

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

8th YEAR No 22

DECEMBER 1, 1958

SIXPENCE

QUIT CYPRUS!

SEVENTY YEARS of British rule in Cyprus have culminated in five years of terror: British terror and nationalist counter-terror. These five years have ended in racial war: "no holds barred" Darling hands out arms to all-comers (so long as they're British); MacMillan justifies "punitive retaliatory measures against the population as a whole" (albeit "in special cases"); gunmen flourish on both sides. And the Cyprus tragedy drags on.

Even before the present crisis, British Imperialism had not treated the Cypriots lightly. The official **Cyprus Annual Report for 1954** shows that average weekly earnings, including overtime payments, bonuses, etc., ranged from 42s 8d in agriculture (the lowest) to 88s 2d in transport and communications (the highest); mining averaged 85s 4d, engineering 64s 8d, clothing 56s 5d, and so on. Prices are no different to those we know here. The Report shows that girls under 18 work as miners (averaging 50s 3d a week), while the relatively high take-home pay in transport and communications has a lot to do with the 66-hour week worked by bus, lorry and taxi-drivers and by porters.

DOCKERS' CHARTER

pages 2 and 3

TRANSPORT

pages 1 and 5

LABOUR PARTY FOR SOCIALISTS?

page 4

The Report states that education is not compulsory. The normal school-leaving age for the children that do attend school is 12, although "in the poorer rural communities children are sometimes taken away at the age of 9 or 10 to help their parents at home or in the fields". More than half the schools have only one teacher, who handles all six classes, while another quarter have two teachers, each of whom takes three classes.

The **Housing Census of 1946** showed that more than one-third of the urban dwellings in the whole island consisted of one room only. One-third of these were occupied by seven or more persons, while the average number of persons per room over the whole island was more than three-and-a-half. Only half the houses have piped water, while less than one-fifth have water flush sanitation (quoted in Thomas Anthem, **Enosis**).

To this the "emergency" has added its own burden. Mass sackings from British installations; curfews which ruin peasant crops and cattle; youth restrictions which effect over 50,000 young people, mostly workers, and rob the Cypriot people of £40,000 per day, or one-sixth of the daily gross national income (**Daily Telegraph**, October 10, quoting the President, Federation of Trade and Industry).

Economic ruin, personal injury and death, mass terror; one soldier for every 15 in the population, man woman and child; special transport from here, free board, wages plus £3 danger money for teenage girls to give a

hand with murder (remember the 5s the Tories refused the busmen?)—these are the essence of British rule in Cyprus. The harder it is to keep in the Middle East; the more vicious this rule.

It is a long way since Churchill, then Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, could say in the Cyprus Legislative Council (1907):

I think it is only natural that the Cypriot people who are of Greek descent should regard their incorporation with what may be called their mother-country as an ideal to be earnestly, devoutly and fervently cherished.

It is hard to believe that in 1915, the island was actually offered to Greece as a bribe to enter the war. It was refused and Cyprus remained "British".

It's a long way. The Tories are hanging on with everything; brutality combines with cynical bluff. They promise to negotiate with Makarios if he drops **Enosis**. He drops it. They refuse to negotiate. What do they want with the island? What interest can justify their savagery?

As a base from which to police the Middle East, Cyprus is useless. The Suez War proved that. And Middle East HQ has been moved to Kenya (to the delight of the white settler minority). It is useless as a bomber strip for global war—Turkey and Greece are nearer Russia's borders and have, for the moment, at least, less hostile peoples.

So much has been admitted by a study group set up by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, a learned institute which acts as the Foreign Office's unofficial club.

(continued on back page)

BUS BOYCOTT

by Robert Emmett

ON November 18, there assembled in Transport House, for the first time ever, an all-embracing national conference of busmen. Representatives of Municipal, Private Company, British Transport Commission and London Transport staffs assembled under one roof to discuss the elements of a national wages policy.

As the conference opened, a time-bomb exploded with the announcement that the central London busmen, the biggest single section of the conference, would boycott the proceedings as a public vote of "no confidence" in the national officers of the T & GWU.

What were the underlying reasons for this, apparently, negative attitude to such an important event? Central London busmen, over the past thirty years, have occupied a position second to none as a progressive

force within the Labour Movement. Their rank and file leaders, at garage and conference floor level, have shown themselves to be a body of mature, experienced, and very doughty fighters. One would expect, therefore, that there had to be very sound and urgent reasons for their boycott decisions—and, indeed, there are.

In a letter to the conference, personally signed by every member of the Central Bus Com-

(turn to page 2)

INDUSTRIAL Porticus writes on THE DOCKERS' CHARTER

THE INTERNATIONAL agreement of the 63 nations, in relation to the conditions that exist in the ships sailing under "flags of convenience" is, of course, to be complimented by all concerned. No praise is too high for universal action designed to improve the working conditions of any group of men whomsoever they may be.

From December 1 to December 4 port workers in every one of these 63 countries will refuse to handle some 1,200 ships owned by the Sea-wolves who have heard nothing of Samuel Plimsoll or trade union agreement but who extend an open invitation to "the man from the Pru."

This expression of solidarity by the unions concerned could become the foundation of a completely new approach to a universal defence of wages and conditions throughout the world and could, if developed correctly, become a bastion against the unqualified spread of big business on international lines. The liaison already established will ensure

that all workers, irrespective of their country, will enjoy identical conditions to the best possible advantage.

Naturally, to obtain such a position, it is essential for the workers in every one of these countries to set their own house in order, for one could hardly insist that some group of workers in the comity of nations should enjoy an improvement in their living standards if those insisting hadn't already obtained such improvements for themselves. Commonsense and equity argue that this must be so.

Four Unions

With this in mind, it behoves port workers in this country to examine the position that exists in their own industry, and here one discovers that whilst there are four separate unions operating "for the interests of all port-workers" by far the largest is the Transport and General Workers Union. It is common knowledge

that for many years now, the rank and file membership hasn't always seen eye to eye with the Executive, and because of this difference of opinion, various groups of militant workers have formed themselves into Liaison Committees with the sole purpose of endeavouring to ensure that the Officials elected to represent them do in fact just this.

Red labels

Unfortunately however, the Officials resent the appearance of these committees born of their own laxity and tag them with "Red" labels even to the extent of communicating such information to the National Press with the result that the general public, unconscious of the truth, view the liaison committees with great suspicion. And yet, what is their real purpose? Nothing more and nothing less than the implementation of a "Dockers' Charter," which should have been the aim, nay, the accomplishment of our National Docks Group many years ago.

