GIVE GAITSKELL MARCHING ORDERS

THIS year the march against the Bomb will be massive. More trade unions and Labour Parties will bring their banners than before. More supporters will be there. Young Socialists will be present in strength, despite their Annual Conference (arranged by some extraordinary coincidence for the same weekend).

But one banner will be missing, unless even at this late hour a correction is made. The Labour Party, which decided for unilateralism at Scarborough, will not be represented by its National Executive Committee. A careful study of everything that has recently come out of Transport House does not reveal an intention on the part of the Leader to set an example, his knapsack on his back.

Marxists have consistently argued that the heart of the movement against war must be the organised working class. Unless this heart is sound, the motions of the limbs will be feverish; the brain will be clouded.

That is why, much as we have admired the courage of the Direct Actionists, we have criticized their methods. To kick an opponent in the shins is good. To deliver a body blow to the solar plexus is better. The working class, which by withdrawing its labour could end the H-bomb, is the only force which can deliver that blow.

The workers are not ready for this action yet. But their Party has decided against the bomb. And the Party, mobilized fully in support of its decision, could and should be preparing the whole class for action on the question.

If the leaders of the Party had really wished to carry out the instructions given them by conference, they would at once have approached the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament with proposals for joint action. They would have offered the support of every constituency and ward in organising this year’s march. They would have suggested that they themselves should march at its head.

The attitude of the CND to these proposals is (and is likely to remain) a matter for conjecture. But it is hard to believe that even the most determinedly “non-political” of its supporters would have rejected them out of hand.

But the Labour Party Leader and Deputy Leader, who do not carry out conference decisions, but spurn and sabotage them, have naturally no intention of doing otherwise on this occasion.

At least they should be told the views of the rank and file. At least they should be made aware of what is expected of them. Constituency Labour Parties should demand official support for the Aldermaston March, with the participation of the NEC. They should say to the gentlemen who for the time being are floating on top of this Labour movement: “Lead in the spirit of decisions taken—or get out!”

REGULAR readers of Socialist Review will perhaps have ceased to examine our program—WHAT WE STAND FOR”—on its monthly appearance on page eight.

This issue carries a completely new formulation of ‘WHAT WE STAND FOR’. It is hoped that this new presentation will be of more use to comrades in arguing the relevance of Socialist ideas to their fellow factory and Labour Party workers.
TU COMMENTARY

KARL DUNBAR

A EU Assistant General Secretary, Ernie Roberts was forced to withdraw his name as a sponsor to the recent Daily Worker conference, under threat of a possible ‘Protest against the Labour Party’. For Bro. Roberts this was not the first time such threats had been made, although his support for various public meetings has always been in his personal capacity and not that of his organization.

This interference in the right of the individual to publicly support causes in which he believes, should be condemned in the strongest terms by all who believe in freedom and democracy. Today it is Bro. Roberts, tomorrow it could be you.

FROM Germany comes the news of a plan to get non-unionists to contribute to union funds. We must agree that this is a new one in industrial thinking, but unfortunately there is a nasty sting in the tail.

The Building Workers Union chairman, George Leber, argues that a ‘solidarity contribution’ by all workers is ‘fair’ because of the material benefits enjoyed by those workers through union negotiation. This is certainly an arguable point, one which could well be discussed in our own movement, and there would be some very interesting views put forward.

In the case of the German TU movement prosperity has resulted in a sharp decline in union membership. Ten years ago 40 percent of all workers were organised, today that has fallen to 32 percent.

Perhaps it is because of this that Herr Leber adds the sting of ‘compulsory arbitration’ to the proposal. But to Harrow workers of their one weapon, the right to strike, is a price too high to pay for any immediate and certainly temporary benefits.

SOCIALIST REVIEW

Jim Stevens, ETU

WITH last year’s victories of the London Transport power workers—women workers at Wigan, etc.—there is a possibility that a long last Central Electricity Authorities’ rates and conditions for workers in the electrical engineers department—one problem remained unsolved, and is receiving the full attention of both rank-and-file members and TU officials.

This is the total inadequacy of the BTC’s Sick Pay and Pension Scheme. The pension scheme is governed by Act of Parliament and is therefore not negotiable, but we have room to manoeuvre over the sick pay scheme.

“If we can work under CEA conditions why can’t we be under the same conditions?” says the ETU’s National Officer, Bill Benson, thereby echoing the opinion of the vast majority of the workers. An attempt has already been made by T&G to evaluate the CEA sick pay scheme in terms of a weekly cable allowance paid to us in our wage packet. This was rejected by the TU officials who received the endorsement of the vast majority of our members. This attempt to give a few pence to a man when he is fit and well and full pay when he needs it most is utterly ridiculous and will be resisted with all means at our disposal.

