THE DEMISE OF “BEVANISM”

The Labour Party conference at Brighton will probably go down in history as the occasion when Aneurin Bevan, who had been drifting to the right for some years, finally and irrevocably broke with the left-wing. To many constituency parties, the break with Bevanism is a disaster; to any lingering Bevanite residuals, it is a relief.

How did it occur? Why did Bevan make his dramatic defence of some of the most objectionable ideas which the right-wing Labour leaders and the Treasures treasure as common property? Many socialists regard Bevan’s actions as a betrayal, comparable with that of MacDonald in 1931. They consider it as an example of a form of self-sufficiency that has led to a mixture of political offices, and of the office being that of Secretary in the new Labour government. However, this approach to Bevan’s actions is superficial. It treats a personal matter something which has historical political foundations. For, if you are going to understand clearly Bevan’s behaviour, you must first understand his personal and ideological and that of the move—Bevanites—that sprung up around him.

The heresy of Bevanism came into being tempestuously as a protest against the Labour Government’s 1951 budget, which sought to pay for an inflated arms programme by cutting down on social services. This sparked off a long ding-dong battle between right- and left-wings. From the initial cause of dispute—the National Health Services charges—the great debate ranged far and wide. Matters of fundamental principle, such as whether nationalization proposals should be included in the Labour Party’s policy, were brought into the open. However, it has been obvious for the last four years that the dispute was not going anywhere. This was because Bevanites were gradually becoming less sure of themselves and of their own convictions. First of all, Harold Wilson, then Freeman and Crossman, followed by many others, crossed over from the Bevanite camp into that of the Establishment. Their vision were quietly forgiven, and some were rewarded with seats in the Cabinet. Their rehabilitation only served to increase the anguish of the few remaining Bevanite MPs and quicken the tempo of Bevanite disintegration.

No program

Why did Bevanism collapse? Well, the answer must be sought in its origins. The 57 MPs who voted against the social service cuts were, like Messrs. Heinz’s 57 varieties, a very varied assortment. Practically the only thing they all agreed on was the opposition to the National Health Service charges.

If Bevanism was to survive it was necessary for it to change from being an amorphous movement of protest into a stable, united force. But this could only be done if there was a thorough-going discussion of basic principles leading to the formulation of a clear, alternative policy to the

Attlee leadership. However, this was never done: Bevanism never had a common policy, strategy or tactics. It was, as a result, a collection of individuals, and a number of factors closed the ranks of the defeated. Let us see to it that this was such a one.

THE MOVEMENT
THE DEMISE OF "BEVANISM"

continued

gunboats and considered that it was the duty of the British and Egyptian forces to fight the Suez canal as an "Ali Baba form of nationalism." In his fight against the political and single- French concern, he forgot to inquire into how the concessions were made, for he did not see that the ideas were superior to those of the right-wing, but also that they could not be more firm and forthright attack upon the Tories.

Bevan opposes industrial action

However, it became more and more painfully obvious that far from wishing to establish a popular, spontaneous hostility towards the Tories, the Bevanites wanted to mobilize the military and industrial workers of 1917, to carry out the trade union by industrial action. They pointed out that their living standards were unchanged, that the Tories failed to carry out their election pledges of maintaining food subsidies and interests and that Bevan in the pursuance and therefore those workers felt they had a right to take an element of strike action to force them to proceed. Yet incessantly Bevan sought to restrain them and sharply reduced the aspect for their own benefit.

Undoubtedly this type of behaviour would have been recognized among the working class. It weakened the already tenuous links between the fact workers and the Bevanites. More and more Bevan and his colleagues got out of touch with the aspirations and aspirations of the broad mass of the population. More and more they degenerated into an introverted parliamentary clique, devoting their time to smart alec manoeuvres.

But as Bevan's ties with the working class weakened, so did Bevan's with those who do not have to indulge in the sordid day-to-day task of living. The Daily Express of May 18, 1957, carried a banner headline on its front page: "Prince Charles to go on TV Child's Hour, the Queen asks 'Nye' to lunch at Buckingham Palace." Symbolically Bevan even sat at the right hand of the Queen. The "Express" goes on to list the other seven guests at the dinner: Mr. Keith Holyoake, deputy Prime Minister of New Zealand; Mr. Patrick Snow, Tory MP; Mr. M. Bevan. Permanent Under-Secretary, Home Office; Mr. Robert Fraser, Labour MP; Mr. A. S. Bullivant, 16th 5th Lancers; Group Captain John Cunningham, chief of staff of the Royal Air Force; Mr. David Sheppard, the test cricketer.

