TORY RAILS SWINDLE

THE new Tory scheme of reorganizing the railways is vicious and presents some obvious results. When, fourteen years ago Parliament debated the Transport Bill, Mr. Herbert Morrison emphasized that the nationalisation of the railways would "weld the transport needs of the country into an efficient and economic whole", would bring about the "coordinating" and "integration" of the transport system. It is true that the Labour Government moved only half-heartedly in this direction (as the interesting article in the present issue by Stan Mills clearly shows).

At that time the Tory spokesman in the House of Commons, Mr. Oliver Poole, evoked the loudest cheers when he said that "he could only look forward to the day when they would reverse some if not all of its provisions." The Conservatives have worked steadily to this end. What their 1953 Act began, their 1962 Act, if it follows the organization plan, will complete. The last remnants of coordination between different forms of transport will then be liquidated.

The running of the railways will be handed over to the regions; the present British Transport Commission will disappear. Ports, Waterways and London Transport, now controlled by the Commission, will be handed over to the regions.

Other Commission activities, such as hotels, British Road Services, Scottish Omnibuses Group, the Thomas Cook travel agency and the Road Freight Shipping Services, will be grouped under a separate holding company.

From here it is only a step to the handing over of the profitable hotels and catering services, the extremely valuable land properties and other fat morsels to private enterprise. The railways will be free to raise fares and freight charges as they wish. This will be done by abolishing the fares tribunal, which hitherto has had approval any increase.

"Broadly," says the Government, "this will set the size and pattern of the railway system. It is already clear that the system must be made more compact." To use more simple words: more uneconomic services will be scrapped, and the public will suffer. The productivity of labour, will have to be pushed up. And as the White Paper makes clear, the present 500,000 railway workers will eventually be substantially reduced.

The White Paper assures the railwaymen that wages and conditions will remain a national concern. However, the break-up of the unified railway system evokes the uneasy suspicion that the national system of wages and conditions will also be broken down. Railwaymen will suffer because they happen to work for a less profitable region. Of course, the Tories will have to think again if they imagine they can split the mighty railwaymen's ranks so easily.

And what about the financial side of the new arrangement? It is true that £400 million are wages paid for? The tax-payer. The old capitalists who owned the railways prior to nationalisation and the bankers who lent millions to it at high interest rates are losing nothing. Up to now, in any case, it was the general public as taxpayers who in practice bore the railways' losses. The new financial arrangement will therefore make scarcely any change as far as this public is concerned.

Speed-ups and sacking of railmen, higher fares and inferior services to the general public—this is the essence of the new Tory plan. Above all, it is the thin edge of the wedge of the restitution of the juicy monies, owned at present by the British Transport Commission, into the hands of private capitalists.

BIG BUSINESS RULES FEDERATION

BY IOAN DAVIES

The wranglings over the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland have shown the deep division between the European settlers and the African workers—but in spite of the Weeneny racist case, the facts are crueler and more basic. Though it is true that most of the Europeans are scared at the thought that Nkoma and Banda are making the final bid for power, they have much more to lose than the "white civilization" that they consider so precious. Lord Malvern, at present resident Director of the British South Africa Co., the major capitalist monopoly in the Federation, has said that African rule would be a "complete sell-out because you know the sort of thing that would satisfy them." What sell-out? The facts are grisly...

The three territories in the Federation have economies which are, in the cases of North and Southern Rhodesia, based on the rapid accumulation of profits from the mineral wealth of the Copperbelt and the goldfields and, in the case of Nyasaland, on the retarded growth of agriculture so as to keep it a source of cheap labour. The mining in Angola is a large cash industry and the reaping of huge profits—

with cheap African labour. While the 280,000 Europeans in the Federation collected £142,800.00 in 1957, the 7,000,000 Africans received only £98,200,000, and out of total profits of £110,500,000, over £50,000,000 was sent abroad.

Agricultural African workers received wages of 1/3 a day, while in the towns the average hourly wages were 1/4 to the average European worker's 14/-.

What type of economic organisation is behind this labour situation? In 1889 the British South Africa Co. was formed under a Royal Charter to control both the government and economy of the two Rhodesias. When it relinquished its administrative powers in 1920 it received half the interest of proceeds of sales of land in North West Rhodesia...
TU COMMENTARY

LONDON

BY KARL DUNBAR

The Frigidare strike is now officially in its third week. On 6th December the strikers returned to work with a notable victory to their credit. Frigidare, another American firm, subsidiary of General Motors, has for many years been the object of serious industrial agitation. Many active workers have sacrificed themselves in the past to build up a militant organisation to Frigidare workers: now these sacrifices have paid off their dividends.

Last month, Socialist Review published the Strike Committee's statement, and called for full financial and moral support for our own workers. We should like, however, to point out that we hope that our small effort contributed to the very good response from all the branches, shop stewards, committees and Labour Parties.

However, the attitude of the AGC and the Government to this strike needs taking up very strongly. For one thing, the second week in December the AEU EC issued instructions to the branches who had members involved in the dispute, to pay strike pay. All well and good, even if the workers had agreed to strike for a month. But the significant point is that the EC never did recognize Frigidare as an official shop stewards. This mouse in the corner attitude of our 'leaders' meant that the stewards had no hands, meeting rooms, picket pay, and so on, had to come from the pockets of our members out in dispute and not, as in the case when a strike is officially sanctioned, from the Union funds. Apart from this, the strikers were not even receiving the encouragement that a forthright attitude on the part of official support would have given them.

Whilst workers are engaged in the struggle, time has to be cut in with criticism. But now the struggle is temporarily over, it is time to look at the lessons gained and to attack those who show their utter inability to lead workers against their class. Let's find out why the AEU EC decided not to officially support the strike. Let's back up the Strike Committee and the General office demanding that all strikes be made official auto.

Let us show that whilst there may not be any leadership in General office there is still plenty of it on the factory floor.

