SOCIALISM AND THE SUMMIT

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

Paris 1960 looked like being a “jaw-jaw” Summit. Kruschev’s refusal to negotiate means the sudden, brutal achievement of nothing through the hysteria of one side, rather than its prolonged achievement by the petty hypocrisy of all sides.

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

U-2!

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

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

However the Left may differ in assessing the causes and ethics of Kruschev’s action, we are all left to face its consequences. The illusion of Peace Through Statesmanship has vanished. In its place, the illusion of Peace through Strength is again rampant. The spokesmen of “Western solidarity”, the apologists for NATO and the Bomb, are at it full blast!

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

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

JOHN FAIRHEAD
DEFEND CLAUSE FOUR

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

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

CLASS PARTY

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

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

ORGANISATION

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

COMMITTEE

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

Now the message has to be carried into every union branch and Labour Party ward in preparation for the TUC and Party
APPRENTICES DEMAND A BETTER DEAL

By ROGAN COX (AEU North London TWC)

DURING the last few weeks a campaign has been growing, rarely seen, where boys and apprentices in the shipbuilding and engineering industry in the North-West, have staged a strike that spread like wildfire, the fuel having been there for many years in the form of low wages, bad housing, and poor training conditions. It needed only initiative and a little organization to set it alight for all to see the problems facing young workers, and apprentices in particular.

SCHEMES

The apprentice can learn the major part of his trade in three years, in some cases even less, although usually for five years, which means that the industry spends the last two years doing mainly production work for two-thirds of the cost of the time. A big disadvantage for engineering apprentices is that, unlike in building, there is no central body which contracts out the working out of apprenticeships, so that it is common that unless the lad himself puts pressure on the management to be moved to another trade, he will generalise the apprenticeship. In printing, to take one case, the apprentices are taught to work on a monotype machine in a matter of one week, and pass the rest of their course in day release. In other words, it is not even found necessary to give the apprentice individual instruction and help on the shop floor. As this is possibly the only type of machine a fully-fledged worker will ever be required to use, it means that the five years of apprenticeship and six years of experience in a matter of a few short months.

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

COLLEGES

Nearly all apprentices have day release schemes. First, as this is only one day a week the disconnection between this day of study and the rest of the week at work is not conducive to the achievement of good educational results. Secondly there is an extreme disparity of educational attainments on the part of pupils in one and the same trade. Twenty may be an A-level pupil working alongside someone from a school where the one subject he does well in may be biology (who finds difficulty even in adding up). Thirdly, there is a general inadequacy of technical college accommodation and equipment and with all educational establishments. There is also little relation between the technical examinations taken at college and the apprentices' experience on the shop floor (in particular the National Certificate). All these disadvantages lead to tremendous proportions of failure at examination. For instance, 20 percent pass among those taking Ordinary National Certificate (3 year course) and ten percent among those taking Higher National Certificate (a two year course). Due to the apprentice's own root of the factories, and other difficulties, the vast majority of apprentices have to spend 7 years at college to complete the courses. Completion is made more difficult by not allowing lads to pass on to the next stage unless they have passed all subjects in the previous one.

Technical colleges should be greatly expanded; there should be an increase in full-time education as far as possible. This can be done by introducing block release (some weeks full-time training, sandwich courses 6 months in industry), or one year's full-time introductory course particularly for the age group of the more backward students.

SINCE 1948

In most trade unions there is little interest in apprenticeships and their problems, hence no provision is made to cater for apprentices. In 1948 a separate organization was formed for workers with their own specific problems. Even in the AEU where there is special provision for young workers through its Junior Workers' Committees and an annual youth conference, resolutions of the conference are almost exactly the same year after year, pointing out the complete indifference to the young workers' demands. For instance, the recent apprentices' strike in the industry and shipbuilding was fought on the basis of demands made year in and year out since 1948. No wonder so few apprentices feel sufficiently affected to join the union.

We should support the apprentice to carry on his shoulders the burden of anti-capitalist militancy that suited the nineteenth century rather than the twentieth. The employers like these antiquities because the more the apprentice is exploited at low wages, while doing a man's job for a large part of his time, the more profits they make.

SHAMEFUL

I think apprenticeships have had their day, and should now go. In their stead a scheme for intensive, comprehensive training over a much shorter period than the present five-year level can be introduced. This can never be done adequately by employers who operate solely through self-interest. The whole of young people's post-school education should therefore be taken over by the Local Education Authorities who deal at present with the education of young workers through their schools and Junior Workers' Committees and an annual youth conference, resolutions of the conference are almost exactly the same year after year, pointing out the complete indifference to the young workers' demands. For instance, the recent apprentices' strike in the industry and shipbuilding was fought on the basis of demands made year in and year out since 1948. No wonder so few apprentices feel sufficiently affected to join the union.