Bevan and the Suez War

As you know doubt gather, Labour has gone a long way since 1945, since 1945 as since Keir Hardie, who entered the House of Commons in his own cloth-cap. Keir Hardie and his colleagues were fighting the Tories. Even the Strike went out of his way to insult him in public by naming him "Mr. MP" and only the Tories at a party at Buckingham Palace. Bevan, by contrast, is received by some Labour MPs and Bevanites that he has a tender spot for him, at least since he became a good and well-behaved boy again.

Keir Hardie always opposed the use of
BACK FROM BRIGHTON

TWO DELEGATES GIVE THEIR VIEWS

One: "The Stockbrokers Road to Socialism"

Basil Cameron, writing in the News Chronicle, described his terrible disappointment at seeing socialism being voted out of the Labour Party programme on the first occasion he has managed to attend Conference in a life-time of activity in the movement. And we, wretched optimists, who had gone there determined to "do our bit" in the fight for a socialist Britain, trudged home with the slow, dawning realisation that we had been witnessing all we have lived for being frustrated—at least for the time being.

WALLY RUSSELL, Romford Borough Labour Party delegate to this year's Labour Party Conference, is a member of the AESD, member of his Party's EC, Political Education Officer and Chairman of the Romford WEA and a Councillor.

The world needs peace now more than ever before in history. Only by building a powerful and effective machinery to eliminate conflicting sources of economic interest (and these are the causes of war), can we hope to achieve that peace. And yet, the one British Party that is based on the working people and which, therefore, is unique in being able to lead us to socialism, has decided to turn its back on its destiny and run into the capitalist shop. Only if it turns again to its task with all its might can our children and ourselves look forward to anything other than a slow drift to World War III. It is our job to make the turn.

Two: A Conference of "incorrupting compromise" — by Sid Bidwell, prospective parliamentary candidate for East Herts

AS DELEGATES at the 1957 Labour Party Conference at Brighton had their feet frozen on the ice-rink on which the assembly was staged, they were more interested in the freezing of the Socialist aspirations of the British workers as well.

The NUR of which I am proud to be a member, refused to remit to the National EC and thus struck a blow for freedom and democracy within the Labour Movement. Above all I have used the word "staged;" this about sums up the Labour Party Conference. It is skillfully managed from beginning to end. Years ago I had formed the opinion that it could not be that bad by post; and yet I am having second thoughts about that too as I read from the bowels dealt me physically, mentally and politically by the ice at Brighton.

The woolly document Industry and Society is as the title suggests, said exactly, nothing. Or, to be more exact, the complete subjugation of the Movement to Keynesian economic doctrine. In the booklet his aid is summed in unashamed terms. It is not easy to get to the esoterum unless one is prepared to speak on every issue (one delegate got there four times as at Blackpool last year) before once was the booklet which refuses to advance Socialism, taken hold of by some journalist and turned into page by page. To be sure 5 minutes is much too short to do it but that is why those who hold similar views should do it collectively.

For the regroupment of the Left

The right-wing turn of Frank Cousins, T & GWU, had to be seen to be believed. He was the most compromising uncomromiser that Conference has seen. The spectacle of Nye Bevan being cackled by his erstwhile friends from the floor on the great Heade show surely writer funds to the Bevan personality cult in the British Labour Movement. In these days of contemporary capitalist misdeeds and now—but so very—thinking in the Labour Party, the great need really is the regroupment of Marxists in the Labour Movement. If Brighton gives any lessons at all it is not the fragmentation of shareholders in the big public Companies but the fragmentation and sectarianism of those who cling to the ideas of scientific Socialism which struggles for clear and united expression in the Party.

The Fordham Management has renewed their attacks on the well—organized Briggs workers. They have challenged the workers to accept or reject overtime by trying to make it compulsory; they are undermining the factory organization by outside pressures on the works premises. These are matters of the utmost importance to the Labour Movement and should be widely known. Next month, Socialist Review will feature an article on the situation at Briggs on the question of an on-the-spot enquiry.
SEYMOUR PAPERT reviews what has happened in the 40 YEARS SINCE THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

FORTY YEARS AGO, in November, 1917, the workers of Russia took control of the machinery of government.

The echo of this great event travelled through the world as a wave of exaltation. It inspired the socialists and oppressed colonial peoples. In the soviet—the workers' councils of Petrograd and Moscow they saw the image of their own future, the promise of the fulfilment of their hopes and struggles.

