

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

8th YEAR No 16

SEPTEMBER 1, 1958

SIXPENCE

OIL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

by Raymond Challinor

OIL—that is the crux of the problems of the Middle East. It is a source of tremendous wealth—and poverty. Of wealth to the oil monopolists, the corrupt shiekhs and all their hangers-on. Of misery to the vast mass of the 50 million people or so living in the Middle East.

With 64 percent of the world's known oil resources, the Middle East is a veritable Eldorado, a land floating on liquid gold. As the world becomes more highly mechanized, more dependent upon oil, the demand grows. Production doubled between 1949 and 1954.

Anglo-American oil companies have cashed in on the rapid expansion. In this country the

Government has been, for obvious reasons, rather shy of letting the British people know the exact position. They have attempted to conceal the vast profits accruing from the exploitation of this area.

"There is no official figure of British oil investment," writes Andrew Shonfield in his recent book, **British Economic Policy Since the War** (Penguin, 1957). "It is buried away in the official statistics on the balance of payments in a ragbag residual, which also includes such things as earnings from films, insurance, civil aviation, royalties and commissions. Ingenuity is required in order to winkle out an estimate of oil earnings from this welter.

Someone seems to be extremely anxious to cover his tracks."

When they are uncovered, what emerges is that of the £667 million British financiers derived as gross profits from overseas investment in 1956, £323 million—in other words, almost half—came from oil. These handsome profits—Shonfield, who is no left-winger, refers to them as "spoils"—were a result of highly favourable agreements negotiated with the Arab rulers.

In return for these cheaply-gained mineral rights, the Arab rulers were given money and protection from their own peoples.

Princes and poverty

The latter point was most important. For the native population gained little or nothing from the coming of the foreigner. Their primitive domestic industries were swamped by cheap manufactures from abroad; their national economy developed not in a balanced way to meet their own requirements but as a mere adjunct of another country's economy; and, finally, since many were driven back from industry to agriculture, the inequalities of land ownership became increasingly oppressive. Alongside wealthy landlords, with their large tracts of land, an increasing number of peasants were forced to eke out a bare existence on very small plots.

The poverty is appalling. In Saudi Arabia, for example, the annual income per head is around £20. Malaria, tuberculosis and venereal disease are rampant, and the bulk of the population are illiterate. Yet, at the same time, only 5.3 percent of the State's expenditure goes on education, health and social services. While 80 percent of the people live on dates, an official of the US agricultural Commission, visiting Saudi Arabia, expressed the belief that the arable acreage "could be increased at least tenfold by the utilization of ground-waters alone." (HA Atkinson, **Security & the Middle East**, p.83.)

Well, why doesn't King Saud do something about it? Would it not be less costly than having to spend 35 percent of the budget on the army to keep the people well under? In actual fact that is not the case. **Saudi Arabia's feudalistic régime is extremely fragile: it would not withstand the social pressure that such developments would necessarily involve. Industrialization would lead to a strong working-class, a wealthy middle-class, and a large number of technicians. These emerging classes would not tolerate the absolutist régime of King Saud, with its numerous barbarities and senseless restrictions.**

[turn to back page]

Local Government 'Reform'

by Stan Newens

The present Government plans for the replacement of percentage grants to local councils by one block grant produced a great outcry in Labour ranks. The associated proposals for changes in local government structure have not been given the same attention, and at a time when plans are being worked out for considerable alterations it behoves us well to examine what is suggested.

White papers and red tape

The broad outline of the Government aims are set out in the first and second white papers on local government reform. What is involved is firstly the revision of the areas covered by existing local authorities and the creation of new authorities; secondly, the delegation or transfer of powers at present exercised by existing county councils to district councils. In short it is planned to decentralise.

To people who have had experience of the bureaucracy and red tape involved in county council procedures, these proposals have a marked appeal. After all, it is pointed out, local governments should be local. County council elections invariably show

the lowest polls and make it clear that the remoteness of County Hall produces the greatest degree of apathy.

Furthermore, county councils normally meet during the day—owing to the difficulties of travelling the considerable distances involved—and many working people are unable or cannot afford to lose the working time involved. As a result, County Councils usually have a higher proportion of retired and middle class members than lower tier authorities.

These arguments have divided the ranks of socialists who participate in local affairs. Unlike in the case of the block grants proposals, Labour opinion is by no means unanimous about the Tory proposals.

Socialist attitude

However, if it is true that members of the Labour Party are all working, broadly speaking, to one end in local government—and this is surely the only justification for Party politics at council level—there can be no justification for the spectacle of one Labour group fighting with the Tories against a Labour group on a different authority. There

[turn to page 7]

Pages 2-3

BUSES DOCKS MARKET

TU COMMENTARY

THE TORIES' VICIOUS ATTACK ON THE PEOPLE'S TRANSPORT SERVICE

Robert Emmett surveys the

STRAIGHT from their long drawn out battle with the LTE and the Tory Government on the question of wages, which culminated in the historic seven-week strike, the London busmen have been plunged into an issue which, from the angle of ultimate

savings on operation—and the brilliant plans of the “master minds” resulted in a dead loss all round.

The relation between reduced services and falling passengers, like the chicken and the egg, is wrapped up in the insoluble

With this issue of SR, Robert Emmett inaugurates a regular busmen's column. Observation and comment are invited from readers. Robert Emmett has been associated with the industry for a number of years and, as readers can see from this first instalment, is extremely well informed—Editor.

effects upon earnings and working conditions, and, indeed, for the whole future of the monopoly London transport services, is more threatening, more pregnant with danger, than anything that has happened since the transport industry was nationalized in 1948.

The mandarins of the LTE, with the full connivance of the Minister of Transport and the Tory Cabinet, have made a murderous assault upon the people's transport services. Some details of their plan, which began on August 20, are:

Fifty-five London bus routes completely wiped off the map—25 on weekdays and 30 on Sundays. A further 191 routes drastically curtailed. The fantastic figure of 32,250,000 miles cut from the annual mileage of the buses. Some 3,000 drivers and conductors made redundant. Fewer buses, fewer staff, longer queues, longer waiting, more overcrowding at higher fares. This is the prospect for staff and passengers that has opened up in a great nationalized industry that bears the proud—if inaccurate—motto “Strong for Service.”

Not the first

The nationalized, monopoly-controlled transport services of the capital city, upon which ten million citizens depend, are to be taken into the knackers' yard and carved up by a bunch of Tory stooges whose knowledge of transport is limited to the operation of their own publicly paid for, chauffeur-driven cars.

The cuts in services, they say, are warranted by the decline in the number of passengers using LTE vehicles. From the economy plans, they expect to make a saving of £3,250,000 a year—almost twice as much as the recent wage award.

These alleged “experts” are, as usual, wrong on both counts. That is not a matter of opinion—but of historical fact.

