QUIT CYPRUS!

SEVENTY YEARS of British rule in Cyprus have culminated in five years of terror: British terror and nationalist counter-terror. These five years have ended in racial war: “no holds barred” Darling hands out arms to all-comers (so long as they’re British); MacMillan justifies “punitive retaliatory measures against the population as a whole” (albeit “in special cases”), gunmen flourish on both sides. And the Cyprus tragedy drags on.

Even before the present crisis, British Imperialism had not treated the Cypriots lightly. The official Cyprus Annual Report for 1954 shows that average weekly earnings, including overtime payments, bonuses, etc., ranged from 42s 8d in agriculture (the lowest) to 88s 2d in transport and communications (the highest); mining averaged 85s 4d, engineering 64s 8d, clothing 50s 5d, and so on. Prices are no different to those we know here. The Report shows that girls under 18 work as miners (averaging 50s 3d a week), while the relatively high take-home pay in transport and communications has a lot to do with the 66-hour week worked by bus, lorry and taxi-drivers and by porters.
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The Report states that education is not compulsory. The normal school-leaving age for the children that do attend school is 12, although “in the poorer rural communities children are sometimes taken away at the age of 9 or 10 to help their parents at home or in the fields”. More than half the schools have only one teacher, who handles all six classes, while another quarter have two teachers, each of whom takes three classes.

The Housing Census of 1946 showed that more than one-third of the urban dwellings in the whole island consisted of one room only. One-third of these were occupied by seven or more persons, while the average number of persons per room over the whole island was more than three-and-a-half. Only half the houses have piped water, while less than one-fifth have water flush sanitation (quoted in Thomas Anthems, *Enosis*).

To this the “emergency” has added its own burden. Mass sackings from British installations; curfews which ruin peasant crops and cattle; youth restrictions which effect over 50,000 young people, mostly workers, and rob the Cypriot people of £40,000 per day, or one-sixth of the daily gross national income (*Daily Telegraph*, October 10, quoting the President, Federation of Trade and Industry).

Economic ruin, personal injury and death, mass terror; one soldier for every 15 in the population, man woman and child; special transport from here, free board, wages plus £3 danger money for teenage girls to give a hand with murder (remember the 5x the Tories refused the busmen?)—these are the essence of British rule in Cyprus. The harder it is to keep it in the Middle East, the more vicious this rule.

It is a long way since Churchill, then Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, could say in the Cyprus Legislative Council (1907):

“I think it is only natural that the Cypriot people who are of Greek descent should regard their incorporation with what may be called their mother-country as an ideal to be earnestly, devoutly and fervently cherished.

It is hard to believe that in 1915, the island was actually offered to Greece as a bribe to enter the war. It was refused and Cyprus remained “British”.

It’s a long way. The Tories are hanging on with everything; brutality combines with cynical bluff. They promise to negotiate with Makarios if he drops ‘Enosis’. He drops it. They refuse to negotiate. What do they want with the island? What interest can justify their savagery?

As a base from which to police the Middle East, Cyprus is useless. The Suez War proved that. And Middle East HQ has been moved to Kenya (to the delight of the white settler minority). It is useless as a bomber strip for global war—Turkey and Greece are nearer Russia’s borders and have, for the moment, at least, less hostile peoples.

So much has been admitted by a study group set up by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, a learned institute which acts as the Foreign Office’s unofficial club.

(continued on back page)

BUS BOYCOTT

by Robert Emmett

ON November 18, there assembled in Transport House, for the first time ever, an all-embracing national conference of busmen. Representatives of Municipal, Private Company, British Transport Commission and London Transport staffs assembled under one roof to discuss the elements of a national wages policy.

As the conference opened, a time-bomb exploded with the announcement that the central London busmen, the biggest single section of the conference, would boycott the proceedings as a public vote of “no confidence” in the national officers of the T&GWU.

What were the underlying reasons for this, apparently, negative attitude to such an important event? Central London busmen, over the past thirty years, have occupied a position second to none as a progressive force within the Labour Movement. Their rank and file leaders, at garage and conference floor level, have shown themselves to be a body of mature, experienced, and very doughty fighters. One would expect, therefore, that there had to be very sound and urgent reasons for their boycott decisions—and, indeed, there are.

In a letter to the conference, personally signed by every member of the Central Bus Com.

(turn to page 2)
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That all workers, irrespective of the conditions to the best possible advantage.

Naturally, to obtain such a position, it is essential for the workers in every one of these countries to set their own house in order, for one could hardly insist that the group of workers in the commodity of nations should enjoy an improvement in their living standards if those insisting hadn't already obtained such improvements for themselves. Commonsense and equity argue that this must be so.

**Four Unions**

With this in mind, it behoves port workers in this country to examine the position that exists in their own industry, and here one discovers that whilst there are separate unions operating for the interests of all port workers by far the largest is the Transport and General Workers Union. It is common knowledge that for many years now, the rank and file membership hasn't been seen eye to eye with the Executive, and because of this difference of opinion, various groups of militant workers have formed themselves into Liaison Committees with the sole purpose of endeavouring to ensure that the officials elected to represent them do in fact just this.

**Red labels**

Unfortunately however, the officials resent the appearance of these committees born of their own laxity in the theory of "Red" labels even to the extent of communicating such information to the National Press with the result that this public service is unconscious of the true, viewing the liaison committees with great suspicion. And yet, what is their real purpose? Nothing more and nothing less than the implementation of a "Dockers' Charter" which should have been the aim, the accomplishment of our National Docks Group many years ago.