Today, forty years later, when we ask whether this promise was true, we are faced with a very different pagoda mediums of the world. One version tells us that Russian society as a whole is in the grasp of a socialist society, or in its more subtle forms, it tells us that while Russian socialism has been developed in various ways, we are still essentially socialist. The other version tries to persuade us that the 1917 revolution was a monster which, now that it has grown big enough, is threatening all of us and the horrible destruction of the world. We believe—that because Russia has a planned economy that in the long run the whole planet it is therefore an "advanced", "progressive" "workers state"; or that its brutal measure of the Hun- Garf im is the proof that communism is evil? Or can we reject both?

The Russian worker

As socialists who believe in the working class we naturally try to answer these questions by looking at the life of the Russian worker. Follow one into his factory. He clocks in as he would in England. Inside he finds a managerial and supervisory staff which assigns his work, watches him to see that he keeps to the time schedule; induces him to work harder by introducing piece-work, production-norms, time-studies and the like. But of course, but familiar paraphernalia of "management."

To see how the worker reacts to all this read the following report of a discussion with a Russian engineer Sasha: In 1947, for example, she said, "a constant pressure from below. The masses had as yet no political leadership and for one time going day in Russia they learn to make economic demands with their own strike. They demand the lowering of production norms, higher wage rates, more breaks and better benefits per head. To enforce the demands they were using the traditional working class weapon, that the strike. As a result of this all the strikes were against the high norms being worked though some were "successful."

This is a report of the curtain the worker finds himself face to face with a management using economic methods (they are increasingly similar) and he resists them in essentially the same way. This one, therefore, for us is nothing new, though it is very likely growing.

"We know—from first hand reports of the underground newspapers under-lease as well as from official Rus-
Eighteen years ago, in the summer of 1939, compulsory military service in peace time was first introduced in Britain. Today, twelve years after the war which was going to establish permanent peace, children born in that grim year are entering the armed forces for two years in uniform, to carry out the foreign and colonial policies of Her Majesty's Government. What sort of job will they be doing, or learning to do? The answer may be seen in the uses to which their elder brothers have been put in these last two decades. The whole thrust of policy have varied with different Prime Ministers and Colonial Secretaries. But about the broad picture there can be no doubt.

In Indonesia, Palestine, Malaya, Korea, and Greece, everywhere thousands of the people of those countries, of all ages, both men and women, have been dragged, or tricked, or herded into detention camps. While the Labour movement is absolutely right to deplore this, and indeed to demand the restoration of the precious young British lives, the disproportion in casualties which is so glaringly apparent between Britain and her allies, and especially Cyprus and Greece, the most "purely" military colonial wars—is not often fully appreciated. How many have been the victims of the obliteration bombing of Korean towns and villages with rockets and jelled petrol, or of the eye effect that seven million Koreans have disappeared? Or the fantastic ratio of "kills" in the campaign against Maou Mau in Kenya, 200 to 1 in favour of the British forces, not to mention the ghastly mass hangings of thousands of trade unionists, coolies, even with terrorists,""being in unauthorised possession of ammunition," and so on. There is as much to this, as that word is generally understood, than simple massacres.

The Forces' function

Certainly, many of the plain facts and figures of oppression and exploitation of the colonial peoples are unknown to large numbers of British workers, and conscious Socialists have an excellent task in seeking to explain these things to the public. What I particularly want to emphasise here, however, is the consistent general character of the operation of the armed forces in the colonial countries. There are many young boys and men who are brothers in spirit with other brothers who passionately condemn the suppression of Cyprus and the invasion of Egypt, but they often see the Army as just an instrument, neither good nor bad in itself, which has happened to be used for ill ends. But if they are to understand why they are being conscripted, and the real nature of the Army, they must go deeper than this. The present worst needs of the British capitalist class—cheap sources of raw materials, more profitable fields of investment, strategic bases against rival powers—have conditioned the whole training, method, organisation and character of the armed forces. I have laid particular stress on the record in the colonies because it is clear that the character has been least disguised in recent years.

But there are other aspects of the war, the task in public discussion, that they cannot possibly be regarded like, say, a railway system or a telephone exchange, whose equipment and technique could, under different control, do as good a job for Socialism as for Capitalism. From year to year the forces are being re-organised and re-equipped with a view to the most efficient conduct of the Third World War, which the criminal lunatics in control are planning to fight. (Sometimes they tell us, and prospective enemies, that they are only bluffing; provided we take them seriously, and many now do, they will never dare to attack us; and we would never attack anyone, of course. Nobody in the government or any of "our" canals). At any rate, the Minister of Defence, Mr. Sands, now tells us that in the event of war, his new conception of defence is no defence for insensates such as the inhabitants of this country, but only for Britain's true treasures, her bomber bases. To this end the army, especially the infantry, is being re-shaped, and a vast effort of military-scientific research is devoted to producing bigger and better bacteria, H-bombs, nerve-gas, and other weapons calculated to exterminate humanity. It is not through the actual "flight" of the forces that is of course only a natural expression of the aims of a ruling class to impose their will upon the "inferior" peoples, but means that the armed forces, in their whole structure, are becoming less and less suitable for use in any way by a Socialist Government.