These are not the first cuts in services. In fact, in smaller doses, the LTE has been amputating bus services for the past seven years. Always it was to produce “economies”—never were those economies realized. Always the inadequate services lost them so many more passengers that falling fares revenue outstripped

question—which came first. History has, at least, made one fact quite clear—there is no more certain way of producing a decline in passengers than to cut the services—and, to accelerate the process, nothing is so effective as an annual increase in fares. Yet these twin “solutions” are the limit to which the puny minds of the LTE have ever stretched.

Tory dividends

Prophesy is a tricky business, yet, I would confidently bet, that in six months from now the LTE will register a further big decline in the number of passengers using its vehicles. The pipe dream of “economies” will go up in smoke. Once again they will be “in the red”—once again they will cut the services—once again the hatchet-men will be called up to lop another limb off London Transport—and the whole sorry process will begin again.

The crime that is being committed by the Tories and their LTE stooges is not merely an offense against 50,000 London busmen—but against 10 million Londoners—and it involves the piecemeal destruction of a great transport system which, ironically enough, up until it was nationalized, was universally recognized as the finest of its kind in the world. One of the more offensive by-products of the present financial set-up and political control is that the very name “LTE” has become a dirty word to millions who daily suffer its operations.

To the active busman trade unionist, daily engaged in battle with the LTE, the passive acceptance by the public of the many indignities heaped upon it, is a source of astonishment heavily tinged with cynicism: why are they so content to be driven and carried like cattle; this is supposed to be a “publicly owned” service—why don't the “owners” rise in their wrath and smite the LTE?

And—why don't they? This is a question that the London Labour Movement should be asking itself. So long as the affairs of London Transport are treated as a private argument between the busmen and their employers, so long will the Tories and the LTE get away with it.

When the small voice of the London busmen is swelled by the mass chorus of the 10 million LTE customers—then, and only then, will those who pay the piper begin to call the tune.

The Central Bus Committee of the T & GWU has requested the London Labour Party and London Trades Council to organize a public campaign of protest against the LTE plans to mutilate bus services. Two or three of the more progressive Borough Councils have protested and requested action from the Joint Standing Committee representing the 28 Metropolitan Boroughs.

And there is urgent need for the London Labour Movement to be roused on this issue, not alone in respect of the projected cuts in services, but for a more fundamental reason.

The Tories are reaping a variety of dividends from their

handling of the nationalized transport industry. In the first place they milk it for a cool £50 million a year for bondholders. In respect of the LTE alone they take another £4 million from diesel oil tax, while licence charges for nationalized buses yield another £2 million. The financial drain of these compulsory payments means that money needed for modernization must be raised in open market. Here the Tory moneylenders step in to reap a rich harvest.

The depressed state of the nationalized industry is then used as the stock answer against all wage claims. The wage freeze thus imposed becomes the pattern for other employers to copy—the miserable 3 percent wage award for the railwaymen is being used everywhere by private employers to rebut wage claims.

(continued next page)

Lessons of THE SMITHFIELD

by Jeff Farquhar

THE RECENT Smithfield lorry drivers' strike, which at the time was overshadowed by the strike of London busmen, has now become a talking point due to two factors: (1) The duration of the dispute; (2) The findings of the Court of Inquiry.

were informed that the employers were requesting a further fortnight to check up on figures relating to the present position of 20 m.p.h. and what might have been their obligations at 30 m.p.h. over the period since the introduction of the increase in

With this survey of the recent strike in Smithfield, Bro. Jeff Farquhar, a leading militant in the industry, begins a regular Smithfield Commentary. Bro. Farquhar should be well-known to readers. He featured largely in the “national” Press during the recent strike and, subsequently, in the deliberations of the Committee of Inquiry, as a leading hothead, irresponsible and destructive. It might not surprise readers to hear that we find him a responsible and militant socialist who has served the labour movement long and well—Editor.

Questions are still being asked regarding the policy adopted at the onset, and at a later stage the complete reversal of that policy; and I feel it is necessary to give in detail the position from April 19, on which date we came into dispute, until our return to work on June 23.

Early in 1957 legislation was introduced whereby the speed limit was raised from 20 to 30 miles per hour for certain vehicles. Road haulage operators had for many years asked for this increase and during that period the Transport and General Workers' Union had made it known that the increase in speed would be implemented only when safeguards had been introduced on behalf of the workers in that particular industry.

Based on that stipulation, the road haulage section of the meat trade through their own Joint Industrial Council sought an increase in payment for the proposed increase in speed. These negotiations commenced some nine months prior to April of this year; their outcome was a complete blank.

At a mass meeting of the section held on Friday, April 10, we

speed.

This ridiculous request was ignored due to the fact that the employers had had nine months to check week by week the position. Nevertheless, the workers did finally agree to give one further week, but at the end of that period, failing an offer, their labour would be withdrawn, and withdraw it they did on April 19.

The first steps

Many meat haulage operators immediately signified their willingness to pay the requested 15 percent increase, and conditional on guarantees being given by them, they were permitted to continue working.

The internal workers of Smithfield market immediately offered to come out in support of the drivers but at this stage the offer was declined in view of the fact that we were not in conflict with the Market Tenants nor with the public, our aim being to keep the meat supplies intact, but to withdraw the right of certain operators to engage in the haulage of that commodity.

It should be made known at

(turn to next page)

LONDON DOCKS

INDUSTRIAL

announcement and . . . apology

Readers will be glad to hear that SR will feature a regular docks column starting from the next issue. It will be written by **Porticus**, that well-informed, militant rank-and-file port-worker to be found in every pen, at every call-stand, in the country. Who he is we can't say, he has too many faces. But his views are easily identified—those of the militant socialist dockerman.

In the meantime, let your editor venture on another prophecy. And if he's out on a limb, well . . . he's out on a limb. You know that a Court of Inquiry into the portworkers' wage claim has ruled in favour of an increase of 7s. 6d. Our prophetic bird tells us that the T&G won't be satisfied and will press for another 9d. The bosses might even agree, and 8s. 9d. it might be.

Finally, let nobody be taken in by the tall figures which broke out like a rash in the "national" Press after the Court's decision. It would cost the employers £2 million a year, was the line, and it looks reasonable: over 100,000 dockers times 52 weeks a year, times 7s. 6d. But, and this is the rub, where is the dockerman that can find regular employment for 52 weeks? What about the thousands that "bump" every day and have to rely on attendance money? They don't get the 7s. 6d. They don't go on the bosses' books. The £2 million melts away when they are taken into consideration. In fact, it's about time that Fleet Street learned that dock labour is still casual.

STRIKE

this stage that at the commencement of the dispute six hundred market men were dismissed due to lack of work, and this factor alone called for a complete stoppage on the market, but this action was withheld to enable the drivers' section to pursue the policy adopted at the onset.

At the end of three weeks, Smithfield market stopped completely, and this necessitated a change of policy. As a result, those drivers who had been permitted to work were called out. At the end of the eighth week the Minister of Labour decided to set up a Committee of Inquiry to investigate the cause of this dispute, and we were requested to return to work to permit the hearing to take place in a strike-free atmosphere.

