REPEL THE RIGHT — WING CHALLENGE

At present, the roll-call of votes at the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party Conference is most encouraging to the Left. The move to water down Clause Four is almost certain to be defeated, at least in its present form of an outright "New Testament" parallel with the Constitution. That would be a huge and welcome step forward in the cause of unilateral nuclear disarmament outnumber those against by at least a million. Yet all of us know that the Right wing is quite capable of manoeuvring such a Transport Committee in such a way as to deaden or even destroy the affirmation of Socialist principle that is so necessary for the future of the movement.

We therefore urge a few thoughts which delegates to Congress and Conference, and their friends and associates in the different organisations of Labour, may ponder during the coming weeks, and perhaps take with them into their respective assemblies. The Left has too often been taken in by this Conference's number.

An attempt may be made to persuade Congress to admit the affirmation of Clause Four, not indeed to the high status of a Constitutional document, but as part of the National Executive's report, or as some other, less exalted form of policy statement. If we are not to be given a New Testament, at least Gaitskellism will have its Apocrypha (that collection of books which the English Church admits as, if not holy, at least "edifying" for the faithful to read).

However, there is nothing particularly edifying about the "clarification". Its basic assumption is that private and public ownership will co-exist as equally important forms in the indefinite future; it even lays open the prospect of the continued dominance of private property over public. Clause Four is not clarified, but only confused, and diluted by the Executive proposals. They should be rejected out of hand.

The possibility of official manoeuvre on the Bomb is considerably wider. An attempt will be made to persuade some of the Labour delegations, and very likely the whole Conference, that the situation has changed since the day when the unilateralist resolutions they are pledged to support were passed. Various "changes" will be canvassed. The failure of the Summit is already being mooted within the AEU leadership as though it were a telling condemnation of the National Committee's unilateralist policy, instead of (as it is) the most overwhelming evidence for the necessity for Britain to abandon the Bomb without waiting till the cows of international negotiation to come home.

NO CHANGE ON Bomb

The NEC statement on defence is also said to constitute a fundamental change of direction which the conferences of recent months unfortunately missed. If this argument were accepted, it would mean that the annual conferences of the trade union movement might as well pack up. Any policy which they endorsed and which ran counter to the pet plans of the General Council and the NEC, would automatically be made null and void of no effect by the simple procedure of issuing a direct order on the issue concerned, which, yielding in no fundamental respect to the demands of the unions concerned, nevertheless possessed the magic, overriding property of being produced other the union conferences that framed the troublesome policy. Lateness thus becomes a substitute for argument. Our Labour leadership of tomorrow will be able to tell us all: "No need to put any resolutions on questions X, Y and Z on your agenda, chaps, because the NEC is going to issue a statement on these matters after you have taken your decisions; in fact, you need bother to decide on questions A, B, C... W either, since we might always turn out a pre-Conference statement on any of these."

DEFEND THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

by JIM PLANT

The Imperialists have been thrown into a paroxysm of rage over Fidel Castro's action in taking over the three big oil refineries in Cuba. The American press is screaming for military action against Cuba: "We hope Washington is planning to slap this lug down" frothed the New York Daily News.

Until the overthrow of the hated and bloodthirsty dictatorship of Batista, Cuba's status was that of a semi-colonial country. The greater part of Cuba's resources—sugar, mineral rights, light industry, public utility concessions, cattle lands—were in the hands of US capital.

Cuba, with no coal deposits or hydro-electric possibilities, relies exclusively on oil for its power requirements. Her oil needs have been met by three refineries owned by the American companies of Esso and Texaco, and the Anglo-Dutch Shell. These three imported practically all the crude oil from their own oil fields in Venezuela.

The price of this oil is artificially high, for it is related not to the production costs of the area concerned but is fixed at a level so as not to undercut the high cost of American produced oil. This is true all over the world; Middle East oil sells in Britain, for example, at the same price as American oil, although production costs in the Middle East are only a fraction of American costs.

In June the Cuban government signed an agreement for the delivery of Soviet crude oil on terms that are particularly advantageous to Cuba. Soviet oil is $1 a barrel cheaper than company oil; it is paid for with Cuba's sugar; and payment is no drain on Cuba's dollar reserves. Under a 1938 law the oil companies must refine government owned oil, however when ordered to process the Soviet oil they refused. The result was the expropriation of the three refineries.

Many sections of the American ruling class are calling for drastic action against Cuba, including military intervention on the "Shore" model. We had an example of the same determination of the imperialists to hang on to their oil profits by any means, even if it means breaking the promise to the American people at the time of the revolution in Iraq and the civil war in the Lebanon.

The direct competition between military action on the part of the State, and the oil capitalists was illustrated when, in 1958, the...
THE INDUSTRIAL STRUGGLE AND PEACE

Essential task for Socialist Trade Unionists

by DUDLEY EDWARDS

The process outlined above will take a relatively long period, perhaps a decade or more. This will displease those who empha-
size the claim to be revolu-
tionaries and those who argue that history will not allow us to achieve our aims through such a slow process.

To think that nuclear war will soon cut short all our activi-
ties is in fact to panic. The struggle against war is part of the struggle against capitalism. The struggle must be con-
ducted with passion, it must also be waged calmly, methodically and scientifically. There are no short cuts for left wing social-
ists who really want to reach the goal of transforming society.

