RAILS

WARNING LIGHT AHEAD!

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

AGAINST THE BOMB!

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

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

(a) perform regular checks on the level of radio active substances, particularly strontium 90 in water, milk, and green vegetables consumed by the people of London and Middlesex;
(b) perform regular checks on the level of strontium 90 in bones of young children;
(c) report regularly, at intervals of not more than 3 months, to the people of London and Middlesex on the results, including the incidence of leukemia.

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

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

BACK THE BOYCOTT!

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

**Tinned Goods:**
Koo
Domingo
Ashilton's
Kroof
L.K.B.
Hugo's
Golden Glory
Surf Maid
Red Robbin
Magnet
Paarl Choice
Gold Reef
Zyp Products
Benedict
Wolsely Pride
Summit
Holen MacGregor

**Wines and Spirits:**
Rembrandt Brandy
Richelieu Brandy
Oudemeester Brandy
Alo Rouge Red Wine
Thenniskn rebuild Dry White
Wine
La Residence Sparkling Wine
Grumbergstein

**Fruit:**
"Outspan" Oranges
"Cape" Apples
"Cape" Grapes
"Cape" Pineapples
"Cape" Avocado Pears
"Cape" Onions

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

RAILWAYS II - BACKGROUND TO NATIONALISATION

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

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

Relaxed

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

The original nationalization Act was different from those applying to the nationalized industries in that the British Transport Commission was not allowed to impose such charges as it saw fit, but had to submit all applications for increases in fares or freight rates to a Transport Tribunal for approval. When the Tory government came to power in 1951 this restriction was relaxed and the TUC was given full powers to fix rates of fares and, as a result, had its predecessor'sgrand names all the way through the growth in the prices of goods and services, the TUC was in a position to help the railways' dividend was as high as before the war.

The facts

So it is really despite the fact that the rise in the cost of living is not as severe as it could be, the railways' revenue must continue to be derisory.

When we consider the facts; when we remember the £3,000,000 plus that the railways paid in "compensation" to the former private owners; when we see Sir Brian Roberts' officials contracting out engineering work which could be done in the railway workshops; then it is difficult to understand why the right-wing labour authors of Success Story, to think that those who at present control the railways are either able or willing to run a railway system that is not an economic museum-piece.

It would be wrong to suppose that the abolition of compensations for branch lines and the railways would do it away with the railways. There are now a negative of the expenses by the TUCs to nationalisation is not an economic museum-piece.

The question arises whether the charge of ownership on the 1st January 1948 was trivial in its effects, or has had any substantial results? It may seem that it was nothing more than a symbolic act which enabled the railways to postpone a decision on the future of the industry. All the problems of backwardness, wartime ravages and competition from the roads were evident twelve years ago. But it is not as if the Labour government at the time held the prospect of a co-ordinated, publicly-owned system of road and rail transport, so that the stubborn resistance of the TUCs to nationalization cannot be ascribed to pure stupidity. While we can see that so long as manufacturing industry was growing, the best nationalized transport system would rather strengthen than weaken the economy as a whole, that objective not only threatened but to absorb some very profitable concerns, but always tended to raise arguments equally applicable to the economy as a whole; whereas for the railways it was important that the debate be kept to the issue of whether nationalization was a remedy best suited to the ills of a particular derelict industry.

KEN COATES

THE SHORTER WORKING WEEK AND THE TUC

On December 25 last year the TUC turned over a new leaf in its relations with the National Health Service by issuing the now famous STATEMENT ON THE SHORTER WORKING WEEK AND THE TUC. This deserves far more attention from socialists than it has had so far.

As the statement itself points out, this is not the first time the TUC has committed itself to the ideal of a 40-hour week: in fact this latest statement is presented as an "enlarged version" of an earlier one issued by "enough people to claim that this is not an echo of radicalism by the TUC."

"By 1947" we are told, "the first stage of the General Council's programme had been largely achieved." But no appeals were made to the government because of the "worsening economic situation".

