

# SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

10th YEAR No 3

MARCH 1960

SIXPENCE

## RAILS —

## WARNING LIGHT AHEAD!

IT HAS BEEN said before, it can be said again: the railwaymen won a magnificent victory last month. They showed that a determined rank-and-file can shake money out of a Tory Government, call "time!" to a postponement (Guillebaud) committee and force its own leadership to take, if not the lead, at least a stand. Such is the power of strike action, or even the threat to use it.

### AGAINST THE BOMB!

The London Labour Party meets for the forty-sixth time on the 26th and 27th at St Pancras Town Hall. As usual, the ban on discussions of national policy and the requirement to stick to matters of local interest make the resolutions in the Preliminary Agenda read like last year's recipe for stodge. There is one exception, and delegates should take note: resolution no. 55 on radioactivity submitted by the Harrow Borough Labour Party reads:

*That this Conference concerned at the danger to human life, both born and unborn, as a result of the testing of thermonuclear weapons, calls upon the local authorities in London and Middlesex to*

(a) *Perform regular checks on the level of radio active substances, particularly strontium 90 in water, milk and green vegetables consumed by the people of London and Middlesex;*

(b) *Perform regular checks on the level of strontium 90 in bones of young children;*

(c) *Report regularly, at intervals of not more than 3 months, to the people of London and Middlesex on the results, including the incidence of leukemia.*

The build-up towards the strike showed, too, that however dis-united and factional the leaders of the three rail unions, their members, or at least the manual grades, are firm in their solidarity to one another and united in fighting their common boss — the British Transport Commission. Reports of moves to concerted action between NUR, ASLE&F and even T&G (bus) members are not lacking to prove the point. *Never has the case for one union for transport workers been underlined so clearly; never have spontaneous moves to unity been more obvious.*

The threat of strike, finally, tore the veil off the fundamental question: who is to pay for modernization? railway workers or not? The Tories have yet to answer. Only then will we be able to see whether the workers have won a round or the whole battle. There are two sets of facts to be considered: one, as shown in another article in this issue, is the enormous tribute levied on the industry by the old private owners and the City plus the Tories' refusal to pay the bill for modernization. The other is the generosity with which they dole out fortunes to private industry. In answer to a question in Parliament on February 10, Heathcote Amory admitted: "Between April 1, 1951 and March 31, 1959, subsidies to private industry and agriculture amounted to £2,311 million".

It is with such facts in mind that railwaymen should pursue their demands for higher wages, better conditions and control over both. Not that the going will be easy. The Tories are trying desperately to turn the wagefight into an interunion squabble over differentials: By giving Guillebaud a fixed sum and leaving it to him to divide amongst the different grades, the Government hopes to get each union to fight for more at the expense of the others. The fact that there are three unions and that their leaders refuse to work in concert makes it very much easier for them. This would be disastrous. *United the three unions could shake more for all from the Tories. United they could impose a lasting settlement of rail finances, demand an end to the bloodletting of the industry, and put up a victorious fight against the sackings that are taking place now and that threaten in the future.*

★ ★ ★

Another danger to railway workers lies in the weakness of their leadership. Greene has shown himself ready to clutch at anything, so long as he could present it as a victory. If the Tories don't come up with a better offer to all railwaymen and to the industry, in other words if the struggle has to go on, this weakness of leadership might well be fatal. Once again, one rail union would strengthen the rank-and-file, not only against the employer but against a leadership that needs a mighty prodding if it is to get anywhere.

## BACK THE BOYCOTT!

Here, to remind you, is a list of South African goods—

### Tinned Goods:

Koo  
Domingo  
Ashton's  
Kloof  
L.K.B.  
Hugo's  
Golden Glory  
Surf Maid  
Red Robin  
Magnet  
Paarl Choice  
Gold Reef  
Zyp Products  
Benedict  
Wolsely Pride  
Summit  
Helen MacGregor

### Cigarettes:

Craven "A"  
Peter Stuyvesant  
Lexington  
Rothmans

Consulate  
Rembrandt  
Piccadilly  
Dunhill  
Guards  
Barons

### Wines and Spirits:

Rembrandt Brandy  
Richelieu Brandy  
Oudemester Brandy  
Alto Rouge Red Wine  
Thenniskraal Dry White  
Wine  
La Residence Sparkling Wine  
Grumbergen Stein

### Fruit:

"Outspan" Oranges  
"Cape" Apples  
"Cape" Grapes  
"Cape" Pineapples  
"Cape" Avocado Pears  
"Cape" Onions

Your Editor who has served you ill or well for the last seven years is moving to other, if related, fields viz., International Socialism. S R will be edited from next issue by C. Dallas.

TONY YOUNG

# RAILWAYS I – BACKGROUND TO NATIONALISATION

LONG before the rail settlement it was clear even to Tory correspondents that a situation which had compelled such a timid and respectable union leader as Mr Sydney Green to seriously threaten national strike action for the first time since 1926 could not continue indefinitely. Drastic decisions would have to be taken for the transport system to achieve a degree of efficiency that would prevent it becoming a brake on the whole British economy.

One need not be a socialist to see the paradox in increasingly overcrowded roads alongside a shrinking railway system carrying far less than it could. But if the capitalists see the contradiction clearly they are still driven to try to impose their own solution.

## Relaxed

In their half-hearted efforts to manage the railways as a "commercial proposition" branch lines and stations are constantly being closed, and service's curtailed everywhere, at the expense of the communities affected. Of course, if there were any real prospect of the railways becoming a profitable concern the Tories would soon take them back into private ownership, as they did with road transport (Even the ETC's least attractive road haulage undertakings, the ones that could find no buyers, still succeed in earning a profit).

The original nationalization Act was different from those applying to the nationalized industries in that the British Transport Commission was not allowed to impose such charges as it saw fit, but had to submit all applications for increases in fares or freight rates to a Transport Tribunal for approval. When the Tory government came to power in 1951 this restriction was relaxed in deference to their own propaganda that the railways ought to be commercially competitive, but in practice the rates lagged a long way behind the general rise in the prices of goods and services because it was realized that sharp increases would only drive more traffic away to road transport.

## The facts

So it is really despite the fact that rail transport is relatively cheaper than pre-war, that the proportion of all goods moved by rail has steadily declined. With the planned cuts in coal output, it is clear that one of the railways' major traditional sources of revenue must continue to dwindle

When we consider the facts; when we remember the £30,000,000 that is paid each year in "compensation" to the former private owners; when we see Sir Brian Robertson's officials contracting out engineering work which could be done in the railway workshops; then it is difficult for anyone, except perhaps the

right-wing labour authors of *Success Story*, to think that those who at present control the railways are either able or willing to run a railway system that is not an economic museum-piece.

