

# SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

**FORTNIGHTLY**  
for the  
**Industrial Militant —**  
for  
**International**  
**Socialism**

9th YEAR No 3

FEBRUARY 1, 1959

SIXPENCE

## SOCIALISM NOT ZURICH!

**The Times** said it editorially (January 17), so do we: "The approval of sixteen schemes which may in time provide work for 1,000 people is about as much as could have been expected" from the Tory Government. This generous government intervention "may in time" solve one-sixth of one percent current official unemployment or one-tenth of one percent according to more reliable estimates. As **The Times** remarks and we, of course, echo: "If the results of the Government's efforts to attract business to the worst pockets of unemployment have so far been meagre . . . it is hardly a matter for surprise." Hear, hear! And "hear, hear!" too, to that paper's conclusion from the news that nineteen new areas—where unemployment has been over four percent for a year or more—have now been scheduled for aid under the Distribution of Industry (Industrial Finance) Act: "it is all likely to be on a very small scale unless and until the economy as a whole begins to move forward once more."

Let's go back a few weeks to a previous editorial from **The Times** — the one commenting on convertibility. "The chief internal need of the British economy," they wrote (December 29), "is a measure of stimulant for industrial capital expenditure. . . . And the natural stimulant—lower long-term interest rates or budget investment allowances, or both—might appear to be made rather more difficult by introducing convertibility first."

So there it is. Measures to alleviate unemployment are poppycock without expansion; expansion is poppycock when coupled with convertibility. The Tories' house organ says so. It must be true.

How has our leadership met this situation? Have they exposed this disgusting hypocrisy? Employment is becoming a prisoner to international finance. What is their policy? How are we to fight the consequences of convertibility?

On one thing we should be quite clear. Convertibility, as **The Times** admits, was not the first priority for the British capitalist economy. There were political reasons which far outweighed anything the economists might have said.

Adjust political power in Europe to the economic facts of life. Pawn France to the German bankers irredeemably. Cash in on the depression in working-class activity to lower European standards — and more.

But there is another reason, one which concerns us nearly. Capitalism is firmly in the saddle and confident in its power in Britain today. It is on the offensive. Gone are the days when it had to hide behind the right-wing leadership of our Party and unions—as it did after the War. Gone are the days of concessions and compromises. It has power and wants to exercise it openly and efficiently — through its Tory Party. A Labour Government, even a mouse of a Labour Government, is an embarrassment. Anything that will sabotage its coming to power is good enough and will be and, in fact, has been used.

The pound is convertible. Their business associates

abroad — the Zurich bankers, the American businessmen — have been told to appoint the Government of this country. As the **Daily Mail** wrote editorially (December 30): ". . . if a Socialist Government were returned he (Gaitskell—Ed.) would find it more difficult to restrain the torrent of money which would run out of the country" as a result of convertibility. Not only would they be able to sabotage a Labour Government in power (as they did in 1951) but they could undermine Labour's election campaign. Writes the **Economist** — faithful mirror of City opinion: "As polling day approaches, some speculators may think that they had better cash in their sterling at the official rates quickly, for fear of being obliged to accept the old discounted transferable rate if Labour should return and not stand steadfastly behind the new system" (January 3).

They need not bother. Our leadership has already surrendered and given its word of honour to obey the dictates of the financial brotherhood. Gaitskell has declared that, however much he dislikes the move, a Labour Government will accept it. Harold Wilson went out of his way on television to assure Zurich, New York and the rest, that a Labour Government would guard the pound as the apple of its eye. British Socialism has already been pawned to the hock-shops of world finance.

But not entirely. British Socialism is not the chattel of Gaitskell, Wilson and the rest. It is not theirs to swap for a capitalist "confidence trick." Rank-and-file Labour must make it clear that there is an alternative to Zurich:

**nationalize the banks to prevent capital flight;**  
**nationalize foreign trade to prevent secret import and export agreements;**  
**open the books of capitalist firms to see what resources are used for what purpose;**  
**plan the economy under workers' control to eliminate control by Wall Street and Zurich;**  
**and, meanwhile, agitate within our Party and Unions to fight this growing unemployment by:**  
**refusing to accept sackings;**  
**reducing the work-week without loss of pay;**  
**and the taking over of shut-down plants by their workers.**  
**Wake up, Labour! Socialism not Zurich!**

### INSIDE

- **Barking 'Revolt'** page 2
- **Building** pages 2 & 3
- **T.U. Commentary** page 3
- **Australian Labour Party** pages 4 & 5
- **Socialist Foreign Policy** page 7
- **Man, Money and Morals** page 8

# INDUSTRIAL A BLOW AGAINST OFFICIALDOM

## —THE BARKING 'REVOLT'

Many of the Left greeted the sit-down strikes on London's Underground as a middle-class extravagance, temporary, isolated from the "real, political struggle," something at which to raise a Left eyebrow, but no more. Others have condemned the strikers for imputing blame to a nationalized industry and its governing body—the London Transport Executive. We believe that both these approaches are fundamentally wrong.

As we have said time and again, the Tory Government are using the LTE to discredit nationalized enterprise. They are using the capital's travelling public as a guinea pig to see how far they can go in providing less and less service for more and more money. They are using London's transport workers as sparring partners for the fights against bigger bodies in our Labour Movement. They are squeezing workers and passengers alike to pay ex-owners compensation.

The effects of these plans are widespread. They involve everyone working in London Transport, using it or even hearing about it. Every reaction on the part of those affected is potentially a political action, not to be ignored. On the contrary, every reaction should be built on and expanded, organized and directed against the Tories and their system, against a nationalization that is divorced from workers' control, against an apathetic leadership who should be directing this fight.

No one is doing this type of job better than the London busmen's rank-and-file journal, **Platform**. We are proud to reprint their editorial of last month and consider it to fully represent the views of **Socialist Review** on the recent sit-down strikes and the way to fight the Tories' campaign against London's transport.

One final word. The article printed herewith is directed at London's busmen. Non-busmen can play their part by getting their local trade-union branches or Labour Parties, Trade Councils and other organizations to protest at the destruction of our transport, by publicising these protests as widely as possible in the local and national Press, by exposing the Tories attack on nationalization in public meetings, by pressing for mayors' meetings, by demanding the end of compensation and so on. **And especially, by refusing any unreasonable demand on the part of the LTE, whether by word of inspectors' mouth or over the new system of loudspeakers which is being installed to take the place of trains and buses.—Editor.**

WHEN district line passengers hoisted the 'Jolly Roger' and mutinied at Barking station on New Year's Day, they struck a blow in defence of the people's transport services that may well have a greater and more far-reaching effect than all the learned political talk has done for years past.

