

page 4

page 5

page 7

page 8

INDUSTRIAL

SR is pleased to reprint the following article
by "punch" from PLATFORM, rank and file busmans' journal

STAND FIRM AGAINST ONE MAN BUSES

A NEW school of thought appears to exist in the Central Bus Committee in respect of the threatened introduction of one-man buses. It argues that, as one-man jobs are already operating in the provinces, and in the country area of the LTE, it is unlikely that we shall be able to prevent them coming to the central area.

Therefore, they argue, instead of fighting an already lost cause, let us make the best bargain we can, i.e., demand 55 per cent of the saving on the one-man jobs for the staff. Let us stop beating our heads against the wall and concentrate on getting some more lolly into the driver's pay packet.

Now this all sounds nice and logical—until you begin to think a bit more deeply about the matter—then it doesn't appear nearly so attractive.

Half-way

In the first place, to assume that the central bus section lacks the strength to prevent one-man operation is to throw up the sponge before a blow has even been struck. Along this line of argument, not only one-man buses, but anything at all that the LTE wants to put over, would be accepted in principle, leaving us only to haggle about the price.

In the second place. Why should we believe that we cannot succeed in stopping one-man jobs—but that we CAN succeed in winning 55 per cent of the lolly saved? Remember that the provinces and country service drivers are doing these jobs for 15 per cent. If we take one-man jobs—because they already operate in the provinces—we are already half-way to taking the price paid in the provinces—indeed, some of our permanent officers are already 90 per cent there.

And, if we have to follow the provinces, then one-man jobs are not the only thing we can expect. For instance, they take eight standing in the provinces. What if the LTE propose this for London—will we take it in principle and only argue about price? Some areas have 14 and 15 hour spreadovers—will we take these too—and only argue about price? And, if so, why not put our entire "Conditions of Service Agreement" up for auction to the highest bidder?

Redundancy

Then, again: Is the driver the only person to be considered where one-man buses are concerned? What about the conductor? Every one-man job that takes the road displaces a conductor. True, staff shortage has so far enabled such redundancy to be absorbed—but how much longer will that position last—with more and more service cuts in the offing?

Already, due to one-man jobs, spare lists of conductors are being built up in the country service

area. These men are being "loaned" often under such irksome conditions as to force many to quit the job. Are not conductors members of our union? Isn't it our job to defend them too?

And, when actual redundancy shows among conductors—what about the women? How long before we hear the cry—let's chuck the women out? Yet these women came on to the job with the agreement of our union. They are members of our union too—isn't it our job to protect them? And what will be our attitude when some hero shouts—let's get rid of the coloured men? Shall we do a "Little Rock" on them too?

Carrot

Yes, brothers! It is highly dangerous ground we are treading on this one-man bus question. Unless we are very, very careful, we shall find ourselves doing something we shall regret for a long time to come.

Even the carrot that is being dangled—in the shape of more pay for the one-man driver, is a poisonous one. Once we embark upon this method of "payment by result" which is involved in both this and the "bonus scheme" now under discussion, we are digging a pit that we are likely to fall into ourselves.

Wrong method

Once begin to build up the pay packet by these methods, and be certain the LTE will make full use of the results in all wage negotiations. Did not the bonus scheme they are operating cut the ground from under the feet of the inside staffs at the last wage settlement? So will the financial results of one-man jobs and bonus schemes be used again in the future.

Who gains?

No scheme that was ever yet cooked up in the board room of 55 Broadway was designed to benefit the staff. Surely, everyone must agree that one-man buses provide an inferior service for the public? Surely everyone can see that one-man operations worsen the job for the driver? Surely everyone can see that only the LTE stand to gain? And is that not a very good reason for opposing their plans?

Membership

Finally, let us remember that every man forced out of LTE employment, whether by service cuts, one-man operations, or what have you—means one less member in the T & GWU. Already, since nationalisation we have lost nearly 20,000 uniform and inside staff members—a fact which should cause even the high-priests of "Woodberry" to feel a little uneasy.

Every vehicle that goes over to one-man operation, will, sooner or later, mean one member less in our union—and the more our strength is reduced, the more difficult is our job in defending our conditions.

I have a high regard for our present CBC, but I feel they are making a big mistake on this issue. I cannot refrain from re-

minding some of the CBC members that they were not slow to criticise their predecessors for proposing to "sell conditions for money"—yet, what else is this bargaining on the one-man jobs?

No one pretends that the fight against one-man buses will be easy. No one can guarantee that we shall win it—but, at least, we can try.

T U BUREAUCRACY

by Omar

LOOKING BACK over the years that have gone the observer can clearly see the change that has taken place in the Trade Union Movement.

In the course of time, it has passed from virility to senility. It has conformed very closely to the pattern familiar to all social organizations and institutions.

A characteristic feature of the Movement is: it has ceased to be progressive and now acts as a fetter on progress. Its economic power is often used as a means for preserving the status quo in industry and society.

Through the medium of the TUC General Council it has become a "junior partner" in the State; a defender of the faith and a staunch supporter of the existing social order.

Many of its principal leaders have accepted the myth of immutability: the belief that the profit making system is the alpha and omega of all progress and the most we can expect is the removal of the worst abuses, but the system itself must remain undisturbed.

degeneration

They have also aligned themselves with those who own and rule the land and in so doing, have degenerated into a servile band who judge the change they fear and the cause they do not understand.

In this there is nothing great and nothing to venerate.

This progressive degeneration has grown concurrently with the decline of industrial capitalism.

Together they have grown and in the process, the trade unions have been locked in the python's deadly embrace.

In peace and war, the Trade

Union Bureaucrats have demonstrated their loyalty to the State by placing at its disposal the full resources of the Movement.

While they continue to serve in this manner, the State will tolerate their existence; but the moment its interests are seriously challenged the State will have no scruples and will strike the lethal blow.

An examination of objective facts will show that the stand has been shifted from social reform to social imperialism in order that its existence can be prolonged and only prolonged, because along this road there is no escape; there is no way back. In the long run, it cannot avoid destruction.

Struggle

Experience has also shown that the Trade Unions in our time, unless they are reconstituted, can only serve as secondary instruments in the cause of Imperialism. To fulfil this role the Bureaucratic Leaders must become disciplinarians in possession of the necessary instruments and powers for disciplining and subordinating their membership in the service of capitalism.