Attempts are still being made by some shop stewards to heal the splits in TU unity which occurred during the power strikes. A small chink of light is the attempt in the Sub Station Employees’ action to reconvene the now extinct shop stewards’ monthly meeting which gives us a chance to shop floor stewards to have direct access to those stewards who sit on the official negotiating machinery. If this is successful it could be the break through we are working for.

COUNCILS IN CRISIS

By Ray Challinor

COUNCILLOR—NEWCASTLE—STAEFS.

The Labour Party’s National Executive Committee, having acquired an aversion to all conferences since Scarboroughe have decided not to hold a conference for Labour Groups on Local Authorities this year. It took this decision, I might add, quite unilaterally, without first seeing whether the Liberal or Tory Parties intended to suspend theirs. Also, it is, in this decision, without considering the urgent needs for co-ordinating local government policy as a whole and all efforts to bring the rates, a feeling of discontent prevalent in the strike shows, could be harnessed against the Government. However, where Labour groups get carried out directives from Whitehall, becoming better little but than tools in every sense of the word, this argument is much more often the Labour Party that receives odium.

Councillors are frequently affected by a peculiar disease—council cretinism—by which they spend so much effort in making the councillors seem so short-sighted that they are led to waste it on the parish page 3
ON THE WRONG TRACK

BY STAN MILLS

In March 1960 the Guilbaud Committee made its report on railway pay. To judge by the criticisms which convulsed the capitalist press for some time after the report one would have assumed that the golden age for railwaymen had arrived.

The real facts bear little resemblance to those presented in the press. While it is true that some grades at the top of the scale received reasonable (but long overdue) increases, some are still in the position of finishing the week with a take home pay of less than 8 pounds with the majority in the 10 pounds per week income bracket.

Many railwaymen of course supplement their wages with excessive overtime and it is a commonplace for a railwayman to work 17 days a week for months at a stretch. For thousands of others however this opportunity to supplement wages does not exist.

Recently the Branch Secretary of the Wear Valley and Shildon NUR branch was reported in the local newspaper as saying: "That the ever present danger of men becoming fatigued and stranded through too frequent turns of duty cannot be ignored". This report followed a statement from the Branch that the management had cancelled rest days for signalling men in the Shildon district for the holiday period which extends from April to October.

While this may be asked, is such action by the management necessary? The short and only answer is the shortage of staff caused by the miserable pay and conditions on British Railways.

If the BTC think that the Guilbaud wage awards will keep the railwaymen happy they would be quickly disillusioned by a glance at the number of recent proposals, deliberate NUR headquarters from branches calling for a new wage claim.

We are never allowed to forget that British Railways are in the red—but what is carefully kept from us is that the stockholders, moneylenders, and big business tycoons are cashing in to the tune of thousands of millions of pounds when rail workers are hard pressed to make ends meet.

The former owners are to be paid 970 millions plus 3½% interest by the year 2008. To repair the depredations of the former owners prior to Nationalisation, the BTC has to find 1580 millions for modernisation. Private industry will of course take a large chunk of these millions in juicy contracts for electricity and diesel electric locomotives. By 1963 the money lenders will be reaping an annual haul of £85 millions due to the Railways having to borrow money on the open market at rates of interest of 6½%.

Ultimately the solution to the railwaymen's problem is a political one. Although minor improvements can be obtained by determined struggle we cannot expect any real change under the existing set-up.

The Labour movement must put an end to this farce and ensure the return of a Labour Government pledged to a programme of Socialist Nationalisation under Workers' Control. The NUR was in the forefront of the workers' control movement before the 1914-1918 war and it must become increasingly apparent that the aims of the pioneers of railway unionism are more consistent with the best interests of both the workers in the industry and the travelling public—who will be better served by rail workers committees than the present bunch of retired gentlemen, superannuated civil servants and company directors.

In the meantime we should press for the end of high compensation, the shifting of the railway deficit to the National Debt, and generous subsidies to nationalised industries requiring improvement.

Only by a positive demand for socialist planning and control of transport can the railwaymen expect to gain the full fruits of their labour.

Brooke's Scheme Means Higher Rents

BY A. MEPHAM

As economic climate grows colder so Tory legislation becomes more and more obviously distinctively class legislation. The Tories Pursue house on housing and rents applied gradually over the past seven years (i.e. since the 1954 Rent Act) has evolved as a threat not only to the living standard of private landlord tenants, not just as an attack upon council tenants as such, not even to mortgagees alone; this calculated drive now embraces all who have a roof over their heads.

Every time the Tories push up rents of privately owned property, so automatically our councils are forced to raise their rents; equally automatically they go the price of new housing and interest rates. The Tories' policy is thus one of pressuring, of terrorizing and discriminating against councils which seek to maintain a fair rent, will force another round of rent raising.