Within a matter of hours, the mutineers of Barking had been joined by a host of supporters at Mile End and Finchley. In refusing to quit their trains before they had reached their scheduled destination they staked a claim for ten million Londoners—that services should be run to meet the needs of the people — and not merely to suit the whims and fancies of a pompous and autocratic group of gentle men at 55 Broadway.

The swift — one-two-three — blows delivered to the LTE's solar plexus, had old Broadway running round in dazed circles. Mr B H Harbour, operations boss, made frantic appeals to the public, in the course of which he delivered himself of the following gem:

"I want to give my personal assurance that we never resort to taking a train out of service unless it's absolutely unavoidable in the general interest. Our sole job in life is to serve the public."

Nobody is talking about "taking a train out of service." What is happening is that vehicles —

both buses and trains—are being turned short of scheduled destinations as part of a calculated and deliberate policy designed to produce economies and boost revenue. And, to this end, the needs of passengers and the well-being of staff alike is completely ignored.

**This policy is part and parcel of the whole LTE approach to the running of London Transport. The aim is to squeeze the maximum revenue from the public for the minimum of service, and the greatest possible effort from the staff for lowest possible wages. So far as old Broadway is concerned, the ten million users of London Transport exist to serve the interests of the LTE—and NOT the other way round.**

In challenging this position, the mutineers of Barking are a hundred times right. If their "New Year Resolution" is kept — and extended throughout the whole range of LTE services the autocratic reign of Sir John and his merry men will come to a speedy end. The Harbour's and the Bunnell's will be taught that they are the SERVANTS — not the MASTERS of London.

So far the revolt of the passengers has been confined to the underground railway system. There is equal need for similar action on the bus and trolleybus systems against the growing practice of "turning short," "localisa-

tion" and "short journey" jobs.

Putting forward its policy against the service cuts, our Central Bus Committee advised staff to:

"Refuse to be turned short to cover service gaps and carry out the right to proceed to scheduled terminal point."

When this advice was given, the Fleet Street Press immediately screamed that we were "hitting the public"—now the public itself is insisting on that very principle —i.e., that vehicles proceed to scheduled terminal point.

This journal has consistently argued that the fight to preserve the people's transport services can only be waged effectively if, and when, the passengers join in. Now they are beginning to do so —and very effectively to. When the passengers that provide the revenue—join forces with the staff that operates the vehicles—then, and only then—will London get the transport service it needs and deserves.

At long last the public "worm" is turning. Forty thousand bus drivers and conductors can assist the process by rigidly adhering to their trade union agreement—by refusing to be turned short—and by explaining the real facts to the public.

Twenty thousand conductors can talk to literally millions of people every day. Let us now begin the biggest talking campaign ever seen on London Transport —and let us back the talk with action.

It is an old business axiom that "The customer is always right." The customer has spoken—and he IS RIGHT.

## JACK FROST SERVES BOSSES

writes TRAMP NAVVY

"That the Annual Conference of the NFBTO strongly condemns the actions of those employers who have ruthlessly used the powers of discharge given in Working Rule 2B to avoid their undoubted responsibilities to the building operatives under Work Rule 2A during the severe spell of frost in February of this year. Conference reaffirms its belief that Working Rule 2A was incorporated in the agreement so as to minimise the hardship to building operatives during severe weather and calls on the affiliated unions to take the necessary steps immediately to strengthen the provisions of Working Rule 2A, and to eliminate the absolute powers of dismissal given to employers in Working Rule 2B."

Please, readers, do not regard the above resolution as a lot of jargon. It was passed at 1956 Annual Conference of the National Federation of Building Trades Workers because of the ruthless way the London Master Builders were interpreting our Working Rule Agreement.

Clause 2A deals with time lost through causes beyond the control of the parties to the Agree-

ment. It states that where abnormal weather conditions interrupt work over a period, and provided the operatives establish that they are available for work in each day, they shall receive payment at the current hourly rate for half the time lost by them on that account during the normal working hours. It also states they they shall be guaranteed a 36-hour minimum week.

When you read this you may say what a lot of lucky so-and-so's building workers are. If it rains or snows or frosts for three weeks on a trot they sit and get paid 36 hours guaranteed. This, however, is far from what actually happens because unfortunately for us there is another clause in our agreement — Clause 2B which deals with the termination of engagement.

Now what this Clause 2B says, among other things, is that termination of service shall be upon

## TRAMP NAVVY—ctd IN THIS ISSUE

the tendering of two hours' notice by either employer or workman, such notice to expire at the normal finishing time on Friday. Again, when work is stopped on the instructions of a recognised competent authority, employment may be terminated at two hours' notice expiring at the end of any day.

If you can swallow all that, and I will excuse you all if you cannot, you will see that the employer finds it much more profitable to ignore Clause 2A and operate Clause 2B.

### Flagrant Attack

In January, 1956, building workers in the London Area were highly organised on the large projects that were going on at that time. A stewards rank-and-file committee was set up to fight our wage claim and at a meeting in Central Hall, 2,500 building workers demonstrated for our wage claim. On the following day thousands of the lads from the sites marched to the employers' offices demanding in a mighty lusty roar—"one, two, three, four, we want a tanner more." Many of these workers had come from Liverpool and Manchester and they really had the employers worried. Not for long though. Along came "Jack Frost" and instead of paying the guaranteed 36 hours minimum, the employers of many sites used the clause that gives them authority to sack on two hours' notice on a Friday—Clause 2B. They used this clause ruthlessly to try and break the power and strength of the building workers at that period. Whole sites were sacked and later all were started back except, as recently in the South Bank, the stewards and militants.

The attack by the employers was so flagrant that the London Regional Council of the NFBTO were compelled by the fury and branch activity of the rank-and-file to put forward the opening resolution here to the 1956 Annual Conference of the NFBTO. This resolution was passed. It may interest some to note that Mr (not Brother) Harry Matthews passionately opposed this resolution on the grounds that if it was passed, many building employers would go bankrupt.

### Leadership wanted

It was Mr Matthews, of course, who gave McAlpines the permission to usurp the power of our great unions by letting McAlpines inform the operatives whom he particularly chose of the decisions of their national union leaders. I expect again Matthews did not want poor McAlpines to go bankrupt.

When this resolution was passed in 1956 I felt our troubles were over and that the NFBTO would use the power of their million-and-a-quarter workers to really put an end to frost witch hunting. But it still goes on. Last month at Harry Neal Contract Stevenage all the labourers' stewards were sacked during the severe spell. Again on the Birmingham motorway project months and months of trade union organizational work was

## PETER BERKELEY REVIEWS

### • MINERS STRUGGLES

MANY YEARS AGO, when I was a kid at school, St. George's Circus, at the bottom of London Road, near the Elephant and Castle, was a favourite spot for political meetings and demonstrations. It was a regular assembly point for the Unemployed Workers' Movement whenever they were on the march, the fact of which would be advertised in whitewash, surreptitiously scrawled across the roadway overnight with lookouts watching for the police. I knew it well, in fact I used to carry the bucket and many times ended up smothered in whitewash, which had spilled whilst "on the run."

