

# SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

10th YEAR No 6

JUNE 1960

SIXPENCE

JOURNAL

for the

Industrial Militant —

for

International

Socialism

## SOCIALISM AND THE SUMMIT

THE HISTORY OF SUMMIT CONFERENCES and Foreign Ministers' negotiations is a dismal one: at worst, a carve-up between war lords, as at Yalta and Geneva 1955; at best, the endless "jaw-jaw" of disarmament parleys, at least preferable (as Churchill put it) to "war-war", but achieving nothing positive.

Paris 1960 looked like being a "jaw-jaw" Summit. Khrushchev's refusal to negotiate means the sudden, brutal achievement of nothing through the hysteria of one side, rather than its prolonged achievement by the polite hypocrisy of all sides.

Speculation has run rife on the motives of the Soviet withdrawal. Khrushchev is strong, and wants to display his strength. Or Khrushchev is weak, and wants to whip up a patriotic frenzy at home. Or he is under pressure from China and neo-Stalinist diehards. Certainly the recent demotion of Khrushchev's nominees in the Soviet leadership lends support to these latter two suggestions. It is also possible that any one with as much power as Khrushchev has, and Stalin had, is bound to go mad after a while.

U-2!

*Espionage is, for all governments, only the continuation of foreign policy by other means. Whether pursued by the capitalist or the Communist world, it is either equally detestable, involving as it does unprincipled intrigue and human corruption, or equally commendable, as reducing the danger of surprise attack from each side. The virulence of the Kremlin's response to the U-2 intrusion points to the possibility that, if Captain Powers did not exist, it would be necessary to invent him. (And Communist governments have not in fact been slow to invent spy-stories, when reasons of State demanded such invention.)*

On the other hand, the timing and manner of the invasion of Soviet air-space, plus Washington's bland approval of this inevitably provocative act, plus Nixon's boast of the thousands of Soviet secrets gleaned through aerial photography, must create the suspicion that Captain Powers' existence, detection and captivity is necessary also to certain American politicians. The lesson of the farce in Paris is that the lessening of world tension will be sacrificed by either side to its internal interests: to Khrushchev's threatened ascendancy in the Praesidium or to Nixon's jingoist candidacy in the Presidential election. Khrushchev and Nixon, no less than Adenauer and Ulbricht, need each other in order to survive. Powers is the scapegoat offered by both camps to the necessary hate.

However the Left may differ in assessing the causes and ethics of Khrushchev's action, we are all left to face its consequences. The illusion of Peace Through Statesmanship has vanished. In its place,

### INSIDE:

APPRENTICES DEMAND	page 2
TEN HOURS ACT	page 3
LABOUR COUNCILS MUDDLE ON	page 4
FIGHT THE TORY SQUEEZE	page 5
THE POLITICS OF SUMMITRY	page 6
LETTERS	page 7

the illusion of Peace through Strength is again rampant. The spokesmen of "Western solidarity", the apologists for NATO and the Bomb, are at it full blast!

The CP and its associates will speedily no doubt reacquire the "Two-Camps" mentality essential to justify Khrushchev's blustering. Independent Socialism and anti-nuclear neutralism will once again be caught in the cross-fire of the Cold War.

The experience may be good for us. Now, anyway, the air is clear. The political atmosphere is at last free of that clammy, foggy dependence on the goodwill of distant statesmen which has for too long seeped into the bones and congested the sturdy voice of the Left. The Summit, it is now obvious, is outside our sphere of influence. Our job is to engage with the policies of our own Government and our own Opposition. The case for unilateral abandonment of the Bomb, and for work to change the Defence strategy of the

● contd page 8

JOHN FAIRHEAD

## DEFEND CLAUSE FOUR

LABOUR'S Fabian past is under fire. Sidney Webb lies on the sacrificial altar. And the priest who wields the knife is certainly no Marxist.

In almost every socialist party in Europe the Right is trying to jettison not revolutionary, but reformist programmes. Lip service is no longer paid to the goal, however distant, of a socialist society. At least one of our continental brother parties—the German—has junked socialism. Crosland and Jay, the twin evils of Gaitskellism, would have us junk it too.

### CLASS PARTY

The attempt to change the Party programme can only be explained in class terms. Since only the working class, by taking power and smashing capitalism, can build the socialist society, it follows that any attack on the basic programme is directed against its class content.

So long as clause four remains, Labour will be a working-class Party, whatever the gyrations of its leadership. When the Party adopted its present constitution, drafted by Webb and Henderson in 1918, it broke its last link with Liberalism and put itself forward, politically as well as in organizational terms, as a class Party.

### ORGANISATION

That is why the attack on

clause four cannot be beaten back by clever manoeuvres. It has to be fought by bringing into action the class which clause four serves. Victory for Socialism, for example, can be drawn into the battle. But it cannot lead the army into action. Its striking force is crippled by its lack of a solid base among trade unionists and by the added disadvantage that its leadership is not under effective rank-and-file control.

### COMMITTEE

To lead this fight, an organization is needed which suffers from neither of these defects. This organization has already made its appearance and it is the task of socialists in the Party to see that it grows. The conference called by the Clause Four Campaign Committee on May 5 attracted an attendance of 70, 46 of whom were delegates. This representation reflects pretty exactly the square-up of forces in the London and Home Counties area at present. A small minority is for Crosland-Jay, but likewise at present only a minority sees the need to organize consistently and on a class footing for this fight.

Now the message has to be carried into every union branch and Labour Party ward in preparation for the TUC and Party

● cont page 8

# APPRENTICES DEMAND A BETTER DEAL

By ROGAN COX (AEU North London TWC)

**DURING** the last few weeks there has been a struggle, rarely seen, where boys and apprentices in the shipbuilding and engineering industry in the North came out on strike. It spread like wildfire, the fuel having been there for many years in the form of low wages and poor training conditions. It needed only initiative and a little organisation to set it alight for all to see the problems facing young workers, and apprentices in particular.

## SCHEMES

The apprentice can learn the major part of his trade in three years, in some cases even less, although usually for five years, which means that the lad spends the last two years doing mainly production work for two-thirds the adult wage.

A big disadvantage for engineering apprentices is that, unlike in building, there is no central body to supervise contracts or examine the working out of apprenticeships, so that it is common that unless the lad himself puts pressure on the management to be moved to another machine and generally learn the craft, he remains stuck in a rut, which makes nonsense of apprenticeship. In printing, to take another example, apprentices are taught to work a mono-type machine in a matter of some weeks full time courses or day release courses. In other words, it is not even found necessary to give the apprentice individual instruction and help on the shop floor. As this is possibly the only type of machine the fully-fledged worker will ever be required to use, it means that the five years of apprenticeship are really achieved in a matter of a few short months.

In building there is a central Building Apprenticeship and Training Council, to which only big firms subscribe. As on the majority of building sites a bonus scheme operates, this leads to large-scale neglect of individual training and poor standards of work which the apprentice has to accept as his model.

## COLLEGES

Nearly all apprentices have day release schemes. First, as this is only one day a week the disconnection between this day of study and the rest of the week at work is not conducive to the achievement of good educational results. Secondly there is an extreme disparity of educational attainments on the part of pupils in one and the same class (there may be an A-level pupil working alongside someone from a secondary modern school who finds difficulty even in adding up). Thirdly, there is a general inadequacy of technical college amenities in common with all educational establishments. There is also little relation between the technical examinations taken at college and the

apprentices' experience on the shop floor (in particular the National Certificate).

All these disadvantages lead to tremendous proportions of failure at examinations: Twenty-six percent passes among those taking Ordinary National Certificate (3 year course) and ten percent among those taking Higher National Certificate (a five-year course). Due to failure and other difficulties, the vast majority of apprentices have to spend extra years at college to complete the courses. (Completion is made more difficult by not allowing lads to pass on to the next stage unless they have passed *all* subjects in the previous one).