We should support the apprentice to carry on his shoulders the burden of anti-capitalist militancy that suited the nineteenth century rather than the twentieth. The employers like these antiquities because the more the apprentice is exploited at low wages, while doing a man's job for a large part of his time, the more profits they make.

THE WORKING DAY AND NIGHT

By L. J. BENNETT (AEU)

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

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

BY STAGES

The claim for a 40-hour, 5-day working week was presented by Bro Tanner, President of the AEU, in 1946, and in 1955 the AEU was吸收er to the Federation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions which adopted the following resolution unanimously: "By successive stages the trade unions have achieved a shorter week, and every year the week is shortened, and we should aim to do the same for the last 8 hours; the 8-hour day to which the movement is committed is not yet established. This Conference, believing the time is now opportune for the establishment of the 40-hour week within the limits of pay, instructs the EC to press for the immediate implementation of Confederation policy in this regard and to mobilise the full resources of the Confederation behind this claim."

ASPIRATIONS

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

The night workers' aspirations to work their 42 hours in either 7, 8 or 9 hours (or whatever hours have been forgotten by everybody except themselves. The spirit of the new working week does not cater for the aspirations of the night workers either, and only this week we read of leaders of a large London factory, Napier, protesting through the national press on this same grievance. It arises because the night workers are prepared to lengthen their working night, either by allowing the starting or finishing times or by voluntarily cutting their dinner break in order to cram the 42 hours into 4 or 5 night shifts. How are these differences of policy on working hours to be resolved? If we continue to demand a shorter working day for dayshift workers—and a longer working night with fewer nights away from home for the night shift workers. Issues of this nature call out loud for a National Week and by direct action the observance of the new working week is essential to sufficient working conditions and relations between these Confederation agreements are negotiated.
THE TEN HOURS ACT -- a workers victory

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

"The great practical success" was limited to skilled workers only to women and young people in textiles, though these made up so high a proportion of the labour force, that it was not as a rule, worth keeping them. The employers got away with it. It was the outcome of more than thirty years' struggle in which the Ten Hours Committee of workers combined with the philanthropic strivings of landowners, such as Lord Shaftesbury, and manufactur- ers, such as John Fielden, to over- come selfish shortsightedness of parliaments dominated by the proper- etied classes.

A most ferocious opposition came, naturally, from the manu- facturers who opposed state regulat- ion, or any regulation at all. The logical radical like John Bright the Act was an affront to the sacred principle of free contract. To an eminent economist like Nassau Senior and to the Tory majority, the total suppression of trade unions. The Act portended the ruin of industry and of all profits made according to him in "the last hour" of the working day.

CLASS STRUGGLE

The agitation was led, from 1832, by Lord Shaftesbury, a Tory pater- nalistic politician, and Chartism were "the two great demons in mortal hatred". John Fielden, cotton manufacturer of Todmorden, was more realistic. One of the few dozen MPs, who supported the Chartist petitions of 1839 and 1842, he had written to William Henry Harrison in 1833 that: "the working people will not long submit to the chains with which they are cuffed by co- operative societies, trade unions, etc.

"It is the Short Time Com- mittee which is working for something since 1819 and particularly strong in the textile areas. Among other profit-sharing groups, which can use its motive power and helped to con- vince the majority in Parliament that they had better concede some of the workers' demands lest worse befal them.

Fielden had shown that the work- ers were capable of organising their own independent political movement, and the Chartist Convention of 1845 had demanded support for the Ten Hours Bill, which its members were convinced, would "confer manifold advantages on myriads of men...particular- ly on the workers."

NIGHT AND DAY--end

KEEPING

It is enough that is enough. The night worker to work only four nights with lengthening the shift, and to operate with the night shift work agreement—that is, to be working 4 nights of 9 hours and 1 day of 6 hours and to be paid for 42. This would appear to more in keeping with the struggle for the Ten Hours Bill and a continuation of the efforts of the early trade union pioneers.

long hours and intense toil in the noxious atmosphere of the rattle box, to uphold the unshakable cause of the mammon-worshing capitalists."