Capitalism may create chaos and desperation, but we should not rely on the prospect of appealing suffering to drive the workers towards Socialism (even if we could rely on its doing so). We should rely on the fact that Socialism manages to avoid producing the sort of catastrophe it has pro-
duced. Socialism's aims can only be achieved through the existing mass organiza-
tions of the working class. In the Communist Manifesto: "The Communists do not form a separate party op-
posing all the others. They form no separate group, no party of their own. They have no interests separate and apart from those of the working class in general. They do not set up any scep-
tarist principles of their own by which to shape and mould the proletariat as a whole."

SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT

The Labour Party may often disappoint us with its lack of cohesion, unity and respectability, but its social composition and historical background are nevertheless quite different from that of the trade union leaders.

The Labour Party has its own history and traditions, which in some ways parallel those of the trade unions. It has its own leaders, its own policies and its own machinery. It is, in fact, a separate organization with its own separate interests.

The Labour Party is, in fact, a separate party. It is not a separate group, no party of their own. They have no interests separate and apart from those of the working class in general. They do not set up any scep-
tarist principles of their own by which to shape and mould the proletariat as a whole.

The Labour Party may often disappoint us with its lack of cohesion, unity and respectability, but its social composition and historical background are nevertheless quite different from that of the trade union leaders.

The Labour Party has its own history and traditions, which in some ways parallel those of the trade unions. It has its own leaders, its own policies and its own machinery. It is, in fact, a separate organization with its own separate interests.

Socialist Review has received an encouraging letter from a veteran Japanese socialist. It shows the main tendencies in Zengakuren, the attitude of the reformist socialists towards their Japanese comrades, and the reaction of the country's most important industries. Such a claim is regarded as unheard of insouciance by the employers and some trade union bureaucrats.
SEAMENS' STRIKE
by NICHOLAS HOWARD

Sir Thomas Yates speaking to the press on the fourth day of the seamen's strike expressed his opinion that 'this thing will run its course as all unofficial strikes do' and that 'the younger element is to blame.' The strike ended ten days later with a threat of resumption if a month's strike failed to produce a 4-hour working week and the provision of shop stewards on ships, were not met within a month. Between them, both employers and union officials are in the dark as to the standards of seafarers' conditions and pay in relation to the average standards enjoyed by factory labour on shore. The complicity of Sir Thomas was typified by the meeting of the officials of this bosses' union and the strength of the strike clearly on a lower level than the factory workers, was the result of a 15-day strike of 50 AEU maintenance men from Lotts Road and Greenwich.

The nighshippers, some 340, were not included in the award and so found themselves for the first time receiving no guarantee of pay than day workers. This was an impossible situation. A claim was made for shift workers and on July 6 notice of strike action was effective from July 10, unless the LTS bosses gave the shift workers justice.

On July 14, a meeting between management and unions resulted in the offer from the LTE of an immediate increase of 10/ per week, effective when the power station workers return to normal working. So far this offer has been rejected. The following day the sub-station workers met to discuss the position and decided that unless there was a return to work by the power station workers, they would withdraw their labour the following morning.

"BLACK JUICE"

During the period we have had many conflicting stories and rumours. This is understandable in view of the fact that we have 90,000 workers spread over small sections, many working in shift systems. Contact between workers is therefore difficult, but there have been certain disturbing factors which cannot be glossed over by citing these difficulties.

For example, the tubes and trolley busses have been kept running, and quite effectively too. This has been done by the use of blackleg labour, the higher officials of the LTE working round the clock in the power stations.

The whole area you will find a single official, over the rank of foreman, to do his normal job. The position here is twofold. First, are all these supervisory grades members of the TSSA? If so, what are trade unionists doing acting as strikebreakers? Secondly, why are the sub-station workers, the trolley bus drivers and so on, not told that they are only at work by the kind permission of blackleg labour. The LTE strike committee issued two statements: one outlined the cause of the strike and called for "nothing to be done by other LTE employees which would damage the case of the strikers", and urged that "fellow trade unionists should ensure that no 'black juice' was exported from their system to ours." The second statement, a short typewritten bulletin, bluntly said that it was clear that "black juice" was being supplied from outside, and that the power stations were being manned by blackleg labour.

Unfortunately during the whole week nothing concrete was done to fill upon the general outside our work on the basis that they were operating through the employment of strikebreakers. It was evident that those workers so appealed to, would have had a real struggle to do it.

The whole system under which the men work is quite archaic from a trade union point of view. For instance the power stations are worked by 12 men, where there may be more. The maintenance workers outside are also in the same position: ETU, AEU, NUR, TGWU, NUMGW, ASW and so on.

POWER COMMITTEE NEEDED

There have been attempts in the past to coordinate these unions into one effective body, but always one union has refused at the eleventh hour. The result of this has been that where the most members are congregated, ie, in the main workshops at Acton and Chiswick, for example, there is no excellent bonus scheme which is however not extended to their colleagues outside. (Skilled maintenance members outside, earn a basic of £11 8s per week, no bonuses on top.)

What the industry needs is a fully representative rank-and-file "power committee" embracing all the unions in power supply and on a unionizing on a national basis. A demand put forward from the example of Ford's shop stewards committee. This would put an end to inter-union rivalry and lead to a new deal for all power supply workers.