Technical colleges should be greatly expanded; there should be an increase in full-time education rather than day-release. This can be done by introducing block release (some weeks' full time training), sandwich courses (6 months in industry), or one year's full-time introductory course particularly to raise the level of the more backward students.

## SINCE 1948

In most trade unions there is little interest in apprentices and their problems, hence no provision is made to cater for apprentices as a separate set of workers with their own specific problems. Even in the AEU where there is special provision for young workers through Junior Workers' Committees and an annual youth conference, resolutions of the conference are

almost exactly the same year after year, showing that there is complete indifference to the young workers' demands. For instance, the recent apprentices' strike in engineering and shipbuilding was fought on the basis of demands made year in and year out since 1948. No wonder so few apprentices feel sufficiently affected to join the union.

*We should not expect the apprentice to carry on his young shoulders the burden of antiquated indentures that suit the nineteenth century rather than the twentieth. The employers like these antiquities because the more the apprentice is exploited at low wages, while doing a man's job for a large part of his time, the more profits they make.*

## SHAMEFUL

I think apprenticeships have had their day, and should now go. In their stead a scheme for intensive, comprehensive training over a much shorter period than the present apprenticeships can be introduced. This can never be done adequately by employers who operate solely through self-interest. The whole of young people's post-school education should therefore be taken over by the Local Education Authorities who deal at present with school education, with, obviously, full liaison between them and industry. This must allow for a much greater degree of mobility than at present exists between different occupations, so that a young worker who may have had only a passing interest in

the work he undertook may be able to change.

The trade unions should take an entirely different attitude to the organisation of all young workers, who more than any other group of workers need their assistance. The attitude of the unions in the recent strike was shameful. They should have utilised the present militancy to raise the problems of young workers and apprentices to a much higher level. Young workers, but not apprentices, have the right to strike and machinery negotiations. For apprentices the agreements only suggest to the employers to treat them in no less favourable a manner, but this is invariably ignored because of the legal contract. The unions should therefore carry out a vigorous campaign against the binding down of any young workers by indentures. This campaign today should keep the question of wages in the forefront, so that the young workers are not exploited to such a degree.

## RESOURCES

*The union leadership in the recent strike proved in every way wanting. They should have declared the strike official, have given liberal financial support to the apprentices, and above all called the adult workers out in solidarity with the apprentices. Again and again people talk about the apathy of the workers. The 60,000 apprentices showed what tremendous untapped resources of militancy exist in the rank-and-file of the movement.*

# THE WORKING DAY AND NIGHT

By L. J. BENNETT (AEU)

**THE** recent 42-hour settlement in the engineering industry appears to have sparked off a chain of reactionary moves throughout the country. Workers in many of the important centres of the industry have at long last accepted the argument of the trade union pioneers on the need for more leisure, but unfortunately there is widespread confusion today as to what exactly the early pioneers were fighting for.

A quick look at the pamphlet "Fight for the Forty-Hour Week" published by London North District Committee AEU, shows that as early as 1890 the resolution on the eight-hour day was carried by the TUC. In 1897 the eight-hour committee was set up in London to carry the demand for the 8-hour day.

## BY STAGES

The claim for a 40-hour, 5-day working week was presented by Bro Tanner, President of the AEU, in 1946, and in 1955 the Annual Conference of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions adopted the following resolution unanimously: "By successive stages the

trade unions have achieved a shortening of the working day and week, but the 8-hour day to which the movement is committed is not yet established. This Conference, believing the time is now opportune for the establishment of the 40-hour week without loss of pay, instructs the EC to press for the immediate implementation of Confederation policy in this regard and to mobilise the full resources of the Confederation behind this claim."

## ASPIRATIONS

The 1960 agreement on the introduction of the 42-hour week states that the 2 hours reduction is to be spread as evenly as possible over the 5 shifts. This agreement has been in operation since the 28th March 1960 and is the one which is being stubbornly defied by many workers. Dissatisfaction with this agreement amongst night shift workers is widespread. Some District Committees of the AEU are running into difficulties with their members over the implementation of this agreement.

The night workers' aspirations

to work their 42 hours in either 4 or 4½ nights appears to have been forgotten by everybody except themselves. The spirit of the new agreement does not cater for the aspirations of the night workers either, and only this week we read of leaders of a large London factory, Napiers, protesting through the national press on this same grievance. It arises because the night workers are prepared to lengthen their working night, either by altering the starting or finishing times or by voluntarily cutting their dinner break in order to cram the 42 hours into 4 or 4½ nights instead of the usual five.

*How are these differences of policy on working hours to be resolved if we continue to demand a shorter working day for dayshift workers—and a longer working night with fewer nights away from home for the night shift workers. Issues of this nature call out loud for a Night Workers' Charter. The inconvenience of night work alone is sufficient to warrant special consideration by the EC when these Confederation agreements are negotiated.*

HENRY COLLINS

## THE TEN HOURS ACT — a workers' victory

ON June 1, 1847, the Ten Hours Factory Act passed its third reading in the Commons. "It was not only a great practical success," wrote Marx, "it was the victory of a principle; it was the first time that in broad daylight the political economy of the middle class succumbed to the political economy of the working class."

The "great practical success" was limited enough. It applied only to women and young people in textiles, though these made up so high a proportion of the total labour force that it was not as a rule, worth keeping the mills open for men alone. It was the outcome of more than thirty years' struggle in which Short Time Committees of workers combined with the philanthropic strivings of landowners, such as Lord Shaftesbury, and manufacturers, such as John Fielden, to overcome the selfish shortsightedness of parliaments dominated by the propertied classes.

The most ferocious opposition came, naturally, from the manufacturers who opposed state regulation on principle. To a bourgeois radical like John Bright the Act was an infringement of the sacred principle of free contract. To an eminent economist like Nassau Senior, who had once demanded the total suppression of trade unions, the Act portended the ruin of industry, since all profits were made, according to him, in "the last hour" of the working day.

### CLASS STRUGGLE

The agitation was led, from 1832, by Lord Shaftesbury, a Tory paternalist, for whom Socialism and Chartism were "the two great demons in morals and politics". John Fielden, cotton manufacturer of Todmorden, was more realistic. One of the few dozen MP's who supported the Chartist petitions of 1839 and 1842, he had written to William Cobbett as early as 1833 that "the working people will not long submit to the chains with which they are enthralled; co-operative societies, trades unions, etc., exist in almost every manufacturing town and village..." In fact it was the Short Time Committees of factory workers, developing since 1819 and particularly strong in the textile areas, which provided the campaign with its motive power and helped to convince a majority in Parliament that they had better concede some of the workers' demands lest worse befall. Chartism had shown that the workers were capable of organising their own independent political movement, and the Chartist Convention of 1845 had demanded support for the Ten Hours Bill, which, its members were convinced, would "confer manifold advantages on myriads of men, women and children whose very lives are being sacrificed by

### NIGHT AND DAY—end IN KEEPING

I would suggest that it is enough for a night worker to work only four nights without lengthening the shift, and to operate in a similar fashion to the shift work agreement—that is, to be working 4 nights of 9 hours with 1 hour for dinner and to be paid for 42. This would appear to be more in keeping with the struggle for better conditions and a continuation of the efforts of the early trade union pioneers.

long hours and intense toil in the noxious atmosphere of the rattle box, to uphold the unhallowed luxury of the mammon-adoring capitalists."

Divisions had also appeared in the ranks of the ruling class. In 1846 the manufacturers had forced through the Repeal of the Corn Laws against the landowners, concerned for their rent rolls. It seemed only just to many of the landlords that, in return, the profits of the cotton manufacturers should take a knock. And so, against a background of severe distress and intense class struggle, the Ten Hours Bill at last became law.

