ANGER, HORROR AND FEAR are swelling the protest against H-Bombery and nuclear rocketry. Thousands have been moved to condemn it. At meetings, through petitions, at by-elections the murmur has crystallized into words: “No, no. We don’t want it. Scrap the Bomb. Scrap the Tests. Disarm!”

As socialists we cannot be content with words alone. For us it isn’t enough to add our voice, our vote and our signature to the many that have been given. Of course we support the lobbies, the petitions, the resolutions; of course we participate in any move to rouse the people to the full horrors of Capitalism’s dilemma.

The Labour leadership can claim our support in any move they make—even the most fractional—to stem the Tories’ madness; the Daily Herald can claim it when it pushes this leadership to declare for unilateral disarmament; those that criticize the Herald for not going so far as to propose the renunciation of NATO have our allegiance—we shall go with them all, and further.

But we want more than words. Words alone have never changed the course of history. They did not stop the Russian butchers in Hungary; nor did they prevent the British attack on Egypt. We want action.

We see the H-Bomb and its rocket delivery as the final, last-ditch blackmail to which the ruling classes of East and West resort in defence of their property, their privileges and their control over humanity. We see them as the ghastly outcome of centuries of class rule, centuries of brutality, exploitation and organized violence against the workers of the world. We see in them the heart and gut of capitalism, its new but vital organs.

For us, war and capitalism are inseparable; peace and the destruction of the class divisions in East and West are one. None but the workers can smash the guardians of privilege wherever they are; working-class action alone can exorcize the shade of total militarization.

The workers of Britain are faced with the supreme task. Slowly, very slowly, they are measuring up to it. Glasgow plumbers are blacking work on rocket sites; the Liverpool Trades Council has registered support to all who do the same; 10 ETU branches in Kent have declared solidarity with any similar action.

This is the way, brothers. This is the way to take the leadership in the campaign against the Bomb and the Bases. It is your right, your power and your future. Spread the action; take to the streets in mass demonstrations! BLACK THE BOMB! BLACK THE BASES! These are the first steps to workers’ control of the war machine and the destruction of capitalism!

Socialists and the industrial front by James D. Young

Trouble is in the air. The “new conservatism” is being replaced by the old Toryism. Cursory examination of the economic and financial press shows that the employers are preparing to wage war on “the inflationary wage demands” of trade unionists. The “social engineering” of the reactionary captains of the welfare (or warfare) state now consists of shunting wage claims into committees of arbitration: a typical Tory delaying tactic. Moreover, the employers are marshaling their forces in order to shift the economic burden of inflation on to the shoulders of the organized workers. But whether capitalism inflates or deflates, it gets the workers anyway.

On the one hand, the Tories are appealing to the British workers to impose a wage-freeze on themselves; on the other hand, they ask trade unionists to cooperate with employers on joint-productivity committees. As workers, we are touched to the quick by these patrician appeals; but facts are “chisels that widens and darning is disputed.” So—we are sick of living under a system of society in which “wealth accumulates and men decay.”

Productivity Councils

The Socialist attitude to productivity councils and so on will depend on circumstances: and comrades on the job are better judges of the grim circumstances of industrial life than right-wing trade union leaders outside.

If workers in a particular industry want to try productivity councils, it is our job to point out that the capitalist system is a form of exploitation of workers by employers. Our attitude should be no collaboration with the bosses. Moreover, we should not refrain from saying that as long as capitalism lasts, class cooperation on productivity council by one set of workers will always be at the expense of another set of workers.

The bribes

British capitalists can buy off sections of workers here partly because they have spare capital invested elsewhere where labour is cheap. We can point that out, turn back page
THE REPORT OF THE COUNCIL OF
Prices, Productivity and Incomes
(Cohen Council), published at the end of
February, comes down so
blatantly on the side of the em-
ployer that it is a Tory Govern-
ment, that even the Right-wing trade union leaders have
been forced to give a com-
mentation to it. Without attempting to
cover up its intentions, the Re-
port notes that, in general, in-
creases at least substantially below
the average of the last few years; increased distribution of
profits and divergences in the pay
structure and green light, and a further rise in
the figure of unemployment would not be unexpected.

As the Times on February 9, 1958, put it:
Noticing that the percentage of
unemployment has so far risen to
18, the Council says that no one
should be surprised or shocked if it proves necessary that it should
go somewhat further. In our opinion it is impossible that a free and flexible
economy can be developed without a perceptible (though possibly
insignificant) margin of unemployment of this kind.

On prices and profits, the Times
also went on to report the
Council says that they cannot recommend the reintroduction of indirect
taxation but advocate a policy of
over investment, price controls, subsidies, or legislation enforcing
dividend limitation, or the repeal of
the 1946 Act. As the Times do not
think that the tendency to-
ward concentration is any different
in profits since 1952 after a long period of standstill, is
open to these qualifications.