This is the first step that should be taken. We must recognise that government policy dictates the wages and conditions of LTE members. Therefore the struggles of the future will become more and more fundamental as the Tories turn the screws on government spending.

We should remember that the recent bus strike was not just an industrial struggle, but also a political battle, in claiming that the bus workers wanted to "bring the government to its knees". We are in the same position on the LTE and therefore we must seek to strengthen our organization as much as possible and present a united front against any attack on any section.
Sedgwick disagrees with Rex...

P.S. Yet it is impossible to conceive of any adequate answer to, for example, Gatiskil's dire warnings of a nuclear arms race and the nuclear weapons rejection by a unilateralist Britain, unless the Campaign's "second stage" is directed primarily to peoples, if necessary over the heads of their governments. Finally, I am disappointed that Rex's advocacy of the "second stage" nowhere includes any reference to domestic problems a unilateral British government might encounter. E P Thompson's "Revolution in Out of Apathy" (reprinted in NLR) has convincingly outlined a set of possible consequences to the British re-nunciation of the Bomb (including, for example, big-business resistance) that a pre-emptive unilateralist action into fatal jeopardy unless a revolutionary transition to socialism was successfully carried through. This kind of approach amounts to saying that the "second stage" of the unilateralist case must be Socialism. So further unilateral renunciation of the Bomb must be precluded, or only must be followed, by a Socialist revolution, is a crystal-gazing detail over which I shall not argue. The point is that unilateralism must break through into Socialism, or go under. They only "institutions which will make H-bomb war impossible for all time" are those of an increasing corpus of co-operation and wealth. The fact that this solution seems very far off at present is no reason to place any confidence in apparent solutions which may seem more of the same, but halfway nothing. Until international Socialism is achieved, mankind lives in danger of extermination. On the other hand, we will not bring Socialism nearer merely by advocating it in general terms or by a campaign. Socialism must be in stating the case against the Bomb and for its un-necessariness to the many people as possible. It is the merit of Rex's pamphlet that it is an attempt to accomplish this rather indispensible, in this work. Its failings should not deter the Campaign for Socialism from attempting to do so.

... And Rex replies

I FIND Peter Sedgwick very much more Talmudist in this piece than I would have hoped. Surely, it is not good enough for Sedgwick to raise the question of the possibility of negotiations between Russia and America by quoting Bebel, any more than it is for Tony Cliff to do so by quoting Rosa Luxemburg's denunciation of Kautsky. Apart from the fact that they were not discussing negotiations between the two superpowers, Socialists must know that you might say here that the problem is the same as the problem of negotiations between the two superpowers - there is the fact that we have H-bomb today and the fact that the H-bomb war can mean is a factor affecting the motivations of Stalinist and Socialists which does not have to be taken into account by Bebel and Luxemburg.

One does not have to be a sentimentalist to doubt the proposition that capitalists and Socialists will say: "We will risk the destruction of the world rather than risk losing my profits or our weapons. Our profit and our weapons are only possible on the basis of a continuing anti-nuclear activity. This is why I think that the fact of nuclear weapons has altered the structure of world society, and that it is impossible to pursue a more socialist, which prevents people from admitting this. This is also true that old habits of thought die hard and that politicians cling desperately to the old forms of politics. But the whole point of the campaign to my mind is to break down these illusions. It seems to me to be very evident that there are divisions among the leaders on both sides of the iron curtain about the usefulness of negotiations. It is our job to begin a campaign among some of those who are realistic enough to understand what negotiations will achieve. Of course, if it is true that either capitalism or Stalinism cannot make the necessary adjustments which disarmament involves, they will collapse. I imagine for example that in Britain our slump could be precipitated by a sudden reduction of state spending. Alright, this is all rhetoric, but my worry is that the campaigners demand that full employment shall be maintained by a switch to new state expenditure, and that our capitalism can't do this, well we will rid of capitalism.

LET'S SURVIVE

The reason why I didn't discuss the problems of re-conversion are purely administrative. The second reason why I did not write anything about it was because I was to have written it but was not ready in time. I don't pretend to be an economist myself, so I don't feel that I could write with authority about this.

On U.N. It is precisely in the diplomatic situations where UN initiatives have some significance, and it is these situations which present the international situation like Africa. The problem, however, is how to resolve, say, the Berlin situation in the long run. What would you advise? I suppose, wait for the International Socialist Commonwealth, and, indeed, Hall are taking so
Nye Bevan — A Socialist analysis

BY JOHN FAIRHEAD

As I have said, the mistake was made by not following the socialist policy right through in a clean and direct fashion.

(Aneurin Bevan, In Place of Fear, p. 99.)

Bevan's death affords the opportunity to pass a review of pattern and progress of the British Left during the last 20 years. He remained so sensitive to the winds and storms which rocked the working-class movement for 50 years.

The last two important and autobiographical, written in 1952, Bevan describes his awakening to the reality of class struggle at the time of the miners' lock-out in 1921. In a passage which gives the key to his whole life, he described how his attitude changed in the workers' story of the interview of the miners leaders with Lord George Lloyd.

Lloyd George is said to have "threatened" the union chiefs with his own resignation and that of his Cabinet. And he taunted them with words which meant: "Run the country without us if you can, and if you dare".

The text of the others at once retreated. And never once down Bevan questioned their action. He draws, to be sure, the correct conclusion that the simplest syndicalism of 1910-1920 was inadequate when the chips were down. The workers, he rightly believed, must organize politically for the conquest of power.