In this industrial, as in other social problems, there can be no neutrality; no middle of the road course; neutrality died with the passing of "free bourgeois democracy"; therefore, it is a thing of the past.

From this it can be seen that the trade unions have a task to perform which embraces the struggle against bureaucracy; the restoration of freedom of action that will enable a progressive policy to be pursued. And this can only be achieved by activity on the part of the members within the respective organizations.

SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose ^{16s.} ^{8s.} ^{4s.} subscription for ^{1 year's} ^{6 months'} ^{3 months'} issue of
SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Name.....

Address.....

Send to M Maddison
21 Aubert Park, London, N5

ECONOMICS JOHN CRUTCHLEY DISCUSSES LABOUR'S PLAN FOR STEEL

THIS Labour Party statement on the re-nationalization of steel must be considered against the background of past battles over steel.

Steel differed from other industries which were nationalized. It was still a profitable concern at the time of nationalization and it plays a dominant part in the growth of the British economy. Furthermore, through "vertical integration" it was not a self-contained industry like coal and railways. Its subsidiaries extended from the mining of iron ore through to branches of the engineering industry.

A fully socialized steel industry could serve as the basis for a socialist economy. Because by acting as a pacemaker it could keep the remaining capitalist sector in line through the threat of nationalization whereas all other nationalized industries merely serve as a prop for the capitalist sector.

In view of these facts the failure of the previous nationalization must be seen as a failure of the 1945-51 Labour Government.

Delay

Many mistakes were made. The most serious, because it weakened the Government's whole argument, was the failure to take over steel as soon after 1945 as possible. Not until 1948 was the bill introduced and only then after pressure from the left wing. Indeed, it was rumoured that the right wing were trying to do a deal with the steel bosses in 1947. This probably explains the late introduction of the nationalization bill.

By 1948 the argument that nationalization was needed to supervise the industry's development plan was weakened by the fact that the plan had been operating for two years and the bosses, taking full advantage of the increased post-war demand, German scrap and the seven day working week, were establishing record outputs of steel. Further, in 1945 Labour had a clear "mandate." By 1948 the "Lords" were demanding a "second mandate." The Labour Party gave way to this pressure and delayed the take-over day until after the 1950 election. Also the fact that it was obvious the steel bosses would resist nationalization made it imperative that the battle should be fought as soon after the record 1945 victory as possible.

Because of these failures the steel battle was fought between a strong and unified boss class and a weak and divided Labour Party. Yet even then the fight could have been won if the right method of nationalization had been applied.

The method of nationalization which had been used for coal, electricity and other industries was not used for steel. Instead, to quote this pamphlet, a "new and imaginative structure" was established. The British Iron and Steel Corporation was set up and made responsible for overall policy and long-term planning. No attempt was made to integrate the steel firms into regional production units and this failure made it easy for the Tories to denationalize. On the possibility of de-nationalization The Economist then said, it would be a "reasonably simple operation, provided . . . that the Corporation had not been active in the interim in reshuffling the assets of its companies. The more actively the Corporation imposes its will on the companies, the more difficult and complex will the disentangling process become. But if it behaves only as a passive holding company it is possible that the identity of the companies may remain for some time substantially unchanged." (September 23, 1950.)

Sabotage

But was it possible for the Corporation to actively impose its will on the steel industry? Considering the Corporation had only 60 members and it was faced by the strongest bosses' combination in Britain, the British Iron and Steel Federation, it did not seem likely. When the Federation was requested to nominate members for the Corporation they refused. Later, when asked by Strauss, Minister of Supply, what their advice would be to any steel boss who was invited to serve on the Corporation they replied "they would tell him he would be most unwise to join the corporation at this stage because of the uncertainty of the political situation and that by so doing he would forfeit the respect of the industry."

In face of this strike of capital the Government retreated. No attempt was made to control the bosses' federation. The Corporation was unable to get any members on this association of firms which they nominally owned. In fact, The Economist thought that

under nationalization the individual firms would have more power, ". . . now it appears how ludicrously weak the corporation will be, it seems that any change is likely to be towards more, not less freedom of action for the steel companies, in fact if not in law." (Ibid.) The "new and imaginative structure" was a complete failure.

From this dismal story two lessons can be drawn. The next Labour Government must nationalize steel as soon as it gains power. Secondly, the form of control must aim at eliminating all individual firms by, at first, a strong centralized corporation capable of reorganizing the industry. This corporation should aim at replacing all the capitalist

directors and managers by democratically electing managers from the factory floor. Only in this way will a workers' government be able to effectively defeat the bosses and prevent denationalization again.

Does the Labour Party statement recognise these lessons? No. They say that "under labour the Steel Corporation had only 60 (members). A similar flexible structure will be established again." If this plan is carried out without attempting to restrict the power of the bosses' federation, steel nationalization will fail again. It is the duty of all Party members to campaign in their branches and wards to get this policy changed before it is too late.

BOOKS

"THE VOICE OF LABOUR"

REVIEWED by NAN MILTON

ALL the Socialist pioneers were remarkable men, and James Clunie, now Labour MP for Dunfermline, is no exception. The world was a very different place fifty years ago when Clunie, then an apprentice house painter, began his life-long work for Socialism.

"It was not easy to be a house painter and a Socialist," he relates in his autobiography. "I experienced insult and injury in many ways which my wife and I took with restraint and forgiveness. After all, when one accepts a cause which, if successful, disinherits the man of property, and the man of property . . . strikes back, there is no reason to complain. Were not the great minds who influenced the making of the world persecuted for their work by people who were totally ignorant of it? The rights and liberties of the poor had to be fought for and won by great sacrifice. The pages of history shine with such examples . . ."

With Maclean

In this book and also in his previous one, *Labour is my Faith*, he pays tribute to many of these historical figures, and his "Portrait of John Maclean" is perhaps the most arresting and controversial chapter, for he regards Maclean, now practically forgotten, as a genius, and in a most moving passage classes him along with Marx and Lenin.

Clunie was closely associated with Maclean until his death in 1923, particularly in his educational activities. When the Scottish Labour College began to function properly for the first time in 1919, Clunie was one of the first four full-time tutors, the others being Maclean himself, W McLaine and W Parker. He publishes for the first time 20 pages of letters written by Maclean to

him during 1921-1923, the last one being written not long before his death, and a good proportion of them being written from Barlinnie Prison.