"Designed to penalise those councils which charge grossly uneconomic rents" (Daily Telegraph 15. 2), there will be a further test under which councils will have to prove their willingness to enter the sinner rent raising stakes, before receiving their housing subsidy of £24 per year per house. Should any councils refuse to accept this economic blackmail, then they will receive merely £8 per year per house.

The facts are plain, economic rents are utterly impossible, and are made so by the constant demands for higher and higher profits by the manufacturers. Building materials costs have risen tremendously and the monopolies commission only recently pronounced judgement against the price fixing by the building materials firms.

Apart from the attacks on council tenants, the Tories aim to give £25 million to approved housing societies on the same conditions as those applying to local councils through the public works loan board, to build houses to let at unsubsidised rents. "The rents may be £4 a week exclusive of rates" (Guardian, 15. 2). Already the Tories and their landlord friends have brought untold misery into thousands of homes through the vicious class legislation aimed at proving that housing is fit only for profits and not for human needs.

The immediate cynicism of the ruling class can be seen when on the same day that Henry Brooke makes his proposals the "defence" budget is increased by £39 million.

There can be no hanging back at this stage of the battle against Toryism; all sections of the community are affected and this should prompt Labour to discard the outdated methods of pursuing the problems of this or that particular section and rally the entire working class for the really fundamental battle against the Tories.
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REVIEWs

HAROLD MOHR

SINCE the nationalisation of the coal industry, gas, etc., under Attlee's Labour Government, the problem of the relationship between state industry and private industry continues to need clarification. Recently a study has been published which explores the relationship between the 'public' and private sectors of the economy. This study has effects on the nationalised industries of government action design to secure the welfare of an capitalist economy. This relationship is found to be one of co-ordination to the short-run needs and interests of capitalist industry.

Subordination of the nationalised sector is an inevitable corollary of the conflict within the Labour movement on the function of nationalised industries, of showing private business pressures and an anti-inflationary emphasis in Government policies. The result is a failure of the attempt to transform Britain by evolutionary policies. It has only had the effect of transforming 'socialism' (nationalised sector) into an adjunct of monopoly capitalism.

Hughes does not draw all of these conclusions, and although he limits his analysis to the major sectors of nationalisation, the pamphlet undoubtedly exposes both Right-wing and Left-wing economic policies in this field.

"BREAK-EVEN" RULE

For example, official Labour thinking in nationalisation was (and is) hopelessly inadequate. It "turns upon the equating of public and private prices and services and with regard to the major nationalised industries in 1947 amounted to £91 million p.a. By 1953, the sum had grown to £221 million p.a., and by the mid-1960s the industries together would be paying something like £350 million p.a. Not only this. Weakness breeds Paralysis. Rentiers. Rentiers ('i.e., people who live by 'clip ping coupons', who take no part whatever in production, who are full of idiocies'—Lenin's apt description) draw from the public corporations each year over £250 million.

However, the exploitation of the nationalised sector does not end here. Between 1949-58 the nationalised industries purchased about £12,000 million of goods and services from private industry, which is a rate of purchase of about £1,200 p.a. Yet, there is no clearly formulated procedure or set of rules for awarding contracts. (Person al connections with private firms result in 'deals'). No effort is made to break through cartel rings. Summarising the findings of the Monopoly Commission's Report on the Supply of Electrical and Allied Machinery and Plant, Hughes writes: "The Monopoly Commission found that manufacturer s were fixing common prices whether in spite of variations in cost of production; the position was that the high cost producers and meant very high profit margins for the low cost producers. The manufacturers justified this partly in terms of the high cost of capital investment and research. Central Electricity Authority's purchase agreements accounted for 80 per cent of the home market trade in major generating equipment. The example of what was happening, the Report showed that profit rates on cost for members of the cartel, large manufacturers and smaller sold in the home market had been 9.3 per cent in the boom year 1952, 3.5 per cent in 1951 and 2.1 per cent in 1952." Could exploitation be carried further?

The answer is Yes. The Tory Government and their friends on the boards have consistently used the nationalised industries for purposes of wage restraint. The issue was not only being viewed on their merits, but "have been narrowly viewed from the angle of cost of production." On analysing the calculation of the price rise any wage increase would precipitate. Moreover, the government has frequently intervened "with the intention of delaying, reducing, or outright refusing wage increases."

Consequently, the rate of increase of the wages of workers in the nationalised industries has lagged behind the rate in other major industries, as Hughes's calculations clearly show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Earnings, Men</th>
<th>Industrial Earnings Index</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The later sections, but the first two-thirds of the work are of great interest especially in the light of hard facts of the nature of the mixed economy. Perhaps this pamphlet will set socialists searching and thinking.

John Hughes's "Nationalization in the Mixed Economy" 1959-60 "the government has relied on exerting disproportionate pressure on the nationalised industries in an effort to stabilise the price level." An example of this sort of behaviour was the Government's action in 1956 to allow the Transport Commission to increase freight charges. "It is said," it quoted the Times on this issue, "to be an independent decision of the Commission. Independence is an ambiguous word in direct pressure and there is direct pressure, the Government say.