Divisions had also appeared in the ranks of the other class. The manufacturers had forced through the Repeal of the Corn Laws against the landowners, con- cerned for their rent rolls. It seemed only just to many of the landlords that, in return, the profits of the cotton manufacturers should take a little bit of the work off the hands of the masters. In a backwater of severe distress and intense class struggle, the Ten Hours Bill at last became law.

VICTORY

Lord Shaftesbury was sure that the battle was over. "I need not, I know," he wrote to the Short Time Committees, "exhort you to an oblivion of past conflicts, and to a sanguine assurance of future harmony. I trust that there will be no more need to look to arms, as though we had defeated an enemy." He underestimated both the greed and the malevolence of the manufacturers and their owners-

"A Millowners' Association" was at once set up to secure the Act's repeal. A desperate measure. The Act would "deprive the employers....and the workers, asking for permission to work all the hours God sent. The Chartist requires, at the beginning of 1849, that:

AEU ELECTION ADDRESS

A SOCIALIST STAND

IT IS NOT OFTEN that one can point out a principled, socialist stand in any section of the Labour Movement, least of all within some of the bigger unions in the country. However, during the recent elections for Divisional Organizer, Division No 25 (North London) of the AEU, Bro Geoff Carlsson, a socialist on the factory floor should be proud to admit. We reprint Bro Carlsson's words to his brothers and sisters in the AEU:

"If we are to have a strong, modern, socialist Labour Movement it must be one that is just, either in our own Union or the Trade Union movement generally.

"Unfortunately, the pattern of elections over the past few years in our Union has been the struggle between the leadership and the Communist Party. This struggle has resulted in an internal fight which has heartened the employers, and weakened our Union in the eyes of the average Trade Unionist generally. Our Union is no longer recognized as being foremost in leading the fight for industrial and political progress, but, on the contrary, is regarded as one of the right-wing Unions, with the Communists being the main force. This has on the membership. In their fight against the Communist Party the Union leadership has been very much neglected and the right-wing Unions principles, and, as a consequence, our Union organisation has suffered with such matters as meetings on the floor of the House of Commons.

In the struggle against re- ducation, which is the principle question which we face in the AEU, we have a policy on paper, but no en- forcement from the leadership of that policy. In fact, it is apparent that, in the main, the struggle for resistance to the compulsory redundancies and the Shop Stewards' Committees, which are the priority target of the employers, and which have ers. In terms of health and vigour, was seen within a generation. Moreover, in Marx emphasised, the Act constituted the "victory of a principle". The triumph of laissez-faire economics was incomplete. The struggle for social control over economic production however, in a formal sense, was conceded. The concession laid the basis for further encroach- ments and, ultimately, for the carve the capitalists' drive for profit in the social interest.

RESULTS

Paradoxically or, more dialectically, one major result of the Ten Hours Act was to stimulate the more rapid development of capitalistic production, the steam power which could work for ten or a half hour and easily be used for forty. A work- place driven by steam, water, and electricity, water powered effect was not easy. The Factory Act, among which the Act of 1847 was the most important, accelerated the closing down of old fashioned, underused plants. They speeded up the concentration and centralisation of capital, to the benefit of the larger capitalists. At the same time they promoted the development of the working class and hence of the labour movement. In the "exclusion of the working day", wrote Marx, "as regards its length, passages, beginning and end, we see the development of a system of long hours and the sublimation of the motive power of steam as a routine part of the working day, in one word, the greater concentration of the means of production and a corresponding greater concourse of workpeople."

The victimisation of shop stewards and shop stewards and, because of their political affiliations, the subsequent denial of support to the Party...has been one of the most disturbing features of our Union life. The most noticeable feature was the dispute at Handley Page, where Bro Knight was sacrificed.

In December 1967, a member of the Labour Party and a firm believer in International Socialism. But he did not believe in the Party that was occurred by accepting the policies of the right-wing leaders or by accept- ing the policies of the Com- munist party, their external loyalties to Russia, and the anti- working-class measures adopted by the Labour Party. We would still fail if we neglected our political obligations. I believe we should, but we cannot be too active within the Labour Party, which is the only party which commands the allegiance of the working class, so that it can be transformed into an instrument for changing the present system of society.

We must stand for a Labour Movement which strives politically for International Socialism--INDEPENDENT OF WASHINGTON and MOSCOW and pursue a policy of increasing the share of our product for our members, which will become, for the government more than just a stage when industry is taken out.
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MULLED ON

There has been a lot of talk recently about Labour councillors who have been doing so much toully what Guitzkell calls 'the image of the Party'. The first thing to realise is that the whole discussion of Labour councils' relations to the public is an economist's position cannot be determined to the antics of certain local representatives. It is not that Labour councillors have been sticking their tongues out at the public gallery, or making rude noises in the chamber.