We duly obliged, and the Inquiry was held and the findings made known. A blank nothing.

At the Inquiry, the employers introduced the usual line, whereby they sought to show that the strike was completely unwarranted and was due, as in the past, to the actions of trouble-makers, and in this direction named two men. We can liken this to the action of a drowning man fighting for air.

In the ranks of the workers today certain men are accepted as advocates and leaders, men who seek to secure a standard of living and to maintain and improve it.

The militants

We have come a long way since Tolpuddle, and along the road militant trade unionists have been branded and stigmatized, but in the face of all this men will always be found to take up the cudgels on behalf of their fellow-workers, and the loyalty of these men was never shown better than in the recent nine weeks' Smithfield dispute.

Attack on transport—end

Then, having produced a state of depression throughout the whole range of the transport industry, the Tories use the very chaos they themselves have created as electioneering propaganda depicting the horrible results that flow from nationalization.

The fight on this issue must be taken outside the closed ranks of a relatively small section of London busmen. This fight is a political fight against the Government, for which the LTE merely act as a front. Every socialist has a personal duty to begin to set on foot a local agitation to bring the whole London Labour movement into a fight to defend the people's transport services and break the stranglehold of the bondholders, moneylenders, and tax collectors.

South Bank

IN THE MIDDLE of last month, twenty-five labourers were given the sack on the South Bank site. The only guarantee that the employers, McAlpines, gave, was that no new operatives would be engaged on the site for the following week. When they do engage more men (which they certainly will do) it is very uncertain that the same men will get their jobs back. In this way McAlpines neatly disposed of nearly all the stewards on the site at one time.

This, following on from the direct attack on working standards (see SR, August) adds the threat of the "Sword of Damocles" hanging over the heads of any militant that opens his mouth on any subject embarrassing to McAlpines.

No doubt Sir Robert has read the Cohen Report.

We have received the following letter from contributor Fred Francis.

August 6, 1958.

I must tender my thanks for your implicit faith in my veracity by publishing my last article in full, but have to inform you after further research, that it did in fact contain an error to the effect that the Union Cold Stores sacked 600 men in Smithfield Market.

This was not true. The responsibility for the action lay elsewhere.

Accordingly, it is incumbent upon me to withdraw absolutely, completely and without reserve all reference to this matter as published and extend my most sincere apologies to the Union Cold Storage Co. for any inconvenience I may have caused.

Yours fraternally,
FJ Francis.

Postscript on the T&G: Quite rightly, the union refused the miserable 3 percent accepted by the leaders of the NUR and fought for more. Every militant in the country supported that fight and the principle of standing up to the Tory offensive. Why, then, is the union behaving so badly when it comes to its own officials? District officers have been offered a 2 percent increase! . . . We are happy to learn that the full-timers on the docks have rejected the pittance out of hand.

SR Industrial report Buses to rule

At the time of going to Press, we hear that the full-time officers have scuttled a Central Bus Committee resolution on how not to cooperate with the LTE. The resolution was ruled out of order at the delegate conference held towards the end of last month and referred to the Negotiating Committee. Non-cooperation has been shelved for the time, but there can be no doubt as to its popularity. Holloway A Branch, for example, has passed a resolution instructing its members how to work to rule in the event of non-cooperation being implemented. The resolution reads:

HOW NOT TO COOPERATE

- (1) A member shall not sign on for, or work, any duty other than as rostered, unless he has previously applied in writing for a change of duty.
- (2) A member shall not drive, or conduct a vehicle other than as laid down in his or her scheduled duty. Private-hire work shall continue as normal.
- (3) All vehicles must run at service-speed and not more than two minutes early at any time.
- (4) Crews shall not leave termini earlier than the times marked on their time-cards.
- (5) Crews must only do that mileage laid down on their time-cards, i.e., no projections or unscheduled journeys of any description.
- (6) Full meal-reliefs must be taken.
- (7) Crews shall not operate vehicles which in their opinion do not come up to Public Service Vehicles standards as laid down:—

"bodywork (inside and out), windows, fittings and seats for passengers, must be maintained in clean and good condition (643/41/7). Steering arms have to be kept free from dirt and rust (9) . . ."

- (8) All lost property (including newspapers, etc.) must be handed in as laid down by law and a receipt for each item obtained.
- (9) Members must not contact the LTE during holidays to find out their showing-up time when returning. Such particulars must be supplied by the LTE before holidays commence. Otherwise members must show up for work at the time laid down on the duty-roster.
- (10) No vehicle shall take standing passengers at any time.
- (11) Staff, when requested to see CDL or District Superintendent on disciplinary matters shall only do so during the LTE's own time.
- (12) None of these working rules shall apply if they cause EXTREME hardship to passengers.
- (13) Members shall not apply non-cooperation in any manner except as laid down by the Branch. When in doubt as to what exactly a working-rule means, do not place oneself in conflict with LTE officials until the delegate has given a ruling on the matter.

In the event of the LTE attempting to victimise an individual for carrying out the above Branch instructions, the delegate shall call the Committee together and they shall call an immediate stoppage of work to protect such a member.

LP COMMENTARY

● Conference Resolutions

Out of a total of 428 resolutions submitted for the forthcoming Conference, 142 concern various aspects of disarmament; of these, 110 unequivocally demand the unilateral abolition of nuclear weapons. It will be interesting to see how the "statesmen" on the platform seek to wriggle out of this demand to ban the bomb. **Two resolutions particularly claim Socialist support, these are No. 118 which calls "upon all organizations connected with labour engaged in the manufacture, testing, or handling of nuclear weapons, and preparation of sites . . . to call upon that labour to cease operations"; and No. 156 which asks for "support for any Trade Union action in opposition to the building of rocket bases".**

Resolution No. 209 after condemning the leadership of the French Socialist Party "both in relation to the suppression of the Algerian people and to the development of reactionary dictatorships in France. It instructs the NEC to press for the expulsion of the French SP from the Socialist International". If this receives the support it deserves, what a slap for the man who tried to crush the Algerian national movement—Mollet!

A resolution (No. 219) which condemns "anti-Semitism and general hostility to strangers" and urges "the application of our Socialist aim of equality of provision for all men" is the best of a trio concerning Immigrants and Racial Minorities.

A resolution (No. 222) regarding safeguarding democracy, asks Conference "to call on the political and industrial strength of the whole working class to defend" democratic institutions and to declare "its opposition to fascism in any form" deserves the support of all comrades.

If resolution No. 225 obtains

JOHN LAWRENCE

John Lawrence and the councillors recently expelled by the NEC from the Holborn and St. Pancras Labour Parties have published an appeal to Labour voters and are collecting signatures for a petition asking for their reinstatement in the Party.