*It would be wrong to suppose that the abolition of compensation payments could by itself enable the railways to "pay their way" for there is now a deficit on their working even before these payments, and the ever-swelling interest charges on the loans they have had to obtain, are met. But it is quite true many shareholders who never received a dividend for years on end in the inter-war decades are now assured of a steady income from their British Transport stock.*

The question arises whether the change of ownership on the 1st January 1948 was trivial in its effects, or has had any substantial results? It may seem that it was nothing more than a symbolic act which enabled the politicians to postpone a decision on the future of the industry. All the problems of backwardness,

wartime ravages and competition from the roads were evident twelve years ago. *But it must be remembered that the Labour government at the time held out the prospect of a co-ordinated, publicly-owned system of road and rail transport, so that the stubborn resistance of the Tories to nationalization cannot be ascribed to pure stupidity.* While we can see that so long as manufacturing industry is privately-owned the best nationalized transport system would rather strengthen than weaken the capitalist economy as a whole, that objective not only threatened to absorb some very profitable concerns, but always tended to raise arguments equally applicable to the economy as a whole; whereas to the Tories it was important that the debate be kept to the issue of whether nationalization was the remedy best suited to the ills of a particular derelict industry.

However, we know how things have actually turned out. What should be the attitude of social-

ists to proposals for "rationalisations" of the railways, involving, for example sharp increases in fares, the closing of "unremunerative" lines etc? No doubt the Tories will present these measures as the other side of the coin to decent conditions for a reduced number of railway men. Before turning to the interests and demands of the railwaymen themselves, we should be clear that the rest of the working-class ought to accept no such proposals. On the contrary, *the Labour movement should demand lower fares and better services as part of a plan to meet the needs of the people. This will bring together the interests of the railwaymen and of the famous "public". To adopt any other policy would be to fall into a trap which the Tories have made to measure for our Right-wing "efficiency" experts.*

Next issue: *Working on the Railways.*

KEN COATES

## THE SHORTER WORKING WEEK AND THE TUC

ON December 28 last year the TUC turned over a new leaf for the National headlines by issuing the now famous STATEMENT ON THE SHORTER WORKING WEEK. This deserves far more attention from socialists than it has had so far.

As the statement itself points out, this is not the first time that the TUC has committed itself to the ideal of a 40-hour week: in fact this latest statement is proudly acclaimed as heir to an impressive list of forbears, each one of which would have been unnecessary had its predecessor borne fruit. Workers should note this fact, and draw the conclusion that the teeth of the TUC are to be found outside the jaws of Congress House: and indeed, that when those teeth are discovered (around the shop floors?) the first wholesome chunk they need to bite out is at the moment securely anchored to the comfortable hams of the tenants of that excellent institution. "In 1944" we are told, "the TUC carried a resolution in favour of the adoption of the 40-hour week and two weeks holiday with pay as soon as possible after the end of hostilities, and the General Council decided that the establishment of the 40-hour week should be pursued principally by way of direct claims to the employers, followed at the appropriate time by an approach to the government with a request for legislation."

### First step

After the war the knights decided that they should "pursue

this goal in two stages" bravely facing the fact that the first of these stages was met at the time by "enough critics... to claim that this spelt economic ruin for Britain." "By 1947" we are told, "the first step of the General Council's program had been largely achieved." But no appeals were made to the government "because of the worsening economic situation".

### Apparent

Of course, the TUC's demand of 1944 was not exactly radical. "In 1939", say Cole and Postgate, "the trade unions were pressing, not very hopefully, for the 40-hour week, which the French and American workers had already to a large extent secured." (*The Common People*, p 647.) The Trade Unions of 1939 were not starry-eyed in their radicalism: for the International Labour Organisation had drafted a forty hours convention in 1936-7: although this remains to be ratified by the British Government. Long before this, it had become apparent to the wit of man that hours could be reduced: as long ago as 1926 the distinguished Mr Shadwell was advancing, in his book *The Breakdown of Socialism*, the firm view that a liberal alternative to socialist wickedness implied support for the eight-hour day.

### Lag behind

If we make so bold as to claim the 5-day week as a social advance already gained (and that is bolder than some people would think it to be), then simple arithmetic tells us that the TUC

is, today renewing an appeal which was hardly new enough to shock the established bigots of 1926. We could go much further: the TUC lists a whole string of countries which normally work a forty-hour week or less: although "until recently the United Kingdom has not shared in this development". (Whose fault is that?) However, to keep things straight, we should recall that Britain did not always lag so far behind. Thorold Rogers, writing in 1884, about the England of 1281, tells us:

"...the hours of labour were not long. They seem to have been not longer than eight hours a day..." (*Six Centuries of Work and Wages*, p 180.)

### Centuries

Thus, after 7 centuries of social advance, it is a joint triumph of industrial capitalism and the keen negotiating powers of the TUC which should not escape notice, that the people labour as long is automated factories and atomic power stations as they used to with windmills and muscles on the hither side of the dark ages. Hosanna!

But there isn't much point in just being rude to the poor old TUC. Let us assume that at last the General Council intends to make a real spurt to raise our conditions in the respect to the dizzy heights of medieval England: even so, there are two large faults in the STATEMENT which require to be discussed and remedied.

contd. page 3

### WORKING WEEK, contd.

The General Council claims that after the war large reductions, "usually to 44 or 45" (hours) were secured in the normal working week. Now this all depends on what you mean by the normal working week. Does "normal" mean "average"? If it does, and it should, then this just isn't true. Kurt Map, in his valuable pamphlet, *The British Economy and the Working Class*, gives the following figures for a representative cross-section of industrial occupations:

Year	Average Hours worked
1938	47.7
1946	47.6
1947	46.6
1948	46.7
1949	46.8
1950	47.6
1951	47.8
1952	47.7
1953	47.9
1954	48.5
1955	48.9
1956	48.5
1957	48.2
1958	47.7

(Kurt Map: *The British Economy and the Working Class*, Worker's League pamphlet, p. 23.) It will be observed that the lowest normal working week was that of 1947, at 46.6 hours. By 1958 we had aspired to the level of 1938, five-day week notwithstanding.

#### True

Now clearly the TUC knows that this is the general picture, and knows that the 44-hour week has been not only not gained, but actually retreated from. But the answer to this disarming item of knowledge will come pat enough: "Ah, but you're including overtime in your computations: and we can't stop that: indeed, when our member Unions try to do so, their members themselves circumvent their own regulations." And this is true. So clearly, if you want to cut the working week, and not simply to advance the hour at which overtime rates must be paid, you have to cut deeper to the bone in your negotiations that as yet the Unions have been able to.

#### Forgets 1944

We can see that in spite of the much bruted advance made by the General Council, the wheel had come full circle back to 1938 twenty years later on: and we can expect it to tend to continue to turn as before unless a mightier spoke than that brandished by the present general council can be thrust into it. The slogan of the hour appears to be, not FOR SHORTER WEEK, but FOR THE SHORTER WORKING WEEK WITH AT LEAST THE SAME NET INCOME AS BEFORE. At the moment, the campaign waged by the Unions bears many of the features of a concealed wage claim: the workers should be awakened to the fact that more than this can be got and should be demanded.

The second modest omission of the STATEMENT is that it forgets the 1944 business about appealing to the government. This should be remembered, and

noisily at that: for many reasons, of which two only will do to begin with. The first is to do with getting the shorter week. The short truth is that you need a law about this to compel the backwoodsmen of industry, including the nationalized ones, to set their shacks in order. In some sectors of the Transport industry the average hours worked in April 1959 were 51. Try negotiating with Sir Brian Robertson for an effective 40-hour week, one paid at the rates presently obtained by working 60 or more hours, and see what medals can be won!