### VICTORY

Lord Shaftesbury was sure that the battle was over. "I need not, I know," he wrote to the Short Time Committees, "exhort you to an oblivion of past conflicts, and to hearty endeavour for future harmony. I trust that there will be no language of triumph, as though we had defeated an enemy." He underestimated both the greed and the tenacity of the manufacturers. A "Millowners' Association" was at once set up to secure the Act's repeal. The method chosen was original—a petition was drawn up and presented for signature to the workers, asking for permission to work all the hours God sent. The Chartist *Northern Star* gave warning, at the beginning of 1848, that

"If the Operatives were to aid, in the slightest degree, this movement, they would merely be playing into the hands of a few selfish and greedy speculators... This movement of Associated Millowners demands an immediate counter movement from the Short Time Committees throughout the country".

Next came the 'Parke Judgement'. According to the ingenious Baron Parke the law only stipulated that a maximum total of ten hours could be worked by juveniles. It said nothing about the period of spread over. After the Judgement, in 1850, women and children worked their ten hours under the 'relay' system. Men worked continuously in the mills which could now stay open indefinitely. Strengthened by the complicity of the law courts, the manufacturers demanded a day of eleven hours. To the disgust of his working class supporters, Shaftesbury compromised and agreed to a ten and a half hour day. An amending Act was passed at once, while the relay system was dealt with at a more leisurely pace, surviving until a second amending Act was passed in 1853. The Ten Hour Day, undiluted by legal evasions, was not secured until 1874.

Despite everything, the Act was a decisive victory for the working class. After its passing the employers, with all their resources and resourcefulness, could only fight delaying actions. Gradually, unevenly, but inexorably, the working day was reduced. The benefit to the work-

ers, in terms of health and vigour, was seen within a generation. Moreover, as Marx emphasised, the Act constituted the "victory of a principle". The triumph of *laissez-faire* was incomplete. The principle of social control over economic processes, in however elementary a form, was conceded. The concession laid the basis for further encroachments, under working class pressure, to curb the capitalists' drive for profit in the social interest.

### RESULTS

Paradoxically—or dialectically—the Ten Hours Act provided a stimulus to the more rapid development of capitalism. Modern steam-powered mills could work the ten or ten and a half hour day and easily show a profit. For the obsolete, water-powered death trap, it was not so easy. The Factory Acts, among which the Act of 1847 was the most important, accelerated the closing down of old fashioned, undercapitalised concerns. They speeded up the concentration and centralisation of capital, to the benefit of the larger capitalists. At the same time they promoted the development of the industrial working class and hence of the labour movement. "The compulsory regulation of the working day", wrote Marx, "as regards its length, pauses, beginning and end, the system of relays of children, the exclusion of children under a certain age, etc., necessitated more machinery and the substitution of steam as a motive power in the place of muscles... in one word, the greater concentration of the means of production and a correspondingly greater concourse of work-people."

### AEU ELECTION ADDRESS

## A SOCIALIST STAND

IT IS NOT OFTEN that one can point out a principled, socialist stand in any section of the Labour Movement, least of all within some of the bigger unions in the country. However, during the recent elections for Divisional Organizer, Division No 25 (North London) of the AEU, Bro Geoff Carlsson, one of the four candidates, put forward a program which every socialist on the factory floor should be proud to adopt. We reprint Bro Carlsson's election address in full:

Dear Brothers,

In allowing my name to go forward for the position of Divisional Organizer, I recognise the importance of this post and the desirability for the members to elect a representative who would best serve their interests.

Although I am comparatively young (35 years old), and do not possess the impressive qualifications of some of the other candidates, I feel the necessity of challenging the present holder, who has not, in my opinion, given the correct leadership which should have been forthcoming during the last few years. However, I have been a Shop Steward since 1955, and Convenor at ENV Willesden, since the end of 1957. I was Branch President in 1955/56, and have served on the Hammersmith & Kensington Trades Council and the Willesden Trades Council. Also, I am a voluntary tutor for the National Council of Labour Colleges.

Important though qualifications may be, more important is the candidate's attitude to the working class problems in general and A.E.U. problems in particular. The employers and the Tory Government will do their utmost to discipline the workers and break the ranks of organised labour. Sad to say, at this crucial time the leadership necessary to inspire and guide working class

action does not exist to any great extent, either in our own Union or the Trade Union movement generally.

Unfortunately, the pattern of elections over the past few years in our Union has been the struggle between the right-wing leadership and the Communist Party. This struggle has resulted in an internal fight which has heartened the employers, and weakened our Union in the eyes of the average Trade Unionist generally. Our Union is no longer recognised as being foremost in leading the fight for industrial and political progress, but, on the contrary, is now regarded as one of the right-wing Unions, with all the deadening effects that this has on the membership. In their fight against the Communist Party, the Union leadership has disregarded fundamental Trade Union principles, and, as a consequence, our Union organisation has suffered where it matters most, i.e., on the factory floor.

In the struggle against redundancy, which I consider is the paramount question which we face in the AEU, we have a policy on paper, but no endeavour from the leadership to carry that policy out. In fact, it is apparent that, in the main, the only resistance is coming from the Shop Stewards' Committees, which are the priority target of the employers, and which have

not had the support of our leadership, who seem more intent on red-baiting and witch-hunting—to the detriment of our Union.

The victimization of Shop Stewards and Convenors and, because of their political affiliations, the subsequent denial of support by the Executive, has been one of the most disgusting features of our Union life. The most recent example of this feature was the dispute at Handley Page, where Bro Knight was sacrificed.

I am a member of the Labour Party and a firm believer in International Socialism. But I do not believe that this can be achieved by accepting the policies of our right-wing leaders or by accepting the policies of the Communists with their external loyalties to Russia, and the anti-working class measures adopted by that country in East Berlin, Poznan, Hungary, etc. If our efforts to obtain a new leadership within the Union were successful, we would still fail if we neglected our political obligations. I believe we must participate far more actively within the Labour Party, which is the *only* party which commands the allegiance of the working class, so that it can be transformed into an instrument for changing the present system of society.

We must stand for a Labour Movement which strives politically to obtain International Socialism—INDEPENDENT OF WASHINGTON and MOSCOW—and which industrially will pursue a policy of increasing the share of our product for our members, until we arrive at a stage when industry is taken out

C. RAYMOND (Stoke-on-Trent)

## LABOUR COUNCILS MUDDLE ON

THERE has been a lot of talk recently about Labour councillors whose public behaviour has done so much to sully what Gaitskell calls 'the image of the Party'.

The first thing to realise fundamental to the whole discussion of Labour councils' relations to the public is that the position cannot be satisfactorily attributed to the antics of certain local representatives. It is not that Labour councillors have been sticking their tongues out at the public gallery, or making rude noises in the electors' ear.

*No, I would submit it goes much deeper than that: the unpopularity of Labour Councils is due to their having no clear distinct policy of their own. Labour Councils are just prepared to muddle through. When an edict comes from Westminster at best the only thing they think of doing is to soften the blow, to mitigate the effects of Tory policy upon the people. They regard themselves as administrators within the context of rules laid down by the central government.*

Labour Councils do not represent themselves as a body of opposition to the Tories. Consequently the electorate do not see them as opposing camps.

When we come to increased rents and rates—things which could legitimately be placed at the Tories' door—Labour Councils are often held to blame. The Tory Government have the satisfaction of not merely carrying out antiworking class measures but of seeing others get the blame for it.