This is an interesting and clearly argued pamphlet. The analysis of contemporary socialism improves somewhat the value of the other sections, but the first two-thirds of the work are of great interest especially in the light of hard facts of the nature of the mixed economy. Perhaps this pamphlet will set socialists searching and thinking.

*Nationalised Industries in the Mixed Economy, by John Hughes. Published by Fabian Society, 1960. 4/.

JOHN McGOVERN - APOSTLE OF MRA

MR John McGovern's autobiography. "Neither Fear Nor Favour" has made it clear that he really interested had he dealt more fully and accurately with the events he refers to. Knowing the M.R.A. in the final chapters is regarded as sufficient justification for the effort.

"It is the story of an individualist who hardly ever played a part in the maze struggles on Class and Class domination. He opposed the first world war, but, although a plumber to trade, he was not involved in the industrial struggles of the period. I first met him at a stormy pro-war meeting in 1916, when I seconded an amendment in his behalf because his foreman was on the platform.

He tells of getting tickets of admission with delay. He also tells about stews being armed and metal being discovered around a meeting addressed by Ramsay MacDonald. As a member of the T.U.C. he played an active part in propaganda work from 1916 onwards. He names some of the active figures of that period, but, strangely he does not mention of John Maclean.

The 40 hours strike is only mentioned in passing. It takes up nine lines in which he refers to the riot and says, "Shinwell disappeared for a time". Shinwell was the most prominent figure in the strike. After the riot he went to the Trades Council office and destroyed some papers. He was arrested and given a longer sentence than any of the other accused men.

He disposes of his association with Guy Aldred and the Anti Parliamentary Communist Federation in a few pages. His break with Aldred is glossed over. Having given two conflicting versions of the quarrel I think it is a pity that McGovern did not provide a readers with a fuller account.

McGovern went to Australia for some short period. On his return he went back to the I.L.P., became a Parish Councillor and, later, was Ward Councillor. In the death of John Wheatley, early in 1930, a new parliamentary candidate had to be selected for Shettleston.

The I.L.P. put forward the
name of John McGovern. There were queries about his trade union membership leading to a meeting of the Glasgow Review Council to the Labour Party. Despite this, McGovern was selected. He was shipped back by the methods adopted to make him the candidate were discussed at the Labour Party conference in 1931. He was eventually the Labour Party and was the only L.P.P. candidate in Glasgow where he had been a member of the 1931 general election. There is nothing about this decision that met the wishes of the workers present by asking for more militancy and better organisation, so that next time the casualties would be on the other side. I am not ashamed of that.

McGovern and I were acquitted, but ten others were sent to prison for three months. He says a lot about imprisonment, but was only there from the Thursday until the following Wednesday. That is all the imprisonment he ever had. One could easily get the impression from McGovern's book that the demonstrations were punished after that riot. There were more, and there was a riot in 1932, which policemen were injured without a single casualty on our side. Sir Percy Sillitoe refers to this in his book. I did not shed a tear.

Dealing with a hunger march in which he took part, McGovern refers to a decision that the unemployed ask for a hearing at the Bar of the House. He says: "I was not there in 1932, whether it was comforting to Hanington and myself as we had been censured for a similar

It was during 1931 that he began to take part in activities outside the Unions. He was employed Workers' Movement, of which I was Scottish Organiser, and later, National Chair- man. McGovern played no part in the organisation of marches or decisions at Trongowrie. He simply walked in and took part when he felt like it. He never came near the organisation.

He tells of a riot that took place in October, 1931. Accord- ing to his version, the waves turned up and was arrested while Kerrigan, Middleton and McLennan failed to do the same. As called that demonstration and did turn up, I was in the dock along with McGovern.

The demonstration was a fol- low-up to one held a week earlier when the effigy of a Glasgow matchstick worker was burned on a public square. Kerrigan was with me at that first demonstration. McGovern was not present in this instance. He was not expected, just as he was not expected at the demonstration discussed in his book. At this second demonstration, I had the assistance of Robert Len- nard, now General Secretary of the Electrical Union.

We had the demonstrators assembled. A Glasgow matchstick worker came up as we saw the police mass near the entrance. It was a dark night so we were about the same silhouette. The demonstrators what was happen and to warn them against participation. When they were the head of the demonstration against the batoa charged it. We had not expected the appearance of McGovern's arrival and arrest. McLennan and I took scattered remnants of the demonstrators out. The Irishman who was hit with a baton.

McGovern says that he turned up disgraced. After the de- monstration was scattered, I decided to keep an appointment with a man from another country, at midnight. I had to pass through a street where there was a mass meeting. I took a tram and there I met a member of the E.C. of the Com- munist League wearing his hat and coat. On the road I remembered a meeting of the Glasgow Review Council, of which I was a member, and decided to call in there. I was wearing another man's hat and coat.