GLASGOW

BY R. ELLIS

SINCE November 2nd, workers at "Caterpillar Tractor Ltd", Tannahill have been on strike against victimisation at two AEU shop stewards.

This American firm refuses to recognise the unions and it has been in the face of repeated management attacks that the workers have organised and defended their representatives.

The strike already resulted in the dismissal of the two stewards was not the first and only object of provocation. Low wages, coupled with long hours of overtime and the adamantine attitude of management, as we say, the attitude of the management finally brought the pot to boiling point.

The fact that one of the two victims was the rearward was sacked was caused for disrupting production by encouraging members to attend Trade Union meetings. The other for refusing to accept quietly his fellow stewards dismissal clearly shows his position.

The strike is 100 per cent solid and officially recognized by the AEU. The Clyde District Committee of the Confederation have pledged full support. The solidarity is being shown by other workers. Aircraft Steel Structures workers, at the Acton factory, have blacked all work from Caterpillars, and donations are being sent from all over the country.

If your branch or Shop Stewards Committee has not received an appeal, then all donations should be sent to: J. Bradley 18, Dechmont Street, Parkhead, Glasgow E.1.

BELFAST

BY J. HANNA

WHEN a ship is launched here, Sir Frederick Robbeck can be counted upon to announce how difficult things are becoming in the industry. On the 30th November he told Connel, locally that in the new year 7,000 shipyard workers must be made redundant: he forecast a thin time in 1961, too thin to look for work.

Belfast, and indeed the whole of Northern Ireland, continues to be plagued by a frightening industrial crisis. No doubt, as new industries have been established here since 1945 but full employment never has. The percentage of unemployed is rarely less than five and the unemployed are, in the main, in the province's two largest cities — Belfast and Londonderry. Recently in the latter city Birmingham Sound Producers closed up their entire factory throwing 1000 men on the dole, because of a change in company products. It seems that British companies, with branches here, are frightened to make certain changes in their British plants but are prepared to alter even their main plants to capitalise (which BSR is doing) no matter how many suffer. BSR "hopes" to have the finishing of "capital time"—renamed Monarch Domestics Electricities.

Meanwhile, the 7000 shipyard workers whose jobs are in serious danger are hoping that the "Queen" replacement from Dunbarton comes to Belfast. This writer has his doubts—the Lagan is a deep river (where it is constantly dredged) but it is not a wide one. Otherwise this yard would be an excellent choice because it is a large conventional affair—unlike the Tyne which has many small-contractors and a few big yards on its books. Ultimately I believe the choice is between Belfast and the Clyde: both have serious unemployment problems.

That ministerial jack-in-the-box Ermie Marples came over on December 2nd on yet another of his fallacy-finding trips: he met the Confed. committee and held it up to being nothing but a racket. The only thing he did was frighten the wits out of a dozen local Labour leaders—e.g., the local (in Ireland Terry) M.P.'s and businessmen—by getting them out of bed to go tearing around the shipyard with him at 7.30 in the morning.

TOO MANY UNIONS!

BY H. FALLOWS

THE Trade Unions were originally formed for workers within certain trades, Boiler makers, Sheet Metal workers etc. Since then these unions have become affiliated to other industries. An example of this is the motor industry, which has been unionized—quite with its own rules and autonomy, functioning according to the factory in which they are established. In British Steel Pressings, a Rootes Group factory, certain operations are "clipped" by a particular union, though the operations are covered by perhaps other unions. A case in point. A torch solderer, engaged by the manage-

ANTI-WAR

CONFERENCE

ON the 19th and 20th November a conference representing a number of small left of centre organizations met in Leeds. Among them were two members of the Socialist Review.

AFTER discussion, the following declaration was adopted by the conference:

1) The threatened war between the U.S.A. and her allies on the one hand, and Russia and her allies on the other, is not, and cannot be, in the interests of the working class, no matter which side, if any, is victorious.

2) The politically conscious workers are therefore called on to declare their attitude to the war preparations and policies of the imperialist powers and who ever possible, strive to win the workers to the principle of complete opposition to war.

3) Effective opposition to war is based on the struggle to end the present system of society which is the main cause of war. Realising that this must inevitably bring us into conflict with the ruling classes about the nature of the struggle necessitates the adoption of a military policy of "defence against being defeated": if the ruling class is to be defeated.

4) Full support must be given to the peoples of all lands: Anti-war Asia who are struggling against imperialism, but they should be warned of the danger of being dragged into the camp of either of the two big powers.

5) Until anti-war propaganda should be stepped up. All military expenditure should be opposed.

6) The increase in war work and the placing of armaments contracts, is encouraged by the war parties. We demand that trades unions as a means of reducing unemployment, "must", under all circumstances, be opposed, and a campaign should be conducted for alternative employment.

7) While recognising the difficulties that hinder the development of international solidarity between workers of the world, we proclaim that principle in the confident belief that a growing number of workers in all countries will move in that direction. We declare our solidarity with workers of all countries, without exception.

8) The ultimate aim is mass militancy, and the same means within our power. We support every genuine anti-war tendency, based on every section of the Labour Movement—in the trades unions, local Labour Parties, Young Socialist branches, N.A.T.O., etc. The factories, mines and workshops.

9) Unilateralists should clearly call for the withdrawal of N.A.T.O., it being absurd to suppose that an alliance domin-

contd. page 3
The burden of interest carried as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>£ 97 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>146 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>262 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

fashion they rarely give their objectives any theoretical formulisation with.

In short, I think that in fighting for 100% trade unionism, the trade union workers recognised that this involves a fight for workers' control as well. Indeed, there are already in Britain many factories and other industrial enterprises in which the working class has already laid the solid foundation required to make the

right from the start by immediately vesting the workers with authority as well as responsibility.

