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THE UGLY OUTBREAKS of violence against coloured people in widely separated parts of Britain make it urgent that we translate our shock at the occurrences into action to protect those who are being molested for their one "crime" of having a different coloured skin.

Why do coloured people come to this country, where difficulties crowd up on them almost from the moment they set foot on shore? Quite simply, hunger drives them from their own homes. Wages on a Jamaican sugar plantation for those lucky enough to find work are a bare £2-3 a week. Housing is shocking, so bad that even the slum tenements they occupy in Britain are lauded compared with the shacks of the West Indies. Unemployment is rife, 25 per cent of the Jamaican population is unemployed. Others, like those on the sugar plantations, work only seasonally.

The big British firms prevent industrialization. It might lead to an all-round rise in wage levels; it would introduce a competitor in the market for what the imperialist companies consider their preserves. All that is built is railways and ports, to help the produce away from the workers who produce it; fine hotels, perhaps, for the European tourists; big houses for the colonial administrators; and, most important, magnificent prisons.

---

Companies like Tate and Lyle, that reap the super profits out of the cheap labour of the colonial peoples—the same Tate and Lyle that, a year or two ago, spent some of these profits conducting a vicious campaign against nationalization—are only too happy to see this feeling of superiority immigrating into Britain. "Divide and rule" has been the guiding policy of imperialism in the colonies. How well it flourishes in Britain?

Most Tories foster the idea lovingly. But to our shame, some Labour MPs have taken their cue from them and are pouring out the same poison. James Harrod (North Nottingham), George Rogers (North Kensington) and Maurice Edelman (Coventry) have each singled out coloured immigrants for special treatment. As if coloured immigration is so important. Entrants from the West Indies rose to 24,000 in 1956 and are now declining. But there is an annual immigration from Ireland of 45,000. "In a couple of post-war years, Britain gave a home to Poles and people from the Baltic states in numbers that exceed the whole Negro population, old and new. In a single year, more Australians came to live here than Negroses in ten years," (Tribune, September 5). Furthermore, there is an annual emigration from Britain of 60-100,000 every year or as much as the total coloured population of 190,000 in two years. No mention is made of restricting the movement of white people from the Commonwealth; only coloured (and occasionally Irish) people are singled out.

Shame upon these crawlers before prejudice! They disgrace the Labour movement!

**Divide and rule**

Industrial management heartily endorses these "divide and rule" policies. In Lancashire employment exchanges mark the cards of some firms NC (No Colour) because they refuse to take coloured workers. A Birmingham Mail (November 10, 1956) head-

---

Where is the Labour Party going? asks Graham Richards

The most important task of this year's Scarborough Conference, meeting in the shadow of an impending General Election, is to establish its identity. The pleasant facts must not be smothered by electoral battle cries. The unity, and an un-

---

Companies like Tate and Lyle, that reap the super profits out of the cheap labour of the colonial peoples—the same Tate and Lyle that, a year or two ago, spent some of these profits conducting a vicious campaign against nationalization—are only too happy to see this feeling of superiority immigrating into Britain. "Divide and rule" has been the guiding policy of imperialism in the colonies. How well it flourishes in Britain? Most Tories foster the idea lovingly. But to our shame, some Labour MPs have taken their cue from them and are pouring out the same poison. James Harrod (North Nottingham), George Rogers (North Kensington) and Maurice Edelman (Coventry) have each singled out coloured immigrants for special treatment. As if coloured immigration is so important. Entrants from the West Indies rose to 24,000 in 1956 and are now declining. But there is an annual immigration from Ireland of 45,000. "In a couple of post-war years, Britain gave a home to Poles and people from the Baltic states in numbers that exceed the whole Negro population, old and new. In a single year, more Australians came to live here than Negroses in ten years," (Tribune, September 5). Furthermore, there is an annual emigration from Britain of 60-100,000 every year or as much as the total coloured population of 190,000 in two years. No mention is made of restricting the movement of white people from the Commonwealth; only coloured (and occasionally Irish) people are singled out.

Shame upon these crawlers before prejudice! They disgrace the Labour movement!

---

The first necessity is to take a clear look at the Labour Party's present position. In 1945 Labour had a parliamentary majority of 180 over the Tories. By 1955 the Tories had a majority of 67 over Labour. In other words, in a matter of 10 years Labour suffered an adverse change in relative strength of 247 MPs and, what is still worse, the Party does not appear to have made much headway since 1935. Despite Suez, the Rent Act, the rising cost of living, and many other blunders of the Tory Government, a recent Gallup Poll shows that, if a General Election were held now, the Tories would be returned again.

Why is this? Why has the Labour Party failed to regain lost support and, in face of Tory attacks, given some leadership to the British people? It is the task—may, the duty—of this year's Party conference to ask this question fearlessly.

The answer lies in the failure of the Labour Party to adopt a socialist policy. The socialist aim is still to gain for workers the full fruits of their labour, no attempt is made to gear present policy to this ultimate aim. The continued existence of capitalism is accepted; at Transport House "Socialism" has become a dirty word. Yet it is with this drift to the right that Labour has lost its electoral support.

Attempting to justify this right-wing policy at last year's Labour Party annual conference, Hugh Gaitskell said:

The Executive could have come to you today and presented a document with a long list of further industries to be nationalized, without a new idea in it, and you would probably have received it with acclamation. Why did we not do that? Because we would have been putting something to you which we did not believe could carry out, and which the electorate were bound to reject.

Gaitskell's first excuse—sheer impossibility—rings rather hollow in an age when people are traveling under the polar ice-cap and sending missiles hundreds of miles above the earth's atmosphere. Why does he believe a Labour Government could not carry out nationalization with workers' control? Socialists have always known that no ruling class likes to be stripped of its power. Whenever possible they do not leave the historical arena without a struggle. But socialists have always had sufficient confidence in the working class—"their solidarity, their militancy, to believe that the unpopular, numeri-

---

Scarborough?

What is wrong with the Labour Party and why is it failing to gain ground?

