Don't trust the "swing"

ATTACK THE TORIES NOW

WHERE is the Opportunity State now? Australian immigration offices. Where our living standards in 25 years? On the picket line, resisting, on a background of stagnating industrial production. What of the plateau of prices? Steeper than ever. Are we any nearer to approach the witch's cauldron on Christmas Island?

The Tories are wide open to attack. Even the disoriented mirror of local government elections, such as were held last month, shows that. Many of their floating supporters turned a hair as 343 council seats changed hands. A General Election held now would give a Labour Government a 100-seat majority.

And this is not the end. The Rents Bill will soon be having its effects. Prices are still going up while the Tories are busily packing ice around wages. If the Tory fortunes are at ebb now, they will have reached their nadir by the time Summer is through.

But there is no point in trusting the "swing" to clear out the Tories. In parliamentary politics whoever gains on the swings loses in the roundabouts. A Labour Government that comes to power by default, on the very remotest and most abject abstentions that is sure to lose it in a similar way. And nothing will remain to mark its passage.

Maybe this is what the Right-wing leadership want. Did not Kenneth Younger MP in a recent Suez debate summon the Tories to return to the "mainstream of our post-war history" and embark once again on a bipartisan foreign policy? Have we seen a campaign worthy of the name against the Rents Bill? Has one demonstration been organized by the Labour Party to protest against the H-Bomb tests?

The opportunities are there, crying out from neglect. The Labour Party could sweep the country on these three issues alone. But for that, the leadership cannot mount an alternative: No Tests, No Bomb, No Arms; Freeze the Rents; A Socialist Foreign Policy, And this they are unwilling, or unable, to do.

The rank-and-file in the Movement cannot afford to accept this for long. The Tories are exacting the price of their international brutality and national capidity from the British workers. These are waiting vainly for their "representatives" to tide of the swinging and balances of Parliamentary fortune.

The time is ripe. The mood is there. Campaign for a General Election now through meetings, demonstrations and industrial action.

Cllr. Peggy Duff shows how ST. PANCRAS SHOWS THE WAY

The ST. PANCRAS BOROUGH COUNCIL, of which I am a Member, has recently caught the headlines by its decision to discontinue Civil Defence.

The matter was first discussed in considering the rate estimates for 1957/58, but the decision is not in any way a financial or economy measure. Our contribution to Civil Defence is under £2,000, out of a budget of nearly £3 million.

The Council decided on this action as a protest against the manufacture and testing of H-Bombs. The White Paper on Future Defence Policy had stated that: "There is no means of providing adequate protection of the population of the country against the effects of sequences of an attack with nuclear weapons . . . widespread devastation could not be prevented."

In a letter to Sir Frank Newsum, of the Home Office, we said: "According to reliable scientific opinion, society is powerless to prevent the murder of unborn babies through the poisoning of the atmosphere which is even now taking place as the result of the mere testing of thermo-nuclear weapons. Should these weapons ever be deliberately used against the people of this country, civil defence would be utterly futile. Under these circumstances, to participate in civil defence is to participate in a cruel deception of the people."

The Political fight

But it is not only because we feel that civil defence can do nothing for a Borough right in the centre of the greatest concentration in the world of nuclear war comes, it is also because we wish to protest against the policy of the Government which places millions of lives to work while admitting that it cannot protect them from the consequences.

"You yourself admit," we told Sir Frank Newsum, "that precisely because or the danger the over-riding consideration must be to prevent war. Every sane man and woman will agree with that, but when you further state that the only means of preserving the population against the effects of nuclear war is by a race to create thermo-nuclear deterrents we must register a profound disagreement."

"It is in our opinion," we said, "utterly irresponsible—the more so since the decision as to whether or not we shall see such a race must largely with the Government of the United States of America over whose actions the British people have absolutely no control."

Firm against H.O. threats

The Home Office is now threatening to take over Civil Defence in the Borough in the name of and at the expense of St. Pancras and to take over the premises and staff, and have asked for a reply, by June 1st. A special meeting of the General Purposes Committee will be held, and a special Council Meeting so that a reply can be sent in time.

What we shall decide I cannot say, but I believe that St. Pancras will stand by its decision. The debate at the last Council Meeting was impressive precisely because Labour Members of the Borough faced the same issues and opinions backed the decision.

What is needed now is that other Labour authorities should rally to the support of St. Pancras and to take part in what is a wicked deception of the people to prevent. The people are opposed, and an integral part of the Labour programme. The only difference is that the people of this Borough that H-Bombs and all nuclear weapons should be banned as the first step towards general disarmament.
After their victorious national strike, engineering and shipbuilding workers watched anxiously as their

INDUSTRIAL VICTORY TURNS SOUR

By Jack Selvin Secretary, Sudbury Hill EAU

"We do not believe that the acceptance of our wage proposals in the present case would imperil the engineering industry..." is among the conclusions of the Court of Inquiry into the engineering dispute (Cmnd. 159, para. 57). A similar conclusion was reached by the Court of Inquiry into the shipbuilding dispute (Cmnd. 160, para. 72).

That is so, this will come as a surprise to those of us in these two industries, who are constantly being told by the newspapers, and a careful, critical reading of these reports will reveal the same.

For as the engineering Report says, "We can appreciate the unwisdom of the employers not to accept this offer (the employers' 31 per cent), having the knowledge that in other industries which were not profitable or much less profitable than the engineering industry appeared to be, wage increases of 3 per cent were being accepted; we therefore recommend a 5 per cent increase at least on wage rates."

The reasoning applied to shipbuilding.

There can be no doubt that the em-


ployers are still mentally in the period when eleven men were looking for ten.

They are cutting wages accordingly whilst bitterly complaining about the demands being submitted under threat of strike action.

The strings... It is not surprising therefore that when it came to the question of the "strings," printed elsewhere on this page) both reports have this to say: "As a result of the employers put forward: "The advantages which they think would be derived from their acceptance, for which they would be prepared to pay.

Before workers rush to cash in on this statement they should note that the Courts suggest no more than another 2½d. per week; and for what? A saving of 4½d. per week (which means, in practice, almost TWO years since new claims must not be submitted within the standard period) ALL disputes to be settled by the parties concerned; the courts to be avoided; the parties to be free to innovations; and, of course, the removal of all means of effective protest should nothing go as the workers want them.

Both Reports urge the acceptance of this settlement. They say: "The principles embodied in these measures are in no sense prejudicial to the interests of the Unions and their members!"

Of course, there would still be the Sick and Superannuation Benefits as a reason for belonging to a Union, and the right to elect a Shop Steward so that he could come round occasionally to see how things were going. If this were a document offered a defeated army, it would be comprehensible. But it represents a surrender from the Unions. But it is not.

The magnificant response of the shipbuilding and engineering Unions to the recent national strike surely indicates what should be done with Annex B. That is, the courts to be used to their full effect to cut down the stoppages of workers as they like with their own."