#### 1901

If the law needs to be invoked at the end of a process, why not invoke it at the beginning, and save heartburn? But this is a shocking thought to many labour MPs. At the recent Swanwich school, organised by the National Association of Labour Student Organisations, I asked two right-wing MPs and a left one where they stood on such an issue. Hands were raised in horror: Parliament was not designed for such matters, I was told. (Lord Shaftesbury didn't think like our present labour MP's, it's worth noticing. Nor did the Fabian pope, Sydney Webb: in 1901 he wrote with glee that

"Liberal candidates are pledging themselves in all directions to support some such "Eight

hours bill" as that drafted by the Fabian Society." (*Socialism in England*, p 105.)

Poor Sydney. He didn't really understand what Parliament was for. If he could come back today Sarah Barker would have his head for sure, assuming he wasn't proscribed before she could get it!)

The re-education of Labour MPs in Fabian doctrine would do no harm to the Labour Party, and might even lighten the monotony at the House a little: but such instruction is scarcely likely to be undertaken by Sir Vincent Tewson unless some considerable heat can be turned on him by his millions, and they might easily get quicker redress by opening schools of their own. The way to start is quite simple: if enough Union branches begin to talk to their MPs about all this, a few minds will begin to change. If VFS is to break through to the industrial workers it could do worse than begin by introducing a forty-hour Bill.

#### A bridge

But there is a second reason for taking all this to Parliament: a very simple one. If we want nuclear disarmament, and if we are to be able to take effective steps to stop the next and more serious Suez, we have to break down the false wall which exists in people's minds between

political and industrial action. When the Fire Brigades Union called for a strike to stop the Suez adventure, this seemed quite sensible even to many liberals who saw the dangers which Imperialist policy opened up. But it didn't seem sensible to FBU members, partly because a long road has to be travelled before the majority of them, and the other trades unionists, are converted to socialism; and partly, in relation to this, because politics and things like strikes are separate matters to them. The danger of war is still far too great for us to be apathetic about this: the fate of the world may one day hang on the ability of the British working man to take on himself the moral responsibility for ending the iniquities of his governors. So if we want to prepare people for such challenges, we have to show them the connection between ordinary politics and their lives. If we can build a bridge across the Trade Union part of the worker's consciousness to the political part of it, and on this issue we can; then it will be a brave man who says confidently that he will only cross it in one direction.

One last word. A forty-hour week is far too long. We are clever enough to shorten the hours of labour again and again beyond such a point: and who will make the pace if we don't?

## TRADE UNION COMMENTARY

By JOHN PHILLIPS

SINCE wage claims are always a matter for discussion and action in the trade union movement it sometimes comes as a bit of a shock when wage increases are recommended by organizations usually opposed to any such 'inflationary' measures.

...For example, the recent struggle between the Transport Commission and the NUR produced support for the railwaymen from unexpected quarters. Almost everyone from the 'top' Times to the 'true blue' Mail have been unanimous in demanding justice for the railwaymen. Where was Greene?

Another case in point is the Bermondsey Borough Council which have circularized a letter to other London Councils recommending that wages of certain manual workers should be raised. This has been followed up by a letter the employers' side of the London Joint Council for Local Authorities' Services saying that the employers fully agree with the proposals except that they prefer negotiations to be held at national level. Where was the Municipal and General?

#### Reasons

Now this sort of things raises two problems. First of all what are the motives behind the bosses campaigning for their employees? In these two cases it seems that the problem is keeping services going that are in danger of collapse because of poor wages and unattractive working conditions.

But there can be other reasons. In a recent speech a cotton employer wondered why the cotton workers didn't ask for more money. This tactic is surely a copy of that used by the American steel firm Kaisers who were the first to concede the steel unions' demands simply because more efficiency (meaning fewer workers) enabled labour costs to rise slower than competing firms and so price them out of markets.

#### No solution

However the second problem is much more immediate to us at the moment. It concerns the attitude of the unions involved (NUR and Municipal Workers Union) towards the course of action to be taken in wage demands. Quite possibly the NUGMW officials are pleased at having someone else to do their work for them, but the issue remains, if the workers want an increase, let them fight for it. Manoeuvring over their heads, even in their interests, won't solve one iota the problem of apathy in the trade union movement.

#### ★

WHAT about it Cousins? This question to the General Secretary of the TGWU in last month's *Socialist Review* has been answered by none other than Bro Cousins himself and Sir Vincent Tewson.

The question referred to the decision by the Cyprus Workers Federation to take industrial action against South African goods and the need for the dockers and transport workers in this country to follow suit. But, the man that pulls the strings, Bro Cousins, and his colleague on the TUC General Council a few days ago viewed 'with grave concern' the possibility of action in the docks. The fact that the dockers have other pressing problems at the moment rather rules out any idea of unofficial action. Nevertheless the TGWU's *Record* says in the February issue that the boycott is "a gesture of solidarity with those who are fighting the evil policy of apartheid." It seems that TUC solidarity is no thicker than South African jam.

#### ★

RUMOR has it that discussions on registration (to end the casual nature of the building industry) are taking place in TGWU branches. Whilst agreeing that this is an important subject isn't amalgamation a more immediate problem?

#### Consolidate

Another point of building news is that London organizers of the NFBTO are working on a recruitment campaign in the city of London. We wonder what plans they have to consolidate this (and the existing) membership.

DEV MURARKA

# FEDERATION MUST GO!

In Central Africa he (the African) feels strongly about his country and its incorporation in a Federation with Rhodesia. He has felt thus for twenty years. The whole armoury of political propaganda is brought to bear to show that he doesn't; or if he does, that he knows nothing about it; or if he does know, that he has been misled by 'irresponsible agitators' and must be put right by further propaganda".

(from the Introduction to *Dawn In Nyasaland* by Guy Clutton-Brock.)

**1960** is the year of crisis in Central Africa. There is grave danger that the Africans in Nyasaland, already persecuted, jailed and silenced, will be submitted to inhuman political pressure to accept the Federation with Rhodesia. The whole course of events since the Devlin Report bears out the fear of those who distrust the Tory government to give a fair deal to Africans. The Tory leaders have learnt nothing from the Devlin Report. They have merely appointed another commission to prepare the ground for constitutional changes in the Federation. They have, however, tied the hands of the commission by restricting its terms of reference in such a way as to preclude any recommendation which even questions the existence of the Federation. This is in accordance with the wishes of Sir Roy Welensky who wants independence for the Federation in 1960 so that without any restrictions from the colonial office, he can reduce the present African serfs to absolute slavery.

## Any length

There should not be any doubts about the nature of struggle which is taking place in Central Africa now. Simply, it is a question of 2,750,000 Africans becoming either free to rule themselves or becoming slaves of 8,700 Europeans. The effect of what happens there in 1960 will be felt throughout Africa where the struggle for freedom is becoming fiercer and fiercer. The White settlers have left no doubt that they are determined to go to any length to maintain their stranglehold. They all speak with the same voice. As early as in 1956 Lord Malvern had said in the Federal Assembly, "We have complete control of our own Defence Force. I only hope we shall not have to use it as the North American colonies had to use theirs, because we are dealing with a stupid Government in the United Kingdom." Sir Roy Welensky echoed, "Should we fail to convince Her Majesty's Government of the justice of that, then will be the time to take stock and decide what other action is necessary. I personally would never be prepared to accept that the Rhodesians have less

guts than the American Colonists had." (from *Dawn In Nyasaland*, p. 142).