Two quotations from the Times
make it quite clear that as far as the Factory Act is concerned, we had better start
preparing for battle in the not-
too-distant future.

FROM THE COAL MINES, which for
years have been crying out for
more labour, more production, etc., we now find that they are
producing rather too much, mine managers are in a surplus of some 83 million tons
of coal, so like the bosses else-
where, the National Coal Board feels that the time has come to use the big stick.

Throughout the different re-
gions, they are attempting to dis-
imply by dismissal, miners who
absent themselves from shifts and,
to take this palatable, the NCB attempts to get the workers to agree to such dismissals by
having the remaining employees come from the pit consultative
committees which represent both management and union.

It seemed to work in some areas.
At the Bentley pit at Doncaster 10 miners were
dismissed and this was Paragraph 1 of the
warning note was sounded by
Brother A Machin, President of the
miners' area of the NUM, who said
Union members should not take
part in any strike.

THE BOARD of the National
Provincial Bank have shown
their usual foresight. Blackleg
transport has been organized to
take some of the employees to work in the event of a London
Transport strike. Merely another
example of the class policies of
this Bank, which not only refuse to recognize the
National Union of Bank Employees (with over 250
per cent. membership here), but also maintains three Staff Asso-
ciations to weaken the negoti-
ing strength of its 12,500
workers.

Back to 26?

The strike of 3,000 Dublin Municipal workers, which paralyzed the
public services of Dublin and the Borough of Dunleary (Dun Laoghaire) for one week, provided a militant challenge to, and a
re-examining victory for De Valera's wage-freeze for civil servants and local authority employees; and, in doing so, showed up the inadequacy of the "10% Agreement" negotiated between the Federal
Government and the Provisional Union
of the Trade Union Movement (PUO).

To appreciate the importance of the strike, it is worth while look-
-ing at the evolution of the past year which led up to it.

Late in May 1957, the PUO (whose main job is to unite the
different trade union centres) started
out a Special Consultative Conference to consider a national wages policy in view of the 11 per cent. rise in the Cost of Living
Index. At that Conference, the Committee of the PUO was mandated
to negotiate with the FUE to agree a formula for a new wage increase.

Talks drag on

Talks went on for four months, and in the absence of any likely agreement, the employees became restless. Late in September, 1957, it seemed that the Conference would be reconvened - the report said that Mr. Langan, Minister for Industry and Com-
merce, apparently warned the em-
ployers that failure to agree on a formula setting out principles and
objectives in the new wage ad-
dispute would end in a free-for-
all, with the devil taking the hindmost.

In the last week of September, 1957, the Conference was re-con-
vened. The Agreement now
known as the '10% Agreement' was recommended by the two negotiators for acceptance as the best that could be obtained in the circumstances. The Agree-
ment was accepted by an
overwhelming majority of the dele-
guates.

The Agreement provided for a ceiling on claims of 10% per week, representing roughly 7
percentage increase of wages against an 11 percent rise in the Cost
of Living Index, which had mean-
while further risen by 4 percent! While 10% per week was the ceiling
figure, clause 5b provided that in an emergency it could pass beyond all doubt, that if as a conse-
quence of this figure being paid unemployment rose to a higher figure, it would ensue, then a lower figure would be negotiated, and in some cases, no increase at all would be agreed.

This last injunction was seized upon by the Government to deny public workers and civil servants any relief which Alajatch, who had 
the private sector most employers had conceded the ten shillings per week to adult males, and tal-

unless and until civil servants organize a public campaign to-
gether with the industrial work-
ers, they will suffer the whip-lash of de Valera's economic policy. Let them demand and establish their industrial rights — and
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Plainclothesmen attack pickets
report Pat Conaty, Strike Committee, Sec.

You've never had it so good.' I doubt if one of our pickets would have agreed while the policemen frog-marched him off and tossed him into their van. He'd been standing there watching a bunch of blacklegs coming through the gate. Suddenly, two of them dived out of the group, twisted his arms behind his back, and started to drag him off. The other pickets appealed to the gate to restrain these assailants, but received the astounding reply: 'They are policemen in plain clothes.' He was charged with insulting behaviour, found guilty and booked over to keep the peace for the next 12 months.

Police turn out
Our misgivings had started on the first morning of the strike. Eight policemen were on the gate, while a black maria stood by with more inside; the law had decided to keep all wages from the red-carpet treatment. Mr Levine had not only brought over representatives to put across wages and sales ideas—he was using their strike-breaking tactics as well.

Support the strikers
Messages and money to M. Byrne
57 Netherwood Street
London, NW6

Our demand was uncomplicated and to the point: Union recognition. The management's reply to our two delegates was brief: 'You're asking for the impossible.'