Anybody at all active in the political arena cannot but recognize this failure. He need not rely on the Gallup Poll to detect widespread apathy and cynicism among the traditionally Labour electorate. He meets it whenever he discusses political affairs.
TU COMMENTARY

REDUNDANCY, WAGES and the AEU

Geoff Carlson, AEU Convener, examines short-time working, and the lack of leadership from the AEU Executive.

With the employers going over to offensive tactics and attempting to smash the workshop organizations, it is imperative that leadership should be given to our members at this time.

... and Rights

For the first time in a number of years, growing unemployment has undermined the 'sense of security which many trade unionists had gained into stability of war. For them it means a new problem and a new answer needed. The reactions to this problem have been many and varied, depending on the strength of the organization in any given factory, but standing out quite clearly from all other solutions is the idea of not accepting redundancy at all.

Ways and means had to be found for keeping everybody employed, and sharing out existing work, introducing a shorter working week, transferring labour, etc.

This essentially new conception of the workers' right to a job, poses a serious threat to the employers, because it begins to challenge their right of hiring and firing, and so raises the question of who controls the industry.

Ignoring the struggle

For the leadership of the AEU this problem should have been paramount. In fact, however, factories facing with such problems had only their own instincts to guide their policies. It is of course true that the AEU policy on redundancy is not to resist it until suitable alternative employment is available, but like so many other trade union policies it was only a decision of the National Committee and no real effort has been made by the Executive to guide, or give leadership to those trade unionists actively engaged in fighting redundancy.

For many active members of the AEU, it seems that the Executive Council has been spending most of its time and energy fighting the Communist Party members who hold positions in our unions, and forgetting the employing members with whom we are in daily conflict.

Causes and results

The newspapers of course give prominence to such activity, and it is to be regretted that the attack on the Communists in the Sheffield and North London District Committees, they refused the official backing to the strike over the sacking of the Communist Convener, of the Yorkshire Engineering Company, and the refusal to back the strike for union recognition at the Master Vending Co., Cricklade, at which the Convener was also a Communist. It is very difficult to recall newspapers which have made the membership amphetamine and have lost temporarily for our unions, and have been forgone during the national stoppage.

Redundancy

The most important of these factors have been redundancy, Unity and strength

As far as most of our members know, the AEU has a claim for increased wages, and after six or nine months a sum of between £150 and £250 has been obtained. The only occasion for which the members were involved was a strike in a paper mill, and it was the occasion when the Confederation called its members out on strike to obtain an increase, and top union officials in the industry was gaining momentum and the workers beginning to experience their power. In such a case, they were ordered back to work by a leadership which was afraid of its own supporters and the impact that that would arise from a successful struggle.

Arising from the national stoppage the report to return to work came the infamous agreement which tied the hands of the workers for months in respect of any further wage claim, and laid down the conditions for stifling factory militancy.

Since that time and the present claim, many new factors have arisen which have made the membership amphetamine and have lost temporarily for our unions, and have been forgone during the national stoppage.

Solidarity Fund

The man who cut off the juice on the tubes during the bus strike is John Frederick Smith, of 74 West Gardens, Clapham Road, S.W.9. He supports a distraught wife and three young children.

We may not agree that this man's method of helping his fellow-man is the best, but we cannot deny that he acted from the finest motives—would there be more doing justice with such feelings of class solidarity?

Fifty thousand busworkers need our fight, if we wish to make the fact that few of us have come to this man to inquire into his condition but to see him alive, in poverty or sickness.

It is reckoned that he is about £6 in debt as a result of doing justice. It is a matter of doing justice to the busworkers, and twenty-one Central Bus Delegates (including members of the C.C.B.) have already agreed to the Holloway Branch meeting in his behalf. Please send all donations to J. Mercier Russell, 74 West Gardens, Clapham, or to the Central Bus Branch, T & GWU, 11a Stonefield Street, Barnsbury, London, N.1.

SEVEN-AND-SIX

Porticus writes

'THE tumult and the shouting dies, the Captains and the Kings depart'; the National Dock Industry pay for the battles. As 7s. 6d. is offered, 7s. 6d. was accepted, despite the opposition of every conceivable delegate to the Conference. The voting: 67 for, 16 against, of whom 15 came from London.

It has been claimed by the employers that this award will cost some two million pounds a year, or about a 1% addition to the wage. Against this, for only if every single docker in the country worked a full shift every day of the year, could it possibly reach such a figure. But, of course, this is not possible in the box system, with thousands of "C" book men permitted only three days, and tens of thousands of Pool men working a day or so each week and "bumping" for the remainder. No, if this figure were halved, it could prove a very conservative estimate.

Turning to the amount itself, I find one a very similar picture, for it is not possible to divide the figure of 7s. 6d. into eleven equal amounts, the dockers working on the basis of eleven four-hour periods every week. Any time a Pool man appears on the dock, he is paid for the dock, it is for a four-hour period; either the employer or the man may turn him out in the middle of that four-hour period. Consequently, a pro rata rate of amount of the 7s. 6d. must be allocated to each worker on the basis of a four-hour periods. The amount agreed upon and which was applied for when the raise came into effect in September, was 8s. for each four-hour period, and at eleven times 8s. is, of course, 7s. 6d.
THE COTTON CRISIS
by Federation Reporter

THE Lancashire Federation of Trades Councils devoted most of its time at its quarterly meeting in Manchester last Saturday to the serious crisis in cotton, and the general industrial situation generally.

Quoting from the latest issue of the Ministry of Labour Gazette, Mr. Ellis Smith, MP, said that unemployment in the North-West was twice the rate in Scotland, four times that of the South, and five times more than in Northern Ireland, all places that had a fair number of factories. While the urban radius of Manchester, the position was serious. Altogether in the North-West in the week to April 30 there were 16,864 unemployed, with places like Blackburn having 1,759, Bolton 2,115, Wigan 1,749, Oldham 3,876; Manchester had almost 8,000.

A considerable section of the unemployed were from the cotton towns. In the last 33 years, over 300 mills had been closed down, a half in the preceding year alone.