The fact that the guilty man of Hola and Nkata Bay, Mr Lennox Boyd, is gone, makes very little difference to Tory colonial policy. All his associates, including the Prime Minister Macmillan, are still there. In spite of his effusion of worn out political clichés during his tour of Africa, we must remember his recent records on the Central African question. It shows that he has brought the art of government by deceit and lies to a new perfection. The treatment of the revealing Devlin Commission Report, appointed by him in the hope of white-washing his infamous actions in Central Africa, was contemptuous and cynical enough. But his record on the Monckton Commission is even more revealing.

## Yes-men

The Monckton Commission was formed as a result of the Labour Party pressure for a Parliamentary Commission. Typically, though the Commission was announced it was a far cry from the sort of Commission that the Opposition asked for. Instead, it was stuffed by Roy Welensky's yes-men, African stooges, people generally hostile to African aspirations, and after the Labour Party refusal to join it, by renegade Labourites like Shawcross and Crawley. Although a pretence was kept up that Labour participation was earnestly desired by the Government, in fact everything possible was done to prevent it, in spite of rightwing Labour leadership's unashamed eagerness to join it if a face-saving formula could be found.

## No confidence

The two concessions which the Labour leadership asked for, were the broadening of the terms of reference and the lifting of restrictions of membership to Privy Counsellors. As soon as the Labour refusal was made final, promptly new members were appointed who were not Privy Counsellors. The claim that the Commission is made up of other Commonwealth members is even more amazing for if it is true than the so-called Commonwealth must be very white indeed. (Indians and other Afro-Asians, please note!) Inevitably, the Commission has inspired confidence in nobody except the settlers. The Africans have decided to boycott it and rightly so.

## Bow group

How ineffective and unsound the Commission's report must be when it is clear that no decent African will give evidence before it for fear of prosecution. It is strange that the Government has not thought it fit to grant legal

privilege for evidence given before the Commission. Thus anyone who expresses opinions contrary to what the Central African Federal Government considers proper, will be liable to prosecution. Under the Police State which is the Federation today, such prosecution can have very serious consequences for the person concerned. What is more important, the real leaders and representatives of the African people in the Federation are behind bars. The shocking scandal of Dr Banda's imprisonment without trial is beginning to disturb even some of the Tories as is evident from the Bow Group Memorandum, *Africa—New Year 1960* which says, "Dr. Banda should be released in Nyasaland (not in London as some Rhodesians suggest) in good time to have the opportunity to take his place in the political system". (Page 4, Para 1.)

## No support

There is another objection to the Monckton Commission. Without going into the merits of the future report or even assuming that by a million to one chance Monckton will become another Devlin, where is the guarantee that Macmillan Government will not treat the Report with the same indifference and contempt which it showed towards the Devlin Report? We therefore urge all Africans and Liberal Europeans to boycott the Monckton Commission. It will be a waste of time to co-operate with it since if the Report will dare to say the truth that **NO AFRICAN SUPPORTS FEDERATION**, it will be rejected by a Tory government assured of a brute majority in the Parliament and power for a long time to come. If it does not express the African aspirations and merely confirms what Roy Welensky and other advocates of White Supremacy want it to confirm, the Africans will have to prepare for a long and bitter fight to secure their rights.

## Responsibility

Upon the labour movement in Britain there is a heavy responsibility with regard to Central Africa. Central Africa is not yet a Dominion and the Africans are looking to Britain to protect themselves from the racial vultures of Sir Roy Welensky. The British Parliament still bears responsibility for the people of Nyasaland and it must see to it that Federation should not become sovereign authority for the people of Nyasaland and Rhodesia. Unfortunately, the Tories are in control of the Parliament. *So the labour movement must keep up an agitation in support of independence for Nyasaland and the break-up of the Federation.*

If the labour movement is not

sufficiently enthusiastic or well informed about the events in Africa in general or Central Africa in particular, and the significance of such events, part of the blame must be shared by the leadership of the party. In the past they have shown a disastrous tendency to play the statesman game without the sinews of power to do so. The result has been pathetic to watch. Let us hope that they have learnt their lesson although the brinkmanship which they showed over not joining the Monckton Commission was not very reassuring. It is their duty to maintain a relentless pressure on the Tories whenever and wherever African rights are threatened. They have often sat upon their own Left for saying the political truth which was unpalatable to them. On the question of Central Africa they might do worse than to listen to what the Tory Bow Group has to say. "If the ultimate future of the Federation is pressed in 1960 the pressure cooker of African nationalism will boil over again in Nyasaland and no amount of legitimate rhapsodising of the economic benefits of the federal system will keep Nyasaland in the Federation except by force of arms". (Page 3, Para 3.)

## Racial

About the racial nature of Sir Roy Welensky's programme there can be few doubts. As late as July 1959, when the Federal Government was proclaiming its racial tolerance, the Manchester Guardian reported the case of an African doctor in Salisbury who was stopped from conducting postmortem examinations because he might have to work on European bodies. The superintendent of the hospital concerned said that the ruling had come from the Ministry. The Federal Secretary for Health admitted this. (*Manchester Guardian*, July 11, 1959).

## Who decides?

Mr. Macmillan's antics concerning the Federation, his two ambiguous and contradictory statements, one in Nigeria and another in the Federation are a grave warning. It is apparent that Sir Roy Welensky has taken complete charge of the British government policy about the Federation. Mr Macmillan may yet reveal himself as a British Guy Mollet. We want to know, who decides British policy? Mr. Macmillan or Sir Roy Welensky?

POLITICS 1960

PAGE 6

NOTTING HILL

NOTEBOOK

PAGE 8

T. CLIFF

# WHAT WAS BEHIND MAC'S AFRICA TOUR?

THE central theme of Macmillan's voyage through Africa was the race between the forces of concession and reform from above and the waxing strength of the revolutionary movements from below. As he put it: "The tide of nationalism is flowing right through Africa" and Britain had to come to terms with it.

The very rapidity and unevenness of the change makes imperialist rule increasingly intolerable for the peoples of Africa. In bygone days it was possible to withdraw forces from one corner of the large continent without retreating elsewhere. Now the unity of the African freedom movement is clear as was dramatically demonstrated when a reply by Macmillan to a journalist in Nigeria brought powerful reactions thousands of miles away in Central Africa.

## The tide

With Ghana, French Guinea, Belgian Congo, Nigeria and Tanganyika independent or on the verge of being so, the tide of national liberation obviously cannot be stopped.

The *Times*, organ of the Establishment, has made it clear that it is ready to ditch even Central Federation in order to come to terms with Africa nationalism:

Whatever decisions are made in British Central Africa will have to take account of... the fixing in Brussels of June 30 as the date for independence of the Congo. The whole federal scheme was drafted in 1953 on the assumption that the Congo would provide a bastion against the southward spread of West African nationalism. Behind this bastion, it was envisaged, the Central African countries could develop policies of partnership at a deliberate pace. During the past twelve months this assumption has been dramatically destroyed... the whole future of the Central African countries, and above all of Northern Rhodesia, whose Copperbelt forms in many ways a single geographical and industrial unit with the Belgian Katanga, must be profoundly affected. (*The Times*, Jan. 28)

In terms no less categorical, another Establishment paper made it clear that an agreement with African nationalism must be arrived at in Kenya, even if the interests of the white settlers had to be sacrificed. (*The Economist*, Feb. 1)

## New imperialism

Even the *Daily Mail*, arch-reactionary paper that it is, protested strongly at the police brutality at Blantyre in Nyasaland during Macmillan's tour.