No. I would submit it goes much deeper than that: the unpopularity of Labour councils is due to their having no clear distinct policy. They are often prepared to support, or even exceed, when an edict comes from Westminster at best the only thing they think of doing is to soften the blow, to mitigate the effect of Tory policy upon the parish. They regard themselves as administrators within the context of rules laid down by the central government.

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

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

VAST SLUMBERING POWER

Labour councils should be citizens of revolt. They should continually be yielding, buffeting, harrying the Tory Government. This cannot be effectively done in ones and twos. It demands effective leadership and a central direction.

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

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

HOUSING AND SCHOOLS

Second, we have the bland, almost unbelievable complacency of the right-wing Labour leadership on local affairs. This can be clearly seen in the recent Transport House document we are informed that in 1951 there was a deficit of 760,000 in dwellings as against households. In other words 760,000 families were without homes even if they really tried. There is no doubt that vast slumbering power lies untried and under the Council Chamber.

In 1959—after 8 years Tory rule—we are supposed to have an excess of dwellings over households of 451,000. From this the document concludes:

'In summa there is becoming in many cases (a) more of a regional than national problem and (b) one of slum clearance rather than of gross overcrowding'.

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

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

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

THREE IMPORTANT ISSUES

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

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

But this should not deter socialists. It should be possible to link activity in various councils. This is of utmost importance. When local socialists come together they can almost certainly find themselves hatched by reactionary forces, as was St. Pancras.

I would suggest there are three important issues socialists need to raise on their authorities--

1. To get a boycott of all South African goods.
2. To mount a concerted campaign against high interest rates.
3. To insist on fair wages for building and public works.

This is important because public building costs have only increased fractionally since 1951; the doubling of the cost of building council houses can be largely attributed to higher interest rates. It has meant the 262 council houses in Britain have been largely postponed.

It also results in vast wealth being taken annually out of the ratepayers' pockets and placed in the pockets of Messrs Bankers and Financials of the City of London. No doubt concerted investigation by the Council chamber would give partial support. It would have the further advantage of putting the Tory Government on the spot: placing them in a position where they will have to justify the £262,000 loan to the City of London and the £1 million to Coal Co Ltd. and certain car manufacturers but not to deserving causes.

To take vigorous, concerted action against Civil Defence. All recent recommendations for Nuclear Disarmament's Scientist Group is examining all Civil Defence literature. It has already found many half-truths and misleading statements. When its work is completed the Council campaign intend to contact all Labour Groups, showing them evidence and asking them to openly oppose present Civil Defence.

If socialists on local councils take up these issues and act together there is no need to expect that the Government will remain the fruitless, unresponsive job it is at present.
AFTER THE LOCAL ELECTIONS

FIGHT THE TORY SQUEEZE

Says KARL DUNBAR (Willesden)

AFTER the defeats of May, when nearly 600 Labour Counecils across the country were swept from office, the movement must return to some fundamental thinking in relation to the Tory threat. Many Socialists towards the problems which beset us in the field of local government. It is quite true, as Morgan Phillips said, that the Tories have turned the accusing finger away from the Labour councils, and this was an important factor in Labour's defeat. In his book, 'The People's Right to Government', he demonstrated by Butler on the eve of poll, argue that most local affairs are the concerns of the local councils, not the Government. In fact, the Tories made the issue of 'freedom', that local government is 'subservient to' by the Government. As Goebbels always said, if you want to take a person, take his bread. But the truth is that Labour have allowed the Tories to get away with it for so long. Now offering any fundamental challenge either to Tory propaganda or to the actual resources of the local administration, results which are becoming more clear every day so far as the work of local councils are concerned.

FACTS

Consider, over 400 local councils had to cease building new houses.
Actual Council building has dropped from 240,000 homes in 1953 to 129,000 in 1959.

A block of 6 flats cost £900 to build. When the loan has been paid, the mortgage on these flats have cost the people of Willesden £300,000. And the greed of building business is never satisfied. Not until every council has ceased to build houses for the needy will the housing system have escaped the burden. Committees have voted to charge the 'economic rent' for council houses will have the Labour Party been compared to the Frankenstein's of their own creation.