Bevan's life, he tells us, became a quest for the source and the centre of that power and the means by which his own class might achieve it. Throughout a lifetime of brilliant posturing in innumerable mock tournaments, this crusader never reached his goal.

Fixing his gaze on the parliamentary foreground, he was aware of the Workers' Party which divided the workers and gave a clear early insistence on the subordination of the industrial struggle to the, for him, "decisive" contest at Westminster. For this reason, he homed in on power which was always beyond and ahead of the workers.

He chose to fight Lloyd George's greed, not proclaiming nor recognizing the need for workers in struggle to fashion the kind of Party which would prepare for power by seeing the capitalist state as the enemy and organizing to smash it. From his first days in politics he believed parliament and the state machine to be neutral agencies, which the workers must capture and use.

With this in mind he looked for the whole tragedy of Bevan's political life, whose final act was played out at Brighton in 1957, may be seen to assume a pattern. "Democratic socialism", he wrote (p 170) "is a child of modern society... its chief enemy is vacillation, for it must achieve passion in action in the pursuit of qualified judgments" (my italics).

The PARLIAMENTARY ROAD

Bevan's support of the People's Front before the war, like his participation in the Labour Cabinet later, was the product of this passionate pursuit of the lesser evil. His vision bounded by parliament, he was obliged to identify the enemy not as capitalism, but as the Tories.

The logic of such a position is excusable, and Bevan did not hesitate to follow it. If parliament be the seat of power and the Tory party its repository, then what is required at all costs is to secure Tories "vermin", as he rightly called them, but he shrank from insecticide.

Thus, being so, the enemies of the Tories must "qualify their judgments" sufficiently to unite against them. Within this unity, the ultimate goal must pass into the keeping of "key people", and in the last three and a half years of Bevan's life, his presence in a Labour Cabinet was the decisive factor. "You are all expendable", he told his henchmen in a famous outburst.

The important thing is that the Left-wing should benefit from Bevan's experience, which is simply its own experience refined and crystallized in the career of one man, incovertibly its most distinguished representative.

from page 4 long over this! By all means let's get on with the socialist revolution, but in the meanwhile, let's have peace.

On the question of the dangers of a German-American alliance, I would want to emphasise two points. One is that unless our unilateral action is followed by rapid moves towards international agreement the alliance will come into existence. But before we can do anything we can by internationalising the campaign to prevent it becoming effective if Athens, Moscow, and Washington agree to set it up. I was certainly at fault in my pamphlet in not emphasising this point more distinctly.

At the same time I think that a revolt of Europe against the bomb is such a speculative proposition at the moment that it is simply an illusion to suppose that this is going to prevent all this. American-German tie-up.

There are signs that it is beginning to do so. Cousins, on whom Bevan's mantle has momentarily fallen, has already placed on record that he is interested in a Labour government only as a means to remove socialists from the Cabinet.

Yet the disease is not eradicated. This very Cousins has stepped back on several occasions from calling the strength of the class into action—from the busmen's strike in 1958 to the anti-apartheid boycott in 1960, crippled by the absence of any lead to the dockers.

The British working class, revived by the post-war boom and in a stronger position than at any time since 1945, is already in a time of sharp skirmishing. In fact Smillie's story of the interview of the miners leaders with Lord George Lloyd is a parliament as anything but an incidental arena of battle, and by understanding that the state power of capitalism can be smashed only by a Party steered and prepared for this task.

Gaitskell MUST GO!

by CLLR. BILL DOW

HURRAH! for the South Paddington Labour Party motion—first in the field. The South Paddington motion which has paved the way for the "Mighty Lobby". The Saturday of the Labour Movement, that's a sharp yelp from South Paddington. These members know very well that they are voicing an opinion of many members in the Labour Party and may be certain of all the active and militant workers who have the job of facing the electorate on the doorstep whilst canvassing and, discover that after each election, that still more seats have been lost. This organisation and election machinery does not win seats. It is necessary to have a strong leadership and Socialist policy. For if we are in the condition, for example, of most Tory voters who come out to support their candidates. Our biggest headache is that good Labour supporters and sometimes life-long Labour voters don't bother to go to the Poll. The reasons given to us on the doorstep for the "stay at home" attitude is that sometimes they do not see much difference between the two parties and others say, that if the Labour Party cannot agree among themselves by continually squabbling, why should they bother to vote. The latter is quite true and unfortunately, we have lost many seats. But, who is to blame? Hugh Gaitskell asks that we fall in behind him, and everything will be OK. But the rank and file do not want to follow his suggested watered down Socialist policies, he is completely out of touch with the mood and wishes of the rank and file in the three campains of the Labour Movement, and has been personally responsible for creating an unnecessary bitterness with his new testament proposals on Clause IV of the Constitution. One Trade Union after another at its Annual Conference has rejected his proposals and backed with the Labour Party Conference, he has now made a hasty retreat and dropped the idea for an Addendum of Clause IV. The rank and file hope that this will be the last of the matter and that it will not be raised again in 1962.