Of course there would probably be no immediate demand on the political right as well as some on the "left" that the approach is an oversimplification of a very big question. Certainly it is admitted that this simple approach to a problem involving such vast questions as a balanced national plan of production and investment will not by itself guarantee success for the socialisation of industry as a whole. What is claimed however, is that once a full participation of the workers in the running of industry was secured, the overall problems would be much more easily solved, workers' participation being the key to the building of a planned economy.

For this very reason the capitalist bosses fight hard to prevent the spread of 100% and closed trade union shops, even though they sometimes get a better production effort from a closed shop if they prepared to fully cooperate with it.

The greater the degree of union control of such matters as overtime, redundancy and retraining of labour, delegation of work, etc., the easier would be the vesting of real control and therefore socialisation, with the proviso of a government sympathetic to such a scheme. This is especially the case in a full employment situation which big business is forced to accept. Instead of a National Plan, it fears the reaction of the organised working class if it tried to introduce a new system of workers' control. In an empire pool which it really considers more suitable to its true economic interests.

What I am contending here is that while many trade unionists are continuing their struggle to nationalise, the workers themselves are doggedly pressing on along their own path to workers' control and in that sense to nationalisation. The politicians on the other hand think that because they are not pressing enthusiastically for nationalisation a la Mr. Gaitskell they have forsaken the struggle for socialism. Now some distance behind the workers' movement is the Labour Party. Consider how easily the worker was "laid off" and directed to the dole queue before the war, and compare this to the numerous and immediate strike actions which in recent years have prevented the boss using his sacred right to "hire and fire". Thousands of workers have now been put straight back in the factory by the action of their mates. The latest example of this is the withdrawal of dismissal notices by the powerful Hoover combine.

Once the right to "put the hammer down" if they so longed to profit the capitalist has been challenged successfully, "workers' control" has already begun to rise and "boss control" has really begun to decline.

Slowly this process is going on every day. In my own factory the workers recently put a ban on the management's co-operation in the bonus scheme to enforce the payment of the national minimum wage for young workers. In the course of this action they not only stopped all overtime, including that of charge hands and supervisor, but stopped all maintenance normally done on the factory day. Shortly after this the labourers were ordered by the supervision staff to clean out dirty machine oil, to repair boilers and extraordinary working time. On their own initiative they came to the stewards and asked if they should carry out this instruction. Obviously the idea of "workers' control" of all sides of enterprise was implicit in this action, even though it may not be consciously expressed.

If workers are prepared to discipline themselves in this way in order to reach a new level, they are also equally capable of acting collectively, to increase production instead of restricting it, to demand that they are in control in their hands and that the effort unitiedly agreed upon will be immediately beneficial to them and all on an equitable basis.

 CENT. AFRICA

from page 1

as well as certain "compensation" and the continued mining rights in Northern Rhodesia, Nyassaland, and 99% of the shares in the Rhodesia Railways Trust. It also controls a large number of agricultural areas in the South. In 1958 it received over £6,000,000 in Royalties, made a profit of £8,000,000 and paid 30% out in dividends.

The Copper mines are controlled by a number of companies which made an operating profit of £430,000,000 in 1957, of which £17,000,000 was paid out to shareholders. These companies are linked to either the American United Steel Metal Co., the Opendreger Humford Beier Interests. Some of the firms could only find 20% for re-investment in 1958, but the rest of the capital is used in the North, and the African workers one-tenth of the wages received by the Europeans. (£19 per year per worker as opposed to £1,895)

ALL WIND

It is not difficult to see Welensky's position in all this. Southern Rhodesia has the greatest proportion of white settlers, and they, in turn own a great proportion of land than do the South Africans. This is full of possibilities for control over Nyassaland. Over 55% of the land in the South is in the hands of either the capitalist farm workers, 35% of the poorer land is allocated to 2,600,000 Africans, and the rest is in the hands of the native farmers. mainly because it fears the reaction of the organised workers if it tried to introduce a new system of workers' control. In an empire pool which it really considers more suitable to its true economic interests.

Treasure the Conservative Party Holand-Martin are all sitting along with ex-MP Captain Charles ("Shoot Nasser") Waterhouse on the boards of these companies. Of course there is an economic case for the Federation—but in the case of these men, which have been created by the government of Cecil Rhodes, and the architects of Rhodesian exploitation. "You know the sort of thing that would happen," he said (a former Prime Minister of the Federation). Socialists must ensure that this consideration is clearly exposed and Lord Selvarn witness the fulfilment of his own prophecy.
Labour History

THE RADICAL TAILOR OF CHARING CROSS

BY HENRY COLLINS

JANUARY 1st is New Year's Day. It is also the 166th an-
iversary of the death of Charles II. Place, at the age of 82, after a
life-time's political activity, mingled with the splendours of
court life.

Place was a working breeches-
maker who rose to become a
master tailor. His shop at
Charing Cross was, for a time, the
main centre of radical poli-
tics in London. His vast collec-
tions of radical documents, now in the British
Museum, is still one of the
primary sources for historians of
the nineteenth century labour
movement. He was neither a
socialist nor, strictly speaking,
a labour leader. His conception of
reform was exclusively political
and he positively dreaded the
thought of revolution. Yet he
fought for the reforms he believ-
ed in with tenacity and an
impressive political talent in so
doing he contributed something
of value to the progress of
democracy in England.

GROWING

As an apprentice at his trade he
had seen the skilled crafts-
smen strike and become a
active trade unionist. In the late
eighteenth century, when the
silk weavers had begun to
spread amongst skilled
craftsmen—printers, tailors,
sweatshop owners, saddlers, brushmakers and the
like—in the form of local
trade clubs which could bargain with
single or even small groups of
employers. When trade unions
were penalised under the
Combination Acts at the end of
the century, these trade clubs
usually survived, officially as
friendly societies but in fact,
continuing to practice collective
bargaining on behalf of their
members. The threat of the
Combination Acts, of the
price inflammation which accom-
panied the Napoleonic wars,
was a constant worry to the
weavers especially in the cotton
and mining in-
dustries. The latter had to
compete with the full force of
the law. Their numbers were growing with the spread of
industry, and Place soon be-
came convinced of the
danger and futility of continued
resis-
tion.