For the misery of the slums and the overcrowding in the slums is in the words, 'So can we phrase the helplessness that pervades the lives of so many working people, trying to rear their families in the shadow of one back room. We can never bring back to life the babies that have died from the diseases that are inherent in slumdom. This is what the Tories are deliberately doing, through the operation of vicious class legislation, legislation which, if not fundamentally challenged, spells doom for Labour and the working class movement as a whole; Willesden's immediate answer to the Tories' pressure has been to raise all Council rents and bring in a rebated rent scheme, which can cost between £600 and £1,000. For every £1 borrowed by council, council £50.10 has to be repaid.

SLUM MISERY

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

Perhaps, the only thing to be said for such a change is that it would expose the contradictions in the Gaitskellite argument. Until now they have argued in favour of a Non-Nuclear Klip. Being in the fewest possible hands. But to put NATO in control would have the exact opposite effect—more nations would have H-bombs under their partial or complete command. The Gaitskellites have also argued in favour of an independent British bomb because it would give Britain a greater say in the councils of the world—remember Bevan's fear of nuclet arms race. But to put NATO in control would have the same effect.

I would suggest that constituency parties try to anticipate any twists or surprises in the party's own strategy, to ensure that their conference resolutions are clear and unequivocal, and in that respect, possessing the H-bomb, by American bomber and missile bases, against NATO and all other nuclear powers.

PHOTOGRAPHS of atrocities committed by the French in Algiers are contained in the current issue of Clarion, the lively journal of Labour students. These pictures of mass executions, expelled refugees, and French parachutists actually raping young Algerian women are reminders that the relentless struggle for colonial freedom still goes on in Algeria.

CANDID COMMENTARY

By JOHN WILKES

IN the next few weeks constitutency parties and other organizations affiliated to the Labour Party will bescratch their heads and put pressure on the local councils to be submitted to the Scarborough conference. These resolutions, which are being passed in the light of what are likely to be the contentious issues before conference. The first of course, will be the Party constitution. Had Gaitskell stuck to his declaration—just to strike out Clause Four—mounting opposition might have been defeated. It was, therefore, Gaitskell and the right-wing have made a strategic retreat by leaving Clause Four in its original form while holding it round with a compromise and other amendments.

Many socialists will feel tempted to vote against the New Testament on the grounds that it is an attempt to be made to put some socialist bite into it. This is no longer the case, as well as being an embarrassment to, and exposure of, the right-wing. You will remember at last year's Blackpool conference Gaitskell, initially the resolution calling for Clause Four, saying that his main objection to it was its ambiguity and the fact that the right-wing were open to misinterpretation by its enemies. Unfortunately, the New Testament is equally open to its construction. Indeed, it only got the overwhelming support of the National Executive because of the widely differing interpretations, members put on the phrase capturing "the commanding heights of the economy".

Moreover, let us be clear about what Socialists mean by "the commanding heights of the economy"—complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance, etc. If there's no need for me to go on. The first two points of the program on the back of the Socialist Review give you a basic idea of the type of amendment that should be moved.

ON the other big issue before conference—nuclear disarmament—the Labour leaders may receive a nasty jolt. So far, Gaitskell has consistently clung to his position on Clause Four, saying that his major objection to it was its ambiguity and the fact that the right-wing would be open to misinterpretation by its enemies. Unfortunately, the New Testament is equally open to its construction. Indeed, it only got the overwhelming support of the National Executive because of the widely differing interpretations, members put on the phrase capturing "the commanding heights of the economy".

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

COMING into a period of rising left-wing activity, when socialists are beginning to circulate more widely and new ideas are being cast a glance at the dismal days of the mid-fifties. That was the time of greatest isolation, but there were opportunities for fruitful activity. A significant part of that difficulty of circulating or getting socialist literature. Contacts were few, the barriers of mistrust were large and imposing. But to day more and more socialist classics are being reprinted. Other interpretations of our basic ideas are appearing.

Even so, this tendency is far from being a flood yet, and it is surprising that more groups failed to notice the reissue of Lenin on the Russian Revolution. Published by Doubleday Anchor Press for 10 cents. It is a must for all socialists. It should not need my recommendation before you go and buy the greatest book on the greatest event of the Twentieth Century.
THE POLITICS OF SUMMITRY

RAYMOND CHALLINOR

The summit meeting had ended in failure. Millions of people all over the world had waited patiently for the conference, pinning all their hopes on a peaceful end to the war. They had hoped for a stable peace, and it is true that the summit meeting held previously had ended with a declaration of war in 1914.