SANITY AND SOCIALISM

Gaitskell and his cronies are also facing defeat at this year's Labour Party Conference on their Defence policy, for here again during the last few months, we have seen the Trade Union vote in a rising tide calling for renunciation of nuclear weapons and unilateral lead for the abolition of nuclear weapons, but aside from this, Mr. Gaitskell and his friends have drawn up a new defence strategy statement which asks the British Public to hide behind an American nuclear weapon. It was bad enough previously under a British nuclear weapon, but what an awful thought that we are suddenly faced with policy that sets us up against American nuclear weapons under the dictates of the White House and the Pentagon.

The militant rank and file of the Labour Movement are waiting for stronger and more realistic leadership. With them their clothes are old fashioned and out of date, but the basic Socialist principles remain the same.

Let's choose between (1) sanity and suicide by this country giving a lead to the rest of the world in the abolition of nuclear weapons, and (2) between complete Socialism and Liberal/Tory type of "Socialism". The rank and file of the Labour Movement have chosen sanity and support the Conference on the other side of the barrier. Under these circumstances he ought to resign and make way for a leader who understands the feelings of the rank and file.

SANS PRINZ CONSULTATION DESIGN / Editor: LUCINE DANIELS
EARLY STRUGGLES FOR WORKERS' CONTROL

A VITAL SECTOR OF LABOUR MOVEMENT HISTORY

by JAMES HIGGINS

THE issue of Clause Four has reopened the discussion on the Labour Party's socialist raison d'être, and if only for this Gaitskell and his Fregival circle are to be congratulated. The fact that the revisionists face certain defeat at the Labour conference is further cause for congratulation, and the frantic back-peddaling that the Gaitskellite arguments are in need of an injection of no little pleasure to readers of Socialist Review. The victory over the revisionists will be a hollow one however if the opportunity is not taken of broadening the discussion to include the industrial unions which have more direct connections with our socialist objectives.

It is true that nationalisation must be at the heart of socialist policy, not because we desire to replace private ownership by a state bureaucracy but because without collective ownership there can be no socialism. In this context the question of workers' control is one of vital importance if the theoretical advantage given by Gaitskell's ineptitude is to be confirmed. The issue of workers' control can once again become live to large numbers of workers in the Labour Party and Trade Unions.

The history of the fight for workers' control in the engineering industry immediately before, during and after the first world war is most effectively analysed by Branko Prlicevic in a Yugoslav research student in his book, "The Shop Stewards Movement and Workers Control 1910-1922." This analysis in the period 1910-1922 is one that can provide some useful lessons for the future.

The movement for workers' control during the period under consideration (1910-1922) was divided into three main tendencies. First the Industrial Unions largely under the influence of the success of the Wobblies in America (Industrial Workers of the World). Secondly the syndicalists led by Tom Mann and last the Guild Socialists. This last group was the most outspoken of the Labour Party and in fact whatever solid basis the movement had was founded on disillusion with the meagre achievements of the Parliamentary Labour Party in which great hopes for social and economic advance had been placed.

DIRECT STRUGGLE NEEDED

The shift in this period was definitely towards industrial action. The reason for this seems fair clear. Despite the existence of a sizable Labour group in the Commons, who it had been hoped would be instrumental in establishing minimum wages and shortening hours, in the period 1900 to 1913 wages were only 6.5%, while retail prices rose 16.5. This resulted in inflation not unnaturally was that more direct forms of struggle with the bosses were called for.

The classic socialist policy of nationalisation was to a degree discredited, owing to the increasing tendency of the government to intervene in disputes, naturally on the side of the employers. It was argued by many that if the state were only an instrument of the employers then no radical improvements could be expected from state nationalisation. It will come asanguage to many people today who have only recently realised bureaucracy as a factor in working class politics to discover that very early in the century state bureaucratic control of industry was arakatha to most industrial militants.

The theoretical point which united the three main tendencies, was the deeply held conviction that capitalism could not be destroyed by political action alone. From this basic agreement the divergence on almost all other points was extremely wide. Industrial Unionsists were organised in two sections, the Socialist Labour Party, the political wing and the Industrial Workers of Great Britain. The theory of the movement was based largely on the ideas of Daniel de Leon can be summarised.

NEW REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

The workers should unite politically and industrially in a revolutionary party and new revolutionary trade unions if they were to gain the advantage which the class struggle could provide. The trade unionists were organised in two sections, the Socialist Labour Party, the political wing and the Industrial Workers of Great Britain. The theory of the movement was based largely on the ideas of Daniel de Leon can be summarised.

had taken over the factories and mines, the socialist majority would adjourn itself.

In De Leon's words: "Any attempt to prolong the political movement would be an illusion." In an attempt to create a unified socialist society the whole administrative, economic and social structure would become the province of the Industrial Unions. This schematic approach, which failed to understand the nature of capitalist state, found few adherents mainly in Scotland. The attempts to form the new industrial unions however were a failure.

Syndicalism which was imparted from France mainly by Tom Mann who had previously been an Industrial Unionist went on to continue to call for "One union for one industry", but rejected the De Leonite method. The main feature of the Syndicalist programme was its insistence on the uselessness of political in and parliamentary action. Only through revolutionary industrial action could workers emancipation be achieved.

NO AGREEMENTS WITH BOSSES

Unlike the S.L.P. the Syndicalists were prepared to work in the existing trade unions, and by amalgamation achieve the objective of industrial unions. Because of the unwillingness to work in existing mass movements, and take part in the day to day class struggles, the movement exercised quite an influence for a time. The Syndicalists were not the only which was a victim of the 1910 welcomed everybody who was willing to take part in the class struggles.