### VAST SLUMBERING POWER

*Labour Councils should be citadels of revolt. They should continually be fighting, badgering, harrying the Tory Government. This cannot be effectively done in ones and twos. It demands effective leadership and a central direction.*

In 1923, we saw what one Labour Council—Poplar—did: by showing themselves unwilling to be the eunuchs of the Government, they compelled the Government to reform its unemployment legislation. Now if this is what one Labour Council could do, under the leadership of George Lansbury, what could all Labour Councils do or even some if they really tried? There is no doubt that vast slumbering power lies untapped beneath the Council Chamber.

There are two reasons for this. First you have that common affliction 'council cretinism'. This is a complaint that affects councillors' eyes, making them so short-sighted they are unable to see further than the parish pump. It makes their vision so defective that they are blind to the wider implications of local issues.

### HOUSING AND SCHOOLS

Second, we have the bland, almost unbelievable complacency of the right-wing Labour leadership on local affairs.

For example in a recent Transport House document we are informed that in 1951 there was a deficit of 760,000 in dwellings as against households. In other words 760,000 families were without a house of their own. But in 1959—after 8 years Tory rule—we are supposed to have an excess of dwellings over households of 451,000. From this the document concludes:

*"It is clear the problem is becoming in many cases (a) more of a regional than national problem, and (b) one of slum clearance rather than of gross housing numbers."*

One almost feels that Transport House is echoing the opinions expressed by the Tory Mayoress of Lincoln who said there was no housing problem, only a vile rumour spread by people without accommodation.

On school building Transport House is equally complacent:

*An expert on education, Mr. John Vaisey, in his book, The Cost of Education, has expressed the opinion that 'it is probable that building at the present rate in primary and secondary education will have the effect of satisfying most demands in 1965'. He considers that in that year, or thereabout, it may well be expected that capital expenditure will be less than half the present rate on school building. On evidence this seems a reasonable conclusion.*

So we see that on the profound authority of Transport House by 1965 the Tory Government will not only have solved the overall housing problem but the question of school building as well. It ignores the fact that the unequal distribution of income leads to an unequal distribution of dwellings. Consequently for those without a home, or young married couples living in digs, it is no consolation to know there is an overall surplus of houses.

### THREE IMPORTANT ISSUES

Further, on schools, Transport House overlooks the fact that many schools which are not on the condemned list are still 'slum' schools. It is impossible for children going to these schools to have the same chances as those going to a more modern school. Consequently when Transport House says the school building problem will be largely settled by 1965 they should add it depends on the standards laid down. In my opinion the present standards are far too low.

*All this leads to the obvious conclusion that if the standard of revolt is to be raised in local councils chambers it will not be as a result of initiative from Transport House.*

But this should not deter socialists. It should be possible to link activity in various councils. This is of utmost importance. When lone socialist councils make a solitary stand, they almost invariably find themselves hatched by reactionary forces, as was St. Pancras.

*I would suggest there are three important issues socialists need to raise on local authorities:—*

1. *To get a boycott of all South African goods.*
2. *To mount a concerted campaign against high interest rates.*

This is important because labour costs have only increased fractionally since 1951; the doubling of the cost of building council houses can be largely attributed to higher interest rates. It has meant that 262 councils in Britain have stopped building for general need.

It also results in vast wealth being taken annually out of the ratepayers' pockets and placed in the pockets of Messrs Bankers and Financiers of the City of London. No doubt concerted mass agitation on this point would arouse considerable public support. It would have the further advantage of putting the Tory Government on the spot: placing them in a position where they will have to justify giving interest free loans to Colville Co Ltd, and certain car manufacturers but not to more deserving causes.

3. *To take vigorous, concerted action against Civil Defence.*

At present the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament's Scientist Group is examining all Civil Defence literature. It has already found many halftruths and misleading statements. When its work is completed the Campaign intend to contact all Labour Groups, showing them the evidence and asking them to openly oppose present Civil Defence.

*If socialists on local councils take up these issues and act together there is no need to expect that local government will remain the fruitless, unrewarding job it is at present.*

## LOCAL ELECTION RESULTS

By STAN BEDWELL (Southall)

THE local election results are a Labour disaster. They are even worse than anticipated by the General Election. In many towns, hitherto regarded as Labour strongholds, the aggregate Tory vote increased.

Even the loss of nearly 600 seats net does not show the full mournful trend. The only redeeming feature in measuring prospects for next year and possibly the next General Election, is that the number of workers who bother to vote in local elections is well below a half and sometimes only a third and a quarter of those eligible. If this trend continued into the County and local elections next year, it would mean that Labour municipal control held since the 1930's could, in many places, be wiped out.

*To be sure Gaitskell and the Labour Party have asked for it. In fact they have shouted for it.*

*The new block grant financial method of the Tory Government which has been the prime factor in the sharp rate increases this year, and the fantastic rate of interest on borrowed money resulting in ever rising building costs, has been answered by the Labour authorities in cringing terms.*

### FED UP

By and large Labour controlled councils have been bending over backwards to mitigate the anti-working-class financial policies of the Tories. They have been struggling not to spend too much money and have been carrying through hideous rent differential policies aided by household means-tests. Animosity of the workers which should have shown itself in a massive anti-Government vote, has heaped itself upon Labour councillors. This was borne out by the low vote in solid working-class areas, continuing the trend of the past few years.

It is quite clear that academic discussion about the new Tory method of finance has largely passed the workers by. I wonder how many readers had the misfortune to listen to the Labour Party broadcast prior to the elections. Not one call for fight in any part of it.

Many Labour councillors are completely fed up with taking the can back for the Tories and are spoiling for a fight. But it needs to be a co-ordinated and simultaneous campaign conducted nationally so that over the next eleven months, up to the County and local elections, workers are in no doubt that the Tories are hell-bent on a financial policy of easing taxation (by reducing Government grants to local councils) and are passing it on to the shoulders of the workers in higher rates and rents.

### FIGHT

Most of the Labour election jargon completely misses the boat. It is too complicated to understand. In any case actions speak louder than words.

It is clear that the major problems confronting all local authorities are national economic ones and that the power of the local council has been steadily declining over the years.

*The Labour left on councils must fight for a national call upon all members to carry through public demonstrations and stop acting the game of administration. To show they mean business they could start by cutting out the frills of middle-ages ceremonial and dressing-up.*

*They could stop carrying the can for the Tories by once more identifying themselves with the workers apart from election times. The story next year could then be very much different.*

## AFTER THE LOCAL ELECTIONS FIGHT THE TORY SQUEEZE

Says **KARL DUNBAR** (Willesdon)

AFTER the defeats of May, when nearly 600 Labour Council seats were lost, the movement must return to some fundamental thinking in relation to policy and the attitude of Socialists towards the problems which beset us in the field of local government.

It is quite true, as Morgan Phillips said, that the Tories have turned the accusing finger away from themselves and onto the local Councils, and this was an important factor in Labour's defeat. The Tories, as amply demonstrated by Butler on the eve of poll, argue that most local affairs are the concern of the local Councils, not the Government. In fact, the Tories made the issue one of 'freedom', that local councils are not 'dictated to' by the Government. As Goebbels always said, if you want to tell a lie make sure it's a big one. But the truth is that Labour have allowed the Tories to get away with this without offering any fundamental challenge either to Tory propaganda or to the results of Tory class legislation, results which are becoming more clear every day so far as the work of local Councils are concerned.

### FACTS

Consider, over 400 local Councils had to cease building altogether.

Actual Council building has

dropped from 240,000 homes in 1953 to 129,000 in 1959.

Interest rates for local Council borrowing have doubled in 10 years.

Many Councils throughout the country are pushing up their rents in attempt to 'make both ends meet'.

In Willesden, where there are 10,000 on the waiting list, and thousands of families live in slum conditions, an acre of land can cost between £6,000 and £10,000. For every £1 borrowed by the council £3.10.0 has to be repaid.