Still it did not guarantee peace. Then the heads of state convened and reached an "agreement in principle". But when they went to search for even more deadly weapons continued unabated; the struggle for influence in the Middle East did not stop. The "Great War" evaporated during the battles in Egypt and Hungary. And the Cold War continued with increased ferocity.

The hope that the end of the war would bring peace has shown itself to be false. The struggle between the international working class for Socialism. As an analysis of the prospects of the Summit and the true road to peace the following article written by R. Challinor a few days before the Summit is of interest.

May 1955, the month for Maypole dancing and love-making, has been chosen as the month on which to hold a summit conference. But unfortunately the heads of state—staid, elderly gentlemen—are an intractable lot. However, hope springs eternal in the human breast: perhaps a crisis might ensue. It is because of this hope, the desire of the overwhelming mass of the world's peoples to discontinue the ghastly quarrels and mutual recriminations, that these politicians have been impelled to choose this summer for the conference. In several cases it is against their will. They realise there has been no major changes in the power of the contending blocks, no dramatic solutions to the world's problems. In light of this summits, therefore, can only hope to issue pious communiqués, saying how ardently all the statesmen of the world want peace. They will then go home to intensify their production of nuclear weapons.

Off-stage, behind all the feasting, talking and communities, are the complex forces that compelled a summit conference in the first place. On the positive side, there is world opinion's yearning, stronger than ever before, for world peace. On the negative side there is the touchingly misguided trust of politicians, a failure to grasp the roots of the cause of the war. Supporters of summit conferences—and we have some almost professional campaigners for them, on the Left—must accept the assumption, whether right or wrong, that the present world tension results from fear and misunderstanding. Consequently it is only necessary to get the respective leaders together, to get them to realise the importance of peace by parading the armaments before them—so that the states of the world and nations will start to live harmoniously side by side.

When this idyllic picture fails to draw summit supporters, I argue that the heads of state are meeting, striving to acquire the entire presence of the world. Labour, Liberal and Communist—did not die.

When humanity is on the brink of disaster, we dare not allow ourselves to be hoodwinked by the real path to peace. Socialist Review believes that only the scientific method of analysis can guide us. The summit conference holds no promise of a peace solution. The struggle of the international working class for Socialism.

It is rich

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

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

"The only feelgood moments for Labour were in the weekend of a Direct Action Conference, held on February 28. "Russians never fly over US"—headline in Daily Worker, May 11.

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

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

"After watching The Times cover the Korean War from 1950 to 1955, I am convinced that the Indo-China war from Paris"—Joseph and Stewart Alsop, The Reporter's Trade.

"Main consists of three parts—soul, body and passport"—The New Statesman, May 21.

"The Socialist Labour League is in the vanguard of the struggle against all bas and proscriptions"—Statement by the League in a newsletter, "Behan Expelled by BLL", Newsletter, May 14.

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

"After this there was a long silence. The penciled paper lay in the centre of the table. At length I said, 'Might it not be thought rather cynical if it appeared we had disposed of these issues, so fateful to millions of people, in such an off-hand manner?' Let us burst this bubble. 'No, you keep it', said Stalin. Two days later, still in Moscow, Cafiero de Telsa held a press conference and gave figures on paper along with a note to Stalin: 'As I said, they would be considered, and then consulted. They are exposed to the scrutiny of the Foreign Office and diplomats all over the world. But they could not be the basis of any public document, certainly not at the time.' A blue pencil tick across a half-sheet of paper. This gives the lie to all the high-sounding politicking talk about 'the people's sacred rights', self determination and democracy. This is so much bluff, to be turned on and off to suit their purposes. When they want they turn it on; when they want to show them under any old government. The forthcoming summit conference, unlike the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, will not make any dramatic changes to the political landscape of the world has become divided into two camps, each with its own prove of war, one a permanent war economy acts as a buttress, propping up an unstoppable arms race and quite otherwise tipping into a crisis of overproduction. On the other side of the Curtain, the new Communist China is under production. To compete economically and militarily with the West, they are in competition to increase production, to decrease costs (i.e. wages). In the world market these two giants struggle, each trying to outdo the other.

The economic contradictions are that they cannot be talked away by smart phrases from the riders of East and West. Nor, if the economic contradictions are allowed to persist, will the verbiage of statements prevent a Third World War. The only solution to the problem we must look elsewhere—to the working class and the struggle for Socialism. Thoughts of international co-operation are not alien to the working class movement; indeed, they constitute a vital part of the movement. The realisation that ordinary decent people through co-operation and joint action are common—particularly the overriding interest of desiring to live in a world which is not condemned to the common action. Further force is given to this drive by the growing realisation that workers demands immediately the same, that their bosses, are pursuing a struggle against them. A common action of solidarity, a friendly helping hand against oppression, stretch out a common action. These are the ways these workers fight for better conditions and a better world.