Blackleg army

True, some capitalist military "experts" are mourning gloomily and pessimistically that history has moved so far in the direction of the old system. The idea of conscripting the whole of the army into a super-succide force will make it more difficult to crush colonial uprisings effectively, where the use of H-bombs might do more harm to "investors" property than to the "inferior" peoples' about, and maybe even revolt from elsewhere. One can only comment that this is their worry, and Socialists should have better things to do than take sides in arguments between different sections of the bosses as to what sort of army would suit them best. Here young Socialists can see, in a crude sense, some of the problems of working as reinforcements for the police in situations dangerous to the ruling class. It is quite true that recently they have not been in evidence in strikes, any

how since the period of Atlee's government, when they were in and out of the docks almost every day. But no Socialist should be surprised, if we enter another period of really big industrial and political battles, to see troops brought in against the workers whenever the capitalists consider it can be got away with.

Killing for fun

If we are right in thinking that the capitalist class organise the forces for the three main purposes outlined above, what is the effect of the necessary training and organisation on the hundreds of thousands of young workers annually conscripted into them? Although certainly the majority escape or recover from the very horrors that can be inflicted, there can be little doubt that the net result is a definitely harmful one from the point of view of the education of the people.

We should realise that the worst effects can be very bad indeed; if a young worker can be turned into a sort of person who is pleased to be photographed playing with the severed heads of Malayan guerrillas, or who can boast about his company being top of his regiment's "scoreboard" in its "atrocities" against its enemies, it has been turned into something less than a human being, and a shameless enemy of all that Socialism stands for. But the attitude of arrogant contempt for human dignity which expresses itself in these ways is to a lesser degree paracross every recruit who lacks the previously formed political convictions against his will, and reject its contempt for the people. For the tasks it is intended for, the capitalist army must cultivate reactionary attitude of contempt for the working people, an unthinking, "sporting" attitude to killing, and must destroy all working-class instincts of solidarity and comradeship of the exploited.

I myself once experienced an incident which symbolised rather plainly the nature of the mental processing carried on in the forces, during my "square-bashing" days. One period of our training one morning was Religious Instruction, during which the chaplain gave us a very eloquent address on the evils of swear-

ing. There immediately followed an hour of bayonet drill, during which we tore the insides out of straw dummies, which the instructor in colourful terms urged us to think of as Russians.

Breeding apathy

However, in present circumstances, perhaps a more obvious corrupting effect is produced by the incredible waste of time, and it is here that once again the bosses find themselves divided as to the value of conscription. A day which is spent drinking tea, reading newspapers, getting drunk, filling and falling in half a dozen forms or

receipts, followed by an evening lying on one's bed listening to Radio Luxem-

burg, can only enfeebles collective thought or any kind of political or trade union outlook. So far so good, but the attitude of complete cynicism and apathy which goes with it is as worrying as it.

Generally, I would suggest, the army fails to inculcate the discipline and unresponsiveness which is so clearly characteristic of it. To all this is dismissed as "bull," and has no permanent effect; in fact, it is a factor which is likely to, for all this is dismissed as "bull," and has no permanent effect; in fact, it is a factor which is likely to lead to, for all this is dismissed as "bull," and has no permanent effect; in fact, it is a factor which is likely to lead to

Class weapon-training

Most of the arguments in favour of the armed forces are sometimes crop up in the Labour Party—that it gives people a chance to meet others from different sections of society, or that regardless of the way it is spent, it somehow teaches self-reliance—simply ignore or forget the class purposes and class organisation of the present-day army. But there are some people who hold it to be desirable that there should be some form of compulsory military service, even in the existing type, and it is a very good point for the majority of the working people to know how to use arms in case the army is the argument used by the Communist Party in favour of the call-up, but it is also found among Labour Party members who fear that in certain conditions the capitalist class might use force to prevent the achievement of Socialism.