For the purpose of explanation there are four main items in the "Charter" which in the opinion of the men, must be resolved satisfactorily, if peace and prosperity is to come to the Docks industry, and they are:—

1. An increase in the basic fall-back guarantee, or attendance money.
2. One call per day.
3. A reasonable share of the work of the port.
4. A Pension and Sick Scheme for ALL Portworkers.

The more one looks at these requests, the more one must agree that they represent a very modest and equitable demand, devoid of any Communist or revolutionary propensity, in fact, they are just plain commonsense proposals, the implementation of which should be the aim or desire of any right-thinking or fair-minded person.

Overtime ban

Time and time again, the various liaison committees have endeavoured to have this "Charter" discussed and at all times they have carried the support of the far-seeing men in the industry, but so far their efforts have come to naught.

Upon one occasion, when work throughout the port was scarce, they endeavoured to introduce a ban on overtime, to ensure an equitable distribution of the work that did exist and were most successful in many cases, but unfortunately to ensure absolute success one must always carry unanimity and this wasn't forthcoming. In other areas it was discovered that men were queuing for the jobs of "fighting militants" when they were dismissed for operating the ban, whilst in one particular sector where only three men supported the ban, their colleagues—one cannot call them brothers—whilst applauding their action and eulogising them for their principles, promptly stepped in and stabbed them in the back. Naturally, with this sort of thing going on, even though it was only apparent in a very few cases, the ban on overtime had to be called off.

Fresh thoughts

Today however, with an unprecedented slack and recessive period in vogue, the wisdom of the words and actions of the militants in the past is revealed with startling clarity. Men are recalling them and having fresh thoughts about the whole situation. They are, in fact, demanding that some positive action be taken.

BUSES—continued

mittee, the central busmen say:

We have decided to take this very serious protest action for the reason that, judging by the actions of our national officers, in relation to the London bus service cuts, we can have no confidence that the decisions of the rank and file delegates to that conference, will be accepted and carried out.

Behind that simple, but very grave statement, lies a long history of endeavour on the part of the London busmen to prevent the piecemeal destruction of the nationalized transport services at the hands of a Tory Government, and an equally long fight to assert the democratic right of the elected committee of the busmen to decide and operate policy within the T & GWU.

Since the London transport services were nationalized in 1948, one-fifth of the entire system has disappeared—having been amputated in successive "cut" operations in the name of economy. More than 2,500 buses have gone from the roads. Some 11,000 less drivers and conductors are operating, and 4,000 vehicle maintenance men have disappeared. Fares have risen eleven times, service has deteriorated to a degree where one frequently waits 40 minutes for a bus that once had a five-minute frequency. The queues

get longer and longer. Literally millions of man-hours are being lost to production as a result of grossly inadequate transport services.

And now the LTE are in the process of making a further cut—the biggest of all. By November 26, a further 650 buses will have been taken off the roads in the space of three months, a further 32 million miles will have been lopped off bus operations—another group of nails will have been driven into the coffin of a transport service that was "nationalized" to "serve the interests of the public".

Central London busmen, who have watched their ranks dwindle and their jobs deteriorate through this systematic murder of the transport services, have utilized every constitutional channel open to them within the T & GWU to get union action against the bus-slashing policy of the Government and LTE.

Proposals vetoed

At garage, committee, and conference level they have requested action. National officials of the union have agreed to a general policy of "non-co-operation" with the LTE, but, when the central busmen interpreted this policy concretely with a series of practical steps to be taken against the

LTE—such proposals were vetoed.

Meeting after meeting took place with national officers. Request after request was made for action without result. The crowning blow was struck when a constitutional request that a further delegate conference be convened to consider the position, was refused by national officials.

This then, was the background to the conference—and the underlying reason for the central busmen's decision to boycott the proceedings. With quite unanswerable logic they argue—"if this is the way officials treat our decisions in respect of working conditions—what can we expect them to do about any decisions we take in respect of wages?"

Wider discussion

That any section of trade unionists should be placed in such a position by autocratic officialdom is to be regretted. In taking their decision to boycott the conference, the central busmen have at least succeeded in focussing public attention upon the calculated carving-up of the transport services, and in bringing before a wider circle of trade unionists the vital question of trade union democracy.

The wider the discussion of these questions within the T & GWU and the Labour Movement generally—the sooner will the hands of the London busmen be strengthened to win their fight.

INDUSTRIAL

WICKMAN'S WORKERS SHOW THE WAY

by Peter Morgan

Ed of B'rum Trades Council Journal

If they are sincere in their desires for such action, the answer is in their own hands and made available to them by constitutional means. First, it is essential that they attend their branch meetings. This is the desire of all militants, contrary to the opinion expressed in the National Press. At these branch meetings it is absolutely necessary for them to elect into office, members who are prepared to serve their interests, for that is the sole purpose of taking office and one is elected because, in the opinion of the men concerned, one is best qualified to serve the interests of the men electing him. Once these committees, composed of honest and resolute men, have been formed, it is essential that they be given unqualified support.

Ginger up

It is true that in the Transport and General Workers' Union, the elections for office are over a year away. It is also true that the responsibility for the composition of the present weak and feeble committees, with their milk and water attitudes to all matters rests solely with the membership. But all is not lost, ground can still be made up. By full attendance at all future branch meetings, this extremely negative old guard can be gingered up as they sit in their well worn seats imparting a Rip Van Winkle air, and if they are not prepared to do the job for which they were elected and have "no stomach for the fight" then, in the words of Shakespeare's Henry V, "let them depart" and whilst no "crowns for convoy will be put into their purse" new and more reliable men will be elected.

Active support

A second very necessary adjunct to success in these endeavours, is active support for the liaison committees, whose very existence argues condemnation of the sterility and vacuity of the Union's present program. Every worker must line up behind his liaison committee and in the areas where no such committee exists, then one must be formed of the trusted leaders and militants to operate until the Union itself does its job properly and effectively.

With such support, the liaison committees will be in a position to ensure discussion on the Charter and prove to all concerned that the industry owes its workers both a fair living and reasonable security for the future. By this method too, the Union itself can be forced to demand for the men a larger measure of control over their own destinies and could ensure that the good yesteryear enjoyed by the employers is utilized to offset the leaner times that the men are now experiencing.

Urgent need

Today more than ever, the hackneyed phrase of "fair shares for all" needs implementation, and this without delay. The increase in the fall-back guarantee should be applied immediately and the one call per day should become a fact. As far as the Pension and Sick-pay Scheme is concerned, we simply cannot wait for a change of Government to make this a reality for the need

is with us now and now is the time to demand that the need be met.