This concessionary trend, however, is interlarded with counter-trends. It is no accident that on the eve of Macmillan's visit a new and even more repressive Public Security Bill was promulgated in Nyasaland. The extremist Kenya settlers should also not be overlooked. *The Observer* of February 7th said: "Their 'ultras' are showing signs of mobilising their forces to prevent what they regard as 'the great sellout now being negotiated in London.'"

But the tide is rising without question, and neither King Canute nor Group Captain Briggs can stop it.

## FAR FLUNG

*Socialist Review* has, if not a widespread influence, at least a far flung one. Our latest success has been in Japan where the marxist writer Tadayuki Tsushima included in his latest work—*A Criticism of Soviet 'Socialism'*—two articles reprinted from the paper—"The Future of the Russian Empire: Reform or Revolution" and "Mao-Tse-tung and Stalin" by Tony Cliff—and a chapter from *Stalinist Russia; a Marxist Analysis* by Cliff, more than 100 pages in all.

One should not conclude from this that political independence is synonymous with economic and social freedom. The United States has no colonies in Africa but this has not prevented her increasing her capital investments from 150 million dollars in 1945 to 2,000 million at present. Again, since India won political independence

from Britain in 1947, private British capital investment in India has risen from £154 million in 1948, to £309 million in 1957.

If imperialism means the rule of monopoly capitalism — or its control of capital, the export of capital, the super-exploitation of backward countries, — then imperialism is far from ended (despite Strachey) in Africa. On the contrary, political independence can give greater leeway for an expansion of this economic exploitation.

Latin America, independent politically, has not ceased being a Yankee colony or semi-colony economically over the last half-century. And along with the general Americanization of Britain, apparent in so many aspects of its economic, social and political system, the Americanization of British imperialism, i.e. reliance on wealth rather than bayonets, is on the order of the day.

This will lead necessarily, even if not immediately, to a greater intertwining of the national struggle with the social, the class struggle. Capital will more and

more openly come to be recognized as the enemy of all workers, white, brown or black.

*Except for its final paragraph, this article was written before Macmillan's „Wind of Change“ speech before the Union Parliament in Cape Town. Readers might think it overtaken by events; alternatively it might be considered a shrewd assessment of the realities of power in Central Africa and Britain. We believe the speech to have marked a significant shift in British imperial policy: from reliance on minute, settler minorities to reliance on the rising African capitalist class as the guardian of British capital abroad. However, wind of change or just wind, the appeal to the labour movement to help in the process of colonial freedom is timely — Editor.*

## THE STRUGGLE FOR A SYMBOL

By Cllr RAY CHALLINOR

"ORDINARILY no one reads Party constitutions," says *Forward's* leader-writer (January 15, 1960), "except perhaps political opponents looking for ammunition." At first glance this remark, coming from a staunch Gaitskellian journal, may appear rather peculiar. For *Forward* supporters have often scoured the Labour Party constitution, examining every dot and comma, in the hope it will assist in the good, old Transport House game 'hunt-the-left-winger'.

But in a deeper, more important sense, *Forward* is largely correct. The constitution has long since stopped being a living force within the Labour Party. The Party constitution should embody the fundamental principles for which the whole membership is working. All practical activity—in Parliament, council chambers and workshops—should be judged by whether it furthers the open and declared aim of the Party, namely, Socialism. However, the Labour leadership does not use this criteria. For them, the word "Socialism" has become a vague, meaningless term.

### Excuse

Gaitskell's smart set of sherry-sippers—Jay, Crosland & Co.—look with abhorrence upon a true definition of Socialism in clause 4 of the constitution: "To secure for the workers by hand or brain the full fruits of their industry and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange, and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry or service."

Gaitskell's move to get this section omitted by this year's conference has led to a comic opera situation within the Labour Party. All members before joining are supposed to accept the Party constitution, clause 4 being so important, so fundamental,

that it has been reprinted, so far, on each membership card. But what are people joining the Party expected to believe in now? The very leaders of the Party no longer accept the fundamental principles of the constitution—and yet they expel some members who do. For example, in Islington some comrades—including *Socialist Review* supporters who accept this basic article of the constitution are being kept out of the Labour Party by those who don't!

The excuse Gaitskell gives for throwing the Labour Party into this turmoil is that the present constitution "is liable to misinterpretation". He wants it replaced with a statement saying a Labour Government would control "the commanding heights of the economy".

*In actual fact what is wrong with the constitution, from Gaitskell's standpoint, is not its ambiguity but the lack of it. With a clear definition in the Party rules, the leaders backsliding and down-right anti-socialist policy stand is exposed. In the past the Labour leaders, while keeping their actions well within the capitalist framework, have claimed, as an ultimate objective, to be in favour of Socialism. The significance of Gaitskell's move is that he now wants to dispense with the socialist trimmings, and to have the Labour Party stand, clearly and openly, as a Party which simply seeks to reform capitalism.*

To say that one favours a Labour Government that would

control "the commanding heights of the economy" commits the leaders to frankly nothing. Indeed, in his speech at the Blackpool conference, Gaitskell argued that the nature of capitalism had changed because the state—even under a Tory Government—controlled the economy, and therefore could regulate the volume of employment. It can, therefore, be argued—indeed, it is implied by Gaitskell's speech—that the present Tory Government controls "the commanding heights of the economy".

What Gaitskell and his colleagues want is *carte blanche*, a statement from the Party that commits them to nothing. In scurrying for this, they are prepared to jettison even the modest measures of the last Labour Government. They no longer wish to bring steel or road haulage into public ownership, nor to re-introduce the controls imposed by the Attlee administration. Yet, even these measures of the Labour Government proved incapable of bringing in any considerable degree of social equality or of taming capitalism.

### Fabian

What is significant is not that Gaitskell has turned his back on Socialism, or on the modest measures of Attlee's Government, but also has turned his back on his own policy of six months ago. This can clearly be seen from the statement of one of his leading lieutenants, CAR Crosland, in *The Spectator* (October 24, 1958):

*Broadly one may say that the revisionist period is over; that is, the business of giving the Labour Party a policy attuned to mid-twentieth century is more or less complete. On the theoretical plane this period began with New Fabian*

*contd. page 7*

# POLITICS 1960

## SOME COMMENTS ON PETER CADOGAN'S ARTICLE IN FEBRUARY SR

P. Mansell

IN THE foreward to his article "Politics 1960", Peter Cadogan said: It is a condition of building the Left in Britain that we produce an increasingly agreed and ultimately valid analysis of the world situation... From such an analysis we shall be progressively capable of developing a general line of policy and action. It is the absence of something of this order that is now the main impediment to the growth of the Left". His article is a contribution to the development of this general line of policy and action.

But are Comrade Cadogan's postulates correct? Naturally any serious Leftist must try to analyse political problems and draw correct conclusions. But is it of primary importance in building a unity of the Left forces to reach an agreed analysis of the world situation?