**BUSES—continued**

We have decided to take this very serious protest action for the reason that, judging by the actions of the car and bus drivers in the heart of the London bus service culture, we can have no confidence that the decision of the rank and file delegates to that conference, will be accepted and carried out.

Behind that simple, but very grave statement, lies a long history of endeavour on the part of the London busmen to prevent the piecemeal destruction of the nationalized transport services at the hands of a Tory Government, and an equally long fight to assert the democratic right of the elected committee of the busmen to decide and operate policy within the T & GWU.

Since the London transport services were nationalized in 1946, a large part of the entire system has disappeared—having been amputated in successive "cut" operations in the name of economy. More than 2,500 buses have gone from the roads. Some 11,000 less drivers and conductors, and 4,000 less vehicle maintenance men have disappeared. Fares have risen eleven times, service has deteriorated to a degree where one frequently waits 40 minutes for a bus that one had a five-minute frequency. The queues get longer and longer. Literally millions of man-hours are being lost to production as a result of grossly inadequate transport services.

And now the LTE are in the process of making a further cut—the biggest of all. By November 26, a further 650 buses will have been taken off the roads in the space of three months, a further 32 million miles will have been lopped off bus operations—another group of nials will have been driven into the coffin of a transport service that was "nationalized" to "serve the interests of the public".

Central London busmen, who have watched their ranks dwindle and their jobs deteriorate through this systematic murder of the transport services, have utilized every constitutional channel open to them within the T & GWU to get union action against the bus-shutting policy of the Government and LTE.

**Proposals vetoed**

At garage, committee, and conference level they have requested action. National officials of the union have agreed to a general policy of "non-co-operation" with the LTE, but, when the central busmen interpreted this policy concretely with a series of practical steps to be taken against the

For the purpose of explanation there are four main items in the "Charter" which in the opinion of the men, must be resolved satisfactorily, if peace and prosperity are to continue in the Dock industry, and they are:

1. An increase in the basic fall-back guarantee, or attendance money.
2. One call per day.
3. A reasonable share of the work of the port.
4. A Pension and Sick Scheme for all Port workers.

The more one looks at these requests, the more one must agree that they represent a very modest or equitable demand, devoid of any Communist or revolutionary propensity, in fact, they are just plain commonsense proposals, the implementation of which should be the aim or desire of any right-thinking or fair-minded person.

**Overtime ban**

"Time and time again, the various liaison committees have endeavoured to mediate this "Charter" discussed and at all times they have carried the support of the far-seeing men in the industry, but so far their efforts have come to naught.

Upon one occasion, when work throughout the port was scarce, they endeavoured to introduce a ban on overtime, to ensure an equitable distribution of the work that did exist and were most successful in many cases, but unfortunately in order to ensure absolute success one must always carry enormity and this was the case in many cases. Naturally, with this sort of thing going on, even though it was only apparent in a very few cases, the ban on overtime had to be called off.

**Fresh thoughts**

Today however, with an unprecedented slack and receptive period in vogue, the wisdom of the words and actions of the militants in the past is revealed with startling clarity. Men are recalling them and having fresh thoughts about the whole situation. They are, in fact, demanding that some positive action be taken.
If they are sincere in their desires for such action, the answer is in their own hands and made available for them by the Constitutional means. First, it is essential that they attend their branch meetings and, if all the members of all the mills, contrary to the opinion expressed in the National Press, all the members of all the branches meet absolutely necessary for them to elect into office, members who are prepared to serve their interests in the absence of any further purpose of taking office and one is elected because, in the opinion of the trade union, the men is the one best qualified to serve the interests of the men electing him. Once their candidates are honest and resolute men, have been formed, it is essential that they be given an unqualified support.

Ginger up
It is true that in the Transport and General Workers' Union, the elections for office are over a year away. It is also true that the responsibility for the conduct of the present week and feeble committees, with their milk and water policies, is still in the hands solely of the membership. But all is not lost, ground can still be gained, and it will be gained at all future branch meetings, this extremely negative old guard can be gingered up as they sit at their winched seats impervious to the Rt. Hon. Winkle air, and if they are not prepared to do the job for which they were elected, all we have are no stomach for the fight then, in the words of Shakespeare's Henry, India's their dungeon and whilst no "crows for convoy will be put into their purses" new and more reliable men will be elected.

Active support
A second very necessary adjutant to success in these endeavours, is active support for the liaison committees, whose very existence argues condemnation of the vitality and viability of the Union's present program. Every worker must line up behind his liaison committee in the areas where no such committee exists, then one must be formed of the active men of the branch, the militants to operate until the Union itself does its job properly and effectively.

With this support, the liaison committees will be in a position to ensure discussion on the Charter, and prove to all concerned that the industry owes its workers both a fair living and reasonable security for the future. By working together, the Union itself can be forced to demand for the men a larger measure of control now, than it did in the past, and could ensure that the good yester year was enjoyed by the employees. It is the only way the leaner times that are now experienced.

Urgent need
Today more than ever, the hackneyed phrase of "fair shares for all" needs implementation, and the Committee could ensure an increase in the fall-back guarantee should be applied immediately and the need for the Union to become a fact. As far as the Pension and Sick-pay Scheme is concerned, we simply cannot wait for a change of Government to make this a reality for the need is with us now and now is the time to demand that the need be met.

It is essential, if the men in general are sincere in their desire for a new deal, that positive action be taken on the lines suggested. This is not foolish, nor will it be a hindrance to any occasion and lead blindly to destruction. Their most ardent demand is for a basis to operate on their behalf and in their interests. At the moment, this vital leadership is not coming from their official representatives, but only from the liaison committees and the militants. With the knowledge that these latter men, have led them in the past without abusing the trust, and that the only course of action is open. Give these men the fullest support and a mandate to go ahead, and in future. Then only can come the realization of the dream of a Dock industry operated for the benefit of the worker and the community at large.