It is essential, if the men in general are sincere in their desire for a new deal, that positive action be taken on the lines suggested. They are not fools to be hoodwinked on any occasion and led blindly to destruction. Their most ardent desire is for a Union to operate on their behalf and in their interests. At the moment, this vital leadership is not forthcoming from their official representatives, but only from the liaison committees and the militants. With the knowledge that these latter men, having led them in the past without abusing the trust imposed only one course of action is open. Give these men the fullest support and a mandate to fight for the future. Then and only then can come the realization of the dream of a Dock industry operating for the benefit of the worker and the community at large.

Distress fund

In the meantime of course, and the docker is nothing if not adaptable, a practicable effort is being made to alleviate the question of distress among the workers in the Upper Pool. A Distress Fund has been inaugurated and is in the process of registration with the local authorities. The aim is to do away with "kites," collections which are made from wharf to wharf upon the occasion of the death, retirement or long illness of various brothers.

In operation

When in operation, it is the intention of the Fund to pay a Death Grant of £75 to all members of the Scheme and to decide later on the question of retirement or long illness. It is obvious to anyone that to run such a scheme successfully, upon the basis of a lottery entails quite a tremendous amount of work, but this has been undertaken in the most enthusiastic manner by an extremely able committee who are working in an entirely voluntary capacity, just giving their time freely and reaping no reward. Neither are commissions being paid in respect of the sale of tickets, the disposal of which is also on a purely voluntary basis.

Self help

The organisers point out however, that this is not a "Sick Scheme" but is concerned at the moment solely with the provision of a Death Grant to dependents of members, and that whilst they will consider the question of retirement and distress through a long period of sickness, it is impossible to incorporate any suggestion of regular sickness benefits. They do however suggest, that any person desirous of entering a sick benefit scheme could be accommodated by the 2-7-9 Club who have such a scheme in operation.

Be that as it may, it is to be hoped most fervently, that all men working in the Upper Pool will co-operate in this splendid effort of self help and that overwhelming success will crown such grand initiative.

ONE of the most significant strikes of post-war Britain concluded on November 11 when Messrs. Wickman's, machine tool manufacturers of Banner Lane, Coventry

(a) reinstated four hundred employees who had been on strike for a month,

(b) withdrew notices from sixty men under threat of dismissal, and

(c) promised there would be no further talk of redundancy until after Christmas.

What was the significance of this dispute? Why was it played down in the Capitalist Press throughout its course? How did the workers win their battle? These were the questions I set myself when I visited Coventry recently and talked with local militants.

the employers' job to decide who should be hired and who fired. And anyone who thought otherwise had another think coming.

It was in this explosive situation that Messrs. Wickmans announced that they would have to dispense with the services of sixty-eight men. The firm announced that they were prepared to prolong their contracts for six weeks "to help the men take advantage of known vacancies in the district". And there was a further warning that they would have to review their employment policy at the end of October.

Lengthy talks were actually in progress between representatives of the Confederation, the Company and the Coventry District Engineering Employers' Association on October 13 when it was

Woolsack and Moneybags !

Company	No. of Shops	Controlled by
Montague Burton	750 ...	Montague Burton
John Collier	400 ...	United Drapery
Hepworth	256 ...	Hepworth
Weaver to Wearer (many Rego Shops are being converted to Weaver to Wearer)	192 ...	G.U.S.
Alexandre	110 ...	United Drapery
Willerby	65 ...	Times Furnishing
Jackson the Tailor	63 ...	Montague Burton
Hector Powe	56* ...	G.U.S.
Claude Alexander	37 ...	United Drapery
Rego (name changed to John Temple, November, 1956)	34 ...	G.U.S.

* plus 31 branches in other stores

Socialist Digest, November, 1958.

To put the case in perspective, readers must cast their minds back to the Annual Conference of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions at Paignton in August. It will be remembered that there was a sharp clash between the theoreticians of the AEU and the Transport and General Workers (the two most powerful organizations in the Confederation) on the question of redundancy.

The AEU position — put bluntly—was that existing work should as far as possible be shared without depleting the payroll. The T and G attitude was that summed up in the BMC Agreement eighteen months ago—adequate compensation for long service. The differences between the two points of view were papered over in a compromise resolution which said, roughly, "Let's get the best we can in each case."

However, following the Conference, the Birmingham District Committee of the Confederation made no bones about it that they favoured the AEU standpoint. At the same time, the Engineering and Allied Employers' National Federation were squaring-up with a number of "planted" speeches indicating very clearly that it was

discovered that notices had been posted to the men in question. Immediately negotiations were broken off and the Union issued a statement that the withdrawal of labour which followed was "in defence of the simple principle of the right to share work in order to prevent redundancy. The action of the management in issuing notices whilst negotiations were in progress and before constitutional machinery had been exhausted, was calculated to provoke the Trade Unions".

Men solid

And after this? Well, really nothing until the final settlement. The men remained solid. All attempts to introduce scab labour were soon abandoned in a city which is a beacon of trade union solidarity in the Midlands. There were some half-hearted attempts to recommence talks. But it was pretty evident that the Coventry Engineering Employers were prepared to sit tight and let the workers stew in their own juice, to see how long the men would stick it.

And this is the real significance of the Wickmans' stoppage. **For Coventry is no longer the thriving, optimistic centre which it was a few years ago.** The cut-back

(continued on page 7)

FORUM Geoff West starts the discussion on LABOUR PARTY FOR SOCIALISTS?

COMMENTING on an article in one of the summer issues of *Socialist Review*, the editor writes:

we believe that anyone attempting to build a revolutionary current outside the (Labour) Party at the present time is doomed to failure and a sectarian existence.

His views are shared by many sincere and thoughtful comrades, which makes it worthwhile asking what he means by the words "failure" and (paralysing epithet) "sectarian." Even more interesting, what does he mean by the "success" which presumably we can reasonably hope to achieve through fighting in the Labour Party?

For ten years or more, most revolutionary socialists in Britain have believed that they should be active members of the LP. In the nineteen-forties there was a good deal of argument as to whether their's was the right course, but it won increasing acceptance and gradually came to be taken almost for granted. In my view these comrades are now making a present virtue out of a past necessity, and it is time to re-examine the issues.

the Youth Sections, where potential revolutionaries are most likely to be found in any numbers in the present LP. Although the vital statistics of the sections are jealously guarded by Transport House, a study of such information as has been published allows us to state two facts. Firstly, that the total national membership is less than 4,000, even allowing for a few large and ephemeral "socialite" sections. Secondly, what membership there is of strongly middle-class composition. Scores of Labour-held (and therefore mainly working-class) constituencies are quite without a Youth Section, showing the Party's utter lack of positive appeal to the youth. It is quite likely that both the Young Communists (membership 1,300) and the Young Tories (about 150,000) have more young workers in their ranks than do the Labour Party Youth Sections.