The record of Labour achievement on the St. Pancras Borough Council, as set out in their Appeal, shows that they have built more houses than most other London Boroughs, they have refused to raise rents and actually lowered some, they started a vigorous slum clearance

the votes it deserves, then the LP will be moving towards a situation in which workers' control might begin to operate in some part, for it calls for the NEC to examine with the TUC and the Co-op "the whole question of the measures necessary to develop the direct participation of workers at all levels in the policy, decisions and management of the industry in which they are engaged". It continues to require the Party to institute legislative action to implement these measures when it takes office.

The resolutions on Education include the following, which make parts of "Learning to Live" quite unnecessary; No. 254 which calls for "a grant-in-aid adequate for the needs of student life"; No. 260 "calls upon the next Labour Government to abolish fee paying for schooling"; No. 269 which asks for the "so-called" Public Schools to be closed "and completely disbanded. The premises could then be used for some useful social purpose"; No. 275 after demanding the abolition of Public Schools calls for "a complete and national comprehensive system" of education; No. 276 "notes with regret the indecision of the NEC with regard to the public schools" and asks to bring "all types of education into line with true ideals".

Resolution No. 326 asks for the re-nationalisation of road transport and that "no compensation shall be paid". A resolution (No. 331) after condemning the LTE for being "an instrument of Government policy" asks for a Board representing workers and consumers.

Resolution No. 390 asking for legislation "making it compulsory for all members of Parliament to declare their financial interests in matters before the House, and that they should not be allowed to vote if direct financial gain would result" might be used to disqualify a Labour MP who was, for example, a council house tenant.

RON COYTE

program until stopped by the Tory minister, they refused to participate in Civil Defence activities in order to show what a farce it is, they have given Council employees a paid holiday on Labour Day and flown the Red Flag from the Town Hall. Further than this they have organised demonstrations against the Rent Act and other examples of Tory policy.

One would have thought that this was a record on which they might have been congratulated and held up as a model to the whole country. Instead, many

leading members are expelled from the Party.

As previous articles in "Socialist Review" have argued, this is nothing less than a disgrace to the Labour Party. Whatever disagreements any Party member may have with Lawrence's views or tactics, this is a flagrant violation of democracy. Lawrence and those associated with him have been expelled for their left wing views and activities. As a result the Party has been split and the Tories strengthened.

Accordingly, every socialist in the Labour Party must press for their reinstatement. This means briefing Annual Conference delegates to support the plea for reinstatement and getting the facts

To vote or not to vote

by Karl Dunbar

The months rush by, eighteen months to go, twelve, perhaps less. "To what?" you say. Why, the General Election, comrade; time to kick the Tories out is approaching.

Now, indeed, for all active Party members is the winter of our discontent, for this is the time for thought, serious thought, and we face the coming Election not with any great anticipation, not with a sense of elation that victory for Labour will be a victory for Socialist progress.

We have had six years of the Tories, six years of watching our living standards steadily being dragged down and yet now, when the chance comes to end all that, we are not confident that a Labour victory is the solution.

For years now I have listened to my local Party comrades asking why it is that active members leave the Party, why there are no serious political discussions any more, why we cannot get candidates for Local Government elections, why the Party can no longer attract youth into its ranks. For an equal number of years we have closed our ears to these questions, pushed them into the background because we felt that more important than anything was the struggle against the Tories.

Most of us have felt that more positive policies could be achieved if we stuck it out long enough. We have recognized this much, that the brake on progressive thought and action has its fountainhead in the upper chambers of the Party machine, not at local Constituency level, not in the local Trade Union branches. The local militants, dwindling in numbers as they are, have kept the flame alive and we have gone on grasping the thought, "they can't hold us back forever, sooner or later we must win."

It has been argued, for instance, that the workers of the world are faced today with two choices, Moscow or Washington, Soviet Imperialism or Capitalism. We argue that there is a third choice, Socialism. Now, the rank-and-file of the Labour Party are also being forced up against the wall. "What do you want," says Transport House. "Us or the Tories?" Well, we want Socialism, so what do we do? Work for the return of a Labour Government that is pledged to perpetuate the Capitalist system, or stay at home on principle?

of the case known as widely as possible.

This is particularly important in the case of Trade Unionists since the Annual Conference decision will be largely in the hands of Trade Union delegates.

Those who want further information or can help, should write to John Lawrence at 59 Seymour Buildings, Churchway, N.W.1. Donations are needed to create an effective campaign and petition forms with collection sheets are available.

Let us show that our support is not confined to silent sympathy. The Labour Party cannot afford to stifle, demoralise and drive out its militants—however wrong on particular aspects of policy they may be.

George Spelvin

We know the past record of successive Labour Governments, we also know that the Parliamentary Labour Party in the last six years in opposition has done so little opposing that it is not beyond the bounds of possibility to assume that the working-class is completely unaware that there is a Parliamentary opposition at all. Further, we know the contents of the policy documents which are to form the basis of a Labour Government's policy, if elected, during the next five years.

Now I ask you, comrade, can we change that policy to something positive? Are we strong enough to force a Labour Government to completely alter its ideas and introduce a Socialist program? We have quite rightly said that the fall of the 1945-51 Labour Government was due entirely to the refusal of the Parliamentarians to introduce Socialist thinking into their legislation. We said then, that to play at State Capitalism was not the job of a Socialist Government. To do so was to play into the hands of the ruling class. I challenge any comrade to prove that the present policy of the Labour Party has fundamentally altered from the past.

Capitalism

Of course, a great deal of theoretical discussion can take place on the position of militants inside the Labour Party, but this does not alter the fact of a Labour Government legislating for the continuance of Capitalism. And that fact affects us all, militants, outsiders, grafters and non-grafters, we will all have to face the music of future Labour back-peddling and sell out. Most of us who have given even a cursory glance to the policy documents must be aware that any Labour Government, attempting to put into practice such policies, is doomed to failure.

In 1945 the Labour Government came to office after six years of war. The task was formidable and it needed Socialists of courage and vision to overcome the difficulties of post-war chaos. Today, unemployment is rising, the threat of war is considerably stronger than in 1951 when Labour retreated from office, world commerce is declining, the colonial peoples are in ferment against their oppressors. Nowhere in the world today is

cont next page

SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose

16s.
8s.
4s.

 subscription for

1-year's
6 months'
3 months'

 issue of

SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Name.....

Address.....

Send to M Maddison

21 Aubert Park, London, N5

YOUNG SOCIALIST

TWICE
MONTHLY

NUMBER 17

SEPT 1, 1958

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM — conclusion

by Michael Kidron

We have seen that capitalism means either the excruciating suffering of a slump or the threat of total annihilation. Because only a small section of the population controls production and is not answerable to the rest of the community; because this section is competing within its own ranks and with similar classes abroad. This small capitalist class can hang on to power only because they control the armed forces, the police and the means of mass "persuasion."