On the following Sunday, a meeting was called by Maxton, Buchanan, Aldred and myself. An attempt was made to keep me off the platform but the workers would not have it. The other speakers deplored the ar- rests and the casualties and used them as a warning for the future. To this day, I have always felt some satisfaction over the fact that the meeting of the workers present by asking for more militancy and better organisation, so that next time the casualties would be on the other side. I am not ashamed of that.

McGovern and I were acquitted, but ten others were sent to prison for three months. He says a lot about imprisonment, but was only there from the Thursday until the following Wednesday. That is all the imprisonment he ever had. One could easily get the impression from McGovern's book that the demonstrations were punished after that riot. There were more, and there was a riot in 1932, which policemen were injured without a single casualty on our side. Sir Percy Sillitoe refers to this in his book. I did not shed a tear.

Dealing with a hunger march in which he took part, McGovern refers to a decision that the unemployed ask for a hearing at the Bar of the House. He says: "I was not there in 1932, whether it was comforting to Hanington and myself as we had been censured for a similar
The Devil, God and the Oracle

BY GEOFF WESTON

The London Labour Party and its paid servant, Bill Jones, the London Region Youth Office, have devoted their campaign days to the utterances of the Delphic Oracle. Alas, even that analogy rings slightly false for the NEC's divinity is even more suspect than that of the Gods. Nevertheless, Comrade Jones dutifully punted on to the London Flood, on pain of excommunication, the latest sanctimonious tirade. Political justice that "Keep Left" was the work of the devil rather than of God and good old Medieval tradition. Young Socialist branches were instructed not to support or assist in any way the publication and distribution of this subversive tract. Redemption is found only in the Oracle itself: "Our Young Socialist Organization is making good progress and the number of Branches in the country is nearing 700... obviously such a promising organisation can bring nothing but dismay to our political opponents."

Was this an oblique reference to a certain Party, unanswerable by name, because of the obscurity Laws and four letter words? Alas, the ungainly names became more explicit. "One such (political opponent) is the authoritarian Socialist Labour League, who pseudo-political philosophy based on revolutionary communism, has little in common with our ideals of democratic socialism. There can be little doubt that "Keep Left" is associated with the SLL... And thus, in true Inquisition fashion, the NEC took upon its shoulders the combined and obscure office, Judge and Executioner. Like Salazar's and Franco's opponents "Keep Left" was a vague word without being have any chance to defend itself.

The right are repeating the old mistakes: they are trying to fight ideas by proscription instead of attacking the ideas. Ideas can't be destroyed. Many people have learnt that: even the medieval Church did, when the truth demanded it. The NEC might try to learn from the past and perhaps copy the Cápablanca which in the press and painfully sight emergence of liberalism.

One thing is clear: bans and proscriptions are wrong and often defeat their own purpose, tending to make the suppressed or heretical ideas even stronger and rallying to them a lot of marginal support from people who have an innate sympathy for the victimised. "Keep Left" has been regained in support of this nature.

But, could the NEC act be a case of political subterfuge? For the Annual Conference of the Young Socialists is being held at Easter (when the large majority of Young Socialists' thoughts will be turned towards Aldermaston, Wetherspoons, Trigakula Square raid than towards the Oracle, God or the Devil) and the NEC, being being particularly on the theme of favour of unilaterism, observance of Conference decisions, clause four and other heresies is trying to confuse and confus... issue, hoping that there will be a space of "Keep Left" resolution in order to keep dis... of others issues in the background. It's hard enough to think for one issue, let alone two with constitution fiddlers and vote-takers splitting subtle technological differences over the meaning of words.

It's clear that "Keep Left" can easily divert attention from the real struggle in the Labour move... But in London, one thing can be done. At the Annual Conference of the London Labour Party a move should be made to force the reference back of the Green Report. It seems that procedural manoeuvres are the best answer to an Executive who defy both reason and morality.

TWO SOCIALISTS IMPRISONED

Two Socialists, Sal Santen and Michel Raptis are imprisoned in Holland because of their efforts to help the Algemen National Movement, the PLN, in its struggle against French oppression. Arrested on July 12, their trial has not been heard by the courts. Throughout the long months of waiting the Dutch authorities have displayed no... orus of that. The two men are kept without reading matter and are allowed to have no visitors, except their wives, who are permitted to see them for 15 minutes a week.

This effront to justice has evoked widespread protests. In the Croydon Parish Street, a well-known philosopher and novelist, has protested, while in... a number of trade union branches have expressed opposition. Register your own protest, individually and through the Labour Movement, by writing to the Dutch Embassy in London.