However, some comrades grant all that has been said about the present-day LP, but fall back on argument (b) above. They think, correctly, that economic conditions will force more workers to concern themselves with

ing leadership with socialists? Most of us know very well that there is no chance of such a development. Surely then we are being less than honest with the working-class if our actions seem to suggest that the Party can be changed in such a way.

But, of course, if any independent revolutionary party is "doomed to failure and a sectarian existence," then we must put up with the LP until we are thrown out. Is it so doomed? It is a matter of common observation in the Labour Movement that the Communist Party is now winning back lost ground. We are told that being outside the LP separates one from the workers in the factories, but the CP, which has suffered from over 30 years of proscription, still succeeds in winning a hearing for its views by directly approaching workers at the factory gate. Surely the deserved distrust which the CP has earned by its subservience to the Moscow bureaucracy must appreciably hinder its growth? Despite this it can maintain a membership of 25,000 and actually win recruits, because—with however little basis in fact—it is thought of as a revolutionary party.

How can it be argued that British political life can support a CP such as it is, but that it would be impossible to build a party of at the least similar size and influence which was demonstrably free of the CP's chief evils? This question calls for an answer above all from those who justify the existence of the little Revolutionary Communist Party from 1943 to 1948, but who reject any idea of a similar organization today as "sectarian."

Why was it right for there to be an RCP in the war and immediate post-war years, with every external condition unfavourable, but not now, when world developments show a definite, if uneven, rise of revolutionary currents? At that time there was still tremendous faith in the LP or alternatively the CP. Today neither arouses any positive enthusiasm anywhere; and the most that anybody gives to the LP is the sort of cynical support he will give to a consistently unsuccessful football club.

It is said that in those days the situation was different because there was a single clear issue—opposition to the war. Is there not an equally clear issue now—opposition to the war? Certainly there are papers such as the *Socialist Review* and the *Newsletter* which very clearly explain week after week the causes and cures for war. But unconnected to any distinct party, they make far less impact than they might.

Time and again we see demonstrations of "anti-Establishment" feeling of a depth unknown for twenty years. Even though it be still largely student and middle-class, even though it is often channelled by pacifists, liberals, or takes on non-political forms of protest, the seeds of revolutionary socialist thought and feeling are undoubtedly there. Revolutionaries in the LP will never attract such currents, for the reason that people have not the sophistication to grasp what they are trying to do. People do judge a political party by its leadership.

One does not have to believe in a "Parliamentary road to Socialism" to appreciate that whether we like it or not, British people, including British workers, regard a political tendency as serious when its spokesmen take part in Parliament and local elections. If we do not suffer from illusions about making the LP a socialist party by some fantastic kind of take-over bid, then clearly we must accept this conclusion: **revolutionary opposition to the H-bomb and all it stands for can only make itself heard through an independent class-conscious party, which will face the decisive task of striking roots in Britain's factories and pits.**

The British Labour Movement has a long history of breakaways—break-away unions and breakaway political parties. It is a living tradition, since even today there are many in its ranks who would like to leave the mainstream of working-class life to wander into the wilderness. *Socialist Review* wishes to initiate a discussion on this matter and presents the following article—with which we entirely disagree—as the first contribution. Others are welcome. The author is a member of a Constituency Labour Party in Southern England—Editor.

What further can be gained by striving to remain in the LP at almost any price? Ought we to postpone much longer an attempt to rebuild an independent Marxist party? Those who call themselves Marxists should keep such questions under constant review in the light of the developing situation.

The basic argument for membership of the LP may be summed up as "we ought to be where the workers are." When examined more closely, this usually resolves into two separate but connected propositions:

- (a) that by joining the LP the revolutionary socialist gains access to politically-minded workers and potential revolutionaries which would not otherwise be possible, and
- (b) that even those workers who are not politically-minded look to the LP to defend their interests, and will turn naturally to it if economic developments force sharper industrial conflicts. Therefore, it is said, the Marxist should be there ready to assist and guide them when needed.

As to (a): surely no one believes that the people now active in the Labour Party are those who will become the revolutionary socialists of the future. These latter will be drawn firstly from young workers and students, and secondly from among older workers who are at present "non-political" and confine their militancy to the industrial front. Just because they have absorbed less Fabian poison than most of the constituency LP committeemen and dance organizers, they will come to revolutionary socialism more swiftly and whole-heartedly when conditions—and our work—bring them into politics.

Granted that a large proportion of these constituency activities take a generally Left view of politics—for more nationalization, against making the H-bomb, etc.—their numbers are really very minute. One suspects that it is the size of the LP electoral machine, those 14 million votes, which hypnotize many Marxists.

It is interesting in this context to look at

politics, and that because of the Trade Union ties of the LP, it is to Labour that they will naturally present their demands and look for a lead.

This argument seems unpleasantly like the Communist Party's argument for pushing their demand for "summit talks." We know that they cannot bring peace, CP-ers will tell a critic, but the workers will learn through the failure of their Governments to fulfil their expectations. We know they cannot bring socialism, Mike Kidron tells us, but the workers will learn through the failure of their leaders to fulfil their expectations.

So far, so good. Of course, people have to learn; there are few short cuts; and even if the working-class thought it could obtain disarmament or nationalization or workers' control by prayer and fasting, that would not make us drop those demands. **What is unpardonable is to foster illusions that God or the great powers or Mr. Gaitskell can bring about these desirable ends, when we do not believe it ourselves.**

This question of a socialist's duty always to speak honestly to the workers is closely connected with the question of the right to organize in the LP. Certainly, if political discussion within the Party could be conducted as its founders seem to have intended, comrades with different views could organize to their hearts' content to have those views publicized and considered. But it is not so long since we saw what happened to Victory for Socialism—not revolutionaries certainly, but a group who clearly wanted real changes in leadership and policy. They were hamstrung the moment they agreed not to form branches on the constituencies and unions. The result was that the Gaitskell faction have things all their own way. To tell Transport House that this is "against the rules" is as senseless as telling an Archbishop that to drop napalm bombs on school children is "un-Christian."

So the editor of "*Socialist Review*," and those who think like him, must answer the question: **Can we honestly tell the workers that socialism may be achieved through the LP, or that there exists a possibility of democratic discussion and of replacing the exist-**

TRANSPORT IN TROUBLE

by Martin Jones

THE RECENT announcement that the British Transport Commission's loss for 1958 might amount to £85 million, draws attention to the crisis facing the transport industry.