National wage policy! Most reasonable people would accept the idea that a dispute between parties should not be heard by someone not directly interested and therefore, by implication, impartial. If this could be arranged it would undoubtedly have its advantages.

But an examination of the facts would quickly reveal that the solution of industrial disputes along these lines would involve a complete reorganization of society.

In their submissions to the Unions in 1955 the employers stated (after stressing the importance of engineering in the national economy) that they must be assured "an adequate return for the risks involved." In short, in efficient profits, no engineering industry!

Indeed, the employers complained to the Court of Inquiry that the time necessary to divest themselves of the dividends mentioned by the Unions were due to new 'capital' investments amounting to £700 million; and that the restrictions allegedly imposed by the Unions inhibited expansion and cut down the chances of making yet more profits. This does not, of course, stop them from introducing bogy the bogey of their members being "perfect.

Such a conclusion, that is, reorganization, would be too revolutionary. It can only be expected from the courts to accept the prevailing philosophy of private profits and production for profit. Indeed, if they were able to get away with it they would be bolder the other way. So we cannot expect impartiality.

The "string" is the link between the employers and the workers. And so it is. The Court proceeds to try and find a way out although they are "deeply conscious that the proposals which we have made have no complete solution to the problem.

They recommend 8½d. or 5 per cent without "strings"," or 1½, with "strings," remarking in passing that we are justified in pointing out that if the Employers and shipbuilders' can't born resistance to a wage claim which is part of a series of similar claims affecting the entire economy the result is likely to be that friction is generated and industrial relations seriously strained. They follow this statement quoted in the beginning of this article.

Threat to unions

These two sets of ideas are contained in and lurking behind the aforementioned Annex B, and the court's conclusion of the application of an "authoritative and impartial body" to settle a wage policy for industry are clearly stated in the two Courts of Inquiry's recommendations.

The smooth way in which they are put over conceals an attempt, under the guise of the general welfare of society, to replace the Trade Unions with some other body not controlled by the workers, whether organized or not.

And it is this fact above all else that is of the widest possible importance to all workers. For the underlying philosophy of the Report is one that totally ignores the fact that the workers are the public (and their labour power) to sell and are ENTITLED within the existing framework, to strike and refuse to work. It seeks to evade the question of the position of workers, and more item on the cost sheet, accepting what is dished out without being able to protest effectively. Of course, if they are human, there is plenty of provision for consultations so that they may blow off steam.

INDUSTRIAL NOTES

By Ron Keating and David Brene

FOR TOO MANY YEARS NOW THE only opposition to the right-wing leadership of the trade-union Movement has come from King Street. On a national level the only alternative to the Carrons and Williams' has been the Birches and Wyckhams. It is now possible for the Employers' and shipbuilders' to make a wage claim which is part of a series of similar claims affecting the entire economy the result is likely to be that friction is generated and industrial relations seriously strained. They follow this statement quoted in the beginning of this article.

1. That any agreements reached on the present national wages application shall be in full settlement of all existing national and district claims, whether by direct negotiations or by individual Unions, for increased wages and differentials (subject to (2) below) and no further applications for such increases or differentials shall be submitted for at least one year from the date of agreement.

2. That any claim surrendered prior to 23rd March, 1957, shall be dealt with under Procedure.

3. That there will be a complete observance of all Agreements, both national and local.

The Executive of all the Unions affiliated to the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions will give effect to this decision in its entirety, including, for example:

(a) Unconstitutional stoppages of work.
(b) Embargoes on overtime.
(c) All restrictions on output or earnings. This provision will not, by itself, be used to reduce piecework prices.

6. That the Executives of all the Unions affiliated to the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions will use their full authority to influence to bring to an end without delay all practices which are contrary to the welfare of the Industry, including, for example:

(a) Unconstitutional stoppages of work.
(b) Embargoes on overtime.
(c) All restrictions on output or earnings. This provision will not, by itself, be used to reduce piecework prices.

6. That the Executives of all the Unions affiliated to the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions will use their full authority to influence to bring to an end without delay all practices which are contrary to the welfare of the Industry, including, for example:

(a) Unconstitutional stoppages of work.
(b) Embargoes on overtime.
(c) All restrictions on output or earnings. This provision will not, by itself, be used to reduce piecework prices.

Post-script: "Engineers, workers and others too, will be shocked by the decision of the Confeder. Executive to operate "on lines of..." settings as the basis for negotiations with the bosses. Anyone who wishes to see some of the dangers inherent in this decision should only look at the following extracts from the reports..." There can be no doubt that the Unions, or rather the handful of union leaders who have so far dominated the movement, have forfeited the trust of their members by thus jeopardizing their real interests. The employers have already shown that they have more than the "stringy" gain of 2½d. a week and a period of industrial "peace."

The urge to accept the "strings" is to protest as firmly as he can, to show that even if he failed to put pressure on his employers, the decision was taken (as advocated in this article) he will not accept the "strings" as binding — Editors.

THE STRINGS (ANNEX B)

1. That any agreements reached on the present national wages application shall be in full settlement of all existing national and district claims, whether by direct negotiations or by individual Unions for increased wages and differentials (subject to (2) below) and no further applications for such increases or differentials shall be submitted for at least one year from the date of such agreement.

2. That any claim surrendered prior to 23rd March, 1957, shall be dealt with under Procedure.

3. That there will be a complete observance of all Agreements, both national and local.

The Executive of all the Unions affiliated to the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions will give effect to this decision in its entirety, including, for example:

(a) Unconstitutional stoppages of work.
(b) Embargoes on overtime.
(c) All restrictions on output or earnings. This provision will not, by itself, be used to reduce piecework prices.

6. That the Executives of all the Unions affiliated to the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions will use their full authority to influence to bring to an end without delay all practices which are contrary to the welfare of the Industry, including, for example:

(a) Unconstitutional stoppages of work.
(b) Embargoes on overtime.
(c) All restrictions on output or earnings. This provision will not, by itself, be used to reduce piecework prices.

6. That the Executives of all the Unions affiliated to the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions will use their full authority to influence to bring to an end without delay all practices which are contrary to the welfare of the Industry, including, for example:

(a) Unconstitutional stoppages of work.
(b) Embargoes on overtime.
(c) All restrictions on output or earnings. This provision will not, by itself, be used to reduce piecework prices.

6. That the Executives of all the Unions affiliated to the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions will use their full authority to influence to bring to an end without delay all practices which are contrary to the welfare of the Industry, including, for example:

(a) Unconstitutional stoppages of work.
(b) Embargoes on overtime.
(c) All restrictions on output or earnings. This provision will not, by itself, be used to reduce piecework prices.

6. That the Executives of all the Unions affiliated to the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions will use their full authority to influence to bring to an end without delay all practices which are contrary to the welfare of the Industry, including, for example:

(a) Unconstitutional stoppages of work.
(b) Embargoes on overtime.
(c) All restrictions on output or earnings. This provision will not, by itself, be used to reduce piecework prices.
we live in a critical period for civilisation. During the last half century humanity has suffered two terrible wars and is now living in the shadow of total annihilation. The present generation has witnessed mass unemployment and hunger, fascism and the gas chamber, barbarous murders of colonial peoples in Kenya and Malaya, Algeria and Korea.

However, in the midst of these terrible conditions, significant gains have been made in a number of countries of the West—the United States, Britain, Canada, Norway, Sweden, Holland, Denmark, Germany and others—show a stubborn adherence to Reformism, a belief in the possibility of major improvements in condition under capitalism, and a rejection of the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism. Why is this so? Why the general political apathy and rejection of revolutionary changes in society, when humanity is which is in the grip of life and death struggles?

Only if we find the correct answer to this question can we answer another one: For how long can Reformism play its role in the working class? There can scarcely be a question more vital for Socialists in this period of intense capitalist Socialism movement. The present article is an attempt to contribute something towards the clarification of these problems.

Lenin's theory

The most important Marxist to define the roots of Reformism was Lenin. In 1913, in an article entitled The Foundations of the International, Lenin explained Reformism, or to use the term he coined, Opportunism, thus: "[I]n the period in which the distribution of the world amongst the 'great' and privileged nations, by whom all other countries are oppressed, is completed. Scraps of the booty enjoyed by the privileged as a result of this oppression undoubtedly fall to the lot of certain sections of the petty-bourgeoisie and the aristocracy and bureaucracy of the working class.

How big was the section of the working class which received these "scraps of booty"? Lenin says "... these sections ... represent an infinitesimal minority of the proletariat and the working masses."

And in line with this analysis Lenin defines Reformism as "the adherence of a section of the working class to the bourgeois against the mass of the proletariat."

The economic foundation of the small "aristocracy of labour" is to be found, according to Lenin, in the aristoc-

cracy and the capitalist's profits. He writes in a preface dated July 6, 1920, to his book Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism:

"Obviously, out of such enormous surpluses (since they are obtained over and above the profits which capitalists squeeze out of the workers of their "own" country) it is possible to bribe their labour leaders and an upper stratum of the labour aristocracy. And the capitalists of the "advanced" countries do bribe them; they bribe them in a thousand different ways, direct and indirect, overt and covert.

"This stratum of bourgeoisized workers or 'labour aristocracy,' who have become completely petty-bourgeois in mode of thought and amount of their earnings, and in their point of view, serve as the main support of the Second International. In our day, the principal social (not for capitalist enterprises) support of the bourgeoisie. They are the real agents of the bourgeoisie in the labour movement, the labour lieutenants of the capitalist class, the real carriers of reformism and chauvinism."

Conclusion vs. facts

An inevitable conclusion following upon Lenin's analysis of Reformism is that a small thin crust of conservatism hides the revolutionary urges of the mass of the workers. Any break with this crust would lead to a going revolutionary lava. The role of the revolutionary Party is simply to make sure that the mass of the workers' interests are betrayed by the "infinitesimal minority" of "aristocracy of labour."

This conclusion, however, is not confirmed by the history of Reformism in Britain, the United States and elsewhere. Over the past half-century, its solidity, its spread throughout the working class, frustrating and largely isolating all revolutionary minorities makes it abundantly clear that the economic, social roots of Reformism are not in an infinitesimal minority of the proletariat and the working class, as Lenin argued.

Showing where Lenin's analysis went wrong will help us to see more clearly the real economic, social and historical foundations of reformism.

How to throw crumbs

The first question one has to ask in tackling Lenin's analysis is: How did the super-profits of say, British companies in the colonies, lead to the "throwing of crumbs" to the "aristo-
cracy of labour" in Britain? The an
ter to this question invades the whole of Lenin's analysis of Reformism.

To take an example, the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company has been drawing magnificent super-profits over decades. How does this lead to crumbs being thrown to the aristocracy of Labour? First of all, this company employs only a small number of workers in Britain. And even these, there are certainly not given higher wages simply because its profiteers are high. No capitalist says to the workers: "I have made high profits this year, so I am ready to give you higher wages."

Imperialism, and the export of capita-

l, can of course greatly affect the wages level in the industrial country by giving employment to many workers who produce the machines, mills, locomotives, etc. which make up the real content of the capital exported. This influence on the level of employment, obviously affects the wages level generally. But why should it affect only the real wages of an "infinitesimal minority"? Does the increase of employment possibilities, and decline in unemployment, lead to the rise of a small "aristocracy of labour" while the conditions of the mass of the working class is hardly affected at all? Are conditions of more or less full employment conducive to increasing differentials between skilled and unskilled workers? They are cer
tainly not.

One may argue that the high super-

profits of the capitalists or their in
estments in the colonies led to a rise of wages in another way: that the capital from these investments goes into housing, education, and other welfare for the workers. But this is so, because it cannot be said to lead to an increasing differentiation of living standards be
tween the different layers of the work-
ing class.

We go up together

Look at simple examples like the prohibition of child labour or limitation of the hours of work, at low wages, etc. These do not affect the supply, and hence wages, in the skilled labour market more than in the unskilled. The limitation of the trade, also does not affect the skilled labour market more than the unskilled. In theory, that raises the standard of living of the mass of the workers, unskilled and semi-skilled, diminishes the difference between their standards and those of the skilled workers. The higher the general standard of living, including the educational level, the easier for unskilled workers to become semi-

skilled or skilled. The financial bur-
den of apprenticeship is more easily borne by better-off workers. And the easier it is for workers to learn a skill, the better the general conditions of life between skilled and unskilled workers.

Again, one can argue that the imperia-

lism throws "crumbs" to workers through the fact that it gets foodstuffs (and raw materials) extremely cheaply, cheaply and thus improves the general living conditions of the whole of the working class of the industrial countries. To this extent, by raising the general living standards, the trade unions consisted only of skilled workers.

In fact, all historical experience testifies that the lower the workers' rights and the more the downtrodden they are, the greater are the differentials, especially between skilled and unskilled workers. This is clearly illustrated by the following table comparing the wages of skilled and unskilled workers between the two worlds war in an economically advanced country like Britain and backward one like Rumania:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Skilled Wages as Percentage of Unskilled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Clark, Conditions of Economic Progress, London, 1950, p.460.)

The point is that the "crumbs" are not given on the basis of the workers' rights or the workers' conditions. However, the conditions of the unskilled or the semi-skilled workers are in fact always determined by the conditions of the skilled workers. In the case of Britain, the skilled workers are not affected by the concessions to trade unions and the political activity of the labour movement on the whole. But the better the general conditions of life of all workers, the better the position of the skilled workers. But this factor, again, affects the standard of living not only of a minority of workers, but of all workers. This is why the trade unions consisted only of skilled workers.

The point is that the "crumbs" are not given on the basis of the workers' rights or the workers' conditions. However, the conditions of the unskilled or the semi-skilled workers are in fact always determined by the conditions of the skilled workers. In the case of Britain, the skilled workers are not affected by the concessions to trade unions and the political activity of the labour movement on the whole. But the better the general conditions of life of all workers, the better the position of the skilled workers. But this factor, again, affects the standard of living not only of a minority of workers, but of all workers. This is why the trade unions consisted only of skilled workers.
language, grown more humane than our forebears that were the sides of those who cannot pay for such a refuge? They sleep where they find a place under a bridge or in some corner where the police and the owners leave them undisturbed.

However, housing, sanitation, education were all of the same standard. One scarcely needs further proof that the conditions prevailing in the whole country, and not only of a small minority, have improved radically under capitalism this last century. Imperialism and reformism

As we have seen, there has been a close connection between the ideas of the expansion of capitalism and the rise of Reformism. What was an immediate cause of the Reformism movement? The two are connected.

(1) The markets of the backward colonial countries, by increasing demand for goods from the industrial countries, weaken the tendency for over-production there, decrease the reserve army of unemployed, and so bring the wages of workers in the industrial countries.

(2) The increase in wages brought about in this way has a cumulative effect. By increasing the internal market, capitalists are capable of an increased demand for goods, and since the tendency for over-production is weakened, unemployment decreases, wages rise.

(3) The export of capital adds to the prosperity of the industrial countries as it creates a market for their goods, and also the export of raw materials of cotton goods from Britain to India, enables the Indian industry to pay for its imports, and, for instance. On the other hand, the export of the capital for the building of a railway presupposes an export of goods—rail, locomotives, etc.—by means of which the export of raw materials and foodstuffs in the colonies allows real wages in the industrial countries to be raised without cutting prices or profit. This increase of wages means widened domestic markets without a decrease in the rate and amount of profit, i.e., without weakening the motive power of capitalist production.

(4) The period during which the agrarian colonial countries, the broader markets for the industrial countries, will be longer in years, the (a) scale of the colonial world compared with the productive power of the advanced industrial countries, and (b) the extent that the industrialization of the former is postponed.

Vested interest in nationalism

(8) All the beneficial effects of Imperialism on capitalist prosperity would disappear if there were national boundaries between the industrial capitalist countries and their colonies.

British exports and capital to India and India's imports of raw materials and industrial products both increased, so that the increase in capital investment in the colonies will be greater. This is because the increase of production for the British market is a real increase of production, and so on. The increase of production means that the Indian industry has to pay for its imports, and, for instance, the export of iron and steel in the colonies allows real wages in the industrial countries to be raised without cutting prices or profit. This increase of wages means widened domestic markets without a decrease in the rate and amount of profit, i.e., without weakening the motive power of capitalist production.

(9) The effects of Imperialism on capitalist prosperity, and thus on the expansion of capitalism, do not limit themselves to the Imperialist Powers proper, but spread to a greater or lesser degree into the whole of the capitalist countries. Thus a prosperous British, for instance, can offer a wide market to Danish butter, and so spread the benefits of derived by British capitalism from the exploitation of the Empire to Danish capitalism.

Economic basis of the Right

(10) The expansion of capitalism through imperialism made it possible for the trade unions and Labour Party to win concessions for the workers from capitalism without overthrowing it. This gives rise to a large Russian bureaucracy, which in its turn becomes a brake on the revolutionary development of the working class. The major function of a bureaucracy is that it is a go-between the workers and the bosses, to mediate, negotiate agreements between them, and "keep the peace" between the classes.

Wages rise before Empire

As a matter of fact a tremendous rise in workers' wages took place long before the 1930 real industrial workers in Britain were some 62 per cent. higher than in 1850 (Layton, A Study of Prices). The reason was quite obvious: the most important factor in improving real wages in Britain was the expansion of work opportunities—the expansion of an economy based on an enlargement of the market for the industrial products. And this took place long before the period of export of capital.

To put it roughly, between 1760 and 1850, when the expanding output of the British industry was accompanied by the export of many British artisans and Irish peasants, these went into the British labour market and so kept wages very low. But since the middle of the 19th century, British artisans and, after the Hungry Forties, the rural and cultural population of Ireland, were either absorbed into British industry, or emigrated from there. From then on, it was the Indian artisan and peasant who were ruined by the competition of British capital, and so they did not enter the British labour market to depress wages.

The following point in the British trade trend took place long before the end of 19th century, and actually at the time when the working class was entering the British labour market. The depression during the 30 years of the 19th century, is clear from the following interesting table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real Wages, 1759 to 1903</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But the trade union and Labour Party bureaucracy are effective in disciplining the working class. The bourgeoisie run only to the extent that the economic conditions of the workers themselves are to a certain extent. In the final analysis the base of Imperialism is in capitalist prosperity.

Labour imperialism

(11) If Reformism is rooted in Imperialism, it is important for it to have a "national" Imperialism against its class enemies, against the rising colonial movements.

Reformism reflects the immediate, day-by-day interests of the whole working class in the Western capitalist countries under conditions of general economic prosperity. These immediate interests are in contradiction with the historical and international character of the working class, of Socialism.

As capitalist prosperity, together with relatively favourable conditions in the labour market, can be held in check by Imperialist expansion, by the exploitation of the colonial peoples and the delay in the extension of production to the colonies of the 19th century, the following point in the Imperialism domination over backward countries was not a large extent the expression of the Imperialism domination over backward countries.

However, prosperity with more or less full employment and relatively tolerant political conditions may be induced at least for a time by the conditions of the permanent war economy (see my article "The Permanent War Economy" Socialist Review, May, 1957). Reformism has economic roots, and the permanent war economy takes the place of Imperialism expansion.

The war economy

During the thirties, in the face of the deep world crisis of the capitalist and Fascism, it looked as if the foundations of Reformism were undermined for good. But the situation in that period and prospects from the future, Trotsky wrote: "in the epoch of decaying capitalism, in a decade in which the systematic change of social reforms and the raising of the masses' living standards, when every capitalist is a petty-bourgeois, a petty bourgeois and every serious demand of the petty bourgeoisie inevitably reaches the working class and its property relations and of the bourgeois state." (The Death Agony of Capitalism).

If serious reforms are no longer possible under capitalism, then the knell of bourgeois parliamentarianism and Fascism, it looked as if it was undermined for good. But the situation in that period and prospects from the future, Trotsky wrote: "in the epoch of decaying capitalism, in a decade in which the systematic change of social reforms and the raising of the masses' living standards, when every capitalist is a petty-bourgeois, a petty bourgeois and every serious demand of the petty bourgeoisie inevitably reaches the working class and its property relations and of the bourgeois state." (The Death Agony of Capitalism).

But the trade union and Labour Party bureaucracy are effective in disciplining the working class. The bourgeoisie run only to the extent that the economic conditions of the workers themselves are to a certain extent. In the final analysis the base of Imperialism is in capitalist prosperity.

(12) Imperialism, as The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, pointed out in an important report, is a "national" Imperialism against its class enemies, against the rising colonial movements.

Reformism reflects the immediate, day-by-day interests of the whole working class in the Western capitalist countries under conditions of general economic prosperity. These immediate interests are in contradiction with the historical and international character of the working class, of Socialism.

As capitalist prosperity, together with relatively favourable conditions in the labour market, can be held in check by Imperialist expansion, by the exploitation of the colonial peoples and the delay in the extension of production to the colonies of the 19th century, the following point in the Imperialism domination over backward countries was not a large extent the expression of the Imperialism domination over backward countries.

However, prosperity with more or less full employment and relatively tolerant political conditions may be induced at least for a time by the conditions of the permanent war economy (see my article "The Permanent War Economy" Socialist Review, May, 1957). Reformism has economic roots, and the permanent war economy takes the place of Imperialism expansion.

The war economy

During the thirties, in the face of the deep world crisis of the capitalist and Fascism, it looked as if the foundations of Reformism were undermined for good. But the situation in that period and prospects from the future, Trotsky wrote: "in the epoch of decaying capitalism, in a decade in which the systematic change of social reforms and the raising of the masses' living standards, when every capitalist is a petty-bourgeois, a petty bourgeois and every serious demand of the petty bourgeoisie inevitably reaches the working class and its property relations and of the bourgeois state." (The Death Agony of Capitalism).

If serious reforms are no longer possible under capitalism, then the knell of bourgeois parliamentarianism and Fascism, it looked as if it was undermined for good. But the situation in that period and prospects from the future, Trotsky wrote: "in the epoch of decaying capitalism, in a decade in which the systematic change of social reforms and the raising of the masses' living standards, when every capitalist is a petty-bourgeois, a petty bourgeois and every serious demand of the petty bourgeoisie inevitably reaches the working class and its property relations and of the bourgeois state." (The Death Agony of Capitalism).

But the trade union and Labour Party bureaucracy are effective in disciplining the working class. The bourgeoisie run only to the extent that the economic conditions of the workers themselves are to a certain extent. In the final analysis the base of Imperialism is in capitalist prosperity.

(12) Imperialism, as The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, pointed out in an important report, is a "national" Imperialism against its class enemies, against the rising colonial movements.
Since the days of Chartism successive working class organisations have been divided between the reformists and the socialists. Indeed the Chartists themselves were similarly divided between the genuine revolutionaries (the representatives of the "school of physical force") and the reformists (the representatives of the "school of moral force"). Even so the Chartist movement before the conflicting class interests and aims of the movement fully developed fought a united battle for a better way of life under the slogan "Political Power Our Means, Social Happiness Our End."

But the Chartist movement declined, not because the representatives of the school of physical force alienated the working class, but because the working class was forced by its own history to accept forward revolutionary ideas. The movement declined because British capitalism was entering a period of boom.

The boom and reforms

With the opening up of Australia, the building of railways in India, and the exporting of commodities all over the world, the expansion of capitalism enjoyed a boom from 1845 until the "great depression" of 1873. Meanwhile Britain was called "the workshop of the world." Free Trade meant abundant imports of cheap food and raw materials which also meant a reduction in the price of wages and foreign competition.

The most politically conscious workers joined forces with middle class Liberals to defend Free Trade against Tory landlords who wanted to bring the Corn Laws back and so raise the prices of grains in their favour. During this period hundreds of thousands of workers (including some politically conscious workers) emigrated to the colonies or to the United States of America. The discovery of gold in California and Australia led to a booming export trade supplying those countries. By exporting machinery and other capital goods we helped to build up the industrial potential of these countries. Capitalism digs its own grave indeed.

The Reform Act had been repealed in 1852, but the trade unions were still shackled by judge-made law. In 1859, 300,000 people, all combinations which tended to "interfere with trade were illegal and even criminal."

"Other working people were allowed to form trade unions, but not to use them to better their conditions by a strike."

That was capitalist justice in the original land of freedom and democracy. We have been seen to take the same step to other countries, especially France. The first international working class organisation, the International Working Men's Association—was formed in 1864. Karl Marx was the inspirer and leading spirit of the IWMA. The International prevented the importation of foreign workers as well as international blacklegging. But theoretical Marxists had yet to sink its roots in Britain.

The Reform Bill of 1867 was passed as a concession to mass agitation, in order to allow our "altering party system" a "new foundation and a new alliance."

Tories united to throw Gladstone's Reform Bill of 1866. The trade union (with the approval of Marx) took part in this struggle. Although the new reform movement did not achieve universal manhood suffrage, the Tory Government was forced to give the vote to the better-paid worker in the boroughs.

RIGHT-WING LABOUR END

For this to happen it is necessary, of course, that the standard of living of workers should be cut to the bone. An American worker would react very strongly to a threat to his car and television set, even if workers elsewhere look at these things as unattainable luxuries. To the extent that past reforms are accepted as necessities, a series of new reforms becomes the expected course of events. With the eating comes the appetite. When capitalism, however, does not extend that any serious demands of the working class reach beyond certain limits, the bell will toll for Reformism.

A realistic understanding of the foundations of Reformism, its strengths and depth, as well as the factors undermining it, is necessary to any understanding of the future of the Socialist movement. As Engels put it more than a hundred years ago: "The condition of the working class is the real basis and point of departure of all social movements at present. A knowledge of proletarian conditions is absolutely necessary to be able to provide solid ground for socialist theories."

"Preface to The Condition of The Working Class in England 1844" By James D. Young

The following article, sent us from Scotland, has had to be shortened unfortunately.

We hope that, in doing so, we have not misinterpreted the author and that readers will be grateful for the satisfactions of his class history written from a socialist view-point. Despite our guillotine, the lessons are clear there are no demarcations in working-class activity between political and industrial action—they serve the same purpose; there can be no substitution of revolutionary struggles by reforms—the latter are often shaken out by the threat of the former. This is not all, but we can leave the reader to draw his own conclusions from this historical survey.

Editors.

The British Labour Movement, 1848-1897

Again and again we witness the power of mass agitation. The organised mass can always get its own way.

The struggle for reforms

British capitalism was now in reverse, and all the other capitalist countries were taking the lead. Besides the nature of capitalism was changing: the building of imperialism, and the expansion of capitalist goods to other countries made the heavy industries the key ones. By exporting machinery and capital for profit, British capitalists dug the grave of their own supremacy.

This forced the competitive system to compete still further. Also British capitalists were forced in their own interests to provide the workers with a minimum standard of education. Gladstone's Government passed the Elementary Education Act of 1870. It was a very niggardly affair, empowering school boards to provide elementary education where the churches were not already doing so. Secondary education was not touched at all.

The Education Act of 1870, like all subsequent educational legislation, was designed to turn out efficient wage-servants, not cultured human beings. All kinds of defenders of Western Democracy constantly speak about educating the colonial peoples for citizenship and national independence; but Gladstone's Government made no attempt to educate the British worker for citizenship.