COBEBT

With the death of Pitt, main
agent of the Whig policy of
tolerant Toryism, in 1805, there was
some rallying of the progressive forces. Robert
Cobett, a son, defending an
extension of the franchise, spread
together in the country. William
Cobett became a radical and his
Weekly Political Register arous-
ed considerable notice, not
only among the middle and
working classes in the towns but
also among farmers and farm
workers in the villages. Place,
alongside a group of radical
weavers and craftsmen, started
the Westminster Radical movement,
to capture a seat in the House
of Commons. Westminster was
one of the few parliamentary
boroughs which enjoyed a wide
franchise. Most of the skilled
workers had the vote, and in the
radicals ran Sir Francis
Burder and Lord Cochrane
as Whigs and Place, "Our attempt," wrote Place,
became the scorn and contempt
of the old guard. Sir Joseph
Tories, not one for the people.
They devised us no little, and
laughed us to scorn. What a
parcel of people were who were
nothing, common tailors, and
Barbers and snobs (i.e. Shoe-
makers—H. C.), to presume to
carry Westminster."

They carried it, in the same way,
the revival of nineteenth century
radicalism after the savage
repression of the anti-Jacobin
period, may be dated from
this victory.

The war lasted, and for
some time after, nothing much
could be achieved in the way of
reform. The period following
the battle of Waterloo was one of
dislocation, heavy unemploy-
ment and revolutionary unrest,
cumulating in the killing
and maiming at Peterloo, already
referred to. This produced a
revival of the High Toryism
among sections of the
middle class. The trade revival
which began in 1820, with the
re-opening of markets in
Europe and South America,
strengthened the demand
for a major element in the ruling
class. Lord Castlereagh's suicide in 1822
was also a great help." Place
wrote, on the time ripe to
organise pressure for the repeal of the
Combination Acts.

"These Manchester yeomen
and magistrates are a greater
set of brutes than you form a
conception of... What but
what has happened could be
expected from these fellows
when left loose... The law will,
from the want of proper inter-
fERENCE, afford no redress.
Should the people seek it
by shooting their enemies one
by one and burning their factor-
ies, I should not be at all
surprised, nor much outra-
ged..." (Frances Place, com-
menting on the Peterloo mass-
aacre, in a letter to J. C.
Hobhouse, August 20, 1819.)

Place himself was a qualified
supporter of trade unionism. Workers
should have the right to
organise and have some say
regulating their conditions of
work. They could not hope
to raise the level of real wages
which were governed, in his
view, by external iron laws of
cost and demand. But how could
the workers realise these facts of
economic life while they were
subjected to unjust discrimina-
tion? Let them be given freedom
to organise and they would soon
discover for themselves the right
channels in which to direct
their energies.

So with Joseph Hume as his
parliamentary agent and J. R.
McCullon as economist, Place
set to work to demolish the
repressive Acts. The Com-
mons was induced to set up
a Committee on Artisans and
Machinery. Place packed
the committee to skill the work-
ing class witnesses. He did not
like the way the repealing Bill
had been drafted by the barrister
employed by the Attorney-
General. "We attacked his
draft," wrote Place, "and after-
wards the printed bills. He paid
but little attention to us, but it
so happened that when the bills
were once printed he considered
himself as having performed all
that he was likely to be re-
numerated for, and he gave him-
self no further concern about
them. We now got them into
our hands, altered them as we
liked, as MS. copies made and
presented to the House. No in-
quiry was made as to who drew
the bills; they were found to
contain all that was needful, and
with some solicitude in seeing
members to induce them not to
speak on the several readings,
they passed the House of Com-
mons almost without the notice
of members within or news-
papers without."

NATIONAL UNION

Once the Government realised
what it had done, or rather that
what it had allowed to slip pass,
there was a powerful movement
in the middle and working
classes. Place countered as
best he could; in the event, an
amending Act was passed in
1825, which left the unions with
the right to organise, though
striking and picketing were still
subject to severe legal restraints.

The other main achievement
of Place's life was the Reform
Act of 1832. A moderate meas-
ure to extend the franchise had
been introduced by the Whig
Government of Lord Grey and
rejected by the House of Lords
in October, 1831. Place organi-
ised the National Political Union
with middle and working class
members to organise support
for the Government. Since the
Bill in question did not propose
to enfranchise the workers but
only the middle class, a section
of the working class, organised
in the National Union of the
Working Classes and Others,
opposed it. Place believed, how-
ever, that the Bill was the most
logical measure attainable at the
time and that, once the aristo-
ocratic monopoly of political
power was broken, the way
would be open for further pro-
gress. He organised massive de-
monstrations, which sometimes
developed into riots. He sup-
ported a move to withhold taxes
until the Bill was carried. Generally,
he helped to produce a climate
of opinion in which the Lords
could be persuaded into passing
the Bill, which became law in
the following year.

BENTHAMITE

More than any other radical of
his time, Place believed in
mass movements and understood
the art of organising them. For
him, that the movements must be led by the middle
class and restricted to middle class
demands. This was not because he was a conservative, but
because he genuinely believed, as a fol-
lower of Ricardo and Bentham,
that the middle and working
classes, properly understood, coincided. They
should combine to demand
anarchic legislation based on
aristocratic privilege.

Later, Place gave tepid sup-
port to the Chartists, helping
Lovett and his London Working
Men's Association write the
first draft of the People's Charter
in 1836. After the rejection of
the second Charter Petition, in 1842,
Place went to work to unite the
middle and working classes
behind a programme of man
hood suffrage. The secret ballot
was added in the
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LABOUR AND THE BOMB

The irony of a Labour Party having to argue whether to accept or reject nuclear weapons might not be widely appreciated, but it can have escaped few people that defence policy and the fate of the party are mutually contingent. A decision on defence that the Left has scored its only significant victory these last years; it is on defence that the Gaiteskellite Right has decided to ‘fight, fight, and fight again’.