The workers' answer to this threat of total annihilation is Socialism. **Workers' control of production; abolishing competition by full nationalization at home and international co-operation between workers' states; defence of the workers' states against middle-class sabotage by arming the entire working class.**

Only thus can the workers' state be kept alive and Socialism attained.

How do we stand as regards the realisation of these general objectives?

At the moment the Labour Movement in Britain shows no interest in revolutionary Socialism. Despite the resurgence of industrial militancy, Socialism is generally regarded as "voting Labour." This is only to be expected in a period of full employment, when real wages, if not rising, are at least not falling. It is true that the increase in real wages since the war has been at the expense of greater effort at work: between 1948 and 1953 real wages increased by 7 per cent and productivity by more than double—15 per cent, and the average work week is higher than it has been for a long time: 49.3 hours in October, 1953, as compared with 47.7 in October, 1938. But this the average worker does not know. He feels, correctly, that his conditions have improved, and so, all's right with the world. This attitude is natural, but can it last?

The capitalist world can only escape a slump by using up its surpluses in arms production. By 1949 the post-war boom was coming to an end. If the re-armament program (one feature of which was the Korean war)—not just the British one, but that of all the Powers—had not got under way, we would now be facing a large-scale slump. But large-scale production of armaments creates problems of its own. Whilst it stimulates boom or semi-boom conditions (full employment, large profits, etc.) as soon as it gets into its stride, it doesn't permit the production of the mass of the consumer goods that would normally be produced during a boom; in fact it may considerably reduce the amounts available. This happened, for example, when the Labour Government had to impose charges on the National Health Scheme

services to pay for its 1950-1 arms budget. And once under way re-armament cannot stop. Competitors in the international market follow suit and we get into the fantastic state of affairs where more and more production leads, in the end, to less and less consumer goods and a forced reduction in the standard of living of the masses.

As yet we haven't come to that in Britain, but there is no doubt that we shall, and as soon as the arms burden begins to cut into living standards we can expect a greater degree of consciousness amongst workers. For the first time in history, world capitalism is preparing for war in conditions of full employment; for the first time war doesn't bring with it the temporary alleviation from the nightmare of unemployment. It now means one thing only—a cut in living standards and the probability of total annihilation. If the fear of the latter won't drive politics into people's heads, the feel of the former will. We shall then witness a tremendous radicalization of the masses, a blind, impetuous radicalization. Our job is to prepare for it, to guide it, to prevent it ending itself in hysterical destruction.

This is no less true in other countries than in Britain. There has not been one major threat to capitalism in this country that has not had its counterpart on the Continent, whether it was the pre-1914 slump or the post-1918 one, the troubles during the great slump of the 'thirties or the tremendous attacks mounted by the working class at the end of World War II. The only difference between here and there has been one of degree—the Continental working class has always gone one step ahead of its British comrade. While we were only threatening a General Strike in May, 1920, Germany was convulsed in revolution and counter-revolution; while we were peacefully installing Labour MPs in Parliament in 1946, the workers of Paris were being disarmed after patrolling the streets with guns on their shoulders. These are only two examples out of many. We needn't be afraid that our Continental comrades will desert us. Our problems are their problems; our future theirs.

A conscious Socialist must do two things today. We must strengthen the left-wing elements wherever we are: in union branch, Labour Party ward, Co-operative Society; and weld them into a body with a united program, working to transform the Labour Movement into a truly Socialist movement. Secondly, this left-wing within the movement must spread its Socialist program—rather, its program for the transition to Socialism—as widely as possible, relating it to the questions of the day, so that as political consciousness strikes deeper roots, the program can pull as many as possible from destructive rebelliousness to constructive revolution. The program of the SOCIALIST REVIEW is such a one.

YS continues next page

To vote? — cont

there an International Socialist movement capable of welding the working-class into positive action against the oppressors. In fact, where the Labour Party could have led that movement within or without the framework of the present International, it chose to concern itself instead with NATO and the United Nations.

The question

There would be no need for concern if, in the past, the Labour Party had been forced, by outside capitalist interests hostile to a workers' Government, to compromise on certain policies, if at the same time the fundamental steps, steps which are embodied to some extent in the program of Socialist Review, had been pursued, regardless of any pressure from the reactionaries.

Of course if that had happened there would be no necessity for this or any similar article. For I believe we should still have had a Labour administration today.

You will notice that there has been no reference to any individuals in this article, the reason being that I believe the Parliamentary Labour Party and also Transport House must share the collective responsibility for the past and indeed the future attitude of the Labour Party. The present "leaders" were elected by their fellows, let us remember that. The present policies will come before Annual Conference, then let us see who is opposing, for instance, the NEC's policy on Cyprus (which is, in fact, the Tory Government's policy). We will all get a much clearer perspective of things to come after the Conference, but I'll make a small wager, say, a ½d., that the present policy documents are approved, that the Cyprus policy is approved, that the possible future Foreign Secretary will be given his suit and briefcase for the conference table. And all this will be done in the name of "unity for the sake of the next Labour Government."

A request, comrade editor. As it would appear and is indeed quite true, that I am personally undecided whether or not to support the Labour Party in the coming General Election and I hasten to say that I am in no way placing myself on a pedestal, but in fact I am sure that there are a great number of Party comrades likewise minded, perhaps other comrades could be induced to answer the simple question, "Why support the Labour Party in the next General Election?"

* * *
Why, Comrade? We believe the answer is quite simple. We know there are many real socialists within the Party who get as impatient as you at seeing every socialist instinct extinguished by the "leadership". We feel the same sense of betrayal and shame at the H-bomb policy, the economic policy, even the educational policy that have been at the centre of events since Brighton last year. But we don't believe in retreating to our tents of apathy.

However bad the Party—and

Christ knows it can be pretty awful at times—we know that the "leadership" can get away with it largely because of this apathy. What they want is an obedient mass who will roll up to the polls whenever called; what they dread is the constant criticism, the exercise of constant control over their actions by an active and militant rank and file.

We don't accept the direction in which Labour Policy is veering; we want a positive socialist policy, such as the one expressed by this paper. But we're not going to get it without a fight. And it is through such a fight that we shall educate and influence others in the Party to implement the program which we accept. A weak Labour Party is not part of such a program. Get out and vote, comrade; and bring the others with you.

Readers are invited to reply to Comrade Dunbar. The debate is important.—Editor.

Labour Party
cont next page

YOUNG SOCIALIST

A true culture?

by John Phillips

COMRADE CRUTCHLEY'S ARTICLE on working class culture (YS, July 1st) raises some points with which I strongly disagree. His main arguments regarding the habits of contemporary working class youth are, as I interpret them, that dance halls, cinemas and record parties are used for the satisfaction of one's sex drive, the desire for courtship and marriage. He then persuades us that there is a high degree of sexual promiscuity at these "centers of orgiastic activity", and that is the only reason teenagers go there.