My personal thanks are due to Clunie, for these letters destroy quite conclusively the myth, assiduously cultivated by the British Communist Party, that only mental illness prevented Maclean from joining the Party, and that his accusations of corruption were "hallucinations." For already, in 1922, he was declaring publicly that the CP had sold itself to Moscow "with disastrous results both to Russia and to the British Revolutionary movement."

Opposed to C P

These letters are of considerable historical importance, because of their comments on contemporary politics. He was politically opposed both to the Labour Party and the Communist Party, but only of the latter did he say "the last-named playing it very dirty." In another letter, however, he says "The honest Socialists in the ILP will be forced to separate from the Tammany gang now in control, and perhaps a clean new movement may be created." This did not happen until a whole decade had passed—and then it was too late. Allusions are also made to the "capture by the CP of the Unemployment Movement, which Maclean organised in 1920, and to their intrigues in the Scottish Labour College.

All this may be an old story, but no Marxist can disagree with Thomas Carlyle when he said "What is all knowledge but recorded experience and a product of history?" The study of the history of our own movement is a task of primary importance.

**BUY YOUR BOOKS THROUGH
S R
BOOK SERVICE
35b Priory Terrace NW6**

POLICY ERIC HEFFER ASKS, IS THIS A SOCIALIST WAGES POLICY ?

THE DISPUTE around the question of a National Wages Policy has been with us for a long time. It will undoubtedly flare again into prominence with the production of the "New Left" pamphlet, **A Socialist Wages Policy. (University and Left Review and New Reviewer, 2/-)**. The pamphlet, 64 pages long, argues the case in a clear way. It is, however, a pamphlet which I feel must be opposed. The useful data and analysis on the causes of inflation are completely outweighed by the fact that we are presented with a reformist method of thinking which can only confuse and divert the worker from what is really required, namely a clear cut policy based on the reality of the class struggle, leading to genuine socialist policies.

The authors of this pamphlet have accepted reformism in its entirety. The language used in the pamphlet is quite clear to those of us who are engaged in the reality of struggle and, frankly, to me the policy outlined is schematic and unrealistic, and even if, by some remote chance, was accepted, would undoubtedly lead to the reverse of what the authors sincerely desire. What we would get would be a regulation of wages, not a regular annual increase.

Nationalization

The authors set the tone of the pamphlet by saying the present "political quietism" must be broken, and this "involves facing up to the strategy and the main problem of making a democratic transition to socialism." Further they say "a radical social policy would probe the limits of reform within capitalism, but strike hard at those points of private economic power which obstruct reforms which have democratic support." **They do not, however, call for increase in Nationalization and expanding public ownership as a part of the policy.**

Transition

The real kernel of their argument, I think, is contained in the following sentence. "Advocacy of a constructive reform-by-reform appeal to the electorate leads generally to arguments as to whether it would be possible to achieve and consolidate reforms on the road to socialist objectives while a considerable sector of private ownership and control remains. The question as to how far British capitalism will accept the implications of modern democracy when it leads to socialist measures is, after all, only to be tested in practice." The pamphlet then goes on to explain that there is, of course, the possible danger of a "strike of capital" and quotes the struggle on steel nationalisation as an example.

In the place of class struggle we are offered the horny theory of the "democratic transition to socialism." We must, stage-by-stage, reform capitalism, but be prepared just in case the capitalists object. What is proposed if they do object is not really very clear, but comes clearer later when the pamphlet concretely deals with the actual proposals for a wages plan.

The proposals in the pamphlet are based on the conception of a Labour Government in office. The authors admit that they could hardly be carried out by a Tory Government. Firstly, they propose that a Labour Government should pledge itself to create the economic conditions for an increase in average hourly earnings, in real terms, of at least three per cent per annum. Over five years the increase should be in the region of 16 per cent and 20 per cent.

Four points

To do this, the Government should be prepared to carry out the following policies:—

1. A significant degree of re-distribution of income and consumption at the expense particularly of rentier incomes.
2. A steady growth in the real national product.
3. Avoidance of disproportionately rapid increases in sectors other than consumer goods and services, so that at least half of the increment in material product is available for increase in private consumption.
4. A deliberate stabilisation of the retail price level."

It seems to me that, what is being proposed here is that, even whilst the capitalist economy exists, apparently the laws of capitalism are no longer to apply. That is why I say the policy is unrealistic, not practical. **Before we can get any real change in the re-distribution of income, a steady growth in the national product, and a stabilisation of prices, the power of the capitalist class must be completely broken, and that surely means taking their real source of power out of their hands. Industry must become the property of the public, under the control of the workers.** In place of such a clear-cut demand which is what, I venture to suggest, the "Left" should be putting forward, we are offered the following scheme to regulate wages.

Persuasion !

"At national level, representatives of Government, TUC, and British Employers Confederation could form a body which we choose to call a National Wages Advisory Council, which would exert influence and persuasion, but not coercion."

The Council may, of course, the authors say, run into difficulties. There might be employers or unions that might not play ball. But then "strong moral pressure could be brought to bear on them, from their respective sides" as "there would be stronger pressure from representatives of the same side in other industries, and from public opinion. . ."

Which state ?

Arbitration would continue: "The role of arbitration in disputes submitted to them would not be materially altered." However, "Even if arbitration were not enthusiastic as to the type of government social policy we have outlined, the clear statement of such policies by the government, and their general acceptability of such policies by the trade unions should limit any mortal aberration on the part of arbitration as to what constitutes an acceptable award." This is almost priceless. It would seem that Hughes and Alexander have never heard of the class nature of the usual arbitrators, and their class bias based as it is in their position and background.

However, the author's view on this is quite understandable when we come to look at their attitude on the State and its rule. It is here that probably more clearly than in anything else they demonstrate their complete break with Marxism and revolutionary politics. They look upon the State as obviously something above classes. The State "in a mixed economy is involved in responsibility for a wide range of economic policies which decisively influence the size and distribution of the national product. It will carry out policies either primarily in the interests of capitalists, or in the interests of the wage earners."