CONSIDERABLE damage is done to our unadventuristic cause by the policy of the Communist Party on neutrality and nuclear weapons. It is clear that there has been a true, of course, for some time now that CP and YCL con... of CNP demonstrations as if the Daily Worker has never accused the actual Aldermaston march for "dividing the broad movement."

We should, of course, welcome Sinners come even late to repentance. It would have been the height of irony if that CP... are arguing with CPers over whether the Russian bomb will soon find that they are quite capable of eloquent expositions of the Western "deterrent" theory, while arguing that Russian... this debate to go on, to be answered."

Dr. Arnold Kettle argues in the October issue of Marxism Today that a Socialist Government should be "not other than the Socialists" "but also as long as necessary, H-bomb." Amen. Cpers, for example, would apply also to a Government pursuing the Communist Party's "British Road to Socialism.""Dr. Kettle states in the same article that neutrality is all right for a capitalist Government but that Socialist neutrality is "opportunist" and "unrealistic." This can only mean that the Left is supposed to advocate a nuclear alliance within the Warsaw Pact rather than NATO.

Amazing as it may seem, this double-think is even found outside the Communist Party, among self-styled Marxists in the Socialist Labour League and the Labour Movement. They will argue that a Socialist Britain will use "every means" in order to protect her workers, including the Peruvian Poles and satanic intervention. How they propose to undertake "de... with the Hydrogen Bomb."

It is the argument of an H-bomb "deterrent" applicable to a workers' state? Can the bomb be used in a civil war, annihilating the class enemy while protecting our own class interests? Can we capitalize with genocide. In publishing these letters, we hope to help the discussion to go on, and clarify the whole problem of a Socialist attitude to the bomb.

Editor

RUSSIA'S BOMB!

Below we reproduce the whole correspondence that was published in the columns of this paper just before the quotation with which the Socialist Party have supported Russian's having the bomb. It is quite characteristic of the Communist Party leadership that it did not find it necessary to justify Russia's having the bomb. Bureaucrats have no need for ideas, for the subject is not a discussion on such a serious matter should not be allowed to deteriorate. The letters of Sedgwick, Alan Bennett, John Daniels and Ken Coates, raise the central issues. Assuming Russia is in fact in possession, what is the argument for an H-bomb "deterrent" applicable to a workers' state? Can the bomb be used in a civil war, annihilating the class enemy while protecting our own class interests? Can we capitalize with genocide. In publishing these letters, we hope to help the discussion to go on, and clarify the whole problem of a Socialist attitude to the bomb.

Mr. Peter Sedgwick talks about the H-bomb as if it is something that exists outside society who can make decisions on its development. The Russian workers, for example, gave their lives for the Hydrogen Bomb. hydrogen bomb has nothing to do with nuclear power.

The Soviet Union is not a capitalist country. Despite the bureaucracy at the head of the USSR, it remains a communist in transition to Socialism. I am not that the hydrogen bomb. But the economic crisis of capitalism of which the hydrogen bomb is a product. As long as capitalism continues, other, more dreadful weapons will be invented."

The Soviet Union is a small country. Despite the bureaucracy at the head of the USSR, it remains a communist in transition to Socialism. But the economic crisis of capitalism is not the hydrogen bomb. As long as capitalism continues, other, more dreadful weapons will be invented."

The existence of the bureaucracy has not altered this basic fact any more than the bureaucracy of Sir Thomas Yate's has. It is the argument of an H-bomb "deterrent" applicable to a workers' state? Can the bomb be used in a civil war, annihilating the class enemy while protecting our own class interests? Can we capitalize with genocide. In publishing these letters, we hope to help the discussion to go on, and clarify the whole problem of a Socialist attitude to the bomb.

Mr. Peter Sedgwick talks about the H-bomb as if it is something that exists outside society who can make decisions on its development. The Russian workers, for example, gave their lives for the Hydrogen Bomb. hydrogen bomb has nothing to do with nuclear power.

The Soviet Union is not a capitalist country. Despite the bureaucracy at the head of the USSR, it remains a communist in transition to Socialism. But the economic crisis of capitalism is not the hydrogen bomb. As long as capitalism continues, other, more dreadful weapons will be invented."

The existence of the bureaucracy has not altered this basic fact any more than the bureaucracy of Sir Thomas Yate's has. It is the argument of an H-bomb "deterrent" applicable to a workers' state? Can the bomb be used in a civil war, annihilating the class enemy while protecting our own class interests? Can we capitalize with genocide. In publishing these letters, we hope to help the discussion to go on, and clarify the whole problem of a Socialist attitude to the bomb.
We are indebted to Mr. Healy for his letter (Tribune, Nov. 25), supporting a Soviet Socialist H-bomb. For years we had wasted our time fighting for an unilateral reponsibility of the Soviet Government for Britain when all we had to do was to get a Socialist Government to make a realistic weapon for the world revolution.