Of course no serious Socialist would rule out such a possibility altogether, although in densely populated Britain, with its close-knit system of communications, the prospects of successfully waging a conventional civil war would be particularly slender. In General Strike 1926 the army and police found themselves disorganised and almost helpless before a force that spread and swept the mass movement, confused and misled as it was: confronted by the enormous majority of the working class consciously acting to establish Socialism, how much less hope could they have of crushing it even if I am wrong, and circumstances arose to make the bosses think that they stood some chance of success from violence, such situations do not blow up overnight; they develop over months and years. If it takes the present army six weeks, including long periods of drilling and boot-polishing, to train a reasonably effective infantryman, then a Socialist movement with reason to fear violent attacks from the Right, could learn to protect itself in time. Surely, then, it is mistaken to argue that we should endure all the proved evils of the call-up for perhaps fifteen (continued next page)
BUILDING WORKERS FACE A CRISIS

The present economic crisis of British capitalism, which in time must seriously affect the employment of all sections of the British workers, will have an immediate effect on the building trade workers. The rise in the Bank Rate to 7% and the consequent higher interest rate on building finance will lead to a serious increase in unemployment amongst the building operators. The situation is regarded so seriously by the National Federation of Building Trades Employers that it is very likely to be opposed against the Government's fiscal policy and have called upon the Government to resign.

Under the Government's new measures, the signs of an approaching slump in building became apparent. In the first four months of the year the unemployment increased in the industry, and has only slightly improved during the summer months (particularly this is so in the north-west). Building workers for the first time since 1945, are beginning again to lose their jobs. We need to do more with regard to trepidation. A building worker receiving dismissal from a firm finds the situation is more serious if lengthened from a day or so to possibly weeks. This to him is the sign of serious unemployment. If trepidation is not an unusual experience, because of the casual nature of building, the difficulty will be for the worker is the length of time between jobs.

A further sign is the hardening of the employers on such things as bonus payment, holidays, pay increases (pension etc.), and wages. To use a building trade idiom, "the whip is out", or at least beginning to appear.

The President of the National Federation of Building Trades Employers, speaking of building trade depression, fully stated: "I am sure that no industry can continue to be prosperous for long unless it pays bonuses in good time. Building in that no further wage increase can be considered until it has been shown, and clearly shown, that the previous one has been earned—there must be giving before receiving."

This is an indication that wage increases are no longer to be expected and on this issue, particularly if the employment situation has deteriorated, a fight can be expected.

Nationalization and Registration

For many years the building trade unions have demanded the nationalization of the industry. This is still the policy of the socialists in the Labour Party. A pamphlet was issued setting out the union's views. The demand is obvious. The demand is one, but the question of the industry, the fact that nationalization is conceived in a bureaucratic fashion, and the workers in the industry will have no control whatever. It is a plan for state-capitalist, not socialist nationalisation. The sights of the union leadership are set more on good will and accommodating the built industry (like their counterpart in railways, gas, electricity, mining, etc.) rather than genuine ownership and control by the building workers themselves. Actually, this very weakness is their strength, for it fails to comprehend the workers whole-hearted enthusiasm. They of course have learnt the lessons of the railways and other nationalized industries.

Many workers because of the insecurity of the industry and the growing fear of future unemployment demand an interim measure, something that can be secured now, within the present economic framework, provided for a scheme of registration similar to the National Dock Labour Scheme.

But the building employers have the semi-skilled and unskilled workers but receive no support from the Government at all. The demands of the building employers have to be tied down to one industry and carpenters and joiners for example have no right to expect support while the dockers well known to be continuously exploited by the workers.

Conditions compared

The building workers have long been the "cinderellas". They do not have a guarantee of full wages for holidays. They have a holiday scheme, whereby stamps are placed on a card at 3d each, there is no guarantee, for example, if a man is ill, unemployed or temporarily transferred from the industry, these stamps even if complete, do not give the worker his full wage.

Secondly, the worker is guaranteed only 32 hours for one week. If the weather is so inclement that he cannot work, after one week he can be dismissed. Employers therefore, many employers refuse even to give one week's guarantee, and discharge workers on a Friday, at the first sign of frost. Dismissed workers discharged this way have no guarantee of re-employment, and many militants and shop-stewards have been removed and their jobs have been filled by strike action by the other workers have these men been re-employed.

The building worker has no pension scheme, no life assurance, no sick pay. A building wage scheme, although the nature of the industry makes these essential. Although there is a British Building Workers (Building Safety & Welfare Regulations) he has to fight continuously to get the regulations enforced. Although today is still one of the most accident prone industries. No special clothes are provided; cold weather suits, except where the workers themselves have managed by militant action to force the employers to buy them.