We are entitled to ask here. The same State? Is then the State a neutral body, itself a reflection of the so-called mixed economy? I feel the authors should be told that the so-called "mixed economy" is not really mixed at all. The economy is capitalist. Capitalist laws apply, and certainly will continue to apply, even in the event of a Labour Government, certainly if it merely buys shares in the various industries and fails to expropriate the owners. The British State is a class State, created by and for the British ruling class. If one doesn't accept this then read Tom Driberg's book on "Guy Burgess," and clearly there the realities of the State's character is shown.

• TRADE UNIONS

I find myself in so much disagreement with so many things in this pamphlet that in a short

article it is difficult to deal adequately with them. Even in relation to such questions as the strengthening of the powers of the General Council of the TUC, the need for closer trade union co-operation, etc., I find myself opposing, not because I disagree in principle but because the author supports these questions for the wrong reasons, and also because they fail to look concretely at the present General Council.

Do they, for example, want a strengthened General Council, so that it will develop more solidarity actions, directing the class struggle to the ultimate defeat of the ruling class? Unfortunately no. "Its departmental apparatus and research department are pitifully inadequate and overloaded with day-to-day business, unable to plan ahead," say the authors.

True, the authors give the General Council a clout for their lack of activity and failure to support the London bus strike, but see the main weakness as a failure on the part of the General Council to have a "coherent approach to the question of incomes and prices." Do we get a downright condemnation of their class collaborationist policies? We do not, the whole tone is one of sorrow more than anger.

The authors condemn, quite rightly, the lack of co-ordination of the trade unions especially in certain industries, but fail to develop the argument. The obvious need is the creation of industrial unions. This, however, is never mentioned, neither is the possibility of rank and file unity through local committees, etc.

Reformism

In Chapter 5 the authors endeavour to deal with possible objections. Again they begin by pointing out that the State can play an important role, as a moderating influence. The basic weakness in the pamphlet seems to me that the authors set limits based on the viewpoint of reformism through step-by-step policies. The transition to socialism is not seen as it surely must be, through hard and bitter class struggle, but, on the contrary, as a reasonably well ordered "democratic transition." Too much also seems to be taken for granted on the role of the Labour leadership. Can we be satisfied with, for example, such a document as the **Plan for Progress?**

The authors write that it was regrettable that the Plan didn't "grasp the nettle." This again is more in sorrow than in anger. We must be concrete and remember that the policies of the 1945-51 Labour Governments were policies of wage restraint, which resulted in a much lower standard of living for the

See next page

ERIC HEFFER — end

workers than was necessary. The reality is that even today some such ideas are prevalent amongst certain leaders and already wage restraint is being mooted in the event of a future Labour Government.

It is interesting to note that *Tribune*, through its various writers are waxing eloquent on this pamphlet, Ian Mikardo saying this could well be Labour policy and should have been issued by the EC. I agree with him, it is certainly not a Marxist document, a fact underlined by the suggestion that the views of Tom Yates, who condemns industrial action for political purposes can be reconciled with those of Harry Nicholas, who stated in his union journal *Record*, July, 1958, that we should beware of those who say we ought not to use our industrial strength for political issues. That really sums up the whole concept of the pamphlet. **The object is designed to soften the struggle, reconcile the opposing views, give us nice orderly advance.**

Orderly advance

I am sure that the pamphlet will commend itself to those who like schemes, like those who for example dreamed up the super-annuation scheme, but it will not commend itself to the mass of the workers, precisely because it is not a realistic, practical policy.

The authors say they write as socialists. If this is so they certainly appear to have become mesmerised by the "mixed economy." If they really are socialists, then for God's sake let us have some clear cut, militant socialist policies, let us do as the authors quite rightly say we should, let us fight "the causes of these effects," by advocating and carrying through a policy of destruction of the capitalist system, so that wages really can be advanced continuously, which they never can whilst industry remains in the hands of the capitalist class, or is controlled by Governments which have a capitalist outlook.

This pamphlet reminds me very much of one issued by the Communist Party at the end of the war. This, too, was a plan for orderly advance. The factor left out, as in this one, was the fact that real power is in the hands of the employing class. Power which incidentally is not automatically destroyed by the mere election of a Labour Government. Could we envisage the employers giving increases and succumbing to moral pressure from their own side?

Conclusion

Orderly wage increases certainly can be gained, annually and for ever, in fact until the wage system is abolished, as Socialists aim, but to do it requires real power in the hands of the workers. Unless this is said, unless this is the perspective, then false dawns are being pictured and we have already had far too many of these. This may be "new thinking" of part of the "New Left," but I'll settle for the old thinking based on class struggle. I am sure in the long road it will be less tortuous and a straight path to real higher wages.

ALDERMASTON TO LONDON

**LABOUR TO POWER—
MINUS THE BOMB!**

THIS year's Aldermaston March has rescued the Campaign For Nuclear Disarmament from the future of Big Names and small hopes, of tired meetings and wrangles with its own extreme "a-political" wing, to which it otherwise might have been doomed. Aldermaston to London, 1959, was not simply the repetition in reverse gear of London to Aldermaston, 1958. In sheer size—ranging from 3,500 to 15,000 on different days, as compared with 600 to 5,000 last year—the March was vastly more impressive; and the difference in size is in itself the reflection of a much greater social range and political "newness" among the participants.

Young people

We shall not know the full facts about the social composition of the March until the official survey of marchers is published. But it was quite obvious that a great number of local groups from all parts of the country, but particularly from the Southern towns, took part. The working-class was under-represented, it is hard to say how much. Eighty to ninety per cent of the marchers were young people from school age to the early twenties. On the last day of the march many more young people were marching than the combined total mem-

berships of the Labour Party Youth Sections, the YCL and the London Schools Left Club.

The political content of the March was also different from last year. There was very little emphasis on unilateral action by Britain in banners or slogans. "Ban the Bomb"—the most popular line—might mean a pious hope for international agreement or a demand for action by the British government. The CP, which supported the March this year, could feel perfectly at home with its Summit Solution posters. Last year public support was obtained on the route from local Labour councils, MPs and unions. This time there was nothing of the kind.

Anti-political

As before, the stewards were aggressively anti-political. This time, the Chief Marshal gave them official backing over the loudspeaker: "No political slogans, please!" (those who shouted "Ban the Bomb" were never reproached by the arm-banded meddlers who went a round nagging left-wing groups): "No red flags, please!" (one zealous steward even tried to tear up a banner of the forbidden colour). **It is about time that local groups of the Campaign started protesting against this sort of interference made in**

the name of the unconsulted "majority of the marchers." Religious groups carrying their sectional symbols were not obstructed, be it noted.