Apparent

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

Segregated

If we make so bold as to claim the 5-day week as a social advance already gained (and that is bolder than some people would think it to be), simple arithmetic tells us that the TUC is, in today renewing an appeal which has had little effect to do with the establishment of 1926. We could go much further: the TUC lists a whole string of countries which normally work a forty-hour week or less: although "recently the United Kingdom has not shared in this development" (Whose fault is that?) However, we keep things simple and we could recall that Britain did not always lag so far behind, Thorold Rogers, writing in 1884, about the England of 1821, tells us: "...the hours of labour were not long. They seem to have been not longer than eight hours a day. ("Wages of Work and Wages, p 180.)

Centuries

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Hours worked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Kurt Map: The British Economy and the Working Class, Worker's League pamphlet, p. 23.) It will be observed that the lowest normal working week was that of 1947, at 46.6 hours. By 1958 we had arrived at the level of 1936, five-day week notwithstanding.

TRADE UNION COMMENTARY

By JOHN PHILLIPS

Since wage claims are always a matter for discussion and action in the trade union movement it sometimes comes as a bit of a shock when wage increases are recommended by national wage boards in a country that is not only among the highest for manufacturing wages but also for living costs. This is what is happening in the Transport Commission and the NUR produced support for the railwaymen from a union that has always been the most cautious. Everyone from the top Times to the "true blue" Mail have been unanimous in condemning just for the railwaymen. Where was Greene?

But there can be other reasons. In a recent speech at the Coal Board, in which the Board's top official was defending the Board's action over strike, he said: "Liberals are candidates are pledging themselves in all directions to support some such "Eight hours bill" as that drafted by the Fabian Society." (Socialism in England, p. 105.) Poor Sydney, he didn't really understand what Parliament was for. If he could come back today and face Henry Barks twelve workmen head on he would have been a little more assiduous about his job. Poor Sydney he didn't seem to have been reading the Fabian Society's "Eight hours bill" as that drafted by the Fabian Society." But he didn't seem to have been reading the Fabian Society's "Eight hours billy" as that drafted by the Fabian Society.

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

Forgets 1944

We can see that in spite of the much bruit advanced made by the General Council, the dockers, and those who are at work, and we can expect it to tend to continue to turn as before unless a mightier effort is made by the present general council can be thrust into it. The slogan of the dockers, ‘we want a SHORTER WEEK, but FOR THE SHORTER WORKING WEEK – AND AT THE SAME NET INCOME AS BEFORE.’ At the moment, the campaign waged by the Unions bears many of the features of a concealed wage claim: the workers should be awakened to the fact that more than that can be got and should be demanded.

The second modest omission of the Statement is that it forgets the 1944 business about appealing to the government. This should be remembered, and political and industrial action. When the Fire Brigades Union called for a strike to stop the Suzu adventure, this seemed quite sensible even to many leaders who saw the dangers of combining this with the other week up. But it didn't seem sensible to FBU members, partly because it was an obvious way of breaking the bounds of authority before the majority of them, and the other trade unionists, are convinced. Partly, it seems a sort of half step, in relation to this, because politics and things like strikes are separate matters to them. The danger of war is still far too great for us to be apathetic about this:

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

The question referred to the dockers' strike in the Federation to take industrial action against South African goods and the need for the dockers and transport workers to travel to follow suit. But, the man that pulls the strings, Bro Cousins, said his colleague in the TUC General Council a few days ago viewed with grave concern the possibility of action in the docks. The fact that the dockers have other pressing problems at the moment rather rules out any idea of action in the docks, says the TGWU's Record says in the February issue that the boycott is "a gesture of solidarity with those who are fighting the evil policy of apartheid."

RUMOR has it that discussions among the TUC bosses, and the usual nature of the culture of the dockers (at the usual content of their meetings) are taking place in TGWU branches. Whilst agreeing that a TUC solidarity policy isn't amalgamation a more immediate problem?
FEDERATION MUST GO!

In Central Africa he (the African) feels strongly about his country and its federation with Rhodesia. He has felt this for many years. The weight of much of this feeling, however, has been the result of political propaganda is brought to bear to show that he doesn't; or if he does, that he is nothing about it; or if he does know, that he has been misled by irresponsible autocratic government put right by further propaganda”.