### SLUM MISERY

A block of 56 flats cost £90,000 to build. When the loan has been repaid those flats will have cost the people of Willesden £300,000. And the greed of big business is never satisfied. Not until every council has ceased to build homes for the needy—not until every council has voted to charge the 'economic' rent for councils houses will the Tories be prepared to look at the Frankenstein of their own creation.

For the misery of the slum dwellers cannot be told in mere words. Nor can we phrase the hopelessness that pervades the lives of those young couples trying to rear their families in the squalor of one back room. We can never bring back to life the babies that have died from

the diseases that are inherent in slumdom. This is what the Tories are deliberately doing through the operation of vicious class legislation, legislation which, if not fundamentally challenged, spells doom for Labour and the working class movement as a whole.

Willesdens' immediate answer to the Tories' pressure has been to raise all Council rents and bring in a rebate scheme. A petition, which will be presented by the Labour MP for West Willesden to the Housing Minister, has been drawn up.

As is the case with every petition to the Commons it is headed 'we humbly beg', and I suppose that once several thousand 'humble' signatures have been collected and our MP 'humbly' presents it to the minister, the Labour movement in Willesden will sit back and say what a wonderful job we have done. It is this sort of approach to politics that makes me ashamed to belong to the Labour Party. The deliberate and calculated drive against the working class that the Tories are pressing at the moment must be met with a determined resistance on the part of organised Labour. No single local Council or Labour Party can do anything in isolation, what is needed and what we must all demand, is a united National campaign.

There are three immediate demands.

1. A radical reduction in interest rates.

2. Full payment of rates by industrialists where they now pay only half.

3. Strong legislative action to stop the racket in buying and selling land and property which is skyrocketing in price.

It is our job to see that these three demands, little enough in themselves but a good start, are made the platform of national action by the working class movement.

How can we do this? By getting your local Trade Union branch, Co-operative section, Ward party and so on, to pass resolutions in favour of the above three demands. Couple that resolution with the demand for 'joint action' by all Labour Council groups, whether in control or not, local Labour Parties, trade unions and the co-operative Party. Demand the setting up of 'action committees' within the localities to work out plans for action. If necessary call for joint committees of neighbouring Parties to begin with, but don't forget that the real need is for a national movement.

### UNITE

Maybe your particular borough is not so beset with the problems of Tory squeeze as it affects housing, but remember that no Council can stand in isolation, even the most progressive Labour groups will go under if they continue to remain aloof. There is a great deal at stake comrades, now is the time to begin the agitation for a real fight against the Tories and their big business backers.

## CANDID COMMENTARY

By **JOHN WILKES**

IN the next few weeks constituency parties and other organisations affiliated to the Labour Party will be scratching their heads and considering what resolutions should be submitted to the Scarborough conference. These resolutions should be drafted, I think, in the light of what are likely to be the contentious issues before conference. The first, of course, will be the Party constitution. Had Gaitskell stuck to his original intention—just to strike out Clause Four—mounting opposition might have defeated him. Therefore, Gaitskell and the right-wing have made a strategic retreat by leaving Clause Four in its original form while hedging it round with a compromising New Testament.

Many socialists will feel tempted to vote against the New Testament en bloc. I think this attitude should be supported by all militants. If, however, we find ourselves unable to rally sufficient support to get conference to reject the New Testament, then we will have to try and recommend that an attempt be made to put some socialist bite into it. This is likely to gain much support as well as being an embarrassment to, and exposure of, the right wing.

You will remember at last year's Blackpool conference Gaitskell, initiating the discussion on Clause Four, saying that his main objection to it was its ambiguity and the fact that its vagueness left the Party open to misinterpretation by its enemies. Unfortunately, the New Testament is equally open to misconstruction. Indeed, it only got the

overwhelming support of the National Executive because of the widely differing interpretations members put on the phrase capturing "the commanding heights of the economy".

So good, let's help Mr. Gaitskell! Let's submit amendments to the New Testament that make it clear and precise, so that even the dimmest wit is unable to misinterpret it. Let us move amendments that clearly show what Socialists mean by "the commanding heights of the economy"—complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance, etc. Indeed, there's no need for me to go on. The first two points of the program on the back of the *Socialist Review* give you a good idea of the type of amendment that should be moved.

\* \* \*

ON the other big issue before conference—nuclear disarmament—the Labour leaders may receive a nasty jolt. So far, Gaitskell has countered the clamour for unilateral disarmament with arguments that do not differ, in any important respects, from those of the Tory Government. If he continues to be "little Sir Echo" to Macmillan, this can only swell the rank of the opposition. Defeat, in the long run, would be certain. But, being a wily bird, he may make a strategic withdrawal. It is possible that the right-wing will swing its emphasis away from advocating Britain should have an independent deterrent and, instead, favour NATO having all nuclear weapons under its command.

From the standpoint of peace, this would be merely a paper concession. Britain would still indulge in nuclear diplomacy, be a base for H-bombers and missiles. In no way would it help to stop the nuclear arms race.

Perhaps, the only thing to be said for such a change is that it would expose the contradictions in the Gaitskellite argument. Until now they have argued in favour of a Non-Nuclear Club, keeping in the fewest possible hands. But to put NATO in control would have the exact opposite effect—more nations would have H-bombs under their partial or complete command. The Gaitskellites have also argued in favour of an independent British bomb because it would give Britain a greater say in the councils of the world—remember Bevan's fears of nudity in the conference chamber!—and now, if Britain were to renounce the bomb in favour of NATO's possession, many of the official arguments, like those contained in Strachey's pamphlet, would have to be dropped. Whatever happens, Labour leaders are in for a rough passage.

I would suggest that constituency parties try to anticipate any twists or wriggles in the party line by making their conference resolutions clear and unequivocal: against Britain possessing the H-bomb, against American bomber and missile bases, against NATO and all other nuclear pacts.

\* \* \*

PHOTOGRAPHS of atrocities committed by the French in

Algeria are contained in the current issue of *Clarion*, the lively journal of Labour students. These pictures of mass executions, uprooted refugees, and French paratroops actually raping an Algerian woman are grim reminders that the relentless struggle for colonial freedom still goes on in North Africa. They are also a reminder that 250,000 Algerian refugees live in Tunisia, with starvation, death and disease as their daily companions. Yet they will not receive a penny from World Refugee Year. Refugees from all other parts of the world will; Algerian refugees will not. It might embarrass the French Government.

\* \* \*

COMING into a period of rising left-wing activity, when socialist ideas are beginning to circulate more widely and freely, it is worthwhile casting a glance at the dismal days of the mid-fifties. That was the time of greatest isolation, of fewest opportunities for fruitful activity. A sign of the times was the extreme difficulty of circulating or getting socialist literature. Contacts were few, the barriers of mistrust were large and imposing. But to-day more and more socialist classics are being reprinted, and reasonable re-interpretations of our basic ideas are appearing.

Even so, this tendency is far from being a flood yet, and it is surprising that all left-wing journals have failed to notice the re-issue of Leon Trotsky's magnum opus, *The Russian Revolution*. Published by Doubleday Anchor Press for 10 shillings, it is a must for all socialists. It should not need my recommendation before you go and buy the greatest book on the greatest event of the Twentieth Century.

# THE POLITICS OF SUMMITRY

RAYMOND CHALLINOR

THE summit meeting has ended in complete failure. Millions of people all over the world had waited patiently for the conference, pinning all their hopes on it. All they got was a painful shock. They had hoped for a stable peace, and it is true that the summit meeting held previously had ended in success—the Geneva conference of July, 1955.

Still this did not guarantee peace. Then the heads of state conferred and reached an "agreement in principle". What happened when they came to translate principle into practice? The search for even more deadly weapons continued unabated; the struggle for influence in the Middle East did not stop for one second; the "Geneva spirit" evaporated during the butchering in Egypt and Hungary. And the Cold War continued with increased ferocity.