Socialists participating in the Marches have generally either submerged themselves in the event with banners, slogans and songs that "nobody could disagree with" (and are consequently pointless) or else have taken up demands that are so ultra-militant as to be ineffective.

Slogans

"Stop Work on Rocket Bases!" is a useless slogan for the ears of that majority of workers that has yet to be convinced of the case against the bomb. **The aim of Socialists in the Campaign at the present stage should above all be to politicize it; to show the connections of policies and parties and oppose any vagueness on the unilateral question. "OUT WITH THE TORIES, OUT WITH THE BOMB! LABOUR TO POWER MINUS THE BOMB!" was a quite effective slogan in this respect, taken up as it was by sections of marchers outside the ranks of the conscious Left. For the rest, it must be the task of Socialists to join their local Campaign groups and work patiently to undo the acquiescence of the workers in the strategic policies of their rulers.**

P Sedgwick

FIGHT AGAINST WITCH-HUNTING!

TRANSPORT House's proscription of the Socialist Labour League and its organ, the *Newsletter*, is an authoritarian and unprincipled act which can gravely harm the movement. The futile cat-and-mouse game of naming and accusing is to be played out in the Wards and Constituencies, sapping the energies and poisoning the relationships of active workers keen to get out to the real job of struggle against Toryism.

No banning

Socialist Review has disagreed and will continue to disagree with many of the attitudes of the Socialist Labour League, and with the formation of the League itself. But such disagreements must not obscure the opposition of every Socialist to the banning on ideological grounds of a political trend within the Party (while groupings on the Right such as Socialist Union are fully tolerated.)

Not defensible

The mechanism of bans and Black Circulars is not even defensible when invoked against Stalinist-controlled organiza-

tions; totalitarian ideas and Muscovite myths will suffer the bankruptcy they deserve without resort to the empty, administrative victory of proscription—and even if they gained support, would have to be beaten by militant, democratic Socialist ideas, not by a duplicated order from a Party office. The method is obviously inexcusable when the target is the non-Stalinist Left: the appearance of the ILP, Common Wealth and Socialist Fel-

lowship in the current "black list" is a reminder that this is not the first time.

Resolutions

Opposition must in the present case be taken up locally, in Ward, Constituency, Borough and Trades Council resolutions which will leave Transport House in no doubt of the ordinary member's hostility to the measure.

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

FORUM

MORE ON

A SOCIALIST FOREIGN POLICY

from Ken Jones, Harlow

BEFORE any further discussion on a Socialist policy for peace, let's tidy a few things up.

1—I agree that capitalism is in the final analysis the cause of wars and rumours of wars and so long as capitalism exists we shall live under the shadow of these.

2—I agree that the international Labour movement is in the long run the most decisive force standing in the way of a world war. All this is Socialist ABC.

3—When I talk about a Socialist foreign policy I mean one which is operated by a Left Wing Labour Government backed by the British Labour Movement. I said so in my article. (SR, mid-January.)

4—When I referred to “the colonies” it was as “stable and independent members of our anti-nuclear alliance.” I should have been clearer and said “ex-colonies.”

Now let's get down to business.

You're wasting your own and

PARLIAMENT — contd.

“Vice-Admiral Hughes Hallet (Croydon NE, Cons.) urged the Government to take the House into their confidence and say how they pictured the Navy being employed in a major war.

“He had never been let into the secret when Vice-Controller of the Navy or Second-in-Command of the Anglo-American striking fleet. He had always supposed the American carriers in the fleet carried atomic bombs, but how many, which of the aircraft could take them, what the conditions for their use were, he had not the slightest idea. Yet had there been an emergency in which the American fleet commander had been killed, the command of that force would have devolved on him.

“Ever since the war those responsible for this country's defensive policy, and for the defence policy of the United States and Russia have been like men working in sealed and shuttered rooms, as if afraid lest the mysterious light by which they worked should be seen by the world outside.”

Well, what a thing to say.

It does not matter whether the crews, officers, knew what they are there for or not. They are already performing their duties efficiently enough. And the duty is to consume. Every ton of oil, every practice round, every tin of beans, every turn of every propeller is a weight taken from a manufacturer's mind. By the sides of the Atlantic that the fleet sails on there are wives in Maryport and Plymouth daily going to the shops and spending the allowances sent by their sailor husbands.

Talk about the Trade Winds!

You and I and the capitalist pay the wages. But the capitalist gets much more back than he spends in taxes.

Who do you imagine pays the difference?

your comrades' limited time and energy if you think you can have an effective peace policy which is limited to shouting “Black the bomb!” Commonsense apart, if you'd read your Lenin you'd know that at each stage in the development of a movement of a campaign, you should select the policies and tactics which make most sense in terms of how the majority of the workers are thinking and feeling at that time—slogans which make sense to them, and which impel them to act, and thus create favourable conditions for the later more ambitious stages of the campaign. If, instead of isolating yourselves like self-righteous cranks, you bent your main efforts to getting a few industrial trade unionists to march from Aldermaston this Easter, and to organize demonstrations, lobbies, and other activities appropriate to the present situation, you'd be giving real assistance where it is badly needed.

In the second place commonsense and Lenin (**One Step Forward, Two Steps Back and What is to be Done?**) should also have taught you that any effective Socialist policy bases itself on the Labour movement, but also seeks to bring in any other available allies, temporary or permanent; it seeks skilfully to exploit all circumstances in favour of its main objective; and it takes advantage of the enemy's divisions. In short, it's as subtle and complex as the real world is. No country, class, or group is all black or all white: it will have some positive features, more or less, which we can exploit to our advantage. Karl Marx called this dialectical thinking, in case P. Mansell has forgotten (Mansell's reply, expressing our editorial view appeared in SR, February 1).

Support

Thus, a Left Wing British Government would look for support for its peace policies not only to its main ally, the international Labour movement (isn't it time we analysed just what that is by the way?) but also to Governments like those of Yugoslavia, India, and Japan, which at present balance with difficulty between the two great nuclear powers, and would certainly find it in their interest to see these Powers disarmed and contained.