It is easy to minimize the Left victory at Scarborough, to impute it to the unsound arithmetic of block voting, or to point to the majority that Gaiteskell could claim amongst Constituency Party delegations. The Left has its realists. The point to remember is that this is the first issue for many years on which block vote arithmetic has added stature to the Left rather than the Right, and this represents a potential advance. The Left has grown from a handful two years ago to well over one-third this time. On defence, the Left is clearly riding a tide of feeling unique since the early post-war years. This is what has given it a claim to party policy. For the moment, le parti et la maison.

But it is as easy to exaggerate the extent of victory. However powerful the revaluation from the humanities of nuclear logic, it is a reaction from one hypothetical front of a policy issue, which is yet unchallenged by the Left at large, as by the bulk of workers. The Bomb is the monster issue of a world divided into nation states. The Left might show its greatest weakness, in fact, by fighting against it. The Bomb is, part by part, it is not. Gaiteskell’s policy has strength because it appeals to a fabric of traditions; it is ‘realistic’ because recognisable. The Left has still to win a battle. ‘Fight, Gaiteskell’s “internationalism” of states, with an internationalism of its own—of workers.

SECTION OF WORKERS

This is not a matter of merely finding arguments to match Gaiteskell’s. The Right’s most powerful weapon is their control on the party and trade union machine and the unscrupulous use they make of it. Long before Scarborough, members of the Municipal and General Branches of Labour in their unilateral resolutions were endorsed by an official-convened and official-inspired recall conference. Leaders of the Amalgamated Engineering Union have forced their members to organize in ways like the two-headed ass. More recently, London and Middlesex Young Socialist Federations have been hammered out of shape under official guidance; and party members known for their activities on the Bomb and related matters have been ousted. These are mere pointers to what might be. The Gaiteskellites will certainly tighten their grip on the Parliamentary Labour Party; ever, it seems, at the price of a split. The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament is under fire. Most important of all, the Right is attacking the formal suzerainty of Conference over the Parliamentary Party.

The Left is in no position to face Gaiteskell’s machine with one of its own. Our organizational resources reflect our weakness in policy. If we place the question of unemployment on the spontaneous recruitment of people to implement them. Our strongest weapon would be to link the issue of defence with the stuff of ordinary life on which workers have shown unshakeable convictions to the point of heroism.

From this angle, it is significant that those sectors of workers that have been engaged in industrial struggle latterly—railwaymen, engine drivers—are in general the most outspoken unilateralist. It is even more significant that the Central London busmen, highly critical as they are of Cousins’ leadership on industrial matters, are solidly behind him. It is obvious that progress the Left lies in breaking down the high states of nuclear diplomacy into the small chips of class struggle.

The Left and the Right is nothing in the record of its accepted leadership to suggest that it will organize around a program of argument by action rather than by word, or indeed, that it sees any connexion between Boss and Bomb. On the contrary, to date it has remained a prisoner to the basic Gaiteskellite assumption: that defence is a national issue, not a class one, and has been able to find none better than the anti-unilateralist Wilson as alternate party leader.

UNITY OF WORKERS

What now? Without mass struggles to force its hand, the Left and the Right have come to very much the halting and unyielding class as a whole and action. It is thus unlikely to break Gaiteskell’s hold on the party machine. But neither can the Right view the prospect with equanimity. If its defence issue has led them to question the party constitution and thereby with the system which left decisions to a handful of trade union leaders. These might like Gaiteskell’s policy but they cannot all enjoy his arrogation of power and their own relative eclipse.

Pulled by the traditional power structure towards the Left and by the traditional arguments towards the Right, they are unlikely to make a clear-cut decision. On the contrary, impatience with political feuds which cannot be seen to have any direct relevance to their problems will reinforce the many other attractions of the soil of class struggle. It represents the unity and working-class bias of the Labour Party. In order to win, the Left will have to recognize at some point that the fight need not be the cause of the split. The Bomb, in this, is victory. This points to the need for a growth of white-collar occupations, the seeming permanence of full employment, the diversification of conditions within and between industries—political parties, and the fact that the Gaiteskell wins ultimately, the price the party will be asked to pay is the enormous one of further weakening the links between organized industrial workers and the other classes.

The issue of defence is too fateful for reconciliation. The Left might be muddled and disqualified, but it represents a real protest against the implications of Gaiteskell’s policy. It represents the possibility, at last, of embedding anti-nuclear politics in the soil of class struggle. It represents the unity and working-class bias of the Labour Party. In order to win, the Left will have to recognize at some point that the fight need not be the cost of the split. The Bomb, in this, is victory. This points to the need for a growth of white-collar occupations, the seeming permanence of full employment, the diversification of conditions within and between industries—political parties, and the fact that the Gaiteskell wins ultimately, the price the party will be asked to pay is the enormous one of further weakening the links between organized industrial workers and the other classes.

The above article is the first of three editorials in the current issue of International Socialism published this month. The others deal with the relations between Russia and China, and the Cuban Revolution.

PENSION VS WINDLE

By STAN BEDWELL

DURING the General Election last Autumn, one of the issues was whether the Labour Party’s driving national superannuation plan was to give a chance to get going, or whether the Tories counter-scheme was to be operated. The Tories won the election hence the Government’s new grandiose pension scheme which is to operate from next April.

As most revolutionary socialists will have noticed, Mr. Gaiteskell failed to display himself as the champion of the workers (he has never been a member of the working-class and has never had to eke out a living like a worker) Harold Macmillian had him on the ropes during nearly every round of the election.

COMPETENT?

If Mr. Gaiteskell had the ability to fight, fight and fight again on bread and butter issues on terms which every worker can understand he may have thoroughly exposed the new Tory fraudulent pension scheme. If it can be shown that the Tories are about to swindle him on a simple question like finance security in old age, the chances are that the worker will begin to see the hoax of the great so-called nuclear deterrent policy.