However, the hopes in Summitry encouraged by the entire press—Tory, Liberal, Labour and Communist—did not die.

When humanity is on the brink of disaster, we dare not allow ourselves to indulge in illusions about the real path to peace. *Socialist Review* believes that only the scientific method of analysis can uncover the real roots of war and imperialism and show how to uproot them—by the struggle of the international working class for Socialism.

Both as an analysis of the prospects of Summitry and the true road to peace the following article written by R. Challinor a few days before the summit fiasco is of value.—Editor.

MAY, traditionally the month for Maypole dancing and love-making, has been chosen as the month in which to hold a summit conference. But unfortunately the heads of state—all staid, elderly gentlemen—are a bit past it. However, hope springs eternal in the human breast: perhaps a love-match might ensue. It is because of this hope, the desire of the overwhelming mass of the world's population for an end to quarrels and mutual recriminations, that these politicians have been impelled to hold this summit conference. In several cases it is against their will. They realise there has been no major changes in the relative power of the contending blocks, no dramatic solutions to the world's problem put forward. A summit conference, therefore, can only hope to issue pious communi-

ues, saying how ardently all the statesmen of the world want peace. They will then go home to intensify their production of nuclear weapons.

Off-stage, behind all the feasting, talking and communiqués, are the complex forces that compelled a summit conference to be held. On the positive side, there is world public opinion's yearning, stronger than ever before, for peace. On the negative side there is the touching, misguided trust of politicians, a failure to grasp the root causes of the drive to war.

Supporters of summit conferences—and we have some almost professional campaigners for them, on the Left—must accept the assumption, whether they realise it or not, that present world tension results from fear and misunderstanding. Consequently it is only necessary to

get the respective leaders together, to get them to realise that they are all jolly decent chaps, and nations will start to live harmoniously side by side. Even when this idyllic picture is not drawn summit supporters argue that while the heads of state are meeting, striving to resolve their differences, then at least war is being warded off.

But it is wrong to assume that talking or conferences *per se*, prevent wars. If they lead to a fuller realisation of irreconcilable conflicting interests, they may hasten the outbreak of war. It may well be that conferences, far from making the foundations of peace more secure actually plan the basis of future hostility. This was the case at the beginning of this century. Conferences successfully led to Britain and France resolving their differences; it also led to them entering into military agreements which, when considered with Germany's pact with Austro-Hungary, made conflict an inevitability. Secret diplomacy, military commitments arrived at behind the backs of the people, were an important factor in generating the First World War.

*The lesson was not lost on socialists, and even some progressive liberals, of that time. Their attitude, far more healthy than the one prevalent to-day, was that politicians could not be trusted. They would not go into ecstasy at the prospect of a summit conference. Rather, they would ask: what dirty plots are the politicians hatching in their secret sessions?*

Some innocents may consider that politicians' standards of behaviour have improved with the passing of years. Far from it: the opposite is the case. Take, for example, the Second World War.

Winston Churchill, in his own incomparable way, describes how the destiny of millions was decided at the Moscow conference in October 1944. In his book, *The Second World War, Triumph and Tragedy*, p 198, Churchill writes, "The moment was apt for business, so I said, 'Let us settle our affairs in the Balkans. Your armies are in Roumania and Bulgaria. We have interests, missions, agents there. Don't let us get at cross-purposes in small ways. So far as Britain and Russia are concerned, how would it do for you to have 90 per cent. predominance in Roumania, for us to have 90 per cent. of the say in Greece, and go 50-50 about Yugoslavia?' While this was being translated, I wrote it down on a half-sheet of paper. I pushed it across to Stalin, who had by then heard the translation. There was a slight pause. Then he took out his blue pencil and made a large tick upon it, and passed it back to us. It was all settled in no more time than it takes to set it down..."

"After this there was a long silence. The penciled paper lay

in the centre of the table. At length I said, 'Might it not be thought rather cynical if it seemed we had disposed of these issues, so fateful to millions of people, in such an off-hand manner? Let us burn the paper.' 'No, you keep it,' said Stalin. Two days later, still in Moscow, Churchill included the percentage figures on paper along with a note to Stalin: 'As I said, they would be considered crude, even callous, if they were exposed to the scrutiny of the Foreign Office and diplomats all over the world. Therefore, they could not be the basis of any public document, certainly not at the present time.'" (p. 202)

*A blue pencil tick across a half-sheet of paper. This gives the lie to all the high-sounding politicians' talk about "the people's sacred rights", "self-determination" and "democracy". This is so much blah, to be turned on and off to suit their purposes. When they want they push people around like cattle shoving them under any old government.*

The forthcoming summit conference, unlike the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, will not make any drastic changes to the world. For since 1945, the world has become divided into two camps, each with its own problems. In the West the permanent war economy acts as a buttress, propping up an unstable economy that would otherwise topple into a crisis of overproduction. On the other side of the Curtain, the rulers are faced with a crisis of underproduction. To compete economically and military with the West, they are constantly forced to increase production, to decrease costs (ie wages). In the world market these two giants struggle, each trying to out do the other.

*The economic contradictions are real; they cannot be talked away by smart phrases from the rulers of East and West. Nor, if these economic conflicts intensify, will the verbosity of statesmen prevent a Third World War.*

*For the solution to this problem we must look elsewhere—to the working class and the struggle for Socialism. Thoughts of international co-operation are not alien to the working class movement; indeed, they constitute a very potent weapon in its hands. The realisation that ordinary decent people throughout the world have interests in common—particularly the overriding interest of desiring to live in peace—is the foundation to common action. Further force is given to this drive by the growing realisation that workers' problems in every country are the same, that their bosses, are pursuing a struggle against them. Joint action, international solidarity, a friendly helping hand against oppression, stretched across all frontier barriers—these are the ways workers fight for better conditions and a better world.*

The summit conference constitutes a challenge to socialists. It is high time that the ruled—not the rulers—got together, held a conference, mapped out

● contd page 7

## IT'S RICH

"If people thought there was a capitalist class and a working class they did not know the true position"—Hugh Gaitskell, speaking at Leeds, as reported in the *Times*, March 12.

"Labour's sole gain in control was at Chard (Somerset)"—report on May local elections, *Times* May 13.

"The only right qualifications for LCS Management are integrity, capacity and experience; no political standpoint, however right or wrong, can or should replace these"—GF Dutch, LCS official, in a letter in *Tribune*, May 6.

"As for timing of civil disobedience demonstrations, the group as a whole recommended that holiday periods should be chosen so that students and teachers should be more available"—Minutes of a Direct Action Conference, held on February 28.

"Russians never fly over US"—headline in *Daily Worker*, May 11.

"The necessity for such activities (sending spy planes over Russia) as measures for legitimate national defence is enhanced by the excessive secrecy practised by the Soviet Union in contrast to the free world"—US State Department comment.

"While reducing the numerical strength of our armed forces, we shall not be diminishing their fire power. This on the contrary will increase many times over"—Krushchov at the fourth session of the Supreme Soviet, January 14.

"After watching *The Times* cover the Korean War from the moment Ian Morrison was killed until the end, it is hard to hold *The Times* in awe, especially since we also observed *The Times* covering the worst Formosan crises from Singapore and the Indo-China war from Paris"—Joseph and Stewart Alsop, *The Reporter's Trade*.

"Man consists of three parts—soul, body and passport"—Old Russian saying recently heard in South Africa.

"The Socialist Labour League is in the vanguard of the struggle against all bans and proscriptions"—Statement by the London Executive Committee, SLL, entitled "Brian Behan Expelled by SLL", *Newsletter*, May 14.

"Lord Attlee excluded the press from a meeting at Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, tonight at which he addressed 150 local Young Conservatives"—*Times*, May 14.