It is heartening to feel that our revolution will be made secure from American imperialism if we are able to bring seemingly com

_We are sorry to see that Mr. Gerry Healy no longer attaches any importance to the international solidarity of the working class (Tribune, November 25)._ 

_We have failed to realise, in giving his blessing to Mr. Khursheechev's H-bombs, that it is true that the social systems of America and Russia are different, the implications of H-bomb ownership are the same._

_The British Labour movement must encourage the Soviet people, and the people of the whole world, against capitalist and imperialism._

_This is a context in which Marxists welcome the recent discussion by the Chinese._

_Khruschev's policy of relying upon peaceful co-existence with the imperialists, the manufacture of nuclear weapons and the struggle of the international working-class is absolutely wrong._

_This struggle will win in the end._

_Brian Pearc_e

_We think that in the absence of such miracles of Soviet science, actions of Russian workers to disarm their leaders would do more to help us to disarm the madness of Dow, the Soviet and the Pentagon than any amount of dialectical sophistry by Mr. Khursheechev._

_Eric Morse

_WHEN Soviet Russia's survival depended on signing the evil treaty of Bret Litesk, Lenin found himself obstructed by people with an itch for phrase-mongering, whose state-manship he summed up in the proposition: "I stake everything on the international working class, and that means I can commit any folly I please."_ 

_For some time the Trotskyist movement has had the misfortune to attract a type of person who saw in it primarily an anti-Stalinist movement, and who, moreover, interpreted anti-Stalinism as hostility to the Soviet Union._

_Trotsky often crossed swords with them, and one may suppose that he often had to warn anyone who said to himself in relation to their statements: "I am not a Trotskyist."_ 

_Such people used "defence of the Soviet Union" as a ritual slogan, to be rejected by other workers. Its purpose was merely to claim the glamour of the October Revolution, without accepting any responsibility._

_Increasingly, as the Socialist Labour League has grown, so that it means business so far as defending the Soviet Union is concerned, such people have turned to propaganda which can be regarded as a soft option which permits one to be a "Red" without its complications and be associated with Communist Party members._

_John Daniels Ken Coates

_NOTTINGHAM TEACHERS FIGHT FOR SOCIALIST POLICY_
Mr. Tshombé is not viewed as an object of Belgian hostility.—Economist, 28 January.

In a healthy and developing democracy, it is not unusual, it is perfectly normal, that the parties, on the whole range of topics, represent similarly minded groups and individuals. The Socialist Party's Shadow Chancellor, at the Hanover Conference of his Party.

They (Trotskyists) have turned their attention to the Y.S. movement because they are dismayed to see such a large, brilliant organ of democratic Socialist.—Part of editorial in New Advance, the official paper of the Young Socialists.

The Pacific Maritime Association agreed to pay a carefully calculated $27,500,000 to the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, led by Mr. Harry Bridges, over the period of six years return for the right to decide how many dockers were needed in working gangs, the size of sling loads and the number of times cargo is handled.—Economist, 28 January.

He (Brian Pearce) twitted Mr. Abe Moffat, the Scottish miners' Communist leader, for having agreed to put down a motion at the Communist Party conference this Easter, calling for unilateral nuclear disarmament by the Soviet Union. As a theorist, Mr. Pearce thought... that such a proposal for the Soviet Union would be a rather a drastic step leftwards at a time when the Communist Party conference Next Steps for Labour, 6 February.

CANDID COMMENTARY cont.

But the Powers will disarm themselves; it is time they clutched a Labour Party membership card.

ALTHOUGH I am an aged political animal, well past my prime, I still can't help being amazed, amused, and held in a childlike trance by the variety of acts in right-wing Labour punctuation. Not merely did this versatile collaboration Woodrow Wyatt and Jim Matthews, join Arms of Industry, an extremely reactionary Tory front organisation. But in the heart of Heartwood Wyatt did his own solo turn, pleading the hardships of the unemployed pensioners on over £6,000 a year. Unfortunately, there is no report of his solicitousness extending as far as regarded the education of the aged pensioners, who are on less than 60 shillings a week.

Then, there's Wee Georgie Brown. He will still be bashing the despotic feudal sheikdom of Bahrain, where oil appears to be the only product that flows freely. Quite appropriately, since incarceration appears to be the second largest industry of Bahrain, our greatest visitors and prides are known perfectly well and lived by. The prison doors clanged behind him than The Spectator took the liberty, rather as a draft of a letter to Mr. Brown that political prisoners might feel it unwise to make major comparisons. SOCIALIST REVIEW is published by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, post paid, include issues. Opinions and policies expressed in signatures by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Socialist Review which are controlled by its shareholders. All communications must be addressed to 117 Carmelite Rd., Harrow Weald, Middlesex. Printed by St. Martin's Printers (T.U.) 86d. Lilbourne Road, London S.W.6. Tel.: PUL: 8437.

brezily transient visitors in the presence of their gaolers. Now, does he seem to understand that he might have a duty, irrespective of the conditions under which the workers were kept (and it is most unlikely that what he saw was normal before world-wide publicity was given to this case), to say something about the rigged trial in which these men had been 'sentenced', and at which the British Government actively connived. Nor does he do him down by saying anything to say, irrespective of the conduct of the Sheikh of Bahrain, of the British Government's part in the affair in arranging for the illegal transfer of three prisoners to St Helena and their wrongful imprisonment there for the past four years."