Distress fund
In the meantime of course, and the docker is nothing if not adaptable, a practicable effort is being made to alleviate the question of distress. A Distress Fund has been inaugurated and is in the process of registration with the local authorities. The aim is to do away with "kites," collections which are made from wharf to wharf upon the occasion of the death, retirement or long illness of various brothers.

In operation
When in operation, it is the intention of the Fund to pay a Death or Widows' Benefit of £75 to all members of the Scheme and to decide later on the question of retirement or long illness. It is obvious to anyone who has run such a scheme successfully, upon the basis of a lottery entails quite a tremendous amount of work, but this has been undertaken in the most enthusiastic manner by an extremely active committee, who are working in an entirely voluntary capacity, just giving their time freely and unselfishly. Neither are commissions being paid in respect of the sale of tickets, the disposal of which is also on a purely voluntary basis.

Self help
The organisers point out however, that this is not "Sick Scheme" but is concerned at the moment solely with the provision of a Death or Widows' Benefit to dependent members, and that whilst they will consider the question of retirement and distress through a long period of sickness, it is impossible to incorporate any suggestion of regular sickness benefits. Therefore, however, it is suggested that any person desirous of entering a sick benefit scheme could be accommodated by the Club who have such a scheme in operation.

Be that as it may, it is to be hoped that the Committee will do this very efficiently, that men working in the Upper Pool will co-operate in this splendid effort of self help and that overwhelming success will crown such grand initiative.

WICKMAN'S WORKERS SHOW THE WAY
by Peter Morgan
Ed of B'rwn Trades Council Journal

ONE of the most significant strikes of post-war Britain concluded on November 21 when Messrs. Wickman's machine tool manufacturers of Battersea Lane, London, announced that they would have to dispense with the services of six experienced workers. The company announced that they were prepared to prolong their contracts for six weeks "to help the men take advantage of known vacancies in the district". And there was a further warning that they would have to review their employment policy at the end of October.

The talks were actually in progress between representatives of the Confederation, the company, and the Coventry District Engineering Employers' Association on October 13 when it was discovered that notices had been posted to the men in question. Immediately negotiations were broken off with a statement that the withdrawal of labour which followed was "in defence of the principle of the agreement made at the time of the Clause in the Recommendations of the AEU and the Transport and General Workers employed in the engineering trade". The action of the management in issuing notices whilst negotiations were in progress and before constitutional machinery had been exhausted, was calculated to provoke the Trade Unions'.

Wool sack and money bags!
Company No. of Shops Controlled by
--- ----------- -----------
Montague Burton 750 Montague Burton
John Collier 10250 John Collier
Hepworth 156 Hepworth
Weaver to Weaver (many Rego Shops are being converted) 192 G.U.S.
Woolf 110 United Drapery
Willerby 65 Times Furnishing
Jackson the Tailor 63 Montague Burton
Hector Powe 56 G.U.S.
Claude Alexander 37 United Drapery
Rego (name changed to John Temple, November, 1956) 34 G.U.S.
* plus 31 branches in other stores

Socialist Digest, November, 1958.

To put the case in perspective, readers must cast their minds back to the Annual Conference of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions at Paignton in August. It will be remembered that there was a vote to deny the right of members of the AEU and the Transport and General Workers (the two most powerful organisations in the Confederation) on the question of redundancy.

The AEU position — put bluntly—was that existing work should as far as possible be shared without depleting the pay roll. The Y and G case was that amount of work that was agreed in the BME Agreement eighteen months ago, i.e. that the 10½ per cent bonus that was agreed at that time was to be maintained. The difference between the two points of view were papered over in a conference resolution which said roughly, "Let's get the best we can in each case.

However, following the Conference, the Birmingham District Joint Committee of the Confederation made no bones about it that they supported the AEU standpoint. At the same time, the Engineering and Allied Employers' National Federation were squaring-up with a number of "planted" speeches indicating very clearly that it was only the employers' job to decide who should be hired and who fired. And at the same time the Government otherwise had another think coming.

It was in this explosive situation that, in October, Wickman announced that they would have to dispense with the services of six experienced workers. The announcement that they were prepared to prolong their contracts for six weeks "to help the men take advantage of known vacancies in the district". And there was a further warning that they would have to review their employment policy at the end of October.

The talks were actually in progress between representatives of the Confederation, the company, and the Coventry District Engineering Employers' Association on October 13 when it was discovered that notices had been posted to the men in question. Immediately negotiations were broken off with a statement that the withdrawal of labour which followed was "in defence of the principle of the agreement made at the time of the Clause in the Recommendations of the AEU and the Transport and General Workers employed in the engineering trade". The action of the management in issuing notices whilst negotiations were in progress and before constitutional machinery had been exhausted, was calculated to provoke the Trade Unions'.

Men solid
And after this? Well, really nothing until the final settlement. The men remained solid. All attempts to introduce sack labour were soon abandoned in a city which is a beacon of trade union solidarity in the Midlands. There were some half-hearted attempts to recommence talks. But there was very little evident that the Coventry Engineering Employers were prepared to sit tight and let the United Drapery take the bitter cup, to see how long the men would stick it. As little as the real significance of the Wickmans' stoppage. For Coventry is no longer the thriving, optimistic centre which it was a few years ago. The cut-back (continued on page 7)
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Geoff West starts the discussion on

LABOUR PARTY FOR SOCIALISTS

COMMENTING on an article in one of the summer issues of Socialist Review, the editor writes:

we believe that anyone attempting to build a revolutionary current outside the (Labour) Party at the present time is doomed to failure and sectarianism.

His views are shared by many sincere and thoughtful comrades, which makes it worthwhile asking what he means by the words "failure" and "sectarianism.

Even more interesting, what does he mean by the "success" which presumably we can realistically achieve through fighting in the Labour Party?

For ten years or more, most revolutionary socialists in Britain have believed that they should be active members of the Labour Party. In the eighteen-forties there was a good deal of argument as to whether their's was the right course, but it won increasing acceptance and gradually came to be taken almost for granted. In my view these comrades are now making a grave mistake, and I want to examine this point carefully, and it is time to re-examine the issues.

The British Labour Movement has a long history of breakthroughs—breakaway unions and breakaway political parties. It is a living tradition. Since the thirties, how many of our rank and file would have liked to leave the mainstream of working-class life to wander into the wilderness?

Socialist Review wishes to initiate a debate on this matter and presents the following article—with which we entirely disagree—as the first contribution. Others are welcome. The author is a member of a Constituency Labour Party in Southern England—Editor.

What further can be gained by striving to remain in the Labour Party at almost any price? Ought we to postpone much longer an attempt to rebuild and form an independent Marxist party?

Those who call themselves Marxists should keep such questions under constant review in the light of the developing situation.

The basic argument for membership of the Labour Party may be summed up as "we ought to be where the workers are." When economic struggle takes the workers into two separate but connected propositions:

(a) that by joining the Labour Party the revolutionary socialist gains access to politically-minded workers and political revolutionaries which would otherwise be impossible;

(b) that even those workers who are not politically-minded look to the Labour Party to defend their interests, and will turn naturally to it if economic developments force sharper industrial conflicts. Therefore, it is said, the Marxist should be there to assist and guide them when needed.

As to (a): surely no one believes that the movement active in the Labour Party are those who will become the revolutionary socialists of the future. These latter will be drawn first from young workers and students, then from among elderly workers who are at present "non-political" and confine their militancy to the industrial front. Just ready to get involved, and therefore less Fabian poison than most of the constituency Labour Party committee men and dance organizers, the "new" socialist, more willing, more swiftly and wholeheartedly to organize—"and our work—bring them into the Party.

Granted that a large proportion of these constituency activities take a generally left view of politics—for more nationalization, against war, and indeed every socialist demand—but their numbers are really very minute. One suspects that it is the size of the Labour Party electoral machine, those 14 million votes, which hypnotize many Marxists.

It is interesting in this context to look at the Youth Sections, where potential revolutionaries are most likely to be found in any numbers in the present Labour Party. Although the vital statistics of the sections are jealously guarded by the Party, a study which information as has been published allows us to state two facts. Firstly, that the total national membership is less than 4,000, even allowing for a few large and ephemeral "socialist" sections. Secondly, what membership there is is highly composition. Scores of Labour-held (and therefore mainly working-class) constituencies are quite without a Youth Section, showing the Party's utter lack of appeal to the radical youth. It is quite likely that both the Young Communists (membership 1,300) and the Young Tories (about 150,000) have more young workers in their ranks than do the Labour Party Youth Sections.

However, some comrades grant that all has been said about the present-day Labour, but fall back on argument (b) above. They think, correctly, that economic conditions will force more workers to concern themselves with politics, and that because of the Trade Union ties of the Labour Party they will naturally present their demands and look for a Labour solution. This argument seems unpleasantly like the Communist Party's argument for pushing their demand for "summit talks." We know that they cannot bring peace, CP-ers will tell a critic, but the workers will learn through the failure of their Governments to fulfil their expectations that they cannot bring socialism. Mike Kidron tells us, but the workers will learn through the failure of their leaders to fulfil their expectations. So far, so good. Of course, people have to learn; there are few short cuts; and even if the working-class could bring about a new disarmament or nationalization or workers' control by prayer and fasting, that would not make us drop those demands. What is impardonable is to foster illusions that God or the great powers or Mr. Gaitskell can bring about these desirable ends, when we do not believe it ourselves.

This question of a socialist's duty to speak honestly to the workers is closely connected with the question of the right to organize in the Labour Party. Certainly, if political discussion within the Party could be conducted as its founders seem to have intended, com- marades with different views could organize to their hearts' content to have those views publicized and considered. But it is not so long since we saw what happened to Victory for Socialism—not revolutionaries certainly, but a group who clearly wanted real changes in leadership. How can they be heard when they were not even strung the moment they agreed not to form branches on the constituencies and unions. It is the result was that the Gaitskell faction has things all their own way. To tell Transport House that this is "against the rules" is as senseless as that the Archbishop of Canterbury that to drop napalm bombs on school children is "un-Christian.

The editor of Socialist Review, and those who think like him, must answer the question: Can we honestly tell the workers that socialism may be achieved through the Labour Party, or that there exists a possibility of democratic discussion and of replacing the existing leadership with socialists? Most of us know very well that there is no chance of such a development. Surely then we are being less than honest with the working-class and我们 believe that anyone attempting to build a revolutionary current outside the (Labour) Party at the present time is doomed to failure and sectarianism.

But, of course, if any independent revolutionary Party is "doomed to failure and a sectarian exercise it's not the Party, it's the CP with the Labour Party until we are thrown out. Is it so doomed? It is a matter of common observation that the Labour Party and the Communist Party is now winning the last round. We are told that being outside the Labour Party is a member of the CP in one of the last thirty years of imprisonment, still succeed in winning a hearing for its views by directly appropriating work and control the factories. Surely the deserved disgust which the CP has earned by its subservience to the Moscow bureaucracy must admirably bide for the future. Despite this it can maintain a membership of 25,000 and actually win recruits, because of that, is a sign that it is thought of as a revolutionary party.

How can it be argued that British politics and the CP can support a CP such as it is, but that it would be impossible to build a party of the same size and influence which was democratically elected and not under the chief evil? This question calls for an answer above all from those who justify the existence of the British Revolutionary Communist Party from 1943 to 1948, but who reject any idea of a similar organization today as "sec- tarianism."

Why was it right for there to be an RCP in the war and immediate post-war years, with every external condition unfavourable, but now, when there is a whole RCP, can we act in a similar fashion? Is that the CP's role. Today neither arouses any positive enthuisasm anywhere; and the most that anybody gives to the Labour Party is the vain hope that some day, it will support he will give to a consistently unsuccess- ful football club.

It is clear that in those days, situation was different because there was a single clear issue—opposition to the war. Is there not an equally clear issue—opposition to the war? Certainly, says the Socialist Review and the Newsletter which very clearly explain week after week the causes and cure for war. But unconnected to any distinct party, they are more likely to go on with their task and the more they are trying to do. People do judge a political party by its leadership.

One last point to make is that there is a "Parliamentary road to Socialism" to appreciate that whether we like it or not, British people, including the so-called "left wing" leaders, regard a political tendency as serious when its spokesmen take part in Parliamentary and local elections. If we cannot claim to suffer from illusions about making the Labour Party or the CP, a political role, a role of some kind of take-over bid, clearly we must accept this conclusion: revolutionary opposition to the Labour Party or all and it stands for can only make itself heard through an independ- ent class-conscious party, which will be the logical expression of striking events in Britain's factories and pits.
TRANSPORT IN TROUBLE

by Martin Jones

THE RECENT announcement that the British Transport Commission's loss for 1958 might amount to £80 million, drew attention to the crisis facing the transport industry.

To understand the roots of this crisis we should look back to the position of British transport on the eve of nationalization. In the present article we shall deal mainly with the railways, as they constitute the overwhelming asset, as well as liability, of British Transport.

The railways were badly run down. "The locomotives on the London and North Eastern were 'old construction' over 32 years old". They were also almost completely standardized as to types. In all, over 30,000 locomotives of various types required by analysis of work to be performed, were over 400 at the time the Transport Commission took over." (R. A. Brady, Crisis in Britain, 1950, p. 259.)

Maintenance arrears

The same situation prevailed with respect to passenger carriages and freight wagons. "Of the 2,820 London and Great Western carriages in 1948, 1,720 were 'old stock'. The Minister of Transport Barmes, 'are obsolete and should be scrapped and replaced within three years' are over 55 years old." In November, 1947, more than a month before nationalization, it was estimated that 'nearly 200,000 wagons were under or awaiting repair' or out of total 1,500,000, 1,250,000, and that there were over 54,000 fewer wagons in operation than a year ago, and over 80,000 than in 1945. Worse still, very few of these wagons were of 40 tons capacity, and the total was over 25 tons capacity. None of them were equipped with vacuum brakes. About nearly half (570,000) had been privately owned, and details of contracts would be made indefinitely from merchant to merchant and from line to line. Few of them were, except for the chassis, of steel construction.

"Again, 'maintenance work on the permanent way', was in arrears to the extent of 10,000,000 sleeper and some 32,000 tons of new steel rails, and much road ballast was in bad shape. Some lines were no more than too small for the larger equipment, and the light weight ballast road bed—and though it was too soft for the British railway system—was wholly obsolete. Terminal and sidings were in a similar condition." (ibid., p. 260.)

High charges

One result of the obsolescence and backwardness of the railways was the increasing subsidy borne by the Government. Thus, during the Second World War the annual State payment amounted to some £38 million. Wartime profits had been maintained by the railways through not keeping up with increased operating expenses and eating up their real capital. At the same time dividends were received largely from rental income to the railways by the government to the tune of £38,000,000 a year. (Beaup, op cit, p. 248.)

And what did the Labour government pay for this industry—so squeezed by its owners over decades? It paid £1,000 million for all rail and canal securities in the form of 3 per cent transport stock, "repayable optionally in 1978 and finally in 1988."

No co-ordination

The former owners were not penalized for running down the industry. The payment was not evaluated according to the value of actually run-down, run-down equipment, but was based largely on the highly overcapitalized British railroads—largely as a result of high payments to contractors, lawyers, and others as the system was built up. "The capitalization figure per mile in this country is £56,000 as against £31,000 in France, £24,000 in Germany and £14,000 in the United States of America." (Hansard, Vol. 431, Col. 1833.)

Nor was it taken into account that the owners of the railways had already been "compensated" enough by the profits in generation. Thus, for instance, "since the coming into operation of the Railways Act, 1921, no less than £800 million has been paid in the form of interest and returns upon the shares, that is, virtually the whole of the capital, which has been repaid in the period since 1921 "until nationalization." Brady, who is not a left-wing writer, could say that all the compensation paid to the railway owners: "... the government were virtually indemnifying and paying them a good price for run-down properties with a future in them, in the absence of nationalization, was dark indeed. Nothing less than a fundamental reorganization of the entire internal transport system of Britain was called for, and failing that—"which only the government was prepared for, and had the necessary resources to carry through—where would they be?"

The heavy compensation burden on the run-down railways is a main cause for the crisis in transport. Another is the lack of co-ordination between railways and the profitable and quickly expanding haulage system.

Stagnation

This promising branch of transport was hardly touched by the Labour Government. Not one-tenth of all vehicles engaged in this industry was nationalized, although practically all long-distance haulage business was beaten by the Tory Government by denationalization. Thus a source of revenue was taken away from the British Transport Commission and by the ending of the quasi-monopoly of commercial transport, general inter- transport—win-win situation—has become impossible. One should not forget that at the time the General Motors announced its intended road haulage, the British Transport Commission was paying its way.

The third cause for the financial crisis of the British Transport Commission lies in the stagnation, and now decline, of industrial production in general, which is a particular, with the consequent decline of traffic in steel, coal, iron, and other raw materials, in general merchandise.

"The fall in coal traffic and the industrial production that it has become devastating since midsummer; the Commission says it is costing over £30 million (The Economist, November 8, 1938.)

The first lesson to be drawn from the crisis of British transport is the need to put an end to the heavy burden of compensation for the run-down railways. (Only in cases of hardship should compensation be paid.)

Secondly, the need for co-ordination of all main branches of transport—railways, haulage, bus and river transport requires their general nationalization.

Thirdly, if a small economic recession can create such havoc for the transport industry, what catastrophe would be brought about by a really deep and long-lasting depression?

What is necessary is a generally planned economy based on the co-ordination of the whole industry, including the complete transport system.

Finally, without workers' control of the nationalized industries, the workers will continue to be subordinated to the profit motive and have to suffer the hardships of capitalism. State ownership without workers' control is nothing but state capitalism. Only when workers' control can guarantee that industrial work is for the benefit of the people engaged in it.

SOLIDARITY DIVIDENDS FOR BUILDERS

All building workers are invited to contribute to our builders' column. If you wish to sign a name—do so. If you would rather the witch-hunters did not know your identity, call yourself, as does our first contributor, building labourer and stewart—TRAMP NAVY. Ideas, policy and space are your own to choose and use—EDITOR.

 psychedelic spirit. This is done by vigorous meetings, with delegates fighting tooth and nail in their Trades Councils, and Labour parties. It is done by setting up certain committees when brothers are in trouble. What a fine example to the movement they gave in the Shell-Mex dispute? London building workers will never forget that Merseyside contingent and the Drumbarton contingent made so eloquently by their spokesman when he called for unity and solidarity that that gigantic meeting in Hyde Park.

IT WAS interesting to note during the summer that the T&GWU held two mid-week schools at Beeston Yard for their building trades stewards. The first school was held during the OFFICIAL steel strikes of last April; and the second school was held during the picket battle of the last Shell-Mex dispute. We are all for progress, but we are (continued next page)
LEARNED IGNORANCE

by John Comley

In this pamphlet I present ... a number of serious documents which go to show that the forces behind Bolshevism in Russia are Jewish emanations and Bolshevism is really... an instrument in the hands of the Jew world leaders for the accomplishment of the Messianic Kingdom. The RULERS OF RUSSIA: Dennis Fahey, C.S.Sp.

THIS LITTLE GEM comes from the pen of the communal leader of Maria Duce, probably the strongest clerico-fascist pressure-group in Eire today. Professor Fahey that expulsion may be no one takes him seriously. But nevertheless this book received the imprimatur of the Catholic censors.

A mine of information it is too! As for anyone who does not know that the present intellectual movement in Russia is Jewish controlled, I can only say that he must be a man who is taken in by the statements of his 'dear friends' (sic).

If Hilaire Belloc could really utter such rubbish as this, how can Dennis Fahey be blamed?

Mention of Belloc evokes the name of another anti-Semitic hoary ox that is busily increasing its numbers. 'Loyalists', is still heard boasting (a) that there isn't any such thing as a fascist and (b) he never was one anyway. AK has denied that he is a fascist so often that I expect the Loyalists will soon be trying to sell their souls to him by himself.

After all, it is twenty years since he edited a paper for Mosley.

BUILDERS COLUMN

Continued

afraid to ask when the next T A is to be held. In 1955, the I TIS of interest also the T and GWU London council are asking their National Executive to offer this approach to new techniques in our industries. All unions have got to tread very carefully with their approach to these problems — we are not yet a socialist society and must not fall head over heels in trying to agree with the management until we see quite clearly where we are going.

Reinstate Behan

JOE ROOTS, a well-known and admired militant stewart, was, after much confusion, elected Divisional Secretary of AUBTW London area. Building workers will wish him the best of luck. It is widely rumoured that his predecessor is to be appointed Federation Official on the South Bank. Both moves should help the declining AUBTW membership.

While talking of declining membership how can we forget the Members of British Power who writing directly to the AUBTW Executive. Before driving in his dagger to the hilt Weaver was making a statement that expulsion solves no problem — maybe his might not: but the real issue now is that we must forget about party, colour or creed, and make this

From Princesdale Road emanates two other notable dissimilar papers: Free Britain (curiously subtitled '...for defence against alien control') and a rather more flowery sheet, Gothic Ripples (the latter proports to be issued by 'Leece's Anti-Jewish Information Bureau'). A certain paranoiac anti-semitism can be discerned in both these sheets as well as the

Builder's Dole

In one year—September, 1957, to September, 1958—unemployment in the building industry has increased by 47 per cent; since September, 1956, it has risen by 97 per cent, and since September, 1955, by 146 per cent. In three years unem-
ployment in our industry has gone up by 146 per cent. The same sorry tale can be told about the civil engineering side. The percentages for the years 1957-6-5, compared with 1956, are 52, 89 and 162.

Operative Builders

November-December, 1958.

Loyalist's missive, 'Caudour'. 'Gothic Ripples' even possesses a sort of Roll of (dis)Honour, 'Jews in the News'. The Jewish race, it appears, has not only built Communism but American capitalism and the Masonic move-
ment as well—quite an achievement! But somehow I feel we've heard all this before. 'Gothic Ripples' does ingeniously attempt to perform the double splits in tempting (a) to rejoice in the anti-semitism of the Soviet Union and (b) to attack Russia at the same time! First, as a further attempt to be played is indeed curious. From its pages we learn of the emergence of a new hero in the American political scene — Governor Faubus of Little Rock fame! We learn also that the Council for Education in World Citizenship is a Jewish 'front organization.'

So's my Aunt Fanny.

Bloody racism

The intellectuals hovering on the periphery of these nasty little groups are catered for by the highly original researches of Mr. George Pile, whose writing also appears in Free Britain. Mr Pile has published a (not very) pence) a booklet entitled Five Races of Europe, in which he 'proves' that 'Aryan' were at the root of not only Chinese classical culture but Egyptian as well — that in fact the 'Aryan race' has produced everything of value that the world has ever known—ex-
cluding of course Herr Hitler, who came from the Ukraine or from Pine stock. According to Mr Pile, HG Wells was also an Alpine and he accounts for the 'materialistic trend of his thinking ...' Mr Pile quotes the right-wing anthropologists Madison Grant and

A WAGE CLAIM is being sub-
mitted again on our behalf. We will have to fight like never before to get it. The employers and Union will meet to discuss the claim probably on about the 8th January, so we must be changed by the rank and file up and down the country through their branches.

OUR HOUSES

In Gr. Britain 4 million houses are over 75 years old, and 2 1 million over 100 years old. In Scotland, 400,000 houses lack the basic sanitary facilities, though over 9,000 building and civil engineering workers are out of work (Sept. figure.)

Operative Builders

November-December, 1958.

Safety on the site

THE QUEEN, on opening Parliament, said that her ministers were going to improve the Safety Act. What many of you may now is that is the news the lads of Belvedere Power Station who made the Queen's speech on safety. For almost the last three months these lads have been lobbying MPs. They tormented the MPs so much that they were allowed to go, to see the minister. With such pressure the government's increasing death toll the minister was forced to act. Full marks to Senior Steward Hugh Barry and his Belvedere boys, and also the efforts of the CEU.

Lotrop Stoddard in order to prove the necessity for a 'United Europe' and Keeping the Empire Whole. The Empire Loyalists won't have anything to do with that sort of caper; witness Austen Bower's criticism of Caudour.

World Government happens to be the policy objective of the British Government and of those secret rulers of the United States, who hold both Harold Macmillan and Dwight Eisenhower in thrall.

There is a certain pleasing atmosphere of Sexton Blake in all this, emphasized by the mystery of the exact identity of these 'secret rulers.' Austen Brooks, true to the rules of his craft, won't tell us until the last instalment!

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

a few copies left

But enough of the caspist. Fahey and Maria Duce are mili-
tant Catholics; Caudour, Gothic Ripples and Free Britain all pro-
gress some sort of militant non-
denominational Christianity. But through all the banality of symbols of racism; and the cult of the Uhermench is as strong in Britain as anywhere in the world. The cricket-playing school captain is as much convinced of his own superiority to the "others," the lesser breeds with-
out the law, as is the Prussian Junker. While capitalism lasts, the words of Doctor Wertham will hold true:

"Just as the neurotic individual reproaches unpleasant guilty feel-
ings from his conscience, so society remains content with formal denouncements of vio-
ence... The dangers of violence that threaten us come not from individuals but from social cir-
cumstances..."

"Am i my brothers' keeper? The answer is, yes."

But an MP who will go into battle on our behalf. Into battle for win-
ing control of our industry and we mean workers' control; and into battle for the winning of Socialism.
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THEORY CAMPAIGN
designed to sweep the present Government back into power at the next General Election is warming up. After the annual jamboree where embarrassing revelations formulated by Tory backwoodsmen were nearly side-step and the smooth conduct of proceedings was marred only by the zeal of the Tory stewards in their election of the League of Empire Loyalists' emissaries, a massed publicity campaign is underway.

Advertisements announce from every newspaper that the Conservative Party needs us. Records of a speech by that fatherly figure Harold Macmillan are being distributed free by the thousand. Canvassers are busily visiting the electors and vast mountains of literature are being distributed.

Socialist salt

No effort is being spared to win over the doubtfuls and all sectors about political honesty. Handbills proclaim the benefits of the NHS Service under the Tories. Others warn controlled-ent property tenants that the Labour Party plans to municipalize the housing through their security.

To cap it all a shadow pensions scheme is announced and exalted to the skies, although it means at best that a married man earning £15 when he retires in the 21st Century will get only £6 pension, after paying his contributions for a lifetime.

All this campaign blurs the distinction between the images created by the rival parties in the mind of the public which in any case is not anything like as clear as many of us would wish.

Naturally the Tories hope and stand to gain by this campaign but they should remember the old adage about "Many a slip 'twixt cup and lip."

The Prime Minister's assurances about the level of unemployment sound very well, but if the level continues to rise this Winter as it must, even his firm convincing tones will be called into question.

The Election will not be won by the Tories until the votes are cast. However despondent the Left may feel about Labour's policy and Labour's hopes, it must not lose heart. The Labour Party and its Left Wing will suffer a grievous blow if the Tories go back again—not to speak of the working class.

Therefore we must stand firm in the face of Tory onslaught. Every socialist worth his salt must do his best to see that Labour is returned. To test Labour's policy in practice will be much more decisive in the government's mind on the future of socialism than to discuss it in theory for a generation. Only if Labour forms the next Government can we really prove to the masses whether or not the policy of New Thinkers can solve the problems of our day.

WICKMAN'S continued

in aircraft orders has hit this limb and heart of industrial England harder than it has hit any other area. The queue of school leavers without jobs has been as long in Coventry as it has been anywhere. And many of the men had cars, TV, washing-machines on HP; houses on mortgage.

It's true—as the firm said—that there were other jobs to go to. But at what price? The down-grading of their skill and a

loss in expertise as well as in earnings. Messrs Wickmans will not lose by this agreement—although they opposed it all the time.

This has been, so far as I know, the first dispute since the Confederal Annual Conference where the workers have formed the directive and "gone for all they could get". It has been a costly strike to the men and their families in monetary terms. But it has been a lesson to the whole British Trade Union movement. It is a lesson that we ought to be trumpeting from the house-tops. Because it was a noble victory for workers' solidarity.

B U I L D  T H E  S O C I A L I S T  S E C U R I T Y !
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A postscript to Robert Emmett's Bus Boycott

Since the above was written, the police officials of the T & GWU have been forced to call an emergency delegate conference of all London busmen to discuss action against the service cuts and to serve notice on the LTE to terminate the clause in the agreement permitting standing passengers in buses. Thus, it would appear, the allegedly "negative" boycott by the Central busmen produced more "positive" results in two days than in two months spent, roaming through the gloaming of the Union's constitutional machinery.

Buy your books through SR BOOK SERVICE

PARLIAMENT

by MICHAEL MILLET

... I am dealing with a Minister who is known as "Smarty-boots ..." Mr. Peart (Wokingston) in asking a question of Mr. Kasun, PARLIAMENT and therefore your correspondent have returned from the Long Vac to a session which even Mr. Gaitskell can hardly prevent from being the last period of Conservative rule for a long time.

The Conservatives have been having a bad time of it since the session opened; they have had no coherent policy since Suez and it is a good general rule that if it is a fast disintegrate policy to attempt nothing more than to keep up with events, then events eventually get the better of policy.

Cyprus, which is a political, as distinct from a local military problem, is now completely out of hand.

Since any possible solution involves negotiation with Archbishop Makarios, the Government will, by its own definition, have to admit defeat. All the Conservatives can do is to hope that nothing worse befalls between now and the General Election when, if they win, they can come to terms with EOKA knowing that this issue will have been forgotten about long before the next General Election. But, if they lose, they know that when the Labour Government makes the necessary concessions, the Conservative propaganda machine can make Labour's right wing, always peculiarly sensitive to charges of lack of patriotism, so intractable that any move towards a solution that the Parliametary Labour Party might make will be extremely difficult.

Not that emolits or union with Greece is any real solution for the people of Cyprus.

Where is the Socialist who would care to be ruled by a political church? What future does working class machines under a government containing the near-fascist Grivas? But these people will have to have their victory, for there is nothing else to be done.

Until that is, the day after independence.

... MODERN SOCIAL legislation started about 150 years ago with Acts which were promptly ignored for improving conditions in factories.

But enlightenment prevailed and the progress of a century and a half of devoted work by Governments and manufacturers was demonstrated in a debate as vitally as a fortnight ago.

Dr. Stross (Labour) said that the 1957 report of the chief inspector made sad reading. There were first aid boxes inadequately stocked. Some contained dirty dressings which would bring about infection when applied. There were queer things in the boxes too. In a number of cases no identifiable person was there to give first aid.

But the real masterpiece was due to Mr. Narbaro, that valiant enemy of the purchase tax, who spoke in the authentic tones of British Capitalism.

Did the Minister have mean to suggest that under the fire prevention regulations proposed he was going to say, for example, that a wooden roof erected in 1932 should not be in use because it enhanced the spread of flame? He might perhaps seek to control new factories but (to take powers to control the prevention of fire in all factories) would be impracticable.

Obviously dangerous work places are part of our glorious British Heritage for with the burning woodwork and broken glass falling around him could not old Smarty-boots still continue to talk himself out of it.
CYPRUS continued

In a report entitled British Interests in the Mediterranean and Middle East, published this year, the author writes:

The attempt to maintain British sovereignty has merely involved immense military expenditure, the diversion of a disproportionate amount of Britain’s slender military strength, a loss of royalty and friends, and a cost of compensation to the use of a repressive policy, which has met some criticism in the world. This policy hitherto has also caused serious rifts inside British opinion.

Finally, Cyprus proved inadequate as a base when the test came during the autumn of 1956. No doubt we have obligations to both the Greek and Turkish communities there, but we also have obligations which are hardly consistent with a long drawn out and forcible military occupation which has become restive under British sovereignty.

Tory prestige?

What then, does Cyprus mean to the Tories? Can it be that its half million people are being sacrificed to Tory prestige and sacrificed to their backbench backwoodsmen? Remember these characters; they are calling for full military government in Cyprus and military courts with power to try and quarter suspects. He proposes to ban the use of transport and so prevent the escape of terrorists by car, motor-cycle, or cycle. The rest—Braine, Legge-Bourke, etc.—offer support. And then, when a backbench revolt looks inevitable, Spier is reported to be “confident that the Government is on the verge of adopting just the measures which we want to see on the island” (Manchester Guardian, November 9, Mac-Mac). Now is the time for the Front bench to take matters in hand, the potential rebels look sweet and Cyprus is clapped into chapter—victims of Tory dreams of Empire.

Concentration camps

These dreams are not parliamen
tary verbiage. They translate into concentration camps on the island. They mean that the half million are fighting the full might of a retrograding and vicious Empire. What can they look forward to? Can they hope to influence the horse deals between MacMillan and his backbenchers? Can they MAKE the hard-faced cynics in Parliament realise that the stakes are human? And if they did, would...