We can see the conference constitutes a challenge to Socialists. It is high time that the rulers—not the workers—held a conference, mapped out
LETTER

THE STRUGGLE IN SOUTH AFRICA

There is no doubt that the oppressed people of South Africa write every time to the publicity of the conditions under which they live, in the hope that people outside South Africa will identify themselves with the struggle against oppression in South Africa. However, it is important that South Africans know that your editorial “The Struggle in South Africa” (Saturday Review, May) plays its part in this exposure; it gives a number of false impressions and entirely dislocates the work that must be done in South Africa from a false picture of the Chamber of Mines and industry in general. Let me try and explain briefly. The position can be simply stated as follows. While the division is essentially a division of class and not one of race, white and black workers alike have a common enemy, the white workers themselves, who are fighting against their fellow black workers. The understanding which is essential to partial victory in the labour movement in Britain can and must play. Mining, agriculture, and other industries in South Africa are based on an abundant supply of cheap black labour. The capitalists would consider it as indecent for capitalists everywhere, to produce their goods as cheaply as possible and to employ much less profit as possible. However this far from explains events in South Africa.

At various times the Chamber of Mines, faced with conditions of low grade ore and deep-level mining, was forced to open up lower grades of ore, skilled work to African workers. Their policy was one of “the maximum employment of natives at the minimum employment of whites”. (de Kiewet, A History of South Africa, p. 164). Why? The Economic and Wage Commission (Union Government, 1932, para. 89) answers this: “...the relatively high wages of white artisans are absorbed and used up in the employment of large numbers of unskilled native labourers, and in this respect the artificial agricultural, in which the whole white community are engaged is maintained as a standard of life approximating rather to that of America than to that of Europe, in a country that is poorer than most countries of eastern Europe, solely because they have at their disposal these masses of docile, lowly paid native labourers.”

This view was already expressed by the Low Grade Mines Commission of 1930 and “had strongly recommended.”

For good measure, this is a far cry from the so called “non political” National Association of Tenants & Residents. Labour In Wolverhampton have the courage to take this step forward and there is no question about it. This step, however, must be the beginning of the much needed utilisation of the skills of the white and black capitalist backers. We must pay the fullest regard to the fact that new developments in the country should be calling on its local unions and trade unions to contact immediately the Wolverhampton Party, find out the exact facts, discuss the possibilities of united action, whilst we desire a much bigger and more centralised movement. This is the way tenants and house buyers should not hesitate to begin the battle for this and the movement in South Africa.

R. L Smith, Wolverhampton, England
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Lawyer, has never been stronger than now. Against the suicidal illusions of Peace Through Sta
Strength, we must set the vital prospect of Peace Through Socialism.

THE CP TURN

Some glimmering of this truth might appear to have penetrated the murky fastness of King Street. The CP Executive, at its meeting, decided to support the in-
dependent renunciation by Britain of the Bomb, and all its works, including NATO and the bases. The silent approval given to un-
ilateralism by the CP'ers on the AEU National Committee is now
openly confirmed, without a word of explanation, recantation, or apology. We may now expect Abe Moffat to swallow his attacks of recent years against this policy. Daily of anti-socialist proposals, and
swit of Socialist Miners' vote behind Cousins and the anti-nuclear bloc. Gone are the Daily Worker's accusations against CND of
"dividing the broad movement.", The CP failure to support the Aldermaston March made ridiculous by the scale of the March and its successors; and the prospect of the renewal of the H-bomb
debate at this year's Labour Party Conference has made Gollan and Parky have second thoughts about lining up the CP-influenced trade union vote once again behind Gaitkell. It is conceivable also that a gentle hint may have passed from Moscow to King Street about the future of the joint consultation, let alone workers' control, has never been con-
spicuous in the relationship between the Kremlin and its devotees abroad, especially the British CP, and the speculation is rather
unilateral.