The cotton spinners were having to face unfair competition from places like Hong Kong, where the workers were working an average of 80 hours a week, at much lower rates of pay, from which he considered almost a

and After from the Docks

Now this leaves 2d., to the credit of every dockworker completing a full week, and an exceptionally intriguing situation has arisen there in the last few weeks. We must not be sufficiently capable, as represented, of obtaining a suitably wider and better realized fundamental that is the effect the Executive Committee had in mind when it decided to get in the dock on the same terms as they are employed at, to gather in every single one of these outstanding credits and lodge them in a bank in the name of the Dockers’ Welfare. What that means at present is anybody’s guess.

Capitulation?
The general reaction of the Board, the Stewards, the men, the representatives was not sufficiently capable. It was supposed that, with the Board, their attitude was not being sufficiently capable, as represented, of obtaining a suitably wider and better realized fundamental that is the effect the Executive Committee had in mind when it decided to get in the dock on the same terms as they are employed at, to gather in every single one of these outstanding credits and lodge them in a bank in the name of the Dockers’ Welfare. What that means at present is anybody’s guess.

Jimmy Fullerton See page 2

As a final word, many of the factories had recently built up on 3d. policies, so when one considers that these policies can bring anything from £20,000 to £40,000 yearly with its potential investment, one can see that the Cotton Industry is using up its own power, while the future of the Dockers is overstepping its duty in withholding this money legally awarded to the workers.

Duty to fight!

The men argue, and with some justification, that the contribution of 1s. weekly demanded by the union, is more than enough for the poor wages they are receiving, and when one considers the

Other delegates thought the part dealing with the proposed embargo on foreign goods should be deleted, as what was required was an interdict on competition, a class struggle, not for each country to try to solve its own problem at the expense of one another. Bro. Henning of Liverpool also took this view, and pointed out that the Manchester delegate had given figures on serious unemployment in that country; also the advocacy of textile unions were being urged not to ask for wage increases, a rather familiar suggestion often made by British manufacturers, on the same plea of cutting costs to export. One delegate had said that the crisis was due to bad management of machinery in England. He took the view that the machinery was only a very tiny contributing factor. After all, the Detroit motor car factories had the "benefit" of American money also the "benefit" of thousands of unemployed. The basic question was what did the others of course, the factories, it was the economic system that was responsible. The need was to remove the basic cause, not just improve the schemes which solved very little. A boycott on goods was no solution. Solution, they were being sold at the meeting; he felt it would be real solidarity to contact the Chinese, Indians, and other textile workers, coordinate our activities, and assist them other internationally in the struggle against our common enemy.

Bob Wright, Stockport, a delegate, said we were now having an inquest on the results of wrong policies adopted at the end of the war. Had we a genuine socialist policy rather than the one foisted on us by our sold-Out leaders, leading the position we would have been quite different. What was required was a socialist plan with ultimate internal and international planning. We could not blame the Chinese, or Japanese, people, or anyone else for developing their industries, it was a perfectly natural process.

Bro. Gay of Stratford accused the Chairman of being sectarian. We couldn’t build a wall around Lancashire, we had to look to the problem on the widest possible basis.

A delegate from Bury Trades Council gave details of a letter he had received from Hong Kong in which facts were given of the bad conditions under which the workers were being treated.

The following resolution was then passed and carried, with a number of delegates against, and our abstention.

That the Lancashire Federation of Trades Councils is profoundly disturbed by the serious position of Lancashire, and the failure of the Government to adopt measures to safeguard the position of the Lancashire workers, and to provide assistance for a continued organisation of this most valuable section of British industry for the purpose of discouraging imports, and progressive economic prosperity.

It calls upon the Government to place a complete embargo upon imports of goods manufactured in mills which don’t conform to agreed international standards of labour.

All Trades Councils are urged to support the workers in the cotton trade in opposing public in-
RENTO ACT - Next Step
by Karl Dunbar, Willesden CLP

At a recent meeting, the Willesden Central Labour Party discussed how activists should be taken to protect tenants who will, in the next few weeks, face the prospect of eviction from their homes. The task was early established in the meeting that whilst we were all agreed that steps of a drastic nature would have to be taken, it was not clear exactly what those steps should be, and this is not surprising when one realizes the absence of any militant and clear-cut lead from the Party itself. If we, in the local organizations, were gathered to discuss how we could implement locally the call for a National campaign that would be simple, for we all know that only through a nation-wide protest can this Rent Bill be defeated. But the issue facing every local Party is simply "what do we do ourselves?" As one comrade put it: "This has become purely parish pump politics," which means all local Parties must go it alone.

Facing the issue

Well we faced up to the issue as best we could, recognising the weakness of individual local actions in comparison with a national campaign, yet not in any sense dismayed at the task before us, or any success if they try to persuade their members not to take action. The factory workers, the transport workers, the dock workers, all of organised labour in fact, and not forgetting the housewives will act in defence of their homes, and willily-silly the Labour Party and the Trades Unions will be forced to do something or be completely isolated from the rank and file.

With these thoughts in mind the local Party came to these decisions:

1. That we should encourage the growth of tenants' committees.
2. That public meetings shall be called in every Ward of the Borough, which meetings shall take place within a period of ten days.
3. That the Willesden Borough Labour Party pledges its full support to all tenants who 'meet attempts at physical eviction with physical resistance.'
4. That neighbouring boroughs already agreed to co-operation should be immediately drawn together to plan united action.

The recent speculation on the possibility of summit talks with conflicting opinions have been expressed by socialists as to whether the working-class can benefit from such discussions.

The argument, which I oppose states that when the heads of Capitalist states get together it is wholly for their personal benefit. If the working-class can in any way participate in a discussion, it is only coincidentally and inevitably from wrong motives.

During the recent speculation on the possibility of summit talks with conflicting opinions have been expressed by socialists as to whether the working-class can benefit from such discussions. The argument, which I oppose states that when the heads of Capitalist states get together it is wholly for their personal benefit. If the working-class can in any way participate in a discussion, it is only coincidentally and inevitably from wrong motives.

5. That every attempt be made to bring the local trade union movement into the struggle.
6. That the Party Executive Committee shall meet within 48 hours to implement the decisions of the Party and that the EC shall co-opt anyone they think will assist in the carrying out of the Party's policy.