In the same issue of The Spectator, another of the Evening's bright-eyed boys—Antony Crosland—comes in for criticism. A Davenport writes: "How Mr CAR Crosland can Entertain (February) that under the Tories 'we still have full employment and planning' passes my understanding."

Well, it passes mine, too.

I know it is far too much to expect our right-wing Labour politicians to become socialists, but wouldn't it be a good thing if they were sufficiently daring, courageous and extremist to take the job of the party leaders—and become good liberals?

ANOTHER Socialist Review scoop! Heated controversy has broken out among Civil Defence experts over the "No Yes" question. The four-minute warning? No. The difficulty of evacuating millions of people to nuclear safety areas? Wrong. Try again. The need for deep, underground shelters? No, I'm afraid you're miles out. The journal International Civil Defence reveals the closely-guarded secret: "Much concern has attached to the British Civil Defence Corps over the lower part of the dress to be worn by women volunteers."

WHAT WE STAND FOR

War is the inevitable outcome of the division of society into classes. Only the working class, controlling and owning the means of production, distribution and exchange in a planned economy, can guarantee the world against war and the annihilation of large sections of humanity. Planning under socialism demands the nationalisation without compensation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land. International administration between socialist states must replace aggregative competition between capitalist states.

The working class will reach the consciousness necessary to change society only by building upon the experience in struggle of the existing mass organisations and organising around a revolution socialist programme.

This programme must include:

- The unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction, withdrawal from NATO and all other aggressive alliances as preliminary steps to international disarmament.
- The withdrawal of all British troops from overseas and the transfer of all British capital in colonies and other underdeveloped territories to their peoples.
- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow. Military and moral support to all workers in the countries in their fight against oppression and their struggle for socialism.
- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions, together with the implementation of the principle of work or full maintenance.
- The extension of the social services by the implementation of the full industrial wage as retirement pension for workers with the establishment of a free Health and Industrial Health service. The abolition of all charges for public transport.
- To help solve the housing problem through the nationalisation of rented property and the nationalisation of the building and building materials industries. The granting of interest free loans to local authorities, with the right to requisition empty-owned land.
- Free education available to all, including adult education. The abolition of fee-paying schools and the primary school system. The extension of education in comprehensive schools. International facilities for technical and practical education. A rigorous programme of school discipline and the nationalisation of all schools. A free optional secondary school system. Adequate maintenance grants for all students without a means test.
- Votes at 18 in national and local elections.
- Firm opposition to all racial discrimination. Freedom of movement to and from Britain.

EDUCATION cont.

proclaiming themselves in public on how "progressive" the Notting-

gaham LEA is. They "believe" in comprehensive schools—so long as nobody makes proposals to introduce them into the City. "Abolishing the eleven-plus exam" is all the city fathers believe, is a good slogan for the annual election man-

ifestos—but a catastrophic practical politics for tomorrow.

This NALT plan punts Labour councillors in the Nottingham faithful and squarely on the spot. The teachers' proposals have been widely supported by the Trade Union branches and Ward meet-

ings. A special City Party meeting has had to be called to di-
suss the plan. But the act of publishing the plan as a pam-

phlet for wide distribution to parents is sound socialist strategy. The Labour teachers have gone over the heads of the professional "Labour Party", the party bureaucrats who believe in narrow-

ing every discussion as a means of blocking democracy in the working party as in themselves.

The Labour Councillors, in full view of the electorate, have now to answer to people saying "yes" or "no" the question "Where do you stand on education and the eleven-plus exam? Are you for merely soothing chatter and pie-in-the-sky promises while continuing to allow the present system of class-privilege in education? Or do you really believe in comprehensive schools and abolishing the eleven-plus exam?"

What terror this blunt question appears to have struck on the hearts of the Nottingham City Labour Councillors! This is the direct result of the brilliant strategy of the socialist teachers behind the campaign—viz. work out the practical implications of Labour policy and take these, and the same arguments, to the same bureaucrats to the voters.

If your reviewer refrains here from describing the proposals made in the pamphlet or from outlining the excellently-written arguments which it marshalls in their support, there is only one reason. She believes that every SR Reader should get a careful study it and go do likewise in his own area. Congratulations to the socialist teachers of Nor-

tingham on this brilliant piece of socialist advocacy.