One of the most touching scenes upon the occasion of these meetings or marches, and I think probably one of the most impressive sights I have ever witnessed, was the point where the Marshal called upon one of the groups of unemployed Welsh miners to sing in their own inimitable style. The result was fantastic and wonderful to behold. A hush would descend upon the previously noisy crowd as the mellifluous tones of the singers rose to the sky and, before the song was finished, you could see tears in the eyes of the listeners.

### For solidarity

That was a long time ago and much has happened since that time. We've been through a war, enjoyed full employment under a fully mandated Labour Government, seen the Welfare State in embryo and, over the last few years, witnessed the determined efforts of a Conservative Government to efface the slight progress made, by typical class legislation.

How well are the Conservatives succeeding? Much better than we think. Unemployment is rising, the cost of living is rising and—the signal of their greatest success of all—a fortnight or so ago, the song of the Welsh miner was heard once again and in St. George's Circus. They were the representatives from the men from the mines in South Wales, assembled for a protest march against the unemployment inevitable with the closure of the pits in their area.

**Surely with such unimpeachable evidence before us, we workers should take heed. We must remember, the miners fight is our fight, their protest our protest and we must support them to**

**destroyed when over 600 men and their stewards were sacked.**

**Sir Richard Coppock, our Secretary, must call on all the affiliated unions to withdraw their members from employers who are using this ruthless method to break down trade union organization. Brother Armstrong, the secretary of the Civil Engineering Operatives, must give more determined leadership on this question than he gave in the South Bank debacle. Building workers up and down the country must demand the implementation of the 1956 resolution.**

**the full, and give them all the help we can. Mark well, worker. You have been warned.**

### • DOCKLAND and BBC

AS THE SIGNS of the times and the aims of the present Government become more and more discernable, Trades Councils in South London are becoming disturbed, not only by the attitude of the Government itself, but also by that of the worker whose laxity on many points, is playing into their hands.

From Deptford, a resolution has gone to the TUC calling for a campaign against overtime and a fairer distribution of work, whilst Bermondsey and Southwark are discussing the question of a South London Area Conference on unemployment, although they pinpoint one particular difficulty in the fact that last year's unemployment problem was more or less concentrated in the docks, which is covered by a self-contained Dock Labour Scheme, which they are unable to discuss.

That the Trades Councils have reason to be disturbed by the attitude of the worker is more than apparent by events which have taken place over the last few weeks in the Upper Pool area, where normally the docker is the most militant of all workers. In defiance of Trade Union agreements which forbids work in such conditions, workers in this area were responsible for discharging the "Polonia" in pouring rain, with only sacks around their shoulders for protection. It's true that this work was done by one team only and with the most vociferous disapproval of the majority of the men in that area, nevertheless, the fact that such a thing could happen in such an area, behoves the worker to wake up and fight to ensure that this doesn't occur again.

### Drinks . . .

Another action on the part of a few men in Tooley Street, which has earned the scorn and derision, not only of the majority of the men there, but also of the local publicans and shopkeepers, concerns the production of an item on the Docks, by the BBC for screening on Television.

A team of BBC camera men descended, without Trade Union permission, on Wilsons Wharf and immediately commenced operations. Normally, the steward should have asked whether the Union had given permission for these people to act in this manner, but somehow this was overlooked and whilst a number of the men actively resented the intrusion, others bought over by bribes of overlong "muggos" or tea-breaks, free food and free beer openly fawned upon the BBC personnel, and allowed them to work alongside them, despite the fact that they represented unregistered labour.

## TU COMMENTARY

Some of the more astute dockers however, contacted the local union official, and it is to his eternal credit, that immediately upon hearing of the matter he contacted the management of Wilsons Wharf and informed them, that unless the BBC people withdrew from handling, or doing dock work, Tooley Street would come to a standstill.

That did the trick insofar as work on the wharf was concerned, but it didn't stop the men from the BBC squandering largesse, in the shape of free meals and free beer, and from pursuing some semblance of a story. Consequently, any visitor to the "Duke of Clarence" in Tooley Street itself, could have seen unprincipled dockers, much the worse for drink, fawning over the "Television Toppers" as they were named, expounding garbled stories of life in dockland, highly coloured and in the main apocryphal, as they imbibed the freely flowing liquor.

### All round

What the item will look like when it eventually reaches the Television screen, just simply cannot be imagined, but one thing is certain, the story will most certainly not be truthful in many respects. A question was asked of the BBC men and that was, "Where did the tremendous amount of money that was being expended in drinks, come from?" and again, "Would the licence now go up to £5," but no answer was forthcoming in either case, and neither did they accept the invitation from several of the more conscientious trade unionists, to meet them at midday on Saturday, January 17, at the Union Office, where the truth of the situation in Dockland would be imparted.

**This could have included the fact that a "witch-hunt" of extreme intensity, has been started by the Docks Group Executive, to remove from their midst a good trade unionist who is presumed to have revealed the story of the resolution which was contained in the last issue of Socialist Review on information laid by a "goody-goody" from one of the London Area Divisional Committees. It is,**

### Hidden facts

however, the "goody-goody" who has either been misinformed, or else hasn't paid attention to the facts for these have been known to the men in Dockland ever since the "infamous" resolution was drawn up, and no official of any description was concerned in the production of my previous article.

**Additionally, the financial embarrassment of the docker "bomping" for considerable periods could also have been revealed, as could the fact that he is unable to apply for National Assistance, since by drawing his fall-back money of £6 1s. 0d. he is regarded as a fully employed man, and this despite the situa-**

*contd. on page 6*

INTERNATIONAL

Reviewing the recent election

BOB HOWARTH gives an analysis of the

## AUSTRALIAN LABOUR PARTY

THE recently concluded elections in Australia resulted in the return to power of the extreme right-wing Conservative coalition led by Menzies. The nature of the election campaign and its results throws some interesting light on the condition of the Labour Movement in that country.

Dr Evatt fought the elections on a policy of pacifying the middle-class and attempting to woo the centrist voters supporting the breakaway Catholic Action "Democratic Labour Party." All socialist and radical content was purged from Labour's policy, and the highlight of the campaign was Evatt's offer to capitulate to the DLP on their own terms (which they refused): in effect, to deny that a faction fight between Left and Right has rent the Labour Party these last three years, and to deny all the gains the Left has made towards shaping a militant class party out of the split. All this Evatt did in the name of the "need for unity" and a return to the ghost of the old Labour Party which could unite so many diverse class elements, but which has now gone for ever.