No doubt other Boroughs are taking action on similar lines to Willesden, on the other hand the Borough speaks with one voice at all. It is the desire of all of us to see a great National Campaign, but failing that the next best thing is that we learn from one another how best to tackle the job of defending our homes. To do this we need to bring together the ideas and actions of the various Parties up and down the country, a paper that will also maintain the consistent demand that the weapon of the working-class must be used to defeat the Tories. It is this need which must be, for one, support the Socialist Review. Let the pages of the Review be a means to bring about working-class unity and so assast the spread of action out from our parochial boundaries to embrace town, city and country, until the whole working-class of Britain is united as one in defence of its homes.

The Tory bench was kicked by the Tories out of its seat. It is not a joke, and by a majority of people of our country go on from their victory to establish a Government pledged to carry out Socialist policy.

A Case for Summit Talks?

During the recent speculation on summit talks with conflicting opinions have been expressed by socialists as to whether the working-class can benefit from such discussions.

The argument, which I oppose states that when the heads of Capitalist states get together it is wholly for their personal benefit. If the working-class can in any way participate in a discussion, it is only coincidentally and inevitably from wrong motives.

The reason, however, for the call for Summit Talks was the desire by the Government to force the main powers to create the impression that they were pursuing every avenue for settling "international disputes." If this has been successful, agreements may have been reached in the past and certainly without the present publicity it is, of course, not genuine. However, the necessity to create the impression of a back-up of public opinion to the present policies.

In Britain we should be proud that the Government has been forced to make this show. We should realise that it is a reflection of our strength and that more militant we become, so our power and influence will increase.

Our power, our interests

Obviously there is a limit to our influence over Capitalism, but the limit is some considerable way off, and when in fact there hasn't been reached, the end of Capitalism will be in sight. As it is we have power and we can force the Government to negotiate. We can also force some of the negotiations to be in our interests. Naturally it is unimportant whether the adjective "summit" is used providing the negotiations take place, and provided they are negotiations based on some extent on the interests of our class.

We can achieve success by campaigning on these lines. We will not succeed in forcing permanent guarantees from capitalists states, but we can obtain limited concessions in the struggle to obtain these will strengthen us in our final struggle to abolish capitalism.

BILL CARTER

As you say, Comrade Carter, "providing they are negotiated based on some extent on the interests of our class." But who is to do the providing? When a commander negotiates with management, we know who our representative is. Even where a trade union bargain with the employers, we know who he is, how-

ever much he may drag his heels. But when the bosses of the eastern negotiates with the bosses (eastern), on whom are we supposed to depend? Who is to see that the negotiations are based "on the interests of our class?"

Strikes to the summit?

Then again, you say that the Tories' show of going to meet "in a reflection of our strength," is it? We have seen strikes in support of wages. Have we ever seen strikes against sacks? Some have been successful, but taken from talk between lesser representatives at, for example, Spurling's. The reason, however, for the call for Summit Talks was the desire by the Government to force the main powers to create the impression that they were pursuing every avenue for settling "international disputes." If this has been successful, agreements may have been reached in the past and certainly without the present publicity it is, of course, not genuine. However, the necessity to create the impression of a back-up of public opinion to the present policies.

In Britain we should be proud that the Government has been forced to make this show. We should realise that it is a reflection of our strength and that more militant we become, so our power and influence will increase.

The Gentle Art of Conference Arrangements . . .

1. In the first place aim to see that undesirable resolutions are rendered completely innocuous by composing or presenting in terms so stupid as to be laughed out of Conference. In the case of recalcitrant delegates who refuse to give way, never fear, the Chairman will see to it that their resolutions are not carried.
2. Be sure that all precautions are taken against any defects of light from which the Chairman may suffer. Take care that his vision is frequently guided in the direction of the leaders of the big and reliable battalions.
3. Time is limited for speakers from the floor, but remember that platforms stars can carry on till Peter blows his horn.
4. Avoid stamp votes. These are likely to cut across the program of hard-working officials who have to fit in for a 48-hour sitting on a site that the beach with the wife, as the empty seats during the Conference sessions testify.
5. Be sure to provide for at least one good debate on a subject which everyone agrees beforehand, e.g. the cost of living. Everyone can sit off steam quite happily during the period when tempers might otherwise become frayed over some unnecessary and nettlesome resolution.
6. Finally, relax! Enjoy yourself! Fortunately, the Trump cards are in your hands. Make sensible men who will not let you down whenever the occasion calls for it.

Even though Sir Tom O'Brien's daughter in 1975 found things dull after Acrington Labour Party Conference has plenty to offer. After all, the accommodation is good, liquid and solid refreshment is plentiful, and provided the weather is fair, a good time can be had by all.
Of the 428 resolutions on the agenda of this year's Labour Party annual conference, 142 of them—in other words, roughly a third—were about leading the charge against the H-bomb. More than 100 resolutions oppose the manufacture, use and testing of H-bombs. The American H-bombers from Britain and for work on the building of rocket sites in this country is certainly a war on us all.

This crescendo of resolutions, each in its own individual way protesting against the lunatic policy of massing increasing numbers of H-bombers, echoes the growing opposition to this policy among the British people.

What is the Labour Party's attitude to this new development? One file is obvious: their numerous resolutions against the H-bomb testify to their support. But what of the Labour leaders? Their position is explained in John Strachey's letter in the recent Leader. Written in an attempt to persuade people that Britain should build the H-bomb, he calls his pamphlet Scrap All H-bombs. It would have been more honest, more in keeping with the aims of the pamphlet, had it been entitled The Fear of Tens of Tens of H-bombs for Britain.

The Labour leaders' task to create a false impression. He starts out by trying to show the differences between the Tories and the Labour Party policies. Born of the electric age, for making the bomb, the Labour leaders are for making the bomb; the Tories want rocket sites. The Labour leaders want rocket sites. They call the only distinct similarities are that Labour would wait until after a summit meeting before they started creating rocket bases and would suspend H-bomb tests.

Fallen with a thud at the trial. It is highly unlikely that a summit meeting would end the Cold War; in fact, I am confident that it won't. For the discord does not arise from some misunderstood or personal quarrel that can be settled by a clash of arms; it stems from a deep and fundamental conflict of economic interests between the ruling class of Russia and the ruling classes of Britain and America. Such conflict cannot be settled by the leaders coming together for their own benefit, but only by the people of East and West coming together—and ending the rulers.

WHAT OUR LEADERS TRIED TO HIDE

1. The Labour Government's maxim: "It won't happen on our watch." It was Labour, not the Tories, who made Britain's first atomic bomb. The whole existence of the bomb was kept in the dark by the Labour Party and the Labour Party conference—by listing the large sums spent under various other items in the official estimates. Neither the Labour Party nor Parliament had any say in the decision.

2. The harmful genetic effects caused by nuclear warfare. The first official Civil Defence Manual on Atomic War, with a foreword by Attlee, who was then Prime Minister, has pages 41 to 39 omitted. From the sequence of the Manual, it is obvious that the missing pages related to the harvest of deformed and defective children that would be born to future generations if a nuclear war were to break out. Fear of a fictitious outcry when the horrible facts were revealed probably led the Labour Government to have second thoughts—and suppressing that part of the Manual—when in the printer's hands.

3. The huge cost of the bomb. That power, would be prepared to use the Bomb. Gaitskell, speaking at Birmingham, was bluntly asked: "Would you be prepared to press the button of?" After considerable evasion, he replied that he would not be prepared to disassociate the determination of the value of the H-bomb.

Since the summit meeting is doomed to failure—and every realist knows it—the Labour leaders are using this to make proposals appear more palatable and less bald. Instead of saying that they would not build another bomb site until an attempt had been made at a summit meeting to reach agreements, with equal assurance, they have simply written that they intend to go on and build them.

Meanless proposal

Their second proposal—to suspend tests—is meaningless. The American, Russian and British Governments have all suspended tests. Sometimes it has been for five minutes, sometimes for five hours, sometimes for five months. The transport and assembling of equipment before a test is not a sensitive and finding after a test all take time. Periodic suspensions are natural and inevitable.

If the Labour leaders' proposal would only have been important if they had stated they would suspend tests, then we say very much so. If we consider that they meant what they said, and were willing to try to effect what they wanted, the word of the H-bomb Power would be meaningless, and would mean test to test. If they have not repudiated this idea, means that the Labour leaders would not be willing to try to stop the nuclear explosion threat by trying to "perfect" more devastating methods of destruction—continued.

Scientists agree that nuclear tests already carried out will cause widespread suffering. The British Atomic Scientists' Association calculates that, on the basis of tests carried out up till 275,000 people will die of bone cancer alone. Commenting on this, Bertrand Russell says: "If any one of these tests causes one to be born an idiot, you are a monster; but if you do the same injury to 50,000 you are a patriot."

Arms and Dead Men

"The record of the main European wars... is shown by the following index series (combining size of the fighting force and number of casualties, number of countries involved, and proportion of combatants to total population):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>12th</th>
<th>13th</th>
<th>14th</th>
<th>15th</th>
<th>16th</th>
<th>17th</th>
<th>18th</th>
<th>19th</th>
<th>20th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harold D. Lasswell World Politics

As Economics, 1945, p. 7.

When Strachey comes on to the main task of his pamphlet, an attempt to reply to those favouring unilateral disarmament by Britain, he trot in the same tirade arguments as Macmillian. This is not to say that Strachey does not understand that Britain and in the opinion of the Russian Government does not launch an invasion against any of the nations that have the power to do so, e.g., Yugoslavia, India. Furthermore, Strachey does not give the impression that for any purpose, Russia is deterred by Britain's H-bomb. Although Britain possesses only three to every 100 possessed by Russia, Macmillian said in Parliament that Britain would not hesitate to be the first nation to be left with nothing to come into with conventional forces. Despite the fact that Britain is a small, densely-populated island, highly vulnerable to nuclear onslaught, Russia's hundreds of H-bombs would not make Macmillian hesitate before trying to press the button. Why should we think that Russia, a huge, sprawling country, covering one-fifth of the world's land mass and supported by the British Government's mere handful of bombs:

How many divisions!

Strachey also argues that Britain must possess the Bomb to give persuasiveness to influence events in general" (p. 15). Strachey clearly considers influence purely a matter of power politics. Considering the power of the Vatican one can really imagine Strachey, to paraphrase Stalin's famous question, even more than how many horses has the Pope?" And when, in his speech amaze, he finds the Pope must be sent, he sends the Pope a copy of his pamphlet along with a personal letter to His Holiness advocating the manufacture of H-bombs so the Vatican can again have "power on the international stage."

Since Strachey regards the power to influence purely in military terms, he omits any consideration of the importance of ideals, the struggle for men's minds. In the long run it is these ideological factors that are crucial. The pen is mightier than the sword.

What sort of power?

The H-bomb is immensely powerful—and immensely weak. While it gives a country's rulers the power to blow another country to smithereens, it does not help in keeping a people in subjection. This is clearly illustrated by the antics of the Americans in the Mediterranean. US News & World Report (May 30th, 1957) boasted that "more actual destruction can be caused by one flight of the 180 aircraft of the Sixth Fleet than by all the bomb- ing of World War II!" Yet, with all this power, the Americans were unable to keep the Western puppet regime in power in Turkey. It could easily blow the oil wells—and everybody else sky-high, but this would hardly help to solve the capital's problem of how to sell their (their) extremely profitable production of oil.

Deals that count

It is ideal that an arms race is becoming discredited. Arab nationalism and the desire for ownership and control of one's own resources is increasing, and therefore we have the spectacle in the Middle East of the British and American Governments with immense military superiority, being impelled to give way, to make concessions. Aramco. Theseussions are but one step toward the day when, if the West increases its nuclear might tenfold, it cannot influence the world.

What can happen to suicide?

The H-bomb is a weapon of mass destruction, not of class warfare. It can never be gently lopped over. A nuclear blast would do in any awkward London dockers. Like the dawn that faded between the first and second attack, an H-bomb would kill capitalists as well as workers. While the capitalists might be killed by the same unry workers out of the way, he would never consider the loss of a few trillions. The H-bomb would blow himself, his factory and his fellow-capitalists up in a radio-active mushroom cloud.

It is for this basic reason—the H-bomb can never be used in the class struggle for Socialism—bed all social classes favoring the bombing of the West, Britain socialist—or Russia, for that matter—it would destroy them all. No conceivable situation could arise in which a Socialist Government could wish to use them. Respect for human life is an essential characteristic of Socialism.

Destruction and Decay

On the other hand, it is only by the decay of the social order, squanders all its resources, including human life. Ever intensifying antagonisms, caused by the clash of economic interests, have smashed one capitalist state against another. As time has gone on, the destruction and decay is more destructive (see chart). Finally, with the advent of the H-bomb, they have reached a pitch where they threaten society's very existence.

No analysis

Judged against the H-bomb, Strachey's pamphlet is sadly lacking. It does not contain any analysis of the economic rivalries that have generated the struggle for mastery of the world. It fails to give any lead to humanity on how to get rid of this nightmarish universal preparation for extinction. Instead Strachey just scratches at the problem, trying to create the illusion that the Labour's right-wing leaders will do something about it. It is to be hoped that the Labour Party conference, seeing through these deceits, will call for an indefinite suspension of the tests and the testing of the bomb.

* For this reason I cannot agree with Robin Flower when he writes, "the H-bomb is a deter- rent aimed not at either of the rival imperialist- ists but at the forces of world revolution" (SR, August 1st.)
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Stan Newens asks

Can Labour Win at Scarborough?

It is clear even to the most optimistic that another 1945 is out of the question. That tremendous wave of enthusiasm which carried Labour to power in 1945 with a majority of 148 seats in 1945 is as remote from the political climate now as Napoleonic jingoism was from the Corn Law agitation of 1845. At the best, we can only hope for something better than 1950.

With this in mind, the eyes of all socialists will be focused on the Labour Party Conference at Scarborough this year. It is the final debate on the new series of policy statements and almost certainly the last Conference before the 1951 General Election. It is probably the last opportunity for the Party to take some drastic step which will radically transform a bleak and dreary outlook ahead.

Apathy and Waste

For the past seven years the policy which has stemmed from the Party leadership is one of moderation.

This policy has been completely out of harmony with the ideas of the rank and file in the constituencies, as reference to resolutions sent in to the Labour Party Conference year after year will show. The result has been to dispel all but the last vestiges of enthusiasm from Party workers.

This loss of enthusiasm has not only demobilized local organizations of some of their finest workers, but also of their finest propaganda agents—the men and women who used to argue the Labour case on the buses and tubes, in the mines and at the factories, in the pubs and along the streets.

The vital issue

At least theoretically, Labour could make the required change at Scarborough. The most vital issue for the question of the E. Bomb. If Labour came out in favour of unilateral handing of the bomb—as near as the resolutions ask—and initiated a real campaign to achieve this, she would attract more middle class votes than the advocates of moderation ever dreamt of. Nuclear disarmament is the key question at this year's Conference.

However immense a victory the acceptance of a policy of unilateral ban would be, in the long run it would not suffice to recapture the mood of 1945. For the trend to moderation at present is highly unlikely. A handful of Trade Union leaders—often drummed into existence against the possibility of rank and file pressure—can easily swamp the votes of the rest by means of the block voting system. The leaders of the Transport and General Workers Union alone hold as many votes as all the Conscripted Parties put together, and the TUC easily defends a proposition for unilateral ban on the bomb.

Defeat again?

Thus, unfortunately, defeat for the left is practically a foregone conclusion, which means that Labour's election prospects will be entirely dependent on the unpopularity of the Tories. In such circumstances, the event takes place. If the Tories are lucky, Labour's hopes will be dashed immediately, and the political future of the country will be shaped, as always, by events beyond Labour's control.

Prospects: No change

Unfortunately, the reversal of this Labour would have to jettison the whole of its policy for mere reforms of capitalism in favour of a full-blooded socialist programme.

Must challenge Capitalism

Leaving aside Industry and Society it would have to make fundamental amendments to the policy documents Learning to Live, Prosper the Plough, and Policy for Progress. At present they merely tinker with the problem in the by-ways. Further than this, the Labour Party would have to back the workers in their day-to-day struggles in a really effective way: in the factories, the docks, in their places of work; against rising prices and rising rents.

Where is the Labour Party going to?

The reason for this middle-class drift to the Tories is surely to be found in the Labour leaders' attempt to cajole middle-class voters. For, by stripping the Party's policies of the last vestiges of socialism, the Labour leaders have shown themselves willing to administer the present economic system. With the parties competing merely to administer capitalism, the middle-class voter generally decides to vote Tory. The middle-class consider it more natural and normal for a capitalist party to administer capitalism. In any case, they have far greater experience at this than the Labour leaders. Therefore the Labour leaders have played into the Tories' hands, given them a greater share of the middle-class vote, by permitting their one means of winning middle-class voters—to show that they represented something fundamentally different to the Tories.

The facts:

But, far more important, was the demoralizing effect of right-wing Gaullist policy upon the workers. Only 16 percent of the total electorate are middle-class voters and between one and two percent capitalists. Therefore, the overwhelming majority—and the most significant from a Labour standpoint—are the working class and the policies.

But how can the Labour Party make a reasonable appeal to the working class when its policy even leaves the majority of its active workers stone cold? On all the important issues of the present time the Labour leaders either like constipated jellyfish. Nuclear disarmament? Their only proposals are the same as the Tories—is to stop tests. Education? Those seats of ruling-class privilege, the public schools, cannot be touched, but the grammar schools can be thrown into turmoil. The House of Lords? After opposing the Bill for Life Peers, the Labour leaders help to make the Lords even more powerful. Therefore, Labour life peers. Nationalization? The Labour leaders think that past nationalization has been a "success story"—and therefore propose to nationalize no fresh industries.