The working classes of Britain, with our inseparable from their struggle for political power, "Educational citizenship" will never come from an imposition from above, but from below, from the actual struggle of the people.

The trade union movement now began to make greater progress. In the year 1873 was the Trade Union Act gave the unions a legal status and protected their funds: trade unions struck successfully for higher wages and shorter hours. Indeed the engineers and the miners were a nine-hour day; which had to be put to unorganised railwaymen and agricultural workers formed trade unions. In 1881 England, Ireland, and Scotland all put in the struggle. But the boom was almost over, and the class struggle would begin anew.

Imperialism arrives

I was in the East End of London yesterday and attended a meeting of the unemployed. I listened to the whole thing, which were just a cry for 'bread, bread, bread,' and on my way home I pondered over the scene and I became more than ever convinced of the importance of the struggle. —Cecil Rhodes.

The First International had meanwhile collapsed through internal dissension. The year 1870 was the end of the boom. The Franco-German War was over. German Unification had taken place, and Britain was faced with a serious competitor in heavy industry. The unification of Germany profoundly upset the economies of all the industrial countries. Capitalism led to a way out by finding markets in the underdeveloped countries. Liberal capitalism was passing into imperial capitalism. Increased productivity in the capitalist world had led to glut and mass unemployment. In Britain rich agricultural land had been driven out of cultivation by the importation of American wheat; before the depression there was a glut of wheat fed by nearly a quarter.

By 1875 the search for the imperial market was being driven by the concessions to the workers at home, had begun. In the same year Disraeli opened the Suez Canal for the British Government. British capitalists began to control the Egyptian economy. The malleability of the workers the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act was passed.

The continuous depression in industry directly led to the formation of the modern British Labour movement. In 1881 the English Workingman's League was formed that the working class of this country could become the tail of the great Liberal Party. But the British working class is a manufacturing monopoly of England is the pivot of the present social system in Britain. We cannot understand the break-down of that monopoly the British working class will lose its privileged position and there will be Socialism again in Britain. The Democratic Federation had been formed in 1881.

The Social Democratic Federation's very existence was the working class and its contempt for the trade unions was largely the fault of H. M. Hyndman, the Irish, an intellectual, who had turned Marxism into a dogma. The Social Democratic Federation soon split between Hyndman and Morris, a much greater Marxist, who formed the Socialist League.
THE MOVEMENT

BRITISH WORKING CLASS

HISTORY—contd.

Socialist Review

Morris unfortunately fell into the error of rejecting all parliamentary action whatever. Nonetheless in his books and his writings he made a mighty contribution to Marxist theory.

Morris made many theoretical mistakes, but when he stood against these achievements his mistakes pale into insignificance. I need hardly point out the fact that Socialists should not make the same mistakes again. In any case, the task of the historian is to evaluate history as it is, not as he should like it to be.

Marxists can profitably read the work of Morris in this sense, because there are too many Marxists who are afraid to examine the works of Morris in case they become contaminated by Marxists who cannot develop his critical faculties and who cannot identify Marxianism is not worth his salt.

Blood in the dump

In 1884 the Liberals extended the vote to the agricultural worker. Democracy was beginning to encroach on the rights of the occupant under the new Liberal government of 1886 led to a working class demonstration in the East End of London. The workers were in a revolutionary mood; indeed, Hyndman, John Burns, and two other members of the British Labour Federation—the looting and window-breaking which had taken place had from them, they were tried for sedition. They were acquitted.

"Bloody Sunday" the Socialists defied the Government's ban on political meetings in Trafalgar Square. The troops had been ordered to be killed; and Burns and Cunningham Graham were jailed for unlawful assembly.

Meanwhile the imperialists were scrambling for Africa. In 1887 British imperialists dug into East Africa; known today as Kenya. Cecil Rhodes, the diamond millionaire, secured rights in the gold-bearing region of South Africa. By sinking mines and building railways, the depression in British industry was temporarily relieved.

But this sentiment was still deep and widespread. In 1889 Ben Tillett and Tom Mann led the London dock strike that secured a minimum wage of 6d. an hour. The London Dock Strike led to the defeat of the British government. The unemployed workers—the "new unionism"—and to a demand for an eight-hour working day. To this end, it made the Marxist not consciously Marxist, it led by Marxists.

Zeal of imperialism

Yet now the Second International was founded with the object of linking up various national working class parties. Within the next year the TUC passed a resolution demanding an Eight Hour Bill for all trades. The workers were demanding a shorter day.

In 1891 the Government introduced free elementary education.

In 1892 the strike movement continued. Uganda and Northern Rhodesia were added to the Empire.

In 1892, the Imperialists, the Imperialist Liberal, defined imperialism quite crudely in the House of Commons as the policy of an "enormous population." He was also an advocate of "municipal socialism at home.

The workers were learning from their experiences in capitalist Britain. In 1891 the Social Democratic Federation was founded by Keir Hardie and others. Though the L.P. drafted a Social Democratic Manifesto, it was defeated on a Marxist basis. It was, nevertheless, an advance.

Two years later Cecil Rhodes' imperialist policy culminated in the Jameson Raid: an illegal (even by the standards of the capitalist Jungle) attempt by Rhodes' subordinate, L. S. Jameson, to annex the Transvaal Republic (rich in goldfields) to the British Empire.

The Boers were in those years in British industry. Britain conquered the Sudan.

In 1895 Britain claimed the right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Transvaal Republic. The Boers kept the British forces bay for three years before the two small republics were forcibly annexed to the British Empire. This was a tremendous shock to British prestige.

Boom ends; L.P. begins

The boom reached its culmination in the winter of 1895. We shall almost say British capitalism had once again once into slump. Wages were forced down, income, all those of the Trafalgar judgment under which trade union funds were liable for damage incurred by their use in trade disputes were arrested.

The Trafalgar judgment intensified the demand for a Labour Party in the United Kingdom. The Labour Party was founded in 1893. Twenty-nine members of the Labour Representation Committee were returned to Parliament in the 1906. The Labour Representation Committee changed its name to the Labour Party. In this year the Trades Disputes Act nullified the Trafalgar judgment by exempting trade union and employers combinations from legal action for "civil wrongs committed in the course of their business." This Act was clearly a concession to working class pressure.

In 1912 the miners had won a dispute for union wage. And in 1913 the miners, railwaymen and transport workers formed the "people alliance" to fight disputes with the trade unions. Thus the years between 1910 and 1914 were remarkable for the growth of working class alliance and organization.

In recent months, a number of requests have been made by "Socialist Review" for articles and reports on the problems of socialism, suitable for the new readers to the socialist camp. Bearing in mind the reviving interest of young people in Labour Party Youth Sections and other young people, we are planning to bring below we have put the costs of contribution required to meet the needs of the situation.

We apologize to those of our readers who have been familiar with the ideas expressed in this way for consumption by newcomers to socialism with whom they may be in contact. Editor.

Most of us, if asked what we needed to enable us to achieve a socialist life would give a different answer. If, however, we sat down and thought the matter out, we should almost all say amongst other things that we required a good income. For with a good income it is possible to wish to have, according to our tastes—fine clothes, good meals, holidays, motoring, and the like. How can we be expected to meet the needs of the situation?

This is very easy for us to scoff at and say that these things have disappeared from Britain for ever. If we are thoughtful, however, we will remember that only last year men working in the motor industry were suddenly thrown out of work and we shall try to decide if there is really anything to prevent a return to pre-war misery and bad conditions.

SOURCES OF WEALTH

What ensures Prosperity and Progress?

To answer this, we must ask ourselves a number of questions. First of all, what is the basis for our present standard of living? What are the new inventions and new inventions are the essential requirements for a rising standard of living? What improvements in the means of production are the means of improving our living standards today?

Unfortunately, however, there is a [continued next page]
Are the white settlers in Central Africa preparing for another Mau Mau?

By Patricia Rushston

WHEN MAU MAU first erupted in Kenya, the Western powers in Britain, who had been encouraged to base their military action upon it as an inexcusable revenge for events in Kenya for some years previous for the Mau Mau had not made much of a high profile, although the perennial frothing of forums and public meetings did suggest that it was a matter of historic fact that in any country where the majority of the population is black, there are both the social and political by a minority and no constitutional methods exist to control them. When such matters, violence will sooner or later break out.

For many years in Kenya the Africans had been endeavouring to put forward their grievances and have them remedied. In the years preceding Mau Mau many African organisations grew up aiming at giving voice to the spirit of self-respect. The Mau Mau was, in turn, declared illegal and suppressed in some other way made ineffective. To those who knew the circumstances it was obvious that the frustration of the African must sooner or later find expression in violence.

Preparing a Kenya

Today exactly the same position exists in Central Africa. The Central African Federation is the product of reconciliation of the African population against their will and they have never ceased to oppose it. Dr. Leopold M. Sedar Senghor, visited Nyasaland in January this year and all African assemblies and individuals decided there to accept the same. The same demand is voiced in Northern Rhodesia. The Federation is a union of the South which suffers from political, economic, social and spiritual frustration. Politically the vast majority of the African population have little or no representation. There are 220,000 Europeans in the Federation and seven million Africans. The Europeans have 26 representatives in the Federal Assembly, the 7 million
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very big snag to overcome. Just as the soldiers of one age man like killing off surplus class who would have prevented the growth of population and the growth of the army. When a new mode of production came into use, so there are many practices in progress, to prevent us from being prevented and are preventing progress today. Unless society is fundamentally changed, that is, once and for all, energy, and automation are fearful threats, not wonderful boons, to our living standards and lives.

What capitalism is

Our present system is called capitalism, which means that:

(1) The means of production (i.e. the factories, mines and land) are owned or controlled by a small minority of the people.

(2) The mass of the people can only earn a living by selling their labour power, i.e. by purchasing their needs from the rich, i.e. by becoming workers.

(3) More or less everything which is produced is not paid to sell (not to be used by the producer) for profit.

Now this third point is most important. It means that the rich who control the means of production will produce more than is needed. Thus, if people need houses, it is more profitable to produce luxury and gain stores, and the latter will be produced. Furthermore if it is not profitable to produce anything that fact, and the employers will cease production.

Profits, unemployment, slump

This brings us to the question of unemployment: in order to make a profit the employers endeavour to keep their workers employed. By keeping wages down, however, they keep down the amount of money the workers will have to spend on their purchases. If the textile manufacturers think they can sell more textiles they build new factories. But, if they discover that they cannot sell all they produce, they will put workers on the "dole" or on short time. The result will be that some of the textile workers will not be able to afford to buy the new clothes that television and radio planners planned. A fall in the demand for workers will thus lead to a slump in consumption, i.e. a depression. If the textile workers cannot sell their goods, it is not to buy even new clothes. Thus the demand for textiles will decline and more textile workers will be put off.

Worst hit of all will be the workers normally employed by firms building factories and mining. They will be turned out of the iron, steel and coal for them (i.e. workers in the producer industries). If the slump is not to return, let alone expand existing plant and machinery is sufficient to keep a vast army of unemployed. The effects of jobs with the consequent effects on their spending powers and thus on markets.

It was this process which caused the slumps in the past—slumps every few years. Every ten years or so there was plenty amidst poverty. This explains why in the 1930's corn was worth nothing, oranges were thrown into the sea, fish were thrown back into the sea, steel piled up and every factory was still being built. Why were our factories blackened out, when they were already planned, and money put into those factories? All this was done because whatever is needed without reference to short-sighted gains for a small minority.

War or Socialism

There is only one reason why a slump has been avoided so far since the war—socialism. As Tony Cliff pointed out in last month's Socialist Review, unemployment only really disappeared with the coming of the Second World War. Tens of thousands have been avoided by being given a proportion of the production of the leading industries in the world to manufacture armaments. Thus we are looking for socialism.

We are on the right.
CASSIA'S CALUMNY

WHEN THE ROLL-NECKED, balding Republican senator from Wisconsin shook off his mortal coils last month, he left behind the most sinister of public legacies. This legacy was the muckraker of British newspapers in Britain featured him as a changed character. But McCarthy, they implied, had retreated into obscurity as a sort of chastened penitent, to rest in the America Senate in December, 1954.

The truth is, however, that although cut down in size by his Senate censures, McCarthy preserved his extreme reactionary policies right up till the time his liver turned sour on him and caused his death.

Only a few weeks before he died McCarthy's policy of reaction led him to go to the Senate and tell Senator Dave Beck, right-wing president of the Teamsters' Union now impeached by the AFL-CIO executive for alleged shady deals involving union funds. While defending Beck, McCarthy tried to smear Labor in the Mercury, the car industry's Labor and mainspring of the drive against union racketeers.

As a member of the McClellan commission investigating rackets and war profiteers, McCarthy led a Senate committee's refusal to give evidence before the committee concerning his personality. When Reuther had complained that McCarthy roundly and said that Reuther had not been so outspoken when he was under McCarthy's banner and silent about their "Communist" connections before McCarthy's own witch-hunting committee. This provoked a stinging attack from Reuther who said McCarthy's defense of Beck was not unexpected because McCarthy himself had refused to give evidence concerning his personal omissions when appearing before a Senate committee. He said: "There are charges that he has used funds sent to him to "fight Communism" for speculation in unsafe business concerns."

Just for good measure Reuther also recollected that in the 1946 labor-mine strike involving Reagan, McCarthy had received Communist support which he did not reject or repudiate. In the summer of 1948 McCarthy said: "That fighting Communism as a matter of political mediocrity was a road to personal power."

Although he did not realise it at the time, McCarthy had just written the most penetrating obituary of McCarthy I have yet read. Pungent and directed at the Labor and the added merit that McCarthy was able to read it himself.

Sir Hartley Shawcross, occasional Labor Member of Parliament for St. Helens, is certainly having a big switch proceeding to tell the story of his life and his virtual retirement from the legal profession in order to make a new start in the Labor Party. He has always been a big Labor Party. Now Sir Hartley is moving house.

His new abode, so I am told, set him back around £20,000. But it seems well worth the money for, not only is it a spacious house, but it also includes some 30 acres of the surrounding English countryside.

Curiously enough, at the 1950 Labour Party conference this month, Mr. Shawcross had appeared on the rostrum to tell the audience why the Labour Party could not be nationalised. Maybe he has left his eye firmly fixed on the future.

IN LAST MONTH'S Socialist Review my colleague David Breen had a few hard words to say about various leading members of the iron and Steel Trades Confederation. These sprang to my mind a few days ago when reading the monthly journal of the iron and steel union, Mint and Metal.

It carried, as it always does, some half-a-dozen full-page advertisements inserted by the iron and steel business. This set me wondering whether the business of iron and steel business were so stupid as to think they could increase the sales of pig iron and steel business by advertising by a union journal.

The thought of hundreds of steel workers doing a bit of steel smelting in the hothouse, just as a child after working hours taxes even my elastic imagination. I know that the dog-germ phlegm craze is spreading but I am sure it has not yet reached such proportions.

I HEAR THE Electrical Trades Union is closing down its college at Esher. The reason, according to the leaders of the ETU, is that recent strikes have emptied the coffers and the holding company shut down as an economy measure.

It has not escaped notice, however, that the director of ETU educational work is Les Cameron who in the Communist Party last year. Many people have always said that the ETU college is just a former building society's college always present (or potential). If this was the case it is easily understandable the dilemma of the ETU chief. Lee and Euston rank and file said to me: "If the college did not shut it would be necessary to invent it."

VISITORS TO THE HOUSE of Commons are very often impressed by the clever fashion in which some MP's use Question Time to put Government spokesmen on the spot. Unfortunately these efforts are not always given the publicity they deserve, so, just for the record, I should like to report the commendable effort of Fred Lee, Labour MP for Newton, last month.

Fred Lee asked the Prime Minister what the Government is proposing against the testing of H-bombs in the Pacific. To which Macmillan replied, in the best of stilted parliamentary language: "None, sir."

This brought Fred Lee to his feet again to ask: "Is it not possible other nations might decide if there is as little danger as the Prime Minister has indicated in his test in the Pacific? Would be no less dangerous if they tested in the Atlantic Ocean?"

Macmillan was on the spot, all he could do was to say: "I do not think any Government would be so irresponsible as to wish to stage tests in the Atlantic Ocean." Which is pretty much the same as many Asians think about British and American tests in the Pacific.

Our new contributors

Mr. Charles J. Geddes is a dangerous man. He himself is harmless but the idea he represents could be ruinous to the trade-union movement if they were adopted.

The Tory Minister of Labour has enthused many an idea and has sponsored the courts of inquiry into the shipbuilding and engineering disputes—the idea of "the authoritative trade-union body" to determine a national wage policy. The courts of inquiry themselves must have got the idea from somewhere, and this is where Geddes comes in.

In 1954, while he was still secretary of the Union of Post Office Workers, he served as a member of a similar court of inquiry. That was when the scheme first bunged up. Today, having more time to deal with labour policy as a whole (he has left his secretaryship) and having once again been a member of the courts of inquiry in the engineering dispute, up to the last minute, I am suggested, not be so time has it all the trimmings designed to placate other unions, who rejected it and the idea came from somewhere, and this is where Geddes comes in.

In 1954, while he was still secretary of the Union of Post Office Workers, he served as a member of a similar court of inquiry. That was when the scheme first bunged up. Today, having more time to deal with labour policy as a whole (he has left his secretaryship) and having once again been a member of the courts of inquiry in the engineering dispute, up to the last minute, I am suggested, not be so time has it all the trimmings designed to placate other unions, who rejected it and the idea came from somewhere, and this is where Geddes comes in.

Streets, we have to start now, from below the middle-class-unionists, to break the job to hand holding Labour Groups in the factories.

Mr. Charles J. Geddes is a dangerous man. He himself is harmless but the idea he represents could be ruinous to the trade-union movement if they were adopted.

The Tory Minister of Labour has enthused many an idea and has sponsored the courts of inquiry into the shipbuilding and engineering disputes—the idea of "the authoritative trade-union body" to determine a national wage policy. The courts of inquiry themselves must have got the idea from somewhere, and this is where Geddes comes in.

In 1954, while he was still secretary of the Union of Post Office Workers, he served as a member of a similar court of inquiry. That was when the scheme first bunged up. Today, having more time to deal with labour policy as a whole (he has left his secretaryship) and having once again been a member of the courts of inquiry in the engineering dispute, up to the last minute, I am suggested, not be so time has it all the trimmings designed to placate other unions, who rejected it and the idea came from somewhere, and this is where Geddes comes in.

What a national wage policy means in our present system is simply to attempt to disarm the workers of their only effective weapon-strike action. The bosses tell their governmen that strikes are wasted and that they will cut into profits, that they harm the "nation's" economy and that, therefore, they should be suppressed. It is placed by friendly discussions throughout the bargaining tables. They turn to the bosses that are there to see their funds dissipated through strikes, that exist by virtue of the fact that they can "compete" differences between bosses and workers, and show how easy it is to add to their states-unite mony by sitting on yet another permanent body, above and apart from the turmoil of industrial struggles.

What the government and trade-union bureaucrats will all along with this new-found constitu- tion which promises to chart us firmly to "industrial peace." Except that in the case of the last-mentioned—the trade-union bureaucrats—there is a nauseating feeling that maybe this time they will be going a bit too far if they accept, their long-suffering membership will react to this slip in the face.

On the other hand, the way, the Railway Review has warned the trade-union leadership what it can expect if it follows the Liberal and Social Democrats' plan. "The consequence of that stripping of the trade power," it writes editorially, "is to make the workers re- examine that they would in fact cease to earn the allegiance of their members.

Page one: Who could be better situated to write on the railways. Borough Council's tussle with the railwaymen about Civil Defence than Counsellor Peggy Dul in a member of the Council's own transport committee.

The new contributors

Jack Selvin, Secretary, Saithall Hill branch of the AEU, speaks with a great deal of real trade-union matters. He was a member of the trade union committee for a number of years.

Page five: Frank Heagney is vice-chairman of the Central Scientific Association of Scientific Workers, an NCJW, National Committee for a regular contributor to trade-union journals.

Page seven: Patricia (or Peggy) Rushon was once secretary of the Council, was chairman of the Local Secretariat of the Movement for Colonial Freedom. She will contribute a regular monthly column on "Colonial Affairs."