PETER CADOGAN

**BRIAN BEHAN EXPELLED**

THE expulsion of Brian Behan from the Socialist Labour League on May 9th came a little sooner than might have been expected. It had to come. The differences that Behan had with Healy were political but the differences that Healy had with Behan were not.

The past, present and future of the Socialist Labour League is only intelligible when it is appreciated that its General Secretary is not really interested in politics at all. This is not intended as a jibe. To Gerry Healy the Plough Press, New Park Publications and the SLL are extensions of his person. He might be in real state, advertising or commerce. It just so happens that he is in politics. It is not so much money that is involved as power, and in relation to that what counts so far as he is concerned is allegiance. A serious critic just has to go.

*This bureaucratic situation is not so different to those in other parties we could mention! The crux of the matter is simple enough. Is leadership to be vested in one man—or a clique—with a retinue to match or is it to be a collective effort characterised by rank-and-file initiative, political science, fraternal relations between equals, and uninhibited criticism?*

Behan has now been expelled from the SLL—of which he was the Chairman—for the same reason as he was 'fixed' by the leadership of the Communist Party in 1957 during the 25th (Special) Congress, when the Panels Commission conducting the election of the Executive Committee found 'reasons' why he should not be re-elected.

On both occasions his line and method were indicative of new standards of collective thought and action such as would smash the Top People if not immediately eliminated at source. This, it seems to me, is the real meaning of the Behan revolt. It is rather a pity to have to call it by that name for it is by no means a one-man affair or a question of personalities.

There are good reasons for believing that the dissident group is substantially larger than the figure of twelve given by Healy. But even the real total is only part of the story. The League is rocked by the faction fight and expulsions coming so closely on the heels of the previous revolt. Even greater is the effect upon those on the fringe without whose increasing support the League can have no future. It is of less significance therefore that aspects of the individual political viewpoint of Brian Behan can be called in question—as indeed they can.

As with so many of us so with Behan—what is important is not the fixed and final article of faith but the creative process of the development of new ideas in the context of the class struggle. The method is the thing. Behan and his co-rebels will be judged not for breaking with Healy but for what they make of the breach.

So that whereas one might, some weeks ago, have taken issue with Behan for reverting to the spent notion of impending capitalist economic crisis, for his ambiguous and slightly sectarian attitude towards the Labour Party and his almost total neglect of the questions of war and peace (in particular Khrushchovism) as things are now it would be quite mistaken to look for points of difference as though they were the critically important matters. They are important. But scientific socialists ought to be able to do battle amongst themselves on any number of problems whilst at the same time extending the area of working agreement. Perfectly ordinary mortals do this all the time! Now we have to make it practical politics.

*If one may presume to say so the omens on the left are good. Things are changing. Experiment is abroad. In the case of Behan another new and valuable element, fresh from its experience in democratic revolutionary factionalism, is now openly engaged in making its contribution to the recreation of the revolutionary party in Britain.*

**LETTER**

IN the April issue of "Socialist Review" there appeared an article on the question of Labour Councils' problems resulting from the Tories financial pressure. In this article it was suggested that unity of action was necessary, that no single Council, Labour Party or Labour Group could be effective, that it was conditional, if any hope of success was contemplated, to meet organised threat with organised resistance.

The Wolverhampton Labour Party is reported, (*Observer*, 24. 4. 60.) to be considering a resolution calling for the "organising of mortgages" to campaign for stabilised interest rates. The supporters of this resolution talk in terms of 'pressures being brought to bear upon the Building Societies Association even to the extent of organised mortgagees withholding their payments'. Note the way the wind is blowing. A politically organised group with a rent strike thrown in

**WOLVERHAMPTON FIGHTS INTEREST RATES**

for good measure. This is a far cry from the so called 'non political' National Association of Tenants & Residents. If Labour in Wolverhampton have the courage to take this step forward, and there is no reason to doubt this, then such a step may be the beginnings of the much needed all tenants political front against the Tories and their capitalist backers. We must pay the fullest regard to this new development. Socialists throughout the country should be calling on their local Parties, Trade Unions and Co-ops to contact immediately the Wolverhampton Party, find out the full facts and discuss the serious possibilities of united action. Whilst we desire a much bigger and broader basis, taking in all tenants and house buyers, we should not hesitate to begin the demand for this around the Wolverhampton resolution.

L R Smith

London N.W.6.

**LETTER****THE STRUGGLE IN SOUTH AFRICA**

THERE is no doubt that the oppressed people of South Africa welcome every bit of publicity of the conditions under which they live, in the hope that people outside South Africa would in one way or another identify themselves with the struggle against oppression in South Africa. However, I feel that while your editorial "The Struggle in South Africa", (*Socialist Review*, May) plays its part in this exposure, it nevertheless gives a number of false impressions of the struggle. I should like to correct one such false impression.

Your editorial makes no mention of the role of the white working class and draws conclusions of what must be done in South Africa from a false picture of the Chamber of Mines and Industry in general. Let me try and explain briefly. The position can be simply stated as follows. While the division is essentially a division of class and while white and black workers alike have a common enemy, the white workers nevertheless fight rear-guard action against their fellow black workers. The understanding of this must dictate what role we here in the Labour movement in Britain can and must play. Mining, agriculture and other industries in South Africa are based on an abundant supply of cheap black labour. The capitalists would like, as indeed capitalists everywhere would, to produce their goods as cheaply as possible and to extract as much profit as possible. However this far from explains events in South Africa.

At various times the Chamber of Mines, faced with problems of low-grade ore and deep-level mining, tried to open up various grades of skilled work to African workers. Their policy was one of "the maximum employment of natives and the minimum employment of whites". (de Kiewet, *A History of South Africa*, p. 164). Why? The Economic and Wage Commission (*Union Government*, 14, 1926, para. 276) answers thus: "...the relatively high wages of white artisans are due to and dependent on the employment of large numbers of unskilled native labourers, and in this respect the artisan is typical of the whole white community who are enabled to maintain a standard of life approximating rather to that of America than to that of Europe, in a country that is poorer than most countries of eastern Europe, solely because they have at their disposal these masses of docile, lowly paid native labourers."

This view was already expressed by The Low Grade Mines Commission of 1920 and "had strongly recommended, as an important means of cutting working costs, an increase in native employment and the removal of the legal colour bar in order to open up to cheaper

**SUMMITRY from page 6**

a common strategy. The *Socialist Review* is not suggesting the foundation of some arid, sectarian grouping, which repeats all the inanities of our own home-grown secretariats on an international scale, but a broadly based organisation, open to any accepting the basic tenets of Socialism. Such an organisation would help to make our internationalism a reality, not merely a phrase; it would stimulate activity based upon common experience; and, most important of all it would help us to fulfil Karl Marx's famous injunction—"Workers of the world unite".

native labour certain activities formerly closed." (de Kiewet, p. 170). In 1922 certain grades of skilled work were opened to Africans.

The reaction of the white workers, who first came out on strike in the coal mines and then the gold mines, is perhaps best described by the following paragraph from de Kiewet (p.170): "On 6 March amid scenes of mob violence, a general strike was called... On 10 March fighting became general. Martial law was declared. Cannons roared in the streets of Johannesburg. Lewis guns spat from aeroplanes; soldiers and special police charged against barricaded strikers. The end of bloody fighting was the end of the strike. The demands of the companies prevailed." This is not the end of the story. The colour bar act was declared **ultra vires** in the Transvaal Provincial Division of the Supreme Court. "Yet such was the force of public opinion that the gold-mining industry continued to act as if the Mines and Works Act had never been declared **ultra vires**." (de Kiewet, p. 228).