For example, within the Left, there is a variety of views about the character of the regime in Russia. These range from near fellow-travellers who declare that Russia is Socialist, through those who believe that it is some (admittedly deformed) kind of worker's state, to those who consider it is state capitalism. Naturally, these important differences in theoretical analysis lead to fundamental differences in political attitudes, from wholehearted support, through critical support, to outright opposition. But does the Left really have to agree on this question before being able to do anything effective in 1960? For every one such question, important in itself but not necessarily of immediate practical importance to-day, there are ten issues requiring urgent action on which large sections of the Left can agree.

### Perspectives

Comrade Cadogan goes on to say that the absence of a generally agreed line of policy by the Left is the main impediment to its growth. Heaven knows there are plenty of shortcomings on the Left. But a far bigger obstacle to its growth is the objective situation. If all the present left-wing groups were imbued with a perfect understanding of scientific Socialism, if they all worked harmoniously together, if they all consisted of dedicated revolutionary heroes, they might be a little bigger and a little bit more effective. But the general political situation would remain basically the same. There would not be a mass revolutionary party. MacMillan would not have to fear that an English Lenin was about to usurp his position. *The perspectives of the Left are much more affected by the boom, by the comparative prosperity and contentment of large sections of workers, by the absence of any strong urge on the part of the workers to change than by lack of theoretical clarity.* This is not to say that the Left should lie back complacently and do nothing until a slump arrives to shake things up. On the contrary, it faces a challenging dilemma.

But the picture is distorted if

we begin with the Left and look at the political situation as though the Left wing groups were the decisive factor. To do so is as misleading and disastrous as to regard the world as the centre of the universe. *It is the working class as a whole, not little groups, which alone is in a position to shape events. Because the Left to-day is small and weak, it has, generally speaking, to react to events. For example, one of the important tasks for the Left is to rally support in the Labour Party for the defence of nationalization as an integral part of the constitution and program. But the time when this issue will become a really live one will depend on when the NEC issues its proposed revision.*

There is therefore some unreality in posing as Comrade Cadogan does an ambitious and comprehensive programme of

## Out of the ice-age

Walter Kendall

WHEN the thaw comes in the Northland the first sign is the cracking of the ice as it breaks into floes. Ken Coates' article (SR, January), the reply by P. Mansell (SR, February), represent a beginning of the end of an ice age in British marxism. A whole era has passed away. A new epoch is being born.

The essential conception that Coates advances is correct. His application is in error. One cannot arbitrarily impose any target, idealistically, on the working class movement. The direction in which millions march is objectively determined by the needs of the movement. The plan for an offensive must arise dialectically as a result of interaction between workers experience and the intellectual appreciation made by their leadership of the possibilities of the moment.

At the time Tom Mann's Eight Hour League was formed London gas workers were employed for a twelve hour day, six days a week. When Will Thorne led the strike for an eight hour day which founded the General and Municipal Workers' Union the workers gained a 50 per cent reduction in working hours. The victory made it possible for the workers to become something more than dumb working animals. The advance was immense.

The proposal Coates makes is by comparison a very minor one. US workers under capitalism have gained this objective without deepening their revolutionary consciousness in any way. In 1889 the demand to limit the working day was a direct challenge to the principles of liberal 'laissez faire' capitalism. This most important factor hardly has relevance today.

Coates is wrong to think that in present circumstances a seven hour day agitation would either raise fundamental issues or find widespread support. Times have changed. Slogans must change with them. In this I agree with Mansell.

Yet, the underlying thought in Coates' article is fundamentally correct. He is right to reject the "party conception", one which I believe despite protestations to the contrary is still held by the leadership of **Socialist Review**.

It seems to me that the **Socialist Review** has adopted Luxemburg as a patron saint with which to counter Healy's "Leninist" Mephistopheles. Yet in tactical approach, in organ-

izational conceptions, the two factions do not fundamentally differ. The SLL at least is consistent. SR vacillates between the two conceptions.

The need of today is a broad movement, one in accord with the historical traditions of the British working class. The emphasis needs to pass from a selection of elite cadres, to that of raising the consciousness of the workers as a class.

In this endeavour, to raise the issue of Workers Control, not as a pious statement in a program, but actively and continuously as a focal point of all agitational activity has become a necessity.

There are historical reasons. Abroad the emergence of the monolithic state in Russia, China and Eastern Europe openly challenges our past claims that state ownership will automatically bring more freedom, more equality, a more healthy and equitably society. At home, the nationalized industries seemingly refute all our claims that socialism will radically alter the workers status.

The fact that British marxists have failed to deal with these matters effectively has meant that a process which ought to have strengthened the Left has in fact gone some way towards aiding the Right instead. It is surely no accident that T. Cliff has written three books and not one of them deals with British conditions. In this he carries on the tradition of thirty years of marxist sectarianism in Britain.

Today more than ever before the British working class movement has the power to smash the capitalist state machine. The trade unions are over 8,000,000 strong. The Labour Party still pools some 12,000,000 votes, more than in 1945. What is lacking is NOT the power it is instead the **conscious active will**.

Trade unions and Labour Party leaderships have no secret police to maintain their power. Bureaucracy whilst powerful is puny in comparison with that which exists, in for example, the United States. The leaders represent, let's face it, only an exaggerated form of the ignorance and passivity of the rank and file. It is this that we have to alter.

Gaitskell's speech at the Blackpool Conference was made possible by the inadequacy of the Left which had failed to fill the vacuum left by the completion of Labour's immediate program in the years 1945-1951. Stalinism has largely lost its ideological influence amongst British workers. Yet so far British marxist have failed to fill the gap.

Two spontaneous movements the

like Britain, with a numerous working class, with long experience of its own democratic organisations, universal literacy etc. has enormous advantages in building Socialism. But in the short run, these very factors create enormous difficulties in the way of overthrowing capitalism and establishing a workers' state. To recognise this is not to be defeatist. To ignore it is to risk ultimate despair.

*Our essential immediate task has to be to study and discuss the trends and problems that will probably be thrown up within the mass political and industrial organizations of the working class, to define a policy towards them and see how this can most effectively be put over and developed within these organizations. This is how the Left will slowly and painfully grow. This is how unity in action can be achieved.*

Campaign of Nuclear Disarmament and the ULR New Left, have made an important impact on recent British politics. Both grew precisely because the sectarian conceptions of British marxists made it impossible for them to fill this gap. The sects have now become a barrier to progress. Their messianic visions in reality don't put them at the head of the class..... They leave them lost, fumbling short sightedly behind it, too often mixed up with the rear-guard or even the camp followers. The 20th Congress and Hungary provided a unique opportunity. Let nobody deny the fact... **IT HAS BEEN MISSED.**

The essential task facing British marxists is to break with their sectarian past and think matters out again in this new era. Lenin's organizational scheme, entirely adequate to Czarist conditions is not appropriate here. The way ahead is only to be found by a reexamination of our own history.

If what we need is not a cadre force, a self chosen elect, what then?

Firstly a planned attempt to revive and reimplant marxist consciousness in the ranks of the working class by means of a revival and reapplication of the old Plebs League/Central Labour College Movement. An attempt to advance by raising the consciousness of the masses in the tradition of JOHN MACLEAN.

Secondly a determination to develop a large-scale movement for workers' control, and to interpret all our socialist propaganda in this light.