To understand the roots of this crisis we should look back to the position of British transport on the eve of nationalization. In the present article we shall deal mainly with railways as they constitute the overwhelming asset, as well as liability, of British Transport.

The railroads were badly run down. "The locomotives on the London and North Eastern were 'on the average . . . over 32 years old'. They were also almost completely unstandardized as to type, and over wide ranges of construction and repair, locomotive parts were not interchangeable. In place of some 35 to 40 types required by analysis of work to be performed, there were over 400 at the time the Transport Commission took over." R A Brady, *Crisis in Britain* 1950, p. 259).

Maintenance arrears

The same situation prevailed with respect to passenger carriages and freight wagons. "Of the latter, 'over 20 per cent,' said Minister of Transport Barnes, 'are obsolete and should be scrapped, and 50 per cent are over 35 years old.' In November, 1947, more than a month before nationalization, it was estimated that 'nearly 200,000 wagons were under or awaiting repair' out of a total of about 1,250,000, and that there 'were over 54,000 fewer wagons in operation than a year ago, and over 80,000 fewer than in 1945. Worse still, very few of these wagons were of 40 tons capacity, and the vast majority of them were under 25 tons capacity. None of them were equipped with automatic couplings. Very nearly half (570,000) had been privately owned, and details of construction varied endlessly from merchant to merchant and from line to line. Few of them were, except for the chassis, of steel construction.

"Again, 'maintenance work on the permanent way was in arrears to the extent of 10,000,000 sleepers and some 328,000 tons of new steel rails,' and much road ballast was in bad shape. Some tunnels and bridges were too small for the larger equipment, and the light weight bull-head type rail—though standard throughout the British railway system—is wholly obsolete. Terminal facilities were in a similar condition." (Ibid, p. 260).

High charges

One result of the run down condition of the railways was high freight charges. Thus Colin Clark estimated that in 1935 the average charge of moving freight in England was five times as high as in the United States and 70 per cent higher than in France. (Colin Clark, *Conditions of Economic Progress*, 1946, p. 32).

Another result of the obsolescence and backwardness of the railways was the increasing subsidizing of the railway companies by the Government. Thus, during the Second World War the annual State payment amounted to some £38 million. Wartime profits had been maintained by the railroads through not keeping up repairs and replacements and eating up their real capital. At the same time dividends were received largely from rentals paid to the railroads by the government to the tune of £38,000,000 a year. (Brady, *op cit*, p. 248).

And what did the Labour government pay for this industry—so squeezed by its owners—over decades? It paid £1,000 million for all rail and canal securities in the form of 3 per cent transport stock, "repayable optionally in 1978 and finally in 1988."

No co-ordination

The former owners were not penalized for running down the industry. The payment was not evaluated according to the value of actually run-down, ramshackle equipment, but was based on the highly over-capitalized British railroads—largely as a result of high payments to landlords, lawyers and others as the system was built up. "The capitalization figure per route mile in this country is £56,000 as against £31,000 in France, £24,000 in Germany and £14,000 in the United States of America." (Hansard, Vol. 431, Col. 1833.)

Nor was it taken into account that the owners of the railways had already been "compensated" enough by the profits in generations past. Thus, for instance, "since the coming into operation of the Railways Act, 1921, no

less than £880 million has been paid in the form of interest and returns upon the shares, that is, virtually the whole of the capital has been repaid in the period since 1921" until nationalization.

Brady, who is not a left-winger, could say about the compensation paid to the railway owners: ". . . the government was virtually in the position of paying them a good price for run-down properties with a future which, in the absence of nationalization, was dark indeed. Nothing less than a fundamental reorganization of the entire internal transport system of Britain was called for, and failing that—which only the government was prepared for, and had the necessary resources to carry through—where would they be?"

The heavy compensation burden on the run-down railways is a main cause for the crisis in transport. Another is the lack of co-ordination between railways and the profitable and quickly expanding haulage system.

Stagnation

This promising branch of transport was hardly touched by the Labour Government. Not one-tenth of all vehicles engaged in this industry was nationalized, although practically all long-distance haulage was. However, even this little inroad into the profitable haulage business was beaten by the Tory Government by denationalization. Thus a source of revenue was taken away from the British Transport Commission and by the ending of the quasi-monopoly of commercial transport, general integration—with all its saving—has become impossible. One should not forget that at the time the Tory Government denationalized road haulage, the British Trans-

port Commission was paying its way.

The third cause for the financial crisis of the British Transport Commission lies in the stagnation, and now decline, of industrial production in general, and of steel and coal in particular, with the consequent decline of traffic in steel, coal, iron, and to a lesser extent, in general merchandise.

"The fall in coal traffic and in steel materials and products has become devastating since midsummer; the Commission says it is costing over £30 million a year" (*The Economist*, November 8, 1958).

The first lesson to be drawn from the crisis of British transport is the need to put an end to the heavy burden of compensation for the run-down railways. (Only in cases of hardship should compensation be paid.)

Secondly, the need for co-ordination of all main branches of transport—railways, haulage, buses, etc—which requires their general nationalization.

Thirdly, if a small economic recession can create such havoc for British transport, what catastrophe would be brought about by a really deep and prolonged slump!

What is necessary is a generally planned economy based on the socialization of the major portion of industry, including the complete transport system.

Finally, without workers' control of the nationalized industries, the workers will continue to be subordinated to the profit motive and have to suffer the hardships of capitalism. State ownership without workers' control is nothing but state capitalism. Only workers' control can guarantee that industrial work is for the benefit of the people engaged in it.

SOLIDARITY DIVIDENDS PAY OFF FOR BUILDERS

All building workers are invited to contribute to our builders' column. If you wish to sign a name—do so. If you would rather the witch-hunters did not know your identity, call yourself, as does our first contributor, a building labourer and steward—TRAMP NAVVY. Ideas, policy and space are your own to choose and use—EDITOR.

WE ARE COMING to the end of a year of struggle against the misdeeds of the master builders and their Tory overlords. It is a year that we can look back upon with pride. The solidarity of the boys up and down the country has been truly magnificent.

At the beginning of the year, many of us in London were glum

when faced with the dismal facts—big projects like Bucklesbury House, Lloyds Bank, Lime Street, Bank of England, Cheapside, Mytons and the Financial Times were coming to an end. But the men who worked on these sites and had learned to fight for decent conditions did not vanish—they are scattered throughout the London area on small jobs.

Merside alert

There is indeed nothing to be glum about, as now these gladiators from the large sites are making their officials realise that the organization of these small sites has been neglected far too long, particularly in the better jobs that employ less than forty men.