Without pretending to be a sociologist I must strongly question these views. In the cinema the audience directs its emotions towards the screen and not to another member of the audience. It would be difficult, if not impossible, for people to satisfy their sex drive—a direct personal relationship between two people—while their emotions were being drained off and channelled towards the screen. For this reason, and also because nearly all young couples make a date to go to the cinema beforehand and are "steadies" anyway, it is very rare to see any "pickup" activity, either by gangs or solitary youths, inside a cinema.

The composition of cinema audiences is another factor against the argument. On average, cinema audiences in working class areas are made up of a large percentage of old and middle aged people, quite a few young children (under 13) and a small minority from the teenage bracket. Even then, the teenagers who do go are mainly the "shy and lonely" people that Comrade Crutchley writes about.

Dancing at the Ritz

Dance halls follow a similar pattern as far as the "pickup" is concerned. At practically all halls (except the glorified brothels) there is always a large surplus of males—who can't dance because of the lack of partners and who are forced to congregate with members of their own sex. Here, too, most girls are escorted by someone they already know, and the chances of anybody satisfying his sex urge through the "pick up" are very rare.

Why do youngsters go dancing? To tie the intention to the sex drive is untrue. Even today most working class youngsters have been brought up in a dingy, miserable environment, been made to feel unimportant and useless, and when an opportunity arises for them to be taken out of their surroundings it is eagerly seized. The dance hall with its super palatial decor and Ritz Victoriana provides this opportunity. Then again the feeling of uselessness that youngsters are given is offset by the physical act of dancing, because it is some-

thing they have learned, something that nobody can do for them, and therefore something very precious to them.

Record talk

Records, as Comrade Crutchley rightly says, are a most important part of teenage social life. However, the picture he paints is rather exaggerated. Here again, sex has been pushed into the foreground as being of primary importance. While agreeing that this motive is there, I would say other things are of equal importance. For instance, I am quite sure that the majority of teenagers, if asked why they went to record parties, would simply answer, "to listen to records".

Comrade Crutchley also says that records are a good topic for conversation. This is true, but contemporary youth are notorious for their lack of conversation, and when the top-ten talking point is exhausted, interest is bound to pall. What better than to fill up these conversational gaps with records?

Class and culture

However, the most important point that the article missed is the way the ruling class uses its power over cultural media as a very decisive weapon in the class struggle.

It used most significantly against young people because they are the natural revolutionaries, and the ones who don't always blindly accept what their elders decide to tell them. So, they are the danger as far as the ruling class is concerned. What does the Government do about

School, Science and Class

The current issue of *School Science Review* shows how vastly unequal provision in science equipment is in public (independent) and State (maintained) schools. "At one extreme an independent boys' school has £3 8s. 10d. a year for each pupil taking science. . . . The highest figure shown by a maintained boys' school is £1 8s. 8d. and for a girls' £1 5s. 10d. At the other extreme, one boys' grammar school has only 1s. 1d."

According to the standards set by the Committee of the Industrial Fund for the Advancement of Scientific Education in Schools (set up with the specific purpose of improving science facilities in independent schools) only 1 out of 373 grammar schools is adequately provided. The Ministry of Education sets much lower standards. Even according to its requirements, only 20 per cent of State grammar schools who participated in a survey on the subject are adequately provided. Grammar schools are clearly better provided than most other kinds of State schools. If this is taken into account, the State sector will look much worse even.

it? It does what any parent would do to stop its child smashing up the furniture or scribbling on the wallpaper. It occupies its mind with something else. Thus the pattern is set.

To combat the growing industrial struggle they give us horror comics, Hank Janson, Reveille, etc. In the age of H-bombs and nuclear rockets, youth is fed with Elvis the Pelvis and other gimmick-ridden crazes.

And the result? An absolute and overwhelming success.

When faced with H-bombs, redundancy, lower earnings or the rising cost of living, do working class youngsters worry? Certainly not. Perhaps they go dancing a little less or buy fewer records, but the real problems are still pushed into the background.

Of course this is due basically to economic oppression—a resignation to the feeling that they are unable to control even the smallest part of their lives; lack of faith in the future—but I think that cultural segregation is a very important factor.

The utility mill

The question that naturally arises from this is, why do teenagers accept, or even welcome this diverting influence? Is it because they are savages that thrive on jungle music? No. It is simply that they haven't been encouraged to have any real appreciation of anything, whether it be music, art, literature or life around them. How is this so? Is appreciation a thing that is common to everybody, or something only the lucky few have?

The answer is that it is a basic human ingredient that has been beaten out of us because it is "dangerous" to some people's interests. It can be put another way. People don't appreciate anything when they themselves are not appreciated. Or yet another. The lack of self-expression in our lives leads to closed minds on anything that is not practical. In other words, **after we have been ground through the utility mill of our education system, as appreciative enquiring human beings we are all chaff. And yet we are criticized by the people responsible as being sub-human with no interest in life except making money.**

The future

For example, in the West End of London, jazz clubs, both modern and traditional, generally charge higher admission prices than the halls that put on classical concerts, and the atmosphere is one of a closed shop for the smartly dressed modern jazz set.

Under the present system no one can deny, as Comrade Crutchley says, that the modern jazz theory is established. But what happens when we no longer have the present system of society?

Buy through

**SR
BOOK
SERVICE**

35B Priory Terrace, London, NW10

Notebook

by Bob Flagg

COMRADES who are members of VFS should make sure that the Members' Meeting to be held in London after Scarborough will provide the occasion to hammer out a policy for youth. We must press VFS to commit itself to support for an independent socialist youth movement—a National Youth Section of the Labour Party of Constituencies, Unions and student organizations, and meanwhile demand the setting up of a democratically elected Youth Committee, both to hammer out a program and mobilize young socialists. Such a body could give the necessary political direction to activate the activists, and make a socialist youth movement a flesh-and-blood reality.

I think there is no future in either modern jazz or the type of folk music (mostly Negro) that is dominant today, as both arose as a result of direct oppression.

Only when we have complete economic and intellectual freedom will we have a culture that is neither working class or any other class but a true culture.

VFS

Equality in Education

by C Dallas

THE VICTORY FOR SOCIALISM policy document, *Equality in Education*, deserves the wholehearted support of the Labour movement.

It does not falter before the basic fact that equality in education is indissolubly bound up with the achievement of a classless society. It says: "Labour must convince the people that the full flowering of individual talent, contributing in rich diversity to the common good, is possible only in society whose basic principle is co-operation."

In this connexion it puts as a fundamental aim a turning away from the present trend, evident even in many new comprehensive schools, to seek "to climb on the other man's back and so get to the top."

This trend is seen, for example, inside the schools in competition for individual honours instead of co-operative work for its own sake; in aristocratic government by prefects instead of the training of all pupils to accept responsibility and practise democratic procedures for themselves; in conformity—that social weapon so terrible to children—in matters small and large at the expense of individuality and the questioning mind.