Thirdly, a clear understanding that the movement which results will be broad and not narrow, one which marxists will influence by means of the relevance of their ideas and not by some divine right to rule. Historically this has been the marching route of the British proletariat. Chartism, the Industrial Syndicalist Education League, the Plebs League, the Guild Socialists, all carried the movement forward without becoming messianic sect.

The needs of the marxist is to break with their own sectarian past, to reapply marxism, without blinkers, to the realities of the British situation.

A first step would be to call an open Congress of all British marxists to consider the relevance of marxist principles to British politics today.

The time of the sects has passed. Either they help to inaugurate a broad movement or history will leave them stranded whilst the tide of progress sweeps by in its majesty. Will they have the courage to meet the challenge that they face?

## IT'S RICH

"In seeking to fulfill his missionary task in Africa today, the Afrikaner is making a stand against Russian and Chinese Communism, Indian imperialism, Eastern, Middle Eastern and North African Mohammedanism, Western European Liberalism, American capitalist sentimentalism, and inflamed anti-White Bantu animism" — Dr PJ Meyer, Director, South African Broadcasting Corporation, in *Trek Verder*.

"The mass of Africans are the happiest people on God's earth. We have done more for our Natives so far as civilizing, educating, and lifting them up than any other country in the world" — Dr AJ van Rhijn, South African High Commissioner in Britain, to a Birmingham Rotary Club luncheon, *Times*, February 9.

"Macmillan steals Labour thunder" — *Reynolds News'* headline on PM's Cape Town speech, February 7.

"Fears that groups of workers might take unofficial action (in connexion with the Boycott) were expressed by Sir Vincent Tewson... and Mr Frank Cousins..." — *Times* Labour Correspondent reporting on the National Council of Labour meeting, February.

"Lord Rootes commented yesterday that a small body of men had no right to jeopardize the livelihood of thousands of families" — *Times* leader, January 27.

"The (US) Federal Government now has some \$9,000m. tied up in surplus commodities. The wheat program alone costs \$1,500,000 a day, and there is now enough surplus wheat being stored at Government expense to feed the nation for two and a half years" — *Times*, February 10.

"The Americans agreed to use their economic help as an incentive to induce the Egyptians to make and keep an agreement on acceptable terms. This was to be understood by all concerned, but not blatantly expressed" — Sir Anthony Eden, *Memoirs* as reprinted in *Times*, January 16.

"...there is much more to a Soviet general election than meets the eye" — *World News*, October 24, 1959, p 514.

"He (Molotov) agreed that there should be free elections in Germany, but that the four occupying powers should surely agree beforehand upon the kind of government they wished to result from free elections" — Sir Anthony Eden, *Memoirs* as reprinted in *Times*, January 13.

"Its lofty Marxist—Leninist ideological content, party spirit, truthfulness, militant revolutionary spirit, irreconcilability to ideological vacillations and revisionism, explain the Soviet people's sincere appreciation of the Soviet Press" — Message from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR to the first Congress of Soviet Journalists, November 12, 1959.

"Cadogan was expelled from the Socialist Labour League because he refused to avail himself of his constitutional right to present his political opinions to the membership and took his views to the public at large" — G. Healy, *Newsletter*, January 30.

## PARLIAMENT *Michael Millett*

A RUSSIAN TSAR once said that his two Generals January and February made victory certain. The rest of the general staff were more dubious material.

The Government, in the week before writing seemed to be all set for a showdown. The centre of London had been washed pink, but not in the blood of opposition Privy Councillors. The battle-hardened divisions of the AA and RAC were ready for a death or glory attack upon the railwayman's children and the Government stood firm and foursquare upon whatever principles it happened to have at the moment.

And then it started to snow. Like many another commander, Mr Butler considered the Meteorological Office report. It would go on snowing. After (no doubt) some expensive radiocommunication with the South Atlantic, the executive of the NUR had a shill-

ing-in-the-pound increase thrust into their (again no doubt) astonished hands.

The British climate is not reliable at all but it has been far more use to the National Union of Railwaymen than some whom the politically innocent might suppose to be on their side. The Parliamentary Labour Party, for example.

### Catastrophe

Mr Bowles and later Mr Shinwell made an attempt to get the strike debated. After all, had not business been suspended already for an emergency debate on Cyprus? Couldn't the Mental Health (Scotland) Bill wait just one more day? The Speaker refused a debate. In an important matter like this, however, an emergency debate can always be arranged; one or the other of the

Front Benches, has only got to ask. But Messrs. Gaitskell and Wilson were as loquacious as a couple of Trappist monks after lights-out. Mr Robens made a speech that could have come from any personnel manager (Whoops, sorry.) He said that the strike would be a catastrophe. If he'd only had a knife to hand he could have demonstrated once more the slicing up of our, by now much fingered, National Cake.

Come Saturday, and in Nottingham Mr Gaitskell was in firm sympathy with the railwayman's plight. What was wrong with saying the same things in Westminster on Friday?

## NEW PRINT

Readers might notice a few typographical changes in the paper this month. There is nothing more sinister behind them than a change of printers. We cannot gauge the full effect of this change as yet, and readers might still hear something to their advantage. One thing can be revealed now, however: our turn-round in the printshop has been cut almost by half and typed copy for publication can now be received only thirteen days before publication date. Last date for receipt of copy this month is the 18th. The address to which it should be sent: Michael Kidron, 94B Regent's Park Road, London NW1 (All other communications should be sent to Geoff Carlsson, 117 Carmelite Road, Harrow Weald, Middx).

### Clue

Mr Gaitskell gave the clue to his attitude in his Nottingham speech. He said that: here were those who, "were supremely indifferent to the views of the electorate as a whole and were not interested in winning power for Labour in the country as a whole on the near future."

### Victory

Save in the unlikely event of the House of Commons being wiped out by Myscamtosis Labour cannot win an electoral victory before 1964. Anybody who might be impressed by the "Statesman-like" attitude to this dispute by the Labour Front Bench will have certainly forgotten it in four years time. But pretending that wage claims are not the business of a working class political party will weaken the loyalties of the solid working class core upon which a socialist victory, left wing or right wing, must be based.

### ★

I DIDN'T SAY IT, HE DID.....

Mr Aubry, Bristol (Lab.), Is the minister aware that the whole of last summer the country was suffering from severe drought and two months later we were having floods in the same places. Can he do something to solve the problem between floods and droughts?

Mr Brooke I am not God.

Sir Godfery Nicholson, Farnham, (Cons.). The people of Britain had had enough of blackmail, of retreating and of being pushed from pillar to post..... the ultimate sanction must be the moment when Britain said "It is no longer worth going on: we shall leave Cyprus."

## ● CLAUSE 4 contd.

Essays, and continued with the analytical work of Mr Strachey, the Socialist Union group, and myself. On the practical plane it culminated in the recent series of Labour statements, all bearing the marks of Mr Gaitskell's personal influence.

A mere year after writing this article Crossland is proposing further revisions, a dilution—almost an impossibility!—of the watery Gaitskellian policy on which the General election was fought. No wonder *The Economist* (January 16) suggests it is solely a matter of "temperamental preference" whether bright young things join the Liberal Party, the Tory Bow Group—or become Gaitskellites.