'Here are your cards. Get out.'

That was 4.55 on Friday evening. The AENP branch met the same evening, so we all trooped down to have it discussed. The advice was: 'You've got to fight and win.'

The fight is now in its fifth week.

The postman comes
On the fifth morning of the strike, every worker, except the two delegates, received a letter from the management: 'Reasonably' explaining that they had no objection to unions, but every worker had the right to choose for himself, and that they, the management, stood firm on this right, and would give workers a chance to receive notices who didn't join the strike; a few days later, another letter arrived, a chance to receive these notices. The whole time, containing the threat that if they had not made an appearance before management within 48 hours, they would lose their cards in the post.

Manning the picket-line
During the 48 hour period most of us had a good appearance, while the management spent most of the time peering out of their offices at the picket line, but the cards arrived at the week-end, so this couldn't have been the most obvious of appearance they had meant...

Solidarity
By this time we had made personal contact with most of the factories in the area and were winning support: the North London District Committee of the AENP had endorsed our action, and official negotiations were in being between the management on the one hand, and the AENP, boilermakers and sheetmetal workers on the other.

Plainclothesmen
The second week saw the unprecedented action of police assisted as workers coming out of the factory and arresting one of our pickets, despite the fact that Union representatives in their numbers were hovering around like mosquitoes; more discussions and more negotiations; and lads withdrawing their tools for the type that would fill our jobs when on strike would have no qualms about filling their pockets with our gear.

Into the streets
In the third week Cricklewood experienced its liveliest and prettiest demonstration for many a long day. The girls and marched down the main road for an hour-and-a-half. The busy shoppers stopped to read the placards, while the banners of supporting factories interested comment. For some of the onlookers it struck a chord in their memories of the '30s; for others it was an insight of days long past. Shop stewards committees in the area were now writing in to Levine asking for and explaining the consequences of his medeival attitude to trade unionism, and that he was now up against the organized workers of North West London; this strike has not only been a blow to the management, it has also given a much-needed shot in the arm to many of the local factories.

First sack; then strike
We entered our fourth week as determined as ever. Our pickets had done a heroic job, especially during the two days of blinding snow and sleet. The Musician's Union had intimated to the management that no more records would be made for their machines; lads from other factories were now coming down during their lunch hour to swell our picket line and a works conversor at a solid meeting of stewards noted that some workers who had been made redundant at his factory were now on strike at ours. The inference was obvious: if the bosses get away with low wages and poor conditions in the smaller factories they would then turn their attention to the bigger, better organised ones.

A repeat performance of the third week's demonstration was an even bigger success. More factories were represented, and their delegations, who had taken time off work, and told their management why, had carefully outlined our girls and lads on their spirit and enthusiasm, especially as most of them had only entered the union ranks two days before the strike started.

The National Council for Civil Liberties are pursuing the case of the disguised policemen, and our local MP Maurice Orbach, is in contact with our Union regarding the matter.

Setting in
The fifth week arrives and also the barbies at the gates. Our pickets, now professionals, explain the situation, bringing the sympathetic drivers to their side; the lads aged 14 are but not a popular English beverage. The blacklegs constantly change, old ones disappear, new ones arrive, and the management take them out in vans as their tactics wear them down. Included in the ranks of those dispersed is the boss himself—according to the General Manager, he's off to Canada. Last week a bloke angrily explained to one of our pickets that he'd come all the way from Manchester for some cash which was owing to him. The reason for his anger? He hadn't got it.

Hands off the Blue Union!

This pamphlet reveals the interesting story of a dispute between two unions and the transport industry, the National Amalgamated Stevedores and Dockers and Transport & General Workers' Union. The historical background of the dispute can be found when the dockers, who had begun to organize towards the end of the nineteenth century, and by 1912 were a constituent part of the National Transport Workers' Federation, went into the new Transport and General Workers Union, into which the federated unions had amalgamated in 1922.

As time went on, the transport workers lost their dominating position in the union, and the dockers never took kindly to the official machinery, so that more often than not, unofficial action was taken to remedy grievances.

General Council takes sides
This aspect of the dispute is only roughly sketched in by H. H. Hunter, but the immediate issue—the transfer of ten thousand men from the R & GWU to the NASD is treated very fully. We can easily appreciate the alarm of the r&gwu and their appeal to the TUC and its General Council for assistance. We can see from the sections of the TUC Annual Reports dealing with the dispute that no union could ever have a better ally than the General Council: one only has to look at the terms dictated by the General Council (Annual Report, TUC, 1957) to the NASD, demanding from the NASD in clause 2, a return to the status quo ante.

A pamphlet for all
We must realize, as the pamphlet points out, that these men are fighting for the right to belong to a union of their own choosing, and this is something we have all the necessary democratic rights.