Gallo says so too

All these attempts of the Labour leaders to make their policies reconcileable to all men has ended with their policy meaning nothing to anybody. The Gallup poll shows that only 25 percent of the electorate regard Gaullist as a good leader. In the last 18 months, it is nothing to know what to think of him—and one can appreciate their sentiments—has risen from 19 to 34 percent. The Gallup poll on to show that the adoption of "a more definite policy" would please three times as many as it would repel; twice as many "undecided" voters; and six times as many Labour voters.

The moral—turn Left

The News Chronicle of August 25th draws the moral—and it must be drawn at the Scarborough Conference:

The poll clearly shows that if Labour is to win the election, by virtue of a positive appeal, the party has to turn to the Left and establish an image distinct from that of the Conservative...
the Isis Trial - a footnote from Stephen Witney, Oxford

The outcome of the Isis trial left us all moderately relieved; for several weeks and during the trial in particular such moderation had not been looked for. A few acts of what Lord Punishment-in-a-Detriment Goddard called “Youthful folly” and the public appetite of the state—Lord Chief Justice, Solicitor General, Christmas Hampheys, dozens of policemen, lashers, Medical, Fleet Street correspondents, flunkies of every variety—descended to wreak the vengeance of society. Total cost to the taxpayer must be in the region of £10,000. For what purpose? Well, the motives were never clear.

5 million for what?

Some people were saying that the expenses for a prosecution came only from the Foreign Office; some that a small group of men had felt embarrassed by the Isis article on frontier incidents; some were saying that it had not been for one very particular thing, to play in the army no action would have been taken. And once all the hue and cry were raised, the little men in bowler hats sent in their reports and the machinery moved relentlessly on towards the inevitable conviction. And for why? If one wanted to give any clear reply to this question it would be something about encouraging the others. From doing what? From letting the British know that its £5,000,000 a year secret service spent its time doing The Russians know anyway.

Responsible to irresponsibles

This obscure organization, independent of all parliamentary control, appears to hold the Treasury at its mercy. A word from the MI and a minister will return to answer a question in Parliament; some possibly harmless person will have his privacy sacrificed, some ambitious young man will be denied for ever the chance of following the career he wants. He can appeal to a committee, theoretically, against the charge, that is, if he knows anything about it. Even the accounts are concealed even from the Prime Minister, the men in the War Office, and from most of the Home Secretary.

The great curse of this organization is its complete unaccountability to anyone. It is the British a great “Keep Away” notice for the Establishment. It has never relented from what it does. 

Areas of public life are shrouded in this way from the arc lights of public curiosity, except in cases they get special permission to publish their memoirs. The power of the Group, which is a state, its prohibition is absolute and unqualified—that it encourages one to believe that everything is secret unless specially exempted.

Keeping it quiet

The annoying thing about the trial was that so much of it was in camera. At the end the judge told the jury—whom he dismissed as nuisance—“I have been left to decide if every thing they had heard as quickly as possible.” I kept looking at them to see whether their features indicated signs of moral shock after each closed session. But they never seemed perturbed about anything.

The lesson

The lesson to be learned from this pointless affair is the Left, in the interests of democracy, for profits for example. And the history of Isis at the end of last term seems to support this. For over two years now, this venereal Oxford institution has become more and more “political.” Last term, matters came to a head; first the H-Bomb, then attacks on the Queen, and Free-masonry, goaded the proprietor to action. The outgoing editor’s nomination for successor was rejected, and the proprietor appointed a rich, young man to substitute pages of sport—beagling, polo—politics and theatre (immoral). However the raw young man was persuade not to take the post, and the left’s nominee was reinstated. But here lies the moral—no more attackers to Freemasonry, Queens or H-Bombs.

FEEL THAT Comrade Witney’s hope that the next Labour government will disabuse the Military Intelligence “service” is little founded on the sad facts. Before the Right-Wing faces up to the more grotesque faces of the Hydra of contemporary capitalism, and tries to cut them out, they will have to mount a serious assault on the more obvious features of rent, interest, justice, and the fruits of their leadership. Were theirs, then, a pointless death? They had no inkling of the events of the next three decades; but does that make their action folly? They were brave men like Köbs and Reichstech since men with vision, true revolutionaries. There will be men like them in the future. History will prove them, and not the sceptics or the pessimists, right.

THE MOVEMENT

Remember Toller writes M. Maddison

Today Ernest Toller is all but forgotten; the plays he wrote are rarely performed and the internees are set against a background that might never have existed. But the period—1914-1923—helped to form the Europe we have to know and (if we are lucky with ourselves) come to dread too.

Toller was the head of the third Czarist Soviet, and after the brutal triumph of the Petrograd counter-revolution he was lucky to escape with five years in a forcing-prison. He saw the hope of democracy literally smashed in blood; his comrades tortured and murdered with barely a pretence of justice; and the forerunners of the soon-to-be familiar storm-troops marching through the streets of Petrograd.

To the Memory of the Sailors Köbs and Reichstech who were shot on September 5th, 1917” so runs the dedication to Toller’s play ‘Draw The Fires. Köbs and Reichstech of the leaders of a Wilhelms-haven sailors’ revolt. A year previously the German and the British fleets had met at Heligoland. There was National solidarity in Germany—alarmingly expressed in 1914 by the Socialist Democratic Party’s volte face and acceptance of the war—crumbling in the face of terrible privations. As in the case of Russia, it was the military rank-and-file who suffered most. They were making the sacrifices, but for whom and for what? What did the Kaiser or the patriotic image mean to men dying in the lines of trenches, or being snuffed out in the giant hull of a battleship? What had “my country” to do with “wrong” when there was no bread, and meat was crawling with maggots? The disembarkation was made more bitter and more final by the existence of a ruling class that made no sacrifices, only anguished utterances about “two boys doing their duty for the Fatherland”.

In Draw the Fires! we see the growth of political consciousness; the sailors experience the moment of truth and take the road to Damascus. Power falls eventually into their hands—like a rotten apple,” a perceptive stoker explains. “I tell you I don’t like it but if I have to I’ll go on with a flash of intuition.