Yet all Evatt's "unity and peace-between-the-factions" policy has achieved is to push the post-election Labour Party to the brink of a new and more savage series of schisms and factional struggles.

## Growth of the left

After the elections Evatt has to explain to the rank and file that this time the threat to his leadership comes from the very people who have backed him so far and on whom he was forced to depend to fight Catholic Action. **Beyond Evatt and his CP allies a new left leadership grouped around the extreme-left MP for East Sydney, Ned Ward, is demanding that if Labour has to fight as a minority, then it fights on the militant policy of the group which is its diehard support, the industrial working-class.**

Ward, who has always been popular with the workers and the Left, would long ago have become the natural leader of Left Labour rather than the intellectual Evatt, if it had not been claimed that he would terrify and alienate the middle-class, who look upon him as a rabble-rouser and a demagogue. In the last twelve months he has earned the hatred of the Right by leading the Left opposition in New South Wales against the corrupt Tammany Hall Labour Government of Joe Cahill.

In a position where the party is still riddled with Right-wingers and the Left has grown too strong to be proscribed and put back in its bottle now that it has served its purpose for Evatt, the Labour schism is very

far from dead. Even more so now that the Australian economy is continuing its roll downhill, where it has been going in fits and starts since the end of the wool boom and the recession of 1952. In answer to this, while the election was at its height, the workers were stepping up strike action all over the country.

The history of the Labour split is interesting in that it shows that it is being fought over deep-going issues that make an absurdity out of any hope of unity and reconciliation while they remain unsolved. **Their solution can only be in the transformation of the Australian Labour Party into a determined anti-status-quo party, prepared to carry political struggle into industry.**

## • LABOUR AND POLITICS

Politics in Australia, far more in Britain, revolve around the Labour Party, and the open factional struggle of the past three years caught the attention of the entire nation and its outcome has been the chief concern of most pressure groups, despite the fact that the Tory forces have been the Federal governing power since 1949.

The schism came into the open in 1955 over the role of the Catholic Action-dominated Labour Party Industrial Groups, which were closing in on the constituency parties and the Labour Movement through their co-ordination and in the semi-secret Catholic-dominated "Movement" organisation. This was led by a Catholic lawyer, Santamaria (also head of the Catholic Rural Movement), and inspired by Melbourne's Archbishop Mannix, with the backing and blessing of Big Business and Big Church.

## In industry

But the original aims of the Industrial Groups had been vastly different from their final clerico-fascist perversion. **The Industrial Groups had been formed shortly after the war as Labour Party factions in industry, intended by the leadership as a counter to CP influence, but seized upon by the militant socialist elements and in many cases becoming weapons to fight the boss.**

**Under militant control for a brief period after the war, the Groups showed the direction in which Labour could develop into an industrial vanguard party. They developed a political program propounded at the first annual conference of the New South Wales Labour Industrial Groups which alarmed the employing class, the Right**

**Wing, and excited Catholic Action into developing its counter-attack. This policy demanded a full-scale strike struggle against the employers, the nationalisation of basic industry under workers' control, requisitioning of all unused dwelling space to solve the chronic housing shortage, and the formation of workers' militia as the foundation of Australia's defence policy.**

## Catholic Action

The rallying cry was Fight The Boss. To infiltrate and finally swamp the Groups the Catholic Action mobilised its followers with the cry of Fight Communism. The CP was also alarmed by the development of the Groups, seeing them as rivals, and undermining the reason for its independent existence as they developed a socialist policy, and so launched an attack on the Groups from the start.

Catholic Action could marshal resources which the militant wing of Labour could not in a period of mounting cold war intervention; it had a foothold in the large Catholic element in the Australian working-class, from which it could organise the most backward sections of its workers under the banner of anti-Communism; it could draw in middle-class supporters, and buy ex-radicals over to its organisation (both Trotskyist and CP) as anti-Communism became more politically profitable; and it had the more-or-less official backing of the Labour leadership and Government (Chifley and Evatt). These gentlemen were then determined to see that Labour was not to be outdone by the Capitalist Parties in the extent of its anti-Communism, and welcomed the Catholic Movement, which also represented to Big Business the only really stable reactionary bulwark in Australia. Chifley and Evatt also instituted the Commonwealth Security Service, a regular secret political police which was later used by Menzies to spy on all sections of the Labour Movement and the community, and which gave the now CA-dominated Industrial Groups practical aid in seizing power in the Trade Unions.

## No alternative

The Menzies Government seized upon CP malpractices (ballot rigging, strong-arm tactics, etc.) in the Unions to pass laws making Union elections on appeal subject to compulsory and postal voting and arbitration court control; further assistance was tendered to the CA by the Security Police rigging ballots, etc., and savage court fines against so-called "illegal" strikes. Even then the main CA victory came only with direct court intervention in deposing the CP

NOW OUT!

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

NOW OUT 4/- post free (bulk order 2/6 per issue) From

leaders of the key Ironworkers' Union (on charge of ballot rigging) and installing the CA as leaders.

The Labour Party had shown in its post-war period of Government that it could offer no alternative to the Conservative forces with its sterile policy of anti-Communism-first. (The Chifley-Evatt Government collapse came about after an abortive attempt at bank nationalisation followed by the use of the Army to smash the nationwide 1949 coal strike.) In opposition and under increasing clerical influence its policy gave little reason for its continued independent existence.

#### Leader by default

On the other hand, the CA Movement was quite clear in its policy, as revealed by its belated exposure by Evatt in 1955. It demanded the shackling of the Labour Movement to the State, development of a peasantry in the countryside based on mass European Catholic migration, dismantling of cities and industry and as a complement to this clerico-feudal internal program, the complete surrender of Australian foreign policy to the US war-drive.

Finally, the Santamarian Movement became so powerful that Evatt and Co were forced to move against it out of self-protection. In doing this they could only fall back for support on the rank and file. Caught between two fires, the official Labour Party leadership risked the unknown quantity of the Left. The fact was that the CA was so completely and utterly reactionary that in its drive for power it could not even accommodate to the centrist opportunism of the official leadership. Evatt found himself by default the leader of the Left.

### • NO MIDDLE WAY

No matter how Evatt vacillates or how far he goes in compromising with the Right, he is still unacceptable to them if only because they demand nothing but pure and immoderated reaction. Evatt first clashed with the CA Right Wing in fighting the Anti-Communist Referendum, and when he was later obviously about to be framed as a GPU dupe by Petrov he again had no choice but to defend himself and line up with the Left. After still more flirting with the CA, Evatt's final denunciation provoked the open split, forestalling what was by now an inevitable move from below.