Not only should dockers secure a copy of this pamphlet, but it deserves the consideration of every trade unionist.

I P Hughes

Liverpool
LABOUR PARTY Commentary

- The start of Victory for Socialism?

What is clear from the current situation is this: that the time of the mixed economy, premised on the 'link' between the press and the NEC has appeared on the scene far earlier than they would have had the leadership, or the country, in the habit of comparatively unknown people. The establishment of local groups by the old VFS was already under way and the present situation would have had considerable impetus. As it is there is considerable doubt whether local groups in the sense in which the old VFS committee envisaged them will indeed be formed.

Having said that however, it is necessary for us to declare unequivocally that VFS must be supported in its present dispute with the NEC. After all's said and done, these people, the leaders of the group, are a matter of small consequence. The important thing is that there is a strong body of opinion within the Party that is opposed to the present reformist line. VFS may well have a part to play in the vocalization of that opposition and it is up to us to see that it does that job efficiently.

- Hangers, whippers, hunters

Two interesting examples from the animal section of our British Way of Life have occurred recently. Firstly, the use of dogs against the anti-H-bomb demonstrators, and secondly, the filibustering of Fred Messer's bill against stag hunting. Both are excellent examples of the bloody-mindedness of the Tories and their deviation to class privileges. The Party should lose no opportunity of expressing its contempt for these types. The Tories are the hangers, whippers and hunters of our society, and that such open opposition to them is another sign of their unfitness to govern.

- Cohen or May?

Will the Cohen Committee be another May Committee?

The answer is up to us in the movement, and fortunately so far, the reactions from the leadership have not been encouraging. The NEC is not the NEC. The NEC is the NEC and the NEC has been used as a vehicle by the Labour Party to choose a candidate.

- Braddock

I am happy to record that Tom Braddock has been endorsed as a candidate in the forthcoming TCC elections. Tom, who was Labour MP for Mitcham from 1945 to 1950, has had a real deal of criticism.

- Robens

In the last issue I gave Robens a bouquet, now for a brickbath. They (strikes) are a blunt instrument with all the dangerous propensities of a boomerang," said Alf Addressing this august body, dead in step with the Labour-Trade Union Partnership Association. He went on to reiterate the Industry and Society view of conservativeism, the idea that "unions should be more concerned with the interests of the company, rather than the workers."

Ron Lewis
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REBEL FOR A CAUSE

When Glasgow students recently peoted Mr. Butler with flour and eggs they were not merely giving vent to youthful exuberance or snubbing at authority; they were demonstrating the undisciplined revolt of youth which is so characteristic of modern society. Undisciplined because these young people, together with other people who are "bored" "fed-up" and who "don't care," do not see the root cause of their dissatisfaction, and hence do not know how or where to direct their energies and anger.

Rebel with a cause

But why is there a revolt? The answer to that question, we believe, lies in the nature of capitalist society. Modern society seems to create the impression that the individual is helpless, helpless before the decisions of government; helpless against the forces of war; helpless against the vagaries of the market. The energy, initiative and imagination of people is blunted by a society which increasingly relies on tradition, and in which authority and the seat of decision is increasingly remote and inaccessible. Our society is motivated less by ideals of human improvement than by the Hydrogen Bomb, the balance of power, profit and pornography. The unreasonableness is rejection of a society which has no use for youthful qualities. It is a society which treats people and human qualities as things to be manipulated, and young people therefore revolt.

Is there no cause?

Youth, it is clear, needs an ideology. But an ideology is merely a guide to action, and, according to some, there is nothing to be done. Writers like Taylor (Manchester Guardian, February 11, 1958), who believes that the Labour Government of 1945-50 "did its job too well" and left nothing to reform. Thus it seems that although youth is "fed-up" there is nothing they can do about it.

The Socialist course

We, however, do not believe this. Indeed, as our article on Nationalization seeks to show, there is a great deal still to reform, and even more to get rid of altogether. Neither do we believe that the individual is helpless. The individual organized with his fellow men, in a socialist society, can become the master of his own life. The ideology which youth so urgently needs is Socialism. The socialist youth movement, the Young Socialist Sections, CAN BE made to become the organization through which young people may develop and express their individuality. The Young Socialist Sections must be made to channel the rebellion of youth into a healthy and effective course—the fight for Socialism.

Notebook

TRANSPORT HOUSE ANNOUCES a new venture! A Youth Sports Day is scheduled for April. Webb House in the summer, when lucky Youth Section members can get within shouting dis
tance of real, live (even) members, and perhaps a Miss, and even hold your breath, catch a glimpse of the misty Youth Section will be chosen.

... THEY'VE DONE IT. London Lab
don Party Youth Sub-Committee is planning a valuable week-end school for October 18/19. London comrades should note this date; the subject—Annual Conference 1958.