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

The recent Aldermaston March was noteworthy for the rapture with which platform speakers looked to the Paris Conference, even at the expense of the aims of the March itself. The slogan of
"Ban The Bomb!" was addressed piously to the Heads of State rather than forthrightly to the British people. A "March To The Summit", rousing off the horrid of Trafalgar are only to be (perhaps carefully) halted by the French authorities. The CND leadership's turn towards Summitism has been put to scorn by Kruschev and Nixon. In the coming weeks, the Left must
resist the anti-nuclear and anti-NATO activity, despite the intei-
twined hostilities of the Two Camps, despite the explosion of false
hopes at Paris. For nearly ten years, Socialist Review has been
among those fighting for an overthrow of all the betrayals of stateism, all the frenzies of capitalism and Stalinism. Its slogan
remains today a potent watchword for the movement:

Neither Washington nor Moscow, but International Socialism!

CONCLUSE FOUR from p. 1

conferences in September and October. The middle-class attack on the only part of the campaign which pleads to us socialism must be met by rally-
ning the working-class base of the

The struggle is many-sided. No socialist paper is playing its part which does not refuse, on the one hand the arguments of the Lib-Labs, and which, falls, on the other, does not give support the organization of the campaign.

PAMPHLET

Socialists should support actively the work of the commit-
tee and see that it spreads throughout the country; reaching into the Tory constituency. As a first step, they should buy the pamphlet produced by the Defence Clause Four, read it and sell as many copies as they can.

The pamphlet, and other pamphlets were obtained from the secretary, Councillor R Spurway, 164 Courtenay Avenue, Harrow Weald, Middle-

OUR DEFENCE

The US Defence Department has recently issued a training manual for its Air Force reservists under the signature of Brigadier-General Chap
pell, director of Staff Operations. "It warns its read-
ers that "Communists and fellow-travelers have success-
fully infiltrated our Churches" and contains several examples of the "Big Brother" attitude which can be recently been mani-
ifested elsewhere in the armed forces, notably in a recent case where a commanding officer ordered his men to spy on each other's private lives. Some of the passages read:

Another foolish remark often heard is that Americans have a right to know what's going on. Most people realize the fool-
hardiness of such a suggestion... Keep in mind that public news media present only as much in-
formation as the Government wants to release.

If you suspect an individual of betrayal or disloyalty, report him, of course, but try to be sure he isn't just disabled or a com-
plainer. If you do know of a dis-
satisfied person, nevertheless, it will be safe only to report him if you are sure he is spy.

Keep an eye out at all times for suspicious activities. actual or implied. In the event, he hesitates to report incidents to the air police, no matter how trivial they may seem.

'The pamphlet also tells the reservists to "be especially watchful for persons who are trying to undermine the Air
force byelling or uncer-
nying at the installations and accom-
plishments." Times February 18

FIGHTING FUND

Our income in May was

Shoreditch 5.1.6
Bingley 4.1.0
Hacket 4.1.7
Leonard 1.1.9
Notting Hill 5.1.0
Harrow 9.1.2
Rugby 2.5.0
Sheen-on-Trent 1.6.0
Jpwich 10.0.0
Liverpool 1.5.0
Nottingham 10.0.0
Total £28.14.3

WE NEED £40 a month. Up to the end of May we received £28.11.3.

Thank's and keep it up.

Conways should also remember that they could do us the world of good by not helping to harm by making all their purchases through London Co-operitive No. 350498.

Contribute to your paper by in-
troducing it to your friends, by
ordering bulk copies, by giving donations.

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published by Socialist Review Publishing Co Ltd. Subscriptions post paid 12/- per annum. For comments and policy ex-
pressed in signed articles by con-
tributors do not necessarily represent the views of Socialist Review which are given in editorial statements. All communications are to be add-
ressed to 117 Carmelite Rd., Harrow Weald, Middlesex.

Printed by St. Martin's Printers (F.U.) 86d. Liddle Road, London, S.W.6. Tel: FUL 8637.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The Socialist Review stands for international Socialist democracy. Only by abolishing the working class and the bourgeoisie, can we stamp out the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. The Social Review believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power on the base of the fol-
"The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insur-
ance and the land with compensa-
tion payments based on a means test. Reorganisation of all den-
ationalised industries without com-
pensation. The nationalised in-
terest 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 na-
tionalised industries i.e. a majority of workers' representatives on all national boards and boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage rate in the industry.

- The establishment of workers' com-
nittees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. The present authori-
tances representatives must be subject to frequent election,imme-
"We are not raising the average skilled wage in the industry."

- The establishment of the prin-
ciple of work or full maintenance.

- The extension of the social

- Free State education up to 18

- Opposing all forms of partici-

- Freedom from political and economic oppression to all co-

- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow.