Annual Conference will pose squarely

THE CHOICE FOR LABOUR

FOR YEARS, the Labour Party leadership has passed on quickly to next business whenever anyone dared to remember that we stand for "the common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange." But it has never—until now—felt it necessary to confront, let alone explicitly, this clause in our program. Today they are doing so. Industry and Society, their latest policy statement, is a conscious retreat from nationalization. It is an attempt to substitute state participation in the capitalist free-for-all for a nationalized and planned economy.

This is not altogether a "new line." When Labour came to power in 1945 it did, it is true, nationalize coal, transport, electricity, gas and steel. But these—except for steel which was never fully taken over—were the less depressed areas of the economy. They were deficit branches, and the rest of industry depended very heavily on them. In stepping in and revitalizing them the Labour Government was serving the interests of the capitalist economy.

This does not mean that a Tory government would have done the same—bitter medicine is not easy to swallow. But if we remember that these industries are often owned by the same men in the most unsozialist countries we can understand that in retrospect British capitalism has not been displeased at the result.

The choice

A Labour Government within the next couple of years is almost a dead certainty. But the conditions are different to what they were twelve years ago: the economy is booming with very few distressed areas to be nursed to life. Whereas in 1945, Big Business opposition to nationalization was tepid; today it is red-hot and organized. Then, the capitalists involved were glad to sell their ruined mines and dilapidated rails for fat prices; today their balances are better and profits assured. Then, the Labour Government could clear up pockets of opposition by means of the controls inherited from the war; today controls barely exist.

The Labour leadership knows this. They know that if they started to nationalize they would be rushing headlong into a bitter struggle with British Capitalism. And they remember the last real fight they had, in 1951; when the Labour Government fell because of a balance of payments crisis; when the money that was needed to pay for imports was smuggled out of the country because the capitalists had "lost confidence."

The choice for labour is a simple one. If we are to nationalize further we shall have to prevent sabotage of the 1951 variety. To prevent sabotage, we shall have to nationalize and control the banks, insurance companies and the finance houses who would otherwise channel "hot money" abroad. We shall have to nationalize the industries that do a lot of business outside the country—oil, chemicals, heavy manufactures, shipping, etc. and who could expand overseas at the expense of contraction at home.

In other words, if we are going to nationalize at all, in a way that will weaken British capitalism, that is, deprive them and in the teeth of their organized opposition, we would have to go all the way. There is nothing they will bring the whole housing and health socialist bacon. It's a question of all or none. We cannot start and then leave them to bring ruination on the country.

This the present leadership knows. That is what frightens them into paranoia. Unwilling to fight capitalism, they will have to rule—when they form the Government—by courtesy of the capitalist class and within the limits set by that class. These limits, to quote Keynes, the great economist of the Establishment, are defined by the "nerves and stomach" of Big Business and the confidence in the safety of their property and the continuation of their profits is the barometer governing right-wing actions.

The very nearness of office has made the leadership define their policy in a way that would inflame confidence in Big Business circles. No matter that the retreat from nationalization is a slap in the face for the workers in industry who couldn't care less whether the state cream off part of the profits they create or not. No matter that it goes against the express wish of the engineering workers, the builders, transport workers, chemical workers and all the others who have gone on record for the nationalization of their industries. What matters to right-wing Labour is not the people who put and keep in office, but the "nerves and stomach" of the capitalists. Their few middle class elements who might vote Labour if Labour's teeth were knocked out completely
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The annual Labour Party Conference next month is crucial for the health of socialism in Britain. With a Labour Government in the offing we have to choose now whether we are going to take a stride forward by nationalizing the economy in spite of the capitalists' active opposition or sit back to push up whatever that class allows to be pushed up.

Management Committees meeting to instruct their delegates must ask themselves: are we or are we not going to reaffirm the basic principle: "Labour Party? Are we going to reiterate our demand for the "common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange" and throw out the leadership's policy statement, Industry and Society? or are we going to accept the rejection of nationalization contained in it and therewith the betrayal of a basic socialist principle?

Delegates to Annual Conference must fight and fight again for the enlargement of nationalization, for the acceptance of all its implications—a fully nationalized and planned economy—for the exposure of the Labour Party philosophy that is willing to accept the capitalist system root and branch.

The struggle will not give in without a struggle. They will put up old-time "left-wingers" to defend their new positions. Bevan, all, sat on the committee that prepared their wretched document. Mikardo likewise. They will be persuasive, very persuasive.

We must not be humbugged into accepting a line that counts the very multiplicity for which we are in the Labour Party, "Industry and Society" must be rejected out of hand by Conference. Delegates must make it clear that for us socialists there is no substitute for nationalization and a planned economy.
INDUSTRIAL STRIKE

GE OFF CARLSSON, shop steward, draws the LESSON of the MARKET STRIKE

THE EXISTENCE of a strong, organized working-class in Britain, especially since the end of the war, has employing class and their agent, the Tory Government, repeatedly been shown to be in the interest of the nation's well-being. It is necessary for it to put the organized working-class, what the government has been and is trying to do.

Their favourite weapon for disciplining workers is the lock-out, and not available, owing to the favourable economic situation since 1945. In the words of a sellers' market which meant that every employer has been using as much labour as possible, and few indeed are the industrial disputes which we knew before the war.

This, the employers as a class would like to wield the whip of unemployment, they see no reason why they, as individuals should first be to use this weapon. Whoever starts will simply lose orders from the competitors.

It is right of this background that the dispute at Covent Garden must be viewed. The Minutes of a lock-out, held through their Association, a considerable monopoly over London's vegetable marketing, and they claimed that the Market workers would be taught a lesson. They succeeded, and have thus set the pattern for employers in other industries to try and settle the score with their workers. When a lock-out is given, the government a much-needed shot in the arm to continue with its anti-working class policy.

Lock-out's history

This dispute, rightly called by the workers a lock-out, started when the employers presented each worker with an 18-page document of warnings, if they accepted out the new working conditions in the Market. The document was signed by the employers' and their subordinates. And no wonder! Its main clauses provided for: (1) redundancies, (2) lock-out of strikers, (3) compulsory overtime, (4) hiring of labour to be taken over by the Union and into those of the employers, (5) employers to decide who should, and who should not, join a trade union.

Any one of these conditions should be sufficient to make organized labour fight. But worse, during the strike, it became clear that a serious threat exists not only to the trade union structure in the Market, but also a serious threat to the whole of organized Labour.

The employers prepared well beforehand, with ships loaded with cargoes and fleets of scab-driven lorries were held in readiness to break the resistance of the workers. During the strike they managed to maintain supplies with the help of their clerical staff and the active help of the police. And this in spite of the hundred per cent, turn-out of the Market workers and the readiness of the docks and the readiness of the dockers who refused to handle "black" goods.

How to succeed

To be successful, the strike had to be extended—no. Cousins who, with the strength of the Transport and General Workers' Union was able to make the employers
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Our trade union movement is nine million strong and without one effective trade union movement. The TUC has done a thorough job of it. It expresses the opinions and policies of the right-wing trade union and Labour leaders. To the majority of rank-and-file it is no different to the Tory or Liberal Press. The press for old looking, old circulation would drop much more rapidly than it is at the moment.

If this strike (like so many others), its class nature, its importance—all these were left to duplicitous trade union and Labour Movement to get to know the issues involved. Where was the voice of the trade union leaders on this strike? The Labour Party to say?—From the top levels, nothing but a disgusting silence.

How to tackle the future

Had the dispute received official recognition, it might have received the support of the organized railway drivers, dockers and cold-storage workers. A strike of the docks would have resulted in handling "black" goods, had there been a call for mass picketing by London's millions of trade unionists and Labour Party members had all these been done, victory would have been assured and the Labour Movement in general.

THE CONFERENCE SEASON

By S. J. Bidwell
Organizer, North London NCLC
Prospective Labour Candidate, E. Herts.

The Trades Union Congress takes place at the beginning of September and the Labour Party Conference on September 21st, the last day of the year when hope rises in the breasts of millions in the British Empire. Some of us see the disintegration of that class struggle.

The General Secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union has written that trade union leaders have to be rational, but not to allow the TUC to be unduly influenced by the force of public opinion.

The magnificent fight of the trade unionists is the demand that we should have the right to strike, and to strike against the government.

You may always be sure that the bulk of officials will never be found two strikes ahead of the rank and file demands. It is much more likely to be a story of lying behind or simply responding to the gathering pressure which events are forcing the workers to exert upon TUC leaders.

The Rent Act, inflationary crisis, Hydrogen-bomb testing, all combine to give the workers urgent needs if the material condition is right now from which violent upheavals are made.

The magnificent fight of the RCT transport workers; the solidarity of the market workers and the dockers; and the battle of the docks against the dockers, these skirmishes between capital and labour remind us of us of the existence of the struggle.

The TUC has on the Agenda a proposal from the Boilermakers to support the TUC, to raise the wages of £4 to £6 in the Rent Act. We can be sure this will be turned down. The Executive of the NUR made a similar call earlier this year and when the AOM of the Union took place in July, an appeal against the decision was narrowly carried by the governing body. This is hardly a case of rank and files being more backhand than the leadership since each delegate represents a large slice of the membership, and would not have been willing to accept the TUC's recommendation.

Industrial and Political struggles

Debates at both the TUC and the Labour Conference provide evidence of the need to be confined to two narrow grooves of industrial and political activity. The TUC naturally reflects in its deliberations the more detailed economic day-to-day problems confronting the working-class; but when it starts to study problems more deeply it cannot refrain from discussing the entire nature of the capitalist state. When doing so, as this year's assembly will show, the thesis of the TUC and its leading members is to see how British Capitalism can be better expanded so that labour can have a bigger bite at the apple. Very little will be heard of the need to establish a workers' state and place power in the hands of those who are a thousand times more capable than the capitalists, i.e., the workers. Indeed one will not hear this language at all, for there are very few TUC leaders who believe it to be so.

Notwithstanding justifiable scepticism, the TUC, though submitted from the CEU, the Doughtenmen, the Building Workers and others, the trade union leaders is so ludicrous that so many active trade unionists, shop stewards and others are not accorded the right of to speak at the Labour Party and many are proud to boast of it. As well as Ward organisation, factory organisation and other measures that are engaged and directly linked with Management Committees. This one sure way of winning over the workers for the Movement and its aspirations.

By a great step forward.

It was not done this time. We must be sure that it is the next time. Whenever and wherever it is produced it is a series of compulsory overtime. To be a mil- lant for trade union action to put this on the Union's agenda is the recognition of the day. How many defects can be chalked off the back of the workers who sit for weeks while their members are out on the streets.

Finally, the national dispute has undermined the need for a socialist daily paper, worthy of respect from the left, for its supporters. The period of increasing industrial and political upheavals it would be readiness for the people to turn their thoughts to a political movement which is the task of the day.

READERS' ROUND-UP

And now Japan. Readers of the Socialist Review are, probably, quite accustomed to read about the support and approval we receive from abroad. In fact, we are getting to use letters of praise from Europe, America, Africa and elsewhere.

And now Japan. A group of militant socialists who publish a monthly paper called Rokurinsha, have sent us a warm letter asking us to keep permanent contact with them. They have already published a pamphlet called "The Future of the Russian Empire: Reform or Revolution?" (Socialist Review Book 1925). It is a fairly good book, Stalinist Russia, A Marxist Analysis, in their paper. The TUC is a group is also an inde- pendent socialist group. We are proud to hear from them and glad to see that these independent socialist groups com- prised of both right-wing Labour and Stalinism—are a true reflexion of experience in the world at large, not only here in Britain.

The position of Nye Bevan on Public Ownership and the anti's of his follow- ing MPs. Tribune (or Michael Foot) has been slow to react but it is now taking on a more challenging note. There is an enormous difference between the position of the majority of yesterdays' hank bed yanked from the table and the letter, and the writer of Nye's News of the World letter, "What does mean the NEC Public Ownership statement and challenges its critics to produce public ownership? Of course, the managers of readers of Tribune read also the Sun- day sexual with the record circulation. To propose that one could have founded no proposition to extend state, i.e., capital- ist-state investment in private industry, should be too difficult.

Industrial groups needed

The political and industrial interests of the workers are intertwined. An end must be put to the attitude that the workers are not worth investigating. The aim must surely be to or- ganize the working-class on an indus- trial line. And may we, slightly. It is ludicrous that so many active trade unionists, shop stewards and others are not accorded the right of to speak at the Labour Party and many are proud to boast of it. As well as Ward organisation, factory organisation and other measures that are engaged and directly linked with Management Committees. This one sure way of winning over the workers for the Movement and its aspirations.
Forum

THE NATIONAL QUESTION

Mary Klopfer, Secretary Scottish MCF, Prospective Labour Candidate, Edinburgh West, writes on

THIS QUESTION is right in the forefront of all peoples-peoples struggling for it without succumbing to nationalism.

In his article Stalin, writing with his approval, pointed out that secession and the fragmentation of states is not the main specific objective. Socialists in the imperialist nations must fight unconditionally for the recognition of this principle. The peoples of these nations must themselves decide whether secession from any given state is a corollary. Socialists in these nations must do so in terms of the prospects of the development and success of socialist objectives. In his detailed debate with Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin dealt not only with the Polish question and with other questions. He wanted writers to examine the position of the colonial territories controlled by the European imperialist powers. His references make it clear that they consider the right to self-determination to apply to such countries.

National independence vs. Russia

Changes, some of them profound, are now taking place in the world. In my view, since these fundamental ideas were set down and, if we are scientific in our approach, we must examine them in the light of these changes.

The most important change derives from the Russian revolution of 1917 and the setting up of the U.S.S.R. On the road to the modern socialist-imperialist world both by establishing state ownership of the means of production and by isolating themselves from the world market for a long period. The right to self-determination was recognized by the Soviet government and Finland exercised it by secession.

But the war of intervention and the attempt by capitalist powers to exploit the national feelings of the component peoples of the U.S.S.R. was not so easily dealt with. In 1920 the Stalinist dictatorial the Baku oil rich and Finland exercised it by secession.

Lenin summarised this development as monopoly capitalism or the highest stage of capitalism, monopoly being a complete contradiction of the original nature and practice of capitalism characteristic of the transition to a higher system (i.e. socialism). He also regarded the complete territorial division of the world among the greatest capitalist powers as essential feature of imperialism. He saw the foundation of the right of nations to self-determination in the proposition that even bourgeois capitalism does not exclude the possibility of imperialist powers back and down the territories exploited by imperialism. He called it by national self-determination. This period of expansion would lead to the development of an imperialist system, the growth of a struggle for socialism by that class.

And later Bakunin made it very clear that the right of nations to self-determination implied the right to secede from any new or existing political unit, empire or state, that the revolutionary socialist movement should recognise this right and support people struggling for it without succumbing to nationalism.

If Stalin, writing with his approval, pointed out that secession and the fragmentation of states is not the main specific objective. Socialists in the imperialist nations must fight unconditionally for the recognition of this principle. The peoples of these nations must themselves decide whether secession from any given state is a corollary. Socialists in these nations must do so in terms of the prospects of the development and success of socialist objectives. In his detailed debate with Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin dealt not only with the Polish question and with other questions. He wanted writers to examine the position of the colonial territories controlled by the European imperialist powers. His references make it clear that they consider the right to self-determination to apply to such countries.

This system is maintained by the traditional apparatus of repression and undemocratic rule. Here the classic thesis that national self-determination can lead to an expansion of productive forces under bourgeois democracy and from there to the growth of a working class capable of opening the struggle for socialism remains entirely correct.

However, the natural question for them is how to cope with present economic difficulties and the growing class-conflict illustrated by the recent upheavals and the new legislation adopted by Nehru to assert that history is tele- scoping the stages and the period of development resulting from self-determination may be very short.

Socialism in one country - out

Another topic for discussion follows naturally from this. If the rapid development of the frictions inherent in capitalism and the fear of our future have furthered the question. Tito’s resistance to Stalinist dictation, Polish developments and the development of socialism in some of the advanced capitalist countries.

A great deal of data on the economic relations between the parts of the U.S.S.R. and that country and the "societies" would need to be a new analysis and for a proper discussion of this topic which we will venture to set up a tentative proposition for discussion. After the Russian revolution of 1917 and the failure of revolutionary movements in the advanced capitalist countries the U.S.S.R. was isolated in conditions of power in backwater and further by the devastation of the civil war and the intervention of foreign powers. The Stalinist dictatorship arose out of these conditions.

To say that it has now accomplished a great task and created an entirely new society is an illusion and to base the study on the "people’s democracies" is not isolated in the U.S.S.R. When the war was in the years after 1917, and so the war. Ask Zamplin on the Stalinist totalitarian state was established to act as a brake upon their development and distort it and conditions in the USSR itself was setting the scene for an ending of that system. In their case, the right to national self-determination may well, therefore, be correctly based upon the need to press for greater democracy in the U.S.S.R. and workers democracies, and Russian control of these countries is an obstacle to such developments. An undemocratic and imperialist proposition may be worth detailed discussion.

The new, disguised Imperialisms

A new form of imperialism has arisen or greatly developed since the first world war: indirect or economic imperialism.

The classical model here is the relationship between the USA and some of the Latin American countries. Capitalist power exercises its economic dominion without direct political control. The economic bosses create autocratic feudal rulers in exchange for exclusive control of some valuable raw materials or oil. This model has been followed by Britain in the Middle East and in a slightly less overt form by the USA in South America.

The intervention of British troops in Oman is no less an imperialist action because it has been "requested" by the nominally sovereign Sultan. In such territories it will be claimed that political reform and the protection of the population is not the question and the support of the struggle for the struggle of new classes against their former exploiters. Imperialism must be based upon the backward and restrictive nature of this alliance. It must be based upon the sacrifices introduced into such territories are already creating a working class and we must study the question of the situation which is thus created and draw our conclusions from it. National self-determination in such countries appears to be directly linked with a class struggle against the old feudal order.

Another form of indirect imperialism arises where an immigrant minority holds the monopoly of economic and political power. South Africa, the most advanced of these countries, has begun to play an independent imperialist role with the export of capital to other parts of Africa and expansionism aims with regard to other territories. The question of the emancipation of the peoples in these countries is a question of whether we think we have given it sufficient attention. The question is whether it is a national question and one of those one of the working class for one race whilst the ruling class is of another. The correct analysis of this question could lead to a much better interpretation of the peoples concerned than any amount of rightist indignation about the excesses of the colour bar.

Finally, socialists should consider the national aspirations which still remain in countries such as Wales and Scotland which were incorporated with England before the modern capitalist form of imperialism had developed. We need, for example, to consider whether the right of nations to self-determination still has a concrete basis in the relations between England and these other parts of Britain.

The problems of imperialism have become more complex, there is a large area of the world where new questions must be posed and answered-and the classical models can no longer be applied to the greater part of the imperialist world. Socialists must give militant support to the struggle of the peoples against the right of nations to self-determination because in so doing they hold open the door for the new working class to come out of the old and break with the old imperialism to come into the international socialist movement which, alone, can solve their problems and ours.
POLICY

THE LABOUR PARTY’s new policy statement sets the tone for the Labour policy debate and is significant in that it is the first time in many years that it has been spelled out in detail. The document is divided into parts, each dealing with a different area of policy. The policy statements are followed by a series of questions, which are intended to help the reader understand the implications of the proposals.

One of the key issues addressed in the policy statement is the need for a new approach to public ownership. The Labour Party has long been a proponent of public ownership, and this policy statement reiterates its commitment to this principle. The statement argues that public ownership is necessary to ensure that the interests of the working class are protected and that the means of production are not used to further the interests of the wealthy few.

Another important issue addressed in the policy statement is the need for a new approach to finance. The Labour Party has long been a critic of the finance industry, and this policy statement reiterates its commitment to regulating this sector. The statement argues that the finance industry must be held accountable for its actions, and that it must be subject to the same standards of oversight as other industries.

In addition to these two key issues, the policy statement also addresses a range of other topics, including housing, education, health, and the environment. The Labour Party has long been a leader in these areas, and this policy statement reiterates its commitment to these issues.

The policy statement is a significant document, and it is likely to have a significant impact on the course of the election campaign. It is clear that the Labour Party is committed to a new and positive approach to politics, and that it is determined to build a society that is fairer and more just for all.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT “REFORM”

BY CLY. PEGGY DUFF • ST. PANCRAS BOROUGH COUNCIL

THE GOVERNMENT’S PROPOSALS FOR THE REFORM OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT are so bedevilled by the financial changes that they are difficult to separate from the others.

The proposals to substitute “block grants”, which have rightly been accepted by both local authorities and by trade unions on them, and to organise the co-ordination of the workers in local authority employment, as a threat to standards, particularly in education, is also an essential part of this. In this, the Labour authority will be penalised. It will only be able to maintain its present standards (far less improve them) if it places an extra burden on its ratepayers. Some Councillors have had to accept these proposals.

In a new rate measure, the Exchequer has already been done successfully with housing, where the burden has been on the Exchequer either on the local rates, or on the Exchequer. It should be understood that, under the new system, the council’s revenue will be determined by the re-rating of commercial premises has faded away, through the 20 per cent differential, and that the promised help through a reduction in the de-rating of industry is to be met by the local rates, but the burden will be on those of the lowest.

The Government, in fact, intends to cut the burden still further by increasing the number of rates that will be imposed on local authorities, thereby increasing the costs of local government. This is particularly unfair in the conurbations where the majority of the houses are held by the local authorities, whose homes have been pulled down to make way for new flats. Unlike those that are built, many of them have not been re-housed.

My own Council has met the burden of this new rate by the extension of local authority services, and they have had to say to the Government that they are not willing to co-operate, neither will we.”

But who suffers most? The people still waiting for a decent home. These Councillors have met the burden of these new rates.

Some Councillors have had the burden and the rates have gone up. They say to this family and to that family: “You are earning more than £12 per week, so we can only give you not only the full cost of building your that, plus the interest, but partly the interest. But they stand by their position, and take the blame. Conservative authorities will no doubt, meekly do the same as those of the Labour Party that, resist that, try to maintain their standards, and their building, will have to take the black for inadequately-funded services. How much should Labour Councils do? It is no coincidence that many of the most progressive and the hardest hit

LABOUR’S “PLAN” FOR INDUSTRY

The finance companies and those finance companies that have large blocks of shares always attend however, and with their votes can usually control the Board. The main quoted small shareholder does not usually attend or at best gives a proxy to say how he wishes to use their vote. It is obvious that even apart from this power the financial interests can wield immense power behind the scenes by influence on the Board of Directors if they are not left in the hands of those nominees on them.

Remember also that when raising fresh capital—from sources other than Loan Stock—it is principally to these institutions that the Board must look. I think the influence of these institutions, which was made very obvious by the authority shown by the Prudential Assurance Co. representation on the Board of Directors last year when Sir Bernard Docker was removed by the shareholders of that Board of Directors.

I think the conclusion to draw from the facts, not that the present policy statement; that the capital structure has changed and that industry is no longer controlled by the capital is, that the influence of these institutions is still very powerful.

Admittedly through death duties, changes in the structure of the company of the workers and other economic factors the private capitalist owner is disappearing but the co-representation of the same class have taken advantage of the structure of the large public companies to control them. This is the result of the private capitalist and his companies for investment would now be under the control of the State.

What service?

Another conclusion of the policy statement with which I must join issue is that many of the large public companies are a burden on the whole nation. I would say that after some six years of almost unbridled capitalism in this country we could have accepted that fact. As a result of allowing

so long as the Government refuses to provide as with the money required to continue building at reasonable rates, the burden to show that it is as equally as is possible in the circumstances, among all the ratepayers in the Borough and this, after all, includes all property owners. With the terrible alternatives of cutting services or raising rates. I hope that Labour councillors will be able to improve the most important services, such as education, health and housing, cut radically what is not essential and, and accept the fact that to do this rates will have to rise.

This will not be a popular decision, for the main burden will fall on the residential ratepayer, and he is already hard-pressed. He has had to bear the effects of the 20 per cent cut in commercial industry. In 1960 his rateable value is £110, but given the current value. The majority of them who live in rented accommodation are having to pay considerably increased in rent. On top of all this if he wants decent education for his children, proper welfare care for his wife and babies, a decent home to live in, he must pay extra for that too.

Now I believe that all Labour authorities ought to take this decision and I think it is very important that the Government should be asked to accept this decision and be united and forthright about it. Nationally and locally the blame must be laid on the Government. If such authorities must go out of their way to explain to their ratepayers what is happening. It is time that they should accept responsibility for their Government’s policy, both by majority and minority Labour authorities. A consistent

(continued next page)
LABOUR'S "PLAN"—contd.

Our Future

By Michael Segal • Co-Editor, Forum, Journal of the Socialist Forum Movement

SociaL FORUMS

What is the strength of modern capitalism? What implications does this hold for radical opinion and action—nationally and internationally—politically and industrially? Does modern imperialism differ in degree or kind from earlier varieties? What does its existence imply the continuation of capitalism in the West? How do we achieve social revolution? What methods be used? What specific forms of industrial and political organisations are needed? What do we mean by 'socialist'-democracy—how does it differ from parliamentary democracy—"people's" democracy?

The list is endless but the discussion, however good, however well-planned and developed, will be useless if it takes place in the context of a general defeat of the working class and a certain defeat of the working movement of events. The conclusions which such a discussion must be applicable and applicable. As a result, therefore, the main object of our work and activity must be the development and clarification of a self-confident, consistent, vigorous and coherent left-wing in the Labour Movement. Within the frame of our controversy, we must extract the major issues of 'grievance and act upon them in a united and effective manner.

Build the Labour Party Left

This is, of course, where the wrangling begins. It also means standing aside the discredited Communist party (although not the remaining discredited Communist party) since it does not exist in the forums and it think it is high time we parted with them openly and with- out fear of offending this or the other.

There are a number of groups who want to create a left-wing within the Labour Party. On the other hand there is several groups having at creating a left-wing within the Labour Party. At some point a choice must be made.

Those who are forming new Parties, Leagues, and Federal bodies, have a partly good, but a little bad, especially, when they are so virulently and stridently left-wing. They are the most popular, and the most effective for their reasons, reasons do not have to be subjected to the views of the pontifex, but to the views of the pontifex, but to the views of the pontifex, but to the views of the pontifex.

REFORM—contd.

policy of attack on the Government is essential. We have seen in St. Pancras that a progressive and forthright Council, with the help of the Socialist contingent, can get the support of people supposed not to be interested in the Socialist Councils, and can get the headlines in local and national newspapers.

If this is to be done successfully, however, the Labour Left must be in the hands of the Parliamentary and the National Labour Party and it is also up to the unions to play their part, not merely in backing their local Councils, but in winning for their people wage increases to compensate for the increased rents and rates.

So far as the other proposals for re- form are concerned, they were very adequately dealt with by the majority of Communists by Mr. Michael Stewart in this way:

The proposals on structure and function are, as stated, qualified by a rivalry and lack of clear purpose throughout. The Government has called it a bold overhaul. It is not an overhaul, it is a fidget. Local authorities are to have only partial re-structuring, no new services, no higher local government, not more than the recognition of the needs of larger cities. The Government will be more progressive and ambitious, even if they are Labour Councilors.

I am inclined to agree with sugges- tions that the new councils be a line with those of County Boroughs. Opposition to such reforms, however, especially in the case of the Town Councils where there are vested interests, is an obstacle. The new councils are reluctantly to part with powers, smaller authorities. Tiny authorities are likely to be absorbed in larger ones. Chairman of Committees shall lead and the smalls often prefer to remain as big fellows in their own little town. In that case the reform will be not much. The Minister will be more progressive and ambitious, even if they are Labour Councilors.

I am inclined to agree with sugges- tions that the new councils be a line with those of County Boroughs. Opposition to such reforms, however, especially in the case of the Town Councils where there are vested interests, is an obstacle. The new councils are reluctantly to part with powers, smaller authorities. Tiny authorities are likely to be absorbed in larger ones. Chairman of Committees shall lead and the smalls often prefer to remain as big fellows in their own little town. In that case the reform will be not much. The Minister will be more progressive and ambitious, even if they are Labour Councilors.

I am inclined to agree with sugges- tions that the new councils be a line with those of County Boroughs. Opposition to such reforms, however, especially in the case of the Town Councils where there are vested interests, is an obstacle. The new councils are reluctantly to part with powers, smaller authorities. Tiny authorities are likely to be absorbed in larger ones. Chairman of Committees shall lead and the smalls often prefer to remain as big fellows in their own little town. In that case the reform will be not much. The Minister will be more progressive and ambitious, even if they are Labour Councilors.

We are breaking down the slogans, the good, the amount of discussion and study to do before clarity and unity are achieved. The worries within the Communist Party and the left of the Labour movement has forced discussion to the forefront. The working of the Forum movement is to channel and develop the discussion until it bears fruit and spills over into concerted action.

The terms of the discussion are de- fined and agreed. It may be that once we are concerned with socialism we are necessarily concerned with the analysis of the modern world in social economic and political terms, with the techniques of achieving a free society of control owned and run by the people, and with the construction of that society.

This article is designed as a con- tribution to discussion and reflects no more than a purely personal expression of opinion.
INTERNATIONAL

The backbone of the fight for national independence in French North Africa is the Algerian trade union movement.

By Andre Giacometti

A GREAT DEAL of recent discussion in the international labour movement has revolved around the Algerian question. At its Fifth Congress in Tunis on January 16th, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (CFTU) demanded that the international labour movement support the Algerian people on the basis of their struggle for Algerian independence.

At the Congress of the Socialist International in Vienna the British and Scottish delegations strongly attacked the policy of the French Socialist Party and of the French government. Several delegations demanded the immediate recognition of Algerian independence; the Congress decided to send an investigation mission to that country.

It is all the more remarkable that the first Congress ever held by an Algerian trade union movement. At the recent Congress of the Algerian Workers' Trade Union Federation in France (CUT), held in Paris from June 28 to July 30, received very little attention in the labour press. Some of the reasons for this, apart from the general political importance of the event, become clear in the historical and present political context of this Congress.

Start and repression

The "Union des Syndicats du Travail d'Algérie" (USTA) was founded in February 1956 in Algiers by trade unionists close to the Algerian nationalist movement, the nationalist party led by Messali Hadji. A month later, the rival National Liberation Front (FLN) followed suit and set up the "Union Générale des Travailleurs Algériens" (UGTA). Both unions maintained separate activities in large part, thanks to the support of the CFTU (controlled trade unions) and the CPA (Communist Party of Algeria).

Their development was cut short by repression. The leadership of the USTA soon found itself in Camp St. Leu; the building was shut down, the records confiscated, and members of the leadership arrested. The USTA continued to function for a few weeks under house arrest and formed a nationalistic party called UDMA which had ties with the FLN under the leadership of Federation of Algeria. The USTA was suppressed, and its leaders were imprisoned in concentration camps. For over a year, the movement was virtually non-existent. They were the leading organizations of the FLN in Algeria.

In France, the USTA remained in existence, under the general laws applying to trade union organizations, and several trade unionists were working in France, who had been either unorganized or members of the USTA. The USTA did not appear in French trade union lines, but the FLN could not rely on its support, for it was split as a result of the 1957 peasants uprising and the FLN split over the question of social democracy, with the FLN and the FLN former members of the USTA. The USTA, which had been unorganized, became a new socialist organization, and organized by employers and police (fringes, searches, arrests); however, the FLN continued to support workers and workers who applied for a visa to return to Algeria).

It made a special point to assert its independence from all Algerians who had been received special open its organization to workers of all political commitments and ethnic origins. It is clear, however, that an Algerian trade union could not evade the political issues arising from the colonial status of the country and the present state of war. Consequently, the Congress adopted a resolution calling for a conference of all a possible conference of representatives of the French government and of all Algerian workers, trade unionists, and other organizations, to negotiate a cease-fire agreement.

The need for independent organization

The need for an independent trade union of Algerian workers has long been a recognized fact. In all fields (education, politics, the press, social security, etc.) the Algerian workers are suffering from discrimination in its most brutal form. They received little support, if any, from French working-class organizations. In the post-war years, almost all organized

its chauvinist and racist reflexes and asking it to collaborate with the USTA in the reconstruction of a free Algeria. Messali Hadji, from Messali Hadji was read, which stated in part: "Even now, you will have to seek by all means internally to establish a federation, with the non-Muslim Algerians who are our brothers, with the Frenchmen and with whom we must build a new Algeria tomorrow, on the basis of a truly democratic, non-totalitarian, non-socialist, non-socialist nation. This great work, which makes demand that all intelligence and human spirit, requires a firm determination to create a situation where the other ethnic groups, living in Algeria will find on our part the friendship, the understanding and the security they need in this period of great change. I say to you, although the most terrible tragedies have befallen the Algerian people, to our brothers of the ethnic minorities all participating in the reconstruction of Algeria, people of all people living in Algeria.

Ays and nays

In France itself, the USTA has also sought the co-operation of French workers, and has found some response among ordinary workers, in spite of widespread racist infection through the press and the radio. Cases are known where workers have stood up—still remained exposed a national—where French workers voted in union elections for the USTA as a protest against the international trade union unions. Although the official leadership of the latter boycotted the Congress of the French National Council of Trade Unions, the FLN was present. Tharreau of the Metal Workers' Federation of Force Ouvrière voted for the CUT. Pierre Tharreau of the GATT, Paul Ruff, Secretary-General of the Teachers' Union of the Paris Region, Marcel of CFTC (Central French Teachers' organization) Hébert, Secretary of YO in Loire-Lorient (St. Nazaire), one of the leaders of the CUT, was one of those who spoke at the Congress or sent greetings.

Faced with this official attitude of the French trade unions has been, not unexpectedly, much different. The leadership of the FLN has supported all phases of the French union movement. It is clear, however, that Algerian workers should join the FLN, the leadership of the CFTC did not commit itself to a political commitment, but kept itself in abeyance until the situation of the FLN, all of whom spoke to the Congress or sent greetings.

The policy of the FLN leadership of the CUT constitutes one of the most important aspects of the Algerian question, and deserves to be exposed in detail.

Unlike the Tunisian and Moroccan trade union bodies, the USTA met with strong opposition from the CUT. At the recent CFTU conference, this opposition expressed itself in the support given by the CUT to the FLN-controlled organization, the Union des Fonctionnaires de l'Etat, which was given by the CUT to the FLN which hopes, not without reason, to capture last part. Contrary to this, the FLN is politically, as well as socially, a patchwork of conflicting interests, its close cohesion and its coherence, is therefore, a considerable achievement. Consequently, the leadership of the USTA was dependent from the beginning on the international Stalins. The Stalins are a ruthless organization of organization as well as political guidance.

In fact, the CUT at first proceeded along the same lines, by setting up the AYCA—an FLN front under CFTU tuition. But, in the face of continued progress

of the USTA, the Stalins leadership fell back on the only methods it can use when it has no political answer. At first, it started a slander campaign, accusing the USTA of being splitters, diversionists, racists, chauvinists, police spies (after 1957, communist spies in general). It denounced USTA organizers by name in publicly distributed leaflets, pointing to them in the street and to the police. Finally, it put its whole apparatus at the disposal of the FLN, which has been in control of the FLN since the end of 1956—supplying the terrorist cells of the FLN with arms from the Stalins (countries) (Eastern Germany in particular). In Lyon, the police recently discovered a large arms cache in a building owned by functionaries of the AYCA-CUT; also in Lyon, the assassination of the local secretary of the USTA a few weeks ago seems to have been organized by French members of the CUT. This is the first case of this nature; it probably will not be the last.

In the省市, the Stalins delegates of the CUT, however, are not content in keeping the USTA out of union elections. In many cities, the Stalins mayors prohibit the CUT from using facilities for USTA meetings and rallies.

By this double policy of attempting to smash the USTA and the FLN, while attempting to expand and strengthen the FLN as it can, the CUT is setting itself once more against the revolution of the Algerian workers and the "achievements" of the Spanish Civil War. But the Algerian workers are not going to cooperate with any of these methods and political manipulation. By now, the Algerian revolution is too big, too old, too organized a movement for the Stalins leadership to handle.

An independent body

From a trade union point of view, and from a political point of view, the CUT is the instrument of the colonial government in French North Africa. It disposes of an experience which none of the other colonial movements had at the outset; the Algerian workers know what bourgeois nationalism is, and how it can paralyze popular mass-struggles; they know what "liberal colonialism" is; they know what Stalinsism is; they know that the only guarantee for progress and freedom is in their own, independent, democratic, socialist movement.

In other words, their own experience has emancipated them from both bourgeois nationalism and from Stalinsism. In this sense, the conflict between USTA and FLN is not completely detrimental to the FLN of Algerian independence. It has clarified the social and political issues from the beginning of the fight for national liberation, and has differentiated a conscious and well-organized proletarian current from the foreign influences which have set it back in Tunisia and in Morocco.

[continued next page]
Oh! What could we do with the money wasted on arms!

by Dona Papert

BRITISH capitalism has been spending £1,600,000 a year on arms. Let us look closely at how this money is spent.

If we went shopping with £1,600,000 a year, what could we buy? First of all think of the things that would provide us with a comfortable standard of living. A large part of the difference between ours and the much vaunted (though partly mythical) American standard of living, is the comparatively larger number of washing-machines, refrigerators, motor cars, etc., owned by the American people. How much would it cost to provide every family with a washing-machine, a refrigerator, and a vacuum-cleaner?

As a rough estimate, suppose that the price of each of these gadgets is £40 (what we want is the cost price, without purchase tax). There are 14,000,000 families in England, and perhaps 2,000,000 already have electrical equipment of this kind. So the figure that we want is £120,000,000 = £1,440,000.

This is less than the amount spent on arms in one year. So with what would our £1,600,000 provide us in one year, every family in England could be given a washing-machine, a refrigerator, and a vacuum-cleaner.

This does not compare with the money which our household knows how this would revolutionise her daily life.

Now consider motor cars. The cost price of a new small car is about £250. If we suppose that there are 13,000,000 families without cars it would cost about £3,250,000,000 to give every family in England a motor car.

The result is clear. We have £1,600,000 a year available for arms. If we spent £1,600,000 a year we could provide our families with a comfortable standard of living and do much more for our homes and our towns.
COLONIAL MALAYA?