(from the Introduction to Dawn in Nyasaland by Guy Clifton Brock)

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

There should not be any doubts about the nature of struggle which is taking place in Central Africa now. Simply, it is a question of 2,750,000 Africans becoming either free to rule themselves or becoming slaves of 8,000 Europeans. The effect of what happens there in 1960 will be felt throughout Africa where the struggle for freedom is becoming fiercer and fiercer. The White settlers have left no doubt that they intend to go to any length to maintain their stranglehold. They all speak with the same voice. As early as in 1956 Lord Malvern had said in the Federal Assembly for East Africa, "We have complete control of our own Defence Force. I only hope we shall not have to use it as the North American colonies had to use theirs, because we are dealing with a stupid Government in the United Kingdom." Sir Roy Welensky echoed, "Should we fail to convince Her Majesty's Government that we are right, then will be the time to take action and decide what other course we would never have been prepared to adopt that the Rhodesian government has not thought it fit to grant legal privilege for evidence given before the Commission. Thus anyone who gives evidence contrary to what the Central African Federal Government consider to be improper, be goaded to prosecution. Under the Police State which is the Federation today, such a commission has very serious consequences for the person concerned. What is more important, the real leaders and representatives of the African people in the Federation are being deprived of their rights. The shocking case of Banda’s imprisonment without trial is beginning to disturb even some of the Tories as is evident from the Bow Group Memorandum, Africa—New Year 1960 which says, “Dr. Banda should be released in Nyasaland (not in London as some Rhodesians suggest) instead of time to have real opportunity to take his place in the political system”. Page 4, Par 1. No support

There is another objection to the Monckton Commission. Without going into the merits of the future report or even assuming that by a million to one chance Monckton would become another Dr. Banda, where is the guarantee that Macmillan Government will not go against the Commission’s recommendations with the same indifference and contempt which it showed towards the recommendations of the African labour’s unshamed cagerness to join it if a face-saving formula could be found.

The two concessions which the Labour government asked for were the widening of the terms of reference and the lifting of restrictions of membership to Privy Counsellors. As soon as the Labour refusal was made final, promptly new members were appointed who were not Privy Counsellors. The claim that the Commission is made up of other Commonwealth members is more amazing for it is true than the so-called Commonwealth must be very white indeed. (Indians and other Afro-Asians please note!). Inevitably, the Commission has no confidence in the settlers except the settlers. The Africans have decided to boycot it and rightly so.

The Bow group

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

Federation is not sufficiently enthusiastic or well informed about the events in Central Africa in particular, and the significance of such events, part of the blame must be shared by the leadership of the party. In the past they have shown a disastrous tendency to play the statesman game without the sinews of power to do so. The result has been bitter. Let us hope that they have learnt their lesson although the brinkmanship which they showed over again in Nyasaland and no amount of legitimate rhapsodising of the economic benefits of the federal system will keep Nyasaland in the Federation except by force of arms”. Page 3, Par 3.

Racial

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

Who decides?

Mr. Macmillan’s antics concerning the Federation, his two ambiguous and contradictory statements, one in Nigeria and another in the Federation are a case in point. Sir Roy Welensky has taken complete charge of the British government policy about the Federation. Mr. Macmillan may yet reveal himself as a British Guy Mollie. We want to know, who are the real decision-makers? Is it Mr. Macmillan or Sir Roy Welensky?

POLITICS 1960
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WHAT WAS BEHIND MAC'S AFRICA TOUR?

The central theme of Macmillan’s voyage through Africa was the race between the forces of communism and reform from above and the waxing strength of the revolutionary movements from below. As he put it: “The tide of nationalism is flowing right through Africa” and Britain has no right, and Britain alone, to try and stop it.”

The very rapidity and unevenness of the change makes imperialist rule increasingly intolerable. In the course of perhaps bygone days it was possible to withdraw forces from one corner of Africa to meet a major threat elsewhere. Now the utilitarian of the African freedom movements is to clear a path for British demonstration when a reply from Macmillan to a journalist in Nigeria brought it to the public reaction of thousands of miles away in Central Africa.

The tide

With Ghana, French Guinea, Belgian Congo, and the ganyika independent or on the verge of being so, the tide of nationalist agitation obviously cannot be stopped.

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

Whatever decisions are made in British Central Africa will have to take account of this upsurge in Brussels of June 30 as the date for independence of the Congo. The whole federal scheme was drafted in 1953 on the assumption that the Congo Federation will provide a bastion against the southward spread of West African nationalism. Behind this is the idea that the Federation could develop policies of partnership at a deliberate pace. During the past twelve months this assumption has been completely destroyed by the political explosion in the future of the Central African countries, and above all; of the northern Rhodesia that is the one concern in many ways a single geographical and industrial unit with the Belgian Congo and Tanganyika, greatly affected.

(The Times, Jan. 28)

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

NEW IMPERIALISM

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

This concessionary trend, however, is interlarded with counter-revolutionary tendencies on the eve of Macmillan’s visit a new and even more repressive Police Act was introduced in Nyasaland. The extremest Kenya settlers should not also be allowed to remain in power.

February 7th said: “Their ‘ultras’ are showing signs of mobilizing their forces to prevent what they regard as the great sellout now being negotiated in London.”

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

FAR FLUNG

Socialist Review has, if not a wide circulation, at least a far flung one. Our latest success has been in Japan where the marxist writer Tadakichi Tsuchin included in his latest work—A Criticism of Soviet Socialist—two articles reprinted from the pages of the Future. Russian Empire: Reform or Revo.

Faction and “Moscow Stalin” by Tony Cliff—and a chapter from Socialist Russia: a Marxist Analysis by Cliff more than 100 pages in all.

One should not conclude from this that political independence is synonymous with economic and social freedom. The United States has no control over much of Africa but has not prevented her increasing her capital investments from 150 million in 1945 to a billion and a quarter million at present. Again, since India won political independence from Britain in 1947, private British capital investment in India has risen from £154 million in 1945, to £304 million in 1957.

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

Latin America, independently political, has not ceased being a Yankee colony or semi-colonial economically over the last half-century. Aided along with the general Americanization of Britain, apparent in so many aspects of its economic, social and political system, the Americanization of British imperialism, i.e. reliance on wealth rather than bayonets, is in the order of the day. This is to say, Britain will not fight another war for the colonial freedom is timely—Editor.

THE STRUGGLE FOR A SYMBOL

By Cllr. Ray Challinor

“ORDINARILY no one reads Party constitutions,” says Forward’s leader-writer (January 15, 1960), “except perhaps political opponents looking for ammunition.” At first glance this remark, coming from a left-wing journal, may appear contradicted by this particular. For Forward supporters have often scouted the Labour Party constitution, examining every dot and comma, in the hope it will assic in the good, old Transport House game “hunt-the-left-winger.”

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

Excuse

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

Gaitskell’s move to get this section dropped from the Party constitution by the conference has led to a comic opera situation within the Labour Party. The leaders before standing are supposed to accept the Party constitution, clause 4 being so important, so fundamental, that it has been reprinted, so far, on each membership card. But what are people joining the Party expected to believe in now? The very leaders of the Party no longer accept the fundamental principles of the constitution— and yet they expel some members who do.

For example, J.B. Singleton some criticism, including Socialist Review supporters who accept this basic article of the constitution are being kept out of the Labour Party by those who don’t.

The excuse Gaitskell gives for throwing the Labour Party into this turmoil is that the present constitution “is liable to misinterpre- tation.” He wants it replaced with a statement saying a Labour government would control “the commanding heights of the economy.”

In actual fact what is wrong with the constitution, from Gaitskell’s standpoint, is not a lack of ambiguity but the lack of it. With a clear definition in the Party rules, the leaders’ back- lidings and down-right anti-socialist policy stand is exposed. In the past the Labour leaders, while encouraging the growth of bureaucracy in the capitalist framework, have claimed, as an ultimate objective, to stand in favour of socialism. The significance of Gaitskell’s move is that he now wants to dispense with the socialist illusion by the excuse of having to have the Labour Party stand, clearly and openly, as a Party which simply seeks to reform capitalism.

Yes, that one favours a Labour Government that would more openly come to be recognized as the enemy of all workers, white, brown or black.

Except for its final paragraph, this article was written before Macmillan’s “Wind of Change speech before the United Nations at Bagdad.” Town. Readers might think it overbroken by events; alternatively it might be considered to have prefigured the current realities of power in Central Africa and Britain. We believe this is the case. The significant shift in British imperial policy: from reliance on minute, bitter minorities to reliance on the rising African capitalists class as the guarantor of British prestige abroad. However, wind of change or just wind, the leaders of the same move- ment to help in the progress of colonial freedom is timely—Editor.

Fabian

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

Broadly one may say that the revisionist period is over: that is, the business of giving the Labour Party a political outlook to mid-twentieth century is more or less complete. On the theoretical plane this period began with New Fabian contd. page 1.
In the forward to his article at the beginning of his book, C. P. Snow said: "It is a condition of building the Left in Britain that we provide an intellectual and ultimately valid analysis of the world situation... From such an analysis, we have to draw progressively capable of developing a general line of policy and action. It is the absence of something of the sort that is the main impediment to the growth of the Left". His article is a contribution to the furtherance of this general line of policy and action.

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

For example, within the Left, there is a lot of variance of view about the character of the regime in Russia. These range from near febrile to the view that since Russia is Socialist, through those who believe that it is some (admittedly) deviant form of worker's state, to those who consider it is state capitalist. Naturally, these important differences in theoretical analysis lead to fundamental differences in political attitudes, from wholehearted support and theoretical support, to outright opposition. But does the Left really have to agree on everything before being able to do anything effective in 1969? For every one such question, it is submitted, there is no necessarily of immediate practical importance to-day, there are ten issues requiring urgent action which are of much larger sections of the Left can agree.

Perspectives

Conrad Cadogan goes on to say that the Left is not in a position to agree a generally agreed line of policy by the Left is the main impediment to its growth. Heavens know there are plenty of shortcomings on the Left. But a far bigger obstacle to its growth is the objective situation. If all the present Left-wing groups were imbued with a perfect understanding of scientific Socialism, that is, that they worked harmoniously together, if all they consisted of dedicated revolutionary forces, they might be a little bigger. But they are not. It is a little bit more effective. But the general political situation would remain basically the same. There would still be a mass revolutionary party. Macmillan would not have to fear for his political life, and would not have to worry about usurping his position. The perspectives of the Left are much more affected by the comparative prosperity and contentment of large sections of workers, by the absence of any strong revolutionary forces, and the workers to change by than lack of theoretical clarity. This is not to say that the task is not back complacently and do nothing until a stamp arrives to shake things up. On the contrary, it faces a challenging dilemma. But the picture is distorted if we begin with the Left and look at the international political situation. Though the Left wing groups were the decisive factor, to do this is to regard the world as the centre of the universe. It is the world which determines the Left, on a whole of big little groups, which alone is in a position to shape events. Because, if the Left today is too weak, it has, generally speaking, to react, to events. For example, one of the important tasks there is for the Left is to rally support in the Labour Party for the defence of nationalisation as an important factor in the continuation of the nationalisation programme. But the time when this issue will become a reality, live one will depend on the period when the NEC issues its proposed revision.

There is therefore some unreality in positing as Conrad Cadogan does an ambitious and comprehensive programme. The SLI at least is consistent. SR does make a clear distinction between the two conceptions. More recently, the two conceptions.

"In no country in the world are the opportunities quite as hopeless as it is here" says Cadogan. What time scale is he using? In the long run, probably. But for a developed capitalist country with a large industrial proletariat, the campaign of the Socialist Left against the growing disorganization of the working class, to ensure a political and industrial organizations of the working class, to define a policy towards them and see how this can most effectively be put over and developed within these organizations, is of the utmost importance..."

"Out of the ice-age"

Walter Kendall

When the thaw comes in the Northland the first sign is the cracking of the ice as it breaks into floes. That is the time when Communist leaders in Britain are to pass from a selection of elite cadres, to that of raising the conscious of the workers a class. In this sense, the two conceptions.