The League insisted that the unions should not sign long term agreements with the employers and should abrogate all conciliation agreements. The ultimate weapon in the workers' class armoury would be the General Strike. If the workers, through the amalgamations and the daily class struggles, had reached a sufficient state of organisation in industrial unions the General Strike would be called, the employers expropriated and the new society under the control of the Unions proclaimed.

In general the syndicalists were deliberately vague as to the form the new society would take. Trades Councils and National Industrial Unions were the basic organs of the new society, with the Guilds taking over of managerial functions by these new unions. The employers, it was thought would not be able to resist, because the unions would have cornered the Labour market. The Guilds would then transfer the ownership of industry to Guilds of workers and consumers. The Guild Socialists evolved a complete system of organisation for the new society, which was certainly more practical than the vague generalisations of the Industrial Unionsists and the Syndicalists.

CORNERING THE MARKET

They reputedly parliamentary government on the grounds that no man could be represented in all his interests as a worker, consumer etc. The National Guild was to be an Industrial Union containing within its ranks all the technicians, managers and manual workers in the industry. Both employed and unemployed would be full members of his or her appropriate Guild. All Guilds were to be members of a Congress which would plan the economic development of the country, settle inter-Guild disputes and cooperate with the Consumer Guilds.

The method by which this desirable result was to be achieved was called "Encroaching Control" which involved the gradual transformation of the Unions into Industrial Unions and the gradual taking over of managerial functions by these new unions. The employers, it was thought would not be able to resist, because the unions would have cornered the Labour market. The Guilds would then transfer the ownership of industry to Guilds of workers and consumers. The Guilds would then plan the economic development of the country, settle inter-Guild disputes and cooperate with the Consumer Guilds.

These three trends were all represented with their faults and strengths in the shop stewards movement during the 1914-18 war. The history of this movement will be the subject of a future article.
CANDID COMMENTARY

by JOHN WILKES

The Direct Action Committee, who have planned a summer campaign at factories producing nuclear weapons, have sent out instructions to their supporters. They have been asked to dress as normally as possible; to eschew beards and pony-tails. The organisers feel that peculiar dress is likely to alienate factory workers and lessen the chances of any significant industrial action against the bomb.

This is, in my opinion, all to the good. It is high time the practising capitalists consciously strove to look normal. Quite often small things, like the way one dresses, can place an insurmountable barrier between socialists and our potential supporters. The sensational press frequently lays stress on the weird clothes worn by Aldermaston marchers and tries to give their readers the impression that unilateral disarmers are a bunch of cranks and fanatics.

Indeed George Orwell, in his book, The Road to Wigan Pier, wrote: "The danger of the whole business is that the reader gets the impression that unilateral disarmers are a bunch of cranks and fanatics.'

"One sometimes gets the impression that the mere words 'Socialism' and 'Commonsense' draw towards them with magnetic force every fruit-juice drinker, nudist, sandal-wearer, sex-man, Quaker, 'Nature Cure' quick, pacifist and feminist in England: writers with wild ideas, the short-haired Marxists chewing polysyllables...birth control fanatics and Labour Party backstairs-crawlers.'"

FOUR MINUTES

It was the Duke of Wellington, I believe, who once said when he was inspecting his troops, "I don't know if they'll scare the enemy, but they damn well scare me!"

This statement should be applied universally. All political and humanitarian considerations are irrelevant, the practical difficulties of equipping British V-bombers with the American Skybolt missile are so immense that anybody capable of second thoughts would surely have them.

The first difficulty is getting them off the ground. Mary Goldring in a BBC talk, now reprinted in The Listener (16.6.60), said: "We expect four or five minutes warning of Russian rocket attack and it takes four to five minutes now to get a V-bomber off the ground without three or four Skybolts hanging under it like Christmas-tree decorations.

With the extra drag it is going to be touch and go whether the bomber can climb to 20,000 feet before enemy bombs fall."

POT-SHOTS

But the real difficulties arise if -big IF -the V-bombers and their 'Christmas-tree decorations' get off the ground. Mary Goldring continues: "Skybolt will guide itself by the stars, but even with its guidance it is hard to see from precisely the right prearranged point. Think what that means. As any pilot he thinks he can fly a big aircraft to an imaginary pin-head fixed in three dimensions in space, in order to release a rocket, and if he does not, goodness knows where the rocket is going to go and what a comforting thought. "Goodness only knows where they are going to land!" For the privilege of having a pot-shot in the dark, the British Government is going to pay extravagant sums of money. Besides purchasing these as yet untested Skybolt missiles, it is committing having aircraft in the air all the time, as the Americans already do. This would mean that, were the V-bombers destroyed on the ground, there would still be a few already airborne that could go off on their deadly mission. But the cost of keeping one aeroplane in the air for one year is — what? You'll find the answer at the end of this column.

OVERRUNED

At the same time as millions are wasted on armaments, Britain has built no new hospitals since the war. The Health Service is overburdened and understaffed. Increased sufficiency in the Civil Service has brought home to me recently, when as a councillor, I had to consider the question of extending the sick-leave of two Council employees. They both were totally disabled, unable to work, and awaiting operations for seven months. One was the case of acute hernia, the other of an affected heart. Both employers, not as humane as local authorities, would have laid them off on full pay for seven months. They would not only have lost the benefit of their employments, but also financial hardship and worry.