Mansell's reply merits close study. Behind it is the same sort of copy-book Marxism as that peddled by the Communist Party (those of you who've had anything to do with that outfit will understand what I mean). He pictures the world in a few simple, bold, primary colours, and each has a neat label pasted on it so you can't go wrong. Yugoslavia is labelled “state capitalism”; but capitalism breeds war; therefore Yugoslavia can be of no assistance in an atomic disarmament policy. The “reply” is full of such crude examples of

oversimplified thinking and ham-fisted logic.

“Life itself”

I suppose the idea is to simplify politics and the facts of life so that constructive thinking doesn't get too much in the way of united militant action. Unfortunately, except in the case of the most dedicated and self

righteous, this leads in the long run to frustration and cynicism. Fellow workers won't listen or else won't do anything. Things don't turn out at all as was hoped. Sooner or later, experience, or “life itself,” as the Russians say, will show to those readers who can learn that we need more than a bundle of slogans and a prayer each week from the Editorial Board if we're going to do something worthwhile as Socialists in Britain in 1959. And it won't help denouncing awkward people like me who confuse the Comrades by insisting what a complicated place the world really is!

LETTERS

FROM P LAVIN

SOCIALISTS AND IRELAND

I NOTE that you have dropped from your programme the idea of a unified and independent Ireland. I had thought that your attitude on this question was the outcome of an impartial consideration of the facts of the case. However, it now appears that I was mistaken. It would seem that you have altered your programme because some pseudo-Socialists in Ireland are “unclear” on the issue. This seems to me to be a perilously near approach to the attitude of the legendary Yankee politician who assured his hearers that “them's my sentiments, and if you don't like them they can be scrapped.”

Perhaps you will allow me to comment on one or two points in the disgraceful article by Mr. Noel Harris (S.R., March 1.) To say that Mr. Harris is “unclear” on the Irish question would be to make a considerable understatement. He says that the overwhelming majority of the Irish people demonstrated their wish for political independence (which is true) but he also says that Northern Ireland was established with the almost complete support of the people within its boundaries (which is demonstrably untrue). At the time when the Tory confidence trick of Partition, as Mr. Harris calls it, was played upon the Irish people, Nationalists were in the majority in the counties of Armagh, Derry, Fermanagh and Tyrone and in the Southern part of County Down. Only in Antrim and in the Northern part of County Down were Tories in the majority. In the city of Belfast itself there were well over 93,000 Catholics. In Derry, the second city of the sorry police statelet, there was a majority of Nationalists. So much for the “almost complete support” accorded to Partition by the people of the Six Counties.

Misrepresentation of this kind is bad enough, but there is worse to come. Because the fraud by which Northern Ireland was established was successful, Mr. Harris thinks that the bastard legislature of Stormont has a right to exist. Is not this the old abominable doctrine that the end justifies the means, which, universally acted upon, would drive the very idea of decency from the minds of men?

To represent the struggle in

Ireland as one between two similar classes with headquarters in Dublin and Belfast respectively is a gross distortion of fact. No reasonable person can deny that the struggle is between the British Empire and the Irish people. Indeed, Harris admits this when he says that Northern Ireland was established as “an integral part of the United Kingdom” and that the lay figures of Stormont are lackeys of British Imperialism. Did not the British Home Secretary tell a Stormont audience not many months ago that Great Britain “was behind Northern Ireland with all her strength, and when I say strength I mean physical as well as moral strength”? This sounds almost like a threat to use “violence,” and violence, according to our neo-Socialists, must never be used against the British Empire.

Mr. Harris has at his command all the down-at-heel clichés of the capitalist anti-Irish journalist: thus he says that the Irish Republican Army is a terrorist organisation, that the Irish people are blinded to facts by their fierce nationalism, and that they are confused by religious bigotry, by years of clerical indoctrination. And, for good measure, we have the inevitable uncomplimentary reference to “Franco's Fascist Spain.”

As for religious bigotry: can Mr. Harris point to anything sponsored by Catholics which is even remotely comparable to the slogans with which the champions of the British Empire befoul the gables of houses in the part of Ireland still occupied by the mercenaries of the English garrison? If he ever takes a trip to the historic city of Armagh he will find one such atrocity quite close to the Catholic cathedral. The plain fact is that the Stormont camorra and their pitiable dupes are obsessed by an ignorant hatred of the Catholic Church—a hatred beyond the power of anyone but a trained alienist to distinguish from insanity. The very existence of the Stormont monstrosity is a standing insult to anyone with even an embryonic sense of decency.

May I ask, in conclusion, why only the Irish, of all the peoples struggling to be free, should be told to postpone their national liberation till a Socialist society has been established?

INTERNATIONAL

from Bob Howarth,

JAPANESE LABOUR ON THE MOVE

THE CONSERVATIVE Japanese Government, formed by Premier Kishi's Liberal Democratic Party, which has latterly split into warring factions, now faces a concerted strike challenge from the militant-led Japanese trade unions, beginning in mid-February. The only thing that has saved the Government so far is that the opposition parties, Socialist and Communist, also have internal difficulties. As these are the outcome of growing agitation of the revolutionary left, however, they are not much comfort to the Government.

In the Japanese press and elsewhere the terms "civil war," "general strike," "class struggle" are used every day to describe a situation where rioting extends to the floor of the Diet itself, where Socialist MPs practise fisticuffs with the Conservatives. Kishi's party is so split that it is described as having "seven divisions and one regiment" (a difference to the seven large, and one small, factions—all right wing), and it has shortly to face a crisis in foreign policy (neutrality) as well as by its attitude to fighting the labour challenge. This latter broke the party last November on the issue of the Opposition defeat of the iniquitous Police Bill.

Socialist Party

The Police Law, which called for unheard of police powers to stop demonstrations and enter private residences, met with bristling opposition from the labour movement; trade unionists fought with the police on the streets and marched on the Diet, students threatened to assassinate the Cabinet, a threat that was taken so seriously that top Cabinet men changed the licence plates on their cars. Inside Parliament, the Socialists were able to finally block the bill, no mean feat in a House two-thirds dominated by the Conservatives, by boycotting the sessions, filibustering and fighting Kishi's men on the floor. The collapse of the Bill was such a shock to the majority Liberal Democrats that they turned on Kishi. The extreme right, ironically, accused him of being "an A-grade criminal" (he was associated with Tojo's wartime cabinet).

The Japanese Socialist Party, however, which has 78 out of 250 seats in the Lower House and 167 out of 467 in the Upper House, is also split. It bears no resemblance to the British Labour Party. It is an avowedly Marxist Party (which was only united in 1956 when the right and left-wing Socialist Parties unified).

The Left is demanding an open class struggle party, the right speaks of a broad "national" party. The Party has no direct links with the trade unions, but is greatly influenced by the left wing General Council of Japanese Trade Unions (Sohyo) which is demanding a more active class struggle and integration of industrial and political action.

The type of attitude expressed by Professor Itsuro Sakisaka, the party's leading theoretician, who states bluntly that the Socialists should forget Parliament, which has never meant much in Japan, and become an outright "revolutionary party," seemed to have gained much ground at the Central Committee Meeting on January 19. Susuki, chairman and leader of the Socialists in the Diet, says that the Diet is now a "conservative organ," that there is no room for the British two-party system in Japan, and that the Party should aim at an open "permanent socialist state."

The Communist Party has no direct power, with only two Diet members, but it has great influence in labour and intellectual circles. It also is split, on the ideological question of the "hard" or "soft" line.

The CP, under the leadership of Sanzo Nozaka, has been quietly built up after the 1952 May Day riots which had smashed the

Party machine (not before American cars had been overturned and burned and fire bombs hurled at the police and US-controlled buildings). Now CP influence in Japan (almost alone among Western bloc nations) has been growing.

But inside the Party there has been a violent clash and some members of the extreme left Zengakeeren (Japanese All Students' Federation) have been expelled. The students are the backbone of the street demonstration squads, and have opposed the "appeasement" policy of the Party (peaceful coexistence, summit talks, and their domestic complements).

Moscow Radio supports the "soft" line, and has rebuked the students and youth.

Organized Labour is preparing to launch a nation-wide wave of strikes and workshop rallies from mid-February. The "labour offensive" (organized by the GCJTU) has one aim in pressing wage increases; it also has a full-scale set of political demands ranging from abrogation of the US-Japanese Security Treaty to overthrow of "the reactionary Kishi cabinet."

Under a Japanese law (of Occupation origin), Government workers are not allowed to strike, workers in private industry are free to. This will mean that the railroad workers

and civil servants will come headlong into conflict with the Government and its forces.

Only an eighth of the labour force in Japan is unionized, the remainder work under conditions ranging from the appalling to the difficult. At present Japan is undergoing an artificial boom, the Government has prepared an expansionist budget, while Japanese trade is being forced out of traditional Asian markets (often by Chinese competition) and forced into the high-grade Australian and American markets, where it has still to fight local business hostility.

According to the recent White Paper on National Livelihood (from the Welfare Ministry) the effect of the boom has been to divide the nation into have-nots and haves.

The immediate future of Japan's political situation lies with organized labour and its success in using the strike weapon to promote political and economic policies.

From half-way across the world comes an example of an advanced working class in action, pursuing policies relevant to British Labour. The movement of Japanese Labour will have portentous effects on Asia and the world, and it may yet come to overshadow the much-more-talked-of Chinese Stalinist upheaval.

QUIT AFRICA — END

To avoid having the Africans fighting for their rights in the political field, the most complicated electoral system has been devised, with one aim and one aim only—to keep control of legislation in European hands: the Federal Assembly is to have 59 members of which 44 are to be elected by 83,000 Europeans and 3,000 Africans with Ordinary Votes. 8 African and 1 European representative of African interests are to be elected by the above voters plus 23,000 Africans and 11,000 Europeans on a Special Roll. 2 European representatives of African interests will be nominated by the Protectorate (N. Rhodesian and Nyasaland) Governors, and **only 4 Africans are to be elected by African Councils in the Protectorates (Ibid).**

On the basis of past knowledge of the settlers' relationship with them, the Africans tried desperately by peaceful means to prevent the two Protectorates from being forced into the Federation before it was born. But the delegations that came to petition the Queen were forbidden to see her. Is it any wonder that, balked at every attempt to safeguard their elementary rights of having a say in their own affairs the African National Congress grew in strength and gained mass support after Federation had shown its milk teeth, and before it could get its permanent ones. Still they acted peacefully, in spite of the utmost provocation on the part of the European settlers. A few quotations from Sir Roy Welensky, Federal Prime Minister, will show what provocation the Africans were subjected to, and what a myth all talk of "partnership" is:

1953: "If man merely by virtue of attaining a certain age had the right to vote, that would mean the destruction of European civilisation in this part of the world."

1958: "Far too much of the money available in the Commonwealth was spent on social services . . . He would like to see some form of curtailment of social services."

Jan., 1959: "When we talk of maintaining high standards in the Federation and Africa we mean white standards." (*Tribune*, 20 March, 1959.)

Still, not a European was touched by Congress. But the European settlers, not satisfied, were determined to have a showdown in preparation for the 1960 Conference which is to review the future of the Federa-

tion, and with the utmost violence and cruelty they shot and killed over 50 Africans and imprisoned hundreds without trial, bringing in special laws to facilitate this operation. To give themselves some backing, they have trumped up a charge of a "plot." The false evidence brought by the police in the Kenyatta trial in Kenya should be sufficient warning to show the lengths to which imperialism will go to get opposition out of the way.

Everything in Central Africa points to the fact that unless the African people wrest power from the hands of the European capitalists, they will never achieve democracy or any rights to which they are entitled in their native lands. The position, unlike Ghana and Nigeria, is complicated by the presence of the settlers who will hang on to their privileges to the bitter end. The situation in this respect bears a close resemblance to Algeria.

We in Britain should press the Labour Party to give full support to the demands of the African people for the right of secession from the Federation and self-determination, for "One man, one vote," for trade union rights, freedom for the African National Congress and all other democratic rights. It should demand the release of all those imprisoned for their fight for freedom, the withdrawal of Southern Rhodesian troops and police from Nyasaland, and oppose the use of British troops.

Labour must be made to use this issue to beat the Tories out of office and come to power on a fighting Socialist policy.

LETTER

Dear Editor,

While agreeing on the whole with the very good article of John Rex in the last issue of SR, I cannot but feel perturbed by his statement, "Labour must demand the withdrawal of Southern Rhodesian troops, even if it means sending British troops to ensure compliance." How can anybody entertain the illusion, especially after the experience of Algeria, that imperialist troops will side with the colonial peoples against the capitalist settler elements?