The aims suggested in this extract serve as a beacon towards which we should steer, but are unfortunately all too seldom breathed in the educational world of our movement. By implication the document strikes hard at the official Labour Party pamphlet, *Learning to Live*, which forbears to deal with such fundamental social problems.

IT IS ONLY two months since we saw the publication of the Tory Government's plan for the solution of the Cyprus problem. In the same period, however, while discussion has been taking place on "the plan for partnership", the naked violence of British Imperialism once more stands revealed. New arrests have topped the thousand mark, and the island which has suffered under a state of emergency for nearly three years is once more graced with the presence of the "cream" of the British Army. Those redoubtable warriors, the Red Devils, have been moved in again to be ably supported by a detachment of the Marine Commandos.

Filling in the details

It is easy for us at home to miss the full impact of what this means, but to one who has served in Cyprus and seen the situation at first hand, the feelings of the Cypriot people can readily be understood. The dreaded red and green berets are once more to be seen in the island. For the last twelve months the Cypriots have been left in the tender care of some twelve major units of Infantry and Royal Artillery assisted by the English and Turkish Cypriot Special Branch. This must have been a period of reasonable tranquility to them compared with what it was like when the "cream" were there before and what it is going to be like now that they are there again.

Education—ctd

The second section deals excellently with the public schools, which it clearly says must be taken over by the State and used as schools for certain priority categories of children (among others, for instance, "children from broken or otherwise unsatisfactory homes"). It aptly answers all the official Labour Party objections to the taking over of the

The recent VFS pamphlet on **Industry Your Servant** will be reviewed in the forthcoming issue of SR—Editor.

schools. If it is cost to the State, it shows how considerably the State is at present subsidizing the direct-grant schools. For example, "Coventry sends 1,500 boys to independent schools, at a cost in school fees in four years that would provide the city with a new secondary school for about 1,200 pupils." If it is apprehension before "an unjustifiable invasion of liberty" (**Learning to Live**), it scotches the argument simply: "It is the same sort of freedom that anyone once had—in theory—of buying a rotten borough, or a colonelcy in the army."

The document deals admirably and in detail with the taking over of the public schools. It also gives a long list of recommendations, all of them very practical and deserving full support as measures that should be pressed for incorporation in official Labour Party policy.

CYPRUS

What is happening

by Oliver Sachs

To many of us the full story of what has been happening in Cyprus has never been told. The Greek Government's regular complaints of British atrocities have been equally regularly dismissed as "a campaign of lies and distortion." Such denials from the Government or headquarters of the Security forces in Cyprus have nearly always come without any investigation into the accusations and even when they have allowed an investigation it has always been carried out by the same type of organization and class of person accused. With such a situation it is no wonder that the truth has never been revealed.

However the need for such denials on the part of the authorities have been noticeably less since the Red and Green berets left the island at the beginning of last year. Now the island is in a turmoil once again and the Government is finally reaping the results of having allowed an 18 per cent minority of population to feel so important. It is now faced with the task of subjecting both sections of the island community and this is not going to be easy with the police force recruited almost exclusively from the Turkish minority. The government's answer to this immediate problem has been the quick sending of 500 British policemen to the island and the return of the Red and Green berets. **Under the name of the restoring the island to law and order the terrorization of the Cypriot people will take on a new lease of life.**

"Law and order"

How long will it be before this myth is dispelled once and for all? How can law and order be restored and the island returned to a state of normality when the actions carried out in the name of this policy by their very nature prevent it?

The actions of British imperialism have left an indelible mark on the minds of the Cypriot people. The detention camps with their high barbed wire fences, machine gun towers, and killer dog patrols are there for all to see. Many a Cypriot has been beaten during cordons and searches and many have had their homes and furniture broken up. The indignities suffered by those unfortunates who have been branded as suspects (possession of an EOKA pamphlet or a picture of the executed terrorists is sufficient for this) have been even worse. Black eyes, cigarette burns, and broken arms are only a few of the sufferings of these men in the hands of the Armed Forces and the Special Branch.

On the larger scale the operations of the Security Forces in the mountain areas have been carried out with great finesse.

The spring of last year saw the death of the "terrorist" leader Afxientou in his mountain hideout where a whole company of British troops eventually burnt him alive by throwing petrol cans on his hideout. This of course was hailed as a great military victory by the press of this country. This summer we have been told of another major victory with the death of an unknown number of Cypriots when a whole valley of caves in the Troodos Mountains was blown up. The widows of men believed to have been killed have been told that they will never be able to have their husbands bodies because it would involve far too much work digging away the tons of rubble under which they are buried.

Unholy Work

This is the sort of work that the "Security Forces" have been engaged in on the island of Cyprus. And the role of the Red and Green berets in this has been very important in the past. They are the trained thugs of British

Local Government 'Reform'—contd

should be, broadly speaking, the possibility of working out a common socialist attitude — for Labour groups on different authorities to take a similar line.

In formulating this line, numerous considerations must be taken into account. One of the most important is the possible effect of an alteration on the extent of Labour control in the future. The places in which Labour's voting strength predominates are normally concentrated and compact. Thus by splitting up existing units of local government it is possible to cut Labour strongholds off from larger areas which Labour at present controls. The result will be the extension of Conservative or anti-Labour influence.

In the London area, for example, the subdivision of the LCC area or the transfer of powers to Metropolitan Boroughs is likely to result in areas like Hampstead having a Tory educational policy put into force instead of a Labour policy.

In Essex, where the possibilities of setting up a metropolitan council to cover the south-eastern urban area or the granting of County Borough status to places like Romford, Dagenham, Barking, Ilford, etc., are being mooted, the case is similar. The exodus of any part of this area from the County will ensure that all possibility of Labour control in Essex will disappear indefinitely. It is a cause for sober reflection that had West Ham and East Ham remained within the County instead of attaining County Borough status, Essex would long have been a Labour stronghold instead of a marginal area.

If Labour control is worth fighting for in local government,

Imperialism. They are no respectors of persons or property when they are in this country as many an unfortunate farmer who has had the misfortune to meet them while they have been on training exercises will relate. It can well be imagined what they are like therefore when they are in the position of occupation forces and feel themselves to be the Lords of the Earth.

Withdraw the troops

The British people must be woken up from their attitude of complacency. The myth that these acts of violence only occur under totalitarian regimes must be exploded. However more important still it is the job of every British Socialist to study the situation in Cyprus and see there the very nature of British Imperialist rule in the face of a desire of a people to be free. And most important of all, our job is to demand the withdrawal of all British troops without delay. The Cypriots, like all oppressed people, must have the right of self-determination.

then clearly it involves fighting against the present Tory proposals insofar as they provide for the subdivision of existing Labour controlled or potentially Labour areas.

Unfortunately, some Labour representatives on lower tier authorities are so fascinated by the prospect of local power that they reject this point of view. They want their own local council to have full power over local affairs—irrespective of whether or not this means abandoning other areas to Tory control.