INDEPENDENCE WITH STRINGS

By Peggy Rushton • Secretary, MCF

ON AUGUST 31ST this year Malaya obtained self government and Independence and so another colonial territory is technically free from British political domination. Yet it would be wrong to say that Malaya truly calls herself 'independent', for even in the instrument of independence—the London Agreement—the economic and military interests of Britain are still seen to be bound with Malaya.

Malaya is an excellent example of that colonial paradox: a country so poor that the average income of the rice farmer is only 150 dollars a year (last available figure 1954) of which more than one-third will be paid in rent, and yet which is able to pay 411 million dollars in capital income from 1947 to 1953 (Benham's National Income of Malaya 1956) was 2.2% of national income. So rich that in the same years (1949 to 1953) it paid abroad profits and dividends of over $204 million; almost $411 million a year.

Most of this money went to British investors, and many foreign owned firms have paid dividends in the last ten years totalling two, three, and even more times their paid up capital.

Nationalize foreign property

If Malaya is to achieve economic independence and economic self reliance, she will have to take steps to keep these profits within Malaya by nationalizing the capital of foreign-owned enterprises. The alternative is to see $411 million a year in profits leave Malaya and be borne (Par 30) "to remain within the Sterling Area" and (Par 31) "to exercise restraint in its foreign investments". The words in return for political freedom Malaya has agreed not to continue its foreign investments, for she does not wish a quick return of the money which Britain holds which belongs to her.

RENTS ACT

should not organize the profound ingenuity of hundreds of thousands into a mighty force. The question is: Will we take a secondary step? Learn the facts

The first step that must be taken everywhere is to see that every tenant who is faced with a rent increase knows his rights under the Act and is given every encouragement and assistance to avail himself of them. The Rent Act is more than a matter of adequate defense for the tenants to organize for the defense of their rights. It is a matter of legislation for the men in the street to follow and the majority of active Labour Party workers will have to study its provisions very carefully before they master all of them.

For them the Labour Party's Rent Act Guide (July, 1957, price 1/e) is indispensable: it gives guidance on practically all issues and every Constancy Party should have a supply available.

For more general distribution, however, every Labour Party covering considerable areas of rented domestic property would do well to follow the excellent example set by the Stoke-on-Trent City Party. Here the Party has established a first class feeding project which conveys the gist of the Act’s provisions in a simple, concise and direct form, easily available to any tenant by posting up a table similar to the one contained on page 48 of the Labour Party Guide, which enables anyone to work out what his maximum rent is under the Act by a simple and readily accessible calculation. Stafford Tivdord Council has also done this.

Briefly, in houses which remain covenanted (those whose Rentable or Net Annual Value is £40 or less in the Metropolitan, and £30 or less elsewhere) the maximum permitted rent depends primarily on the Gross Value of any house. This is a figure fixed for rating purposes, obtainable from the Rating department of the local authority in whose house is situated. Given the maximum annual rent is 2½ times this figure if the landlord is responsible for all repairs, including internal decoration, twice this figure if he does not do internal decoration, and 1½ times if the tenant is responsible for both inside and outside repairs.

However, the landlord must give three months' notice of an intended increase—on the correct form A—and he may not put the whole increase into effect before it proceeds 7/6. for a further six months.

Even then the tenant has the right to see a notice on the front door to the landlord, keeping a dated copy himself, listing any faults or defects in need of repair and mail to the local authority for a certificate of disrepair on Form I of the landlord fails to undertake to remedy these after six weeks.

If the local authority issues a certificate of disrepair, the tenant need only pay his original rent (or after the 6th January, 1958, a rent of ½ times the gross value) until the repairs are done. Furthermore, he may deduct from his rent at the reduced level, the total amount above this original rent prior to the issue of the certificate of disrepair.

According to a social worker quoted by the Times (9th August, 1957)—"It has been impossible for many working people who are elderly people to understand either the documents given them by the landlord or the Government's pamphlets." Unless they are given full advice in their rights, many of them will not use them.

This is one of the main problems with a leaflet supplied that produced in Stoke-on-Trent, and a supply of the most important forms G, D and E to representants of the local authority or local parties, in order to find an enthusiastic reception at many doors in rented property areas and will undoubtedly bring an increase in the resistance of landlords to the Bill.

Form Tenants' Associations

Wherever feasible, an attempt should be made to form a tenants' association which is unconnected with any political party, though, of course, many members of such associations are of great importance in such associations. Many people who for one reason or another feel that a political party will participate wholeheartedly in a tenants' movement.

Further developments which can affiliate to the National Association of Tenants and Residents which is able to provide expert advice and to provide direct contact between tenants facing similar problems throughout the country.

However, where tenants' associations are not possible and owing to the scarcity of money for tenants' interests, this will often be the case. The Labour Party must fill the breach. In London at least, where they meet up, they must set up local advice bureaux served by local councillors and other representatives. Will be the responsibility of every tenant to answer every query brought in or to secure the answer if it is obscure.

The result of a widespread campaign of this character will be striking. Tenants will realise their own strength and their consciousness of the connection between their affairs and that of the local and the national parties will be heightened. Many of the tenants of houses which have been controlled (i.e., those whose Net Annual Value is £40 or more in the Metropolitan, and £30 or more in the thickest of the struggle and in many places there will be tenaciously fought rent increases.

By supporting the struggle to the full, by emphasising the fact that the policy of the Government is the cost of houses to all sections—not only rented property tenants but also tenants of houses sold in the open market by means of increasing mortgage rates—it will be possible to develop a movement which will care for the well-being of the tenant. The movement will gradually impede the implementation of this unjust Act of 1957, which will strike fear into the working tenants of Britain of rule by the rich for all time.