But, of course, Hugh, Douglas, Tony and Roy (right-wing Labour theorists) don’t see much need to fight the Tory defence policy so there is not much fight on domestic issues either. The two go together: if the Tories are competent to run Britain on the next count, why not on the other?

COPYING LABOUR SCHEMES

Although there was criticism from some left quarters about the Labour Party superannuation scheme, and many of its proposals was justified because it failed to meet the problem of working-class old age right now, on the whole the idea of a half-pension entitlement by virtue of the insurance principle, had a familiar face. A couple of hundred jobs in the book of the working class shut out from any decent pension.

Then again, the Labour scheme was not exactly a half-pension scheme because for lower-paid workers it proposed to allow the benefit of more than half pay and, in the case of big-

FRANCIS PLACE
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and triennial parliaments. He founded the Metropolitan Parliamentary Reform Association to campaign for the Reform Act 1832 but this time met with little response. He had outlived his political youth.

Place believed profoundly in the workers and in the contribution he was convinced they could make in a capitalist society freed from monopoly and Tory ownership. He died in the period immediately before the emergence of the working class as an independent force in British politics.

"So Castlereagh has cut his throat! The worst of this is that his own was not the first" expressed the Contemporary View.

"A favourite punch-bag for Marx in Capital."
PENGUIN Books have pro-duced their finest treatment of Lady Chatterley's Lover with a quaint blurb. "If anyone is making up a book on authors who flunked the Hells Angels in 1960" it says, "then D.H. Lawrence has claims to be the favorite villain of this source of plug?—The Times!

Anybody who followed the trial, or read the brilliant accoun-t of it which Kenneth Tynan published in the Observer, which should certainly be repub-lished as a pamphlet, will know that there were certain people who had very strong objections to allowing Lawrence to "come into his own". Indeed, the Times itself was not conspicuous-ly in the front of the battle against such people. Well, we won. But does that mean that Lawrence has come into his own? I think not.

GREAT BOOK

"Lady Chatterley's Lover" is a very great book and now we have it whole for the first time. The mutilated edition is at halt without it. Lack of luck would be Crime and Punishment if author-i-ty saw fit to excuse its murderers.

It is the greatest crime of our betters that they have lamed D.H. Lawrence for so long. They have lamed real people and their loves wholesale down the years, so that the efforts of Mrs. Pro-estes Grundy in literature have to be measured against her triumphs in life. Going to the gallows of her crusade against the living that we have at last defeated her onslaught on life and women: fiction is a book brought us into a part of the inheritance that the great ones have so long been savaging (up to their luxury editions), and for that we should give praise. But that doesn't mean that Lawrence has come into his own. On the contrary.

I am not going to claim that Lawrence was a socialist and didn't know it; he wasn't, and did. I am claiming that he became one of us; and certainly that he was not, as Christopher Caudwell once foolishly thought, a fascist. This natty character-isation has survived Caudwell long after some of his greater work has had to show him in limbo as if there were
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"Billy Liard" is fortunately not overloaded with plot but is content to tell simply of the topoy-tury adolescent world of Northern Provincial Billy, whose implausible and unconvincing past persists lies get him into awkward-situations—like getting engaged to a girl in the wrong town and falling in love with a third. Billy tells lies to his father and makes him say "bloody" to the judge. Billy's mother is a desipar, and to his grandmother, who, in the middle of the second night, is discovered with a taxi driver, adding a dash of unwelcome melodrama. In fact, Billy's world is a world of make-believe, of retreat from reality. And who can blame him? The world his parents' generation created, con-sists of lies, half-lies, whole lies and high-pressure lies.

Billy is a complex character and as a character, our age, mixed-up, restless, ambivalent, shunning adult values and in-teresting for what is wrong with our society, that our values are distorted, but which, above all, is his complete realis-m. He is a character with whom we may not always agree, but who is nevertheless a far more promising creation than any of our post-war novels.

On the level of entertainment, "Billy Liard" provides a number of good laughs at the expense of the town. Billy is trying to get an arm around his first—and rather unappetising friend who says he, Billy, is a good sportsman and says she, coyly edging away with an air of experience. That is he is also trying to get the ring back for a short while, so as to let his second fiancée have it for a time only serves to make things more awkward for him. Suspensions are aroused, the truth discovered and Billy has to face his first really big sto-ick. Of course, Mother did not approve of "No. 2"—a tight-skirted, peroxide, stil-shirted girl who is a "honest Palais de Danse. But, undoubtedly the highlight comes in the thing that he does in the garden. He takes an ordinary garden-cane and in imagination transforms it into a huge and in-tones the Last Post, into an N.C.O.'s swagger-stick and into a number of other things. Here, Billy becomes, paradoxically enough, a little more than a dreamy, mixed-up kid, still des- perate to be more of himself but more adult.

The scene, played as a tragi-comedy, is remarkable. Old Albert Finney as something more than a breezy comic, as an actor of true sensitivity whose performance in the film "Saturday Night and Sunday Morning" was certainly not at the West End theatre and the whole bore of the film is an attack on the system, whose production had pace and which was otherwise unobtrusive. Which is as good as productions should be.
Pensions
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generated incomes, it was less than half pay. Again, a pension scheme was
planned to take the lion's share of the contributions from the employer, i.e. 5 per cent with 3 per cent worker and 2 per cent from the state.

Private superannuation schemes are usually based upon per-
centage contributions on all earnings with a sometimes 50- 50 split between employer and employee. When a worker leaves or gets the sack (whether in a small pension scheme or a large superannuation scheme) he usually forfeits all the employers' contributions.