The CA exposure was followed by a clear differentiation in terms of policy by the Left "Anti-Grouper" forces. Large numbers of mass Right Wing expulsions and withdrawals occurred, from which was born the Catholic DP. But much of the CA organisation, though now officially proscribed (starting with the Industrial Groups) remained intact within the Labour Party, particularly in New South Wales, and the other heterogeneous non-CA Right Wing also remained, often in leading positions.

It was obvious that any continuance and sharpening of the struggle would lead to a clearer differentiation of the Left, both in organisation and policy. Hence once the first wave of fighting was over the leadership tried to drop its new "Left" stance and

maintain the status-quo at all costs. There followed feelers for reunity, for the DLP, though likely to remain a splinter group, could muster enough votes (approximately 12 per cent) to keep Federal Labour permanently out of power under the Australian electoral system.

#### No real unity

This phoney "unity" was also finally taken up by the CP (for their factions within the Australian Labour Party). Although its influence had increased as an initial result of the split, particularly over the leadership of the Left Wing, it nevertheless had no wish to see a strong Left socialist Labour Party emerge which would draw away much of its support. In fact, even with the small amount of Left swing in Labour, many workers left the CP influence and returned to Labour; the CP has maintained its strength only in N.S.W., where by a bad chain of circumstances no open split took place.

The defeat of the CA on the political field led to their decline in industry and the trade unions, but it was the CP that profited most from this decline. In the absence of Left Labour organisation in the Trade Unions the workers were given the choice of the CA or the CP; naturally, every self-respecting militant preferred the CP.

## GET YOUR BOOKS THROUGH S R BOOK SERVICE

35b Priory Terrace  
London, NW6

The effect also of Evatt's "unity" calls, and the general squashing of the factional struggle, and the playing down of militant policy, led to a growth of cynicism among many workers about the aims of the fight. The CP was only too pleased with this result, and it used its position of influence in the Left Wing leadership to tie the Left to the official policy of discontinuing the struggle against the Right, and making sure that, while no independent Left socialist policy was proclaimed by Labour, Left Labour supporters in industry could not stand on such a policy in the Trade Unions and provide an alternative to the CA and the CP on a genuine Fight The Boss basis.

#### New developments

But against these obvious sell-out policies of both the official "Left" leaders and the CP there developed a move, particularly from New South Wales, from the more conscious socialist elements, which aimed at synchronising rank and file discontent and disgust by presenting a series of militant socialist demands at the annual conferences, combined with demanding the replacement of all officials by outright Leftists, as opposed to the sharing of all positions on a horse-trading basis as advocated by official pacifiers and the CP. Along with this came

the demand for Labour supporters groups to be formed in industry, based on a fighting policy. Whether these aims were immediately gained was not so important. They were aimed at developing Left Labour as an independent force in the Party, the Trade Unions and the country as a whole.

These aims were largely successful in the recent New South Wales Labour Conference, and CP influence was diminished, as it was finally forced to tail behind demands which it had condemned "super-militant Trotskyism." The Left appeared as a force with a voice and a policy and continued struggle, and even though the official unity drive gathered strength as the elections approached, the banner had been raised. The inevitable election debacle has opened the opportunity for the anti-Right Wing struggle to be opened on a massive scale.

#### Great battles ahead

Labour's defeat at a time of unemployment and growing industrial unrest came as a result of middle-class alienation (despite the official no-policy). The workers remained solid behind their party. The CP suffered a catastrophic decline from its 240,000 Senate votes in 1954 (pre-split) to a mere fraction of 1 per cent. The DLP gained no seats; the total official Labour vote increased, but seats were lost due to the DLP intervention.

Australian Labour is facing another period of great battles both within and without the framework of their organisation. If the present series of strikes develops into a movement to challenge the Menzies régime, as it has been on other occasions in the past nine years, the new Left leadership, if it has the time to crystallise into a broad front, will have the opportunity to give the movement a direction it has not had on previous occasions. Otherwise the magnificent instinctive anarchism of the Australian workers will once again be dissipated, through lack of a genuinely fighting Left leadership.

But this time the consequence of continuing Menzies rule could be far worse, the very future of an effective Labour opposition is at stake. Without it Menzies could consolidate his rule into a virtual dictatorship.

#### Towards a workers' party

Already Labour supporters' groups have been formed in a few unions, but so long as they cannot stand out firmly on an official independent Labour policy of Fight The Boss they are left open to either renewed CA infiltration or to becoming mere appendages to CP tactics in industry.

Evatt, whose leadership has pleased no one, now serves a useful purpose to no one. The logic of events gives to the extreme Left a chance to assert its leadership. If this leadership is given full rein, and particularly through the success of Labour supporters' groups in the Trade Unions, there is no reason why it could not lead the Australian Labour Party further along the road to an industrial vanguard party, with a clear and democratic socialist policy which could unleash the potential fighting ability of the Australian workers, and make the Menzies Government mark the end of capitalist rule in Australia.

# M-ROSA LUXEMBURG COMMEMORATIVE EDITION

MADDISON, 21 AUBERT PARK, N.5

## THE MOVEMENT

BILL BRADDOCK recalls

## THE MERSEYSIDE WOBBLIES

This article by BILL BRADDOCK, former Northern Secretary of the International Workers' of the World, recounts the stormy struggles of Labour on the Merseyside. The author played a prominent part in them.

The IWW, referred to in this article, was a militant rank-and-file organization. Its forthright, fighting spirit aroused fears in the hearts of employers and trade union bosses. Unfortunately, the IWW's one failing—its rigid sectarianism cut it off from the only sources for survival and recruitment. Its influence has now dwindled to nothingness. But many of its members integrated themselves into the Labour Movement and played a valuable part in the left-wing of the 20's and 30's.—Editor.

THE SEEDS of industrial unionism on the Merseyside were sown by Larkin, Connolly and Big Bill Haywood when they held meetings in Liverpool from 1911 to 1913. Their efforts were furthered by seamen who had encountered the IWW while in the States and brought back the ferment of Wobbly philosophy to this country.

It quickly took root. Jack Hamilton, a quiet, scholarly mason, formed the Building Workers' Industrial Union. While it never grew to any size, the BWIU conducted intensive socialist education from its club headquarters at 52 Byrom St., Liverpool, which became the centre of militant activity throughout the Merseyside.

By 1917, the discontent caused by war-time hardship was beginning to mount. The British Government began to get alarmed. It decided to take repressive measures against those opposing the war... and that included the IWW.