The cost of keeping one V-bomber in the air for one year is £27 million.

IT'S RICH

Signor Togliatti ... denied that last week's demonstrations had been organized by the communists. On the contrary the communists had made every effort to restrain the masses.

Counsel, cross-examining Col. Piauera, head of the Sharpeville police force: "Do you think you have learned any useful lesson from the events in Sharpeville?" Piauera: "Well, we may get better equipment." Observer, July 10

It is at least discreet to remove a person, even with his consent, from his domicile in a friendly country in such a clandestine way.

The Times on Eichman, June 22

...some AEU leaders seem to take the view that the new official statement (on defence) is not in conflict with the resolution passed by their national committee.

Times, July 12

"I think Mr. Kennedy is a very suitable candidate... I have danced with him and he was a very interesting conversationalist."

Janet Leigh, actress, at Democrats' Convention, reported in Evening Standard, July 12

"Masculine clothes worn by a woman alter the woman's own psychology, they tend to vitiate her relations with the opposite sex and they probably impair her maternal dignity in front of her children."

Cardinal Siri, Archbishop of Genoa, in a letter to charges d'affaires of arch-diocese, reported in Daily Worker, July 12

Congo chaos plays into hands of imperialists

The strikes of 1955-56, and the national demonstrations against Belgian rule early last year, are the key to imperialist strategy in the Congo immediately before and after Independence Day (July 30).

Faced with a demand by all African political parties for independence by January, 1961, the Belgian rulers decided to abandon the political and administrative policies of the African middle-class leaders to prevent the onset of administrative chaos. Out of such chaos the imperialists hoped to see the rule of Union Minière and the Société Générale secured through the dismembrangement of the country and its administration by the Societe's puppets.

NO DISCIPLINED FORCE

No strong African capitalist class exists in the Congo. Even African bureaucrats are lacking, the Belgian policy always having been rigid control rather than administrative policies. The only force which could effectively have confronted imperialism, ousted it in struggle, and proceeded to construct a new order would have been an African political party based on the working class, organized and educated along Marxist lines.

Such a party is totally lacking. The Congolese National Movement (the party of the premier, Patrice Lumumba) mirrors all the weaknesses and the strength of such bodies as the Indian National Congress. The other main party, the Abaka (led by President Kasavubu) is tribalist and separatist in outlook. Only the People's Party, linked with the Left-wing of the socialist party of Belgium, even professes allegiance to socialism.

In such a situation the anger of the Congolese peasants, including the soldiers, has exploded with full force against the European oppressor, and has been diverted from the necessary ends of smashing the deceptive economic might of imperialism.

Indeed, the imperialists have been able to full advantage of the situation. Breakdown at the centre has enabled Moise Tshombe, a demagogue of small ambitions, to sc: up a Huey Long-type racket in the wealthy Katanga province. Imperial interests, Belgian and international, have muscled into suggestion federation of the Katanga with northern Rhodesia. The brain behind this scheme is said to be that of Capt E. Charles Waterhouse, former Tory MP and member of the Suez group.

WITHDRAW ALL TROOPS

Waterhouse sits on the board of Tananganyika Concessions, which is associated with Union Miniere. However, 10 per cent share in the railway which transports Union Miniere's products. This economic stranglehold, coupled with Welensky's troops, represents the main immediate danger to the Congolese.

The Labour movement here must put up pressure on the government to prevent British or Central African Federal troops from being sent to the Congo. Socialists must campaign for the withdrawal of all troops, including those of the United Nations, who are there as policemen in defence of imperialist property. Congolese workers and peasants must be free to settle their own future.

THE DIRECT ACTION COMMITTEE

Our income in July was £2,880. Our expenditure was £2,878.

Our income for the latest three months was £8,612.

Our expenditure for the latest three months was £8,610.

Our household expenses were £800.

Our income for the year to date is £28,288.

Our expenditure for the year to date is £28,286.

Our household expenses for the year to date are £3,000.

The minutes of our meeting of 29th July are attached.

WE NEED £40 a month. Up to the end of July we received £28,800. This is not enough. We have to have the support of the Labour movement.

Comrades should also remember that they could do us in the world of good and the much needed for the poor in the picture of their own countries.

Comrades! Help your paper by introducing it to your friends, by ordering bulk copys by giving donations!
THE RUSSIAN ORGANISATION MAN
by M. Turov

A NEW and interesting book "The Russian Organisation Man" by a professor making a comparative study of management in the USSR and the US has recently been published.*

When describing to American businessmen the set-up in Soviet industry Dr Turov was asked: "Why, the Russian managers use the same gimmicks as we do?" The Russian reply was: "They don't. It's just a different set of organizational problems, and the same ways of handling them..." I had rediscovered the American world of management, they said." (pp. 15-16).

The factory manager in Russia is as privileged as his "brother under the skin" in America: "It seems reasonable to think of planning and controlling a total labour force of 500-1500 employees as receiving something in the order of five to ten percent of the earnings of the average worker. To see this in American terms, the average wage rate here in America is a much smaller piece of the same pie, because according to calculations made by the American labor union leader in manufacturing in 1957 was $54.00. At American plant director would have to earn $22,000 a year in order to attain the same position relative to the average income, and this as the Russian director holds compared with the American worker.