In this, there are differences of opinion between the two conceptions. The SR is more critical of the Russian state, the two conceptions.

The essence of the problem is that organizational structures are correct. His application is in error. One cannot arbitrarily impose any target, idea, discipline, or any other form of control on workers. The direction in which capital is moving is objectively determined by the needs of the movement. The plan for an offensive must arise dissociatedly as a result of interaction between workers experience and the intellectual appreciation made by their leadership of the possibility of the moment.

At the same time, Tom Mann's Eight Hour League was formed London gas workers were employed for a twelvemonth, six days a week. When Will Thorne led the strike for an eight hour day which founded the General Municipal Workers' Union the workers gained a 40 per cent reduction in working hours. The victory made it possible for the workers to become something more than dumb working animals. The advance was immense.

The proposal Crates makes is by implication very minor. The US workers under capitalism have gained very little, and without depending on their revolutionary consciousness in any way. In 1899 the demand to limit the working day was a direct challenge to the principles of liberal laissez faire capitalism. This most revolutionary period hardly has a parallel today.

Crates is wrong to think that in present circumstances a seven hour day agitation would either raise fundamental issues or find lasting support. Times have changed. Similar scenes are possible in the US. The United States. The leadership, Left, the effect, only an ex post facto exercise in the passivity of the rank and file. It is this we have to alter.

The Left wing of the Labour Party Conference was made possible by the inadequacy of the Left wing of the Labour Party Conference. The Blair Question is a matter of going in for the full. The Left which has had the vainly the left by the completion of Labour's immediate future. In its present Review, it seems to me that the Socialist Review has adopted Luxemburgian as a pattern tact with which to counter Healy's "Leninist" Mephistopheles. Yet in tactical approach, in organizational conceptions, the two factions don't fundamentally differ. The SLI at least is consistent. SR does make a clear distinction between the two conceptions. More recently, the two conceptions.
IT'S RICH

"In seeking to fulfill his missionary task in Africa today, the Afrikaner is making a stand against Russian and Chinese Communist policies in the Red Eastern, Middle Eastern and North African Mohammedanism, Western European Liberalism, American capitalistic sentimentalism, and inflation and the French in the South African High Commissioner in Britain, to a Birmingham Rotary Club luncheon, Times, February 9.

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

"Fears that groups of workers might take unfair action (in connexion with the Boycott) were expressed by Sir Vincent Tewson... and Mr Frank Cousins..." — Times Labour Correspondent reporting on the National Council of Labour meeting, February 9.

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

"(The US) Federal Government now has some 99,000m. tied up in surplus commodities. The wheat program alone costs $1,500,000 a day, and there is now enough surplus wheat being stored to supply the nation for two and a half years" — Times, February 10.

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

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

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

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

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

PARLIAMENT

Michael Millett

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

The Government of the week beginning March 7th seemed to be all set for a showdown. The centre of London had been washed by two days of rain but not by any visible action Privy Councillors. The battle-hardened divisions of the AA and RAF were ready for battle, and the pressure of a gloomy attack upon the railwayman's children and the Government was mounting and becoming upon whatever principle it happened to have at the moment.

As for the politicians, like another commander, Mr Butler considered the Meteorological Office report. It would go on snowing. After (no doubt) some expensive emergency communication with the South Atlantic, the executive of the NUR had a shilling-in-the-pound increase thrust into their (again no doubt) astonished hands.

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

Catastrophe

Mr Bowles and later Mr Shinwell will reach the attempt to get the strike debated. After all, had not business been suspended already for an emergency debate on Cyprus? Couldn't the Mental Health (Scotland) Bill wait just one more day? The Speaker refused a debate. In an important matter like this, however, an emergency debate can always be arranged; one or the other of the Front Benches, has only got to ask. But Mears, Gaitskell and Wilson were as loquacious as a couple of Trapnott monkeys after like-out. Mr Gaitskell made a speech that could have come from any personnel manager (hence, very shortly) that the strike would be a catastrophe. If he'd only had a knife to hand he could have delivered it once more the slicing up of our, by now much fingered, National Coal.

Came Saturday, and in Nottingham Mr Gaitskell was in firm sympathy with this villains' delight. What was wrong with saying the same things in Westminster on Friday?

NEW PRINT

Readers might notice a few typographical changes in the paper this month. There is nothing more sinister behind them than a change of printers. We cannot gauge the full effect of this change yet, and readers might still hear something to their advantage. One thing can be reported now, however, our turn-round in the printshop has been cut almost by half and typed copy for publication can be received not only within three days before publication, but can be sent this month. The address to which it should be sent: Michael Kildren, 1 Regent's Park Road. London NW1 (All other communications should be sent to Geoff Carlsson, 117 Carmelite Road, Harrow Weald, Middx).

Close

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

Victory

Save in the unlikely event of the House of Commons being withdrawn by Mr Macmillan Labour cannot win an electoral victory before 1964. Anybody who might be impressed by the 'Statesmanlike' attitude of this dispatch by the Labour Front Bench will have certainly forgotten it in four years time. But pretending that wage claims are not the business of a working class political party will weaken the country's real work class core upon which a socialist victory, left wing or right wing, must be based.

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

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

Sir Geoffrey Nicholson, Farnham, (Con.). The people of Britain had enough of blackmail, of attempt to undermine and to alienate the ultimate sanction must be the moment when Britain said "It is according to go on: we shall leave Cyprus.

* * *

Essayists, and combined with the analytical work of Mr Smiley, the Socialist Union group, and myself, On the practical plane it is the main theme of a continuous series of Labour statements, all bearing the marks of Mr Gaitskell's personal influence.

A mere year after writing this article, providing further revisions, a dilution—almost an impossibility—of the work of the Gaitskellite policy on which the General election was fought. No wonder The Economist calls it "provisional". It is solely a matter of "temperamental preference" whether bright young things join the Liberal Party, the Tory Bosom Group—or become Gaitskellites.

Of course, the Labour left must not be less preoccupied with the backslidings of the Hampstead set, and fight for the retention of clause 4 of the Party constitution. It must also expose the chicanery used by the trade union bosses, who will not least disregard their own union constitutions to bring their decisive block vote behind Gaitskell's programme.

At the same time, left-wing romantic conception of the Labour PARTY's 1919 constitution, which, for the first time, contain cluse 4. Tribune (January 8) is right in insisting on the formal adoption of clause 4 transformed the Labour Party into a Socialist Party. It has always been a Socialist Party. Hereafter the Labour Party has been prepared to clothe its modest place in the reforming capitalism with a socialist cloak, claiming that over the decades, or centuries, it would bring in Socialism.

What is significant is that the constitution, acceptable to the right-wing leaders of 1919—like MacDonald and Snowden—is now deemed to be too left-wing by our dear Mr Gaitskell. The Labour Party to transform itself into something comparable with the American Democratic Party.
NOTTING HILL NOTEBOOK
by C.C. Byfield

One of the worthwhile things done by the Borough of Kensington in reducing the possibility of racial friction, was to adopt a new scheme at the staff of its Citizens Advice Bureau to help in cases involving coloured and white peoples. And although the role of such a person is unsought and unwelcome, the staff of the Citizens Advice Bureau has done a great deal of work. It is true that it has been done, nevertheless the efforts made by the holders of this job have shown, quite clearly, where the immediate problems lie.

But it is not, as many people think, the belief that coloured people are depriving white people of accommodation which leads to hostility on the part of the white people, but rather the fear that a coloured person has bought a house with a "sitting tenant." And in probing these cases, it has been found that there is a good deal of ignorance of the law regarding landlord and tenant. Also, that "very often" the coloured landlord has bought the house through a mortgage with a high interest rate, then finds that in order to do the necessary repairs he needs to let more rooms than he had at first intended. This leads to efforts by the landlord to secure the tenant accommodation for furnished letting which in turn leads to hostility on both sides.

Three things it seems need to be done: Firstly, the speeding-up of rehearing schemes in general, the restriction of interest rates charges for house mortgages; and thirdly, wider dissemination of knowledge of the law regarding tenants' rights.