The boys on the Merseyside woke up to this long ago. When one considers that with the exception of the Unit Construction project and Bowater site there are few if any other jobs employing more than seventy men, one can only be amazed at this fight-

ing spirit. This is done by vigorous meetings, with delegates fighting tooth and nail in their Trades Council, and Labour parties. It is done by setting up action committees when brothers are in trouble. What a fine example to the movement they gave in the Shell-Mex dispute! London building workers will never forget that Merseyside contingent and the passionate appeal made so eloquently by their spokesman when he called for unity and solidarity at that gigantic meeting in Hyde Park.

IT WAS interesting to note during the year that for the first time ever the T and GWU held two mid-week schools at Beatrice Webb House for their building stewards. The first school was held during the OFFICIAL steel-fixers' Shell-Mex dispute last April; and the second school was held during the picket battle of the last Shell-Mex dispute. We are all for progress, but we are

(continued next page)

LEARNED IGNORANCE

by John Comley

In this pamphlet I present . . . a number of serious documents which go to show that the forces behind Bolshevism in Russia are Jewish forces, and that Bolshevism is really an instrument in the hands of the Jews for the establishment of their Messianic Kingdom. . . . **THE RULERS OF RUSSIA:** Dennis Fahey, C.S.Sp.

THIS LITTLE GEM comes from the pen of the nominal leader of Maria Duce, probably the strongest clerico-fascist pressure-group in Eire today. Professor Fahey is an old man and maybe no one takes him seriously. But nevertheless this book received the imprimatur of the Catholic censors.

A mine of information it is too! As for anyone who does not know that the present revolutionary movement in Russia is Jewish controlled, I can only say that he must be a man who is taken in by the statements of our deplorable press" (sic).

If Hilaire Belloc could really utter such rubbish as this, how can Dennis Fahey be blamed?

Mention of Belloc evokes the name of Chesterton. GK is deceased but the still small voice of AK., indefatigable leader of the bloody - but - unbowed Empire Loyalists, is still heard protesting (a) that there ain't any such thing as a fascist and (b) he never was one anyway. AK has denied that he is a fascist so often that I expect he genuinely believes it himself by now. After all, it is twenty years since he edited a paper for Mosley!

From Princedale Road emanates two other not dissimilar papers; **Free Britain** (curiously subtitled—"for defence against alien control") and a rather more flowery sheet, **Gothic Ripples** (!) This latter purports to be issued by "Leese's Anti-Jewish Information Bureau." A certain paranoid anti-semitism can be discerned in both these sheets as well as the

heard all this before. "Gothic Ripples" does ingeniously attempt to perform the double splits in attempting (a) to rejoice in the anti-semitism of the Soviet Union and (b) to attack Russia at the same time! The mentality displayed is indeed curious. From its pages we learn of the emergence of a new hero in the American political scene — Governor Faubus of Little Rock fame! We learn also that the Council for Education in World Citizenship is a Jewish 'front organization.'

So's my Aunt Fanny.

Bloody racism

The intellectuals hovering on the periphery of these nasty little groups are catered for by the highly original researches of Mr George Pile, whose writing also appears in **Free Britain**. Mr Pile has published (at his own expense) a booklet entitled **Five Races of Europe**, in which he 'proves' that 'Aryans' were at the root of not only Chinese classical culture but Egyptian as well—that in fact the 'Aryan race' has produced everything of value that the world has ever known—excluding of course Herr Hitler, who came from the despised Alpine stock. According to Mr Pile, HG Wells was also an Alpine and this accounts for the 'materialistic trend of his thinking. . . ." Mr Pile quotes the right-wing anthropologists Madison Grant and

Lothrop Stoddard in order to prove the necessity for a 'United Europe' and Keeping the Empire White. The Empire Loyalists won't have anything to do with that sort of caper; witness Austen Brooks, writing in **Candour**.

World Government happens to be the policy objective of the British Government and of those secret rulers of the United States, who hold both Harold Macmillan and Dwight Eisenhower in thrall.

There is a certain pleasing atmosphere of Sexton Blake in all this, emphasized by the mystery of the exact identity of these 'secret rulers.' Austen Brooks, true to the rules of his craft, won't tell us until the last instalment!

Builder's Dole

In one year—September, 1957, to September, 1958—unemployment in the building industry has risen by 47 per cent; since September, 1956, it has risen by 97 per cent, and since September, 1955, by 146 per cent. **In three years unemployment in our industry has gone up by 146 per cent.** The same sorry tale can be told about the civil engineering side. The percentages for the years 1957-6-5, compared with 1958, are 52, 89 and 162.

Operative Builder,
November-December, 1958.

Loyalist's missive, "Candour." "Gothic Ripples" even possesses a sort of Roll of (dis)Honour, "Jews in the News." The Jewish race, it appears, has not only built Communism but American capitalism and the Masonic movement as well—quite an achievement! But somehow I feel we've

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

a few copies left

But enough of the cesspit. Fahey and Maria Duce are militant Catholics; **Candour**, **Gothic Ripples** and **Free Britain** all profess some sort of militant non-denominational Christianity. But through them all run the bloody symbols of racism; and the cult of the Uebermensch is as strong in Britain as anywhere in the world. **The cricket-playing school captain is as much convinced of his own superiority to the "others," the lesser breeds without the law, as is the Prussian Junker.** While capitalism lasts, the words of Doctor Wertham will hold true;

"Just as the neurotic individual represses unpleasant guilty feelings from his conscience, so society remains content with formal denunciations of violence. . . . The dangers of violence that threaten us come not from individuals but from social circumstances. . . ."

"Am I my brothers' keeper? The answer is, yes."

an MP who will go into battle on our behalf. Into battle for winning control of our industry and we mean workers' control; and into battle for the winning of Socialism.

BUILDERS COLUMN

continued

afraid to ask when the next T and GWU school will be held. **IT IS** of interest also that the T and GWU London council are asking their National Executive to consider this approach to new techniques in our industries. All unions have got to tread very carefully in their approach to these problems—we are not yet a socialist society and must not fall head over heels in trying to agree with the managements until we see quite clearly where we are going.

Reinstate Behan

JOE ROOTS, a well-known and admired militant steward, was, after much confusion, elected Divisional Secretary of AUBTW London area. Building workers will wish him the best of luck. It is widely rumoured that his predecessor is to become Federation Official on the South Bank. Both these moves should help the declining AUBTW membership.