The Labour Party scheme, in-
introduced by Crossman at the Conference at Brighton in 1957, had for the first time, secured approval from the TUC for such ideas to be embodied in a state scheme. That is, uneven con-
tributions and uneven benefits. Hitherto, the TUC policy on pensions had stuck rigidly to the principle of a flat rate contribution and a flat-rate benefit. High paid workers got the same as low paid workers. But the time employers and trade unions, industry by industry, have pressed for occu-
pational schemes over and above the state flat-rate scheme ('From April next', it will be £14.12.6d for a couple and £27.17.6d for a single person, and, of course, this heavy increase in contributions).

So we have to concede that, by and large, the scheme has con-
tributed uneven contributions with matching contributions from the employers on the basis of earnings. In other words it is conceded that pensions will be unequal when drawn, as wages are unequal, when negoti-
ated by trade unions.

SPECSULATOR'S PARADISE

According to the "Financial Times", a successful property developer can expect a building, when completed, to be sold and sold off into an institution's property portfolio, to yield some 25% on the capital investment.

The journal gives the size of recent large schemes, via Bluebridge and Blackfriars, Hammersmith (London) £6m (this includes civic centre, shops, etc.—both Hammer-
smith), Bradford £5m and Ifford £5m (this includes civic centre, shops, etc.—both Harlow, Essex) £1.5m (shopping centre, hotel, etc.—E. Alex Colman and Bernard Sunley Investment Trust). (Financial Times, 23 November, 1960).

In the pamphlet it sets out the scale of contributions and the scale of benefits and explains why employers generally are sending to "contract-out" the best paid workers and "allow-
ing" their lower paid and parti-
cularly women workers to go in.

In recent months shop stewards and workers representatives everywhere have been trying to work out what is the best course of ac-
tion to press upon the employers. They have generally found (as the L.R.D. did) that higher paid workers i.e. £14 and £15 and onwards per week, can get better terms from an insurance company. There cannot be a bigger indication of the Tory scheme.

Workers in the state scheme will have to live well above the national expectation of life to get their and the employers con-

tributions back. Even, if so, the maximum benefit obtainable (if in it from 18 to 65 contributing £15 earnings or more the foregoing principle might mean that a future Chancellor would "rob" housing benefit) could be best to stick to the "insurance" principle based upon individual and employer and state contributions.

The operation of the Labour scheme would have meant eventually that the employer ad-
vantage of having workers in his grip because of pension contributions (particularly older workers from about 50 onwards) would have been bypassed. The onus of joining the proposed state scheme would have been on the individual.

There is a considerable public sympathy for the problem of being old, so the Tories have brought out a miserable caricature of the Labour Party scheme known as the Graduated Pension Scheme.

HOW IT WORKS

The Labour Research Depart-
ment (on the list of proscribed organisations because of past and present links to Stalinist control) has done a good job with its advice service and its little pamphlet Pension—Should We Contract Out?.

SCHEME

If workers are contracted-out by employer action, if they are sacked or leave, the employer has to "buy" them into the state scheme at the rate of 7/8 per week for every week out of it. The employer can recover half his cost of so doing from any lump of money which might be due back to the worker under his occupational scheme. He must not take it out of wages. "Thus the principle embodied in the Labour scheme for work-
ners to go from one employer to another and take employer/ worker contributions intact for ultimate pension entitlement, is contained in the Tory scheme. In many cases where high pay workers are concerned, employers are preparing new schemes or improved schemes especially to contract-out the state arrangements. It means greatly extended business for the insur-
ance companies which are really underwrite the occupational pensions and often append a life assurance as well.

WHAT TO BE DONE?

It is not hard to expose the Tory pension snivdle. Its full effect will be realised in April. It offers the Labour Party the chance to fight on a simple domestic issue of the people's resources are to be allocated to the aged of the present and the future? Labour ideology would thus be affairs are as assured. If they had to live workers and die like them as they have and would have much more "storage" for anti-Tory attitude in and out of Parliament.

The leader of this Majesties more or less, the Opposition cannot fight the bomb and he cannot fight Tories on anything else either. It is about time he went around with his "Gaitskellism" as well.

Here is an opportunity to re-

poll Labour's strength by a nation-
wide exposure campaign if only we had a leadership capable of it.
WHO IS KILLING THE RAILWAYS?

THE Government's licensed trick cyclist and minister of transport Mr Marples surely doesn't think he is fooling anyone when he suggests that the Government is convinced that the railways on railway re-organisation is an impartial committee of disinterested citizens. The four tycoons who compose this committee are Sir Ian Macpherson, Mr H. A. Benson an Accountant and Company Director. Between them these worthies hold directorships valued at one thousand pounds a year. Despite strong and persistent pressure the committee had no representatives from the Trade Unions or the Nationalised industry the Stedeford Committee remains unsullied by any kind of working class representation.

It was the activities of businessmen such as these who in the years prior to nationalisation brought the railways practically to a standstill. Big Business with the connivance of both the Labour and Tory governments has been looting the Railways since Nationalisation.

The Transport act of 1947 was intended to provide an integrated Transport system but Labours' policy in fact was feebile in the extreme. In 1948 alone it allowed the issuing of 590,516 'C' Licences for taxi drivers and the railways by 1959 there were 1,317,472 such licences in existence. When this competition began to develop the railways with their scanty resources and burdened by the pension payments were unable to compete. With the process of nationalisation of road transport the chance to integrate transport and give the service to the public and wages to the workers in the industrial process. But even between road and rail it can only lead to the ruin of both with the railways carrying too few goods and getting deeper and deeper in the red, and road transport not even being able to cover its costs.

In the early years of nationalisation before the rise of road services, it would have been quite possible for the railways to retain much higher profits than in the past. But if they had been allowed to raise freight charges to the big industrialists. With a bipartisanship that is truly astounding both Labour and Tory governments refused this request. The result was that the nationalised railways were saddled with an immense mass of compensation debt to old shareholders, facing new debt in the form of modernisation loans to repair the ravages of years of constant cutbacks in passenger and freight services. They were left with meagre profits and low uneconomic freight charges. One of the main victims of this policy was of course the railway worker. Little wonder then that the railways slid further into debt. This is likely to be aggravated as the charges for using the railways will be expected to meet interest charges of 110 million pounds.