Yours fraternally

T Cliff

We agree—Editor

COTTON CLOTHES AND PAPER RAGS

by Cressida Lindsay

EMPIRE, the word that must have thudded through the minds of countless Victorian children in their classrooms as meaning a great riot of conquered lands, British-owned and therefore glorious.

When my husband arrives home from some Saturday shopping waving a pair of vermilion trousers for our son and shouting, "Only one and six," I say, "That's cheap, it must be Empire."

So the word has come to mean for me, and probably for many others, the mark of a bargain, or the Woolworth's answer to the suspicious sales of the West End shops. They may come apart quicker, they may even lose their original starched brightness, but they do at least last the rapid growth of children.

Compromise

Now I hear that, due to the losses of the Lancashire Mills, I am to be deprived of some of my bargains and forced to buy home-made British underpants. (Don't say it—I'm unpatriotic.)

But even the women in the mills shop at Woolworths; their husbands will have to give them more housekeeping money to bridge the gap in trouser buying, of course they'll then ask for more pay, so then what! The problem, I know, is complicated, and the Government have, as usual, compromised. They have tried to keep their own baby happy by depriving its brother in Hong Kong of a few sweets.

Great demand

Although labour is cheap in Hong Kong it is not impossible to produce cheap goods with expensive labour. This might have been possible if some of the fathers of our cotton industry had spared a few more coppers for their own concerns; the mills, apparently, are far behind in modern equipment and better techniques. There is, and always will be, a great demand for cheap cotton goods, why not make the best use of it instead of forcing higher prices on the consumer?

Incidentally, I hear that Hong Kong is only on loan to the British Government from China. I wonder if, when the lease is up, the word Empire will be shelved with words like "utility" or be great-grandma's memory of cheaper days?

• A NEW "ANTI"

THE failure of the **Recorder** to be taken to the hearts of every stolid British man like the **Express** and **Mail** has not left the original sponsors undaunted, soon we are to be confronted by yet another national daily. The policy-makers of this paper are very positive of what they are "Anti," in fact they are going to be very busy being "anti"—Anti-Communist, Anti-Fascist

and Anti-Socialist or anything that supports Nationalization.

Too negative

A rather negative beginning for any movement or publication. I mistrust any organization that is founded on negative principles; it ignores so much of what is going on by being too busy condemning everything. It collects as its followers the mistrustful and the bored, the people who think they are being hard done by without looking for the causes. Such a following, enlightened only by hatred and by the keeping of their own private property intact, cannot survive the onslaught of progress.

Equality?

The new daily will advocate

Equality of Opportunity (where have I seen that before?) yet it wants to keep the Social Services at bay. Say I took my opportunity and became a miner, if I broke my leg on an out-dated pony cart, would I be allowed to have it set in a hospital without paying all of a week's pay? Ah, well, at least some people will have to pay less income tax by this venture and someone else will be kept happy writing private and unenterprising articles that will be read over breakfast tables by people already paying doctors' bills and enjoying it. But I wish that those who had money to spare would spend it on marsh mallows, then they would only damage their own teeth.

CRESSIDA LINDSAY

PARLIAMENT

by

Michael Millett

MACAULAY said of some aspect of Roman history that had incurred his displeasure "these facts must be retained in the memory as they are inaccessible to the understanding."

Any detailed analysis of the defence program suffers from much the same handicap.

Do Thor missiles work? Is Nato effective? Is Russia concerned about the British deterrent—sorry, deterrent. (For the record, the answer is No in each case.)

The complexity of the irrationality of the detailed aspects of defence planning makes them incomprehensible to those who have not the task of building up a department or enlarging a command or otherwise winning promotion.

But underlying the whole tangle there is a basic simplicity.

The easiest task of a capitalist is to manufacture goods and mark them up with a percentage profit. Then comes the problem of finding buyers for the new goods.

The most difficult problem is then to persuade the same buyers to throw those not quite-so-new goods away and buy the (possibly) improved next year's production. This problem is almost entirely eliminated in arms production. The race for superiority, the rapid obsolescence, the difficult technical requirements, the needs of reserves and training, the bad conditions of storage and use all imply that, even in peacetime the market will never fail.

The only limitation is the amount of money which the generals, admirals and air marshals can wring out of the government. And the government has to attempt the explaining of those needs or else give some palatable camouflage for them to the tax payers and workers. This it usually does in Parliament.

Interestingly, this is how Parliament originally came about. A

medieval king who was usually one of the largest direct landowners in his own right and had various traditional and therefore unquestionable taxes, could rub along for years of peace and never consult any more democratic authority than his current mistress. War, however, became more and more expensive. The king was impelled to summon **parliaments** to whom he could explain his tax proposals and who would themselves "advise" the king to levy them. The potential opposition was then committed in advance—like the present Labour Opposition.

In the medieval period, though, there was one difference—it is believed that the "well-beloved" and "trusty" burgesses, knights and peers knew what they were talking about. Nowadays, it is possible that nobody does—certainly not the Opposition. Why on earth the Labour Party is in favour of conscription when the Conservatives are to end it passes the imagination!

In the recent debate on the Defence White Paper, there was one speech so incredible amongst a number of undistinguished contributions it is remarkable that it has not been widely publicised. Although, perhaps, if it appeared in the popular press it would too plainly tell the population that the king is plain stark naked. The **Times** report, which is quoted here would do no harm. Top people either know already or couldn't care anyway.

See page 6

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published twice a month by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, post paid: 1 year: 16s. 6 months: 8s. 3 months: 4s. Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of **Socialist Review** which are given in editorial statement.

All communications to be addressed to the publisher, M. Maddison, 21 Aubert Park, London, N5

Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. TU, Bush Fair, Harlow, Essex

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The **SOCIALIST REVIEW** stands for international Socialist democracy. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The **SOCIALIST REVIEW** believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power on the basis of the following programme:

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Renationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation. — The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.

- Workers' control in all nationalised industries ie, a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.

- The establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all instances representatives must be subject to frequent election, immediate recall, and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.

- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions.

- The establishment of the principle of work or full maintenance.

- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.

- The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.

- Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants — without a means test—for all university students.

- Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

- Freedom from political and economic oppression to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the underdeveloped countries.

- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.

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

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