DEFEND THE CUBAN SOLUTION

Until lately Senate Anti-Trust Committee subcommittee some votes taken by top oil capitalist, A. C. Ingraham of Socony Vacuum, at a meeting of heads of oil corporations attended by the then Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. Dulles declared that he knew "the oil companies were interested in the nationalization issue" in Iraq and the Lebanon, and that "nationalization of this kind of operation should be discussed." Not long after this meeting US troops landed in the Lebanon and the world witnessed another perilous feat of brimishment.

To make the present situation all the more ominous, there are signs that capitalism is steadily losing the economic struggle in competition with the Soviet bloc. Thus Clarence B. Randall, steel capitalist and special assistant to President Eisenhower, told the Economic Club of Detroit, December 9, 1957: "You now understand Sputnik but you don't understand the full import of the economic advantages of a country which is making swift strides in the future resources and markets of the world which are being taken away from the American business community by the Russians. I say to you as soberly as I have ever said anything in my life, free enterprise is at the crossroads today in the world. This is the ultimate and final testing of the success of our industrial way of life."

The selling of Soviet oil to Cuba at less than the fixed world price is an example of further economic inroads into the vitals of capitalism. The implications of these developments are ominous: when a ruling class begins to feel its existence depends, feelings of desperation are likely to gain the upper hand, thus leading them to press harder for a military showdown. The attitude of socialists towards Cuban solution: uncompromising solidarity with the anti-imperialist struggle of the workers and peasants of Cuba! No war for oil profits! Hands off Cuba!

At the same time, we should not have any illusions about the Castros regime and its programme. The revolution carried out under the leadership of Fidel Castro was not a socialist revolution. Batista's overthrow marked the beginning of a movement which lashes out against imperialist domination, against the semi-colonial status of the country, with its consequent restrictions on, and distortions of, Cuba's economic and social development. Today Castro's power rests on the armed revolutionary people, and he has had to respond to the pressure of the masses for whom the overthrow of Batista was only a stepping stone in the direction of independence from hunger and oppression. However the power of the people has not been consolidated by placing the nationalized concerns under workers' control and ownership, and transforming the new revolutionary organizations into the legal form of state power. This will not be done unless the working class group themselves around a consistent revolutionary socialist programme and leadership.

* Repel the right-wing challenge. From page 1, it is still here; because the border patrols are still scotting; because the 24-hour watch, H-bombers always in the air, all kept; because the money for hospitals, factories, roads, schools, houses and all the decencies of existence is still being converted into murderous projectiles and poisoned warheads; because the cloud of Strontium-90 is raining over populations, and emptying down in Hiroshima and Nagasaki; babies are still being born deformed, and girls are sterile or dying; because the threat of universal obliteration is still mouthed by our statesmen; because war began by accident; because local war might mount by stages into war by small atomic bombs, and from there into war by H-bombs; because our lives and the lives of those we hold dear are perpetually threatened by the classes in power.

Delegates, Brothers, comrades: all these things were true when your organisations voted in April, May, June and July, and they still are true when you vote next year at Congress or Conference, in September and October. Whatever the platform may say,whatever order of the chairman may rule, nothing has changed.

Change will begin when the Labour movement decides that the Bomb must no longer be made, used, or brandished, and acts upon that decision with all its power, industrial and political. There is no other way.

WORKERS' RESISTANCE

If the Russian manager is very similar to the American, the Russian worker is very different. Like his American brother. The Russian workers' reaction to pressure from above is compared to that of the American: "Just like American workers, Russians are concerned with avoiding special hard work for the same money..." (p. 214) As in the USA, the Russian worker is able to have a difficult bottleneck to overcome that of "output restrictions by wages". The eight-hour workers show resistance to the shift-work system.

The similarity in the set-up in the Russian and American factory shows itself above all in the relation between workers and foreman. "Managements in both countries have regularly wrestled with the issue of what to do with the foreman; they have come up with virtually identical theoretical solutions; and they have shared the same disapprovement with the practical results achieved." (p. 277).

MORE THAN CHAINS

The privileges of the factory management have, however, not been able to explain the conservative policies of the Soviet rulers. Neither the Red Executives nor the Party's own social democracy is any longer the revolutionary of the 1920's. When Marx in the "Capital" described the period preceding the world revolution, he addressed himself to the worker who had "nothing to lose but his chains." The Red Executive and the Party administration have a great deal more to lose—and they know it. The attitude of industry towards world revolution and other threats to peace must inevitably bear the imprint of this knowledge." (p. 19).

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The Socialist Review stands for international Socialism as the only programme of the historical working class in the industrial and political struggle against the development and overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. The Review firmly believes that a really consistent Labour Government would be brought to the basis of the following programme:

1. The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and transport with compensation payments based on a means test. Rationalisation of all de- nationalised industries without compensation.

2. The establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all instances representatives must be subject to turnover, straightforward wage indexation, and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.

3. The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions.

4. The establishment of the principle of work or full maintenance.

5. The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.

6. The reform of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities for requisition privately held land.

7. Free State education up to 18. Abolition if fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools an adequate maintenance grants—without a means test—for all university students.

8. Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers, irrespective of their colour or origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

9. Freedom from political and social oppression to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the underdeveloped countries.

10. The abolition of conciliation and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.

11. The abolition of the H-bomb and the formation of a nuclear disarmament Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.

12. A Socialist foreign policy embodied in the will of the Washington or Moscow.