The sailors have the power, and the authorities are paralysed for a time. But there is retribution—Köbs and Reichstechs and the fruits of their leadership. Was theirs, then, a pointless death? They had no inkling of the events of the next three decades; but does that make their action folly? They were brave men like Köbs and Reichstech since men with vision, true revolutionaries. There will be men like them in the future. History will prove them, and not the sceptics or the pessimists, right.
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Mosley—end from page 8

countries, if they can be persuaded to join the union, they prove to be very loyal members. The AEU in Birmingham did well some time ago to issue a leaflet directed to coloured immigrants pointing out the advantages of belonging to the union, and in the Standard and BMC strikes in 1956 the coloured workers proved their loyalty quite as well as the other workers, in some cases coming out 100 per cent. where the rest of the shop was not solid. In the London strikes, coloured workers again showed their solidarity. The writer has come across no case of blacklegging on the part of coloured workers in any strike.

Misery for all

If there should be large-scale unemployment, a few thousand coloured workers would not make the slightest difference to the prevailing misery. In the early thirties there were thousands of coloured workers to speak of in Britain. Unemployment then embraced three million British workers.

Class the problem

Today, except for a few patches, there is full employment, with 25 million at work. There are 190,000 coloured immigrants in Britain, that is, one in 263 of the population or one in 115 of the workers. In full employment if the working class is united, coloured workers can only add to working-class strength.

Our job is to make it clear to the whole people, class is the problem, not colour. Down with racism and the society which breeds it. Join hands with the exploited of all colours to strike at the heart of our system—class division.
Mosley's Men—and这才

them was paying one guinea per
week to live and sleep, some four in one room, with no fire pre-
caration. The overall picture in Bir-

ningham found cases of three
married couples in one room, in
some cases with 10 people. The
same person reported a case in
which one landlord collected £500 a week from 12 houses. It is
not common for landlords to
clearly charge different rents for
white and coloured people for

exactly the same accommodation,
and yet, the coloured immi-

grants are forced to accept these rentals. As the Birmingham
Weekly News (June 6, 1956) corresponded that not only about 1 land-

lady in 5 would take coloured lodgers.

One would have hoped that the

working class would have stood out solidly against this effort by

their very own exploiters to split their ranks. Unfortunately it can-

cannot be said that its ranks are

fragmented. In this latter respect,

Trade unionists may remember the
disgraceful strike of West Bromwich

in 1955 over the employment of a

single coloured worker (an Indian). In the same year, the Asso-

ciation General and General Workers Union in

Nottingham threatened to strike if

coloured conductors were pro-

moted in the same berths before every

white conductor had been given the chance. (They were later won

over to a compromise position.)

Unrest among Birmingham trans-

port workers led to a plebiscite on

the question of promotion for

workers. (The majority were

against discrimination.) At a con-

ference of coloured workers in

December 1954, a pro-

minent Midlands trade union of-

ficial proposed that in case of un-

employment, coloured drivers should

get priority in getting jobs. The

drivers, who should go first and in

promotion white workers should have

preference. (This was not

found and he was heckled through his speech).

Who is to blame?

Even from these facts, it is

clear that an attitude of discrimi-

nation is by no means universal

in the trade unions. Many un-

ited unions, including the Asso-

ciation General Union of

Ministers, have passed resolutions

against any discrimination by racial

Exploiting these insecure condi-

tions of capitalism are various

racist organisations, Mosley's Uni-

ons, the so-called Anti-Semitism

League, and the British National

party, to make magnifying capital

cut out of the lumpen potentials of

the area. The coloured population

are forced by the hidden colour

bar of the more "respectable" areas

of the city. They have been

called a number of leaks by the

general tenor: "Protect your jobs

stop coloured invasion", has

been the slogan of the meeting in

the middle of the troubled area of

Nottingham Hill, and have done all in

the name of the League of Imperialists

and the Ku-Klux-Klan, to rule the

streets. Their accusations rest on

one very much of the accusations

made by the Nazis against the

Jews. These were the "inter-

national bankers" or "Commun-

ists" according to which you

wished to harangue at the time.

The colour bar of the Nazi's

riding around in Rolls Royces,

and Cadillacs, "one month after

they lost off a black lunch

from house and a big car," (quated

in the Observer, September 7), or

alternatively of being filthy,

ragged, illiterate.

Fight the gangs

To combat the activity of these
gangs it is necessary to

start working with them as the

socialist Labour party, to

open direct air-open meetings

in the heart of the troubled

spots. Upholders of ele-

itary democracy for our

coloured brethren will flock

to thousands in such meetings.

Nottingham Socialists are to

be congratulated on holding a

meeting of coloured and white

inhabitants the very day after the

outbreak of the riot. An im-

proved peaceful (bullies are

eared) and entirely successful.

In addition, where it is at all

possible it is important to or-

ganize defence teams to go to

the places where trouble is likely

to start out, first to protect the

coloured people by frightening

away the gangs, and to speak to

the unemployed in the troubled

area, reassuring them that the

streets will not be monopolized

by the hooligans, and winning

over the workers over by a

pointed attitude to their coloured

neighbours, whose lives are after

all so much like their own, only per-

haps harder.

Letters to the press, petitions,

open churches, are important,

but cannot be the sole source of

success with street activity, where

the trouble takes place and the

local situation is sure to be enenc-

tered.

In addition, in our places of

work, it is important to get over

the workers understanding of

the same government and the same

bosses who exploit both the colonial

workers and the British, and the

British workers exploit the

workers' point of view to

their "divide and rule" policy should be

"unity is strength."

Unite!

Draw the colonial workers

who are unorganized into the

trade unions. They are often

reluctant to do this or take part

in any political activity for

fear of repercussions either here

or at home, where they mostly

hope to return, which would take

away any security they may have

in this situation in particular.

However, with the antagonism to

exploitation that they drew in with

their mother's milk in their home,

turn back to page 2

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The Socialist Review stands for the real solution to all the social

problems of today. Only the mass mobilization of the working class in the

industries can prevent the spread of capitalism and the capitalist system.

The Socialist Review believes that all working people should work for

the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of socialism.

Socialist Review