SHOREDITCH & FINSBURY, that enterprising North London Section has arranged a useful day school for Sunday, March 30th, at their Labour Hall, 114 Shep
erdess Walk, E1; there will be two sessions, the first, on 'Youth in Industry,' will be opened by Mike Kidron, Editor of SR; the second will be on 'Youth and the Labour Movement; all details of the arrangements for the school can be obtained from Shoreditch & Finsbury YS at Shepherdess Walk.

A meeting, a change, and a policy

WHEN THE ACM of the local Labour Party deprived the Youth Section of its usual meeting place, we had to look for other accommodation. We met in a member's house, and what a change there was!

Since last November when it was first formed, the Youth Section has been meeting under the nose of the parent party and subject to its close scrutiny. This time, no party officers were present and a very different atmosphere prevailed. The youth let their hair down and formalities disappeared.

At the end of the meeting, all agreed that it was the most successful yet held.

The whole episode shows the

The Fight for Socialism

by Michael Kidron

AS LONG AS EACH FACTORY, EACH shipyard, each shop is responsible to a single owner, or to a small group of owners, and as long as the only relationship existing between these groups of owners is competition, there can be no planning, no rational organization of production. This is what causes one of the most serious problems of capitalist production: on the one hand there is the most meticulous organization within each factory where every process is worked out to the last farthing, on the other hand you find complete chaos and anarchy in the relations between the various capitalist organizations.

An American Socialist, Max Shachtman, has described very exactly the disorganized way in which Capitalism does advance and the logical answer to such chaos. The trouble is that this expansion of production in boom times is in its very nature unplanned. For example, a 100 percent increase in wheat production does not require a 100 percent increase in the production of threshing machines. A 100 percent increase in the production of threshing machines may mean a 100 percent increase in the iron that goes into the machines, but only a 10 percent increase in the production of the tools by which the threshers are made. A 100 percent increase in the production of cotton textiles may require only a 25 percent increase in the production of textile machines. What is more, the small increase in textile machinery for one year may suffice to keep textile production at a higher rate for five years—the market for textiles themselves is more con
tinuous than the markets for textile machinery, the one is used up far more rapidly than the other.

"If all the capital which could be joined under one roof, and production centrally planned with meticulous care, it would be possible to work out a schedule of expansion for each industry so that each would develop in harmonious proportion to the other. Planning on a national scale (eventu
al on an international scale) could regulate the proportions in which each industry should be expanded so that the whole of economic life advances harmoniously. " (Max Shachtman, The Fight For Socialism, p. 51, New International Publishing Co., New York, 1946).

Even Partial Nationalization—a success story

IN BRITAIN only 20 percent of industry is nationalized—the deficit industries at that—and yet their success from a capitalist point of view, has been remarkable.

Before nationalization, the railway companies were running at a loss for a rate which, in one form or another, didn't make as much profit as other capitalist investments. So the Government stepped in with a subsidy, with loans and with other forms of aid, and guaranteed the railway owners a net profit of £40 million a year (1940) which was later raised to £54 (continued next page)
YOUNG SOCIALIST

FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM — continued

a year (1944). When vesting day came and the railways were nationalized the owners received compensation to the tune of £1,065 million which was saddled on to the nationalized industry. The British Transport Commission now has to pay £59 million a year (1950) in the form of interest and redemption of debentures. This, and in spite of the fact that British Transport doesn’t get one penny in Government aid, still makes a clear profit (441 million in 1950).

The same is true of the coal industry. Production has gone up by 25 million tons since nationalization. Output has risen by 2 cwt. per man-shift. The National Coal Board pays out over £21 million a year in interest and redemption to the ex-owners. It provides the steel and chemical capitalists with 20 million tons of coal a year at a price considerably below that for coal-for-the-grate. And yet it makes a profit and the miners-would have still been able to fight for and win a position as third in the wage list of the whole country (after being 62nd in the list for so long).

The cotton industry shows the same trend. A surplus has been accumulated since nationalization (profits in 1955-6: £19 million) while its output has increased by 95 per cent since nationalization (to be compared with a rise in manufacturing output of 54 per cent). Its prices have gone up less than those of any other major product. No wonder the Tory Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fuel and Power, Joynton-Hicks, hinted that the failure to expand has gone hand in hand with increased efficiency.” (Hansard, October 26th, 1953).

The cotton industry can tell the same story, so can the British Overseas Airway Corporation and the Bank of England—all nationalized, all profitable from a strictly capitalist viewpoint.

LIMITATIONS OF PARTIAL NATIONALIZATION

PARTIAL NATIONALIZATION may please the capitalists; it cannot satisfy a socialist. Not only has the state relieved the private capitalist of his least-profitable investments, now its state-capital sector still work in the interests of the private capitalist sector by paying huge compensation and by providing cheap services, but the state-capitalist sector is still caught up in the problems of capitalism.

POLICY

END CLASS EDUCATION

ABOLISH PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by Peter Ibbotson

SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialist democracy. One of the huddles in the path is the existence in the education field of two separate and distinct systems. Publicly attended schools are consolidated, the former caters for the great majority of the children’s lives; the latter for a small minority, some 5 percent. The former is paid for out of our rates and taxes; the latter is financed out of school fees and, in some cases, investment income, endowments, gifts, etc.

The existence of these two systems of education sharply divides the nation. It creates a rigid caste system—electricity deputed at a fee-paying school, outside the state system, gain thereby provision, social advantage; and often this advantage is in no way connected with academic or social advantage.

I call two witnesses to testify to the effect of the fee-paying system of education. The first is the Right Hon. G. Abingdon, who in his book The Middle Way (1938) said, “It is possible to conceive of a community in which would ... give us at the same time better education and less class antagonism. In so far as a community which has existed in this country, it is largely a product of class differences in education and opportunity.” The second is Sir John Maud who, as an Old Etonian and the first Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education, is in a position to speak with authority. In his book Local Government (1947) edition he writes “There is a great gulf between the private and public system of education ... and English education, unlike the American or the Continental, tends for better or for worse to emphasise distinctions of class.”

Entry Fee

The main citadel of class distinction in education is, of course, the huge school fees (largely boarding) known as the “public” schools. At these schools, parents pay large sums of money for their children’s education. The Eton, £443; Harrow, £426; Rugby £414; Winchester, £387; Stoove and Clifton, £398, and so on. Indeed, the average fee at a “public” school is over £200 a year, and on top of that the parents have to clothe their boys, keep them during the school holidays, and provide pocket money and holidays as well.

Clearly the “public” schools are the preserve of the wealthy. They are also necessarily attended by the cleverest boys in the country. Certainly there is a competitive entrance examination, the Public Schools Common Entrance Examination, but this is prepared for at special boarding schools known as preparatory (prep) schools which the sons of wealthy parents are sent to, or the private. Some between the ages of 8 and 13, at which age the Common Entrance is given. These schools are selected to teach their pupils only the subjects needed for the Common Entrance: English, French, Latin, history, geography, scripture, arithmetic, algebra and geometry; no science, be it noted. Fees at prep schools, especially at those with the highest reputation, are high; £250 a year and upwards being a common charge.

Payment for privilege

What do parents get for their money at these “public” schools? What are they about? At a state grammar school is the standard education higher than at a state grammar school. Where it is higher, it is due in the main to the better amenities at the “public” schools, and to the fact that the “public” schools attract teachers with higher qualifications than the state schools do. 

Classes in “public” schools are smaller than at state grammar schools; an average of 13 pupils per teacher against 15 in state grammar schools. And the “public” schools generally pay salaries in excess of those paid in the state system. 

What parents do get for their money is privilege. There is certainly a “public school free-masonry” which stands former generations of these school pupils in good stead when they have left school. For example, 65 out of Britain’s 305 Universties have a special quota for “public” schoolboys. Of the top managers in industry, 33 percent attended “public” schools. A higher per cent of higher Civil Servants were at “public” schools. 260 out of 840 Times correspondents in 1955 were ex-public school. Judges, Bishops, Colonial Governors, and senior officers in the armed forces, are often drawn from the ranks of former “public” schoolboys.

Attendance at “public” school is very helpful to those who wish to go to a university, particularly Oxford or Cambridge. In 1955, 53 percent of undergraduates newly admitted to Cambridge came from “public” schools; 42 percent at Oxford.

The role of the “public” schools today is to prepare their pupils for the right jobs, the right social circles. Their basic function is educational. And it is, in fact, the social function of the schools, which to parents justifies the high fees charged.

The existence of the “public” schools is an anachronism in present-day conditions when we (concluded next page)
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MARCH 9, 1763

THE GREATEST FIGURE in working-class journalism, on whom Marx modelled his style and whose writing left wing journalists of today cost a fortune to hire, was a 15-year-old printer’s apprentice, a supporter of tradition and authority. Cobett’s army background, his love of the English countryside and of the sturdy, independent yeoman with which his imagination peopled it, predisposed him to support the establishment and to look with suspicion and hostility on French Jacobins and English Radicals. In 1802 he founded the Weekly Political Register and, as a conscientious political journalist he learned, though slowly, where the responsibility for rural evictions and slum housing really lay.

In 1806 William Pitt, the drunken and misanthropic symbol of road-quarrying and embezzlement, was put on the table of the Army of All Talents” which succeeded to the government. Though there was a perceptible easing of repression it soon became clear that no reform would come from the “enlightened” school of British thought. Cobett, Francis Place, Sir Francis Burdett and Lord Cochrane began a campaign to mobilize public pressure for the return of radicals to Parliament. Burdett and Cochrane became MPs for Westminster—one of the few boroughs with any kind of popular franchise—in 1807, and with the support of Cobett’s paper, political radicalism re-emerged from underground.

REACTION AT HOME AND ABROAD

The program of the new radicalism was at first extremely limited. War-time conditions created a situation in which the House of Commons was corrupt beyond belief—bribery of electors by candidates and of MPs by the Government being accepted features of the constitution. While the war lasted, Cobett and the radicals called upon the Government to accept the principle of a parliamentary government with the aim of reducing taxes. The program appealed to those sections of the middle class which were being crushed by taxation without representation, and also to those who were now finding new forms of work, workers, slowly coming to realize that their misery was increased by high taxes on the necessities of life.

Cobett was well aware, however, of the connexion between a reactionary economic policy at home and reactionary political objectives abroad. The war against France, ostensibly for the defence of British sea lanes, was in reality an attempt to restore the fortunes of feudal monarchy in Europe. “The war, which began in 1793, is now over,” wrote Cobett on September 25, 1815: “The war which was all paid off, the account is not wound up, but the war is over. Social Order is restored: the arts of war, the power of the Bourbon Revolution is at an end; no change has been effected in England; our Bourgeois, and our Church, and Nobility and all have been preserved; our government tells us, that we have owed it all ourselves with glory...”

He turns to the workers

If parliament was to be reformed, however, so that the crushing weight of taxes might be relieved, the people—at least those of them who paid direct taxes—must be enfranchised. But the cause of reform was hampered by the strength of the urban working class and Cobett instinctively turned to that class...

POLITICAL SCHOOLS

are trying to establish democracy. Many people have put forward schemes for the “public” schools to recruit pupils only from the ranks of the wealthy, whereas they ought to be recruiting pupils from all strata of society. All schemes proposed by the “public” schools throughout the country are bullied by “reformers” such as the Bow Group, who insist on no control over the curriculum, and who believe that all schools should be state-supported, with no private fees, and no “middle class” or “upper class” schools to which none of the working class should be able to aspire. In other words, public money is to be used to subsidize private colleges—by which is merely infeasible.

Labour leader’s policy

Unfortunately, many prominent

Labour Party members have defended the “public” schools and have even designed schemes to open the doors of the “public” schools to the children of the workers. Finding these schemes involve, also, the subsidizing of the “public” schools with public money while leaving them free of public control. The class-consciousness of the workers is growing and the growth of the working-class would lose the cream of its intellect to the stifling atmosphere of privilege. The only solution which will satisfy a Socialist is that all the “public” schools, and their after-schools and prep schools, and their private fee-paying schools which subsidize a new form of scholastic snobbery, should be taken over by the state and turned into state schools. Preferably, they should be used not only for primary education but also for secondary education. Only by taking over the “public” and all other fee-paying schools as the National Association of Labour Teachers has argued (in an excellent pamphlet recently published) can we be assured of having a truly NATIONAL system of education. No longer class-divided, education would become an instrument for promoting social and hence national unity.

As it began, from the end of the war and for the first time in history, to emerge as an independent force in politics. His Weekly Political Register has cost a fortune to hire, and his “enlightened” school of working-class pocketbooks, though country workers had formed the habit of having extracts from the Register read to them in pubs.

The “Two Penny Trash”

In November 1816, he wrote the first of his “Addresses to the Journeymen and Labourers” which he published simultaneously in his ordinary edition and in a special two-penny edition which, since it contained no letters, was printed in the cheap half size, all only a twopence, a two-penny duty on newspapers. The venture was a huge success, and “Cobett’s Twopenny Trash,” as it was called by its critics and, long after, by reformers as a symbol of workers’ rights, became a reality. Cobett was no longer a middle class radical and champion of the rural workers. He had become the authentic spokesman and leader of the working class—the first leader of a workers’ mass movement in history.

In that eloquent first “Addresses to the Journeymen and Labourers,” Cobett wrote: “Whatever the Pride of rank, of riches or of scholarship may have induced some to believe, or to affect to believe, the real strength and success of the interests of a country, ever have sprung and ever must spring from the labour of its people... Elegant dressing, superb furniture, stately buildings, fine roads and canals, fine homes and carriages, numerous and stout ships, warehouses teeming with goods; all these, and many other objects that fall under the head of material wealth, are the fruits of the labour of the people. But all these spring from labour. Without the Journeymen and the labourers... the country would be a wilderness, hardly worth the notice of an invader.”

Cobett went on to demand the vote for everyone who paid direct taxes. Such a vote, he argued, would appeal to the conditions in which the workers were impoverished by indirect taxes, and he began to work for universal adult male suffrage, which was to become the central demand of the Chartist movement twenty years later.