## A visit

Our Liverpool local of the IWW had only been formed a few months. Although a raw recruit, I was appointed secretary. No sooner had I taken up my appointment than four big, determined-looking CID men visited my lodgings. While I was kept in the landlady's parlour, they ransacked my bedroom, even tearing the mattress. They said they were hunting for seditious documents. Funnily enough, what they were after was literally under their noses. They used a cardboard box file, containing all the membership, minutes and documents of the Liverpool Local IWW as a writing pad.

Undeterred by their fruitless search, the police raided the Byrom Street Club. They hauled us off to Dale St. Police Station. There we were questioned by local and national CID men—as

**PETER BERKELEY—end**  
tion which would provide him with a higher income if he was registered as unemployed.

Many are the facts which could have come to light if an impartial body were to seek them, but unfortunately those like the BBC are biased to a high degree and it behoves the worker to have little to do with them without the aid of expert advice.

well as by agents of the FBI.

My interrogation lasted for two and a half hours. I was grilled about class warfare, the struggle for Socialism and on royalty. Being new to the Movement, I did not know what some of the questions meant. But my innocence was mistake for guile. After finishing with me, my brother John was cross-questioned. The police believe in fair shares for all!

## Ballot fiddled?

By this time, the Local was beginning to grow. We acquired a printing press, and decided to print our own stickers. Liverpool was covered with stickers. Even the police headquarters' walls had their quota. We carried on our agitation among seamen and firemen. At Garston docks support for industrial unionism led to an official referendum being taken on whether dockers should remain in their existing union or join the IWW. Although unsuccessful, we polled a large number of votes. There was reason to suspect the ballot had been fiddled: dockers in the coal section, still as black as spades, returned a 100 spotless ballot papers—all against the IWW.

## Robbery!

All the time we were helping the Shop Stewards Movement. In the Railway wagon shop, where my brother and I worked, we got 90 per cent of the men into this unofficial movement—despite opposition from the paid officials of the NUR and craft unions. We also had a wall newspaper in the canteen filled with short articles by the men and industrial news.

Papers like *Solidarity*, edited by Jack Tanner, and Sylvia Pankhurst's *The Workers Dreadnought* were being widely sold in the docks, shipyards and building sites. Wobblies took an active part in this hard, dangerous work.

Our work was by this time being assisted by IWW deportees from America. The US Government had unleashed a reign of terror—imprisoning all American Wobblies and throwing all those without American citizenship out of the country. They arrived at Liverpool, often possessing only the clothes they wore, and quickly joined in our struggle. They were a fine bunch. There was, for instance, Jimmy Culley, a grand tearaway speaker. He used to start an open-air meeting shout-

ing, "I've been robbed; I've been robbed!" A crowd quickly gathered, and then Jimmy went on to explain how the capitalist system robbed him and everybody else. Then there was Joe Kennedy, "King of the Idaho, Montana, Wobblies," who would take on the toughest assignments, and Taro Yoshihari, a burly Jap, who had been Big Bill Haywood's bodyguard. Eventually he hoboed his way through China and reached Moscow. There were many examples of self-sacrifice: Albert Whitehead, released at the dock, gave all his cash to poor children.

As each American boat docked at Liverpool fresh faces would appear at the Byrom Street Club

—comrades from the States asking for somewhere to doss down and help with finding a job. They quickly settled down in Liverpool and resumed their political activities. One evening Tom Rimmer, a refugee from the "land of the free," espied an old friend, newly deported from the States. "Jesus Christ," he exclaimed, "is it you?" "No," replied Moses Baritz gravely, "merely one of his descendants."

All these comrades, and countless thousands of others, all helped to create the Labour Movement on the Merseyside. Their sacrifices, heroism, and ideas were the motive force behind the Movement's development.

## STEEL DOLDRUMS

by JOHN CRUTCHLEY

STEEL PRODUCTION in Britain in 1958 was 19½ million tons. This was 1½ million tons lower than in 1957. A million tons of this decline was in the third quarter. Production in December was 21 per cent below December, 1957, and 19 per cent below the total 1957 output. These figures were announced by the Iron and Steel Board on January 15.

There is a threefold reason for this decline—capitalists are running down their surplus stocks of steel, internal consumption of steel has decreased and the international trade in steel products has declined.

## Little hope yet

An inventory recession hits hardest the producers of the heavy industrial products that form a part of all production, such as steel, coal and heavy engineering. When capitalists find they are not selling their output they cut their demand for raw materials. This vibrates throughout the economy, finally reaching the basic heavy industries. This happened in Britain in 1958. Consumers of steel who built up substantial stocks during the post-war shortages began drawing on their stocks rather than ordering more. Twelve-13 weeks supply was thought to have been the minimum below which steel consumers could not reduce and during the period of shortages stocks have been considerably higher than this minimum. These stocks were substantially reduced in 1958 and it is likely that stocks will be reduced below the bare minimum. These cuts in stocks has resulted in a drop in steel production.

Secondly, there has been an absolute decrease in steel consumption. During the third quarter of 1958 it was seven per cent down on the 1957 level. This was mainly caused by the reduction in fixed capital investment. Capital investment has been reduced in the nationalized indus-

tries (coal and rail) and 1958 saw the end of the investment boom in the private industries that began in 1954.

**The steel industry has also been hit by the cut in conventional armaments. It has been estimated that as much as 15 per cent of steel and engineering production in Sheffield during the last few years was accounted for by conventional arms orders.** Any cut, such as occurred in 1958 has a large effect on steel and heavy engineering industries.

Government investment in 1959 will not substantially increase the demand for steel as this investment will be confined to a type of fixed investment that will not consume much steel—roads, electricity and schools. The boom in motor cars as a result of the freeing of HP restrictions again will not increase steel consumption as much as might be thought. Motor cars consume less steel than commercial vehicles and these are not booming.

There seems little hope for an increase in steel production until the second quarter of 1959 when steel stocks will have been reduced to a minimum and the internal and external prospects of trade may be brighter.

Finally, world trade in steel products declined 20 per cent in the first nine months of 1958 below the 1957 level. Britain maintained its share of this declining market. (13 per cent.) However the European Coal and Steel Community and Japan increased their share during the same period while the United States share declined substantially.

**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

## For the Editorial Board P. Mansell answers Ken Jones

# POLICY

# PEACE THROUGH WORKERS' ACTION

**I**N THE LAST SOCIALIST REVIEW Ken Jones outlined what he suggested should be a socialist foreign policy. He criticised Zilliacus for assuming that if Britain cut free from the American alliance she would be able to force or persuade the two major powers to come to an agreement. But he took it upon himself to propound a "solution" to international antagonisms that was scarcely less superficial and naive.