And, particularly in a rural area, this is no joke. Primary schools, for example, exist within 25 miles of London which must be more backward than London schools were fifty years back.

Of course, the argument will be advanced that rural areas have not the same income from rates. This, however, only strengthens the case. Despite the elaborate formula for rate deficiency grants, rural areas are likely to lose income from being cut off from urban areas. At a time when socialists are rightly in favour of aiding the backward areas of the world at international level, cannot they consider helping the backward areas at home.

Of course, it may be argued that what is required is a much more rational structure for local government; that the Central Government can compel backward authorities to carry out progressive policies, but this does not justify support for present Tory proposals.

These proposals are designed to divide Labour at a parochial level and should be resisted. Some County conferences have already been organised to bring Labour representatives together, but un-

turn to next page

OIL—contd.

Therefore, for sheer survival, if for nothing else, King Saud and his clique must block the road to indigenous economic development. They do this by sending the economic surplus, which could be spent on building factories, social welfare schemes, etc., on their own personal pleasures.

King Saud is having a 90-million dollar palace built near Riyadh, the capital. Daily his food is brought from America in refrigerated planes. He has recently had installed "a submarine night-club with walls of glass, through which the circumambient fish could watch the dancing." (JB Philby, *Arabian Jubilee*, p.228.) When he visits his fellow Arab rulers, he is mindful to bestow bountiful gifts. The Emir of Qatar received a luxury yacht, and the late King Feisal was given four Cadillacs and two Rolls-Royces. To reciprocate, the Emir had a £350,000 guest house built specially for King Saud's visit.

Afterwards, "an enterprising business man tried to purchase it from the Ruler for conversion into a hotel (none exist in Qatar). But the Ruler decreed: 'Where my friend the King has slept none will be permitted to enter. It must be razed to the ground.'" (New Statesman, July 13, 1957.)

Such extravagant squander amid such terrible squalor quite naturally provokes criticism. But King Saud, like the other Arab rulers, has many novel ways of dealing with critics. For example, "pumping water into their stomachs, tying up their genitals with wire and then hanging them upside down until they die of burst bladders." (Ibid.) Another of his playful tricks is chopping off his victim's hands and impaling him in the main street of Riyadh.

Western Governments support these barbaric Arab rulers simply because of the favourable agreements they have contracted with the oil monopolists. They fear that, if they were overthrown, the new, democratic governments would want far more royalties or, even worse, they might want to control and derive the full benefit from the natural resources of their own countries. And, whatever the horrors of King Saud's torture chambers, they dwindle to insignificance in the minds of the oil magnates when compared to the horror of oil nationalization. It is to avert this capitalist calamity that Western Governments meddle in the affairs of the Middle Eastern countries and wage a struggle that amounts to: "Peace with all kings and war with all peoples."

How this works out in practice can be seen if we take the case of Jordan, where Britain landed troops in July. After a general

election, held at the end of 1956, a majority of left-wingers, hostile to King Hussein, were returned. King Hussein's reply was to overthrow Jordan's first democratically-elected Government. With the American Sixth Fleet standing menacingly by, this grave boy king decreed: no political parties (dissolved), no Parliament (indefinitely adjourned), no trade unions (banned) no student organization (illegal), no public meetings (forbidden), no opposition newspapers (all five closed down), no civil rights (replaced by martial law). And so King Hussein, who rules by the grace of Allah, the American Sixth Fleet and the Tory Government, saved Jordan for "the free world."

The situation that existed after Hussein gained absolute power is described by Paul Johnson: "The régime maintains itself with a brutality rare even in the Middle East. Nearly 400 people were murdered in April; all the nationalist politicians are either dead, in prison, in exile or under house-arrest. The day I arrived, a 12-year-old boy was sentenced to two years' penal servitude for writing a pathetic letter to President Nasser, complaining that the police had beaten up his father." (New Statesman, July 6, 1957.) Hussein also carried out a thorough purge of the civil service and army. It was so severe that some Government departments ceased to function and illiterate Bedouins were made officers.

Yet, despite all his purges, Hussein's position remains wobbly. Besides executing 60 officers two months ago, who were accused of "plotting," he introduced a savage law imposing the death sentence on virtually anyone who criticizes his régime. And even then Hussein found it necessary to call in British troops to gain temporary respite from an angry people. He tried to justify foreign intervention with the same phoney excuse as the Hungarian Government used when it was having trouble with its people: namely, that the disturbance was a result of foreign trouble-makers who had infiltrated into the country. In both Hungary and Jordan, United Nations observers stated that there was no evidence of outside interference.

The presence of British troops in Jordan, which is equally as wrong as Russian troops being in Hungary, is an example of the lengths the Tory Government will go to in an attempt to preserve the huge profits of the oil monopolists. In the end this policy is doomed to failure. For it is im-

possible to keep down a people indefinitely. Sooner or later—that is, if the criminal actions of the British Government do not lead to a Third World War—the Arab peoples will gain control of their countries and their natural resources.

We of the British Labour Movement must help the Arabs in every way we can. They, just like us, are fighting British big business. Their struggle is our struggle—we have the same enemy. By our united efforts we can win higher wages, better conditions and democratic rights for both the British and Arab peoples. For unity is strength, and an injury to one is an injury to all.

The Tory Government, by their armed intervention, are striking a blow at the British as well as Arab workers. It is an elementary point as Edmund Burke insisted in his indictment of Warren Hastings 170 years ago, that the denial of a right abroad means, sooner or later, the denial of right at home. Men cannot discipline themselves to treat strangers unjustly without, ultimately, treating their countrymen in a similar way.

Local Government 'Reform'

fortunately many are too parochial in outlook even to bother to attend—illustrating once again that members of Labour groups are apt to forget their reliance on the Party. Every Party member at Ward, GMC or other level should endeavour to see that Party representatives on local authorities take cognisance of the need for a concerted socialist policy on the Tory plan.

As longer term aims, more research and discussion of a Labour plan for local government reform is required. The futility of the Harrogate Conference over a year ago and other local government conferences organised by Labour is painful to contemplate.

More immediately, the Labour Party should seek to introduce legislation to compel all employers to allow their employees adequate time to serve on local authorities and on magisterial benches, etc. All such time taken should be paid for at the representative's normal rate of pay—thus preventing the financial loss which many people incur by giving their services. Reform of this aspect of local government is long overdue.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

first issue now out, includes

Industrial Struggle in Britain. Kidron
Khrushchev's Russia. Cliff
French Socialist Party. Giacometti

80 pages price 2/- 2/6 by post 10/- one year from
M Maddison 21 Aubert Park, London N5

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.

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

● The inclusion of workers' representatives on the boards of all private firms employing more than 20 people. These representatives to have free access to all documents.

● 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, linked to a realistic cost-of-living index, 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 unification of an independent Ireland.

● The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas. The abolition of all weapons of mass destruction.

● A Socialist foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow.

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

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

Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. TU, Potter Street, Harlow, Essex.