A NOOTHER of the good things that came out of the troubles of '58, is the setting-up of a committee by the Mayor of West Kensington to look into the integration of the various races living in the Borough; and it was largely due to the efforts of this committee that the West Indian social worker was appointed by the CAB. However, the Mayor's term of office will be ending soon, and the question arises: Will this committee die with his leaving, or will it be handed over to his successor? Since, in the words of the present West Indian social worker, "there is still a great deal of tension and potential antagonism among the bi-racial inhabitants of North Kensington, steps should be made to see that this is not the case, and that the Mayor's Committee carry on.

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

In these Associations, coloured and white people have joined together to fight for socially beneficial causes. Their efforts are the most promising of any in the worst affected streets. It would seem that in matters where the people can be made to see the benefits that would accrue from their efforts, they are in greater agreement in pursuing them to join in the fight. What's more, working together in such matters; a good deal of prejudices and suspicions are broken down. I am sure there is a lesson here for everyone.

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

Alan Williams was obviously eager for the success of the new organization, and his opinions on the subject of publicity and program did not meet with serious opposition when delegates had their chance to speak. The sharp counter-posing of "political" and "social" activities, familiar in the past was not much in evidence, although there was general agreement on the need to approach uncommitted youth in new ways rather than continually to predict future disputes on whether or not to cover up socialist ideas for the sake of some members where the two may conflict.

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

Breaking through

Most delegates saw the need to overcome the suspicions and noise in the air towards the Labour Party on the part of even those young people who already show that they care about political and social issues such as the H-Bomb at Aldermaston and the appeasement of the procedure a.g.j. to the convention of requiring all in attendance to submit a declaration that they were members of a proscribed organization. Such an attitude was guaranteed to repel some seriously interested and I am sure thei who wanted to think for themselves.

Two delegates concentrated on working-class and secondary-school youth. Alan Williams had pointed out that the existing YS Sections were particularly weak in Scotland, Wales and the North. It was quite a fact that the Younger Party was at present making practically no impression at all on young trade-unionists while there was a small group at night school, but whatever the difficulties of breaking through to even a minority of these people, striving to appeal to some more interested and I am sure thei who wanted to think for themselves.
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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 domain can defeat the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

SOCIALIST REVIEW believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power on the basis of the fol-

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance, land with compensation payments based on a means test. Renationalisation of all den-
- Workers' control in all na-
- The establishment of workers' committees to control all private enter-
- The establishment of the pri-
- The extension of the social services by the payment of ad-
- The extension of the hous-
- Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fees paying schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants — without a means test — for all uni-
- 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 of the colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the underdeveloped countries.
- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.
- The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.
- A Socialist foreign policy that will defend working classes from Moscow.

Young Socialists Report from Gillingham by Tony Young, Ramsgate
THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE has decided to set up a youth council called the Young Socialists. A series of Area Conferences are to be held to explain how the provision is to be made, and to try to enlist the enthusiastic sup-
support of the constituency parties. The first one was held at Gillingham on Sunday 7th February, for the 19 constituencies in Region 6. It was attended by over 70 delegates.

To reveal the details of the meeting, Fred Mulloy for the Park division of Sheffield, and Alan Williams, National Youth Officer. Delegates knew that the LP Youth Section, first set up in 1955 had utterly failed to win more young new members for the Party than had the old League of Youth, or to stem the drift towards political indifference and anti-labour activities among youth in general. Mr. Mulloy, explained on these themes. The National Executive were seriously concerned to outline the network of local Young Socialists and by the evidence suggesting that the young leaders showed a definite "swing" against Labour, regarding the Party as "reactionary and faddist". Fred Mulloy wrote the words very clearly on his paper as an "arresting" and "degrading" for the younger generation. Alan Williams described the proposed organisational set-up, outlined the network of local constituency, Area, Regional and National conferences and commented on the need to be "completely integrated" with the Party itself, exchanging delegations at their respective levels. He told the audience of the national publicity campaign which the Party plans to launch around the Young Socialists.