Craftsmen in London and Liverpool get 47½ an hour, and laborers 4/1. Building men get 4½ an hour, and lower rates due to a system of area grading. The hours of work are normally 44, over 50 in the winter, although some areas work 46½ hours. A bonus agreement can be worked, if joint agreement is reached, between the employers and the employers at site level. Increasingly employers are seeking to avoid such agreements because this agreement has the effect of giving the workers in the same industry receiving different rates of pay, which in turn, leads to a weakening of solidarity. This is part of the legacy of the "Increase Production" schemes from 1945 onwards, when the Compensation Scheme was set up, the government and the Labour Party played a major role in assisting for solving capitalism's problems. The stick is now coming to the workers can be seen by the ridiculously low basic rates of pay. Bonuses replaced wages, and in this period of growing retribution, the full effects of such a policy will be felt.

Building workers' program

The NBF is on record like most Federations and Unions for the shorter working week. This will begin to prepare the ground to get it. In Australia the unions declare for and intend to get the 40 hours is not yet achieved, in fact most building workers seek overtime to make up to 50 hours. Therefore demand must be backed up by militant struggle.

In my opinion, the building workers must begin their campaign by forming shop-stewards committees on all sites, large and small, and electing shop-stewards to co-operate and coordinate the activities on the jobs, and unite the workers as one force. 100% trade unionism must be transformed from the slogan it now is to a fact.

They must fight now for increased [continued next page]
TASKS FOR TRADE-UNIONISTS

By Owen Roberts

THE WHEATERS on Macmillan’s top hill bristled with indignation at Brighton last month when he denounced as a “wicked accusation” the charge that Tory economic policy was responsible for averting unemployment and did not desire to reduce the living standards of any section of the population.

A good yardstick against which to measure Macmillan’s statements is the recent history of the employment situation issued by the Ministry of Labour and National Service, which plainly the direction in which the Government policy is slanted.

While the company Labour Check was made at the end of August there were 265,000 workers registered as unemployed at the Job Centre, or 264,000. On the surface, then, it would appear that the total result of the way in which the company Labour Check figures have been published to show that unemployment has been to increase the number of out of work by only 2,000. A look behind these figures, however, reveals a more disturbing tendency.

In August of last year the number of persons in civilian employment had 23,212,000; this August the figure was 25,111,000—which means that the number of persons employed at the government has dropped by 101,000 in twelve months while the number out of work has only increased by 2,000. This is the story of this figure. What, then, has happened?

The main cause for the difference in these figures lies in the fact that the number of women at work has dropped by 200,000 in twelve months. At the end of August, 1956, there were 7,878,000 women at work in civilian employment in this country and this year there were 7,309,000—a fall of 69,000.

This trend was noted in an article in the April issue of Socialist Review when it was pointed out that it arose largely because many of the women, going out to work to make up their husband’s pay, were finding it more difficult to get jobs. Hence, on becoming unemployed, they eventually quit the labour force. This, of course, means a decline in the female wage rate and a reduction in living standards.

Cut in standards

For more important, however, is another tendency hidden in the Ministry of Labour Report. This is the tendency for the credit squeeze to push workers into lower paid jobs by the companies which are employing fewer workers, with safeguards for those who wish mobility of employment.

The employers to be forced to employ workers only through the trade unions.

They must demand nationalisation of the industry with full workers’ control.

They must demand the safety regulations and working conditions that the NFTO now being set up into a Building Workers’ Industrial Union.

Above all else, they must prepare to struggle against the capitalist system as a whole, and carry through their demand for the only industrial democracy, registration and nationalisation in themselves is not enough, their demand must be set on the grand target of a socialist Britain.

The next stage of the struggle is for those who accept a militant programme that is to be able to fight and win support for the programme. To force the leaders to stepretreating and to demand greater control by the rank and file, more democracy is needed, which must lead to more positive action. The Cliffordians could well play the leading parts.

neuralled annual wage must be pressed with great determination. This not be cause that many workers will be any better to win than straight wage demands—but because they will make unemployment the economic proposition for the bosses.

Organize and politicise

Alongside these demands on the bosses must be pursued a really big organising drive in the workshops. There are still far too many workers outside the ranks of organised labour—and as the fault of the whole of society is a weak link in the chain. A hundred percent union shop with first class organisation must be the aim of every rank and file trade-unionist— for this will also help to strengthen the hand of the militant rank and file when seeking to convince the right wing leadership to stand up and fight against the bosses. The solution of the so-called interest of “Britain’s economic situation.