The only way to help the railways is to remove the crushing burden of accumulated losses and get the money to invest in new equipment and new structures for the future. In the meantime the present state of the railways has to be transferred to the exchequer and the railways given a fresh start. To imagine that Sir Ivan Stedeford and his co-representatives of nationalisation have any sympathy with such a scheme is to conjure up miracles. The whole trend of public transport is to rationalise and close down on the grounds of profitability without regard to the needs of the travelling public. With the closing of branch lines and the curtailling of services we shall shortly have the worst transport service for 50 years.

The labour movement must insist on the nationalisation of pas senger, road and commercial transport and the end of cut-rate competition. Both post war governments have failed to come to grips with our transport system. What is needed is an up-to-date transport system based on the best organisation and technique can give. No hand to mouth subsidies will do. The railways must be relieved of the total burden of debt and they and road transport force us to work full time. This is the new form of activity that is why the Stedeford committee will only delay the basic changes that are needed. Ultimately the problems of our transport system like the rest of our economic difficulties rests with the questions of political control.

Although improvements can be won by a determined fight we cannot expect to get everything we want in the next few years. The majority of the part time members of the British Transport Commission share between them, in common with the Stedeford committee, many directorships in privately owned concerns. Their attitude to the Railway workers is unlikely to be any more favourable than other private employers. Most railwaymen understand that it is not nationalisation that has failed, but its operation in the interests of the stockholders, business executives and directors of the interests of the railway men and the public. The Labour Movement must insist that any future Labour Government must replace the private railway companies and we can really get down to the job of planning our transport system.

"NEW ADVANCE" — OLD RETREAT

BY GEOFF WESTON

In 1955 the Labour League of Youth was disbanded. This incident fact reared its head in the Labour Party of one generation. Early this year the Party leadership unhappily watching their membership and support rapidly going, suddenly awoke to the need of a League and one was constituted upon a national basis. Accordingly, the Young Socialists were formed and last month Transport House issued its first number of a monthly to "fully meet the needs of the (Young Socialist) branches." I submit that "New Advance" does nothing of the sort and is merely another example of the leadership using Party organisation to advance their own particular and sectional interests. A brief glance through the pages of "New Advance" shows pictures of Comrade Gainskilb and Sophia Loren and indicates that the leadership want, and are prepared to spend Party funds, to create a faithful puppy which will dutifully and obediently die at the breads of Mother Hench. Moreover, noticing that there was a complete ignoring of the two things that make a healthy youth; nuclear disarmament and Youth Section organisation and concluding from quotations from "New Advance" aimed at projecting a desirable image may profitably be compared with what every Young Socialist should know.

A "New Advance" reporter declares that "the youth of this country is getting to its feet, speaking its mind, demanding to be heard. And we will go on demanding to be heard, however much the establishment may try and stifle us." The Editor himself then concludes that "the Young Socialists are now an important voice in the Labour Movement." Are we really heard and important? Alas, the truth is that the leadership are doing all what they can to stifle us; except of course, the tragi-comic youthful pink revisionists that still pimple Y.S. branches and in one case, rule—almost as absencesent as the mighty Superman Hopsit. For instance, the Y.S. Area Federations are not allowed to pass 'political' resolutions. "It's not for the "New Advance" to be "New Advance" and the file is open", said one paid official when he gently added a right-wing "New Advance" to the files of the Federation. Yet our National Youth Officer can write, "Your programme must be based on unshakable educational base." I suppose political resolutions are fine; but only if they go to G.M.C.s. where they are rejected behind the arid but important rows over 11 month's rates. Of course, we are getting our National Conference—at Easter, that may possibly be a coincidence with Aldermaston.

Perhaps the most enlightening feature of "New Advance" is the implied political relationship between Y.S. branches and the adult Party. In an article reprinted from the "Guardian" Mr. Richard Marsh M.P. clearly reveals the cynical attitude that the leadership holds towards us. He writes that the "Young Socialists are never satisfied with merely sociability and an atmosphere of political activity is marked by a lusty contempt for authority and a determination to create Socialist Utopia by the end of the week." This is his excuse for the lack of enthusiasm shown us by party officials. The inference is clear; many party officials don't want a Socialist Utopia. A "contempt for authority"? Yes; only because that authority is dictatorial and denies us freedom of expression for the Committee", said one paid official when he gently added a right-wing "New Advance" to the files of the Federation. Yet our National Youth Officer can write, "Your programme must be based on unshakable educational base." I suppose political resolutions are fine; but only if they go to G.M.C.s. where they are rejected behind the arid but important rows over 11 month's rates. Of course, we are getting our National Conference—at Easter, that may possibly be a coincidence with Aldermaston.

A "contempt for authority"? Yes; only because that authority is dictatorial and denies us freedom of expression for the Committee", said one paid official when he gently added a right-wing "New Advance" to the files of the Federation. Yet our National Youth Officer can write, "Your programme must be based on unshakable educational base." I suppose political resolutions are fine; but only if they go to G.M.C.s. where they are rejected behind the arid but important rows over 11 month's rates.

The situation is certain to be repeated, because the leadership realise that radical youth politics is inevitable. The Party is trying to steer between a waterfall and a whirlpool. The waterfall is carrying away many of the traditional labour supporters through apathy; old age and death. The whirlpool is youth; radical, iconoclastic and restless, stirring up ideas and rejecting traditional political concepts. The support is 'there but it is still isolated. Aldermaston COULD have provided a base for the growth of a virgin youth movement. But, by floundering between these, the youth of Labour have not been destined get the worst of both.

FIGHT

It is plain from "New Advance" that the leadership is terrified of a POLITICAL youth movement. It is a movement that shows the way out of this, that we will never get it with our present leadership. Thus, the rest is clear.