There then followed the defeat of Smuts's Government (the government of the capitalists) at the ballot box, and we find a coalition of the Nationalist and Labour Parties, with a new onslaught against the black workers. In 1926 the colour bar act was brought back again. At various times since then the mines and other industries have half-heartedly pleaded for opening up some skilled grades to African workers, but once the white workers had fought their way into the ranks of the capitalists, and allowed the capitalists to rule with their conniving, we are not very likely to see another 1923. In view of this one is not surprised when the Chamber of Mines recently declared that it had no thought of protesting to the Government on the situation that gave rise to the events of Sharpeville.

If we have recognised these things and the support of the white working class for **apartheid** we can put in much better perspective what we in this country can do. Perhaps most important is that we should make sure that none of our unions have segregated branches in South Africa; that we must press the TUC to call for the expulsion of the South African trade unions which do not admit non-white people to full membership and grant recognition to the non-white unions (these do not practice discrimination). Then, and only then, can the exposing of the British capitalists in South Africa make any sense, from the point of view of the oppressed people of South Africa.

Ismail Karra

London

**SOCIALIST STAND—end**

of the hands of the Capitalist Class and placed under Workers' control.

Briefly the above indicates my attitude to our problems. I trust it will receive your support.

Yours fraternally,

GEOFF CARLSSON.

Supported by:

Bro. Heath, Secretary Acton North.

Bro. Parker, Shop Steward, Rotax.

Bro. Carroll, Shop Steward, Rotax.

Bro. Dunbar, Shop Steward, Staines Equipment.

Bro. Bond, Shop Steward, Handley Page.

Bro. Johnson, President East Acton.

Bro. Smith, Secretary East Acton.

Bro. Clarke, Chairman, E.N.V. S/S. Ccmmittee.

## ● SOCIALISM AND THE SUMMIT FROM PAGE 1

Labour Party, has never been stronger than now. Against the suicidal illusions of Peace Through Statesmanship and Peace through Strength, we must set the vital prospect of Peace Through Socialism.

### THE CP TURN

Some glimmering of this truth might appear to have penetrated the murky fastness of King Street. The CP Executive, at its meeting just before the Summit fiasco, decided at last to support the independent renunciation by Britain of the Bomb, and all its works, including NATO and the bases. The silent approval given to unilateralism by the CPers on the AEU National Committee is now openly confirmed, without a word of explanation, recantation or apology. We may now expect Abe Moffat to swallow his attacks of recent years against Lawrence Daly's unilateralist proposals, and swing the Scottish Miners' vote behind Cousins and the anti-nuclear bloc. Gone are the *Daily Worker's* accusations against CND of "dividing the broad movement". The CP's failure to support Aldermaston was made ridiculous by the scale of the March and its successors; and the prospect of the renewal of the H-bomb debate at this year's Labour Party Conference has made Gollan and Co. have second thoughts about lining up the CP-influenced trade union vote once again behind Gaitskell. It is conceivable also that a gentle hint may have passed from Moscow to King Street about the imminent bankruptcy of Summit demands; but joint consultation, let alone workers' control, has never been conspicuous in the relationship between the Kremlin and its devotees abroad, especially the British CP, and the speculation is rather unlikely.

*Lest we be tempted to rejoice overmuch at sinners come late to repentance, let us bear in mind that the Line can be reversed with equal ease against unilateralism at any time in the future. Gaitskell and Brown can now point to the "friends" that CND now has in Congress and Conference, and rake up the Worker's old attacks on CND. Above all, we must remember that the success of the anti-nuclear movement will not primarily be measured by the line taken by this or that bloc vote in the Labour Party (important as this is) but in the active, conscious rejection of the Deterrent and all its works by the rank-and-file working people of Britain.*

The recent Aldermaston March was noteworthy for the rapture with which platform speakers looked to the Paris Conference, even at the expense of the unilateralist aims of the Campaign. The slogan "Ban The Bomb!" was addressed piously to the Heads of State rather than forthrightly to the British people. A "March To The Summit", blessed by Canon Collins, set off from Trafalgar Square, only to be (perhaps mercifully) halted by the French authorities. The CND leadership's turn towards Summitry has been put to scorn by Krushov and Nixon. In the coming months, the Left must renew its anti-nuclear and anti-NATO activity, despite the intertwined hostilities of the Two Camps, despite the explosion of false hopes at Paris. For nearly ten years, *Socialist Review* has been among those fighting for an outlook that withstands all the betrayals of statesmen, all the frenzies of capitalism and Stalinism. Its slogan remains today a potent watchword for the movement:

*Neither Washington nor Moscow, but international Socialism!*

### CLAUSE FOUR from p. 1

conferences in September and October. The middle-class attack on the only part of our Constitution which pledges us to socialism must be met by rallying the working-class base of the Party.

The struggle is many-sided. No socialist paper is playing its part which does not refute, on the one hand the arguments of the Lib-Labs, and which fails, on the other hand to offer clear guidance in the organization of the campaign.

### PAMPHLET

*Socialists should support actively the work of the committee and see that it spreads throughout the country, reaching into every trade union and every constituency. As a first step, they should buy the pamphlet produced by the committee, Defend Clause Four, read it and sell as many copies as they can.*

The pamphlet, and other particulars, may be obtained from the secretary, Councillor R Spurway, 163 Courtenay Avenue, Harrow Weald, Middlesex.

### HOUSING FACTS

At present land suitable for housing development is unlikely to fetch less than £3,000 an acre, and in some of the better London commuting areas prices are not far off £10,000 an acre. Recently, a sale of 77 acres in Sussex fetched £¼ million, and in Essex a parcel of 3½ acres sold for £19,000... It is clear that the price of land has been the main cost factor in the rise in new house prices. Actual building costs have remained nearly static for several years, even though wage increases may in some cases have added marginally to the bill. Nowadays, the value of the land may constitute anything between 15 per cent and 30 per cent of the price of a new house." (*Financial Times* February 24)

Under Tory rule a Council House which costs £1,000, carries an interest burden of £4,110 (*Forward*, March 18).

The bankers, certainly, have never had it so good!

## US "Defence"

The US Defence Department has recently issued a training manual to its Air Force reservists under the signature of Brigadier-General Chappell, deputy Chief of Staff operations. It warns its readers that "Communists and fellow-travellers have successfully infiltrated our Churches" and contains several examples of the "Big Brother" attitude which has recently been manifested elsewhere in the armed forces, notably in a recent case where a commanding officer ordered his men to spy on each other's private lives. Some of the passages read:— Another foolish remark often heard is that Americans have a right to know what's going on. Most people realize the foolishness of such a suggestion... Keep in mind that public news media present only as much information as the Government wants to release.

If you suspect an individual of deliberate subversion, report him, of course, but try to be sure he isn't just dissatisfied or a complainer. If you do know of a dissatisfied person, nevertheless, he will bear watching.

Keep an eye out at all times for suspicious activities, actual or implied. Don't hesitate to report incidents to the air police, no matter how trivial they may seem.

*'The pamphlet also tells the reservists to "be especially watchful for persons who are trying to undermine the Air Force by belittling or sneering at its policies and accomplishments.'*

*Times* February 18

### FIGHTING FUND

Our income in May was:

	£	s	d
Shoreditch	5	1	6
Islington	4	1	0
Hackney	4	17	6
Lewisham	1	19	3
Notting Hill	5	10	0
Harrow	1	12	0
Ramsgate	2	5	0
Stoke-on-Trent	1	0	0
Ipswich	10	0	
Liverpool	15	0	
Nottingham	10	0	
Total	£28	11	3

WE NEED £40 a month. Up to the end of May we received £28.11.3. Thanks! and keep it up, Comrades should also remember that they could do us the world of good and themselves no harm by making all their purchases through London Co-operative No. 350498. Comrades! Help your paper by introducing it to your friends, by ordering bulk copies, by giving donations!

**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. Tel.: FUL. 8637.

## 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.