Comrade Jones's proposal is to build up an anti-nuclear association. Within this association there are to be some strange bed-fellows. First, the "uncommitted" countries such as India and Yugoslavia, then the colonies and the other underdeveloped areas. Incidentally, he does not explain how colonies, i.e., territories ruled by a metropolitan power, could be free to join such an association. Add to these any other country which care to join the anti-nuclear club (Japan and the Scandinavian countries are mentioned). The only link connecting these countries together is that either they have not the resources to make nuclear weapons or for the present have decided not to enter the nuclear race. Is such a collection of relatively weak powers likely to have any influence on the governments of USA or Russia? As a deterrent they will be just as ineffective as Britain alone.

### Frustrated association

Comrade Jones merely states that this association would "mount such social and economic pressures" that the two great powers would be bound to take notice. This is utter nonsense. Within the terms of capitalist power politics, there is no group of powers which can hope to rival either USA or Russia. And is it conceivable that the two great powers would stand aside to let any formation arise that could come within miles of challenging them? There are all kinds of ways in which the build up of this "third force" association could be frustrated. The economic pressures would be exercised by one or other of the great powers against the neutralist powers and not the other way about.

The assumption behind Comrade Jones's article is that war can be averted, without overthrowing capitalism. He even takes the United Nations Organization out of its

skeleton-ridden cupboard, and suggests that with a bit of clearing up it will help in the good work. Comrade Jones does not state what he thinks are the causes of modern war. Presumably he would not accept that **capitalism in its decline drives inexorably to war, that war is as much of its essence as profit-making. This is the socialist viewpoint and it determines the socialist answer. The only way of fighting against war is by fighting against and destroying capitalism. And from this it follows that the only force within society capable of putting an end to war is the working class, the class which is obliged to struggle against capitalism and which in its international solidarity is powerful enough to win the struggle. Russia and America can afford to despise Britain, India, etc., as they are at present governed. But it would be a totally different story if workers' governments in these countries appealed for the support of American and Russian workers over the heads of their governments.**

Comrade Jones says that "there is only one force which can achieve the nuclear disarmament of the two atomic giants, and that is humanity organized on a world scale." But under capitalism humanity is so deeply divided by class antagonisms that it is misleading and indeed meaningless to speak of "humanity" as if it were a unified social force.

Comrade Jones criticizes socialists who under the slogans of "black the bases and ban the bomb" argue for industrial action against war preparations. He says that industrial action is out of the question and that pursuing this objective can only "divide and confuse the Labour movement and waste(s) time and energy." It is unfortunately true that the majority of the workers do not at present accept the need for industrial action against the manufacture of the bomb. But this is not an argument against propaganda in favour of this step. Does Comrade Jones suggest that a slogan should never be put forward unless it is sure to win the support of the majority of the workers at once? In other words, Socialists should never aim to give a lead. They should always tag on behind the majority. By putting forward a slogan like this and discussing it, Socialists can advance the process of political education. The majority that may reject the policy of today can be persuaded to change their

minds and accept it tomorrow.

Why should this slogan in particular be accused of dividing and confusing the movement? Of course there are many different ideas and policies being put forward at present on what is by far the most serious and terrifying problem facing us. The correct policy is much more likely to emerge from the clash of discussion than from damping it down in the name of "unity." Those who support the "black the bases" slogan can equally and much more correctly charge Comrade Jones and those who agree with him with introducing division and confusion.

### The point of production

**By calling for industrial action, we appeal directly to the working class to take action WHICH LIES IN THEIR POWER. Industrial action is the only power in the workers' hands and by using it to the full they can both win their immediate objective and strengthen themselves for future struggles and the ultimate overthrow of capitalism. The true allies of the British workers are not Japanese imperialism and Yugoslavian state capitalism but the workers of other countries, above all the workers of USA and Russia.**

Comrade Jones on the other hand is regarding the workers as essentially passive. In some vague way—by the pressure of "public opinion," presumably—they are going to persuade a British government (either Macmillan or Gaitskell) to leave NATO and build up a third force. How is this persuasion to work? Through the devious channels of Parliamentary democracy? Both parties are officially pledged to support NATO and the leaders of neither have shown any desire to break free. Even if a strong "public opinion" existed in favour of Comrade Jones's policy, how would it make its will felt through purely political machinery? There are an infinite number of ways in which awkward "public opinion" can be side-tracked or frustrated. **At every crucial point in the history of the working class, it has been through the workers' own action, and more often than not at the point of production, that the significant victories have been won and the real advances made. This will be no less true of this issue of the H-bomb. Only when the workers of Britain and other countries refuse to make the bombs, will the bombs stop being made.**

## "LAY DOWN YOUR HEAD PETER SEDGWICK"

says PATRICK MACARTHUR

**R**READING PETER SEDGWICK'S cynical diatribe was like listening to that skiffle classic "Poor Tom Dooley." What solution does he give to take leadership from the "Bungling reformist hands" and replace it by rank and file control?

Does he condemn those who say that the working class movement in this country needs the inspiration of people of the calibre of Hardie, Luxemburg, Trotsky, and Morris?

Shifting his ground, he makes the further charge that there are those who are claiming that the mantles—or at least the raincoats—of these great departed have fallen upon them. Does Peter Sedgwick really believe that those in the groups he mentions are doing anything so preposterous?

If any of the groups condemned are fit to be described as "Pretenders," Victory For Socialism is the best candidate, a product of the militant proletariat of Parliament Square. It reminds me of the parson and the gravedigger; they are both in the movement

but which one is on top?

The Universities and Left Review group is quite unfairly condemned. Although these people are by their nature not closely connected with the working class, in the main they are aware of this defect and are anxious to listen to genuine industrial workers who are prepared to discuss their problems with them. Workers who took part in the bus strike and the South Bank lock-out were given a welcome opportunity of putting their views to the ULR and they have been invited to speak on more general problems. Are these students who are prepared to learn from the workers "Pretenders"? I wonder.

What is wrong with Peter Fryer suggesting (with others) that Trade Unionists should keep Mosley's men off the streets? Are the workers in Notting Hill to shout "Alleluia" when George Rogers and the Mosley boys roar "Control immigration," and "Kick out the niggers"? I am sure that Peter Sedgwick really agrees with Fryer on this matter, but

because he cannot agree with him on everything he refuses to support him on anything. Is Fryer really pretending when he is fighting "nigger-baiters"?

### Against labels

If people with Socialist aspirations are sincere, and in an honest way are trying to reach out to the masses, why condemn and label them "Pretenders"? I hate labels and label-stickers. This new one disgusts me. It does not mean anything. It is an attitude comparable with that of those who claim that their opponents are suffering from some sort of mental disorder. The only advantage is: that by painting "Pretender" meglomaniac or some category on the opposition, one is saved the arduous task of examining and discussing their contribution.