While talking of declining membership how can we forget the kicking out of Brian Behan by the AUBTW Executive. Before driving in his dagger to the hilt Weaver was making the statement that expulsion solves no problem—maybe his might not: but the real issue now is that we must forget about party, colour or creed, and make this

Executive recoil with shame — **this decision must be changed by the rank and file up and down the country through their branches.**

OUR HOUSES

In Gt. Britain 4 million houses are over 75 years old, and 2½ million over 100 years old. In Scotland, 400,000 houses lack the minimum sanitary facilities, though over 9,000 building and civil engineering workers are out of work (Sept. figure).

Operative Builder,
November-December, 1958.

Safety on the site

THE QUEEN, on opening Parliament, said that her ministers were going to improve the Safety Act. **What many of you may not know is that it was the lads of Belvedere Power Station who made the Queen speak on Safety.** For the last three months these lads have been lobbying MPs. They tormented the MPs so much that they were allowed to go, to see the minister. With such pressure and the ever-increasing death-roll the minister was forced to act. Full marks to Senior Steward Hugh Barr and his Belvedere boys, and also the efforts of the CEU.

A WAGE CLAIM is being submitted again on our behalf. We will have to fight like never before to get it. The employers and Union will meet to discuss this claim probably on January 8. Last year the London NFBTO gave lukewarm and half-hearted promises that they would initiate a campaign, and in the end they did absolutely nothing.

We demand a fighting campaign around our claim. Let us show the employers that in spite of their hiring and firing; their killing; their black-listing; their victimization and other crimes, that we building workers are indomitable. Let us show the employers that dole queues will make us fight harder than ever against them for our just demands. Let us also, engage the Tories in battle by first of all making sure that we are on the voting register, and then by getting the fighting policies of our branches into the Labour Party. By making sure that in the next election we are putting forward

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

The Tory Campaign

by N. SWEEN

THE TORY CAMPAIGN designed to sweep the present Government back into power at the next General Election is warming up. After the annual jamboree where embarrassing resolutions formulated by Tory backwoodsmen were neatly side-stepped and the smooth conduct of proceedings was marred only by the zeal of the Tory stewards in their ejection of the League of Empire Loyalists' emissaries, a monster publicity campaign is underway.

Advertisements announce from every newspaper that the Conservative Party needs us. Records of a speech by that fatherly figure Harold Macmillan are being distributed free by the thousand. Canvassers are busily visiting the electors and vast mountains of literature are being distributed.

Socialist salt

No effort is being spared to win over the doubtfuls and all scruples about political honesty have as usual been overcome. Handbills proclaim the benefits of the Health Service under the Tories! Others warn controlled-rented property tenants that the Labour Party plans to municipalize housing threaten their security.

To cap it all a shadow pensions scheme is announced and exalted to the skies, although it means at best that a married man earning £15 when he retires in the 21st

Century will get only £6 pension, after paying his contributions for a lifetime.

All this campaign blurs the distinction between the images created by the rival parties in the mind of the public which in any case is not anything like as clear as many of us would wish.

Naturally the Tories hope and stand to gain by this campaign but they should remember the old adage about "Many a slip 'twixt cup and lip."

The Prime Minister's assurances about the level of unemployment sound very well, but if the level continues to rise this Winter as it must, even his firm convincing tones will be called into question.

The Election will not be won by the Tories until the votes are cast. However despondent the Left may feel about Labour's policy and Labour's hopes, it must not lose heart. **The Labour Party and its Left Wing will suffer a grievous blow if the Tories go back again—not to speak of the working class.**

Therefore we must stand firm in the face of the Tory onslaught. Every socialist worth his salt must do his best to see that Labour is returned. **To test Labour's policy in practice will be much more decisive in the great debate on the future of socialism than to discuss it in theory for a generation. Only if Labour forms the next Government shall we really prove to the masses whether or not the policy of New Thinkers can solve the problems of our day.**

loss in expertise as well as in earnings. Messrs. Wickmans' will not lose by this agreement—although they opposed it all the time.

This has been, so far as I know, the first dispute since the Confederated Annual Conference where the workers have formed the directive and "gone for all they could get". It has been a costly strike to the men and their families in monetary terms. But it has been a lesson to the whole British Trade Union movement. It is a lesson that we ought to be trumpeting from the rooftops. Because it was a noble victory for workers' solidarity.

WICKMAN'S

continued

in aircraft orders has hit this limb and heart of industrial England harder than it has hit any other area. The queue of school leavers without jobs has been as long in Coventry as it has been anywhere. And many of the men had cars, TV, washing-machines on HP; houses on mortgage.

It's true—as the firm said—that there were other jobs to go to. But at what price? The down-grading of their skill and a

A postscript to Robert Emmett's 'Bus Boycott'

Since the above was written, the top officials of the T & GWU have been forced to call an emergency delegate conference of all London busmen to discuss action against the service cuts and to serve notice on the LTE to terminate the clause in the

agreement permitting standing passengers in buses. Thus, it would appear, the allegedly "negative" boycott by the Central busmen has produced more "positive" results in two days than in two months spent roamin' through the gloamin' of the Union's constitutional machinery.

Buy your books through

SR BOOK SERVICE

PARLIAMENT

by MICHAEL MILLET

"... I am dealing with a Minister who is known as "Smarty-boots..." Mr. Peart (Wokington) in asking a question of Mr. Macmillan.

PARLIAMENT and therefore your correspondent have returned from the Long Vac to a session which even Mr. Gaitskell can hardly prevent from being the last period of Conservative rule for a long time.

The Conservatives have been having a bad time of it since the session opened; they have had no coherent policy since Suez and it is a good general rule that if it is policy to attempt nothing more than to keep up with events, then events eventually get the better of policy.

Cyprus, which is a political, as distinct from a local military problem, is now competely out of hand.

Since any possible solution involves negotiation with Archbishop Makarios, the Government will, by its own definition, have to admit defeat. All the Conservatives can do is hope that nothing worse befalls between now and the General Election when, if they win, they can come to terms with EOKA knowing that this issue will have been forgotten about long before the subsequent election. And if they lose, they know that when the Labour Government makes the necessary concessions the Conservative propaganda machine can make Labour's right wing, always peculiarly sensitive to charges of lack of patriotism, so intractable that any moves towards a solution that the Parliamentary Labour Party might make will be extremely difficult.

Not that enosis or union with Greece is any real solution for the people of Cyprus.

Where is the Socialist who would care to be ruled by a

political church? What future have working class organizations under a government containing the near-fascist Grivas? But these people will have to have their victory, for there is nothing else to be done.

Until, that is, the day after independence.

MODERN SOCIAL legislation started about 150 years ago with Acts (which were promptly ignored) for improving conditions in factories.

But enlightenment prevailed and the progress of a century and a half of devoted work by Governments and manufacturers was demonstrated in a debate of as recently as a fortnight ago.