Of course, the Labour left must keep the Red Flag flying, opposing the backslidings of the Hampstead set, and fight for the retention of clause 4 of the Party constitution. It must also expose the chicanery used by the trade union bosses, who will doubtless disregard their own union constitutions to bring their decisive block vote behind Gaitskell's revisions.

At the same time, left-wingers romantic conception of the Labour Party's 1918 constitution, which, for the first time, contained clause 4. *Tribune* (January 8) is wrong when it suggests that the formal adoption of clause 4 transformed the Labour Party into a Socialist Party. It has never been a Socialist Party. Hitherto the Labour Party has been prepared to clothe its modest plans for reforming capitalism with a socialist cloak, claiming that over the decades, or centuries, it would bring in Socialism.

### Function

What is significant is that the constitution, acceptable to the right-wing leaders of 1918—traitors like MacDonald and Snowden—is now deemed to be too left-wing by our dear Mr Gaitskell. He wants the Labour Party to transform itself into something comparable with the American Democratic Party.

*This Americanization may tempt genuine socialists to drop out of the Party or form some independent party. But this would be disastrous. For so long as the Labour Party holds the allegiance of the organized working class, then the workers will look to the Labour Party at times of stress. And while Gaitskellism may appear adequate during fair weather, capitalist storms will demand socialist solutions. It is important that socialists remain inside the Party where they can be most effective.*

Our function in the years that lie immediately ahead is to swim against the stream, to be in the forefront of industrial struggles, to win intellectual battles against the right-wing. Periods of prosperity are hard on socialists, but they are testing periods. We may remain small, isolated, our message hardly understood. However, if socialists are to be a force when the crisis of capitalism comes—as surely it must—then it is important to keep the flame alight even in the darkest hour of the night.

## Notting Hill notebook

by C.C. Byfield

One of the worthwhile things done by the Borough of Kensington to reduce the possibility of racial friction, was to appoint a West Indian social worker to the staff of its Citizens Advice Bureau to help in cases involving coloured and white peoples. And although the role of such a person is usually one of trying to undo the damage after it has been done, nevertheless the efforts made by the holders of this job have shown, quite clearly, where the immediate problems lie. *And top of the list is housing.*

But it is not, as many people think, the belief that coloured people are depriving white people of accommodation which leads to hostility on the part of the white people, but chiefly specific cases where a coloured person has bought a house with a "sitting tenant".

And in probing these cases, it has been found that there is a good deal of ignorance of the law regarding landlord and tenant. Also, that "very often" the coloured landlord has bought the house through a mortgage with a high interest rate, then finds that in order to do the necessary repairs he needs to let more rooms than he had at first intended. This leads to efforts by the landlord to secure the tenants accommodation for furnished letting which in turn leads to hostility on both sides.

Three things, it seems, need to be done: *Firstly, the speeding-up of rehousing schemes; secondly, the restriction of interest rates charged for house mortgages; and thirdly, wider dissemination of knowledge of the law regarding tenants' right.*

ANOTHER of the good things that came out of the troubles of '58, is the setting-up of a committee by the Mayor of Kensington to help in the integration of the various races living in the Borough; and it was largely due to the efforts of this committee that the West Indian social worker was appointed by the CAB. However, the Mayors' term of office will be ending soon, and the question arises: Will this committee die with his leaving, or will it be handed over to his successor?

Since, in the words of the present West Indian social worker, "there is still a great deal of tension and potential antagonism among the bi-racial inhabitants of North Kensington" *strenuous efforts should be made to see that this is not the case, and that the Mayors' Committee carry on.*

YET ANOTHER of the efforts being made by the people of North Kensington to make life easier, is the formation of Tenants Associations to campaign against racketeering landlords, inadequate street cleaning and rubbish disposal facilities, inadequate playgrounds for children, prostitution, "undesirable" clubs, and insufficient amenities for old peoples.

*In these Associations, coloured and white people have joined together to fight for mutually beneficial causes, and judging by the response of the people in the worst affected streets, it would seem that in matters where the people can be made to see the benefits that would accrue from their efforts, there is no great difficulty in persuading them to join in the fight. What's more, by working together in such matters, a good deal of prejudices and suspicions are broken down. I am sure there is a lesson here for everyone.*

## Young Socialists

Report from Gillingham

by Tony Young, Ramsgate

THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE has decided to set up a youth organization to be called the *Young Socialists*. A series of Area Conferences are to be held to explain how the new movement is intended to work, and to try to enlist the enthusiastic support of the constituency parties. The first of these took place at Gillingham on Sunday 7th February, for the 19 constituencies in Kent, and was attended by over 70 delegates.

To reveal the details of the new organization there were Fred Mulley MP for the Park division of Sheffield, and Alan Williams, National Youth Officer. Delegates knew that the LP Youth Section, first set up in 1955 had utterly failed to win

more new young members for the Party than had the old League of Youth, or to stem the drift towards political indifference and anti-Labour ideas among youth in general. Mr Mulley, expanded on these themes. The National Executive were seriously concerned, he said, about the tiny number of active Party members aged under 40, and by the evidence suggesting that the youngest electors showed a definite "swing" against Labour, regarding the Party as "reactionary" and the Tories as "modern".

Alan Williams described the proposed organizational set-up, outlined the network of local, constituency, Area, Regional and National conferences and committees, all to be "completely intergrated with the Party itself, exchanging delegates at their respective levels." He told the audience of the national publicity campaign which the Party plans to launch around the *Young*

*Socialists*, and put forward his views as to the type of program YS branches should adopt in order to have an impact on young people as yet uninterested in politics.

Alan Williams was obviously eager for the success of the new organization, and his opinions on the subject of publicity and program did not meet with serious opposition when delegates had their chance to speak. The sharp counter-posing of "political" and "social" activities, familiar in the past was not much in evidence, although the general agreement on the need to approach uncommitted youth in new ways no doubt concealed sharp future disputes on whether or not to cover up socialist ideas for the sake of numbers where the two may conflict.

Left-wing delegates—nearly all the young socialists who took part in the discussion were in that category—concentrated their attention on the need for the utmost freedom in shaping policy and activity if the organization were ever to be of any assistance to the Party in the long run. Nobody thought that the bewildering variety of committees, or any other constitutional novelties, would much impress young people outside the Party, but it was repeatedly urged that any attempt to gag or discipline the *Young Socialists*, however "embarrassing" to the leadership they might sometimes appear, would be fatal to that leadership's hopes of building up a body of keen canvassers and future local councillors.

### Breaking through

Most delegates saw the need to overcome the suspicions and cynicism directed towards the Labour Party on the part of even those young people who already show that they care about political and social issues such as the H-Bomb and colourbar, and applauded the procedure adopted at the conference of requiring all in attendance to submit a declaration that they were not members of a proscribed organization. Such an attitude was guaranteed to repel anyone seriously interested in ideas and who wanted to think for himself.

Two delegates concentrated on working-class and secondary-modern-school youth. Alan Williams had pointed out that the existing LP Youth Sections were particularly weak in Scotland, Wales and the North. It was quite clear that the Party is at present making practically no impression at all on young trade-unionists and those at night-school, but whatever the difficulties of breaking through to even a minority of these people, striving to appear respectable would ensure failure.

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, post paid. 12 issues: 8s. Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of *Socialist Review* which are given in editorial statement.

All communications to be addressed to 117 Carmelite Rd., Harrow Weald, Middlesex.

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

## 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.