Although there are many valuable points in Peter Sedgwick's analysis, this categorization is sterile. Too easily it becomes a convenient cover for cynicism and defeatism.

Lest this "Pretender" cancer sets in I say:  
"Lay down your head Peter Sedgwick,  
Lay down your head and cry,  
Lay down your head Peter Sedgwick,  
Poor boy, you're going to die."

# GRAHAM RICHARDS writes on MAN, MONEY AND MORALS

**S**UPPORTERS of the Tory Government's bill, proposing heavier fines and imprisonment for prostitutes, overlook one important fact. Flossie and her friends on their beat are not the people who make the most money out of prostitution. It is the Press Lords. These eminently respectable gentlemen periodically indulge in "vice" exposures to give a boost to their papers' sagging circulation. It always pays a big dividend.

The Press Lords do this because they realise that there is almost a universal public interest in this subject. And we should ask ourselves, therefore, why are people so interested in prostitution? The answer is, I think, that **the prostitute symbolizes the present 'British way of life.'**

She shows, in the most striking way possible, that almost everything — and everybody — has a price tag can be bought and sold. Her actions are more revealing than those of Salome's — for when she drops her veils the naked truth is there for all to see: **money is the master of contemporary capitalist society.**

That most people would do anything for money was shown some time ago by Dr E. L. Thorndike in his book, **Adult Interests.** He gives a list of cash payments which would induce men and women to do things that are normally repugnant. For example, the average woman would practise cannibalism for 750,000 dollars, but the average man, being less squeamish, would do it for 50,000 dollars. Women, on the other hand, would renounce all hope of life after death for 10 dollars whereas men would want 1,000 dollars. Thorndike goes on to give 'money equivalents' for temporary insanity, blindness, eating beetles and earthworms, cutting a pig's head off, choking a stray cat to death, and spitting on a crucifix and pictures of Charles Darwin, George Washington and one's own mother.

But this has not always been the case. Money has not always been master and Man his puppet. Under feudalism Man had a certain kinship, loyalty and respect for his fellow. He could work creatively, gaining pleasure and fulfilment from the knowledge that his labour satisfied some human need. But capitalism has severed these ties that bound man to man. It has replaced them with a new relationship—man is bound to a thing, money.

## Profit motive

While capitalism has greatly increased the community's material wealth, it has been at the expense of spiritual impoverishment. Work became transformed into degrading drudgery, a forced labour that left the worker physically and mentally exhausted. It has stultified his creative powers. Nor have the professional classes been immune to this process. Capitalism, as Marx points out in the **Manifesto**, "has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe.

It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science into its paid wage labourers."

For all workers, whether they work by hand or brain, labour under the direct or indirect control of the capitalist class. Production takes place only to do one thing—to make a profit. What it does to the consumer is quite irrelevant. Whether "Blobbo," the new detergent, contains a chemical that rots clothes as it bleaches them does not matter one tittle so long as the housewife goes on buying the infernal stuff. And to persuade her to use it on her undies—which are small enough without the corrosive effect of "Blobbo"—we have that intricate system of public deception known as advertising.

## Buy, buy, buy

The advertisers, using every conceivable gimmick, aim to squeeze the maximum amount of money out of the customers. Lies, half-truths, curvacious cuties and handsome hulks of manhood are all employed, without qualm to beat down consumer resistance, to make him buy, buy, BUY!

With his eyes firmly focused on the rising sales curve, the capitalist is quite unconcerned about the social consequences. His sole concern is with £ s d. But he is not the only person 'on the make,' 'concerned with Number One.' A class society must, to be stable, have a certain unity: the ideas of the ruling class must be accepted by the ruled. And this is the case with capitalism.

The working class, reflecting the capitalists' concern about money, also tend to forget the social consequences of production. Whether a worker happens to be employed on a building site or a rocket site is a matter of indifference. He is not concerned with the end result of his actions, but with the immediate question: Will I earn a higher wage at the rocket site or at the building site?

## Man and machine

Capitalist culture tries to condition the worker, to blunt his sensibility, so that he is not aware of actually what he is, in the long run, helping to do. Ultimate effects are made to seem remote, too distant to have any emotional impact or be of any concern. That is why a decent man, who would be revolted by the idea of going out into the street with a knife and stabbing the first child he sees, is prepared, flying in a bomber 20,000 feet above the earth, to drop bombs that will kill not one but thousands of children—and in a far more painful way.

Capitalism's continuation inevitably involves an increasing brutalization of Man. This process can not only be seen in horror comics, horror films, horror bombs, the commercialization of culture, but also, at its foundation, in the scientific exploitation of the worker at the point of production. Time and motion study, the speed-up of production, the gearing of man to the machine

intensify exploitation and makes work an even greater burden.

## Collective action

**But capitalism, creating these social problems, also provides the basis for their solution. The exaggerated importance of money—a direct result of capitalism reducing everything to a strictly cash basis—leads the worker to take more than a passing interest in his wage packet. The emphasis on 'looking after Number One'—a direct result of the rugged individualism of early, self-made capitalist employers—leads the workers increasingly to the conclusion that he can only 'look after Number One,' that is, improve his own conditions, by banding together with his fellow workers.**

And, most important of all, the process of not being concerned with the effects of what they produce on other human beings, creates an increased awareness of the effects of production upon themselves.

## Collective ownership

Robert Tressell admirably describes this in his book, **The Ragged-Trousered Philanthropist;** "When the workers arrived in the morning they wished it was breakfast time. When they started after breakfast they wished it was dinner time. After dinner they wished it was one o'clock on Saturday. So they went on, day after day, year after year, wishing their time was over and, without realising it, really wishing that they were dead."

Whether on Tressell's building site or on Swaffham's rocket site, capitalism is an instrument of death, sapping life of its vitality, purposefulness and creativeness, and preparing for mass, radioactive executions. It brings into being its dialectical opposite—a doctrine of life, Socialist Humanism. This doctrine argues that Man, with his immense present and future potentialities, can only be liberated when he controls production collectively and can creatively develop his own faculties.

Until this occurs, and Man, not money, has become the measure of all things, people's energies and talents will be perverted and result increasingly in their own misery. The prostitute is an example of this process: how something that is a valuable part of the human personality, like sex, which can up-lift individuals, is used to degrade.

It is unfortunate that the Wolfenden Commission, so anxious to fine and imprison the prostitute, overlooked the most profound and original statement on the whole business. It was made by Marx in his early writings, where he wrote: "**Prostitution is only the particular expression of the universal prostitution of the worker and since prostitution takes in not only the prostituted but the prostitute (the lowest of all) so the capitalist, etc., falls into this category.**"

# 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.