Dr. Stross (Labour) said that the 1957 report of the chief inspector made sad reading. There were first aid boxes inadequately stocked. Some contained dirty dressings which would bring about infection when applied. There were queer things in the boxes too. . . . In a number of cases no identifiable person was there to give first aid.

But the real masterpiece was due to Mr. Narbarro, that valiant enemy of the purchase tax, who spoke in the authentic tones of British Capitalism.

Did the Minister mean to suggest that under the fire prevention regulations proposed he was going to say, for example, that a wooden roof erected in 1925 should not continue in use because it enhanced the spread of flame? . . . He might perhaps seek to control . . . new factories but (to) take powers to control the prevention of fires in all factories . . . would be impracticable.

Obviously dangerous workplaces are part of our Glorious British Heritage for with the burning woodwork and broken glass falling around him could not old Smarty-boots still continue to talk himself out of it.

BUILD THE SOCIALIST REVIEW!

Please send a free trial copy of SOCIALIST REVIEW to the following:

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Send to SOCIALIST REVIEW,
M Maddison, 21 Aubert Park, N5

CYPRUS

continued

In a report entitled **British Interests in the Mediterranean and Middle East**, published this year, they write:

The attempt to maintain British sovereignty has merely involved immense military expenditure, the diversion of a disproportionate amount of Britain's slender military strength, a loss of royalty and friendship in the island, and the use of a repressive policy which has met some criticism in the world. This policy hitherto has also caused serious rifts inside British opinion. Finally, Cyprus proved inadequate as a base when the test came during the autumn of 1956. No doubt we have obligations to both the Greek and Turkish communities there, but we also have other obligations which are hardly consistent with a long drawn out and forcible military occupation of an island which has become restive under British sovereignty.

Tory prestige?

What, then, does Cyprus mean to the Tories? Can it be that its half million people are being savaged for Tory prestige and sacrificed to their backbench backwoodsmen? Remember these characters. Tory MP Speir calls for full military government in Cyprus and military courts with power to try suspects. He proposes to ban the use of transport and so prevent the escape of terrorists by car, motor-cycle, or cycle. The rest—Braine, Legge-Bourke, etc.—offer support. And then, when a backbench revolt looks inevitable, Speir is reported to be "confident that the Government is on the verge of adopting just the sort of policy he wants to see on the island" (*Manchester Guardian*, November 9). MacMillan announces the arms hand-out, the potential rebels look sweet and Cyprus is clapped into chains—victims of Tory dreams of Empire.

Concentration camps

These dreams are not parliamentary verbiage. They translate into concentration camps on the island. They mean that the half million are fighting the full might of a retreating and vicious Empire. What can they look forward to? Can they hope to influence the horse deals between MacMillan and his backbenchers? Can they make the hard-faced cynics in Parliament realise that the stakes are human? And if they did, would

it matter?

They are told to negotiate. When they declare themselves willing to do so, they are spurned. They are told to cease fire. When they do so, they are hunted. What can they do but despair. And despair breeds desperate measures, ruthlessness and terrorism.

Terrorism not condoned

Let us be quite clear. No socialist can condone terrorism. It cannot be excused, neither on humanitarian grounds nor on grounds of efficacy. The bullet and knife are not working-class weapons. On the contrary, they are the arguments of dictatorship and fascism. But if a small minority of Cypriots have adopted them as their most telling argument, if the vast majority condone their use, if only passively, it is because no alternative seems to exist. British Imperialism has crushed them against the wall; they can either shoot or be shot.

In this, our Labour leadership has much to answer for. Shamelessly they retract their promise of a year ago—at the Brighton Conference—to support Independence. They hound Barbara Castle for describing the real situation on the island. They take refuge in mawkish sentimentality and assure the embattled people of Cyprus that the "official Opposition also give full support to the British Security Forces in their difficult, dangerous and distasteful task" (Gaitskell in the Commons, October 12). Not a word about the filthy job these troops are forced to perform. Not a word of hope to the Cypriots; not a hint of a Labour campaign in this country to demand unconditional independence and the immediate withdrawal of British troops. Nothing to show that terror is not the only solution.

All our spokesmen can offer are demands that "houses should be requisitioned for our troops and it is the Greeks who, if necessary, ought to be under canvas" (Paget in the Commons, November 3) and sombre warnings such as "we know that a Labour Government would have to take very stern measures to meet violence, just as we did when we were in office at the time of the trouble in Malaya" (Donnelly in the Commons, October 26).

It does not need much political acumen on the part of the *Daily Telegraph* to realize what all this means. Writing editorially, they warn (October 28): it is well that they (the Cypriots)

and their political chief in Athens should realise how they are alienating British Socialists. This should strengthen the Government's hand.

Shame on these "socialists" who can "strengthen the Government's hand"; shame on internationalists who can prescribe the "Malayan treatment" of manhunts, starvation and martial law to a people fighting for freedom. Shame—and more than shame—for allowing 17,000 volunteers for NAAFI to be used—without protest, without addressing an appeal to their conscience—as scabs in a lock-out, as accomplices in Imperial murder.

Bleeding quarry

Retribution can be terrible. Nothing is more ghastly than civil war—it is a fact in Cyprus. Nothing breeds contempt for human lives and values as race-infested fratricide. This is happening in Cyprus. "The only good terrorists are dead terrorists", "the only good Britishers are dead Britishers".

It was civil war in Algeria that created the fascist paras; it was civil war that created Hitler's thugs. It is civil war in Cyprus that is breeding a generation of British gunmen schooled in racial superiority, despising the "natives", and despising the "system" and its politicians that neither go the whole hog or withdraw. This is a generation bred to violence and reaction—a tool in the hands of the most reactionary elements of the ruling class, potentially as dangerous to the British Labour Movement (and to the leaders who refuse to recognize it) as it is to the Cypriot worker and peasant today.

Let it be known. The Cypriot people are the bleeding quarry in the blood sports of Tory di-hards. A terrible weapon is being forged there, one that might ultimately prove as deadly to us as to the islanders. And our leadership blindly signify their assent. No protest, no alternative. Nothing but criminal negligence.

Socialism imprisoned

British socialism is imprisoned in the wire-cages of Nicosia. It will never be freed without the unconditional independence of Cyprus, to be used as her people think fit. It will never be achieved without the unconditional and total withdrawal of British troops.

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, i.e., 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, 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 BULK ORDER

(Six or more copies post free)

Please send me.....copies of the next.....

issue(s) of SOCIALIST REVIEW, for which you will bill me.

Name.....

Address.....

Send to SOCIALIST REVIEW,
35B Priory Terrace, London, NW6.

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

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

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