THE LACK OF ORGANIZATION

Under conditions of post-war crisis in which falling prices and demobilization combined to cause mass unemployment, Cobett’s influence among the workers was immense and was being used to good effect. The strength of the urban working class, Cobett instinctively turned to that class...
PARLIAMENT

by MICHAEL MILLET

To the Parliament however, the cream of the joke is this; in the production of ordinary items like chairs and tables, cups and saucers, the output has to be sold to none other than the sort of people who made them. And when prices are added to the cost, which is made up of wages, however, can there be enough money to buy all the things made? If arms are made, this incoherence which leads to all those nasty slumps, is avoided. Instead, the Industrial Front

and add that the struggle for colonies has already twice in a lifetime landed us in a world war, and may do so again.

We can ask workers whether class peace and co-operation is worth Hiroshima or H-bombers. How will they answer all this out, we can yet support any action which workers want to take (e.g. the struggle for higher wages) in their own short-term interests.

While the Tory Government remains unconcerned it can fire on working class living standards, the respectable leaders of the Parliament, and Labour Party in particular, stand by and do nothing. Thus is created the apathy in the Labour movement which these selfsame Leaders so often complain about. Thus are many working and middle class people inevitably brought to say: "They are all alike, all out for themselves; who's the good of voting" - as at the last general election.

How to get rid of Tories

Meanwhile Socialists have got to destroy working class apathy by showing that the status quo can be changed, and that nothing is impossible. What should Socialists do by way of helping to change the present situation in the Labour movement?

It seems to us that in considering how to get rid of the Tories, the main thing is to fight against the right wing assumption that the only weapon allowable to Labour is the Parliamentary one.

To say that because Macmillan has a majority in Parliament, we must passively obey whatever policy he proclaims, and do nothing except wait for the next election (which may not come till 1969) is absolutely ridiculous. Yet that is the line laid down by right-wing leaders like Gaiskull, Morrison, Shawcross and their like. This is a time when Macmillan has the power to plunge us into an American Nuclear war any day — in fact, when the working classes, in one way or another, are taxed for armaments. This consumption goes to futility and waste but on the way profits are extracted — stable, easy profits.

For ruling classes rearmament is the best thing invented since the railways, which were equally useful to the Egyptian aristocracy.

What matters the danger — and it is a real one of a tremendous thermo-nuclear war compared to all these golden numbers? Tip people have always had a suspicion that Canada has a healthier climate.
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Americans can plunge us into it without even asking Macmillan's permission!

The old moral

The moral is the old moral which was familiar to the Labour movement 40 or 50 years ago: that Labour must use both political and industrial weapons in the struggle against capital.

Of course fight the Tories at every election, but also refuse to obey their exhortations to suspend wage claims for the sake of "the national interest."

Which nation

The "national interest" of the Tories is not our interest. Our interest is not to make Macmillan's job easy, but to make it difficult in every possible way. So press all wage claims; support all strikes, official or unofficial, large or small; repudiate all obligations to the capitalist state, till the Tories are kicked out by the combined industrial and political boot of organised Labour.

Root of evil

By showing how all the struggles of the moment for peace, for the struggle against the plan to build rocket-launching sites in Scotland are related to the struggle against the wage-and-profit system, that is, capitalism, we are actually fighting for the realization of the Socialist program: the nationalization of the means of production under workers' control.

And it is only with such a program clearly in mind, guiding every activity of the Movement, that we shall be able to use the strength to reject the current policy of making peace (with the bosses) in order to wage war (with H-bombs) and replace it by waging class war to win peace and the fulfillment of man.

JAMES D. YOUNG

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The Socialist Review stands for international socialism. Only the mass mobilization of the working class and the working class political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. This is why we believe that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power by means of the following programme:

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the railway network and the defense services with payment compensation based on a means test. Redistribution of nationalised industries without compensation. The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.

- The establishment of councils on the lines of the nationalised industries, i.e., a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and re-election, with a wage fund to operate wage rules in the industry.

- The inclusion of workers' representatives on the boards of all employers' associations, no less than 30% and preferably, more than 20 people. These representatives to have free access to all documents.

- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and dismissal of workers where more than 20 people are employed.

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

- The nationalisation of all social services by the payment of adequate pensions, linked to a realistic cost-of-living index, the nationalisation of all public services for the National Health Service and the development of one comprehensive nationwide service.

- The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities, with the nationalisation of all private and quasi private land.

- Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. Free comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants — without a means test — for all university students.

- Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights for all British citizens in relation to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom for the emigration of British workers to and from Britain.

- Freedom from political and economic oppression to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the under-developed world.

- The unification of an independent Ireland.

- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from the colonial dependencies.

- The abolition of all weapons of mass destruction.

- A Socialist foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow.
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