They must also, of course, demand the equal recognition of every militant trade unionist:

1. No retreat in face of Tory attack.
2. Fight the bosses all the way.
3. For shorter hours without loss of pay. Abolish annual wage and compensation, and pay a guaranteed standard annual wage.
4. Over 600 current union shops in every country in Brita.
5. First class workshop leaders in the project to counteract the growth of the no-trade unionists in the country.
6. For the benefit of readers who are not members of the AEU, we reproduce it in full below. Readers who read Socialist Review regularly will recognize its author, CARLSON, as one of our contributors.

Dear Brothers,

In allowing my name to go forward for the post of National Organizer I realize that I am not the ideal job. It is, I am a comparatively young member (53 years old) and do not possess any of the necessary qualifications that other candidates possess. But I am a committee man, I have been on the Union’s Executive Committee in 1955 and 1956 and executive member of the TUC’s Industrial Relations and Yorkshire Trades Council during the same years, and I am also an NCLG tutor.

We write to our members that the trouble with the two new developments the building unions is that there is nothing to do but sit back and remunerate.

In this same book of election addresses there is one that can serve as a model to every worker in the industry: the AEU’s present a clear-cut alternative to the policies of both right-wing and Stalinist parties in the Labour movement. The leadership is determined to dismantle the machinery of capitalism.


Building Workers — end

wages, abolition of the bonus agreement, for the shorter working week and for the end of working.

They must see the shorter working week, as part of the struggle against unemployment. They must see the schools of registration of building workers, to be administered by the building unions, as the safeguards for those who wish mobility of employment.

The employers to be forced to employ workers only through the trade unions.

They must demand nationalisation of the industry with full workers’ control.

They must demand the safety regulations and working conditions that the NFTO now being set up into a Building Workers’ Industrial Union.

Above all else, they must prepare to struggle against the capitalist system as a whole, and carry through their demand for the only industrial democracy, registration and nationalisation in themselves is not enough, their demand must be set on the grand target of a socialist Britain.
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much politics.” For most of them this is just an excuse not to attend meet-
ing or to take part in union activity. The heart of the problem is that they are busy trying to keep politics out of the industrial setting. We must face the fact that political and indus-
trial activity are one and cannot be separated.

In the elections for union officials over the past few years members have had to vote for candidates backed by either right-wing Labour or the Communist Party. The choice has no meaning for them, but they do it, although most Brothers owe allegiance to the Labour Party, they cannot accept the fact that the AEU is part of the Trade-union Movement and the Labour Party when these include wage-
freely collective action, “get rich or bust out”” (Annex B of the latest wage award and the ditching of Brother McLeod’s suggestion to introduce a made-
cent examples). On the other hand, although they respect the militant activi-
ties of the individual Communist Party member in the day-to-day struggle on the shop floor, they cannot ignore the recent split between the CP to Soviet Russia nor forget the anti-
working measures adopted both in that country (Estonia, Berlin, Poznan, Hungary, and so on).

I am a member of the Labour Party and an advocate of the Socialism, but I do not believe it can be achieved by accepting the policies of the Communist Party or the right-wing at Transport House. I believe that we members of the AEU must fight for these things within these organisations for a full-
complete change of leadership and policy.

Every movement depends for its growth and survival on the support given by its leaders. People have been going to Forums because of the uncommitted ex-CP mem-
bers anxious to understand what had happened. (b) Many members of the CP are convinced of the left ten-
dencies in the Labour Party, and (c) members of various “marxist” trends ins-
side the CP who saw the Forums as a recruiting ground, the latter being in sup-
port to that of marxists. A new revolutionary workers’ party.”

People will stop going to Forums (a) if they feel the CP’s policy and knowledge is not appreciated deeply; (b) if they feel they have been "recruited" to their limit and being so assured that they have all the answers feel that Forums are a waste of time; and (c) if they are all interesting that the Forum’s “aren’t getting anywhere.”

The initial heart-searching phase is over but because of the rate of development this is not true of all forums. Militant socialists who are in the CP suffer from a superficial outlook which will enable them to understand and direction in their work, and often either will either in desperation join the CP and work as individuals or attempt to join the CP and work as an individual.

An opportunity for forums to establish a “tendency” inside or outside the CP (this is known as “coming to a fork in the road”) at that time and are important in a way that is into a well-meaning personal political life.

Need for Marxist theory.

And so an historical opportunity will have been lost. An opportunity for marxists and late-marxists outside the CP (together with those critics still in) to present a living marxist analysis and thus redeem the working class a theory terribly and unjustly dis-

The end of the world for which socialism can be no consistent coherent advance to Socialism. (It is not the case.) The present leaders of the Left and Trade Union federations through the CP.

The Socialist who is a materialist, there is no all-encompassing theory, no mechanical, no guide, no action as yet put for-
ward by any school of thought, that is, the school of marxism. What there is, is a great deal of criticism. But no marxist ever claim that Marx, Engels, Lenin, and a “pen-

It is not irreducible dogmas in which we believe, but a way of looking at man’s history, a method of looking at changing society in its reality which means constantly reassessing and retesting our theories in the light of this reality.

What there is not in this country, and what is not enough in the world, is centres of marxist discussion linked internationally, and, one hopes eventually, internationally, where working class intellectuals in the CP, the CP and in the tendencies outside both, people who share a scientific-humanistic, rec-

tical materialist view of society and the world who have already taken the initiative in this age of new primary meetings, the elimin-

The CP, however, would never toler-
ated the kind of discussions that have been going on; the CP have an equal suspi-
cion of any” marxist “discussions, the ISSS are concerned with essentially a reformist view of national and interna-
national affairs, Universities and Left Review are not concerned primarily with developing a re-emergent coherent marxist view but with an attempt at integrating many left-wing, including the marxist, views; the various marxist tendencies have in the past not satisfied the CP, if the CP are more or less “converted” and really only concerned to recruit, so that in this context Forums have to do which no other organisation can do. (I am not saying that membership of Forums is unimportant, but that the CP and the CP “tellers” to a forum—I disagree with Joe Young about that. I believe you can only effectively live without political parties—but the forums could be a necessary independent source of marxist discussion, commentary with membership of a political party.)

Forums should therefore, I believe, organise the opportunity for marxists and near-marxists of all schools to meet and discuss, in order to present to the world the non-stalinist marxist attitude and written commentary on history around us, in the world as a whole; and the problems of achieving Socialism at home.

We all know there is an appalling lack of understanding amongst the majority in the Labour movement of what “marxism” means, apart from slogans and agreements amongst themselves. For the latter, it is too much to hope that the Forums might change that. It is, in the light of the 20th century marxist analysis to emerge. The majority of workers, it must be faced, have no political interest in even wanting to know what marxism means because for them it has been associated with things like the single Party State and practices like the show trials and the development of old communists, theories and practices which they have instinctively repudiated in their anti-working class. The British CP has been singularly successful in making the word “marx-

the other betrays socialism and scorn.

In this context it becomes particularly important for those marxists who do not except a democratic practice of “stalinism” (how I hate that word!) to redeem the reputation of marxism and not to make it known as the false, undogmatic, scientific humanist out-

It is an attractive force.

If such a militant body of marxist opinion emerged in the Labour move-

ment with a philosophy and a coherent theory behind it, opposed to it, opposed to it when it is right, friendly and sympathetic to the socialist revo-

lutions and achievements of the Rus-

sian revolution and the Chinese people, I believe such people will be listened to with much greater attention and respect. (I don’t use self-destructive jargon) than the CP can ever muster and that a great many workers will respond. It is the CP that is di-

ated, who while instinctively rejecting the attitude of the CP to the individual will yet respond to a militant approach to socialism based on a scientific and humane theory of society and change.

Better Marxists

If the Forums can succeed in mak-

ing a better marxist out of me, in educating militant workers in the real es-

ence of marxist method and theory, if they can get us in gaining and help in the small opposing trends to meet and find agreement and so strengthen for those of marxists on the Lab-

our movement, then they will be per-

forming a historically necessary job and effect marxism and growth.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The Socialist Review stands for international Socialism democracy. Only the mass mobilisation of working the class in the industrial and political arena can put an end to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The Socialist Review believes that a really complete end to all working class poverty must be brought to power on the basis of the following programme:

1. The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and public utilities, with compensation payments based on a means test. Realisation of all of our nationalised industries into an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profits.

2. Workers’ control in all nationalised industries, i.e., a majority of workers’ representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.

3. The inclusion of workers’ representatives on the boards of all private firms employing more than 20 people. These representatives to have free access to all documents.

4. The establishment of workers’ committees in all concerns to control hiring and working conditions.

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

6. The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, linked to a 60% of average living index, the abolition of all pay-

ments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.

7. The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.

8. Free State education up to 18, Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools, indefinite maintenance grants—with a means test—for all university students.

9. Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection for workers of every country of origin.

10. Freedom from political and economic oppression to all colonies.

11. The enforcement of technological assistance to the people of the under-
developed countries.

12. The reaffirmation of an independent Ireland.

13. The abolition of the British Commonwealth and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas. The abolition of all weapons of mass destruction.